- 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 Yohaness 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- 29 evitting is preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

30

31 Abstract

Background: In Africa, where the burden of diseases is disproportionately high, significant 32 challenges arise from a shortage of skilled researchers, lack of research funding, and limited 33 mentorship opportunities. The continent faces a substantial gap in research output largely 34 35 attributed to the dearth of mentorship opportunities for early career researchers. **Objective:** To explore existing mentorship approaches, identify challenges, gaps, successes, 36 and benefits, and provide insights for strengthening mentorship programs in African health 37 research institutions. 38 Methods: We registered the review protocol on the International Prospective Register of 39 40 Systematic Reviews [CRD42021285018] and searched six electronic databases – EMBASE, AJOL, Web of Science, PubMed, DOAJ and JSTOR from inception to 10 November 2023, for 41 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 reference lists of included studies for additional literature. Two independent reviewers 44 conducted screening of titles and abstracts of identified studies, full-text screening, 45 assessment of methodological quality, and data extraction. We assessed study quality against 46 the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT). We resolved any disagreements through 47 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
64 65	Key words: Mentorship, health research, early career researchers, Africa PROSPERO registration number: CRD42021285018
64 65 66	Key words: Mentorship, health research, early career researchers, Africa PROSPERO registration number: CRD42021285018
64 65 66 67	Key words: Mentorship, health research, early career researchers, Africa PROSPERO registration number: CRD42021285018
64 65 66 67 68	Key words: Mentorship, health research, early career researchers, Africa PROSPERO registration number: CRD42021285018
64 65 66 67 68 69	Key words: Mentorship, health research, early career researchers, Africa PROSPERO registration number: CRD42021285018
64 65 66 67 68 69 70	Key words: Mentorship, health research, early career researchers, Africa PROSPERO registration number: CRD42021285018
64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71	Key words: Mentorship, health research, early career researchers, Africa PROSPERO registration number: CRD42021285018
 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 	Key words: Mentorship, health research, early career researchers, Africa PROSPERO registration number: CRD42021285018
 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 	Key words: Mentorship, health research, early career researchers, Africa PROSPERO registration number: CRD42021285018
 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 	Key words: Mentorship, health research, early career researchers, Africa PROSPERO registration number: CRD42021285018
 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 	Key words: Mentorship, health research, early career researchers, Africa PROSPERO registration number: CRD42021285018
 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 	Key words: Mentorship, health research, early career researchers, Africa PROSPERO registration number: CRD42021285018
 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 	Key words: Mentorship, health research, early career researchers, Africa PROSPERO registration number: CRD42021285018

80

81 Introduction

There exists a significant gap in research output in sub-Saharan Africa where the burden of disease is disproportionately high (1). The current state of health science research, funding, and research capacity in the continent falls short of addressing the existing and unmet health research needs (2). Some of the contributing factors to this challenge are the scarcity of welltrained and skilled researchers and lack of opportunities for hands-on research experience with research specialists, leading to inadequate supervision and limited mentorship 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, often with a distinguished record of accomplishment, provides guidance and support to a less 93 experienced mentee. This close, personalized interaction facilitates in-depth discussions, 94 transfer of skills, and the cultivation of a strong mentor-mentee relationship (6). Through this 95 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

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

111 Recognizing mentorship as a vital strategy for personal and professional growth (9,10), there is a growing awareness of its importance in enhancing the capacities of individuals, including 112 researchers (11). However, mentorship practices are not widespread in low- and middle-113 114 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 structures present in the research systems. The dearth of a well-established culture of 116 mentorship, the absence of formal policies, and the inadequacy of structured tools for 117 assessing mentorship further compound the challenges faced in fostering effective 118 mentorship programs in LMICs (13). 119

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. We sought to synthesize evidence on various mentorship approaches prevalent in the region 122 in order to provide a more comprehensive understanding of mentorship in health research 123 124 institutions in Africa. We explored the nature and effectiveness of mentorship initiatives in African research institutions to identify both successes and challenges encountered in 125 implementing these programs, pinpoint existing gaps in mentorship practices, and provide 126 valuable insights. 127

128 Methods

129 **Protocol registration**

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

134 S1 Table: PRISMA guidelines (2020)

135 Information sources and search

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

- 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

Teams of two reviewers from MN, PMG, OO, SM, CHK, SM, LO, MNa, SKM, YDW, and PKW 154 independently screened titles, abstracts, and full texts of the selected studies. Any 155 disagreements between the two reviewers were addressed through discussion and 156 consensus, or by consulting a senior reviewer (GA). The scope of our search was limited to 157 studies published in English language. We used the Population, Intervention, Comparison, 158 Outcomes and Study (PICOS) design as a framework to formulate eligibility criteria. The PICOS 159 160 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 regularities; iii) comparisons - all mentorship programs were considered, regardless of the 162 presence of a comparison group; iv) outcomes – studies reporting on mentorship approaches, 163 benefits, successes, gaps, and challenges were included in the review; v) settings - African 164 165 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 opinion pieces. 167

Data collection process

Four reviewers (MN, PMG, OO, PB) independently extracted data from the selected studies
using a Microsoft Excel extraction form. Key variables extracted were study author and date,
country, study design, characteristics of the study population, sample size, intervention,
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

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

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

We employed a narrative synthesis approach to interpret findings from the included studies. 194 For this reason, publication bias and heterogeneity in study designs, interventions, and 195 196 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 summarizing the characteristics of included studies, such as study design, population, 198 interventions, and key outcomes. We then categorized findings based on themes, similarities, 199 200 and differences, providing a nuanced understanding of the evidence. The narrative synthesis 201 was guided by the PRISMA guidelines.

202 **Results**

203 Search output

The initial search yielded 1623 articles from six databases. We identified an additional 176 articles through searches on open grey and specific institutional websites, resulting in 1799 retrieved articles. After removing 423 duplicates, we screened 1376 titles and abstracts, leading to the preliminary selection of 303 articles for full-text review. Ultimately, 21 studies 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

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

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

217 Characteristics of participants

The review included a diverse cohort of early career, mid-career, and senior researchers (N= 218 1198) from various institutions. The participants were recruited from universities (13, 14, 18, 219 19, 21, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 32), health research institutions (15–17, 20, 22, 23, 25, 28), public 220 221 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 health, biomedical sciences, biostatistics, health system and policy, and public health. The 223 224 inclusion of mid- or senior-level faculty researchers, doctoral fellows, statisticians, and undergraduate students contributed to a well-rounded participant pool. This diversity not 225 only enriches the study's findings but also underscores the broad relevance and applicability 226 227 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

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

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

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

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**

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

The Transforming Health Professions Education in Tanzania (THET) project (32) included a 270 271 component where young peers received mentorship from senior researchers through 272 mentored research awards and research training. These peers, in turn, provided reciprocal peer-to-peer mentorship to undergraduate students. This approach emphasizes the 273 274 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 mentorship workshops were conducted over four years to train mid- and senior-level 276 investigators engaged in public health, clinical, and basic science research across multiple 277 academic institutions in LMICs (21). These workshops focused on developing mentorship skills 278 locally and regionally, recognizing the value of nurturing research talent within specific 279 280 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

initiative aims to equip these fellows with research, teaching, and leadership skills to build a

viable and sustainable research network.

284 Specialized capacity building programs

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

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

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

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

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

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

318 Successes

In this section, we highlight the diverse successes derived from the health research mentorship programs implemented in 12 different African countries. We consolidate these successes into five crucial themes outlined herewith: establishment of partnerships and collaborations; development of research programs; individual capacity strengthening; 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 career investigators and served as a conduit to transfer health research training opportunities 331 to researchers in African institutions (15). Through mentorship programs, various 332 organizations and government agencies were able to make definite commitments toward 333 more investment in implementation research. For example, in Nigeria, the National Agency 334 for the Control of AIDS (NACA) in collaboration with the United Nations Children's Fund 335 (UNICEF) and the Population Council was able to launch the "Adolescent and Young People 336 337 Challenge" pilot project. This project sought to fund innovative ideas led by youth to provide comprehensive HIV education to at least 200,000 Nigerians (19). The mentorship programs 338 339 also led to the establishment of sustainable partnerships between researchers in sub-Saharan African countries and other LMICs, as well as with institutions in the north. These partnerships 340 facilitated collaborative cutting-edge research in global mental health and provided a 341 342 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**

Thirteen studies reported the development of research programs as a key success of the respective mentorship programs. The different aspects achieved under this theme, as reported by the highlighted studies, were that early career investigators learned how to navigate the complex international research environment to build local research capacity (14, 16) with trainees experiencing moderate increases in research confidence that were 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 provided knowledge on valuable concepts and a structure for the development and 353 354 strengthening of formal mentoring programs across LMIC institutions, leading to the growth of institutional support, the establishment of several new institutional mentorship training 355 programs, the initiation of peer mentorship networks, and regular mentor-mentee meetings. 356 A qualitative study conducted in Kenya, Peru, India, and South Africa reported that the 357 mentorship training model expanded as a national mandate for research training, nested 358 within a required training program (21). Hubs that evolved into centers of research excellence 359 360 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 members attended at least one of 15 faculty development workshops. Forty-one faculty 364 members underwent a one-year advanced faculty development training in medical education 365 366 and leadership, 33 mentored research scholars were trained under the novel NECTAR, and 52 and 12 in cardiovascular and mental health programs, respectively (34). In Rwanda, three-367 368 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 completed an additional DHS analysis, 71% completed an additional survey analysis, and 79% 370 provided mentorship to others about survey data analysis (27). 371

In addition, individual capacity strengthening was achieved as mentors enrolled in other
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 12 to 24, and mentored graduates increased from 41 to 67 in the second cohort. Eight senior 375 fellows enrolled in PhD programs, and 10 of 12 had registered for a PhD fellowship (31–33). 376 377 In Malawi, Uganda, and South Africa, the ARCADE project was successful in developing and delivering courses that reached over 920 postgraduate students (20). In Ethiopia, Ghana, 378 Malawi, South Africa, Uganda, Zimbabwe, Kenya, Liberia, Nigeria, and Sri Lanka, the 379 mentorship programs have achieved more success, including participants completing their 380 courses for second master's degrees with a special focus on specific health aspects, winning 381 awards to support the further development of their research careers, and the appointment 382 383 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 reported by nine studies. For instance, during the first two years of the program in Tanzania, 386 various research articles from the mentored programs were published, with other 387 manuscripts in the final stages of preparation. Each mentee had at least one or more 388 389 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, 26–28). In South Africa, 70 interns contributed to 51 peer-reviewed articles (22), while in 393 Uganda, 80 publications not related to PhD thesis work were co-authored by PhD students 394 395 (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 South Africa reported 21 grant applications being made successfully over the mentorship 399 period (25). Similarly, in Tanzania, young peers began to broaden their research careers by 400 involvement in other ongoing research projects and grant applications (33), with a majority 401 402 (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 of the PhD students have pursued research that has led to independent grant funding, as well 406 407 as collaborative grants on which they are listed as a co-investigators (29). The mentorship programs also led to awards. For instance, two travel fellowship grants for early career 408 409 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 were won, enabling participants to interact with other external partners and build sustainable 411 collaborations (24). 412

413 Benefits

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

417 Capacity building and skill development

The mentorship programs led to significant skill development and capacity building among participants (26, 32). This was evident through diverse training in research methodologies, epidemiology, biostatistics, grant writing, and other crucial aspects (33). The acquisition of these skills not only enhanced the participants' ability to conduct high-quality research (28, 33) but also made them valuable contributors to national and international projects (17). The establishment of training centres and departments further institutionalised these skills, 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 among institutions and researchers (20). These collaborations were instrumental in the 427 success of various projects and contributed to the publication of research papers (24, 28). The 428 projects served as a platform for early career and mid-level researchers to take leadership 429 roles in published papers (25), demonstrating the effectiveness of mentorship in fostering a 430 collaborative research environment. In addition, the North-South and regional collaboration 431 432 programs exposed participants to international perspectives thus encouraging the integration of local and global knowledge (16, 33). 433

434 Career advancement and marketability

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

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

444 Challenges and gaps

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

451 Limited funding

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

462 Lack of a healthy mentorship culture

In seven studies, (15, 20–23, 25, 27), the lack of understanding of the concept of mentorship 463 464 leading to a lack of institutional mentoring culture was highlighted as a challenge. Sustaining mentorship and institutional support for mentorship, and failure by institutions to 465 acknowledge or 'give credit' for mentoring activities in the merit or promotional processes 466 are notable challenges in health research mentorship. Of particular concern in many of the 467 468 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.

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

For mentees, different sets of administrative regulations across institutions were reported to lead to complications and delays in starting or sustaining certain capacity-building activities. Mentees reported difficulties in balancing work burdens, as they were involved in research activities as well as the training and support for their institutions and their development. This lack of protected time for health research mentorship was also cited as a gap by one study (33). Lack of infrastructure support that enables high-quality research including grants administration, mentorship, research leadership, research culture, and open communication

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

491 Negative attitudes towards research as a career

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

498 Lack of prioritisation of research mentorship

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

504 **COVID**-

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

530 in Africa (AESA) and the Coalition for Research and Innovation (CARI) are platforms that can

531 provide support for training African researchers and opportunities for collaboration (1).

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

We further establish that the main hindrance to the development of health research capacity 545 including mentorship programs is limited local funding. Current funding for health research 546 547 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 development. Furthermore, African countries can leverage international programs which can 550 be institutionalized and tailored to respond to local needs for health research capacity 551 development. Consistent with our findings, limited local health research capacity 552

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

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

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

strengthening, increased publication outputs, and successful grant applications and awards.
These programs not only benefited individual participants but also contributed to broader
capacity building, skill development, networking, collaboration, and career advancement at
institutional, country, regional, and international levels.

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

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

599 Limitations of the study

600 While this systematic review provides important insights into mentorship programs for health researchers in African institutions, it is crucial to recognize certain inherent limitations in the 601 602 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 been overlooked, potentially impacting the thoroughness of the findings. Additionally, 604 despite efforts to include diverse African regions, the search strategy may exhibit biases 605 606 toward specific countries or regions, stemming from variations in research visibility and accessibility. This potential bias could constrain the generalizability of the findings across the 607 608 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 retrieve as many articles as possible and to ensure a comprehensive coverage of mentorship 610 programs across different African contexts. Lastly, the heterogeneity of mentorship 611 programs, characterized by variations in types, durations, and regularities, poses challenges 612 in comparing and synthesizing outcomes. To address this challenge, we made effort to 613 614 systematically categorize and classify mentorship programs based on predefined criteria, allowing for a structured synthesis of findings. 615

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

- Simpkin V, Namubiru-Mwaura E, Clarke L, Mossialos E. Investing in health r&d: Where we are,
 what limits us, and how to make progress in africa. BMJ Glob Heal. 2019;4(2).
- 6542.Kasprowicz VO, Chopera D, Waddilove KD, Brockman MA, Gilmour J, Hunter E, et al. African-655led health research and capacity building- is it working? BMC Public Health. 2020;20(1):1–10.
- 3. Jasińska KK, Guei S. Neuroimaging field methods using functional near infrared spectroscopy
 (NIRS) neuroimaging to study global child development: Rural sub-Saharan Africa. J Vis Exp.
 2018;2018(132):1–11.
- A. Nakanjako D, Byakika-Kibwika P, Kintu K, Aizire J, Nakwagala F, Luzige S, et al. Mentorship
 needs at academic institutions in resource-limited settings: A survey at makerere university
 college of health sciences. BMC Med Educ. 2011;11(1):1–6.
- 5. Nicholson BA, Pollock M, Ketcham CJ, Fitz Gibbon HM, Bradley ED, Gibbon F. Beyond the
 mentor-mentee model: A case for multi-mentoring in undergraduate research. Perspect
 Undergrad Res Mentor [Internet]. 2017;6(1):1–14. Available from:
 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.
- 7. Young BR, Williamson HJ, Burton DL, Massey OT, Levin BL, Baldwin JA. Challenges and Benefits
 in Designing and Implementing a Team-Based Research Mentorship Experience in Translational
 Research. Pedagog Heal Promot. 2015;1(4):233–46.
- 8. Hunn V. African American Students, Retention, and Team-Based Learning: A Review of the
 Literature and Recommendations for Retention at Predominately White Institutions. J Black
 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.
- 67610.Margaret Nora L. The 21st century faculty member in the educational process-what should be677on the horizon? Acad Med. 2010;85(9 SUPPL.):45–55.
- 11. Kanaskie ML. Mentoring A staff retention tool. Crit Care Nurs Q. 2006;29(3):248–52.
- 67912.Sambunjak D, Straus SE, Marusic A. A systematic review of qualitative research on the meaning680and characteristics of mentoring in academic medicine. J Gen Intern Med. 2010;25(1):72–8.
- 13. Noormahomed E, Williams P, Lescano AG, Raj T, Bukusi EA, Schooley RT, et al. The evolution of
 mentorship capacity development in low- and middle-income countries: Case studies from
 Peru, Kenya, India, and Mozambique. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2019;100(Suppl 1):29–35.
- Hong QN, Fàbregues S, Bartlett G, Boardman F, Cargo M, Dagenais P, et al. The Mixed Methods
 Appraisal Tool (MMAT) version 2018 for information professionals and researchers. Educ Inf.
 2018;34:285–91.
- 15. Daniels J, Nduati R, Kiarie J, Farquhar C. Supporting early career health investigators in Kenya:
 A qualitative study of HIV/AIDS research capacity building. Pan Afr Med J. 2015;20:1–8.
- Ager A, Zarowsky C. Balancing the personal, local, institutional, and global: Multiple case study
 and multidimensional scaling analysis of African experiences in addressing complexity and
 political economy in health research capacity strengthening. Heal Res Policy Syst.
 2015;13(1):1–9.
- Daniels J, Nduati R, Farquhar C. Right from primary school, i liked science: understanding health
 research capacity building in sub-saharan africa through kenyan training experiences. Glob
 Health Promot. 2014;21(2):32–42.
- 69618.Dartnall E. Harnessing the power of South-South partnerships to build capacity for the697prevention of sexual and intimate partner violence. African Saf Promot. 2017;15(1):8–15.
- Ezeanolue EE, Iheanacho T, Patel D V., Patel S, Sam-Agudu N, Obiefune M, et al. Challenges and
 strategies for improving training of mid-level research personnel in Nigeria. Ann Glob Heal.
 2019;85(1):1–6.
- Färnman R, Diwan V, Zwarenstein M, Atkins S. Successes and challenges of north-south
 partnerships Key lessons from the African/Asian Regional Capacity Development projects.
 Glob Health Action. 2016;9(1):1–10.

- Gandhi M, Raj T, Fernandez R, Rispel L, Nxumalo N, Lescano AG, et al. Mentoring the mentors:
 Implementation and evaluation of four fogarty-sponsored mentoring training workshops in
 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.
- 23. Langhaug LF, Jack H, Hanlon C, Holzer S, Sorsdahl K, Mutedzi B, et al. "we need more big trees as well as the grass roots": Going beyond research capacity building to develop sustainable careers in mental health research in African countries. Int J Ment Health Syst [Internet].
 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
- Gureje O, Seedat S, Kola L, Appiah-Poku J, Othieno C, Harris B, et al. Partnership for mental
 health development in Sub-Saharan Africa (PaM-D): A collaborative initiative for research and
 capacity building. Epidemiol Psychiatr Sci. 2019;28(4):389–96.
- Somefun OD, Adebayo KO. The role of mentoring in research ecosystems in Sub-Saharan Africa:
 Some experiences through the CARTA opportunity. Glob Public Health. 2021;16(1):36–47.
- Thomson DR, Semakula M, Hirschhorn LR, Murray M, Ndahindwa V, Manzi A, et al. Applied
 statistical training to strengthen analysis and health research capacity in Rwanda. Heal Res
 Policy Syst [Internet]. 2016;14(1):1–7. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12961-0160144-x
- Torondel B, Balls E, Chisenga CC, Kumwenda S, Okello E, Simiyu S, et al. Experiences of capacity
 strengthening in sanitation and hygiene research in Africa and Asia: The SHARE Research
 Consortium. Heal Res Policy Syst. 2019;17(1):1–10.
- Manabe YC, Nambooze H, Okello ES, Kamya MR, Katabira ET, Ssinabulya I, et al. Group
 mentorship model to enhance the efficiency and productivity of PHD research training in SubSaharan Africa. Ann Glob Heal. 2018;84(1):170–5.
- 30. Ughasoro M, Musa A, Yakubu A, Adefuye B, Folahanmi A, Isah A, et al. Barriers and Solutions
 to Effective Mentorship in Health Research and Training Institutions in Nigeria: Mentors,
 Mentees, and Organizational Perspectives. Niger J Clin Pract. 2019;22:1070–7.
- Balandya E, Sunguya B, Kidenya B, Nyamhanga T, Minja IK, Mahande M, et al. Joint Research
 Mentoring Through the Community of Young Research Peers: A Case for a Unifying Model for
 Research Mentorship at Higher Learning Institutions. Adv Med Educ Pract. 2022;13(April):355–
 67.
- Mremi A, Pancras G, Mrema D, Morris B, Mwakyandile T, Msanga DR, et al. Mentorship of
 young researchers in resource-limited settings: experiences of the mentees from selected
 health sciences Universities in Tanzania. BMC Med Educ. 2023;23(1):1–7.
- 33. Balandya E, Sunguya B, Gunda DW, Kidenya B, Nyamhanga T, Minja IK, et al. Building
 sustainable research capacity at higher learning institutions in Tanzania through mentoring of
 the Young Research Peers. BMC Med Educ. 2021;21(1):1–11.
- 34. Hakim JG, Chidzonga MM, Borok MZ, Nathoo KJ, Matenga J, Havranek E, et al. Medical
 Education Partnership Initiative (MEPI) in Zimbabwe: Outcomes and challenges. Glob Heal Sci
 Pract. 2018;6(1):82–92.
- McGuire CM, Riffenburg K, Malope S, Jack B, Borba CPC. Mixed-methods evaluation of family
 medicine research training and peer mentorship in Lesotho. African J Prim Heal Care Fam Med.
 2020;12(1):1–17.
- Kaba M, Birhanu Z, Fernandez Villalobos NV, Osorio L, Echavarria MI, Berhe DF, et al. Health
 research mentorship in low- and middle-income countries: a scoping review. JBI Evid Synth.
 2023;21(10):1912–70.
- 754 ___
- 755



Flow diagram for study identification