

1 **LESSONS LEARNED FROM COVID-19 MODELLING EFFORTS FOR POLICY**
2 **DECISION-MAKING IN LOWER- AND MIDDLE-INCOME COUNTRIES**

3

4

5 Collins J Owek¹, Fatuma Guleid², Justinah K Maluni³, Joyline Jepkosgei³, Vincent Were⁴, So Yoon Sim⁵,
6 Raymond Hutubessy⁵, Brittany L Hagedorn⁶, Jacinta Nzinga², Jacquie N Oliwa³

7

8

- 9 1. Department of Public and Global Health, University of Nairobi, Nairobi, Kenya
10 2. Health Economics Research Unit, KEMRI Wellcome Trust Research Programme, Nairobi,
11 Kenya
12 3. Health Services Unit, KEMRI Wellcome Trust Research Programme, Nairobi, Kenya
13 4. Data Synergy and Evaluation unit, African Population and Health Research Center, Nairobi,
14 Kenya
15 5. Department of Immunization, Vaccines and Biologicals (IVB), World Health Organization
16 Headquarters, Geneva, Switzerland
17 6. Institute for Disease Modelling, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation

18

19

20

21 Corresponding author
22 Jacquie Oliwa
23 KEMRI-Wellcome Trust Research Programme
24 P.O. Box 43640-00100
25 Nairobi, Kenya
26 Joliwa@kemri-wellcome.org

27 **Abstract**

28 **Introduction**

29 The COVID-19 pandemic had devastating health and socio-economic effects, partly due to mitigating
30 policy choices. There is little evidence of approaches that guided policy decisions in settings that had
31 limited modelling capacity pre-pandemic. We sought to identify knowledge translation mechanisms,
32 enabling factors, and structures needed to translate modelled evidence to policy decisions
33 effectively.

34 **Methods**

35 We utilised convergent mixed methods in a participatory action approach, with quantitative data
36 from a survey and qualitative data from a scoping review, in-depth interviews, and workshop notes.
37 Participants included researchers and policy actors involved in COVID-19 evidence generation and
38 decision-making. They were mostly from lower- and middle-income countries (LMICs) in Africa,
39 Southeast Asia, and Latin America. Quantitative and qualitative data integration occurred during
40 data analysis through triangulation and during reporting in a narrative synthesis.

41 **Results**

42 We engaged 147 researchers and 57 policy actors from 28 countries. We found that the strategies
43 required to use modelling evidence effectively include capacity building of modelling expertise and
44 communication, improved data infrastructure, sustained funding, and dedicated knowledge
45 translation platforms. The common knowledge translation mechanisms used during the pandemic
46 included policy briefs, face-to-face debriefings, and dashboards. Some enabling factors for
47 knowledge translation comprised solid relationships and open communication between researchers
48 and policymakers, credibility of researchers, co-production of policy questions, and embedding
49 researchers in policymaking spaces. Barriers included competition among modellers, negative
50 attitude of policymakers towards research, political influences and demand for quick outputs.

51 **Conclusion**

52 Our findings led to the co-development of a knowledge translation framework useful in various
53 settings to guide decision-making, especially for public health emergencies. Furthermore, we
54 provide a contextualised understanding of knowledge translation for LMICs during the COVID-19
55 pandemic. Finally, we share key lessons on how knowledge translation from mathematical modelling
56 complements the broader learning agenda related to pandemic preparedness and long-term
57 investments in evidence-to-policy translation.

58 **Keywords**

59 Knowledge translation, Lower- and middle-income countries, COVID-19, mathematical modelling,
60 policy, researchers, modellers, policymakers, policy actors, decision-making

61 **What is already known on this topic**

- 62 • There has been a multitude of modelling frameworks used in diverse ways to advise the various
63 pandemic responses the world over, to an extent not seen before in public health.
- 64 • However, it is likely that not all modelling and evidence was adequate, effectively
65 communicated, or used by policymakers.
- 66 • This is especially of concern in many LMICs that had strained health systems and resource
67 constraints pre-pandemic.

68 **What this study adds**

- 69 • The know-do gap is a bottleneck to rapid, effective policy decisions, especially crucial in
70 emergencies.
- 71 • As part of pandemic preparedness, it is necessary to have decision support systems in place.
- 72 • To ensure this is done well, there is a need to understand how modelling and analytical methods
73 can rapidly be made available and fully integrated into decision-making processes.

74 **How this study might affect research, practice, or policy**

- 75 • This study contributed to the co-development of a knowledge translation framework that will be
76 useful in building model-to-policy systems that can be adapted for use in various settings.

- 77 • We identified mechanisms required to strengthen knowledge translation in LMICs, and this
78 complements the broader learning agenda related to pandemic preparedness and long-term
79 investments in evidence-to-policy translation.

80 **Introduction**

81 The COVID-19 pandemic is the most defining global health crisis of our times. According to the latest
82 estimates, there have been over 700 million confirmed cases of COVID-19 and just over seven
83 million deaths globally ¹. Besides directly causing death and disability, the pandemic also disrupted
84 essential health services, putting additional stressors on health systems that were already under
85 strain, especially in lower-and middle-income countries (LMICs) ²⁻⁵. Policies to curb the spread of
86 COVID-19 negatively affected economic growth and disrupted social services, leading to untold
87 impacts- the pandemic disproportionately affected the most vulnerable ^{2,4,6}.

88 Understanding the magnitude of the effects of the pandemic on health and economic outcomes was
89 essential to developing policies to respond to the crisis. At the pandemic's beginning, policy
90 decision-makers needed to know the fundamentals of the pathogen and the risk of spread. As it
91 evolved, they needed to understand the incidence, hospitalisation and mortality rates, the effects of
92 various pharmaceutical and non-pharmaceutical interventions and how to allocate resources
93 optimally. As the pandemic subsided, the focus shifted to recovery and long-term impacts ⁷.


94 Consequently, there was an unprecedented demand for modelling analytics to understand the
95 pandemic and support various mitigation decisions. Compartmental models were commonly used
96 during the pandemic, to monitor individuals as they transition through various infection states
97 (Susceptible-Infectious-Recovered (SIR) and Susceptible-Exposed-Infectious-Recovered (SEIR)
98 models). Agent-based models were also widely used, employing computer simulations to generate a
99 virtual environment where individuals follow defined rules ⁸. However, not all modelling and
100 evidence were likely adequate, effectively communicated, or effectively used by decision-makers ⁹⁻¹¹.

101 Despite considerable resources dedicated to research, transferring findings to practice is often a
102 slow, unpredictable process and a bottleneck to rapid, evidence-based policy decisions needed in
103 emergencies¹². This may have resulted in missed opportunities, wasted time and effort, and loss of
104 life during the pandemic. It is, therefore, imperative to minimise the knowledge-to-action gap by
105 understanding that knowledge translation processes occur in an environment of diverse evidence
106 sources under uncertainty, with complex social interactions among various stakeholders. Dealing
107 with uncertainties, mainly how to communicate them to decision-makers, is also a significant
108 bottleneck.

109 Graham's knowledge-to-action framework (Fig1) has been tested as a model for planning and
110 evaluating knowledge translation strategies^{12,13}. The framework is based on planned action theories.
111 It divides the knowledge-to-action process into two concepts: i) knowledge creation- where the
112 researchers and policy actors generate policy-relevant questions and the modelling approaches to
113 use them) and ii) action- where the modelling evidence is adapted to the local context and used.
114 Guided by Graham's framework, we set out to identify good practices, enabling factors, and
115 structures needed for the successful creation and use of modelling evidence during the COVID-19
116 pandemic as a test case for future emergencies.

117 We found few studies that explicitly described knowledge translation strategies and how they were
118 used to promote the uptake of modelling evidence for policy decision-making during the pandemic,
119 and most of them were from higher-income settings¹⁴⁻¹⁶. LMICs may have had limited modelling and
120 knowledge translation capacity pre-pandemic, and this may have hindered rapid decision-making
121 during the pandemic¹⁷. We therefore engaged both researchers and policy actors (primarily drawn
122 from LMICs) to understand how modelling data was used for decision-making during the pandemic,
123 what challenges they faced, and suggestions for improvement. This work resulted in co-creation of a
124 framework to guide evidence-based policy decision-making. It complements the broader learning

125 agenda related to pandemic preparedness and investments in long-term improvement in evidence-
126 to-policy translation.



127

128 *Figure 1 Graham's Knowledge to Action Framework*¹²

129 **Methods**

130 **Study Design**

131 We conducted a mixed methods study in a convergent manner, as described by Creswell and Clark¹⁸
132 , using participatory action approaches¹⁹. Quantitative data were from an online survey, whose
133 insights helped shape qualitative data collection from a scoping review, in-depth interviews, and
134 participant observer notes from learning workshops. Graham's knowledge-to-action framework
135 helped frame the study objectives, design the initial interview guides, and structure the analysis.

136 We carried out participatory action research through collective, self-reflective inquiry of local
137 context and social relationships as described by Gilson et al.²⁰. We did this through collaborative and
138 introspective inquiry with participants by looking into their experiences around modelling,
139 knowledge translation and evidence-based policy decision-making during the pandemic. The
140 investigators were thus also participants in the workshops and participated in the co-creation
141 process of the knowledge translation framework. As investigators, we tried to minimise bias by
142 limiting our participation to mainly listening in and only stepping in to facilitate where needed. Our
143 weekly data reflection meetings enabled us to exercise reflexivity to ensure the participants'
144 perceptions were captured^{21 22}.

145 **Study Setting and Participants**

146 We purposively selected participants mainly from Africa, Southeast Asia, and Latin America to
147 represent varied levels and capacities of knowledge translation of COVID-19 modelled evidence in
148 lower-resourced settings. Various authors have defined successful knowledge translation as a
149 demonstrable change in knowledge, skill or practice^{23 24}. We determined successful knowledge
150 translation through collective sensemaking with participants on whether and how modelled
151 evidence was considered or used during the public health decision-making process for the pandemic
152 in their respective settings.


153 We did stakeholder mapping and a scoping review to identify key actors with interest and influence
154 in the COVID-19 modelling knowledge translation space. This helped us generate a database of
155 nearly 200 individuals from 28 countries. Stakeholders included researchers (epidemiologists,
156 infectious disease modellers, economic modellers), with some from the Centres for Epidemiological
157 Modelling and Analysis^{25 26} and The COVID-19 international Modelling consortium-COMO)²⁷; policy
158 actors/decision makers (government officials, regional and global WHO representatives, task
159 force/technical working group members); the COVID-19 Multi-Model Comparison Collaboration-
160 CMCC⁸ with members from the World Bank, Health Intervention and Technology Assessment
161 Program-HITAP and WHO Head Quarters; intermediaries (knowledge brokers and boundary

162 organisations); funders; non-governmental organisations; and the public through the media and
163 patient support groups. (S1 Table 1 shows details of the stakeholders, the various countries they
164 were from and the study activities they participated in).

165 **Study Procedures**

166 The study involved a scoping review, an online survey, in-depth interviews and learning workshops
167 as data sources. Fig 2 shows the convergent mixed method approach that we used.

168 We briefly detail the data collection and analysis processes in the subsequent section.



169

170 *Figure 2 Description of the Mixed Methods Approach*

171

172 **i) Online Survey**

173 We distributed 156 survey questionnaires to potential stakeholders via email in May 2022. We
174 translated and back-translated the surveys in French, Portuguese and Spanish and hosted them on
175 QuestionPro²⁸ (supplementary file S2). We exported data from the survey into RedCAP software
176 and ran consistency checks. We generated descriptive statistics on participant demographics, their
177 knowledge creation and utilisation approaches and the enablers and structures needed for
178 successful knowledge translation.

179 **ii) Scoping review**

180 We carried out electronic searches in relevant databases and grey literature in English between
181 March 2020 and April 2022, appraising literature on knowledge translation approaches used to
182 promote the uptake of COVID-19 modelling evidence decision-making.

183 FG, JM and CO used Rayyan and EndNote to screen titles and abstracts for eligibility. FG and JM did
184 full-text screening and data extraction. Any discrepancies were resolved through discussion with the
185 study team. Supplementary file S3 has details of the search strategy and a summary of the studies.

186 **iii) In-depth interviews and learning workshops**

187 We identified key informants focusing on LMIC researchers and policy actors in two stages, initially
188 purposively and then snowballing until the point of saturation. They shared their experiences
189 translating modelled evidence to policy decisions during the pandemic. Graham's framework initially
190 informed semi-structured interview guides (supplementary file S4) and was later adapted to further
191 explore survey and scoping review findings. We conducted the interviews online due to COVID-19
192 restrictions between May and December 2022.

193 Concurrently, we conducted three learning workshops with our stakeholders. The first workshop
194 was to get reflections from participants on their experiences with knowledge translation of modelled
195 COVID-19 data. The second workshop enabled sense-checking and initiated discussions on a
196 knowledge translation guidance framework. The third workshop disseminated further study findings

197 and continued with the co-development of the knowledge translation framework. The investigators
198 were participants in these workshops and took observation notes.

199 We managed interview transcripts, participant observation notes, and scoping review using NVivo
200 version 12 software. We conducted a thematic framework analysis²⁹ to determine the knowledge
201 creation and utilisation processes used during the pandemic, the participants' perspectives of what
202 approaches worked well and why, and what could be done differently for future emergencies. CO,
203 JM and JJ read the transcripts and notes and generated initial codes. Discrepancies were discussed
204 and refined during weekly team data reflection meetings. Similar codes were grouped into
205 categories to form a working analytic framework. The process drew on the original research aims
206 guided by Graham's framework and analytical themes from the recurrence of views or experiences.
207 Next came indexing and charting into a framework matrix. The final stage involved integrating
208 qualitative and quantitative findings from the survey into a narrative synthesis. Anonymised quotes
209 were used for illustrative purposes. Supplementary file S5 has the codebook and S6 snapshot of the
210 framework analysis matrix.

211 **Ethics approval**

212 This study was approved by The KEMRI (Kenya Medical Research Institute) Scientific and Ethics
213 Review Unit (SERU): Protocol number - KEMRI/SERU/CGMR-C/4425.

214 **Results**

215 We present the mechanisms used for knowledge translation of modelled evidence for policy
216 decisions during the COVID-19 pandemic in lower-resourced settings, highlighting the enabling
217 factors and infrastructural requirements for successful knowledge translation in future emergencies.

218 We were guided by GRAMMS criteria³⁰ for reporting mixed methods studies, where we illustrated
219 key findings from the quantitative and qualitative arms and how we integrated them.

220 We engaged 147 researchers and 57 policymakers/advisors from 20 LMICs and eight high-income
221 countries. S1 Tables 1-4 show the details of the countries that the participants were drawn from.

222 **Participants' characteristics**

223 Table 1 summarises the sociodemographic characteristics of study participants. The online survey
 224 had 69 respondents, 47 (68%) researchers and 22 (32%) policymakers; most (43%) were from Africa.
 225 Slightly more than half were male, and nearly 40% were aged 35-44. There were 25 interview
 226 respondents, 17 (68%) researchers, and 8 (32%) policymakers, who were distributed across the three
 227 main regions (36% from Africa, 32% from Asia, and 28% from Latin America). Most interviewees
 228 were male (60%), and more than half were aged 45- 54 years. The three learning workshops had 110
 229 participants, 83 (75%) researchers and 27 (25%) policymakers. The workshop attendees were mainly
 230 from Africa (55%), Asia (15%) and Latin America (5%).


231 *Table 1 Sociodemographic characteristics of study participants*

Characteristic	Survey n (%) N=69	Interview n (%) N=25	Workshops n (%) N= 110
Region			
Africa	30 (43%)	9 (36%)	60 (55%)
Asia	8 (12%)	8 (32%)	16 (15%)
Latin America	10 (15%)	7 (28%)	6 (5%)
Other	21 (30%)	1 (4%)	28 (25%)
Role played			
Researchers/Modellers	47 (68%)	17 (68%)	83 (75%)
Policymakers	22 (32%)	8 (32%)	27 (25%)
Years in this role			
<5yrs	20 (29%)	10 (40%)	
5-10yrs	16 (23%)	12 (48%)	
11-19yr	19 (28%)	2 (8%)	
≥20yrs	5 (7%)	1 (4%)	
Missing	9 (13%)	0	
Sex			
Male	32 (53%)	15 (60%)	
Female	27 (45%)	10 (40%)	
Other	1 (2%)	0	
Age group			
25-34yr	11 (18%)	3 (12%)	

35-44yr	23 (38%)	6 (24%)	
45-54yr	20 (33%)	14 (56%)	
55-64yr	6 (8%)	2 (8%)	
≥65yr	1 (2%)	0	
Missing	7 (10%)	0	

232 **Findings from the stakeholder mapping exercise**

233 Figure 3 summarises findings from stakeholder mapping. The stakeholders in category A were high
234 influence but low interest and had to be handled with care/kept informed. They included local policy
235 actors, country office representatives of WHO and local media and patient support groups. Category
236 B was the high-influence and interest group, and we engaged actively with them throughout. They
237 included representatives from members of centres of modelling excellence (CEMA, SACEMA and
238 COMO), the Gates Foundation, regional WHO offices, and CMCC group members (with
239 representation from the World Bank, WHO HQ and HITAP). Category C was the low-influence and
240 low-interest stakeholders that we occasionally consulted mainly to get a developed world
241 perspective, but they were not the focus of our study. This group comprised researchers and partner
242 organisations from high-income settings. Finally, category D had high interest but low influence
243 stakeholders, several of whom needed encouragement to participate. Several stayed engaged
244 throughout. They included researchers, knowledge brokers/intermediaries and task force members
245 from LMICs.



246
247

248

Figure 3 Stakeholder mapping

249 Quantitative findings

250 Knowledge creation

251 We asked survey participants about the knowledge-creation approaches used during the pandemic,
252 see Panel Fig 4 (i). Each proportion represents the number of survey participants from either
253 researchers or policymakers' groups who responded to each question. Approximately a third of the
254 researchers commented that the policymakers requested modelling data from them, while around a
255 quarter presented their data unsolicited. For the policymakers, almost a quarter reported requesting
256 modelling data, whereas 20% received data unsolicited. Twenty per cent of researchers said they
257 had working relationships with their counterpart policy actors before the pandemic. At the same
258 time, around a quarter reported needing to develop new relationships to respond to the pandemic.
259 Conversely, nearly 30% of policy actors reported having an existing relationship with researchers
260 pre-pandemic, and an equal proportion reported needing to develop new relationships.

261 Knowledge transfer/ utilisation

262 Participants' responses to the knowledge transfer/utilisation queries are shown in Fig 4 (ii). Around a
263 third of researchers felt that policy actors read and understood their modelling reports.
264 Approximately a quarter responded that the modelling outputs they presented were used in policy
265 decisions, and few perceived that their outputs were not utilised. A third of policymakers reported
266 that they understood the modelled results presented to them, while nearly 10% acknowledged
267 difficulties interpreting the data. A fifth said using model results to guide their decision-making; very
268 few recognised that the data did not influence their policy decisions.

269 *Preferred knowledge translation activities*

270 When asked about knowledge translation activities, researchers and policymakers preferred face-to-
271 face debriefing sessions, followed by printed policy briefs of evidence summaries on dashboards (Fig
272 4 iii). Knowledge brokers/intermediaries were the least preferred platform by both researchers and
273 policymakers.

274

5




Figure 4 Panel with a summary of responses from survey participants

6
7

278 **Qualitative findings**

279 The scoping review summarised the knowledge translation strategies used to disseminate modelled
280 evidence during the COVID-19 pandemic. Eight articles were eligible for full-text screening. They
281 were from the WHO Eastern Mediterranean Region ¹⁵, the ECOWAS region ¹⁶, New Zealand ³¹,
282 Hungary ³², Canada ³³, Nigeria ¹⁴, and two had Global representation ²⁷ ³⁴. All the articles gave
283 descriptive reports on how modelling evidence on COVID-19 was shared with policymakers. Other
284 than information about who was targeted for the knowledge translation strategies, none of the
285 studies provided details about the duration, frequency or timing of events or the personnel and
286 resources required. The specific studies and critical lessons are summarised in supplementary file S3
287 Table 1.

288 In the subsequent section, we present emerging themes from the interviews and workshops and
289 triangulate these with findings from the survey and scoping review in a narrative synthesis,
290 highlighting enablers and structures required for effective knowledge translation.

291 **Enabling Factors for Knowledge Translation**

292 *Working relationships between modellers and policymakers*

293 Collaborative efforts between researchers (modellers) and policymakers before COVID-19 led to
294 positive working relationships during the pandemic.

295 *“We’ve spent a lot of time developing relationships with the Ministry of Health*
296 *and mechanisms for engaging with policymakers...essentially developing prior*
297 *relationships with policymakers is important because it facilitated knowledge*
298 *translation during the Covid-19 pandemic.” (Researcher 04_Africa_Interview)*

299 This corroborated survey findings where nearly a third of the researchers and policymakers reported
300 having had pre-existing relationships.

301 In instances where relationships were poor, there was ineffective knowledge translation where the
302 policy actors were not open to advice. This frequently frustrated the researchers, as was observed in
303 some settings.

304 *“But the...government didn't take...any advice from us...The...government ignored*
305 *completely the advice of...scientists...it was not easy dealing with the*
306 *policymakers in most regions of X...The government was not very open to the*
307 *suggestions...” (Researcher_15_Latin America_Interview)*

308 The need for urgent and timely research outputs as the pandemic evolved occasionally led to
309 strained relationships. Running models and packaging outputs required time, yet policymakers
310 expected results quickly, which pressured modellers who worked round the clock to meet the
311 demands.

312 *“...there's always some sort of a clash regarding time and expectations between*
313 *policymakers and researchers. But then how you address those working together*
314 *over time so that you build those relationships?” (Researcher 2_Africa_Interview)*

315 In addition, researchers reported the need for some autonomy when building models, even as they
316 acknowledged the need for good relationships and long-term engagement with policymakers before
317 any crisis.

318 *Communication*

319 We noted that effective and regular communication between the researchers and the policymakers
320 was fundamental to maintaining relationships. This was substantiated in the scoping review, where
321 open communication was similarly noted as an enabling factor. Good communication ensured that
322 urgent policy questions and research/modelling outputs were promptly exchanged and explained.

323 *“...it helped a lot to have very regular communication with government... it was*
324 *really a back and forth, we would come forward with results to present them, and*

325 *they would ask us for results as well... effective communication with*
326 *government...was key to... make understanding and the uncertainty a little bit*
327 *easier..." (Researcher 5_Africa_Interview)*

328 Where there was ineffective communication, researchers sometimes sought alternative channels
329 such as the media, which sometimes forced policy actors to consider advice from researchers due to
330 pressure from the public.

331 *"...groups were engaging with the media out of frustration, because... they were*
332 *not able to get through to the policymaking partners..." (Researcher*
333 *7_Asia_Interview)*

334 The media, therefore, became an essential channel for information exchange during the pandemic.

335 *"...we had a lot of work with the press, so we put a lot of effort into giving as*
336 *many interviews as we can to ask, to reply to the questions that people were*
337 *having, and also to use the press to spread the recommendations..."*
338 *(Researcher_15_Latin America_Interview)*

339 *Trust and Credibility*

340 Continuous engagement and communication created trust between researchers and policymakers,
341 facilitating the uptake of research/modelling outputs if a researcher/institution was perceived to be
342 credible.

343 *"I think it was also a thing of trust. It was this they knew they could rely on*
344 *us...because of that relationship, cementing and this constant*
345 *communication...people know us, and they come to us now...Right now, we get*
346 *asked for things instead of even one going forward..." (Researcher*
347 *5_Africa_Interview)*

348 This was corroborated by workshop participants, one of whom emphasised that building trust takes
349 time.

350 *"...building trust takes time. It can't happen overnight during an emergency..."*
351 *(Researcher_Workshop 1)*

352 Trust and credibility were also key enablers of knowledge translation identified in the scoping
353 review. Likewise, in the survey, most researchers reported that policymakers specifically requested
354 COVID-19 modelling data from them to guide the decision-making, implying trust in their evidence.

355

356 *Co-creation*

357 Where trust and long-standing relationships existed, co-creation of evidence was possible. Co-
358 creation here refers to the engagement of policymakers with researchers in knowledge generation
359 processes, including generation and prioritisation of policy research questions, evidence synthesis,
360 development of models, and interpretation of model outputs. The co-creation process was
361 perceived as a vital enabler in using modelling evidence to inform decisions on COVID-19 response
362 strategies.

363 *"One of the strategies is coproduction of knowledge...a lot of the evidence*
364 *generation processes we were... actively involving the policymakers...so that they*
365 *become part of providing the solution..." Researcher and Policy*
366 *Advisor_Africa_Interview*

367 We also noted this in the workshops where participants reiterated the importance of co-creation in
368 getting modelled evidence used in policy decision-making.

369 *"Other organizational-level factors that were important for COVID-19 were*
370 *organisations that had documented processes for co-creating models or engaging*
371 *the government from the beginning and model creation. And were much more*
372 *successful at making sure that their models were...relevant to government*
373 *priorities and policy needs..." (Researcher, Workshop 1)*

374 Furthermore, research institutions with previous collaborations in the knowledge creation process
375 had established positive working relationships, which made it more likely for their evidence to be
376 considered during the pandemic decision-making.

377 *“Institution Y has invested in co-creating research with the Ministry of Health, so*
378 *all the COVID-19 research that we did over the past two years was a collaboration*
379 *between Institution Y and the Ministry of Health...all our outputs have both*
380 *Institution Y’s scientists and Ministry of Health employees.and we've been*
381 *invited severally to make presentations to policymakers.” (Researcher*
382 *4_Africa_Interview)*

383 In the scoping view, the involvement of policymakers in the generation of evidence encouraged
384 ownership of the process, which enabled them to use the evidence in decision-making. Similarly, in
385 the survey, most policymakers reported working jointly with researchers to develop policy questions
386 for decision-making during the pandemic.

387 *Embeddedness*

388 Besides, co-creation, an embedded approach where researchers were situated within policymaking
389 spaces, was an effective way for both researchers and policymakers to be actively involved in
390 generating evidence. We also identified some policymakers attached to research
391 organisations to participate in knowledge generation. The participation of policymakers allowed
392 them to have a better understanding of knowledge generation processes. Thus, they were better
393 positioned to interpret and potentially use model outputs for decision-making.

394 *“...an embedded approach ... we adopted a way of working with*
395 *policymakers...we do that research within policymaking spaces and with active*
396 *involvement and participation of policymakers...that has evolved over time and*
397 *because of that it has really helped to facilitate the actual application of the*
398 *research that we do.” (Researcher 2_Africa_Interview)*

399 Sometimes, researchers were invited to present their findings during live policy discussions. This was
400 perceived to encourage the uptake of recommendations and their implementation.

401 *“...so that allows the scientists to come and attend those cabinet sessions if at all*
402 *there is an issue on the agenda...is one of the greatest ways to have this evidence*
403 *to the policymakers...” (Policymaker 3_Africa_Interview)*

404 **Structures needed for successful knowledge translation**

405 *Capacity building*

406 We identified capacity building for local modelling expertise as critical for successful knowledge
407 translation. Researchers and policymakers both underscored the importance of having several
408 modellers who could generate context-relevant models for policy decision-making.

409 *“We have shortage of modelling expertise...policymakers wanted to have*
410 *geographic specific interventions for Covid-19 response...we as a country, kept*
411 *waiting for [researchers]to be able to guide but also inform us of which model*
412 *and what is likely to work out where.” (Policymaker 03, Africa_Interview)*

413 Workshop participants brought up that having regional centres of excellence responsible for training
414 modellers, fundraising, building collaborations, and forming stable links with policymakers for co-
415 creation purposes would be a good aspirational goal.

416 Beyond technical modelling capacity strengthening, the participants identified a need to train
417 researchers and policymakers in science communication, specifically in disseminating scientific
418 outputs to a lay audience. Several researchers found themselves in the deep end during the
419 pandemic, having to communicate their findings with no prior training.

420 *“...it was hard, but we really didn't have any previous training on how to do*
421 *that...we had this big group, and we saw which were the good speakers, the*
422 *people that had more clarity to spread the ideas, and then we just pushed them*
423 *to do the interviews...” (Researcher 15_Latin America_Interview)*

424 Workshop participants also emphasised that policymakers needed training to empower them to
425 interpret and use scientific evidence for decision-making, including understanding the uncertainties
426 in modelling and which questions can or cannot be answered by modelling data.

427 *Data infrastructure*

428 In addition to capacity building, the participants reported the need for local data systems and
429 policies that made high-quality data available and enabled data sharing. Such infrastructure would
430 allow modellers to develop timely models based on local data and with the capacity to inform local
431 decision-making.

432 *“...important factors included the availability of high-quality local data and*
433 *information systems that modellers could quickly pull up and use to develop*
434 *models. It was helpful when these data systems were transparent and...*
435 *formatted in a way that made them accessible and usable for modellers.”*
436 *(Researcher, Workshop 2)*

437 The need for collaboration between academic institutions and the government was underscored to
438 attain better data infrastructure, more so in low-resource settings.

439 *“...better data systems...improved surveillance, more open data, accessible data*
440 *and then the other thing is more opportunities for collaboration between*
441 *academia and government because you have to build trust.” (Researcher*
442 *14_Latin America_Interview)*

443 **Dedicated funding streams**

444 Resources are needed to build capacity for technical modelling, knowledge translation expertise, and
445 data infrastructure. Respondents mentioned political buy-in as critical for governments to invest
446 domestic public resources in modelling and for policymakers to use model outputs for decision-
447 making. Therefore, researchers must build alliances within various levels of government that may
448 lead to dedicated resource allocation for modelling.

449 *“... getting that political buy-in and the government to invest dedicated resources*
450 *for modelling to respond to pandemics. I think it is a big challenge in low- and*
451 *middle-income countries. If you look at countries in the West, most countries have*
452 *a dedicated resource, a dedicated unit, or a dedicated university who have been*
453 *assigned the responsibility and also the dedicated resources for those groups”*
454 *(Researcher 11_Southeast Asia_Interview)*

455

456 **Framework to guide the use of modelling data to guide policy decision-making.**

457 We presented the empirical evidence from our study during the learning workshops. We asked
458 participants to deliberate on how best to support using models for policy decision-making in
459 preparation for future pandemics, especially in countries with limited capacity. We co-developed a
460 framework with an implementation matrix (fig 5) and a simplified road map for policy consumption,
461 whose details are described further **in this policy brief ³⁵ and publication.**

462 In summary, the overall goal of the framework is to ensure the routine use of reliable, timely and
463 locally generated modelling evidence to inform public health decisions for better population health
464 outcomes. The final five key components include i) Sustainable funding to support modelling for
465 policy; ii) capacity building leading to centres of excellence for modelling; iii) sustainable systems and
466 structures for the generation and use of model outputs; iv) dedicated platforms for knowledge
467 translation; and v) policymakers engaged throughout the knowledge generation process and thus
468 committed to a culture of using evidence to guide decision making.




Figure 5 Framework to guide the use of models for Policy decision-making

471 Discussion

472 Our study led us to understand better the preferred mechanisms used for knowledge translation of
473 modelled data during the COVID-19 pandemic, enabling factors and infrastructural requirements in
474 preparation for future global emergencies, especially in lower and middle-income country settings.

475 The commonly used knowledge translation activities were face-to-face debriefs, policy briefs, and
476 evidence summaries on dashboards. Relatedly, in studies from humanitarian emergencies,
477 policymakers preferred research findings presented in short messages with key actions highlighted
478 in bullet points or infographics on websites they could easily access and use ³⁶. A study in the
479 Mediterranean region likewise described the benefits of sharing research findings via non-technical
480 audio-visual presentations and policy briefs ¹⁵. Surprisingly, we found that using knowledge
481 brokers/intermediaries was the least popular knowledge translation mechanism; policymakers in
482 LMICs preferred direct engagement with researchers. This is contrary to what was observed from
483 studies from higher-income settings where knowledge brokers promoted a culture of using evidence
484 for decision-making and thought to be an optimal knowledge translation and exchange strategy ^{37 38}.

485 As we explored enablers for effective knowledge translation of modelled evidence during the
486 pandemic, pre-existing relationships between the researchers and policymakers, coupled with open
487 communication, trust, and credibility, were vital to co-creating policy-relevant knowledge products.
488 In examples from Israel, Switzerland, Germany, Canada and South Korea, countries where the
489 government collaborated well with scientists seemed to have better patient outcomes during the
490 pandemic, compared to Italy, Spain, Brazil and the United States, where the government and
491 scientists had more strained relationships with devastating consequences ^{32 39-42}. An example from
492 LMICs, Nigeria, had a co-production approach through a presidential taskforce of decision-makers
493 and multi-disciplinary academics. This enabled swift production and effective utilisation of scientific
494 data in response to the COVID-19 pandemic ¹⁴. Kenya and South Africa similarly had participatory
495 approaches of co-production and embeddedness, where researchers worked alongside policymakers

496 to support collaborative research and learning processes pre-pandemic, which proved helpful in the
497 pandemic responses ²⁰.

498 Barriers to effective knowledge translation included competition among modellers, negative attitude
499 of policymakers towards research, political influences and demand for timeliness of research
500 outputs for policy decisions. Policymakers sometimes cited difficulties in determining the quality of
501 evidence, which has been reported in other studies ⁴³. Some said that close integration caused a loss
502 of autonomy and the impact of power dynamics on model quality ¹⁴. Findings from a review cited
503 lack of time, limited access to research evidence, limited capacity to appraise and translate research
504 evidence and resistance to change as some of the barriers to evidence-informed decision-making ³⁷.

505 Finally, we used participatory approaches to identify and prioritise structures required to navigate
506 the barriers and support the effective translation of modelled evidence to policy, especially in lower-
507 resourced settings. We packaged these in a framework and roadmap to guide policymakers that are
508 described in detail elsewhere ³⁵. A need for capacity building particularly stood out. Lower-resourced
509 countries relied on collaborative efforts to cope during the pandemic. This was seen in action
510 through efforts of groups like the COVID-19 Modelling Consortium (COMO)²⁷ and the emergence of
511 centres of excellence like SACEMA in South Africa ²⁶ and The Centre for Epidemiological Modelling
512 and Analysis (CEMA) in Kenya ²⁵. The pandemic also saw work from the COVID-19 Multi-Model
513 Comparison Group (CMMC) that provided guidance to ensure models were relevant, robust and
514 useful for policy decision-making ^{34 44}.

515 **Strengths and Limitations**

516 We used mixed methods, including an online survey, a scoping review, interviews and learning
517 workshops that gave us rich insights into knowledge translation mechanisms, what worked well,
518 where and why, and how best to improve. Furthermore, the study findings contributed to the co-
519 development of a knowledge translation roadmap and framework with an implementation matrix.

520 The fundamental limitation is that the study happened during the pandemic, which limited
521 interviews to online platforms. We strengthened the quality of our outputs by using mixed methods
522 that enabled us to triangulate our findings, and when restrictions eased, we had an in-person
523 learning workshop.

524 **Conclusion**

525 The findings from this study led to the co-development of a knowledge translation framework that
526 will be useful in integrating model-policy translation dynamics. The framework can be adapted in
527 various settings to guide decision-making in preparation for and response to public health
528 emergencies. Furthermore, we provide a contextualised understanding of knowledge translation for
529 lower and middle-income countries during the COVID-19 pandemic. Face-to-face debriefings were
530 the most preferred knowledge translation interventions. The critical enabling factor was pre-existing
531 relationships between researchers and decision-makers. In addition, co-creation and embeddedness
532 contributed to successful knowledge translation. Challenges identified included competition among
533 modellers, the negative attitude of some policymakers towards science and political influence.
534 Finally, we provide vital lessons on how knowledge translation from mathematical modelling
535 complements the broader learning agenda related to pandemic preparedness and long-term
536 investments in evidence-to-policy translation.

537 **Key for supplementary files**

538 S1 Study Participants
539 S2 Online survey tool
540 S3 Scoping review
541 S4 Interview guides
542 S5 Coding Framework
543 S6 Thematic Analytic Framework Matrix charting
544

545 **Acknowledgements**

546 We would like to thank the study participants and all the stakeholders for generously sharing their
547 time and information with this project. We also acknowledge the tireless efforts of our
548 administrative team led by Metrine Saisi and Elizabeth Isinde, that helped coordinate the smooth
549 running of our workshops with participants coming in from all over the world.

550 The contents of this article are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not represent the
551 official views of WHO or the Gates Foundation.

552 **Authorship Contributions**

553 JNO and BLH conceptualised the idea of the study. CJO, JM and JJ were responsible for primary data
554 collection. CJO, JM, JJ, FG and JNO met weekly for data reflection and analysis. JN, VW, SSY, and RH
555 joined the rest of the study team monthly to brainstorm on the themes from the data to refine the
556 framework, working on feedback from the other contributors. CJO and JNO wrote the early drafts of
557 the manuscript and refined it with feedback and input from all the authors. All authors approved the
558 final version of the manuscript.

559 **Funding**

560 Funds from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation grant (INV-034291) awarded to Dr Jacquie N
561 Oliwa supported this work. The views in this article are those of the authors and do not represent
562 the official views of the Gates Foundation or WHO. The funders had no direct role in study design,
563 data collection and analysis, the decision to publish or the preparation of the manuscript.

564 **Competing interests**

565 The authors completed the ICMJE Disclosure of Interest Form (available upon request from the
566 corresponding author) and some have declared technical consultancies and travel support outside
567 the submitted work. No commercial companies were involved.

568 **Patient and public involvement**

569 Patients and the public were not involved in this research's design, conduct, reporting, or
570 dissemination plans.

571 **Patient consent for publication**

572 Not required.

573 **Data availability**

574 The survey responses and qualitative interview transcripts are housed on secure servers at
575 the KEMRI-Wellcome Trust Research Programme. Access applications can be made
576 through the Data Governance Committee, with details available at www.kemri-wellcome.org
577 or email to dgc@kemri-wellcome.org.

578

579 **References**

- 580 1. World Health Organisation. WHO Coronavirus (COVID-19) Dashboard 2023 [updated 31st
581 December 2023; cited 2023 31st December 2023]. Available from:
582 <https://covid19.who.int/> accessed 31st December 2023.
- 583 2. Haleem A, Javaid M, Vaishya R. Effects of COVID-19 pandemic in daily life. *Curr Med Res*
584 *Pract* 2020;10(2):78-79. doi: 10.1016/j.cmrp.2020.03.011 [published Online First:
585 2020/04/03]
- 586 3. The United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN DESA). Everyone
587 Included: Social Impact of COVID-19 [cited 2022 7th February]. Available from:
588 <https://www.un.org/development/desa/dspd/everyone-included-covid-19.html>
589 accessed 7th February 2022.
- 590 4. Pak A, Adegboye OA, Adekunle AI, et al. Economic Consequences of the COVID-19
591 Outbreak: the Need for Epidemic Preparedness. *Frontiers in Public Health* 2020;8
592 doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2020.00241
- 593 5. Veettil SK, Schwerer L, Kategeaw W, et al. Scoping review of modelling studies assessing
594 the impact of disruptions to essential health services during COVID-19. *BMJ Open*
595 2023;13(9):e071799. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-071799
- 596 6. World Health Organisation. Impact of COVID-19 on people's livelihoods, their health and
597 our food systems 2020 [cited 2022 7th February]. Available from:
598 [https://www.who.int/news/item/13-10-2020-impact-of-covid-19-on-people's-](https://www.who.int/news/item/13-10-2020-impact-of-covid-19-on-people's-livelihoods-their-health-and-our-food-systems)
599 [livelihoods-their-health-and-our-food-systems](https://www.who.int/news/item/13-10-2020-impact-of-covid-19-on-people's-livelihoods-their-health-and-our-food-systems) accessed 7th February 2022.
- 600 7. Adiga A, Dubhashi D, Lewis B, et al. Mathematical Models for COVID-19 Pandemic: A
601 Comparative Analysis. *J Indian Inst Sci* 2020;1-15. doi: 10.1007/s41745-020-00200-6
602 [published Online First: 2020/11/05]
- 603 8. Group. C-M-MCCCP. Guidance on use of Modelling for policy responses to COVID-19,
604 2020.
- 605 9. Cairney P, Wellstead A. COVID-19: effective policymaking depends on trust in experts,
606 politicians, and the public. *Policy Design and Practice* 2021;4(1):1-14. doi:
607 10.1080/25741292.2020.1837466
- 608 10. Colman E, Wanat M, Goossens H, et al. Following the science? Views from scientists on
609 government advisory boards during the COVID-19 pandemic: a qualitative interview

- 610 study in five European countries. *BMJ Global Health* 2021;6(9):e006928. doi:
611 10.1136/bmjgh-2021-006928
- 612 11. Kristen N, Sonia J, Felix P, et al. Real-time COVID-19 forecasting: challenges and
613 opportunities of model performance and translation. *The Lancet Digital Health* 2022
614 doi: 10.1016/s2589-7500(22)00167-4
- 615 12. Graham ID, Logan J, Harrison MB, et al. Lost in knowledge translation: Time for a map?
616 *Journal of Continuing Education in the Health Professions* 2006;26(1):13-24. doi:
617 10.1002/chp.47
- 618 13. Ward V, House A, Hamer S. Developing a Framework for Transferring Knowledge Into
619 Action: A Thematic Analysis of the Literature. *Journal of Health Services Research &*
620 *Policy* 2009;14(3):156-64. doi: 10.1258/jhsrp.2009.008120
- 621 14. Abubakar I, Dalgligh SL, Ihekweazu CA, et al. Lessons from co-production of evidence and
622 policy in Nigeria's COVID-19 response. *BMJ Glob Health* 2021;6(3) doi:
623 10.1136/bmjgh-2020-004793
- 624 15. Adib K, Hancock PA, Rahimli A, et al. A participatory modelling approach for investigating
625 the spread of COVID-19 in countries of the Eastern Mediterranean Region to support
626 public health decision-making. *BMJ Glob Health* 2021;6(3) doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-2021-
627 005207
- 628 16. Sombié I, Johnson E, Lokossou V, et al. How does the West African Health Organisation
629 (WAHO) contribute to the evidence based decision-making and practice during
630 COVID-19 pandemic in ECOWAS region? *Pan Afr Med J* 2020;37(Suppl 1):20. doi:
631 10.11604/pamj.supp.2020.37.20.25625 [published Online First: 20201002]
- 632 17. Silal S, Bardsley C, Menon R, et al. Epidemiological modelling for public health decision-
633 making in sub-Saharan Africa: A strategic plan for capacity strengthening. London:
634 Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office, 2022.
- 635 18. Creswell JW, Plano Clark VL. Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research. 2nd
636 ed. The United States of America: SAGE Publications 2011.
- 637 19. Baum F, MacDougall C, Smith D. Participatory action research. *Journal of Epidemiology*
638 *and Community Health* 2006;60(10):854-57. doi: 10.1136/jech.2004.028662
- 639 20. Gilson L, Barasa E, Brady L, et al. Collective sensemaking for action: researchers and
640 decision makers working collaboratively to strengthen health systems. *BMJ*
641 2021;372:m4650. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m4650
- 642 21. Bergen N, Labonté R. "Everything Is Perfect, and We Have No Problems": Detecting and
643 Limiting Social Desirability Bias in Qualitative Research. *Qual Health Res*
644 2020;30(5):783-92. doi: 10.1177/1049732319889354 [published Online First:
645 20191213]
- 646 22. Molyneux S, Sukhtankar P, Thitiri J, et al. Model for developing context-sensitive
647 responses to vulnerability in research: managing ethical dilemmas faced by frontline
648 research staff in Kenya. *BMJ global health* 2021;6(7):e004937. doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-
649 2021-004937
- 650 23. Dobbins M, Hanna SE, Ciliska D, et al. A randomized controlled trial evaluating the
651 impact of knowledge translation and exchange strategies. *Implement Sci* 2009;4:61.
652 doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-4-61 [published Online First: 20090923]
- 653 24. LaRocca R, Yost J, Dobbins M, et al. The effectiveness of knowledge translation strategies
654 used in public health: a systematic review. *BMC Public Health* 2012;12(1):751. doi:
655 10.1186/1471-2458-12-751

- 656 25. (CEMA) CfEMaA. A center of excellence using data-driven approaches to control
657 infectious diseases in Kenya & Africa University of Nairobi2023 [cited 2023 26th
658 June]. Available from: <https://cema.africa/> accessed 26th June 2023.
- 659 26. (SACEMA) SACfEMaA. Modelling and analysis to improve health in Africa
660 Stellenbosch2023 [cited 2023 26th June]. Available from: <https://www.sacema.org/>
661 accessed 26th June 2023.
- 662 27. Aguas R, White L, Hupert N, et al. Modelling the COVID-19 pandemic in context: an
663 international participatory approach. *BMJ Glob Health* 2020;5(12) doi:
664 10.1136/bmjgh-2020-003126
- 665 28. QuestionPro [cited 2022 25th January]. Available from: <https://www.questionpro.com/>
666 accessed 25th January 2022.
- 667 29. Srivastava A, Thomson SB. Framework analysis: A qualitative methodology for applied
668 policy research. *Journal of Administration and Governance* 2009;4(2):72-79.
669 [published Online First: 9 April 2016]
- 670 30. O'Cathain A, Murphy E, Nicholl J. The quality of mixed methods studies in health services
671 research. *J Health Serv Res Policy* 2008;13(2):92-8. doi: 10.1258/jhsrp.2007.007074
- 672 31. Hendy S, Steyn N, James A, et al. Mathematical modelling to inform New Zealand's
673 COVID-19 response. *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand* 2021;51(sup1):S86-
674 S106. doi: 10.1080/03036758.2021.1876111
- 675 32. Gombos K, Herczeg R, Erőss B, et al. Translating Scientific Knowledge to Government
676 Decision Makers Has Crucial Importance in the Management of the COVID-19
677 Pandemic. *Popul Health Manag* 2021;24(1):35-45. doi: 10.1089/pop.2020.0159
678 [published Online First: 20200902]
- 679 33. Hillmer MP, Feng P, McLaughlin JR, et al. Ontario's COVID-19 Modelling Consensus
680 Table: mobilizing scientific expertise to support pandemic response. *Can J Public*
681 *Health* 2021;112(5):799-806. doi: 10.17269/s41997-021-00559-8 [published Online
682 First: 20210830]
- 683 34. Teerawattananon Y, Kc S, Chi YL, et al. Recalibrating the notion of modelling for
684 policymaking during pandemics. *Epidemics* 2022;38:100552. doi:
685 10.1016/j.epidem.2022.100552 [published Online First: 20220302]
- 686 35. Guleid F, Oliwa J. Policy Brief: framework to Guide the Use of Mathematical Modelling in
687 Evidence-based Policy Decision Making. Nairobi: KEMRI-Wellcome Trust Research
688 Programme, 2023.
- 689 36. Khalid AF, Grimshaw JM, Parakh ND, et al. Decision-makers' experiences with rapid
690 evidence summaries to support real-time evidence informed decision-making in
691 crises: a mixed methods study. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2023;23(1):282. doi:
692 10.1186/s12913-023-09302-0 [published Online First: 20230325]
- 693 37. Dobbins M, Hanna SE, Ciliska D, et al. A randomized controlled trial evaluating the
694 impact of knowledge translation and exchange strategies. *Implementation Science*
695 2009;4(1):61. doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-4-61
- 696 38. van Kammen J, de Savigny D, Sewankambo N. Using knowledge brokering to promote
697 evidence-based policy-making: The need for support structures. *Bull World Health*
698 *Organ* 2006;84(8):608-12. doi: 10.2471/blt.05.028308
- 699 39. Moeckli B, Peloso A, Oldani G, et al. The Swiss approach to the COVID-19 outbreak. *Am J*
700 *Transplant* 2020;20(7):1935-36. doi: 10.1111/ajt.15939 [published Online First:
701 20200623]

- 702 40. Oh J, Lee JK, Schwarz D, et al. National Response to COVID-19 in the Republic of Korea
 703 and Lessons Learned for Other Countries. *Health Syst Reform* 2020;6(1):e1753464.
 704 doi: 10.1080/23288604.2020.1753464
- 705 41. Yamey G, Gonsalves G. Donald Trump: a political determinant of covid-19. *Bmj*
 706 2020;369:m1643. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m1643 [published Online First: 20200424]
- 707 42. Almeida de L, Carelli PV, Cavalcanti NG, et al. Quantifying political influence on COVID-19
 708 fatality in Brazil. *PLoS One* 2022;17(7):e0264293. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0264293
 709 [published Online First: 20220712]
- 710 43. Muscatello DJ, Chughtai AA, Heywood A, et al. Translation of Real-Time Infectious
 711 Disease Modeling into Routine Public Health Practice. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2017;23(5)
 712 doi: 10.3201/eid2305.161720
- 713 44. Group C-M-MCCCP. Guidance on use of modelling for policy responses to COVID 19,
 714 2020.
 715

716 **Supplemental material**

717 **S1 Study Participants**

718 **Table 1 Countries that participated in the study**

Country	Region	Country Classification (World Bank)	Survey	Interviews	Learning Workshops
1. Kenya	Africa	LMIC	X	X	X
2. South Africa		UMIC	X	X	X
3. Ghana		LMIC	X		
4. Congo		LMIC	X		
5. Nigeria		LMIC	X		X
6. Rwanda		LIC	X		X
7. Uganda		LIC	X	X	X
8. Tunisia		LMIC			X
9. Thailand	Asia	UMIC	X	X	X
10. India		LMIC	X		
11. Malaysia		UMIC	X	X	X
12. Singapore		HIC	X	X	X

13. Kyrgyzstan		LMIC	X	X	
14. Argentina	Latin America	UMIC	X	X	
15. Brazil		UMIC	X	X	
16. Panama		HIC	X		
17. Colombia		UMIC	X		
18. Ecuador		UMIC	X		
19. Chile		HIC	X	X	
20. Paraguay		UMIC	X		
21. UK		Other regions	HIC	X	
22. USA	HIC		X		X
23. Switzerland	HIC		X		X
24. Australia	HIC		X		X
25. France	HIC				X
26. Netherlands	HIC				X
27. New Zealand	HIC				X
28. Canada	HIC				X

719

720 **Table 2 Survey Respondents**

Region	Country	Researchers	Policymakers	Total
Africa	Kenya	11	8	19
	South Africa	2	2	4
	Multiple Countries	1	1	2
	Ghana	0	1	1
	Congo	0	1	1
	Nigeria	1	0	1
	Rwanda	1	0	1
	Uganda	1	0	1

Southeast Asia	Thailand	1	2	3
	India	0	1	1
	Malaysia	1	0	1
	Singapore	3	0	3
Latin America	Argentina	2	0	2
	Brazil	1	0	1
	Panama	1	0	1
	Colombia	2	1	3
	Ecuador	1	0	1
	Chile	1	0	1
	Paraguay	1	0	1
Others	UK	10	1	11
	Multiple	2	0	2
	USA	2	2	4
	Switzerland	0	2	2
	Kyrgyzstan	1	0	1
	Australia	1	0	1
TOTAL		47	22	69

721

722 **Table 3 Interviews Respondents**

Region	Country	Researchers	Policymakers	Total
Africa	Kenya	4	1	5
	South Africa	1	0	1
	Multiple Countries	0	1	1
	Uganda	0	1	1
	Tunisia	1	0	1
Southeast Asia	Thailand	4	1	4

	Malaysia	2	0	2
	Singapore	1	0	1
Latin America	Argentina	0	1	1
	Brazil	2	3	5
	Chile	1	0	1
Others	Kyrgyzstan	1	0	1
TOTAL		17	8	25

723

724

725

726

727 **Table 4 Learning workshop participants**

Region	Country	Researchers	Policymakers	Total
Africa	Kenya	38	6	44
	South Africa	2	1	3
	Multiple countries	0	3	3
	Uganda	0	2	2
	Tunisia	3	0	3
	Nigeria	3	0	3
	Rwanda	2	0	2
Southeast Asia	Thailand	7	4	11
	Malaysia	3	0	3
	Singapore	2	0	2
Latin America	Ecuador	1	0	1
	Argentina	0	2	2
	Brazil	2	0	2
	Chile	1	0	1
	Switzerland	0	4	4

Others	France	1	0	1
	UK	10	0	10
	USA	6	2	8
	Australia	0	1	1
	Netherlands	1	0	1
	New Zealand	0	2	2
	Canada	1	0	1
TOTAL		83	27	110

728

729

730 [S2 Online Survey tool \(English\)](#)

731 This section is to collect general information about you and the professional role (s) that you play.

732 1. Indicate your gender

733

734 Male

735 Female

736 Other

737

738 2. Indicate which age group you fall under

739

740 <25yr

741 25-34yr

742 35-44yr

743 45-54yr

744 55-64yr

745 ≥65yr

746

747 3. Indicate which region you work (Specify Country)

748 Africa _____

749 South East Asia _____

750 North America _____

751 Central/South America _____

752 Europe _____

753 Eastern Mediterranean _____

754 Western Pacific _____

755

756

757 4. Specify which professional role you play

758 Researcher/modeller: (Specify the type of modelling area specific to COVID-19, e.g.,
759 economic modelling, epidemiological modelling, etc.)

760

761 Policymaker

762

763 5. Specify time spent in this role

764

765 <5yr

766 5-10 yr.

767 11-14yr

768 15-20yr

769 >20yr

770

771 6. For researchers, any experience sharing your COVID-19 modelling data outputs with policy
772 decision-makers:

773

774 Yes

775 No

776 7. For researchers, if yes, select all statements that reflect your perceptions of what is relevant about
777 your experiences about sharing COVID-19 modelling data outputs with policymakers:

778 The policymakers requested COVID-19 modelling data from you/your group to guide their
779 decision-making during the pandemic

780 You/your group presented COVID-19 modelling data to policymakers (unsolicited)

781 You/your group have a pre-existing working relationship with policymakers and have been
782 working together to create policy questions and generate evidence for decision-making before the
783 pandemic

784 You/your group developed a new working relationship with policymakers during the pandemic
785 and are now working together to create policy questions and generate evidence for decision-making

786 My/our group's COVID-19 modelling reports were read and understood by policymakers (you
787 received positive feedback from them/the evidence you shared was referenced/cited by them)

788 My/our group's COVID-19 modelling reports were not read and understood by policymakers (you
789 have not received any positive feedback from them)

790 Policymakers reported having difficulties understanding my/our COVID-19 modelling data reports

791 I have had training in science communication/disseminating my findings to a lay audience

792 My group has a science communicator/engages with science communicators to help communicate
793 our findings to a lay audience

794 My/our group's COVID-19 modelling reports were utilised as they were by policymakers (you
795 received positive feedback from them/the evidence you shared was referenced/cited by them)

796 My/our group's COVID-19 modelling reports were not utilised by policymakers/did not inform or
797 influence policy decisions (you have not received positive feedback from them)

798 My/our group's COVID-19 modelling reports influenced choices and decisions by policymakers
799 (you received positive feedback from them about adapting your findings)

800 My/our group's COVID-19 modelling reports did not influence the choices and decisions of
801 policymakers (you have not received positive feedback from them)

802 Other (specify) _____

803

804

805 8. For researchers, tick all the relevant methods you/your group used to share/disseminate your
806 COVID-19 modelling data outputs with policymakers

807 Printed policy briefs/brochures of evidence summaries in lay language

808 Face-to-face debriefing sessions

- 809 Evidence summaries posted on the group’s website/dashboards/blogs
810 Email dissemination of evidence summaries
811 Use an intermediary/knowledge broker/science communicator to simplify your findings and
812 share them with policymakers
813 Media briefings of evidence summaries in lay language
814 Other (specify)_____

815
816

817 9. For researchers (please respond whether you ticked yes or no to Q 6), give your suggestions of
818 what you could have done differently/can be done to better engage with policymakers to
819 disseminate your COVID-19 modelling outputs

820 _____
821 _____

822

823 10. For policymakers, any experience receiving COVID-19 modelling data outputs from researchers
824 to aid your decision-making process

825

826 Yes

827 No

828

829 11. For policymakers, if yes, select all statements that reflect your perceptions of what is relevant
830 about your experiences about receiving COVID-19 modelling data outputs from researchers:

831 I/we requested COVID-19 modelling data from researchers/modellers to guide the decision-
832 making during the pandemic

833 I/we had researchers present their COVID-19 modelling data to us (unsolicited)

834 I/we have a pre-existing working relationship with researchers and have been working together to
835 create policy questions and generate evidence for decision-making before the pandemic

836 I/we have developed a new working relationship with researchers during the pandemic and are
837 now working together to create policy questions and generate evidence for decision-making

838 I read and understood information from COVID-19 modelling data reports presented to me

839 I read but had difficulties understanding the COVID-19 modelling data reports presented to me

840 I/we have utilised COVID-19 modelling reports as they were to guide decision-making

841 I/we adapted COVID-19 modelling reports from settings similar to ours to guide decision-making

842 COVID-19 modelling reports influenced my/our choices and decisions related to the pandemic

843 (Specify which ones, e.g., epidemiological, scenario forecasts, economic models, etc.)

844 COVID-19 modelling reports did not necessarily influence my/our choices and decisions related to
845 the pandemic

846 Specify any other experience, positive or negative, that you had trying to utilise COVID-19 modelling
847 reports for your decision-making.

848 _____
849 _____

850

851 12. For policymakers, tick all the relevant methods you prefer to receive COVID-19 modelling data
852 outputs from researchers

853 Printed policy briefs/brochures of evidence summaries in lay language

854 Face-to-face debriefing sessions

855 Evidence summaries posted on the group’s website/dashboards/blogs

856 Email dissemination of evidence summaries

- 857 Use an intermediary/knowledge broker/science communicator to simplify your findings and
 858 share them with policymakers
 859 Media briefings of evidence summaries in lay language
 860 Other (specify)_____

861
 862 13. For policymakers, (please respond whether you ticked yes or no to Q 10) give your suggestions of
 863 what you could have done differently/can be done to better engage with researchers to support
 864 your decision-making efforts

865 _____
 866 Thank you very much for the time you have dedicated to this very important initiative. The findings
 867 of this study will help us understand how to improve the utilisation of COVID-19 modelling data for
 868 decision-making as we combine efforts to mitigate the disastrous effects of the ongoing pandemic.
 869 We will present results to key stakeholders in workshops, which you are invited to be a part of. We
 870 will also share written reports of our findings with you, including actionable recommendations from
 871 the lessons learned.

872
 873

874 **S3 Scoping Review**

875 **Specific objectives of the review:**

- 876
 - Describe knowledge translation strategies and tools used in translating modelling evidence
 877 during the pandemic.
- 878
 - Identifying barriers and facilitators to using knowledge translation strategies intended to
 879 promote uptake of COVID-19 modelling evidence for decision-making.
- 880
 - Identify outcomes reported for those knowledge translation approaches.
- 881
 - Identify key players in the COVID-19 modelling knowledge translation space.

882 **Search Strategy**

883 The following search strategy was used:


884 Table: Search strings used in the scoping review. Concepts were combined using the Boolean
 885 operator “AND”

Concept 1: Knowledge translation	Concept 2: COVID-19	Concept 3: Modelling
knowledge OR evidence OR finding* OR research OR synthesis) AND ("research to action" OR "decision mak*" OR "policy mak*" OR policy OR decision OR "evidence-informed decision making" OR "evidence to policy" OR participat*)) AND (appl* or broke* or creation or diffus* or disseminat* or exchang* or implement* or manage* or mobili* or translat* or transfer* or uptak* or utili* OR "knowledge translation" OR kt	((("COVID-19"[Mesh] OR "SARS-CoV-2"[Mesh] OR "COVID-19 Vaccines"[Mesh] OR "COVID-19 Serological Testing"[Mesh] OR "COVID-19 Nucleic Acid Testing"[Mesh] OR "SARS-CoV-2 variants" [Supplementary Concept] OR "COVID-19 drug	("mathematical model*" OR model* OR predict* OR dynamic* OR estimat* OR forecast* OR "economic model*" OR likelihood

	treatment" [Supplementary Concept] OR "COVID-19 serotherapy" [Supplementary Concept] OR "2019-nCoV" OR "2019nCoV" OR "cov 2" OR "Covid-19" OR "sars coronavirus 2" OR "sars cov 2" OR "SARS-CoV-2" OR "severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2" OR "coronavirus 2" OR "COVID 19" OR "COVID-19" OR "2019 ncov" OR "2019nCoV" OR "corona virus disease 2019" OR "cov2" OR "COVID-19" OR "COVID19" OR "nCov 2019" OR "nCoV" OR "new corona virus" OR "new coronaviruses" OR "novel corona virus" OR "novel coronaviruses" OR "SARS Coronavirus 2" OR "SARS2" OR "SARS-COV-2" OR "Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2"))	
--	---	--

886

887 **Selection process**



888

889

Figure 1 Selection process for the scoping review

890

891 **Table Scoping review: Characteristics of included studies**

Author	Study	Region	Experiences/ Findings
Adib et al.2021 ¹⁵	A participatory modelling approach for investigating the spread of COVID-19 in countries of the Eastern Mediterranean Region to support public health decision-making	Mediterranean	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited surveillance data Designed a participatory process to develop rapid modelling analyses tailored to the COVID-19 epidemic situation.
Abubakar et al.2021 ¹⁴	Lessons from co-production of evidence and policy in Nigeria's COVID-19 response	Africa - Nigeria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited transparency Bureaucratic obstacles Focus on epidemiological approaches
Sombie et al, 2020 ¹⁶	How does the West African Health Organisation (WAHO) contribute to the evidence-based decision making and practice during COVID-19 pandemic in ECOWAS region?	Africa – West African region	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity building to policy actors on the synthesis of recent data, development of guides and policy briefs
Hendy et al, 2021 ³¹	Mathematical modelling to inform New Zealand's COVID-19 response	New Zealand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describes how the Stochastic model was used to compare the effects of various interventions in reducing the spread of the virus and to estimate the probability of elimination
Hillmer et al, 2021 ³³	Ontario's COVID-19 Modelling Consensus Table: mobilising scientific expertise to support pandemic response	Ontario – East Central Canada	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> COVID-19 Modelling Consensus Table (MCT) is a partnership between the province and academic modellers and consists of multiple experts, health system leaders, and senior decision-makers.
Aguas et al., 2020 ²⁷	Modelling the COVID-19 pandemic in context: an international participatory approach	Several	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describes the creation of a participatory modelling approach platform, the COVID-19 Modelling (CoMo) Consortium model, and illustrates some of its use cases
Teerawattananon Et al.,2022 ³⁴	Recalibrating the notion of modelling for policymaking during pandemics	Several	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use fitness-for-purpose flowchart and reporting standards trajectory to address the challenges in using models for policymaking. Adopting such tools can provide a strong justification for increased funding essential for preventing and responding to public health emergencies.
Gombos et al., 2020 ³²	Translating Scientific Knowledge to Government Decision Makers Has Crucial Importance in the Management of the COVID-19 Pandemic	Hungary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formation of a multidisciplinary research team performed a large amount of scientific data analysis and mathematical and socioeconomic modelling of the COVID-19 epidemic

892 S4 Interview guides

893 Interview guide for researchers (English)

Interviewee code	
Country code	
Organisation code	
Date	
Position/Role	
Age group	
Gender	
Period I have worked in this role.	
Involvement in Technical Working Group (TWG)	

894

895 (After introducing yourself, explaining the purpose of the interview, seeking consent, and finding a
896 setting and time that will make the interviewee comfortable, below is a list of topics to be discussed.

897 The topic guide will remain flexible concerning what is relevant to participants)

- 898
- 899 • Can you tell me what your role(s) have been as an epidemiologist/statistician/modeler in
900 this organisation, how long have you served in this capacity? Have your responsibilities
901 changed in response to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic? If yes, in what ways? How has this
902 affected your morale/motivation?
903 *(Probe: type of modelling done: mathematical, economic, etc.; specify which disease areas
904 they have worked in; identify if roles have changed due to demand from the pandemic?)*
 - 905 • What does it mean for you to be a scientist working in the public eye on COVID-19?
906 *(Probe: has the experience been positive or negative? In what ways?)*
 - 907
 - 908 • Have you been involved in presenting evidence to inform policy? How has your experience in
909 being part of this?
910 *(Probe: in what capacity? policy briefs; TWG meetings; news briefings; other?)*
 - 911
 - 912 • What institutional/group changes, if any, have you had to make to accommodate evidence
913 demands/support knowledge sharing?
914
 - 915 • How have you found collaborating with government and policy organisations? How have
916 these collaborations evolved, especially with the ongoing pandemic?
917
918 *(Probe: What impact has this experience had on your relationship with policymakers?)*
 - 919
 - 920 • Have you been part of collaborative efforts with other modelling groups? Which ones? How
921 has the experience been?
922
 - 923 • Are you aware of any of the formal knowledge translation methods? Have you ever used any
924 of them? Specify which?
925 *(Probe: -targeted dissemination; involving users in the research process; developing networks
926 between researchers and users; use of knowledge brokers)*
927 *(Probe: what capacity needs have you experienced? Has your capacity to communicate
928 evidence improved?)*
 - 929

- 930 • Describe which approaches you/your organisation use to share your research findings with
931 policymakers: i) outside the pandemic; ii) during the pandemic?
932 *(Probe: long-form reports; short country reports; policy/issue briefs; interactive websites;*
933 *webinars; newspapers; blogs; websites etc.) ask them to specify where a combination has*
934 *been used.*
935
- 936 • Have policymakers ever approached you/your organisation to request data, or do you
937 approach them to share your findings? Have you been part of a technical working
938 group/advisory board?
939 *(Probe: how has this changed with the pandemic? What has been your experience in being*
940 *part of a TWG/advisory board?)*
941
- 942 • What has been your experience trying to make your research findings of complex
943 mathematical models more palatable to lay people?
944 *(Probe: have you had any specific training in science communication? Does your organisation*
945 *offer this support? Has this changed with the pandemic)?*
- 946 • How have you been involved in presenting scientific evidence to the public, and how have
947 you found this?
948 *(Probes: How has your role in informing the public about COVID-19 evolved?)*
- 949 • How do you feel about how the press covers your scientific contributions?
950 • How do you feel about sharing your scientific evidence on social media?
951 • How do you feel about how the government presents (your) scientific evidence to the
952 public?
953 • What kind of reactions have you received from the public? Have you received disturbing
954 reactions or threats? How did you deal with this?
955 • How has your involvement in COVID-19 research and advising policy/government affected
956 your professional life?
957 • How do your COVID-19 roles and responsibilities impact your existing roles?
958 • How has your involvement in COVID-19 research and advising policy/government affected
959 your personal life? How have you dealt with that?
960 • What have you learned from your experience of informing COVID policy?
961 *(Probe: What do you think are the most important lessons from this experience? What can be*
962 *done to improve things?)*
- 963 • If a new pandemic breaks out in the future, what should be done differently regarding
964 sharing information and bringing scientists and policymakers together?
965 • Do you have any additional remarks?
966 • Is there something you think we didn't cover relevant to this issue/topic?
967 • Is there someone else you think we should talk to?
968

969 *(Thank the participant for their time and find out if they are okay with being followed up later to*
970 *clarify things and to share the overall findings and invite them to be part of the learning sessions.)*

971

972

973 **Interview guide for policymakers (English)**

974

Interviewee code	
Country code	
Organisation code	
Date	
Position/Role	
Age group	
Gender	
Period I have worked in this role.	
Involvement in Technical Working Group (TWG)	

975

976

977 *(After introducing yourself, explaining the purpose of the interview, seeking consent, and finding a*
978 *setting and time that will make the interviewee comfortable, below is a list of topics to be discussed.*
979 *The topic guide will remain flexible concerning what is relevant to participants)*

980

981 • Can you tell me what your role(s) have been as a policy maker, how long have you served in
982 this capacity?

983 *(Probes: Have your responsibilities changed in response to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic? If*
984 *yes, in what ways? How has this affected your morale/motivation?)*

985

986 • What does it mean for you to be a policymaker working in the public eye on COVID-19?
987 *(Probe: has the experience been positive or negative? In what ways?)*

988

989 • Have you been involved in using evidence to inform policy? How has your experience in
990 being part of this?

991 *(Probe: in what capacity? Reading policy briefs/manuscripts; TWG meetings; news briefings;*
992 *other?)*

993

994 • How have you found collaborating with research organisations? How have these
995 collaborations evolved, especially with the ongoing pandemic?

996 *(Probe: What impact has this experience had on your relationship with researchers?)*

997

998 • Describe which approaches researchers use to share your research findings with you: i)
999 outside the pandemic; ii) during the pandemic?

1000 *(Probe: Probe: Have these approaches increased your accessibility to evidence?)*

1001

1002 • Have you, as a policy maker, ever approached a researcher/research organisation to request
1003 data, or do they approach you to share their findings? Have you been part of a technical
1004 working group/advisory board?

1005 *(Probe: how has this changed with the pandemic? What has been your experience in being part*
1006 *of a TWG/advisory board?)*

1007

- 1008 • What has been your experience in trying to understand/make sense of research findings of
1009 complex mathematical models?
1010 *(Probe: have you had any specific training in science communication? Does your institution*
1011 *offer this support? Has this changed with the pandemic? Has your capacity to use research*
1012 *evidence improved?)*
1013
- 1014 • How have you assessed the quality of modelling evidence that you use to make decisions?
1015
- 1016 • Do you intend to continue seeking research evidence to make policy decisions in the future?
1017
- 1018 • In your opinion, what impact has evidence exchange had on COVID-19 policymaking? Give
1019 local examples if available.
1020
- 1021 • How have you been involved in presenting scientific evidence to the public, and how have
1022 you found this?
1023 *(Probes: How has your role in informing the public about COVID-19 evolved?)*
1024
- 1025 • How do you feel about how the press covers scientific contributions?
1026
- 1027 • How do you feel about sharing scientific evidence on social media?
1028
- 1029 • How do you feel about how scientific evidence is presented to the public?
1030
- 1031 • What kind of reactions have you received from the public? Have you received disturbing
1032 reactions or threats? How did you deal with this?
1033
- 1034 • How has your involvement in COVID-19 policy decision-making affected your professional
1035 life?
1036
- 1037 • How do your COVID-19 roles and responsibilities impact your existing roles?
1038
- 1039 • How has your involvement in COVID-19 policy decision-making affected your personal life?
1040 How have you dealt with that?
1041
- 1042 • What have you learned from your experience of generating COVID policies?
1043 *(Probe: What do you think are the most important lessons from this experience? What can be*
1044 *done to improve things?)*
1045
- 1046 • If a new pandemic breaks out in the future, what should be done differently regarding
1047 sharing information and bringing scientists and policymakers together?
1048
- 1049 • Do you have any additional remarks?
1050
- 1051 • Is there something you think we didn't cover relevant to this issue/topic?
1052 • Is there someone else you think we should talk to?
1053
- 1054 *Thank the participant for their time, find out if they are okay with being followed up later to clarify*
1055 *things, share the overall findings, and invite them to be part of the learning sessions.*
1056

1057 **S5 Coding framework**

Name	Description
1. Knowledge Creation (Knowledge creation processes)	
a. Knowledge co-production	Narrations on knowledge co-production processes, i.e., where researchers and policymakers report on collaborative meetings to discuss questions that might have led to the need for modelling and use of modelling evidence
b. knowledge synthesis	Narrations on knowledge synthesis approaches utilised, including literature or document reviews/reports.
c. modelling	Narrations on the types of modelling done by the researchers
2. Strategies/ activities of Knowledge Transfer (Knowledge transfer/translation methods utilised)	
a. Knowledge co-production	Knowledge co-production [knowledge production as well]
b. embeddedness	Narrations on scenarios/instances of researcher embeddedness with policymakers
c. Knowledge brokers	Narrations on the use of knowledge brokers and their roles
d. Interviews (Print & electronic interviews)	Narrations on the use of newspapers and any other printed material as an approach for KT
f. policy briefs	Narrations on the use of Policy briefs/reports as a method of KT between researchers and Policymakers
g. infographics	Narrations on the use of infographics as a method of KT between researchers and Policymakers
h. dashboards	Narrations on the use of Websites, dashboards, or any other electronic method on KT
i. presentations	Narrations where researchers made online/physical PowerPoint presentations to policymakers
j. policy engagement workshops	Narrations on the use of policy engagement workshops as means of KT between researchers and Policymakers
k. report	Narrations on the use of reports method of KT between researchers and Policymakers
3. Facilitators (of successful knowledge translation)	

Name	Description
a. Relationship– (through collaborations/partnerships with government and institutions)	Narrations where relationships, whether previously established/existing or newly created, between researchers/modellers, Government, and other institutions helped in evidence generation (availability/access to data) and translation of evidence to policy.
b. Trust	Narrations that describe the importance of trust and trust building between researchers/modellers and policymakers. And the implication on evidence uptake/use.
c. credibility	Narrations where the credibility of an institution is mentioned
d. capacity building	Narrations on the need for training researchers/modellers/media on science communication
e. media	Narrations on the use of media (social media, press, TV, newspaper) in making the process of KT a success
4. Barriers on KT (Barriers to successful Knowledge Transfer/translation)	
a. Communication skills	Lack of capacity (in communication skills) - Narrations on lack of good communication skills among researchers
b. Misinterpretation	Narrations on the policymakers lacking knowledge to understand modelling work leading to wrong interpretation, or description of the government presentation of results as misrepresented
c. Timeliness	Narrations on the strict timelines that were set by policymakers for researchers to respond to the questions raised by the policymakers or even give feedback to the policymakers on issues raised
d. Relationships	Narrations on the difficulty of engaging the government officials/policymakers due to the lack of existing relationships
e. Organizational bureaucracy	Narrations on organisational bureaucracy (Delays in approvals/Challenges in engagement in the research process due to delays from the government
f. Knowledge brokers	Narrations on the challenges of using knowledge brokers in KT
g. Media	Narrations on the challenge of using the media (social media, print media, TV, Radio) on KT
h. quality data	Narrations on Concerns about poor quality of data
5. Lessons learnt or recommendations	
a. Personnel	Narrations that describe capacity building on modelling, communication skills, and any other mode of capacity building of researchers/policymakers to improve KT

Name	Description
b. behaviour change	Narrations on behaviour change- e.g., policymakers can listen to researchers and scientists.
c. timeliness	Narrations on the importance of timeliness when engaging stakeholders/policymakers in ensuring that your topic is timely and relevant, as well as issues of concern at that moment
d. social media	Narrations on how to leverage social media (media generally, print, TV, Radio) as a method of KT
e. exit meetings	Narrations on the importance of conducting brief feedback meetings with people as they wait for the comprehensive report
f. continuous process	Narrations that describe the KT as a continuous process, through a constant engagement between the researchers and policymakers and not a one-time thing
g. collaborations (Including Institutional collaborations)	Narrations described the importance of working together between different entities (researchers, modellers, policymakers).
h. coordination	Narrations on explicit coordination mechanisms within and between collaborating and non-collaborating organisations and government
Recommendations	
government and partners	Narrations on the partnerships between governments, partners, and other research institutions. Including access and use of local people/organisations as an essential aspect during pandemics
6. Knowledge translation infrastructure (infrastructure needed for successful knowledge translation)	
a. Knowledge translation frameworks	Narrations on the importance of having a KT framework or strategy that can be adapted to support the KT process
b. Modelling expertise	Narrations on the importance of the capacity building of personnel, modellers, communication teams, and policymakers' know-how on science communication
c. Modelling software	Narrations on the importance of having modelling software available for use by modellers
d. Accuracy of the evidence	Narrations on the accuracy of the evidence and the need for explicit communication on any assumptions made
e. Media	Narrations on the importance of the use of media (social media, print media, TV, Radio) as a KT approach

Name	Description
f. Power imbalance	Any narrations on power plays, e.g., Power dynamics between international and local players
g. funding	Narrations on the need/availability/or lack of funding to support modelling
7. Best Practices (perceived)	
a. National taskforce on COVID-19 response	Narrations on the existence/creation of a COVID-19 Taskforce to facilitate the link between policymakers and researchers to ease the KT process
b. Review of reports	Narrations on conducting a review of reports among the policymakers and researchers/modellers before a formal feedback meeting

1058

1059

1060

1061

1062

1063

1064

1065

1066

1067

S6 Snapshot of the Thematic Analytic Framework matrix

Theme	Definition	Sub theme	Data	Narrative
Capacity	Capacity includes technical skills to conduct both mathematical modelling and KT. It also includes capacity to use model outputs to make policy decisions.	Modelling expertise	<p><i>if we had modellers, if we had real time modellers, we would have information to guide the policymakers because they wanted to have geographic specific interventions for Covid 19 response for example, but it is the models that inform them and so I want to tell you that we as a country, we kept waiting for CDC, USCDC to be able to guide but also inform us of which model and what is likely to work out where. (Policymaker 03, Africa)</i></p> <p><i>We have shortage of modelling expertise (Policymaker 03)</i></p> <p><i>I would not be the right person to talk about the quality of modelling, but however I can comment on the fact that this pandemic allowed us to use a modelling in terms of involvement in the pandemic and I think this will be a great avenue for us to explore future outbreaks, future pandemics or epidemics that will happen in our country because now we do have or we have sort of piloted on how modelling would assist in terms of decision making, in terms of intervention that needs to be done to prevent more mortality from these diseases. (Policymaker, 01 - Africa)</i></p> <p><i>We had very talented, um, advisors with us, a few of them, and they, they were very helpful to, you know, trying to get all the, uh, results of the modeling from different groups and try to make it integrated and come up with the, the summaries of, you know, what for each task that we've been asked to do, everyone tried to use their own model to produce some result. Sometimes results agree, sometimes results, completely different. And these advisory people trying to help guiding us into the decision as a, as a group so that, you know, the modelers can, uh, work together peacefully and also benefit from each other in that modeling exercise. It, I think it was quite a challenging job to do, you know when you listen to three different models and you have to try to make sense of all of them and come up with a conclusion every time. (Researcher 0)</i></p>	<p>Researchers & policy makers underscored the importance of having a pool of modellers who are available to generate locally relevant mathematical models. To make decisions tailored to the local context, policy makers need model outputs that reflect their current situation. Modellers were concerned about relying on partners and other non-local organisations for their modelling needs both in terms of the type of model utilised and the relevance of the outputs to their setting.</p>
		Training for KT	<p><i>The issue of science communication is a very big problem I am telling you in Uganda here because researchers, no the scientists they openly tell you that for us we don't speak much, it is those politicians who speak much. I am not trained to speak to media houses for example, so they want to interview him and he would tell you that is rumours, I don't want to speak to those guys, they are wasting my time. (Policymaker 03)</i></p> <p><i>I think knowledge translation should be spread across different programmes. Even modellers need to be trained on knowledge translation and people who are in knowledge translation should be trained on what modelling is all about. So that even at the institutional level, we have modellers speaking with knowledge translators is... and communication department, a language that is easy for the public to understand. (Researcher 01)</i></p> <p><i>I think it's... it's... uum... it's faster, more efficient uum... and more impactful if modellers are trained in how to communicate and speak the language of the policymaker (Researcher 07)</i></p>	