

Clinical ethics: Consent for vaccination in children

Dominic JC Wilkinson<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Antonia McBride<sup>4</sup>

**Affiliations:** 1. Oxford Uehiro Centre for Practical Ethics, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Oxford, UK. 2. John Radcliffe Hospital, Oxford, UK 3. Murdoch Children's Research Institute, Melbourne, Australia. 4. Alder Hey Children's Hospital

**Correspondence:** Prof Dominic Wilkinson, Oxford Uehiro Centre for Practical Ethics, Suite 8, Littlegate House, St Ebbes St, Oxford, OX1 1PT, UK. Tel: +44 1865 286888, Fax: +44 1865 286886 Email: dominic.wilkinson@philosophy.ox.ac.uk

**Funding:** This research was funded in whole, or in part, by the Wellcome Trust [203132/Z/16/Z] and by the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) as part of the UK Research and Innovation rapid response to Covid-19 [AH/V013947/1]. The funders had no role in the preparation of this manuscript or the decision to submit for publication. For the purpose of open access, the author has applied a CC BY public copyright licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising from this submission.

**Acknowledgements:** The authors are very grateful for extremely helpful feedback from Mr Robert Wheeler, Dr Steven Turner, Dr Maggie Wearmouth

**Conflicts of interest:** The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in Archives of Disease in Childhood and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights,

as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge (“APC”) for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

The prospect of vaccinating children and young people (CYP) against COVID raises questions that apply more widely to vaccination in children. When can CYP consent, on their own, for vaccination? What should happen if children and their parents disagree about the desirability of a vaccine? When, if ever, should vaccination proceed despite a child's dissent or apparent refusal? A range of ethical dilemmas may arise. (Box 1) In this article, we will address general ethical issues relating to consent for vaccination, highlighting their relevance to COVID. We will not address the wider ethical questions of whether or when children should be vaccinated against COVID.

- A. Two parents disagree about vaccination for a young child (one supports, the other is opposed)
- B. Both parents support vaccination, but a three-year old child cries vigorously and tries to escape when vaccination is attempted
- C. A twelve-year old requests a vaccine in the absence of parental permission (eg in a school vaccination program)
- D. Parents decline vaccination, but an adolescent requests vaccination
- E. Parents support vaccination but an adolescent refuses

Box 1. Ethical dilemmas relating to vaccine consent for children and young people

### **Parental consent**

In general, parents play a key role in making decisions about medical treatment and procedures in their children. Except in an emergency, informed consent is always sought from a caregiver with parental responsibility prior to significant medical interventions. For childhood vaccinations in the UK consent from parents is currently routinely required, though some groups have argued that mandatory vaccination would promote children's best interests. If parents decline immunisations after being counselled about the evidence for vaccine safety and efficacy, their decision would usually be respected. Rarely vaccination may proceed against parental wishes; for example, for a child in care, or a child at particularly high risk from a specific infection, although this would usually require a Best Interests decision by a court.

As with other medical procedures, consent from a single adult with parental responsibility is sufficient for vaccination to proceed. However, if it is known that the parents have opposing views (case #A), health professionals should encourage them to reach consensus. In cases of persistent parental disagreement, one parent may apply to the court for a "specific issue order". In that situation, the courts have generally taken the view that it would be in the child's best interests to receive vaccines that are on the current immunisation schedule and authorised immunisation.<sup>1</sup> In a recent case, the court declined to rule on COVID vaccination (since it was not at the time approved for children), but the judge noted: "it is very difficult to foresee a situation in which a vaccination against COVID approved for use in children would not be endorsed by the court as being in a child's best interests".<sup>3</sup>

### **Child assent**

Many childhood immunisations are given prior to a child having sufficient maturity to make an informed decision for themselves. However, it is widely accepted that it is important to

---

<sup>1</sup> A version of this paper with additional references can be found on PhilArchive:  
<https://philarchive.org/archive/WILCEC-3>

involve children in medical decisions as much as practicable. For primary school-age children, their agreement would typically be sought even though they are not able to consent. “Assent” is a concept used more often in relation to research; it refers to the agreement of a child or young person who is not legally able to give informed consent. Ideally, the child should be provided with age-appropriate information or explanation. Assent might be verbalised, or simply inferred from sitting still for the injection.

### **Child dissent**

In a pre-school child or infant, behavioural or verbal evidence of not wanting immunisation is common, developmentally appropriate and may be unavoidable (Case #B). Comfort holding or gentle firm restraint are commonly used by parents or health professionals in these settings.<sup>4</sup> Such restraint may be ethically justified if it is unavoidable and the procedure is in the child’s best interests.<sup>1</sup> However, efforts should be made to use other techniques (analgesia, distraction, play therapy, age-appropriate explanation etc.) before resorting to restraint, and parents should be involved in the discussion about how best to gain their child’s cooperation. If a child is particularly distressed at the prospect of immunisation, it may be best to defer, seek the support of caregivers and try again on another occasion.

For non-urgent interventions in older children, restraint is an option of last resort.<sup>1</sup> In some children, for example those with developmental problems, resistance to immunisation may persist despite all reasonable attempts. It may not be in the child’s best interests to proceed. Where other options have been exhausted, paediatricians should weigh up whether the risks of sedation (in an appropriate, monitored clinical environment) outweigh the risks of non-immunisation.<sup>1</sup>

### **Adolescent refusal**

For an adolescent over the age of 16, or younger than 16 but with the maturity and capacity to understand the nature of the decision (ie Gillick competent),<sup>1</sup> and who declines immunisation (Case #E), health professionals should make efforts to correct any misunderstandings. Reluctant teenagers may be able to be persuaded, or encouraged. Needle fear and phobia can often be effectively managed using behavioural and psychological techniques.<sup>1</sup> However, persistent refusal should usually be respected, even if parents have given their permission and even if the paediatrician believes that it would be in the young person’s best interests to be immunised. While courts have occasionally authorised life-saving treatment (for example blood transfusions) against the objections of competent teenagers, there are no precedents for this occurring for immunisation.

1. Does the young person have sufficient maturity to make this sort of decision?
2. Are they sufficiently free from undue influences on their decision-making (eg social media, peer pressure, family pressure, fear)?
3. Do they understand the reasons why immunisation is being offered?
4. Do they understand and are they able to weigh up the risks and benefits of immunisation?
5. Do they understand their options in this situation?

Box 2: Potential checklist for determining Gillick Competence for immunisation<sup>1,2</sup>

### **Adolescent consent**

A different dilemma may arise where an adolescent presents for vaccination either in the absence of information about their parents' wishes (Case #C), or despite their parents declining immunisation (Case #D).

Current UK programs for school-based human papilloma virus HPV vaccination in 12-13 year olds often include a requirement for parental written consent. Lack of parental authorisation is the commonest barrier to young people receiving these vaccinations.<sup>5</sup> However, ethically and legally, those adolescents (<16 years) who are Gillick competent can consent on their own. This has been incorporated into some HPV vaccination programs, though it appears that it is rarely enacted.<sup>5</sup> In such a setting, if it is not possible to obtain parental consent, professionals should assess whether the young person is Gillick competent and understands the risks and benefits of vaccination (Box 2).<sup>1</sup> If they do, immunisation can ethically (and should usually) proceed.

### **COVID and consent**

There are no in-principle differences between COVID vaccines and other vaccines. If or when COVID vaccination become available for young people under 16, the same principles should apply as for other routine immunisations in childhood/adolescence. Vaccine hesitancy, either among young people or their parents, may reduce the uptake of a COVID vaccine. Some of these issues may make the expansion of vaccine programs to young people more complicated and resource intensive than vaccination in adults. As with the HPV vaccination, lack of parental consent is likely to be the main barrier to adolescents receiving the vaccination, and self-consent by Gillick competent adolescents (or those over the age of 16) should be supported.

1. Griffith R. What is Gillick competence? *Hum Vaccin Immunother* 2016;12(1):244-47. doi: 10.1080/21645515.2015.1091548
2. Larcher V, Hutchinson A. How should paediatricians assess Gillick competence? *Arch Dis Child* 2010;95(4):307-11. doi: 10.1136/adc.2008.148676
3. M v H (Private Law Vaccination) [2020] EWFC 93.
4. Bray L, Carter B, Ford K, et al. Holding children for procedures: An international survey of health professionals. *J Child Health Care* 2018;22(2):205-15. doi: 10.1177/1367493517752499 [published Online First: 2018/01/23]
5. Audrey S, Farr M, Roderick M, et al. How acceptable is adolescent self-consent for the HPV vaccination: Findings from a qualitative study in south-west England. *Vaccine* 2020;38(47):7472-78. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2020.09.074>