Original Article

From ancient healing to modern litigation: a historical journey through medical negligence and tort law

***Milad Mashayekh*[1*], *Mahdi Abbasi Sarmadi*[2]**

1. Assistant Professor, Department of Law, University of Kashan, Kashan, Iran.
2. Associate Professor, Department of International Law, University of Kharazmi, Tehran, Iran.

Abstract

This article traces the historical evolution of medical negligence from ancient outcome-based penalties to modern tort law. Employing a historical-analytical method, it examines primary legal texts—from the Code of Hammurabi to landmark cases like *Bolam* and *Bolitho*—and secondary sources to analyze this transformation. The findings reveal a shift from ancient codes that penalized results, through medieval guild regulation, to the common law's establishment of a duty of care and a professionally defined standard subject to judicial scrutiny. Modern developments, such as the rise of informed consent and defensive medicine, illustrate tort law's ongoing adaptation to the complexities of healthcare. The conclusion underscores that this journey reflects evolving societal expectations for reasonable medical care, balancing patient rights with clinical realities. Understanding this history is vital for contemporary debates on patient safety and professional accountability, pointing to future research into non-Western traditions as well as to challenges such as artificial intelligence.

***Corresponding Author**

Milad Mashayekh
Address: *Faculty of Humanities and Law, University of Kashan, 6th Km., Ghotb Ravandi Blvd., Kashan, Iran.*
Postal Code : *8731753153*
Tel: *(+98) 911 196 8891*
Email: *mashayekh@kashanu.ac.ir*

Received: *23 May 2025*
Accepted: *21 Oct 2025*
Published: *20 Dec 2025*

Citation to this article:
Mashayekh M, Abbasi Sarmadi M. From ancient healing to modern litigation: a historical journey through medical negligence and tort law. J Med Ethics Hist Med. 2025; 18: 19.
https://doi.org/10.18502/jmehm.v18i19.20604

Keywords: *Medical negligence; Medical malpractice; Tort law; History of medicine; Bolam test.*

Introduction

Medical negligence, a complex intersection of healthcare and law, represents a failure by a medical professional to meet the accepted standard of care, resulting in injury to a patient. This area of law falls under the umbrella of tort law, specifically the tort of negligence. Unlike intentional wrongs, negligence pertains to carelessness or a lack of due diligence. In the medical context, this involves a deviation from established professional standards that causes harm. The historical development of medical negligence law mirrors the evolution of both medical practice and legal systems, transitioning from informal accountability to a structured legal framework designed to protect patients and uphold professional standards. Understanding this history reveals the shifting societal expectations placed upon healers and the legal mechanisms created to address instances where care falls below acceptable norms, leading to preventable harm.

This article traces the historical trajectory of medical accountability, from ancient ethical considerations to the sophisticated tort principles governing medical negligence today. It seeks to answer the central research question: How have the legal and conceptual foundations of medical negligence evolved from ancient outcome-based penalties to a modern system centered on a breach of a professional duty of care? To answer this, the paper will first establish its methodological approach, then examine key historical milestones, landmark cases that refined core principles such as the standard of care and causation, and the modern challenges that continue to shape the legal landscape.

Methods

This paper employs a historical-analytical and comparative legal research methodology to trace the conceptual evolution of medical negligence from ancient civilizations to the modern era. The analysis is grounded in two primary categories of sources: (1) primary legal and historical texts, including ancient legal codes (e.g., the Code of Hammurabi), landmark judicial opinions from common law jurisdictions (e.g., *Slater v. Baker*, *Bolam*, *Bolitho*), and foundational ethical texts (e.g., the Hippocratic Oath); and (2) secondary scholarly sources from the fields of legal history, medical ethics, and the history of medicine. A comparative approach is used to illuminate shifts in legal standards and ethical reasoning across

different epochs and, where instructive, between legal traditions such as English and American common law. The objective is to provide a synthesized historical narrative that identifies and explains the pivotal moments in the development of the legal principles governing medical accountability, moving beyond mere description to analyze the "why" and "how" of these legal transformations.

Background: Early Concepts of Medical Accountability

Ancient and Medieval Practices and Responsibilities

Concepts of accountability for those who provided healing services existed long before the formal development of modern legal systems. Ancient civilizations often incorporated provisions related to the outcomes of medical treatments within their legal or ethical codes. The Code of Hammurabi, dating back to approximately 1754 BC, included specific penalties for surgeons based on the success or failure of their procedures, particularly concerning injuries or death to patients or slaves (1). While these laws were often focused on outcome rather than the process or standard of care, they demonstrate an early societal expectation that healers bore some responsibility for the results of their interventions. This outcome-based approach, while crude, established a critical precedent: society could formally intervene to regulate healers and provide redress for patients, laying a foundational stone for the principle of accountability that would later evolve.

The Hippocratic Oath, originating in ancient Greece, established ethical guidelines for physicians, emphasizing beneficence, non-maleficence, and professional conduct (2). While primarily an ethical standard rather than a legal one enforceable by external authorities, it underscored the physician's duty to act in the patient's best interests and to avoid harm. In ancient Rome, some legal principles regarding negligence began to emerge, particularly regarding the actions of skilled professionals, including doctors. Actions could be brought under laws like the Lex Aquilia for harm caused by wrongful conduct, although applying this directly to complex medical judgments was challenging (3). During the medieval period, medical practice varied widely. Accountability was often informal, tied to reputation, religious strictures, or feudal obligations. Complaints might be handled through ecclesiastical courts or local manorial courts, or result in the loss of the practitioner's livelihood or expulsion from a community. The focus remained less on a standardized "duty of care" and more on egregious

errors or failures to adhere to basic, often rudimentary, procedures known at the time.

Healing and Accountability in Ancient Persia

To provide a broader historical framing that aligns with the article's title, it is essential to consider the sophisticated concepts of healing and accountability in the ancient Persian civilization. Within the Zoroastrian tradition—the state religion of the Achaemenid, Parthian, and Sassanid empires—medicine was a sacred art deeply intertwined with religious duty and cosmic order. The Vendidad, a legal and ritual text within the Zoroastrian canon, provides explicit regulations for physicians, establishing a system of accountability that was both spiritual and material (4).

The physician, or *manthran*, occupied a position of high social and religious esteem, charged with combating the forces of sickness and decay, which were manifestations of the evil spirit, Angra Mainyu. The Vendidad (Fargard 7) outlines a fee structure based on the patient's social class, but crucially, it also prescribes penalties for medical failure. For instance, if a physician treated a priest and caused his death, the penalty was akin to that for willful murder. This was not merely a civil fine but a spiritual transgression requiring expiation (5). This system reveals a nuanced understanding of accountability that went beyond the simple outcome-based penalties of the Code of Hammurabi. While Hammurabi's code prescribed "an eye for an eye" for a surgical failure, the Zoroastrian approach considered both the *outcome* and the physician's *knowledge and intent*. A key analytical distinction lies in the concept of the "three healers" also described in the Vendidad: one who heals with the knife (surgeon), one who heals with herbs (herbalist), and one who heals with sacred words (incantation priest). If a patient died under the care of any of these, the legal and spiritual consequences were assessed based on the practitioner's adherence to the established norms of their respective craft. This suggests an early, proto-professional standard of care in which a practitioner was expected to possess and correctly apply the knowledge and skills of their specific branch of medicine (6).

Therefore, the ancient Persian civilization did not view medical error in a legal vacuum. Still, it held a comprehensive worldview in which health was a sacred good, and the healer's role carried profound responsibility. The existence of this formalized, text-based system of medical accountability in one of the ancient world's major empires demonstrates that the conceptual journey of medical negligence—from informal grievance to codified principle—was not a uniquely Western

phenomenon but a feature of advanced legal and religious systems across civilizations (7).

Early Regulation of Physicians and Surgeons

The late medieval and early modern periods saw the rise of professional guilds and corporations for physicians and surgeons, particularly in Europe. These bodies, such as the Royal College of Physicians and the Company of Barber Surgeons in London, began to establish internal standards, oversee training, and regulate practice. Their primary function was often to control entry into the profession and maintain the reputation of their members, but they also handled complaints against practitioners (8).

Regulation by these bodies provided a form of accountability, often resulting in fines, suspension, or expulsion from the guild for incompetence or misconduct. However, these were internal disciplinary processes, not external legal mechanisms for compensating injured patients. Legal recourse for patients remained limited. Actions were sometimes framed under contract law, alleging a failure to perform the agreed-upon service competently, or trespass, if the medical intervention itself was deemed an unauthorized touching. The concept of a general duty arising from the professional relationship itself, independent of a specific contract or physical trespass, was not yet fully articulated in the common law. This gap between internal professional discipline and external legal compensation for patients highlights a key transition that the common law would later fill by developing the tort of negligence.

The development of statutory regulation of medicine also began during this time, primarily focused on licensing to prevent unqualified individuals from practicing. These early regulations were more concerned with public health and the prevention of fraud than with establishing a legal framework for holding qualified practitioners liable for negligent errors in treatment. The foundation for what would become medical negligence law required the broader evolution of tort law principles, particularly the concept of negligence as a distinct basis for liability (9).

The origins of medical malpractice litigation can be traced back to medieval England, with Stanton v. Cavendish (1375) serving as an early precedent. By the fifteenth century, such lawsuits became more frequent, leading to physician testimony and even early forms of procedural insurance. In contrast, the first recorded American case, *Cross v. Guthery*, did not occur until 1794, and litigation remained infrequent for much of the early 19th century (6).

A seismic shift occurred between 1935 and 1955, in the mid-20th century, when malpractice claims in the United States increased twentyfold. This surge was fueled by medical advancements, such as antibiotics and diagnostic imaging, which created more objective standards of care and higher patient expectations (6). The trend accelerated in the latter half of the century, with one 1957 American Medical Association study indicating that one in seven physicians had been sued. By 1975, approximately 14,000 suits were filed annually, with average jury awards reaching $171,000. This litigation crisis precipitated a corresponding crisis in malpractice insurance, with annual premiums soaring from $60 million in 1960 to $1 billion in 1975, forcing insurers to raise rates drastically or exit the market altogether (10).

The Foundations of Medical Negligence in Common Law

Emergence of the Concept of Duty of Care

The modern concept of a legal "duty of care" as a prerequisite for negligence liability developed gradually within the common law system, primarily in England. Initially, liability for harm was often tied to specific writs or established relationships, such as carrier and passenger, or innkeeper and guest. Applying these concepts to the provision of professional services, including medicine, was not straightforward (11).

The idea that a person could owe a duty of care to another simply because their actions could foreseeably cause harm gained prominence over centuries through case law. This principle eventually coalesced into the modern test for duty of care, famously articulated in the neighbor principle by Lord Atkin in the landmark case of *Donoghue v Stevenson* (1932) (12). Although not a medical case, this ruling solidified the idea that a duty is owed to those who are "so closely and directly affected by my act that I ought reasonably to have them in contemplation as being so affected" (12).

In the medical context, the establishment of a duty of care became inherently linked to the doctor-patient relationship. When a physician undertakes to treat a patient, a legal relationship is formed that imposes a duty to exercise reasonable care in providing that treatment (13). This duty is not contractual but arises from the common-law obligation not to cause foreseeable harm by careless action or inaction. The physician is expected to act in the patient's best interest, reflecting the fiduciary nature sometimes attributed to the relationship.

Development of the Standard of Care

Once a duty of care is established, the law must define the standard against which the professional's conduct is measured. For ordinary negligence, the standard is typically that of a "reasonable person" under the circumstances. However, for professionals, the standard is elevated to that of a reasonably competent practitioner in that specific field (14).

In medical negligence, this means the standard of care is not perfection, but rather the level of skill and care that a reasonably prudent and competent medical professional would exercise in the same or similar circumstances. This standard acknowledges the inherent risks and uncertainties in medicine. It requires the physician to possess and apply the knowledge and skill ordinarily possessed and applied by members of the profession in good standing. The specific standard can vary depending on the medical specialty, the practitioner's level of training, and the context in which care is provided (e.g., general practitioner versus specialist, rural setting versus major teaching hospital, etc.) (15).

Crucially, the standard of care in medical negligence is determined by the medical profession itself. The court's role is to ascertain what a responsible body of medical opinion considers appropriate practice. This principle, rooted in early case law, recognizes that judges and juries lack the medical expertise to independently determine the proper course of treatment or diagnostic procedure. Therefore, expert medical testimony becomes essential to establish the relevant standard and determine whether the defendant physician deviated from it (16). It should be noted that medical standards of care are often evidence-based and evolve as new research and consensus emerge.

Early Precedents in English Courts

Early English common law cases laid the groundwork for holding medical practitioners accountable for incompetence. Cases from the 14th century onward show instances in which surgeons were sued for botched procedures. These actions were often framed under trespass or an early form of negligence related to the negligent performance of a craft.

One notable early case is *Stratton v. Swanlond* (1377), where a surgeon was sued for failing to cure a hand injury. The case involved allegations of unskillful treatment (17). While the legal language and framework differed from modern tort law, it demonstrates that individuals sought legal redress for perceived medical mistreatment centuries ago.

By the 18th and 19th centuries, as the tort of negligence developed, medical liability cases became more clearly defined within this

framework. The principle that a medical man was liable for "gross negligence or ignorance" began to appear. The case of *Slater v. Baker & Stapleton* (1767) is often cited as an early example where surgeons were held liable for re-breaking and improperly setting a healed bone, using an experimental and ultimately harmful technique without proper consultation. The court emphasized that the defendants had acted "out of the course" of what was considered standard practice by competent surgeons, hinting at the emergence of a professional standard of care (18). This case marks a pivotal shift in the “how” of legal reasoning: the court began looking to the profession itself to define the bounds of acceptable practice, moving the legal focus from the mere fact of a bad outcome to the method and conformity of the care provided as the basis for liability.

These early precedents, though limited by the medical understanding and legal structures of their time, established the crucial idea that medical practitioners were not immune from legal consequences for harmful errors in their professional conduct. They paved the way for the more systematic development of medical negligence law in the 20th century.

Evolution and Refinement Through Landmark Cases

Key Cases Shaping the Standard of Care (e.g., Bolam, Bolitho)

The 20th century saw significant refinement of the medical standard of care in English law through several landmark cases. The most influential was *Bolam v. Friern Hospital Management Committee* (1957). In this case, the court articulated the "Bolam test," stating that a doctor is not guilty of negligence if acting in accordance with a practice accepted as proper by a responsible body of medical opinion skilled in that particular art. This test heavily deferred to the medical profession, suggesting that if a doctor's actions were supported by one body of respectable medical opinion, they would not be found negligent, even if another body of opinion preferred a different approach (19).

The Bolam test provided clarity but also faced criticism for potentially allowing a practice, even if illogical or outdated, to be considered non-negligent simply because “some” doctors supported it. This led to the refinement in *Bolitho v. City and Hackney Health Authority* (1997). The House of Lords in *Bolitho* clarified that while the court would typically respect a body of professional opinion, it would not do so if that opinion was not "responsible, reasonable, or respectable." The court reserved the right to scrutinize the professional opinion and reject it if it

could not withstand logical analysis. This introduced a judicial check on the Bolam test, requiring that the practice not only be accepted by a responsible body but also have a rational basis (20). The result was a crucial judicial check on medical autonomy, demonstrating why the law must balance professional deference with its ultimate responsibility to define reasonableness. The Bolitho decision ensured that the standard of care would evolve logically with scientific advancement, preventing the medical profession from being the final arbiter of its own legal accountability.

These cases are cornerstones in defining the standard of care, balancing deference to professional expertise with the court's ultimate duty to determine what constitutes reasonable conduct. They established that the standard is one of ordinary skill and care, judged by peers, but subject to judicial oversight for rationality.

Development of Causation Principles in Medical Contexts

Establishing a breach of duty is only one element of medical negligence; the plaintiff must also prove that the breach caused the injury. Causation in tort law generally requires both factual causation (the "but for" test) and legal causation (proximity and lack of intervening acts). In medical negligence, causation can be particularly complex (14).

The "but for" test asks: But for the defendant's negligent act or omission, would the injury have occurred? In medicine, this is often difficult to prove with certainty. Patients may have complex underlying conditions, and adverse outcomes can occur even with appropriate care. Determining whether the injury resulted from the alleged negligence, the natural progression of the illness, or other factors requires careful medical analysis and often involves probability assessments. English courts have generally required the plaintiff to prove causation on a balance of probabilities (more likely than not) (21). Cases like *Wilsher v. Essex Area Health Authority* (1988) highlighted the challenges that arise when multiple potential causes exist, reiterating that the plaintiff must show the defendant's negligence was a material cause, not just one of several possible causes (22).

Legal causation considers whether the injury was a foreseeable consequence of the breach and if any intervening events broke the chain of causation. This is less frequently an issue in straightforward medical negligence cases than, say, personal injury arising from an accident, but can be particularly important if a subsequent event exacerbates the injury or if the initial negligence leads to a

sequence of events that complicates matters. The principles of causation in medical negligence have evolved to grapple with the inherent uncertainties of medical outcomes and the need to attribute responsibility reasonably.

Influence of American Jurisprudence and State Variations

While U.S. medical negligence law is rooted in English common law, it has developed along its own path, influenced by American legal culture, the structure of the healthcare system, and federalism. Early American courts largely adopted the English "reasonable physician" standard, often applying a "locality rule" which judged a doctor's conduct based on the standard of care practiced by reasonably competent physicians in the same or similar community; instances include *Small v. Howard, 128 Mass. 131, 136* (1880) and *Kaiser v. Suburban Transp. Sys., 398 P.2d 14, 16* (Wash. 1965). This reflected the significant variations in medical training and resources available in different geographic areas during the 19th and early 20th centuries (23).

As medical education and standards became more nationalized, the strict locality rule was increasingly viewed as outdated, particularly for specialists. Many U.S. states moved toward a national standard of care, especially for board-certified specialists, who were required to meet the standard expected of reasonably competent practitioners in the same specialty nationwide; Shipley v. Williams (Tenn. Ct. App. Aug. 14, 2009) is an example. For general practitioners, a modified locality rule or a "same or similar circumstances" rule is often applied, taking into account factors like available resources (23).

Another divergence lies in the procedural aspects and the scale of litigation. The U.S. system, with its use of juries in civil trials, contingent fees for lawyers, and potentially higher damage awards (including punitive damages in some cases), has led to a different litigation environment compared to the UK. State laws also vary significantly in terms of requirements for bringing medical negligence claims, such as affidavits of merit, pre-litigation screening panels, and caps on non-economic damages, reflecting ongoing debates about tort reform and liability concerns (24).

Applying Tort Law Principles to Medical Injury

Establishing Duty in the Doctor-Patient Relationship

The first step in a medical negligence claim, like any negligence claim, is to establish that the defendant owed the plaintiff a duty of care. In the medical context, this duty is almost universally established once a doctor-patient relationship

forms, which is typically when a physician agrees to provide medical treatment or advice to a patient. The scope of the duty is defined by the nature of the relationship and the services undertaken. For example, a physician treating a patient owes a duty related to that treatment, while a physician merely offering an informal opinion in a casual setting might not owe a formal legal duty (25).

Hospitals and other healthcare institutions also owe a duty of care to their patients. This duty can include ensuring that medical staff are competent, providing adequate equipment and facilities, and maintaining appropriate policies and procedures. Thus, a medical negligence case can be brought against individual practitioners, hospitals, or both, depending on the circumstances of the alleged negligence.

The existence of a duty is usually not the most contested element in medical negligence cases, provided a clear doctor-patient relationship can be shown. However, complex scenarios, such as duties owed by consulting physicians, on-call doctors who did not directly interact with the patient, or institutions regarding the conduct of non-employee physicians, can sometimes raise novel duty questions (26). However, the “why” behind this simple rule reveals a fundamental legal policy: the law seeks to define a clear and limited scope of liability. By firmly establishing the duty through the relationship itself, the courts create a predictable framework that prevents a flood of claims against healthcare providers for remote or unforeseeable consequences.

Proving Breach: The Role of Professional Standards

Once duty is established, the plaintiff must prove that the defendant breached that duty by failing to meet the applicable standard of care. This is where professional standards become central. The plaintiff must demonstrate, typically through expert testimony, that the defendant's conduct fell below the level of skill and care that a reasonably prudent practitioner in the same field would have exercised under similar circumstances.

Proving breach requires presenting evidence of the accepted standard of care for the specific situation and showing how the defendant deviated from it. This evidence often includes:

- Expert witness testimony: A qualified medical professional explains the standard of care and why the defendant's actions (or inactions) failed to meet it.
- Medical literature and guidelines: Textbooks, journal articles, and

professional organization guidelines can illustrate accepted practices.

- Hospital policies and protocols: Internal rules can sometimes establish a minimum standard of care.
- Evidence of common practice: Testimony about how other practitioners typically handle similar situations may be used to evaluate the performance of the defendant.

The defense will often present counter-expert testimony arguing that the defendant's actions were within the range of acceptable medical practice, even if a different approach was also valid. The jury or judge must then examine the evidence and expert opinions to determine if a breach occurred (27).

This “battle of the experts” is not merely a procedural step; it is the core manifestation of the tension identified in Bolam and Bolitho. The “how” of proving breach demonstrates the practical challenge for courts in adjudicating between competing professional opinions, highlighting why the Bolitho logical scrutiny test was a necessary evolution to prevent the legal standard from being held hostage by a recalcitrant minority within the profession.

Navigating Factual and Legal Causation Challenges

Proving causation is often the most challenging aspect of a medical negligence case. The plaintiff must demonstrate that the defendant's breach of the standard of care was both a factual and a legal cause of the injury sustained. Factual causation requires showing that the injury would not have occurred "but for" the negligence. For example, if a delayed diagnosis is alleged, the plaintiff must prove that an earlier diagnosis and treatment would have prevented or significantly reduced the harm. This often involves complex medical testimony about probabilities and alternative outcomes.

The challenge of proving causation in delayed-diagnosis cases has led some courts to accept a "material increase in risk" as sufficient evidence of causation. This principle was applied in *Sydney South West Area Health Service v Stamoulis*, where a 10-month delay in diagnosing breast cancer elevated the statistical risk of metastasis from 38% to 42%. The court deemed this 4% absolute (10% relative) increase in risk significant enough to satisfy the legal test for causation, applying a common-sense approach to the factual chain (28). This reasoning, echoed in subsequent cases like *Elbourne v Gibbs and Pierce*, demonstrates the legal system's struggle to adapt traditional

causation principles to the probabilistic nature of medical outcomes.

Legal causation, or proximate cause, requires that the injury be a foreseeable consequence of the negligent act and that there be no superseding events that break the causal chain. While usually less contentious than factual causation in medical cases, it ensures fairness by limiting liability to harms that are sufficiently connected to the defendant's actions. For example, if a patient is negligently treated but then is injured in an unrelated car accident on the way home, the car accident is likely a superseding cause, and the doctor's negligence would not be the legal cause of the accident-related injuries (29).

Special rules and legal doctrines have developed in some jurisdictions to address specific causation challenges, such as loss-of-chance cases, where the negligence reduced the patient's chance of a better outcome, even if that outcome was not certain absent the negligence. These legal tests attempt to adapt the general principles of causation to the unique complexities of medical scenarios. The Australian case of *Tabet v Gett* further probed the limits of the "loss of chance" doctrine. The defendant physician was found negligent for failing to order a timely CT scan for a pediatric patient with persistent headaches, which later revealed a brain tumor. Critically, the court found that while the delay constituted a breach of duty, it could not be established as the definitive cause of the patient's ultimate disability on the balance of probabilities, as the injury was primarily attributed to the tumor itself and subsequent surgery. However, the court recognized that the negligence had denied the patient the opportunity for a better outcome. In a nuanced ruling, compensation was awarded for this lost chance, with the court quantifying the defendant's contribution to the overall damage at 25%, and within that portion, attributing 40% specifically to the loss of chance (30). This case highlights the persistent tension between traditional causation standards and the desire to provide redress for diminished recovery probabilities.

The Tabet case illustrates the profound difficulty courts face in the “how” of causation. When medicine cannot provide certainty, should the law deny all compensation? The loss of chance doctrine represents a legal innovation—an attempt to adapt rigid causation principles to the probabilistic nature of medical outcomes. The varying judicial acceptance of this doctrine across jurisdictions reveals a fundamental philosophical conflict: Should tort law only compensate for specific

harms, or should it also account for the destruction of possibilities?

Assessment of Damages and Remedies

If a plaintiff successfully proves duty, breach, causation, and damages, they are entitled to compensation for the harm suffered. The goal of damages in tort law is generally to restore the injured party, as much as possible, to the position they would have been in had the negligence not occurred. Damages in medical negligence cases can include both economic and non-economic losses.

Economic damages compensate for quantifiable financial losses, such as:

- Past and future medical expenses related to treating the injury caused by negligence
- Lost wages or earning capacity due to the injury
- Costs of long-term care, rehabilitation, or necessary accommodations (13)

Non-economic damages are more subjective and compensate for non-monetary losses, including:

- Pain and suffering
- Emotional distress
- Loss of enjoyment of life
- Loss of consortium (claimed by a spouse for loss of companionship and support)

In some jurisdictions, punitive damages may be awarded in cases of particularly egregious or reckless conduct, intended to punish the defendant and deter similar behavior. However, these are rare in medical negligence cases, which typically involve errors rather than intentional harm. Debates around the cost of medical negligence and the impact of significant damage awards have led to legislative efforts in many places, particularly in the U.S., to cap non-economic damages (31).

Modern Challenges and the Contemporary Legal Landscape

The Critical Role of Expert Testimony

Expert testimony remains the linchpin of most medical negligence cases. Given the technical nature of medical practice, judges and juries rely heavily on qualified medical experts to understand the relevant standard of care, whether it was breached, and whether the breach caused the patient's injury. Experts typically review medical records, imaging, lab results, and other evidence to form their opinions (32).

The selection and qualification of expert witnesses are subject to legal rules (e.g., the Daubert standard in U.S. federal courts). Experts must demonstrate relevant expertise in the specific area of medicine involved in the case. Challenges arise regarding the objectivity of hired experts, the "battle of the

experts" presenting conflicting opinions, and the cost of obtaining expert testimony, which can be a significant barrier to litigation for plaintiffs (33).

Experts frequently use professional guidelines and standards of care published by medical associations to support their opinions on acceptable practice. These resources can help inform the court on what constitutes reasonable care in specific clinical scenarios.

The Rise of Informed Consent and Patient Autonomy

Historically, medical practice was often characterized by paternalism, where the physician made decisions deemed best for the patient (34). However, modern medical law strongly emphasizes patient autonomy and the requirement of informed consent. Informed consent is the process by which a patient is given relevant information about a proposed treatment or procedure, including its risks, benefits, alternatives, and the likely outcome if nothing is done, allowing them to make a voluntary decision. Failure to obtain informed consent can be a separate basis for a medical negligence claim, even if the procedure itself was performed without technical negligence (35).

The legal standard for what information must be disclosed varies. Some jurisdictions follow a professional standard (what a reasonable medical practitioner would reveal). In contrast, others adopt a patient-centered standard (what a reasonable patient in the plaintiff's position would consider material to their decision). Landmark cases, such as *Canterbury v. Spence* (1972) in the US, have been instrumental in shifting the focus towards the patient's informational needs. Failure to obtain informed consent can sometimes be framed as an "injury to autonomy" (36). The rise of informed consent reflects a broader societal shift towards empowering patients and recognizing their right to self-determination in healthcare decisions. This shift is not merely social but represents a fundamental “why” in the evolution of medical law: the legal reframing of the doctor-patient relationship from a paternalistic model to a fiduciary one. The law now compels a sharing of power (information), recognizing that a patient's values are an essential component of medical decision-making. This is arguably the most significant ethical and legal development in modern healthcare, moving the standard from what a doctor thinks is best to what a patient has the right to choose.

Issues of Defensive Medicine and Liability Concerns

The potential for medical negligence lawsuits has significantly affected medical practice, raising concerns about "defensive medicine." This refers to medical professionals altering their practice patterns primarily to reduce their exposure to liability, rather than solely based on clinical indications. Examples include ordering excessive diagnostic tests (for fear of missing a diagnosis), avoiding high-risk procedures, or referring complex cases more readily. While some defensive practices might align with good medical care, others can increase healthcare costs, expose patients to unnecessary procedures, or even reduce access to care in certain specialties or geographic areas.

Empirical research consistently demonstrates that the fear of litigation profoundly influences physician behavior, a phenomenon known as defensive medicine. A landmark study by Studdert et al. found that 92% of surveyed physicians in Pennsylvania admitted to ordering unnecessary imaging and diagnostic tests for assurance. In comparison, 42% reported avoiding high-risk procedures or complex patients (37). This trend is not confined to the United States; a study of Japanese gastroenterologists yielded similar concerns about malpractice litigation (37). The pervasiveness of this mindset is further underscored by a Harvard Medical School study, which concluded that a defensive culture is prevalent across multiple medical specialties (37). These findings collectively illustrate that defensive medicine is a widespread adaptive response to the legal environment, directly impacting clinical decision-making and healthcare costs.

Liability concerns also contribute to rising medical malpractice insurance premiums, particularly for high-risk specialties. This can affect physician supply and distribution. Balancing the need to hold negligent practitioners accountable with the desire to foster an environment where physicians can practice effectively without undue fear of litigation is an ongoing challenge for the legal and healthcare systems. The impact of litigation risk on physician behavior and healthcare costs is a key aspect of the contemporary medical negligence landscape.

Medical Negligence Reform Movements and Future Trends

Concerns about the cost and perceived inefficiencies of the traditional tort system for resolving medical injury claims have fueled various medical negligence reform movements, particularly in the United States. These reforms aim to reduce litigation, control costs, and ensure fairness. Common proposals and implemented changes include:

- Caps on damages, especially non-economic damages, to limit extensive jury awards
- Implementing pre-litigation screening panels where medical experts review claims before they can proceed to court
- Promoting alternative dispute resolution methods, such as mediation or arbitration
- Developing specialized health courts with judges who have expertise in medical and legal issues
- Encouraging transparency and apology laws that allow providers to apologize for adverse outcomes without the apology being admissible as evidence of liability
- Focusing on patient safety initiatives and error prevention within healthcare systems to reduce incidents of negligence

Future trends may involve greater use of data analytics to identify patterns of medical error, the influence of artificial intelligence and technology on both medical practice and liability, and continued evolution of legal standards in response to advances in medicine (e.g., genomics and neuroscience) (38). The system continues to adapt to balance patient rights, physician responsibilities, and the complexities of modern healthcare.

The existence of these vigorous reform movements is a direct political and legal response to the problems identified earlier, such as defensive medicine. The “why” behind these movements is a fundamental debate about the very purpose of the medical negligence system: Is it primarily to compensate every injured patient, or to efficiently deter substandard care while maintaining a stable, affordable healthcare system? Proponents of reform argue that the current system fails on all counts, while opponents see reforms as limiting valid patient rights. This ongoing conflict ensures that the legal landscape of medical negligence will continue to evolve.

Conclusion

The history of medical negligence law is a story of evolving societal expectations, medical knowledge, and legal principles. From the outcome-based penalties of the Code of Hammurabi and Ancient Persia to the sophisticated, duty-based tort framework of today, the journey reveals a consistent theme: society's expectation that those entrusted with health and life will act with reasonable care. The common law's significant contribution was to systematize this expectation into the core elements of duty, breach, causation, and damages, moving from a system of

internal guild discipline to one of external legal accountability.

This historical journey, from the fixed penalties of Hammurabi to the nuanced, logical scrutiny of *Bolitho*, demonstrates a legal system continually adapting to define reasonable care in an increasingly complex medical world. The rise of informed consent underscores a fundamental shift from medical paternalism to patient autonomy. At the same time, the phenomenon of defensive medicine illustrates the profound impact legal accountability has on clinical behavior.

Ultimately, this study confirms that the conceptual foundations of medical negligence evolved from simplistic, outcome-focused penalties to a sophisticated system centered on a breach of a professionally defined, yet judicially supervised, duty of care. Future research could fruitfully explore this theme in non-Western legal traditions, such as Islamic medical jurisprudence, or investigate the novel challenges posed to negligence law by emerging technologies, such as artificial intelligence in diagnostics and treatment. Understanding the past, as this journey has shown, remains an essential tool for navigating the future of medical accountability and patient safety.

Funding

This work is based upon research funded by Iran National Science Foundation (INSF) under project No.4024907

References

1. Saputra B, Bene O, Aprizon Putra D. Analyzing the Code of Hammurabi: exploring ancient legal principles and their relevance in modern law. NEGREI Acad J Law Gov 2024; 4(1): 4-9.
2. Karamanou M, Androutsos G, Poulakou-Rebelakou E, Kousoulis AA. The Hippocratic Oath: a pledge for physicians, then and now. Hell J Cardiol 2016; 57(5): 289-91.
3. Gordley J. The jurists: a critical history. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2021.
4. Azizi MH. The history of ancient Persian medicine. Iran J Public Health 2007; 36(Suppl 1): 1-5.
5. Shaki M. The concept of the physician in ancient Iran. In: Acta Iranica. 3rd series, Vol. 21. Leiden: Brill; 1981.
6. Zaehner RC. The dawn and twilight of Zoroastrianism. New York: Putnam; 1961.

7. Jafarey AA. The Vendidad: its code of conduct. In: Cama KR, editor. Cama Oriental Institute proceedings. Bombay: Cama Oriental Institute; 1989.
8. McGrew RE. Encyclopedia of medical history. New York: McGraw-Hill; 1985.
9. Mello MM, Studdert DM, Kachalia AB. The medical liability system and quality of health care. N Engl J Med 2022; 386: 1856-64.
10. Lindenfeld E. Moving beyond the quick fix: medical malpractice non-economic damage caps a poor solution to the growing healthcare crisis. Thurgood Marsh Law Rev 2016; 41(1): 107-35.
11. Plunkett J. The historical foundations of the duty of care. Monash Univ Law Rev 2015; 41(3): 717-45.
12. Donoghue v Stevenson [1932] UKHL 100.
13. Peters PG. The role of the doctor-patient relationship in medical malpractice. In: Sanbar SS, editor. Legal medicine. 7th ed. St. Louis: Mosby; 2007. p. 45-62.
14. Harpwood V. Principles of tort law. London: Cavendish Publishing; 2000.
15. Samanta A, Samanta J. The standard of care in medical negligence: a complex web of policy and practice. Clin Med (Lond) 2019; 19(3): 218-21.
16. Kopitnik NL, Nouhan PP. Expert witness. In: StatPearls [Internet]. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing; 2024.
17. Chapman CB. Stratton vs. Swanlond: the fourteenth-century ancestor of the law of malpractice. Pharos Alpha Omega Alpha Honor Med Soc 1982; 45: 20-4.
18. Annas GJ. Doctors, patients, and lawyers: two centuries of health law. N Engl J Med 2012; 367: 445-50.
19. Bolam v Friern Hospital Management Committee [1957] 1 WLR 582.
20. Bolitho v City and Hackney Health Authority [1998] AC 232.
21. Stauch M. The 'loss of chance' doctrine in medical negligence: a comparative analysis. Med Law Rev 2020; 28(2): 211-33.
22. Wilsher v Essex Area Health Authority [1988] AC 1074.
23. Ginsberg M. The locality rule lives! Why? Using modern medicine to eradicate an 'unhealthy' law. Drake Law Rev 2013; 61: 323-65.

24. Hyman DA, Black B, Silver C, Sage WM. Does tort reform affect the size and shape of medical malpractice claims? Evidence from Texas. J Empir Leg Stud 2019; 16(1): 86-119.
25. British Medical Association. Medical ethics today: the BMA's handbook of ethics and law. 3rd ed. London: BMJ Books; 2024.
26. Dehlawi S, Alqahtani MD, Alzhrani MM, Alhazmi AH. Medical negligence in healthcare organizations and its impact on patient safety and public health: a bibliometric study. J Patient Saf Risk Manag 2021; 26(2): 60-71.
27. Panagiotou OA. Professional standards, clinical guidelines and medical liability. Eur J Health Law 2018; 25(2): 159-81.
28. Sydney South West Area Health Service v Stamoulis [2009] NSWCA 153.
29. Keefe R. Causation problems in medical negligence cases. Precedent 2023; (177): 44-8.
30. Skene L. Loss of chance in medical negligence. Anaesth Intensive Care 2014; 42(3): 300-3.
31. Avraham R. The economics of non-economic damages. J Tort Law 2019; 12(1): 1-35.
32. Bishop MC. The negligence of medical experts. J R Soc Med 2004; 97(12): 599-600.
33. Bennett C. The gatekeeping role in medical negligence litigation: a critical review of expert evidence standards. Int J Law Psychiatry 2021; 74: 101668.
34. Hart JT. Book of the month: The autonomous patient: ending paternalism in medical care. J R Soc Med 2002; 95(12): 623-4.
35. Pugh J. Informed consent, autonomy, and beliefs. In: Autonomy, rationality, and contemporary bioethics. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2020.
36. Keren-Paz T. Compensating injury to autonomy in English negligence law: inconsistent recognition. Med Law Rev 2018; 26(4): 585-609.
37. Sekhar M, Vyas N. Defensive medicine: a bane to healthcare. Ann Med Health Sci Res 2013; 3(2): 295-6.
38. Macchiaroli Eggen J. Mental disabilities and duty in negligence law: will neuroscience reform tort doctrine? Indiana Health Law Rev 2015; 12(2): 591-634.