ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS AND MEDICAL ETHICS IN THE CONTEMPORARY HEALTHCARE SYSTEM

Daniel-Dumitru Guse, *PhD Student, Doctoral School of International Business and Economics, Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Romania*

Camelia Petrescu, *Senior Researcher II, Institute for Research, Development and Innovation, Titu Maiorescu University, Bucharest, Romania*

https://doi.org/10.66793/titue19proceeding12

ABSTRACT

Today's healthcare systems face challenges that go beyond the limits of traditional medicine. Technology, economic constraints, and demographic shifts reshape medical decision-making and the relationship between patients and healthcare institutions. In this context, medical ethics and patient rights become essential anchors for balancing technological progress, financial sustainability, and human dignity. This paper explores the foundations of modern medical ethics and the extension of its principles into the economic dimension of healthcare. It examines key issues such as patient autonomy, confidentiality, equity in resource allocation, responsibility in using digital technologies, and the relationship between efficiency and social justice. It also analyzes the economic effects of moral decisions and the costs generated by violations of patient rights. The findings support the idea that effective healthcare governance requires a strong ethical framework. Moral values do not conflict with economic rationality—they enhance it: ethics reduces waste, strengthens trust, and improves care quality. In a world increasingly driven by data, algorithms, and performance metrics, responsibility toward the human person remains the core criterion of a fair and sustainable health economy.

I. FOUNDATIONS OF MEDICAL ETHICS

Ethics, as a fundamental branch of philosophy, explores moral issues and seeks answers to questions such as what is right or wrong and how one ought to act. Contemporary medical ethics evolved in response to increasingly complex moral dilemmas arising from modern healthcare. Bioethics, a field of applied ethics, focuses on conflicts stemming from moral obligations in medical contexts and aims to find appropriate resolutions. Unlike abstract morality, which attempts to distinguish good from evil in absolute terms, bioethics guides healthcare professionals in specific situations, addressing their responsibilities toward patients and society. Ethics, in this sense, does not function as an infallible judge but as a practical tool to support morally sound decisions in clinical settings. A scenario becomes ethically relevant only when it involves a choice between alternatives. Without options, ethical reasoning has no ground. Medicine—often faced with decisions about life, death, and quality of life—provides fertile ground for such reasoning.

Medical deontology, by contrast, defines the ethical framework specific to healthcare professionals. The term comes from the Greek word "deon" (duty) and reflects the obligations and principles that physicians and nurses must uphold in their practice. Deontology outlines ethical standards of professional behavior aimed at maximizing patient benefit. It encodes duties such as respecting confidentiality, prioritizing the patient's health and life, maintaining collegial relationships, and acting with honesty and integrity. A historical example is the Hippocratic Oath. In modern times, ethical guidelines have been formally adopted, such as the International Code of Medical Ethics ratified by the World Medical Association in 1949, which has influenced many national codes. Deontology and bioethics are closely linked: the former sets clear professional duties, while the latter offers a broader reflection on moral values that often go beyond formal codes.

One of the defining concepts of modern bioethics is respect for patient autonomy, which marks a departure from past paternalistic traditions. Today, competent adult patients have the right to make informed decisions about their medical treatment, and physicians are ethically required to honor those decisions. The core principle of modern medical ethics is precisely this respect for autonomy, reflected through the practice of informed consent. Still, autonomy is not the only guiding principle. According to the classic principlism model proposed by Beauchamp and Childress, four key principles govern ethical medical practice: autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice. Additional values—such as personal dignity, truthfulness, and integrity—shape day-to-day clinical judgment and form the basis for analyzing ethical dilemmas.

As bioethics developed, the concept of patient rights also emerged. These rights express the ethical and legal protection of the core values of individuals receiving medical care. Seen as a practical application of moral principles, patient rights legally formalize respect for autonomy, dignity, privacy, and other essential elements of the doctor–patient relationship.

Autonomy affirms a patient's right to make informed and voluntary decisions about personal healthcare. When a physician disregards this autonomy by overriding the patient's decision in favor of their own judgment, the practice becomes paternalistic.

Informed consent extends autonomy and includes various forms. Implicit consent applies when a healthcare provider interprets a patient's actions or body language as agreement to proceed with a medical intervention.

The ethical duty of truth-telling requires physicians to communicate all relevant medical information to patients, enabling them to understand their condition and make well-informed decisions. This practice supports both autonomy and consent.

Confidentiality safeguards private medical data, ensuring access only for individuals authorized by the patient through explicit consent. Trust between healthcare professionals and patients depends on confidentiality. Exceptions may apply when disclosure is mandated by court order or is necessary to prevent harm to public safety.

Preserving life represents another key ethical commitment. Physicians aim to treat illness with the intent of prolonging life, in line with the general expectations of patients. Still, this principle may be limited by advance directives or formal statements in which patients decline resuscitation or certain interventions.

Justice refers to the fair allocation of resources and opportunities within society. In medicine, it addresses how healthcare services and treatments are distributed. Ethical models may emphasize equality (egalitarianism) or the maximization of overall well-being (utilitarianism). Medical deontology refers to the professional ethical framework that governs healthcare workers' conduct. It includes duties to maintain confidentiality, to act responsibly for the patient's health and life, and to maintain respectful peer relationships. Physicians are expected to use their knowledge fully and focus on relieving suffering or restoring health. Information provided to patients must serve their benefit and strengthen the therapeutic relationship.

Patient autonomy, seen as a right, means that each individual has the freedom to decide regarding the medical act that concerns them, after receiving correct information about the options. In Romania, Law no. 46/2003 on patient rights clearly states that "the patient has the right to refuse or stop a medical intervention, in writing, taking responsibility for their decision; the consequences of the refusal or stopping of medical acts must be explained to the patient." Such provisions strengthen the principle of autonomy: the final decision belongs to the patient, and the role of the doctor is to ensure that the patient understood the implications of the decision. Alongside autonomy, dignity constitutes a central pillar of patient rights. Every human being has intrinsic value, and the quality of being a patient does not diminish this value – on the contrary, it imposes additional consideration and sensitivity from the medical staff. To treat a patient with dignity means to respect them as a person, without reducing them to their illness or symptoms and without showing condescending or discriminatory attitudes. Romanian law provides that "the patient has the right to be respected as a human being, without any discrimination." Another essential right is that related to confidentiality and private life. The doctor–patient relationship involves trust, and the patient needs the assurance that their personal information remains protected. Confidentiality constitutes a professional obligation and a legal right. According to Romanian law, "all information regarding the patient's condition, the results of investigations, the diagnosis, prognosis, treatment, personal data are confidential, even after their death."

Autonomy, dignity, and confidentiality form the fundamental triad of patient rights, which reflects the value of the human person in the medical context. They oblige the doctor to adopt a position of respect and partnership toward the patient: the doctor uses their knowledge and skill to heal or alleviate, but does so together with the patient, not against their will, and always with consideration for the person in suffering. These rights are not mere theoretical

ideals but operational principles, inscribed in laws, ethical codes, and policies of healthcare institutions, meant to guide day-to-day clinical conduct.

Persons with disabilities constitute a vulnerable and heterogeneous group, since disabilities can be of very different natures – physical, sensory, intellectual, or psychological – and the degree of impairment varies greatly from one individual to another. What they have in common is the risk that the medical system (and society in general) may not accommodate their special needs and rights. A person with a severe intellectual disability, for example, may be incapable of giving informed consent, which places them in total dependence on the decisions of guardians and doctors. Ethics requires that in such cases doctors act with careful paternalism, in the patient's best interest, but also with maximum respect for their dignity – even if the person cannot understand, they surely feel the attitude of those around them, and the way they are treated matters deeply. People with intellectual disabilities often need explanations adapted to their abilities, more patience, and the involvement of specialists (psychologists, social workers) in communication. On the other hand, people with physical or sensory disabilities (for example, paraplegia, blindness, deafness) may be fully mentally capable to decide, but encounter practical barriers and prejudices. A common mistake is assuming that a person who cannot see or walk is not capable of understanding. Such patients must be treated as equal partners in medical discussions, and the medical team must provide them with appropriate means of communication. In the case of a deaf person, this may mean the presence of a sign language interpreter or providing information in writing. For a blind person, it is necessary to read documents and forms aloud. Immobilized patients must benefit from easy access in medical spaces, through adapted infrastructure. From a legal standpoint, many states, including Romania, have regulations that protect the rights of persons with disabilities, ensuring equal access to health services. In this context, ethics meets social justice: treating unequally those already disadvantaged means committing a double injustice. By offering compensations and reasonable solutions – such as access ramps, alternative methods of communication, and trained staff for special needs – the medical system fulfills its obligation to guarantee everyone fair chances for care. A distinct domain is represented by vulnerable patients involved in medical research or clinical studies. Children, persons with intellectual disabilities, institutionalized patients, or those dependent on caregivers are considered vulnerable categories and require additional protections to prevent any form of exploitation. The principle is that no vulnerable patient should be involved in biomedical research if we risk violating their rights or if they cannot clearly benefit from the research results, except under strict conditions (consent from a representative, minimal risk, direct potential benefit, special approval from an ethics committee, etc.). The same increased care applies in the clinical context as well: for example, a very elderly patient with no family should not become the subject of questionable decisions (such as stopping treatment or transferring them) just because "no one is asking about them." Vulnerability calls for responsibility – this is the ethical credo. Medical staff have the duty to act on behalf of the vulnerable to protect their rights and interests. This requires both individual moral conscience (each doctor or nurse must act as an advocate for their vulnerable patient) and institutional mechanisms (laws, procedures) to prevent abuse or neglect.

Children, the elderly, and persons with disabilities illustrate different facets of vulnerability in medicine. Each situation requires a balance between respecting, as much as possible, the autonomy of these patients and ensuring their protection when they cannot protect themselves. Empathy, patience, and a personalized approach are essential. A society and a medical system can be judged by the way they treat their most vulnerable members; the ethical standard requires us to offer them more care, not less, precisely because they need additional support. By ensuring fair treatment and compassion for these categories, medicine affirms not only its technical efficiency but also its deep humanism.

II. DIGITAL ETHICS: ELECTRONIC MEDICAL RECORDS, TELEMEDICINE, ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

The rapid technological advancement of recent decades has brought to the forefront new topics of ethical reflection in medicine, often grouped under the term digital ethics or e-health ethics. From the digitization of medical records and the expansion of telemedicine to the use of artificial intelligence (AI) in diagnosis and treatment, the digital environment raises specific issues related to confidentiality, data security, responsibility, and the nature of the doctor–patient relationship. The fundamental ethical principles remain valid here as well, but the way they are applied requires certain adjustments and clarifications in the context of new technologies. The electronic medical record (EMR), or the patient's electronic file, has replaced old paper registries in many places. The advantages are clear: rapid access to information from anywhere, easy sharing among specialists, storage of a large volume of data (including imaging, test results, complete history), and the possibility to use software that warns about drug interactions or assists in clinical decisions. However, as the medical record has become digital and interconnected, the risks to data confidentiality have increased. A basic principle of ethics, confidentiality, must be rethought in the digital age in terms of cybersecurity. Electronically stored medical data can be vulnerable to unauthorized

access (hacking), security breaches, or even internal abuse (medical staff accessing a patient's data without professional justification).

In the European Union, the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) explicitly classifies health data as sensitive data requiring enhanced protection. This means that hospitals and clinics have the legal (and ethical) obligation to implement strict measures: secure IT systems, authentication protocols for record access, access logging, and, very importantly, the patient's consent for the processing of their data. The patient has the right to know who accesses their record and for what purpose, the right to request correction of any errors, and, in some systems, even the right to data portability (transfer of their medical history if they change healthcare providers). From an ethical perspective, digitalization does not change the nature of confidentiality, only the means: doctors and institutions must exercise the same care in preserving professional secrecy, whether the information is on paper or in the cloud. Also, transparency toward the patient is crucial—for example, if a security breach occurs and data is lost or exposed, honesty requires informing the affected patients and taking remedial action.

Telemedicine, meaning the provision of medical services at a distance via phone, videoconference, or online applications, has seen accelerated development, especially after the global pandemic that began in 2020. This model of care allows patients to access consultations without the need to travel and, at times, gives them the opportunity to reach a specialist more quickly, especially in remote areas or in conditions of reduced mobility. The rapid technological advance of recent decades has brought to the forefront new subjects of ethical reflection in medicine, often grouped under the term digital ethics or e-health ethics. From the digitalization of medical records and the expansion of telemedicine to the use of artificial intelligence (AI) in diagnosis and treatment, the digital environment raises specific issues related to confidentiality, data security, responsibility, and the nature of the doctor–patient relationship. The fundamental ethical principles remain valid here as well, but their application requires certain adjustments and clarifications in the context of new technologies. The electronic medical record (EMR), or the patient's electronic file, has replaced in many places the old paper registers. The advantages are clear: fast access to information from anywhere, easy sharing between specialists, storage of a large volume of data (including imaging, analyses, complete history), and the possibility of using software that alerts about drug interactions or assists in clinical decisions. However, as the medical record has become digital and interconnected, the risks to data confidentiality have increased. A basic principle of ethics, confidentiality, must be rethought in the digital age in terms of information security. Medical data stored electronically can be vulnerable to unauthorized access (hacking), to security breaches, or even to internal abuse (medical personnel accessing a patient's data without having a professional reason).

In the European Union, the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) explicitly classifies health data as sensitive data that require increased protection. This means that hospitals and clinics have the legal (and ethical) obligation to implement strict measures: secured IT systems, authentication protocols for accessing files, access logging, and, very importantly, the patient's consent for the processing of their data. The patient has the right to know who accesses their file and for what purpose, has the right to request correction of any errors, and, in some systems, even the right to data portability (transfer of medical history if changing the healthcare provider). From an ethical perspective, digitalization does not change the nature of confidentiality, only the means: doctors and institutions must show the same care in preserving professional secrecy, whether the information is on paper or in the cloud. Also, transparency towards the patient is crucial – for example, if a security breach occurs and data is lost or exposed, honesty requires informing the affected patients and taking remedial measures. Telemedicine, meaning the provision of medical services at a distance through phone, videoconference, or online applications, has seen accelerated development, especially following the global pandemic triggered in 2020. This model of care allows patients to access consultations without needing to travel and sometimes gives them the opportunity to reach a specialist more quickly, especially in isolated areas or in conditions of reduced mobility.

From an ethical point of view, telemedicine opens up a series of challenges and obligations. First, the confidentiality and privacy of the consultation must be protected at the same level as in the traditional context. The doctor and the patient must have the discussion in a private space, without the risk of third parties listening or intervening. Also, the platform used must be secured and encrypted, and the systems that store the data generated – such as audio-video recordings or images – must comply with personal data protection regulations. Second, the quality of the medical act must not be compromised – the doctor has the duty to recognize their limits: not every issue can be solved remotely, and if the remote consultation is insufficient, the patient must be directed to an in-person consultation. Deontological codes underline that the ethical principles of the profession are the same in telemedicine; for example, the doctor must not issue a prescription or an online diagnosis if the information obtained is insufficient, merely for the sake of convenience.

Another aspect is the doctor–patient relationship and consent: before starting a telemedicine consultation, the patient should be informed that they are in a different context (for example, that the doctor cannot physically examine them) and must give their consent for this type of interaction. Many patients are delighted by the convenience, but some may be reluctant or anxious about the technology – the doctor must be attentive to these aspects. Also, the transmitted data must be protected: test results, images sent by the patient, etc. – all fall under medical confidentiality.

Telemedicine also raises the issue of equity: not all patients (especially the elderly or those from disadvantaged environments) have access to quality internet or to the digital skills required; health systems must avoid creating a "digital gap" that disadvantages precisely the vulnerable categories. Ethically, the adoption of telemedicine therefore requires accompanying educational measures (for patients and doctors) and standards of good practice to ensure that the patient receives care just as conscientiously as in person. A principle often stated is that technology must serve the patient, not the patient having to adapt forcibly to technology. In other words, the patient's dignity and interest remain the focus, and telemedicine is only a tool serving these aims. Artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning algorithms have begun to be used in medicine for various purposes: interpreting X-rays and CTs, analyzing genomic data, predicting disease risk, assistance in clinical decision-making, or even patient triage. AI promises increased efficiency and accuracy in diagnosis and treatment, but its introduction raises multiple ethical problems.

One of the concerns is responsibility and decisional transparency. If an algorithm suggests a diagnosis or a treatment option, who bears the responsibility for the accuracy of that suggestion? The attending physician is the one who remains responsible for all decisions made regarding the patient. Therefore, AI systems must be seen as a decision support, not as substitutes for medical reasoning. From an ethical point of view, the doctor should not rely blindly on a result offered by a computer. They must understand the conditions under which that system was created and use the data provided by it only together with their own observations and knowledge about the patient. Another important aspect is transparency. Many programs using artificial intelligence offer a result but do not show clearly how it was obtained. For example, if a program indicates a diagnosis, it is important to know which tests or information were taken into account. Without these explanations, the patient cannot understand how a certain conclusion was reached, and trust can be affected. There is also another problem: some programs are "trained" with data that is not sufficiently diverse. If a system was built using only information from certain categories of people (for example, only men or only people from a certain region), it may produce incorrect results for other patients who do not fit that pattern. This can lead to weaker treatments or even diagnostic errors. To avoid such injustices, these systems must be tested on different patient groups, and any problems must be corrected constantly.

Briefly, technology can bring significant benefits to medicine, but it must be used carefully, with critical thinking, and always under the responsibility of the physician, whose duty is to act in the patient's best interest.

Confidentiality also needs to be reconsidered in the context of AI. Artificial intelligence systems require large volumes of medical data for training. These data come from real patients' records. Even if anonymized, there is still a risk of re-identification or use in ways the patients have not explicitly consented to. A well-known ethical controversy involves situations where hospitals grant tech companies access to thousands of X-rays or clinical files to develop automated systems. If this data sharing occurs without patients' knowledge, it raises serious ethical concerns. In this context, transparency and explicit consent from patients regarding the use of their data for research purposes become essential. Some experts propose the idea of extended consent or even institutional responsibility: hospitals should manage data in the patient's exclusive interest, with respect and clear approval. Beyond data use, questions also arise about the human relationship in medicine. Medicine is not just about diagnosis and treatment—it also involves empathetic communication and emotional support. If patients end up interacting more with automated systems—like programs that ask questions—than with real doctors, a vital component of care is lost: active listening, understanding personal context, and tailoring advice to individual needs. Therefore, technology should assist, not replace, the human connection. For example, if an automated system handles repetitive tasks like documentation or lab result interpretation, the physician can devote more time to the patient and provide personalized attention. Digital ethics remains an expanding field. Organizations like the World Medical Association and national authorities are drafting guidelines that establish clear rules for the appropriate use of digital technology in healthcare. However, the fundamental values of medical ethics—confidentiality, autonomy, patient welfare, equity, and dignity—must remain intact, regardless of the tools involved. Technology may change procedures, but it must not alter the principles that define medical practice. Young doctors, including today's students, bear the responsibility of integrating these values into new digital contexts and transforming them into a foundation for a modern yet deeply humane medicine.

III. ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS IN THE CONTEMPORARY HEALTHCARE SYSTEM

The rising costs of healthcare and budgetary constraints require a rethinking of the relationship between ethical values and economic decisions. Today's healthcare systems face a dual challenge: protecting human dignity while ensuring financial sustainability. Medical ethics can no longer be treated as separate from economic analysis, because every resource allocation decision affects patients' rights, and every clinical choice comes with an opportunity cost. Ethical principles such as autonomy, the right to equitable treatment, and protection of privacy directly shape how resources are allocated and prioritized. For example, respecting informed consent requires more time for consultations, additional training for staff, and adapted administrative systems—all of which involve real costs. On the other hand, disregarding these rights produces indirect economic consequences: increased litigation, deterioration of the doctor–patient relationship, and declining public trust in the healthcare system. Western European models offer practical solutions. In France, the health technology assessment system (HAS) incorporates both cost-efficiency and ethical criteria such as disease severity and inequalities in access. Sweden applies a hierarchy of principles: human dignity, medical need, and economic efficiency, in that order. This means that life-saving treatments receive priority, even if they are not the most cost-effective. Romania lacks a coherent legal framework that integrates economic evaluation with ethical criteria, leading to unequal allocations, non-transparent waiting lists, and informal pressures on decision-makers. Medical innovations further complicate this intersection. Orphan drugs, gene therapies, and AI-based technologies can bring significant benefits, but at very high costs. From an ethical standpoint, denying reimbursement for innovative therapies raises questions about equality in the right to health. From an economic perspective, reimbursing these treatments for all patients may destabilize the national health budget. This is where economic ethics plays a role: defining legitimate prioritization criteria, such as the social impact of the disease, incremental efficiency, and quality-adjusted life years (QALYs).

Additionally, systems must decide which treatments will be publicly funded and which will fall under the patient's responsibility. If these decisions lack transparency and ethical foundations, inequalities deepen and vulnerable groups face exclusion. In Romania, informal payments and out-of-pocket costs burden low-income households and discourage access to complex treatments. Integrating ethics into economic analysis requires a paradigm shift in how health policies are designed and implemented. The goal is not to oppose what is ethical to what is financially efficient, but to build a decision-making framework in which both dimensions reinforce each other.

A clear example is the Health Technology Assessment (HTA) process. In its most advanced forms, HTA goes beyond cost-efficiency calculations to include considerations such as equity, impact on vulnerable groups, patient preferences, and the broader social consequences of reimbursement decisions. A drug for a rare disease, for instance, might not meet traditional cost-effectiveness thresholds but may still be approved based on ethical arguments related to urgent need and lack of alternative treatments.

To make this kind of reasoning the rule rather than the exception, healthcare systems must establish clear institutional mechanisms. Decision-making committees should include experts from complementary fields—health economists, bioethicists, clinicians, patient representatives—to ensure a multidimensional evaluation. Each medical option should be assessed not only in terms of budgetary impact but also its ethical and social value. In the absence of such structures, there is a risk of unbalanced decisions driven either by financial pressures or by emotionally charged arguments lacking economic foundation. In Romania, for example, the lack of a formal prioritization framework leads to decisions that are often arbitrary or inconsistent. This results in systemic inefficiency and a widespread perception of unfairness, which directly undermines public trust in healthcare institutions.

Incorporating ethics into health economics also requires transparent criteria for resource allocation. When public budgets are limited, prioritization must be based on shared and clearly defined principles: severity of disease, net therapeutic benefit, marginal cost, risk of social exclusion, protection of minorities, or prevention of medical poverty. These principles must be applied clearly, consistently, and with justifiable rationale.

At the same time, ethical values contribute to economic stability. A strong ethical framework reduces litigation risk, limits conflicts of interest, improves transparency in public procurement, and leads to better-targeted spending. For example, well-grounded ethical decisions on end-of-life care can avoid costly and medically futile interventions, reallocating funds to more effective and humane palliative care.

This combined ethical and economic approach is increasingly vital in today's global context, shaped by rapid demographic shifts, recurring health crises, and growing pressure on public budgets. Health policies that fail to

integrate equity, efficiency, and moral responsibility risk losing both public support and the ability to achieve meaningful health outcomes.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Contemporary health systems must simultaneously respond to complex and often contradictory needs: universal access, high quality, financial sustainability, and the integration of innovation. In this context, a rigid separation between ethics and economics has proven ineffective. Policies that ignore the ethical implications of resource allocation lead to inequities and discrimination, while decisions based solely on moral principles but lacking financial grounding become impossible to implement.

One of the most important lessons drawn from the current analysis is the need for an integrated approach. Medical ethics must move beyond abstract normative discourse and actively contribute to the decision-making process in health planning. It is no longer enough to state that all patients deserve the same treatment. It is essential to determine under what conditions resources can be distributed fairly and sustainably, who decides these allocations, and what the direct consequences of different choices are.
The economic dimension has often been perceived as a restriction imposed on ethics: lack of funds, high costs, shortage of personnel. However, in reality, ethics can guide economics toward human-centered efficiency. For example, respecting informed consent is not only a moral obligation but also reduces the risk of litigation, increases patient satisfaction, and fosters a more effective doctor–patient relationship. Ethically applied reasoning generates significant indirect economic benefits. Digital technologies and artificial intelligence emphasize this interdependence. They offer opportunities to reduce costs and expand access, but also raise major challenges related to confidentiality, equity, and accountability. If implemented without a solid ethical foundation, these technologies can reinforce existing inequalities or lead to non-transparent and unjust algorithmic decisions. The use of personal data without informed consent or the automation of decision-making without human validation risks deeply undermining trust in the medical system. Another crucial direction is reforming governance in the healthcare sector. Decisions regarding reimbursements, infrastructure investment, or treatment prioritization can no longer be made exclusively by administrative bodies or based on accounting criteria. An institutional framework is needed that includes experts from multiple fields—public health, economics, bioethics, law, and patient representatives—to ensure a deliberative, transparent, legitimate, and justifiable process. Only in this way can health policies be transformed from mere reactions to crises into instruments that balance what is efficient, fair, and socially acceptable. In conclusion, the sustainability of health systems does not derive solely from budget optimization, but from embracing clear principles that balance economic efficiency and respect for human dignity. A mature health economy cannot exist without ethics integrated into every stage of decision-making. And a modern medical ethics, without a solid economic understanding, risks remaining an inoperative ideal. Only through this coherence between values and resources can a functional, fair, and sustainable healthcare system be built.

REFERENCES

1. Alhomidan, Z. S., Albaqami, N. M., Alshehri, A. A. et al. (2025). *Confidentiality in the era of electronic health records: ethical challenges and solutions*. International Journal of Community Medicine and Public Health, 12(4).
2. Andrews, B. P. (2024). *Medical Ethics and Physician Motivations*. Journal of Health Economics, 98, 102933.
3. Beauchamp, T. L. & Childress, J. F. (2019). *Principles of Biomedical Ethics* (ed. a 8-a). Oxford University Press.
4. Bognar, G. & Hirose, I. (2022). *The Ethics of Health Care Rationing: An Introduction* (ed. a 2-a). Routledge.
5. Colegiul Medicilor din România (CMR). (2016). *Codul de deontologie medicală al CMR* (Hotărârea nr. 3/2016, Monitorul Oficial nr. 981/2016).

6. Comisia Europeană – Observatorul European pentru Sisteme și Politici de Sănătate. (2019). *Towards a sustainable health system: balancing equity, quality and financial efficiency*. Brussels: European Commission.
7. Daniels, N. (2016). *Resource Allocation and Priority Setting*. În Barrett, D. H. et al. (Eds.), *Public Health Ethics: Cases Spanning the Globe*, pp. 61–94. Springer, Cham.
8. High-Level Expert Group on Artificial Intelligence (EU). (2019). *Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy AI*. Comisia Europeană, Bruxelles.
9. Kim, D. D. & Basu, A. (2021). *How Does Cost-Effectiveness Analysis Inform Health Care Decisions?* AMA Journal of Ethics, 23(8), E639–647.
10. Lane, H., Sarkies, M., Martin, J. & Haines, T. (2017). *Equity in healthcare resource allocation decision making: A systematic review*. Social Science & Medicine, 175, 11–27.
11. Nittari, G., Khuman, R., Baldoni, S. et al. (2020). *Telemedicine Practice: Review of the Current Ethical and Legal Challenges*. Telemedicine and e-Health, 26(12), 1427–1437.
12. OMS. (2021). *Ethics and governance of artificial intelligence for health*. Geneva: WHO.