Building Clinical Research Capacity for HIV & Noncommunicable Diseases (NCDs) in Nigeria

Kevin Gibas, M.D.¹, Alexander Huang², Mahmoud Umar Sani, MBBS⁴, Fatimah Tsiga-Ahmed, MBBS, MSc⁴, Baba Musa, MBBS, MPH^{4,5}, C. William "Bill" Wester, MD, MPH^{1,3}, Carolyn Audet, Ph.D.^{2,3}, Aima Ahonkhai, MD, MPH^{1,3} and Muktar Aliyu, MBBS, DrPH, MPH^{1,3}

Affiliations: (1) Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, TN, USA; (2) Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN, USA, (3) Vanderbilt Institute for Global Health Nashville, TN, USA; (4) Aminu Kano Teaching Hospital (AKTH) & Bayero University Kano (BUK), Kano, Nigeria; (5) Africa Center of Excellence in Population Health, Kano, Nigeria

BACKGROUND & OBJECTIVES

The Vanderbilt-Nigeria Building Research Capacity in HIV and Non-communicable Diseases (V-BRCH) program is a training platform with the goal of developing Nigerian investigators to become leaders in HIV-associated NCDs research. This goal is accomplished through intensive on-site workshops in Nigeria for physicians and research staff focused on essential research topics and skills. Here we present the results of two workshops focused on implementation science and grant writing for Nigerian physician-scientists.

METHODS

- Trainees attended interactive week-long workshops at Aminu Kano Teaching Hospital in Kano, Nigeria focused on developing skills in either or both:
 - Implementation science frameworks, strategies, adaptation, and outcomes
 - Grant writing techniques, grant review processes, and funding opportunities.
- Participants completed pre- / post- workshop surveys assessing self-perceived knowledge and confidence in specific topics and skills related to implementation science and grant writing
 - Survey results presented in Tables 1—4.

Analytic Approach

- For both pre- & post- workshop surveys, participants ranked their knowledge and/pr confidence in specific competencies on a scale of 1 to 4 (1 not confident at all, and 4 very confident).
- Rankings were transformed to: 4= 100, 3= 75, 2= 50, and 1= 25.
- Averages of confidence in specific competencies were taken with these new values.
- The gap was calculated as the difference between pre-and post-workshop average rankings.
- Percentage increase in confidence was calculated by dividing the gap by the pre-workshop average.

RESULTS

Table 1ː Average Knowledge by Topic Area Pre & Post Workshop					
Topic	Pre-Workshop	Post-Workshop	Percent Increase		
Factors that impact implementation success	53	91	72%		
Implementation theory and frameworks	44	86	95%		
Implementation strategies	41	89	117%		
Adaptation frameworks	37	84	127%		
Implementation outcomes	43	87	102%		
Implementation study designs	45	86	91%		
Implementation grants	35	72	106%		

Table 2: Average Confidence by Topic Area Pre & Post Workshop					
Topic	Pre-Workshop	Post-Workshop	Percent Increase		
Identifying setting characteristics that impact implementation success	44	92	109%		
Identifying individual characteristics that impact implementation success	43	92	114%		
Selecting a good framework for my implementation science research	41	86	110%		
Selecting the most important implementation science outcomes	36	85	136%		
Assessing implementation measures	40	86	115%		
Analyzing implementation measures	36	81	125%		
Writing a hybrid grant	36	69	92%		
Teaching others about implementation science	35	85	143%		

Table 3: Average Knowledge by Topic Area Pre & Post Workshop					
Topic	Pre-Workshop	Post-Workshop	Percent Increase		
Generating research questions for a scientific grant proposal	48	91	90%		
Principles of study design/methods to evaluate grant proposal research questions	68	91	34%		
Developing specific aims & hypotheses for grant proposal research questions	70	94	34%		
Key components of scientific grant proposals	46	91	98%		
Scientific writing techniques for grant proposals	65	89	37%		
Features of strong grant proposals	46	90	96%		
Types of grant funding sources	40	86	115%		
Data analysis plans for different types of studies being conducted	59	86	46%		

Table 4: Improvements in confidence in grant-writing competencies by topic area.				
Topic	Pre-Workshop	Post-Workshop	Percent Increase	
Developing a research question & hypotheses to evaluate one's own research question	63	91	44%	
Selecting the appropriate study design for a specific research question	66	85	29%	
Selecting the appropriate analysis plan for a chosen scientific study	61	82	34%	
Writing specific aims pages for a grant proposal	50	93	86%	
Identifying the important features of the grant review process	39	81	108%	
Interacting with funding agencies	37	80	116%	
Providing feedback on grant proposals	48	84	75%	

IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY AND PRACTICE

The V-BRCH program will create a cohort of skilled Nigerian scientists capable of designing & implementing high quality research that will generate evidence to inform policy and practice ultimately leading to improved outcomes for Nigerians impacted by HIV-associated NCDs.

Training programs such as these facilitate larger efforts to decolonize global health by providing physician-scientists with skills needed to compete for independent funding, to develop sustainable implementation strategies tailored to local needs, and to disseminate research findings.

CONCLUSIONS

Improvement in participant knowledge and/or confidence was observed in every topic area and competency measured (including implementation science and grant writing techniques)

Findings will inform the development of similar research training programs in analogous settings.

CONTACT

Kevin M. Gibas, MD

Phone: (615) 322-5000 | Email: kevin.gibas@vumc.org

REFERENCES

For questions, to discuss further, or for a list of references that informed this poster, please email kevin.gibas@vumc.org

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by the Fogarty International Center and the National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism of the National Institutes of Health (D43TW011544). KMG received a training grant from the Agency For Health Care Research and Quality (T32HS026122).

PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS







