

## UC Davis prof argues three-person IVF not same as “life-saving treatment”

UC Davis Assistant Professor of Philosophy [Tina Rulli](#) published a report titled “[What is the Value of Three-Parent IVF?](#)”...If you have seen any of the countless descriptions of three-parent or three-person IVF...as a “[life-saving treatment](#),” you might find the question in the title confusing. How could any life-saving treatment not be of value?

As Rulli explains, the claim that this technology would save lives is “inaccurate and exaggerated.” Three-person IVF would not cure, treat, or save anyone...The choice a woman would make is not “do I save my child?” but “do I want to have a child in this way?” Rulli makes [the]...argument that these are not morally equivalent, and that it is irresponsible to act as though they are.

...

Rulli...therefore concludes, despite the [Institute of Medicine’s report](#) endorsing the potential of “clinical trials,” that any public research investment in three-person IVF would be unethical.

...

Proponents are already pointing to three-person IVF as a pioneer technology...Rulli’s report will be a useful framework to have on hand.

**The GLP aggregated and excerpted this blog/article to reflect the diversity of news, opinion and analysis. Read full, original post:** The Case Against Public Investment in Reproductive Genetic Modification