African Journal of Social and Behavioural Sciences (AJSBS)
Volume 15, Number 10 (2025) ISSN: 2141-209X

ETHICAL FRAMEWORK, CULTURAL HUMILITY IN FOSTERING INNOVATION IN CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY

Ahmed Jibrin[1]*, Nuhu Gideon Sammni[2] & Tanimu Muhammed[3]

[1]Department of Psychology, Nasarawa State University, Keffi, Nigeria

[2]Department of Social Studies, Federal University of Education, Zariya

[3]Department of Educational and Management, Nasarawa State University, Keffi, Nigeria

*ahmejibrin17@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: This paper advances an integrative ethical framework for clinical psychology that aligns mid-level Principlism with cultural humility to guide decisions in culturally plural, innovation-driven care settings. We address a practical problem: clinicians must weigh autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice while engaging patients' cultural values and fast-emerging technologies. The aim is to provide a concise, actionable model that clarifies how Principlism can be operationalized without erasing local meanings of illness, care, and community. Drawing on illustrative cases, digital mental-health tools, eco-conscious nanomedical approaches, traditional herbal practices, and a subnational vignette from Keffi, Nasarawa State, we show how cultural humility calibrates principle-based analysis, improving consent processes, risk appraisal, and fairness in access. The contribution is a pragmatic ethical framework for clinical psychology that specifies when and how to adapt principled reasoning to context while preserving normative rigor. Implications include transparent justification of clinical choices, culturally responsive consent and disclosure, and criteria for selecting and evaluating innovations so that interventions remain equitable, respectful, and clinically defensible across diverse populations.

Keywords: Clinical psychology, Biomedical ethics, Cultural competence, Principlism, Health innovations, Compassionate care

INTRODUCTION

This paper proposes a concise, practice-oriented ethical framework for clinical psychology that helps clinicians' reason clearly about culture and biomedical innovation without sacrificing normative standards. Across contemporary services, clinicians confront two intersecting pressures: (1) culturally diverse expectations about autonomy, family involvement, and traditional healing; and (2) rapid diffusion of digital and biomedical innovations that complicate consent, risk, and justice. In Nasarawa State, especially Keffi, an educational and administrative hub with high smartphone access, post-COVID digital dependency among adolescents and young professionals has grown alongside reports of sleep problems, emotional exhaustion, and strained interpersonal communication, highlighting both opportunity and risk in technology-mediated care.

Why principlism? We privilege Beauchamp and Childress's principlism because its mid-level, action-guiding principles are portable across settings, auditable in practice, and compatible with pluralism. Compared with purely relativist approaches, it resists ethical drift; compared with single-theory accounts (e.g., utilitarian or deontological), it offers balanced, case-level adjudication; and compared with virtue/care ethics alone, it yields clearer procedural guidance for documentation and oversight.

Illustrations were purposively chosen for clinical salience and cultural breadth: (a) digital mental-health tools; (b) sustainability-minded nanomedicine; (c) traditional herbal practices; and (d) a Keffi subnational vignette to foreground local realities.

This is a conceptual paper that develops an integrative ethical framework for clinical psychology, marrying principlism with cultural humility to evaluate emerging practices and technologies in culturally diverse contexts while specifying concrete implications for consent, risk management, and justice.

The globalisation of healthcare has generated unprecedented opportunities for the exchange of knowledge, practices, and technologies across borders, yet it has also brought to the fore enduring tensions between universal ethical principles and culturally specific traditions. Clinical practice, particularly in psychology and related health sciences, is no longer confined within national boundaries but is increasingly shaped by international standards of care and transnational flows of patients, professionals, and innovations. Within this landscape, the principles of biomedical ethics, autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice, have provided a shared moral framework for clinicians worldwide (Beauchamp & Childress, 2009). These principles are lauded for their universality, offering practitioners a common language with which to navigate ethical dilemmas. Nevertheless, they are frequently challenged by cultural norms, communal values, and patient expectations that vary markedly across societies, raising questions about their applicability in diverse contexts (Ten Have, 2016). Concurrently, healthcare is being reshaped by the rapid rise of technological and biomedical innovations. Mobile health (mHealth) applications and telepsychiatry have extended access to psychological interventions in resource-limited settings, albeit with implications for privacy, consent, and patient autonomy (Haddad et al., 2022). Advances in nanomedicine and biomedical engineering hold promise for transformative possibilities in diagnosis and treatment, while raising concerns regarding safety, sustainability, and distributive justice (Patil et al., 2023). Alongside these developments, there has been a global resurgence of interest in traditional and herbal-based remedies, such as Indian herbs for oral ulcerations, which are deeply embedded in cultural heritage and valued for their perceived natural efficacy (Agnihotri et al., 2020). These parallel trajectories—of high-technology innovation and traditional practice—underscore the plurality of healthcare choices that clinicians must respect and ethically navigate. Against this backdrop, the central challenge arises: how can clinicians balance the universality of ethical principles with the particularity of cultural traditions in contexts that are increasingly pluralistic and technologically advanced? This paper argues that an integrative approach is necessary—one that retains fidelity to core ethical principles while embracing cultural humility and sensitivity. Such a model must also critically appraise emerging innovations, ensuring that new technologies are introduced responsibly, equitably, and in ways that respect patients' cultural values. In addressing this question, the paper proposes a conceptual framework that situates

compassionate clinical care at the nexus of ethics, culture, and innovation, thereby offering guidance for practitioners seeking to navigate the complexities of twenty-first-century healthcare.

Ethical Foundations

The ethical foundation comprises principles like respect for autonomy, non-maleficence, beneficence, and justice, guiding moral decision-making and behaviour. These scholars: Beauchamp and Belmont made a huge contribution on this note. Beauchamp and Childress' principlism is one of the most influential ethical frameworks in biomedical and clinical practice. While the Belmont Report (1979) articulated three guiding ethical principles for research involving human subjects, which has been discussed elaborately below.

Beauchamp and Childress' Principlism

Beauchamp and Childress' principlism remains one of the most influential ethical frameworks in biomedical and clinical practice. It is founded on four central principles: autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice (Beauchamp & Childress, 2009). Autonomy underscores the right of patients to make informed decisions about their own care. Beneficence requires clinicians to act in ways that promote well-being. Non-maleficence embodies the commitment to avoid harm, and Justice calls for fairness in the distribution of healthcare resources. Collectively, these principles have become a cornerstone of contemporary bioethics, providing a pragmatic approach that transcends individual moral theories.

Nevertheless, principlism has not been immune to critique. One persistent debate concern whether the principles are genuinely universal or whether they reflect a Western moral outlook that may not resonate with other cultural traditions. Critics argue that principlism risks privileging individual autonomy in contexts where communal or familial decision-making is paramount, thereby neglecting non-Western moral systems (Amesbury, 2010). Defenders of the framework counter that while the principles originate in Western philosophical traditions, their broad moral appeal makes them adaptable across diverse societies, provided that cultural contexts inform their interpretation (Gillon, 2003). The tension between universalism and relativism thus remains at the heart of principlism's application in global clinical practice.

Belmont Report Revisited

The Belmont Report (1979) articulated three guiding ethical principles for research involving human subjects: respect for persons, beneficence, and justice. Originally developed to address abuses in biomedical research, the report has since been extended to inform ethical clinical practice more broadly (National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioural Research, 1979/2008). Respect for persons emphasises autonomy and the protection of vulnerable individuals, beneficence requires maximising possible benefits while minimising harm, and justice insists upon fairness in subject selection and resource allocation.

In clinical psychology and allied health professions, these principles have gained renewed relevance. For example, respect for persons entails recognising patients' rights to informed consent

in culturally sensitive ways, while beneficence and non-maleficence compel practitioners to evaluate new interventions—whether digital tools or herbal remedies—against evidence of safety and efficacy. Justice extends beyond research subjects to encompass broader systemic concerns, including access to mental health services and the equitable integration of innovations into clinical practice. The Belmont principles, much like principlism, continue to anchor discussions of ethics while remaining subject to reinterpretation in light of cultural and technological change.

Common Morality versus Cultural Contexts

A further debate within global bioethics concerns the notion of "common morality" as the basis of ethical decision-making. Proponents argue that there exists a set of moral norms shared across cultures, reflected in principles such as honesty, fairness, and the duty not to harm (Beauchamp, 2003). On this view, principlism and the Belmont framework articulate a universally recognisable moral grammar that is intelligible across diverse cultural contexts.

Conversely, scholars working within cultural bioethics caution against assuming universality, arguing that moral norms are mediated by cultural traditions, religious beliefs, and communal practices (Turner, 2018). For instance, while Western contexts may prioritise individual choice, many societies place greater emphasis on relational autonomy, family authority, or spiritual considerations in clinical decision-making. The question of whether to privilege a "common morality" or to adapt bioethics to local traditions thus remains contested. For clinical psychologists and healthcare providers, this tension manifests in practical dilemmas: whether to uphold universal ethical principles when they conflict with patients' cultural expectations, or to privilege cultural sensitivity even where it may appear to compromise principled ethical commitments.

Cultural Dimensions in Clinical Practice

Cultural dimensions significantly influence clinical practice, impacting communication styles, health beliefs, family involvement, pain expression, and traditional healing practices, requiring healthcare providers to deliver culturally sensitive care by assessing patients' cultural background, using interpreters, involving family members, being aware of nonverbal cues, and adapting treatment plans to accommodate patients' cultural beliefs and practices. Cultural competence models and the case of traditional herbal remedies in oral health have discussed below.

Cultural Competence Models

Cultural competence has become a central concern in clinical psychology and broader healthcare practice, recognising that cultural contexts mediate patient experiences are expectations. One of the most widely cited frameworks is Campinha-Bacote's *Process of Cultural Competence in the Delivery of Healthcare Services* (2018), which conceptualises competence not as a fixed attainment but as an ongoing process comprising cultural awareness, cultural knowledge, cultural skill, cultural encounters, and cultural desire. This model emphasises that clinicians must continually strive to engage with patients' cultural backgrounds to deliver care that is both respectful and effective.

Yet cultural competence models have also been subject to critique. Kleinman and Benson (2006) contend that attempts to codify cultural knowledge into generalised categories risk stereotyping patients and reducing culture to a set of checklists. Instead, they advocate for cultural humility, which prioritises listening to patients' narratives, recognising their values and explanatory models of illness, and maintaining reflexivity regarding one's own cultural assumptions. For clinical psychology, this approach is particularly relevant, as therapeutic alliances and treatment adherence often hinge upon an empathetic understanding of how mental health and wellbeing are framed within different cultural traditions. Thus, the debate between cultural competence and cultural humility underscores the need for clinicians to balance structured frameworks with openness to individual lived experiences.

Case of Traditional Herbal Remedies in Oral Health

A compelling example of cultural practice within clinical care is the widespread use of traditional herbal remedies in oral health. Agnihotri et al. (2020) conducted a scoping review on the application of Indian herbs in the management of oral ulcerations, highlighting the therapeutic roles of turmeric (*Curcuma longa*), aloe vera (*Aloe barbadensis*), neem (*Azadirachta indica*), licories (*Glycyrrhiza glabra*), chamomile (*Matricaria chamomilla*), honey, and ginger (*Zingiber officinale*). These remedies, deeply rooted in cultural heritage, are valued for their anti-inflammatory, analgesic, antimicrobial, and immunomodulatory properties, and are often perceived by patients as safer alternatives to synthetic drugs.

The use of such remedies raises significant ethical considerations. From the perspective of autonomy, patients may prefer herbal treatments over conventional pharmacological interventions, reflecting both personal choice and cultural identity. Clinicians are thus challenged to respect these preferences while ensuring that patients are adequately informed about efficacy and potential risks. Beneficence and non-maleficence require a careful weighing of benefits against harms, particularly as herbal remedies may lack the rigorous standardisation and clinical validation applied to pharmaceutical drugs. Unregulated use, contamination, or misapplication can undermine safety, even as these remedies offer promising therapeutic potential. Finally, justice demands attention to issues of access and equity. While traditional remedies may provide affordable and culturally acceptable care for marginalised populations, there is also a risk of exploitation through the commercialisation and patenting of indigenous knowledge by global pharmaceutical industries.

In this context, traditional herbal medicine serves as a microcosm of the broader tension between cultural traditions and universal ethical principles in healthcare. For clinical practice, the challenge lies in integrating these remedies into treatment in ways that respect cultural values, safeguard patient welfare, and ensure fairness in access and benefit-sharing.

Biomedical Innovation and Ethics

Biomedical innovation raises important ethical considerations, including ensuring informed consent, protecting patient privacy, and balancing benefits against risks. Key areas of focus include gene editing, artificial intelligence in healthcare, and access to innovative treatments. Ethical frameworks help guide decision-making and ensure that innovations prioritize human well-being

and dignity. Nanomedicine and sustainability, digital health and cultural adaptation, survivorship and long-term care, balancing principles in practice, as well as pa proposed integrated framework havebeen captured.

Nanomedicine and Sustainability

Nanomedicine represents one of the most promising frontiers in contemporary healthcare, offering innovative pathways for diagnostics, targeted drug delivery, and therapeutic interventions. Patil et al. (2023) explored the green synthesis of gold nanoparticles using extracts from ginger, neem, apta, and umber plants, underscoring the biomedical potential of eco-friendly nanotechnological approaches. While such methods offer sustainability advantages by reducing reliance on toxic chemicals, they also raise important ethical questions concerning safety, efficacy, and equitable access. From a principlist perspective, beneficence requires clinicians and researchers to maximise the potential health benefits of nanomedicine, whereas non-maleficence obliges them to ensure that long-term toxicological risks are fully understood before widespread adoption. Justice demands attention to the global distribution of nanomedical innovations, as high costs and proprietary technologies may exacerbate inequities between high-income and resource-limited settings. Moreover, questions of sustainability highlight the responsibility of healthcare systems to pursue innovations that are environmentally as well as clinically responsible.

Digital Health and Cultural Adaptation

Digital health innovations, particularly mobile health (mHealth) interventions, are transforming the delivery of clinical and psychological care by expanding access, reducing costs, and enabling real-time monitoring. Haddad et al. (2022) examined the application of Innovation Corps (I-Corps) methods in adapting an mHealth obesity treatment for use within community mental health settings. Their findings revealed the importance of stakeholder engagement—administrators, clinicians, and service users—in identifying barriers such as resource limitations, educational gaps, and institutional inertia. From an ethical standpoint, digital health presents both opportunities and challenges. Autonomy can be enhanced by empowering patients with information and self-management tools. Yet, it may also be compromised if digital systems impose surveillance or fail to provide adequate consent mechanisms. Beneficence is served when digital interventions improve access to care, but non-maleficence cautions against risks of data breaches, misinformation, or inadequate clinical oversight. Culturally sensitive adaptation, as demonstrated through stakeholder-centred methodologies, is essential to ensure that digital innovations are contextually relevant, equitable, and respectful of patient populations' values and lived realities.

Survivorship and Long-Term Care

The ethical and cultural dimensions of biomedical innovation are particularly salient in survivorship and long-term care. Advances in cancer treatment, for instance, have significantly increased survival rates, yet they have also generated new challenges in addressing the quality of life for survivors. The *BMJ*'s analysis of breast cancer survivorship highlights how post-treatment care must extend beyond biomedical outcomes to encompass psychosocial wellbeing, equity of access to follow-up services, and cultural sensitivity in addressing patients' diverse needs. From the

perspective of autonomy, survivors require comprehensive information and involvement in decisions about ongoing care, rehabilitation, and lifestyle adaptation. Beneficence and non-maleficence demand that interventions minimise long-term side effects while enhancing psychological resilience and social reintegration. Justice is implicated in ensuring that survivorship services are not limited to privileged populations but are extended equitably across different socio-economic and cultural groups. Survivorship thus exemplifies how biomedical innovation cannot be ethically appraised solely by its capacity to extend life; it must also be evaluated by its ability to support dignified, culturally responsive, and holistic care.

Balancing Principles in Practice

The application of ethical principles in clinical practice is rarely straightforward; rather, it requires ongoing negotiation between universal frameworks and cultural, social, and technological realities. Autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice remain indispensable anchors, yet divergent cultural norms, uncertainties in biomedical innovation, and disparities in healthcare cases often complicate their implementation

Autonomy is perhaps the most contested principle across cultural contexts. In many Western settings, individual self-determination is prioritised, with patients expected to make independent choices regarding treatment. However, in cultures where decision-making is embedded within family or community structures, autonomy is exercised relationally rather than individually. For example, patients may defer critical treatment decisions to elders or family heads, a practice that challenges the Western emphasis on individual consent but reflects deeply held communal values. Clinicians must therefore navigate the delicate balance of respecting patient choice while acknowledging the cultural legitimacy of collective decision-making.

Beneficence obliges healthcare providers to promote patient well-being, yet its enactment must account for both clinical evidence and cultural acceptance. While a digital health intervention may demonstrate efficacy in reducing psychological distress, it may fail if patients view technology as impersonal or culturally incongruent. Similarly, herbal remedies such as turmeric or aloe vera, valued in traditional practices for their healing properties, may be embraced by patients despite limited standardisation in clinical trials. In such cases, beneficence requires not only the pursuit of clinically effective treatments but also a sensitivity to interventions that align with patients' cultural identities and values.

Non-maleficence, or the obligation to avoid harm, takes on new complexity in the era of biomedical and digital innovation. Nanomedicine, for instance, holds immense therapeutic promise but carries unresolved questions regarding long-term toxicity and environmental sustainability (Patil et al., 2023). Digital health tools may empower patients but also expose them to risks of data breaches or inadequate clinical oversight (Haddad et al., 2022). Likewise, while herbal remedies for oral health demonstrate potential, unregulated use may result in contamination or ineffective dosing (Agnihotri et al., 2020). The precautionary principle becomes critical, requiring clinicians to remain vigilant about potential harms even in the face of promising innovations.

Justice requires fairness in the allocation of healthcare resources, ensuring that marginalised groups are not excluded from the benefits of either traditional or innovative interventions. The global uptake of digital health risks exacerbating inequities if vulnerable populations lack access to the necessary infrastructure or digital literacy. Similarly, the commercial appropriation of indigenous herbal knowledge without equitable benefit-sharing raises issues of exploitation and distributive injustice. Survivorship care in oncology further highlights the principle of justice, as long-term support services often remain disproportionately available to patients in high-resource settings, leaving many without equitable access to psychological and rehabilitative care. Justice thus demands that healthcare systems prioritise inclusivity, ensuring that innovations are not restricted to the privileged few but are equitably extended across diverse populations.

Taken together, the four principles illustrate the complex balancing act required in contemporary clinical practice. Autonomy must be interpreted through cultural lenses, beneficence must embrace both scientific evidence and cultural acceptance, non-maleficence must remain alert to the risks of novel interventions, and justice must guide equitable access. The challenge for clinicians lies not in applying these principles in isolation but in harmonising them within culturally and ethnically diverse contexts.

Proposed Integrated Framework

The ethical and cultural challenges confronting contemporary clinical practice necessitate a structured framework that integrates universal moral principles with cultural traditions and biomedical innovations. The following six-step model is proposed as a guide for clinicians, policymakers, and researchers seeking to harmonise these dimensions in practice.

Step 1 – Universal Ethics**.** Clinical practice must be grounded in established ethical principles, particularly those articulated in Beauchamp and Childress's principlism—autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice—and reinforced by the Belmont Report's values of respect for persons, beneficence, and justice. These principles provide the normative anchor for decision-making across diverse contexts.

Step 2 – Cultural Engagement. Clinicians should recognise and actively engage with cultural traditions that shape patients' health beliefs and practices. This includes acknowledging the significance of herbal care, communal decision-making, and indigenous health systems, not as obstacles but as integral components of patients' lived experiences and identities.

Step 3 – Evidence-Based Validation. While respecting cultural traditions, clinicians have a duty to subject remedies and practices to rigorous evaluation. Herbal treatments such as turmeric, aloe vera, neem, and licorice, widely used in oral health care, must be appraised through controlled trials to establish their efficacy and safety. Evidence-based validation bridges the gap between cultural respect and scientific integrity.

Step 4 – Innovation Ethics. Emerging biomedical technologies—including nanomedicine, mHealth applications, and engineering advances—must be assessed not only for clinical effectiveness but also for potential risks, long-term consequences, and sustainability. Ethical reflection should

accompany innovation, ensuring that new technologies promote well-being without causing unintended harm or environmental degradation.

Step 5 – Shared Decision-Making. Balancing patient autonomy with clinician expertise requires genuine dialogue. Shared decision-making enables patients to exercise choice within the bounds of informed consent, while allowing clinicians to guide patients towards interventions that are both clinically effective and culturally appropriate. This approach mitigates conflicts between universal principles and cultural norms by fostering mutual respect and trust.

Step 6 – Policy and Justice. Finally, ethical clinical practice must extend beyond the individual encounter to address systemic issues of equity. Policies should ensure that marginalised groups have equal access to both traditional remedies and cutting-edge innovations. Justice also demands the protection of indigenous knowledge systems from exploitation, such as the unregulated patenting of herbal remedies without benefit-sharing. Global frameworks must be designed to uphold fairness, inclusivity, and the protection of vulnerable communities.

Taken together, these six steps provide an integrative model for clinical practice that is ethically sound, culturally sensitive, and scientifically rigorous. By grounding care in universal principles, engaging with cultural traditions, validating remedies, reflecting critically on innovations, embracing shared decision-making, and ensuring justice at the policy level, clinicians can deliver compassionate and contextually attuned care in an increasingly globalised healthcare landscape.

Conclusion

The realities of twenty-first-century clinical practice necessitate an integrative paradigm that harmonises universal ethical principles, cultural traditions, and biomedical innovation. Foundational frameworks such as principlism and the Belmont Report remain indispensable, offering clinicians a shared moral vocabulary for addressing complex ethical dilemmas across diverse contexts. Nevertheless, these principles cannot be applied in isolation; they must be critically interpreted through the cultural lenses and lived experiences that shape patients' conceptions of health, illness, and care. Cultural practices—including the use of indigenous and herbal remedies—should not be dismissed as antithetical to universal ethics but rather understood as complementary traditions that, when subjected to rigorous empirical validation, can expand and enrich the clinical repertoire. The accelerating integration of biomedical and digital technologies further underscores the need for ethical vigilance and accountability. Innovations such as nanomedicine, mobile health applications, and survivorship care programmes promise transformative benefits, yet they simultaneously introduce novel uncertainties and inequities. These developments demand continuous ethical appraisal through the principles of beneficence, non-maleficence, autonomy, and justice. A truly responsive model of clinical care must transcend the binary oppositions of tradition versus modernity or universalism versus relativism, striving instead for a synthesis that combines principled consistency with contextual adaptability. The future of healthcare thus depends on cultivating systems and professional practices that are ethically grounded, culturally attuned, and scientifically validated. Such a model of compassionate and reflective care ensures that patients—regardless of cultural background, identity, or socio-economic position—receive interventions that are both effective and respectful of their inherent dignity,

beliefs, and rights. By integrating universal ethics, cultural wisdom, and technological progress, clinicians can advance a vision of healthcare that is inclusive, sustainable, and socially just. Nonetheless, certain limitations must be acknowledged. The present discussion is largely conceptual and interpretive, relying on theoretical synthesis rather than empirical validation. Consequently, it may not fully capture the contextual complexities and regional diversities that influence ethical decision-making and culturally informed care. Additionally, the rapid evolution of biomedical and digital technologies renders ethical analyses provisional, necessitating continual reassessment to maintain relevance and rigour. Future research should therefore pursue empirically grounded investigations into how clinicians navigate ethical–cultural intersections in diverse practice environments, particularly in multicultural and resource-constrained settings. Comparative and cross-cultural studies could illuminate how ethical frameworks are operationalised within varying healthcare systems and professional cultures. Furthermore, deeper exploration of the ethical ramifications of emerging technologies—such as artificial intelligence, telehealth, and genomic medicine—will be critical to ensuring that innovation remains aligned with humanistic values, equitable access, and global standards of ethical integrity.

REFERENCES

Agnihotri, N., Wanjari, S. P., & Agnihotri, R. (2020). Oral ulceration and Indian herbs: A scoping review. *Journal of Indian Academy of Oral Medicine and Radiology, 32*(2), 156–162. https://doi.org/10.4103/jiaomr.jiaomr_113_20

Beauchamp, T. L. (2003). A defense of the common morality. *Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal, 13*(3), 259–274. https://doi.org/10.1353/ken.2003.0026

Beauchamp, T. L., & Childress, J. F. (2009). *Principles of biomedical ethics* (6th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Betancourt, J. R., Green, A. R., Carrillo, J. E., & Owusu Ananeh-Firempong, I. I. (2003). Defining cultural competence: A practical framework for addressing racial/ethnic disparities in health and healthcare. *Public Health Reports, 118*(4), 293–302. https://doi.org/10.1093/phr/118.4.293

The BMJ. (2018). Advances in the care of breast cancer survivors. *BMJ, 363*, k3845. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.k3845

Campinha-Bacote, J. (2018). The process of cultural competence in the delivery of healthcare services: A model of care. *Journal of Transcultural Nursing, 29*(3), 203–210. https://doi.org/10.1177/1043659617737123

Carrese, J. A., & Sugarman, J. (2006). The inescapable relevance of bioethics for the practising clinician. *Chest, 130*(6), 1864–1872. https://doi.org/10.1378/chest.130.6.1864

Delvecchio Good, M. J., & Hannah, S. D. (2015). "Shattering culture": Perspectives on cultural competence and evidence-based practice in mental health services. *Transcultural Psychiatry, 52*(2), 198–221. https://doi.org/10.1177/1363461514557348

Gillon, R. (2003). Ethics needs principles—Four can encompass the rest—and respect for autonomy should be "first among equals." *Journal of Medical Ethics, 29*(5), 307–312. https://doi.org/10.1136/jme.29.5.307

Gostin, L. O., & Powers, M. (2006). What does social justice require for the public's health? Public health ethics and policy imperatives. *Health Affairs, 25*(4), 1053–1060. https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.25.4.1053

Haddad, L. M., Zhang, S., Clarke, J., & Lavori, P. W. (2022). Using Innovation Corps (I-Corps) methods to adapt an mHealth obesity treatment for use in community mental health. *Frontiers in Public Health, 10*, 963537. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2022.963537

Jonsen, A. R., Siegler, M., & Winslade, W. J. (2015). *Clinical ethics: A practical approach to ethical decisions in clinical medicine* (8th ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Kleinman, A., & Benson, P. (2006). Anthropology in the clinic: The problem of cultural competency and how to fix it. *PLoS Medicine, 3*(10), e294. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.0030294

Metzl, J. M., & Hansen, H. (2014). Structural competency: Theorizing a new medical engagement with stigma and inequality. *Social Science & Medicine, 103*, 126–133. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2013.06.032

National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research. (1979/2008). *The Belmont Report: Ethical principles and guidelines for the protection of human subjects of research*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/belmont-report/index.html

Patil, N. A., Shinde, D. R., & Patil, P. D. (2023). Green synthesis of gold nanoparticles using extracts of ginger, neem, apta, umber plants and their characterization using XRD, UV-Vi's spectrophotometer. *Journal of Applied Organometallic Chemistry, 3*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.22034/jaoc.2023.355403.1059

Ten Have, H. (2016). *Global bioethics: An introduction*. Routledge.

Turner, L. (2018). Bioethics in cultural contexts: Reflections on methods and finitude. *Medicine, Health Care and Philosophy, 21*(4), 589–600. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11019-018-9830-5