Philanthropy and charitable giving: A rapid of reviews
Review Protocol

Table of Contents

Philanthropy and charitable giving: A rapid of reviews
Review Protocol **1**

Table of Contents **2**
- Anticipated start 3
- Funding sources/sponsors 3
- Conflicts of interest 3
- Review question(s) 3
- Searches 3
- Search strategy 3
- Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria 4
- Condition or domain being studied 5
- Participants/population 5
- Intervention(s), exposure(s) 5
- Comparator(s)/control 5
- Types of study to be included 5
- Context 5
- Primary outcome(s) 5
- Secondary outcomes 5
- Data extraction (selection and coding) 6
- Risk of bias (quality) assessment 6
- Strategy for data synthesis 6
- Type and method of review 6
- Language 6
- Keywords 6
- Current review status 6

Data Extraction Template **6**

References **8**

Anticipated start

July 2019

Funding sources/sponsors

No funding was associated with this review

Conflicts of interest

The project team declares that they have no conflicts of interest.

Review question(s)

- What interventions influence charitable donations?

Searches

- Limited search to post-1990 (as per Smith, Devane, Begley, & Clarke, 2011)
- Search the following databases:
    - Scopus
    - PsycINFO (Ovid)
    - Web of Science
    - Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effects
- For pragmatic reasons to expedite the review, we implemented the following strategies that have been shown to have limited influence on conclusions (Ganann, Ciliska, & Thomas, 2010):
    - Limit search to English
    - Limited searches of reference lists
    - Only excluded studies reviewed by second reviewer
    - Limit inclusion to papers that can be found electronically without Interlibrary Loans
    - Excluding of grey literature

Search strategy

- Search for reviews and meta-analyses:
    - meta-anal* OR
    - meta-regress* OR
    - “systematic review” OR
    - “rapid review” OR
    - “scoping review” OR
    - “State-of-the-art review” OR
    - “Systematic search and review” OR
    - “Systematized review” OR
    - “Mapping review” OR
    - “Systematic map”

        - Terms taken from Grant and Booth (2009)
- Search for charitable donations as outcomes:
    - Altruis* OR
    - Charit* OR
    - Philantho* OR
    - Donat* OR
    - Non-profit
- Limit search to English
- Exclude subject areas that are irrelevant:
    - Life sciences (e.g., biology)
    - Physical science (e.g., physics)
    - Medical sciences (e.g., nursing)
- Scopus search:
    - TITLE-ABS-KEY(meta-anal* OR meta-regress* OR "systematic review" OR "rapid review" OR "scoping review" OR "State-of-the-art review" OR "Systematic search and review" OR "Systematized review" OR "Mapping review" OR "Systematic map") AND
      TITLE-ABS-KEY(Altruis* OR Charit* OR Philantho* OR Donat* OR Non-profit)
      AND PUBYEAR > 1989 AND (LIMIT-TO (LANGUAGE,"English")) AND NOT (SUBJAREA(AGRI OR BIOC OR IMMU OR NEUR OR PHAR OR CENG OR CHEM OR COMP OR EART OR ENER OR ENGI OR ENVI OR MATE OR MATH OR PHYS OR MEDI OR NURS OR VETE OR DENT OR HEAL OR MULT))
- Search conducted July 2019

Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria

- Inclusion
    - Article type: systematic reviews, meta-analyses, or similar reviews characterised by Grant and Booth (2009); see search strategy)
    - Outcome measured: individual philanthropy (aka. charitable donations) to identified cause
    - Published in English
- Exclusion
    - Non-systematic reviews, theory papers, or narrative reviews
        - Rationale: narrative reviews are more prone to bias and selective reporting
    - Papers reporting primary research (i.e., not secondary reviews; e.g., RCTs)
    - Papers primarily describing the behaviours of organisations rather than

individuals

- Rationale: the processes behind organisational decision making, and the inherent incentives, make comparisons between organisational and individual processes difficult. What works in one of these domains may not work in the other.

- Only reviews non-financial donations donation as outcomes (e.g., blood/organ donation)
  - Rationale: the motives and level of personal investment required for organ donation vs. charitable donation may be different, so cross-applications may be challenging. Similarly, people occasionally receive reimbursement for blood donation, so intentions may not be altruistic.
- Other kinds of prosocial behaviour as outcomes (e.g., honesty)
  - These are qualitatively different from charitable donations and the essential characteristics of prosocial behaviour are unclear (e.g.,, is "good science" prosocial)

Condition or domain being studied

Individual philanthropy (aka. charitable donations) to identified cause(s)

Participants/population

Reviews summarising studies of any population of individuals will be included

Intervention(s), exposure(s)

Reviews summarising studies of any interventions with the aim to influence individual philanthropy will be included

Comparator(s)/control

Reviews summarising studies of any design will be included

Types of study to be included

We will include reviews of a systematic nature, but not exclusively systematic reviews. This would include full systematic reviews, but also reviews of lower rigour. That is, we will include any of the following types of review: systematic reviews with or without meta-analyses, rapid reviews, scoping reviews, state-of-the-art reviews, systematic searches with review, systematized reviews, mapping reviews or systematic maps.

Context

Any context will be considered (e.g., natural experiments, contrived experiments, non-experimental research, non-experimental research)

Primary outcome(s)

If we find at least two meta-analyses, we will focus on the pooled effect size estimates for interventions that promote charitable donations. If not, we will present a table of characteristics for interventions that have been studied and what has been shown to be effective.

Secondary outcomes

Secondary outcomes will include moderators of pooled-effect size estimates, mediators of intervention effectiveness, and narrative summaries of findings.

Data extraction (selection and coding)

Title and abstract screening. Titles and abstracts for the initial (deduplicated) yield of records will be screened by one reviewer. Any records that were excluded at this stage will be screened by a second reviewer. Articles included by either reviewer will be moved to full-text screening. After screening, the DistillerAI software toolkit (a component of DistillerSR, Evidence Partners, Ottawa, Canada) will be used to scan excluded references for those that potentially should have been included. We will use a Naive Bayes classifier and a Support Vector Machine classifier to train on a subset of human screened references. We will then score references in terms of their likelihood for inclusion. Excluded references scoring above a predefined threshold ($p = .5$) will be flagged as potential wrongfully excluded references and reviewed by a senior member of the team.

Full text screening. The full text of records that were included at the title/abstracts step will be screened by one reviewer. Any records that were excluded at this stage will be screened by a second reviewer. Outstanding conflicts will be resolved by discussion.

Data extraction. Records included at the full-text step will be extracted by one reviewer.

Quality assessment. Quality assessment will be conducted by one reviewer.

Risk of bias (quality) assessment

We will use the NIH Systematic Review and Meta-analysis quality assessment tool, see Appendix A.

Strategy for data synthesis

If multiple meta-analyses are included on non-overlapping samples of studies, a synthesis of the meta-analyses will be conducted. Ideally, a meta-meta-analysis using the R package *metafor (Viechtbauer, 2017)* will be conducted (Tang, Caudy, & Taxman, 2013). Otherwise, due to limited resources, we may include the meta-analyses results in our qualitative synthesis and narrative review.

Type and method of review

Rapid review of systematic reviews

Language

English

Keywords

Charity, non-profit, donation, altruism

Current review status

Protocol complete, beginning search

Data Extraction Template

- Study Information
  - Title
  - Author
  - Year
  - Review question(s)
- Review Methods
  - Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria (including condition or domain being studied, participants/population, intervention(s), exposure(s), comparator(s)/control, types of study to be included, and/or context)

    - Search strategy
        - Search terms
        - Databases searched
- Review Results
    - Yield
        - Number of studies (K)
        - Number of participants (N)
    - Results of data synthesis
        - Pooled effect estimates with confidence intervals
        - Results of each moderation analysis
- Conclusion as quoted by authors

References

Ganann, R., Ciliska, D., & Thomas, H. (2010). Expediting systematic reviews: methods and implications of rapid reviews. *Implementation Science: IS*, *5*, 56. doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-5-56

Grant, M. J., & Booth, A. (2009). A typology of reviews: an analysis of 14 review types and associated methodologies. *Health Information and Libraries Journal*, *26*(2), 91–108. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-1842.2009.00848.x

Smith, V., Devane, D., Begley, C. M., & Clarke, M. (2011). Methodology in conducting a systematic review of systematic reviews of healthcare interventions. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, *11*(1), 15. doi: 10.1186/1471-2288-11-15

Tang, L. L., Caudy, M., & Taxman, F. (2013). A statistical method for synthesizing meta-analyses. *Computational and Mathematical Methods in Medicine*, *2013*, 732989. doi: 10.1155/2013/732989

Viechtbauer, W. (2017). Package "metafor" (Version 2.0). Retrieved from https://github.com/wviechtb/metafor