How does policy modelling work in practice? A global analysis on the use of modelling in Covid-19 decision-making

Authors: Liza Hadley*[ab]; Caylyn Rich[c]; Alex Tasker[d]; Olivier Restif[a]; Sebastian Funk[b].

* *Corresponding author (LH667@CAM.AC.UK)*
[a] *Disease Dynamics Unit, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK*
[b] *Centre for the Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Diseases, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK*
[c] *Independent researcher*
[d] *University of Bristol, Bristol, UK*

Abstract:

This study examines the use and utility of infectious disease modelling in national and international COVID-19 outbreak response. We investigate COVID-19 modelling-policy practices in 13 countries, by carrying out expert interviews with a range of national modellers, decision makers, and scientific advisors. The included countries span all six UN geographic regions. We document experiences and collate lessons learned during the COVID-19 pandemic across four key themes: the structures and pathways to policy, communication, collaboration and knowledge transfer, and evaluation and reflection. Full analysis and interpretation of the breadth of interview responses is presented, providing evidence for a best practice on the use and translation of outbreak modelling for policy.

Funding: Wellcome Trust.
Key words: modelling, policy, communication, collaboration, outbreak, decision-making.

1 Introduction

This study examines the use of mathematical modelling in COVID-19 response in 13 different countries/ jurisdictions. Infectious disease mathematical modelling has been at the forefront of public health decision-making during the COVID-19 pandemic, in many countries for the first time. Our definition of infectious disease mathematical modelling ('modelling' or 'outbreak modelling' for short) encapsulates epidemiological modelling in the broadest sense, to include statistical modelling and analytics too. Many countries relied heavily on this type of modelling for resource allocation, planning, and forecasting during the pandemic, especially in the face of unprecedented public health interventions and incomplete knowledge (Aguas et al., 2020; Jit et al., 2023; Owek et al., 2024; Xiang et al., 2021). While the field is highly technically developed, transformation of insights from infectious disease modelling into policy in a clear, timely, and relevant manner is oftentimes less thoroughly considered than its academic and technical counterparts. The uptake of modelling, and more broadly science advice as a whole, in policy can be streamlined with improvements to the translation, communication, direction, and timeliness of scientific evidence. Previous works have identified many open questions (Hadley et al., 2021; Mollison et al., 2022) and it has become clear that best practice is needed for navigating the new prominence of infectious disease mathematical modelling in public health decision making. Our study addresses the *translation* of modelling, rather than the technical modelling itself or modelling methodology. For technical works, we refer the reader to for example Paireau et al. and Keeling et al. on France and the UK (Keeling et al., 2022; Paireau et al., 2022).

As countries have invariably faced differing challenges in COVID-19, a cross-country comparison on the use and translation of outbreak modelling in policy is vital. It is essential to document these practices such that we can learn from shared experiences and begin to develop evidence for best practice on the use of outbreak modelling in policy. Of most interest are the perceptions of those who were *directly* involved in COVID-19 modelling response - national epidemiological modellers and the decision makers and scientific advisors that they interacted with. Particular individual modelling groups have reflected and reported on their own modelling (for example (Howerton et al., 2023) in the US and (Abbott & Funk, 2022; Funk et al., 2020) in the UK) but there is strong need for a breadth study drawing together global practices.

Dedicated research studies on the *use* of modelling in outbreak response have previously been sparse - this is an emerging field that is not yet well-organised. Nonetheless, there are independent pieces of note. Prior to COVID-19, these include the papers of Van Kerkhove & Ferguson for pandemic influenza and Chretien et al. for Ebola virus disease (Chretien et al., 2015; Van Kerkhove & Ferguson, 2012). Emergent COVID-19 reflective studies include those run by the Covid-19 Multi-model Comparison Collaboration (CMCC), the KEMRI-Wellcome Trust, and Imperial College London (Christen et al., 2023; CMCC Policy Group, 2020; CMCC Technical Group, 2020; Oliwa et al., 2024; Owek et al., 2024). For example, the inter-agency COVID-19 Multi-model Comparison Collaboration (CMCC) in 2020 produced an extensive technical report and policy report advising countries on model fitness-for-purpose. The policy report provided early guidance on how models can be used in COVID-19, beginning with a technical primer of the strengths & limitations of different types of models, input parameters, and data needs, introducing a 'reporting standards trajectory' for assessing the quality of model reporting, discussion to define accountability in outbreak response, and the setting out of three distinct classes of policy questions suitable for modelling (projecting epidemiological impact in the absence of intervention; scenario analyses and impact of interventions; modelling related to costs) (CMCC Policy Group, 2020). There is also important discussion surrounding visuals as well as brief examples of the modelling-to-policy infrastructure and collaborations in a few select countries. Supplementary work is now needed to examine modelling-to-policy infrastructures in more detail, to provide contextual recommendations on the future of modelling in outbreaks. Additional research into communication, visualisation, and framing of modelling is also required.

Our own study builds on this research gap. In this paper, we examine the use of modelling in national COVID-19 response across four themes: structures and pathways to policy, collaboration and knowledge

transfer, communication, and evaluation and reflection. An adjacent paper considers the topic of visualisation (Hadley et al., n.d.). Data collection takes the form of in-depth semi-structured interviews with key modelling-policy actors in 13 different countries. The later data collection period (2023-2024) represents learnings from 2-3 full years of outbreak response with crucial time to reflect. Interviewees represent all six UN geographic regions, and capture the breadth of COVID-19 experience. Research centres on understanding and assessing the current use of modelling in outbreak response, synthesising the perceived needs and barriers to good practice. Specific, contextual recommendations for future working are also presented.

The aims of this study are as follows:
a) Compare national practices on the use of infectious disease modelling in COVID-19 decision-making, addressing structures and pathways to policy, collaboration and knowledge transfer, communication and visualisation, and evaluation and reflection.
(b) Generate a typology for the different types of modelling-policy infrastructure observed.
(c) Propose preliminary recommendations to best practice on the use of outbreak modelling and policy, contextual to different country settings.

We report below a qualitative analysis of our findings, using thematic analysis and ideal-type analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Stapley et al., 2022). Results are divided into two sections: the current use of modelling (Section 3), and recommendations for future practice (Section 4).

2 Methods

2.1 Country and participant selection

In total, 12 countries and 1 jurisdiction (Hong Kong, China) took part in the study.[1] Stratified random sampling by UN geographic region was used to select the first country in each region; remaining countries were chosen to represent the breadth of COVID-19 experience, capturing LMICs and HICs, low- and high-COVID-19 prevalence, and a mix of prior experience of modelling for national decision-making (or none), formal modelling structures or consortiums (including those with no formal capacity), pre-COVID-19 pandemic preparedness ratings, and population size. Researchers then used purposeful sampling to contact key modelling-to-policy actors in each country for interview (Palinkas et al., 2015). If no relevant participants could be sought, a second country was chosen. Countries with a population of less than 5 million were excluded. In total, 27 participants from 13 countries took part.

Participant names are kept anonymous but participants reported the following as their countries (or jurisdictions) of practice: Australia, Canada, Colombia, France, Japan, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China (Hong Kong), Kenya, New Zealand, Peru, Republic of Korea (South Korea), South Africa, Uganda, and the United Kingdom. At least two respondents were recruited from each of the above countries. Table M1 describes the countries in our study and Table M2 describes the make-up of participants. Of the 27 interviewees, 12 self-identified as scientific advisors or policy/ decision makers (3, 9 respectively), and 15 as modellers. The group of scientific advisors and decision makers included national Government Chief Scientific Advisors and heads of the relevant national Health department or agency, as well as intermediaries or convenors assigned specifically to coordinate or relay modelling activities.

[1]For brevity, we use the term 'country' to mean 'country or jurisdiction' throughout this article, with the knowledge that Hong Kong, China is a jurisdiction or 'special administrative region' and not itself an independent country.

Country of practice	Country details			
	UN geographic region[2]	Income status[3]	GHS pandemic preparedness rating (2019)[4]	Population size (in millions)[5]
Australia	Oceania	HIC	4th	25.8
Canada	Northern America	HIC	5th	38.0
Colombia	LAC	UMIC	65th	51.2
France	Europe	HIC	11th	64.5
Hong Kong, China[6]	Asia	HIC	51st*	7.5
Japan	Asia	HIC	21st	124.9
Kenya	Africa	LMIC	55th	52.5
New Zealand	Oceania	HIC	35th	5.1
Peru	LAC	UMIC	49th	33.5
South Korea	Asia	HIC	9th	51.8
South Africa	Africa	UMIC	34th	59.1
Uganda	Africa	LIC	63rd	45.1
United Kingdom	Europe	HIC	2nd	67.2

Table M1: The 13 countries/ jurisdictions involved in our study and relevant demographic statistics. Each interviewee reported their country(ies) of practice as one of the above. LAC = Latin America and the Caribbean; LIC = Low-income country; LMIC = Lower-middle income country; MIC = Upper-middle income country; HIC = High-income country.

[2]UN geographic region as defined in: United Nations World Population Prospects 2022 Locations Documentation, Online Edition (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division, 2022a).

[3]Income as defined by World Bank income groups (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division, 2022a).

[4]Ranking taken from the 2019 Global Health Security Index, indicating expected overall preparedness for an infectious disease outbreak (NTI & Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, 2019). All countries are above the average score ranking of 85th position. *Note: Hong Kong's ranking of 51st represents the overall ranking for China.

[5]Population as of 1st January 2021, taken from United Nations World Population Prospects 2022 Demographic Indicators, Online Edition (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division, 2022b).

[6]As noted above, Hong Kong is a Special Administrative Region of China.

Affiliation	Role	No. of interviewees
Academic	Modeller	15
	Independent scientist and advisor	3
Government	Policymaker	5
	Senior government (For example head of a Ministry of Health or Public Health Agency, senior Chief Scientific Advisors, senior members of Cabinet, and related roles)	4

Table M2: Make-up of study participants.

2.2 Interview format and location

Interviews were in-depth semi-structured, lasting approximately 1 hour each. The format was structured discussion on four topics in turn, facilitated by the interviewer. Additionally, the first interviewee in each country was invited to co-create a 'sketch diagram' with the interviewer mapping out the key actors in modelling and policy in their country from their perspective. This rough diagram served as a reference point for discussion, and the main pathways were verbally verified through discussion with subsequent interviewees. The remainder of the interview followed the standard semi-structured format.

The interview schedule was heavily informed by previous work on 'Challenges for Future Pandemics' in 2020/2021. Hadley et al., 2021 introduces a succinct framework that defines the areas for progress on the interface of outbreak modelling and policy (reproduced here as Figure M1) (Hadley et al., 2021). This idea-generating piece directly informed the core themes and specific interview questions used in our study. Hadley et al., 2021 identifies seven broad challenges of pandemic modelling for policy; we narrow this down to focus in on four related interview 'themes' namely 'Structures and pathways to policy' (1&3), 'Collaboration and knowledge transfer' (2&4), 'Communication and visualisation' (5), and 'Evaluation and reflection' (7)[7]. Our study does not discuss technical model challenges, as this has been frequently researched and reported on in the wider literature (as an example, see (Sherratt et al., 2023) for European nations, among others). The full interview schedule is included in the Supplementary Material. Results on visual preferences are presented in our adjacent study (Hadley et al., n.d.). Four interviews were conducted in-person; the remaining 23 were conducted online via video-conferencing software. Majority of interviews were conducted in English, with one using an independent translator to aid communication.

[7]Numbers refer to the seven broad challenges of Hadley et al., 2021 that inspired our four themes. See Figure 1 for the numbering.



Figure M1: Infographic depicting seven broad challenges of pandemic modelling for policy, around the central equation of epidemic spread. Reproduced from Hadley et al., 2021 (Hadley et al., 2021).

2.3 Data collection and analysis

All interviews were audio recorded, transcribed, independently 'coded', and then reviewed for accuracy by the study researchers. Analysis of data followed a two-pronged approach: using thematic analysis for descriptive findings and ideal-type analysis for a more in-depth understanding of the data, enabling contextual recommendations to be made on the future of modelling (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Stapley et al., 2022). A draft version of this article was also circulated to all interviewees to enable verification and opportunity for revisions of the key findings.

This research study has been reviewed by the University of Cambridge Psychology Research Ethics Committee (application number PRE.2023.034). All participants provided informed consent.

3 Results: Current use of modelling

Results on the current use of modelling and future recommendations are presented in this and the next section respectively (3 and 4).

3.1 Modelling and policy infrastructure

Ideal-type analysis has identified two key parameters concerning the pathway of modelling to national decision-making within each country: type of modelling infrastructure, and level of government interaction with modelling. We observe four distinct types of national **modelling infrastructure**, presented in Figure R1. These are: one modelling team; a consortium consisting of multiple teams but only one model, led by a committee of modellers; a consortium consisting of multiple teams and multiple models, led by a committee of modellers; and finally, teams working in isolation with no explicit modelling committee, feeding independently into government. Types 2 and 3 are separated to distinguish a single-model infrastructure that would have no capacity to work on the same questions with a multi-model infrastructure that does have capacity for self-verification, reproduction, or consensus (in any form). Type 4 considers settings where the modelling is 'combined' in-house by a government non-modelling committee – individual modelling teams/ modellers likely did not confer with each other. Our classification aims to capture three features: the size of each country's primary modelling capacity, ability or inability to reproduce model findings, and whether different forms of modelling are *combined and synthesised by modellers* (1-3) or *non-modellers* (4) such as other infectious diseases or policy experts.



Figure R1: The four types of national modelling infrastructure observed in our study. One modelling team (1); multiple teams but with only one model (no capacity to reproduce), led by a committee of modellers (2); multiple teams and multiple models (capacity to reproduce), again led by a committee of modellers (3); modellers and/or modelling teams working independently and feeding results into government to be combined by a committee of non-modellers. Pictured: Individuals with hats represent modelling principal investigators or related roles. Computers represent models. Boxes represent committees, either of modellers or non-modelling government employees ('GOV').

Additionally, one can classify each country by the **level of government interaction in modelling**. This is shown in Table R1 along with additional findings on the structures and pathways to policy in each country. Leftmost columns concern *modelling* infrastructure while the rightmost columns consider the policy infrastructure for modelling and provide a relative ranking for the level of government interaction and

independence in each setting, based on in-depth discussion with interviewees. One sees for example that the level of interaction in modelling from government bodies varied greatly (Medium: 3 countries; High: 5; Very high: 2; Embedded: 2). Illustrative definitions are provided in the Supplementary Material. Note that countries where modelling had little or no use by government were not studied.

Country	Type of modelling infrastructure (type #)	Name of MC or team if given	Main affiliation of modellers	Main government linkage point(s)	Level of (structural) government interaction
Africa					
Kenya	Multiple teams, multiple models (3)	Led by Centre for Epidemiological Modelling and Analysis (CEMA), University of Nairobi	Universities or research institutes	Health, also Education, Faith *Multiple linkages reported: MoH mainly, also Ministry of Education, National Council of Churches and religious groups, National Taskforce, and Cabinet at times*	High. Kenyan Covid-19 modelling review team sits within the National Covid-19 Task Force.
South Africa	Multiple teams, one model (2)	South African COVID-19 Modelling Consortium (SACMC)	Universities or research institutes	Health, Economics *Ministry of Health advisory groups, MoH direct at times, Treasury*	High. SACMC convened by the National Institute of Communicable Diseases at the request of MoH.
Uganda	Teams working independently, feeding into government (4)	NA	Universities or research institutes	Health *Epidemiological Advisory Group, PRESIDE and National Planning Authority*	Medium. Two modellers on relevant SACs.
Asia					
Hong Kong, China	One team (1)	Led by LKS Faculty of Medicine, University of Hong Kong researchers	Universities or research institutes	Health *Covid-19 Expert Advisory Panel, and Cabinet at times*	High. Highly-integrated key individuals as brokers.
Japan	One team (1)	Led by Kyoto University researchers	Universities or research institutes	Health *Ministry of Health*	Very high. Modellers in-housed to MoH during first wave and modeller on relevant SAC.
South Korea	Teams working independently, feeding into government (4)	NA	Universities or research institutes	Health *Korean Disease Control and Prevention Agency (CDC)*	Medium. Brokerage carried out by influential ID specialist due to limited modelling expertise.
Europe					
France	One team initially (1); then multiple teams, multiple models (3)	Led by Institut Pasteur researchers; later the Coordinated Action of Modelling for Disease (ACM)	Universities or research institutes	Health *Conseil Scientifique*	Medium. One modeller on national SAC throughout.
United Kingdom	Multiple teams, multiple models (3)	Scientific Pandemic Influenza Group on Modelling, Operational (SPI-M-O)	Universities or research institutes primarily, with government contributors	Health primarily *SAGE (Government Office for Science); Cabinet Office at times*	High. Several modellers on national SAC throughout, secondments to Cabinet Office, and regular

					attendees from Cabinet Office to MC meetings.
Latin America and the Caribbean					
Colombia	Multiple teams, multiple models (3)	Led by National Institute of Health (INS)	Government, with university/ research institute teams contributing on occasion	Health, Education *Ministry of Health, Ministry of Education*	Embedded (primary modelling team).
Peru	One team (1)	CDC-Peru modelling unit	Government	Health *Ministry of Health*	Embedded.
Northern America					
Canada	Multiple teams, multiple models (3)	Led by Public Health Agency of Canada (PHAC)	Government, with university/ research institute teams contributing regularly	Health *Minister of Health, Cabinet*	Embedded (primary modelling team).
Oceania					
Australia	One team (scenarios) (1); multiple teams, multiple models (forecasting) (3)	Doherty Modelling consortium and National COVID-19 Situational Assessment Consortium	Universities or research institutes primarily	Health, Economics *Multiple linkages including Australian Health Protection Principal Committee (AHPPC), Treasury*	High. Long-term pre-existing relationship and modellers on multiple SACs.
New Zealand	Multiple teams, multiple models (3)	Covid-19 Modelling Aotearoa (CMA)	Universities or research institutes	Health *Ministry of Health, Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet*	Very high. Extremely close science-policy system but still with modellers' independence.

Table R1: Modelling infrastructure and details on the structures and pathways to policy in each named country, as described by interviewees. MC = Modelling Committee. SAC = Scientific Advisory Committee or expert panel. MoH = Ministry of Health / Department of Health. ID = Infectious Diseases.

Further analysis led us to produce a joint classification of all modelling-policy interfaces observed in this study. This is depicted in Figure R2. Methodological details are given in the Supplementary Material. As mentioned, size/type of modelling capacity and level of government interaction with modelling were identified as key contexts to consider when grouping country settings. The five types of modelling-policy interface identified were: (A) Countries with small modelling capacity and likely high government linkage; (B) Countries with large modelling capacity and high or very-high government linkage; (C) Countries where modelling teams worked independently, combined by non-modellers in government; (D) Countries with a large modelling capacity with a primary government modelling team; (E) Countries with one government modelling team. Producing a robust categorisation of current modelling-policy systems crucially enables one to give *specific, contextual recommendations* for future practices. To this end, subsequent results are presented by these groupings (where possible and relevant, predominantly in Section 4).



Figure R2: Types of modelling-policy interfaces. Size of modelling capacity and level of government interaction with modelling were identified as key contexts to consider when grouping country settings. The five Ideal Types produced were: (A) Countries with small modelling capacity and likely high government linkage, such as Hong Kong; (B) Countries with large modelling capacity and high or very high government linkage, such as Kenya; (C) Countries where modelling teams worked independently, combined by non-modellers in government, such as South Korea; (D) Countries with a large modelling capacity with a primary government modelling team, such as Canada; (E) Countries with one government modelling team, such as Peru.

3.2 Collaboration

In the majority of cases, modelling activity was focussed on primary health outcomes (i.e. Covid-19 transmission and disease) but there were a few interdisciplinary success stories where modelling collaborated with other disciplines. Costing, or the idea of evaluating tradeoffs (either health or economic based) was reported by modellers in New Zealand, Australia, Canada, and Peru, but were explicitly indicated as not existent in the UK, Colombia, and France. For example, in New Zealand, while economic modelling remained the responsibility of Treasury, the country's modelling consortium (Covid-19 Modelling Aotearoa, CMA) collaborated to provide analyses of isolation policy tradeoffs and linked informal health modelling within the CMA to economic modelling within the Treasury. In Australia, despite modellers previous collaborative work with social scientists on the use of citizen juries to inform ethical

vaccine allocation, during the Covid-19 response such networks suffered a lack of behavioural social sciences. A respondent from South Korea also emphasised the importance of an interdisciplinary approach to modelling: "This is a policy where extensive educational, social, and economic losses are expected, so it is necessary to listen to the opinions of experts in each field." Different forms of science can of course be combined 'higher up' in senior government, but there was a shared sentiment of desire for more cross-pollination in countries that lacked it. For example, post Covid-19, modellers from Kenya reported that they are now actively working with behavioural scientists in a local School of Anthropology on the current Rift Valley Fever outbreak.

Note: Limitations to the scope of analyses resulted in a lack of evaluation for the *quality* of interaction across disciplines, but rather sought to determine whether collaboration existed.

3.3 Translators and knowledge brokers

We define 'translators' as those individuals who took on the role of packaging information, converting complex epidemiological modelling findings into meaningful language for policy. In countries where modelling had a level of independence from government, this 'translator' role was often taken on by the most senior modeller(s) (Australia, France, Kenya, South Africa) or epidemiologist (Hong Kong). Exceptions include New Zealand's small close-knit science-policy ecosystem where modellers interacted directly with senior government and first translation was performed largely by the relevant Chief Scientific Advisor, and the UK whose modelling committee (SPI-M-O) was jointly convened by a policy co-chair and academic co-chair. The policy co-chair and SPI-M-O secretariat were all civil servants. Uniquely these UK individuals had significant past modelling expertise and could effectively synthesise key modelling findings that the policy co-chair, crucially *inside* government, could take into the parts of government that the academics reportedly had limited access to. Countries with more government embeddedness saw a mix of translators: the Chief Public Health Officer in Canada, the lead academic modeller in Japan, the relevant Peru CDC department director in Peru, and the Epidemiological Advisory Group government subgroup in Uganda. Finally, in South Korea where there were reported to be no dedicated infectious disease modelling teams at the beginning of the Covid-19 pandemic (primarily mathematics or public health research groups with only some modelling expertise), translation was taken on by an experienced and informed (non-modelling) infectious diseases specialist and principal investigator. The origin of each of these interactions varied; as one interviewee commented "it is hard to create strict rules around who should communicate: it ends up being the persons involved where their strengths lie and what structures they have around them".

3.4 Communication and framing

Policy makers' time is limited – they do not have the capacity to read extensive reports or peer-reviewed journals. The responsibility to ensure that messages are accurately delivered therefore falls to the credibility of translators delivering the information, ensuring that key modelling messages were maintained. For example, in Australia, one interviewee commented that "what is presented to policy makers is informed by what is less likely to be misinterpreted rather than what is 'liked'". Subsequently, in Australia (and elsewhere) papers were more detailed than reports to the government. For example, the median was included in published papers but excluded for policy makers to avoid misinterpretation. Similar tactics were applied in other countries to ensure the integrity of the message from modelling was maintained - these are discussed in a related paper (Hadley et al., n.d.). In the UK at times, secretariat members ensured that an accurate interpretation of the modelling was relayed to ministers, by meticulously agreeing appropriate slide headings with Cabinet Office officials to ensure the knowledge was conveyed appropriately; the benchmark became whether policy makers would be able to understand the

implications of the content if they only read the headings. In contrast, the Senior Presidential Advisor in Uganda erased the need for another liaison and reduced the opportunity of distorting the message by translating modelling-speak into policy-maker speak directly. And finally in Canada the takeaway message was reportedly emphasised at the end of presentations; “if they remember one thing, let it be that”. Respondents' comments on this issue suggest that whatever approach translators rely on to present aspects of modelling, it is critical that the core message is clear.

3.5 Review

Formats for reviewing modelling work varied by country. In Uganda, policy makers requested information and recommendations independently from multiple sources. This triangulation served as a rudimentary form of peer-review and ensured a level of rigour and review to the models. In some countries, it was quicker to have an internal group responsible for peer review of reports rather than waiting on external review (ie. formal journal processes). In New Zealand policy makers also valued the peer review process for high-level reports, which underwent an expedited review before reports were submitted to policy makers. In Canada, models and assumptions were additionally published in peer-reviewed journals, and documentation was made available online as part of good scientific practice, knowledge transfer, and transparency. Several other countries also routinely published modelling work on their government websites for transparency.

3.6 Mistakes

Many respondents were additionally asked to identify what they perceived to be the ‘biggest mistake’ when using modelling in the response. Responses are shown in Table R2 and broadly fall under the following concepts:

- Overbelieving the capacity of modelling or miscommunicating the limits (5)
- Only focusing on health; not drawing in other fields and disciplines adequately (3)
- Not considering the full socioeconomic impact of proposed interventions (2)
- Justifying interventions solely on the basis of modelling (2)
- Technical shortcomings in the use of modelling (3)
- Not investing enough in resources (3)
- No major mistakes observed (1).

These comments were shared with the interviewer in the spirit of identifying shared challenges and should be interpreted not as shortcomings of a particular individual but as areas where we could collectively improve.

Policy makers work with certainty, which is not something modelling can deliver. Attempting to workaround this oversight, the ability of modelling to predict the future was at times unintendedly *over-estimated by policy makers and the media, or the limitations of modelling were poorly communicated*. One respondent indicated that caution should be taken when applying modelling to policymaking, as it can also be presented as *too precise* a tool. This resulted in for example a decision to lockdown mistakenly being attributed by the media as *solely having been made on the basis of modelling*. Dismissing the socioeconomic *impact of interventions* in modelling exacerbated sentiments of mistrust in one setting: “We were scared of missing that worst case scenario and I think that was a mistake”. Fear-mongering and presenting only worst case scenarios consequently evoked public mistrust in one setting, and failing to

clarify the limitations of modelling's abilities at times stirred mistrust from policy makers when models could not deliver what was expected. For example, one interviewee commented "There are the big figures which came out about how many people might die and so on, and the studies terrorised everybody. And so that also had an impact, but not necessarily a good impact". *Technical shortcomings* within the models used and aspects of modelling itself were also cited by three interviewees, such as underestimating the number of deaths or relying on a single model. Finally, a lack of investment in financial resources and human capital in modelling sacrificed the quality of modelling conducted in a few settings, with one modeller even in a larger-capacity country concerned with human burnout and increased error. One policymaker contrarily posed the downplaying of models predictions as the major mistake, while the final interviewee, from a country with large modelling infrastructure and high government linkage, struggled to determine any mistakes made (albeit suggesting this only occurred by a slim chance).

What was your biggest mistake (in relation to the use of modelling)?
Not being transparent enough with lack of knowledge; allowing policy makers to espouse more certainty in the models than existed
Inability to address vaccine hesitancy - lacked incorporating behavioural or economic scientists into modelling which contributed to elevated vaccine hesitancy
Underestimating the number of deaths
Relying on a single model/ not managing to develop a multiple model consortium
Lack of understanding of types of modelling and modelling's limitations (not investing in the pedagogy of modelling)
Not taking an interdisciplinary approach, only collaborating with the Ministry of Health rather than other ministries
Utilising worst-case scenarios to justify actions, especially when presented in a public forum
Erring too far on the pessimistic side of modelling/ the negative outcome or worst-case scenario
Accidentally getting too involved with politically motivated media figures
Lack of resources (financial) to pool expertise
Risk in using models as the primary reason for introducing a lockdown
Not believing vaccines would be available so quickly
Not grasping the impact of interventions
Lack of resourcing creating biases in datasets - marginalised communities couldn't enjoy same level of for example surveillance consequently forcing 'national' rather than 'local' models onto indigenous communities
Some modellers/ modelling groups struggled to recognize the time and place appropriate for complex vs simple models
Narrow scope of metrics, no modelling of socioeconomic impacts
Downplaying models' predictions
"I don't think we made a mistake but with hindsight we've always thought, thank God, we kind of did it right and we didn't get it wrong"
Not being prepared capacity-wise
Poorly communicating the risks

Table R2: Responses to the question "What was your biggest mistake (in relation to the use of modelling)?".

4 Results: Recommendations for future practices

Towards the end of each interview, interviewees were asked to discuss their key takeaways and recommendations for the future of outbreak modelling for policy. There was a heavy emphasis on data, systems, communication, and economic/ behavioural considerations, as well as suggestions of novel and nuanced strategies to improve the use of modelling. Figure R3 provides a pictorial summary of the key drivers. These are crucial suggestions from global key actors, many with extensive experience in multiple outbreaks and from different perspectives.



Figure R3: The four driving enablers of successful outbreak modelling for policy - data, systems, communication, and interdisciplinarity/ relationships. This figure follows the style of earlier work Hadley et al, 2021.

We have synthesised the major key takeaways and recommendations and present the full narrative below. Recommendations are split by those which were universal, and those which are context-specific - for countries with limited modelling capacity, for countries where modelling work was independent from government, and additional recommendations provided by decision makers and advisors.

Universal key takeaways

- Tremendous progress on the use of modelling at scale in outbreak response, in many countries for the first time.
- DATA. “Be extremely close to the data.” “The crucial resource is data”. Almost all interviewees stressed data access and quality as essential enablers. For example, in one country interviewees acknowledged that the modellers had unique access for understanding the nuance of the data and extracting desired data for modelling questions: “We could go to the people working on the data and say ‘these are the things that we need’”. This enabled for example analysis on reinfections. Interviewees working in Hong Kong and mainland China also identified a need to work more closely with the ‘data generator’ and are now considering how to build this capacity for the future.
- Motivating data. Modelling also has a role in *motivating* data gathering. Key actors from Kenya and France for example identified a need to engage with their Ministry of Health to convey modelling needs (i.e. data collection).
- Geographic differences. Australian interviewees highlighted that externally reported data, e.g. from the Western Pacific or WHO, out of country can be misused. The work needs to be context

dependent when decisions are made. Similar concerns were raised by key actors in New Zealand, where for example Māori communities faced 'national' rather than localised models and a lack of resources complicated datasets - from an equity perspective marginalised communities couldn't enjoy the same level of for example surveillance. This was also echoed in Canada, given the lack of disaggregated data on First Nations, Inuit, and Metis peoples in different provinces and territories across the country.

- SYSTEMS. Funding and maintenance/ survival of Covid-19 systems. Almost all interviewees cited long-term funding for modelling teams and modelling-policy systems as an obvious constraint or enabler on future practices. Countries that developed modelling capacity rapidly during the pandemic had strong desire to maintain both the expertise and modelling-policy relationships. Interviewees reported that for example Canada, Kenya, and South Korea were working to maintain or evolve their Covid-19 modelling-policy systems post-pandemic, while at the time of interview, New Zealand and the additional country from the Global South for example had been so far unsuccessful in sourcing long-term funding for modelling and formal modelling committees had disbanded. However there have been *informal* efforts in New Zealand (and elsewhere) to maintain collaboration between public health, policy makers, and academic modellers. One interviewee hypothesised that modelling capacity will be continued not through formal structures but through continued outbreak response.
- Legitimacy. One of the biggest reported strengths in Kenya was that the modelling consortium was assigned *within* the Ministry of Health. This gave modelling official placement and recognition throughout the pandemic. Other countries where modelling was external but had high government linkage also echoed this view.
- Structural change in the "inter-epidemic" period. Surveillance systems need to be improved not during emergency responses. Capacity and trust take time to build. It was agreed that now is the most crucial time for countries to strengthen their systems.[8]
- Skill development in periods of peacetime. Australian modellers noted that they are currently experimenting with and strengthening forecasting targets and visualisation techniques, without the pressure of an emergency response, as undoubtedly are many other teams around the world. Additionally, skills can be honed in all sorts of disease settings, not just high priority ones.
- TRUST AND COMMUNICATION. Strong communication between modellers and policymakers was routinely highlighted as paramount to successful relationships. For example, interviewees from one country cited the strength of their appointed convenor's communication and brokerage on both the technical and knowledge translation side. Having an individual on board whose speciality is in communication was desired, even just to free up the time of other key actors.
- Trust takes time to build. It is important to have an *advocate* for modellers working with government in peacetime.
- Overbelieving modelling or its capacity or other misunderstandings. Overbelieved modelling can be more dangerous than no modelling - "once you predict something, people stop thinking about it". Key actors in Japan and South Korea described misunderstandings between scenario modelling and forecasts, even among the public health sector, acknowledging that it is essential for the limitations of modelling to be carefully explained. This (limitations) was echoed by all modellers in the study. The misalignment between poor data and impact on outputs for example was not effectively

[8]Of course not every country is in relative 'peacetime' right now - one African interviewee stressed that "infectious diseases are a real and present danger in African settings in a way that they are not in most of the Global North".

communicated in one setting. Language barriers can also amplify confusion; interviewees noted that there is no different word for 'projection' and 'forecast' in either Korean or Japanese for example.

- INTERDISCIPLINARITY AND RELATIONSHIPS, taking a holistic view. Modelling primarily, or in many cases solely, focused on modelling for *health outcomes* (cases, deaths, hospitalisations etc.). Modellers acknowledged the very narrow metrics of measuring the impact of public health measures, based largely on "just keeping people out of hospital". While this is absolutely critical work, the inability to model the socioeconomic impact of restrictions was a concern for many. In Hong Kong, modelling lacked economics and behavioural science considerations, and it was remarked that a sole focus on health-outcomes work may have contributed to higher vaccine hesitancy. Key actors from Kenya stressed that future outbreak and modelling response needs to have a *holistic* view: "Some people have gone hungry or had their lives messed up a bit because we couldn't, we didn't have the time to know or to be able to prioritise those things equally". While social science and modelling collaborations were not in place for Covid-19 in Kenya, there have been changes to build on this moving forward - in the current Rift Valley Fever outbreak, modellers have been working with their colleagues in the School of Anthropology, consulting social scientists to inform their work.
- Economics. Following on from the above point, there was a mix of views on whether or not epidemiological modelling should explicitly model costs and if it is solely the job of Cabinet to see the different forms of science. A country where modelling did have an ear to Economics during Covid-19 was that of Australia - key actors acknowledged the importance of having developed relations with the Treasury to enable consideration of the economic impacts of both social restrictions and disease burden. The Australian Treasury's interest in the use of modelling reportedly grew over time as disease severity fell, to understand for example social impacts of workplace absenteeism and related supply chain issues. Policymakers in Colombia also frequently requested modelling to integrate with economics. Modellers acknowledged that this is very difficult to do but a conversation that needs to be had - between epidemiological modellers and economic modellers. Modellers from South Korea were similarly vocal that modelling focused on *health*, not economics, mental health etc. "The modelling is correct in terms of minimising cases but overall we don't know what is best for the country". They acknowledged it was the job of the decision makers at least in South Korea in bringing together different streams of science but important for all parties to acknowledge the health-focus so that modelling is not overbelieved.

<u>Specific recommendations from decision makers and science advisors</u>

- DATA. Access to quality data - "models are only as strong as the data inputs". Many of the decision makers and science advisors in the study recognised that data is critical for modelling. Poor intervention data was cited as a specific barrier in Peru; the Ministry of Health and Peruvian CDC are working to improve their data sources.
- SYSTEMS. Capacity - the capacity for modelling in some countries is still lacking. We need to increase this, by providing secure jobs for modellers and training in countries with fewer experts. In Japan, physics and economics experts did some of the modelling but did not have training in the basics of infectious disease epidemiology; there is a need to have modelling-specific groups rather than relying on one team. An interviewee from Peru cited a need to integrate training in university settings - "they teach Mathematics and Computer Science but not these epidemiology things - we

need to engage with universities to train more undergraduates in these methods". Despite a regional interest in the use of modelling in Latin America and the Caribbean, there is a *lack of capacity to train* people to model, and this is most notable that only a few Latin American countries practice infectious disease modelling.

- Canadian key actors also acknowledged the unprecedented speed in which scientists but especially modellers had to operate - they propose to facilitate a stronger onboarding process, making it easier to hire modellers and those adjacently supporting modelling work.
- COMMUNICATION. Part of improving capacity is in improving communication. Countries should focus on facilitating communication between policymakers and modellers, with co-creation of the model questions. Improving risk communication is also vital to better response and adherence in outbreaks.
- Complex models were at times overpitched; there is a need for simple models in policy spheres.
- Brokering. It is critical to have an interpreter or translator (who may or may not be a modeller) within policymaking spheres to provide a space for modelling. Key actors in Canada and New Zealand both highlighted that it is useful to have someone who can provide a 'key takeaway' or 'one-liner' to synthesise information into practical and brief terms. Trusted academics that were comfortable sharing ballpark estimates with senior government in for example New Zealand proved very useful operationally. Other individuals also commented that modellers' method of providing results should be more policy-friendly, in order to be accepted as useful by decision makers.
- Certainty. Building on the above point, interviewees commented that it is critical to understand that policymakers need to convey certainty in policy responses, which is inherently at odds with aspects of modelling. The environment of academia (and what is valued) obscures the importance of more emergency response and findings needed from studies - actors acknowledged the difference between academic modelling and what is important in policy.
- Retrospective verification of your own modelling is essential. "Many modellers console themselves by saying that my results can naturally be wrong and it was the best in that situation. But such a method can slow down improvement." Politicians and stakeholders remarked that it is essential for modellers to retrospectively evaluate their own modelling and to share why things failed when they did - honesty between researchers and politicians is essential for progress.
- INTERDISCIPLINARITY AND RELATIONSHIPS. A lack of pre-existing relationships between modellers and policymakers meant it was difficult to establish rapport urgently in New Zealand. However the unique nature of New Zealand's smaller community and head of Government being invested in science facilitated an informal communication style. Interviewees commented that perhaps a more formal bureaucratic structure would have been constricting - mobility comes with informality.
- Sharing scientific advice and government consensus documents regularly with the public. "Publishing routinely was absolutely the right thing to do". It is democratic, enabled transparency, accountability, and "made our work better".
- AND FINALLY, it is "important to recognise that mistakes will be made, that policymakers are human, that models are imperfect, but that 'incremental gains' can and should be made".

<u>Specific recommendations from countries with small or limited modelling capacity</u>

- SYSTEMS. Capacity - it is important to have an existing body of people working in infectious disease epidemiology. In one country, interviewees described a situation where exactly the same people were drawn into the response for Covid-19 as for previous infectious disease emergencies, likened

to a 'wholesale transfer' from HIV to Covid-19. It was crucial to have these existing relationships.

- There were numerous calls (both from modellers and policymakers) for more training of modellers and more standing capacity for modelling with secure jobs in peacetime. A modeller from Uganda remarked "it is frustrating in Uganda that I can't even tell you what modellers we have!". Activities to build a modelling community in Uganda have so far been unsuccessful; however the prominence of modelling for policy in Uganda is growing and senior Presidential Advisors have recently provided training for around 70 policymakers on understanding modelling evidence.
- Review. While the addition of more modellers was not possible or not universally drawback-free in some countries, many individuals with small modelling capacity cited the desire for in-country peer review systems for emergency work. "What if we made mistakes that we weren't aware of?". The idea of peer-review was also discussed by some in larger modelling consortiums, for example via an external network of modellers to facilitate innovation and robustness of in-country modelling.
- A novel solution to capacity - Australia had insufficient capacity for multiple groups working on scenario modelling, but it was acknowledged that this strengthened the single model with skills and expertise coming together from multiple universities. Interestingly, the Australian national government also hired consulting companies at times; a unique solution to modelling capacity constraints. This was felt to be beneficial when applied to an area where existing modelling teams had less skills (for example in vaccine distribution). Teams working within and outside government were able to gainfully collaborate, sharing complementary knowledge and approaches to rapidly address urgent questions about national immunisation thresholds informed by a robust knowledge of delivery constraints.

<u>Specific recommendations from countries where modelling sat 'outside' of government</u>

- SYSTEMS. In the UK, the pre-pandemic plan was for most modelling to be carried out *within* government, run by those employees of the country's public health agency who attended the "SPI-M-O" modelling committee, with academic members of the committee supporting and acting as a challenge function. However due to various reasons this was not the case, and modelling work was predominantly carried out by the academic groups themselves. Interviewees acknowledged a true 'fence' between those *inside* the UK government and those *outside*. It was commented that the planned system would have been strained anyway, with the model 'inside' and the modellers 'outside'. There was discussion in two interviews on other European countries who pulled their academic modellers inside government, which at times had the unfortunate result of divorcing modellers from the rest of their community. Modellers in the UK enjoyed a much more coherent and supportive community with open efforts.
- Preserving relationships and protecting against evolution of political systems. Modellers relaying to a government committee rather than one or two government individuals has likely preserved future modelling-policy relationships under high government turnover in New Zealand.
- Funding and not having the money to resource a group. In the UK, interviewees highlighted one of the key mistakes as not being able to pay for the modelling expertise and people that the country needed. Modelling support was provided at goodwill under the overwhelming fear and shock that Covid-19 brought. It might not be possible for this goodwill to be repeated.
- COMMUNICATION. One-directional communication from policy to modelling early on was identified as a real barrier in some countries. Without a discursive relationship, modellers in these settings had no opportunity to understand what is actually being asked and what they were actually

saying. It was not until two-way communication and invited co-creation of policy questions that modelling-policy proliferated in these countries.

- Further to the above, explicit information on what the government is trying to do was deemed very useful. No model is policy neutral - “all models have to have an assumption about policy in them, even if the policy is to do nothing”.
- Brokerage. Kenyan actors noted that there was unclear messaging and competing scientific advice before establishing a proper modelling committee and route for translation. There are now desires and aims to keep the modelling committee structure post-pandemic.
- INTERDISCIPLINARITY AND RELATIONSHIPS. Lastly, in countries where emergency modelling sat ‘outside’ of government, there is a need for more in-housing or at least *relationships* and formal *agreements* in place ahead of time, such as memorandums of understanding. For example, one interviewee noted that the role of evidence commissioning structures for disease control is currently being assessed nationally in Australia.

Throughout, we see four driving enablers to successful outbreak modelling and policy: **data**, **systems**, **communication**, and **interdisciplinarity/ relationships**. These are depicted in Figure R3 above.

5 Discussion

At the time of shock, when the pandemic first hit, nations organised scientific and modelling capacity, and crucially this self-organisation happened in *different* ways, resulting in *different successes and challenges* as outlined in detail above. More universally, there was a desire for modelling to have an eye to wider societal impacts, and in many settings, work formally with other experts. We highlight two success stories of modelling successfully working with economics and social science either in the Covid-19 pandemic or as an active post-Covid-19 advancement.

On the Communication front, trust has emerged as a recurring theme. Trust in the *individual* appears in many settings to have been the gateway to trust in the *message*. We have also introduced the idea of *re-translation*, acknowledging the need to ensure that not only is modelling translated and packaged effectively to policymakers, but that in subsequent iterations 'up the chain' the message is maintained. There is a need now for further emphasis in Science Communication work on enabling *subsequent* translation of modelling, at least in policy settings.

Finally, we acknowledge the overarching themes of data, communication, systems, and relationships as primary enablers to successful evidence-based practice. We have been able to synthesise specific and contextual recommendations for future practice on the use of modelling in outbreak response. This work provides a crucial evidence base to begin best practice agreements in the newly high-profile field of applied infectious disease modelling.

Looking to related literature in this area, Owek et al. identified pre-existing relationships between researchers and decision-makers as an enabling factor for successful knowledge translation, in addition to co-creation of advice and embeddedness (Owek et al., 2024). Our findings echo this, with 'Systems' and 'Relationships' both being pivotal for future outbreak modelling and response. Our findings on Systems also reflect that of formal inquiries taken on by several countries - for example in the UK's Covid-19 Inquiry, modellers (as well as all other scientists, policymakers, decision makers, and associated key actors) provided witness statements detailing their involvement in the country's pandemic response from which it is clear that the systems and relationships built prior to and during Covid-19 were fundamental to modelling's utility in the pandemic response (Ferguson, 2023).

Additionally there was acknowledgement of the role of translators by the CMCC discussed earlier in this article, noting that where needed "decision makers may be supported by advisors or knowledge brokers with a high literacy to interpret models". In contrast, Owek et al. found that face-to-face debriefings between scientists and policymakers were preferred in Low and Middle Income Countries over the use of a knowledge broker or intermediary. We observed much more of a mix of translators in our study - of the five countries classified as LMICs in Table M1 (Colombia, Kenya, Peru, Uganda, and South Africa), translation was taken on by the most senior modeller in three settings but by an intermediary in the other two. It is worth acknowledging whether academics should be the ones responsible for making strong visuals or if this activity could be more effectively in-housed. There is merit for the latter in the countries we have investigated.

In terms of limitations, we have aimed to capture a range of experiences in our study but there was a limited number of participants (27) and in most cases, only two participants per country. Consequently, we do not attribute recommendations to specific countries (with the exception of giving examples) and

instead present the major analyses by typology (e.g., suggestions for countries with small modelling capacity, suggestions for countries where modelling sat 'outside' of government, etc.). Note also that interview data represents the *perceptions* of interviewees, hence this study only evaluates the perceived use of modelling, albeit from highly-informed individuals. Nonetheless, this may not reflect official policy or how individuals would behave in practice. We also use the term 'government' loosely throughout, and acknowledge that this relates to different individuals and committees in each country, due to the multifaceted political structures.

We also acknowledge that state-level and regional (multi-country) modelling were outside the scope of this study, as were case study countries where modelling *did not* contribute to national Covid-19 response. State-level modelling played a role in many of the larger countries of our study, such as Colombia, Canada, and Australia, but these activities are not reported here.

With the above limitations in mind, our study provides an evidence base for the use of modelling in national Covid-19 response, and analysis has enabled initial recommendations from which we can now build. This study will directly contribute evidence to formal activities to develop best practice, such as the Lancet Commission on 'Strengthening the Use of Epidemiological Modelling of Emerging and Pandemic Infectious Diseases' (Jit, 2023).

Author contributions

LH proposed the study and led the project. All authors were involved in conception and design. LH carried out the data collection. LH and CR analysed, interpreted and wrote up the results. LH wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All authors provided feedback on the manuscript and approved the final version for publication.

Acknowledgements

LH acknowledges support from the Wellcome Trust (block grant no. RG92770). SF also acknowledges support from the Wellcome Trust (grant no. 210758/Z/18/Z). The authors also thank Sungmok Jung, Mircea Sofonea, and all other interviewees for dedicating their time and experience to the study.

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

Abbott, S., & Funk, S. (2022, March 25). *EpiForecasts—Reflections on two years estimating effective reproduction numbers*. https://epiforecasts.io/posts/2022-03-25-rt-reflections/#back-to-2020would-we-do-it-again

Aguas, R., White, L., Hupert, N., Shretta, R., Pan-Ngum, W., Celhay, O., Moldokmatova, A., Arifi, F., Mirzazadeh, A., Sharifi, H., Adib, K., Sahak, M. N., Franco, C., & Coutinho, R. (2020). Modelling the

COVID-19 pandemic in context: An international participatory approach. *BMJ Global Health*, *5*(12), e003126. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2020-003126

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Brooks-Pollock, E., Danon, L., Mason, S., House, T., Read, J. R., & Keeling, M. J. (2020). *University of Bristol and University of Exeter: Impact of opening schools on the effective reproduction number – analysis of the Social Contact Survey, 30 April 2020*. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/university-of-bristol-and-university-of-exeter-impact-of-opening-schools-on-the-effective-reproduction-number-analysis-of-the-social-contact-survey

Chretien, J.-P., Riley, S., & George, D. B. (2015). Mathematical modeling of the West Africa Ebola epidemic. *eLife*, *4*, e09186. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.09186

Christen, P., Van Elsland, S., Saulo, D., Cori, A., & Fitzner, J. (2023). *Workshop Report: Advanced analytics to inform decision making during public health emergencies*. [object Object]. https://doi.org/10.25561/108600

CMCC Policy Group. (2020). *Guidance on Use of Modelling for Policy Responses to COVID-19*. https://decidehealth.world/sites/default/files/2020-09/Policy_Report_Sept.1.pdf

CMCC Technical Group. (2020). *Technical Group Report: Model Fitness-for-purpose Assessment Report*. https://decidehealth.world/sites/default/files/2020-09/Technical_Report_Sept1.pdf

Ferguson, N. (2023). *UK Covid-19 Inquiry INQ000185337—Witness Statement of Professor Neil Ferguson Module 1, dated 11/05/2023*. https://covid19.public-inquiry.uk/documents/inq000185337-witness-statement-of-professor-neil-ferguson-dated-11-05-2023/

Funk, S., Abbott, S., Atkins, B. D., Baguelin, M., Baillie, J. K., Birrell, P., Blake, J., Bosse, N. I., Burton, J., Carruthers, J., Davies, N. G., Angelis, D. D., Dyson, L., Edmunds, W. J., Eggo, R. M., Ferguson, N. M., Gaythorpe, K., Gorsich, E., Guyver-Fletcher, G., … Investigators, I. (2020). *Short-term forecasts to inform the response to the Covid-19 epidemic in the UK* (p. 2020.11.11.20220962). medRxiv.

https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.11.20220962

Hadley, L., Challenor, P., Dent, C., Isham, V., Mollison, D., Robertson, D. A., Swallow, B., & Webb, C. R. (2021). Challenges on the interaction of models and policy for pandemic control. *Epidemics*, *37*, 100499. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epidem.2021.100499

Hadley, L., Rich, C., Tasker, A., Restif, O., & Funk, S. (n.d.). *Visual preferences in Covid-19 decision making: Epidemiology and modelling*.

Hitchings, R., & Latham, A. (2020). Qualitative methods I: On current conventions in interview research. *Progress in Human Geography*, *44*(2), 389–398. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132519856412

Howerton, E., Contamin, L., Mullany, L. C., Qin, M., Reich, N. G., Bents, S., Borchering, R. K., Jung, S., Loo, S. L., Smith, C. P., Levander, J., Kerr, J., Espino, J., van Panhuis, W. G., Hochheiser, H., Galanti, M., Yamana, T., Pei, S., Shaman, J., … Lessler, J. (2023). Evaluation of the US COVID-19 Scenario Modeling Hub for informing pandemic response under uncertainty. *Nature Communications*, *14*(1), 7260. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-023-42680-x

Jit, M. (2023). How modelling can better support public health policy making: The Lancet Commission on Strengthening the Use of Epidemiological Modelling of Emerging and Pandemic Infectious Diseases. *The Lancet*, *0*(0). https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(23)02758-7

Jit, M., Ainslie, K., Althaus, C., Caetano, C., Colizza, V., Paolotti, D., Beutels, P., Willem, L., Edmunds, J., Nunes, B., Namorado, S., Faes, C., Low, N., Wallinga, J., & Hens, N. (2023). Reflections On Epidemiological Modeling To Inform Policy During The COVID-19 Pandemic In Western Europe, 2020–23. *Health Affairs*, *42*(12), 1630–1636. https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2023.00688

Keeling, M. J., Dyson, L., Tildesley, M. J., Hill, E. M., & Moore, S. (2022). Comparison of the 2021 COVID-19 roadmap projections against public health data in England. *Nature Communications*, *13*(1), 4924. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-31991-0

Mollison, D., Isham, V., Dangerfield, C., & Hollingsworth, D. (2022). Preface: Challenges for future pandemics. *Epidemics*, *40*, 100621. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epidem.2022.100621

NTI & Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health. (2019). *Global Health Security Index: Building*

Collective Action and Accountability.

Oliwa, J. N., Guleid, F., Owek, C. J., Maluni, J., Jepkosgei, J., Sim, S. Y., Were, V., Nzinga, J., Walekhwa, A. W., Hadley, L., Clapham, H., Dabak, S. V., KC, S., Unduragga, E. A., Hutubessy, R., & Hagedorn, B. L. (2024). *A FRAMEWORK TO GUIDE THE USE OF MATHEMATICAL MODELLING IN EVIDENCE-BASED POLICY DECISION-MAKING*.

Owek, C. J., Guleid, F., Maluni, J. K., Jepkosgei, J., Were, V., Sim, S. Y., Hutubessy, R., Hagedorn, B. L., Nzinga, J., & Oliwa, J. N. (2024). *LESSONS LEARNED FROM COVID-19 MODELLING EFFORTS FOR POLICY DECISION-MAKING IN LOWER- AND MIDDLE-INCOME COUNTRIES* [Preprint]. https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.01.30.24301978

Paireau, J., Andronico, A., Hozé, N., Layan, M., Crépey, P., Roumagnac, A., Lavielle, M., Boëlle, P.-Y., & Cauchemez, S. (2022). An ensemble model based on early predictors to forecast COVID-19 health care demand in France. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *119*(18), e2103302119. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2103302119

Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful Sampling for Qualitative Data Collection and Analysis in Mixed Method Implementation Research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, *42*(5), 533–544. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-013-0528-y

Public Health Agency of Canada. (2020, September 22). *Mathematical modelling and COVID-19: Epidemiology and modelling presentations* [Education and awareness]. https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/services/diseases/coronavirus-disease-covid-19/epidemiological-economic-research-data/mathematical-modelling.html

Sherratt, K., Gruson, H., Grah, R., Johnson, H., Niehus, R., Prasse, B., Sandmann, F., Deuschel, J., Wolffram, D., Abbott, S., Ullrich, A., Gibson, G., Ray, E. L., Reich, N. G., Sheldon, D., Wang, Y., Wattanachit, N., Wang, L., Trnka, J., … Funk, S. (2023). Predictive performance of multi-model ensemble forecasts of COVID-19 across European nations. *eLife*, *12*, e81916. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.81916

SPI-M-O. (2021). *SPI-M-O: Summary of further modelling of easing restrictions – roadmap Step 4, 9 June*

2021. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/spi-m-o-summary-of-further-modelling-of-easing-restrictions-roadmap-step-4-9-june-2021

Stapley, E., O'Keeffe, S., & Midgley, N. (2022). Developing Typologies in Qualitative Research: The Use of Ideal-type Analysis. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *21*, 16094069221100633. https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069221100633

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. (2022a). *World Population Prospects 2022—Documentation* [Dataset]. https://population.un.org/wpp/Download/Documentation/Documentation/

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. (2022b). *World Population Prospects—Demographic Indicators* [Dataset]. https://population.un.org/wpp/Download/Standard/MostUsed/

Van Kerkhove, M., & Ferguson, N. (2012). Epidemic and intervention modelling – a scientific rationale for policy decisions? Lessons from the 2009 influenza pandemic. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, *90*(4), 306–310. https://doi.org/10.2471/BLT.11.097949

Xiang, Y., Jia, Y., Chen, L., Guo, L., Shu, B., & Long, E. (2021). COVID-19 epidemic prediction and the impact of public health interventions: A review of COVID-19 epidemic models. *Infectious Disease Modelling*, *6*, 324–342. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.idm.2021.01.001