The Algorithmic Dilemma: Should AI Be Used in Life-and-Death Transplant Decisions?

Rasit Dinc

Rasit Dinc Digital Health & AI Research

Abstract

The Algorithmic Dilemma: Should AI Be Used in Life-and-Death Transplant Decisions? The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into medicine is rapi...

The Algorithmic Dilemma: Should AI Be Used in Life-and-Death Transplant Decisions?

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into medicine is rapidly transforming clinical practice, offering unprecedented tools for diagnosis, treatment, and resource allocation. Few areas present a more profound ethical and technical challenge than **solid organ transplantation**, where the stakes are life and death. With over 100,000 patients on the waiting list in the US alone, and demand far exceeding supply, the question is no longer *if* AI can help, but **should** it be entrusted with decisions that determine who receives a life-saving organ [1].

AI's promise in transplantation is compelling. Machine learning models excel at processing the vast, complex datasets—from donor and recipient genetics to imaging and physiological data—that traditional statistical methods struggle to manage. These algorithms are already demonstrating success in three critical areas: optimizing **organ allocation and donor-recipient matching**, predicting **long-term graft survival and patient outcomes**, and personalizing **immunosuppressive regimens** [2]. By enhancing precision and efficiency, AI holds the potential to reduce organ wastage and improve overall transplant success rates.

The Ethical Crossroads: Navigating the 'Black Box'

Despite the clear clinical benefits, the use of AI in this high-stakes, ethically charged domain introduces significant moral and practical dilemmas. The core of the debate centers on three critical ethical pillars:

1. Bias and Fairness: The Risk of Algorithmic Inequity

Organ allocation systems are designed to be equitable, yet existing health

disparities can be inadvertently encoded into AI models. If the training data reflects historical biases, the algorithm may perpetuate or even amplify these inequities in its recommendations [3]. The challenge is to develop AI that is not only accurate but also fair, ensuring that efficiency does not come at the cost of justice for vulnerable populations.

2. Transparency and Explainability: Unveiling the Algorithm

Many of the most powerful AI tools, particularly those based on deep learning, operate as "black boxes." Their complexity makes it difficult for clinicians and patients to fully understand the reasoning behind a specific decision. In a field where informed consent and clinical accountability are paramount, this lack of **explainability** is an ethical barrier [4].

For a patient to give truly informed consent, they must understand why an organ was allocated to them—or why it was not. For a physician, the inability to interpret an AI's recommendation undermines their professional autonomy and oversight. Ethical frameworks demand that AI systems in healthcare be transparent, allowing for the identification and correction of errors or biases, thereby upholding the principle of non-maleficence.

3. The Patient-Physician Relationship and Algorithmic Authority

The introduction of an AI intermediary risks eroding the fundamental trust between patient and physician. If a patient perceives that a life-altering decision is being made by an impersonal algorithm rather than a human clinician, it can lead to a sense of depersonalization and skepticism [5].

Physicians must resist the temptation of **"algorithmic authority,"** where an AI's recommendation is followed without critical human evaluation. AI should serve as a powerful tool to augment, not replace, clinical judgment. The physician remains the ultimate decision-maker, responsible for interpreting the AI's output in the context of the patient's unique needs and values. Clear communication about AI's supportive role is essential to maintaining a strong, human-centered patient-physician relationship.

Conclusion: A Future of Augmented Decision-Making

AI offers indispensable tools to manage the complexity and scarcity inherent in organ transplantation, promising better outcomes and more efficient allocation. However, its integration must be governed by a robust ethical framework that prioritizes **fairness, transparency, and human oversight**.

The future of transplantation is not one where machines make the final call, but one where human experts are empowered by intelligent systems. By committing to ethical AI development—ensuring representative data, explainable models, and maintaining the physician's central role—we can harness the power of AI to save more lives while upholding the highest standards of medical ethics.

For more in-depth analysis on the intersection of digital health, AI, and ethical governance, the resources at www.rasitdinc.com provide expert commentary and professional insight.

**

References

[1] United Network for Organ Sharing (UNOS). Data as of March 2024*. [2] Salybekov, A. A., et al. (2025). Ethics and Algorithms to Navigate AI's Emerging Role in Organ Transplantation.* J Clin Med*, 14(8), 2775. [https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12027807/]* (https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12027807/) *[3] Drezga-Kleiminger, M., et al. (2023). Should AI allocate livers for transplant? Public attitudes and ethical considerations.* BMC Med Ethics*, 24(1), 94. [https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10683249/]* (https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10683249/) *[4] Lozano-Suarez, N., et al. (2025). Bioethical challenges in the integration of artificial intelligence in clinical practice.* BMC Med Ethics*, 26(1), 38. [https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12198544/]* (https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12198544/) *[5] Salybekov, A. A., et al. (2025). Ethics and Algorithms to Navigate AI's Emerging Role in Organ Transplantation.* J Clin Med*, 14(8), 2775. [https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12027807/] (https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12027807/) (Section 6.1)