

Online Supplementary Material

Awareness vs. Law Passage

Our paper argues that although the Organ Transplant Law was passed in March 2008, individuals were primarily unaware of the change until November 2010. We support this claim in several ways.

First, Dr. Ashkenazi (a coauthor on this paper), is the Executive Director of the Israeli National Transplant Center (INTC) and as such has first-hand knowledge of these issues. She can verify that the Organ Transplant Law was not publicized or advertised by the INTC in any form until November 2010. Even transplant candidates were not notified about the priority program by INTC staff prior to November 2010. Moreover, the aim of the November 2010 campaign — and of those that followed it — was to mitigate the risk that Israelis who subsequently needed organs would claim ignorance of the priority policy. Given those facts, we think it is reasonable to assume that there should have been an effect of the priority program starting only in November 2010.

Second, we have done an Internet search for “organ transplantation” on the biggest Israeli news site, ynet.co.il, on the dates between January 1, 2008 and October 31, 2010. We only found two articles mentioning that priority would be given to registered donors. In addition, one of the two focused on other aspects of the Transplant Law (establishing the time of death and priority given to live donors) and not on the priority for registration or deceased donation.

Third, the campaign in 2010 was extensive — it included substantial TV and radio coverage and an Internet campaign resulting in millions of clicks. People on the waiting list were also notified by the INTC about the priority only starting in late 2010. This is the type of exposure that was needed for a substantial portion of the population to know about the policy.

Ideally, one would try to separately estimate whether the Transplant Law had a (possibly weaker) effect on registrations between March 2008 and November 2010 before the campaign about its existence. Unfortunately, this is not a practical possibility because of very severe multicollinearity that results if we attempt to estimate that effect separately. The multicollinearity arises because the Transplant Law was passed very shortly after online and phone registrations became available and so we do not have a long enough period between them to separately identify their effects. In Stoler *et al.* (2015), however, this same set of authors analyzes next-of-kin consent rates to organ donation, which is a setting in which we can separately identify the effect of the passage of the law and the awareness of the law. That study does not suffer from multicollinearity because whether online and phone registrations were available is not a right hand side variable explaining next-of-kin consent rates for deceased organ donation. That paper shows an increase in next-of-kin consent rates starting in 2011 (after the awareness campaign about priority) but not during 2008-2010 (after the passage of the law but before the campaign).

Length of Event Window

Another point we wish to clarify is why we chose an event window of two of three months before April 1, 2012 to test whether the program deadline generated additional registrations. This choice is a result of our wish to be conservative. Because there was a campaign during November and December 2011, using 4 months before the April 1, 2012 deadline includes a month that is also during the heart of a campaign. While the campaign coefficient is supposed to control for the existence of campaigns, to the extent that the November and December 2011 campaign was more effective than other campaigns, part of its effect will not be picked up by the campaign variable but instead by the “Dec 2011 – Mar 2012” variable.

We have performed this analysis and the results are very similar to the results reported in the paper. We believe an event window of just one month is also incorrect in that it throws away too much useful data by imposing a restriction that the deadline only affects registrations in the last month before April 2012. Unsurprisingly, the “Mar 2012” coefficient is not statistically significant. The results for the event windows of 1 month and 4 months are presented in Table OSM1, below.

Table OSM1: Effect of policy change and other events on the number of daily registrations

Variable	1 month window	4 month window
Aware	56.30 (18.91)***	49.70 (16.85)***
Post April 2012	-30.82 (36.36)	29.78 (22.36)
Mar 2012	138.60 (121.23)	
Dec 2011 – Mar 2012		224.73 (68.01)***
Campaign	59.72 (9.84)***	58.86 (9.78)***
CampaignXAware	131.04 (52.21)**	87.46 (57.04)
Online and Phone	62.26 (12.86)***	80.48 (11.38)***
Clergy option	8.79 (7.37)	4.56 (7.19)
Election	26630.98 (65.44)***	26674.07 (69.66)***
National Holiday	-98.69 (5.19)***	-98.65 (5.12)***
Constant	114.70 (16.31)***	117.95 (15.70)***
Number of observations	8036	8036
R-Squared	0.77	0.77
Mean registrations (pre Nov 2010)	93.93	93.93

Numbers are rounded to 2 digits after the decimal point (except for p-values that are rounded to 3 digits after the decimal point). Robust standard errors were used. *, **, *** indicate statistical significance at the 0.1, 0.05, and 0.01 significance level respectively. Coefficients for the day of the week, month, and trend terms are suppressed.