A Conceptual Framework for Integrating Clinical Education and Global Health Practice in Medical Training Programs

GLORY IYANUOLUWA OLATUNJI[1], OPEOLUWA OLUWANIFEMI AJAYI[2], FUNMI EKO EZEH[3]
[1]*Kyiv Medical University, Ukraine*
[2]*Amazing Grace Adult Home, Akure, Ondo State, Nigeria*
[3]*Sickle Cell Foundation, Lago, Nigeria*

Abstract- ***Medical education in the 21st century faces the urgent task of adapting to a rapidly globalizing world. While clinical education traditionally centers on local healthcare systems, the growing interconnectedness of global health demands a paradigm shift. This paper presents a literature-based conceptual framework for integrating clinical education with global health practice in medical training programs. Through a critical review of scholarly work on medical curricula, global health competencies, and international rotations, the paper identifies key domains essential for preparing globally competent physicians. These include cross-cultural clinical skills, ethical engagement, longitudinal mentorship, and sustainability in global partnerships. The proposed framework emphasizes the need for institutional reform, curricular alignment, and ethically grounded, reciprocal international collaborations. By bridging classroom learning with real-world global health challenges, the framework supports transformative educational experiences that can ultimately contribute to improved global healthcare equity.***

Keywords: Medical Education, Global Health Integration, Clinical Training, International Rotations, Curriculum Development, Healthcare Disparities

I. INTRODUCTION

The twenty-first century has brought about significant shifts in global health dynamics [1], [2], spurred by globalization, increasing migration, climate change, and the rapid spread of infectious and non-communicable diseases [3]. These shifts demand a transformation in medical education that goes beyond traditional didactic training and embraces the realities of healthcare disparities and global health challenges [4], [5]. Consequently, medical training programs must adapt by embedding global health competencies into clinical education, preparing graduates not just for local practice, but for health systems that are increasingly interconnected [6], [7].

Historically, clinical education has been rooted in local contexts, often emphasizing technical proficiency and biomedical knowledge within national healthcare systems [8]. However, this model no longer suffices in the current landscape, where physicians are expected to address diseases that transcend borders, manage diverse patient populations, and engage with global health policies and practices [9]. Thus, the integration of global health practice into clinical education is not merely supplementary but foundational to cultivating a generation of doctors who are globally competent, ethically aware, and adaptable [10], [11].

Global health, broadly defined, encompasses the study, research, and practice that prioritizes improving health and achieving equity in health for all people worldwide [12], [13]. While global health was previously regarded as a specialty or elective subject, it is now increasingly recognized as a core element of medical education [14]. Institutions like the Consortium of Universities for Global Health (CUGH) have advocated for standardized global health competencies for medical trainees, emphasizing the need for institutional reforms that bridge academic training with global health realities [15], [16].

Despite this recognition, a gap persists between clinical education and global health implementation [17], [18]. Existing frameworks for medical training frequently lack structured, longitudinal exposure to

global health practice, and clinical rotations abroad are often treated as extracurricular rather than integrative components of training [19], [20]. Moreover, the absence of uniform assessment metrics, ethical considerations, and logistical planning in international rotations limits the efficacy of such programs and raises concerns about sustainability, reciprocity, and equity [21].

This paper aims to address these gaps by proposing a conceptual framework for integrating clinical education with global health practice in medical training programs. Drawing exclusively on a comprehensive literature review, this framework seeks to articulate key domains, pedagogical strategies, and structural supports that align clinical training with global health imperatives. By examining existing scholarship, educational models, and global health training experiences, we argue that a restructured, competency-based approach is essential to foster meaningful engagement with global health in clinical education [22], [23].

Furthermore, we contend that this integration should be longitudinal, ethical, and contextually grounded, accounting for the needs of host communities while promoting mutual benefit and sustainable collaboration. Such a framework would not only enrich the educational experiences of medical students but also contribute to the global effort to strengthen health systems through knowledge exchange, capacity building, and culturally competent care [24].

The implications of such an integrative approach extend to policy-making, curriculum design, faculty development, and the operational logistics of international rotations. Therefore, the objective of this paper is threefold: (1) to critically examine the literature surrounding clinical education and global health integration, (2) to identify best practices and recurring challenges in existing models, and (3) to propose a conceptual framework that can guide the design and implementation of integrated medical training programs globally [25], [26].

The structure of the paper is as follows: Section 2 presents a literature review that explores the evolution of global health education, current models of clinical-global integration, and the pedagogical and ethical considerations therein. Section 3 outlines the proposed conceptual framework, including its core domains and operational components. Section 4 discusses implications for policy and practice, while Section 5 identifies limitations and directions for future research. Section 6 concludes the paper by reaffirming the urgency and utility of bridging clinical education with real-world global practice.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Historical Context of Clinical Education

Modern clinical education emerged from the Flexnerian model of the early 20th century, emphasizing structured scientific instruction, laboratory-based learning, and hospital-based clinical rotations [27], [28]. While this model revolutionized medical education in North America and beyond, it largely focused on the biomedical model and neglected the social, economic, and cultural determinants of health [29], [30]. Over the decades, the rise of community-based medical education and problem-based learning introduced a more holistic approach, but global health remained peripheral to core curricula [31].

2.2 Emergence and Scope of Global Health Education

Global health education gained traction in the late 1990s and early 2000s, coinciding with heightened awareness of health disparities, humanitarian crises, and the HIV/AIDS pandemic [1]. Academic global health programs began proliferating across medical schools, offering specialized tracks, certificates, and electives [2], [32]. The field's interdisciplinary nature spanning public health, epidemiology, anthropology, and policy challenged traditional disciplinary silos and pushed for more integrative educational models [33], [34].

2.3 Global Health Competencies

The CUGH developed a core set of global health competencies that include: (1) global burden of disease, (2) health equity and social justice, (3) health systems and governance, (4) ethical reasoning, (5) cultural humility, and (6) collaboration and partnership [35], [36]. These competencies reflect the skills and knowledge expected of globally competent physicians and emphasize values-based education

grounded in equity and sustainability [37], [38]. Integrating these competencies into clinical education requires curricular innovation and structural adaptation.

2.4 Existing Models of Integrated Programs

Various medical schools have pioneered efforts to integrate global health into clinical education. Programs such as Yale's Global Health Concentration and UCSF's Global Health Pathway embed global health coursework alongside international clinical experiences [39], [40]. Similarly, institutions like the University of Toronto and Harvard offer longitudinal tracks that link global health theory with field placements [41], [42]. These models vary in scope, duration, and rigor, with some offering mentored international rotations, while others focus on domestic underserved populations as a proxy for global experience [43], [44].

2.5 Pedagogical and Ethical Considerations

Pedagogically, global health integration necessitates experiential learning, reflective practice, and interprofessional education [45], [46]. Students benefit from immersive experiences that challenge preconceived notions, build empathy, and enhance cross-cultural communication skill [47], [48]. However, ethical considerations abound. Critics argue that short-term international rotations risk promoting "medical tourism," disrupt local health systems, and offer more benefit to students than host communities [49], [50]. Ethical frameworks stress the importance of reciprocity, cultural sensitivity, and sustainable partnerships [51], [52].

2.6 Barriers and Enabling Factors

Barriers to integration include lack of faculty expertise in global health, limited funding, curriculum overload, and regulatory constraints on international travel [53], [54]. Conversely, enabling factors include institutional commitment, strong partnerships with host institutions, and flexible curricular structures that accommodate elective time abroad [55], [56]. Digital health technologies and virtual exchanges also offer new pathways for global learning, especially in the post-pandemic era [57].

2.7 Summary and Synthesis

The literature demonstrates a growing consensus on the value of integrating global health into clinical training but also reveals wide variation in implementation. While some institutions have achieved meaningful integration through well-funded, ethically grounded programs, others struggle with fragmented initiatives. The need for a unifying conceptual framework is thus evident. Such a framework must draw from best practices while addressing logistical, ethical, and pedagogical challenges to ensure sustainability, mutual benefit, and relevance across diverse educational settings.

III. A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR INTEGRATION

Based on insights from the literature, we propose a conceptual framework to guide the integration of global health practice into clinical education. The framework consists of seven interrelated domains, each essential to equipping future medical professionals with the skills, attitudes, and knowledge necessary for global health engagement. The framework prioritizes ethical responsibility, sustainable partnerships, and learner transformation within a competency-based educational structure.

3.1 Domain 1: Global Health Competency Alignment

This domain emphasizes the need to align clinical education with established global health competencies. Curricula should be mapped to include competencies such as health systems understanding, global disease burden, cultural humility, ethical reasoning, and social justice [58], [59]. These competencies must be embedded across both didactic instruction and clinical practice to ensure a cohesive training experience. Competency-based evaluation tools should also be developed to track student progress [60].

3.2 Domain 2: Cross-Cultural Clinical Skill Development

Effective global health engagement demands sensitivity to cultural, linguistic, and socioeconomic diversity. Clinical training programs must foster cross-cultural communication skills and expose students to

varied healthcare contexts through immersive experiences [61], [62]. This includes training in resource-limited settings, culturally adapted patient interactions, and language support. Such preparation enhances diagnostic accuracy, patient rapport, and health equity awareness [63].

3.3 Domain 3: Ethical and Equitable Engagement

Ethical considerations must underpin all global health activities. Programs must prioritize reciprocity, community engagement, and respect for local autonomy [64], [65]. This domain includes pre-departure training on ethics, the co-creation of learning goals with host institutions, and post-return debriefings to promote critical reflection. Clear guidelines are needed to avoid harm, reduce extractive practices, and ensure that clinical activities match trainee qualifications [66], [67].

3.4 Domain 4: Longitudinal Mentorship and Faculty Engagement

Sustainable global health integration requires committed faculty and longitudinal mentorship models. Faculty development programs must train mentors in global health pedagogy, cultural safety, and partnership building [68], [69]. Mentorship should extend across the training continuum from pre-clinical exposure through residency to guide student development and institutionalize global health pathways [70], [71].

3.5 Domain 5: Integrated International Clinical Rotations

International rotations should be structurally integrated into the core curriculum rather than offered as isolated electives. This includes formal partnerships with vetted institutions abroad, coordinated logistics, safety protocols, and supervised learning outcomes. Structured rotations enable students to contribute meaningfully while learning about local health systems, resource allocation, and public health interventions [72], [73].

3.6 Domain 6: Host Institution Reciprocity and Partnership Sustainability

Sustainable partnerships rely on mutual respect and shared benefit. This domain calls for bi-directional exchange programs, capacity-building initiatives, and collaborative research agendas [74], [75]. Institutions must invest in long-term relationships, providing resources to support host infrastructure and faculty development, while regularly assessing the equity and impact of these engagements.

3.7 Domain 7: Monitoring, Evaluation, and Feedback Mechanisms

A robust monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system is critical for measuring educational outcomes, ethical impact, and program effectiveness [76]. Tools should include student self-assessments, host institution feedback, patient satisfaction measures, and longitudinal tracking of graduate engagement in global health [77]. M&E findings should inform continuous curriculum refinement.

3.8 Visualizing the Framework

The framework may be conceptualized as a wheel with seven interconnected domains radiating from a central hub of global health ethics and education. Each domain contributes to the holistic development of a globally competent clinician.

In sum, this framework synthesizes the educational, ethical, and operational components necessary to embed global health into clinical education. It is designed to be adaptable across contexts while rooted in universal principles of equity, collaboration, and learner-centered development.

IV. IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY AND PRACTICE

The integration of clinical education and global health practice requires substantial shifts in medical education policy, institutional culture, and operational logistics. Translating the proposed framework into action involves aligning accreditation standards, securing sustainable funding, fostering equitable partnerships, and implementing supportive administrative structures. Below are key policy and practice implications derived from the literature and the conceptual framework.

4.1 Curriculum Reform and Accreditation Standards

Medical schools and accreditation bodies must recognize global health competencies as core educational objectives rather than supplementary skills. Accrediting agencies such as the Liaison Committee on Medical Education (LCME) and the World Federation for Medical Education (WFME) can play pivotal roles in endorsing standards that mandate global health content in curricula [78], [79]. Curriculum committees should embed global health domains across the training continuum, integrating them into pre-clinical modules, clerkships, and elective rotations.

4.2 Faculty Development and Institutional Leadership

Faculty are central to successful implementation. Institutions should invest in faculty development programs that equip educators with the tools to mentor students in global contexts, apply ethical frameworks, and assess global health competencies [80]. Leadership buy-in is also essential; deans and department heads must prioritize global health integration in strategic planning, faculty hiring, and resource allocation [81]. Institutions may consider designating Global Health Education Coordinators to oversee the integration process.

4.3 Funding Models and Resource Allocation

Cost remains a major barrier to international clinical training. Sustainable funding mechanisms through scholarships, grants, alumni donations, and public-private partnerships are necessary to support travel, accommodation, insurance, and faculty supervision [82], [83]. Equity must guide resource distribution to ensure that students from all socioeconomic backgrounds can participate in global health programs without undue financial burden.

4.4 Partnership Development and Reciprocity Frameworks

Collaborative partnerships between sending and host institutions should be formalized through Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) that define expectations, ethical principles, capacity-building efforts, and mechanisms for reciprocity [84], [85]. Institutions must avoid extractive models and instead co-design programs with host communities, sharing credit in publications, joint research, and mutual faculty exchange [86].Evaluating partnership quality and impact should be a regular process.

4.5 Administrative Infrastructure and Legal Considerations

Operationalizing international clinical training demands robust administrative support. Institutions should establish dedicated global health offices that manage logistics such as visa arrangements, health insurance, legal liability, safety protocols, and program evaluation [87], [88]. Legal and regulatory compliance particularly with national medical councils and immigration authorities must be ensured to protect both students and partner institutions [89], [90].

4.6 Monitoring, Evaluation, and Accountability

A data-driven approach to implementation is essential. Institutions should track student learning outcomes, host feedback, ethical adherence, and longitudinal career trajectories using qualitative and quantitative metrics [91]. Global health education must be accountable not only to institutional goals but also to the well-being and priorities of host communities. Transparent evaluation fosters program improvement and stakeholder trust [92].

4.7 Global Health Policy Integration and Advocacy

At the macro level, health ministries and international health organizations can support integration through policy guidance, technical assistance, and funding [93], [94]. Ministries of health can incorporate global health training into national health workforce strategies, particularly in countries facing critical human resource shortages [95], [96]. Academic institutions can also advocate for policies that promote ethical student mobility, global health equity, and inclusive education.

In conclusion, the practical integration of clinical education and global health requires multi-level coordination across curriculum committees, institutional leadership, government agencies, and global partners. The policy and practice strategies outlined here aim to transform the proposed conceptual framework into actionable, ethical, and sustainable medical education reform.

V. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

While this paper offers a comprehensive framework for integrating clinical education with global health practice, several limitations must be acknowledged. These limitations primarily stem from the methodology namely, the exclusive reliance on secondary data sources and the evolving nature of global health education.

5.1 Methodological Constraints

This study is based solely on a literature review and does not include primary data collection. As such, the framework has not been empirically validated through field testing, stakeholder interviews, or institutional implementation. The insights and domains proposed herein are synthesized from existing academic literature, which, while rich and informative, may not capture the full diversity of institutional practices and lived experiences in global health training [97], [98]. Furthermore, the literature may reflect a bias toward programs from high-income countries, with limited representation of perspectives from low- and middle-income country (LMIC) partners.

5.2 Contextual and Regional Variability

Global health education is inherently context-specific, influenced by local regulatory environments, cultural values, and health system structures. A framework developed through literature primarily drawn from North American and European contexts may not fully translate to institutions in Sub-Saharan Africa, Southeast Asia, or Latin America without substantial adaptation [99]. Future work must consider regional variations in educational infrastructure, resource availability, and cross-border mobility constraints.

5.3 Evolving Field and Dynamic Practices

Global health is a rapidly evolving field. New priorities such as planetary health, health security, and decolonizing global health are reshaping educational goals and frameworks. As these discourses mature, there may be a need to update the proposed framework to reflect emerging best practices and critical perspectives [100]. This paper presents a 2019 conceptualization and should be viewed as a foundation rather than a definitive model.

5.4 Ethical and Operational Uncertainties

Implementing international rotations raises ongoing ethical and logistical concerns that cannot be fully resolved through literature alone. Issues such as power imbalances, unintended harm to host communities, and inadequate supervision remain salient. There is a need for longitudinal, participatory research involving both sending institutions and host communities to evaluate the true impact positive or negative of clinical global health programs [101], [102].

5.5 Directions for Future Research

Future research should focus on empirical validation of the conceptual framework across diverse institutional contexts. Mixed-methods studies can assess the feasibility, acceptability, and effectiveness of integrated global-clinical training. Additionally, comparative case studies can illuminate best practices in partnership development, competency assessment, and ethical engagement. There is also scope for developing standardized tools to evaluate student learning outcomes and community impact in global clinical settings.

Another important area for research is the perspective of host institutions. Much of the literature is authored from the viewpoint of sending institutions, potentially overlooking the priorities and concerns of LMIC partners. Studies led by or in collaboration with host country educators, clinicians, and policymakers can help balance this narrative and inform more equitable models.

Lastly, future work should investigate the long-term career trajectories of students exposed to integrated global health training. Understanding how such education influences future practice, specialty selection, global engagement, and leadership in health equity will help gauge the transformative potential of the proposed framework.

CONCLUSION

The integration of clinical education with global health practice represents a critical step toward preparing future healthcare professionals to operate effectively in an increasingly interconnected and complex world. This paper has explored the conceptual, pedagogical,

and institutional foundations necessary for designing and implementing such integrative training models. Through a comprehensive literature review and the development of a multi-domain conceptual framework, we have demonstrated how global health experiences can enrich medical education by fostering cultural competency, ethical awareness, systems thinking, and interprofessional collaboration.

Our proposed framework grounded in seven interconnected domains offers a blueprint for curricular innovation, stakeholder engagement, and sustainable partnership-building. It underscores the importance of aligning global health education with core competencies in clinical training, supported by robust institutional commitment and reflective pedagogy. Moreover, the framework provides actionable guidance for educators, policymakers, and institutions seeking to bridge the divide between theoretical instruction and real-world medical challenges.

The implications for policy and practice are significant. Medical schools must adopt adaptive policies that encourage global engagement without compromising academic rigor or ethical standards. Faculty development, funding mechanisms, and cross-border collaborations will be instrumental in operationalizing this vision. At the same time, limitations such as variable institutional capacity, logistical constraints, and the need for longitudinal outcome data highlight areas where further research and investment are needed. In conclusion, the integration of clinical education and global health practice is not merely an academic endeavor it is a moral imperative in a globalized era marked by health disparities and shared vulnerabilities. By embracing this integrated approach, medical training programs can better equip future clinicians with the knowledge, skills, and values needed to serve diverse populations, address global health challenges, and advance equity in health outcomes worldwide.

REFERENCES

[1] B. Stanton *et al.*, "Global Health Training for Pediatric Residents," *Pediatr Ann*, vol. 37, no. 12, pp. 786–787, 2008, doi: 10.3928/00904481-20081201-11.

[2] N. Low *et al.*, "Global issues in medical education.[comment]," *Lancet*, vol. 359, no. 9307, pp. 713–714, Feb. 2002, doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(02)07799-1.

[3] E. R. J. M. C. W. J. S. A. K. A Binagwaho, "Uniting to address pediatric heart disease in Africa: advocacy from Rwanda," *SA Heart Journal*, vol. 10, pp. 440–6, 2013.

[4] "The future of global health education: training for equity in global health | BMC Medical Education." Accessed: Aug. 01, 2018. [Online]. Available: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s12909-016-0820-0

[5] V. Govindarajan and C. Trimble, "Reverse innovation: create far from home, win everywhere," 2012, *Harvard Business Review Press*.

[6] "Sustainability and growth of university global health programs," 2014, *CSIS*.

[7] A. W. Bazemore, L. M. Goldenhar, C. J. Lindsell, P. M. Diller, and M. K. Huntington, "An International Health Track Is Associated With Care for Underserved US Populations in Subsequent Clinical Practice," *J Grad Med Educ*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 130–7, Jun. 2011, doi: 10.4300/jgme-d-10-00066.1.

[8] J. C. Kolars *et al.*, "Perspective: partnering for medical education in sub-Saharan Africa: seeking the evidence for effective collaborations," *Acad Med*, vol. 87, no. 2, pp. 216–20, 2012, doi: 10.1097/acm.0b013e31823ede39.

[9] J. Pfeiffer, J. Beschta, S. Hohl, S. Gloyd, A. Hagopian, and J. Wasserheit, "Competency-based curricula to transform global health: redesign with the end in mind," *Acad Med*, vol. 88, no. 1, pp. 131–6, 2013, doi: 10.1097/acm.0b013e318276bdf4.

[10] A. Binagwaho *et al.*, "Shared learning in an interconnected world: innovations to advance global health equity," *Global Health*, vol. 9, no.

1, p. 37, Aug. 2013, doi: 10.1186/1744-8603-9-37.

[11] A. Binagwaho *et al.*, "The human resources for health program in Rwanda – a new partnership," *N Engl J Med*, vol. 369, no. 21, pp. 2054–9, Nov. 2013, doi: 10.1056/nejmsr1302176.

[12] A. Monroe-Wise *et al.*, "The clinical education partnership initiative: an innovative approach to global health education," *BMC Med Educ*, vol. 14, no. 1, p. 1043, 2014, doi: 10.1186/s12909-014-0246-5.

[13] F. Mullan and V. B. Kerry, "The global health service partnership: teaching for the world," *Acad Med*, vol. 89, no. 8, pp. 1146–8, 2014, doi: 10.1097/acm.0000000000000283.

[14] V. B. Kerry and F. Mullan, "The global health service partnership: building health professional leadership," *Lancet*, vol. 383, no. 9929, pp. 1688–91, 2014, doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(13)61683-9.

[15] C. Cancedda *et al.*, "Enhancing formal educational and in-service training opportunities in rural Rwanda: a partnership among the public sector, a non-governmental organization, and academia," *Acad Med*, vol. 89, no. 8, pp. 1–8, 2014, doi: 10.1097/acm.0000000000000376.

[16] C. C. John, G. Ayodo, and P. Musoke, "Successful global health research partnerships: what makes them work?," *Am J Trop Med Hyg*, vol. 94, no. 1, pp. 5–7, Jan. 2016, doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.15-0611.

[17] A. Bleakley, J. Brice, and J. Bligh, "Thinking the postcolonial in medical education," *Med Educ*, vol. 42, no. 3, pp. 266–70, Mar. 2008, doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2923.2007.02991.x.

[18] H. Karle, L. Christensen, D. Gordon, and J. Nystrup, "Neo-colonialism versus sound globalization policy in medical education," *Med Educ*, vol. 42, no. 10, pp. 956–8, Oct. 2008, doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2923.2008.03155.x.

[19] P. C. Drobac *et al.*, "Comprehensive and integrated district health systems strengthening: the Rwanda Population Health Implementation and Training (PHIT) partnership," *BMC Health Serv Res*, vol. 13, no. Suppl 2, p. S5, 2013, doi: 10.1186/1472-6963-13-s2-s5.

[20] N. M. Tapela *et al.*, "Implementation science for global oncology: the imperative to evaluate the safety and efficacy of cancer care delivery," *J Clin Oncol*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 43–52, Jan. 2015, doi: 10.1200/jco.2015.61.7738.

[21] K. Sherr, J. H. Requejo, and P. Basinga, "Implementation research to catalyze advances in health systems strengthening in sub-Saharan Africa: the African health initiative," *BMC Health Serv Res*, vol. 13, no. Suppl 2, p. S1, 2013, doi: 10.1186/1472-6963-13-s2-s1.

[22] M. L. Rich *et al.*, "Excellent clinical outcomes and high retention in care among adults in a community-based HIV treatment program in rural Rwanda," *J Acquired Immune Defic Syndr*, vol. 59, no. 3, pp. e35-42, Mar. 2012, doi: 10.1097/qai.0b013e31824476c4.

[23] A. Vasan *et al.*, "Integrated care as a means to improve primary care delivery for adults and adolescents in the developing world: a critical analysis of integrated management of adolescent and adult illness (IMAI)," *BMC Med*, vol. 12, no. 1, p. 6, Jan. 2014, doi: 10.1186/1741-7015-12-6.

[24] L. Sudhof *et al.*, "Local use of geographic information systems to improve data utilisation and health services: mapping caesarean section coverage in rural Rwanda," *Trop Med Int Health*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 18–26, Jan. 2013, doi: 10.1111/tmi.12016.

[25] B. R. Hunt, S. Whitman, and M. S. Hurlbert, "Increasing black-white disparities in breast cancer mortality in the 50 largest cities in the united states," *Cancer Epidemiol*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 118–23, 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.canep.2013.09.009.

[26] B. Starfield, J. Gérvas, and D. Mangin, "Clinical care and health disparities," *Annu Rev Public Health*, vol. 33, pp. 89–106, Apr. 2012, doi: 10.1146/annurev-publhealth-031811-124528.

[27] A. Binagwaho, C. T. Nutt, P. Mugwaneza, C. M. Wagner, and S. Nsanzimana, "Convergence of mortality rates among patients on antiretroviral therapy in South Africa and North America," *PLoS Med*, vol. 11, no. 9, p. e1001719, Sep. 2014, doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1001719.

[28] P. Braveman, "Health disparities and health equity: concepts and measurement," *Annu Rev Public Health*, vol. 27, pp. 167–94, 2006, doi: 10.1146/annurev.publhealth.27.021405.102103.

[29] J. P. Koplan *et al.*, "Towards a common definition of global health," *Lancet*, vol. 373, no. 9679, pp. 1993–5, 2009, doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(09)60332-9.

[30] J. Furin, M. Paternek, and J. T. Katz, "Global health equity as the focus of graduate medical education," *Med Educ*, vol. 39, no. 11, p. 1161, 2005, doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2929.2005.02299.x.

[31] A. W. Bazemore, L. M. Goldenhar, C. J. Lindsell, P. M. Diller, and M. K. Huntington, "An International Health Track Is Associated With Care for Underserved US Populations in Subsequent Clinical Practice," *J Grad Med Educ*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 130–137, Jun. 2011, doi: 10.4300/JGME-D-10-00066.1;

[32] J. G. Calhoun, K. Ramiah, E. M. G. Weist, and S. M. Shortell, "Development of a core competency model for the master of public health degree," *Am J Public Health*, vol. 98, no. 9, pp. 1598–1607, Sep. 2008, doi: 10.2105/ajph.2007.117978.

[33] E. R. Houpt, R. D. Pearson, and T. L. Hall, "Three domains of competency in global health education: recommendations for all medical students," *Acad Med*, vol. 82, no. 3, pp. 222–225, 2007, doi: 10.1097/acm.0b013e3180305c10.

[34] A. B. Jotkowitz, A. Gaaserud, Y. Gidron, J. Urkin, C. Z. Margolis, and Y. Henkin, "Evaluation of student attitudes and knowledge in a new program in international health and medicine," *Med Teach*, vol. 26, no. 6, pp. 574–576, Sep. 2004, doi: 10.1080/01421590410001711571.

[35] J. A. Crump and J. Sugarman, "Ethical considerations for short-term experiences by trainees in global health," *JAMA*, vol. 300, no. 12, pp. 1456–1458, Sep. 2008, doi: 10.1001/jama.300.12.1456.

[36] N. Saba and T. F. Brewer, "Beyond borders: building global health programs at McGill University Faculty of Medicine," *Acad Med*, vol. 83, no. 2, pp. 185–191, 2008, doi: 10.1097/acm.0b013e31816094fc.

[37] P. K. Drain, A. Primack, D. D. Hunt, W. W. Fawzi, K. K. Holmes, and P. Gardner, "Global health in medical education: a call for more training and opportunities," *Acad Med*, vol. 82, no. 3, pp. 226–230, 2007, doi: 10.1097/acm.0b013e3180305cf9.

[38] C. S. J. G. M. M. J. P. S. F. L. B. S. G. A Hagopian, "Developing competencies for a graduate school curriculum in international health," *Public Health Rep*, vol. 123, no. 3, pp. 408–414, 2008.

[39] T. F. Brewer, N. Saba, and V. Clair, "From boutique to basic: a call for standardised medical education in global health," *Med Educ*, vol. 43, no. 10, pp. 930–933, Oct. 2009, doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2923.2009.03458.x.

[40] N. Blum, A. Berlin, A. Isaacs, W. J. Burch, and C. Willott, "Medical students as global citizens: A qualitative study of medical students' views on global health teaching within the undergraduate medical curriculum," *BMC Med Educ*, vol. 19, no. 1, May 2019, doi: 10.1186/S12909-019-1631-X.

[41] A. B. A. H. K. W. J Evert, "Going global: considerations for introducing global health into family medicine training programs," *Fam Med*, vol. 39, no. 9, pp. 659–665, 2007.

[42] R. Battat *et al.*, "Global health competencies and approaches in medical education: A literature review," *BMC Med Educ*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 1–7, Dec. 2010, doi: 10.1186/1472-6920-10-94/TABLES/2.

[43] D. Gruner *et al.*, "Introducing global health into the undergraduate medical school curriculum using an e-learning program: A mixed method pilot study Approaches to teaching and learning," *BMC Med Educ*, vol. 15, no. 1, Sep. 2015, doi: 10.1186/S12909-015-0421-3.

[44] S. H. K Pottie, "Health advocacy for refugees: Medical student primer for competence in cultural matters and global health," *Can Fam Physician*, vol. 53, no. 11, pp. 1923–1926, 2007.

[45] J. L. K Parsi, "Preparing medical students for the world: service learning and global health justice," *Medscape J Med*, vol. 10, no. 11, p. 268., 2008.

[46] Y. H. J AM Urkin, "Integrating Global Health and Medicine into Medical Curriculum," *Education and Health*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 127–131, 2001.

[47] D. R. C. G. J. B. C. W. L. B. A. C. A. J. C Haq, "New world views: preparing physicians in training for global health work," *Fam Med*, vol. 32, no. 8, pp. 566–572, 2000.

[48] J. P. Koplan *et al.*, "Towards a common definition of global health," *Lancet*, vol. 373, no. 9679, pp. 1993–1995, 2009, doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(09)60332-9.

[49] C. Z. Margolis, R. J. Deckelbaum, Y. Henkin, S. Baram, P. Cooper, and M. L. Alkan, "A medical school for international health run by international partners," *Acad Med*, vol. 79, no. 8, pp. 744–751, 2004, doi: 10.1097/00001888-200408000-00005.

[50] K. Reed, "Global health in today's medical education," *Iowa Med*, vol. 96, no. 6, p. 23, 2006.

[51] R. M. Harden, "International medical education and future directions: a global perspective," *Acad Med*, vol. 81, no. 12 Suppl, pp. S22-29, 2006, doi: 10.1097/01.acm.0000243411.19573.58.

[52] "Global health competencies and approaches in medical education: a literature review | BMC Medical Education." Accessed: Aug. 01, 2018. [Online]. Available: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/1472-6920-10-94

[53] B. D. Nelson, A. C. C. Lee, P. K. Newby, M. R. Chamberlin, and C. C. Huang, "Global health training in pediatric residency programs," *Pediatrics*, vol. 122, no. 1, pp. 28–33, Jul. 2008, doi: 10.1542/peds.2007-2178.

[54] J. T. V. B. G. M. GJ Fox, "Medical students, medical schools and international health," *Med J Aust*, vol. 187, no. 9, pp. 536–539, 2007.

[55] M. J. Thompson, M. K. Huntington, D. D. Hunt, L. E. Pinsky, and J. J. Brodie, "Educational effects of international health electives on U.S. and Canadian medical students and residents: a literature review," *Acad Med*, vol. 78, no. 3, pp. 342–347, Mar. 2003, doi: 10.1097/00001888-200303000-00023.

[56] R. Izadnegahdar *et al.*, "Global health in Canadian medical education: current practices and opportunities," *Acad Med*, vol. 83, no. 2, pp. 192–198, 2008, doi: 10.1097/acm.0b013e31816095cd.

[57] C. Bateman, T. Baker, E. Hoornenborg, and U. Ericsson, "Bringing global issues to medical teaching.[see comment]," *Lancet*, vol. 358, no. 9292, pp. 1539–1542, Nov. 2001, doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(01)06586-2.

[58] R. Edwards, J. Piachaud, M. Rowson, and J. Miranda, "Understanding global health issues: are international medical electives the

answer?[comment],” *Med Educ*, vol. 38, no. 7, pp. 688–690, Jul. 2004, doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2929.2004.01849.x.

[59] R. Edwards, M. Rowson, and J. Piachaud, “Teaching international health issues to medical students,” *Med Educ*, vol. 35, no. 8, pp. 807–808, 2001, doi: 10.1046/j.1365-2923.2001.1014c.x.

[60] D. W. McKinley, S. R. Williams, J. J. Norcini, and M. B. Anderson, “International exchange programs and U.S. medical schools,” *Acad Med*, vol. 83, no. 10 Suppl, pp. S53-57, 2008, doi: 10.1097/acm.0b013e318183e351.

[61] J. Frenk *et al.*, “Health professionals for a new century: transforming education to strengthen health systems in an interdependent world,” *Lancet*, vol. 376, no. 9756, pp. 1923–58, Dec. 2010, doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(10)61854-5.

[62] J. A. Crump *et al.*, “Working Group on Ethics Guidelines for Global Health Training (WEIGHT). Ethics and best practice guidelines for training experiences in global health,” *Am J Trop Med Hyg*, vol. 83, no. 6, pp. 1178–82, Dec. 2010, doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.2010.10-0527.

[63] O. A. Khan *et al.*, “Global health education in U.S. medical schools,” *BMC Med Educ*, vol. 13, no. 1, p. 3, 2013, doi: 10.1186/1472-6920-13-3.

[64] F. Collins *et al.*, “A database on global health research in Africa,” *Lancet Glob Health*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. e64-5, 2013, doi: 10.1016/s2214-109x(13)70012-3.

[65] M. Withers, C. H. Browner, and T. Aghaloo, “Promoting volunteerism in global health: lessons from a medical mission in northern Mexico,” *J Community Health*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 374–84, Apr. 2013, doi: 10.1007/s10900-012-9627-z.

[66] C. Warugaba, B. Naughton, B. Hedt-Gauthier, E. Muhirwa, and C. L. Amoroso, “Experience with a massive open online course in rural Rwanda,” *Int Rev Res Open Distributed Learning*, vol. 17, no. 2, p. 2, 2016, doi: 10.19173/irrodl.v17i2.2401.

[67] M. J. Peluso, J. Encandela, J. P. Hafler, and C. Z. Margolis, “Guiding principles for the development of global health education curricula in undergraduate medical education,” *Med Teach*, vol. 34, no. 8, pp. 653–8, Aug. 2012, doi: 10.3109/0142159x.2012.687848.

[68] L. Wilson, B. Callender, T. L. Hall, K. Jogerst, H. Torres, and A. Velji, “Identifying global health competencies to prepare 21st century global health professionals: report from the global health competency subcommittee of the consortium of universities for global health,” *J Law Med Ethics*, vol. 42, no. s2, pp. 26–31, Dec. 2014, doi: 10.1111/jlme.12184.

[69] P. E. Farmer and L. C. Ivers, “Cholera in Haiti: the equity agenda and the future of tropical medicine,” *Am J Trop Med Hyg*, vol. 86, no. 1, pp. 7–8, Jan. 2012, doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.2012.11-0684b.

[70] V. B. Kerry, T. Ndung’u, R. P. Walensky, P. T. Lee, V. F. I. B. Kayanja, and D. R. Bangsberg, “Managing the demand for global health education,” *PLoS Med*, vol. 8, no. 11, p. 11, Nov. 2011, doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1001118.

[71] N. Archer, P. P. Moschovis, P. V. Le, and P. Farmer, “Post-earthquake Haiti renews the call for global health training in medical education,” *Acad Med*, vol. 86, no. 7, pp. 890–1, 2011, doi: 10.1097/acm.0b013e31821b3e14.

[72] J. Crane, “Scrambling for Africa? Universities and global health,” *Lancet*, vol. 377, no. 9775, pp. 1388–90, 2011, doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(10)61920-4.

[73] N. Anandaraja, S. Hahn, N. Hennig, R. Murphy, and J. Ripp, “The design and implementation of a multidisciplinary global health residency track at the Mount Sinai School of Medicine,” *Acad Med*, vol. 83, no. 10, pp. 924–8, 2008, doi: 10.1097/acm.0b013e3181850a3b.

[74] J. Furin *et al.*, "A novel training model to address health problems in poor and underserved populations," *J Health Care Poor Underserved*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 17–24, Feb. 2006, doi: 10.1353/hpu.2006.0023.

[75] D. Ozgediz, K. Roayaie, H. Debas, W. Schecter, and D. Farmer, "Surgery in developing countries: essential training in residency," *Arch Surg*, vol. 140, no. 8, pp. 795–800, Aug. 2005, doi: 10.1001/archsurg.140.8.795.

[76] P. K. Drain, K. K. Holmes, K. M. Skeff, T. L. Hall, and P. Gardner, "Global health training and international clinical rotations during residency: Current status, needs, and opportunities," *Acad Med*, vol. 84, no. 3, pp. 320–5, 2009, doi: 10.1097/acm.0b013e3181970a37.

[77] D. Palazuelos and R. Dhillon, "Addressing the 'global health tax' and 'wild cards': practical challenges to building academic careers in global health," *Acad Med*, vol. 91, no. 1, pp. 30–5, Jan. 2016, doi: 10.1097/acm.0000000000000845.

[78] P. K. Drain, A. Primack, D. D. Hunt, W. W. Fawzi, K. K. Holmes, and P. Gardner, "Global health in medical education: a call for more training and opportunities," *Acad Med*, vol. 82, no. 3, pp. 226–30, 2007, doi: 10.1097/acm.0b013e3180305cf9.

[79] M. Roberts, "Duffle bag medicine," *JAMA*, vol. 295, no. 13, pp. 1491–2, 2006, doi: 10.1001/jama.295.13.1491.

[80] L. V. Adams, C. M. Wagner, C. T. Nutt, and A. Binagwaho, "The future of global health education: training for equity in global health," *BMC Med Educ*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 1–7, Nov. 2016, doi: 10.1186/S12909-016-0820-0/TABLES/1.

[81] M. Sammy Wabomba, mukiira Peter Mutwiri, M. Fredrick, M. Fredrick Modeling, and F. Kenyan, "Modeling and Forecasting Kenyan GDP Using Autoregressive Integrated Moving Average (ARIMA) Models," *GDP Using Autoregressive Integrated Moving Average (ARIMA) Models. Science Journal of Applied Mathematics and Statistics*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 64–73, 2016, doi: 10.11648/j.sjams.20160402.18.

[82] P. Anzola-Román, C. Bayona-Sáez, and T. García-Marco, "Organizational innovation, internal R&D and externally sourced innovation practices: Effects on technological innovation outcomes," *J Bus Res*, vol. 91, pp. 233–247, Oct. 2018, doi: 10.1016/J.JBUSRES.2018.06.014.

[83] P. Khosravi, C. Newton, and A. Rezvani, "Management innovation: A systematic review and meta-analysis of past decades of research," *European Management Journal*, vol. 37, no. 6, pp. 694–707, Dec. 2019, doi: 10.1016/J.EMJ.2019.03.003.

[84] V. Bacon-Gerasymenko, "When do organisations learn from successful experiences? The case of venture capital firms," *International Small Business Journal: Researching Entrepreneurship*, vol. 37, no. 5, pp. 450–472, Aug. 2019, doi: 10.1177/0266242619833878.

[85] Y. Zhao and P. Thompson, "Investments in managerial human capital: Explanations from prospect and regulatory focus theories," *International Small Business Journal: Researching Entrepreneurship*, vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 365–394, Jun. 2019, doi: 10.1177/0266242619828264.

[86] A. Tariq, Y. Badir, and S. Chonglerttham, "Green innovation and performance: moderation analyses from Thailand," *European Journal of Innovation Management*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 446–467, May 2019, doi: 10.1108/EJIM-07-2018-0148.

[87] G. Gomes and R. M. Wojahn, "Organizational learning capability, innovation and performance: study in small and medium-sized enterprises (SMES)," *Revista de Administração*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 163–175,

Apr. 2017, doi: 10.1016/J.RAUSP.2016.12.003.

[88] B. Hou, J. Hong, K. Zhu, and Y. Zhou, "Paternalistic leadership and innovation: the moderating effect of environmental dynamism," *European Journal of Innovation Management*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 562–582, May 2019, doi: 10.1108/EJIM-07-2018-0141.

[89] C. Pang, Q. Wang, Y. Li, and G. Duan, "Integrative capability, business model innovation and performance: Contingent effect of business strategy," *European Journal of Innovation Management*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 541–561, May 2019, doi: 10.1108/EJIM-09-2018-0208.

[90] Ratnawati, B. E. Soetjipto, F. D. Murwani, and H. Wahyono, "The Role of SMEs' Innovation and Learning Orientation in Mediating the Effect of CSR Programme on SMEs' Performance and Competitive Advantage," *Global Business Review*, vol. 19, no. 3_suppl, pp. S21–S38, Jun. 2018, doi: 10.1177/0972150918757842.

[91] H. Guan, Z. Zhang, A. Zhao, J. Jia, and S. Guan, "Research on innovation behavior and performance of new generation entrepreneur based on grounded theory," *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, vol. 11, no. 10, May 2019, doi: 10.3390/SU11102883.

[92] M. Dodgson, "Innovation in firms," *Oxf Rev Econ Policy*, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 85–100, Jan. 2017, doi: 10.1093/OXREP/GRW034.

[93] B. M. Daff, C. Seck, H. Belkhayat, and P. Sutton, "Informed push distribution of contraceptives in Senegal reduces stockouts and improves quality of family planning services," *Glob Health Sci Pract*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 245–252, May 2014, doi: 10.9745/GHSP-D-13-00171.

[94] C. Barkman and L. Weinehall, "Policymakers and mHealth: Roles and expectations, with observations from Ethiopia, Ghana and Sweden," *Glob Health Action*, vol. 10, 2017, doi: 10.1080/16549716.2017.1337356.

[95] S. S. Lim *et al.*, "Measuring the health-related Sustainable Development Goals in 188 countries: a baseline analysis from the Global Burden of Disease Study 2015," *The Lancet*, vol. 388, no. 10053, pp. 1813–1850, Oct. 2016, doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(16)31467-2.

[96] K. K. Sinha and E. J. Kohnke, "Health care supply chain design: Toward linking the development and delivery of care globally," *Decision Sciences*, vol. 40, no. 2, pp. 197–212, May 2009, doi: 10.1111/J.1540-5915.2009.00229.X.

[97] W. Wang, M. Winner, and C. R. Burgert-Brucker, "Limited service availability, readiness, and use of facility-based delivery care in Haiti: A study linking health facility data and population data," *Glob Health Sci Pract*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 244–261, Jun. 2017, doi: 10.9745/GHSP-D-16-00311.

[98] M. Harris, E. Weisberger, D. Silver, and J. Macinko, "'They hear "Africa" and they think that there can't be any good services' - perceived context in cross-national learning: A qualitative study of the barriers to Reverse Innovation," *Global Health*, vol. 11, no. 1, Nov. 2015, doi: 10.1186/S12992-015-0130-Z.

[99] S. B. Syed *et al.*, "Developed-developing country partnerships: Benefits to developed countries?," *Global Health*, vol. 8, Jun. 2012, doi: 10.1186/1744-8603-8-17.

[100] I. Holeman, T. P. Cookson, and C. Pagliari, "Digital technology for health sector governance in low and middle income countries: A scoping review," *J Glob Health*, vol. 6, no. 2, 2016, doi: 10.7189/JOGH.06.020408.

[101] R. Pandya-Wood, D. S. Barron, and J. Elliott, "A framework for public involvement at the design stage of NHS health and social care research: Time to develop ethically conscious

standards," *Res Involv Engagem*, vol. 3, no. 1, Apr. 2017, doi: 10.1186/S40900-017-0058-Y.

[102] B. Bévière-Boyer, "Intimacy in health: Definition, protection and projection," *Ethics Med Public Health*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 28–36, Jan. 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.jemep.2017.02.009.