

1 **Research participants' perception of ethical issues in stroke genomics and neurobiobanking**  
2 **research in Africa**

3 **Authors**

4 Ayodele Jegede<sup>1</sup>, Olubukola Balogun<sup>1</sup>, Olorunyomi Felix Olorunsogbon<sup>2,3</sup> Michelle Nichols<sup>4</sup>  
5 Joshua Akinyemi<sup>5</sup>, Carolyn Jenkins<sup>4</sup>, Mayowa Ogunronbi<sup>2</sup>, Arti Singh<sup>6</sup>, Reginald Obiako<sup>7</sup>,  
6 Kolawole Wahab<sup>8</sup>, Abiodun Bello<sup>8</sup> Albert Akpalu<sup>9</sup>, Fred S. Sarfo<sup>10</sup>, Lukman F. Owolabi<sup>11</sup>,  
7 Babatunde Ojebuyi<sup>12</sup>, Muyiwa Adigun<sup>13</sup>, Dorcas Olujobi<sup>2</sup>, Rabiou Musbahu<sup>11</sup>, Musibau  
8 Titiloye<sup>3</sup>, Ibukun Afolami<sup>14</sup>, Benedict Calys-Tagoe<sup>9</sup>, Ezinne Uvere<sup>15</sup>, Ruth Laryea<sup>9</sup>, Adekunle  
9 Fakunle<sup>15</sup>, Osi Adeleye<sup>16</sup>, Deborah Adesina<sup>16</sup>, Nathaniel Mensah<sup>10</sup>, Wisdom Oguike<sup>7</sup>, Nathaniel  
10 Coleman<sup>9</sup>, Sunday Adeniyi<sup>8</sup>, Lanre Omotoso<sup>8</sup>, Shadrack Asibey<sup>10</sup>, Lois Melikam<sup>7</sup>, Jibril Yusuf<sup>11</sup>,  
11 Abdullateef Gbenga<sup>7</sup>, Aliyu Mande<sup>11</sup>, Muhammed Uthman<sup>8</sup>, Rajesh N. Kalaria<sup>2,17</sup>, Mayowa  
12 Owolabi<sup>15,18</sup>, Bruce Ovbiagele<sup>19</sup>, Oyedunni Arulogun<sup>2</sup>, Rufus O. Akinyemi<sup>2,15,18\*</sup>

13 **Affiliations**

14 <sup>1</sup>Department of Sociology, Faculty of the Social Sciences, University of Ibadan, Nigeria

15 <sup>2</sup>Neuroscience and Ageing Research Unit, Institute for Advanced Medical Research and Training,  
16 College of Medicine, University of Ibadan, Nigeria

17 <sup>3</sup>Department of Health Promotion and Education, Faculty of Public Health, University of Ibadan,  
18 Nigeria

19 <sup>4</sup>College of Nursing, Medical University of South Carolina, Charleston, SC, USA

20 <sup>5</sup>Department of Epidemiology and Medical Statistics, College of Medicine, University of Ibadan,  
21 Nigeria

22 <sup>6</sup>School of Public Health, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Kumasi,

23 Ghana

24 <sup>7</sup>Neurology Unit, Department of Medicine, Ahmadu Bello University Teaching Hospital, Shika,

25 Zaria, Nigeria

26 <sup>8</sup>Neurology Unit, Department of Medicine, University of Ilorin Teaching Hospital, University of

27 Ilorin, Nigeria

28 <sup>9</sup>University of Ghana Medical School, College of Health Sciences, Accra, Ghana

29 <sup>10</sup>Neurology Unit, Department of Medicine, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and

30 Technology, Kumasi, Ghana

31 <sup>11</sup>Neurology Unit, Department of Medicine, Bayero University/Aminu Kano Teaching Hospital,

32 Kano, Nigeria

33 <sup>12</sup>Department of Communication and Language Arts, Faculty of Arts, University of Ibadan,

34 Nigeria

35 <sup>13</sup>Department of Public Law, Faculty of Law, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria.

36 <sup>14</sup>Department of Human Nutrition and Dietetics, College of Medicine, University of Ibadan,

37 Nigeria.

38 <sup>15</sup>Department of Medicine, College of Medicine, University of Ibadan, Nigeria

39 <sup>16</sup>Neurology Unit, Department of Medicine, Federal Medical Centre, Abeokuta, Nigeria

40 <sup>17</sup>Neurovascular Research Group, Institute of Neuroscience, Newcastle University, Newcastle

41 upon Tyne, United Kingdom

42 <sup>18</sup>Centre for Genomic and Precision Medicine, College of Medicine, University of Ibadan, Nigeria

43 <sup>19</sup>School of Medicine, University of California, San Francisco, CA, USA

44 **\*Corresponding Author:** [roakinyemi@com.ui.edu.ng](mailto:roakinyemi@com.ui.edu.ng), [rufusakinyemi@yahoo.com](mailto:rufusakinyemi@yahoo.com) (ROA)

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

## 64 **Abstract**

65 **Background:** There is a growing interest in stroke genomics and neurobiobanking research in  
66 Africa. These raise several ethical issues, such as consent, re-use, data sharing, storage, and  
67 incidental result of biological samples. Despite the availability of ethical guidelines developed for  
68 research in Africa, there is paucity of information on how the research participants' perspectives  
69 could guide the research community on ethical issues in stroke genomics and neurobiobanking  
70 research. To explore African research participants' perspectives on these issues, a study was  
71 conducted at existing Stroke Investigation Research and Education Network (SIREN) sites in  
72 Nigeria and Ghana.

73 **Method:** Using an exploratory design, twenty-eight Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) sessions  
74 were conducted with stroke survivors (n=7), caregivers(n=7), stroke - free controls(n=7), and  
75 Community Advisory Board members(n=7). Data were collected using an interview guide.  
76 Interviews were conducted in English and indigenous languages of the community, audio  
77 recorded, and transcribed verbatim. Data were analyzed using NVivo (March, 2020) Software.

78 **Result:** Results revealed that stroke genomics and neurobiobanking research in Africa require  
79 researchers' direct attention to ethical issues. Concerns were raised about understanding,  
80 disclosure and absence of coercion as components of true autonomous decision making in research  
81 participation. Participants argued that the risk and benefits attached to participation should be  
82 disclosed at the time of recruitment. Fears around data sharing were voiced as adherence to the  
83 principle of privacy and confidentiality were of paramount importance to participants. The  
84 preference was to receive the results of incidental findings with no stigma attached from society.

85 **Conclusion:** Research participants' perspectives are a vital aspect of community engagement in  
86 stroke genomics and neurobiobanking research. Findings from this study suggest that research

87 participants are interested in these fields of research in Africa if their concerns about ethical issues  
88 are appropriately addressed within the research framework.

89 Keyword: **Perception, ethical issues, neurobiobanking, stroke genomics, Africa**

90

## 91 **Introduction**

92 As part of the efforts targeted towards combating the increasing prevalence and incidence of stroke  
93 and other cerebrovascular disorders (CVDs) in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs),  
94 especially in sub-Saharan Africa, genomics and neurobiobanking-based studies are on the increase.  
95 However, despite the scientific advancements, there exist challenges relating to ethical, legal, and  
96 social issues (ELSI). Hence, it is important to identify and develop strategies for addressing these  
97 challenges in the region.

98 For about a decade, the Human Heredity and Health in Africa (H3Africa) consortium has engaged  
99 in research on the African continent to generate data and samples that could be used to improve  
100 global health [1, 2]. In essence, they have developed numerous guiding documents on ethics,  
101 informed consent, governance, data sharing, and community engagement[3]. The African  
102 Neurobiobank for Precision Stroke Medicine (ELSI) project within the H3Africa consortium is a  
103 stroke genomic and neurobiobanking project across seven cities in Africa with the goal of  
104 identifying, examining, and developing novel approaches to address ELSI of biobanking and  
105 stroke genomic research in sub-Saharan Africa[4]

106 Stroke genomics research raises several ethical questions and challenges [5], such as informed  
107 consent (who can give informed consent, type/nature of consent, what information should be  
108 contained in consent forms), sample ownership and management, sample sharing and storage, data

109 storage and sharing, and role of regulatory committees are some of the ethical issues identified and  
110 broadly discussed in the literature[6].

111 Neurobiobanks are organized repositories for collection, storage, sharing and reuse of brain tissues,  
112 whole brain specimens and associated data for neurological research purposes [7]. These samples  
113 and data are used for a broad range of applied research activities in the development of tools  
114 tailored towards the prevention, diagnosis and treatment of diseases also known as precision  
115 medicine (PM). The samples and data are stored to be used for further research either in the  
116 countries of origin or other countries[7]. The field of neurobiobanking is growing in Africa with  
117 few studies already being conducted to understand the perspectives and willingness towards brain  
118 donation and brain banking among Africans[4, 8]. In addition, organized brain bank is being  
119 developed to accrue and store neural tissues for future research in neurology and psychiatry[9].

120 Genomics data deals with highly sensitive personal information which could significantly impact  
121 the lives of participants and their families. There is a need to consider ELSI in practice as there is  
122 still a dearth of literature about the consistent definition of key factors that constitute the ELSI  
123 variables in genomic research [10].

124 Though gaps exist in literature about what constitute and are defined as ethical criteria, most of  
125 these hinge on bioethical principles of beneficence, non-maleficence and autonomy, including  
126 those criteria that refer to human rights and dignity[10]. For reflection on ethical issues, empirical  
127 studies exploring research participants' views and perceptions provide a good starting point to  
128 understanding stroke genomic and neurobiobanking research. Due to the complexity of the  
129 concepts and the vast cultural and geographical diversities in a multi-ethnic society, it is necessary  
130 to explore views from multicultural and diverse participants, including stroke survivors,  
131 caregivers, stroke free controls and Community Advisory Board (CAB) members.

132 In this study, we adopted Beauchamp’s and Childress’ four principles of beneficence, non-  
133 maleficence, autonomy and justice[11] for discussion of ethical issues in stroke genomic and  
134 neurobiobanking research. Autonomy is based on the principle of respect for persons to make their  
135 own choice or decision. The principle of beneficence is contained in the Hippocratic Oath which  
136 guides medical practice and is hinged on the principle of doing good or what will enhance patients’  
137 interest. The ethical principle of non-maleficence requires that harm should be avoided to  
138 participants[12]

139

## 140 **Method**

### 141 **Setting**

142 The study was conducted in seven cities, five in Nigeria (Abeokuta, Ibadan, Ilorin, Kano and Zaria)  
143 and two in Ghana (Accra and Kumasi), as an integral part of an ongoing study [4].

### 144 **Study design**

145 The study design was exploratory and employed Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) (S1 File) to  
146 investigate participants’ perception of ethical issues in stroke genomics and neurobiobanking  
147 research.

### 148 **Study population**

149 The study population consisted of purposively selected stroke survivors, caregivers, stroke - free  
150 controls and Community Advisory Board (CAB) members between the ages of 18-85 involved in  
151 the SIREN study (Table 1) from seven sites in the established SIREN communities in Southern  
152 (Abeokuta and Ibadan), Central (Ilorin), and Northern (Kano and Zaria) Nigeria and Southern  
153 (Accra) and Central (Kumasi) Ghana[4]

## 154 **Instrument**

155 The FGD guide (S1 File) was developed from peer-reviewed literature relating to ELSI of  
156 neurobiobanking and stroke genomics, as well as lay literature in study communities/sites. The  
157 FGD guide explored issues around informed consent, data sharing, sample storage and reuse,  
158 feedback of research result and incidental findings, bio-right, governance, and regulation[4]

159

## 160 **Ethical consideration**

161 All the seven sites obtained ethical approval from their institutional ethics review committee before  
162 the commencement of the study. University of Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria (UI/EC/18/0641);  
163 Federal Medical Centre, Abeokuta, Ogun State, Nigeria (FMCA/470/HREC/04/2019/01) Murtala  
164 Muhammad Specialist Hospital, Kano State, Nigeria (MOH/OFF/797/TI/1264); Ahmadu Bello  
165 University Teaching Hospital, Zaria, Kaduna State, Nigeria (ABUTHZ/HREC/E25/2018);  
166 University of Ilorin Teaching Hospital, Kwara State, Nigeria (UITH/CAT/189/19/007);  
167 University of Ghana College of Health Sciences, Accra, Ghana (EPRC/FEB/2021); Kwame  
168 Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Kumasi, Ghana (CHRPE/AP/262/20). Written  
169 informed consent was obtained from each FGD participant. Participants were informed in detail  
170 about the study. Participation in this study was voluntary. The study participants were informed  
171 that they could withdraw from the study at any stage without any consequences to their benefiting  
172 from the outcome of the study, if any. To ensure confidentiality of study participants' identity,  
173 numeric codes were allotted to each participant and only researchers had access to the data.  
174 Identifiers were removed from the transcripts.

175



## 176 **Data collection procedure, management, and analysis**

177 A total of twenty- eight FGD sessions were conducted across all the seven sites between 26<sup>th</sup> June  
178 2019 and Feb 2020, and each session included between six and ten participants to ensure  
179 meaningful but actively guided discussions. CAB members were first briefed about the project  
180 during CAB meetings at each site and subsequently received updates at all CAB meetings. Other  
181 participants were approached and briefed by the study site coordinators about the study objectives.  
182 Participants were enrolled following informed consent. FGD sessions were held separately with  
183 each of the groups (stroke survivors, stroke caregivers, stroke-free control, and CAB members) in  
184 their respective sites. An interactive information sharing approach as a technique was adopted for  
185 this study, which involved participants providing information about stroke genomic and  
186 neurobiobanking research.

187 FGD sessions were conducted by a team comprising study sites coordinator and research assistants  
188 with experience in FGDs and qualitative research methods. Preceding the commencement of the  
189 FGDs, the research teams were trained on the protocol for data collection for this study. A pilot of  
190 the FGDs guide was carried out and revised before the actual data collection. The FGD sessions  
191 lasted on the average between 40-60 minutes.

192 All discussions were audio-recorded with the verbal consent of participants. The audio recordings  
193 were later transcribed verbatim and uploaded on REDCap, a secure data storage site. Transcripts  
194 were imported into NVivo (March 2020) software. The transcripts were reviewed and coded by  
195 three of the authors following the thematic framework for coding. Codes were generated in themes,  
196 inductively and deductively, both from literature and data [13]. The framework approach involving  
197 five stages were used which comprises: 1) familiarization 2) identification of thematic framework  
198 3) indexing 4) charting and 5) mapping and interpretation of data for data analysis.

199

## 200 **Results**

201 A total of two hundred and thirteen persons (n =213) participated in the FGDs as presented in  
202 Table 1. The five themes identified from within the data were related to Beauchamp and Childress’  
203 principles of biomedical ethics[11].

204 Table 1. Focus group demographics

<b>Study participants</b>	<b>Age range (years)</b>	<b>Males</b>	<b>Females</b>	<b>Total</b>
Stroke survivor	22-80	27	22	49
Stroke free controls	22-65	31	18	49
Stroke caregiver	17-74	29	27	56
Community Advisory Board	27-82	45	14	59
<b>Total</b>	<b>17-82</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>213</b>

205

206 The analysis focused on exploring ethically relevant themes from research participants’ views,  
207 although the results are organized and presented according to Beauchamp and Childress’ principles  
208 of biomedical ethics[11]. Extracted text from participants’ perspectives were assigned to different  
209 themes and discussed iteratively.

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217 **Table 2: Bioethical principles and themes**

Bioethical principle	Themes
Autonomy	Understanding of research purpose
	Disclosure of details of the research process
	Coercion
Beneficence	Inducement
	Individual Outcomes
	Knowledge of treatment
Non-maleficence	Diagnosis of stroke disorder
	Privacy and confidentiality
	Data security
Stigmatization	

222 **Autonomy**

223 Autonomy was explored regarding how participants viewed the informed consent process towards  
224 empowering decision making. Specifically, this pertains to how individuals voluntarily decide to  
225 participate in stroke genomic and neurobiobanking research. Majority of study participants  
226 indicated that there is the need to empower people with adequate information through the consent  
227 process by the researchers prior to participation to be able to express themselves voluntarily  
228 (Patient right). Participants expressed that for autonomous decision making (right to participate  
229 without coercion), an understanding of the purpose of the research, full disclosure of the research  
230 process and information about the study are important before consent.

231 **Understanding of research purpose**

232 Participants in this study indicated that a detailed explanation of the purpose of the research  
233 including the use of bio-samples should be expressly communicated before obtaining consent and  
234 participant understanding is crucial to decision making. Participants emphasized comprehensive  
235 understanding to prevent withdrawal. A respondent said:

236 *What I understand...is before I join you in doing whatever you bring to me, you*  
237 *need to share information about what you want to do and make sure I understand*  
238 *it, get my feedback to say that I understand it. It is then I can agree if I can continue*  
239 *with you or not.* (Stroke - free control, Abeokuta)

240 A stroke caregiver respondent clarified that ‘...*the individual must be properly counseled about*  
241 *the purpose of the research, and she/he must understand it* (Stroke caregiver, Zaria).

242 CAB members across sites corroborated this view as indicated by a participant,

243 *“What I know is that everything someone does, there is the need to brief her/him.*  
244 *Someone needs to be educated about it. If someone understands and accepts to do*  
245 *it...then she/he can sign for it”* (CAB member, Kumasi).

246 The central hallmark of the participants’ views is that participants’ empowerment will enable  
247 research participants make informed voluntary decisions. For them, once participants have  
248 adequate knowledge of the study it will be easy to make an informed decision.

249

## 250 **Disclosure of details of research processes**

251 Participants expressed the need to be provided with detailed information about the research  
252 processes including the risk and benefit associated with the use of samples obtained through the  
253 research.

254 *Permission given with the full knowledge of the implications of their actions in*  
255 *terms of the side effects associated with the exact procedure that will be done on*  
256 *them, the products that will be obtained from them, how they will be obtained, and*  
257 *the consequences of it, if any... (Stroke caregiver, Zaria)*

258 This view was corroborated by the CAB participants saying that full disclosure of  
259 information about the research to be carried out for which participants would be recruited  
260 is important. According to a participant:

261 *There must be full disclosure and the complete information must be provided*  
262 *regarding the purpose for this research (CAB, Zaria).*

263 This view was corroborated by the stroke survivor group according to one of them saying:

264 *It is telling people all about the research - the good, the bad, and the ugly part of*  
265 *the research. Thereby participants are making an informed decision to be part of*  
266 *the studies. (Stroke survivor, Zaria)*

267 With respect to ethical concerns about neurobiobanking research, most respondents were in full  
268 support of sample usage, storage, and data sharing provided study participants are duly informed

269 *So you have to inform the person that sample will be stored for future use because*  
270 *you cannot just take the sample and use it without informing the person (Stroke*  
271 *Free control, Accra).*

272 **Coercion**

273 Participants were of the view that consent should be sought without coercion. They argued that  
274 participants should have a good understanding of the reasons they should participate in the  
275 research. For instance, a participant said:

276 *Consent that is given out of knowledge, for the fact that you know, not that you were*  
277 *compelled, or you are forced, or you are coerced...it means you have been told what*  
278 *it entails. (Abeokuta, CAB).*

279  
280 A stroke - free control participant emphasized the need for voluntariness (out of a free will) saying:

281 *...that everything that you are doing (participation) is out of your own free will, you*  
282 *know nobody is forcing you to do it, every role you are to play, you are playing it*  
283 *freely and you are not doing it under duress. (Stroke - free control, Abeokuta).*

## 284 **Inducement**

285 Participants emphasized that research participants should not be made to participate in  
286 research by giving or promising them what would make them lose their senses in making  
287 an irrational decision. For them, consent must be given freely without undue inducement.  
288 Adequate knowledge of the research activities was considered important for avoiding  
289 undue inducement. According to a participant:

290 *You know what you are doing, you are not just giving the consent out of any*  
291 *inducement, it is done voluntarily, it is done by knowledge, it is done with full*  
292 *information at your disposal (CAB, Abeokuta).*

## 293 **Beneficence**

294 With regards to the benefits of participating and sharing genetic information, participants across  
295 sites hold positive and inviting views towards stroke genomic research. The views are categorized  
296 into three themes: Individual outcomes, knowledge of treatment of stroke, and diagnosis of stroke.  
297 This will guide effective and informed participation in research.

## 298 **Individual outcomes**

299 Participants revealed that individual outcomes (benefits) as important ingredients in research  
300 participation. This view is rooted in the idea that individual outcomes of participating in research  
301 provide benefits to the community

302 *... You can share with others; we too can gain from their research. For example,*  
303 *they can do research we have not done, we can benefit from them. We too can-do*  
304 *research and they will benefit from us (Stroke survivor, Ilorin).*

305  
306 However, participants echoed the need to be informed about the risk and potential benefits of the  
307 study before consenting to participate indicated that *...the benefits are outlined and if there are*  
308 *any risk too you are told.... (CAB, Accra).*

309  
310 This view was corroborated by the stroke - free control group in Ibadan saying:  
311 *'The person must know about what he wants to get into and the benefits he will*  
312 *derive from it, the importance of the research, what he is going to gain from it*  
313 *before he can agree or disagree'. (Stroke -free control, Ibadan).*

314  
315 Most of the participants corroborated the fact that participants benefit from research outcomes and  
316 individuals can show reciprocity by contributing to research for the benefit of humanity.

317 *People have volunteered for research in the past that resulted in knowledge that is*  
318 *beneficial to my health so I would like to contribute to humanity (Stroke Free*  
319 *Control, Ilorin).*

320

321 Another potential benefit was expressed by a stroke survivor:

322 *It is good, research helps to inform and make people and government aware of the*  
323 *appropriate medications for certain types of diseases. (Stroke survivor, Kano).*

324 Participants' perceptions of sample use for neurobiobanking research were positive as they posited  
325 the benefits to the society as stated by a stroke caregiver thus..."*it is good because it makes*  
326 *diseases to reduce in our environment and anything that will reduce illnesses and diseases is good*  
327 *for our society. (Stroke caregiver, Abeokuta).* For the future advancement of genomic science '*It*  
328 *is good because you have something to fall back to when you want to do other genetic research*  
329 *(Stroke survivor, Zaria).* As well as benefits to humanity '*well, I think it a good thing I'm positively*  
330 *disposed to it, because the blood sample been kept is going to be used for research purposes that*  
331 *will benefit humanity so I'm positively disposed to it (Stroke - free control, Abeokuta).*

332

333

### 334 **Discovery of treatment of stroke**

335 Most of the participants across the study sites were in support of sharing data from stroke genomic  
336 research. They explained that the outcome of the research done with their samples will increase  
337 medical knowledge and practice in the treatment of stroke.

338 *'There is nothing wrong in that because it is the research some people do that gives*  
339 *us the knowledge of how to treat such diseases. So, if they do our own too and find*



340 *out the causes of our disease and how the disease can be treated...'* (Stroke  
341 survivor, Abeokuta).

342

343 Similarly, a stroke caregiver corroborated the view saying:

344 *'When you share data...it will serve as a standard for other health officials to know*  
345 *how to go about it when someone has the disease and then you can care for people*  
346 *well'* (Stroke caregiver, Accra).

347

348 The Stroke survivor group agreed with this opinion as indicated by one of them who said:  
349 *...It will increase the knowledge of the researchers and the providers* (Stroke survivor,  
350 Kano).

351

352 Similarly, the Stroke caregiver group corroborated the views on the advantages of data sharing  
353 citing how it can improve the knowledge of healthcare providers and increase expertise in stroke  
354 genomic research. A respondent said:

355 *'Sharing of data and other findings concerning participants is very good, it is*  
356 *through that the health providers updates their knowledge and skills to treat*  
357 *patients'* (Stroke caregiver, Kano).

358

359 Participants also expressed the opinion that storage of bio-samples for research will enhance the  
360 advancement of knowledge about diseases and new innovations for treatments.

361 *Storage of blood sample or fraction is very good, it is through those future*  
362 *investigations or research are conducted to know about the diseases and the new*  
363 *innovations on treatments and others (Stroke caregiver, Kano).*

## 364 **Diagnosis of stroke genetic disorders**

365 Participants were unanimous that research could advance the process of establishing the diagnoses  
366 of stroke genetic disorders as well as finding new treatments. A participant said:

367 *And the biobanking that you mentioned, I think it is very purposeful and if it is*  
368 *banked, the purpose of the banking is to ensure that you get the information so let's*  
369 *say you have stroke or the sickness when your blood sample is banked, it helps to*  
370 *do more ... So then you can also know the severity of the illness ) (Stroke survivor,*  
371 *Accra).*

## 372 **Non-maleficence**

373 There was a consensus among participants across the study sites about the use and sharing of data  
374 as well as the return of results. Several ethical concerns on conditions of use, data sharing, and  
375 return of result/incidental findings were emphasized by the participants.

376

## 377 **Privacy and confidentiality**

378 Participants' echoed support for sharing of genetic information, if only identity will be protected.

379 *...I don't see anything wrong with that if it will not involve mentioning our names*  
380 *(Stroke survivor Abeokuta).*

381 *'Well, I don't have any reservation about it and such information can be shared but*  
382 *about that as well will it be shared in a manner that will involve you saying this is*

383 *my blood which contains something that I don't want anyone to know and is it going*  
384 *to be shared in that manner? If it is going to be shared without my identity that*  
385 *shouldn't be a problem.'* (CAB member, Accra).

386 *I think if he would share it with another person, he has to seek my consent before*  
387 *he could share it with another person. If not, he is exposing my secret to someone*  
388 *else* (Stoke caregiver, Kumasi).

389 On the other hand, there was a participant who was not too concerned about the privacy  
390 and confidentiality of data,

391 *I don't have a problem with it. I gave it out so that it can be used to help others so*  
392 *I am okay with it being shared* (Stroke survivor, Kumasi).

393

#### 394 **Data security**

395 A relatively large number of participants expressed concerns about the security of data obtained  
396 from bio-sample data from participation in stroke genomic and neurobiobanking research

397 *The issue of confidentiality is very important because if data is not properly*  
398 *managed there could be leakage which has legal implications that may result in*  
399 *suing ourselves* (Stroke survivor, Abeokuta).

#### 400 **Stigmatization**

401 Most participants acknowledged the risk associated with stroke genomic and neurobiobanking  
402 research. A potential risk is stigmatization.

403 *I think that stigmatization is also another factor, and we are in a society where*  
404 *people would always be stigmatized and given names based on their sickness and*

405 *because of this people find it very difficult opening up, to give themselves up for a*  
406 *certain research work... (Stroke survivor, Accra).*

407 These views suggest that an individual's health condition, especially when it is stigmatized, may  
408 influence response to persons experiencing or who had experienced one form of ill-health  
409 condition would want to participate in research on such condition or not.

410

## 411 **Discussion**

412 The study explored participants' perception of ethical issues in genomics and neurobiobanking  
413 using the Beauchamp and Childress (2001) ethical principles of autonomy, beneficence and non-  
414 maleficent. Data revealed similar sensitivities in perception from participants that understanding  
415 of research purpose, disclosure of details of the research process, coercion, inducement, individual  
416 outcomes, knowledge of treatment of stroke, diagnosis of stroke genetic disorders, privacy and  
417 confidentiality, data security, and stigmatization were critical ethical concerns associated with  
418 genomic and neurobiobanking research identified by participants across the study sites.

419

420 Participants were of the view that understanding and participation in stroke genomic and  
421 neurobiobanking research depends on how ethical issues and concerns are taken into consideration  
422 in the research process. Participants argued that the relationship between participants and  
423 researchers is shaped by community engagement strategy resulting in how well the potential  
424 participants understand the research process starting with the informed consent, use of the sample,  
425 and data sharing in an ethically safe approach. This finding agrees with other emerging body of  
426 knowledge from Africa on the collection, use, storage, and data sharing of biological samples [14-

427 17]. Participants were of the view that adequate understanding of research during the consenting  
428 process is important for making well informed decision. This confirms the view expressed in an  
429 earlier study by [18] where it was argued that comprehension of information is an important  
430 ingredient to achieving free and informed consent decision making. Therefore, advancing research  
431 endeavours and promoting willingness especially in genomics and neurobiobanking requires  
432 innovative ways such as equipping researchers with adequate knowledge of the vocabularies in the  
433 field as well as translating them to the language of the participants for ease of comprehension. For  
434 example, we previously developed a mini dictionary showing definitions of vocabularies present  
435 in both our study instruments and the informed consent document [19]. This was translated to the  
436 main local languages in the different sites and each research assistant used this as guide when  
437 engaging the research participants in the language of their choice. This enhanced better  
438 understanding of the research focus and processes among the study participants.

439 While most participants viewed data sharing as a benefit, privacy and confidentiality of  
440 information were major ethical concerns raised by most of the participants. These views suggest  
441 that researchers have an obligation to accord respect to participants and allow them make an  
442 autonomous decision about their preference for sharing and re-use of their data. Participants were  
443 of the view that this should be agreed upon explicitly by both participants and researchers during  
444 the informed consent process. This finding agrees with views expressed by participants in a  
445 previous study with a similar theme [16, 20].

446 Coercion and inducement were viewed as twin ethical issues that need to be properly addressed so  
447 that participation in genomic and neurobiobanking research would be ethical. Free and informed  
448 consent, as the process of engaging potential participants, remains the solution to avoid coercion  
449 and inducement. Similarly, majority in our previous study opined that donation for genomic

450 research should be a personal decision[21]. Due to the nature of genomic and neurobiobanking  
451 research, participation would be determined by how well participants are recruited and retained in  
452 the study. Coercion and inducement can be minimized by the researcher's relationship with the  
453 potential participants. When trust is established with a particular researcher it can be extended to  
454 other researchers as earlier reported [22]. It is therefore imperative that researchers be transparent  
455 with participants so that they can gain their trust. They should ensure that the trust is sustained  
456 because once trust is lost it is difficult to recapture[23].

457 Closely associated with trust are issues of privacy and confidentiality. This is important because  
458 they determine, to a large extent, how participants would respond to requests for use, storage and  
459 sharing of data. All these bother on how much trust research participants have towards researchers.  
460 Research participants may use potential benefits as a condition for establishing trust in the  
461 researcher as earlier reported [22]. Therefore, providing unrealistic potential benefits may cause  
462 harm to the research process. However, researchers should endeavour to discuss both short- and  
463 long-term benefits of the research with the participants[24].

464 Participants also raised concern about the stigmatization of health conditions as an important issue  
465 to take into consideration during research engagement. This is because if the outcome of a  
466 diagnosis would result in a stigmatization, as is the case with stroke, participants may not want to  
467 participate. In this study participants indicated that stigmatization is a major risk associated with  
468 stroke genomic research. Despite large scale research on the challenges associated with  
469 stigmatized health conditions resulting in a large volume of scholarly publication in the literature,  
470 little attention has been devoted to addressing the ethical issues on stigmatized groups and health  
471 conditions[25]. Generally, a major ethical challenge identified with the stigmatized condition is

472 the vulnerability of the person experiencing it[26]. This suggests the need for researching this area  
473 to understand how better to protect the vulnerable population.

## 474 **Conclusion**

475 This study demonstrated that details of the research process, coercion, inducement, individual  
476 outcomes, knowledge of treatment of stroke, diagnosis of stroke genetic disorders, privacy and  
477 confidentiality, data security and stigmatization were ethical issues associated with genomic and  
478 neurobiobanking research in this cohort of West African research participants. Participants were  
479 of the view that understanding and disclosure of detailed information about the research during the  
480 consenting process would enable potential research participants make free and informed choices.  
481 Also, adequate knowledge of the research process through disclosure of information about the  
482 research in the informed consent process would reduce coercion and inducement as well as  
483 promote trustworthiness between participants and researchers. Participants were positive towards  
484 participation in neurobiobanking research but have specific ethical concerns that should be  
485 addressed within local contexts. Finally, the study showed that the ethical issues around  
486 stigmatizing health conditions are a major hindrance to a willingness to participate in research by  
487 persons experiencing such stigmatizing health conditions.

488 Researchers should take into consideration the ethical concerns of stroke genomic and  
489 neurobiobanking research participants in order to gain their trust and sustain their participation.  
490 The researcher should also ensure that participants are fully informed about what they need to  
491 know about the use, re-use, and sharing of their data and/or biological samples.

## 492 **Funding**

493 ROA is supported by the African Neurobiobank for Precision Stroke Medicine ELSI Project  
494 (U01HG010273), Recruitment and Retention for Alzheimer's Disease Diversity Genetic Cohorts  
495 in the ADSP (READD-ADSP) (U19AG074865), and the Origins of Alzheimers Disease in African  
496 Americans (R01AG072547) from the National Institutes of Health. MO is supported by grants  
497 from the National institute of Health, the SIREN Study (U54HG007479) and the Systematic  
498 Investigation of Blacks with Stroke using Genomics (SIBS Genomics) Study (R01NS107900).  
499 ROA is further supported by the UK Royal Society/African Academy of Sciences  
500 (FLR/R1/191813, FCG/R1/201034) and the Alzheimer Association (GBHI ALZ UK-21- 24204).

## 501 **Disclosure of interest**

502 The authors report there are no competing interests to declare.

## 503 **References**

- 504 1. Mulder N, Abimiku A, Adebamowo SN, de Vries J, Matimba A, Olowoyo P, et al.  
505 H3Africa: current perspectives. *Pharmgenomics Pers Med*. 2018;11:59-66.
- 506 2. Rotimi C, Abayomi A, Abimiku A, Adabayeri VM, Adebamowo C, Adebisi E, et al.  
507 Research capacity. Enabling the genomic revolution in Africa. *Science*. 2014;344(6190):1346-8.
- 508 3. H3Africa Ethics Working Group. Ethics and governance framework for best practice in  
509 genomic research and biobanking in Africa. 2018.
- 510 4. Akinyemi RO, Jenkins C, Nichols M, Singh A, Wahab K, Akpalu A, et al. Unraveling the  
511 Ethical, Legal, and Social Implications of Neurobiobanking and Stroke Genomic Research in  
512 Africa: A Study Protocol of the African Neurobiobank for Precision Stroke Medicine ELSI  
513 Project. *Int J Qual Methods*. 2020;19.



- 514 5. De Vries J, Bull SJ, Doumbo O, Ibrahim M, Mercereau-Puijalon O, Kwiatkowski D, et al.  
515 Ethical issues in human genomics research in developing countries. *BMC medical ethics*.  
516 2011;12:1-10.
- 517 6. Joly Y, Dalpé G, So D, Birko S. Fair shares and sharing fairly: a survey of public views on  
518 open science, informed consent and participatory research in biobanking. *PloS one*.  
519 2015;10(7):e0129893.
- 520 7. Freund M, Taylor A, Ng C, Little AR. The NIH NeuroBioBank: creating opportunities for  
521 human brain research. *Handbook of Clinical Neurology*. 150: Elsevier; 2018. p. 41-8.
- 522 8. Akinyemi R, Ojagbemi A, Akinyemi J, Salami A, Olopade F, Farombi T, et al. Gender  
523 differential in inclination to donate brain for research among Nigerians: the IBADAN Brain Bank  
524 Project. *Cell Tissue Bank*. 2019;20(2):297-306.
- 525 9. Akinyemi RO, Salami A, Akinyemi J, Ojagbemi A, Olopade F, Coker M, et al. Brain  
526 banking in low and middle-income countries: Raison D'etre for the Ibadan Brain Ageing, Dementia  
527 And Neurodegeneration (IBADAN) Brain Bank Project. *Brain Res Bull*. 2019;145:136-41.
- 528 10. Ascencio-Carbajal T, Saruwatari-Zavala G, Navarro-Garcia F, Frixione E.  
529 Genetic/genomic testing: defining the parameters for ethical, legal and social implications (ELSI).  
530 *BMC Medical Ethics*. 2021;22(1):1-15.
- 531 11. Beauchamp TL, Childress JF. *Principles of biomedical ethics*: Oxford University Press,  
532 USA; 2001.
- 533 12. Iserson KV. Principles of biomedical ethics. *Emergency Medicine Clinics*.  
534 1999;17(2):283-306.

- 535 13. Nowell LS, Norris JM, White DE, Moules NJ. Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the  
536 trustworthiness criteria. *International journal of qualitative methods*.  
537 2017;16(1):1609406917733847.
- 538 14. Tindana P, Molyneux CS, Bull S, Parker M. Ethical issues in the export, storage and reuse  
539 of human biological samples in biomedical research: perspectives of key stakeholders in Ghana  
540 and Kenya. *BMC Medical Ethics*. 2014;15(1):1-11.
- 541 15. Bukini D, Mbekenga C, Nkya S, Purvis L, McCurdy S, Parker M, et al. A qualitative study  
542 on aspects of consent for genomic research in communities with low literacy. *BMC medical ethics*.  
543 2020;21(1):1-7.
- 544 16. Matandika L, Ngóngóla RT, Mita K, Manda-Taylor L, Gooding K, Mwale D, et al. A  
545 qualitative study exploring stakeholder perspectives on the use of biological samples for future  
546 unspecified research in Malawi. *BMC medical ethics*. 2020;21(1):1-10.
- 547 17. Ochieng J, Kwagala B, Barugahare J, Mwaka E, Ekusai-Sebatta D, Ali J, et al. Perspectives  
548 and ethical considerations for return of genetics and genomics research results: a qualitative study  
549 of genomics researchers in Uganda. *BMC medical ethics*. 2021;22:1-9.
- 550 18. Jegede AS. Understanding informed consent for participation in international health  
551 research. *Developing world bioethics*. 2009;9(2):81-7.
- 552 19. Uvere EO, Nichols M, Ojebuyi BR, Isah SY, Calys-Tagoe B, Jenkins C, et al. Capacity-  
553 Building for Stroke Genomic Research Data Collection: The African Neurobiobank Ethical, Legal,  
554 and Social Implications Project Experience. *Biopreserv Biobank*. 2023;21(2):158-65.
- 555 20. Erdmann A, Rehmann-Sutter C, Bozzaro C. Patients' and professionals' views related to  
556 ethical issues in precision medicine: a mixed research synthesis. *BMC medical ethics*.  
557 2021;22(1):116.

- 558 21. Singh A, Arulogun O, Akinyemi J, Nichols M, Calys-Tagoe B, Ojebuyi B, et al. Biological  
559 sample donation and informed consent for neurobiobanking: Evidence from a community survey  
560 in Ghana and Nigeria. *PLoS One*. 2022;17(8):e0267705.
- 561 22. Berrios C, James CA, Raraigh K, Bollinger J, Murray B, Tichnell C, et al. Enrolling  
562 genomics research participants through a clinical setting: the impact of existing clinical  
563 relationships on informed consent and expectations for return of research results. *Journal of genetic  
564 counseling*. 2018;27:263-73.
- 565 23. Jegede AS. What led to the Nigerian boycott of the polio vaccination campaign? *PLoS  
566 medicine*. 2007;4(3):e73.
- 567 24. Bedeker A, Nichols M, Allie T, Tamuhla T, van Heusden P, Olorunsogbon O, et al. A  
568 framework for the promotion of ethical benefit sharing in health research. *BMJ Glob Health*.  
569 2022;7(2).
- 570 25. Millum J, Campbell M, Luna F, Malekzadeh A, Karim QA. Ethical challenges in global  
571 health-related stigma research. *BMC medicine*. 2019;17:1-9.
- 572 26. Tekola F, Bull S, Farsides B, Newport MJ, Adeyemo A, Rotimi CN, et al. Impact of social  
573 stigma on the process of obtaining informed consent for genetic research on podoconiosis: a  
574 qualitative study. *BMC medical ethics*. 2009;10:1-10.

## 575 **Supplementary information**

576 **S1 File. Focus group discussion guide.**

577