Public engagement and crowdfunding for health research: A global qualitative evidence synthesis and TDR pilot

Eneyi E. Kpokiri[1*] Clarisse Sri-Pathmanathan[1*] Priyanka Shrestha[1,2], Sana Navaid[3], Teerawat Wiwatpanit[4], Asha Wijegunawardana[5], Mahmud Ali Umar[6], Debra Jackson[7], Jackeline Alger[8], Meghan A. Bohren[9], Mia Hoole[10], Meredith Labarda[11], Noel Juban[11], Pascal Launois[12], Beatrice Halpaap[12], Weiming Tang[13], Joseph D. Tucker[1,3]

[1] Clinical Research Department, Faculty of Infectious and Tropical Diseases, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, United Kingdom
[2] Department of Global Health, University of Washington, Seattle, USA
[3] Institute of Global Health and Infectious Diseases, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, USA
[4] National Center for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology, National Science and Technology Development Agency, Pathum Thani, Thailand
[5] Department of Bioprocess Technology, Faculty of Technology, Rajarata University of Sri Lanka
[6] Department of Biology, Kano University of Science and Technology, Wudil, Kano State, Nigeria
[7] Faculty of Epidemiology and Population Health, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, United Kingdom
[8] Department of Clinical Laboratory, Hospital Escuela; Faculty of Medical Sciences, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Honduras; and Instituto de Enfermedades Infecciosas Parasitología Antonio Vidal; Tegucigalpa, Honduras
[9] Gender and Women's Health Unit, Centre for Health Equity, Melbourne School of Population and Global Health, University of Melbourne, Carlton, VIC, Australia
[10] Because Stories, UK
[11] Department of Medicine, University of the Philippines, Manila-School of Health Sciences, Leyte, Philippines
[12] TDR, The Special Programme for Research and Training in Tropical Diseases co-sponsored by UNICEF, UNDP, the World Bank and WHO, hosted at WHO, Geneva, Switzerland
[13] University of North Carolina Project-China, Guangzhou, China

*These authors contributed equally to this work

Correspondence to Dr. Eneyi E. Kpokiri, eneyi.kpokiri@lshtm.ac.uk
Clinical Research Department, Faculty of Infectious and Tropical Diseases, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, United Kingdom

Abstract

Background: Many exceptional researchers, especially in low-and middle-income countries (LMICs) face structural disadvantages in applying for research grants. Public engagement and crowdfunding make it possible for researchers to directly seek support from the public, by engaging large groups of people who make small contributions to support a project. This manuscript synthesizes global qualitative evidence and describes a WHO-TDR public engagement and crowdfunding pilot programme.

Methods: We searched six databases for primary qualitative and mixed-methods research. We used a thematic synthesis approach and assessed our findings using the GRADE-CERQual approach. A crowdfunding approach to finance research studies was tested through a pilot programme, with a focus on infectious diseases of poverty. TDR Global mentors provided support for five finalists to engage the public and develop crowdfunding campaigns.

Results: Nine studies were included in the qualitative evidence synthesis. Themes were developed into seven key findings, including the need for extensive public engagement, the potential for crowdfunding to open a communication channel between researchers and the public, key correlates of crowdfunding success and the risks of crowdfunding health research with associated mitigation strategies. The TDR pilot programme received 121 entries from 37 countries. Five LMIC-based researchers received training and joined a working group. Three researchers launched their crowdfunding campaigns, met their goals and received substantial monetary and non-monetary contributions.

Conclusion: Public engagement provides a foundation for effective crowdfunding for health research. Our evidence synthesis and pilot data provide practical strategies for LMIC researchers to engage the public and conduct crowdfunding campaigns.

Keywords: Public engagement; crowdfunding

Introduction

Crowdfunding is increasingly used to support public health and medical research.[1] Crowdfunding is the process of engaging large groups of people who make small contributions to support a project (e.g., a research study).[2 3 4] It provides a method for researchers to engage with the public to spur interest and cultivate local partnerships.[5] From a public perspective, crowdfunding provides a way for people to invest in locally important topics and directly contribute to science. Research, internet metrics, and fundraising data all suggest that public engagement is essential for crowdfunding.[5 6] We define public engagement in research as a two-way communication between the researcher and the public for mutual benefit.

Crowdfunding has been used to support research studies in many high-income countries.[7-9] One COVID-19 crowdfunding campaign raised one million euros for a clinical trial.[10] Crowdfunding platforms focus on serving researchers in high-income countries (HICs).[11,12 13] However, there is a substantial need for crowdfunding in low and middle-income countries (LMICs).[14] LMIC researchers are often disadvantaged in applying for research grants compared to their counterparts in HICs.[15] LMIC institutions sometimes lack the administrative support necessary to apply for research grants or are not eligible to apply for research grants. Funder policies may inadvertently favour researchers from HICs.[16] More local funding for research is one step to disrupt these unequal relationships.[17] In addition, local researchers working in their own communities may have a greater likelihood of transitioning to locally financed public programs compared to foreign-funded research.

LMIC researchers can raise money for their research directly through crowdfunding. Crowdfunding is the process of engaging large groups of people who make small contributions to support a research study. We conducted a scoping review and qualitative evidence synthesis to identify practical suggestions for research crowdfunding. In addition, we organised a TDR Global pilot programme including an open call to identify and support LMIC researchers to crowdfund for their own research. TDR, the Special Programme for Research and Training in Tropical Diseases is based at the World Health Organization (WHO) and is co-sponsored by the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the World Bank and WHO. TDR Global is a

community of passionate scientists and experts working to support global research efforts on infectious diseases of poverty. This manuscript synthesizes global qualitative evidence and describes a TDR pilot focused on public engagement and crowdfunding for research. The overall aim is to expand the literature by summarising the available evidence on crowdfunding for research and by assessing its feasibility in LMIC settings

Methods

This paper describes our scoping review, qualitative evidence synthesis, and TDR Global pilot programme. The same working groups involved in these processes also created a WHO-TDR practical guide on public engagement and crowdfunding. This practical guide provides practical advice on public engagement and crowdfunding resulting from an adapted Delphi method.[18]

Scoping review and qualitative evidence synthesis

The purpose of this scoping review was to synthesize evidence on practical tools for crowdfunding for health research and determine barriers and facilitators of crowdfunding. We used Arksey and O'Malley's five-step framework for conducting scoping reviews.[19-21] We followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) for article selection and reporting.[22-24] We chose to conduct a scoping review to map the limited evidence on crowdfunding for health research and to identify implications for policy and practice. This review was registered on the Open Science Framework platform (10.17605/OSF.IO/E7QH5).[25]

We searched PubMed, EMBASE, Web of Science, Scopus, Global Health and Google Scholar. We used the key terms [Crowdfunding or public funded or public contribution] OR [Public engagement or Public involvement or community participation or community engagement] AND [Research]. We also searched registers for grey literature including theses and dissertations, article pre-prints, conference proceedings, and the reference lists of relevant manuscripts. Search outputs from the databases were combined and deduplicated.

Search outputs were screened by title, then abstract and finally full text. Our inclusion criteria were limited to studies reporting crowdfunding in health research and published the English language, between 1st January 2000 and 23rd March 2021. The search was updated on 22nd

September 2021. We included primary qualitative and mixed-methods studies (where qualitative data were able to be extracted), while purely quantitative studies, editorials, guides and reviews without any qualitative analysis were excluded. Two independent reviewers (EK and CS) screened studies for inclusion and discordant studies were discussed within the review team. EK and CS extracted relevant data from included studies, including study objectives, participants, study setting, study design, data collection methods, qualitative themes, main study findings and where possible, correlates of crowdfunding success.
We also independently assessed methodological limitations using the CASP tool and completed checklists for each included study. We assessed all the studies included for methodological limitations using the CASP tool, including the following domains validity, relevance, adequacy, methodological limitations and potential risk for bias.[26]

We used a thematic synthesis approach[27] for data analysis, which involved familiarization with the data, coding the primary studies, developing themes, and using these themes to generate further understanding and hypotheses. We used the GRADE-CERQual (Confidence in the Evidence from Reviews of Qualitative research) approach to assess confidence in each qualitative review finding, based on four key components: methodological limitations, coherence of the review finding, adequacy of the data, and relevance of the included studies to the review question.[28-33] After assessing each component, we made an overall consensus judgement about confidence in the evidence as high, moderate, low or very low. The CERQual approach has been applied to qualitative and mixed-methods systematic reviews in a number of WHO global guidelines because it provides high levels of transparency and precision.[28]

The pilot programme

In partnership with TDR Global, we organised a crowdfunding pilot programme. The main objective of this pilot programme was to test the effectiveness of public engagement and crowdfunding as a mean to finance health research in LMICs. This pilot had three stages: an open call to solicit LMIC researchers interested in public engagement and crowdfunding; a capacity building workshop to develop skills on public engagement and crowdfunding; mentorship and support for finalists to organize public engagement and crowdfunding activities (Figure 1).

The open call

The crowdsourcing open call was designed using the framework provided by the TDR/SESH/SIHI Practical Guide on Crowdsourcing in Health and Health Research.[34] Our open call was conducted in five steps, including convening a steering committee, promoting for community participation and engagement, receiving and judging contributions, recognising the finalists and implementing solutions. Detailed information on the process of these stages is described in Appendix I. We invited stakeholders in public engagement and crowdfunding to join the steering committee. The crowdfunding call had 15 confirmed steering committee members (nine women and six men). All members of the steering committee had LMIC experience in crowdfunding for research or public engagement. The steering committee met monthly via a one-hour videoconference to provide guidance on the open call. The open call accepted submissions over six weeks. We promoted the call for submissions using infographics shared on social media channels and emails. At the end of the call, all submissions were screened for eligibility by the research team and eligible entries were sent to judges. We invited independent judges from the WHO TDR Global network to review submissions. Criteria for evaluation included compelling science, capacity for public engagement, and personal connection to the infectious disease topic. A total of 592 people volunteered to serve as judges and 47 were selected to review submissions. We prioritized TDR Global members and research experience in LMICs for selecting the volunteer judges.

Capacity building

The finalists were recognised through a TDR announcement and supported to attend a capacity building workshop in Geneva. The one and half day workshop included 1:1 mentoring from TDR Global members, presentations on public engagement and crowdfunding (Appendix II), and group discussions about how to enhance public engagement and crowdfunding in LMICs. After the workshop, a monthly working group composed of finalists and mentors reported on public engagement progress and preparations for crowdfunding.

Public Engagement

Given the importance of public feedback in this process, we incorporated public input at several stages. In March 2021, a working group and an end-user group were invited to comment on the first draft of this manuscript and suggest areas for improvement. An external peer review by one person at TDR Global was completed in September 2021. An open call

was then organised to gather a wide range of external feedback from individuals interested in crowdfunding across different settings from multiple research networks, including authors of the papers included in this review. A total of six people in LMICs responded to the open call and provided feedback. All members of both groups received a revised version of the manuscript and the associated practical guide.

Results

Qualitative evidence synthesis

This qualitative evidence synthesis summarizes evidence from published literature on facilitators and barriers of crowdfunding for research. Our initial electronic searches yielded 498 citations after deduplication (Figure 2). We assessed articles through title screening, abstract and finally through full-text screening. After exclusions, six papers from the database search met our inclusion criteria. An additional three studies were retrieved from reference lists and a grey literature search, for a total of nine included studies. Seven studies focused on high-income countries and two included global data, including from LMICs. Seven studies reported on data from one country and two reported on data from multiple countries. Four studies were qualitative studies and five were mixed methods. Included studies were assessed for methodological limitations using the critical appraisal tool. Key concerns which emerged were typically in relation to sample size and data analysis. The full detail of the critical appraisal is available in Appendix VI.

Of the nine included papers, six explored the processes and factors that were associated with successful crowdfunding campaigns.[1 35-37 5 38] Three articles assessed the feasibility of conducting crowdfunding for health and/or scientific research.[39-41] Characteristics of included studies and their main findings is provided in Appendix III, and the summary qualitative findings and evidence profile are reported in Table 2 We identified seven findings which we organised into three broad domains: 1) public engagement strategies, 2) correlates of crowdfunding success, and 3) risks and concerns associated with crowdfunding. Of the seven findings, five were graded as moderate confidence and two were graded as low confidence using the GRADE-CERQual approach (full assessments available in Table 2).

Strong public engagement (e.g., networking and disseminating appealing, clear, and locally relevant information) facilitated crowdfunding for research. (Moderate confidence)[1 5 35-38 41]

Evidence showed that networking skills and the ability to share a campaign among personal, professional and social media networks were strongly associated with achieving crowdfunding campaign goals. Those organizing crowdfunding projects recommended using multiple communication methods, including social media, blogs, direct contact, e-mail, traditional media (newspaper, community radio), in-person events and conferences. Using simple messages delivered by image or video increased donations. Four studies suggested that campaigns with videos were more likely to succeed and were preferred by potential backers.[36-38 41] They also found that keeping the audience updated through regular communication during and after the campaign led to more pledges and higher odds of success.[36 37] Four studies found that researchers who partnered with non-governmental organizations, universities, or foundations enhanced their public engagement.[1 35 36 39]

Crowdfunding expanded bidirectional communication between researchers and the public. This channel between researchers and the public increased the public's trust, awareness, and understanding of science. (Low confidence)[5 36-38]
One study found that feedback mechanisms, particularly two-way feedback between the backers and the researcher, significantly increased crowdfunding success.[38] Evidence showed that crowdfunding can also help to bridge the gap between society and science by promoting public understanding of science through accessible resources.

Correlates of funding success included lower funding targets, researcher endorsements, offer of rewards, testimonials, and input from known NGOs. Projects were also more successful if they were hosted on scientific crowdfunding platforms. (Moderate confidence)[1 37 38]

In addition to public engagement and communication strategies, certain factors were associated with crowdfunding success. One study found that campaigns endorsed by professional scientists were more likely to meet their donation goals.[37] One study found that campaigns hosted on specialized scientific crowdfunding platforms were more likely to reach their goals compared to campaigns on other types of crowdfunding platforms.[1] Projects that offered rewards (e.g., small gifts to backers) had higher odds of achieving their goals.[37] The evidence on researcher endorsements is mixed. One study found that researcher endorsements by other professionals increased funding success,[37] but another found that research quality signals (highest academic

title, scientific awards and the complexity and length of project description) had no effect on funding success.[38] Similarly, endorsements and the sponsorship of platforms by established journals were not correlated with funding success. In a survey of stated preferences, one study found that researcher reputation is important to backers.[35]

Students, early career researchers and people with innovative studies were more likely to meet their crowdfunding goals and benefit from the process. (Moderate confidence)[37-39 41]
Four studies found that students, early career researchers, and people with innovative studies were more likely to meet their campaign goals and benefit from the process.[37-39 41] Early career researchers were defined as people within ten years of a terminal degree and had higher rates of achieving financial crowdfunding goals. Although established researchers may have larger research networks, crowdfunding engages broader audiences. Three studies found that project risk was not associated with lower odds of success.[5 37 38] However, one study found that some donors were risk averse and that innovative projects were modestly less successful.[1]

Early-stage or pilot research for rare diseases, cancer, neglected tropical diseases (NTDs) and infectious diseases of poverty (IDPs) were particularly suited to crowdfunding. (Moderate confidence)[1 5 36 37 39-41]
Seven studies showed that crowdfunding may be an effective option to rapidly raise funds for research projects.[1 5 36 37 39-41] Studies suggested that crowdfunding may be especially useful for pilot, phase 1 clinical trials or early-stage proof-of-concept research because campaigns with smaller targets were usually more successful. [35 40] Crowdfunding could complement or extend an existing research project. Alternatively, crowdfunding supported pilot studies before applying for larger grants.[41] One study showed many campaigns used a flexible model where researchers kept all the funds raised.[40] These flexible models enabled researchers to get started on projects regardless of whether they reached their target, in contrast to all-or-nothing models. Two studies found crowdfunding is an effective way to support drug development on cancer, rare diseases, NTDs and IDPs.[36 39]

The third theme incorporates evidence surrounding the limitations and risks of crowdfunding, and mitigation strategies to manage these.

There were concerns regarding the ethics and potential risks of crowdfunding. Evidence suggested there was a lack of standardised peer review to ensure projects are ethically sound, valuable and of high scientific quality. (Moderate confidence)[1 5 37 38 41]

Five studies found that crowdfunding for scientific research was based on the public's judgement and may thus promote research that is low-value, ethically unsound or not methodologically rigorous.[1 5 37 38 41] In addition, studies identified additional limitations of crowdfunding, including the inability to monitor research funding allocation post-campaign and to sanction fraud and falsification.

The risks associated with crowdfunding may be mitigated by involving expert reviewers to assess quality, developing partnerships with NGOs, universities, and other institutions, and seeking mentorship from senior researchers. (Low confidence)[5 37 39 41]

Two studies found an internal peer review system could be a solution to promoting high quality research related to crowdfunding.[37 41] Some platforms required approval from ethical committees prior to launching their campaign, but these requirements varied.[37] Seeking mentorship and partnering with NGOs specialised in marketing and fundraising helped researchers.[39] They could facilitate efficient research administration and facilitate payment collection.

Pilot programme

The open call received 121 unique submissions from researchers based in 37 LMICs. The judging process was conducted in three phases. In the first phase, all 121 entries were screened for eligibility using pre-defined criteria, including a description of clear scientific question and hypothesis, significance of the project and relevance to the public. This initial screening yielded 66 eligible entries. All eligible entries were then reviewed by judges and assigned scores. The five entries with a score of 7 and above were selected as finalists to receive detailed feedback and campaign support. The five finalists were from Guatemala, Mozambique, Nigeria, Sri Lanka, and Thailand (Table 3). All described social innovations in health and focused on infectious diseases of poverty.

All five finalists used the tools of public engagement to develop videos descriptions of their research study and benefitted from substantial non-monetary support (Table 3). In-kind

contributions included assistance with developing and editing short videos from their universities, student support on social media, and identification of TDR Global mentors. Among the five finalists, three launched crowdfunding campaigns. All three exceeded their original goals and were associated with substantial non-monetary support (Table 3).

The pilot program also identified potential risks and risk mitigation strategies (Appendix V). Potential risks of crowdfunding included fraud and deception, misinformation, fairness in allocation of funds and sustained interest in the project. Strategies to mitigate these risks included obtaining ethical approvals and support from local experts, clear communication of the process and results using open access tools, transparent engagement with the public using videos and personal stories and partnerships with universities, community organizations, and other groups.

Discussion

Our data suggest that public engagement is essential for crowdfunding in research. The pilot programme demonstrates that LMIC researchers can benefit from the monetary and non-monetary support that crowdfunding provides. This research expands the literature by summarising the available evidence on crowdfunding for research and by assessing its feasibility in LMIC settings. The majority of the evidence on crowdfunding for research collected in our review has come from high-income country settings.[11 40 42 43] Crowdfunding could be a powerful tool to decentralise and democratise research in resource-constrained settings.

Our qualitative evidence synthesis review and pilot highlight that public engagement is essential for crowdfunding. Previous studies have shown that public engagement generates interest, which in turn leads to backers offering to help with projects and providing feedback.[44] Public engagement skills may help to translate descriptions of science into more easily understood messages.[44] Active engagement with the public during the campaign across a wide range of mediums (lab notes, e-mail updates, online webinars) can increase fundraising success.[37] Although all three of the completed pilot finalists had limited social media experience, they were successful in developing digital engagement strategies. All three of the finalists used video as part of their crowdfunding campaign and this may have enhanced public engagement, consistent with evidence on the importance of videos in science communication.[45] The finalists received training on storytelling, and they found that using

personal stories from affected community members made their video pitches more meaningful. This is consistent with fundraising literature demonstrating that personal stories can be a useful tool to seek funding from donors for non-profit causes.[46 47]

Our review results show that early stage investigators and more innovative research studies were more likely to reach crowdfunding goals. The public may place less emphasis on previous research experience compared to other research grant funding application processes.[1 38] Therefore, campaigns with a broad audience and efficient public engagement strategies can be successful in funding innovative research. In addition, we found that crowdfunding is useful for early-stage research and can then be used as preliminary data for larger grants.

Our pilot data demonstrate that crowdfunding is feasible in diverse LMICs settings. Evidence suggests there are barriers to seeking traditional research funding for many LMIC researchers, including fewer institutional research resources, less experience with research grants, and racism in science.[48 49] One example is authorship and the fact that LMIC researchers who have worked in international partnerships are less likely to be first or corresponding authors.[50] This likely disadvantages LMIC researchers when applying for grants.[51] Crowdfunding may be a useful tool for LMIC researchers to directly obtain support for research with less reliance on external donors or HIC researchers. It can also be argued that because crowdfunded research is often more grassroots and community-based, it may be more ethical and have a more enduring positive impact.[52]

Our data identified strategies to mitigate ethical issues associated with crowdfunding. Partnerships with local organizations and mentorship from experts could alleviate some of the concerns raised about limited peer review. During the pilot, our TDR Global team helped build some of the local partnerships and mentorship opportunities to mitigate risk. Additional risk mitigation strategies included obtaining ethical committee review approval prior to launch, ensuring transparency throughout the campaign, and the use of open access tools to disseminate findings. Finalists were also encouraged to build south-south partnerships and seek support from colleagues who were not part of the research team. This finding is consistent with other literature showing that south-south collaboration can improve research quality.[53]

Our study has several limitations. First, the studies identified from the qualitative evidence synthesis were disproportionately from high-income countries and only included articles in English language. However, there was data from some LMIC settings and the pilot provided more detailed complementary information on LMIC settings. Second, we did not collect information from backers, funders, or other organizations who are important to creating a crowdfunding ecosystem. Third, some researchers do not have a strong background in public engagement. At the same time, our pilot shows how researchers without social media experience can effectively organize public engagement and successful crowdfunding campaigns.

This research has implications for research and policy (Box1). Our pilot demonstrates that crowdfunding is feasible to support infectious disease research in LMICs. Public engagement can build horizontal local partnerships, contributing to empowering local funding sources for global health research. From a policy perspective, crowdfunding has not been widely used to support research studies and few platforms focus on research crowdfunding. There are also fewer crowdfunding platforms in LMICs compared to HICs. Global health institutions and universities should help LMIC researchers expand public engagement and consider crowdfunding.[5 39] Alongside the WHO-TDR practical guide,[18] our evidence can help expand crowdfunding for research.

Our data demonstrate that crowdfunding can be an alternative option for supporting research in LMIC settings. Our qualitative review synthesis suggests that it may be particularly well-suited to early-phase research studies led by early stage investigators. Crowdfunding has the potential to decentralise research funding and re-orient some of the core underlying principles that underpin global health funding. While our initial pilot was organized and supported by TDR Global, further institutional support will be essential for building capacity related to public engagement and crowdfunding.

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to the crowdfunding open call steering committee, the volunteer judges and working group and end user group members. We also wish to thank the internal TDR reviewer and external peer reviewers, open call participants and finalists. We appreciate support received from Social Entrepreneurship to Spur Health (SESH) and Social Innovation in Health Initiative (SIHI).

We would especially like to thank TDR Global mentors, backers and others.

Funding

The work received support from the TDR, the Special Programme for Research and Training in Tropical Diseases, co-sponsored by UNICEF, UNDP, the World Bank and WHO. TDR is able to conduct its work, thanks to the commitment and support from a variety of funders. These include our long-term core contributors from national governments and international institutions, as well as designated funding for specific projects within our current priorities. For the full list of TDR donors, please visit TDR's website at https://www.who.int/tdr/about/funding/en/. TDR receives additional funding from Sida, the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, to support SIHI.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no potential conflicts of interest.

List of Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Meaning
AI	Artificial Intelligence
CERQual	Confidence in Evidence from Reviews of Qualitative research
CL	Cutaneous leishmaniasis
EMBASE	Excerpta Medica database
LMICs	Low and Middle-Income Countries
HICs	High Income Countries
IDPs	Infectious Diseases of Poverty
MM	Mixed Methods study
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organisations
NTDs	Neglected Tropical Diseases
PRISMA-ScR	Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis extension for Scoping Reviews
QUAL	Qualitative study
SESH	Social Entrepreneurship to Spur Health
SIHI	Social Innovation in Health Initiative
TB	Tuberculosis

TDR	Special Programme for Research and Training in Tropical Diseases
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UK	United Kingdom
US	United States of America
WHO	World Health Organisation

References:

1. Aleksina A, Akulenka S, Lublóy Á. Success factors of crowdfunding campaigns in medical research: perceptions and reality. *Drug discovery today* 2019;24(7):1413-20.
2. Forbes H, Schaefer D. Guidelines for successful crowdfunding. *Procedia cirp* 2017;60:398-403.
3. Crowdfunding science: Sharing research with an extended audience. Proceedings of the 18th ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work & Social Computing; 2015.
4. Dahlhausen K, Krebs BL, Watters JV, et al. Crowdfunding campaigns help researchers launch projects and generate outreach. *Journal of microbiology & biology education* 2016;17(1):32.
5. Byrnes JE, Ranganathan J, Walker BL, et al. To crowdfund research, scientists must build an audience for their work. *PloS one* 2014;9(12):e110329.
6. Wiebe DP, FitzGerald JM. Crowdfunding for respiratory research: a new frontier for patient and public engagement? *European Respiratory Journal* 2017;50(4)
7. Siva N. Crowdfunding for medical research picks up pace. *The Lancet* 2014;384(9948):1085-86.
8. Renwick MJ, Mossialos E. Crowdfunding our health: economic risks and benefits. *Social Science & Medicine* 2017;191:48-56.
9. Snyder J, Crooks VA, Mathers A, et al. Appealing to the crowd: ethical justifications in Canadian medical crowdfunding campaigns. *Journal of medical ethics* 2017;43(6):364-67.
10. Mitjà O, Corbacho-Monné M, Ubals M, et al. A cluster-randomized trial of hydroxychloroquine for prevention of Covid-19. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2020
11. Schucht P, Roccaro-Waldmeyer DM, Murek M, et al. Exploring Novel Funding Strategies for Innovative Medical Research: The HORAO Crowdfunding Campaign. *Journal of medical internet research* 2020;22(11):e19715.
12. Koole MA, Kauw D, Winter MM, et al. A successful crowdfunding project for eHealth research on grown-up congenital heart disease patients. *International journal of cardiology* 2018;273:96-99.
13. Saleh SN, Ajufo E, Lehmann CU, et al. A Comparison of Online Medical Crowdfunding in Canada, the UK, and the US. *JAMA network open* 2020;3(10):e2021684-e84.
14. Akwaowo CD, Umoh IO, Udoh AI, et al. Crowdfunding for Cancer: Successes and Challenges of a Female Physician's Organization in Nigeria. *African Journal of Health Economics* 2020;9:46-52.

15. Munim ZH, Shneor R, Adewumi OM, et al. Determinants of crowdfunding intention in a developing economy: ex-ante evidence from Bangladesh. *International Journal of Emerging Markets* 2020;ahead-of-print(ahead-of-print) doi: 10.1108/IJOEM-08-2019-0657
16. Abimbola S, Asthana S, Montenegro C, et al. Addressing power asymmetries in global health: Imperatives in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic. *PLoS medicine* 2021;18(4):e1003604.
17. Abimbola S, Pai M. Will global health survive its decolonisation? *Lancet (London, England)* 2020;396(10263):1627-28.
18. WHO/TDR/SESH/SIHI. Public engagement and crowdfunding in health research: A practical guide. Geneva, Switzerland: WHO, 2021.
19. Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. *International journal of social research methodology* 2005;8(1):19-32.
20. Peters MD, Godfrey C, McInerney P, et al. Chapter 11: scoping reviews. *Joanna Briggs Institute Reviewer's Manual The Joanna Briggs Institute* 2017
21. Micah D, Peters BHSc M, Godfrey C. Guidance for conducting systematic scoping review. *Int J Evidence-Based Healthc [Internet]* 2015
22. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, et al. PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR): checklist and explanation. *Annals of internal medicine* 2018;169(7):467-73.
23. Higgins JP, Thomas J, Chandler J, et al. Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions: John Wiley & Sons 2019.
24. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *Bmj* 2021;372
25. Kpokiri EE, PhD, Sri-Pathmanathan, C., Shrestha, P., & Tucker, Joseph. Public Engagement and Crowdfunding for Research: A scoping review and open call. OSF Registry, 2021.
26. Casp U. Critical appraisal skills programme (CASP). *Qualitative research checklist* 2017;31(13):449.
27. Thomas J, Harden A. Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews (ESRC National Centre for Research Methods Working Paper Series Number 10/07), 2008.
28. Lewin S, Glenton C, Munthe-Kaas H, et al. Using qualitative evidence in decision making for health and social interventions: an approach to assess confidence in findings from qualitative evidence syntheses (GRADE-CERQual). *PLoS Med* 2015;12(10):e1001895.
29. Lewin S, Bohren M, Rashidian A, et al. Applying GRADE-CERQual to qualitative evidence synthesis findings—paper 2: how to make an overall CERQual assessment of confidence and create a Summary of Qualitative Findings table. *Implementation Science* 2018;13(1):11-23.
30. Munthe-Kaas H, Bohren MA, Glenton C, et al. Applying GRADE-CERQual to qualitative evidence synthesis findings—paper 3: how to assess methodological limitations. *Implementation Science* 2018;13(1):25-32.
31. Glenton C, Carlsen B, Lewin S, et al. Applying GRADE-CERQual to qualitative evidence synthesis findings—paper 5: how to assess adequacy of data. *Implementation Science* 2018;13(1):43-50.
32. Noyes J, Booth A, Lewin S, et al. Applying GRADE-CERQual to qualitative evidence synthesis findings–paper 6: how to assess relevance of the data. *Implementation Science* 2018;13(1):51-61.

33. Colvin CJ, Garside R, Wainwright M, et al. Applying GRADE-CERQual to qualitative evidence synthesis findings—paper 4: how to assess coherence. *Implementation Science* 2018;13(1):33-41.
34. Organization WH, UNICEF. Crowdsourcing in health and health research: a practical guide: World Health Organization, 2018.
35. Dragojlovic N, Lynd LD. What will the crowd fund? Preferences of prospective donors for drug development fundraising campaigns. *Drug discovery today* 2016;21(12):1863-68.
36. Ortiz RA, Witte S, Gouw A, et al. Engaging a community for rare genetic disease: best practices and education from individual crowdfunding campaigns. *Interactive journal of medical research* 2018;7(1):e3.
37. Sauermann H, Franzoni C, Shafi K. Crowdfunding scientific research: Descriptive insights and correlates of funding success. *PLOS ONE* 2019;14(1):e0208384. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0208384
38. Schäfer MS, Metag J, Feustle J, et al. Selling science 2.0: What scientific projects receive crowdfunding online? *Public Understanding of Science* 2018;27(5):496-514.
39. Dragojlovic N, Lynd LD. Crowdfunding drug development: the state of play in oncology and rare diseases. *Drug discovery today* 2014;19(11):1775-80.
40. Sharma A, Khan JS, Devereaux PJ. Is crowdfunding a viable source of clinical trial research funding? *The Lancet* 2015;386(9991):338.
41. Krittanawong C, Zhang HJ, Aydar M, et al. Crowdfunding for cardiovascular research. *International journal of cardiology* 2018;250:268-69.
42. Oonyu LM. Guide for Leveraging Crowdfunding to Bridge Scientific Research Resource Gaps in Developing Countries: Descriptive Insights, Prospects, and Challenges from Selected African Countries. 2020
43. Jin P. Medical crowdfunding in China: empirics and ethics. *Journal of medical ethics* 2019;45(8):538-44.
44. Makris GC. Crowdfunding: from startup businesses to startup science. *Bmj* 2015;350
45. Finkler W, Leon B. The power of storytelling and video: a visual rhetoric for science communication. *Journal of science communication* 2019;18(5):A02.
46. Fumagalli DC, Gouw AM. Focus: personalized medicine: crowdfunding for personalized medicine research. *The Yale journal of biology and medicine* 2015;88(4):413.
47. Zhou H, Ye S. Legitimacy, worthiness, and social network: An empirical study of the key factors influencing crowdfunding outcomes for nonprofit projects. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 2019;30(4):849-64.
48. Khan M, Abimbola S, Aloudat T, et al. Decolonising global health in 2021: a roadmap to move from rhetoric to reform: BMJ Specialist Journals, 2021.
49. Besson EK. Confronting whiteness and decolonising global health institutions. *Lancet (London, England)* 2021;397(10292):2328-29.
50. Abimbola S. The foreign gaze: authorship in academic global health: BMJ Specialist Journals, 2019.
51. Lawrence DS, Hirsch LA. Decolonising global health: transnational research partnerships under the spotlight. *International Health* 2020;12(6):518-23.
52. Perry JE. The People's NIH-Ethical and Legal Concerns in Crowdfunded Biomedical Research. *Notre Dame JL Ethics & Pub Pol'y* 2015;29:453.
53. Omaswa F, Kiguli-Malwadde E, Donkor P, et al. The medical education partnership initiative (MEPI): innovations and lessons for health professions training and research in Africa. *Annals of global health* 2018;84(1):160.

Boxes, tables, and figures

Box 1: Practical recommendations for implementing crowdfunding for research*
1. *Public engagement is an important component for conducting a successful crowdfunding for research campaign* 2. *Bi-directional communication may increase the number of crowdfunding donations and enhance the public's trust and understanding of science.* 3. *Young scholars and early-career researchers may consider crowdfunding for their research* 4. *Smaller crowdfunded grants can top up existing research funding or fund early-stage research that can then be used to apply to public research grants.* 5. *Partnerships with experts can provide some feedback and improve the rigor of research prior to launching a crowdfunding campaign.* 6. *Seeking formal organizational approvals and ethical committee review can increase the likelihood of success.* 7. *To increase donations, campaigns should include quality signals, such as endorsements and testimonials, offer rewards, partner with known NGOs and aim for a realistic funding target.*
**A practical guide was developed alongside this review. Researchers interested in strategies and tools to optimise their crowdfunding campaigns can access this guide here*

Figures:



Figure 1: Stages of the TDR Global Pilot Programme



Figure 2: PRISMA flow diagram showing selection of studies[20]

Table 1: Summary of included studies and quality assessment

	Author	Study aim	Method QUAL or MM	Study design	Data collection method	Country /region or context / setting	Sample size	Primary or secondary data
1	**Sharma et.al.,**	To explore the feasibility of using crowdfunding for randomised clinical trial (RCT) funding	QUAL	Simplified content analysis of online crowdfunding campaign data	Data scraping from online sources	English crowdfunding websites	20	Secondary data from multiple crowdfunding campaigns
2	**Aleksina et.al.,**	Correlates of crowdfunding success for projects hosted by Consano.org and Experiment.com	MM	Standardised content analysis of online crowdfunding campaign data using mixed methods including OLS regression	Data scraping from online sources	North America only	109	Secondary data from multiple crowdfunding campaigns
3	**Krittanawong et.al.,**	To explore the feasibility of using crowdfunding for the support of cardiovascular research	QUAL	Simplified content analysis	Data scraping from online sources	Top online crowdfunding websites in English (based on site volume)	34	Secondary data from multiple crowdfunding campaigns
4	**Dragojlovic and Lynd, 2014**	To explore the feasibility of using crowdfunding for oncology research and rare diseases	MM	Simplified content analysis of online crowdfunding campaign data	Data scraping from online sources	North America and Europe	125	Secondary data from multiple crowdfunding campaigns
5	**Ortiz et.al.,**	Crowdfunding pilot to fund 6whole exome sequencing research and data analysis	Pilot, MM	Crowdfunding pilot, mixed methods analysis of successful crowdfunding campaign metrics and survey data	(1) Data scraping from three online platforms (2) Post-campaign survey among participants and donors.	North America only	9	Primary data from crowdfunding campaign creators
6	**Byrnes et.al.,**	'SciFund' crowdfunding pilot to fund various types of scientific research	Pilot, MM	Crowdfunding pilot and mixed methods analysis of crowdfunding campaign metrics and survey data	(1) Data scraping from Rocket Hub and other online sources (2) Post-campaign survey among pilot participants	North America only	47,49, & 22	Primary data from crowdfunding campaign creators
7	**Sauermann et.al.,**	Correlates of crowdfunding success for projects hosted on Experiment.com	QUAL	Standardised content analysis of online crowdfunding campaign data and modelling using OLS regression	Data scraping from online sources	Global (but 89% of Experiment.com campaigns are US-based)	725	Secondary data from multiple crowdfunding campaigns
8	**Dragojlovic**	Stated preferences of donors	QUAL	Qualitative analysis of survey	Survey among	North America only	814	Primary data from

	and Lynd, 2016	in crowdfunding projects		data	crowdfunding donors			backers
9	**M. Schafer et.al.,**	Correlates of crowdfunding success for projects on English and German-language platforms	MM	Standardised content analysis of online data and logistic regression, guided by four theoretical frameworks	Data scraping from online sources	Global	371	Secondary data from multiple crowdfunding campaigns

MM- Mixed methods
QUAL- Qualitative study
Primary data- from a creator / organiser
Secondary data- analysis of multiple campaigns (interpretation of primary data

Table 2: Evidence profile

		Review finding	Studies contributing to the finding	Methodological limitations	Coherence	Adequacy	Relevance	*CERQual assessment of confidence in the evidence*	Explanat CERQua assessme
1		**Strong public engagement (e.g., networking and disseminating appealing, clear, and locally relevant information) facilitated crowdfunding for research.**	2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9	**Moderate methodological limitations** due to limited reflexivity, lack of transparency on recruitment strategy, and unclear ethical considerations Two studies (5 and 6) lacked formal qualitative analysis	**Minor concerns about coherence**	**Minor concerns regarding adequacy** due to contributions from 7 studies with moderately thick data.	**Minor concerns about relevance,** although 6 studies presented data from high income countries. Only one study (9) presents globally acquired data	Moderate confidence	Minor co over cohe adequacy relevance Moderate methodol limitation
2		**Crowdfunding expanded bidirectional communication between researchers and the public. It opened a channel**	5, 6, 7, 9	**Serious methodological limitations** (2 studies with no or minor	**Moderate concerns about coherence**	**Serious concerns about adequacy** due to weak and at times	**Minor concerns about relevance,** with 3 studies mainly focused on	Low confidence	Due to m concerns relevance Moderate

	between researchers and the public, and increased the public's trust, awareness, and understanding of science.		concerns (7,9) and 2 studies (5,6) with severe concerns following incomplete analysis on a very small sample)	due to study findings based on insufficiently analysed data	incomplete analysis presented in 2 out of 4 studies contributing to this review finding.	crowdfunding and research success, one study focused on selected platforms from high income countries alone		concerns coherenc Serious c about ade and Serio methodol limitation
3	**Correlates of funding success included lower funding targets, researcher endorsements, the offer of rewards, testimonials, and input from known NGOs. Projects were also more successful if they were hosted on scientific crowdfunding platforms.**	2, 7, 9	**Minor methodological limitations,** robust qualitative analysis presented from all three studies. Strong methodology presented with 4 conceptual frameworks in one study (9)	**Moderate concerns about coherence**, because one study finding (9) contradicts another (2)	**Moderate concerns regarding adequacy** The findings from two studies (2,9) are limited to one platform	**Minor concerns about relevance** All studies focused on success indicators for crowdfunding	Moderate confidence	Minor cc for methodol limitation relevance moderate concerns coherenc adequacy
4	**Students, early career researchers, and people with innovative studies were more likely to meet their crowdfunding goals and benefit more from the process.**	3, 4, 7, 9	**Moderate methodological limitations** due to lack of reflexivity (4, 7, 9); unclear recruitment strategy and limited data analysis (3)	**Minor concerns about coherence**	**Moderate concerns about adequacy** Due to 3 contributing studies with thick data (4, 7, 9) and 1 study with moderately thick data	**Moderate concerns about relevance** All studies are relevant, but 3 contributing studies are only focused on high-income contexts	Moderate confidence	Minor co regarding coherenc Moderate concerns regarding adequacy relevance methodol limitation
5	**Early-stage or pilot research for rare diseases, cancer, neglected tropical diseases (NTDs) and infectious diseases of poverty (IDPs) were particularly suited to crowdfunding.**	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7	**Moderate methodological limitations** (2 studies with no concerns (4,7) one study with minor concerns, 2 studies with moderate concerns due to small sample size and one study with severe concerns following incomplete analysis on a very small	**Minor concerns about coherence**	**Moderate concerns about adequacy** due to low sample size from 2 studies (1,7) with moderately thick data from 4 studies (1,2,3,4) and thin data from one study	**Minor concerns about relevance** as all study mainly focus on crowdfunding for health research and related medical disease. Findings mainly are from high income settings with relevance in other settings.	Moderate confidence	Moderate confidenc minor co about rele and cohe and mode concerns adequacy moderate methodol limitation

				sample)					
6		**There are concerns regarding the ethics and risks of crowdfunding. Evidence suggests there was a lack of standardised peer review to ensure projects are ethically sound, valuable and of high scientific quality**	2, 3, 6, 7, 9	**Moderate methodological limitations** Severe concerns for one study (6) due to a lack of formal qualitative analysis. Moderate or minor concerns for the other studies due to recruitment strategy ambiguity and limited reflexivity (2, 3, 7, 9)	**Minor concerns about coherence**	**Moderate concerns about adequacy** Due to 3 contributing studies with moderately thick data (2, 3, 7, 9) and 1 study with thin data (6)	**Moderate concerns about relevance** due to evidence from limited contexts, with data mainly from high-income settings.	Moderate confidence	Minor co regarding coherenc Moderate concerns regarding adequacy relevance methodol limitation
7		**The risks associated with crowdfunding may be mitigated by involving expert reviewers to assess quality, developing partnerships with NGOs, universities, and other institutions, and by seeking mentorship from senior researchers**	3, 4, 6, 7	**Moderate methodological limitations** due to limited reflexivity and a lack of formal data analysis in one study (6)	**Moderate concerns about coherence** due to gaps in the data that could specifically back this finding	**Moderate concerns about adequacy** 3 contributing studies with moderately thick data	**Moderate concerns about relevance** due to data coming only from high-income settings.	Low confidence	Moderate concerns regarding methodol coherenc adequacy relevance

Table 3: Details of finalist projects for public engagement and crowdfunding

S/N	Country-Disease	Project aim	Gender of lead researcher	Public engagement strategies in preparation for campaign launch	Amount asked/ amount raised
1	Sri Lanka-Leishmaniasis	To facilitate sand fly vector and leishmaniasis disease control via instructions and improving access	F	Video pitch, students and social media, diaspora citizens, Emails	$5,650/ $7,244
2	Thailand-Zika Virus	To neutralize and block Zika transmission from mother to child during pregnancy	M	Video pitch, social media posts, alumni networks, Spanish translation	$8,000/ $8,180
3	Nigeria-Urogenital Schistosomiasis	To implement effective strategies to reduce the urogenital schistosomiasis disease in dam-site communities	M	Video pitch, radio announcement, local presentations, community leaders, citizens in diaspora, clean water foundations	$9,485/ $11,122
4	Guatemala-Cutaneous leishmaniasis	To reduce time for diagnosis and treatment of cutaneous leishmaniasis using a community operated mobile clinic with an artificial intelligence system	F	Video pitch, personal stories, promotion with students, social media posts	In Process - Public engagement*
5	Mozambique-Tuberculosis	Towards tuberculosis elimination through shorter preventive therapy, employing community health workers to increase patient access and treatment uptake	M	Video pitch and social media posts	In Process - Public engagement*

*** -Not launched a crowdfunding campaign yet**