Important issues are also raised by recent developments in prenatal genetic testing. Since 2011, a new non-invasive prenatal test (NIPT) has been offered to pregnant women during the first trimester of pregnancy to screen for Down syndrome. Consisting of a simple sample of the mother’s blood, the technique is more reliable, safer for the foetus, and can be used earlier in the pregnancy than the previous method for this kind of genetic screening. According to some specialists, these features, in conjunction with the commercial interests in making in NIPTs a routine practice, risk increasing pressure on women, who find themselves with the moral burden of deciding whether or not to agree to the test, without being well informed by medical personnel in making this decision.[[i]](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/" \l "m_8180782956259405939__edn1" \o ") In addition, the number of conditions NIPTs can detect is steadily increasing, to the point where it will soon be able to offer a wide range of genetic information about the foetus. We have reason to ask ourselves whether the possibility of obtaining more information about the foetus is a positive development from an individual and societal point of view. To what extent are we preserving the right of pregnant women to not be informed of the likelihood that their foetus presents atypical genetic conditions? On the level of society, doesn’t prenatal genetic screening encourage eugenics?
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