Some important issues have also been raised by recent developments in prenatal genetic testing. Since 2011, a new non-invasive prenatal test (NIPT) designed to detect Down’s syndrome has been offered to women during their first trimester of pregnancy. Consisting simply of a maternal blood sample, this is a more reliable technique, safer for the foetus, and one which may be used earlier on in the pregnancy than the method previously used for this type of genetic screening. According to some specialists, these attributes, combined with the commercial interests in favour of NIPT, risk increasing the pressure placed on the women, who find themselves wrestling with the moral quandary of deciding whether or not to have the test, without necessarily being well-informed by medical staff when faced with the decision.[[i]](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/" \l "https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/" \o ") What’s more, the number of conditions for which NIPT is capable of screening is continually increasing, so much so that soon it should be possible to obtain a wide range of genetic information about the foetus. It is questionable as to whether the capacity for obtaining an increased amount of genetic information about a foetus is a positive development, from both individual and societal standpoints. To what extent are we preserving the rights of pregnant women to remain uninformed about the possibility that their foetus may carry atypical genetic conditions? On a societal level, is prenatal genetic screening not perhaps encouraging eugenics?
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