Similarly, recent developments in prenatal genetic testing raise critical issues. Since 2011, a new non-invasive prenatal test (NIPT) has been available to pregnant women during the first trimester of pregnancy to screen for Down syndrome. As it involves a simple maternal blood test, it is a more reliable technique, safer for the fetus, and can be used earlier in the pregnancy compared to previous methods for this type of genetic screening. According to a number of experts, these characteristics, together with the commercial interests supporting the routine use of NIPT, may put more pressure on women, who have to carry the moral burden of deciding whether or not to have this test, while not being adequately informed by medical staff about this decision.[[i]](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/" \l "m_8180782956259405939__edn1" \o ") Furthermore, the number of conditions that can be detected through NIPT keeps growing, so that it should soon be able to offer a wide range of genetic information about the fetus. This raises the question of whether obtaining more genetic information about a fetus is a positive development from an individual and societal point of view. To what extent are we protecting the right of pregnant women not to know the likelihood of atypical genetic conditions in their fetuses? At the societal level, does prenatal genetic testing encourage eugenics?
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