MAH 2nd quarterly meeting 2025 – Accra, Ghana

Criteria for abstract scoring

Research Abstracts

- **4 (highest):** The research is focused on a country or countries in West Africa. The research is methodologically sound (i.e. parameter assumptions and uncertainties are explicitly stated and explained alongside results). The work was undertaken by a researcher in a West African setting, or if the lead author is based abroad, there was close collaboration with colleagues in the modelled country.
- **3:** The research is relevant to West Africa, but lacks clarity on the assumptions made and/or modelled uncertainties are not presented. The researcher is based in West Africa or if abroad, has evidence of collaboration with colleagues in the modelled country.
- **2:** The research is relevant to West Africa, but lacks clarity on the assumptions made and/or modelled uncertainties are not presented. The researcher is *not* based in West Africa and presents *no* evidence of collaboration with colleagues in the modelled country.
- **1 (lowest):** The research lacks clarity, methods and parameter assumptions are missing and no uncertainties of model estimates are presented. The research is not relevant to West Africa, measles or rubella modelling and is poorly presented or not clearly explained.

Data, modelling or methodological challenges & innovations abstracts

- **4 (highest):** The work clearly explains a data, modelling or methodological challenge within the context of West Africa measles and rubella modelling. The work discusses challenges alongside approaches or recommendations to address the challenges. The work is led by an investigator in a West African setting, if the investigator is based abroad, there is evidence of collaboration with local investigators or stakeholders.
- **3:** The works is relevant to West Africa, but the data, modelling or methodological challenge is not clearly explained. Suggestions on how to improve the challenge are lacking. The investigator is based in West Africa or if abroad, presents evidence of collaboration with colleagues in the modelled country.
- **2:** The works is relevant to West Africa, but the data, modelling or methodological challenge is not clearly explained. No suggestions are made on how to improve the challenge. The investigator is *not* based in West Africa or if abroad, presents *no* evidence of collaboration with colleagues in the modelled country.
- **1 (lowest):** The data, modelling or methodological challenge is not relevant to West Africa, measles or rubella modelling and is poorly presented or not clearly explained.

Abstracts for best practice examples of modelling collaborations

- **4 (highest):** The work clearly explains a collaboration between modellers or analysts and stakeholders to address a need within West Africa for measles and rubella modelling. The work includes details about the different phases of the collaboration, including initiation, project development and communication of results. The work was undertaken by an investigator in a West African setting, or if the head author is based abroad, there was collaboration with colleagues in the country of intervention.
- **3:** The work includes a best practice example and is relevant to West Africa, but is missing information on the different phases of the collaboration. The work was undertaken by an investigator in a West African setting, or if the head author is based abroad, there was collaboration with colleagues in the country of intervention.
- **2:** The work includes a best practice example and is relevant to West Africa, but is missing information on the different phases of the collaboration. The investigator is *not* based in West Africa or if abroad, presents *no* evidence of collaboration with colleagues in the modelled country.
- **1 (lowest):** The work does not demonstrate a collaboration between modeller(s) and stakeholder(s). The work is not relevant to West Africa, measles or rubella modelling, and is poorly presented or not clearly explained.