

1 **Mentorship in Health Research Institutions in Africa: A Systematic Review of** 2 **Approaches, Benefits, Successes, Gaps and Challenges**

3 **Short title: Mentorship in health research institutions in Africa**

4 Maurine Ng'oda¹

5 Peter Muriuki Gatheru^{1,3}

6 Oyetunde Oyeyemi²

7 Phylis Busienei¹

8 Caroline H. Karugu¹

9 Sharon Mugo¹

10 Lilian Okoth¹

11 Margaret Nampijja¹

12 Sylvia Kiwuwa-Muyingo¹

13 Yohanness Dibaba Wado¹

14 Patricia Kitsao-Wekulo¹

15 Gershim Asiki¹

16 Evelyn Gitau¹

17

18 ¹African Population and Health Research Center, Nairobi, Kenya.

19 ²Department of Biosciences and Biotechnology, University of Medical Sciences, Ondo City,

20 Ondo Estate, Nigeria

21 ³School of Public Health, University of Ghana.

22

23 *Corresponding author:

24 mngoda@aphrc.org; maurinekn2012@gmail.com (MN)

25 Authorship contribution

26 MN, PMG, OO, PB – Conceptualization, methodology, data synthesis, writing original draft,

27 review & editing. MN, PKW, GA – Conceptualization, supervision, writing - review & editing.

28 SKM, LO, MNa, YDW, SM, CHK – Conceptualization, Data synthesis, writing – review &

29 **NOTE:** This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

30

31 **Abstract**

32 **Background:** In Africa, where the burden of diseases is disproportionately high, significant
33 challenges arise from a shortage of skilled researchers, lack of research funding, and limited
34 mentorship opportunities. The continent faces a substantial gap in research output largely
35 attributed to the dearth of mentorship opportunities for early career researchers.

36 **Objective:** To explore existing mentorship approaches, identify challenges, gaps, successes,
37 and benefits, and provide insights for strengthening mentorship programs in African health
38 research institutions.

39 **Methods:** We registered the review protocol on the International Prospective Register of
40 Systematic Reviews [CRD42021285018] and searched six electronic databases – EMBASE,
41 AJOL, Web of Science, PubMed, DOAJ and JSTOR from inception to 10 November 2023, for
42 studies published in English reporting on approaches of mentorship in health research in
43 African countries. We also searched grey literature repositories, institutional websites, and
44 reference lists of included studies for additional literature. Two independent reviewers
45 conducted screening of titles and abstracts of identified studies, full-text screening,
46 assessment of methodological quality, and data extraction. We assessed study quality against
47 the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT). We resolved any disagreements through
48 discussion and consensus. We employed a narrative approach to synthesize the findings.

49 **Results:** We retrieved 1799 articles and after screening, included 21 studies in the review. The
50 reviewers identified 20 mentorship programs for health researchers (N=1198) in 12 African
51 countries mostly focusing on early career researchers and junior faculty members. A few
52 included mid-career and senior researchers. We categorized the programs under three key

53 mentoring approaches: international collaborative programs, regional and in-country
54 collaborations, and specialized capacity-building initiatives. Our review highlighted the
55 following successes and benefits of health research mentorship programs: the establishment
56 of collaborations and partnerships, development of research programs and capacities,
57 improvement of individual skills and confidence, increased publications, and successful grant
58 applications. The gaps identified were limited funding, lack of a mentorship culture, negative
59 attitudes towards research careers, and lack of prioritization of research mentorship.

60 **Conclusion:** Our review highlights a diverse landscape of health research mentorship aspects
61 predominantly targeting early career researchers and heavily driven by the North. There is a
62 need for locally driven mentorship initiatives in Africa to strengthen mentorship in order to
63 advance health research in the region.

64 **Key words:** Mentorship, health research, early career researchers, Africa

65 PROSPERO registration number: CRD42021285018

66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79

80

81 **Introduction**

82 There exists a significant gap in research output in sub-Saharan Africa where the burden of
83 disease is disproportionately high (1). The current state of health science research, funding,
84 and research capacity in the continent falls short of addressing the existing and unmet health
85 research needs (2). Some of the contributing factors to this challenge are the scarcity of well-
86 trained and skilled researchers and lack of opportunities for hands-on research experience
87 with research specialists, leading to inadequate supervision and limited mentorship
88 opportunities for early career researchers (3).

89 Mentorship is defined in simple terms as a relationship where someone experienced, in this
90 context researcher, guides and supports another person to help them learn and grow
91 professionally (4). There are two common approaches to mentorship. The first approach is
92 the traditional one-on-one mentoring model (5). In this paradigm, an experienced researcher,
93 often with a distinguished record of accomplishment, provides guidance and support to a less
94 experienced mentee. This close, personalized interaction facilitates in-depth discussions,
95 transfer of skills, and the cultivation of a strong mentor-mentee relationship (6). Through this
96 approach, the mentor can offer valuable insights, share experiences, and assist the mentee
97 in navigating the complexities of the research landscape. The one-on-one model is particularly
98 effective for tailoring mentorship to the unique needs and goals of the mentee, fostering a
99 deep sense of individualized support and professional development (5).

100 The second common approach to mentorship in research involves group or team-based
101 mentoring (7). In this collaborative model, a mentor oversees a cohort of mentees who work
102 together on related research projects or within a shared research theme. This approach
103 promotes a sense of community and encourages peer learning among mentees. Group

104 mentoring can be especially beneficial in fostering interdisciplinary collaborations, providing
105 diverse perspectives, and creating a supportive network for mentees (6). It also allows the
106 mentor's expertise to be leveraged across multiple individuals simultaneously (8). The group
107 dynamic enhances social learning, as mentees not only benefit from the mentor's guidance
108 but also from the collective knowledge and experiences of their peers. Group mentorship is
109 adaptable to various research settings and can effectively address the evolving needs of
110 mentees in collaborative research environments (7).

111 Recognizing mentorship as a vital strategy for personal and professional growth (9,10), there
112 is a growing awareness of its importance in enhancing the capacities of individuals, including
113 researchers (11). However, mentorship practices are not widespread in low- and middle-
114 income countries (LMICs) (12), and available evidence on existing approaches demonstrates
115 mixed results regarding effectiveness, often failing to account for the unique challenges and
116 structures present in the research systems. The dearth of a well-established culture of
117 mentorship, the absence of formal policies, and the inadequacy of structured tools for
118 assessing mentorship further compound the challenges faced in fostering effective
119 mentorship programs in LMICs (13).

120 The aim of the systematic review was to inform the development of optimized mentorship
121 programs that address the specific needs and challenges faced by health researchers in Africa.
122 We sought to synthesize evidence on various mentorship approaches prevalent in the region
123 in order to provide a more comprehensive understanding of mentorship in health research
124 institutions in Africa. We explored the nature and effectiveness of mentorship initiatives in
125 African research institutions to identify both successes and challenges encountered in
126 implementing these programs, pinpoint existing gaps in mentorship practices, and provide
127 valuable insights.

128 **Methods**

129 **Protocol registration**

130 We followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses
131 (PRISMA) guidelines (2020) as shown in supplementary documents S1 Table. We registered
132 the protocol for this review with the PROSPERO under the registration number
133 CRD42021285018.

134 **S1 Table: PRISMA guidelines (2020)**

135 **Information sources and search**

136 We identified relevant studies by searching various databases such as EMBASE, AJOL, Web of
137 Science, DOAJ, PubMed, and JSTOR from their inception up to 10th November 2023.
138 Additionally, we conducted searches on open grey literature repositories and specific
139 institutional websites to identify any other relevant studies. We also conducted a manual
140 search of reference lists of identified studies for any additional findings. A list of relevant
141 search terms and keywords was prepared. The search terms were used in the following
142 combinations: (“Practices”) AND (“Success” OR “Benefits” OR “Advantages”) AND (“Gaps” OR
143 “Challenges”) AND (“mentor” OR “mentorship” OR “mentoring” OR “mentoring relationship”
144 OR “onsite training” OR “vertical mentorship” OR “on-the-job training” OR “OJT” OR “capacity
145 building” OR “capacity strengthening” OR “mentee” OR “mentoring program” OR “mentoring
146 models” OR “career coaching” OR “career counselling” OR “career support” OR “mentorship
147 advice”) AND (“research institutions” OR “research program” OR “researchers” OR “research
148 organizations”) AND (“Africa” OR “African” OR “sub-Saharan Africa” OR “Africa South of the
149 Sahara” OR “East Africa” OR “West Africa” OR “Southern Africa” OR “Central Africa” OR

150 “Northern Africa”). The detailed search strategy is described in supplementary documents S2

151 Table.

152 **S2 Table: Search strategy**

153 **Study selection and eligibility criteria**

154 Teams of two reviewers from MN, PMG, OO, SM, CHK, SM, LO, MNa, SKM, YDW, and PKW
155 independently screened titles, abstracts, and full texts of the selected studies. Any
156 disagreements between the two reviewers were addressed through discussion and
157 consensus, or by consulting a senior reviewer (GA). The scope of our search was limited to
158 studies published in English language. We used the Population, Intervention, Comparison,
159 Outcomes and Study (PICOS) design as a framework to formulate eligibility criteria. The PICOS
160 elements comprised; i) participants – researchers at any career level, serving as mentors or
161 mentees; ii) interventions – diverse mentoring programs of varied types, durations, and
162 regularities; iii) comparisons – all mentorship programs were considered, regardless of the
163 presence of a comparison group; iv) outcomes – studies reporting on mentorship approaches,
164 benefits, successes, gaps, and challenges were included in the review; v) settings – African
165 academic and/or research institutions. Articles focusing on non-human health research were
166 not eligible. We also excluded systematic reviews, conference abstracts, commentaries, and
167 opinion pieces.

168 **Data collection process**

169 Four reviewers (MN, PMG, OO, PB) independently extracted data from the selected studies
170 using a Microsoft Excel extraction form. Key variables extracted were study author and date,
171 country, study design, characteristics of the study population, sample size, intervention,
172 mode of delivery, and outcome measures, including challenges, gaps, benefits, and successes.

173 Discrepancies during the extraction process were resolved through discussion and consensus
174 building.

175 **Assessment of methodological quality**

176 Two reviewers (MN, PM) independently evaluated the quality of the included studies using
177 the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) (14), which enables the concurrent assessment
178 of various empirical study types. The MMAT encompasses two general screening questions
179 applicable to all study types and specific sets of five questions for each of the five study types:
180 qualitative, quantitative randomized controlled trials, quantitative non-randomized,
181 quantitative descriptive, and mixed methods design. Both reviewers utilized the MMAT
182 criteria to assess key methodological components, including sampling, data collection,
183 response bias, outcome measurements, and data analysis/reporting, providing a
184 comprehensive evaluation of each study's overall quality. Disagreements were resolved
185 through discussion and consensus. Ratings were assigned based on the proportion of fulfilled
186 quality criteria, with studies classified as low risk ($\geq 75\%$), moderate risk (25-75%), or high risk
187 ($< 25\%$). The included articles were categorised as qualitative, quantitative (observational),
188 and mixed methods studies.

189 **Outcome measures**

190 The primary outcome of this review was the mentorship approach including the mode and
191 period of delivery. Secondary outcomes included successes, benefits, gaps, and challenges
192 associated with the mentorship interventions.

193 **Synthesis of evidence**

194 We employed a narrative synthesis approach to interpret findings from the included studies.
195 For this reason, publication bias and heterogeneity in study designs, interventions, and
196 outcomes were not considered. A comprehensive exploration of the outcomes of interest
197 within the literature was achieved through a narrative synthesis. The synthesis involved
198 summarizing the characteristics of included studies, such as study design, population,
199 interventions, and key outcomes. We then categorized findings based on themes, similarities,
200 and differences, providing a nuanced understanding of the evidence. The narrative synthesis
201 was guided by the PRISMA guidelines.

202 **Results**

203 **Search output**

204 The initial search yielded 1623 articles from six databases. We identified an additional 176
205 articles through searches on open grey and specific institutional websites, resulting in 1799
206 retrieved articles. After removing 423 duplicates, we screened 1376 titles and abstracts,
207 leading to the preliminary selection of 303 articles for full-text review. Ultimately, 21 studies
208 that met the inclusion criteria were included in the review as shown in Fig 1.

209 **Fig 1. Flow diagram for study identification**

210 **Study characteristics**

211 All the 21 studies included in the review were observational studies published between 2013
212 and 2023. The studies were from 12 different African countries including Kenya, Tanzania,
213 Uganda, Ethiopia, Nigeria, South Africa, Malawi, Ghana, Liberia, Zimbabwe, Rwanda, and
214 Lesotho. The primary studies used diverse methods which included qualitative designs (10

215 studies; 48%) (15–24), quantitative designs (9 studies; 43%) (25–33), and mixed methods (2
216 studies; (9%) (32, 33).

217 **Characteristics of participants**

218 The review included a diverse cohort of early career, mid-career, and senior researchers (N=
219 1198) from various institutions. The participants were recruited from universities (13, 14, 18,
220 19, 21, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 32), health research institutions (15–17, 20, 22, 23, 25, 28), public
221 health teaching institutions (33), and hospitals (35). Notably, their work focus spanned a
222 range of fields, including HIV/AIDS research, mental health, sanitation and hygiene, family
223 health, biomedical sciences, biostatistics, health system and policy, and public health. The
224 inclusion of mid- or senior-level faculty researchers, doctoral fellows, statisticians, and
225 undergraduate students contributed to a well-rounded participant pool. This diversity not
226 only enriches the study's findings but also underscores the broad relevance and applicability
227 of research mentorship across multiple disciplines within the health sciences. The detailed
228 characteristics of the individual studies included in the review can be found in supplementary
229 information (S3 Table).

230 **S3 Table: Characteristics of studies included in the review**

231 **Methodological quality of individual studies**

232 Ten qualitative studies, nine quantitative studies, and two mixed-methods studies were
233 assessed for methodological quality. We rated eight studies as low risk and 13 studies as
234 moderate risk. Detailed information on the risk rating for each study can be found in
235 supplementary information (S4 Table).

236 **S4 Table: Risk of bias assessment for individual studies**

237 **Approaches of research mentorship**

238 We identified three key approaches from the included studies that have been used for
239 mentoring health researchers in Africa. Broadly, we have categorized these into international
240 collaborative programs (14–16, 19, 24, 33), regional and in-country collaborations (17, 18, 20,
241 23, 31), and specialized capacity building programs (21, 22, 25–28, 30, 32, 34).

242 **International collaborative programs**

243 International collaboration emerged as a central theme in the findings as one of the
244 approaches used in health research mentorship, demonstrating a concerted effort to foster
245 exchanges through cross-cultural training programs global symposia and workshops,
246 resources sharing through north-south and south-south collaborations, and building a global
247 community of researchers through multinational research hubs, global networks, and
248 infrastructure development. These collaborative initiatives aimed to transcend geographical
249 boundaries, leverage diverse expertise, and collectively address health research challenges to
250 achieve sustainable and impactful outcomes.

251 The ARCADE project (20) and the 5-year multinational collaboration across five African
252 countries, the USA, and the UK highlight both north-south and south-south collaborations
253 (34). These initiatives brought together researchers from different continents, acknowledging
254 the importance of shared expertise and resources. The collaborative capacity strengthening
255 initiative at the University of Western Cape (UWC) in South Africa (16), involving international
256 symposia and workshops provided platforms for researchers to come together, share insights,
257 and engage in collaborative learning. The exchange of ideas fosters a global perspective on
258 research challenges, methodologies, and solutions. The AIDS International Training and

259 Research Program (AITRP) (15) and the collaborative capacity strengthening initiative
260 involving the UWC in South Africa (16) exemplify cross-cultural training programs.

261 **Regional and in-country collaborations**

262 In-country and regional collaborations are also prominently highlighted as an avenue to
263 mentorship, reflecting the recognition of the importance of strengthening research capacity
264 at the local and regional levels. This theme involves partnerships and initiatives that focus on
265 collaboration within a specific country or region. For instance, the Nigeria Implementation
266 Science Alliance (NISA) (19), an initiative that involves collaboration among partners within
267 Nigeria and the sub-Saharan African region focuses on local research capacity strengthening.
268 The program aims to facilitate collaboration, enhance implementation research, and identify
269 culturally appropriate strategies to improve public health through research.

270 The Transforming Health Professions Education in Tanzania (THET) project (32) included a
271 component where young peers received mentorship from senior researchers through
272 mentored research awards and research training. These peers, in turn, provided reciprocal
273 peer-to-peer mentorship to undergraduate students. This approach emphasizes the
274 importance of building mentorship networks within the country, creating a sustainable model
275 for capacity strengthening. In a separate example, a series of two-day intensive regional
276 mentorship workshops were conducted over four years to train mid- and senior-level
277 investigators engaged in public health, clinical, and basic science research across multiple
278 academic institutions in LMICs (21). These workshops focused on developing mentorship skills
279 locally and regionally, recognizing the value of nurturing research talent within specific
280 geographic contexts. The African Mental Health Research Initiative (AMARI) (23) recruits and
281 trains research fellows at Master's, PhD, and post-doc levels within the African region. The

282 initiative aims to equip these fellows with research, teaching, and leadership skills to build a
283 viable and sustainable research network.

284 **Specialized capacity building programs**

285 This approach recognizes the importance of tailoring mentorship initiatives to the unique
286 needs and challenges faced by researchers in Africa and involves targeted initiatives designed
287 to enhance specific skills and competencies related to health research. For example, the
288 Consortium for Advanced Research Training in Africa (CARTA) program (26), delivered
289 through PhD training fellowships is a specialized training that focuses on creating a network
290 of locally trained but globally recognized African scholars. CARTA recognizes the importance
291 of advancing research capacity at the doctoral level locally, contributing to the development
292 of a cadre of highly skilled researchers.

293 The Sanitation and Hygiene Applied Research for Equity (SHARE) program (28) incorporates
294 specialized mentoring integrated into research, administration, financial management, and
295 communication activities. This approach ensures that participants receive guidance and
296 support in areas directly relevant to their research projects.

297 The Sexual Violence Research Initiative (18) provided intensive mentoring and technical
298 advice specifically for the development or adaptation and conduct of preliminary proof of
299 concept testing of violence against women and violence against children primary prevention
300 interventions. This specialized training addressed the unique challenges associated with
301 research on sensitive topics and provided targeted support for researchers in the field of
302 sexual violence prevention. The Medical Education Partnership Initiative – Medical Education
303 for Equitable Services for All Ugandans (MEPI-MESAU) program (29) goes beyond the
304 traditional mentorship by providing infrastructure support including administrative support,

305 paid tuition fees, tools, and skills training – on study design, biostatistics, manuscript and
306 grant writing, to early career researchers.

307 Lastly, initiatives like AFFIRM, LATIN-MH, PAM-D, RedeAmericas, and SHARE, funded by the
308 National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH), specifically targeted mental health research (24).
309 These hubs aimed to improve the research core for evidence-based mental health
310 interventions, enhance research skills in global mental health, and provide capacity-building
311 opportunities for early career investigators in LMICs. In Rwanda, the 6-week deliverable-
312 driven survey analysis training program (27) aimed at strengthening the skills of local research
313 leaders and statisticians. This hands-on training focused on a specific aspect of research
314 (survey analysis) and was designed to achieve tangible outcomes within a defined period.
315 Supplementary Table S5 summarizes the approaches to mentorship in health research
316 identified in this review.

317 **S5 Table: Summary of mentorship approaches identified in the 21 studies**

318 **Successes**

319 In this section, we highlight the diverse successes derived from the health research
320 mentorship programs implemented in 12 different African countries. We consolidate these
321 successes into five crucial themes outlined herewith: establishment of partnerships and
322 collaborations; development of research programs; individual capacity strengthening;
323 development of research publications; and successful grant applications and awards.

324 **Establishment of partnerships and collaborations**

325 Six studies mentioned the establishment of partnerships and collaborations as one of the
326 successes of mentorship programs in health research institutions in Africa (15, 19, 24, 25, 28,

327 29). The successes related to this aspect included the establishment of mutually beneficial
328 collaborations between investigators in different countries that were developed during
329 training, which built a supportive research environment. There were also shared and mutually
330 beneficial resources within international research collaborations, which supported early
331 career investigators and served as a conduit to transfer health research training opportunities
332 to researchers in African institutions (15). Through mentorship programs, various
333 organizations and government agencies were able to make definite commitments toward
334 more investment in implementation research. For example, in Nigeria, the National Agency
335 for the Control of AIDS (NACA) in collaboration with the United Nations Children’s Fund
336 (UNICEF) and the Population Council was able to launch the “Adolescent and Young People
337 Challenge” pilot project. This project sought to fund innovative ideas led by youth to provide
338 comprehensive HIV education to at least 200,000 Nigerians (19). The mentorship programs
339 also led to the establishment of sustainable partnerships between researchers in sub-Saharan
340 African countries and other LMICs, as well as with institutions in the north. These partnerships
341 facilitated collaborative cutting-edge research in global mental health and provided a
342 management strategy that builds partnerships between local and international partners for
343 efficient coordination and timely achievement of set goals (25).

344 **Development of research programs**

345 Thirteen studies reported the development of research programs as a key success of the
346 respective mentorship programs. The different aspects achieved under this theme, as
347 reported by the highlighted studies, were that early career investigators learned how to
348 navigate the complex international research environment to build local research capacity (14,
349 16) with trainees experiencing moderate increases in research confidence that were
350 statistically significant, and an observed positive research culture being created (35). In a

351 study conducted in Uganda, the mentored PhD students were able to supervise and mentor
352 65 Master's students, thus building local research capacity (28). Participation in workshops
353 provided knowledge on valuable concepts and a structure for the development and
354 strengthening of formal mentoring programs across LMIC institutions, leading to the growth
355 of institutional support, the establishment of several new institutional mentorship training
356 programs, the initiation of peer mentorship networks, and regular mentor-mentee meetings.
357 A qualitative study conducted in Kenya, Peru, India, and South Africa reported that the
358 mentorship training model expanded as a national mandate for research training, nested
359 within a required training program (21). Hubs that evolved into centers of research excellence
360 with a crop of dedicated researchers were also established (25).

361 **Individual capacity strengthening**

362 Individual capacity strengthening was reported to increase as participants engaged in various
363 training programs, workshops, and research activities. For instance, in Zimbabwe, faculty
364 members attended at least one of 15 faculty development workshops. Forty-one faculty
365 members underwent a one-year advanced faculty development training in medical education
366 and leadership, 33 mentored research scholars were trained under the novel NECTAR, and 52
367 and 12 in cardiovascular and mental health programs, respectively (34). In Rwanda, three-
368 quarters of the participants mentored others in survey data analysis or conducted an
369 additional survey analysis in the year following the training. Similarly, 36% of participants
370 completed an additional DHS analysis, 71% completed an additional survey analysis, and 79%
371 provided mentorship to others about survey data analysis (27).

372 In addition, individual capacity strengthening was achieved as mentors enrolled in other
373 courses or training. In Tanzania, most young peers had taken at least three research training

374 short courses, and six had enrolled in PhD programs. The number of fellows increased from
375 12 to 24, and mentored graduates increased from 41 to 67 in the second cohort. Eight senior
376 fellows enrolled in PhD programs, and 10 of 12 had registered for a PhD fellowship (31–33).
377 In Malawi, Uganda, and South Africa, the ARCADE project was successful in developing and
378 delivering courses that reached over 920 postgraduate students (20). In Ethiopia, Ghana,
379 Malawi, South Africa, Uganda, Zimbabwe, Kenya, Liberia, Nigeria, and Sri Lanka, the
380 mentorship programs have achieved more success, including participants completing their
381 courses for second master's degrees with a special focus on specific health aspects, winning
382 awards to support the further development of their research careers, and the appointment
383 of one participant as a professor and another young researcher at a Health Institute (24).

384 **Development of research publications**

385 The mentorship programs led to the development of new publications in various fields, as
386 reported by nine studies. For instance, during the first two years of the program in Tanzania,
387 various research articles from the mentored programs were published, with other
388 manuscripts in the final stages of preparation. Each mentee had at least one or more
389 manuscripts published or accepted for publication, and young peers shared authorship in at
390 least one of the published articles (31–33). Various publications were also done in other
391 different mentorship programs across various countries, with authorship being from multi-
392 institutional teams and submitted to international peer-reviewed scientific journals (23, 24,
393 26–28). In South Africa, 70 interns contributed to 51 peer-reviewed articles (22), while in
394 Uganda, 80 publications not related to PhD thesis work were co-authored by PhD students
395 (29).

396 **Successful grant applications and awards**

397 Five studies reported funding applications with some grants being awarded as a major success
398 derived from the mentorship programs. A study done in Ghana, Kenya, Liberia, Nigeria, and
399 South Africa reported 21 grant applications being made successfully over the mentorship
400 period (25). Similarly, in Tanzania, young peers began to broaden their research careers by
401 involvement in other ongoing research projects and grant applications (33), with a majority
402 (n=7/12) receiving research grants for their research program (32) and six small- to medium-
403 sized research grants won (31). Similarly, the mentorship programs led to the formation of a
404 peer network of researchers that was deemed a pivot of success. For instance, through the
405 SHARE program, nine networks were created during phase II of the project, out of which six
406 of the PhD students have pursued research that has led to independent grant funding, as well
407 as collaborative grants on which they are listed as a co-investigators (29). The mentorship
408 programs also led to awards. For instance, two travel fellowship grants for early career
409 researchers to attend the 2016 and 2017 World Psychiatric Association International Congress
410 were won. Grants to attend conferences to share findings for completed dissertation projects
411 were won, enabling participants to interact with other external partners and build sustainable
412 collaborations (24).

413 **Benefits**

414 This review reveals benefits that extend beyond the individual participants. We summarize
415 these benefits under three pivotal themes: capacity building and skill development;
416 networking and collaboration; and career advancement and marketability.

417 **Capacity building and skill development**

418 The mentorship programs led to significant skill development and capacity building among
419 participants (26, 32). This was evident through diverse training in research methodologies,
420 epidemiology, biostatistics, grant writing, and other crucial aspects (33). The acquisition of
421 these skills not only enhanced the participants' ability to conduct high-quality research (28,
422 33) but also made them valuable contributors to national and international projects (17). The
423 establishment of training centres and departments further institutionalised these skills,
424 fostering a culture of continuous learning and research excellence (26, 28).

425 **Networking and collaboration**

426 The initiatives for research mentorship played a crucial role in fostering strong collaborations
427 among institutions and researchers (20). These collaborations were instrumental in the
428 success of various projects and contributed to the publication of research papers (24, 28). The
429 projects served as a platform for early career and mid-level researchers to take leadership
430 roles in published papers (25), demonstrating the effectiveness of mentorship in fostering a
431 collaborative research environment. In addition, the North-South and regional collaboration
432 programs exposed participants to international perspectives thus encouraging the integration
433 of local and global knowledge (16, 33).

434 **Career advancement and marketability**

435 There was a positive impact of the mentorship programs on the career trajectories of
436 participants (28, 32, 33). Interns who engaged in significant research projects became more
437 marketable as research practitioners (22). The experience gained and the demonstrated
438 completeness of their work opened doors to attractive positions in academia (32, 33),

439 government, and other sectors (22). Additionally, the model of mentorship proved effective
440 in strengthening skills among full-time working professionals (27), allowing them to enhance
441 their capabilities without disrupting ongoing work commitments. This contributed to the
442 overall growth of faculty (34), increased student enrolment (33), and the establishment of
443 new research support centres (34).

444 **Challenges and gaps**

445 The reviewed studies identified limited funding and the absence of a robust mentorship
446 culture as significant barriers to research advancement. Negative perceptions of research as
447 a career path and the lack of emphasis on mentorship in research further exacerbated the
448 reported obstacles. The challenges were compounded by the Covid-19 pandemic, which
449 disrupted research operations and constrained available resources. These factors are
450 discussed in detail in the following section.

451 **Limited funding**

452 Six studies (15, 16, 18, 23, 25, 32) reported on the challenges of funding for health research
453 mentorship programs. Limited funding encompassed the failure of health researchers to
454 access funding to support research, the inability of early career researchers to access
455 independent research funding without external collaborators, and the inability to secure long-
456 term funding for meaningful capacity strengthening. Limited funding was also reported to
457 include a lack of support for degree programs, post-doctoral training, and research (14, 25).
458 A mismatch between the availability of short-term funds for specific research initiatives and
459 requirements for longer-term investment in capacity building was reported as a gap (16).
460 Lastly, in instances where funding is available, the funders often drive the focus of mentorship
461 programs, and the lack of southern ownership was identified as a gap (16).

462 **Lack of a healthy mentorship culture**

463 In seven studies, (15, 20–23, 25, 27), the lack of understanding of the concept of mentorship
464 leading to a lack of institutional mentoring culture was highlighted as a challenge. Sustaining
465 mentorship and institutional support for mentorship, and failure by institutions to
466 acknowledge or ‘give credit’ for mentoring activities in the merit or promotional processes
467 are notable challenges in health research mentorship. Of particular concern in many of the
468 mentorship programs was a general lack of time management strategies to balance
469 mentoring with other competing activities including academic pursuits, teaching duties, and
470 burdensome administrative roles. Related to the lack of a mentorship culture was limited
471 mentoring skills, and lack of motivation, or zeal on the part of both mentors and mentees.

472 Mentors reported that getting mentees to understand their roles and commit to achieving
473 the set goals was a burdensome challenge (16). Mentorship was also reported to place a
474 heavy demand on senior researchers’ time (21), which is already committed to urgent needs
475 such as obtaining donor funds, reporting to donors, managing projects, networking and
476 publishing – all attached to a researcher’s performance appraisal. This in turn led to increasing
477 levels of stress among mentors and very little time left to focus on mentees who needed
478 significant guidance and support (28).

479 For mentees, different sets of administrative regulations across institutions were reported to
480 lead to complications and delays in starting or sustaining certain capacity-building activities.

481 Mentees reported difficulties in balancing work burdens, as they were involved in research
482 activities as well as the training and support for their institutions and their development. This
483 lack of protected time for health research mentorship was also cited as a gap by one study
484 (33). Lack of infrastructure support that enables high-quality research including grants
485 administration, mentorship, research leadership, research culture, and open communication

486 between policymakers and researchers as well as difficulties in accessing a PhD supervisor
487 were other challenges faced by mentees (20–23). Several other gaps were also identified
488 including the lack of recognition of mentorship as a key success factor for early career
489 researchers (21), the absence of a formal mentorship structure (21,26), and the lack of clarity
490 in expectations of a mentor-mentee relationship (21).

491 **Negative attitudes towards research as a career**

492 Research, as a career, was not a very attractive proposition in many Southern contexts
493 according to some studies (16–19). Researchers being drawn by incentives to ‘consultancy
494 not research’ complicated this. Research was also viewed as inaccessible, especially to young
495 people and outside academic settings. Lack of research interest was cited as a gap in three
496 studies (14, 15, 22), with institutions such as universities or health departments prioritizing
497 teaching rather than focusing on research careers (18, 29).

498 **Lack of prioritisation of research mentorship**

499 The low priority given to research mentorship by funders and governments was recognized in
500 studies conducted in South Africa, Rwanda, Ghana, Kenya, Liberia, and Nigeria (21, 24), and
501 weak collaborations between different stakeholders and countries involved in mentorship
502 may have contributed to this (16). The absence of a national research strategy (16) was also
503 identified as a gap in research mentorship programs in various African countries.

504 **COVID-19 related factors**

505 Challenges related to the emergence of Covid-19 were reported in two studies (31, 32) and
506 included halting of physical meetings between mentors and mentees because of the global
507 restriction of face-to-face meetings. Other Covid-19-related challenges included suspension

508 of research activities such as enrolment of participants, procuring of laboratory reagents,
509 delays in data collection, hiking of prices, and delays in delivery of procured research materials
510 (32). Internet connectivity challenges leading to suboptimal quality of video conferences were
511 also highlighted as challenges (33).

512 **Discussion**

513 In this review, we identified 20 mentorship programs involving a diverse group of African
514 health researchers across 12 countries in sub-Saharan Africa. Only two of these were initiated
515 in Africa and funded from local sources. While most African researchers have benefited from
516 North-South collaboration, there is an opportunity to develop local mentorship programs to
517 reduce the overreliance on foreign-funded and foreign-driven programs. Foreign-initiated
518 and driven programs can be beneficial to building local health research capacity; however,
519 local programs are often more accessible and sustainable, given their understanding of the
520 local, context, infrastructure, and resources (30). Such programs can foster a stronger sense
521 of community and collaboration, contributing to long-term impact. Locally led initiatives also
522 empower African mentors to play leadership roles, reinforcing a sense of ownership and self-
523 determination in shaping the future of their communities (26). Overall, locally initiated
524 mentorship programs are better positioned to address the nuanced localized needs of
525 mentees, promoting a more inclusive and impactful approach to personal and professional
526 development. This finding is similar to those reported in earlier studies (36) that most health
527 research mentorship initiatives in LMICs were introduced and funded by high-income
528 countries and were not institutionalized as yet. Nevertheless, even though few, Africa-led,
529 Africa-centered, and Africa-specific initiatives such as the Alliance for Accelerating Excellence

530 in Africa (AESAs) and the Coalition for Research and Innovation (CARI) are platforms that can
531 provide support for training African researchers and opportunities for collaboration (1).

532 Our review highlights mentorship benefits that extend beyond the individual level to
533 institutional, country, regional, and international arenas. Capacity building and skills
534 development, networking and collaboration, and career development and marketability were
535 highlighted in the reviewed studies. Not only were individuals participating in mentorship
536 programs upskilled in various aspects such as research methodologies, epidemiology,
537 biostatistics, and grant writing among other skills, but mentorship enabled individuals to
538 contribute to national and international projects. Enhancing individual capacities enables
539 local researchers and junior faculty to navigate the complex international research
540 environment and transfer health research training to African institutions. Even though most
541 mentorship initiatives are North-initiated and driven, the programs expose participants to
542 international perspectives that contribute to the integration of local and international
543 knowledge. Additionally, participants are also enabled to develop their research niches within
544 academia, government, and the private sector.

545 We further establish that the main hindrance to the development of health research capacity
546 including mentorship programs is limited local funding. Current funding for health research
547 and research capacity development remains inadequate to address Africa's unmet health
548 needs. This calls for African countries to develop clear and context-informed strategies and
549 mechanisms to foster both private and public investment in health research capacity
550 development. Furthermore, African countries can leverage international programs which can
551 be institutionalized and tailored to respond to local needs for health research capacity
552 development. Consistent with our findings, limited local health research capacity

553 development funding has also been previously highlighted by other researchers as a major
554 challenge to capacity development (1, 14, 35).

555 Additionally, lack of a healthy mentorship culture in most African health research institutions
556 mostly arising from a lack of understanding of the concept and importance of mentorship in
557 research capacity development was a substantial gap. Efforts are needed to ensure that
558 mentorship is appreciated and given credit during merit and promotion activities. This will
559 ensure that mentorship is prioritized alongside other core research capacity activities such as
560 teaching, administrative roles, applying for grants, managing projects, reporting to donors,
561 and networking. Coupled with mentorship prioritization, capacity development in mentorship
562 skills, and arousing interest to engage in mentorship would also contribute to having
563 mentorship being treated as an important part of health research capacity development.

564 Lastly, for mentorship to be viewed as a key success factor for early career researchers and
565 junior faculty, institutions must address unfavorable administrative regulations, and lack of
566 protected time along the mentorship continuum for both mentors, and mentees.
567 Additionally, deliberate efforts to establish formal mentorship structures, provide clarity in
568 expectations of a mentor-mentee relationship, and prioritize mentorship on the part of
569 funders, governments, and institutions will go a long way in institutionalizing health research
570 mentorship in Africa.

571 **Conclusion**

572 Our review revealed three main approaches to mentorship in Africa: international
573 collaborative programs, regional and in-country collaborations, and specialized capacity-
574 building programs. The successes of these programs were diverse and included the
575 establishment of partnerships, the development of research programs, individual capacity

576 strengthening, increased publication outputs, and successful grant applications and awards.

577 These programs not only benefited individual participants but also contributed to broader
578 capacity building, skill development, networking, collaboration, and career advancement at
579 institutional, country, regional, and international levels.

580 However, several challenges and gaps were identified, such as limited funding, a lack of a
581 healthy mentorship culture, negative attitudes toward research as a career, lack of
582 prioritization of research mentorship, and challenges related to the COVID-19 pandemic. The
583 review emphasizes the critical need for increased local funding for health research
584 mentorship programs, the establishment of a robust mentorship culture, and addressing
585 challenges related to administrative regulations, protected time, and mentorship skills.

586 Furthermore, the findings underscore the importance of developing locally initiated
587 mentorship programs to reduce reliance on foreign-funded initiatives. Researchers should
588 make efforts to establish local and regional collaborative partnerships. While international
589 collaborations are valuable, locally led programs can be more accessible, sustainable, and
590 tailored to address nuanced local needs, fostering a stronger sense of community and
591 collaboration.

592 In addressing the identified challenges and building on the successes, African countries must
593 develop clear and context-informed strategies for both public and private investment in
594 health research capacity development. Additionally, efforts are needed to promote
595 mentorship appreciation in merit and promotion activities, develop mentorship skills, and
596 institutionalize mentorship structures. Only through these comprehensive efforts can health
597 research mentorship be prioritized and effectively contribute to the sustainable development
598 of research capacity in Africa.

599 **Limitations of the study**

600 While this systematic review provides important insights into mentorship programs for health
601 researchers in African institutions, it is crucial to recognize certain inherent limitations in the
602 study design and execution. The review's focus on studies published exclusively in English
603 introduces a potential language bias, as pertinent research in other languages might have
604 been overlooked, potentially impacting the thoroughness of the findings. Additionally,
605 despite efforts to include diverse African regions, the search strategy may exhibit biases
606 toward specific countries or regions, stemming from variations in research visibility and
607 accessibility. This potential bias could constrain the generalizability of the findings across the
608 entire African continent. To mitigate these limitations, multiple databases were consulted,
609 and searches were conducted using a variety of relevant keywords and MeSH terms to
610 retrieve as many articles as possible and to ensure a comprehensive coverage of mentorship
611 programs across different African contexts. Lastly, the heterogeneity of mentorship
612 programs, characterized by variations in types, durations, and regularities, poses challenges
613 in comparing and synthesizing outcomes. To address this challenge, we made effort to
614 systematically categorize and classify mentorship programs based on predefined criteria,
615 allowing for a structured synthesis of findings.

616 Despite these limitations, the systematic approach, adherence to PRISMA guidelines, and
617 comprehensive exploration of mentorship outcomes enhance the credibility of the findings
618 derived from this review. Nevertheless, researchers and policymakers should approach the
619 interpretation of the results with an awareness of these limitations and endeavour to conduct
620 further research addressing identified gaps and challenges in mentorship programs for health
621 researchers in Africa.

622

623 **Acknowledgements**

624 We would like to express our sincere gratitude to the African Research Excellent Fund (AREF)
625 for their generous support of this systematic review, which was facilitated through the African
626 Population and Health Research Center via its Research and Related Capacity Strengthening
627 (RRCS) unit. We extend our heartfelt appreciation to Lisa Omondi for her invaluable
628 contribution in organizing writing workshops specifically tailored for this review. Her
629 dedication and expertise significantly enhanced the quality and rigor of our work.

630 **Competing interests:** Authors declare no competing interests.

631 **Data availability statement:** All data relevant to the review are included in the article or
632 uploaded as supplementary information.

633 **Supplementary information**

634 Fig 1. Flow diagram for study identification

635 S1 Table: PRISMA guidelines (2020)

636 S2 Table: Search strategy

637 S3 Table: Characteristics of studies included in the review.

638 S4 Table: Risk of bias assessment for individual studies.

639 S5 Table: Summary of mentorship approaches identified in the 21 studies.

640 S6 Table: List of abbreviations

641

642

643

644

645

646

647

648


649

650

651 References

- 652 1. Simpkin V, Namubiru-Mwaura E, Clarke L, Mossialos E. Investing in health r&d: Where we are,
653 what limits us, and how to make progress in africa. *BMJ Glob Heal*. 2019;4(2).
- 654 2. Kasprowicz VO, Chopera D, Waddilove KD, Brockman MA, Gilmour J, Hunter E, et al. African-
655 led health research and capacity building- is it working? *BMC Public Health*. 2020;20(1):1–10.
- 656 3. Jasińska KK, Guei S. Neuroimaging field methods using functional near infrared spectroscopy
657 (NIRS) neuroimaging to study global child development: Rural sub-Saharan Africa. *J Vis Exp*.
658 2018;2018(132):1–11.
- 659 4. Nakanjako D, Byakika-Kibwika P, Kintu K, Aizire J, Nakwagala F, Luzige S, et al. Mentorship
660 needs at academic institutions in resource-limited settings: A survey at makerere university
661 college of health sciences. *BMC Med Educ*. 2011;11(1):1–6.
- 662 5. Nicholson BA, Pollock M, Ketcham CJ, Fitz Gibbon HM, Bradley ED, Gibbon F. Beyond the
663 mentor-mentee model: A case for multi-mentoring in undergraduate research. *Perspect*
664 *Undergrad Res Mentor* [Internet]. 2017;6(1):1–14. Available from:
665 <https://www.elon.edu/u/academics/undergraduate-research/purm/purm-6-1/>.
- 666 6. Mullen CA, Klimaitis CC. Defining mentoring: a literature review of issues, types, and
667 applications. *Ann N Y Acad Sci*. 2021;1483(1):19–35.
- 668 7. Young BR, Williamson HJ, Burton DL, Massey OT, Levin BL, Baldwin JA. Challenges and Benefits
669 in Designing and Implementing a Team-Based Research Mentorship Experience in Translational
670 Research. *Pedagog Heal Promot*. 2015;1(4):233–46.
- 671 8. Hunn V. African American Students, Retention, and Team-Based Learning: A Review of the
672 Literature and Recommendations for Retention at Predominately White Institutions. *J Black*
673 *Stud*. 2014;45(4):301–14.
- 674 9. Sambunjak D, Straus SE, Marušić A. Mentoring in academic medicine: A systematic review. *J*
675 *Am Med Assoc*. 2006;296(9):1103–15.
- 676 10. Margaret Nora L. The 21st century faculty member in the educational process-what should be
677 on the horizon? *Acad Med*. 2010;85(9 SUPPL.):45–55.
- 678 11. Kanaskie ML. Mentoring - A staff retention tool. *Crit Care Nurs Q*. 2006;29(3):248–52.
- 679 12. Sambunjak D, Straus SE, Marusic A. A systematic review of qualitative research on the meaning
680 and characteristics of mentoring in academic medicine. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2010;25(1):72–8.
- 681 13. Noormahomed E, Williams P, Lescano AG, Raj T, Bukusi EA, Schooley RT, et al. The evolution of
682 mentorship capacity development in low- and middle-income countries: Case studies from
683 Peru, Kenya, India, and Mozambique. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2019;100(Suppl 1):29–35.
- 684 14. Hong QN, Fàbregues S, Bartlett G, Boardman F, Cargo M, Dagenais P, et al. The Mixed Methods
685 Appraisal Tool (MMAT) version 2018 for information professionals and researchers. *Educ Inf*.
686 2018;34:285–91.
- 687 15. Daniels J, Nduati R, Kiarie J, Farquhar C. Supporting early career health investigators in Kenya:
688 A qualitative study of HIV/AIDS research capacity building. *Pan Afr Med J*. 2015;20:1–8.
- 689 16. Ager A, Zarowsky C. Balancing the personal, local, institutional, and global: Multiple case study
690 and multidimensional scaling analysis of African experiences in addressing complexity and
691 political economy in health research capacity strengthening. *Heal Res Policy Syst*.
692 2015;13(1):1–9.
- 693 17. Daniels J, Nduati R, Farquhar C. Right from primary school, i liked science: understanding health
694 research capacity building in sub-saharan africa through kenyan training experiences. *Glob*
695 *Health Promot*. 2014;21(2):32–42.
- 696 18. Dartnall E. Harnessing the power of South-South partnerships to build capacity for the
697 prevention of sexual and intimate partner violence. *African Saf Promot*. 2017;15(1):8–15.
- 698 19. Ezeanolue EE, Iheanacho T, Patel D V., Patel S, Sam-Agudu N, Obiefune M, et al. Challenges and
699 strategies for improving training of mid-level research personnel in Nigeria. *Ann Glob Heal*.
700 2019;85(1):1–6.
- 701 20. Färnman R, Diwan V, Zwarenstein M, Atkins S. Successes and challenges of north-south
702 partnerships - Key lessons from the African/Asian Regional Capacity Development projects.
703 *Glob Health Action*. 2016;9(1):1–10.

- 704 21. Gandhi M, Raj T, Fernandez R, Rispel L, Nxumalo N, Lescano AG, et al. Mentoring the mentors:
705 Implementation and evaluation of four fogarty-sponsored mentoring training workshops in
706 low-and middle-income countries. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2019;100(Suppl 1):20–8.
- 707 22. Mda T. Growing researchers from the historically disadvantaged groups through internships.
708 *Perspect Educ.* 2013;31(2):92–101.
- 709 23. Langhaug LF, Jack H, Hanlon C, Holzer S, Sorsdahl K, Mutedzi B, et al. “we need more big trees
710 as well as the grass roots”: Going beyond research capacity building to develop sustainable
711 careers in mental health research in African countries. *Int J Ment Health Syst [Internet].*
712 2020;14(1):1–14. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13033-020-00388-1>
- 713 24. Da Silva ATC, Hanlon C, Susser E, Rojas G, Claro HG, Quayle J, et al. Enhancing mental health
714 research capacity: Emerging voices from the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) global
715 hubs. *Int J Ment Health Syst [Internet].* 2019;13(1):1–9. Available from:
716 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13033-019-0276-9>
- 717 25. Gureje O, Seedat S, Kola L, Appiah-Poku J, Othieno C, Harris B, et al. Partnership for mental
718 health development in Sub-Saharan Africa (PaM-D): A collaborative initiative for research and
719 capacity building. *Epidemiol Psychiatr Sci.* 2019;28(4):389–96.
- 720 26. Somefun OD, Adebayo KO. The role of mentoring in research ecosystems in Sub-Saharan Africa:
721 Some experiences through the CARTA opportunity. *Glob Public Health.* 2021;16(1):36–47.
- 722 27. Thomson DR, Semakula M, Hirschhorn LR, Murray M, Ndahindwa V, Manzi A, et al. Applied
723 statistical training to strengthen analysis and health research capacity in Rwanda. *Heal Res*
724 *Policy Syst [Internet].* 2016;14(1):1–7. Available from: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12961-016-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12961-016-0144-x)
725 [0144-x](http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12961-016-0144-x)
- 726 28. Torondel B, Balls E, Chisenga CC, Kumwenda S, Okello E, Simiyu S, et al. Experiences of capacity
727 strengthening in sanitation and hygiene research in Africa and Asia: The SHARE Research
728 Consortium. *Heal Res Policy Syst.* 2019;17(1):1–10.
- 729 29. Manabe YC, Nambooze H, Okello ES, Kamyra MR, Katabira ET, Ssinabulya I, et al. Group
730 mentorship model to enhance the efficiency and productivity of PHD research training in Sub-
731 Saharan Africa. *Ann Glob Heal.* 2018;84(1):170–5.
- 732 30. Ughasoro M, Musa A, Yakubu A, Adefuye B, Folahanmi A, Isah A, et al. Barriers and Solutions
733 to Effective Mentorship in Health Research and Training Institutions in Nigeria: Mentors,
734 Mentees, and Organizational Perspectives. *Niger J Clin Pract.* 2019;22:1070–7.
- 735 31. Balandya E, Sunguya B, Kidenya B, Nyamhanga T, Minja IK, Mahande M, et al. Joint Research
736 Mentoring Through the Community of Young Research Peers: A Case for a Unifying Model for
737 Research Mentorship at Higher Learning Institutions. *Adv Med Educ Pract.* 2022;13(April):355–
738 67.
- 739 32. Mremi A, Pancras G, Mrema D, Morris B, Mwakyandile T, Msanga DR, et al. Mentorship of
740 young researchers in resource-limited settings: experiences of the mentees from selected
741 health sciences Universities in Tanzania. *BMC Med Educ.* 2023;23(1):1–7.
- 742 33. Balandya E, Sunguya B, Gunda DW, Kidenya B, Nyamhanga T, Minja IK, et al. Building
743 sustainable research capacity at higher learning institutions in Tanzania through mentoring of
744 the Young Research Peers. *BMC Med Educ.* 2021;21(1):1–11.
- 745 34. Hakim JG, Chidzonga MM, Borok MZ, Nathoo KJ, Matenga J, Havranek E, et al. Medical
746 Education Partnership Initiative (MEPI) in Zimbabwe: Outcomes and challenges. *Glob Heal Sci*
747 *Pract.* 2018;6(1):82–92.
- 748 35. McGuire CM, Riffenburg K, Malope S, Jack B, Borba CPC. Mixed-methods evaluation of family
749 medicine research training and peer mentorship in Lesotho. *African J Prim Heal Care Fam Med.*
750 2020;12(1):1–17.
- 751 36. Kaba M, Birhanu Z, Fernandez Villalobos NV, Osorio L, Echavarria MI, Berhe DF, et al. Health
752 research mentorship in low- and middle-income countries: a scoping review. *JBI Evid Synth.*
753 2023;21(10):1912–70.
- 754
- 755



Flow diagram for study identification