Execution by organ procurement: Breaching the dead donor rule in China

Matthew P. Robertson\* & Jacob Lavee\*\*

Last compiled on 26 December, 2021

\*Australian National University; Victims of Communism Memorial Foundation. ORCID# 0000-0003-2545-8918   
\*\*Heart Transplantation Unit, Leviev Cardiothoracic Center, Sheba Medical Center; Tel Aviv University Faculty of Medicine. ORCID# 0000-0002-3641-1114

Corresponding author: Jacob Lavee, Professor of Surgery, Heart Transplantation Unit, Leviev Cardiothoracic Center, Sheba Medical Center, Ramat Gan, Israel

email: [Jacob.Lavee@sheba.health.gov.il](mailto:Jacob.Lavee@sheba.health.gov.il)

**Non-standard abbreviations used in this manuscript:**

Dead donor rule (DDR)

Brain death declaration (BDD)

**Running title:** Execution by organ procurement in China

**Word count:** 4,387 words (article body); 197 words (abstract)

Abstract

The dead donor rule is fundamental to transplant ethics. The rule states that organ procurement must not commence until the donor is both dead and formally pronounced so, and by the same token, that procurement of organs must not *cause* the death of the donor. In a separate area of medical practice, there has been intense controversy around the participation of physicians in the execution of capital prisoners. These two apparently disparate topics converge in a unique case: the intimate involvement of transplant surgeons in China in the execution of prisoners via the procurement of organs. We use computational text analysis to conduct a forensic review of 2,838 papers drawn from a dataset of 124,770 Chinese-language transplant publications. Our algorithm searched for evidence of problematic declarations of brain death during organ procurement. We find evidence in 71 of these reports, spread nationwide, that brain death could not have properly been declared. In these cases, the removal of the heart during organ procurement must have been the proximate cause of the donor’s death. Because these organ donors could only have been prisoners, our findings strongly suggest that physicians in the People’s Republic of China have participated in executions by organ removal.

Introduction

A core value in medical ethics is the principle of ‘do no harm,’ famously captured in the Hippocratic Oath. This principle motivates two widespread professional medical prohibitions: the dead donor rule (DDR), which forbids the procurement of vital transplant organs from living donors,[1](#ref-Robertson1999-qz),[2](#ref-Groot2010-pe) and the injunction against physician participation in executions.[3](#ref-Litton2013-kg),[4](#ref-Heath2008-gx)

These two prohibitions are adhered to throughout most of the world: Transplant doctors typically procure organs from free and voluntary donors who have died of natural causes; most countries do not carry out capital punishment.[5](#ref-Reality_Check_team2020-bx),[6](#ref-Hood2015-ep) Very few countries, even those retaining capital punishment, allow organ donation from condemned individuals.[7](#ref-Hamilton2012-kq)

But how should we understand the physician’s role in a context where executed prisoners are the primary source of transplant organs? Might the transplant surgeon become the *de facto* executioner? Evidence suggestive of such behavior has emerged over many years from the People’s Republic of China (PRC).[8](#ref-Wang2001-ir)–[14](#ref-Li2019-lz) To investigate these reports, this paper uses computational methods to examine 2,838 Chinese transplant-related medical papers published in scientific journals, systematically collecting data and testing hypotheses about this practice. By scrutinizing the clinical procedures around intubation and ventilation of donors, declaration of brain death, and commencement of organ procurement surgery, we contribute substantial new evidence to questions about the role of PRC physicians in state executions.

Background on human organ transplantation in the PRC

From the 1980s to the present, the PRC developed one of the largest transplantation systems in the world based primarily on organs from prisoners, supplied by the state’s security and judicial system.[15](#ref-Macartney2005-ns)–[18](#ref-Huang2012-cl) This practice has been condemned by international medical organizations.[19](#ref-Danovitch2011-zr) The state regards both the number of judicial executions and the true number of transplants as official secrets.[20](#ref-Smith2020-jv),[21](#ref-Xu2015-du) The identity of all prisoner donors is also unknown, and controversy has long centered on whether non-condemned political prisoners like Falun Gong practitioners and Uyghur Muslims have been used as an organ source.[22](#ref-China_Tribunal2018-wc)

In the medical literature, China is thought to be the second-largest transplant country in the world as measured by absolute transplant volume, behind the United States.[23](#ref-Kirk2014-gb),[24](#ref-Hu2019-qy) According to human rights researchers however, China performs even more transplants than the US (which reported over 39,000 in 2020).[22](#ref-China_Tribunal2018-wc),[25](#ref-Unos2019-dh) PRC hospitals continue to advertise transplant waiting times of weeks, whereas wait times in the US are measured in months and years.[26](#ref-Nanjing_Drum_Tower_Hospital2021-bv) Hospitals continue to advertise organs to transplant tourists with websites in English, Russian, and Arabic.[27](#X1586bb9410ea25478b9c8f09e6dad70bf792830) Chinese authorities now say they will be performing 50,000 transplants by 2023 — allegedly all from voluntary donors.[28](#ref-Liu2020-bv) If this transpires, China will be operating the most successful and rapidly growing voluntary transplant program in the world. But Chinese governmental accounts of its organ transplantation sector are often contradictory, and the state has published confusing and demonstrably manipulated datasets to the international community.[29](#ref-Robertson2019-er)

Prisoners as organ donors

The data we rely on in this paper involves transplant surgeries from 1980 to 2015. During this period, there was no voluntary donation system and very few voluntary donors. According to three official sources, including the current leader of the transplant sector, the number of voluntary (i.e. non-prisoner) organ donors in China cumulatively as of 2009 was either 120 or 130,[30](#ref-Zhao2015-ci)–[32](#ref-Cnn2009-jw) representing only about 0.3% of the 120,000 organs officially reported to be transplanted during the same period (on the assumption that each voluntary donor gave three organs).[18](#ref-Huang2012-cl),[33](#ref-Chen2013-rc),[34](#ref-Chen2006-ba) The leader of China’s transplant sector wrote in 2007 that effectively 95% of all organ transplants were from prisoners.[35](#ref-Huang2007-md) According to official statements, it was only in 2014 that a national organ allocation system could be used by citizens.[36](#ref-Wu2015-jx)

The papers we examine typically do not say anything about the donors’ identity and do not identify the donors as prisoners. However, based on the above official statements, it logically follows that almost all the organ transplants in the papers we consider must have been from prisoners. Presumably this includes both death row prisoners and prisoners of conscience.[22](#ref-China_Tribunal2018-wc) The question remains as to how they were executed, and the role of transplant surgeons and other medical workers in that process.

The challenge of ethically procuring hearts and lungs from prisoners

Hearts and lungs have been chosen for this analysis because their procurement typically entails donors whose hearts are still beating. Under the DDR, ethical procurement of vital organs from heat-beating donors requires the donor to be brain dead. In countries with hospital-based donation systems, brain death is commonly due to stroke, head trauma, or other causes, and is certified prior to procurement. The PRC does not have a brain death law, but Chinese transplant clinicians have published extensively on the topic since the 1980s, translating and discussing definitions and operationalizations of brain death in Japan, England, and the US.[37](#ref-1986-bd)–[40](#ref-2004-ab)

It is unclear how the DDR might apply in cases where vital organs are procured from prisoners. China provides no information about whether, or how, the prisoner-cum-donor is rendered brain dead in preparation for procurement.

Procuring vital organs from prisoners demands close cooperation between the executioner and the transplant team. The state’s role is to administer death, while the physician’s role is to procure a viable organ. If the execution is carried out without heed to the clinical demands of the transplant, the organs may be spoiled. Yet if the transplant team becomes too involved, they risk becoming the executioners.

Our concern is whether the transplant surgeons establish first that the prisoners are dead before procuring their hearts and lungs. This translates into two empirical questions: (1) Is the donor intubated only after they are pronounced brain dead? And (2) Is the donor intubated by the procurement team as part of the procurement operation? If either were affirmative the declaration of brain death could not have met internationally accepted standards because brain death can only be determined on a fully ventilated patient. Rather, the cause of death would have been organ procurement.

Methods

Our data sources for this project were Chinese-language medical papers published in scientific journals. Such papers are available online and through subscription to academic and commercial databases.

The code for cleaning, searching, and extracting the text was written in the R statistical programming language by the lead author (MPR), a former interpreter and translator from Chinese. The code and replication files — pdf and txt files of the Chinese-language clinical reports, the hand-coded xlsx and docx files, processed bib files, and janitorial R code — are hosted on the Harvard Dataverse and GitHub.

Pilot study

We first conducted a pilot study using highly targeted keyword searches in commercial and academic Chinese-language scientific databases. These searches and the papers they uncovered are presented in Appendix 1. We qualitatively analyzed and classified the resulting 683 papers, during which we developed a criteria for problematic Brain Death Declaration (BDD), and therefore a probable DDR violation.

We define as problematic any BDD in which the report states that the donor was intubated *after* the declaration of brain death, and/or the donor was intubated *immediately before* organ procurement, as part of the procurement operation, or the donor was ventilated by face mask only.

From this pilot analysis we collected several dozen Chinese-language text strings associated with BDD. In the main analysis, we used computational text analysis to search for similar strings across a much larger corpus.

Computational text analysis

While the pilot study relied on searches in commercial and academic Chinese scientific databases, the main phase of the study involved searching directly through a large local dataset of Chinese-language medical publications. The full dataset comprises 124,770 Chinese transplant-related medical papers collated as part of the lead author’s doctoral project. The collection was gathered between late-2018 and October 2020 using dozens of keyword searches for transplant-related terms in several PRC databases, including one that claims 90% coverage of all academic publications in China.

The full dataset covers publications between July 1951 to October 2020. We filtered it for publications from 1980 onwards involving heart and lung transplants from human subjects, leading to a total of 2,884 papers. This number was reduced to 2,838 after subtracting 46 files for which we could not obtain the full pdf. We converted these 2,838 pdfs to plain text files using UNIX command-line utilities and optical-character recognition software.

We then developed a fuzzy string matching algorithm in the R statistical programming language and used it to search across the corpus for language similar to the text strings identified in the pilot phase.

To avoid extensive manual review, we used a stringent cut-off for string similarity. This meant that only papers that included strings with a Jaro–Winkler distance of less than 0.28 — i.e. very similar — to the curated target strings were included, *and* which included the Chinese term “donor” in the surrounding text.[41](#ref-stringdist) This reduced the number of papers for clerical review from 2,838 to 310.

We then manually reviewed each of these 310 papers, and qualitatively evaluated them against our criteria for problematic BDD, and therefore likely DDR violations. For these, we excerpted the relevant text, extracted author names and institutions from the reference metadata, removed duplicates, and classified them by institution type and location using geocomputation libraries in R.[42](#ref-ggmap) The relevant excerpts and paper identification data are in Appendix 2. Full references and lists of hospitals and surgeons are available in the project’s replication files.

Machine translation was initially used for the problematic BDD excerpts found by our fuzzy matching algorithm. Each translated excerpt was then examined and corrected by the lead author (MPR) and reviewed by two native Chinese speakers familiar with clinical procedures. Both authors then examined, discussed, and coded the papers (with JL relying on translation by MPR).

Results

Our workflow is illustrated in Figure 1 by the modified Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) diagram.[[1]](#footnote-1)

**Fig 1. PRISMA flow chart**

The number of studies with descriptions of problematic BDD was 71, published between 1980 and 2015. Problematic BDD occurred at 56 hospitals (of which 12 were military) in 33 cities across 15 provinces. The geographic spread of these practices is represented in the map of the PRC in Figure 2, with every hospital marked with a red circle. A total of 348 surgeons, nurses, anesthesiologists and other medical workers or researchers were listed as authors on these publications.

The complete list of these 71 papers and excerpts with problematic BDD are in Appendix 2. Examples include:

* “The heart donor was a brain trauma patient. By the time of heart procurement, breathing had ceased. Endotracheal intubation was performed and artificial respiration [established]. The heart beat well. The donor heart was procured …”[43](#ref-3229)
* “The donor was intravenously injected with heparin 3mg/kg 1h before the operation… The heartbeat was weak and the myocardium was purple. After assisted ventilation through tracheal intubation, the myocardium turned red and the heartbeat turned strong… The donor heart was extracted with an incision from the 4th intercostal sternum… This incision is a good choice for field operation where the sternum cannot be sawed open without power.”[44](#ref-0573)
* “After donor brain death, tracheal intubation was performed as soon as possible for artificial ventilation. The chest was opened quickly, and the ascending aorta and pulmonary artery were infused with cold cardioplegia…”[45](#ref-3666)
* “After the donor was confirmed brain dead the trachea was intubated, artificial respiration was established, rapid median sternal incision…”[46](#ref-0150)
* “2.1 Obtaining and protecting the donor organs. After the donor’s whole body is heparinized, donor is supine, endotracheal intubation is performed through the mouth, and the anesthesiologist intermittently gives oxygen to the lungs by manual balloon pressure. Split the breastbone in the middle…”[47](#ref-0639)

**Fig 2. Map of the PRC identifying a national pattern of problematic brain death declarations**

Discussion

We have documented 71 descriptions of problematic brain death declaration prior to heart and lung procurement. From these reports, we infer that violations of the DDR took place: given that the donors could not have been brain dead before organ procurement, the declaration of brain death could not have been medically sound. It follows that in these cases death must have been caused by the surgeons procuring the organ.

The 71 papers we identify almost certainly involved breaches of the DDR because in each case the surgery, as described, precluded a legitimate determination of brain death, an essential part of which is the performance of the apnea test, which in turn necessitates an intubated and ventilated patient. In the cases where a face mask was used instead of intubation[48](#ref-0173),[49](#ref-0191) — or a rapid tracheotomy was followed immediately by intubation,[50](#ref-0039) or where intubation took place *after* sternal incision as surgeons examined the beating heart[44](#ref-0573) — the lack of prior determination of brain death is even more apparent.

If indeed these papers document breaches of the DDR during organ procurement from prisoners as we argue, how were these donors prepared for organ procurement? The textual data in the cases we examine is silent on the matter. Taiwan is the only other country we are aware of where death penalty prisoners’ vital organs have been used following execution. This reportedly took place both during the 1990s and then once more in March 2011.[51](#ref-Tsai2011-rv),[52](#ref-Rothman1997-rt)

According to a 2011 paper by Tsai et al,[51](#ref-Tsai2011-rv) executions in Taiwan were typically carried out by firing squad. The prisoner was anesthetized prior to execution, and the bullet was aimed at the prisoner’s head to preserve heart function. The prosecutor and a forensic doctor examined the body 20 minutes after the shooting to pronounce legal death. Finally, the prisoner was rushed to a nearby hospital for organ procurement. The problem the authors identify is the unreliable nature of inflicting brain death by firing squad: “The bullet penetrating the temporal bone of skull will not reach the brainstem, so a direct brainstem death could not occur. However, through causing intracranial hemorrhage, which will lead to increased intracranial pressure, herniation of the big brain [sic], and compression of the brainstem, this could possibly cause brainstem death to occur. However, such a means is indirect, imprecise and unreliable.”[51(p12)](#ref-Tsai2011-rv)

In this scenario, the authors write, cranial damage renders the typical means of establishing brain death — coma, absence of brainstem reflexes (i.e. pupil movement, facial and tracheal response), and lack of autonomous breathing (ascertained by the apnea test) — almost impossible. “As a result, when being transferred from execution chamber to hospital for transplantation, the death-row inmates… execution is continued after the firing squad and finished by transplantation surgeons.”[51(p12)](#ref-Tsai2011-rv)

The Bellagio Taskforce in 1995 gave an even more explicit report of practice in Taiwan, which it says ended in 1994: “in Taiwan the physician sedated and intubated the prisoner and inserted an intravenous line prior to execution. Immediately after the prisoner was shot (in the head), the physician stemmed the blood flow, put the prisoner on the respirator, and injected compounds to raise blood pressure and cardiac output so as to keep the organs perfused. In this way, the physician became an intimate participant in the execution process, functioning not to preserve life but to manipulate death in the service of transplantation.”[52](#ref-Rothman1997-rt)

The Taiwanese case highlights the challenges inherent in complying with the DDR when procuring hearts and lungs from executed prisoners. According to Tsai et al., this only took place with three prisoners in Taiwan before it was stopped.

The PRC papers we have identified do not describe how the donor was incapacitated before procurement, and the data is consistent with multiple plausible scenarios. These range from a bullet to the prisoner’s head at an execution site before they are rushed to the hospital, like Tsai’s description, or a general anesthetic delivered in the operating room directly before procurement. Paul et al. have previously proposed a hybrid of these scenarios to explain PRC transplant activity: a lethal injection, with execution completed by organ procurement. They write: “in cases in which thiopental’s effect is insufficient and organ explantation begins immediately after cardiac arrest, the inmates may suffer from excruciating pain induced by organ explantation surgery, the surgical opening of the abdomen and/or chest.”[11](#ref-Paul2018-pl) It is also possible that a specialized device was used to inflict brain death in close quarters and thus insulate medical professionals from the process. A patent for a “Primary brainstem injury percussion machine” was held by a former PRC police chief involved in organ transplants.[53](#ref-Wang2012-pf) The patent description says it was to be used for medium-sized animals. There is no public evidence that it was ever used on humans. Previous anecdotal, eyewitness, and textual evidence is consistent with these accounts — including procurement from donors prior to death,[12](#ref-Tohti2019-qj) and targeted execution procedures intended to forestall cardiac arrest and thus minimize warm ischemic time.[9](#ref-Human_Rights_Watch1994-bf)

A question remains: why did the authors of these papers publish them at all, given the gravity of what they document? We propose this explanation: They are in Chinese, in Chinese academic and commercial databases, and they were produced for a small readership of peers. There are significant technical challenges in accessing the documents at scale. Even then, the DDR violations remain hidden — a phrase of a few characters in a paper several pages long. Gathering, organizing, discovering, and explaining the significance of this data requires a combination of Chinese-language expertise, technical competence, and knowledge of heart and lung transplant surgery. It is unlikely the authors anticipated these accounts would be compiled and analyzed when they wrote them over a decade ago, though they may have become alert to this possibility in more recent years.

Our data does not allow us to make quantifiable inferences about the representativeness of our sample for all heart and lung procurement surgeries in the PRC. Many of the 2,838 papers caught in our search were not direct clinical reports. We do not know how many published clinical papers were inadvertently excluded from our analysis. Inadvertent exclusions may have happened for several reasons, including: (1) our failure to capture them from the original Chinese-language repositories, (2) our set of keywords and phrases developed in the pilot study being insufficient to fully capture the underlying phenomenon of interest, (3) our choice to focus on only very close string matches and thus limit the number of papers to closely examine to several hundred only. Further, the most significant inferential gap lies in the fact that we do not know what portion of total heart and lung transplant surgeries actually result in publications. Of these, an even smaller number detail the methods of donor procurement; and of these, only a portion describe the procedures we have discovered.

Many papers we encountered described similar surgical procedures but do not refer to donor brain death or donor intubation.[54](#ref-3462)–[59](#ref-0332) Papers of this sort are likely the majority of all publications about heart and lung procurement operations. They were only inadvertently caught in our search.

We identified over two dozen additional papers that described almost identical surgical procedures to the papers we classified as problematic BDD. In these papers, reference is often made (n=16) to “establishing ventilation” (建立呼吸) or “maintaining ventilation” (维持呼吸) immediately following the declaration of donor brain death and/or just prior to procurement.[60](#ref-0591),[61](#ref-0255) These descriptions in fact appear to capture the same clinical procedures as papers we did include, except the term “intubate” is absent.[62](#ref-0587)–[69](#ref-3694)

The only circumstances under which the DDR would not be violated in such cases is if the surgeons adhered to rigorous BDD protocols. In that case, the phrase “establish ventilation” could have referred to turning on the ventilator, not intubating the patient. This would only have been possible if the donor had *already* been intubated and the apnea test performed. However, none of this is described in the papers, despite the otherwise detailed descriptions of routine surgical procedures. Further, if the donor was intubated before determination of brain death, then brain death must have been achieved in a controlled manner — to prevent cardiac arrest prior to transportation to hospital and procurement — and surgeons must have insisted on risking the donor’s cardiac death and ischemic damage while conducting the apnea test. This is a possible scenario, but we do not think it is the most plausible or practical one, and we found no evidence for it. Given the number of papers we identified and the clear benefits to transplant success they imply, we think it is most probable that “establish ventilation” simply refers to intubation. It also suggests that problematic BDD, and therefore likely DDR violations, may be more widespread than we can conclusively document.

Apart from the timing of intubation around BDD, there are two other indications of problematic BDD in the papers. These are: (1) establishing venous lines for introducing heparin around intubation time,[73](#ref-0126) and (2) injecting heparin intramuscularly.[76](#ref-2497) If the donor was a genuine brain-dead patient, venous lines would already have been established before BDD as part of antemortem treatment — they are never established just before organ procurement. The reference to intramuscular injection of heparin suggests that the donor had no peripheral venous lines before surgery and may even have been ambulant. This is consistent with eyewitness testimony about organ procurement from prisoners;[8](#ref-Wang2001-ir),[9](#ref-Human_Rights_Watch1994-bf) but it is not consistent with standard procurement procedures in brain dead donors.

During our review, we also came across papers that give clear reports of intubation *prior* to BDD in the context of procurement from reportedly voluntary donors. Such reports, particularly in recent years, are consistent with change of practice in line with official PRC claims of procurement from voluntary donors. (They are also consistent with increased *reporting* of ethical procurement surgery.) An example of such papers: “Three of the donors were normally healthy and in a deep coma, without spontaneous breathing. Mechanical ventilation was maintained through tracheal intubation; the brainstem reflex had disappeared, EEG was flat, and the transcranial Doppler ultrasound showed brain death patterns.”[77](#ref-0623)

Our analysis builds on testimonials of former PRC surgeons like Wang Guoqi and Enver Tohti,[8](#ref-Wang2001-ir),[12](#ref-Tohti2019-qj) as well as the textual and interview research by investigators and researchers such as Ethan Gutmann, Robin Munro, Li Huige, Paul Norbert, the World Organization to Investigate the Persecution of Falun Gong, and others.[9](#ref-Human_Rights_Watch1994-bf)–[11](#ref-Paul2018-pl),[13](#ref-Gutmann2014-cj),[14](#ref-Li2019-lz),[78](#ref-Woipfg2014-sr) These sources have highlighted anecdotal and textual accounts of apparent DDR violations by surgeons. Our study, using systematic computational methods, corroborates them.

We think that our failure to identify more DDR violations relates to the difficulty of detecting them in the first instance, not to the absence of actual DDR violations in either the literature or practice. Our choice to tightly focus only on papers that made explicit reports of apparent DDR violations likely limited the number of problematic papers we ultimately identified. We found similar descriptions of intubation and surgical procedures from liver and kidney donors, for instance, but they were not part of our study.[79](#ref-other_0243)–[82](#ref-other_0158) We thus suspect that we captured a tiny sample of a substantial hidden population.

Almost all global health bodies have condemned the use of prisoners for their organs in China.[83](#ref-World_Medical_Association2006-iq),[84](#ref-OConnell2016-kx) This is primarily due to the belief that the inherently coercive circumstances in which condemned prisoners are held impairs their (or their families’) capacity to give free and informed consent to donate organs upon death.[85](#ref-Caplan2011-fc)

Chinese officials have alternately defended and criticized their own use of prisoners — often based on consent. As late as January 2015, the leader of the transplant sector, Dr. Huang Jiefu, told journalists: “I am not saying that I am against prisoners donating. If they found their conscience and want to donate their organs, it is fine, as long as it is within the citizen donation system…”[36](#ref-Wu2015-jx) Yet just two months later he told a state-affiliated newspaper: “They [*i.e. prisoners*] were forced to donate… The family has to agree, and their parents didn’t, they complained, they didn’t even agree to the death sentence — how could they consent to organ donation?”[86](#ref-Wang2015-th)

Dr. Huang also attributes the success of organ transplantation in China to the supply of bodies provided by the PRC security apparatus: “We are deeply grateful to the many cadres in the judicial system, because without their cooperation, without organs donated from death row prisoners, China’s transplantation system would not be as technologically advanced and mature as it is today.”[87](#ref-Xu2015-cm)

Dr. Huang is on record stating that in the PRC “transplant surgeons have absolutely no involvement with the process of execution.”[35(p194)](#ref-Huang2007-md) Our research suggests otherwise. If the reports we examine are accurate, they indicate that heart and lung procurement by the surgeon was the proximate cause of the prisoner’s death, thus directly implicating the surgeon in the execution.

As of 2021, China’s organ transplant professionals have improved their reputation with their international peers. This is principally based on their claims to have ceased the use of prisoners as organ donors in 2015. The international transplantation community seems satisfied with the PRC’s progress, and unconcerned with the apparent falsification of official datasets.[29](#ref-Robertson2019-er)

While more voluntary donations are taking place in China than ever before, there are as yet no reliable data on the true scale of the reforms. It is also unclear whether and to what degree death row prisoners and prisoners of conscience are still being utilized as organ sources. Given the lack of sanctions and accountability for procurement of prisoner organs in the past, the strong financial incentives to continue such activity, and the difficulty of external observers of detecting it, it is unclear why Chinese hospitals would cease engaging in this profitable trade.

A final question is whether DDR violations continue in the present day. The most recent medical paper we found was published in 2015. There are several potential explanations for this. The most benign is that the reform program indeed ceased the use of prisoners, and thus these abuses. Alternatively, it may be because grassroots human rights activists and researchers exposed DDR violations in September 2014, and PRC officials are attentive to international perceptions.[78](#ref-Woipfg2014-sr) Instructions to state-managed medical journals to cease publishing such details could have been issued, and this could explain the absence of such admissions past 2015. The authors see no way to objectively adjudicate between these two potential interpretations.

The major unknown is whether prisoners are still being used as an organ source in the PRC. If they are not, then the sort of DDR violations we have identified would naturally no longer occur. But if prisoners — of whatever sort — are indeed still being used as an organ source, we think it is most rational to believe that the procurement of their organs continues to occasion violations of the DDR.

Conflict of interest statement

The authors report no conflicts of interest.

Author contributions

Both authors jointly conceived the study, reviewed all included papers in the study, and developed the categories used in the study. Dr. Lavee was responsible for determining the criteria for problematic BDD papers. Mr. Robertson gathered the data, wrote the code, and performed or confirmed the translations. The authors are jointly responsible for the manuscript.

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful for the time and thought of the following people: Wendy Rogers, Tobias Smith, Martin Elliott, Daniel Fu-Chang Tsai, David McGiffin, Benjamin Goldsmith, Katrin Travouillon, Katrine Beauregard, Kenneth Benoit, Bermond Scoggins, Sophia Fang, Raymond L. Hinde, Michael Kumove, and Sarah J. Hinde.

This work was supported by the Google Cloud Research Credits program (award GCP19980904), the Australian Government Research Training Program Scholarship, and the Victims of Communism Memorial Foundation.

Data availability statement

Replication materials are available on the Harvard Dataverse at <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/XNGDPE> and on GitHub at github.com/mpr1255/dead\_donor\_replication.

Supporting Information

* Appendix 1: Pilot study
* Appendix 2: Excerpts from medical papers showing apparent dead donor rule violations

References

1. Robertson JA. Delimiting the donor: The dead donor rule. *Hastings Cent Rep*. 1999;29(6):6-14.

2. Groot YJ de, Groot YJ de, Kompanje EJO. Dead donor rule and organ procurement. *Pediatric Critical Care Medicine*. 2010;11:314. doi:[10.1097/pcc.0b013e3181c3150d](https://doi.org/10.1097/pcc.0b013e3181c3150d)

3. Litton P. Physician participation in executions, the morality of capital. *J Law Med Ethics*. 2013;41(1):333-352. doi:[10.1111/jlme.12024](https://doi.org/10.1111/jlme.12024)

4. Heath MJ. Revisiting physician involvement in capital punishment: medical. *Mayo Clin Proc*. 2008;83(1):115-6; aythor reply 121. doi:[10.4065/83.1.115](https://doi.org/10.4065/83.1.115)

5. Reality Check team. Death penalty: How many countries still have it? *BBC*. Published online December 2020. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-45835584>

6. Hood R, Hoyle C. *The Death Penalty: A Worldwide Perspective*. Oxford University Press; 2015.

7. Hamilton D. *A History of Organ Transplantation: Ancient Legends to Modern Practice*. University of Pittsburgh Press; 2012.

8. Wang G. Statement of wang guoqi, former doctor, chinese people’s liberation army hospital. Published online June 2001. <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CRECB-2001-pt10/html/CRECB-2001-pt10-Pg13682-2.htm>

9. Watch HR. *China: Organ Procurement and Judicial Execution in China*. Vol 6. (Munro R, ed.). Human Rights Watch/Asia; 1994.

10. Paul NW, Caplan A, Shapiro ME and. Human rights violations in organ procurement practice in china. *BMC Med Ethics*. 2017;18(1):11. doi:[10.1186/s12910-017-0169-x](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12910-017-0169-x)

11. Paul NW, Caplan A, Shapiro ME, Els C, Allison KC, Li H. Determination of death in execution by lethal injection in china. *Camb Q Healthc Ethics*. 2018;27(3):459-466. doi:[10.1017/S0963180117000846](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963180117000846)

12. Tohti E. Independent tribunal into forced organ harvesting in china: Witness testimony. Published online March 2019. <https://chinatribunal.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/A15_Submission_ID459T_EnverTohti_PD.pdf>

13. Gutmann E. *The Slaughter: Mass Killings, Organ Harvesting, and China’s Secret Solution to Its Dissident Problem*. Prometheus Books Amherst; 2014.

14. Li H. Submission by li huige: Live organ harvesting. Published online March 2019.

15. Macartney J. China to “tidy up” trade in executed prisoners’ organs. *Times Online*. Published online December 2005.

16. Huang J, Mao Y, Millis JM. Government policy and organ transplantation in china. *Lancet*. 2008;372(9654):1937-1938. doi:[10.1016/S0140-6736(08)61359-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(08)61359-8)

17. Allison KC, Caplan A, Shapiro ME, Els. Historical development and current status of organ procurement. *BMC Med Ethics*. 2015;16(1):85. doi:[10.1186/s12910-015-0074-0](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12910-015-0074-0)

18. Huang J, Millis JM, Mao Y, Millis M. A pilot programme of organ donation after cardiac death in china. *Lancet*. 2012;379(9818):862-865. doi:[10.1016/S0140-6736(11)61086-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(11)61086-6)

19. Danovitch GM, Shapiro ME, Lavee J. The use of executed prisoners as a source of organ transplants in china must stop. *American journal of transplantation: official journal of the American Society of Transplantation and the American Society of Transplant Surgeons*. 2011;11(3):426-428. doi:[10.1111/j.1600-6143.2010.03417.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-6143.2010.03417.x)

20. Smith T. Body count politics: Quantification, secrecy, and capital punishment in china. *Law Soc Inq*. Published online May 2020:1-22. doi:[10.1017/lsi.2020.10](https://doi.org/10.1017/lsi.2020.10)

21. Xu G. 原卫生部副部长：周永康落马打破死囚器官移植利益链 [former health minister: Zhou yongkang’s downfall broke the profit chain using death row prisoner organs]. Published online March 2015.

22. Tribunal C. Interim judgement. Published online December 2018.

23. Kirk AD, Knechtle SJ, Larsen CP and. *Textbook of Organ Transplantation Set*. John Wiley & Sons; 2014.

24. Hu D. 国家卫健委：我国器官捐献、移植数量均位居世界第2位 [national health and family planning commission: China’s organ donation and transplant numbers are ranked second in the world]. Published online October 2019.

25. UNOS. Organ transplants in united states set sixth consecutive. Published online January 2019.

26. Nanjing Drum Tower Hospital. 南京鼓楼医院肝脏移植中心 [Nanjing Drum Tower Hospital Transplant Center] About Us. Published online 2021. <http://njtransplant.com/>

27. Lovehandy Healthcare Service. Kidney transplant. <http://tran-kid.com/>

28. Liu H. 黄洁夫：我国将成世界第一器官移植大国，但有大量器官浪费 [huang jiefu: China will become the world’s largest organ transplant country, but there’s still a lot of organ waste]. Published online November 2020.

29. Robertson MP, Hinde RL, Lavee J. Analysis of official deceased organ donation data casts doubt on. *BMC Med Ethics*. 2019;20(1):79. doi:[10.1186/s12910-019-0406-6](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12910-019-0406-6)

30. Zhao H, Wu N. 专访黄洁夫: 中国器官移植事业光明正大地登上世界舞台 [exclusive interview with huang jiefu: The china organ transplant field justly and honorably steps onto the world stage]. Published online January 2015.

31. Beijing Youth Daily. 中国使用死囚器官做移植将成历史 [china’s use of death row prisoners for transplants will become a thing of the past]. Published online March 2015.

32. CNN. China hopes organ donor system stops trafficking. Published online August 2009.

33. Chen X, ed. *器官移植临床指南 第三版 [Clinical Guidelines for Organ Transplantation 3rd Edition]*. 科学出版社 [Science Press]; 2013.

34. Chen Z et al. 中国首批国际标准化脑死亡自愿无偿器官捐献及成功移植——24位捐献者,106个器官。拯救100例移植病人 [china’s first international standardized brain-dead voluntary free organ donation and successful transplantation-24 donors, 106 organs. Rescue 100 transplant patients]. In: *中华医学会第六次全国胸心血管外科学术会议论文集（胸外科分册）[proceedings of the Sixth National Conference on Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgery of the Chinese Medical Association (Thoracic Surgery)]*.; 2006. <http://111.21.214.29/KCMS/detail/detail.aspx?filename=ZHYX200611006029&dbcode=CPFD&dbname=CPFD2007>

35. Huang J. Ethical and legislative perspectives on liver transplantation in the people’s republic of china. *Liver Transpl*. 2007;13(2):193-196. doi:[10.1002/lt.21081](https://doi.org/10.1002/lt.21081)

36. Wu X. 黄洁夫：我只看过一次摘取器官 觉得需要改变 [huang jiefu: I’ve only witnessed organ harvesting once but feel there’s need for change]. *Phoenix Television*. Published online January 2015.

37. Baojian] 陈保健 [Chen. 脑死亡的概念和诊断标准 [concept and diagnostic criteria of brain death]. *国外医学 (内科学分册) [Foreign Medicine (Internal Medicine)]*. 1986;7.

38. Hanming] 杨涵铭 [Yang. 脑死亡的最新认识和展望 [the latest understanding and prospects of brain death]. *中国急救医学 [China Emergency Medicine]*. 1993;13(06).

39. Tianxi] 张天锡 [Zhang. 对 ’脑死亡’ 诊断标准的认识 [awareness of the diagnostic criteria of ’brain death’]. *中华神经外科疾病研究杂志 [Chinese Journal of Neurosurgical Disease Research]*. 2003;2(2):97-99.

40. Tianxi] 张天锡 [Zhang. 关于脑死亡临床诊断标准的刍议 [a discussion on the clinical diagnosis standards of brain death]. *中华内科杂志 [Chinese Journal of Internal Medicine]*. Published online 2004.

41. M.P.J. van der Loo. The stringdist package for approximate string matching. *The R Journal*. 2014;6:111-122. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=stringdist>

42. Kahle D, Wickham H. Ggmap: Spatial visualization with ggplot2. *The R Journal*. 2013;5(1):144-161. <https://journal.r-project.org/archive/2013-1/kahle-wickham.pdf>

43. 王鞠武王志增. 心脏移植麻醉3例的初步体会 [preliminary experience of 3 cases of heart transplantation anesthesia]. *上海医学; Shanghai Medical Journal*. Published online 1980.

44. 杨辰垣孙宗全. 原位心脏移植一例报告 [a case report of orthotopic heart transplantation]. *临床心血管病杂志; Journal of Clinical Cardiology*. Published online 1995.

45. 谢维泉浦晓东. 同种异体心肺联合移植术一例 [a case of allogeneic combined heart-lung transplantation]. *中国胸心血管外科临床杂志; Chinese Journal Of Clinical Thoracic And Cardiovascular Surgery*. Published online 1997.

46. 王伟孙全胜. 同种异体原位心脏移植供心的切除与保护 [resection and protection of donor heart for orthotopic heart allograft transplantation]. *徐州医学院学报; Acta Academiae Medicinae Xuzhou*. Published online 2004.

47. 潘禹辰罗爱国. 供体心肺同时摘取的初步经验 [preliminary experience of simultaneous extraction of donor heart and lung]. *中国胸心血管外科临床杂志; Chinese Journal of Clinical Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgery*. Published online 2015.

48. 刘建王康荣. 心脏移植供心采取及保护的探讨 [discussion on the adoption and protection of donor heart in heart transplantation]. *江苏大学学报(医学版); Journal of Zhenjiang Medical College*. Published online 2004.

49. 程旺生陈利民. 1例原位心脏移植的体外循环管理 [cardiopulmonary bypass management in a case of orthotopic heart transplantation]. *华南国防医学杂志; Military Medical Journal of South China*. Published online 2005.

50. 于佳生林雪维. 原位心脏移植术供心的采取与保护 [adoption and protection of donor heart in orthotopic heart transplantation]. *临床医学; Clinical Medicine*. Published online 2002.

51. Tsai DF-C, Tsai M-K, Ko W-J. Organs by firing squad: The medical and moral implausibility of death penalty organ procurement. *American Journal of Bioethics*. 2011;11(10):11-13. doi:[10.1080/15265161.2011.603805](https://doi.org/10.1080/15265161.2011.603805)

52. Rothman DJ, Rose E, Awaya T, et al. [The bellagio task force report on transplantation, bodily integrity, and the international traffic in organs](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9290810). *Transplant Proc*. 1997;29(6):2739-2745.

53. Wang L et al. 原发性脑干损伤撞击机 [primary brainstem injury percussion machine]. Published online August 2012.

54. 刘明政金沐. 同种原位心脏移植手术的麻醉处理 [anesthesia treatment of orthotopic heart transplantation]. *中华麻醉学杂志; Chinese Journal of Anesthesiology*. Published online 2006.

55. 张铸伊力亚尔·夏合丁. 同种异体单肺移植一例报告 [a case report of allogeneic single lung transplantation]. *中华器官移植杂志; Chinese Journal of Organ Transplantation*. Published online 2006.

56. 邵永丰黄陈军. 单肺移植治疗终末期肺病(附4例报告) [single lung transplantation for end-stage lung disease (report of 4 cases)]. *南京医科大学学报(自然科学版); Acta Universitatis Medicinalis Nanjing(Natural Science)*. Published online 2007.

57. 许凝陈静瑜. 同期心脏和肺移植6例 [6 cases of heart and lung transplantation during the same period]. *中国组织工程研究与临床康复; Journal of Clinical Rehabilitative Tissue Engineering Research*. Published online 2011.

58. Hongying] 徐红颖 [Xu. 心脏移植的手术配合 [surgical cooperation for heart transplantation]. *中国城乡企业卫生; Chinese Journal of Urban and Rural Enterprise Hygiene*. Published online 2017.

59. 刘琼JY. 序贯式双肺移植术的手术配合与护理 [surgical cooperation and nursing for sequential double lung transplantation]. *临床护理杂志; Journal of Clinical Nursing*. Published online 2007.

60. 臧旺福陈子道. 三例心脏移植的远期心功能 [long-term cardiac function of three cases of heart transplantation]. *中国胸心血管外科临床杂志; Chinese Journal Of Clinical Thoracic And Cardiovascular Surgery*. Published online 1997.

61. 刘季春万于华. 原位心脏移植的临床研究 [clinical study of orthotopic heart transplantation]. *江西医学院学报; Acta Academiae Medicinae Jiangxi*. Published online 2006.

62. 段楷WM. 脑死亡患者的自主呼吸激发试验应用与安全 [application and safety of spontaneous breathing provocation test in patients with brain death]. *医学综述*. Published online 2020.

63. 于波李学奇. 重症慢型克山病的治疗—心脏移植(附3例报告) [treatment of severe chronic keshan disease—heart transplantation (report of 3 cases)]. *中国地方病学杂志; Chinese Journal Of Epidemiology*. Published online 1999.

64. 肖漓蔡明. 1例心脏移植受者HLA-G5表达动态观察 [dynamic observation of HLA-G5 expression in a heart transplant recipient]. *北京生物医学工程; Beijing Biomedical Engineering*. Published online 2007.

65. 胡滨李辉. LPD液对无心跳供体肺的保护作用 [protective effect of LPD liquid on non-heartbeat donor lung]. *中华胸心血管外科杂志; Chinese Journal of Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgery*. Published online 2007.

66. 2001年一等奖项目介绍 同种原位心脏移植的实验和临床应用研究 [introduction to the first prize project in 2001. Experimental and clinical application research on homologous orthotopic heart transplantation]. *中华医学信息导报; China Medical News*. Published online 2002.

67. 许凝, 陈静瑜, 解强, 隗玉川, 王艳俊, 应朝辉, 曲永业, 吕树良, 梳楠 [Xu Ning, Chen Jingyu, Xie Qiang, Kui Yuchuan, Wang Yanjun, Ying Chaohui, Qu Yongye, Lu Shuliang, Su Nan]. 不同受者同期分别接受同一供者的心、肺移植六例 [different recipients received six heart and lung transplants from the same donor at the same time]. *中华器官移植杂志; Chinese Journal of Organ Transplantation*. Published online 2007.

68. 孙国成刘维永. 同种原位心脏移植供心的保护 [protection of donor heart in orthotopic heart transplantation of homogeneous]. *第四军医大学学报; Journal Of The Fourth Military Medical University*. Published online 2000.

69. 张本固蔡广振. 单侧肺移植技术──附一例报告 [unilateral lung transplantation technique──a case report]. *广州医学院学报; Academic Journal Of Guangzhou Medical College*. Published online 1998.

70. 邹海英LS. 心脏移植体外循环2例护理体会 [nursing experience of 2 cases of heart transplantation and cardiopulmonary bypass]. *齐鲁护理杂志; Journal of Qilu Nursing*. Published online 2006.

71. 王玫胡咏梅[WangM. 肺移植供肺切取配合及保养研究 [study on coordination and maintenance of donor lung removal in lung transplantation]. *广东医学; Guangdong Medical Journal*. Published online 1999.

72. 张军花狄桂萍[ZhangJ. 心脏移植供心切取的配合及保护 [coordination and protection of donor heart removal in heart transplantation]. *第三军医大学学报; Acta Academiae Medicine Militaris Tertiae*. Published online 2001.

73. 张明宇田海. 急性脑死亡对移植供体心脏形态学损害的研究 [study on the damage of acute brain death to the morphology of the transplanted donor’s heart]. *哈尔滨医科大学学报; Journal of Harbin Medical University*. Published online 2004.

74. 曹向戎李继勇. 心肺联合移植供心及肺的采取和保护 [collection and protection of donor heart and lungs in combined heart-lung transplantation]. *心肺血管病杂志; Journal of Cardiovascular and Pulmonary Diseases*. Published online 2003.

75. 刘金东曹君利. 同种异体原位心脏移植手术的麻醉管理 [anesthesia management of orthotopic heart transplantation]. *徐州医学院学报; Acta Academiae Medicinae Xuzhou*. Published online 2003.

76. 唐晓阳钱燕宁. 同种异体原位心脏移植手术15例的麻醉管理 [anesthesia management of 15 cases of orthotopic heart transplantation]. *江苏医药; Jiangsu Medical Journal*. Published online 2011.

77. 陈丽花牟晓玲. 等待肺移植病人心理状况与其生存质量的相关性分析 [analysis of the correlation between the psychological status of patients waiting for lung transplantation and their quality of life]. *护理研究; Chinese Nursing Research*. Published online 2012.

78. WOIPFG. 中国大陆医学专业论文中有关中共活体摘取法轮功学员器官的证据 [evidence of the CCP harvesting of organs from falun gong practitioners in medical papers in mainland china]. Published online September 2014.

79. 柳勤龙高振明. 原位灌洗联合快速切取腹腔器官的临床应用(附56例报告) [clinical application of in situ lavage combined with rapid excision of abdominal organs (a report of 56 cases)]. *大连医科大学学报; Journal of Dalian Medical University*. Published online 2006.

80. 邱繁荣高志刚. 原位肝移植供肝切取与修整技术的探讨 [study on the technique of donor liver harvesting and trimming in orthotopic liver transplantation]. *中华外科杂志; Chinese Journal of Surgery*. Published online 2002.

81. 蔡金贞朱志军. 肝肾等多脏器联合切取的手术方法改进 [improvement of the surgical method for combined extraction of multiple organs such as liver and kidney]. *肝胆胰外科杂志; Journal of Hepatopancreatobiliary Surgery*. Published online 2005.

82. 徐军明夏强. 改良法快速肝肾供体联合切取的探讨 [discussion on the improved method of rapid combined extraction of liver and kidney donors]. *中华普通外科杂志; Chinese Journal of General Surgery*. Published online 2004.

83. World Medical Association. WMA Council Resolution on Organ Donation in China. Published online April 2006.


84. O’Connell PJ, Ascher N, Delmonico FL. The Transplantation Society believes a policy of engagement will facilitate organ donation reform in China. *Am J Transplant*. 2016;16(11):3297-3298. doi:[10.1111/ajt.14050](https://doi.org/10.1111/ajt.14050)

85. Caplan A. The Use of Prisoners as Sources of organs: An Ethically Dubious Practice. *American Journal of Bioethics*. 2011;11(10):1-5. doi:[10.1080/15265161.2011.607397](https://doi.org/10.1080/15265161.2011.607397)


86. Wang Y. 黄洁夫: 使用死囚器官是历史难堪一页 [huang jiefu: The use of death row prisoner organs is an embarrassing page in history]. Published online March 2015.

87. Xu G. 公民自愿器官捐献是阳光下的生命延续 [voluntary citizen donation sustains life transparently]. Published online March 2015.

Figures



*Fig. 1 PRISMA flow chart*



*Fig 2. Map of the PRC identifying a national pattern of problematic brain death declarations*

1. The modifications to the flowchart are explained in the ./code/05\_prisma.R file [↑](#footnote-ref-1)