ISSN- 2581-575X
INDIAN JOURNAL OF HEALTH, SEXUALITY AND CULTURE
REVIEW ARTICLE

Ethical and Legal Dimensions of Informed Consent for Survivors of Sexual Violence in Indian Clinical Trials

Preetisha Choudhury[1*], Naveen Kumar[2]

[1*]*Research Scholar, Department of Law, North-Eastern Hill University, Shillong, Meghalaya, India.*
[2]*Associate Professor, Department of Law, North-Eastern Hill University, Shillong, Meghalaya, India.*

ARTICLE INFO

Correspondence:
Preetisha Choudhury
preetishachoudhury020@gmail.com
Research Scholar, Department of Law, North-Eastern Hill University, Shillong, Meghalaya, India.

Dates:
Received: 31-03-2025
Accepted: 21-05-2025
Published: 20-06-2025

Keywords:
Informed consent, Clinical trials, Sexual violence survivors, Autonomy, National and international frameworks.

How to Cite:
Choudhury P, Kumar N. Ethical and Legal Dimensions of Informed Consent for Survivors of Sexual Violence in Indian Clinical Trials. Indian Journal of Health, Sexuality and Culture. 2025;11(1): 57-66.
DOI: *10.21590/ijhsc.11.01.08*

Abstract

A crucial ethical and legal prerequisite for clinical research is informed consent, which ensures the autonomy of participants and protection from coercion. However, where clinical trials involve survivors of sexual violence, the application of informed consent principles becomes deeply challenging. Survivors often experience significant psychological trauma, societal stigma, and structural inequalities that compromise their ability to provide free and fully informed consent. These issues are especially relevant in India, where cultural, legal, and institutional barriers further complicate the ethical conduct of clinical trials involving such vulnerable populations. This paper explores the complexities of truly informed consent in Indian clinical studies on sexual violence research and analyzes the effectiveness of national regulations, such as 'the New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules, 2019,' and international guidelines, such as the 'Declaration of Helsinki' and the 'Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences' (CIOMS) guidelines. The paper also examines judicial interpretations of informed consent in clinical research, highlighting landmark Indian cases and global best practices that can appraise policy reforms. By advocating trauma-informed consent procedures, strengthened legal regulations, and survivor-centric ethical standards, this study aims to achieve a more equitable framework for conducting clinical trials with survivors of sexual violence. It thus highlights the need for a balanced approach that maintains both the scientific validity of research and the dignity and rights of participants, ensuring that consent remains a genuine expression of autonomy and not a procedural formality.

Introduction

Consent is built on four essential components: disclosure, comprehension, competence, and voluntariness.[1] Disclosure refers to the adequacy and extent of information provided to participants, while comprehension ensures that they fully understand the information shared. Competence relates to an individual's ability to provide consent, and voluntariness signifies that consent is given freely, without coercion or undue influence.[2] Beyond being a formal requirement, consent serves to legitimize ethical considerations in research. Free and informed consent is the cornerstone of ethical research, functioning as an ongoing process rather than a one-time procedure.[3] It requires that participants fully grasp the study's objectives, purpose, research design, methods,

tools, and how the results will be disseminated, thereby ensuring transparency and respect for their autonomy.

Informed consent is a fundamental value in clinical research, ensuring that participants voluntarily engage in studies with full awareness of the risks, benefits, and alternatives. It is a process by which a medical practitioner informs a patient about the dangers, advantages, and available options of a particular treatment or operation.[4] It is more than just merely signing a document; it is a way through which physicians and volunteers communicate between themselves. Patients retain the right to refuse or pull out their consent at any point during their treatment. Thus, this practice upholds patient autonomy, fosters trust among the participants and serves as a safeguard against unethical clinical conduct.[5]

The evolution of informed consent in the context of medicine stems from the creation of ethical standards and legal criteria that define the autonomy of the patient. Towards the beginning of the 20th century, medical practice was "predominantly paternalistic in nature," whereby physicians would make decisions on behalf of patients without regularly informing them of the process.[4] The notion of truly informed consent first surfaced through the landmark case of 'Schloendorff v Society of New York Hospital,[6] in which the court held that "Every human being of adult years and sound mind has a right to determine what shall be done with his own body, and a surgeon who performs an operation without his patient's consent commits an assault for which he is liable in damages" (Lord Cardozo). Thus, the idea that patients must consent to medical procedures was established by this decision. After that, through several other judicial decisions, the concept of 'informed consent' was considered a key component of any clinical research involving human participants.

However, in the middle of the 20th century, the occurrence of unethical medical experiments, such as the 'Tuskegee Study of Untreated Syphilis in the Negro Male' and the 'Nazi human experiments during World War II,' highlighted the urgent necessity for rigorous consent standards.[7] These incidents led to the creation of the 'Nuremberg Code,' the 'Belmont Report,' the 'Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects,' and the 'International Ethical Guidelines for Biomedical Research Involving Human Subjects,' which established informed consent as a core ethical principle in research involving human subjects.[8] The process of obtaining informed consent has progressed from merely acquiring a patient's signature to a process focused on effective communication. The process now lies in making the participants understand the aims, objectives, and risks of the study surrounding them, thereby solidifying its role as a fundamental aspect of patient-centered care in medical ethics. However, the process of obtaining informed consent becomes particularly complex when the participants include survivors of sexual violence. The psychological trauma, power imbalances, and social stigma associated with sexual violence create unique challenges in guaranteeing that consent is actually of their own, informed, and free from coercion.[9]

In the Indian context, the Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules, 2019, along with the Indian Council of Medical Research (hereafter, ICMR) Ethical Guidelines, provide a regulatory guideline for clinical trials in India. While these frameworks recognize the vulnerability of certain populations, they fail to explicitly address the distinct concerns of sexual violence survivors. Survivors of sexual violence frequently experience post-traumatic stress disorder (hereafter PTSD), depressive disorders, and anxiousness, which may affect their decision-making capacity.[10] Additionally, many survivors participate in mental health and reproductive health studies, raising concerns about implicit coercion, privacy risks, and ethical oversight in such research.

This paper explores the intersection of informed consent, sexual violence, and clinical trials in India, analyzing the legal, ethical, and sociocultural challenges involved. By examining national legal frameworks, judicial precedents, and international best practices, it argues that in a diverse country like India, where clinical trials are rapidly increasing, survivors of sexual violence must be recognized as a 'vulnerable population' requiring additional legal and ethical protections. India should, therefore, move towards a more equitable and survivor-centric approach to medical research.

Sexual Violence Survivors as a Vulnerable Population

Sexual violence survivors have substantial mental health effects on survivors around the globe.[11] In clinical research, these groups represent a uniquely vulnerable population due to the profound physical, psychological, and social consequences of their trauma. Though international and national legal frameworks recognize the need for additional protections for vulnerable groups, these outlines often miss the mark in explicitly discussing the distinct encounters faced by survivors of sexual violence. The insertion of such individuals in experimental trials, particularly in studies related to mental health, reproductive health, and trauma recovery, raises significant ethical concerns regarding coercion, re-traumatization, and the validity of well-versed consent.[12]

The perception of 'vulnerability in clinical trials' is recognized in international ethical standards such as in the Belmont Report (1979), which highlights the need for additional safeguards when research subjects face power imbalances. Further, the Declaration of Helsinki (1964, revised 2013) emphasizes special protections for individuals whose ability to give informed consent is compromised.[13] In India, survivors of sexual abuse frequently suffer from (i) post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and associated mental health issues, (ii) minimal support from healthcare workers, (iii) social stigma and cultural pressures that may prevent them from refusing participation, and (iv)economic dependency.[14] And these challenges increase the risk of falling in the hands of coercion in clinical trials. However, they fail to get a special recognition under the Indian rules and regulations. For instance, the ICMR Ethical Guidelines (2017), which classify some groups as vulnerable populations, fail to specifically mention sexual violence survivors.[15] Similarly, India's New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules, 2019, do not explicitly classify sexual violence survivors as a vulnerable group, despite their heightened risk of exploitation and emotional distress in research settings.

The lack of such recognition raises concerns about the adequacy of ethical oversight in research involving sexual violence survivors in India. To report these alarms, it is essential to integrate trauma-informed consent procedures, which involve enhanced pre-consent counseling, ensuring survivors understand their rights and the experimental nature of research participation. Additionally, independent and efficient ethical review boards is required to assess trials involving sexual violence survivors, ensuring that recruitment methods do not exploit their vulnerabilities.

The Intersection of Informed Consent and Sexual Violence Survivors in Clinical Trials

A key component of clinical research is informed consent, which entails informing study participants about the investigation and getting their voluntary consent to participate.[16] It ensures autonomy, transparency, and voluntarism through clear information, counseling, and researcher-participant collaboration, empowering independent decisions.[17] Individuals who go through traumatic events, such as elder abuse, domestic violence, sexual assault, ethno-violence, and others, may suffer from long-term negative physical and psychological impacts. And so, for the participants of sexual violence, the process of giving well-informed consent becomes complex due to such psychological trauma, social stigma, and economic vulnerabilities, which may impair their autonomous decision-making. In India, a basic requirement is that a doctor cannot observe any victim or survivor without first obtaining their informed consent,[18] yet the country fails to recognize sexual violence survivors as vulnerable in research explicitly. This section explores the psychological, ethical, and feminist legal dimensions of informed consent for survivors, emphasizing the need for trauma-sensitive consent models and legal recognition to uphold their rights and autonomy.

Autonomy as a fundamental principle

At the core of informed consent lies the important principle of 'self-determination and individual patient autonomy.'[19] 'Autonomy' a foundational ethical principle in clinical research, affirms people's right to freely and voluntarily choose whether or not

to participate in clinical investigations. Rooted in respect for persons, it ensures that participants have the freedom to provide or withhold consent based on full disclosure of relevant information, free from coercion or undue influence.[20] This profound ethical principle was notably reinforced in a judicial ruling by Justice Cardozo in 1914, summarized in his memorable pronouncement.[21] In the context of survivors of sexual violence, autonomy takes on a complex and deeply sensitive dimension, as these individuals may face significant psychological trauma, societal stigma, and systemic barriers that impact their decision-making capacity.[22] Trauma can affect cognitive processing and decision-making, making it essential that consent procedures are designed to be trauma-informed, free from coercion, and respectful of the survivor's emotional state.[23]

Psychological and Ethical Challenges

As discussed earlier, patient autonomy and self-determination lie at the heart of informed consent. However, as sexual survivors are themselves the victims of some heinous offenses, questions arise regarding their capacity to provide truly informed consent for procedures involving their bodies. As they suffer from various psychological ailments,[24] their participation may be motivated by their need to seek treatment urgently, leading to implicit coercion where the line between voluntary participation and necessity-driven consent becomes blurred.[25] This raises profound ethical concerns, requiring researchers to navigate the delicate balance between ensuring access to potentially beneficial research and protecting survivors from exploitation, undue influence, and re-traumatization.

Another challenge faced by the sexually assaulted victims is the trauma of the incident. Trauma profoundly affects a survivor's ability to make rational, autonomous decisions. Research often indicates that traumatic patients often exhibit symptoms of hypervigilance and heightened stress responses, which may compel them to make impulsive decision-making under perceived pressure, dissociation, and memory disturbances, affecting their ability to fully comprehend risk disclosures during informed consent procedures and dependency on medical or psychological treatment, making them more likely to consent out of necessity rather than free will.[26] Clinical trials focusing on psychotropic drugs, PTSD treatments, sexual and reproductive health interventions, and trauma recovery therapies disproportionately recruit sexual violence survivors.[27] Without adequate safeguards, these studies pose risks of exploitation, where survivors participate not out of informed choice but due to a lack of alternatives.

Feminist Perspective on Bodily Autonomy

From a feminist legal perspective, every person has the 'right to make informed decisions about their reproductive health and choices' free from outside pressure or interventions.[28] Feminists further contend that this ability of women to make true choices relating to what should be done to their bodies also includes the opportunity to obtain safe and lawful choices about abortion. This 'freedom to choose' or, in other words, 'bodily autonomy' lies at the heart of women's gender equality and women empowerment. [28, p. 13] This also includes the ability of a woman to withdraw medical interventions without proper informed consent.

Feminist scholars and activists assert that women's autonomy over their bodies, medical decisions, and reproductive rights is essential to gender equality.[29] However, clinical research may result in gendered coercion, especially in reproductive health studies, where sociocultural pressures limit well-informed consent. Thus, these challenges call for survivor-centric models, ongoing consent processes, community-based ethical oversight, and legal recognition of sexual violence survivors as vulnerable populations, ensuring special protections and promoting gender justice in clinical research.

Legal and Ethical Framework for Informed Consent in India

The idea of consent has changed over the past few decades, transforming itself from being 'doctor-centric to patient-centric.' Nowadays, informed consent, in every medical practice and clinical research, represents not only an 'ethical principle but also a legal mandate.'[30] It essentially requires the disclosure of relevant information by doctors, the intellectual

capacity of patients to comprehend their options, and the ability to make voluntary decisions free from coercion. Competence in providing consent includes understanding available options, evaluating personal costs and benefits, and aligning them with one's values and priorities.[31]

The regulation of informed consent in studies involving human subjects began with the German Guidelines for New Therapy and Human Experimentation (1931), which were among the first official regulations addressing ethical considerations in medical research.[32] These were followed by the Nuremberg Code of 1947, which emerged as a retort to the horrors of Nazi medical experiments. This code highlighted the necessity of free participation and informed consent in medical research.[33] 'The Declaration of Helsinki' (1964), approved by 'the World Medical Association,' reinforced the importance of freely given consent by ensuring that participants are sufficiently well-versed about the study's objectives, procedures, expected advantages, and possible hazards.[34] Despite these international safeguards, ethical violations continued, as seen in the Tuskegee Syphilis Study (1932-1972) in the United States, where participants were misinformed and denied treatment.[35] Such unethical practices reinforced the need for stringent ethical regulations.

In 1979, the 'Belmont Report' presented three key ethical values for human subject research: 'respect for individuals (autonomy), beneficence (maximizing benefits while minimizing risks), and justice (equitable distribution of research benefits and burdens).'[36] Following this, the Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences (hereafter CIOMS) Guidelines, 1982, provided moral standards for studies in biomedicine across different cultural and regulatory contexts.[37] The WHO Guidelines for Good Clinical Practice (1995) and the ICH-GCP Guidelines (1997) further strengthened ethical research practices, ensuring participant safety, informed consent, and the integrity of clinical trial data.[38]

In India, Article 21 of the Constitution guarantees the 'right to life and personal liberty,' which includes a patient's autonomy and self-determination. This means that individuals have the right to withdraw medical treatment, except in cases of emergency situations where a doctor may provide necessary treatment without prior consent. However, for consent to be legally valid, it must be informed, voluntary, and given by a competent individual. [33, p. 343]

The primary legal structure governing 'informed consent in clinical trials' is primarily outlined under the Drugs and Cosmetics Act of 1940, alongside subsequent amendments. In 2005, the government introduced significant reforms in Schedule Y of the Drugs and Cosmetics Rules 1945, which mandated an intricate informed consent procedure. Schedule Y summarizes the duties of clinical investigators, trial sponsors, and Institutional Ethics Committees to ensure that participants understand the nature of the study before enrolling. The Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR), as the highest authority, has been instrumental in establishing moral standards for research involving human subjects. The ICMR Ethical Guidelines, first published in 2000 and later updated in 2006 and 2017, underline the core ethical ideologies of 'autonomy, beneficence, and non-maleficence.' These guidelines supplement the legal framework and ensure that informed consent remains a fundamental requirement in medical and clinical research.[39] Further, the New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules, 2019 impose stringent requirements for obtaining informed consent, including the requirement of providing all relevant details in a language that the participants can understand and the mandatory use of audio-visual recording for vulnerable groups.[40] These rules aim to enhance transparency and prevent coercion, requiring researchers to unveil details about the trial's purpose, potential risks, alternative treatments, and reimbursement in cases of injury or death arising out of participation in clinical trials.

However, the omission of the inclusion of sexual survivors as vulnerable populations in these guidelines raises concerns about the adequacy of ethical safeguards for individuals who have experienced significant trauma and may struggle with decision-making autonomy in clinical research settings.

Ethical challenges surrounding informed consent in India extend beyond legal compliance and involve deeper concerns related to power imbalances, coercion, and the structural limitations of the healthcare and legal systems. Additionally, cultural, social, and linguistic barriers further impact the level of quality

of informed consent and its validity, particularly in a varied populace with fluctuating levels of literateness and healthcare awareness.[41] Many clinical trial participants, especially those from marginalized socio-economic backgrounds, may not fully understand the implications of their participation due to language barriers, medical complexities, and limited education. Furthermore, financial incentives offered in some trials can create situations where economically disadvantaged individuals enroll out of desperation rather than genuine voluntariness, thus compromising the integrity of informed consent.[42]A research study by DeCosta *et al.* conducted in a village in Haryana, India, found that most respondents made decisions about clinical trial participation after consulting with community members.[43] The study also highlighted a significant level of implicit trust in the medical system among participants, coupled with a lack of awareness regarding essential information required for informed consent. These conclusions underline the investigator's critical obligation to ensure that participants fully understand the implications of their consent.[44]

A significant ethical concern in informed consent for clinical trials involving sexual violence survivors is the risk of re-traumatization. Trauma research has shown that survivors frequently experience hyper-vigilance, dissociation, and memory suppression, all of which can impact their ability to comprehend risk disclosures and thoroughly evaluate the consequences of their participation. In such cases, traditional informed consent procedures may not be sufficient to confirm that consent is justly voluntary and conversant.[45] Without a trauma-sensitive approach, there is a heightened risk of implicit coercion, potentially retraumatizing survivors. While India has an all-inclusive legal and ethical outline for informed consent in clinical trials, significant gaps remain in protecting sexual violence survivors and other vulnerable populations.

Judicial Approach to Informed Consent in Clinical Trials in India

The Indian judiciary has been instrumental in shaping the current legal landscape of informed consent in clinical trials. Over the years, courts of justice have reinforced the fundamental right to 'autonomy and self-determination,' emphasizing that informed consent is 'not merely a procedural formality but also a substantive right' essential to medical ethics and human dignity. The courts in India have repeatedly upheld that Article 21 of the Constitution of India, which protects the 'right to life and personal liberty,' also includes the 'right to a well-informed consent.' In 'K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd) and Anr. v Union of India and Ors.,'[46] the Supreme Court of law recognized the 'right to privacy' as an important fundamental right, reaffirming the principles of bodily autonomy, dignity, and personal choice as an integral part of it. These principles on the other side are crucial for valid informed consent in clinical trials. Similarly, in 'Common Cause (A Regd. Society) v Union of India',[47] the court of law upheld the status of individual autonomy in medical decision-making, emphasizing that consent must be free and well-versed, particularly in medical and research settings.

The judiciary has consistently underlined the need for knowledgeable decision-making in medical events. In the breakthrough case of 'Samira Kohli v Dr. Prabha Manchanda,'[48] the Apex Court ruled that a patient's consent for a diagnostic procedure does not extend to therapeutic interventions unless the patient expressly consents. [42, p. 164] Further, the Indian judiciary has been instrumental in exposing and addressing unethical clinical trials where informed consent was either absent or improperly obtained. A notable instance is the Public Interest Litigation (PIL) filed by 'Swasthya Adhikar Manch v Union of India',[49] before the Supreme Court. The petition brought to light large-scale unethical drug trials conducted on economically disadvantaged individuals without proper informed consent. The court expressed grave concerns over regulatory lapses and directed the government to strengthen the legal framework governing clinical trials, leading to the establishment of the New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules, 2019.[50] Time and again, the courts have also recognized the importance of consent and autonomy in cases involving rights related to sexuality and reproduction. In 'Suchita Srivastava v Chandigarh Administration',[51] the Supreme Court confirmed that a woman's right to make reproductive decisions, including whether to have children

or not, is acknowledged as a component of her individual liberty under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.[52] Similarly, in 'Delhi Domestic Working Women's Forum v Union of India and Others',[53] the Court highlighted the need to establish a supportive environment that not only ensures justice but also promotes the psychological and social rehabilitation of survivors of sexual assault.

Despite these legal precedents, courts have not explicitly addressed how informed consent should be obtained from survivors of sexual violence in clinical trials. In, India, a pertinent question often arises as to "how informed is the informed consent"? It is well known that there is typically a dependence between the patient and the physician; this is especially true in India, where economic and other inequities emphasize this dependence.[54] The highest court of the country, in the landmark instance of 'Jacob Puliyel v Union of India,[55] has underscored the critical necessity of obtaining informed permission from volunteers in clinical trials, highlighting the paramount significance of safeguarding their well-being.

While these cases have contributed to the regulatory framework of informed consent in clinical trials, there remains a significant gap in addressing the unique vulnerabilities of survivors of sexual violence. To bridge this gap, stronger judicial oversight is necessary to ensure that clinical trials involving survivors of sexual violence adhere to ethical and legal standards. The courts must mandate trauma-informed consent processes, including the right of the survivors to withdraw or modify their consent at any stage of the trial. Additionally, judicial intervention is also required to enforce mandatory ethical reviews for such trials, ensuring that survivors are not subjected to re-traumatization or implicit coercion again.

Conclusion

Informed consent in Indian clinical trials, particularly in research involving sexual violence survivors, presents a complex interplay of ethics, autonomy, and vulnerability. While legal and ethical frameworks such as the ICMR Guidelines, the New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules, 2019, and international instruments like the Declaration of Helsinki aim to safeguard participants, they often fall short in addressing the unique challenges faced by survivors of sexual violence. A key concern is the lack of explicit recognition of sexual violence survivors as a vulnerable population within India's clinical trial regulations. While existing guidelines emphasize voluntary participation and adequate disclosure of risks, they do not incorporate trauma-informed consent practices that consider the psychological and emotional state of survivors. Furthermore, structural coercion arising from limited access to healthcare, economic hardships, and societal pressures can impair a survivor's ability to make autonomous decisions. Without addressing these factors, informed consent remains a procedural formality rather than a meaningful exercise of autonomy.

Some of the suggestions that can be put forward are: Firstly, researchers and ethics committees must adopt trauma-sensitive consent practices, ensuring survivors receive information in an accessible manner with the option to withdraw freely. Secondly, India's regulatory framework should explicitly classify sexual violence survivors as a vulnerable group, mandating stricter ethical safeguards. Ethics committees must include gender studies experts, mental health professionals, and survivor advocates to prevent exploitation and re-traumatization. Thirdly, engaging survivor-led organizations and NGOs in the consent process can foster trust and provide independent guidance. Fourthly, stronger legal enforcement, transparency, and stricter penalties for non-compliance are essential to uphold ethical standards. Lastly, clinical trials must include continuous monitoring and post-trial care, offering counselling and healthcare support to mitigate potential harm and ensure survivor well-being beyond research participation.

Thus, at last it can be concluded, stating that ensuring meaningful informed consent in clinical trials involving sexual violence survivors requires a paradigm shift from a regulatory compliance approach to an ethically driven, survivor-centred framework. By integrating trauma-sensitive methodologies, strengthening legal protections, and fostering a multidisciplinary approach to ethical review, India can move toward a more just and equitable clinical research environment. Protecting the rights, dignity, and autonomy of survivors is not just

an ethical obligation; it is a necessary step toward ensuring justice and fairness in medical research.

References

1. Sim J, Waterfield J. Focus group methodology: some ethical challenges. Quality & Quantity. 2019;53(6):3003-3022. Available from: doi.org/10.1007/s11135-019-00914-5.
2. Gupta UC. Informed consent in clinical research: Revisiting few concepts and areas. Perspectives in Clinical Research. 2013;4(1):26-32. Available from: doi.org/10.4103/2229-3485.106373.
3. Kazembe DM, Woldeamanuel Y, Abay SM. Researchers experience and views on participants' comprehension of informed consent in clinical trials in Malawi: a descriptive qualitative study. BMC Medical Ethics. 2024 ;25(1):101. Available from: doi.org/10.1186/s12910-024-01100-5.
4. Shah P, Thornton I, Kopitnik NL, Hipskind JE. Informed Consent. [Updated 2024 Nov 24]. In: StatPearls. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing; 2025. Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK430827/ [Accessed 17th May 2025].
5. Thirumoorthy T. Core concepts of consent in medical practice. Singapore Medical Journal. 2023 ;64(6):398-402. Available from: doi.org/10.4103/singaporemedj.SMJ-2023-044.
6. Schloendorff v Society of New York Hospital, 105 N.E. 92, 211 N.Y. 125.
7. Harrison 3rd RW. Impact of biomedical research on African Americans. Journal of the National Medical Association. 2001 ;93(3 Suppl):6S-7S. Available from: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC2593959/.
8. Gallin S, Bedzow I. The Holocaust as an Inflection Point in the Development of Research Ethics. In: Stacy Gallin Ira Bedzow. (eds.) Bioethics and the Holocaust. The International Library of Bioethics, vol. 96, Springer, Cham; 2020; 229- 246. Available from: doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-01987-6_13.
9. Greco D, Dawgert S. Poverty and sexual violence: Building prevention and intervention responses: a guide for counselors and advocates. Pennsylvania Coalition Against Rape; 2007. Available from: https://www.pcar.org/sites/default/files/pages-pdf/poverty_and_sexual_violence.pdf [Accessed 22nd March 2025].
10. Chivers-Wilson KA. Sexual assault and posttraumatic stress disorder: A review of the biological, psychological and sociological factors and treatments. McGill Journal of Medicine: MJM. 2006;9(2):111- 118. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18523613/.
11. Dworkin ER, Weaver TL. The impact of sociocultural contexts on mental health following sexual violence: A conceptual model. Psychology of Violence. 2021;11(5):476-487. Available from: doi.org/10.1037/vio0000350.
12. Welie SP, Berghmans RL. Inclusion of patients with severe mental illness in clinical trials: issues and recommendations surrounding informed consent. CNS Drugs. 2006; 20:67-83. Available from: doi.org/10.2165/00023210-200620010-00006.
13. Gordon BG. Vulnerability in research: Basic ethical concepts and general approach to review. Ochsner Journal. 2020;20(1):34-38. Available from: doi.org/10.31486/toj.19.0079.
14. Pohane PU, Jaiswal SV, Vahia VN, Sinha D. Psychopathology, perceived social support, and coping in survivors of adult sexual assault: a cross-sectional hospital-based study. Indian Journal of Psychiatry. 2020 ;62(6):718-722. Available from: doi.org/10.4103/psychiatry.IndianJPsychiatry_432_19.
15. Indian Council of Medical Research. National Ethical Guidelines for Biomedical and Health Research involving Human Participants. New Delhi: ICMR; 2017. p. 57.
16. Arellano L, Alcubilla P, Leguízamo L. Ethical considerations in Informed Consent. In: Miroslav Radenkovic (ed) Ethics - Scientific Research, Ethical Issues, Artificial Intelligence and Education [Working Title]. IntechOpen; 2023. Available from: doi:10.5772/intechopen.1001319.
17. Roberts LW. Informed consent and the capacity for voluntarism. American Journal of Psychiatry. 2002;159(5):705-712.Available from: doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.159.5.705.
18. Narayanareddy J. Medical Examination of Survivors / Victims of Sexual Violence: A Handbook for Medical Officers. New Delhi: UNFPA & NHM; 2017. Available from: https://india.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/pub-pdf/Violence%20Kit-1.pdf [Accessed 27th March 2025]; See also, Government of India, Ministry of Health & Family Welfare. Guidelines & Protocols Medico-legal care for survivors/victims of Sexual Violence. New Delhi: MoHFW; 2014. Available from: https://health.mizoram.gov.in/uploads/attachments/2023/07/28651cad-3c4af99356210b9dcd0907b2/pages-189-guidelines-protocols-sexual-harassment.pdf [Accessed 27th March 2025].
19. Jain D. Regulation of Digital Healthcare in India: Ethical and Legal challenges. Healthcare (Basel). 2023; 11(6): 911. Available from: doi.org/10.3390/healthcare11060911.
20. The Medic Portal. Medical Ethics: Autonomy. Available from: https://www.themedicportal.com/application-guide/medical-schoolinterview/medical-ethics/medical-ethics-autonomy/ [Accessed 22nd March 2025].
21. Schoendorff v Society of New York Hospital, 105 N.E. 92, 93 (N.Y. 1914).
22. Hopkins T, Lopez C. The Psychological Impact of Sexual Trauma in Women and the Impact of their Healing Journey. 12 MSW Capstone Conference. 2024;1-33. Available from: https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/mswconference/12?utm_source=scholarlycommons.pacific.edu%2Fmswconference%2F12&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages [Accessed 26th March 2025].

23. Berring LL, Holm T, Hansen JP, Delcomyn CL, Søndergaard R, Hvidhjelm J. Implementing trauma-informed care—settings, definitions, interventions, measures, and implementation across settings: a scoping review. Healthcare (Basel). 2024; 12(9): 908. Available from: doi.org/10.3390/healthcare12090908.
24. RAINN. Effects of Sexual Violence. Washington (DC): Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network. Available from: https://rainn.org/effects-sexual-violence [Accessed 28th March 2025].
25. Indiana Coalition to End Sexual Assault. Evaluation and management of the sexually assaulted or sexually abused patient. Indianapolis (IN): ICESAHT. Available from: https://icesaht.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Sexual-Assault-e-book-1.pdf [Accessed 28th Mar 2025].
26. Center for Substance Abuse Treatment (US). Trauma-Informed Care in Behavioral Health Services. Rockville (MD): Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (US); 2014 (Treatment Improvement Protocol (TIP) Series, No. 57.) Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK207192/ [Accessed 22nd March 2025].
27. O'Doherty L, Whelan M, Carter GJ, Brown K, Tarzia L, Hegarty K, Feder G, Brown SJ. Psychosocial interventions for survivors of rape and sexual assault experienced during adulthood. Cochrane database of systematic reviews. 2023(10):CD013456. Available from: doi.org/10.1002%2F14651858.CD013456.pub2.
28. Nyinawagaba Beatrice R. Reproductive Rights as Fundamental Human Rights: A Feminist Perspective on Bodily Autonomy and Social Justice. Eurasian Experiment Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences. 2024; 5(2): 9-14.
29. United Nations Human Rights Special Procedures. Women's Autonomy, Equality and Reproductive Health in International Human Rights: Between Recognition, Backlash and Regressive Trends. Available from: https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/Women/WG/WomensAutonomyEqualityReproductiveHealth.pdf [Accessed 29th March 2025].
30. Gera A, Sood J. Informed consent–Ethical doctrine and a legal mandate. Current Medicine Research and Practice. 2023;13(6):286-291.
31. Jacob KS. Informed consent and India. The National Medical Journal of India. 2014; 27(1): 35-38.
32. Reich, Warren T. (ed.) (1982). Encyclopedia of Bioethics. 2nd ed. New York: Macmillan; 1982. Appendix, p. 2762-2763.
33. Nandimath OV. Consent and medical treatment: The legal paradigm in India. Indian Journal of Urology. 2009 ;25(3):343-347. Available from: doi.org/10.4103/0970-1591.56202.
34. Carlson RV, Boyd KM, Webb DJ. The revision of the Declaration of Helsinki: past, present and future. British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology. 2004 ;57(6):695-713. Available from: doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2125.2004.02103. x.
35. Ogungbure AA. The Tuskegee Syphilis Study: Some Ethical Reflections. Thought and Practice. 2011; 3(2):75-92.
36. The National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioural Research. The Belmont Report: ethical principles and guidelines for the protection of human subjects of research. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office; 1978.
37. Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences (CIOMS), in collaboration with the World Health Organization (WHO). International ethical guidelines for health-related research involving humans. Geneva: CIOMS; 2016.
38. World Health Organization. Handbook for good clinical research practice (GCP): guidance for implementation. Geneva: WHO; 2005.
39. Indian Council of Medical Research. Ethical Guidelines on Medical and Health Research on Human Participants. New Delhi: ICMR; 2017.
40. The New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules, 2019. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India.
41. Mahani A, Zadu R. The role of consent in Indian judiciary: Implications for cancer treatment practices. Indian Journal of Forensic and Community Medicine. 2024; 11(4): 159-172. Available from: doi.org/10.18231/j.ijfcm.2024.034.
42. Resnik DB. Bioethical Issues in Providing Financial Incentives to Research Participants. Medicolegal Bioethics. 2015; 24(5): 35-41. Available from: doi.org/10.2147/MB. S7041635.
43. DeCosta A, D'souza N, Krishnan S, Chhabra MS, Shihaam I, Goswami K. Community based trials and informed consent in rural north India. Journal of Medical Ethics. 2004;30(3):318-323. Available from: doi.org/10.1136/jme.2002.001065.
44. Nijhawan LP, Janodia MD, Muddukrishna BS, Bhat KM, Bairy KL, Udupa N, Musmade PB. Informed consent: Issues and challenges. Journal of Advanced pharmaceutical Technology & Research. 2013;4(3):134-40. Available from: doi.org/10.4103/2231-4040.116779.
45. Newman E, Risch E, Kassam-Adams N. Ethical issues in trauma-related research: A review. Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics. 2006;1(3):29-46. Available from: doi.org/10.1525/jer.2006.1.3.29.
46. K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd) And Anr. v Union of India And Ors., AIR 2017 SC 4161.
47. Common Cause (A Regd. Society) v Union of India, AIR 2018 SC 1665.
48. Samira Kohli v Dr. Prabha Manchanda, AIR 2008 SC 1385.
49. Swasthya Adhikar Manch v Union of India, Writ Petition(s)(Civil) No(s). 33/2012.
50. Oxfam India. Regulatory Capture and Access to Health Care India Case Study. Available from: https://www.oxfamindia.org/sites/default/files/INDIA%20CASE%20STUDY.pdf [Accessed 27th March 2025].
51. Suchita Srivastava v Chandigarh Administration, (2009)

9 SCC 1.
52. This position has been reiterated by a 9-judge bench of the Supreme Court in Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) and Anr. v Union of India And Ors., AIR 2017 SC 4161.
53. Delhi Domestic Working Women's Forum v Union of India and Others, (1995) 1 SCC 14
54. Munshi R and Thatte U. Compensation for research related injury. Perspectives in Clinical Research. 2013; 4(1): 61-69. Available from: doi.org/10.4103/2229-3485.106392.
55. Jacob Puliyel v Union of India, Writ Petition (Civil) No. 607 of 2021.