



Blood and organ donation: Health impact, prevalence, correlates and interventions.

Journal:	<i>European Health Psychology Society</i>
Manuscript ID	GPSH-2018-0582.R3
Manuscript Type:	Psychology and Health
Keywords:	Blood Donation, Organ Donation, Altruism, Reciprocity

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Ferguson E, Murray C & O'Carroll RE (2019) Blood and organ donation: health impact, prevalence, correlates, and interventions. *Psychology and Health* p. 32.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/08870446.2019.1603385>

Blood and organ donation: Health impact, prevalence, correlates and interventions.

Abstract

Objective: Without a supply of blood, health services could not meet their clinical needs. Similarly, organs for transplantation save and transform lives. Donations are acts of generosity that are traditionally seen as altruistic, and accordingly, interventions to recruit and retain blood and organ donors have focused on altruism. We review the predictors, prevalence and correlates of these two behaviours, how effective interventions have been, and draw common themes. **Design:** Narrative review. **Results:** We highlight that both recipients and donors benefit, and as such neither blood nor organ donation is purely altruistic. We also highlight health problems associated with both types of donation. In evaluating interventions, we highlight that a move to an opt-out default for organ donation may not be the simple fix it is believed to be and propose effective interventions to enhance the opt-in default (e.g. social media updates). We show that incentives, text messaging, feedback and a focus on prosocial emotions (e.g., 'warm-glow', 'gratitude') may be effective interventions for both blood and organ donation. Interventions designed to reduce fainting (e.g., water pre-loading) are also effective for blood donation. **Conclusions:** We conclude that affect is key to understanding both types of donation and in designing effective interventions.

Definitions

What is Blood and Organ Donation?

People's health is influenced, in part, not only by their own behaviour (e.g., diet) but also by the behaviour of others. Some aspects of people's behaviour negatively impacts other's health (e.g., passive smoking), while other aspects have dramatic life changing benefits. Such life changing benefits are exemplified by blood and organ donation. Blood and blood products are derived from (1) *whole* blood donations (i.e., giving 450mls of blood), or (2) *apheresis* donations (e.g., where blood is drawn, platelets and plasma extracted, and the blood replaced in the donor minus these products). Organs similarly come from two avenues of donation: *posthumous* and *living*. Living donations are further divided into *directed* donation towards a family member, and *non-directed* (so called 'altruistic') donation towards a stranger (Table 1). All forms of blood and organ donation are traditionally viewed as altruistic.

However, how strong is the evidence for the claim of altruism?

Altruism – Behavioural Definition: For all types of blood and organ donation, people give voluntarily, without personal gain, at some personal cost, to help a stranger in need (Ferguson, 2015; Ferguson & Lawrence, 2015; Ferguson & Masser,

1
2
3
4 2018; Steinberg, 2010). Specifically, whole blood and apheresis donors give blood
5
6
7 voluntarily to benefit a stranger in need, but also pay a cost in terms of time, effort,
8
9
10 blood loss, and undergoing a medical procedure. Posthumous organ donation
11
12
13 occurs after death. Under an opt-in system (see later) there may be some emotional
14
15
16 cost to registering on the organ donor register (ODR), as it forces the individual to
17
18
19 confront their own mortality and bodily integrity (Morgan, Miller & Arasaratnam, 2002;
20
21
22 Morgan, Stephenson, Harrison, Afifi & Long, 2008). Living organ donors can donate
23
24
25 a kidney or a lobe of either their liver or lung. This incurs significant cost in terms of
26
27
28 medical procedures, loss of an organ or part of an organ, and pain and recovery
29
30
31 from surgery. For directed organ donation, there may be additional costs in terms of
32
33
34 social interactions with relatives where the donor may feel coerced or obliged to
35
36
37 donate (Gill & Lowes, 2008; Sharp & Randhawa, 2014)¹. *Evolutionary biology*
38
39
40 defines altruism as a behaviour that increases the fitness of the recipient (i.e., long-
41
42
43 term survival and fecundity) at a cost to the donor's fitness (Bshary & Bergmüller,
44
45
46 2008; Sober & Wilson, 1998). Behaviourally, all types of blood and organ donation fit
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58
59 ¹ There may also be an additional cost as in some cases the donor finds out that they are not
60 actually related to their relative.

1
2
3
4 this definition. However, while behaviourally an act may appear altruistic, it may not
5
6
7 be motivated exclusively by the needs of others (Sober & Wilson, 1998).
8
9

10 11 **Altruism – Motivational Definition and Considerations: *Psychological altruism***

12
13
14
15 focuses on the motivations underlying helping behaviour (Sober & Wilson, 1998).
16

17
18 Motivational definitions of altruism across economics, psychology and philosophy
19

20
21
22 converge on the idea that *pure altruism* is either a preference, or an ultimate desire,
23

24
25 to maximize the welfare (utility) of others, by reducing their suffering, at a personal
26

27
28 cost, without personal benefit (Andreoni, 1990; Batson, 1991; Nagal, 1970). So, are
29

30
31
32 blood and organ donors motivated by *pure altruism* or is there some *personal*
33

34
35
36 *benefit?*
37
38

39
40 Ferguson (2015a) suggested a framework to understand and model these

41
42
43 motivations that maps the mechanisms of altruism (MOA) derived from psychology,
44

45
46 economics, biology, sociology, and philosophy (e.g., Andreoni, 1990; Batson, 1991;
47

48
49 Fehr & Fischbacher, 2004a, 2004b; Fehr & Schmidt, 1999; Nowak, 2006) onto blood
50

51
52
53 and organ donor motivations, preferences and behaviour. Drawing on the MOA
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 approach, behavioural economic analyses² of blood and organ donor preferences

5
6
7 has revealed that both are not purely altruist (Ferguson, 2012a; Ferguson, 2015;

8
9
10 Ferguson & Lawrence, 2018; Ferguson, Zhao, O'Carroll & Smillie, 2018). Rather

11
12
13 blood donors are motivated by a general prosocial preference towards 'warm-glow'

14
15
16 (Ferguson, Farrell & Lawrence, 2008; Ferguson, Taylor, Keatley, Flynn & Lawrence,

17
18
19 2012a). Warm-glow describes the feelings of positive affect that arise as a

20
21
22 consequence of helping (Andreoni, 1990, 1995). Furthermore, Ferguson, Atsma, de

23
24
25 Kort, and Veldhuizen (2012) identified a preference in blood donors they termed

26
27
28 '*reluctant altruism*'. Reluctant altruists help because they do not trust others to help.

29
30
31 This is particularly the case in a context like blood donation where 96% free-ride on

32
33
34 the generosity of the 4% of the eligible population who donate blood at any one time.

35
36
37 The idea of reluctant altruism further suggests that blood donors are more likely to

38
39
40 act when they perceive others as acting unfairly. Consistent with this, blood donors

41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

² The MOA approach recommends that behavioural economic games are used to assess these mechanism so as to avoid social desirability effects when simply asking people why they donate blood or register to be an organ donor (Ferguson 2015a; Ferguson & Lawrence, 2015).

1
2
3
4 have been shown to have an increased tendency to punish unfairness (Ferguson &
5
6
7 Lawrence, 2018).
8
9

10
11 While for some there may be emotional costs to signing the organ donor register
12
13
14 (Morgan et al., 2002, 2008), as the donor is deceased, the actual personal physical
15
16
17 cost for posthumous organ donation is zero. This has led some to question its pure
18
19
20 altruistic nature (Moorlock, Ives & Draper, 2014). Ferguson et al. (2018) reasoned
21
22
23 that if this were the case, organ donors should have a preference for costless
24
25
26 helping in general. Consistent with this reasoning, in a series of economic games to
27
28
29 assess costless and costly helping, organ donors gave more generously in a
30
31
32 costless game. Thus, some people may be drawn to posthumous organ donation
33
34
35 due to its relative costless nature.
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Directed living donors may feel coerced or obliged to donate to loved ones, which
43
44
45 undermines the voluntary nature of the behaviour (Gill & Lowes, 2008; Lennerling et
46
47
48 al., 2003). The non-directed donor also may gain personal benefits in terms of pride,
49
50
51 admiration by others or self-esteem (Roff, 2007). In both cases, therefore, the notion
52
53
54 of pure altruism is undermined.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Thus, we can see that all forms of blood and organ donation may be better
5
6
7 described as acts of impure altruism.
8
9

10 11 **Impact of Blood and Organ Donation** 12

13
14 For blood and organ donation there are impacts both on the donor (or their
15
16 family) as well as the recipient, as discussed below.
17
18
19

20 21 **Blood Donation** 22

23
24
25
26 **Impact on the Recipient:** Health services could not operate without a continual
27
28 supply of blood. This is used to treat a wide range of illnesses and disease
29
30 processes. For example, from whole blood, red blood cells, among other things, are
31
32 used to treat anaemia, sickle cell disease, thalassaemia, blood loss following surgery
33
34 and trauma in child-birth, as well as in palliative care. White cells are used to treat
35
36 immunodeficiency conditions. platelets to treat clotting deficient conditions (e.g.,
37
38 leukaemia) and immunoglobins and albumin, derived from plasma, to treat
39
40 infections, as well as kidney and liver disease.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53
54 **Impact on the Donor:** Both positive and negative health effects have been
55
56 reported for donors. There is increasing evidence that whole blood donation may
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 result in long-term iron deficiency (Brittenham, 2011; Di Angelantonio et al., 2017).
5
6

7 Whether or not this is of clinical significance and its effects on long-term health are
8
9
10 yet fully determined. There are also reported health benefits of donating blood with
11
12
13 respect to: (1) reduced mortality (Ullum et al., 2015; Vahidnia et al., 2013), (2) better
14
15
16 mental health in young donors and physical health in older donors (Rigas et al.,
17
18
19 2017), and (3) reduced risk of myocardial infarction (Salonen, Tuomainen, Salonen,
20
21
22 Lakka & Nyysönen, 1998). However, there is a potential *selection bias* (the '*healthy*
23
24
25 *donor effect*') in operation as blood donors are a self-selected healthier group
26
27
28
29
30
31
32 (Atsma, Veldhuizen, Verbeek, de Kort & de Vegt, 2011). Yet even after controlling for
33
34
35 the 'healthy donor effect,' there is still evidence of reduced mortality (Ullum et al.,
36
37
38 2015) and better self-reported health (Atsma et al., 2011) in blood donors, which
39
40
41
42 may reflect healthier lifestyles amongst blood donors (Atsma et al., 2011).
43
44
45

46 Organ Donation

47
48
49
50 **Impact on the Recipient:** Advances in transplant surgery and post-surgical
51
52
53 medical care mean that post-transplant outcomes for patients are usually very good
54
55
56
57 (National Health Service Blood and Transplant [NHSBT], 2017). However, there
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 currently exists a global shortage of organs for transplant, significantly impairing the
5
6
7 health and well-being of those awaiting donated organs. In 2018 in the US more than
8
9
10 114,000 people were awaiting an organ transplant, around 20 of whom died every
11
12
13 day (organdonor.gov), and in the UK, more than 6,000 people were on the transplant
14
15
16 waiting list, approximately three of whom died every day (NHSBT;
17
18
19
20
21 <https://www.nhsbt.nhs.uk>).

22
23
24
25 **Impact on the Donor:** For the posthumous donor there is no direct impact, but
26
27
28 there is impact for the relatives of the donor, who will be approached (both under
29
30
31 opt-in and soft opt-out defaults) by a specialist nurse for organ donation (SNOD) to
32
33
34 consent to their relatives' organs being used for transplant. This can be a very
35
36
37 distressing time for family members who are coming to terms with the death of a
38
39
40 relative and are then asked for consent for their relatives' organs to be removed and
41
42
43
44
45
46
47 donated.

48
49
50 For living donation there are significant health impacts on the donor that arise from
51
52 the removal of the organ, not just in terms of the surgery and immediate recovery, but also in
53
54 terms of long-term health consequences. For example, persistent post-surgical pain is
55
56 reported by over one quarter of living liver donors 12-months later (Holtzman et al., 2014).
57
58
59
60

Prevalence of Blood and Organ Donation

Blood Donation

How many donate blood? Across Europe about 40% of people say that they have donated whole blood at some point in their lives

(http://ec.europa.eu/commfrontoffice/publicopinion/archives/ebs/ebs_333b_en.pdf).

However, while blood and blood products are available to all, at any one time only 3-4% of the eligible UK population donate blood. This figure is consistent across western style donation systems. At present, in the UK, whole blood donors can donate up to 4 times a year if male, and 3 times if female, while apheresis donors can donate up to 24 times a year.

How many donors are needed? Whole blood has a shelf life of 35 days and the UK National Health Service (NHS) requires 31 units of blood per 1000 of the population, per annum, to provide the efficient and safe delivery of health care (Blood 2020, NHSBT Annual Review 2012-13). To meet these healthcare demands, recruiting new donors, especially young donors, is an ongoing issue, with nearly 200,000 new donors required by the UK NHS yearly. New donors, compared to repeat donors, have a higher risk of fainting and higher incidence of red cell antibodies for transfusion-transmittable-infections (TTIs) (Lucky et al., 2013; Zou et al., 2012). Thus, converting 'new donors' into 'repeat donors' constitutes a significant saving in terms of recruitment costs, improved donor safety, and reduce waste in terms blood that cannot be subsequently used. However, the conversion rate from 1st to repeat donations is low, with only 7.2% making three subsequent donations (Schreiber et al., 2005), thus interventions to enhance conversion rates are needed.

While there has been a steady reduction in the demand for red cells across the world, due to better cell-salvage or operative procedures, this does not mean that recruiting new

1
2
3
4 donors and retaining repeat donors is not an on-going issue. Future shortfalls in blood
5
6 supplies are predicted as the population ages (requiring more transfusions), the current donor
7
8 pool ages out, and younger donors not being recruited to replace lost donors (Carter et al.,
9
10 2011; Greinacher & Fendrich, 2010; Greinacher, Fendrich, Alpen, & Hoffman, 2007;
11
12 Greinacher, Fendrich, & Hoffman, 2010).

13
14
15 **Who is needed?** With the genomic revolution, more detailed blood typing and
16
17 matching offers the possibility of improved treatment options that require matching specific
18
19 donors with particular blood types and antigens to specific recipients. Thus, recruitment
20
21 becomes targeted on specifically needed donors, rather than an ‘all-comers model’. This is
22
23 exemplified by a world-wide need to recruit donors from minority groups (van Dongen,
24
25 Mews, de Kort, & Wagenmans, 2016). A particular need is to encourage donors from Black,
26
27 Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) backgrounds to improve the treatment of certain
28
29 conditions (e.g., sickle cell disease: SCD), that have a higher prevalence in BAME
30
31 communities (Shaz, Zimring, Demmons, & Hillyer, 2008). SCD requires repeat transfusions
32
33 and are most effectively delivered with phenotype-matched red blood cells for the Ro Kell
34
35 antigen to reduce haemolytic transfusion reactions (Shaz et al., 2008). The Ro Kell type has a
36
37 much higher prevalence in BAME communities at approximately 55% in black Africans,
38
39 43% in black Caribbean, 17-24% in mixed race and 2% in white Caucasians, making
40
41 phenotypic matching easier if the number of BAME donors increases. However, of the 4% of
42
43 the UK population who donate, only 4% are from BAME groups (NHSBT Annual Review
44
45 2012-13). The UK NHSBT needs to recruit 40,000 BAME donors per year, with the current
46
47 number approximately 15,000 ([https://nhsbtde.blob.core.windows.net/umbraco-assets-](https://nhsbtde.blob.core.windows.net/umbraco-assets-corp/4481/nhsbt-strategic-plan-2017-2022.pdf)
48
49 [corp/4481/nhsbt-strategic-plan-2017-2022.pdf](https://nhsbtde.blob.core.windows.net/umbraco-assets-corp/4481/nhsbt-strategic-plan-2017-2022.pdf)). Thus, interventions to encourage BAME
50
51 donors is a pressing clinical need.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Organ Donation

1
2
3
4 **How many donate?** Currently, approximately 38% of the population are registered
5
6 posthumous donors on the UK opt-in ODR. Furthermore, families/next of kin refuse to
7
8 consent in 34% of requests for organs, often over-riding the wishes of potential donors
9
10 ([http://www.organdonation.nhs.uk/](http://www.organdonation.nhs.uk/statistics) statistics, NHSBT 2017-2018). This, and other factors
11
12 (e.g., health of the donor's organs) means that only a very small proportion of deaths convert
13
14 to organs donated. For example, in the UK in 2017-2018 from 600,000 deaths there were
15
16 7,281 potential donors which then reduced to 6,038 eligible donors. Of these, only 2,233 had
17
18 actively opted-in and this eventually resulted in 1,574 actual donors (NHSBT, 2017-2018).
19
20
21

22 **Who are needed?** Ethnic minority groups represent 11% of the UK population, but
23
24 only 7% of deceased organ donors (NHSBT, 2017-2018), and rates of consent from family
25
26 members are lower than for white family members. As with blood donation there is an urgent
27
28 need to engage BAME communities and explore reasons for the lower consent rates.
29
30
31

32 **Correlates of Blood and Organ Donation**

33 **Blood Donation**

34
35
36 **Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB):** TPB is the theoretical model most often
37
38 applied to blood donor behaviour (Bednall, Bove, Cheetham & Murray, 2013;
39
40 Ferguson, 1996). Within the TPB, intentions are the proximal predictor of behaviour,
41
42 with intentions predicted by (1) attitudes, (2) subjective norms (i.e., people who are
43
44 important to the donor approve of blood donation), and (3) perceived behavioural
45
46 control (PBC: i.e., feeling able to donate despite possible barriers). Attitudes can be
47
48 further split in to affective (i.e., anticipated and current positive or negative emotional
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 responses) and cognitive (i.e., pros and cons) (Trafimow & Sheeran, 1998). With
5
6
7 respect to blood donation, the TPB has been extended to include *descriptive norms*
8
9
10 (i.e. the perception of how many others perform the behaviour), self-efficacy, and
11
12
13 donor role identity. Prosocial factors including *pure altruism*, *personal moral norms*
14
15
16 (i.e. donors' beliefs that they *ought to help*), and *warm-glow* (termed 'satisfaction with
17
18
19 self' by Bednall et al., 2013) have also been added. Bednall et al.'s (2013) meta-
20
21
22 analytic review showed that intentions are the strongest predictor of blood donor
23
24
25 behaviour ($r = .362$), followed by PBC ($r = .311$), attitudes ($r = .216$) and subjective
26
27
28 norms ($r = .165$). Self-efficacy ($r = .352$) and role identity ($r = .232$) were also
29
30
31 significant predictors of behaviour from the extended TPB. In terms of prosocial
32
33
34 factors, personal moral norms ($r = .188$) and warm-glow ($r = .097$) both predicted
35
36
37 actual donations, but pure altruism did not ($r = -0.015$) (Bednall et al., 2013; see also
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46 Ferguson, 1996).

47
48
49 **Transtheoretical Model (TTM):** Blood donors potentially progress through a
50
51
52 'donor career,' cycling through repeat donations (Ferguson, 1996; James &
53
54
55
56 Matthews, 1993). Starting as non-donors, they then become 1st time/novice donors,
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 and if not deferred³, return to become repeat donors. This career structure makes
5
6
7 the TTM a promising theoretical framework to describe the donor career and the
8
9
10 types of intervention that may be appropriate at each stage (Ferguson & Chandler,
11
12
13 2005). The TTM consists of two main factors: *stages* and *processes* of change
14
15
16 (Prochaska, DiClemente & Norcross, 1992). The model outlines five *stages* to
17
18 progress through: (1) 'pre-contemplation' where individuals have no intention to
19
20
21 change, (2) 'contemplation' where individuals are aware of the reasons to change
22
23
24 and may weigh up the pros and cons, (3) 'preparation' where individuals are
25
26
27 intending to take action in the next month, (4) 'action' where individuals have
28
29
30 successfully achieved the desired behaviour, and (5) 'maintenance' where the
31
32
33 desired behaviour is maintained for at least six months. Ten basic *processes of*
34
35
36 *change* (e.g., consciousness raising) are proposed to facilitate the transition from
37
38
39 one stage to the next (Prochaska & DiClemente, 1982), and can be explained by two
40
41
42 higher order factors with respect to blood donation (Ferguson & Chandler, 2005): (1)
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

experiential processes (e.g., cognitive and emotional strategies including *dramatic*

³ A person may be *permanently* (can never give blood) or *temporally* (can give blood after a designed time window) deferred from blood donation. Permanent deferrals occur if, for example, the person has had a blood transfusion (or blood products) since 1st January 1980. Temporary deferrals can be on grounds of anaemia, travel abroad, sexual behaviour, tattoos, or intravenous drug taking.

1
2
3
4 *relief* i.e. “Dramatic portrayals about the consequences of a lack of blood donors upset me”,
5
6 *social liberation* i.e. “I know I'd feel better about myself if I was a blood donor”), and (2)
7
8
9 *behavioural processes* (e.g., activity based strategies including *stimulus control* i.e. “I
10
11
12 leave stickers / letters about blood donation in prominent places around my home” and
13
14
15 *counter-conditioning* i.e. “When giving blood I try to think of something else”). Ferguson
16
17
18 and Chandler (2005) further showed that the number of previous donations was
19
20
21
22 positively predicted by *behavioural* processes and negatively predicted by
23
24
25
26 *experiential* processes. Stage and process factors became uncorrelated as donors
27
28
29 became more experienced, suggesting that helping donors develop behavioural
30
31
32 strategies would be beneficial. Further support for the psychometric validity of the
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
TTM with respect to blood donation has been reported (Amoyal et al., 2013; Burditt,
et al., 2009).

Prosocial Emotions: Ferguson and Masser (2018) suggested that prosocial
emotions are central to understanding blood donor behaviour, and used Haidt's
(2003) concept of ‘families of moral emotions’ to categorize these. They argued that
warm-glow (i.e. happiness) and *pride* (within the family of self-conscious emotions),
are key emotions, with warm-glow predicting donor return (Bednall et al., 2013;

1
2
3
4 Ferguson et al., 2008; Piliavin & Callero, 1991), and more likely to be reported by
5
6
7 experienced donors (Ferguson et al., 2012b). Ferguson and Flynn (2016) have
8
9
10 shown, theoretically, that warm-glow can also be anticipated, making it equivalent to
11
12
13 the concept of an anticipated affective reaction in the prosocial context. This is
14
15
16 important as anticipated positive affective reactions have been shown to be
17
18
19 significant predictors of blood donor behaviour (Conner, Godin, Sheeran & Germain,
20
21
22 2013).
23
24
25
26
27

28 *Pride* can be divided into *hubristic* (linked to arrogance and conceit), and
29
30
31 *authentic* (linked to achievement) (Tracy & Robins, 2007). Authentic pride is linked to
32
33
34 both prosociality (Tracy & Robins, 2007; Weiner, 1985) and warm-glow (Saito, 2015)
35
36
37 generally, and recent evidence shows that plasma donors report authentic pride as a
38
39
40 function of giving 'more' than whole blood donors (Bove, Bednall, Masser & Buzza,
41
42
43 2011).
44
45
46
47
48

49 *Shame* and *guilt* are also self-conscious emotions referring to the self-
50
51
52 representation of personal wrong-doing. Guilt is private and behaviour-focused and
53
54
55 shame public and self-focused (Amodio, Devine & Harmon-Jones, 2007). People are
56
57
58 motivated to avoid the guilt of not acting prosocially or the shame of acting selfishly
59
60

1
2
3
4 (Saito, 2015), and both emotions lead to increased prosociality (Allpress, Brown,
5
6
7 Giner-Sorolla, Deonna, & Teroni, 2014). Guilt has been identified as a key blood
8
9
10 donor motivation (France, Kawalsky, France, Himawan, Kessler, & Shaz, 2014), and
11
12
13 one that is linked to donating blood in emergency contexts (Chliaoutakis, Trakas,
14
15
16 Socrataki, Lemonidou, & Papaioannou, 1994). The concept of *anticipated regret* at
17
18
19 not donating is clearly linked to guilt and shame, with evidence showing that
20
21
22
23
24 anticipated regret is a strong, positive predictor of both intentions to donate (Godin, et
25
26
27
28 al., 2005) and actual donation (Godin, Conner, Sheeran, Bélanger-Gravel, &
29
30
31
32 Germain, 2007).

33
34
35 The 'other-praising emotions' of *gratitude*, *awe* and *elevation* are all potential
36
37
38 important predictors of blood donation. Of these, gratitude is likely to be significant.
39
40
41
42 There is extensive evidence that gratitude is linked to prosociality and both direct and
43
44
45 indirect reciprocity (Ma, Tunney & Ferguson, 2017). Indeed, reciprocity towards the
46
47
48 blood service and the donor, is a frequently cited motivation by blood donors (Bendall
49
50
51
52 & Bove, 2011).

53
54
55
56 **Fear and Anxiety:** The emotions of fear and anxiety associated with donating
57
58
59 blood have been shown to impact negatively on return rates by increasing the
60

1
2
3
4 chances of the donor fainting (Chell, Waller & Messer, 2016; Meade, France, &
5
6
7 Peterson, 1996; Viar, Etzel, Ciesielski & Olatunji, 2010), or directly by fear and anxiety
8
9
10 making people less willing to donate in the first place (Bednall & Bove, 2011).

11
12
13
14 **Vasovagal Reactions:** A consistent strong predictor of a donor not returning is
15
16
17 the experience of feeling faint, or actually fainting (Ditto & France, 2006; France et
18
19
20 al., 2014a; France et al., 2013; France, Rader & Carlson, 2005), which results in a
21
22
23
24
25 20% and 33% reduction in return rates amongst first time and experienced donors
26
27
28 respectively (France et al., 2005 see also Bednall et al., 2013). Effects of fainting on
29
30
31 return rates are not just confined to those fainting, but are also seen in those
32
33
34
35 observing others faint (Ferguson & Bibby, 2002).
36
37

38
39 **The Functional Model of Volunteer Behaviour:** Omoto and Snyder (1995) and
40
41
42 Clary et al. (1998) identified six functional motivations for volunteerism (Table 2).
43
44
45 Applied to blood donation more experienced donors express motivations that reflect
46
47
48 avoidance of guilt at not donating, and strengthening of social bonds (Alfieri, Paolo,
49
50
51
52 Marta, & Saturni, 2016; Paolo, 2013; Paolo, Alfieri, Marta, & Saturni, 2015),
53
54

55
56 **Self Determination Theory (SDT):** Self-determination theory describes people
57
58
59 as motivated along a continuum from extrinsic to intrinsic motivation (Ryan & Deci,
60

1
2
3
4 2000). Extrinsic motivation has four components that increase in personal autonomy
5
6
7 from 'external regulation' (motivated by rewards), to 'introjected regulation'
8
9
10 (avoidance of guilt), to 'identified regulation' (personally valued behaviour) to
11
12
13 'integrated regulation' (behaviours consistent with a person's life goals). Pure intrinsic
14
15 motivations concern behaviours that are enjoyable and satisfying. France, Kawalsky
16
17
18 and colleagues (2014) developed the Donor Identity Survey that assesses the
19
20
21 fundamental motivation of SDT for blood donation. Table 2 shows how the
22
23
24
25 motivations from SDT, the Functional Model of Volunteer Behaviour and MOA align
26
27
28 with respect to prosociality. For example, intrinsic motivation from SDT and the
29
30
31
32 enhancement motivation from the functional approach all assess warm-glow, as do
33
34
35
36 affective attitudes. To avoid a 'jangle fallacy' (where by the same construct is given
37
38
39 different names) in the area of prosociality, we propose that they should all be termed
40
41
42
43
44
45
46 warm-glow as this is a fundamental MOA.

47
48
49 **Personality:** Bekkers (2006) showed that while trait helpfulness (i.e., being
50
51
52 helpful and cooperative) predicted blood donation, traits of warmth (akin to
53
54
55 agreeableness) and empathy did not. The lack of significant association between
56
57
58
59 both traits of agreeableness and empathy with blood donation has also been
60

1
2
3
4 reported by others (Ferguson, 2008; Ferguson et al., 2008; Steele, et al., 2008). This
5
6
7 lack of association with prosocial traits, in conjunction with the observation that
8
9
10
11 repeat blood donation follows a career path, led Ferguson (2008) to reason that trait
12
13
14 conscientiousness (linked to being organized) should predicted repeat donation.
15
16
17
18 However, while Ferguson (2008) shows that conscientiousness predicts the
19
20
21 frequency and rate of past donations, the link between conscientiousness and
22
23
24 reported future blood donation has not be established (see White, Poulsen & Hyde,
25
26
27
28 2017).

31
32 **Deferrals:** A person may be *permanently* (can never give blood) or *temporarily*
33
34
35 (can give blood after a designed time window) deferred from blood donation.
36
37
38
39 Temporary deferrals have a medium sized negative effect on return rates (Bednall et
40
41
42 al., 2013).

45
46 **Donation Context:** The experience the donor has while donating blood may
47
48
49 greatly influence subsequent donor behaviour. Ferguson (1996) showed that longer
50
51
52 waiting times have a large negative effect on return rates ($r = .417$), while satisfaction
53
54
55
56 with the quality of services has a positive effect on both return rates ($r = .092$) and
57
58
59 intentions to return ($r = .290$) (Bednall et al., 2013).
60

1
2
3
4 **Donor Experience (past behaviour):** The number of previous donations has an
5
6
7 important influence on donor return rates, intentions and motivations. More
8
9
10 experienced donors, especially those who have made five or more donations, exhibit
11
12
13 higher return rates (Bednall et al., 2013; Ferguson, 1996; Ferguson & Chandler,
14
15
16
17
18 2006). However, the link between past and future blood donor behaviour is complex
19
20
21 and best represented by a quadratic inverted U shaped function, which is positive up
22
23
24 to 60 previous donations, and then levels off and becomes negative (Ferguson &
25
26
27
28 Bibby, 2002). Similarly, past behaviour influences the effects of intentions on future
29
30
31 behaviour, such that the intentions-behaviour link is significant and positive for novice
32
33
34 donors (4 or less donations), and not significant for experienced donors (5+
35
36
37
38
39 donations: Ferguson & Bibby, 2002; Sheeran et al., 2017). Indeed, an inverted U
40
41
42 shaped quadratic function also explains this link between donor intentions and
43
44
45 behaviour, with intention predictive up to a certain point of experience, and then
46
47
48 dropping off (Sheeran et al., 2017). Experienced donors are also less likely to be
49
50
51
52 adversely affected by temporary deferrals and more positively motivated by
53
54
55
56 anticipated regret (Bednall et al., 2013).
57
58
59
60

Organ Donation

Models of Organ Donation: A variety of models have been proposed to explain organ donor behaviour. Many focus on social cognition models (e.g. TPB) and have been recently reviewed by Falomir-Pichastor, Berent and Pereira (2013).

The authors conclude that in addition to attitude and intention, 14 additional determinants of organ donation can be identified. Distal predictors of attitude and intention included demographic factors, cultural differences, religiosity, social insertion and personality factors. Proximal predictors of organ donation included behavioural beliefs, normative beliefs, self-efficacy, past behaviour, direct experience, affective reactions, social representations, identity and moral norms. Hyde, Knowles and White (2013) tested the utility of an extended TPB model and found that it explained 75% of the variance in organ donation intentions. Significant predictors in the final model included attitude, subjective norm, self-efficacy, self-identity and in-group altruism. They concluded that future donation strategies should foster a perception of self as the type of person who donates and address preferences to donate organs to in-group members only.

1
2
3
4 The IIFF model (Siegel et al., 2010) propose that four factors are key to
5
6
7 donation: (1) an *immediate* and complete registration opportunity ('ICRO' "a card in
8
9
10 the hand"), (2) *information*, (3) *focused* engagement and (4) *favourable* activation.
11
12
13
14 Alvaro, Siegel and Jones (2011) tested one component of the IIFF, the ICRO, and
15
16
17 found that simply providing an ICRO significantly increased organ donor registrations
18
19
20
21 (see section below on community-based interventions).
22
23
24

25
26 Quick, Anker, Feeley and Morgan (2015) compared three models of organ
27
28 donation behaviour – (1) Bystander Intervention Model (BIM) which emphasises
29
30
31 bystanders' situational interpretation with respect to intervening to help others in
32
33
34 need, (2) Vested Interest Theory (VIT) which positions vested interest as a
35
36
37 moderator of the attitude-behaviour relationship, and (3) The Organ Donation Model
38
39
40 (ODM) which was developed to take into account affective attitudes. They found that
41
42
43
44 VIT accounted for most variance in organ donation registration intentions.
45
46
47
48
49

50 **Attitudes of Potential Donors:** Negative affective attitudes have been identified
51
52
53 as important barriers to organ donation (Morgan et al., 2008; O'Carroll, Dryden,
54
55
56
57 Hamilton-Barclay, & Ferguson, 2011, O'Carroll, Foster, McGeechan, Sandford, &
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Ferguson, 2011) and shown to be stronger predictors than TPB variables (Morgan et
5
6
7 al., 2008; O'Carroll, Dryden, et al., 2011; O'Carroll, Foster, et al., 2011) or knowledge
8
9
10 (Morgan et al., 2008). These affective barriers include concerns that clinicians may
11
12
13 not try as hard to save the potential donor ("medical mistrust"), disgust at the thought
14
15
16 of donation ("ick factor"), that registering in some way hastens one's death ("jinx
17
18
19 factor"), and discomfort at the thought of one's body being operated on for organ
20
21
22 retrieval ("body integrity").
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 **Personality:** Relationships between the 'Big Five personality traits' (Costa, &
30
31 McCrae, 1992; Goldberg, 1993) and organ donation behaviour have been explored,
32
33
34 and the prosocial trait of agreeableness and its facets (e.g., cooperation, trust,
35
36
37 empathy) have been linked to organ donor behaviour and intentions. For example,
38
39
40 individuals registered to donate some specific, but not all organs, have been found to
41
42
43 have higher warmth (agreeableness) (Bekkers, 2006), and higher agreeableness
44
45
46 scores have been associated with positive organ donation attitudes and intentions
47
48
49 (Hill, 2016). Altruism (a facet of agreeableness) has been associated with
50
51
52
53
54
55
56 possession of a signed organ donor card (Kopfman & Smith, 1996), but was not
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 directly associated with Singapore residents' willingness to donate (Lwin, Williams &
5
6
7 Lan, 2002)⁴, or the organ donor registration status of American students (Hill, 2016).

8
9
10
11 In a meta-analysis, altruism (measured using generic scales that assess low cost
12
13
14 unconditional altruism towards strangers) was associated with an increased
15
16
17 likelihood of organ donor registration (Nijkamp, Hollestelle, Zeegers, van den Borne,
18
19
20 & Reubsaet, 2008). Compassion and empathy (facets of agreeableness) have also
21
22
23 been linked to intentions to donate (Demir & Kumkale, 2013). Thus, unlike blood
24
25
26 donation there seems to be some linkage between unconditional altruism,
27
28
29
30
31
32 empathy/compassion and organ donor registration.

33
34
35
36 **Clinicians' Attitudes Towards Living Donation:** Twenty-eight percent of UK
37
38
39 kidney donations currently come from living donors (NHSBT, 2017/2018). There
40
41
42 exists wide variation in non-directed living donation rates across transplant centres
43
44
45 which may reflect clinicians' attitudes to non-directed donors, which are polarized
46
47
48 between seeing them as extremely altruistic or psychiatrically disturbed (Henderson
49
50
51 et al., 2003). However, comparisons of directed versus non-directed UK kidney
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

59
60 ⁴ Singapore operates a priority system, with those on the organ donation register given greater priority to organs if needed. This powerful default is likely to over-ride other factors.

1
2
3
4 donors have found no difference in psychiatric history, personality, or current
5
6
7 depression, anxiety, stress, self-esteem, or well-being. Importantly, no differences in
8
9
10 donors' physical outcomes were found and non-directed donors recovered from the
11
12
13 operation slightly quicker (Maple et al., 2014).
14
15
16

17 **Intervention to Promote Blood and Organ Donation**

18 **Blood Donation**

19
20
21
22
23 As there is a clear blood donor career, we explore interventions targeted prior
24
25
26 to donation (to recruit and retain donors), as well as during donation (donor safety
27
28
29 and satisfaction) (Ferguson, et al., 2007; van Dongen, 2015).
30
31
32
33

34 **Interventions for Recruitment and Retention:** A number of techniques have
35
36
37 been used to enhance both recruitment and retention such as use of reminders
38
39
40 (letters, texts, emails), social motivational interventions to enhance positive attitudes
41
42
43 of altruism (usually messages and slogans such as 'do something amazing, save a
44
45
46 life'), and techniques such as 'foot-in-the-door' (i.e. asking for a small commitment to
47
48
49 donate initially, then for a subsequent larger one). A meta-analysis of these
50
51
52 interventions undertaken by Godin et al. (2012) showed that, overall, reminders were
53
54
55 quite effective (OR = 1.91, $r = .69$), as were foot-in-the-door techniques (OR = 1.86, r
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 = .68) and cognitive based social motivations (OR = 2.47, $r = .77$). Godin et al.
5
6
7 showed that altruism-based interventions had the largest effect size (OR = 3.89, $r =$
8
9
10
11 .89). However, while coded as altruism, Ferguson et al. (2007) had previously
12
13
14 argued that these 'altruism' based interventions are in fact tapping 'impure' rather
15
16
17 than 'pure' altruism.
18
19
20

21 Evidence suggests that feedback on the success of a prosocial act increases
22
23
24 the likelihood of subsequent prosocial acts (Smith, Keating & Stotland, 1989). In
25
26
27 blood donation, providing text messages to donors saying that their blood has been
28
29
30
31 used, increases return rates by approximately 8% (Gemeilli, Carver, Garmm, Wright
32
33
34 & Davison, 2018).
35
36
37

38 Making a plan after donating, indicating when and where the donor's next
39
40
41 donation will be ('implementation intention') increases the likelihood of return
42
43
44 donations (Godin et al., 2013 & 2014; Wevers, Wigboldus, van den Hurk K, van
45
46
47 Baaren, & Veldhuizen, 2015). However, with appointment systems becoming more
48
49
50 common, additional interventions are needed to enhance the motivation to return
51
52
53 once an appointment has been made. Motivational interviewing is one promising
54
55
56 possibility with evidence that a motivational interview increased personal autonomy
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 and intrinsic motivation, with both linked to increased likelihood of making a
5
6
7 subsequent donation (France & France, 2018; France, France, Carlson, Frye, et al.,
8
9
10 2017; France, France, Carlson, Himawan, et al., 2017). Finally, a recent feasibility
11
12
13 study on the use of TTM stages and process tool to recruit blood donor has shown
14
15
16 that such an approach would be acceptable and increase intentions to donate blood
17
18
19
20
21 (Robbins et al., 2015).
22
23

24
25 While showing promise, all these interventions focus on “cold” cognition, while
26
27
28 the above review suggests that affect is important. Furthermore, they are all based
29
30
31 on an assumption that blood donors are pure rather than impure altruists. Below,
32
33
34 therefore, we consider some promising avenues for interventions based on affect
35
36
37 and the impure altruistic donor.
38
39
40

41
42 Evidence shows that *anticipatory* guilt (guilt arising in advance of a future
43
44
45 transgression, which can be avoided), rather than *reactive* guilt (guilt experienced
46
47
48 when a transgression takes place), predicts intentions to donate blood (Renner,
49
50
51 Lindenmeier, Tscheulin, & Drevs, 2013). However, if the activation of guilt is
52
53
54 perceived as manipulative (“if people like you do not donate then there will be
55
56
57 shortages”) it can lead to anger and reactance (Cotte, Coulter, & Moore, 2005). To
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 avoid this problem, Ferguson (2015a) and Ferguson and Lawrence (2015)
5
6
7 suggested a form of message to engender prosocial guilt based on the models of
8
9
10 inequality aversion (Fehr & Schmidt, 1999). Such a message would state: “As
11
12
13 someone in good health, you can help someone whose health is not as good as
14
15
16 yours by donating blood”. There is some initial evidence that this form of message
17
18
19
20
21 may be effective (Ferguson, 2015b).
22
23
24

25 As experiencing warm-glow becomes a more salient motivation in
26
27
28 experienced donors, Ferguson (2015a) has argued that promoting warm-glow should
29
30
31 be a more effective intervention for donor retention. Consistent with this, Ferguson et
32
33
34 al. (2008) contrasted a warm-glow appeal with a pure-altruism appeal and showed
35
36
37 that the warm-glow appeal increased willingness to donate in those who committed
38
39
40 to donate blood. Further, interventions that reactivate the feelings of ‘warm-glow’
41
42
43 after donating are also a promising avenue to pursue (Ferguson, 2015). Currently an
44
45
46 RCT is underway with the Australian Red Cross to test this (pre-registered with OSF:
47
48
49 <https://osf.io/r8dca/>).
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 Similarly, a simple ‘thank-you’ that likely engenders feelings of *gratitude*
57
58
59 should be an effective intervention (Ma et al., 2017) and there is some evidence, in
60

women, that this is the case compared to an implementation intention or reward

(Myhal, Godin & Dubuc, 2017).

As blood donors can be characterised as impure altruists, financial incentives could be beneficial (Ferguson, 2015). While it has been argued that financial incentives (i.e., 'blood money') may de-motivate ("crowd-out") intrinsically experienced donors (Titmuss, 1970), framing the transaction as a 'social exchange' (i.e., the donor provides a 'gift of life' and the blood service thanks them with a gift), may be effective (Mauss, 1990; Sharp & Randhawa, 2014). This approach has been explored in two ways, either as a (1) 'gift voucher' in return for donation ('*Gift Exchange*': Lacetera, Macis, & Slonim, 2013, 2014) or (2) financial gift that can be donated to another health charity ('*Charity Option*': Mellstrom & Johannesson, 2008; Sass, 2013). The opportunity to help another charity in exchange for donating blood should provide the opportunity to gain *extra warm-glow*. When incentives were given for a pre-donation health check, evidence to-date suggests that a charity option has a neutral effect, while a financial exchange leads to crowding-out in female donors (Mellstrom & Johannesson, 2008). In contrast, when focusing explicitly on a financial 'gift exchange' there is empirical support that donor attendance is proportional to the

1
2
3
4 value of the gift card (Lacetera et al., 2013, 2014). While the financial 'gift exchange'
5
6
7 seems promising, there is no real evidence for any systematic effects of other
8
9
10 financial (e.g., tax relief) and non-financial (including time off work, cholesterol
11
12
13 testing) incentives to donate blood (Chell, Davison, Masser & Jensen, 2018).
14
15
16

17 **Interventions During Donation to Enhance Donor Experiences and Health:**

18
19
20
21 How the donor feels or reacts (vasovagal reactions) while donating blood influences
22
23
24 both their intentions and actual return (Bendall et al., 2013). Vasovagal reactions
25
26
27 also have implications for the donor's health at their time of donation. Diverting
28
29
30 attention away from anxiety provoking stimuli can have significant benefits
31
32
33
34 (Anderson, Baron & Logan, 1991). In the context of blood donation, donors who
35
36
37 prefer avoidant coping strategies were less likely to experience negative reactions
38
39
40
41 when watching a movie while donating blood, and those who preferred vigilant
42
43
44 coping were neither helped nor harmed by watching the movie (Bonk, France &
45
46
47 Taylor, 2001). Similarly, mixed detrimental and beneficial findings have been
48
49
50 reported for the presence of "easy listening" background music as a function of
51
52
53 donation experience and vigilance coping (Ferguson, Singh, & Cunningham-Snell,
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 1997).

1
2
3
4 Repeated, rhythmic contraction of major muscle groups of the arms and legs -
5
6
7
8 applied muscle tension (AMT) – has been used successfully to treat fainting
9
10
11 reactions in blood and injury phobia (e.g., Ost & Sterner, 1987). AMT has been
12
13
14 applied to prevent negative reactions in blood donors (e.g., Ditto, France, Lavoie,
15
16
17 Roussos & Adler, 2003). Meta-analytic evidence shows that while AMT did not
18
19
20
21 reduce vasovagal reactions as reported by the phlebotomist, it did result in a
22
23
24 reduction in vasovagal symptoms (*Mean Difference* = -0.07, $p = .02$) (Fisher et al.,
25
26
27 2016). Furthermore, AMT is effective when performed at key points across the
28
29
30
31 donation process (when the needle is inserted, the needle is removed, and getting
32
33
34 up from the chair) (Thijssen et al., 2018). There is some evidence that AMT increases
35
36
37 intentions to return (*Mean Difference* = 2.87, $p = .004$), but not actual return
38
39
40
41
42 behaviour (*RR* = 1.02, $p = .64$).
43
44

45
46 Based on evidence that healthy individuals show increased vascular
47
48
49 constriction and arterial constriction after consuming water (Scott, Greenwood,
50
51
52 Gilbey, Stoker & Mary, 2001), the effect of pre-donation hydration on the experience
53
54
55 of vasovagal reactions has been examined in blood donors (e.g., Newman et al.,
56
57
58
59 2006). Meta-analysis results show that pre-loading significantly reduces blood donor
60

1
2
3
4 vasovagal reactions as reported by the phlebotomist ($RR 0.79, p < .0001$), as well as
5
6
7 vasovagal type symptoms ($MD = -0.32, p = .001$) (Fisher et al., 2016). There are no
8
9
10 data at present linking water consumption directly to return rates. However, these
11
12
13 techniques may have indirect effects on return rates via vasovagal symptoms and
14
15
16 intentions (France et al., 2013).
17
18
19
20

21 **Interventions Targeted at Specific Groups:** Blood donation agencies face the
22
23 need for increased specialization in donor recruitment to meet clinical needs. This is
24
25 exemplified, as described above, by the need for increased donations from the
26
27
28 BAME community. In terms of developing targeted recruitment campaigns for BAME
29
30
31 donors, no unique *cultural specific motivating* factor that differentiates BAME
32
33
34 donors/non-donors from non-BAME donors/non-donors has been identified (e.g.,
35
36
37
38 Burzynski, Nam, & Le Vior, 2016; Tran, Charbonneau, & Valderrama-Benitez, 2013).
39
40
41
42 Altruism emerges as a motivator across all communities and may offer critical
43
44
45 insights when considered within a cross-cultural perspective. First, BAME
46
47
48 communities conceptualize altruism that focuses on reciprocity *within* the community
49
50
51 rather than helping strangers, which is common in western cultures (Tran et al.,
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59 2013). Second, evidence shows that *lack of trust* in healthcare provision/medical
60

1
2
3
4 mistrust (Guerrero, Mendes de Leon, Evans, & Jacobs, 2015; Kimberly et al., 2013),
5
6
7 and in transfusion services (e.g., Boenigk, Mews & de Kort, 2015; Boulware, Ratner,
8
9
10 Cooper et al., 2002), is an important demotivating factor within BAME communities.
11
12
13
14 A focus on reducing medical mistrust would, therefore, appear to be a fruitful avenue
15
16
17
18 to pursue for interventions in this context.
19
20
21

22 **Organ Donation**

23
24
25 Interventions for posthumous donation to-date have largely focused around
26
27
28 legislative change (e.g., changing to an opt-out policy or prioritising transplant
29
30
31 candidates who have shown commitment to organ donation: Sallis, Harper, &
32
33
34
35 Sanders, 2018).
36
37
38

39
40 **Legislative Approaches - "Opt-In Versus Opt-Out":** Many governments have
41
42
43 moved to an 'opt-out' default (i.e., presumed consent to organ donation, unless an
44
45
46 individual actively opts out) from an 'opt-in default' (i.e., the default is to be a non-
47
48
49 donor unless one actively registers). Some countries (e.g., Austria) have a "hard-opt-
50
51
52
53 out system" where the registration will be followed, regardless of the families' wishes,
54
55
56
57 whereas other countries (e.g., Spain) offer a "soft opt-out" system whereby families
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 of potential donors are given the chance to refuse (Reinders, van Kooten, Rabelink,
5
6
7 & de Fijter, 2018).

10
11 It has been shown that, on average, changing the default to an opt-out system
12
13
14 leads to an increase in donation rates (Bilgel, 2012; Johnson & Goldstein, 2003;
15
16
17
18 Rithalia, Myers & Snowden, 2009; Ugur, 2015) and this change is supported by
19
20
21
22 public opinion (Moseley & Stoker, 2015; Rockloff & Hanley, 2014; van Dalen &
23
24
25
26 Henkens, 2014). However, while, on average, opt-out is associated with higher
27
28
29
30 deceased donations, compared to opt-in, it is also associated with lower living
31
32
33
34 donations (Shepherd, O'Carroll & Ferguson, 2014). Indeed, there are a number of
35
36
37
38 other concerns about moving to an opt-out default that detract from its actualized
39
40
41
42 effectiveness (see McCartney, 2017; Wellesley, 2011; Willis & Quigley, 2014). The
43
44
45
46 main concerns (Table 3) with an opt-out system include: (1) an epidemiological focus
47
48
49
50 on the average that obscures important cross-country variance, with many opt-out
51
52
53
54 countries performing less well than opt-in countries, (2) reduced living donation
55
56
57
58 rates, (3) difficulty interpreting what passively not opting-out means in terms of the
59
60
61
62 donor's true preference to be a donor, (4) moral objections relating to 'state'

1
2
3
4 ownership of organs and lack of autonomy, (5) potential negative consequences of
5
6
7 the 'lone wolf effect' whereby people are more likely to follow the lead of others de-
8
9
10 registering, as signalled by posts on social media for example, and opt-out and (6)
11
12
13 inability to establish causality. Furthermore, while the Spanish system is widely
14
15
16 heralded as a great illustration of the success of an opt-out system, having now
17
18
19 achieved 40 deceased donors per million (Matesanz, Gil, Coll, Mahillo & Marazuela,
20
21
22 2017), Spain does **not** have an opt-out register for those who do not wish to become
23
24
25 organ donors. The presumed consent law in Spain is thus dormant. In these
26
27
28 circumstances, Spain's world-leading deceased organ donor rate cannot be
29
30
31 attributed an opt-out system (Fabre, Murphy & Matesanz, 2010). Instead, the
32
33
34 pioneers of the "Spanish model" attribute its success to three main features: (1)
35
36
37 promoting early referral of donors from outside intensive care unit and incorporating
38
39
40 the option of organ donation into end-of-life care, (2) expanding the criteria for organ
41
42
43 use (e.g., from older donors), and (3) developing donation after circulatory death
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53 (Matesanz et al. 2017).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Many countries have implemented a soft opt-out system where removal of
5
6
7 organs goes ahead only with family agreement. Indeed, under an opt-in system, the
8
9
10 UK has one of the highest family refusal rates for organ donation in the world, with
11
12
13 34% of families currently refusing. This will possibly be higher under an opt-out
14
15
16 system where it may be impossible for relatives to infer the true preference of the
17
18
19 potential donor. While Vincent and Logan (2012) suggested a set of potentially
20
21
22 modifiable factors relating to the family approach, the uncertainty that deemed
23
24
25 consent brings is hard to overcome. Importantly, family members often later regret
26
27
28 not giving consent (see Burroughs, Hong, Kappel & Freedman, 1998; Rodrigue,
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Cornell & Howard, 2008).

Increasing Registrations Within an Opt-in System: If an opt-out system does
not solve the organ shortage problem, it could be argued that the focus should be to
improve registration and donation rates under an opt-in system. Since 2009 under
the UK opt-in system, there has been a steady annual increase in the number of
registered donors, increasing from 16.1 million in 2009 to 24.9 million in 2018
(NHSBT, 2017-2018).

1
2
3
4 One option to further enhance this growth is by using *social media* (e.g.,
5
6
7 WhatsApp, Facebook, Twitter). Social media, as well as web-based and print media
8
9
10
11 opinion and comment, play an important role in organ donor recruitment that can be
12
13
14 capitalized on (Aykas, Uslu & Simsek, 2015; Bail, 2016; Bramstedt & Cameron,
15
16
17 2017; Brzezinski & Klikowicz, 2015; Cameron et al., 2013). A good example of this is
18
19
20
21 a *Facebook* campaign that gave individuals the opportunity to post status updates
22
23
24 with respect to their organ donor registration which resulted in increased
25
26
27
28 registrations (Cameron et al., 2013). Thus, rather than an expensive change to an
29
30
31 opt-out system, resources are perhaps better spend enhancing the opt-in system
32
33
34
35 with social media used to increase registrations under an opt-in system.
36
37
38

39 *Reciprocal altruism* is another potential effective mechanism to increase
40
41
42 organ donor registration under an opt-in system (Landry, 2006). Reciprocal altruism
43
44
45 (direct and indirect) has a selfish component (Ma et al., 2017; Nowak, 2006), thus
46
47
48
49 Landry proposed that campaigns should appeal to individuals' self-interest but
50
51
52
53 balance this against their desire to do what is fair and just. He termed this voluntary
54
55
56 reciprocal altruism (VRA). This is achieved by asking people to consider if they
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 would 'accept' an organ if they needed one, highlighting self-interest ('you may need
5
6
7 an organ') and reciprocity and fairness ('if we do not register to give there may not be
8
9
10 a sufficient supply for us all'). These ideas gained some support in a pilot study
11
12
13
14 which showed that medical students' intentions to donate were higher following
15
16
17 exposure to a VRA message (Landry, 2006). Developing on this, O'Carroll, Haddow,
18
19
20 Foley, and Quigley (2017) and O'Carroll, Quigley and Miller (2018) showed that non-
21
22
23 registered participants exposed to a VRA message, compared to controls, reported
24
25
26 greater intentions to register. The effect of VRA on behaviour (donor registration)
27
28
29 was demonstrated by the results from a large scale (1 million participants) trial
30
31
32 comparing nine different messages on UK driving license application web pages. A
33
34
35 VRA message ("If you needed an organ transplant, would you have one? If so,
36
37
38 please help others") was the most successful, followed by a loss framed message
39
40
41 ("Three people die every day because there are not enough organs") (Sallis et al., 2018).
42
43
44
45 Norm based strategies ("Every day thousands of people who see this page decide to
46
47
48 register") were the least successful, and when combined with an image of people,
49
50
51 norm-based strategies had a detrimental effect, resulting in a reduction in donor
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 registrations (Sallis et al., 2018). The UK NHSBT advertising campaign currently

1
2
3
4 uses VRA, asking “If you needed an organ transplant would you have one?”(NHSBT,
5
6
7 2016).

11 *Anticipated regret* (AR) is an example of an anticipated affective reaction.

14 Asking people to anticipate possible future regret is a potentially powerful behaviour
15
16
17
18 change technique (Brewer, DeFrank & Gilkey, 2016). O’Carroll, Dryden, et al. (2011)
19
20
21 and O’Carroll, Foster, et al. (2011) assessed the impact of a simple AR intervention,
22
23
24
25 showing that intention to join the UK ODR was significantly higher for participants
26
27
28 asked to rate possible AR compared with a control condition. However, a
29
30
31
32 subsequent large-scale trial with 14,509 members of the Scottish public which
33
34
35 measured actual registrations, found significantly *lower* registrations in the AR arm
36
37
38 compared to a pure control (O’Carroll, Shepherd, Hayes, & Ferguson, 2016). In
39
40
41
42 attempting to understand why the brief AR intervention led to a significant decrease
43
44
45 in registrations, the authors speculated that as those in the active arms completed
46
47
48 items assessing affective responses in relation to organ donation (e.g., jinx) and
49
50
51 control participants did not, they were ‘primed’ to consider negative beliefs about
52
53
54 organ donation. To test this possibility, Doherty, Dolan, Flynn, O’Carroll, and Doyle
55
56
57 (2017) found that omitting negative affective items resulted in higher intention to
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 donate organs and marginally higher rates of acceptance of organ donor cards
5
6
7 (proxy measure of behaviour). These findings suggest that questions about negative
8
9
10 affective responses require careful consideration and should probably be omitted in
11
12
13
14 public health campaigns attempting to increase organ donor registration (Doherty et
15
16
17
18 al., 2017).

21 **Community Based Interventions:** Golding and Cropley (2017) conducted a
22
23
24 narrative systematic review of psychological interventions designed to increase the
25
26
27
28 number of individuals in the community who register as organ donors. They identified
29
30
31
32 24 studies, 19 of which found a positive intervention effect, but only 8 were rated as
33
34
35 being methodologically robust. The previously cited study by Alvaro et al. (2011),
36
37
38 which provided an immediate registration opportunity (ICRO), was found to be the
39
40
41
42 most effective with an OR of 5.9.

45 **Primary Care Interventions:** Pedder-Jones, Papadopoulos and Randhawa
46
47
48 (2017) showed that successful interventions in primary care were characterised by
49
50
51
52 active participant engagement and those that encouraged donation at the point of
53
54
55
56 patient contact (ICRO).
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 **“Myth-Busting”**: Myths or incorrect beliefs (e.g., “Doctors may not try their best
5
6
7 to save my life if I am registered as an organ donor”) are common deterrents of
8
9
10 organ donation registration. Miller, Currie and O’Carroll (2018) recently evaluated the
11
12 effectiveness of myth correcting interventions. They found that for participants who
13
14 plan to opt-in to the organ donor register or passively register (deemed consent),
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22 dispelling myths acted to increase donor intentions. However, for the group the
23
24
25 intervention is aimed at (i.e., those who plan to opt-out or are unsure), dispelling
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

32 **Xenotransplantation**: A very different intervention to reduce the organ
33
34
35 shortage is to move to a source of organs other than humans: *Xenotransplantation*
36
37
38 (Denner, 2014). Recent advances in engineering pig (the most suitable organism for
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The potential endless supply of organs offers a real solution to the organ shortage

1
2
3
4 (Harris et al., 2014; Hryhorowicz, Zeyland, Slomski, & Lipinski, 2017). However,
5
6
7 there is an urgent need to assess acceptability to patients and relatives.
8
9

10
11 **Correlated Behaviours:** Blood and organ donation behaviours are consistently
12
13
14 correlated across countries (Ferguson et al., in press). This implies that recruiting
15
16
17 organ donors from blood donors, or vice-versa, is a distinct possibility. Indeed, in
18
19
20 some countries (e.g., Australia) blood donors are encouraged to become organ
21
22
23 donors (<https://www.donateblood.com.au/learn/organ-tissue-donation>).
24
25
26
27
28

29 **Common Themes**

30
31
32

33 While blood and organ donation are both health-based voluntary philanthropic
34
35
36 acts, they are different in a number of ways (Table 1), have different predictors, and
37
38
39 require unique interventions. There are, however, a number of communalities that
40
41
42
43 can be identified across the two that suggest common themes.
44
45
46

47 **Emotions and Empathy Gaps.** A key emerging theme from the review on blood and
48
49
50 organ donation is the role of emotional experiences. Such processes tend to be
51
52
53
54 dynamic – blood donors cycle through a number of donations, and people consider
55
56
57 registering as an organ donor and then register or not. Thus, we need to consider
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 this dynamic emotional journey and *empathy gaps* offer one theoretical tool to do
5
6
7 this. An *empathy gap* emerges when people have difficulty in predicting how they will
8
9
10 act in an emotional state different to their current one (Loewenstein, 2000). Important
11
12
13 to this discussion are *prospective hot-cold* and *cold-hot* empathy gaps. Prospective
14
15
16 gaps refer to how well people predict their future behaviour, when in a different
17
18
19 emotional state to their current one. Hot-cold gaps are experienced when people in
20
21
22 an aroused emotional state underestimate how their current emotions influence their
23
24
25 decisions. In cold-hot gaps, people in a cold emotional state under-estimate how their
26
27
28 emotions in an aroused state will influence their behaviour. There are *cold-hot*
29
30
31 *prospective* empathy gaps in both blood and organ donation behaviour. For blood
32
33
34 donation this focuses on people's prospective prediction that they may faint when
35
36
37 donating blood. Indeed, the potential blood donor's emotional responses are very
38
39
40 different depending on whether or not they can observe images and equipment
41
42
43 associated with blood donation (Clowes & Masser, 2012; Masser, France, Himawan,
44
45
46 Hyde, & Smith, in press), with anxiety being higher when blood donation
47
48
49 paraphernalia are present. Similarly, *cold-hot prospective* empathy gaps are likely to
50
51
52 be present in relation to deceased organ donation registration. That is, while people
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 express a positive attitude towards organ donation (70% or more) in the UK, only
5
6
7 approximately 38% register. Reflecting a possible cold-hot prospective empathy gap,
8
9
10
11 people may feel more negative emotions when it comes to signing up on the organ
12
13
14 donor register than they anticipated, and this is sufficient to prevent them from
15
16
17
18 registering.
19
20
21

22
23 There are also *hot-cold retrospective empathy-gaps* in both blood and deceased
24
25 organ donation. The blood donor in the hot after-glow of donation, may over estimate
26
27 their likelihood of return, but as they emotionally cool-off they may recall the donation
28
29 less positively. Thus, interventions to enhance blood donors' recall of post-donation
30
31
32
33 positive affect would be a useful avenue to pursue. Ferguson and Masser (2018)
34
35
36 provide a detailed theoretical account of the application of empathy gaps to blood
37
38
39 donor research. Applying *hot-cold retrospective empathy-gaps* may also explain why
40
41
42
43 many family members express regret for earlier decisions not to consent to organ
44
45
46
47 donation from their relatives (Rodrigue et al. 2008), as their decision was made in a
48
49
50 hot emotional state and later reflected on in a cold emotional state.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

mechanisms to boost organ donor registrations under an opt-in default may be more successful, especially if combined with a VRA manipulation or social media updates.

References

- Alfieri, S., Paolo, G., Marta, E., & Saturni, V. (2016). Economic crisis and blood donation: How are donors' motivations changing? *Transfusion and Apheresis Science*, *55*(3), 396-400.
- Allpress, J. A., Brown, R., Giner-Sorolla, R., Deonna, J. A., & Teroni, F. (2014). Two faces of group-based shame: moral shame and image shame differentially predict positive and negative orientations to in-group wrongdoing. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *40*(10), 1270-1284.
- Alvaro, E. M., Siegel, J. T., & Jones, S. P. (2011). Increasing organ donor registration rates by providing an immediate and complete registration opportunity: An experimental assessment of the IIFF model. *Psychology, Health and Medicine*, *16*(6), 686-694.
- Amodio, D. M., Devine, P. G., & Harmon-Jones, E. (2007). A dynamic model of guilt: Implications for motivation and self-regulation in the context of prejudice. *Psychological Science*, *18*(6), 524-530.
- Amoyal, N. R., Robbins, M. L., Paiva, A. L., Burditt, C., Kessler, D., & Shaz, B. H. (2013). Measuring the processes of change for increasing blood donation in black adults. *Transfusion*, *53*(6), 1280-1290.

- 1
2
3
4 Anderson, R., Baron, R. S., & Logan, H. (1991). Distraction, control, and dental
5
6 stress. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 21*(2), 156-171.
7
8
9 Andreoni, J. (1990). Impure altruism and donations to public goods: A theory of
10
11 warm glow giving. *The Economic Journal, 100*(401), 464-487.
12
13
14 Atsma, F., Veldhuizen, I., Verbeek, A., de Kort, W., & de Vegt, F. (2011). Healthy
15
16 donor effect: Its magnitude in health research among blood donors. *Transfusion,*
17
18 *51*(8), 1820-1828.
19
20
21
22 Aykas, A., Uslu, A., & Simsek, C. (2015). Mass media, online social networks, and
23
24 organ donation: Old mistakes and new perspective's. *Transplantation*
25
26 *Proceedings, 47*(4), 1070-1072.
27
28
29
30 Bail, C. A. (2016). Cultural carrying capacity: Organ donation advocacy, discursive
31
32 framing. and social media engagement. *Social Science and Medicine, 165*, 280-
33
34 288.
35
36
37
38 Batson, C. D. (1991). *The altruism question: Toward a social-psychological answer*
39
40 (pp. 1-257). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
41
42
43 Bendall, T.C., & Bove, L.L. (2011). Donating blood: a meta-analytic review of self-
44
45 reported motivators and deterrents, *Transfusion Medicine Reviews, 25*(4), 317-
46
47 334.
48
49
50
51 Bednall, T. C., Bove, L. L., Cheetham, A., & Murray, A. L. (2013). A systematic
52
53 review and meta-analysis of antecedents of blood donation behavior and
54
55 intentions. *Social Science and Medicine, 96*, 86-94.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Bekkers, R. (2006). Traditional and health-related philanthropy: The role of
5
6 resources and personality. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 69(4), 349–366.
7
8
9 Beshears, J., Choi, J. J., Laibson, D., & Madrian, B. C. (2008). How are preferences
10
11 revealed? *Journal of Public Economics*, 92(8-9), 1787-1794.
12
13
14 Bilgel, F. (2012). The impact of presumed consent laws and institution on deceased
15
16 organ donation. *European Journal of Health Economics*, 13(1), 29-38.
17
18
19 Boenigk, S., Mews, M., & de Kort, W. (2015). Missing minorities: Explaining low
20
21 migrant blood donation participation and developing recruitment tactics.
22
23
24 *Voluntas*, 26(4), 1240-1260.
25
26
27 Bonk, V. A., France, C. R., & Taylor, B. K. (2001). Distraction reduces self-reported
28
29 physiological reactions to blood donation on novice donors with a blunting coping
30
31 style. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 63(3), 447-452.
32
33
34
35 Boulware, L. E., Ratner, L. E., Cooper, L. A., Sosa, J. A., LaVeist, T. A., & Powe, N.
36
37 R. (2002). Understanding disparities in donor behavior: Race and gender
38
39 differences in willingness to donate blood and cadaveric organs. *Medical Care*,
40
41
42
43
44 40(2), 85-95.
45
46 Bove, L. L., Bednall, T., Masser, B., & Buzza, M. (2011). Understanding the
47
48 plasmapheresis donor in a voluntary, nonremunerated environment. *Transfusion*,
49
50
51
52 51(11), 2411-2424.
53
54 Bramstedt, K. A., & Cameron, A. M. (2017). Beyond the billboard: The Facebook-
55
56 based application, donor, and its guided approach to facilitating living organ
57
58 donation. *American Journal of Transplantation*, 17(2), 336-340.
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Brewer, N. T., DeFrank, J. T., & Gilkey, M. B. (2016). Anticipated regret and
5
6 behaviour change: A meta-analysis. *Health Psychology, 35*(11), 1264-1275.
7
8
9 Brittenham, G. M. (2011). Iron-chelating therapy for transfusional iron overload. *The*
10
11 *New England Journal of Medicine, 364*(2), 146-156.
12
13
14 Brzezinski, M., & Klikowicz, P. (2015). Facebook as a medium for promoting
15
16 statement of intent for organ donation: 5-years of experience. *Annals of*
17
18 *Transplantation, 20*, 141-146.
19
20
21
22 Bshary, R., & Bergmüller, R. (2008). Distinguishing four fundamental approaches to
23
24 the evolution of helping. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology, 21*(2), 405-420.
25
26
27 Burditt, C., Robbins, M. L., Paiva, A., Velicer, W. F., Koblin, B., & Kessler, D. (2009).
28
29 Motivation for blood donation among African Americans: Developing measures
30
31 for stage of change, decisional balance, and self-efficacy constructs. *Journal of*
32
33 *Behavioural Medicine, 32*(5), 429-442.
34
35
36
37
38 Burroughs, T. E., Hong, B. A., Kappel, D. F., & Freedman, B. K. (1998). The stability
39
40 of family decisions to consent or refuse organ donation: Would you do it again?
41
42 *Psychosomatic Medicine, 60*(2), 156-162.
43
44
45
46 Burzynski, E. S., Nam, L. S., & Le Vior, R. (2016). Barriers and motivations to
47
48 voluntary blood donation in sub-Saharan African settings; A literature review.
49
50 *ISBT Science Series, 11*(2), 73-81.
51
52
53
54 Cameron, A. M., Massie, A. B., Alexander, C. E., Stewart, B., Montgomery, R. A.,
55
56 Benavides, N. R., ... Segev, D. L. (2013). Social media and organ donation
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 registration: The Facebook effect. *American Journal of Transplantation*, 13(8),
5
6 2059-2065.
7

8
9 Carter, M. C., Wilson, J., Redpath, G. S., Hayes, P., & Mitchell, C. (2011). Donor
10
11 recruitment in the 21st century: Challenges and lessons learned in the first
12
13 decade. *Transfusion and Apheresis Science*, 45(1), 31-43.
14
15

16
17 Chell, K., Davison, T. E., Masser, B., & Jensen, K. (2018). A systematic review of
18
19 incentives in blood donation. *Transfusion*, 58(1), 242-254.
20
21

22
23 Chell, K., Waller, D., & Masser, B. (2016). The Blood Donor Anxiety scale: A six-item
24
25 anxiety measure based on the Spielberger State-Trait Anxiety inventory.
26
27 *Transfusion*, 56(6,2), 1645-1653.
28
29

30
31 Chliaoutakis, J., Trakas, D. J., Socrataki, F., Lemonidou, C., & Papaioannou, D.
32
33 (1994). Blood donor behaviour in Greece: Implications for health policy. *Social*
34
35 *Science and Medicine*, 38(10), 1461-1467.
36
37

38
39 Clary, E. G., & Snyder, M. (1999). Motivations to volunteer: Theoretical and practical
40
41 considerations. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 8(5), 156-159.
42
43

44
45 Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R. D., Copeland, J., Stukas, A. A., Haugen, J., &
46
47 Miene, P. (1998). Understanding and assessing the motivations of volunteers: A
48
49 functional Approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(6), 1516-
50
51 1530.
52
53

54
55 Clowes, R., & Masser, B. M. (2012). Right here, right now: The impact of the blood
56
57 donation context on anxiety, attitudes, subjective norms, self-efficacy, and
58
59 intention to donate blood. *Transfusion*, 52(7), 1560-1565.
60

1
2
3
4 Conner, M., Godin, G., Sheeran, P., & Germain, M. (2013). Some feelings are more
5
6 important: Cognitive attitudes, affective attitudes, anticipated affect, and blood
7
8 donation. *Health Psychology, 32*(3), 264-72.
9

10
11
12 Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-*
13
14 *R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) manual*. Odessa, FL:
15
16 Psychological Assessment Resources.
17

18
19
20 Cotte, J., Coulter, R. A., & Moore, M. (2005). Enhancing and disrupting guilt: The
21
22 role of ad credibility and perceived manipulative intent. *Journal of Business*
23
24 *Research, 58*(3), 361-368.
25

26
27
28 Csillag, C. (1998). Brazil abolishes “presumed consent” in organ donation. *The*
29
30 *Lancet, 352*(9137), 1367.
31

32
33
34 Demir, B., & Kumkale, G. T. (2013). Individual differences in willingness to become
35
36 an organ donor: A decision tree approach to reasoned action. *Personality and*
37
38 *Individual Differences, 55*(1), 63–69.
39

40
41
42 Denner, J. (2014). Xenotransplantation – progress and problems: A review. *Journal*
43
44 *of Transplantations Technologies and Research, 4*(2), article: 1000133.
45

46
47
48 Di Angelantonio, E., Thompson, S.G., Kaptoge, S., Moore, C, Walker, M., Armitage,
49
50 J., ... INTERVAL Trial Group. (2017). Efficiency and safety of varying the
51
52 frequency of whole blood donation (INTERVAL): A randomised trial of 45 000
53
54 donors. *Lancet, 390*(10110), 2360-2371.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Ditto, B., & France, C.R. (2006). Vasovagal symptoms mediate the relationship
5
6 between predonation anxiety and subsequent blood donation in female
7
8 volunteers. *Transfusion*, 46(6), 1006-1010.
9
10
11 Ditto, B., France, C. R., Lavoie, P., Roussos, M., & Adler, P. S. (2003). Reducing
12
13 reactions to blood donation with applied muscle tension: a randomized controlled
14
15 trial. *Transfusion*, 43(9), 1269-1275.
16
17
18
19 Doherty, S., Dolan, E., Flynn, J., O'Carroll, R., & Doyle, F. (2017). Circumventing the
20
21 "Ick" factor: A randomized trial of the effects of omitting affective attitudes
22
23 questions to increase intention to become an organ donor. *Frontiers in*
24
25 *Psychology*, 8, Art. No.: 1443.
26
27
28
29 Evans, R., & Ferguson, E. (2014). Defining and measuring blood donor altruism: A
30
31 Theoretical approach from biology, economics and psychology. *Vox Sanguinis*,
32
33 106(2), 118-126.
34
35
36
37 Fabre, J., Murphy, P., & Matesanz, R. (2010). Presumed consent: A distraction in the
38
39 quest for increasing rates of organ donation. *British Medical Journal*,
40
41 341, c4973.
42
43
44
45 Falomir-Pichastor, J. M., Berent, J. A., & Pereira, A. (2013). Social psychological
46
47 factors of post-mortem organ donation: A theoretical review of determinants and
48
49 promotion strategies, *Health Psychology Review*, 7(2), 202-247.
50
51
52
53 Fehr, E. (2009). On the economics and biology of trust. *Journal of the European*
54
55 *Economic Association*, 7(2-3), 235-266.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Fehr, E., & Fischbacher, U. (2004a). Third-party punishment and social norms.
5
6 *Evolution and Human Behavior, 25*, 63-87.
7
8
9 Fehr, E., & Fischbacher, U. (2004b). Social norms and human cooperation. *Trends*
10
11 *in Cognitive Science, 8*(4), 185-190.
12
13
14 Fehr, E., & Schmidt, K. M. (1999). A theory of fairness, competition and cooperation.
15
16 *Quarterly Journal of Economics, 114*(3), 817-868.
17
18
19 Ferguson, E. (1996). Predictors of future behaviour: A review of the psychological
20
21 literature on blood donation. *British Journal of Health Psychology, 1*(4), 287-308.
22
23
24 Ferguson, E. (2015a). Mechanism of altruism approach to blood donor recruitment
25
26 and retention: A review and future directions. *Transfusion Medicine, 25*(4), 211-
27
28 226
29
30
31
32 Ferguson, E (2015b). *Blood Donation and Altruism*. 25th Regional Congress of the International
33
34 Society of Blood Transfusion (ISBT), London, United Kingdom June 27 - July 1
35
36 Ferguson, E., Atsma, F., de Kort, W., & Veldhuizen, I. (2012b). Exploring the pattern
37
38 of blood donor beliefs in first time, novice and experienced donors:
39
40 Differentiating reluctant altruism, pure altruism, impure altruism and warm-glow,
41
42 *Transfusion, 52*(2), 343-355.
43
44
45
46 Ferguson, E., & Bibby, P. A. (2002). Predicting future blood donor returns: Past
47
48 behavior, intentions, and observer effects. *Health Psychology, 21*(5), 513-518.
49
50
51 Ferguson, E., & Chandler, S. (2005). A stage model of blood donor behaviour:
52
53 Assessing volunteer behaviour. *Journal of Health Psychology, 10*(3), 359-372.
54
55
56 Ferguson, E., Dorner, L., France, C. R., France, J. L., Masser, B., Lam, M., Marta,
57
58 E., Alfieri, S., Merz, E-M., Adams, B., Huis in 't Veld, E., & Scerri, J. (*In press*)
59
60

Blood donor behaviour, motivations and the need for a systematic cross-cultural perspective: The example of moral outrage and health and non-health based philanthropy across seven countries (*ISBT Science Series*)

Ferguson, E., Farrell, K., & Lawrence, C. (2008). Blood donation is an act of benevolence rather than altruism. *Health Psychology, 27*(3), 327-336.

Ferguson, E., & Flynn, N. (2016). Moral relativism as a disconnect between behavioural and experienced warm glow. *Journal of Economic Psychology, 56*, 163-175.

Ferguson, E., France, C. R., Abraham, C., Ditto, B., & Sheeran, P. (2007). Improving blood donor recruitment and retention: Integrating social and behavioral science agendas. *Transfusion, 47*(11), 1999-2010.

Ferguson, E., & Lawrence, C. (2015). Blood donation and altruism: The mechanism of altruism approach. *ISBT Science Series, 11*(S1), 148–157.

Ferguson, E., & Lawrence, C. (2018). It is only fair: Blood donors are more sensitive to violations of fairness norms than non-donors – converging psychometric and ultimatum game evidence. *Vox Sanguinis, 113*(3), 224-250.

Ferguson, E., & Masser, B. (2018). Emotions and pro-sociality: Lessons for blood donation. In D. M. Williams, R. E. Rhodes & M. T. Conner (Eds.), *Affective Determinants of Health-Related Behavior*. Oxford University Press

Ferguson, E., Shichman, R., & Tan, J. H. W. (2018). *The 'Lone wolf' Defector is Detrimental to Organ Donor Registration Rates When Moving to an Opt-Out Organ Registration Default: A Behavioral Economic Experiment*. 3rd European Conference on Donor Health and Management. Copenhagen, 5th to 7th September 2018.

- 1
2
3
4 Ferguson, E., Singh, A., & Cunningham-Snell, N. (1997). Stress and blood donation:
5
6 Effects of music and previous donation experience. *British Journal of*
7
8
9 *Psychology, 88*(2), 277-294.
10
11
12 Ferguson, E., Taylor, M., Keatley, D., Flynn, N., & Lawrence, C. (2012a). Blood
13
14 donors' helping behavior is driven by warm glow more evidence for the blood
15
16 donor benevolence hypothesis. *Transfusion, 52*(10), 2189-2200.
17
18
19 Ferguson, E., Zhao, K., O'Carroll, R. E., & Smillie, L. D. (2018). Costless and costly
20
21 pro-sociality: Correspondence among Personality traits, economic preferences,
22
23 and real world pro-sociality. *Social Psychological and Personality Science. (in*
24
25 *press)*.
26
27
28
29
30 Fernandez, J. M., Howard, D. H., & Krose, L. S. (2013). The effects of cadaveric
31
32 kidney donations on living kidney donations: An instrumental variables approach.
33
34 *Economic Inquiry, 51*(3), 1696-1714.
35
36
37
38 Fisher, S. A., Allen, D., Doree, C., Naylor, J., Di Anelantonio, E., & Roberts, D. J.
39
40 (2016). Interventions to reduce vasovagal reactions in blood donors: A
41
42 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Transfusion Medicine, 26*(1), 15-33.
43
44
45 France, CR., France, JL., Wissel, ME, Ditto, B., Dickert, T., & Himawan, LK.(2013). Donor
46
47 anxiety, needle pain, and syncopal reactions combine to determine retention: a path
48
49 analysis of two-year donor return data. *Transfusion, 53*, 1992-2000.
50
51 DOI: 10.1111/trf.12069
52
53 France, C. R., & France, J. L. (2018). Can survey responses to online motivational
54
55 interview questions enhance blood donation intention? *Transfusion, 58*, 244A-
56
57
58 244A
59
60

1
2
3
4 France, C. R., France, J. L., Carlson, B. W., Frye, V., Duffy, D., Kessler, D. A., ...

5
6 Shaz, B. H. (2017) Applying self-determination theory to the blood donation
7
8 context: The blood donor competence, autonomy, and relatedness enhancement
9
10 (Blood Donor CARE) trial. *Contemporary Clinical Trials*, 53, 44-51.
11
12

13
14 France, C. R., France, J. L., Carlson, B. W., Himawan, L. K., Kessler, D. A., Reboza,
15
16 M., ... Fox, K.R. (2017). A motivational interview promotes retention of blood
17
18 donors with high internal motivation *Transfusion*, 57, (10), 2433-2439.
19
20

21
22 France, C. R., France, J. L., Carlson, B. W., Himawan, L. K., Stephens, K. Y.,
23
24 Frame-Brown, T.A., ... Menitove, J.E. (2014). Fear of blood draws, vasovagal
25
26 reactions, and retention among high school donors. *Transfusion*, 54(3), 918-924.
27
28

29
30 France, C. R., France, J. L., Wissel, M. E., Ditto, B., Dickert, T., & Himawan, L. K.
31
32 (2013). Donor anxiety, needle pain, and syncopal reactions combine to
33
34 determine retention: a path analysis of two-year donor return data. *Transfusion*,
35
36 53(9), 1992-2000.
37
38

39
40 France, C. R., Kawalsky, J. M., France, J. L., Himawan, L. K., Kessler, D. A., &
41
42 Shaz, B. H. (2014). The blood donor identity survey: A multidimensional
43
44 measure of blood donor motivations. *Transfusion*, 54(8), 2098-2105
45
46

47
48 France, C. R., Rader, A., & Carlson, B. (2005). Donors who react may not come
49
50 back: Analysis of repeat donation as a function of phlebotomist ratings
51
52 of vasovagal reactions. *Transfusion and Apheresis Science*, 33(2), 99-106.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Gemelli, C. N., Carver, A., Garn, A., Wright, S. T., & Davison, T. E. (2018).
5
6 Evaluation of the impact of a personalized postdonation short messaging service
7
8 on the retention of whole blood donors. *Transfusion*, *58*(3), 701-709.
9
10
11 Gill, P., & Lowes, L. (2008). Gift exchange and organ donation: Donor and recipient
12
13 experiences of live related kidney transplantation. *International Journal of*
14
15 *Nursing Studies*, *45*(11), 1607-1617.
16
17
18
19 Godin, G., Amireault, S., Vézina-Im, L. A., Sheeran P, Conner, M., Germain,
20
21 M., Delage, G. (2013). Implementation intentions intervention among temporarily
22
23 deferred novice blood donors. *Transfusion*, *53*(8), 653-60.
24
25
26
27 Godin, G., Vézina-Im, L. A., Beélangier-Gravel, A., & Amireault, S. (2012). Efficacy of
28
29 interventions promoting blood donation: A systematic review. *Transfusion*
30
31 *Medicine Reviews*, *26*(3), 224-237.
32
33
34
35 Godin, G., Conner, M., Sheeran, P., Bélangier-Gravel, A., & Germain, M. (2007).
36
37 Determinants of repeated blood donation among new and experienced blood
38
39 donors. *Transfusion*, *47*(9), 1607-1615.
40
41
42
43 Godin G., Germain, M, Conner, M, Delage, G., Sheeran, P. (2015). Promoting the
44
45 return of lapsed blood donors: A seven-arm randomized controlled trial of the
46
47 question-behavior effect. *Health Psychology*, *33*(7), 646-655.
48
49
50
51 Godin, G., Sheeran, P., Conner, M., Germain, M., Blondeau D., Gagne, C., ...
52
53 Naccache, H. (2005). Factors explain the intention to give blood among the
54
55 general population. *Vox Sanguinis*, *89*(3), 140-149.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Goldberg, L. R. (1993). The structure of phenotypic personality traits. *American*
5
6
7 *Psychologist*, 48(1), 26–34.

8
9 Golding, S. E., & Cropley, M. (2017). A systematic narrative review of effects of
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

community-based intervention on rates of organ donor registration. *Progress in Transplantation*, 27(3), 295-308.

Greinacher, A., Fendrich, K., Alpen, U., & Hoffman, W. (2007). Impact of demographic changes on the blood supply: Meckenburg-West Pomerania as a model region for Europe. *Transfusion*, 47(3), 395-401.

Greinacher, A., & Fendrich, K. (2010). Demographic changes: The impact for safe blood supply. *ISBT Science Series*, 5, 239-243.

Greinacher, A., Fendrich, K., & Hoffman, W. (2010). Demographic changes: The impact for safe blood supply. *Transfusion Medicine Hemotherapy*, 37(3), 141-148.

Guerrero, N., Mendes de Leon, C. F., Evans, D. A., & Jacobs E. A. (2015). Determinants of trust in health care in an older population. *Journal of American Geriatrics Society*, 63(3), 553-557.

Haidt, J. (2003). The moral emotions. In R. J. Davidson, K. R. Scherer & H. H. Goldsmith (Eds.), *Handbook of affective sciences* (pp. 852-870). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harris, D. G., Quinn, K., Dahi, S., Burdorf, L., Azimzadeh, A. M., & Pierson, R. N., III. (2014). Lung xenotransplantation: Recent progress and current status. *Xenotransplantation*, 21(6), 496-506.

- 1
2
3
4 Henderson, A. J. Z., Landolt, M. A., McDonald, M. F., Barrable, W. M., Soos, J. G.,
5
6 Gourlay, W., ... Landsbery, D. N. (2003). The living anonymous kidney donor:
7
8 Lunatic or saint? *American Journal of Transplantation*, *3*(2), 203-213.
9
10
11 Hill, E. M. (2016). Posthumous organ donation attitudes, intentions to donate, and
12
13 organ donor status: Examining the role of the big five personality dimensions and
14
15 altruism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *88*, 182-186.
16
17
18
19 Holtzman, S., Clarke, H. A., McCluskey, S. A., Turcotte, K., Grant, D., & Katz, J.
20
21 (2014). Acute and chronic postsurgical pain after living liver donation: Incidence
22
23 and predictors. *Liver Transplantation*, *20*(11), 1336-1346.
24
25
26
27 Hryhorowicz, M., Zeyland, J., Slomski, R., & Lipinski, D. (2017). Genetically
28
29 modified pigs as organ donors for xenotransplantation. *Molecular Biotechnology*,
30
31 *59*(9), 435-444.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38 Hyde, M. K., Knowles, S. R., & White, K. M. (2013). Donating blood and organs:
39
40 using an extended theory of planned behavior perspective to identify similarities
41
42 and differences in individual motivations to donate. *Health Education Research*,
43
44 *28*(6), 1092–1104.
45
46
47
48 James, R. C., & Matthews, D. E. (1993). The donation cycles: A framework for the
49
50 measurement and analysis of blood donor and return behaviour. *Vox Sangninis*,
51
52 *64*(1), 37-42.
53
54
55
56 Johnson, E. J., & Goldstein, D. G. (2003). Do defaults save
57
58 lives? *Science*, *302*(5649), 1338-1339.
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Kopfman, J. E., & Smith, S. W. (1996). Understanding the audiences of a health
5
6 communication campaign: A discriminant analysis of potential organ donors
7
8 based on intent to donate. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 24(1),
9
10 33-49.
11
12
13
14 Lacetera, N., Macis, M., & Slonim, R. (2013). Economic rewards to motivate blood
15
16 donation. *Science*, 340(6135), 927-928.
17
18
19 Lacetera, N., Macis, M., & Slonim, R. (2014). Rewarding volunteers: A field
20
21 experiment. *Management Science*, 60(5), 1107-1129.
22
23
24 Landry, D. W. (2006). Voluntary reciprocal altruism: A novel strategy to encourage
25
26 deceased organ donation. *Kidney International*, 69(6), 957-959.
27
28
29 Lennerling, A., Forsberg, A., & Nyberg, G. (2003). Becoming a living donor.
30
31 *Transplantation*, 76(8), 1243-1247.
32
33
34
35 Loewenstein, G. (2005). Hot-cold empathy gaps on medical decision making. *Health*
36
37 *Psychology*, 24(4S), S49-S56.
38
39
40 Lucky, T. T. A, Seed, C. R., Keller, A., Lee, J., McDonald, A., Ismay, S., ... Wilson,
41
42 D.P. (2013). Trends in transfusion-transmissible infections among Australian
43
44 blood donors from 2005 to 2010. *Transfusion*, 53(11), 2751-2762.
45
46
47
48 Lwin, M. O., Williams, J. D., & Lan, L. L. (2002). Social marketing initiatives: National
49
50 kidney foundation's organ donation programs in Singapore. *Journal of Public*
51
52 *Policy & Marketing*, 21(1), 66-77.
53
54
55
56 Ma, L., Tunney, R., & Ferguson, E. (2017). Does gratitude enhance prosociality: A
57
58 meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 143(6), 601-635.
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 MacKay, D., & Robinson, A. (2016). The ethics of organ donator registration policies:
5
6 Nudges and respect for autonomy. *American Journal of Bioethics*, 16(11), 3-12.
7
8
9 Maple, H., Chilcot, J., Burnapp, L., Gibbs, P., Santhouse, A., Norton, S., ... Mamode,
10
11 N. (2014). Motivation, outcomes and characteristics of unspecified (nondirected
12
13 altruistic) kidney donors in the United Kingdom. *Transplantation*, 98(11), 1182-
14
15
16
17 1189.
18
19
20 Martin, K. D., Roter, D. L., Beach, M. C., Carson, K. A., & Cooper, L. A. (2013).
21
22 Physician communication behaviour and trust among black and white patients
23
24 with hypertension. *Medical Care*, 51(2), 151-157.
25
26
27
28 Masser, B. M., France C. R., Himawan, L. K., Hyde, M. K., & Smith, G. (*in press*).
29
30 The impact of the context and recruitment materials on nondonors' willingness to
31
32 donate blood. *Transfusion*. doi: 10.1111/trf.13805
33
34
35
36 Masser, B. M., White, K. M., Hyde, M. K., Terry, D. J., & Robinson, N. G. (2009).
37
38 Predicting blood donation intentions and behavior among Australian blood
39
40 donors: Testing an extended Theory of Planned Behavior model. *Transfusion*,
41
42
43 49(2), 320-329.
44
45
46
47 Matesanz, R., Gil, B. D., Coll, E., Mahillo, B., & Marazuela, R. (2017). How Spain
48
49 reached 40 deceased organ donors per million population. *American Journal of*
50
51 *Transplantation*, 17(6), 1447-1454.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

- 1
2
3
4 McCartney, M. (2017). When organ donation isn't a donation. *British Medical*
5
6 *Journal*, 356, 1028.
7
8
9 Meade, M. A., France, C. R., & Peterson, L. M. (1996). Predicting vasovagal
10
11 reactions in volunteer blood donors. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 40(5),
12
13 495-501.
14
15
16 Mellstrom, C., & Johannesson, M. (2008). Crowding out in blood donation: Was
17
18 Titmuss right? *Journal of European Economic Association*, 6(4), 845-863.
19
20
21
22 Miller, J., Currie, S. & O'Carroll, R. E. (2018). 'What if I'm not dead?': Myth-busting
23
24 and organ donation. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, (in press).
25
26
27 Moorlock, G., Ives, J., & Draper, H. (2014). Altruism in organ donation: An
28
29 unnecessary requirement? *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 40(2), 134–138.
30
31
32
33 Morgan, S. E., Miller, J., & Arasaratnam, L. A. (2002). Signing cards, saving lives: An
34
35 evaluation of the worksite organ donation promotion project. *Communication*
36
37 *Monographs*, 69(3), 253-273.
38
39
40
41 Morgan, S. E., Stephenson, M. T., Harrison, T. R., Afifi, W. A., & Long, S. D. (2008).
42
43 Facts versus 'feelings': How rational is the decision to become an organ donor?
44
45 *Journal of Health Psychology*, 13(5), 644–658.
46
47
48
49 Moseley, A., & Stoker, G. (2015). Putting public policy defaults to the test: The case
50
51 of organ donor registration. *International Public Management Journal*, 18(2),
52
53 246-264.
54
55
56
57 Myhal, G., Godin, G., & Dubuc, S. (2017). The relative efficacy of three interventions
58
59 to favour return to give blood. *Blood Transfusion*, 15(5), 398-404.
60

1
2
3
4 Nagal, T. (1970). *The possibility of altruism*. London, UK: Oxford University Press..

5
6
7 National Health Service Blood and Transplant [NHSBT]. *Blood 2020: A strategy for*

8
9 *the blood supply in England and North Wales*. Retrieved from:

10
11
12 [https://nhsbt.dbe.blob.core.windows.net/umbraco-assets-corp/1652/blood-](https://nhsbt.dbe.blob.core.windows.net/umbraco-assets-corp/1652/blood-2020.pdf)
13
14
15 2020.pdf

16
17 National Health Service Blood and Transplant [NHSBT]. (2012-2013). *Annual*

18
19 *Review 2012-13: Saving and improving lives*. Retrieved from:

20
21
22 [https://nhsbt.dbe.blob.core.windows.net/umbraco-assets-](https://nhsbt.dbe.blob.core.windows.net/umbraco-assets-corp/1881/nhsbt_annual_review_2012-13.pdf)
23
24
25 corp/1881/nhsbt_annual_review_2012-13.pdf

26
27 National Health Service Blood and Transplant [NHSBT]. (2016). Retrieved from:

28
29
30 <https://www.organdonation.nhs.uk/>

31
32 National Health Service Blood and Transplant [NHSBT]. (2017). *ODT performance*

33
34
35 *report: September 2017*. Retrieved from:

36
37
38 [https://nhsbt.dbe.blob.core.windows.net/umbraco-assets-corp/5074/odt-smt-](https://nhsbt.dbe.blob.core.windows.net/umbraco-assets-corp/5074/odt-smt-monthly-performance-report-201709-website-version.pdf)
39
40
41 monthly-performance-report-201709-website-version.pdf

42
43 National Health Service Blood and Transplant [NHSBT]. (2017-2018). *Organ*

44
45 *donation and transplantation: Activity report 2017/2018*. Retrieved from:

46
47
48 [https://nhsbt.dbe.blob.core.windows.net/umbraco-assets/1848/transplant-activity-](https://nhsbt.dbe.blob.core.windows.net/umbraco-assets/1848/transplant-activity-report-2017-2018.pdf)
49
50
51 report-2017-2018.pdf

52
53 Neuberger, J., Trotter, P., & Stratton, R. (2017). Organ transplantation rates in the

54
55
56 UK, *British Medical Journal*, 359, j5218.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Newman, B. H., Tommolino, E., Andreozzi, C., Joychan, S., Pocedic, J., &
5
6 Herringhausen, J. (2006). The effect of a 16-oz. water drink on blood donor
7
8 reaction rates in high-school students: Two independent studies combined.
9
10
11 *Transfusion*, 46, S80A.
- 12
13
14 Nijkamp, M. D., Hollestelle, M. L., Zeegers, M. P., van den Borne, B., & Reubsaet, A.
15
16 (2008). To be(come) or not to be(come) an organ donor, that's the question: A
17
18 meta-analysis of determinant and intervention studies, *Health Psychology*
19
20
21 *Review*, 2(1), 20-40.
- 22
23
24
25 Nowak, M. A. (2006). Five rules for the evolution of cooperation. *Science*, 314(5805),
26
27 1560-1563.
- 28
29
30 O'Carroll, R. E., Dryden, J., Hamilton-Barclay, T., & Ferguson, E. (2011a).
31
32 Anticipated regret and organ donor registration--a pilot study. *Health Psychology*,
33
34 30(5), 661-664.
- 35
36
37
38 O'Carroll, R. E., Foster, C., McGeechan, G., Sandford, K., & Ferguson, E. (2011b).
39
40 The "ick" factor, anticipated regret, and willingness to become an organ donor.
41
42 *Health Psychology*, 30(2), 236-245.
- 43
44
45
46 O'Carroll, R. E., Haddow, L., Foley, L., & Quigley, J. (2017). If you needed an organ
47
48 transplant would you have one? The effect of reciprocity priming and mode of
49
50 delivery on organ donor registration intentions and behaviour. *British Journal of*
51
52 *Health Psychology*, 22(3), 577-588.
- 53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 O'Carroll, R. E, Shepherd, L., Hayes, P. C., & Ferguson, E. (2016). Anticipated
5
6 regret and organ donor registration: A randomised controlled trial. *Health*
7
8
9 *Psychology, 35*(11), 1169-1177.
10
11
12 O'Carroll, R. E., Quigley, J., & Miller, C. B. (2018). The effect of reciprocity priming
13
14 on organ donor registration intentions and behavior. *Annals of Behavioral*
15
16 *Medicine, 23*, R827.
17
18
19 Omoto, A. M., & Snyder, M. (1995). Sustained helping without obligation: Motivation,
20
21 longevity of service, and perceived attitude change among AIDS volunteers.
22
23 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*(4), 671-686.
24
25
26
27 Ost, L. G., & Sterner, U. (1987). Applied tension. A specific behavioral method for
28
29 treatment of blood phobia. *Behaviour Research and Therapy, 25*(1), 25-29.
30
31
32
33 Paolo, G. (2013). *Quando uno vale due: Psocologia della donazione di sangue* (pp.
34
35 1-88). Milan, Italy: Editrice La Scuola.
36
37
38 Paolo , G., Alfieri, S., Marta, E., & Saturni, V. (2015). New donors, loyal donors, and
39
40 regular donors: Which motivations sustain blood donation? *Transfusion and*
41
42 *Apheresis Science, 52*(3), 339-344.
43
44
45
46 Pedder-Jones, C., Papadopoulos, C., & Randhawa, G. (2017). Primary care
47
48 interventions to encourage organ donation registration: A systematic review.
49
50 *Transplantation Reviews, 31*(4), 268-275.
51
52
53
54 Piliavin, J. A., & Callero, P. L. (1991). *The Johns Hopkins series in contemporary*
55
56 *medicine and public health. Giving blood: The development of an altruistic*
57
58 *identity*. Baltimore, MD, US: Johns Hopkins University Press.
59
60

1
2
3
4 Prochaska, J. O. & DiClemente, C. C. (1982). Transtheoretical therapy: Toward a
5
6 more integrative model of change. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and*
7
8
9 *Practise, 19*(3), 276-288.

10
11 Prochaska, J. O., DiClemente, C. C. & Norcross, J. C. (1992). In search of how
12
13 people change: Applications to addictive behaviors. *American Psychologist,*
14
15
16
17 *47*(9), 1102-1114.

18
19 Quick, B. L., Anker, A. E., Feeley, T. H., & Morgan, S. E. (2016). An examination of
20
21 three theoretical models to explain the organ donation attitude–registration
22
23 discrepancy among mature adults. *Health Communication, 31*(3) 265-274.

24
25 Reinders, M. E. J., van Kooten, C., Rabelink, T. J., & de Fijter, J. W. (2018).
26
27 Mesenchymal stromal cell therapy for solid organ transplantation.
28
29
30
31
32
33 *Transplantation, 102*(1), 35-43.

34
35 Renner, S., Lindenmeier, J., Tscheulin, D. K., & Drevs, F. (2013). Guilt appeals and
36
37 prosocial behaviour: An experimental analysis of the effects of anticipatory
38
39 versus reactive guilt appeals on the effectiveness of blood donor appeals.
40
41
42
43
44 *Journal of Nonprofit and Public Sector Marketing, 25*(3), 237-255.

45
46 Rithalia, A., Myers, L., & Sowden, A. (2009). Impact of presumed consent for organ
47
48 donation on donation rates: A systemic review. *British Medical Journal Open,*
49
50
51
52 *338*, a3162.

53 Robbins, M.L., Paiva, A.L., Amoyal, N. R., = Brick, L., Kessler, D. A., Burditt, C.,
54
55 Caltabiano, M., & Shaz, B. H. (2015) Acceptability and Feasibility of Culturally
56
57 Tailored Internet-Delivered Intervention to Promote Blood donation in Blacks. *Health*
58
59
60 *Promotion Practice, 16*, (2) 227-235

- 1
2
3
4 Rodrigue, J. R., Cornell, D. L., & Howard, R. J. (2008). The instability of organ
5
6 donation decisions by next-of-kin and factors that predict it. *American Journal of*
7
8 *Transplant*, *8*(12), 2661-2667.
9
10
11 Roff, S. R. (2007). Self-interest, self-abnegation and self-esteem: Towards a new
12
13 moral economy of non-directed kidney donation. *Journal of Medical Ethics*,
14
15 *33*(8), 437-441.
16
17
18 Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of
19
20 intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*,
21
22 *55*(1), 68-78.
23
24
25 Saito, K. (2015). Impure altruism and impure selfishness. *Journal of Economic*
26
27 *Theory*, *158*(Part A), 336-370.
28
29
30 Sallis, A., Harper, H., & Sanders, M. (2018). Effect of persuasive messages on
31
32 national health service organ donor registrations: A pragmatic quasi-randomised
33
34 controlled trial with one million UK road taxpayers. *Trials*, *19*(1), 513.
35
36
37
38 Salonen, J. T., Tuomainen, T. P., Salonen, R., Lakka, T. A., & Nyysönen, K. (1998).
39
40 Donation of blood is associated with reduced risk of myocardial infarction. The
41
42 Kuopio Ischaemic Heart Disease Risk Factor Study. *American Journal of*
43
44 *Epidemiology*, *148*(5), 445-451.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51 Sass, R. G. (2012). Toward a more stable blood supply: Charitable incentives,
52
53 donation rates and the experience of September 11. *The American Journal of*
54
55 *Bioethics*, *13*(6), 38-45.
56
57
58
59
60

Schreiber, G. B., Sharma, U. K., Wright, D. J., Glynn, S. A., Ownby, H. E., Tu, Y., ...

Gitcher R. Retrovirus Epidemiology Donor Study. (2005). First-year donation patterns predict long-term commitment for first time donors. *Vox Sanguinis*, *88*(2), 114-121.

Scott, E. M., Greenwood, J. P., Gilbey, S. G., Stoker, J. B., & Mary, D.A. (2001).

Water ingestion increases sympathetic vasoconstrictor discharge in normal human subjects. *Clinical Science*, *100*(3), 335-342.

Sharp, C., & Randhawa, G. (2014). Altruism, a gift giving and reciprocity in organ

donation: A review of cultural perspectives and challenges of the concepts.

Transplantation Review, *28*(4), 163-168.

Shaz, B. H., Zimring, J. C., Demmons, D. G., & Hillyer, C. D. (2008). Blood Donation

and blood Transfusion: Special Considerations for African Americans.

Transfusion Medicine Review, *22*(3), 202-214.

Sheeran, P., Godin, G., Conner, M., & Germain, M. (2017). Paradoxical effects of

experience: Past behavior both strengthens and weakens the intention-behavior relationship. *Journal of the Association for Consumer Research*, *2*, 309-318.

Shepherd, L., O'Carroll R. E., & Ferguson, E. (2014). An international comparison of

deceased and living organ donation rates in opt-in and opt-out systems: A panel study. *BMC Medicine*, *12*(1), 131-145.

Siegel, J. T., Alvaro, E. M., Crano, W. D., Gonzalez, A. V., Tang, J. C., & Jones, S.

P. (2010). Passive-positive organ donor registration behavior: A mixed method assessment of the IIFF Model. *Psychology, Health and Medicine*, *15*(2), 198–209.

- 1
2
3
4 Smith, K. D., Keating, J. P., & Stotland, E. (1989). Altruism reconsidered: The effects
5
6 of denying feedback on a victim's status to empathically witness. *Journal of*
7
8 *Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(4), 641-650
9
10
11 Sober, E., & Wilson, D. S. (1998). *Unto others: The evolution and psychology of*
12
13 *unselfish behavior*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
14
15
16
17 Steele, W. R., Schreiber, G. B., Guiltinan, A., Nass, C., Glynn, S. A., Wright, D. J.,
18
19 ... Garratty, G. Retrovirus Epidemiology Donor Study. (2008). The role of
20
21 altruistic behavior, empathic concern, and social responsibility motivation in
22
23 blood donor behaviour. *Transfusion*, 48(1), 43-54.
24
25
26
27 Steinberg, D. (2010). Altruism in medicine: Its definition, nature and dilemmas.
28
29 *Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics*, 19(2), 249-257.
30
31
32
33 Sykes, M., & Sachs, D. H. (2001). Mixed chimerism. *Philosophical transactions of*
34
35 *the Royal Society of London Series B-Biological Sciences*. 356(1409), 707-726.
36
37
38 Thaler, R. H. & Sunstein, C. R. (2009) *Nudge: Improving decisions about health,*
39
40 *wealth, and happiness*. Yale University Press, New Haven: CT.
41
42
43 Thijsen, A., Gemelli, CN., Davison, TE., O'Donovan, J., Bell, B., & Masser, Barbara
44 (2018) Does using applied muscle tension at strategic time points during donation reduce
45 phlebotomist- and donor-reported vasovagal reaction rates? A three-armed randomized
46 controlled trial. *Transfusion*, 58, 2352-2359. DOI: 10.1111/trf.14940
47
48
49
50 Titmuss, R. M. (1970). *The gift relationship: From human blood to social policy*.
51
52
53 Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2007). The psychological structure of pride: A tale of
54
55 two facets. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92(3), 506-525.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Trafimow, D., & Sheeran, P. (1998). Some test of the distinction between cognitive
5
6 and affective beliefs. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *34*(4), 378-397.
7
8
9 Tran, N. Y. L., Charbonneau, J., & Valderrama-Benitez, V. (2013). Blood donation
10
11 practices, motivations and beliefs in Montreal's block communities; The modern
12
13 gift under a new light. *Ethnicity and Health*, *18*(6), 508-529.
14
15
16 Ugur, Z. B. (2015). Does presumed consent save lives? Evidence from
17
18 Europe. *Health Economics*, *24*(12), 1560-1572.
19
20
21 Ullum, H., Rostgaard, K., Kamper-Jørgensen, M., Reilly, M., Melbye, M., Nyrén O.,
22
23 ... Hjalgrim, H. (2015). Blood donation and blood donor mortality after
24
25 adjustment for a healthy donor effect. *Transfusion*, *55*(10), 2479-2485.
26
27
28 van Dongen, A. (2015). Easy come, easy go. Retention of blood donors. *Transfusion*
29
30 *Medicine*, *25*, 227-233. DOI: 10.1111/tme.12249
31
32
33 van Dongen, A., Mews, M., de Kort, W. L. A. M., & Wagenmans, E. (2016). Missing
34
35 minorities: A survey based description of the current state of minority blood
36
37 donor recruitment across 23 countries. *Diversity and Equality in Health and*
38
39 *Care*, *13*(1), 138-145.
40
41
42
43 Vahidnia, F., Hirschlr, N.V., Agapova, M., Chinn, A., Busch, M. P. & Custer, B.
44
45 (2013). Cancer incidence and mortality in a cohort of US blood donors: A 20-
46
47 year study. *Journal of Cancer Epidemiology*, Article ID 814842.
48
49
50
51 van Dalen, H. P., & Henkens, K. (2014). Comparing the effects if defaults in organ
52
53 donation systems. *Social Science and Medicine*, *106*, 137-142.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Viar, M. A., Etzel, E. N., Ciesielski, B. G., & Olatunji, B. O. (2010). Disgust, anxiety,
5
6 and vasovagal syncope sensations: A comparison of injection-fearful and
7
8 nonfearful blood donors. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 24(8), 941-945.

9
10
11 Vincent, A., & Logan, L. (2012). Consent for organ donation. *British Journal of*
12
13 *Anaesthesia*, 108(1), i80-i87.

14
15
16
17 Weiner, B. (1985). An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion.
18
19 *Psychological Review*, 92(4), 548 –573.

20
21
22 Wellesley, H (2011). A nudge in the right direction for organ donation-but is it
23
24 enough? *British Medical Journal*, 343, d5726.

25
26
27 Wevers, A., Wigboldus, D. H., van den Hurk, K., van Baaren, R., Veldhuizen, I. J.
28
29 (2015). Increasing first-time blood donation of newly registered donors using
30
31 implementation intentions and explicit commitment techniques. *Vox Sanguinis*,
32
33 108(1), 18-26.

34
35
36
37 White, K. M., Poulsen, B. E., & Hyde, M. K. (2017). Identity sand personality
38
39 influences on donating money, time and blood. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector*
40
41 *Quarterly*, 46, 371-394.

42
43
44
45 Willis, B. H., & Quigley, M. (2014). Opt-out organ donation: On evidence and public
46
47 policy. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 107(2), 56-60.

48
49
50
51 Yamada, K., Sykes, M., & Sachs, D. (2017). Tolerance in xenotransplantation.
52
53 *Current Opinion in Organ Transplantation*, 22(6), 522-528.

1
2
3
4 Zou, S., Stramer, S. L., & Dodd, R. Y. (2012). Donor testing and risk: Current
5
6 prevalence, incidence, and residual risk of transfusion-transmissible agents in
7
8 US allogenic donations. *Transfusion Medicine Reviews*, 26(2), 119-128.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Behavioural characteristics of Blood and Organ Donation

	Whole Blood Donation	Organ Donation		
		Posthumou s	Living- familial (directed)	Living – stranger (non- directive/altruistic)
Voluntary	√	√	√	√
Anonymous	√	√		√
Single Act	√	√	√	√
Repeat Act	√	√		√
Costly: Self	√		√	√
Costless: Self		√		
Benefit: Stranger	√	√		√
Benefit: Relative			√	
Genetic Similarity	√	√	√	√
Phenotypic Similarity		√	√	√
Feedback	√		√	
Free-riding	√	√		
Obligation felt by recipient			√	
Surrogate Decisions		√		

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 2. Links Between Volunteer Function, Self-Determination Theory-motivations and Mechanisms of Altruism (see also Ferguson & Lawrence 2015)

Volunteer Functions	Definition	Self-Determination Theory (SDT) Motivations	Link to MOA
<i>Values</i>	Volunteers can express values of altruism/humanitarianism	Extrinsic: Identified regulation	Pure Altruism
<i>Understanding</i>	Volunteer can learn new skills that they would not normally have the chance to exercise		Self-Interest
<i>Social</i>	Volunteer in activities that important others view favourably and strengthen social bonds		Reputation Building & Gratitude
<i>Career</i>	Volunteering enhances career related goals	Extrinsic: external regulation	Self-Interest
<i>Protective</i>	Volunteering is ego protecting by reducing feelings of guilt from being better off	Extrinsic: Introjected regulation	Inequality Aversion
<i>Enhancement</i>	Volunteers grow personally and emotionally	Intrinsic regulation	Warm-Glow

Table 3. Advantages and Disadvantages of an opt-out deceased organ donor registration system.

	<i>Evidence</i>	<i>Reference</i>
Advantages		
Under opt-out more organs for transplantation are available	Epidemiological evidence that countries with opt-out defaults, on average, to have higher transplantation rates than opt-in countries	Bilgel, 2012; Johnson & Goldstein, 2003; Rithalia, Myers & Snowden, 2009; Ugur, 2015; Shepherd, O'Carroll & Ferguson, 2014
Power of defaults	The default option is on average selected by the majority	Thaler & Sunstein, 2009
Positive public attitude	Members of the general public are positively disposed to an opt-out system	
Disadvantages		
High donation variance: The range of donation/transplantation rate varies widely by opt-out and opt-in countries	For example, Sweden, Luxembourg and Bulgaria have opt-out default since 1996 yet remain lowly-ranked countries for organ donation within Europe, and lower than many opt-in countries such as England	Shepherd, O'Carroll & Ferguson, 2014
Negative impact on living donations	Under opt-out default the number of living donations goes down. This is especially the case for non-directed living donations	Fernandez, Howard & Krose, 2013; Shepherd, O'Carroll & Ferguson, 2014
Individual presumed content is not interpretable	<i>Passively</i> not opting-out (deemed consent) does not provide any information about a person's true preferences to be a posthumous organ donor. People may not opt-out because; they want to be a donor, they forgot to, inertia, or lack of effort. Thus, there may be people who do not want to be a donor who are on the register by 'default'. This lack of certainty is problematic	Beshears, Choi, Laibson & Madrian, 2008

1
2
3
4 when it comes to asking for relatives' consent and this group will
5 reflect a large percentage of donors registered under an opt-out
6 system
7

8 Moral concerns

9 There are public concerns around medical mistrust and
10 reactance to State "ownership" of organs and lack of personal
11 autonomy
12

Csillag, 1998 ; MacKay & Robinson, 2016

13 'Lone wolf effects' – a reciprocal
14 effect where by people follow the
15 lead of a person opting-out and
16 follow suit and this is a stronger
17 effect than following the lead of
18 someone opting in ('A good
19 Shepherd Effect')

20 In the world of social media there is evidence that updating
21 Facebook status about being an organ donor greatly enhances
22 registration under an opt-in system. Game theoretic analyses
23 and data shows that an opposite and more powerful 'lone wolf
24 effect' emerges under opt-out. Here when people share
25 information that they have decided to opt-out, it acts as a strong
26 social force resulting in others rapidly following suit

Ferguson, Shichman & Tan, 2018

27 Causal Status

28 The cross-sectional nature of the epidemiological evidence
29 means that it is not possible to infer any real causal role to a
30 change to opt-out. While Shepherd et al. (2014) used
31 instrumental variable to infer a causal role of an opt-out system,
32 this does not allow for an estimate the direct causal role the
33 dynamic change from opt-in to opt-out and visa-versa.

34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000