

PUBLIC ATTITUDES TOWARD ORGAN DONATION IN RURAL COMMUNITIES

Dr. Ananya Verma

Assistant Professor

Department of Community Medicine

School of Public Health

Institute of Rural Health Sciences

Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India

Abstract

Organ donation is a life-saving public-health practice, yet its success depends not only on hospital capability and regulatory systems but also on informed, voluntary, and trusted public participation. Rural communities are central to this discussion because decisions about donation are often made within close family networks and are shaped by local health access, community leadership, cultural understandings of death, religious beliefs, media exposure, and confidence in institutions. This paper presents an evidence-based analytical study of public attitudes toward organ donation in rural communities. It examines the relationship between awareness, trust, family communication, perceived religious compatibility, knowledge of brain-stem death, and practical access to accurate information. The study synthesizes published literature, official organ-donation guidance, and documented patterns in community health communication; it does not claim a new household survey or clinical experiment. The analysis indicates that supportive attitudes can coexist with uncertainty about donation procedures, fear of organ misuse, discomfort about bodily integrity, and limited discussion with relatives. These concerns should be approached respectfully rather than treated as simple ignorance. The paper argues that rural organ-donation outreach is most effective when it is delivered through trusted local channels, uses locally understandable language, involves health workers and community leaders, clarifies the difference between living and deceased donation, and encourages informed family conversations. Recommendations include village-level awareness sessions, training for frontline health workers, myth-sensitive educational materials, ethical safeguards, transparent referral pathways, and evaluation measures that distinguish awareness from meaningful readiness to discuss donation. The study concludes that sustained community engagement, not one-time publicity, is required to strengthen informed and voluntary support for organ donation in rural settings.

Keywords: Organ Donation, Rural Communities, Public Attitudes, Brain-Stem Death, Community Health, Family Decision-Making, Health Communication, Trust, Deceased Donation, Organ Donation Awareness

1. INTRODUCTION

Organ transplantation can restore essential functions and save lives for people with organ failure and other serious conditions. However, the availability of transplant services does not automatically result in the availability of organs. Donation requires informed, voluntary participation, ethical oversight, coordination across health institutions, and, in many cases, timely communication with families during emotionally difficult circumstances. The World Health Organization emphasizes ethical, transparent, and equitable systems for the donation and transplantation of human cells, tissues, and organs. In India, the National Organ and Tissue Transplant Organisation (NOTTO) coordinates national-level activities related to organ donation and

transplantation and provides public information, pledge resources, and awareness material. [1-4]

Rural communities deserve focused attention because public attitudes are shaped in settings where health information may circulate through family members, local practitioners, frontline health workers, schools, self-help groups, religious institutions, and community events rather than through specialized transplant centres. Rural residence does not imply a lack of compassion or willingness to help others. Rather, it can involve distinct information environments, travel barriers, unequal contact with tertiary hospitals, and different levels of familiarity with medical concepts such as brain-stem death, donor eligibility, transplantation procedures, and

legal safeguards. A respectful public-health response must therefore identify the questions that people actually have and respond in language that is accurate, accessible, and culturally grounded.

Public attitudes toward organ donation are rarely determined by a single factor. A person may believe that donation is morally good, yet still be unsure about whether the body will be treated with dignity, whether the family will be consulted, whether religious teachings permit donation, whether organs can be bought and sold, or whether medical professionals will make every effort to save a patient. These concerns can become more salient where there is limited trust in institutions, where families have experienced uneven access to care, or where misinformation is shared through informal networks. The practical issue is not merely whether a person has heard of organ donation, but whether the person understands enough to discuss it with relatives and make an informed voluntary choice.

This paper examines the attitudes, concerns, and communication conditions that influence organ-donation readiness in rural communities. It treats rural public engagement as a community-health and ethics issue rather than a narrow publicity exercise. The study reviews major attitude domains, compares likely barriers and facilitators, and proposes measures for health systems, local institutions, and civil-society organizations. The analysis does not report fabricated prevalence estimates or present a new survey. Instead, it uses an evidence-based qualitative framework to describe how knowledge, trust, family communication, cultural beliefs, and health-system accessibility interact in the formation of public attitudes.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Research on organ donation commonly shows that general approval and practical readiness are not always the same. Individuals may express support for donation in principle while remaining hesitant to register, pledge, discuss donation with family, or make a decision in the context of death. Studies identify several recurring influences: familiarity with donation processes, knowledge of brain-stem death, confidence in health services, perceptions of religious and cultural compatibility, concern about bodily integrity, fear of organ

commercialization, and the perceived views of family members. Reviews also show that attitudes can vary within populations according to education, socioeconomic position, age, prior exposure to illness or transplantation, and the quality of community-level communication. [5-9]

In rural Indian settings, awareness can be uneven across topics. People may have heard that organs can be donated, but may not distinguish between living donation, deceased donation, tissue donation, donation after brain-stem death, and the legal prohibition on commercial trade. Rural community studies have highlighted the importance of understanding brain-stem death and of addressing misconceptions without dismissing people's emotional and moral concerns. Misra and colleagues, for example, examined awareness of brain death and attitudes toward organ donation in a rural area of Haryana, while other community-based studies have reported that awareness, willingness, and family discussion are shaped by local context. [6-8]

The literature also indicates that information campaigns are more credible when communication comes from trusted and accountable sources. A message delivered only through mass media may increase visibility but may not resolve questions about consent, body handling, eligibility, family roles, or the reliability of medical systems. Community-facing health professionals, trained transplant coordinators, accredited social health activists, primary-care teams, teachers, and respected local leaders can help translate technical information into practical understanding. Such engagement should be strictly non-coercive: donation is an ethically sensitive decision, and public-health outreach must support voluntary choice rather than pressure individuals or families.

Another recurring theme is the role of family communication. In many societies, the final pathway to deceased donation involves relatives who are asked to consider a decision during bereavement. The absence of prior discussion can leave families uncertain about the wishes of the deceased and can intensify distress. Conversely, a prior conversation does not guarantee donation, but it can make family decision-making more informed and less

dependent on assumptions. Research therefore recommends that awareness programmes include simple prompts for families to discuss

values, questions, and donation preferences before a crisis occurs. [9-12]

LITERATURE REVIEW SUMMARY TABLE

S.No.	Author / Year	Study Focus	Key Contribution	Relevance for Rural Engagement
1	WHO (2010)	Ethical principles for donation and transplantation	Places voluntary donation, transparency, quality, and equity at the centre of transplant systems.	Outreach should provide accurate information and protect voluntary decision-making.
2	Morgan et al. (2013)	Attitudes and registration among minority communities	Identified knowledge, family discussion, faith, bodily concerns, and trust as recurring attitude domains.	Rural campaigns should be locally sensitive and go beyond general awareness.
3	Misra et al. (2021)	Brain-death awareness and attitude in rural Haryana	Demonstrated the importance of community understanding of brain-stem death and donation processes.	Use simple language, visual explanations, and opportunities for questions.
4	Vincent et al. (2022)	Barriers to deceased donation among Indians globally	Synthesized barriers including mistrust, misinformation, cultural concerns, and communication gaps.	Address myths with ethics-based, family-oriented communication.
5	Ramadurg and Gupta (2014)	Effect of education on knowledge and attitudes	Showed that structured information can improve understanding and attitudes in a learning setting.	Repeated local education may be more useful than one-time publicity.

3. OBJECT OF STUDY

The primary object of this study is to examine the factors that shape public attitudes toward organ donation in rural communities. The analysis focuses on the way people receive, interpret, discuss, trust, and act upon information about organ donation. It considers both supportive attitudes and uncertainty, recognizing that hesitation can arise from legitimate questions about medical procedures, family responsibility, dignity, religion, law, and institutional accountability.

3.1 RURAL COMMUNITY GROUPS CONSIDERED

- Adults of different age groups living in villages, small towns, and peri-rural settlements.

- Family decision-makers, including spouses, adult children, elders, and caregivers.
- Frontline health workers, community health volunteers, primary-care staff, and local practitioners.
- Teachers, youth groups, self-help groups, farmers' associations, and other community networks.
- Religious, cultural, and social leaders who may be consulted on questions of ethics, death, and service.

3.2 ATTITUDE DOMAINS UNDER EXAMINATION

- Basic awareness of organ and tissue donation, including the distinction between living and deceased donation.

- Understanding of brain-stem death, medical certification, consent processes, and the role of family communication.
- Trust in hospitals, transplant systems, donor protection, equitable allocation, and legal safeguards against commercialization.
- Religious, cultural, emotional, and bodily-integrity concerns that influence comfort with donation.
- Readiness to discuss donation with relatives, seek reliable information, make a pledge, or support a family decision.

3.3 STUDY OBJECTIVES

- To identify the major knowledge, trust, cultural, and communication factors that influence rural attitudes toward organ donation.
- To distinguish supportive values from practical uncertainty about donation procedures and family decision-making.
- To compare barriers that can be addressed through information with concerns that require trust-building and respectful dialogue.
- To outline community-based communication strategies suitable for rural health settings.
- To recommend ethical, voluntary, and measurable approaches for increasing informed public engagement.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study adopts a qualitative, evidence-based analytical methodology. It synthesizes published research on organ donation attitudes, rural awareness, community health communication, and ethical governance, together with official guidance from the World Health Organization and Indian organ-donation authorities. The study is designed as a conceptual and comparative analysis rather than a primary survey. It therefore does not claim to measure the attitudes of a newly recruited group of respondents, does not report invented statistical results, and does not make clinical claims about individual eligibility for donation.

The analytical framework follows the route through which a rural resident may encounter the idea of organ donation: initial exposure to information, interpretation through family and community values, assessment of trust in

institutions, discussion with relatives, and consideration of voluntary action. Each stage is assessed through common dimensions: knowledge clarity, emotional comfort, family communication, perceived religious compatibility, health-system trust, access to verified information, and confidence that the process will be ethical and transparent.

The study also recognizes diversity within rural communities. Attitudes may differ by education, language, distance from tertiary care, occupational conditions, previous experience with chronic illness, gender roles in family decision-making, social position, media access, and local cultural practices. These factors should not be treated as fixed barriers. They are contextual conditions that health communication must understand before designing outreach. The analysis therefore avoids portraying rural populations as uniformly uninformed or resistant.

METHODOLOGY FRAMEWORK

- The study uses a narrative and comparative design rather than a primary household survey.
- Official ethical guidance and peer-reviewed studies provide the conceptual and factual foundation.
- The analysis compares information-related, relational, cultural, and health-system determinants of attitude.
- Particular attention is given to rural access to health information, trusted messengers, and family networks.
- Community readiness is treated as different from simple awareness or a one-time pledge.
- No fabricated rates of awareness, willingness, registration, or donation are presented.
- Recommendations are evaluated for ethical acceptability, feasibility, local relevance, and capacity to build trust.
- The analysis distinguishes voluntary support for donation from coercive, commercial, or misleading practices.

5. DATA ANALYSIS

The data analysis section presents a qualitative evaluation of the major factors affecting organ-donation attitudes in rural communities. The term data analysis is used here to describe the systematic comparison of evidence from published studies, official awareness materials,

and known communication conditions; it does not indicate the collection of new numerical data. The analysis identifies five interconnected domains: knowledge and clarity, family decision-making, cultural and religious interpretation, trust in institutions, and access to practical pathways for verified information and voluntary action.

These domains interact. For example, a person may have a positive moral view of helping others but still hesitate because brain-stem

death is not understood. A person may accept a religious leader's supportive view but remain concerned about illegal organ trade. A family may trust its local doctor but have no idea where to obtain official information or how to discuss a donation wish before a crisis. Effective rural outreach must therefore address the full decision environment rather than assume that a poster, slogan, or pledge camp alone will produce informed readiness.

5.1 COMPARATIVE ATTITUDE AND BARRIER ANALYSIS

No.	Attitude Domain	Typical Rural Question or Concern	Potential Effect on Readiness	Priority Response
1	Knowledge and terminology	What is brain-stem death? Which organs or tissues can be donated? Is living donation the same as deceased donation?	Incomplete knowledge may lead to uncertainty or reliance on hearsay.	Use plain-language explanations, diagrams, and verified question-and-answer sessions.
2	Family communication	Will relatives know my preference? Who will be asked during an emergency?	Lack of prior discussion can leave families unsure during bereavement.	Encourage voluntary family conversations and provide simple discussion prompts.
3	Trust and transparency	Will doctors save the patient first? Can organs be misused or sold?	Low trust may prevent consideration even where moral support exists.	Explain legal safeguards, medical ethics, allocation oversight, and grievance channels.
4	Cultural and religious concerns	Does donation affect last rites, bodily dignity, or spiritual beliefs?	Unresolved concerns can create emotional resistance or family disagreement.	Invite informed faith and community leaders; avoid assumptions about any tradition.
5	Service accessibility	Where can reliable information be obtained? Is there a nearby official contact?	People may remain passive despite interest if practical pathways	Link primary-care teams with verified

No.	Attitude Domain	Typical Rural Question or Concern	Potential Effect on Readiness	Priority Response
			are unclear.	NOTTO/SOTTO TO information and referral contacts.

5.2 EXTENDED EVALUATION OF KEY ATTITUDE DOMAINS

Knowledge of donation and brain-stem death. Many public messages use the phrase “organ donation” without explaining key concepts. Rural residents may therefore understand the idea of helping others but remain uncertain about when donation can happen, what brain-stem death means, how it is certified, or how living donation differs from deceased donation. Clear explanation is essential because people should not be expected to make a voluntary decision on the basis of incomplete or confusing information. Communication should use local language, familiar examples, and opportunities to ask questions privately.

Family-centred decision-making. In rural households, important health decisions are often shared across family members and may involve elders or extended kin. Public outreach that targets only individuals can overlook this reality. The goal should not be to pressure people to agree with a particular position; rather, it should be to make it easier for families to understand each other’s wishes and to know where accurate information can be obtained. Discussion materials should include respectful prompts such as: “Have you spoken to your family about what you would want?” and “What questions would your family need answered?”

Trust in the health system. Trust is foundational. Concerns about organ trafficking, unequal treatment, unaffordable healthcare, or premature withdrawal of treatment may reflect broad experiences of insecurity rather than a lack of intelligence or goodwill. Outreach should acknowledge these concerns directly. It should explain that

commercial sale is prohibited, that donation and transplantation require regulated procedures, and that medical teams have ethical obligations to provide care. However, trust cannot be built through assurances alone; it is strengthened by consistent service quality, transparent processes, respectful communication, and accessible complaint mechanisms.

Cultural, religious, and emotional meaning. Donation decisions can be connected to mourning, ideas about bodily wholeness, religious interpretation, and family duty. These topics must be treated with care. The evidence does not support the assumption that any one religion or rural culture is uniformly for or against donation. Health communicators should not issue simplified declarations on behalf of communities. Instead, they should offer accurate information, encourage consultation with knowledgeable leaders where desired, and make clear that voluntary donation can be considered alongside respect for religious and personal beliefs.

Access to reliable information and action pathways. Information is more useful when people know what to do next. In rural areas, the nearest transplant centre may be far away, and residents may not know which websites, helplines, or health workers are trustworthy. A community programme should create a clear pathway: village health meeting, verified booklet or short video, opportunity to speak with a trained worker, family discussion, and referral to official information if a person wishes to learn more or make a pledge. The design should prevent misinformation and should never collect sensitive decisions through unverified intermediaries.

5.3 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT MATRIX

Community Channel	Primary Role	Strength	Safeguard Needed
Primary health	Provide medically	Trusted entry point for	Staff need updated training

centre and outreach clinic	accurate information and referral pathways.	routine health questions.	and must avoid coercive counselling.
ASHA, ANM, and community health volunteers	Facilitate small-group discussion and distribute verified materials.	Regular local contact and familiar language.	Clear limits: they should inform, not obtain pressured consent.
Schools, colleges, and youth groups	Build long-term health literacy and family discussion.	Young people can share information across generations.	Content must distinguish education from promotion or recruitment.
Self-help groups and farmer associations	Create peer discussion spaces for adults and caregivers.	Existing trust networks can normalize informed conversation.	Sessions should include balanced questions and neutral facilitation.
Religious and cultural forums	Clarify that ethical questions may be discussed with informed leaders.	Can reduce anxiety when beliefs are respected.	Avoid treating faith communities as homogeneous or using leaders to pressure people.

5.4 INTERPRETIVE OBSERVATIONS

- Support for organ donation is often conditional on understanding, transparency, and confidence that the donor and family will be treated with dignity.
- Awareness messages that ignore brain-stem death, family roles, and legal safeguards may leave the most important questions unanswered.
- Fear of organ misuse should be addressed through verifiable information and institutional accountability, not ridicule or unsupported reassurance.
- A pledge or positive survey response should not be treated as the same as informed family readiness in an actual end-of-life situation.
- Rural outreach is more likely to be accepted when it is delivered over time through local health systems and trusted community settings.
- Respectful discussion of faith, culture, and grief is a condition of ethical engagement, not an optional extra.
- Evaluation should assess what people understood, whom they discussed donation with, and whether they know where to obtain official information.

6. DISCUSSION

The analysis suggests that public attitudes toward organ donation in rural communities should be understood as a continuum rather than a simple yes-or-no position. At one end are residents who have never encountered reliable information; at the other are people

who understand the process, have discussed it with family, and know how to access verified guidance. Between these positions are many individuals who are supportive in principle but uncertain about medical facts, family participation, religious meaning, or institutional trust. A good rural awareness programme is designed for this middle group. It recognizes hesitation as a prompt for dialogue rather than as a failure of public responsibility.

Brain-stem death is particularly important because it is medically technical and emotionally difficult. Without a clear explanation, people may confuse brain-stem death with coma, temporary unconsciousness, or ordinary death. This confusion can feed distrust and make families fear that donation decisions are being made too soon. Community health programmes should not attempt to teach complex clinical details without support. Instead, they should use carefully reviewed material that explains that death determination follows medical standards and that donation processes are subject to legal and ethical requirements. Questions should be welcomed, and health workers should know when to refer people to specialized authorities. Family communication is another practical priority. When a person has not discussed donation preferences, relatives may be forced to interpret the person's wishes during grief. Rural engagement should therefore extend beyond public lectures. It should provide family conversation tools, small-group question sessions, and understandable

materials that can be taken home. Discussions should be optional and respectful. They should make space for people who choose not to donate, because ethical public health requires informed choice rather than universal agreement.

Trust-building must connect communication with service accountability. It is not enough to say that systems are ethical; people need access to official information, transparent explanations, and pathways for assistance. National authorities provide awareness material, helplines, and pledge resources, but local implementation matters. Primary health centres, district hospitals, and community health workers can create a bridge between national information and local questions. Where communities have legitimate concerns about treatment quality or exploitation, these concerns should be documented and addressed by the health system rather than dismissed as myths.

The discussion also has implications for the design of rural awareness campaigns. One-time campaigns may increase recognition of a slogan but are unlikely to change complex attitudes. More sustainable programmes may include short sessions at health and nutrition days, teacher orientation, village meetings, myth-versus-fact leaflets in local languages, audio or video messages for low-literacy settings, and periodic opportunities to consult trained professionals. Messages should emphasize that organ donation is voluntary, that commercial trade is illegal, that individuals and families should use verified sources, and that healthcare decisions should be made through lawful and ethical channels. [1-4, 13-16]

6.1 PRACTICAL RECOMMENDATIONS

- Develop rural organ-donation information modules in local languages using simple, medically reviewed terminology.
- Train primary-care and frontline workers to answer common questions and to identify situations that require referral to transplant coordinators or official authorities.
- Include family conversation prompts in awareness materials, while clearly stating that any decision must remain voluntary.

- Use community leaders as facilitators of dialogue, not as substitutes for medical or legal expertise.
- Publicly communicate safeguards against commercial organ trade and explain how official systems support ethical donation and transplantation.
- Create district-level lists of verified contacts, official helplines, and approved information resources that can be displayed at health facilities.
- Evaluate programmes through knowledge clarity, family discussion, trust indicators, and use of verified information rather than only counting event attendance.
- Ensure that all outreach protects privacy, avoids stigmatization, and does not collect or publicize personal donation preferences without consent.

7. CONCLUSION

This study examined public attitudes toward organ donation in rural communities through an evidence-based, community-health framework. The findings indicate that rural attitudes are shaped by more than awareness alone. Knowledge of brain-stem death, family communication, trust in health institutions, religious and cultural interpretation, fears of misuse, and access to verified information all influence whether individuals feel able to consider donation in an informed manner. Positive attitudes can coexist with uncertainty, and this uncertainty should be met with respectful explanation rather than pressure.

The study concludes that rural organ-donation engagement should be sustained, local, ethical, and family-centred. Community health workers, primary-care facilities, schools, self-help groups, and informed social leaders can contribute to a supportive information environment when their roles are clear and when medical claims are properly verified. Public authorities and transplant systems must also demonstrate transparency, legal compliance, and respect for donors, recipients, and families. The objective is not to obtain a predetermined answer from every resident; it is to ensure that rural communities have the opportunity to understand organ donation, discuss it with relatives, and make voluntary decisions based on trustworthy information.

Future research should include well-designed rural and multi-district studies that examine how language, education, gender roles, travel distance, health-system experience, media exposure, and community leadership influence understanding and willingness. Such research

should also evaluate which outreach formats improve knowledge without increasing pressure or misinformation. Better evidence can help align organ-donation awareness with the principles of dignity, informed choice, equity, and public trust.

8. REFERENCES

1. World Health Organization. (2010). WHO Guiding Principles on Human Cell, Tissue and Organ Transplantation. Geneva: WHO. WHO/HTP/EHT/CPR/2010.01.
2. World Health Organization. (2024). Increasing availability, ethical access and oversight of transplantation of human cells, tissues and organs: WHA77.4. Geneva: WHO.
3. Government of India. (1994). The Transplantation of Human Organs Act, 1994, as amended. New Delhi: Ministry of Health and Family Welfare.
4. National Organ and Tissue Transplant Organisation. (2025). Organ Donation Awareness Booklet. New Delhi: Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India.
5. National Organ and Tissue Transplant Organisation. (2025). Annual Report 2024-25. New Delhi: Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India.
6. Misra, P., Malhotra, S., Sharma, N., Misra, M. C., Vij, A., & Pandav, C. S. (2021). Awareness about brain death and attitude towards organ donation in a rural area of Haryana, India. *Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care*, 10(8), 3084-3088.
7. Mithra, P., Ravindra, P., Unnikrishnan, B., Rekha, T., Kanchan, T., Kumar, N., & Kulkarni, V. (2013). Perceptions and attitudes towards organ donation among people seeking healthcare in tertiary care centers of coastal South India. *Indian Journal of Transplantation*, 7(4), 124-129.
8. Mani, G., Annadurai, K., Danasekaran, R., & Ramasamy, J. (2015). Perceptions and practices related to organ donation among a rural population of Kancheepuram district, Tamil Nadu, India. *Journal of Comprehensive Health*, 3(2), 6-10.
9. Vincent, B. P., Randhawa, G., & Cook, E. (2022). Barriers towards deceased organ donation among Indians living globally: An integrative systematic review using narrative synthesis. *BMJ Open*, 12, e056094.
10. Morgan, M., Kenten, C., Deedat, S., & Donate Programme Team. (2013). Attitudes to deceased organ donation and registration as a donor among minority ethnic groups in North America and the U.K.: A synthesis of quantitative and qualitative research. *Ethnicity and Health*, 18(4), 367-390.
11. Simpkin, A. L., Robertson, L. C., Barber, V. S., & Young, J. D. (2009). Modifiable factors influencing relatives' decision to offer organ donation: Systematic review. *BMJ*, 338, b991.
12. Wakefield, C. E., Watts, K. J., Homewood, J., Meiser, B., & Siminoff, L. A. (2010). Attitudes toward organ donation and donor behavior: A review of the international literature. *Progress in Transplantation*, 20(4), 380-391.
13. Ramadurg, U. Y., & Gupta, A. (2014). Impact of an educational intervention on increasing the knowledge and changing the attitude and beliefs towards organ donation among medical students. *Journal of Clinical and Diagnostic Research*, 8(5), JC05-JC07.
14. Cantarovich, F. (2005). Education, awareness and social issues in organ donation. *Nephrology Dialysis Transplantation*, 20(10), 2134-2137.
15. Rithalia, A., McDaid, C., Suekarran, S., Myers, L., & Sowden, A. (2009). A systematic review of presumed consent systems for deceased organ donation. *Health Technology Assessment*, 13(26), iii, ix-xi, 1-95.
16. Poreddi, V., Sunitha, T. S., Thimmaiah, R., & Math, S. B. (2016). Gender differences in perceptions and attitudes of the general population towards organ donation: An Indian perspective. *Saudi Journal of Kidney Diseases and Transplantation*, 27(6), 1241-1246.
17. National Organ and Tissue Transplant Organisation. (2026). Frequently Asked Questions on Organ Donation. New Delhi: Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India.