The Academic
International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research

An Online Peer Reviewed / Refereed Journal
Volume 3 | Issue 8 | August 2025
ISSN: 2583-973X (Online)
Website: www.theacademic.in

Moral Dilemmas and Principles in Organ Transplantation in India: A Review

Dr. Satyajit Kalita

Research Fellow, Holistic Science Research Centre, Surat, satyajitkalita28081995@gmail.com

Dr. Sanjib H. Thakuria

Associate Professor of Philosophy, Morigaon College, Assam

DOI : https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17130395

ARTICLE DETAILS

Research Paper

Accepted: 27-08-2025

Published: 10-09-2025

Keywords:

Organ transplantation, ethical dilemmas, bioethics, THOA, brain death, human organ trade.

ABSTRACT

For patients suffering from end-stage organ failure, organ transplantation has become an essential therapeutic measure. The procedure presents significant ethical, social, and legal issues, especially in the Indian setting, even if it gives people hope and a shot at survival. Since the 1970s, organ transplantation has advanced significantly in India, but there have also been ongoing moral dilemmas pertaining to access, consent, allocation, and commercialization. The Transplantation of Human Organs Act (THOA) was passed in 1994 and has since undergone changes, yet unlawful organ trade and the exploitation of vulnerable groups have persisted due to legislative flaws, abuse of provisions, and lax enforcement. The historical development of transplantation in India, the THOA's features and limitations, and the moral dilemmas surrounding organ donation, distribution, and trade are all covered in this paper. The ethicality of implied permission, the legal and societal acceptability of brain death, the equitable distribution of organs, and the eligibility of patients with histories of imprisonment, lifestyle-related diseases, or suicidal thoughts are among the important issues discussed. This article makes the case that a transparent, fair, and morally sound transplantation system is crucial for upholding human dignity and fostering confidence in healthcare institutions. It bases this

claim on the bioethical principles of respect for life, non-maleficence, beneficence, autonomy, and justice. In order to bring India's organ transplantation processes into line with moral and humanitarian principles, the review ends by suggesting changes to public awareness, laws, and regulatory frameworks.

Introduction

One of the greatest advances in contemporary medicine is organ transplantation, which allows patients who have irreversible organ failure to recover and live longer. However, the technique also raises difficult moral dilemmas that require careful consideration. Organ transplantation in India has been influenced by legal actions, medical advancements, and socioeconomic realities, but it has also been tainted by ethical transgressions, commercialisation, and unequal access.

Around the world, the discussion of organ transplantation frequently centres on striking a balance between the harsh reality of organ shortage and the ideals of justice, equality, and beneficence (Shroff, 2009). India has significant obstacles in this area because of its sizable population and high rate of end-stage organ failure. Although 150–200 liver transplants and 3500-4000 kidney transplants are carried out each year, there is still a woefully inadequate supply of cadaveric organs available (Limbu, 2020). As a result, the main supply of organs is now live related and unrelated donations, which opens the door for exploitation and illegal trafficking.

A significant step towards controlling organ donation and reducing commercialisation was the passage of the Transplantation of Human Organs Act (THOA) in 1994. The Act aimed to promote cadaveric transplantation by legalising brain death as a requirement for organ donation. But in reality, its efficacy has been weakened by sociocultural impediments, misapplication of provisions, and implementation shortcomings (Jha, 2017). Systemic reform is desperately needed, as seen by the continued prevalence of kidney rackets and illegal transplant operations.

Three main categories can be used to classify ethical quandaries surrounding organ transplantation in India:

i. organ donation, which includes concerns about consent, brain death identification, and family decision-making;

ii. organ distribution, which involves concerns about equity, prioritisation, and social value; and

iii. organ trade, which involves the exploitation of vulnerable populations and the discussion of regulated incentives.

These problems are made worse by the particular sociocultural circumstances of India, such as ignorance, poverty-driven choices, and religious views on mortality.

Objectives and Methodology:

This study aims to investigate the moral and ethical quandaries that surround organ transplantation in India, evaluate the legal framework and policy guidelines that regulate organ transplantation in the nation, and assess the bioethical principles of autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice in relation to transplantation practices. It also seeks to assess the societal, cultural, and religious viewpoints that affect whether organ donation and transplantation are accepted or rejected, while pointing out the main obstacles and providing suggestions for resolving these moral dilemmas.

This study uses a qualitative, review-based methodology, concentrating on ethical discussions, legal requirements, and available literature. To evaluate the problems found and determine potential remedies that might lead to more morally sound and socially conscious transplant procedures in India, it makes use of philosophical and bioethical frameworks.

The Evolution of Organ Transplantation in India Over Time:

Organ transplantation in India has a history that can be broken down into discrete periods that show how medical developments, public perceptions, and legislative actions have interacted.

Initial Stages (1960s–1970s)

In 1965, a kidney from a cadaver donor was used in Mumbai in the first kidney transplant attempt ever documented in India (Shroff, 2009). However, there were major social, immunological, and technological obstacles to this endeavour. A negative social reaction exacerbated medical issues including infection and transplant rejection. There was widespread mistrust and opposition to cadaveric donation programs because some people believed that organ transplantation was abnormal or even "neo-cannibalism" (Shroff & Navin, 2000). By the 1970s, live donor kidney transplants were being performed in India, and much of this time was spent perfecting surgical methods and immunosuppressive

treatments. The lack of a thorough legal framework meant that ethical issues went neglected even as medical progress rose.

Commercialisation and Growth (1980s)

The 1980s saw a dramatic increase in the demand for transplants due to better surgical results. However, commercial organ trade was made possible by inadequate regulation, especially with regard to kidney transplants. People from lower-income backgrounds started selling kidneys to those in higher-income groups, frequently via middlemen. As a result of this exploitation, India became a centre for "transplant tourism," drawing in patients from outside looking for less expensive treatments (Cohen, 2002). During this time, there existed a permissive mindset that normalized the trading in organs. "Why donate when you can buy" was a popular saying that reflected the moral decline that came with commercialization.

Regulation and Reform (1990s)

International condemnation of India's uncontrolled transplantation methods increased during the late 1980s and early 1990s. Human rights activists, bioethicists, and doctors denounced the kidney trade's exploitative practices. The Indian government implemented regulatory steps in response to growing pressure. A turning point was reached in 1994 with the passage of the Transplantation of Human Organs Act (THOA). It encouraged cadaveric transplantation, legalised brain death, and outlawed the trafficking of organs. Additionally, it established organisations like Appropriate Authorities and Authorisation Committees to oversee transplantation facilities and living donations. Despite being a major ethical and legal advancement, the Act was difficult to execute.

Scandals and Struggles in the 2000s

There were attempts to improve cadaveric donation programs in the first ten years of the twenty-first century, especially in areas like Tamil Nadu and Maharashtra. However, public confidence was consistently damaged by scandals involving illicit kidney rackets. Taking advantage of THOA loopholes, including Section 9(3), which permitted unrelated donors to give out of "affection or attachment," several unrelated transplants were carried out with questionable clearances (Jha, 2017). Numerous "voluntary donors" were really impoverished people who were forced or tricked into selling their organs, according to media investigations. Often, cases concluded with contributors claiming that intermediaries had denied promised cash reimbursement.

Current Trends (2010s–Present)

Although the number of dead donor programs in India has increased somewhat over the last ten years, it is still far below the need. Non-governmental organisations' (NGOs') and dedicated hospitals' efforts have been crucial. In order to enhance THOA, tighten rules, and prevent misuse, the government has simultaneously submitted modifications. However, difficulties still exist. Because of cultural and religious reluctance, brain death is still not widely acknowledged or accepted. Black-market commerce and illegal transplants persist due to enforcement lapses. The increasing sophistication of Indian medical practice is also indicated by developments in multi-organ transplantation, including liver, heart, and pancreas transplantation.

Transplantation of Human Organs Act (THOA) as the legal framework In order to control organ transplantation and outlaw the sale of human organs for profit, the Transplantation of Human Organs Act (THOA), 1994, was passed. Its main goals were to:

i. Stop the trade of organs for exploitation.
ii. Legalizing brain death to encourage cadaveric donation.
iii. Putting in place supervision procedures for transplant operations.

Essential Elements of THOA (1994)

- Definition of brain death: The Act made it possible to retrieve organs from deceased donors by recognizing brain death as being comparable to death. Two physicians, one of whom had to be a neurosurgeon or neurologist, had to do examinations six hours apart in order to be certified.
- Living donations: Authorized by close family members (spouse, parents, siblings, and kids). The Authorization Committee has to approve donations from unconnected individuals. In order to examine unconnected gifts and stop commercial motivations, authorization committees (ACs) were established at the state and hospital levels.
- Transplant centres may be licensed, inspected, and regulated by the appropriate authorities (AAs), who can also look into complaints of infractions.
- Licensing system: Hospitals had to get distinct, five-year permits for every kind of organ transplant.

Notifications in the Gazette and Amendments

Section 9(3) of the THOA, which permitted unrelated donations for "special reasons" like compassion or connection, was one of the flaws that eventually came to light. Poor donations were deceitfully portrayed as friends or well-wishers, a widespread misuse of this option. The government published gazette notifications and revisions to address these issues:

- Grandparents are now considered eligible relatives. Strict paperwork requirements, including notarized declarations, genetic tests, and family photos.
- Donors must undergo a required mental health examination to determine their voluntariness and consent.
- Authorization Committee interviews that were captured on video.
- Prompt decision-making: ACs must accept or reject within a day.
- Requirements for transparency, such as making decisions available to the public on hospital websites.

There are still enforcement loopholes in spite of these actions. While inadequate oversight enables illegal networks to thrive, authorization committees are frequently criticized for their ineffectiveness or corruption.

Implementation Difficulties

- Why Low rates of dead donation: There is still cultural aversion and little public knowledge of brain death.
- Ongoing commercialization: As illegal kidney rackets are discovered, regulatory flaws are revealed.
- Inequitable state-level development: While many states trail behind, others like Tamil Nadu have strong deceased donor programs.
- Inadequate post-transplant support: Poorer patients' long-term success is limited by the high expense of access to anti-rejection drugs.

Therefore, the THOA is a necessary but flawed approach to control transplanting. Although it established the groundwork for moral behaviour, ongoing abuse and inadequate supervision highlight the need for change and improved governance.

Ethical Dilemmas in Indian Organ Transplantation

Even though organ transplantation has advanced significantly in India, the procedure is fraught with moral dilemmas that call into question justice, fairness, and the value of human life. These problems are made worse by a lack of organs and lax enforcement of regulations. The main ethical issues with India's transplantation system are examined in the next subsections.

1. Consent and Autonomy: Presumed vs. Explicit Consent

Whether organ donation should be predicated on presumptive permission or explicit informed consent is a basic ethical conundrum. Currently, India has an opt-in system, meaning that organs can only be recovered with the donor's (or family's) express consent. In contrast, cadaveric contributions have dramatically expanded in places like Spain and Austria where "opt-out" or implied consent protocols are in place (Quigley et al., 2012). The ethical dilemma is how to strike a balance between the interests of the group and individual liberty. While opponents contend that presumed consent may compromise autonomy if people's choices are inferred without being expressly stated, proponents contend that it upholds the concept of beneficence by optimising organ availability. Presumed permission is morally and socially controversial in India due to a lack of knowledge and cultural views regarding the sacredness of the body after death.

2. Brain Death and Cultural Resistance

Although it was a historic move, the legalization of brain death under THOA is still not widely accepted. Brain death is rejected as a valid criterion by many families, who only consider death to occur when the heart stops pumping. Cadaveric donation is hampered by this cultural opposition. There are two ethical dilemmas here:

- Medical ethics: When announcing a patient's death, doctors must be truthful and avoid any conflicts of interest.
- Cultural and religious ethics: Families sometimes confuse the removal of organs with the mutilation of the deceased, which raises questions with afterlife beliefs and dignity.

A lack of public education and confidence in medical institutions is reflected in the failure to advance knowledge about brain death. It restricts chances for fair organ distribution and ethically contradicts the value of respect for life.

3. Allocation of Organs: Equal Access vs. Maximum Benefit

Due to organ scarcity, allocation decisions must be made carefully. Whether distribution should prioritise maximal benefit (giving preference to patients with better prognoses or social duties) or equal access (everyone gets the same opportunity regardless of circumstances) is at the heart of ethical discussions in India.

Important dilemmas include:

- Repeat transplants: Should first-time recipients be given preference or should a patient who has already received one organ be eligible for another? Refusing repeat transplants would seem reasonable from a justice standpoint, but it might also ignore beneficence if the second transplant has a higher chance of surviving.

- Young parents vs senior citizens: Should those who have dependent children be given preference over senior citizens? This may be supported by the utility principle, but imposing "social worth" standards jeopardises justice and increases the likelihood of discrimination.

- Success rate vs. urgency: Should the patients who are most likely to survive the organ over the long run be given priority over the sickest? One of the most difficult moral dilemmas in transplantation is finding this equilibrium (Danovitch, 2010).
  The lack of a nationally standardized allocation mechanism in India makes disparities worse because access is frequently based on regional availability, medical networks, and financial capability.

4. Lifestyle-Induced Organ Failure

Whether to deprioritize patients whose own behaviors—such as smoking, drinking, or abusing drugs contributed to organ failure is a particularly contentious ethical issue. Opponents contend that those whose lifestyles may compromise the transplant's success shouldn't receive limited organs. Proponents argue that such assessments run the risk of establishing a "blame-based" healthcare system and are ethically dubious.

The concept of justice is violated from a bioethical standpoint when lifestyle-related situations are excluded since medical care shouldn't be based on moral assessments of prior actions. But it's crucial to make sure that post-transplant patients follow medical recommendations, which connects this conundrum to accountability and autonomy.

5. Suicidal Patients and Eligibility

Whether or whether people with a history of suicide attempts should be able to get organ transplants is another moral conundrum. Given the limited quantity and ambiguity surrounding long-term results, some contend that giving an organ to someone who has tried suicide before compromises justice. Others argue that refusing access would violate the concept of respect for life and unfairly stigmatise mental illness. Whether the patient is suicidal at the moment or has recovered is the complex ethical difference. Since mental health disorders are curable and do not lessen a patient's need for treatment, patients who have had psychiatric examination and show signs of recovery should not be turned away (Youngner & Bartlett, 1993).

6. Economic Disparities and Access

The question of whether the impoverished should have equal access to transplantation when they are unable to pay for post-operative care or anti-rejection medications is a recurring ethical conundrum in India. Wealthier patients had a higher chance of surviving and continuing to comply, which begs the question of whether allocation should be influenced by financial capabilities. Ethically, preferring the rich contradicts justice and perpetuates injustice. However, the truth is that the healthcare system is morally failing as impoverished people frequently refuse treatment because of the expense. This underlines the essential need for government subsidies or insurance systems to ensure equal access.

7. Prisoners and the Right to Transplantation

The eligibility of lifers or sentenced inmates for organ transplants is a contentious issue. Using the social worth concept, opponents contend that those who have committed major crimes shouldn't receive the few resources available to them. Since incarceration does not deprive people of their fundamental dignity, proponents argue that denying inmates access to life-saving care is against medical ethics and human rights (Pont et al., 2012). In India, there is no defined regulation on prisoners' eligibility, leaving choices primarily to institutional discretion. The conflict between justice, vengeance, and compassion in society is reflected in this ethical discussion.

8. Organ Trade and Exploitation

One of the most serious moral dilemmas is the continued existence of organ trafficking on the illicit market in India. Poor people are frequently forced or tricked into selling kidneys despite THOA's ban, only to get little compensation or be denied access to adequate medical treatment. These actions

violate the ideals of autonomy, fairness, and non-maleficence by taking advantage of economic fragility. To decrease illicit commerce and boost supply, some bioethicists suggest regulated, incentive-based donation schemes (Radcliffe-Richards et al., 1998). Commodifying the human body, according to detractors, compromises dignity and runs the risk of institutionalizing exploitation. This strategy is morally dubious in India's socioeconomic setting due to the risk of coercion.

These dilemmas show that organ transplantation in India is a significant ethical conflict as well as a medical one. The topics, which range from allocation and trade to consent and brain death, touch on socioeconomic inequality, cultural values, and international bioethical discussions. In order to assess these dilemmas and direct more moral transplantation procedures, the next part uses fundamental bioethical concepts.

Bioethical Principles Applied to Organ Transplantation in India

Without a foundation in bioethics, the ethical issues surrounding organ transplantation in India cannot be properly addressed. These values, which were created to direct medical practice, provide a moral framework for striking a balance between cultural contexts, individual rights, and group requirements. When applied to Indian transplantation, they highlight the system's advantages and disadvantages.

1. Autonomy and Informed Consent

The concept of autonomy highlights people's freedom to make choices about their own bodies. According to this concept, donors (or their families) must provide their free, informed permission without being forced to do so in order for transplants to proceed.

- Living contribution: Family members in India frequently experience emotional or societal pressure to make a donation. Although acknowledged by law, this kind of coercion undermines true autonomy.
- Cadaveric donation: Because India has an opt-in system, families' refusals frequently supersede the deceased's possible desires, eroding the person's postmortem autonomy.
- Organ trade: When impoverished people "consent" to sell kidneys due to financial hardship, their autonomy is limited by their situation rather than being completely free. Respecting autonomy requires enhancing informed consent procedures, shielding donors from coercion, and increasing public knowledge about brain death.

2. Beneficence: Acting for the Patient's Good

Medical choices must be made with the wellbeing of patients in mind in order to be considered beneficent. This idea underpins initiatives to boost organ supply and guarantee positive results in transplantation. However, there are problems:

- Should the sickest patients be excluded in favour of those who have the best chance of long-term survival?
- Why Even if someone has never undergone a transplant, should they still be provided if they could save a life?
- Richer patients who can afford post-operative care are occasionally given preference in Indian practice, thereby maximizing gain at the expense of equity. In order to prevent perpetuating inequity, beneficence and justice must be considered ethically.

3. Non-Maleficence: Do No Harm

The non-maleficence principle warns against doing damage. In addition to patients, donors and society at large may potentially suffer injury during transplantation.

- Living donors: Infection, long-term health issues, and psychological trauma are dangers associated with donation procedure. Using black market tactics to take advantage of low-income contributors is a flagrant violation of non-maleficence.
- Recipients: Patients may suffer more harm than gain from transplantation if appropriate post-operative care is not provided (for example, because of poverty or limited access to medications).
- Society: Organ trafficking organisations damage society more broadly by undermining public confidence in the healthcare system.

Strict regulatory control is therefore required to reduce damage on both a systemic and individual level.

4. Justice: Fair Distribution of Resources

The fair allocation of limited medical resources is a matter of justice. Justice in transplantation requires that organs be distributed according to open, equitable, and nondiscriminatory standards.

Justice is weakened in India by:

- Economic disparities: Transplants are more likely to be obtained by wealthy individuals.
- Regional disparities: Rural populations are disadvantaged by the dominance of urban centres in the infrastructure for organ transplantation.
- Social stigma: Eligibility is disputed for some groups, such as inmates or individuals with diseases linked to their lifestyle.

To achieve equity regardless of socioeconomic background, justice demands a national allocation strategy, government subsidies, and universal access to anti-rejection medications.

5. Respect for Human Dignity

Transplantation presents issues with human dignity that go beyond the four fundamental criteria. The human body might be reduced to a market commodity if organs are treated like commodities, which would undermine respect for individuals. In a similar vein, disregarding cultural sensitivities over death and burial can drive people away from one another and deter charitable giving. An ethically competent system must ensure that transplantation procedures protect the dignity of the recipient as well as the donor, whether they are living or deceased.

6. Cultural Sensitivity and Pluralism

The cultural and religious diversity of India makes transplantation ethics more complicated. Organ donation is seen differently by many Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Sikhs, and Buddhists. Opinions range from approval as a charitable gesture to opposition because of beliefs about the integrity of the body after death. In order to prevent any population from feeling pressured or excluded, ethical policymaking must be considerate of these diverse viewpoints.
When bioethical standards are used, it becomes clear that transplantation is both a medical treatment and a moral endeavour in India. Coercion and cultural resistance threaten autonomy, resource scarcity limits beneficence, black markets threaten non-maleficence, and inequality jeopardises justice. If India is to create a transplantation system that is both morally sound and socially acceptable, improvements must be guided by respect for dignity and cultural sensitivity.

Towards Ethical and Sustainable Organ Transplantation in India

The organ transplant experience in India serves as an example of the intricate relationship that exists between ethical decision-making, cultural variety, economic disparity, and medical innovation. Even though transplantation gives thousands of patients with end-stage organ failure hope, there are

significant ethical dilemmas because of the organ scarcity, the exploitation of vulnerable groups, and the uneven access to care. Finding a balance between individual rights and the welfare of the group is one of the main issues. Although the autonomy principle emphasises that people should be free to choose whether or not to donate their organs, fully voluntary permission is sometimes complicated by socioeconomic pressure, religious convictions, and familial influence. India needs extensive public education efforts to normalise organ donation and brain death recognition as socially responsible practices in order to balance autonomy with cultural heterogeneity.

The conflict between justice and beneficence is another enduring issue. Prioritising younger, healthier applicants with higher prognoses may be justified from a utilitarian standpoint by maximising the survival of recipients. However, fairness requires that organs be given out fairly, without regard to social standing, age, gender, or income. A concerning imbalance is shown by the existing predominance of private institutions in transplantation, where financial capability frequently takes precedence above medical urgency. Such disparities may be lessened and a more equitable distribution might be guaranteed via a clear, centralised national organ allocation register.

The concept of non-maleficence, which calls for the protection of both donors and beneficiaries, is equally important. Since impoverished donors are at risk for surgery, insufficient follow-up, and long-term health decline, the widespread illicit organ trading in India is a flagrant breach of this principle. Improving the sanctions for trafficking networks and bolstering the Transplantation of Human Organs and Tissues Act (THOA) enforcement are still top goals. Furthermore, one aspect of ethical transplantation that is often overlooked is economic sustainability. Many patients cannot afford immunosuppressive treatment for the rest of their lives, even after a successful transplant, which leads to graft rejection and early mortality. The moral promise of transplantation is compromised in the absence of government funding for post-operative care. Justice and beneficence would be improved by extending insurance programs and state-sponsored medication assistance.

Lastly, the ethical and cultural traditions of India must be taken into consideration while discussing organ transplantation. Organ donation has a moral foundation as an altruistic act according to ancient Indian philosophies including the notion of ahimsa (non-violence) and the principle of dāna (selfless giving). Public campaigns that incorporate these ideals might lessen cultural opposition and advance the idea that giving is a social and spiritual good.

Conclusion

In India, organ transplantation is at the nexus of ethical obligation and medical innovation. Although the Transplantation of Human Organs and Tissues Act has established a legal framework, advancements are nevertheless hampered by implementation flaws, socioeconomic inequalities, and moral dilemmas. Sustainable transplantation procedures require a comprehensive strategy that incorporates respect for cultural variety and dignity with the bioethical concepts of autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice.

The following are essential reforms:

- National awareness campaigns on organ donation and brain death.
- An open and equitable national organ distribution system.
- Tougher enforcement against the trafficking of organs.
- Post-transplant care funding, including immunosuppressive medication subsidies.
- Cooperation with cultural and religious authorities to foster public confidence.

In the end, organ transplantation must be seen as a moral activity that exemplifies justice, compassion, and solidarity rather than just as a technical medical operation. India can make transplantation a system that not only saves lives but also upholds social justice and human dignity if it is led by these moral principles.

References

Beauchamp, T. L., & Childress, J. F. (2019). *Principles of biomedical ethics* (8th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Goyal, M., Mehta, R. L., Schneiderman, L. J., & Sehgal, A. R. (2002). Economic and health consequences of selling a kidney in India. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 288*(13), 1589–1593. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.288.13.1589

Government of India. (1994). *The Transplantation of Human Organs Act, 1994*. Ministry of Law and Justice. Retrieved from https://legislative.gov.in/

Government of India. (2011). *The Transplantation of Human Organs and Tissues (Amendment) Act, 2011*. Ministry of Law and Justice. Retrieved from https://legislative.gov.in/

Jha, V. (2004). Current status of renal transplantation in India. *International Journal of Organ Transplantation Medicine, 17*(6), 440–445.

Shroff, S. (2009). Legal and ethical aspects of organ donation and transplantation. *Indian Journal of Urology, 25*(3), 348–355. https://doi.org/10.4103/0970-1591.56203

Shroff, S., & Navin, S. (2016). The evolution of deceased donor transplantation in India. *Asian Cardiovascular & Thoracic Annals, 24*(8), 699–706. https://doi.org/10.1177/0218492316648834

World Health Organization. (2010). *Guiding principles on human cell, tissue and organ transplantation*. WHO Press. Retrieved from https://www.who.int/transplantation

Zargooshi, J. (2001). Quality of life of Iranian kidney donors: A cross-sectional study. *American Journal of Transplantation, 1*(4), 372–380. https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1600-6143.2001.10404.x