The Role of Decision Analysis and Mathematical Modeling in COVID-19 Public Health Decision-Making: Applications, Challenges, and Opportunities

1. Introduction

The Unprecedented Challenge of COVID-19

The emergence and rapid global spread of SARS-CoV-2 created an unprecedented public health crisis, confronting decision-makers worldwide with a unique confluence of extreme challenges. Governments and public health authorities were tasked with protecting populations from a novel pathogen about which reliable information was initially scarce and constantly evolving.[1] Decisions of enormous consequence for public health, societal functioning, and economic stability had to be made under conditions of immense uncertainty regarding the virus's transmission dynamics, severity, and the effectiveness of potential countermeasures.[3] This uncertainty was compounded by severe time pressure, as delays in implementing interventions could have grave consequences due to the potential for exponential growth in infections.[1]

Furthermore, the pandemic forced policymakers to grapple with complex and often conflicting objectives. Measures intended to curb viral transmission, such as lockdowns and social distancing, inevitably imposed significant socioeconomic costs, impacting mental health, education, economic productivity, and individual liberties.[1] Balancing these competing interests—physical health, mental well-being, economic stability, equity, and fundamental rights—required navigating difficult trade-offs under intense public scrutiny and political pressure.[1] The situation was further complicated by an overwhelming influx of new, evolving, and frequently conflicting scientific evidence, alongside widespread misinformation, making it difficult to establish a clear evidence base for action.[12] In many instances, critical decisions had to be made simultaneously with, or even ahead of, the generation of the evidence intended to inform them, highlighting the limitations of traditional evidence-to-decision processes in a rapidly unfolding crisis.[3] The sheer scale, complexity, uncertainty, and high stakes of the COVID-19 pandemic stretched conventional public health decision-making frameworks to their limits, revealing a need for more structured and robust approaches to navigate the crisis.[4]

The Role of Analytical Tools

In response to these profound challenges, decision analysis and mathematical modeling, including agent-based modeling (ABM), emerged as crucial analytical tools. These methods were deployed to help structure thinking, synthesize complex information, forecast potential epidemic trajectories, evaluate the likely impact of various interventions, and systematically navigate the inherent uncertainties and trade-offs.[1] The pandemic context, characterized by deep uncertainty where traditional forecasting is unreliable, necessitated a shift away from simple 'predict and act' strategies towards more adaptive approaches focused on 'prepare, monitor, and adapt', allowing policies to evolve as knowledge accumulated and circumstances changed.[5] Analytical models provided frameworks for exploring potential futures, assessing the robustness of strategies across different scenarios, and identifying key uncertainties requiring monitoring. The extreme conditions of the pandemic did not merely present an opportunity for using these tools; they created a significantly amplified need for them. The overwhelming complexity, uncertainty, and time pressure exposed the limitations of relying solely on intuition or consensus, driving demand for more formal, structured methods to support the difficult choices policymakers faced.[1]

However, the application of these tools occurred within a context that created significant tension. The ideal of evidence-informed decision-making (EIDM), a cornerstone of modern public health, emphasizes basing policy on the best available scientific evidence.[3] Yet, the reality of the pandemic often involved making urgent decisions with evidence that was insufficient, rapidly evolving, conflicting, or simply unavailable at the time required.[1] Studies found that many early decisions were taken under conditions of evidence uncertainty, with few explicitly incorporating the best available evidence.[3] This underscores that simply "following the science" was often an aspiration rather than a straightforward operational directive, as the science itself was contested, incomplete, and changing at a pace that outstripped policy cycles.[14] Data and scientific analysis were necessary but not sufficient, requiring integration with ethical reasoning and value judgments to guide action.[14]

Report Objective and Structure

This report provides a comprehensive, evidence-based analysis of the application, challenges, and opportunities associated with decision analysis and mathematical/agent-based modeling in public health decision-making during the COVID-19 pandemic. Drawing primarily upon the provided research material, it aims to synthesize how these analytical methods were used to address the complexities of the crisis, the significant hurdles encountered in their application, and the potential they offer for strengthening future pandemic preparedness and response. The subsequent sections will delve into: the use of formal decision analysis frameworks; the application of mathematical modeling, particularly compartmental models; the specific contributions of agent-based modeling; the cross-cutting challenges faced in applying these tools; the opportunities they present; and concluding recommendations.

2. Decision Analysis Frameworks for Navigating Complexity

Formal Decision Analysis in Public Health

Formal decision analysis provides a structured, systematic methodology for evaluating choices that involve multiple, often competing, objectives, significant uncertainties, and unavoidable trade-offs. During the COVID-19 pandemic, various decision analysis techniques were employed or proposed to bring clarity and rigor to complex public health policy choices. Key approaches include Cost-Effectiveness Analysis (CEA), Cost-Utility Analysis (CUA), and Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA), which formally assess trade-offs involving health benefits, harms, and resource costs.[26] These methods often utilize metrics such as costs per Quality-Adjusted Life Year (QALY) gained or evaluate the monetary value of mortality benefits versus intervention costs.[26] Decision trees and influence diagrams are tools used within these analyses to map out decision pathways, uncertainties, and potential outcomes.[27] Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis (MCDA) offers a broader framework for evaluating options based on multiple, potentially conflicting criteria, integrating both quantitative and qualitative factors beyond purely economic or health metrics.[27]

Structuring Problems and Trade-offs

A primary contribution of decision analysis methods during the pandemic was their ability to structure inherently complex problems and make the necessary trade-offs explicit and quantifiable.

- **Explicit Trade-offs:** The pandemic forced societies into numerous difficult trade-offs, most notably between mitigating the direct health impacts of the virus and minimizing the adverse socioeconomic consequences of control measures.[9] Decision analysis techniques provided ways to frame and evaluate these dilemmas. For instance, studies used methods like Discrete Choice Experiments (DCEs) to quantify the public's willingness to accept income losses, restrictions on daily life (lockdowns), educational impairment for students, or increased societal poverty in exchange for reducing COVID-19 mortality.[11] Such studies revealed strong preferences for avoiding deaths, even at significant cost in other domains.[11] Other analyses explored how the framing of communication about the health-versus-economy trade-off could influence public preferences and willingness to adhere to protective measures.[10] Furthermore, ethical frameworks informed by decision analysis principles prompted explicit consideration of trade-offs between public health goals and infringements on individual liberties or impacts on justice and equity.[7]

- **Handling Uncertainty:** Decision-making occurred under conditions of "deep uncertainty," where reliable probabilities could not be assigned to future events or model parameters.[5] Decision theory offers formal approaches for making rational choices in such environments.[1] This involves acknowledging the limitations of predictive models, recognizing disagreements among experts, and potentially employing non-Bayesian decision rules that seek robustness across a range of possible futures rather than optimizing based on a single probabilistic forecast.[1] The concept of Decision Making under Deep Uncertainty (DMDU) emphasizes strategies that are adaptive, allowing for adjustments as uncertainty resolves over time.[5] The debate over school closures served as a pertinent example: faced with conflicting model predictions about the impact on transmission versus socioeconomic costs, decision theory provided rules to systematically evaluate closure options while explicitly accounting for the profound uncertainty.[1]
- **Incorporating Multiple Criteria (MCDA):** Recognizing that pandemic decisions involve more than just health outcomes and economic costs, MCDA provided a valuable tool for integrating a wider array of criteria.[27] MCDA allows decision-makers to define relevant criteria, assign weights reflecting their relative importance (potentially varying by stakeholder perspective), and score alternatives against these criteria to arrive at a prioritized ranking or choice.[29] Applications included prioritizing the use of scarce COVID-19 vaccines by considering factors like equity, risk levels, and feasibility alongside direct health benefits.[27] MCDA was also proposed for "horizon scanning" – rapidly evaluating emerging health technologies (like diagnostics or contact tracing apps) during the emergency based on clinical, economic, ethical, and social desirability criteria from different perspectives (patients, health professionals, decision-makers).[29] Evidence-to-decision frameworks, such as the WHO-INTEGRATE framework adapted for COVID-19 (WICID), represent a form of structured decision support akin to MCDA, explicitly incorporating criteria like equity, acceptability, feasibility, resource implications, and human rights alongside health impacts when evaluating non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs).[7]

Examples of Application

Several specific frameworks and applications illustrate the use of decision analysis during the pandemic:

- **WICID Framework:** Developed as an adaptation of the WHO-INTEGRATE framework, WICID (WHO-INTEGRATE COVID-19) aimed to support comprehensive, evidence-informed decision-making on NPIs under the time constraints and uncertainties of the pandemic.[7] It proposed 11 substantive criteria: implications for the pandemic course and health system capacity; impacts on quality of life, social well-being, and mental health; implications for non-COVID physical health and healthcare access; interactions with the health system; proportionality and fundamental rights; equity and fair distribution; societal and environmental implications; economic implications; resource implications; feasibility; and acceptability (implicitly covered). An additional meta-criterion addressed the quality of evidence for each aspect. This structure encouraged a holistic assessment embracing a complex systems perspective.[7]

- **MCDA for Vaccine Prioritization and Technology Assessment:** MCDA was applied to develop prioritization systems for COVID-19 vaccine allocation when supplies were limited, explicitly incorporating criteria beyond simple mortality reduction, such as risk exposure, equity for vulnerable groups, and maintaining essential services.[27] Similarly, MCDA frameworks were used for rapid horizon scanning of new technologies, such as evaluating contact tracing apps based on their potential value (clinical, economic, ethical) versus potential risks, considering perspectives of citizens, health professionals, and decision-makers.[29] These applications allowed for a structured comparison of options based on multiple, explicitly weighted dimensions.
- **CEA/CUA/CBA for Intervention Evaluation:** Economic evaluation techniques were used to assess the value proposition of large-scale interventions. For example, analyses of social distancing measures, despite acknowledging their high economic costs, found that the mortality benefits (valued in monetary terms or QALYs) were potentially much greater, suggesting the interventions were cost-beneficial from a societal perspective.[27] Such analyses often employed decision tree or Markov modeling structures to simulate patient pathways and long-term outcomes under different intervention scenarios.[27]

The use of formal decision analysis methods, even when applied informally or qualitatively, offers a significant advantage in crisis situations by providing a structured and potentially more transparent pathway for articulating the rationale behind difficult policy choices. By requiring the explicit definition of objectives, alternatives, potential outcomes across different dimensions (health, economic, social, ethical), and the handling of uncertainties, these methods force a clearer articulation of the problem and the reasoning underpinning a chosen course of action.[1] This structured approach contrasts with less formal or purely intuition-driven decision-making, which can be more opaque.[33] Explicitly stating the criteria, weights, perceived trade-offs, and how uncertainty was addressed can enhance the legitimacy, defensibility, and communicability of decisions, potentially fostering greater public trust.[1]

However, while decision analysis offers powerful theoretical frameworks, its practical implementation during the acute phases of the COVID-19 pandemic faced considerable barriers. The complexity inherent in some methods, particularly MCDA involving multiple criteria and weighting schemes, can be daunting.[30] Furthermore, these approaches often have significant data requirements, which were difficult to meet given the data scarcity and quality issues prevalent during the pandemic.[30] Ideal application often involves stakeholder participation to define objectives and weights, a process challenging to conduct effectively under extreme time pressure.[7] Integrating the outputs of potentially time-consuming analyses into the rapid, often politically charged, decision-making cycles of a pandemic proved difficult.[1] The general challenges of evidence gaps, time constraints, and political influences likely limited the extent to which formal, rigorous decision analysis was systematically applied, suggesting a gap between the recognized theoretical potential of these tools and their practical deployment in the heat of the crisis.[3]

The following table summarizes the key decision analysis techniques discussed in the context of the COVID-19 response:

Table 1: Summary of Decision Analysis Techniques in COVID-19 Response

Technique	Description	Key Application Examples (from snippets)	Strengths Highlighted	Limitations/ Challenges Noted	Relevant Snippets
CEA/CUA/CBA (Cost-Effectiveness / Utility / Benefit Analysis)	Formal assessment of trade-offs involving benefits (health outcomes, QALYs, monetary value), harms, and costs of alternative	Evaluating social distancing policies (benefits vs. costs) [27]; Informing pricing, reimbursement, benefit design.[26]	Provides formal assessment of efficiency and value for money [26]; Can use decision trees/Markov models.[27]	Focus primarily on health/economic outcomes; Difficulty quantifying all relevant factors; Ethical debates around valuing life	[26]

	interventions. Uses metrics like ICER (Incremental Cost-Effectiveness Ratio).			(e.g., QALYs).	
MCDA (Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis)	Framework for evaluating options based on multiple, potentially conflicting criteria (quantitative & qualitative). Involves defining criteria, weighting, scoring, and aggregating.	Vaccine prioritization considering multiple factors [27]; Horizon scanning/evaluation of new technologies (e.g., contact tracing apps) [29]; Integrating diverse data for healthcare resilience.[28]	Integrates multiple criteria beyond cost-effectiveness; Incorporates different stakeholder perspectives/values; Structured approach.[27]	Can be complex; Requires significant data; Determining criteria and weights can be subjective/difficult; User-friendliness varies; Integration into rapid decisions challenging.[30]	27
Decision Theory / DMDU (Decision Making under Deep Uncertainty)	Theoretical frameworks and rules (Bayesian, non-Bayesian) for making rational choices under uncertainty, especially deep uncertainty where probabilities are unknown or unreliable.	Guiding policy choices (e.g., school closures) amidst conflicting expert/model predictions [1]; Framing policy challenges under uncertainty [1]; Supporting adaptive management ('prepare,	Provides rational basis for choice under uncertainty; Helps manage conflicting information; Supports robust and adaptive strategies; Enhances transparency and justification.[1]	Can be abstract; Requires careful definition of uncertainties and objectives; Non-Bayesian approaches may be less familiar; Formal application can be complex.	1

		monitor, adapt').[5]			
Specific Frameworks (e.g., WICID)	Tailored evidence-to-decision frameworks adapting general principles (like MCDA) to specific contexts (e.g., NPIs during COVID-19).	Guiding decisions on NPIs by balancing health, rights, equity, societal/economic impacts, feasibility etc..[7]	Provides comprehensive checklist of relevant criteria; Adapts established methods to crisis context; Supports balanced decisions under time pressure.[7]	Relies on availability of evidence for each criterion; Stakeholder participation often limited by time constraints.[7]	7
DCE (Discrete Choice Experiment)	Survey-based method to elicit preferences by asking individuals to choose between hypothetical scenarios described by varying attributes.	Quantifying public trade-offs between COVID-19 deaths and income loss, life restrictions, educational impact, poverty.[11]	Quantifies preferences and trade-offs directly from target population; Flexible tool for studying choices.[11]	Relies on hypothetical scenarios; Cognitive burden for respondents; Results depend on survey design and attributes included.	11

3. Mathematical Modeling: Predicting Dynamics and Evaluating Interventions

Mathematical modeling served as a cornerstone of the scientific response to the COVID-19 pandemic, providing essential tools for understanding disease dynamics, forecasting potential outcomes, and evaluating the likely impact of interventions.

The Workhorse of Epidemiology: Compartmental Models

The most widely employed class of mathematical models were compartmental models, particularly variants of the Susceptible-Infectious-Recovered (SIR) and

Susceptible-Exposed-Infectious-Recovered (SEIR) frameworks.[18] These models divide the population into distinct compartments based on infection status (e.g., Susceptible, Exposed, Infectious, Recovered, Hospitalized, Deceased) and use systems of ordinary differential equations (ODEs) to describe the rate at which individuals move between these compartments over time.[18] The basic SIR model, for instance, uses parameters like the transmission rate (β) and the recovery rate (γ) to define these flows, assuming a homogeneously mixed population.[18] Extensions like SEIR add an 'Exposed' compartment for individuals infected but not yet infectious, while more complex variants, such as the SEIR(MH) model, explicitly incorporated parameters related to public health interventions (like lockdowns) and medical system capacity (like hospital beds).[36] The relative simplicity and long history of use contributed to the widespread adoption of these models.[18]

Applications in the COVID-19 Pandemic

Compartmental models and other mathematical approaches were applied to a wide range of critical questions during the pandemic:

- **Understanding Transmission Dynamics:** Models were crucial for estimating fundamental epidemiological parameters, such as the basic reproduction number (R0) – the average number of secondary infections caused by a single infectious individual in a fully susceptible population – and the effective reproduction number ($ReorRt$) – the equivalent measure at a given time point, accounting for population immunity and interventions.[18] They also helped quantify the significant role of undocumented or asymptomatic transmission in driving the pandemic.[19]
- **Forecasting Epidemic Trajectories:** Models were extensively used to generate short-term and long-term forecasts of key outcomes like daily new cases, hospital admissions, ICU occupancy, and deaths under various assumptions.[19] While essential for planning, these forecasts were subject to considerable uncertainty, particularly early in the pandemic when data was sparse and understanding of the virus was limited.[16]
- **Evaluating Non-Pharmaceutical Interventions (NPIs):** A major application of modeling was the evaluation of the effectiveness of NPIs aimed at reducing transmission. Models simulated the impact of measures such as lockdowns, social distancing mandates, school closures, mask-wearing policies, quarantine protocols, and travel restrictions.[19] Numerous studies, often using SEIR-type models, assessed how these interventions influenced the epidemic curve, with many concluding that early and stringent implementation was critical for maximizing effectiveness.[36] Evaluating NPIs was a predominant focus, especially in early modeling studies.[34]

- **Optimizing Vaccination Strategies:** As vaccines became available, mathematical models played a vital role in informing deployment strategies. They were used to compare the impact of prioritizing different population groups (e.g., based on age or risk status), evaluate different dosing intervals, assess the value of booster doses, and estimate the overall effect of vaccination campaigns on reducing morbidity and mortality.[40] These models often incorporated factors like varying vaccine efficacy (VE) against infection, symptomatic disease, and transmission, as well as waning immunity over time.[43] For example, modeling suggested that prioritizing older age groups was generally a robust strategy for minimizing deaths [41], while prioritizing completion of primary vaccination series might be more effective than widespread early boosters under certain conditions.[43] Models also explored the impact of vaccinating specific groups like healthcare staff in high-risk settings.[44]
- **Informing Resource Allocation:** Models helped anticipate and plan for the immense strain the pandemic placed on healthcare resources. They were used to estimate the demand for hospital beds, ICU capacity, ventilators, diagnostic tests, and personal protective equipment (PPE) under different epidemic scenarios.[36] Furthermore, optimization models were developed to determine the most efficient allocation of scarce resources, such as vaccines, tests, or medical personnel, to maximize health outcomes or control efficiency.[40] These studies demonstrated that optimized allocation could significantly improve pandemic control, and conversely, that resource shortages (e.g., insufficient ICU beds or vaccines for vulnerable groups) led to demonstrably worse outcomes.[45]

Beyond Compartmental Models

While compartmental models dominated, other mathematical and computational approaches were also utilized. Statistical models were used for analysis and forecasting, sometimes integrated with mechanistic models in hybrid approaches.[18] Machine learning algorithms were applied, for instance, to aid diagnosis from medical images or incorporated into resource allocation models.[19] Network models, which explicitly represent connections between individuals or groups, offered alternatives to the mean-field assumptions of basic compartmental models. Simulation techniques like Monte Carlo methods were often used within various modeling frameworks (e.g., CEA, CUA) to handle uncertainty.[19]

Mathematical models were undeniably indispensable tools during the pandemic, providing quantitative insights, enabling rapid exploration of "what-if" scenarios, and supporting critical planning and policy decisions when empirical data was lacking or slow to emerge.[18] However, their utility was intrinsically linked to their underlying assumptions and the quality of the data used to inform them. Especially in the early stages, characterized by profound uncertainty about SARS-CoV-2 and limited data availability, models faced significant challenges in terms of accurate calibration, validation, and prediction.[16] The divergence in predictions from different prominent models highlighted these limitations and sometimes led to public debate and erosion of trust when forecasts proved inaccurate.[16] Thus, while essential, models were powerful yet imperfect guides through the complexities of the pandemic.

A crucial factor determining the reliability and usefulness of model outputs was the process of parameterization and calibration. The behavior of epidemiological models is highly sensitive to the values assigned to key parameters, such as transmission rates, incubation periods, duration of infectiousness, severity probabilities, and vaccine efficacy estimates.[18] Obtaining accurate estimates for these parameters was challenging, particularly early on, due to limited, noisy, or delayed data.[19] Calibration, the process of fitting model parameters to observed data (e.g., case counts, hospitalizations, deaths), was a common practice, often relying heavily on initial data from China.[34] However, validation – testing the model's predictive performance against independent data – was less frequently reported.[34] While many studies attempted to account for parameter uncertainty through sensitivity analyses, addressing structural uncertainty – the uncertainty related to the model's underlying assumptions and structure itself – was identified as a less common and more challenging aspect of modeling practice.[34] These difficulties in accurately parameterizing and calibrating models against a backdrop of data scarcity and evolving scientific understanding represented a fundamental challenge that directly impacted the trustworthiness and applicability of model results.

The following table provides an overview of the main mathematical modeling approaches used during the COVID-19 pandemic:

Table 2: Overview of Mathematical Modeling Approaches in COVID-19

Model Type	**Description/Mechanism**	**Key Applications During COVID-19**	**Data Requirements/Inputs**	**Strengths Noted**	**Limitations/Challenges Noted**	**Relevant Snippets**
SIR/SEIR &	Population divided	Estimating R0/Re;	Population size/demo	Simplicity; Long	Homogeneity	18

Variants (Compartmental Models)	into compartments (S, E, I, R, etc.). ODEs describe flows between compartments based on average rates (e.g., transmission β, recovery γ). Assumes population mixing.	Forecasting cases/hospitalizations/deaths; Evaluating NPIs (lockdowns, masks); Evaluating vaccination strategies; Estimating resource needs (beds).	graphics; Epidemiological parameters (incubation/infectious periods, severity rates, R0); Intervention effects; Contact rates; Initial conditions.	history of use; Computationally efficient; Useful for broad population dynamics.	assumption (ignores individual variation); Assumes mass action/random mixing; Sensitive to parameter estimates; Difficulty incorporating complex behaviors/networks; Accuracy depends heavily on data quality/calibration.	
Statistical Models	Use statistical methods (e.g., time series analysis, regression) to analyze trends and make predictions based on observed data patterns.	Short-term forecasting; Identifying correlations; Analyzing impact of factors on outcomes.	Historical data on cases, deaths, hospitalizations, mobility, interventions, etc.	Data-driven; Can capture complex patterns without mechanistic assumptions.	Less explanatory power (less insight into mechanisms); Extrapolation can be unreliable; Requires sufficient historical data.	19
Network	Represent individuals	Modeling transmissi	Detailed data on	More realistic	High data requireme	18

Models	or groups as nodes and contacts/connections as edges. Simulate disease spread along the network structure.	on in specific social structures (households, workplaces); Assessing impact of network-targeted interventions.	contact patterns and network structure (often synthetic or inferred).	representation of contact structures than simple mixing; Can capture heterogeneity in connectivity.	nts for network structure; Computationally more intensive than basic compartmental models.	
Hybrid Models	Combine mechanistic models (like SEIR) with data-driven approaches (like machine learning or statistical methods).	Improving forecast accuracy; Integrating different data sources; Parameter estimation.	Combines requirements of constituent models (epidemiological parameters + historical data).	Leverages strengths of both approaches; Potentially more accurate predictions.	Can be complex to develop and interpret; Requires expertise in multiple methods.	18
Other Simulation Models (e.g., Monte Carlo)	Use repeated random sampling to obtain numerical results, often used to represent uncertainty in other models.	Quantifying uncertainty in CEA/CUA; Simulating stochastic processes in epidemiological or economic models.	Probability distributions for uncertain parameters.	Explicitly handles uncertainty; Flexible.	Can be computationally intensive; Results depend on input distributions.	19
Optimization	Mathematical	Optimizing resource	Objective function	Provides optimal	Solutions are	41

Models (e.g., Nonlinear Programming)	techniques used to find the best solution (e.g., minimize deaths, maximize efficiency) subject to constraints (e.g., resource limits).	allocation (vaccines, tests, staff, beds); Optimizing intervention timing/intensity.	definition; Constraint definitions; Model parameters (epidemiological, cost, capacity).	strategies under given assumptions/constraints; Useful for resource planning.	sensitive to model formulation and assumptions; May require significant computational effort; Real-world implementation can be complex.	

4. Agent-Based Modeling: Capturing Heterogeneity and Behavior

Introduction to Agent-Based Modeling (ABM)

Agent-Based Modeling (ABM) represents a distinct computational paradigm, often described as a "bottom-up" approach, that contrasts with the "top-down" nature of traditional equation-based compartmental models.[48] In ABM, systems are simulated by creating virtual populations of autonomous entities called "agents".[21] Each agent is endowed with specific attributes (e.g., age, health status, location) and follows a set of rules governing its behavior and interactions with other agents and its environment.[21] The overall system dynamics, such as the spread of an epidemic, are not predefined by equations but rather *emerge* from the cumulative result of these numerous individual-level interactions over time.[21] This approach allows for the simulation of complex systems where individual heterogeneity and local interactions play a crucial role.[24]

Unique Contributions of ABM in the COVID-19 Context

ABM offered several unique capabilities that were particularly valuable for understanding and responding to the complexities of the COVID-19 pandemic:

- **Heterogeneity:** Unlike simpler compartmental models that often assume population homogeneity [34], ABMs excel at representing individual-level differences.[24] Agents can be assigned diverse characteristics, including demographic attributes (e.g., age structure reflecting census data [49]), varying susceptibility or severity profiles, different behavioral patterns, unique social connections, and specific spatial locations (e.g., household, workplace, school assignments).[47] This allows for a more granular analysis of how the epidemic affects different subgroups and how interventions might have differential impacts.

- **Social Interactions and Networks:** ABMs provide a natural framework for explicitly modeling the social structures through which diseases spread.[22] Instead of assuming random mixing, ABMs can simulate interactions within specific contexts like households, workplaces, schools, or community locations.[49] Transmission events occur based on proximity or contact between individual agents within these defined networks.[21] This allows for investigation of how different contact patterns influence epidemic dynamics and the effectiveness of interventions targeting specific interaction settings.
- **Spatial Dynamics:** ABMs can readily incorporate geographical space, allowing agents to move within simulated environments representing real-world locations like towns, cities, or specific facilities such as college campuses or healthcare settings.[23] This spatial dimension enables the study of geographically targeted interventions, the impact of mobility patterns, and transmission dynamics within specific built environments.
- **Behavioral Realism:** A key potential strength of ABM is its capacity to incorporate more complex and realistic representations of human behavior and decision-making.[24] Agents can be programmed with rules that reflect responses to perceived risk (e.g., fear of infection leading to reduced contacts [9]), compliance with public health guidance (e.g., mask-wearing, isolation), or economic motivations.[21] While the full potential for behavioral complexity may not have been realized in all COVID-19 ABMs (as discussed later), the framework allows for exploring the interplay between individual behavior, social influence, and disease transmission.[23]

Examples of ABM Applications

The flexibility of ABM led to its application in diverse scenarios during the pandemic:

- **Simulating Spread in Specific Settings:** Researchers developed ABMs tailored to specific geographical contexts or population groups. Examples include models simulating COVID-19 spread in small US towns like New Rochelle, NY, calibrated against local data [52]; models assessing transmission dynamics on residential college campuses [53]; simulations representing entire countries or states like Australia, New Zealand, the UK, or New York State [23]; and models focused on specific locations like Davao City in the Philippines.[55]
- **Evaluating Complex Interventions:** ABMs proved useful for evaluating nuanced intervention strategies that are difficult to capture in aggregate models. This

included comparing different testing approaches (e.g., traditional hospital testing vs. safer drive-through facilities, varying testing frequency) [52]; assessing the impact of manual versus digital contact tracing [54]; exploring different vaccination strategies, potentially prioritizing specific groups or locations [52]; analyzing the combined effects of various NPIs like social distancing, mask use, and isolation under different compliance levels [21]; and even modeling the impact of interventions outside the traditional public health sphere, such as food relief programs during lockdowns.[55]
- **Exploring "What-If" Scenarios:** The computational nature of ABMs makes them well-suited for exploring counterfactual scenarios and assessing the potential consequences of different policy choices or behavioral patterns.[20] For example, simulations compared the epidemiological and economic impacts of full lockdowns versus strategies combining mask use with partial isolation, suggesting the latter might offer a better compromise.[21] Models were also used to predict the potential for second waves under scenarios of decaying adherence to restrictions [23] or to estimate the level of immunity coverage needed to achieve herd immunity on a college campus.[53]

Specific ABM Platforms

Several specific ABM platforms were developed or adapted for COVID-19 research. COVID-ABS was proposed as an open-source model integrating epidemiological dynamics (SEIR states) with economic factors (business, employment, government subsidies).[21] Covasim, another prominent ABM, was used to evaluate epidemic scenarios and interventions in New York State and the UK, incorporating detailed demographics and contact layers (household, school, work, community).[49] OpenABM-Covid19 was developed as a detailed, computationally efficient model calibrated to UK data, featuring Python and R interfaces to facilitate use by researchers and policymakers for evaluating NPIs and vaccination.[54] Other models built upon existing frameworks originally designed for influenza pandemics.[22] The public availability of source code for some platforms aimed to enhance transparency and usability.[21]

A core strength of agent-based modeling lies in its capacity to mechanistically link micro-level processes to macro-level outcomes. By simulating the actions, interactions, and state changes of individual agents within their specific social and spatial contexts, ABMs demonstrate how population-level patterns—such as epidemic curves, hospitalization rates, or the overall effectiveness of an intervention—emerge from the bottom up.[21] This provides an understanding of the underlying mechanisms driving observed phenomena that can be more challenging to obtain from purely statistical models or highly aggregated compartmental models, which represent flows between population groups rather than individual trajectories and interactions.[48] For example, ABM can illustrate how specific contact network structures or heterogeneous behavioral responses shape the overall trajectory of an outbreak.

Despite this potential, particularly regarding the incorporation of nuanced human behavior, the practical application during the COVID-19 pandemic may not have fully capitalized on this capability. While ABM frameworks *allow* for sophisticated modeling of individual decision-making, psychological factors, and social influences [24], many of the reviewed COVID-19 ABMs appeared to focus primarily on structural heterogeneity (age, location, contact layers like household/work/school) and relatively straightforward behavioral rules (e.g., movement patterns, basic SEIR state transitions).[48] While some models did incorporate elements like compliance or fear-based behavior change [21], systematic reviews noted significant heterogeneity in how human behavior and decision-making were represented, suggesting variability in depth and perhaps a tendency towards simplification.[24] There appears to be a discrepancy between the complex behavioral dynamics relevant to policy needs and the level of behavioral detail implemented in many simulation models during the crisis.[51] Fully leveraging ABM's capacity to integrate empirically grounded, complex behavioral science insights into epidemiological models remains a significant area for future development and refinement.

5. Cross-Cutting Challenges in Applying Analytical Models

The deployment of decision analysis and mathematical modeling during the COVID-19 pandemic, while offering significant benefits, encountered a formidable array of interconnected challenges that spanned data availability, model development, communication, policy integration, and ethical considerations.

Data Infrastructure Deficiencies

Perhaps the most fundamental and pervasive challenge was the inadequacy of existing public health data systems.[17] This manifested in several ways:

- **Availability, Timeliness, and Quality:** Throughout the pandemic, modelers and decision-makers struggled with a lack of timely, reliable, complete, and consistent data.[12] Reporting of crucial information like case counts, hospitalizations, deaths, and testing results from local or state levels to national or international agencies (e.g., CDC, ECDC) was often delayed, incomplete, or used incompatible formats and definitions.[25] Data quality was a persistent concern, with questions raised about the accuracy of case counts and the consistency of reporting requirements across different government agencies.[12] These data limitations severely hampered the ability to accurately parameterize, calibrate, and validate models in real-time.[18] Agent-based models, with their need for detailed individual-level data, were particularly sensitive to these data gaps.[20]

- **Granularity and Representation:** Effective modeling, especially for understanding heterogeneity and equity impacts, requires granular data disaggregated by demographics (age, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status), location, and potentially behavior or contact patterns. Obtaining such data proved difficult.[17] For instance, incomplete demographic data collection made it challenging to assess the disproportionate impact of the pandemic on communities of color.[17] ABMs needing detailed inputs on household structures, workplace distributions, and social networks often had to rely on statistical data or synthetic populations.[47]
- **Interoperability and Standardization:** A major obstacle was the lack of standardized data formats, definitions, and interoperable IT systems connecting different parts of the public health ecosystem (local, state, federal) and linking public health surveillance with clinical healthcare data.[17] This fragmentation hindered efficient data collection, sharing, and analysis, often requiring laborious manual processes and time-consuming workarounds to integrate information from disparate sources.[56]

Model Development and Validation Issues

The process of building, refining, and validating analytical models also presented significant hurdles:

- **Complexity vs. Parsimony:** Modelers faced a constant trade-off between creating models complex enough to capture relevant real-world dynamics (especially important for ABMs representing heterogeneity and interactions) and keeping models simple enough to be parameterized with available data, computationally tractable, and interpretable by decision-makers.[16] Overly complex models can be difficult to fit and validate [19], while overly simplistic models risk missing crucial factors influencing the epidemic.[47]
- **Assumptions and Structural Uncertainty:** All models are simplifications of reality and rely on assumptions. However, the documentation, justification, and sensitivity testing of these assumptions (i.e., addressing structural uncertainty) were often inadequate in COVID-19 modeling studies.[16] Many early models, for example, made simplifying assumptions about homogenous mixing or primarily symptomatic transmission, which were later found to be inaccurate.[34] Concerns were raised about the lack of rigor and transparency in some models.[12]

- **Calibration and Validation:** Fitting models to the sparse, noisy, incomplete, and rapidly changing data streams available during the pandemic was exceptionally difficult, especially in the early phases when understanding of the virus was minimal.[19] Validating model predictions against independent data sources or future observations was often limited or not reported.[34] Furthermore, the scientific practice of model replication, which is crucial for verifying results and building confidence, is computationally intensive, time-consuming, and often undervalued within the academic publication system.[20]
- **Representing Uncertainty:** Accurately characterizing and communicating the multiple layers of uncertainty inherent in pandemic modeling—including parameter uncertainty, structural uncertainty (model assumptions), and scenario uncertainty (future conditions)—proved to be a major challenge.[1] Models sometimes presented outputs with a false sense of precision, and the misrepresentation or mismanagement of uncertainty contributed to public confusion and damaged trust in modeling efforts.[16]

Computational and Resource Demands

Developing and running sophisticated analytical models, particularly large-scale ABMs that simulate millions of individual agents, requires substantial computational power, specialized software, and significant technical expertise.[20] Building, calibrating, testing, and analyzing these models is also a time- and labor-intensive process.[20] These resource requirements may not be readily available in all public health settings, potentially limiting the accessibility and application of advanced modeling techniques.

Communication and Knowledge Translation Barriers

A critical breakdown occurred at the interface between modelers and decision-makers/the public:

- **Bridging the Science-Policy Gap:** Translating complex, nuanced, and uncertain model outputs into clear, concise, and actionable insights for policymakers proved challenging.[1] Researchers and decision-makers often operate under different timelines, pressures, and objectives, creating a gap in understanding and communication.[3] Technical jargon and complex methodologies could be barriers to comprehension for non-experts.[3]
- **Communicating Uncertainty:** Effectively conveying the inherent uncertainties, assumptions, and limitations of models to policymakers and the public, without either paralyzing decision-making or undermining confidence, was a persistent difficulty.[1] Failures in clear communication about uncertainty led to confusion, misinterpretation, and distrust when predictions inevitably differed from reality.[14]

Effective uncertainty communication requires careful consideration of the audience's needs and the use of clear, tested language, recognizing that even common scientific terms can be misunderstood.[62]

- **The "Infodemic":** The pandemic generated an "infodemic"—an overwhelming deluge of information, including accurate data, preliminary findings, conflicting model results, and outright misinformation.[12] This made it extremely difficult for decision-makers and the public to discern reliable guidance.[15] It is important to recognize that this infodemic was not solely caused by external misinformation; the sheer volume, speed, and sometimes conflicting nature of the scientific output itself, including differing model predictions and expert assessments, coupled with inadequate communication of caveats and uncertainties, significantly contributed to the confusing information landscape.[1]

Difficulties in Policy Integration

Even when models produced relevant insights, integrating them effectively into the policy-making process faced obstacles:

- **Timeliness vs. Rigor:** The urgent need for decisions often clashed with the time required for careful model development, calibration, validation, and peer review.[1] Policies were frequently formulated and implemented before definitive modeling results were available.
- **Political Context and Trust:** Public health decisions are inherently political, involving value judgments and resource allocation.[63] Model outputs represented just one input among many competing factors, including political considerations, economic pressures, and public opinion.[3] Lack of transparency in decision-making processes, perceived political influence on scientific advice, or concerns about the integrity of evidence could undermine the use and impact of modeling results.[12]
- **Cognitive Biases:** Decision-making under the extreme stress, uncertainty, and time pressure of a pandemic is highly susceptible to cognitive biases.[4] These include groupthink (pressure to conform, stifling dissent), narrow focus (fixating on immediate virus containment while neglecting broader consequences), and escalation of commitment (persisting with ineffective strategies despite contrary evidence).[4] While models aim to provide objective analysis, they could inadvertently reinforce these biases if decision-makers selectively focused on models confirming pre-existing beliefs or locked onto a single model's narrative without critically evaluating alternatives or uncertainties.[1]

Ethical Considerations and Equity Implications

The application of modeling and decision analysis tools raised significant ethical questions:

- **Value Judgments:** Models are not value-neutral. Choices about model structure, parameter selection, outcome measures (e.g., prioritizing deaths averted vs. QALYs gained vs. economic costs), and interpretation of results inevitably embed ethical assumptions and value judgments.[7] These underlying values needed to be made explicit and subject to ethical deliberation, guided by principles like beneficence, non-maleficence, justice, respect for persons, solidarity, and proportionality.[7]
- **Equity:** A major ethical concern was the potential for modeling and subsequent policies to overlook or exacerbate existing health inequities.[7] Many models lacked the necessary granularity or specific focus to adequately assess how the virus or proposed interventions would differentially affect vulnerable populations based on race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, occupation, housing conditions, or disability. While some decision frameworks explicitly incorporated equity or justice criteria [7], ensuring equitable outcomes remained a significant challenge, often hampered by data limitations and the urgency of the response.[17]
- **Transparency and Legitimacy:** The perceived legitimacy of pandemic policies depended partly on the transparency of the decision-making process, including the role played by models.[8] Opaque processes or poorly communicated rationale could erode public trust and cooperation.[8] Public engagement and clear communication about the basis for policies, including uncertainties and trade-offs, were highlighted as crucial for maintaining legitimacy.[8]

These diverse challenges were not isolated but deeply interconnected. Deficiencies in data infrastructure directly undermined the ability to build and validate reliable models. The inherent limitations and uncertainties of the models made effective communication exceedingly difficult. Failures in communication, in turn, hampered policy integration and eroded public trust. The intense pressure and complexity, exacerbated by data and modeling issues, often pushed ethical considerations, particularly around equity, to the sidelines. Addressing these multifaceted problems requires a systemic perspective that recognizes these interdependencies.

The following table synthesizes the key cross-cutting challenges identified in applying analytical models during the COVID-19 pandemic response:

Table 3: Synthesis of Key Challenges in Modeling for Pandemic Response

Challenge Category	Specific Issues Identified	Illustrative Examples/Context from COVID-19	Relevant Snippets
Data Infrastructure	- Lack of timely, complete, reliable data - Inconsistent data reporting/definitions across jurisdictions - Poor data quality (e.g., case count accuracy) - Lack of granular data (demographics, location, contacts) - Poor interoperability between systems (public health, healthcare) - Lack of standardization	Delayed reporting from states/countries to CDC/ECDC; Inconsistent COVID-19 case/death definitions; Difficulty tracking impact on specific racial/ethnic groups; Manual data integration workarounds needed.	[12]
Model Development & Validation	- Balancing complexity vs. parsimony/data availability - Insufficient documentation/justification of assumptions - Poor handling of structural uncertainty - Difficulty calibrating to sparse/noisy/changing data - Limited validation against independent data - Difficulty/lack of incentive for model replication - Concerns about rigor of some models	Early models assuming homogenous/symptomatic transmission; Heavy reliance on early Chinese data for calibration; Divergent predictions from major models (e.g., Imperial vs. IHME); Lack of replication studies.	[1]

Computational & Resource Demands	- High computational cost for complex models (esp. ABM) - Need for specialized expertise and software - Time-consuming nature of model building/calibration/analysis	Large-scale ABMs requiring significant computing power; Need for trained modelers within public health agencies.	20
Communication & Knowledge Translation	- Difficulty translating complex outputs for policymakers - Ineffective communication of uncertainty & limitations - Technical jargon as a barrier - Gap between researcher goals and decision-maker needs - Contribution to the "infodemic" via conflicting/unclear results	Confusion over differing model forecasts; Public distrust due to perceived lack of transparency or inaccurate predictions; Difficulty explaining model assumptions/caveats.	1
Policy Integration	- Mismatch between modeling timelines and decision speed - Political influences on use/interpretation of models - Lack of transparency in decision processes - Potential for models to reinforce cognitive biases (groupthink, narrow focus, escalation)	Decisions made before model results available; Concerns about political interference with scientific advice; Tendency to lock onto single narratives despite uncertainty.	1
Ethics & Equity	- Implicit value	Lack of granular data	7

	judgments in model structure/outputs - Difficulty assessing/addressing differential impacts on vulnerable groups - Potential for models/policies to exacerbate inequities - Need for transparency and public engagement for legitimacy	hindering equity analysis; Trade-offs (e.g., health vs economy) reflecting societal values; Need for ethical frameworks (e.g., WICID, JHU) to guide choices.	

6. Opportunities for Enhanced Pandemic Preparedness and Response

Despite the significant challenges encountered, the experience of applying decision analysis and mathematical modeling during the COVID-19 pandemic also highlighted substantial opportunities for improving future preparedness and response efforts. These analytical tools offer powerful capabilities that, if properly developed, resourced, and integrated, can significantly enhance public health decision-making in crises.

- **Systematic Evaluation of Complex Trade-offs:** Pandemics inevitably force societies to confront difficult trade-offs between competing values and objectives. Analytical models provide structured methodologies for making these trade-offs explicit and evaluating them systematically.[1] Techniques like CEA, CUA, and CBA allow for quantitative comparison of health benefits versus economic costs, while MCDA offers a framework to incorporate a broader range of criteria, including ethical considerations, social impacts, and feasibility, reflecting diverse stakeholder perspectives.[27] Utilizing these tools can lead to more reasoned and defensible policy choices when balancing conflicting priorities.
- **Exploring Counterfactual Scenarios ("What-If" Analyses):** One of the most valuable functions of modeling is the ability to explore hypothetical scenarios and counterfactuals in a simulated environment.[5] Decision-makers can use models to ask "what-if" questions: What might have happened if interventions were implemented earlier or later? What is the likely impact of achieving different levels of vaccine coverage or adherence to NPIs? What are the potential consequences of relaxing restrictions under different epidemiological conditions? This capacity for exploring alternative futures and policy options, which cannot be tested directly in the real world, is crucial for anticipatory planning, risk assessment, and

strategic decision-making.

- **Optimizing Intervention Strategies:** Analytical models can move beyond simply evaluating predefined interventions to actively optimizing them. Optimization techniques, often coupled with epidemiological models, can identify the most efficient strategies for achieving public health goals given resource constraints or other limitations.[41] This includes determining the optimal timing, duration, intensity, targeting (e.g., by age group or geographic area), and combination of interventions like NPIs, vaccination campaigns, testing protocols, and resource allocation (e.g., distributing vaccines, tests, or medical staff).[36] Optimization modeling can help maximize the impact of limited resources and minimize negative consequences.
- **Understanding the Impact of Heterogeneity and Behavior:** Agent-based modeling, in particular, provides a powerful lens for understanding how individual-level differences and behaviors shape population-level outcomes.[20] By simulating heterogeneous agents interacting within realistic social networks and spatial environments, ABMs can shed light on why certain groups are more vulnerable, how specific contact patterns drive transmission, and how behavioral responses (like compliance or risk aversion) influence the effectiveness of interventions. This deeper understanding allows for the design of more targeted, efficient, and potentially more equitable public health strategies.
- **Supporting Robust and Adaptive Decision-Making Under Deep Uncertainty:** Recognizing that perfect prediction is impossible in a pandemic, modeling can support the development of strategies that are robust—performing reasonably well across a wide range of plausible future scenarios—rather than optimal only under a single set of assumptions.[1] Frameworks like DMDU encourage stress-testing policies against various uncertainties.[5] Furthermore, ongoing modeling integrated with real-time surveillance data can support adaptive management approaches, where policies are designed with pre-planned triggers for modification as new information emerges or conditions change.[5] This fosters flexibility and resilience in the face of evolving threats.
- **Enhancing Transparency and Communication:** When employed thoughtfully and communicated effectively, analytical models can serve as tools for transparency.[1] By making assumptions, data inputs, criteria, and trade-offs explicit, models can help clarify the rationale behind policy decisions for stakeholders and the public. This transparency, particularly regarding how uncertainty and competing values are handled, can enhance the perceived legitimacy of decisions and potentially foster greater public trust and cooperation.[1]

Beyond their direct role in informing specific decisions, the process of developing, calibrating, and analyzing models serves as a crucial learning tool in itself. Engaging with modeling forces researchers and policymakers to formalize their understanding of the complex systems involved in a pandemic, articulate assumptions clearly, identify critical knowledge gaps, and explore the potential consequences of different factors and interactions.[5] This iterative process of model construction, testing, and refinement inherently deepens understanding of epidemiological, social, and behavioral dynamics, effectively serving as a way to formalize, test, and improve mental models of the crisis, even when precise prediction remains elusive.

Furthermore, the pandemic underscored the limitations of purely epidemiological models and highlighted the need for more integrated modeling approaches. Effectively supporting holistic decision-making requires frameworks that can bridge disciplinary silos and capture the critical interdependencies between epidemiological dynamics, economic consequences, behavioral responses, resource constraints, and ethical considerations.[7] Models that explicitly link epidemic modules with economic modules [9], incorporate behavioral feedback loops [9], account for resource limitations [36], or are embedded within broader decision-analytic frameworks that include ethical and equity criteria [7] represent a crucial direction for future development. Investing in these integrated approaches offers the opportunity for more comprehensive and relevant decision support in future crises.

The following table summarizes the key opportunities presented by analytical and modeling approaches for enhancing pandemic preparedness and response:

Table 4: Synthesis of Opportunities Presented by Modeling in Pandemics

Opportunity Area	**Description**	**How Modeling Contributes**	**Specific COVID-19 Examples (from snippets)**	**Relevant Snippets**
Evaluating Trade-offs	Systematically assessing choices involving competing objectives (e.g., health vs. economy, liberty	Makes trade-offs explicit; Provides quantitative frameworks (CEA/CBA/CUA, MCDA, DCE) for	Quantifying public willingness to trade income/restrictions for fewer deaths [11]; Evaluating social	1

	vs. safety).	comparison; Incorporates multiple values.	distancing benefits vs. costs [27]; MCDA for balancing criteria in vaccine/tech decisions [28]; WICID framework including diverse criteria.[7]	
Scenario Analysis ("What-If")	Exploring potential outcomes under different hypothetical conditions or policy choices.	Simulates counterfactuals not testable in reality; Assesses impact of varying assumptions (e.g., compliance, VE); Supports anticipatory planning.	Comparing lockdown vs. partial isolation strategies [21]; Predicting second waves under decaying adherence [23]; Assessing impact of delaying interventions; Evaluating outcomes with/without vaccination.[19]	[5]
Intervention Optimization	Identifying the most effective or efficient ways to design, time, target, and combine interventions.	Uses mathematical optimization linked to models; Finds best strategies under constraints (e.g., resources); Improves efficiency of response.	Optimizing vaccine allocation by age group [41]; Optimizing resource distribution (tests, staff, beds) [42]; Determining optimal NPI timing/intensity.[3] [6]	[36]

Understanding Heterogeneity & Behavior	Analyzing how individual differences (demographics, contacts, behavior) influence outcomes.	ABMs simulate individual agents, interactions, networks, spatial dynamics; Captures emergent effects from micro-level processes; Allows for targeted intervention design.	ABM simulating spread in specific towns/campuses [52]; Modeling impact of contact networks [22]; Potential to model compliance/fear responses.[21]	20
Managing Uncertainty	Developing strategies robust to deep uncertainty and adaptable to new information.	DMDU frameworks stress-test policies; Models support adaptive management plans with monitoring/triggers; Focus on robustness across scenarios vs. single prediction.	Applying DMDU concepts [5]; Using decision rules under conflicting model predictions [1]; Developing adaptive policies.[5]	1
Enhancing Transparency & Communication	Making the basis for decisions clearer and more understandable to stakeholders and the public.	Explicitly defines assumptions, criteria, trade-offs; Provides structured rationale for choices; Can foster trust if communicated well.	Using decision theory for transparent policymaking [1]; MCDA making criteria/weights explicit [29]; Clear communication emphasized in ethical frameworks.[8]	1

Facilitating Learning	Improving understanding of complex system dynamics through the modeling process itself.	Model building clarifies assumptions/mechanisms; Calibration identifies data gaps; Simulation explores system sensitivities; Formalizes/tests mental models.	Process of developing DMDU strategies [5]; Using models to structure/synthesize understanding [16]; Identifying knowledge gaps through modeling.[19]	5
Enabling Integrated Approaches	Moving beyond purely epidemiological models to incorporate economic, behavioral, resource, and ethical dimensions.	Developing linked epi-econo models [9]; ABMs incorporating behavior/economics [21]; Models including resource constraints [36]; DA frameworks integrating multiple values.[7]	Models linking epidemic and economic modules [9]; ABMs simulating economic impacts [21]; Resource optimization models [42]; WICID/MCDA frameworks.[7]	7

7. Conclusion and Recommendations

Recap of Modeling's Role

The COVID-19 pandemic presented an unparalleled test for public health systems globally. In navigating this crisis, decision analysis and mathematical modeling, including agent-based approaches, played a critical and multifaceted role. These analytical tools proved indispensable for structuring the immense complexity, quantifying potential outcomes, evaluating intervention options, and grappling with the profound uncertainties and difficult trade-offs inherent in the pandemic response. They provided essential frameworks for understanding transmission dynamics, forecasting trajectories, assessing NPIs, optimizing vaccination strategies, and planning resource allocation when empirical evidence was scarce or emerging too slowly. However, the application of these powerful tools was far from seamless. Their effectiveness was frequently constrained by significant hurdles, including pervasive data limitations, challenges in model validation under rapidly changing conditions, difficulties in communicating complex and uncertain findings, barriers to integrating insights into time-pressured policy processes, and the need to better incorporate crucial ethical and equity considerations.

Synthesis of Key Lessons Learned

The collective experience of utilizing analytical modeling during COVID-19 yields several critical lessons for future pandemic preparedness:

1. **Data Infrastructure is Foundational:** The pandemic starkly revealed that robust, timely, granular, standardized, and interoperable public health data systems are not optional luxuries but absolute prerequisites for effective modeling and evidence-informed decision-making in a crisis.[17] Chronic underinvestment in this area created severe bottlenecks.
2. **Modeling Practice Requires Rigor and Humility:** Effective modeling demands careful consideration of model choice, explicit articulation and testing of assumptions, rigorous calibration and validation against available data, sophisticated handling and transparent communication of uncertainty (both parameter and structural), and a recognition of inherent limitations.[16] Over-reliance on single models or predictions without acknowledging uncertainty can be misleading and erode trust.
3. **Communication is Paramount:** The gap between complex model outputs and the needs of decision-makers and the public must be actively bridged through clear, timely, and tailored communication that explicitly addresses assumptions, limitations, and uncertainties.[1] Failure in communication contributes to confusion, mistrust, and hinders effective action.
4. **Integration into Decision-Making Needs Structure:** Analytical insights are only useful if they can be effectively integrated into decision-making processes that are often rapid, complex, and politically charged.[1] This requires established pathways, trusted relationships between scientists and policymakers, and frameworks that can accommodate analytical inputs within realistic timelines.
5. **Ethics and Equity Must Be Explicit:** Pandemic responses involve profound ethical choices and have significant equity implications. These dimensions cannot be treated as afterthoughts but must be explicitly integrated into modeling frameworks and decision-making processes from the outset, ensuring that values are considered alongside empirical evidence.[7]

Recommendations for Future Pandemic Preparedness

Based on the analysis of experiences during the COVID-19 pandemic, the following recommendations are proposed to strengthen the role and effectiveness of decision analysis and modeling in future public health emergencies:

1. **Invest in Foundational Public Health Capabilities:** Prioritize sustained, substantial investment in modernizing public health data systems at all levels (local, state, national, global), focusing on interoperability, standardization, timeliness, and granularity.[17] Simultaneously invest in strengthening laboratory capacity and addressing chronic underfunding and workforce shortages in public health agencies to ensure the personnel and infrastructure exist to utilize data and models effectively.[17]
2. **Strengthen Modeling Capacity and Promote Good Practices:** Build and maintain dedicated, skilled modeling teams within key public health institutions.[17] Promote the adoption of best practices for model development, including transparency (e.g., use of reporting standards like ODD/TRACE for ABMs [20]), rigorous validation, comprehensive uncertainty quantification, and efforts towards model replication and comparison.[20] Foster research and development of integrated modeling approaches (epi-econo-behavioral-ethical).
3. **Improve Science Communication and Knowledge Translation:** Invest in developing dedicated expertise and clear protocols for translating complex modeling results, including assumptions and uncertainties, for diverse audiences (policymakers, public, media).[62] Cultivate stronger, ongoing relationships and mechanisms for dialogue between modelers and decision-makers to ensure models address relevant policy questions.[3] Train public health communicators in simplifying complex scientific knowledge without losing critical nuance.[15]
4. **Formalize and Adapt Decision Support Processes:** Encourage the proactive adoption and adaptation of formal decision analysis frameworks (e.g., MCDA, DMDU principles, structured evidence-to-decision pathways) within public health agencies to systematically structure complex decisions, explicitly manage trade-offs, and enhance transparency during crises.[1] Develop pre-prepared adaptive management plans for plausible pandemic scenarios.[5]
5. **Embed Ethical Considerations and Equity Analysis:** Integrate ethical frameworks and equity impact assessments as standard components of the modeling and decision-making process from the beginning, not as peripheral concerns.[7] Ensure processes actively seek and incorporate diverse perspectives, particularly from vulnerable and marginalized communities.[8]
6. **Foster Collaboration and Data Sharing:** Establish robust protocols, platforms, and agreements (nationally and internationally) to facilitate timely data sharing, collaborative modeling efforts, and comparative analysis during public health emergencies.[12] Strengthen multi-agency coordination and cross-sector partnerships (public health, healthcare, research, community organizations)

before crises occur.[17]

Concluding Thought

The COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated that decision analysis and mathematical modeling are indispensable assets for navigating the complexities of modern public health emergencies. However, these analytical tools are not panaceas. Their ultimate effectiveness hinges on their integration within a resilient, adequately resourced public health ecosystem characterized by strong leadership, modernized data infrastructure, established and transparent decision processes, clear communication channels, robust partnerships, and an unwavering commitment to ethical principles, including equity. The challenging lessons learned from COVID-19 provide a critical roadmap for building such a system, ensuring we are better prepared to leverage the power of analysis in protecting public health during the inevitable crises to come.

Works cited

1. Rational policymaking during a pandemic | PNAS, accessed April 26, 2025, https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.2012704118
2. Rational policymaking during a pandemic - PMC, accessed April 26, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7848715/
3. Evidence in decision-making in the context of COVID-19 in Latin America - PubMed Central, accessed April 26, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9299752/
4. Optimizing Decision-Making Processes in Times of COVID-19: Using Reflexivity to Counteract Information-Processing Failures - PMC, accessed April 26, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8258315/
5. Decision making under deep uncertainty for pandemic policy planning - PMC, accessed April 26, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10156381/
6. On Ambiguity Reduction and the Role of Decision Analysis during the Pandemic - PMC, accessed April 26, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8013914/
7. WICID framework version 1.0: criteria and considerations to guide ..., accessed April 26, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7688443/
8. An Ethics Framework for the COVID-19 Reopening Process - Johns ..., accessed April 26, 2025, https://bioethics.jhu.edu/research-and-outreach/covid-19-bioethics-expert-insights/resources-for-addressing-key-ethical-areas/grappling-with-the-ethics-of-social-distancing/
9. The unequal effects of the health–economy trade-off during the COVID-19 pandemic - PMC, accessed April 26, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10896714/
10. The health-economy trade-off during the Covid-19 pandemic: Communication matters - PMC, accessed April 26, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8437286/

11. Trade-offs during the COVID-19 pandemic: A discrete choice experiment about policy preferences in Portugal - PMC, accessed April 26, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9757580/
12. Challenges to evidence-informed decision-making in the context of ..., accessed April 26, 2025, https://gh.bmj.com/content/7/4/e008268
13. Challenges to evidence-informed decision-making in the context of pandemics: qualitative study of COVID-19 policy advisor perspectives - PMC, accessed April 26, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9023846/
14. Public health decisions in the COVID-19 pandemic require more than 'follow the science' | Journal of Medical Ethics, accessed April 26, 2025, https://jme.bmj.com/content/47/5/296
15. Public Health and Risk Communication During COVID-19—Enhancing Psychological Needs to Promote Sustainable Behavior Change - PMC - PubMed Central, accessed April 26, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7652763/
16. Model uncertainty, the COVID-19 pandemic, and the science-policy interface - PMC, accessed April 26, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10864780/
17. Public Health COVID-19 Impact Assessment: Lessons Learned and ..., accessed April 26, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8406505/
18. MATHEMATICAL MODELS FOR COVID-19 PANDEMIC: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS - PMC - PubMed Central, accessed April 26, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7523122/
19. A review of mathematical model-based scenario analysis and interventions for COVID-19, accessed April 26, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8314871/
20. High-Fidelity Agent-Based Modeling to Support Prevention Decision-Making: an Open Science Approach - PMC - PubMed Central, accessed April 26, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8591590/
21. COVID-ABS: An agent-based model of COVID-19 epidemic to simulate health and economic effects of social distancing interventions - PubMed Central, accessed April 26, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7340090/
22. Agent-based modelling for SARS-CoV-2 epidemic prediction and intervention assessment: A methodological appraisal - PMC - PubMed Central, accessed April 26, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7461315/
23. Modelling SARS-CoV-2 disease progression in Australia and New Zealand: an account of an agent-based approach to support public health decision-making - PubMed, accessed April 26, 2025, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35238437/
24. Agent-Based Social Simulation of the Covid-19 Pandemic: A Systematic Review - JASSS, accessed April 26, 2025, https://www.jasss.org/24/3/5.html
25. thinkeuropa.dk, accessed April 26, 2025, https://thinkeuropa.dk/files/media/document/ecdc-final.pdf
26. How Does Cost-Effectiveness Analysis Inform Health Care Decisions? | Journal of Ethics, accessed April 26, 2025, https://journalofethics.ama-assn.org/article/how-does-cost-effectiveness-analysi

s-inform-health-care-decisions/2021-08
27. The economics of the COVID-19 pandemic: economic evaluation of government mitigation and suppression policies, health system innovations, and models of care - PubMed Central, accessed April 26, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10206578/
28. (PDF) SMART Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis (MCDA)—One of the Keys to Future Pandemic Strategies - ResearchGate, accessed April 26, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/389843218_SMART_Multi-Criteria_Decision_Analysis_MCDA-One_of_the_Keys_to_Future_Pandemic_Strategies
29. Multi–Criteria–Decision–Analysis (MCDA) for the Horizon Scanning of Health Innovations an Application to COVID 19 Emergency - MDPI, accessed April 26, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/1660-4601/17/21/7823
30. Expanding Use of Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis for Health Technology Assessment, accessed April 26, 2025, https://www.ajmc.com/view/expanding-use-of-multicriteria-decision-analysis-for-health-technology-assessment
31. Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis to Prioritize People for COVID-19 Vaccination When Vaccines Are in Short Supply - Frontiers, accessed April 26, 2025, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/health-services/articles/10.3389/frhs.2022.760626/full
32. Multi–Criteria–Decision–Analysis (MCDA) for the Horizon Scanning of Health Innovations an Application to COVID 19 Emergency - ResearchGate, accessed April 26, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/346438897_Multi-Criteria-Decision-Analysis_MCDA_for_the_Horizon_Scanning_of_Health_Innovations_an_Application_to_COVID_19_Emergency
33. Ethical implications of COVID-19: vulnerabilities in a global perspective - Oxford Academic, accessed April 26, 2025, https://academic.oup.com/eurpub/article/31/Supplement_4/iv50/6423457
34. Mathematical modelling of COVID-19: a systematic review and quality assessment in the early epidemic response phase - PubMed Central, accessed April 26, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8884788/
35. An evaluation of mathematical models for the outbreak of COVID-19 - PMC, accessed April 26, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7376265/
36. Estimating the Effects of Public Health Measures by SEIR(MH) Model of COVID-19 Epidemic in Local Geographic Areas - Frontiers, accessed April 26, 2025, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/public-health/articles/10.3389/fpubh.2021.728525/full
37. Estimating the Effects of Public Health Measures by SEIR(MH) Model of COVID-19 Epidemic in Local Geographic Areas - PubMed, accessed April 26, 2025, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35059370/
38. Unmasking Challenges CDC Faces in Rebuilding Public Trust Amid Respiratory Illness Season | 2023 Congressional Testimony from CDC, accessed April 26, 2025, https://www.cdc.gov/washington/testimony/2023/challenges.html
39. Understanding COVID-19 reporting behaviour to support political

decision-making: a retrospective cross-sectional study of COVID-19 data reported to WHO | BMJ Open, accessed April 26, 2025, https://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/13/1/e061717
40. Resource allocation for different types of vaccines against COVID-19: Tradeoffs and synergies between efficacy and reach - PubMed Central, accessed April 26, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8520874/
41. Optimizing two-dose vaccine resource allocation to combat a pandemic in the context of limited supply: The case of COVID-19 - Frontiers, accessed April 26, 2025, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/public-health/articles/10.3389/fpubh.2023.1129183/full
42. Assessing the impact of vaccination and medical resource allocation on infectious disease outbreak management: a case study of COVID-19 in Taiyuan City - Frontiers, accessed April 26, 2025, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/public-health/articles/10.3389/fpubh.2024.1368876/full
43. Evaluating COVID-19 Booster Vaccination Strategies in a Partially Vaccinated Population: A Modeling Study - MDPI, accessed April 26, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/2076-393X/10/3/479
44. Mathematical Modeling to Inform Vaccination Strategies and Testing Approaches for Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in Nursing Homes - Oxford Academic, accessed April 26, 2025, https://academic.oup.com/cid/article/74/4/597/6292250
45. Optimal resource allocation model for COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis, accessed April 26, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/378210804_Optimal_resource_allocation_model_for_COVID-19_a_systematic_review_and_meta-analysis
46. Optimal resource allocation model for COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis, accessed April 26, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10865525/
47. Agent-based modeling for realistic reproduction of human mobility and contact behavior to evaluate test and isolation strategies in epidemic infectious disease spread - arXiv, accessed April 26, 2025, https://arxiv.org/html/2410.08050v2
48. Simulation Agent-Based Model to Demonstrate the Transmission of COVID-19 and Effectiveness of Different Public Health Strategies - Frontiers, accessed April 26, 2025, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/computer-science/articles/10.3389/fcomp.2021.642321/pdf
49. Agent-based modeling of COVID-19 outbreaks for New York state and UK: Parameter identification algorithm - PMC, accessed April 26, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8627046/
50. Full article: Agent-based modelling in active commuting research: a scoping review, accessed April 26, 2025, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09581596.2025.2483473?src=
51. Agent-Based Social Simulation of the Covid-19 Pandemic: A Systematic Review, accessed April 26, 2025,

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/352878395_Agent-Based_Social_Simulation_of_the_Covid-19_Pandemic_A_Systematic_Review
52. High-Resolution Agent-Based Modeling of COVID-19 Spreading in a Small Town - PMC, accessed April 26, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7995144/
53. Individual-based modeling of COVID-19 transmission in college communities - medRxiv, accessed April 26, 2025, https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.06.03.21258315v1.full-text
54. OpenABM-Covid19—An agent-based model for non-pharmaceutical interventions against COVID-19 including contact tracing | PLOS Computational Biology, accessed April 26, 2025, https://journals.plos.org/ploscompbiol/article?id=10.1371/journal.pcbi.1009146
55. An agent-based model of COVID-19 dynamics during enhanced community quarantine: Exploring the role of food relief system in the presence of two SARS-CoV-2 variants - Frontiers, accessed April 26, 2025, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/applied-mathematics-and-statistics/articles/10.3389/fams.2023.1068180/full
56. Lessons for Public Health Excellence from the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Perspective from New York City - NAM, accessed April 26, 2025, https://nam.edu/perspectives/lessons-for-public-health-excellence-from-the-covid-19-pandemic-a-perspective-from-new-york-city/
57. Are CDC's Priorities Restoring Public Trust and Improving the Health of the American People? | 2024 Congressional Testimony from CDC, accessed April 26, 2025, https://www.cdc.gov/washington/testimony/2024/t20240723.htm
58. Preparing for the Next Pandemic: Lessons Learned and the Path Forward | 2024 Congressional Testimony from CDC, accessed April 26, 2025, https://www.cdc.gov/washington/testimony/2024/t20241114.htm
59. Public health and social measures for health emergencies and pandemics in the EU/EEA: recommendations for strengthening preparedness planning, accessed April 26, 2025, https://www.quotidianosanita.it/allegati/create_pdf.php?all=1710931373.pdf
60. Unlocking the potential of data in light of early lessons from COVID-19, accessed April 26, 2025, https://www.ehfg.org/conference/programme/sessions/innovative-digital-solutions-for-comparable-data-strong-health-systems-and-good-decision-making
61. Challenges and dynamics of public health reporting and data exchange during COVID-19: insights from US hospitals - Oxford Academic, accessed April 26, 2025, https://academic.oup.com/healthaffairsscholar/article/2/1/qxad080/7512715
62. Communicating scientific uncertainty - PNAS, accessed April 26, 2025, https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.1317504111
63. Governance and Public Health Decision-Making During the COVID ..., accessed April 26, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10904583/
64. Optimizing Decision-Making Processes in Times of ... - Frontiers, accessed April 26, 2025, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/psychology/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.650525/full

65. What Can Public Health Administration Learn from the Decision-Making Processes during COVID-19? - MDPI, accessed April 26, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/1660-4601/21/1/4
66. Ethical considerations during the COVID-19 pandemic, accessed April 26, 2025, https://www.ccjm.org/content/early/2020/06/01/ccjm.87a.ccc038
67. Ethical considerations in responding to the COVID-19 pandemic ..., accessed April 26, 2025, https://www.nuffieldbioethics.org/publication/ethical-considerations-in-responding-to-the-covid-19-pandemic/
68. Ethical Framework for Decision Making in HPC During the COVID-19 Pandemic - NHPCO, accessed April 26, 2025, https://www.nhpco.org/wp-content/uploads/COVID-19-Ethical-Framework-Decision-Making.pdf
69. Lessons Learned from Cross-Systems Approach to COVID-19 Pandemic Response in Juvenile Justice System, Colorado, USA - CDC stacks, accessed April 26, 2025, https://stacks.cdc.gov/view/cdc/152939/cdc_152939_DS1.pdf
70. COVID-19: Ethics Considerations & Resources, accessed April 26, 2025, https://vtethicsnetwork.org/medical-ethics/covid-19-resources
71. ECDC assessment of public health workforce capacity in prevention and control of infectious diseases in the EU/EEA - European Union, accessed April 26, 2025, https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/ecdc-assessment-public-health-workforce-capacity-prevention-and-control
72. Healthcare Ethics During a Pandemic - PMC, accessed April 26, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7234717/
73. CDC Moving Forward Summary Report, accessed April 26, 2025, https://www.cdc.gov/about/cdc-moving-forward/index.html
74. WHO Public Health and Social Measures Initiative, accessed April 26, 2025, https://www.who.int/initiatives/who-public-health-and-social-measures-initiative
75. Public Health Lessons Learned in Responding to COVID-19 Among People Experiencing Homelessness in the United States - CDC stacks, accessed April 26, 2025, https://stacks.cdc.gov/view/cdc/117814/cdc_117814_DS1.pdf