

# The BIRD Recommendation on the Use of Ivermectin for Covid-19



# B/RD

British  
*Ivermectin*  
Recommendation  
Development



Proceedings and conclusions of the British Ivermectin Recommendation Development meeting held on the 20<sup>th</sup> February 2021 in Bath, United Kingdom.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements .....	1
The BIRD Ethos .....	3
Executive summary.....	4
  Evidence-to-decision framework .....	8
A. The priority questions .....	8
B. Assessment of the evidence .....	11
1) Effects .....	11
2) Resources .....	27
3) Equity .....	31
4) Acceptability .....	34
5) Feasibility .....	36
C. Conclusions .....	40
D. Evidence Profile .....	44
E. References .....	49
Annex 1. Forest plots .....	56
Annex 2. Real world evidence .....	66
Annex 3. Ivermectin prophylaxis and treatment protocols in use .....	73
Annex 4. Outline of the British ivermectin recommendation development (BIRD) process .....	75
Annex 5. Ivermectin for prevention and treatment of covid-19: Systematic review methodology .....	78
Annex 6. British ivermectin recommendation development participants .....	86
Annex 7. Declaration of interests of participants.....	93
Annex 8. Summary of BIRD recommendation development panel judgements ....	96
Annex 9: Ivermectin API suppliers.....	102
Annex 10. Endorsement of the british ivermectin recommendation* .....	104

## Acknowledgements

This British Ivermectin Recommendation Development (BIRD) panel recommendation is the product of a collaborative philanthropic effort, involving an international group of health professionals, covid-19 patients and members of the public, for the greater good of humanity. The Evidence-based Medicine Consultancy Ltd, Bath, United Kingdom, which co-ordinated the effort, gratefully acknowledges the contributions that many individuals have made to this recommendation.

Mr. Andrew Bryant, Dr. Ketan Gajjar, Dr. Tess Lawrie, Dr. Scott Mitchell, Dr. Claire Mock-Muñoz de Luna, Dr. Tina Peers, Dr. Tony Tham were the members of the BIRD Steering Group that managed the recommendation development process.

The members of the BIRD Recommendation Development Panel included Prof. Jose Luis Abreu Quinter (Mexico), Dr. Gustavo Aguirre-Chang (Peru), Prof. Olufemi Babalola (Nigeria), Prof. Ira Bernstein (Canada), Mr. Mark Bradley (UK), Dr. Tau Braun (USA), Prof. Hector Eduardo Carvallo (Argentina), Dr. David Chesler (USA), Ms. Emma-May Chitty (UK), Dr. Christine Clark (UK), Mr. Ian Clayton (UK), Mr. Roger Felber (UK), Mr. Kenneth Finlayson (UK), Dr. Edmund Fordham (UK), Dr. Yasmin George (UK), Dr. Marie Gerval (UK), Dr. Martin Gill (South Africa), Mrs. Jane Green (UK), Dr. Rebecca Hall (UK), Mrs. Sally Harrison (UK), Dr. Jennifer Hibberd (Canada), Dr. Vicky Hildreth (UK), Dr. Shaun Hiu (UK), Prof. Justus Hofmeyr (South Africa/Botswana), Dr. Wendy Hoy (Australia), Dr. Christopher Hughes (UK), Ms. Juliet Johnson (UK), Dr. Rosemond Jones (UK), Dr. Denise Kelly (Ireland), Prof. Pierre Kory (USA), Dr. Allan Landrito (The Phillipines), Dr. Michael McConville (Ireland), Dr. Abbi Lulsegg (UK), Dr. Shashikanth Manikappa (Australia), Mr. Gavin McKinley (UK), Mr. Gez Medinger (UK), Dr. Eunice Minford (UK), Prof. Biswa Mohan Padhy (India), Mr. Antoine Guérin de Montgareuil (France), Dr. Arabella Onslow (UK), Ms. Jessica Peers (UK), Ms. Agnes Pinnel (Hungary), Ms. Linda Rae (UK), Prof. Linda Rapson (Canada), Dr. Jill Rasmussen (UK), Ms. Margarita Reygan (UK), Dr. Jon Rogers (UK), Mr. Jon Spiteri (UK), Mr. Chris Street (UK), Emeritus Prof. Geoffrey Taylor (Australia), Dr. Robert Taylor (UK), Ms. Seema Taylor (UK), Prof. Hannah Vowles (UK), Dr. Deborah Waller (UK), Dr. Marc Wathelet (Belgium), Dr. Robert Watkins (UK), Prof. Morimasa Yagisawa (Japan), Mr. David Rose

(UK), and Dr. Michael Yeadon (UK). Emeritus Prof. Jim Neilson served as Chair of the BIRD Recommendation Development Panel.

We would also like to thank the Technical Working Group including Mr. Andrew Bryant, Mr. Juan Chamie, Dr. Therese Dowswell, Dr. Edmund Fordham, Dr. Tess Lawrie, Mr. Mark Lawrie, Dr. Claire Mock-Muñoz de Luna, and Miss Isabella Rushforth. Grading of the evidence was performed by Mr. Andrew Bryant and Dr. Therese Dowswell. Dr. Sarah Hill provided the evidence on resources and cost-effectiveness. Dr. Edmund Fordham provided the Annex on ivermectin protocols in use. Dr. Tess Lawrie drafted the evidence to decision framework and the final recommendation document with input from the BIRD Steering Group and the Technical Working Group.

No funding was received for this work.

## The BIRD Ethos

**The ethos of the BIRD process is that of scientific rigour and transparency in the spirit of international collaboration towards a common goal – that of saving lives.**

*“Research is essential in the context of public health emergencies. The primary purpose of such research is to advance public health, prevent illness and save lives. Every researcher that engages in generation of information related to a public health emergency or acute public health event with the potential to progress to an emergency has the fundamental moral obligation to share preliminary results once they are adequately quality controlled for release. The onus is on the researcher, and the funder supporting the work, to disseminate information through pre-publication mechanisms, unless publication can occur immediately using post-publication peer review processes.”*

**World Health Organization statement on ‘Global norms for sharing data and results during public health emergencies’, after the Ebola emergency (2015)**

## Executive summary

### Introduction

A global health emergency that causes significant mortality and morbidity with serious economic and societal consequences is of the highest priority. Global deaths from covid-19 have reached 2.4 million. No specific treatments are recommended for routine use in all covid-19 infections, and while the population of developed countries will eventually be given the choice of having a vaccine, this choice may not be afforded to people in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) for a long time.

The antiparasitic medicine ivermectin, which is widely available in LMICs, has been tested in numerous clinical trials of prevention and treatment of covid-19 with promising results. A large body of evidence on ivermectin use in covid-19 had thus accumulated, which required urgent review by health professionals and other stakeholders to determine whether it could inform clinical practice in the UK and elsewhere. More specifically, answers were needed to the following priority questions: (i) For people with covid-19 infection, does ivermectin compared with placebo or no ivermectin improve health outcomes?, and (ii) for people at higher risk of covid-19 infection, does ivermectin compared with placebo or no ivermectin improve health outcomes?

On the 20<sup>th</sup> of February 2021, the British Ivermectin Recommendation Development (BIRD) meeting was convened in Bath, United Kingdom, to evaluate the evidence on ivermectin use for the prevention and treatment of covid-19. Evidence to address the priority questions was evaluated by a panel of clinical experts and other stakeholders in the form of a DECIDE evidence-to-decision framework, the gold standard tool for developing clinical practice guidelines.

### Target audience

The recommendation in this document are aimed at informing national- and local-level health policies and clinical protocols on covid-19 prevention and treatment. As such, the target audience includes national and local policymakers, health care professionals, implementers, patients and the public.

## Recommendation development methods

This recommendation on ivermectin for covid-19 was developed using the standard procedures for guideline development as described in the *World Health Organization Handbook for Guideline Development* (2014). Briefly, these procedures include: (i) Identification of priority questions and outcomes; (ii) Evidence retrieval and synthesis; (iii) Assessment of the evidence; (iv) Formulation of the recommendation; and (v) Planning for implementation, dissemination, impact evaluation and updating. The Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) approach for quantitative evidence was applied, to ensure the quality of the scientific evidence that forms the basis of the recommendation. An up-to-date systematic review and meta-analysis were conducted to prepare the evidence underpinning each of the priority questions.

The BIRD panel of international experts and stakeholders convened to review and make judgements on the evidence and other relevant considerations for each of the following criteria: intervention effects, values, resources, equity, acceptability, and feasibility. The intervention effect criterion refers to the benefits and harms associated with ivermectin for covid-19. The values criterion refers to the importance that those affected by covid-19 assign to the outcomes associated with ivermectin. The resources criterion refers to the resource implications (costs and cost-effectiveness) of ivermectin implementation. The equity criterion considers the health equity implications associated with ivermectin. How acceptable ivermectin would be to relevant stakeholders, including health care workers and patients, and how feasible it would be to implement were also judged by the panel.

Using an electronic survey link, the panel made judgements on these different decision-making criteria which were recorded in a summary table. The summary of the panel judgements then informed the formulation of the draft recommendation, which was guided by the BIRD Steering Group. Possible recommendations included:

- A recommendation in favour of the use of ivermectin for covid-19
- A recommendation not in favour of the use of ivermectin for covid-19
- A recommendation in favour of the use of ivermectin in certain contexts, such as a research context or specific populations or settings.

For the purpose of transparency, the meeting was recorded and live-streamed. The public was invited to participate through a survey link on a streaming channel. With this online survey they were able to make judgements on the evidence as part of a public participation and involvement initiative (PPI).

## The BIRD recommendation

*The British Ivermectin Recommendation Development panel recommends ivermectin for the prevention and treatment of covid-19 to reduce morbidity and mortality associated with covid-19 infection and to prevent covid-19 infection among those at higher risk.*

To ensure that the recommendation is understood and applied in practice, the contributing experts provided additional remarks where necessary. Whilst the panel agreed that ivermectin should be immediately rolled out, they suggested that further randomized trials of ivermectin for covid-19 within individual country settings would be of value to investigate optimal dosage (dose, duration) and combination treatments according to covid-19 severity and risk factors. The overwhelming majority of the panel agreed that placebo control trials are unlikely to be ethical unless conducted among individuals who are uncertain whether or not to use ivermectin. The panel noted that Ivermectin for human use is given orally. Prevention and treatment protocols can be derived from the clinical trials and numerous protocols already developed by expert clinicians in the field. Many of the expert protocols for the treatment and prevention of covid-19 also include vitamin D3, vitamin C and zinc. The panel also suggested that the public would benefit from general advice on how to keep healthy and to boost immunity.

## Implementation considerations

The BIRD panel also considered how to implement the recommendation. They agreed that policymakers will need to address with urgency the authorization, manufacture/import, and distribution of ivermectin to guarantee supply. The panel also indicated the need to raise awareness among frontline workers and the public about the benefits of ivermectin.

Additional considerations by the panel included the postal distribution of covid-19 home kits that include ivermectin and possibly also nutritional supplements, such as zinc and vitamins, to reduce the pressure on health services. For pregnant and lactating women, the panel noted some uncertainty with regard to the safety of ivermectin and suggested that pregnant and lactating women should be encouraged to consult their health care practitioners before using ivermectin. This caution also applies to parents and carers, as ivermectin may not be suitable for young children under five. Finally, for prophylaxis during foreign travel, the panel considered that pre-travel advisory clinics could control the dispensing of the medication depending on individual risk factors and covid-19 prevalence in the area of travel.

### Dissemination of the recommendation

The Steering Group undertook to communicate and disseminate the recommendation to policy makers, decision makers, regulatory bodies, and implementers as soon as possible in the interest of expediting implementation. These bodies include the World Health Organization, the United States National Institutes of Health, Public Health England, among others.

**GRADE**  **DECIDE** Evidence-to-decision framework

## A. The priority questions

1. For people with covid-19 infection, does ivermectin compared with placebo or no ivermectin improve health outcomes?
2. For people at higher risk of covid-19 infection, does ivermectin compared with placebo or no ivermectin improve health outcomes?

### Priority of the problem:

A global health emergency that causes significant mortality and morbidity with serious economic and societal consequences is of the highest priority. Global deaths from covid-19 have reached 2.4 million. No specific treatments are recommended for routine use in all covid-19 infections.

**Perspective:** Clinical practice recommendation – population perspective

**Population:** For question 1: People with covid-19 infection

For question 2: People without infection at higher risk of contracting covid-19

**Intervention:** Ivermectin administered orally for prevention or treatment of covid-19 infection

**Comparison:** Placebo or no ivermectin (with or without co-interventions)

**Setting:** Low-, middle- and high-income countries

### Main outcomes:

Comparison 1: Ivermectin treatment versus control

- **Death (primary outcome)**
- Admission to ICU
- Mechanical ventilation
- Recovery time to negative PCR, in days
- Clinical recovery time, in days

- Length of hospital stay, in days
- Improvement
- Deterioration
- Admission to hospital (for outpatient treatment)
- Duration of mechanical ventilation
- Serious adverse events

#### Comparison 2: Ivermectin prevention versus control

- **Covid-19 infection (primary outcome)**
- Death due to any cause
- Serious adverse events

### Background

In countries across the globe, hospitalisations and deaths from covid-19 have increased rapidly over recent months with total deaths now exceeding 2.4 million people (1). These figures may be underestimates of the true burden of this disease as in many settings tests are not readily available. In the UK alone, 'deaths involving covid-19' have exceeded 120,000 (2).

To date, very few treatments have been identified which have been demonstrated to reduce the burden of morbidity and mortality from covid-19. While corticosteroids are used in those with severe illness and have been shown to reduce mortality (3), there has been little evidence on interventions that may prevent disease, reduce hospitalisations and reduce the numbers of people progressing to critical disease and death.

Ivermectin is an anti-parasitic medication widely used in low- and middle-income countries to treat parasitic infections in adults and children (4,5). Having been used for decades for this purpose, it is considered safe and effective (5,6) and has an increasing list of indications due to its antiviral and anti-inflammatory properties (6). It is included in the World Health Organization's *Model List of Essential Medicines* (7).

The dominant mechanism of action of ivermectin as an anti-viral agent against a wide class of RNA viruses (8) is believed to be the blocking of the nuclear import of viral

proteins (9). If imported into the host nucleus, these proteins play a key role in viral replication by suppressing the normal immune response to infection. Ivermectin has also been shown to have a variety of anti-inflammatory effects (10).

Ivermectin's utility has expanded considerably over the last decade and since April 2020 a large and growing database of observational and randomised studies of ivermectin use against covid-19 has been accumulating. A recent review by the Front Line Covid-19 Critical Care Alliance (FLCCC) summarised findings from 27 randomised controlled trials (RCTs) and observational studies on ivermectin for prevention and treatment of covid-19 infection. Their conclusion was that ivermectin “demonstrates a strong signal of therapeutic efficacy”; the FLCCC has therefore recommended the global adoption of ivermectin use against covid-19 (11). Another review commissioned by WHO has reported that ivermectin reduces deaths by 75% but that more evidence is needed (12).

New trials on ivermectin have reported data since these reviews; therefore, an up-to-date systematic review and meta-analysis has been conducted using Cochrane systematic review methodology (13). This systematic review was more comprehensive and interpreted findings in light of risk of bias in individual trials and the certainty of the evidence for each of the outcomes in the review. This Evidence to Decision (EtD) framework presents this latest evidence from this review on the effectiveness and safety of ivermectin for preventing and treating covid-19, as well as other considerations related to the use of ivermectin, including people's values and preferences, equity implications, resources, acceptability and feasibility considerations.

The evidence on the effects of ivermectin in this EtD framework is based on evidence from a systematic review that included RCTs, which offer the highest level of evidence in a review (14). The use of evidence in the form of systematic reviews is now considered to be an international standard for guideline development (15). Guidelines are systematically developed recommendations to assist practitioner and patient decisions about treatments for clinical conditions. Many guideline developers, such as the WHO and NICE, recommend the use of these research syntheses to underpin guideline recommendations (16, 17). Guideline development in response to a health and social care emergency requires an acceleration of the process while maintaining transparency of decision-making and reporting. This is one of [the core principles](#) underpinning the development of all NICE guidance and standards. It

ensures that users can make judgements on the credibility and applicability of the guideline recommendations (17). Full inclusion criteria and details of methodology of the systematic review that underpins this evidence to decision framework is given in Annex 5.

## **B. Assessment of the evidence**

### **1) EFFECTS**

The evidence on health effects is derived from a systematic review and meta-analysis that originally included 18 RCTs (15 RCTs and 3 quasi-RCTs)(13). This is a rapidly evolving research field and, since the original review, 3 additional studies have reported results, bringing the total number of studies contributing data to updated analyses as at 18 February 2021 to 21 (18 RCTs and 3 quasi-RCTs). The review was conducted using Cochrane review methodology (14). The overall risk of bias in trials was judged as low in 10 trials, moderate or unclear in 5 trials and high in 6 trials. Table 1 summarises the characteristics of these included studies.

Three trials involving 738 participants evaluated covid-19 prevention and 18 trials involving 2003 participants evaluated covid-19 treatment. No trials were conducted among people with long-covid-19. Trial size ranged from 24 to 363 participants. Among the trials of ivermectin for covid-19 treatment, most looked at mild to moderate covid-19; however, four trials included patients with severe covid-19.

Most studies were registered on clinical trial registries, appeared to be self-funded and had been undertaken by clinicians working in the field. There were no obvious conflicts of interest.

**Table 1: Characteristics of included studies**

Study ID (refs 18-38)	Country	Design	Funding	Participants	Sample size	Ivermectin dose and frequency*	Comparator	Origin of data	Overall risk of bias
<b>Covid-19 treatment studies</b>									
Ahmed 2020 (18)	Bangladesh	Double-blind	BPL(Pharma); Bangladesh, Canada, Sweden, and UK govt	Mild to moderate covid (inpatients)	72	12mg x 1 day or x 5 days (3 study arms)*	Placebo	Published in PR journal; emailed/responded with data	LOW
Babalola 2020 (19)	Nigeria	Double blind	Self-funded	Asymptomatic, mild or moderate covid (45 inpatients and 17 outpatients)	62	6 mg every 84 hrs x 2 wks (arm 1) or 12 mg every 84 hrs x 2 wks (arm 2)	Ritonavir/lopinavir	MedRxiv pre-print: emailed/responded with data. Accepted for publication.	LOW
Chaccour 2020 (20)	Spain	Double blind	Idapharma, ISGlobal and the University of Navarra	Mild covid (outpatients)	24	0.4mg/kg x 1 dose	Placebo	Published in PR journal	LOW

Chachar 2020 (21)	Pakistan	Open label	Self-funded	Mild covid (outpatients)	50	12mg at 0, 12, and 24 hours (3 doses)	SOC	Published in PR journal	MODERATE
Chowdhury 2020 (22)	Bangladesh	Quasi- RCT	None reported	Outpatients with a +ve PCR (approx. 78% symptomatic)	116	0.2mg/kg x1 dose*	HCQ 400 mg 1st day then 200mg BID x 9 days + AZM 500 mg  daily x 5 days	Research Square pre-print	HIGH
Elgazzar 2020 (23)	Egypt	Open label RCT	None reported	Mild to severe covid (inpatients)	200	0.4mg/kg daily x 4 days	HCQ 400 mg BID x 1 day then 200 mg BID x 9 days	Research Square pre-print: emailed/responded with data	MODERATE
Fonseca 2021 (24)	Brazil	Double blind	Institution- funded	Moderate to severe (inpatients)	167	14mg daily x 3 days (plus placebos x 2 additional days)	HCQ - 400mg BID on day 0 then daily x 4 days ; CQ -450mg BID day 0 then daily x 4 days	Pre-publication data/ manuscript in progress was obtained via email	LOW
Hashim 2020 (25)	Iran	Quasi- RCT	None reported	Mild to critical (inpatients)	140	0.2mg/kg x 2 days*	SOC	MedRxiv pre-print	HIGH

						Some had a 3 <sup>rd</sup> dose a week later			
Krolewiecki 2020 (26)	Argentina	Open label	None reported	Mild to moderate (inpatients)	45	0.6mg/kg/day x 5 days	Placebo	SSRN pre-print	LOW
Mahmud 2020 (27)	Bangladesh	Double blind	None reported	Mild to moderate covid (inpatients)	363	12mg x 1 dose*	Placebo + SOC	Data published on clinical trial registry and clarification obtained via email	LOW
Mohan 2021 (28)	India	Double blind	Institution funded	Mild to moderate	152	12 mg or 24 mg elixir x 1 dose	Placebo	MedRxiv pre-print Research Square pre-print	LOW
Niaee 2020 (29)	Iran	Double blind	Institution-funded	Mild to severe covid	180	0.2mg/kg x 1 and 3 other dosing options) ~ 14 mg tablet**	HCQ 200mg/kg BID or placebo (?duration)	Research Square pre-print	LOW
Okumus 2021 (30)	Turkey	Quasi-RCT	None reported	Severe covid	66	0.2mg/kg x 5 days	SOC	Pre-publication data/manuscript in progress obtained via email	HIGH

Petkov 2021 (31)	Bulgaria	Double blind	Pharma funded	Mild to moderate covid	100	0.4mg/kg x 3 days	Placebo	Pre-publication data obtained from another source	UNCLEAR
Podder 2020 (32)	Bangladesh	Open label	Self-funded	Mild to moderate (outpatients)	62	0.2mg/kg x 1 dose	SOC	Published in PR journal	HIGH
Raad 2021 (33)	Lebanon	Double blind	Self-funded	Asymptomatic outpatients	100	9 mg PO if 45kg to 64kg, 12mg PO if 65kg to 84kg and 0.15mg/kg if body weight ≥ 85 Kg	Placebo	Pre-publication data/manuscript in progress obtained via email	UNCLEAR
Ravikirti 2021 (34)	India	Double blind	Self-funded	Mild to moderate covid (inpatients)	112	12mg x 2 days + SOC	Placebo + SOC	Published in PR journal	LOW
Rezai 2021 (35)	Iran	Double blind	None reported	Mild to moderate covid (inpatients)	60	0.2mg/kg x 1 dose	SOC	Pre-publication data obtained from another source	UNCLEAR

Schwartz 2021 (36)	Israel	Double blind	None reported	Mild to moderate (outpatients)	94	IVM 0.15 to 0.3mg/kg x 3 days	Placebo	Pre-publication data obtained from another source	UNCLEAR
<b>Covid-19 prevention studies</b>									
Chala 2021 (37)	Argentina	Open label	None reported	Health care workers	234	12 mg (in drops) weekly + Iota-carrageenan 6 sprays daily x 4 wks	SOC	Pre-publication data/manuscript in progress obtained via email	HIGH
Elgazzar 2020 (23)	Egypt	Open label	Self-funded	Health care and family contacts	200	0.4mg/kg, weekly x 2 weeks	SOC	Research Square pre-print: emailed/responded with data	MODERATE
Shouman 2020 (38)	Egypt	Open label	Self-funded	Family contacts	304	2 doses (15mg – 24 mg depending on weight) on day 1 and day 3	SOC	Published in PR journal	HIGH

## Summary of review findings – Forest plots can be found in Annex 1

### A. Evidence on ivermectin use for the treatment of covid-19 infection compared with no ivermectin use

Outcome	No. of participants (studies)	Risk ratio or Mean diff (95% confidence interval)	Assumed risk without IVM	Corresponding risk with IVM	Certainty of evidence***	Number needed to treat (NNT) to prevent 1 event	Interpretation of evidence
Death due to any cause*	1892 (13)	RR 0.32 (0.14 to 0.73)	91 deaths per 1000 (all inpatients, including severe covid)*	62 fewer deaths per 1000 (from 25 fewer to 78 fewer)	Low to moderate	NNT (all severity of illness): 16 (13 to 41)	IVM may have a significant effect on reducing deaths
Admission to ICU	279 (2)	RR 1.22 (0.75 to 2.00)	Evidence on admission to ICU was very low certainty.		Very low	–	–
Need for mechanical ventilation	431 (3)	0.65 (0.14 to 3.10)	There was no clear difference between study groups for this outcome		Low	–	IVM may make little or no difference to need for mechanical ventilation

Recovery time in days (negative PCR)	375 (4)	MD -3.20 days (-5.99 to -0.40)	Evidence on relative recovery time to negative PCR (in days) is very low certainty.		Very low	–	–
Recovery time in days (clinical)	176 (2)	MD -3.98 (-10.06 to 2.10)	Evidence on relative clinical recovery time (in days) is very low certainty.		Very low	–	–
Length of hospital stay	72 (2)	MD 0.13 days (-2.04 to 2.30)	Evidence on length of hospital stay is very low certainty.		Very Low	–	–
Improvement	681 (4)	RR 1.34 (1.22 to 1.48) mild/mod  RR1.88 (1.54 to 2.30) severe	543 improved per 1000 (with mild/moderate covid)  Not calculated	185 more per 1000 (from 119 more to 260 more)  Not calculated	Low	–	IVM may lead to relatively more patients improving in a given time frame
Deterioration	1041 (5)	RR 0.26 (0.11 to 0.61)	189 per 1000 (any disease severity)	140 fewer per 1000 (from 74	Low	–	IVM may lead to fewer patients

				fewer to 169 fewer)			deteriorating in a given time frame
Admission to hospital	194 (2)	RR 0.16 (0.02 to 1.32)	Evidence on admission to hospital is very low certainty		Very low	–	–
Duration of mechanical ventilation	–	–	–		Not estimable	–	–
Severe adverse events (SAEs)	880 (8)	RR 3.23 (0.55 to 18.87)	5/547 (<1%) had an SAE in the IVM group and 0/427 (0%) in control**		Low	–	There may be little or no difference between IVM or no IVM on SAEs

**GRADE Working Group grades of evidence**

**Very low certainty:** We are very uncertain about the estimate.

**Low certainty:** Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.

**Moderate certainty:** Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate.

**High quality:** Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect.

\* Control group rate across all included studies

\*\*The five SAEs occurred in 3 trials – two patients had esophagitis (this is a known side effect of doxycycline, which was co-administered with ivermectin in this trial); one patient had hyponatraemia (this trial used high-dose ivermectin for 5 days); and two patients in a study from Turkey had serious "delirium-like behaviour", which the authors attributed to a possible genetic mutation.

\*\*\* See Section D. Evidence Profile, for grade details.

## B. Evidence on ivermectin use for preventing covid-19 infection among people at high risk compared with no ivermectin use

Outcome	No. of participants (studies)	RR (95% CI)	Assumed risk without ivermectin	Corresponding risk with ivermectin	Certainty of evidence**	Number needed to treat (NNT) to prevent 1 event	Interpretation of evidence
Covid-19 infection	738 (3)	RR 0.14 (0.09 to 0.21)	296 infections per 1000*	254 fewer infections per 1000 (234 to 269)	Low	NNT: 4 (4 to 4)	IVM may have a significant effect on reducing covid-19 infection
Severe adverse events	538 (2)	–	No severe adverse events recorded.				
<b>GRADE Working Group grades of evidence</b> <b>Very low certainty:</b> We are very uncertain about the estimate. <b>Low certainty:</b> Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate. <b>Moderate certainty:</b> Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate. <b>High quality:</b> Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect.							

\*Control group rate across all included studies

\*\* See Section D. Evidence Profile, for grade details

### SUMMARY OF EFFECTS

The evidence from meta-analyses show that ivermectin treatment may reduce the risk of death among people with covid-19 by an average of 68% (27% to 86%). Analysis also suggests that, in contexts where the death rate among hospitalized patients is high (around 9.1%), the number needed to treat (NNT) to prevent one death may be around 16 patients (95% CI 13 to 41). The evidence also suggests that it may lead to fewer patients deteriorating if they receive ivermectin compared with them not getting ivermectin. Severe adverse events were infrequent suggesting there may be little or no difference in these events with ivermectin use.

With regard to prophylaxis among those with high exposure, the evidence shows that prevention with ivermectin may reduce the risk of getting infected with covid-19 infection by an average of 86% (79% to 91%). The NNT to prevent one covid-19 infection among those with high exposure may be around 4 (95% CI 4 to 4). No severe adverse events occurred in the two studies reporting this outcome.

### DESIRABLE EFFECTS

*Judgement: How substantial are the desirable anticipated effects of ivermectin compared with no ivermectin?*

Judgement					
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Don't know	Varies	Trivial	Small	Moderate	Large

### UNDESIRABLE EFFECTS

*Judgement: How substantial are the undesirable anticipated effects of ivermectin compared with no ivermectin?*

Judgement					
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Don't know	Varies	Large	Moderate	Small	Trivial

### CERTAINTY OF THE EVIDENCE

*Judgement: What is the overall certainty of the evidence on the health outcomes associated with ivermectin?*

Judgement				
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No included studies	Very low	Low	Moderate	High

### BALANCE OF EFFECTS

*Judgement: Does the balance between desirable and undesirable effects favour ivermectin or no ivermectin?*

Judgement						
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Don't know	Varies	Favours no ivermectin	Probably favours no ivermectin	Does not favour ivermectin or no ivermectin	Probably favours ivermectin	Favours ivermectin

### Additional considerations on effects

- Findings from controlled observational studies are consistent with the RCT evidence demonstrating significant reductions in mortality and morbidity associated with covid-19 (11).<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Due to time and resource constraints, we have not expanded on these in this EtD framework.

2. Ivermectin has a well-established safety profile with billions of doses of ivermectin having been used worldwide for parasitic indications (5,6,39,40). Various WHO documents on parasitic infections refer to ivermectin's long safety record (40, 41), noting it to have a wide therapeutic window, which minimizes the risk of adverse events (41). In addition, a systematic review of adverse events associated with ivermectin use suggests that it is safe even at higher than usual doses (39). The low risk of serious adverse events is evident on the World Health Organization and Uppsala University Vigibase database for pharmacovigilance (42) (updated 1 March 2021), which shows that 16 deaths and 4673 adverse events have been reported for ivermectin since 1992. Putting this in context, 417 deaths and 5489 adverse events had been registered for remdesivir, and 1585 deaths and 177052 adverse events had been registered for covid-19 vaccines by same date with less than a year of use and far fewer doses administered.

**Data retrieved from Vigibase (01.03.2021)**

<b>Medicine<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Year reporting started</b>	<b>Deaths<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Adverse events<sup>4</sup></b>
Ivermectin	1992	16	4673
Remdesivir	2020	417	5489

<sup>2</sup> It is not possible to compare different drugs based on this information and conclude that one drug is safer than another. Vigibase reports refer to a suspected causal relationship between a drug and an event, not a confirmed relation. Spontaneous reporting is influenced by many factors and only a small percentage of the occurring adverse drug reactions are notified.

<sup>3</sup> These are unadjusted estimates, therefore do not take into account patient characteristics, indications for treatment, number of patients treated, etc.

<sup>4</sup> Vigibase is a user-friendly interface that allows us to search Vigibase® and retrieve statistical data on medicines and vaccines side effects (suspected adverse reactions) reported to the WHO Programme for International Drug Monitoring (WHO PIDM).

COVID-19 vaccines	2020	1585	177052
----------------------	------	------	--------

3. The Peruvian government approved ivermectin for use for covid-19 in May 2020 (43). After implementation, death rates in eight states reduced from between 64% to 91% over a two-month period (44). In a further analysis of Peruvian data from 24 states with early ivermectin deployment, excess deaths dropped 59% at 30 or more days and 75% at 45 or more days (44). Overall, between July 31st and November 30th 2020, deaths dropped from 646 to 50 per day. When government policy changed limiting ivermectin use, after a new president took office in November 2020, excess deaths rose from 50 on November 30th to 578 on January 31st 2021. It is possible that this might be due to better compliance with lockdowns, PPE, or other factors. (see Annex 2 for Peru graphs).
4. Uttar Pradesh, the largest state by population in India, started using ivermectin for covid-19 in early August 2020. Ivermectin kiosks were set up and treatment kits of ivermectin, doxycycline and zinc were disseminated. Deaths declined soon after and have since been extremely low for the population size (>210 million)(45). For example, no deaths due to covid-19 were reported in this state on the 9<sup>th</sup> Feb 2021. (see Annex 2 for Uttar Pradesh graphs and other regional case studies).
5. Slovakia, Honduras, Bolivia, Panama and Zimbabwe are among several countries that have incorporated the use of ivermectin into their treatment protocols (46-49).
6. Covid-19 death rates between countries where the African Programme for Onchocerciasis Control (APOC) has been implemented and those of non-APOC countries has been compared (50). Among APOC countries with a community-directed treatment with ivermectin strategy, they report a 28% lower mortality (RR= 0.72, 95% CI: 0.67-0.78) and an 8% lower rate of covid-19 infection (RR= 0.92, 95% CI: 0.91-0.93) compared with non-APOC countries. The authors suggest that substantial community use of ivermectin in APOC countries may have inadvertently had a preventive effect against covid-19.

7. A French study has reported serendipitous control of covid-19 by prophylactic treatment of residents and staff at a nursing home where the index case was hospitalised for scabies and treated with ivermectin (51). In addition, a US geriatrician has reported on his observations of treating over 200 high-risk, elderly residents at six assisted living and nursing homes (52). Early on in the pandemic, based on evidence from an in-vitro study of Ivermectin from Monash University, and his extensive experience of using ivermectin successfully to combat scabies among residents and staff, the clinician started treating residents in the facilities under his care as they tested positive for covid-19 with ivermectin (12mg on Day 1 and Day 8), a combination of vitamins (C, D3, zinc), and an antibiotic (usually doxycycline). He later started using the cocktail for prevention too, when someone in a nursing home tested positive, to prevent infection among others. At six facilities housing a total of 444 high-risk elderly residents, 223 tested positive for covid-19 and 37 died. He reports that the majority of deaths that occurred were among very old residents, those in hospice, and those with pre-existing conditions such as diabetes. No residents experienced respiratory failure or needed respirator support.
8. There is currently no specific treatment on offer for long-covid-19 patients. Emerging evidence suggests that ivermectin may be effective in ameliorating symptoms in this vulnerable group of long-term sufferers, possibly at different dose regimen than for acute covid-19 (53). In a prospective observational study from Peru, 33 long-covid sufferers who were between 4 and 12 weeks from the onset of symptoms were given ivermectin (0.2mg or 0.4mg/kg/day ) for between 2 to 4 days depending on symptom severity (53). Additional doses were also given depending on clinical improvement. Total improvement (without any symptoms) was observed in 29 out of the 33 patients after 2 daily doses and total clinical resolution of symptoms was observed among 31 patients.
9. Several prominent clinical covid-19 experts are strongly recommending ivermectin for use in prompt, early initiation therapy for covid-9 infection. (11,54-56) (See protocols table in Annex 3).

## VALUES AND PREFERENCES

*Is there important uncertainty about, or variability in, how much health professionals and the public value the health outcomes associated with ivermectin?*

Treatment outcomes included in this review and meta-analysis were derived from the core outcome set for covid-19 (COS-covid) for hospitalised patients, therefore are important outcomes from a clinician's perspective.(56) Mortality is considered a critical outcome by all, the public and patients (57), as well as healthcare professionals.

Judgement			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Important uncertainty or variability	Possibly important uncertainty or variability	Probably no important uncertainty or variability	No important uncertainty or variability

## 2) RESOURCES

*How large are the resource requirements (costs) associated with ivermectin use for covid-19?*

### Research evidence

The resources required to manage people with covid-19 in hospital are substantial; it has been estimated that between 5-10% of those with a coronavirus infection will require hospitalisation and 25% of hospitalisations require intensive care (58). A global systematic review of hospitalisations due to covid-19 identified median lengths of hospitalisation ranging from 5 to 29 days, and median stays in an ICU ranging between 5 and 19 days (59). Few published studies have explored the costs associated with covid-19 hospitalisations; however, recently published economic evaluations of treatments for covid-19 infections have reported the cost of one day in ICU to range from USD 1,128 in South Africa (60) to £4520 in the UK (61), and ventilation in a non-ICU setting in the UK has been reported to cost £1356 (61). A further economic

evaluation based on US data estimated an average hospital admission cost for moderate covid-19 infection of USD 7,207 and USD a cost of 33,247 for a severe covid-19 infection admission (62).

Effective prevention of covid-19 could yield significant reductions in hospitalisation-related resources and, if all strategies are equally effective, the one that can be delivered to the largest numbers with the lowest associated costs will be the most cost-effective option. Treatment that minimises the severity of covid-19 infection and reduces hospitalisation length of stay (in particular admission to ICU) would also have potential to reduce hospital resources substantially. As the review evidence on effects of ivermectin suggests that fewer covid-19 patients may deteriorate and that more patients are likely to improve in a given time frame this has the potential to lead to reductions in hospital resource use.

#### MAIN RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS

No studies examining the resources required for the use of ivermectin for treatment or prophylaxis of covid-19 were identified. However, in many countries (particularly LMICs) ivermectin is readily available and affordable (5,40). The direct cost of ivermectin to either individuals or healthcare purchasing bodies will vary across countries, however, a pack of 100 12mg tablets of ivermectin in 2018 was estimated at approximately \$2.90, with a unit price of 0.029 per tablet by an Expert Committee on scabies (40).

In some countries (e.g. the UK and South Africa), oral ivermectin is not currently licensed or registered for human use, therefore, there is no available data on the cost of ivermectin on which to pass judgement of the resources required for its provision. Ivermectin, is however, a generic drug and can be manufactured widely.

Resources required for the administration and monitoring of ivermectin use in hospitalised patients with covid-19 could be expected to be similar to, or less than, comparable oral treatments such as dexamethasone, which is also a generic drug that has been re-purposed to treat covid-19. Economic evaluations of dexamethasone for treating covid-19 have assumed a regimen of one-dose daily for up to 10 days (59,61). Comparatively, the studies of ivermectin reported above in Table 1 propose regimens of one-dose daily for up to five days for inpatients. The resources required for prophylactic use of ivermectin in the community would be lower again, with Table 1

recommending doses ranging from a single dose to three doses, without any associated inpatient administration or monitoring costs.

Excluding non-healthcare technology strategies for the prevention of covid-19 (such as social distancing, national lockdowns, promoting hand washing and wearing of masks etc), resources required for the prevention of covid-19 are substantial. For example, the most prominent healthcare-technology prevention strategy currently is mass vaccination. The UK National Audit Office recently reported total expected investment of £11.7 billion to “purchase and manufacture COVID-19 vaccines for the UK, deploy them in England and support global efforts to find vaccines” (63). Furthermore, purchase of sufficient supplies of vaccinations in LMICs, and even upper-middle income countries such as South Africa, will be slower than in high-income countries (64). The resources required for the use of ivermectin prophylactically would likely be lower than that of vaccination on a per-dose basis as vaccination programmes are associated with administration costs of skilled vaccinators and vaccination centres. Comparably, oral ivermectin would not be subject to these costs as the medication can be taken unsupervised in one’s own home. However, doses of ivermectin for prophylaxis would be required more frequently than vaccination, which is expected to provide protection after one or two doses (65), as ivermectin would be required at regular intervals prophylactically or following each potential exposure to a coronavirus infection.

#### RESOURCES REQUIRED

*How costly are the resources required for ivermectin compared with no ivermectin?*

Judgement						
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Don't know	Varies	Large costs	Moderate costs	Negligible costs or savings	Moderate savings	Large savings

*Judgement: What is the certainty of the evidence on costs?*

Judgement				
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No included studies	Very low	Low	Moderate	High

#### COST-EFFECTIVENESS

*How cost-effective is ivermectin compared with no ivermectin?*

There is no existing evidence of the cost-effectiveness of ivermectin for either treatment or prophylaxis of covid-19 compared to alternative courses of action. However, a systematic review of economic evaluations of antiviral treatments in pandemics and outbreaks of respiratory diseases, similar to covid-19, has shown that antiviral treatments are likely to be cost-effective either as standalone treatments or as part of a multifaceted treatment approach (66). Economic evaluations of ivermectin for treatment and prophylaxis of covid-19 are needed to examine whether it is cost-effective against alternative treatments and preventive programmes, such as vaccination.

*Judgement: How cost-effective is ivermectin compared with no ivermectin?*

Judgement						
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Don't know	Varies	Favours no ivermectin	Probably favours no ivermectin	Does not favour ivermectin or no ivermectin	Probably favours ivermectin	Favours ivermectin

### 3) EQUITY

*What would be the impact of ivermectin on equity?*

#### Research evidence

No specific research studies were identified in related to the equity implications of ivermectin for covid-19.

#### Additional considerations

1. Covid-19 is a disease that is proving to disproportionately affect disadvantaged communities, both in low- and high-income settings. Cheap and effective treatments for covid-19, therefore, have the potential to improve health equity.
2. Black and Minority Ethnic (BAME) population groups are more exposed to Covid-19 due to occupation and living conditions and are thus at higher risk than the general population for being infected and experiencing worse associated health outcomes compared with other ethnic groups (68, 69).
3. BAME groups are also accessing vaccines in lower numbers than other ethnic groups in certain countries (70). Ivermectin may more effectively reach traditionally 'hard-to-reach' groups because it is cheap, easy to distribute and administer, and has a good safety record.
4. Some countries, such as India, are awaiting further safety data on the covid-19 vaccines (71); it would therefore improve health equality to offer people in these countries a re-purposed medicine such as ivermectin that has a good chance of reducing deaths and infection rates among those at risk.
5. Disadvantaged people and those living in LMICs are likely to have lower access to covid-19 vaccinations than those living in high-income countries, as the roll-out of the vaccines is expected to take much longer in LMICs.
6. Health care and other frontline workers are great risk of covid-19 infection. The evidence shows that ivermectin may reduce their

occupational risk, thereby improving health equity for this occupationally vulnerable group.

7. The UK Office of National Statistics reports that covid-19 disproportionately affects people with disabilities – ‘in England, the risk of death involving the coronavirus (COVID-19) was 3.1 times greater for more-disabled men and 1.9 times greater for less-disabled men, compared with non-disabled men; among women, the risk of death was 3.5 times greater for more-disabled women and 2.0 times greater for less-disabled women, compared with non-disabled women’ (67).
8. Ivermectin is affordable, and can be distributed by various means, e.g. post, and self-administered. It can therefore effectively reach traditionally ‘hard-to-reach’ and vulnerable populations such as undocumented migrants, homeless, the elderly living alone or in care homes, those lacking transport to reach health facilities, and those who lack access to adequate health care for other reasons.
9. Ivermectin has for the past 30+ years has been used extensively, safely and successfully for the control and eradication of common and disabling tropical diseases affecting a majority of populations in LMICs. The mass drug administration (MDA) of ivermectin in these settings has also brought significant non-target benefits, e.g. health and socioeconomic prospects, of all communities where MDA has been carried out (72).
10. A recent review and meta-analysis of 35 studies has shown that the majority of children exhibit needle fear. Among adolescents, prevalence estimates for needle fear ranged from 20-50% and, in young adults, 20-30%. Avoidance of influenza vaccination because of needle fear occurred in 16% of adults, 27% of hospital employees, 18% of workers at long-term care facilities, and 8% of healthcare workers at hospitals (73). Having an alternative preventive measure against covid-19 will buy time and increase equity through increased access to health care for when vaccination is not widely available or not an option.
11. There are some early indications that vaccination may not be suitable for all elderly people, who are an at-risk group for poor health outcomes associated with covid-19 infection (74). Having an alternative or additional preventive measure with a known safety profile in this age group could be

welcomed by care takers and nursing home residents and could, therefore, improve health equity for this vulnerable group.

12. Recognition of the contributions made by clinician-researchers' in LMICs to covid-19 research, as well as of the people who took part in this valuable research, will help to improve research equity. The case of ivermectin may encourage high impact factor journals in high-income countries to be more receptive and supportive of clinician-researchers in LMICs (for example, by providing assistance with medical writing and paper submission) and may reduce publication bias against research originating from LMICs.
13. Health care waiting lists for people suffering from non-covid-19 health issues are increasing exponentially and in England, for example, it is estimated that numbers could reach 10 million by April 2021, which represents 185 of the population (76). Any intervention that will reduce waiting times and facilitate increased access to hospital treatment will improve equity.

*Judgement: What would be the impact of ivermectin on equity?*

Judgement						
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Don't know	Varies	Reduced	Probably reduced	Probably no impact	Probably increased	Increased

#### 4) ACCEPTABILITY

*Would ivermectin be acceptable to health professionals, patients, families and other stakeholders?*

##### Research evidence

No specific research studies were identified on the acceptability of ivermectin for covid-19.

##### Additional considerations

1. Several of the previous additional consideration bullet points of this document indicate that this would be an acceptable intervention, such as its widespread use in many countries for parasitic indications, its growing use for covid-19, its potential to reduce the health, social and economic impact of covid-19 and lockdowns and its long safety record.
2. Ivermectin is already on the WHO Essential Medicine List (7) and has a long track record of clinical safety (40,41). This is supported by the adverse events registrations on the Vigibase database (42) described above, and findings of a recent systematic review of adverse events confirming that ivermectin is safe, even at higher than usual doses (39). As it has been used for covid-19 in several countries and states for some months, any increase in deaths would have been demonstrated on the Vigibase database by now, as has been shown with Remdesivir and covid-19 vaccines. This further suggests that ivermectin would be acceptable.
3. The evidence shows that ivermectin may reduce covid-19 deaths, as well as the severity of illness, therefore, it is likely to be very acceptable to people with any stage of covid-19 infection.
4. For prevention of at-risk people, such as health workers and family contacts, a weekly dose of 12 mg (one tab) for a 60 kg adult has been used. This is a similar dose to treating scabies (40), which suggests that people would find this acceptable.
5. Logic suggests that any intervention that reduces the demand for hospital beds would be very acceptable to policymakers and health care workers.

6. Similarly, logic suggests that any intervention that reduces the risk of getting covid-19 infection without serious side effects would be acceptable to most stakeholders.
7. Logic also suggests that individuals suffering with long-covid would be interested in trying a re-purposed, widely used and inexpensive medicine such as ivermectin, with its long safety record, when there is nothing else on offer, if there is the remotest chance that it may ameliorate symptoms.
8. Finally, Emergency Use Authorisation (EUA) has been acceptable for covid-19 vaccines and other novel treatments. The Emergency use authorisation for covid-19 vaccines is based on “the totality of scientific evidence available that the product may be effective to prevent covid-19 during the covid-19 pandemic and that the known and potential benefits outweigh the known and potential risks.” The terminology “may prevent” is consistent with low certainty evidence. In addition, the options that have already been given EUA, such as covid-19 vaccines and remdesivir, have less safety data than ivermectin – therefore an EUA for ivermectin is likely to be at least as acceptable to stakeholders as these options.

*Judgement: Would ivermectin be acceptable to health professionals, patients, families and other stakeholders?*

#### Judgement

☐

Don't know

☐

Varies

☐

No

☐

Probably No

☐

Probably Yes

☒

Yes

## 5) FEASIBILITY

*Would ivermectin be feasible to implement?*

### Research evidence

No specific research studies were identified on the feasibility of ivermectin for covid-19.

### Additional considerations

1. The drug has proven record on safety in human use, with the total doses distributed in the last 30 years apparently equalling one-third of the present world population (5).
2. From the demand side, if ivermectin is free and available, it is extremely feasible in all countries. As it is a relatively inexpensive medicine, many people, particularly in higher income countries, may even be prepared to pay for ivermectin themselves.
3. However, on the supply side there may be several considerations to take into account, such as changes in regulatory norms and policies (e.g. tariffs, labelling, imports, government oversight, etc.), how sustainable the production is (local or imported), and how to guarantee product availability.
4. Ivermectin is unlicensed in some countries, including the UK, and the implications of this are uncertain. However, as ivermectin is a generic medicine, there are many manufacturers worldwide. In addition, during the current emergency situation it would be expected that governments' have measures in place to expedite approval and implementation of re-purposed medicines that reduce deaths associated with covid-19.
5. For immediate supplies in those countries without a manufacturer of ivermectin, importation would be required and ways of facilitating this without delays may need additional consideration.

*Judgement: Would ivermectin be feasible to implement?*

Judgement					
Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/> Varies	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Probably No	<input type="checkbox"/> Probably Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes

### Summary of BIRD panel judgements on ivermectin\* (✓)

Desirable effects	- Don't know	- Varies		- Trivial	- Small	- Moderate	✓ Large
Undesirable effects	Don't know	- Varies		- Large	- Moderate	- Small	✓ Trivial
Certainty of the evidence on effects	- No included studies			- Very low	- Low	- Moderate	✓ High
Values				- Important uncertainty or variability	- Possibly important uncertainty or variability	- Probably no important uncertainty or variability	✓ No important uncertainty or variability
Balance of effects	- Don't know	- Varies	- Favours no ivermectin	- Probably favours no ivermectin	- Does not favour ivermectin or no ivermectin	- Probably favours ivermectin	✓ Favours Ivermectin
Resources required	- Don't know	- Varies	- Large costs	- Moderate costs	- Negligible costs or savings	- Moderate savings	✓ Large savings
Certainty of evidence of required resources	- No included studies			- Very low	- Low	- Moderate	✓ High
Cost-effectiveness	- Don't know	- Varies	- Favours no ivermectin	- Probably favours no ivermectin	- Does not favour ivermectin or no ivermectin	- Probably favours ivermectin	✓ Favours ivermectin

<b>Equity</b>	- Don't know	- Varies	- Reduced	- Probably reduced	- Probably no impact	- Probably increased	✓ Increased
<b>Acceptability</b>	- Don't know	- Varies		- No	- Probably No	- Probably Yes	✓ Yes
<b>Feasibility</b>	- Don't know	- Varies		- No	- Probably No	- Probably Yes	✓ Yes

\*Majority judgements – see Annex 7 for judgement graphs.

## C. Conclusions

### Recommendation

The British Ivermectin Recommendation Development Panel recommends ivermectin for the prevention and treatment of covid-19 to reduce morbidity and mortality associated with covid-19 infection and to prevent covid-19 infection among those at higher risk.

Judgement		
<p>We do not recommend the intervention</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>We recommend considering the intervention</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> in specific contexts</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> with targeted monitoring and evaluation</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> in the context of rigorous research</p>	<p>We recommend the intervention</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>

### Remarks

- Whilst the panel agreed that ivermectin should be immediately rolled out, they suggested that further randomized trials of ivermectin for covid-19 within individual country settings would be of value to investigate optimal dosage (dose, duration) and combination treatments according to covid-19 severity and risk factors.
- The overwhelming majority of the panel agreed that placebo control trials are unlikely to be ethical unless conducted among individuals who are uncertain whether or not to use ivermectin.
- Ivermectin for human use is given orally. Prevention and treatment protocols can be derived from the clinical trials and numerous protocols already developed by expert physicians in the field. Suggested protocols include:

- For covid-19 prevention among frontline workers: 12mg every 4 to 6 weeks. (Alam/India protocol)
- For covid-19 prevention among case contacts: 12mg on day 1 and day 3 or 4 post-exposure. (MATH+ and Shouman protocols)
- For covid-19 prophylaxis among elderly nursing home residents: 12mg on day 1 and day 8 after identification of an index case. (Chesler protocol)
- For covid-19 treatment of asymptomatic and mild covid-19 (early outpatient treatment): 0.2mg/kg (~12mg tablet for a 60kg person) on day 1 and day 2. Days 3 to 5 the same, if not recovered. (MATH+ protocol) Some protocols use 0.4mg/kg instead of 0.2mg/kg.
- No RCT evidence was found on ivermectin for the treatment of people with long-covid and it is possible that different dosing regimen may be required. Therefore, determining the appropriate dosing regimen for long-covid sufferers represents an important research gap. In the meantime, a published regimen for long covid-19 gives an ivermectin dose of 0.2mg/kg or 0.4mg/kg, depending on symptom severity, for 2 to 4 days. (Aguirre-Chang protocol)
- Many of the expert protocols for the treatment and prevention of covid-19 also include vitamin D3, vitamin C and Zinc. (refer to Annex 4)
- The public would benefit from general advice on how to keep healthy and to boost immunity, such as taking daily exercise; avoidance of alcohol and sugar; daily vitamin and mineral supplements during the pandemic (in particular, vitamin D, vitamin C and zinc); getting as much sunshine on the skin as possible; and spending time in nature.
- Courtesy of Professor Satoshi Omura and colleagues at Kitasano University, a list of international suppliers can be found in Annex 8. This list is not comprehensive.

## Implementation considerations

1. Policymakers will need to expedite ivermectin authorisation. Those countries without ivermectin manufacturers will need to look at how to establish a guaranteed supply of the medicine and how to distribute it in the most efficient way, e.g. based on prioritisation according to high risk groups or areas.
2. Media coverage and campaigns may be the most effect way to raise public awareness and to counter-act the extensive misinformation that has been disseminated about this effective and safe medicine.
3. Policymakers may wish to ensure that frontline workers are informed of the benefits of ivermectin prevention as soon as possible and, after allocating doses to hospitals for covid-19 treatment, may wish to prioritise supplies of ivermectin for this at-risk group.
4. Policymakers in some countries may wish to make ivermectin a medically dispensed medicine rather than an over the counter medicine and a registry could be kept, to accumulate country-specific evidence on its uptake, use and safety.
5. Policymakers may wish to consider providing their populations with a covid-19 home kit for each family member, consisting of a blister pack of a dose of ivermectin, plus 7 days of zinc, vitamin D3 and vitamin C for use in the event of exposure to, or contact with, a person with covid-19 infection. This should be possible at relatively low cost. Guidance on the appropriate ivermectin dose according to weight, and for children over five, could also be provided with the kit.
6. The covid-19 home kit could be delivered by post in many countries, thereby, reducing the risk of those with covid-19 infection infecting others. This would alleviate the need for people to visit a doctor for the medication and would reduce the pressure on health services.
7. Pregnant and lactating women would need to be made aware that they must consult their general practitioners if they are exposed to someone with covid-19 or if they develop symptoms, as ivermectin may not be suitable for use.
8. Parents and carers would need to be made aware that ivermectin may not be suitable for young children under five; they would need to consult their general practitioners for advice should their young child develop symptoms.

9. For prophylaxis during foreign travel, the prescribing process could be within the remit of pre-travel advisory clinics run by general practitioners. Pre-travel advisory clinics could control the dispensing of the medication depending on individual risk factors and covid-prevalence in the area of travel.

### Research gaps

1. In people with covid-19 infection, what are the optimal ivermectin dose regimens to reduce the risk of having long covid-19 and other longer-term sequelae?
2. In people with covid-19 infection, does ivermectin in combination with doxycycline or other medicines, such as hydroxychloroquine, compared with ivermectin alone lead to improved health outcomes?
3. For people with long-covid, what are the effects of different ivermectin regimen (with or without other medications) on health outcomes?
4. What is the best dose and frequency to be used for routine prophylaxis among different at-risk groups?

## D. Evidence Profile

**Author(s):** Andrew Bryant, Theresa A Lawrie, Therese Dowswell, Edmund Fordham, Sarah Hill, Scott Mitchell, Tony Tham

**Date:** 2021-02-13

**Question:** Should Ivermectin vs control be used for the treatment of covid-19 infection?

**Settings:**

**Bibliography:** Bryant A, Lawrie TA, Dowswell T, Fordham E, Hill S, Mitchell S, Tham T. Ivermectin for prevention and treatment of covid-19 infection. (updated analyses of a submitted review)

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Certainty	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Ivermectin	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Death from any cause (subgrouped by disease severity)												
13	randomised trials	serious <sup>1</sup>	serious <sup>2</sup>	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	25/989 (2.5%)	82/903 (9.1%)	RR 0.32 (0.14 to 0.73)	62 fewer per 1000 (from 25 fewer to 78 fewer)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ LOW	CRITICAL
Death (sensitivity analysis excluding Fonseca 2021)												
12	randomised trials	serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	13/937 (1.4%)	57/788 (7.2%)	RR 0.25 (0.13 to 0.48)	54 fewer per 1000 (from 38 fewer to 63 fewer)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ MODERATE	CRITICAL
Death (sensitivity analysis excluding studies at high ROB)												
11	randomised trials	serious <sup>3</sup>	serious <sup>4</sup>	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	19/894 (2.1%)	67/803 (8.3%)	RR 0.28 (0.09 to 0.88)	60 fewer per 1000 (from 10 fewer to 76 fewer)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ LOW	CRITICAL
Death (sensitivity analysis excluding studies with active controls)												

9	randomised trials	very serious <sup>5</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	7/575 (1.2%)	22/508 (4.3%)	RR 0.45 (0.21 to 0.98)	24 fewer per 1000 (from 1 fewer to 34 fewer)	⊕⊕⊕ LOW	CRITICAL
<b>Recovery time to -ve PCR test (Better indicated by lower values)</b>												
4	randomised trials	serious <sup>6</sup>	serious <sup>7</sup>	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>8</sup>	none	207	168	-	MD 3.2 lower (5.99 to 0.4 lower)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ VERY LOW	IMPORTANT
<b>Recovery time (clinical) - Outpatient treatment (Better indicated by lower values)</b>												
2	randomised trials	very serious <sup>9</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>10</sup>	none	92	84	-	MD 1.06 lower (1.63 to 0.49 lower)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ VERY LOW	IMPORTANT
<b>Recovery time (clinical) - Inpatient (mild to moderate) (Better indicated by lower values)</b>												
1	randomised trials	very serious <sup>9</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>11</sup>	none	48	48	-	MD 7.32 lower (9.25 to 5.39 lower)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ VERY LOW	IMPORTANT
<b>Recovery time (clinical) - Inpatient (severe) (Better indicated by lower values)</b>												
1	randomised trials	very serious <sup>9</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>11</sup>	none	11	22	-	MD 3.98 lower (10.06 lower to 2.1 higher)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ VERY LOW	IMPORTANT
<b>Admission to ICU</b>												
2	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias <sup>12</sup>	no serious inconsistency	serious <sup>13</sup>	serious <sup>14</sup>	none	20/107 (18.7%)	31/172 (18%)	RR 1.22 (0.75 to 2)	40 more per 1000 (from 45 fewer to 180 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ VERY LOW	CRITICAL
<b>Mechanical ventilation</b>												

3	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias <sup>12</sup>	no serious inconsistency	serious <sup>13</sup>	serious <sup>14</sup>	none	13/207 (6.3%)	29/224 (12.9%)	RR 0.65 (0.14 to 3.1)	45 fewer per 1000 (from 111 fewer to 272 more)	LOW	CRITICAL
<b>Length of hospital stay - Mild to moderate covid-19 (Better indicated by lower values)</b>												
1	randomised trials	serious <sup>3</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious <sup>15</sup>	none	45	23	-	MD 0.13 higher (2.04 lower to 2.3 higher)	VERY LOW	IMPORTANT
<b>Improvement - Mild to moderate covid-19</b>												
4	randomised trials	serious <sup>3</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	other	257/353 (72.8%)	178/328 (54.3%)	RR 1.34 (1.22 to 1.48)	185 more per 1000 (from 119 more to 260 more)	LOW	IMPORTANT
<b>Improvement - Severe covid-19</b>												
1	randomised trials	Very serious <sup>16</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	94/100 (94%)	50/100 (50%)	RR 1.88 (1.54 to 2.3)	440 more per 1000 (from 270 more to 650 more)	LOW	IMPORTANT
<b>Deterioration</b>												
5	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias <sup>12</sup>	serious <sup>17</sup>	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	27/534 (5.1%)	96/507 (18.9%)	RR 0.26 (0.11 to 0.61)	140 fewer per 1000 (from 74 fewer to 169 fewer)	LOW	IMPORTANT
<b>Admission to hospital</b>												
2	randomised trials	serious <sup>16</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious <sup>18</sup>	none	0/99 (0%)	5/95 (6%)	RR 0.16 (0.02 to 1.32)	-	VERY LOW	IMPORTANT
<b>Serious adverse events</b>												

9	randomised trials	serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>19</sup>	none	5/547 (1%)	0/427 (0%)	RR 3.23 (0.55 to 18.87)	-	LOW	CRITICAL
---	-------------------	----------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------	------	------------	------------	-------------------------	---	-----	----------

<sup>1</sup> Most of the studies contributing data had design limitations or serious design limitations

<sup>2</sup> Statistical heterogeneity (I<sup>2</sup>) = 61%. There was considerable variation in the size of treatment effect

<sup>3</sup> Most of the studies contributing data had design limitations

<sup>4</sup> High statistical heterogeneity (I<sup>2</sup> = 69%)

<sup>5</sup> Most of the data (80%) were from studies with very serious design limitations

<sup>6</sup> Studies contributing data had design limitations (approximately half had serious design limitations (49.4%))

<sup>7</sup> There was serious statistical heterogeneity (I<sup>2</sup> = 90%)

<sup>8</sup> Total sample size less than 400 participants

<sup>9</sup> Data from studies with serious design limitations

<sup>10</sup> Total sample size >200

<sup>11</sup> Data from single study with small sample size (<100)

<sup>12</sup> Not downgraded for study design. Most of the data was from a study with lower risk of bias

<sup>13</sup> The study contributing most of the weight had an active control group

<sup>14</sup> Wide 95% CI crossing the line of no effect

<sup>15</sup> Wide 95% CI crossing the line of no effect and low sample size

<sup>16</sup> Single study with design limitations

<sup>17</sup> High statistical heterogeneity (I<sup>2</sup> = 63%)

<sup>18</sup> Wide 95% CI crossing line of no effect and low event rate

<sup>19</sup> Wide 95% CI crossing line of no effect (not downgraded for low events - sample size 974 - but only 5 events)

**Author(s):** Andrew Bryant, Theresa A Lawrie, Therese Dowswell, Edmund Fordham, Sarah Hill, Scott Mitchell, Tony Tham

**Date:** 2021-02-13

**Question:** Should Ivermectin vs control be used for the prevention of covid-19 infection?

**Settings:**

**Bibliography:** Bryant A , Lawrie TA, Dowswell T, Fordham E, Hill S, Mitchell S, Tham T. Ivermectin for prevention and treatment of covid-19 infection. (updated analyses of a submitted review)

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Certainty	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Ivermectin	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
covid-19 infection												
3	randomised trials	very serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	21/420 (5%)	94/318 (29.6%)	RR 0.14 (0.09 to 0.21)	254 fewer per 1000 (from 234 fewer to 269 fewer)	⚬⚬⚬⚬ LOW	IMPORTANT
Serious adverse events												
2	randomised trials	very serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious <sup>2</sup>	none	0/320 (0%)	0/218 (0%)	not pooled	No estimable data	⚬⚬⚬⚬ VERY LOW	CRITICAL

## E. References

1. WHO (2021) WHO Coronavirus Disease (covid-19) Dashboard. [www.covid19.who.int](http://www.covid19.who.int) (downloaded 7th January 2021).
2. Office for National Statistics (2021) Coronavirus (covid-19) Latest Data and Analysis on coronavirus (covid-19) in the UK and its effect on the economy and society. [www.ons.gov.uk](http://www.ons.gov.uk) (downloaded 3rd January 2021).
3. Horby P, Lim WS, Emberson JR, et al. Dexamethasone in hospitalised patients with covid-19 - preliminary report. *NEJM*. 2020 Jul 17;NEJMoa2021436.
4. Conterno LO, Turchi MD, Corrêa I, Monteiro de Barros Almeida RA. Anthelmintic drugs for treating ascariasis. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2020, Issue 4. Art. No.: CD010599. Accessed 28 December 2020.
5. Banerjee K, Nandy M, Dalai CK, Ahmed SN. The Battle against COVID 19 Pandemic: What we Need to Know Before we "Test Fire" Ivermectin. *Drug Res (Stuttg)*. 2020 Aug;70(8):337-340.
6. Kircik, LH, Del Rosso, JQ, Layton AM, Schaubert J. Over 25 Years of Clinical Experience With Ivermectin: An Overview of Safety for an Increasing Number of Indications. *J Drugs Derm* 2016; 15:325-332.
7. World Health Organization. 21st Model List of Essential Medicines. Geneva, Switzerland. 2019. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHOMVPEMPIAU2019.06>. Accessed 29 December 2020.
8. Heidary H, Gharebaghi R. Ivermectin: a systematic review from antiviral effects to COVID-19 complementary regimen. *J. Antibiot (Tokyo)* 2020; 73, 593-602
9. Caly L, Druce L, Catton MG, Jans DA, Wagstaff KM. The FDA-approved drug ivermectin inhibits the replication of SARS-CoV-2 in vitro. *Antiviral Res*. 178, 104787.
10. DiNicolantonio JJ, Barroso J, McCarty, M. Ivermectin may be a clinically useful anti-inflammatory agent for late-stage covid-19. *Open Heart* 2020;7:e001350.
11. Kory P, Meduri GU, Iglesias J, et al. Review of the emerging evidence demonstrating the efficacy of ivermectin in the prophylaxis and treatment of covid-19. 18 Dec 2020. <https://covid19criticalcare.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/FLCCC-Ivermectin-in-the-prophylaxis-and-treatment-of-covid-19.pdf>.
12. Andrew Hill, Ahmed Abdulmir, Sabeena Ahmed, Asma Asghar, Olufemi Emmanuel Babalola, Rabia Basri, et al. Meta-analysis of randomized trials of ivermectin to treat SARS-CoV-2 infection, 19 January 2021, PREPRINT (Version 1). Research Square January 19, 2021. <https://www.researchsquare.com/article/rs-148845/v1>.
13. Bryant A, Lawrie TA, Dowswell T, Fordham E, Tham T, Hill S, Mitchell S. Ivermectin for prevention and treatment of covid-19 infection: a systematic review and meta-analysis (submitted 5-2-2021).

14. Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch VA (editors). Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 6.0 [updated July 2019]. Cochrane, 2019. Available from [www.training.cochrane.org/handbook](http://www.training.cochrane.org/handbook).
15. WHO. *Who Handbook for Guideline development*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Geneva, Switzerland: In, 2014. [https://www.who.int/publications/guidelines/handbook\\_2nd\\_ed.pdf](https://www.who.int/publications/guidelines/handbook_2nd_ed.pdf)
16. Lunny C, Ramasubbu C, Gerrish S, *et al*. Impact and use of reviews and ‘overviews of reviews’ to inform clinical practice guideline recommendations: protocol for a methods study. *BMJ Open* 2020;10e031442. Doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-031442
17. NICE. Developing NICE guidelines: the manual. Process and methods [PMG20]Published date: 31 October 2014 Last updated: 15 October 2020
18. Ahmed S, Karim MM, Ross AG, Hossain MS, Clemens JD, Sumiya MK, *et al*. A five-day course of ivermectin for the treatment of covid-19 may reduce the duration of illness. *Int. J. Infect. Disease* [Internet] 2Dec.2020. Available from: [https://www.ijidonline.com/article/S1201-9712\(20\)32506-6/fulltext](https://www.ijidonline.com/article/S1201-9712(20)32506-6/fulltext) (Accessed 29 Dec. 2020)
19. Babalola OE, Bode CO, Ajayi AA, Alakaloko FM, Akase IE, Otrofanowei E, *et al*. Ivermectin shows clinical benefits in mild to moderate covid19: A randomised controlled double blind dose response study in Lagos. *medRxiv* January 6, 2021. (Accessed January 25 2021). [DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.05.21249131>]
20. Chaccour C, Casellas A, Matteo A, Pineda I, Fernandez-Montero A, Castillo P, *et al*. The effect of early treatment with ivermectin on viralload, symptoms and humoral response in patientswith mild covid-19: a pilot, double-blind, placebo-controlled, randomized clinical trial. *Research Square* December 7 2020 (Accessed January 25 2021). [DOI: 10.21203/rs.3.rs-116547/v1]
21. Chachar AZK, Khan KA, Asif M, Tanveer K, Khaqan A and Basri R. Effectiveness of Ivermectin in SARS-CoV-2/covid-19 Patients, *Int. J. Sciences* [Internet] Nov.2020:31-35 Available from: <https://www.ijsciences.com/pub/article/2378> (Accessed 29Dec.2020)
22. Chowdhury, ATMM, Shahbaz, M, Karim, MR, Islam, J, Guo, D, and He, SA Randomized Trial of Ivermectin-Doxycycline and Hydroxychloroquine-Azithromycin therapy on covid19 patients. *Res. Square* [Internet] 14Jul.2020. Available from: <https://www.researchsquare.com/article/rs-38896/v1>. (Accessed 29 Dec.2020.)
23. Elgazzar A, Eltaweel A, Youssef SA, Hany B, Hafez M and Moussa H. Efficacy and Safety of ivermectin for Treatment and prophylaxis of covid-19 Pandemic. *Res. Square* [Internet] 28Dec.2020. Available from: <https://www.researchsquare.com/article/rs-100956/v3> (Accessed 29 Dec.2020)
24. Fonseca AJ. The effect of chloroquine, hydroxychloroquine OR ivermectin in patients with severe manifestations of coronavirus. *Registro Brasileiro de Ensaio Clinicos* 2020. [Other: <https://ensaiosclinicos.gov.br/rg/RBR-8h7q82/>]

25. Hashim HA, Maulood MF, Rasheed AM, Fatak DF, Kabah KK, Abdulami AS, et al. Controlled randomized clinical trial on using Ivermectin with Doxycycline for treating covid-19 patients in Baghdad, Iraq. medRxiv [Internet] 2020.10.26.20219345. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.26.20219345> (Accessed 29Dec.2020)
26. Krolewiecki A, Lifschitz A, Moragas M, Travacio M, Valentini R, Alonso D. Antiviral effect of high-dose ivermectin in adults with covid-19: a pilot randomised,controlled, open label, multicentre trial. ResearchGate November 2020. (Accessed January 25 2021). [Other: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/345953065\\_Antiviral\\_effect\\_of\\_high-dose\\_ivermectin\\_in\\_adults\\_with\\_COVID-19\\_a\\_pilot\\_randomised\\_controlled\\_open\\_label\\_multicentre\\_trial\\_Summary\\_Background](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/345953065_Antiviral_effect_of_high-dose_ivermectin_in_adults_with_COVID-19_a_pilot_randomised_controlled_open_label_multicentre_trial_Summary_Background)]
27. Mahmud R. Clinical Trial of Ivermectin Plus Doxycycline for the Treatment of Confirmed covid-19 Infection. ClinicalTrials.gov [Internet] 2020 Oct registration number: NCT04523831. (Accessed 20Dec.2020)
28. Mohan A. Randomised Controlled Trial of Ivermectin in hospitalised patients with covid19. Clinical Trials Registry -India <http://www.ctri.nic.in/Clinicaltrials/pmaindet2.php?trialid=44196>.
29. Niaee MS, Gheibi N, Namdar P, Allami A, Zolghadr L, Javadi A, et al. Ivermectin as an adjunct treatment for hospitalized adult covid-19 patients: A randomized multi-centre clinical trial. Res. Square [Internet] 24Nov.2020. Available from: <https://www.researchsquare.com/article/rs-109670/v1> (Accessed 29Dec.2020.)
30. Okumus N. Ivermectin for Severe covid-19 Management. <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04646109> 2020.
31. Petkov S. Multicenter, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study investigating efficacy, safety and tolerability of ivermectin HUV-19 in patients with proven SARS-CoV-2 infection (covid-19) and manifested clinical symptoms. EU Clinical Trials Register <https://www.clinicaltrialsregister.eu/ctr-search/trial/2020-002091-12/BG>.
32. Podder CS, Chowdhury N, Mohim IS and Haque W. (2020). Outcome of ivermectin treated mild to moderate covid-19 cases: a single-centre, open-label, randomised controlled study. IMC Journal of Medical Science. 14. Available from: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344240147\\_Outcome\\_of\\_ivermectin\\_treated\\_mild\\_to\\_moderate\\_covid-19\\_cases\\_a\\_single-centre\\_open-label\\_randomised\\_controlled\\_study](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344240147_Outcome_of_ivermectin_treated_mild_to_moderate_covid-19_cases_a_single-centre_open-label_randomised_controlled_study). (accessed 30Dec.2020)
33. Raad H. In vivo use of ivermectin (IVR) for treatment for corona virus infected patients (covid-19): a randomized controlled trial. Chinese Clinical Trial Registry <http://www.chictr.org.cn/showproj.aspx?proj=54707>.

34. Ravikirti et al. Ivermectin as a potential treatment for mild to moderate covid-19 – A double blind randomized placebo-controlled trial. 2021. (Preprint server)
35. Rezai M. Effectiveness of Ivermectin in the Treatment of Coronavirus Infection in Patients admitted to Educational Hospitals of Mazandaran in 2020. Iranian Registry of Clinical Trials <https://en.irct.ir/trial/49174>.
36. Schwartz E. Ivermectin vs. Placebo for the Treatment of Patients With Mild to Moderate COVID-19. <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04429711>.
37. Chala RE. NCT04701710. Prophylaxis Covid-19 in Healthcare Agents by Intensive Treatment With Ivermectin and Iota-carrageenan (Ivercar-Tuc). <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04701710>
38. Shouman W. Use of Ivermectin as a Prophylactic Option in Asymptomatic Family Close Contact for Patient with covid-19. Clinical Trials.gov [Internet] 2020 Jun registration number NCT04422561. (Accessed 29Dec.2020)
39. Navarro M, Camprubí D, Requena-Méndez A, Buonfrate D, Giorli G, Kamgno J et al. Safety of high-dose ivermectin: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy 2020;75(4):827-834. [DOI: 10.1093/jac/dkz524. PMID: 31960060]
40. World health Organization Expert Committee on the selection and use of essential medicines. Application for inclusion of ivermectin on the WHO Model List of Essential Medicines (EML) and Model List of Essential Medicines for Children (EMLc) for the indication of Scabies. World Health Organization; Geneva, Switzerland 2018;[https://www.who.int/selection\\_medicines/committees/expert/22/applications/s6.6\\_ivermectin.pdf](https://www.who.int/selection_medicines/committees/expert/22/applications/s6.6_ivermectin.pdf)((accessed 28/12/2021)). [Other: ]
41. WHO informal consultation on a framework for scabies control. Meeting report. WHO Regional Office for the Western Pacific. Manila 19021 February 2019. ISBN 978-92-4-000806-9.
42. World Health Organization and the Uppsala Monitoring Centre. VigiAccess. <http://www.vigiaccess.org> (accessed 12 February 2021).
43. Chamie J. Real-World Evidence: The Case of Peru. Causality between Ivermectin and COVID-19 Infection Fatality Rate. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344469305> 2020;Accessed 1 February 2021.
44. Chamie-Quintero J, Hibberd J, Scheim DE. covid-19 case fatalities and total deaths with and without ivermectin treatment in different states in Peru. Open Science Foundation. <https://osf.io.ydc2p/> (accessed 12/01/2021).
45. Trialsitenews. Northern Indian State of Uttar Pradesh Drops Hydroxychloroquine & Replaces with Ivermectin for COVID-19 Patients. <https://trialsitenews.com/northern-indian-state-of-uttar-pradesh-drops-hydroxychloroquine-replaces-with-ivermectin-for-covid-19-patients/>(Accessed 12/02/2021).
46. Trialsitenews. <https://trialsitenews.com/slovakia-becomes-the-first-eu-nation-to-formally-approve-ivermectin-for-both-prophylaxis-and-treatment-for-covid-19-patients/> (accessed 12 February 2021).
47. Despacho de Comunicaciones y estrategia Presidential. Honduras <https://covid19honduras.org/> article title (accessed 14/2/2021)


48. Bolivian Ministry of Health. [Ministry of health authorises the use of ivermectin to control covid-19] <https://www.minsalud.gob.bo/4157-ministerio-de-salud-autoriza-uso-de-ivermectina-contr-el-covid-19-bajo-protocolo>
49. Republic of Panama, Ministry of Social Security. 'Pharmaceutacol protocol will be applied to patients testing positive for covid-19 recovering at home.'  
[www.css.gob.pa/web/13-agosto-2020ab.html](http://www.css.gob.pa/web/13-agosto-2020ab.html) 13th August 2020 (Accessed on February 18<sup>th</sup> 2021)
50. Guerrero, R, Bravo, LE, Munoz, E, et al. COVID-19: The Ivermectin African Enigma. Colombia Medica (2020). DOI: 10.25100/cm.v51i4.4613
51. Bernigaud C, Guillemot D, Ahmed-Belkacem A, Grimaldi-Bensouda L, Lespine A, Berry F, et al. Oral ivermectin for a scabies outbreak in a long-term-care facility: Potential value in preventing COVID-19 and associated mortality? British Journal of Dermatology (in press);<https://doi.org/10.1111/bjd.19821>.
52. Chesler DL. Letter to Dr Bray at the National Institutes of Health. Personal communication.
53. Aquirre-Chang G, Castillo Saavedra E, Yui Cerna M, Trujillo Figueredo A, Cordova Masias J. Post-acute or prolonged covid-19: treatment with ivermectin for patients with persistent or post-acute symptoms. Researchgate. English translation. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344318845>.
54. McCullough PA, Alexander PE, Armstrong R, Arvinte C, Bain AF, Bartlett RP, et al. Multifaceted highly targeted sequential multidrug treatment of early ambulatory high-risk SARS-CoV-2 infection (COVID-19). Reviews in Cardiovascular Medicine 2020; 21(4):517-530.
55. Frontline Covid-19 Critical Care Alliance. MATH+ Protocol. <https://covid19criticalcare.com/math-hospital-treatment/pdf-translations/> (accessed 16-02-2021).
56. COMET. The meta-COS for research in covid-19 hospitalised patients. [https://www.comet-initiative.org/assets/downloads/covid-19%20meta%20COS\\_Table%201\\_29th%20October%202020.pdf](https://www.comet-initiative.org/assets/downloads/covid-19%20meta%20COS_Table%201_29th%20October%202020.pdf) (accessed 12/01/2021)
57. Harvey D, Kueper M. Improving patient experience during covid-19 pandemic: one family's reflections. J. Hosp. Med. 2020 December;15(12):760-762.
58. Salzberger B, Buder F, Lampl B, et al. Epidemiology of SARS-CoV-2. Infection (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s15010-020-01531-3>.
59. Rees EM, et al (2020) covid-19 length of hospital stay: a systematic review and data synthesis. BMC Medicine (2020) 18:270 pp1-22, <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-020-01726-3>.

60. Jo Y, Jamieson L, Edeka I, Log L, Silal S, Pulliam JRC, Moultrie H, et al. Cost-effectiveness of remdesivir and dexamethasone for COVID-19 treatment in South Africa. 2020. medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.24.20200196>.
61. Águas R, Mahdi A, Shretta R, Horby P, Landray M, White L, the CoMo Consortium. Analysis: The potential health and economic impact of dexamethasone treatment for patients with COVID-19. medRxiv 2020.07.29.20164269; doi:<https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.29.20164269>
62. Congly SE, Varughese RA, Brown EC, Clement FM, Saxinger L. Treatment of moderate to severe respiratory COVID-19--A cost-utility analysis. medRxiv 2020.09.21.20199182; doi:<https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.21.20199182>
63. National Audit Office. The Comptroller and the Auditor General. Investigation into preparations for potential COVID-19 vaccines. HC 1071, Session 2019-2021. 16 December 2020. <https://www.nao.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/Investigation-into-preparations-for-potential-COVID-19-vaccines.pdf>
64. Dyer Owen. Covid-19: Countries are learning what others paid for vaccines BMJ 2021; 372 :n281
65. Iacobucci G, Mahase E. Covid-19 vaccination: What's the evidence for extending the dosing interval? BMJ 2021; 372 :n18.
66. Dawoud DM, Soliman KY. Cost-Effectiveness of Antiviral Treatments for Pandemics and Outbreaks of Respiratory Illnesses, Including COVID-19: A Systematic Review of Published Economic Evaluations. Value Health. 2020;23(11):1409-1422. doi:10.1016/j.jval.2020.07.002
67. Ons.gov.uk. 2021. *Updated estimates of coronavirus (COVID-19) related deaths by disability status, England - Office for National Statistics*. [online] Available at: <<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/deaths/articles/coronaviruscovid19relateddeathsbydisabilitystatusenglandandwales/24januaryto20november2020>> [Accessed 18 February 2021].
68. Public Health England. Beyond the data: Understanding the impact of covid-19 on BAME groups. Public Health England(Accessed January 26 2021). [Other: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/892376/COVID\\_stakeholder\\_engagement\\_synthesis\\_beyond\\_the\\_data.pdf?fbclid=IwAR0w2j456Fg7z3EjoLDe131AAOiJVmDd9TKzfd8xhWzspYitP4oJKDWNRpk](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/892376/COVID_stakeholder_engagement_synthesis_beyond_the_data.pdf?fbclid=IwAR0w2j456Fg7z3EjoLDe131AAOiJVmDd9TKzfd8xhWzspYitP4oJKDWNRpk)]
69. Webb Hooper M, Nápoles AM, Pérez-Stable EJ. COVID-19 and Racial/Ethnic Disparities. JAMA.2020;323(24):2466–2467. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.8598 (Accessed 17 February 2021)
70. Royal Society for Public Health. New poll finds BAME groups less likely to want covid vaccine. 16 December 2020. <https://www.rsph.org.uk/about-us/news/new-poll->

- finds-bame-groups-less-likely-to-want-covid-vaccine.html (Accessed 17 February 2021)
71. Trialsitenews. Pfizer bails out of India after country demands safety testing for covid vaccine. 10 February 2021. <https://www.lifesitenews.com/news/pfizer-bails-out-of-india-after-country-demands-safety-testing-for-covid-vaccine/> (accessed 14 February 2021).
  72. Ōmura S, Crump A. Ivermectin and malaria control. *Malar J* 2017. 16; 172.
  73. Molyneux DH. Combating the “other diseases” of MDG 6: changing the paradigm to achieve equity and poverty reduction? *Transactions of The Royal Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene* 2008; 102(6):509–519.
  74. McLenon J, Rogers MAM. The fear of needles: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Adv Nurs*. 2019 Jan;75(1):30-42. doi: 10.1111/jan.13818. Epub 2018 Sep 11. PMID: 30109720.
  75. <https://committees.parliament.uk/publications/3965/documents/39887/default/> (accessed 12/01/2021)
  76. Review Manager 5 (RevMan 5) [Computer program]. Version 5.4. Copenhagen: Nordic Cochrane Centre, The Cochrane Collaboration, 2020.
  77. Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ* 2003;327(7414):557-60.
  78. The GRADE Working Group. GRADE [website] 2020 [Available from: [www.gradeworkinggroup.org](http://www.gradeworkinggroup.org)].

## ANNEX 1. FOREST PLOTS


### Forest plot: Death due to any cause (main analysis)



#### Footnotes

- (1) IVM 12mg x 5 days (24 pts) or IVM 12 mg + doxy x 5 days (24 pts)
- (2) IVM 6mg-12mg every 84 hrs for 2 wks; vs lopinavir/ritonavir
- (3) IVM 0.4mg/kg single dose
- (4) IVM up to 24 mg daily for 4 days vs HCQ
- (5) IVM 0.2mg/kg x 2-3 days + Doxy 100 mg BID x 10 days
- (6) IVM 6mg once + Doxy 100 mg x 5 days
- (7) IVM 12mg or 24 mg single dose
- (8) IVM 0.4mg/kg x 3 days
- (9) IVM 12 mg x 2 days
- (10) IVM 0.2mg/kg single dose
- (11) IVM up to 24 mg daily for 4 days vs HCQ
- (12) IVM 14 mg x 3 days vs HCQ x 5 days or CQ x 5 days
- (13) IVM 0.2mg/kg x 2-3 days + Doxy 100 mg BID x 10 days
- (14) IVM 0.2mg/kg x 5 days (both arms received HCQ, favipiravir, azithromycin)
- (15) IVM 0.2mg/kg to 400 µg/kg (1 to 3 doses) vs HCQ


### Forest plot: Death due to any cause (excluding Fonseca)




#### Footnotes

- (1) IVM 12mg x 5 days (24 pts) or IVM 12 mg + doxy x 5 days (24 pts)
- (2) IVM 6mg-12mg every 84 hrs for 2 wks; vs lopinavir/ritonavir
- (3) IVM 0.4mg/kg single dose
- (4) IVM up to 24 mg daily for 4 days vs HCQ
- (5) IVM 0.2mg/kg x 2-3 days + Doxy 100 mg BID x 10 days
- (6) IVM 6mg once + Doxy 100 mg x 5 days
- (7) IVM 12mg or 24 mg single dose
- (8) IVM 0.4mg/kg x 3 days
- (9) IVM 12 mg x 2 days
- (10) IVM 0.2mg/kg single dose
- (11) IVM up to 24 mg daily for 4 days vs HCQ
- (12) IVM 0.2mg/kg x 2-3 days + Doxy 100 mg BID x 10 days
- (13) IVM 0.2mg/kg x 5 days (both arms received HCQ, favipiravir, azithromycin)
- (14) IVM 0.2mg/kg to 400 µgm/kg (1 to 3 doses) vs HCQ

Forest plot: Death due to any cause (excluding high ROB trials)




Forest plot: Death due to any cause (excluding trials with active controls)



**Footnotes**

- (1) IVM 12mg x 5 days (24 pts) or IVM 12 mg + doxy x 5 days (24 pts)
- (2) IVM 0.4mg/kg single dose
- (3) IVM 0.2mg/kg x 2-3 days + Doxy 100 mg BID x 10 days
- (4) IVM 6mg once + Doxy 100 mg x 5 days
- (5) IVM 12mg or 24 mg single dose
- (6) IVM 0.4mg/kg x 3 days
- (7) IVM 12 mg x 2 days
- (8) IVM 0.2mg/kg single dose
- (9) IVM 0.2mg/kg x 2-3 days + Doxy 100 mg BID x 10 days
- (10) IVM 0.2mg/kg x 5 days (both arms received HCQ, favipiravir, azithromycin)


### Forest plot: Admission to ICU



#### Footnotes

- (1) IVM 14 mg x 3 days vs HCQ x 5 days or CQ x 5 days  
(2) IVM 12 mg x 2 days; data for "invasive ventilation"


### Forest plot: Need for mechanical ventilation



#### Footnotes

- (1) IVM 14 mg x 3 days vs HCQ x 5 days or CQ x 5 days  
(2) IVM 12mg or 24mg  
(3) IVM 12 mg x 2 days; data for "invasive ventilation"


### Forest plot: Recovery time to -ve PCR



#### Footnotes

- (1) IVM 12 mg daily x 5 days
- (2) IVM 12mg + doxy 200 mg stat then 100 mg BD x 4 days
- (3) IVM 6mg-12mg every 84 hrs for 2 wks; vs lopinavir/ritonavir
- (4) IVM 200 mcg/kg single dose + doxy 100 mg x 10 days vs HCQ and azithromycin
- (5) IVM 0.2mg/kg x 2 + Doxy 100 mg BID x 10 days
- (6) IVM 0.2mg/kg x 2 + Doxy 100 mg BID x 10 days

### Forest plot: Recovery time (clinical)




Test for subgroup differences:  $\chi^2 = 37.70$ ,  $df = 2$  ( $P < 0.00001$ ),  $I^2 = 94.7\%$

#### Footnotes

- (1) IVM 200 mcg/kg single dose + doxy 100 mg x 10 days vs HCQ and azithromycin
- (2) IVM 200 mcg/kg single dose
- (3) IVM 200mcg/kg x 2 + Doxy 100 mg BID x 10 days


## Forest plot: Improvement



### Footnotes

- (1) IVM 12mg daily x 5 days
- (2) IVM 12mg s+ doxy 200mg stat then 100 mg BD x 4 days
- (3) IVM 12 mg at 0, 12, and 24 hours
- (4) IVM 6mg once + Doxy 100 mg x 5 days
- (5) IVM up to 24 mg daily for 4 days. Control group received hydroxychloroquine
- (6) IVM up to 24 mg daily for 4 days. Control group received hydroxychloroquine


## Forest plot: Deterioration



### Footnotes

- (1) IVM 0.4mg/kg single dose
- (2) IVM up to 24 mg daily for 4 days. Control group received hydroxychloroquine
- (3) IVM 200µg/kg + Doxy 100 mg BID x 10 days
- (4) IVM 6mg once + Doxy 100 mg x 5 days
- (5) IVM 12mg or 24mg

### Forest plot: Length of hospital stay




Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable

#### Footnotes

(1) IVM 12 mg daily x 5 days

(2) IVM 12mg + doxy 200 mg stat then 100 mg BD x 4 days

### Forest plot: Admission to hospital




#### Footnotes

(1) IVM 0.2mg/kg single dose

(2) IVM 12 or 15mg x 3days


## Forest plot. Severe adverse events



### Footnotes

- (1) IVM 0.4mg/kg single dose
- (2) IVM 12mg or 24mg
- (3) IVM 12 mg x 5 days
- (4) IVM 6mg-12mg every 84 hrs for 2 wks
- (5) IVM 0.6mg/kg x 5 days
- (6) 0.4mg/kg x 3 days
- (7) IVM 12 or 15mg x 3 days
- (8) IVM 12mg + doxy x 5 days
- (9) IVM 6mg once + Doxy 100 mg x 5 days
- (10) IVM 0.2mg/kg x 5 days (both arms received HCQ, favipiravir, azithromycin)


### Forest plot. covid-19 infection



#### Footnotes

- (1) IVM 12 mg weekly + Iota-Carrageenan 6 sprays/day
- (2) IVM up to 24mg weekly depending on weight x 2 doses
- (3) IVM up to 24 mg depending on weight, given in 2 doses 72 hours apart

### Forest plot. Severe adverse events (prophylaxis)




#### Footnotes

- (1) 12 mg (drops) and Iota-carrageena 6 sprays daily
- (2) IVM up to 24 mg depending on weight, given in 2 doses 72 hours apart

## ANNEX 2. REAL WORLD EVIDENCE

### Fortaleza (Brazil)


A. All-cause deaths




B. COVID-19 Incidence



C. COVID-19 Fatalities



D. Community mobility



May 5 2020. Pharmacies reported increases in IVM demand.


<https://www.vitamedic.ind.br/2020/05/05/ivermectina/>

May 15 2020. Regional Health care institution included IVM in the treatment protocol.


<https://www.focus.ior.br/covid-19-unimed-fortaleza-adota-protocolo-para-uso-da-cloroquina-no-tratamento-de-pacientes/>

## Belém (Brazil)


A. All-cause deaths




B. COVID-19 Incidence



C. COVID-19 Fatalities



D. Community mobility



May 3 2020. Pharmacies increased process and reported increases in IVM demand.

<https://www.oliberal.com/belem/remedios-contr-a-covid-19-tem-acesso-dificil-e-variacao-de-precos-1.263563>

May 12 2020. Regional Health care institution included IVM in the treatment protocol.


<https://revistaforum.com.br/coronavirus/unimed-belem-monta-drive-thru-de-cloroquina/>

## Macapá (Brazil)


A. All-cause deaths




B. COVID-19 Incidence



C. COVID-19 Fatalities



D. Community mobility



May 14 2020. Regional Government included IVM in the treatment protocol.


<https://bambamnoticias.com.br/prefeitura-de-macap-a-flagra-pacientes-com-muitas-receitas-nas-farmacias-das-ubss>

## Chiapas (México)


A. All-cause deaths




B. COVID-19 Incidence



C. COVID-19 Fatalities



D. Community mobility



Jun 17 2020. MDs prescribe IVM as a COVID treatment

<https://aquinoticias.mx/kit-covid-19-tiene-coste-aproximado-de-600-pesos-pero-esta-agotado/>

Jul 2 2020. Local Government started campaign detecting patients and early treating with IVM


<https://www.sie7edechiapas.com/post/repartir%C3%A1n-10-mil-kits-con-ivermectina-para-combatir-covid-19-en-tuxtla>

## Tlaxcala (México)


A. All-cause deaths




B. COVID-19 Incidence



C. COVID-19 Fatalities



D. Community mobility




July 7 2020 Local government embraced IVM as their official COVID treatment

<https://gentetlx.com.mx/2020/07/07/tlaxcala-pionero-en-la-utilizacion-de-medicamento-efectivo-contr-el-covid-19/>

## Loreto (Peru)


A. All-cause deaths




B. COVID-19 Incidence



C. COVID-19 Fatalities



D. Community mobility




IVM treatments started in late April


Source: Sharp reductions in COVID-19 case fatalities and excess deaths in Peru in close time conjunction, state-by-state, with ivermectin treatments

## Ucayali (Peru)


A. All-cause deaths




B. COVID-19 Incidence



C. COVID-19 Fatalities



D. Community mobility



IVM treatments started in early May

Source: Sharp reductions in COVID-19 case fatalities and excess deaths in Peru in close time conjunction, state-by-state, with ivermectin treatments

## Cusco (Perú)


A. All-cause deaths




B. COVID-19 Incidence



C. COVID-19 Fatalities



D. Community mobility




IVM treatments started in early mid August


Source: Sharp reductions in COVID-19 case fatalities and excess deaths in Peru in close time conjunction, state-by-state, with ivermectin treatments

## Uttar Pradesh (India)


A. COVID-19 Fatalities



B. COVID-19 Incidence



C. Community Mobility



Aug 8, 2020. Uttar Pradesh embraces IVM as their treatment protocol


<https://www.indiatvnews.com/fyi/ivermectin-new-drug-to-treat-covid-19-coronavirus-to-be-used-in-uttar-pradesh-640473>

Aug 22, 2020. The government assure IVM supply after a temporary shortage.


<https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/city/lucknow/ivermectin-back-in-stores-but-could-cost-rs-2-rs-90-per-tablet/articleshow/77684406.cms>

## Karnataka (India)


A. COVID-19 Fatalities



B. COVID-19 Incidence



C. Community Mobility



Sep 19, 2020. Doctors in Karnataka embraces IVM

<https://www.newindianexpress.com/states/karnataka/2020/sep/19/hcq-no-longer-a-magic-pill-doctors-move-to-new-drugs-2198937.html>

Sep 20, 2020. Regional Health Authority

[https://www.business-standard.com/article/news-ani/health-ministry-plans-to-introduce-mass-drug-administration-programme-in-yadgir-district-karnataka-119092000834\\_1.html](https://www.business-standard.com/article/news-ani/health-ministry-plans-to-introduce-mass-drug-administration-programme-in-yadgir-district-karnataka-119092000834_1.html)

### Sources:

Peru:

Data SINADEF – MINSA, <https://cloud.minsa.gob.pe/s/NctBnHXDnocgWAg/download>

Centro Nacional de Epidemiología, prevención y Control de Enfermedades – MINSA

<https://www.datosabiertos.gob.pe/group/datos-abiertos-de-covid-19>

Brazil:

Portal de Transparência do Registro Civil, <https://transparencia.registrocivil.org.br>

Marcelo Oliveira: <https://github.com/capyvara>

Painel de casos de doença pelo coronavírus 2019 (COVID-19) no Brasil pelo Ministério da Saúde

<https://covid.saude.gov.br/>

México:

Datos Abiertos Dirección General de Epidemiología <https://www.gob.mx/salud/documentos/datos-abiertos-152127>

Bases de datos del boletín estadístico sobre el exceso de mortalidad en México

<https://www.datos.gob.mx/busca/dataset/bases-de-datos-del-boletin-estadistico-sobre-el-exceso-de-mortalidad-en-mexico>

India:

COVID-19 India Org Data Operations Group

<https://api.covid19india.org/>

Google mobility:

<https://www.google.com/covid19/mobility/>

### ANNEX 3. IVERMECTIN PROPHYLAXIS AND TREATMENT PROTOCOLS IN USE

Source	Prophylaxis (PrEP and PEP) healthcare workers (PrEP); contacts of confirmed cases (PEP)		Early outpatient treatment and /or “mild” case treatment	
	<i>ivermectin</i>	<i>adjuncts</i>	<i>ivermectin</i>	<i>adjuncts</i>
<b>Marik et al.</b> “I-MASK” & “MATH+” protocols EVMS	<b>Day 1: 200 µg/kg</b> <b>Day 3: 200 µg/kg</b>  (PEP: per exposure) (PrEP: <b>200 µg/kg</b> fortnightly)	Vit D3: ≤ 3000 IU qd Vit C: 1 g bid Zn: 50 mg qd Quercetin: 250 mg qd Melatonin: 6 mg qhs	<b>Day 1: 200 µg/kg</b> <b>Day 2: 200 µg/kg</b> <b>Days 3 -5: same</b> (if not recovered)	Vit D3: 4000 IU qd Vit C: 2 g bid or tds Zn: 100 mg qd Quercetin: 250 mg bid Melatonin: 10 mg qhs Aspirin: 325 mg qd
<b>Borody</b> CDD	<b>Day 1: 12 mg</b>  (PrEP: Fortnightly)	Doxycycline: 100 mg qd (4 days) Zn: unspecified	<b>Day 1: 12 mg</b> <b>Day 4: 12 mg</b> <b>Day 8: 12 mg</b>	Doxycycline: 100 mg qd (10 days) Zn: unspecified
<b>McCullough et al.</b>  Baylor U., Dallas	No prophylaxis recommendations		<b>200-600 µg/kg</b> <b>Days 1, 3, 5</b> or: qd 2-5 Days Plus: hydroxychloroquine or: favipiravir (dual antiviral policy)	Doxycycline: 100 mg bid or:  Azithromycin 250 mg bid Vit D3: 5000 IU qd Vit C: 3 g qd Zn: 50 mg qd Quercetin: 500 mg bid
<b>Chesler</b> Nursing Homes, Virginia	<b>Day 1: 12 mg</b> <b>Day 8: 12 mg</b>	Doxycycline: 100 mg qd (10 days) Vit D3: unspecified Vit C: unspecified Zn: unspecified	<b>Day 1: 12 mg</b> <b>Day 8: 12 mg</b>	Doxycycline: 100 mg qd (10 days) Vit D3: unspecified Vit C: unspecified Zn: unspecified Dexamethasone: prn Enoxaparin: prn
<b>Fareed</b> Brawley Medical Center California	<b>Day 1: 200 µg/kg</b> <b>Day 3: 200 µg/kg</b>	Vit D3: 4000 IU qd Zn: 25 mg qd	<b>Day 1: 200 µg/kg</b> <b>Day 3: 200 µg/kg</b>	Doxycycline: 100 mg qd (5 days)

	Weekly: <b>50 µg/kg</b> or: Monthly: <b>200 µg/kg</b>  (PrEP and PEP)	Vit C: unspecified Multivitamins: unspecified Quercetin: unspecified	<b>Day 5: 200 µg/kg</b>	Vit D3: 4000 IU qd Zn: 25 mg qd Vit C: unspecified Multivitamins: unspecified Quercetin: unspecified
<i>Source</i>	<i>Prophylaxis (PrEP and PEP)</i> <i>healthcare workers (PrEP); contacts of confirmed cases (PEP)</i> <b>ivermectin</b> <i>adjuncts</i>		<i>Early outpatient treatment</i> <i>and/or "mild" case treatment</i> <b>ivermectin</b> <i>adjuncts</i>	
<b>Shouman</b>  Zagazig U, Egypt	<b>Day 1: 15 mg, 18 mg, 24 mg</b> <b>Day 4: same</b>  15mg: 40-60 kg BW 18 mg: 60-80 kg BW 24 mg: > 80 kg	Hygiene measures	Not a treatment trial	
<b>Chala et al.</b> Tucuman, Argentina	<b>Day 1: 12 mg oral solution</b> <b>repeat weekly</b> PrEP of healthcare workers	Iota-carageenan topical spray (daily)	Not a treatment trial	
<b>Carvallo et al.</b>  Buenos Aires, Argentina	<b>Day 1: 12 mg tablet</b> <b>repeat weekly</b> PrEP of healthcare workers	Iota-carageenan topical spray (daily)	Not a treatment trial	
<b>Elgazzar et al.</b>  U. Benha, Egypt	<b>Day 1: 400 µg/kg</b> <b>repeat weekly</b>  PrEP health care workers; PEP contacts conf. cases	Hygiene measures	<b>Day 1: 400 µg/kg</b> <b>Days 2, 3, 4: same</b>	Azithromycin 500 mg qd (6 days) Vit C: 1 g qd Zn: 50 mg qd Lactoferrin: 100 mg bid Acetylcysteine: 200 mg tds
<b>Alam</b> Bangladesh Medical College Hospital	<b>Day 1: 12 mg</b> <b>repeat monthly</b> PrEP healthcare workers	None specified	Not a treatment trial	
<b>Behera et al.</b>  All India Institute of Medical Sciences	<b>Day 1: 300 µg/kg</b> <b>Day 4: 300 µg/kg</b> <b>Repeat monthly</b>  PrEP healthcare workers	None specified	Not a treatment trial	

## ANNEX 4. OUTLINE OF THE BRITISH IVERMECTIN RECOMMENDATION DEVELOPMENT (BIRD) PROCESS

### INTRODUCTION

A large body of evidence had accumulated on a drug called ivermectin for the prevention and treatment of covid-19 that required urgent review by health professionals and other stakeholders to determine whether it could inform clinical practice in the UK and elsewhere.

### TARGET AUDIENCE

National and local policymakers, health care professionals, implementers, patients and the public.

### RECOMMENDATION DEVELOPMENT METHODS

The recommendation on ivermectin for covid-19 was developed using the standard procedures for guideline development as described in the *World Health Organization Handbook for Guideline Development*. Briefly, these procedures include:

1. Identification of priority questions and outcomes;
2. Evidence retrieval and synthesis;
3. Assessment of the evidence;
4. Formulation of the recommendations; and
5. Planning for implementation, dissemination, impact evaluation and updating.

### GROUPS INVOLVED IN THE PROCESS

#### 1. The Steering Group

The role of the BIRD Steering Group was to co-ordinate the BIRD meeting, draft the recommendation for the stakeholder panel to review, assist in preparation of the finalized recommendations document, and manage its publication and dissemination. The members of the BIRD Steering Group are listed below (in alphabetical order):

Mr. Andrew Bryant (Statistician, Faculty of Medical Sciences, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne)  
Dr. Ketan Gajjar (Consultant Gynae-Oncologist, Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Nottingham City Hospital, Nottingham)

Dr. Tess Lawrie (Director of the Evidence-based Medicine Consultancy Ltd, Bath)

Dr. Claire Mock-Muñoz de Luna (Public Health Researcher, Evidence-based Medicine Consultancy Ltd, Bath)

Dr. Tina Peers (Consultant in Contraception and Reproductive Healthcare, Surrey)

Dr. Tony Tham (Consultant Gastroenterology, Ulster Hospital, Belfast)

## 2. The Recommendation Development Panel (RDP)

This international panel comprised invited health care professionals as well as patient and public representatives. All attendees were required to submit a declaration of interest before the meeting.

## 3. Technical Working Group (TWG)

The Technical Working Group comprised systematic reviewers and guidelines methodologists from the independent Evidence-Based Medicine Consultancy Ltd, Bath, and the University of Newcastle, Newcastle upon Tyne. The TWG also included a health economist and a data analyst, who produced real-world evidence graphs.

### CONDUCT OF THE MEETING

For the purpose of transparency, the meeting was recorded and live-streamed. The public were invited to participate through a survey link on the streaming channel. With this online survey they were able to make judgements on the evidence – these data will be analysed and included in the final recommendation document.

The meeting was chaired by Professor Jim Neilson, Emeritus Professor of Obstetrics and Gynaecology at the University of Liverpool. Dr. Tess Lawrie presented the evidence and other relevant considerations on ivermectin for covid-19 infection in the form of a DECIDE evidence to decision (EtD) framework. The panel considered evidence and other relevant considerations for each of the following criteria:

- **Effects:** What are the benefits and harms associated with ivermectin for covid-19?
- **Values:** What importance do those affected assign to the outcomes associated with ivermectin?
- **Resources:** What are the resource implications of ivermectin implementation?
- **Equity:** What are the equity implications associated with ivermectin for covid-19?
- **Acceptability:** Will ivermectin be acceptable to key stakeholders, e.g. patients, their families and health care professionals?
- **Feasibility:** Will ivermectin be feasible to implement in terms of resource availability, infrastructure and training?

Using an electronic survey link, the panel made judgements on these different decision-making criteria, which were recorded in a summary table. Twelve judgements were made during the course of the BIRD proceedings. Statistician, Mr. Andrew Bryant presented a summary of the panel judgements. This summary informed the formulation of the draft recommendation.

### FORMULATING THE RECOMMENDATION

Any of the following recommendations could have been made:

- A recommendation in favour of the use of ivermectin for covid-19
- A recommendation not in favour of the use of ivermectin for covid-19

- A recommendation in favour of the use of ivermectin in certain contexts, such as a research context or specific populations or settings.

After the recommendation was made, a 30-minute panel discussion followed during which implementation and research gaps were considered.

#### DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (DOI)

In line with the *WHO handbook for guideline development*, all those invited were asked to declare in writing any competing interests (academic, financial or other) they may have at the time of the invitation to participate in the BIRD meeting. They were asked to sign a DOI form and return it prior to the meeting for review by the Steering Group. If an individual was considered to have a substantial conflict of interest, for example, research grants or other financial interests from private industry, the Steering Group reserved the right to withdraw the invitation. No invitations were withdrawn.

#### DOCUMENT PREPARATION, REVIEW AND DISSEMINATION

Following the BIRD meeting, the Steering Group prepared a draft of the recommendation/s document with revisions to accurately reflect the deliberations and decisions of the panel. The draft recommendation document was sent electronically to the panel members for approval and suggestions. The document was also sent to 12 external health professionals to review. The revised final version of the document has been made freely available to all stakeholders. The Steering Group undertook to communicate and disseminate the recommendation as soon as possible in the interest of expediting implementation.

## **ANNEX 5. IVERMECTIN FOR PREVENTION AND TREATMENT OF COVID-19: SYSTEMATIC REVIEW**

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### **Objectives**

To assess the effectiveness of ivermectin treatment among people with covid-19 infection (to address priority question 1) and as a prophylaxis among people at higher risk of covid-19 infection (to address priority question 2).

Safety will also be assessed in included randomised controlled trials (RCTs). However, since it is one of the World Health Organisation's *Essential Medicines* ([WHO 2019](#)) and is considered safe for use in humans ([Banerjee 2020](#); [Navarro 2020](#); [WHO 2018](#)), no assessment will be made beyond included RCTs.

#### **Methods**

##### **CRITERIA FOR CONSIDERING STUDIES FOR THIS REVIEW**

##### **TYPES OF STUDIES**

Prespecified eligibility criteria is as follows:

##### **Study design**

- Randomised controlled trials (RCTs)
- Quasi-RCTs
- Cluster-RCTs

##### **Minimum study duration**

Any time frame.

##### **TYPES OF PARTICIPANTS**

- For research question 1: People with mild, moderate, severe or critical covid-19 infection.
- For research question 2: People at higher risk of covid-19 infection, such as frontline workers and covid-19 contacts.

Special populations of interest are healthcare and other frontline workers, the elderly, and those with pre-existing health conditions.

## TYPES OF INTERVENTIONS

### Intervention

- Oral ivermectin, administered as a minimum single dose of 6 mg.
  - Studies assessing ivermectin in combination with doxycycline or other medicines or supplements will be included.
  - Studies comparing different formulations, doses, and schedules of ivermectin will also be included.

### Comparator(s)

- No ivermectin
  - placebo, or
  - another active treatment

## TYPES OF OUTCOME MEASURES

### PRIMARY OUTCOMES

For Question 1: Ivermectin treatment vs control/comparator:

- Death from any cause

For Question 2: Ivermectin prophylaxis vs control:

- covid-19 infection

### SECONDARY OUTCOMES

For Question 1: Ivermectin treatment vs control/comparator:

- Time to PCR negativity, in days
- Time to clinical recovery, in days
- Admission to ICU
- Requiring mechanical ventilation
- Length of hospital stay, in days
- Admission to hospital
- Duration of mechanical ventilation
- Serious adverse events
- Improvement, as measured by investigators

- Deterioration, as measured by investigators

For Question 2: Ivermectin prophylaxis vs control:

- Admission to hospital
- Death from any cause
- Serious adverse events

Studies will be included in the review irrespective of whether they measured outcome data that are reported in a way that allows us to include them in meta-analysis. We will also include studies that are otherwise eligible but may not necessarily report on the review's outcomes; these studies will be summarised in [Characteristics of included studies](#) tables. This will be done in case we miss any outcomes that are pertinent as new outcomes of importance may emerge given the changing nature of the pandemic. We will note any such analyses as post hoc and interpret accordingly.

We will also produce a brief economic commentary (BEC) to summarise the available economic evidence relating to: 1) ivermectin as treatment and 2) ivermectin as prophylaxis for covid-19 infection.

## SEARCH METHODS FOR IDENTIFICATION OF STUDIES

### ELECTRONIC SEARCHES

An information specialist, (JP) designed all of the searches and will conduct them. These were informed and verified by a content expert (TL) and were independently peer reviewed by (ANS). The Medline search strategy is presented in [Appendix 1](#). The search strategies in other electronic databases will be adapted accordingly. The following electronic databases will be searched:

- Medline from 1946 (for completeness but nothing should appear until 2019 in theory)
- Embase from 1980
- CENTRAL (latest issue)
- Cochrane covid-19 Study Register
- Chinese databases

We will perform a supplementary search to identify economic evaluation studies. The search will be conducted in Medline and Embase and limited to published studies from November 2019 to capture studies conducted since the initial outbreak of SARS-CoV-2. The search strategies that will be used to identify economic evidence can be viewed in [Appendix 2](#). Following current guidance ([Aluko 2020](#)), the reference lists of the studies included in the main review will also be examined for any relevant economic data.

### SEARCHING OTHER RESOURCES

We will search [www.controlled-trials.com/rct](http://www.controlled-trials.com/rct), [www.clinicaltrials.gov](http://www.clinicaltrials.gov) and [www.cancer.gov/clinicaltrials](http://www.cancer.gov/clinicaltrials) for ongoing trials.

We will search the reference list of included studies, and of two other 2021 literature reviews that we are aware of on ivermectin ([Kory 2021](#); [Hill 2021](#)). We have made initial contacts to experts in the field (Drs. Andrew Hill, Pierre Kory and Paul Marik) for information on new and emerging trial data but will follow these contacts up during the review process. This is a rapidly expanding evidence base so the number of trials are increasing quickly; as such, we will check for updates on ongoing trials regularly and perform hand searches as necessary.

## DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

### SELECTION OF STUDIES

#### Screening

All titles and abstracts retrieved by electronic searching will be downloaded to Endnote and duplicates will be removed. Two review authors (AB, TL, TD) with expertise in systematic reviewing will screen all titles and abstracts for eligibility. Full texts will also be reviewed by two reviewers (AB, TL, TD). Discrepancies will be resolved by consensus. Reasons for exclusion will be recorded for all studies excluded after full text review.

#### Inclusion of non-English language studies

Where possible, we will translate any reports of RCTs published in other languages than English.

### DATA EXTRACTION AND MANAGEMENT

We will abstract data using a pilot form which will be trialled by two reviewers (TL, TD, AB or GG) to record the following:

- Study design (including methods, location, sites, funding, study author declaration of interests, inclusion/exclusion criteria)
- Setting: hospital inpatient, outpatient
- Participant characteristics: disease severity, age, gender, co-morbidities, smoking, occupational risk
- Intervention characteristics: dose and frequency of ivermectin
- Comparator characteristics: dose and frequency of comparator
- Risk of bias items (see below)
- Length of follow-up
- Outcomes (as above) including numbers in each arm, definitions, unit of measurements, etc.

Data on outcomes will be extracted as below:

- For dichotomous outcomes (i.e. death from any cause, SAEs, etc), we will extract the number of participants in each treatment arm and the number of participants assessed at endpoint, in order to estimate a risk ratio.
- For continuous outcomes (i.e. length of hospital stay), we will extract the final value and standard deviation of the outcome of interest and the number of participants assessed at endpoint in each treatment arm at the end of follow-up, in order to estimate the mean difference between treatment arms and its standard error.

If possible, we will extract data relevant to an intention-to-treat analysis, in which participants are analysed in groups to which they are assigned.

We will use Microsoft Excel to collate the data. If there is a conflict between data reported across multiple sources for a single study (e.g. between a published article and a trial registry record), we will email the authors for clarification. Differences between reviewers will be resolved by discussion.

#### ASSESSMENT OF RISK OF BIAS IN INCLUDED STUDIES

An assessment of risk of bias in each included RCT will be conducted by two reviewers (TL, TD, AB or GG) using the Cochrane risk of bias tool ([Higgins 2019](#)). Discrepancies will be resolved by discussion and, if necessary, involving a third reviewer. The risk of bias includes assessment of:

- sequence generation
- allocation concealment
- blinding (Assessment of blinding will be relevant to participants, health care personnel and outcome assessors)
- incomplete outcome data: We will record the proportion of participants whose outcomes were not reported at the end of the trial and will note whether loss to follow-up is not reported. We will code a satisfactory level of loss to follow-up for each outcome as:
  - Yes, if fewer than 20% of participants are lost to follow-up and reasons for loss to follow-up are similar in both treatment arms
  - No, if more than 20% of patients are lost to follow-up or reasons for loss to follow-up is different between treatment arms
  - Unclear if loss to follow-up is not reported
- selective reporting of outcomes
- other possible sources of bias

We will pay close scrutiny to unpublished reports and those of unpublished works and preprints that have not undergone formal peer review. If we can retrieve adequate information we will reach consensus in

either making an appropriate risk of bias judgement in each domain for that trial or exclude is sufficient doubt as to whether it is truly an RCT.

Results will be presented in both a risk of bias graph and a risk of bias summary. Results of meta-analyses will be interpreted in light of the findings with respect to risk of bias.

## MEASURES OF TREATMENT EFFECT

We will use the following measures of the effect of treatment:

- For dichotomous outcomes (e.g. death from any cause, SAEs), we will use the risk ratio
- For continuous outcomes, we will use the mean difference (MD) or standardised mean difference (SMD) as appropriate. Continuous outcome data for length of hospital stay and time to recovery will be standardised to the same unit of measurement (i.e. days) so the need to use SMD is unlikely.

## UNIT OF ANALYSIS ISSUES

We will consider interventions that comprised multiple doses of ivermectin as a single intervention and subgroup when necessary. None of our outcomes should be time-dependent (e.g. measured at a particular time point since these are relatively short term outcomes given nature of the virus and intention of the interventions).

We will also include cluster randomised controlled trials (cluster-RCTs). If the analysis accounts for the cluster design then a direct estimate of the desired treatment effect will be extracted e.g. RR plus 95% CI. If the analysis does not account for the cluster design, we will extract the number of clusters randomised to each intervention, the average cluster size in each intervention group and the outcome data, ignoring the cluster design, for all participants in each group. We will then use an external estimate of the intracluster coefficient (ICC) to estimate a design effect to inflate the variance of the effect estimate ([Higgins 2019](#)). It will then enter the data into RevMan 5.4 and combine the cluster randomised trials with individually randomised trials in the same meta-analysis.

## DEALING WITH MISSING DATA

We will not impute missing data for any of the outcomes.

## Contacting study authors

Authors of trials will be contacted for missing outcome data and for clarification on study methods, if possible, and for trial status for ongoing trials. We are aware that many studies will be in preprint form or not in peer review journals yet, so we will request full and transparent information on trial conduct including risk of bias confirmation as well as details on participants populations, interventions and

outcomes if necessary. We will follow Cochrane guidelines and recommendations on the need to include these data from unpublished studies to attempt to reduce publication bias and selective reporting of outcomes ([Higgins 2019](#)).

#### ASSESSMENT OF HETEROGENEITY

We will assess heterogeneity between studies by visual inspection of forest plots, by estimation of the  $I^2$  statistic ( $I^2 \geq 60\%$  was considered substantial heterogeneity) ([Higgins 2003](#)), by a formal statistical test to indicate statistically significant heterogeneity ([Deeks 2001](#)) and, if possible, by subgroup analyses (see below). If there is evidence of substantial heterogeneity, the possible reasons for this will be investigated and reported.

#### ASSESSMENT OF REPORTING BIASES

Funnel plots corresponding to meta-analysis of the primary outcome will be examined to assess the potential for small study effects if more than 10 trials are included in the analysis. If there is evidence of small-study effects, publication bias will be considered as only one of a number of possible explanations. If these plots suggest that treatment effects may not be sampled from a symmetric distribution, as assumed by the random effects model, sensitivity analyses will be performed using fixed effects models ([Higgins 2019](#)).

#### DATA SYNTHESIS

If sufficient clinically similar trials are available, we will pool their results in meta-analyses. We will use forest plots to display the results of the data syntheses.

- For dichotomous outcomes, the risk ratios will be pooled.
- For continuous outcomes, the MD or standardised mean difference (if appropriate) will be pooled

Trials with multiple treatment groups are discussed above, but in the unlikely event the 'shared' comparison group was divided into the number of treatment groups and comparisons made between each treatment group, the split comparison group were treated as independent comparisons.

We will meta-analyse data using the random effects model ([DerSimonian 1986](#)). Results will use Mantel-Haentzel method for weighting.

Where interventions differed to any degree or there was other substantial heterogeneity the results were reported in a narrative.

## SUBGROUP ANALYSIS AND INVESTIGATION OF HETEROGENEITY

Where possible, we will perform subgroup analyses grouping trials by:

- Disease severity, namely mild, moderate, severe and any disease
- Inpatients vs outpatients
- Single dose vs multiple doses

## SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS

We will perform sensitivity analysis by excluding trials which do not confirm adequate methods of randomisation for treatment assignment and allocation concealment. We will also perform sensitivity analysis for other aspects that may put a trial at high risk of bias and trials creating unexplained heterogeneity as outlined above in [Assessment of heterogeneity](#) and trials identified in subgroup analysis.

## GRADE AND SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

All outcomes will be assessed independently by two review authors (TD and AB) using the GRADE approach ([Schünemann 2019](#); [GRADE 2020](#)), which ranks the quality of the evidence. Results will be presented in a summary of findings table for treatment and prophylaxis outcomes ([Appendix 4](#)). Any differences will be resolved by discussion with the wider group. We will use Cochrane Effective Practice and Organisation of Care guidance to interpret the evidence ([EPOC 2015](#)).

## BRIEF ECONOMIC COMMENTARY

We will develop a brief economic commentary (BEC) based on current methods guidance ([Aluko 2020](#)). The (BEC) will summarise the availability and core findings of full economic evaluations (cost-utility analyses, cost-effectiveness analyses and cost-benefit analyses) of ivermectin compared to alternatives regimens for 1) treatment and 2) prophylaxis of SARS-CoV-2. Findings from studies conducted in all settings globally will be considered.

## ANNEX 6. BRITISH IVERMECTIN RECOMMENDATION DEVELOPMENT PARTICIPANTS

### BIRD STEERING GROUP (ENGLAND, UK)

**Theresa Lawrie**

Director  
Evidence-based Medicine Consultancy Ltd  
Bath  
United Kingdom

**Andrew Bryant**

Statistician  
Faculty of Medical Sciences  
Newcastle University  
Newcastle upon Tyne  
United Kingdom

**Ketan Gajjar**

Consultant Gynae-Oncologist  
Obstetrics and Gynaecology  
Nottingham City Hospital  
Nottingham  
United Kingdom

**Scott Mitchell**

Associate Specialist  
Emergency Department  
Princess Elizabeth Hospital  
State of Guernsey

**Tina Peers**

Consultant in Contraception and  
Reproductive Healthcare  
Surrey  
United Kingdom

**Tony Tham**

Consultant Gastroenterology  
Ulster Hospital  
Belfast  
United Kingdom

**Claire Mock-Muñoz de Luna**

Doctor in Public Health  
Research Associate  
Evidence-based Medicine Consultancy Ltd  
Bath  
United Kingdom

### BIRD TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP (ENGLAND, UK)

**Therese Dowswell**

Research Associate  
Cochrane Pregnancy and Childbirth  
Department of Women's and Children's  
Health  
University of Liverpool  
Liverpool Women's NHS Foundation Trust  
Liverpool  
United Kingdom

**Edmund Fordham**

Physicist  
South-East Cambridge  
England  
United Kingdom

**Andrew Bryant**

Statistician  
Faculty of Medical Sciences  
Newcastle University  
Newcastle upon Tyne  
United Kingdom

**Theresa Lawrie**

Director of the Evidence-based Medicine  
Consultancy Ltd  
Bath  
United Kingdom

**Mark Lawrie**

Freelance Director and Editor  
Non-executive Director  
Evidence-Based Medicine Consultancy Ltd  
Bath  
United Kingdom

**Isabella Rushforth**

Volunteer Intern  
Evidence-based Medicine Consultancy Ltd  
Bath  
United Kingdom

**BRITISH IVERMECTIN RECOMMENDATION  
DEVELOPMENT PANEL**

**Rosamond Jones**

Consultant Paediatrician, Retired  
HART (Health Advocacy & Recovery  
Team)  
United Kingdom

**Deborah Waller**

General Practitioner, Retired

**NHS Primary Care**

Oxford  
England  
United Kingdom

**Christine Clark**

Freelance Medical Writer  
Pharmaceutical Consultant  
Christine Clark Ltd  
Greater Blackburn  
England  
United Kingdom

**Marie Gerval**

Medical Doctor  
The Menopause Consultancy  
Chelsea and Westminster NHS Foundation  
Trust  
England  
United Kingdom

**Hector Eduardo Carvallo**

Professor of Internal Medicine  
Universidad Abierta Interamericana  
Argentina

**Jennifer Hibberd**

Paediatric Dental Surgeon  
Division of Dentistry  
Department of Surgery  
William Osler Health System  
Toronto  
Canada

**Ira Bernstein**

Family Physician, Lecturer  
Department of Family and Community  
Medicine

University of Toronto  
Canada

**Gustavo Aguirre-Chang**

Doctor of Medicine  
Health and Work Management Systems  
SAC (SIGESA SAC)  
Peru

**Biswa Mohan Padhy**

Professor  
Department of Pharmacology  
All India Institute of Medical Sciences  
(AIIMS)  
Bhubaneswar  
India

**Pierre Kory**

Chief Medical Officer  
Front Line COVID-19 Critical Care Alliance  
United States of America

**Olufemi Babalola**

Professor and Principal Investigator  
Department of Ophthalmology  
Bingham University  
Karu  
Nigeria

**Jose Luis Abreu Quinter**

President  
Dean  
Institute of Higher Education  
Spenta University  
Mexico

**Allan Landrito**

Medical Doctor  
City Health Department

Metro-Manila  
The Philippines

**Shashikanth Manikappa**

Specialist Anaesthetist  
Melbourne  
Australia

**Emma-May Chitty**

Clinical Nurse Specialist  
East Anglia's Children's Hospice  
Cambridge  
England  
United Kingdom

**Tau Braun**

Executive Director  
U.S. Counterterrorism and Emergency  
Management National Advisor and Trainer  
BioChem Engineering  
United States of America

**Morimasa Yagisawa**

Visiting Professor  
Omura Satoshi Memorial Institute  
Kitasato University  
Tokyo  
Japan

**Geoffrey Taylor**

Independent Researcher, Retired  
Perth  
Australia

**Wendy Hoy**

Professor of Medicine  
Director of Centre for Chronic Disease  
University of Queensland  
Australia

**Jill Rasmussen**

Medical Doctor  
Director of psi-napse  
Independent Consultancy psi-napse  
United Kingdom

**Agnes Pinnel**

Former Founder and CEO  
Argint International Clinical Research  
Hungary

**Rebecca Hall**

Medical Doctor  
Covid Clinical Assessment Service  
Glastonbury Surgery  
England  
United Kingdom

**Robert Taylor**

Medical Doctor  
Frome Medical Practice  
Frome  
England  
United Kingdom

**Christopher Hughes**

Appraiser  
Medical Directorate  
NHS England South (South East)  
NHS England  
Surrey  
England  
United Kingdom

**Denise Kelly**

PhD  
Independent Researcher  
Ireland

**David Chesler**

Medical Doctor  
Internal Medicine, Women's Health and  
Geriatric Care  
Charlottesville Family Medicine  
Charlottesville  
West Virginia  
United States of America

**Vicky Hildreth**

Medical Doctor  
The Wall House Surgery  
Reigate  
Surrey  
England  
United Kingdom

**Eunice Minford**

Consultant General Surgeon  
Antrim Hospital, NHSCT  
Northern Ireland  
United Kingdom

**Arabella Onslow**

Medical Doctor  
Burnett Edgar Medical Centre  
Barrow-in-Furness  
England  
United Kingdom

**Abbi Lulsegg**

Consultant Physician  
Endocrinology and Diabetes Mellitus,  
General Medicine  
Health 121 Ltd  
London  
England  
United Kingdom

**Seema Taylor**

Detective Constable  
Surrey Police  
West Sussex  
England  
United Kingdom

**Sarah Hill**

Health Economist Research Associate  
Population Health Sciences Institute  
Faculty of Medical Sciences  
Newcastle University  
England  
United Kingdom

**Linda Rapson**

Medical Doctor  
Assistant Professor  
Department of Family & Community  
Medicine  
University of Toronto  
Canada

**Justus Hofmeyr**

Professor  
Associate Program Director  
Faculty of Medicine  
Obstetrics and Gynaecology  
University of Botswana  
Botswana

**Michael McConville**

Medical Doctor  
Owner  
Ballyhaise Medical Clinic  
County Cavan  
Ireland

**Juan Chamie**

Data Analyst  
Cambridge, Massachusetts  
United States of America

**Martin Gill**

Ear, Nose & Throat Specialist  
Private Practise  
Sandton  
Johannesburg  
South Africa

**Shaun Hiu**

Research Assistant, Biostatistician  
Population Health Sciences Institute  
Faculty of Medical Sciences  
Newcastle University  
Newcastle  
England  
United Kingdom

**Jessica Peers**

Nursing Student  
University of Greenwich  
London  
England  
United Kingdom

**Geoffrey Taylor**

Emeritus Professor  
Faculty of Science  
University of Melbourne  
Melbourne  
Australia

**David Rose**

Journalist  
Daily Mail  
England

United Kingdom

**Robert Watkins**

Contract Design Engineer/ Physicist  
Department of Astrophysics  
University of Oxford  
United Kingdom

**Gavin McKinley**

Research Technician  
Centre for Medicines Discovery  
University of Oxford  
England  
United Kingdom

**Gez Medinger**

Filmmaker  
Student Paramedic  
University of Hertfordshire  
England  
United Kingdom

**Jon Spiteri**

Social Worker  
Learning Disability LAC  
Scottish Borders Social Services  
Scotland  
United Kingdom

**Kenneth Finlayson**

Research Associate  
School of Community Health and  
Midwifery  
Faculty of Health and Care  
University of Central Lancashire  
England  
United Kingdom

**Marc G. Wathelet**

Consultant  
Coronavirus Specialist  
Freelance  
Villers-la-Ville  
Walloon Region  
Belgium

**Antoine Guérin de Montgareuil**

Research Engineer, Renewables  
France

**Hannah Vowles**

Professor of Architecture  
Interim Head of School  
Faculty of Arts, Design and Media  
Birmingham City University  
Birmingham  
England  
United Kingdom

**Jon Rogers**

Medical Doctor, Retired  
Bristol  
England  
United Kingdom

**Micheal Yeadon**

Biochemist, Pharmacologist  
Freelance Consultant  
Surrey  
England  
United Kingdom

**Mark Bradley**

Patient Advocate  
PeopleWith Limited  
England  
United Kingdom

**Juliet Johnson**

Health Campaigner  
Digital Marketing  
Amara Way  
England  
United Kingdom

**Sally Harrison**

Registered Nurse  
Charity  
Oxfordshire  
England  
United Kingdom

**Roger Felber**

CEO  
Pathe Films  
United Kingdom

**Yasmin George**

Orthodontics, Aesthetic and CEREC  
Dentistry  
Confident Smiles  
Oatlands Dental Lounge  
Weybridge  
Surrey  
England  
United Kingdom

**Christopher Govan Street**

Science and Mathematics Tutor  
The Tutor Master  
England  
United Kingdom

**Linda Rae**

Health Advocate  
Durham  
England  
United Kingdom

**Margarita Reygan**

Carers Governor  
Central and Northwest London NHS Trust

**Jane Green**

Advocate, Volunteer Chair  
Sussex Ehlers-Danlos and Hypermobility  
Support (SEDS)  
England  
United Kingdom

**Ian Clayton**

Legal Consultant  
Durham  
England  
United Kingdom

## ANNEX 7. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS OF PARTICIPANTS


Name (with title)	Disclosure of interest	Conflict of interest and management
<b>Prof. Jose Luis Abreu Quinter</b>	None declared	None declared
<b>Dr. Gustavo Aguirre-Chang</b>	None declared	None declared
<b>Prof. Olufemi Babalola</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Prof. Ira Bernstein</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Mr. Mark Bradley</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Dr. Tau Braun</b>	Has a research company involved in non-medical and non-pharmaceutical solutions and strategies to covid amongst other diseases	Not considered serious enough to preclude participation
<b>Prof. Hector Eduardo Carvallo</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Dr. David Chesler</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Ms. Emma-May Chitty</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Dr. Christine Clark</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Mr. Ian Clayton</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Mr. Roger Felber</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Mr. Kenneth Finlayson</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Dr. Yasmin George</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Dr. Marie Gerval</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Dr. Martin Gill</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Ms. Sharon Gray</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Mrs. Jane Green</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Dr. Rebecca Hall</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Mrs. Sally Harrison</b>	None declared	Not applicable

<b>Dr. Jennifer Hibberd</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Dr. Vicky Hildreth</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Dr. Shaun Hiu</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Prof. Justus Hofmeyr</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Dr. Wendy Hoy</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Dr. Christopher Hughes</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Ms. Juliet Johnson</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Dr. Rosemond Jones</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Dr. Denise Kelly</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Prof. Pierre Kory</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Dr. Allan Landrito</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Dr. Michael McConville</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Dr. Abbi Lulsegged</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Dr. Shashikanth Manikappa</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Mr. Gavin McKinley</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Mr. Gez Medinger</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Dr. Eunice Minford</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Prof. Biswa Mohan Padhy</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Mr. Antoine Guérin de Montgareuil</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Emeritus Prof. Jim Neilson</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Dr. Arabella Onslow</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Ms. Jessica Peers</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Ms. Agnes Pinnel</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Ms. Linda Rae</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Prof. Linda Rapson</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Dr. Jill Rasmussen</b>	None declared	Not applicable


<b>Ms. Margarita Reygan</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Dr. Jon Rogers</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Mr. David Rose</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Mr. Jon Spiteri</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Mr. Chris Street</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Emeritus Prof. Geoffrey Taylor</b>	A colleague of Prof Borody who promotes an ivermectin treatment pack	Not considered serious enough to preclude participation
<b>Dr. Robert Taylor</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Ms. Seema Taylor</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Prof. Hannah Vowles</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Dr. Deborah Waller</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Dr. Marc Wathelet</b>	Reviewer for EU Covid-related research proposals	Not considered serious enough to preclude participation
<b>Dr. Robert Watkins</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Prof. Morimasa Yagisawa</b>	None declared	Not applicable
<b>Dr. Michael Yeadon</b>	None declared	Not applicable

## ANNEX 8. SUMMARY OF BIRD RECOMMENDATION DEVELOPMENT PANEL JUDGEMENTS


**Q1 - How substantial are the desirable anticipated effects of ivermectin compared with no ivermectin?**




**Q2 - How substantial are the undesirable anticipated effects of ivermectin compared with no ivermectin?**




### Q3 - In your view, what is the overall certainty of the evidence on the important outcomes associated with ivermectin?




### Q4 - Does the balance between desirable and undesirable effects favour ivermectin or no ivermectin?




**Q5 - Is there important uncertainty about, or variability in, how much people value the main outcomes associated with ivermectin?**




**Q6 - How costly are the resources required for ivermectin compared with no ivermectin?**




## Q7 - What is the certainty of the evidence on costs?




## Q8 - How cost-effective is ivermectin compared with no ivermectin?




## Q9 - What would be the impact of ivermectin on equity?




## Q10 - Would ivermectin be acceptable to health professionals, patients, families and other stakeholders?



## Q11 - Would ivermectin be feasible to implement?



## Q12 - Based on the evidence presented, do you think ivermectin should be recommended?



## **ANNEX 9: IVERMECTIN API SUPPLIERS<sup>5</sup>**

**Ref Price \$168/kg**

### **China**

SUZHOU RYWAY BIOTECH, Suzhou, China

RICHBERYL BIOTECH CO., LTD. OF RAOYANG COUNTY, China

Shandong Qilu King-Phar Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., Jinan, China

ZHEJIANG APELOA KANGYU PHARMACEUTICAL CO. LTD, Hangzhou, China

Dalian Richon Chem. Co., Ltd, Dalian, China

HENGDIAN GROUP, Hangzhou, China

North China Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., Shijiazhuang, China

Hebei Veyong Animal Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd, Shijiazhuang, China

HANGZHOU THINK CHEMICAL CO., LTD., Hangzhou, China

Zhejiang HISUN Pharmaceuticals Co., Ltd, Taizhou, China

### **Other than China**

Jai Radhe Sales, Gujrat, India

Dr. Reddy's Laboratories, India

SAMEX OVERSEAS, Gujarat, India

Athos Chemicals, Gujarat, India

Zydus Cadila (India)

Pharmaffiliates Analytical & Synthetics Ltd., Panchkula, India

---

<sup>5</sup> List of suppliers kindly provided by Professor Satoshi Omura and colleagues of Kitasato University, Japan.

Hovione Farmaciencia, Lisboa, Portugal

Delta Synthetic Co., Ltd, New Taipei, Taiwan

Tecoland Co., Irvine CA, USA

MERCK & CO. INC., Whitehouse Station, NJ, USA

**Others (API uncertain)**

Galderma Laboratories LP, Fort Worth, TX, USA , SOOLANTRA

Arbor Pharmaceuticals, Atlanta, GA, USA

Licensed to Kaken Pharma.: ivermectin lotion (0.5%) for head lice;

Boehringer Ingelheim, Germany; Ivomec (veterinary)

Edenbridge Pharmaceuticals, Parsippany, NJ, USA; Generic tablets 3mg

Perrigo Company plc, Dublin, Ireland; topical cream

MedinCell S.A, Montpellier, France

Generic: Actavis, Bryant, Edenbridge, NuCare, Prasco, Taro

## ANNEX 10. ENDORSEMENT OF THE BRITISH IVERMECTIN RECOMMENDATION\*

### **G. Umberto Meduri, M.D.**

Professor of Medicine  
Division of Pulmonary, Critical Care,  
and Sleep Medicine  
Memphis VA Medical Center (123)  
1030 Jefferson Avenue  
Suite room #CW444  
Memphis TN 38104  
United States of America

University of KwaZulu Natal  
719 Umbilo Road  
Durban  
4001  
South Africa

### **Fred Wagshul, MD**

Pulmonologist & Med. Dir.,  
Lung Center of America  
Clinical Instructor, Wright State  
University School of Medicine,  
Dayton, Ohio  
United States of America  
FLCCC.net

### **Dr Aurence Nkosingathi Mdladla, MD**

Associate Professor  
Chief of ICU  
Sefako Makgatho University  
Dr George Mukhari Academic Hospital  
Pathology Building, Office no. N358  
Molotlegi Street, Ga-Rankua Zone 1,  
Ga-Rankua, 0208  
South Africa

### **Colleen Aldous, PhD**

Professor of Medical Research  
College of Health Sciences,  
University of KwaZulu-Natal  
Nelson R Mandela School of  
Medicine  
719 Umbilo Rd  
SCM laboratory, Main Building  
Durban 4001  
South Africa

### **Anisa Mosam, MD PhD**

Associate Professor in Dermatology  
Nelson R Mandela School of Medicine,  
University of Kwazulu Natal,  
Rm 327 3rd Floor, Main Building Medical  
School, 719 Umbilo Rd,  
Durban  
South Africa

### **Fahmida Shaik, MD**

MBChB (Natal), MCLinPharm (UKZN)  
Research Clinician  
Nelson R Mandela School of Medicine

### **Soo Downe**

Professor of Midwifery Studies  
UCLan  
Preston  
PR1 2HE  
United Kingdom  
[sdowne@uclan.ac.uk](mailto:sdowne@uclan.ac.uk)

**Dr Lucy Kerr, MD**

Sonimage Director

President of Kerr Institute - São Paulo,  
Brazil

Avenida Brigadeiro Luiz Antônio, 2504 -  
2º andar

Jardim Paulista, 01402-000

São Paulo

Brazil

\* These individuals were unable to attend the BIRD meeting on the 20<sup>th</sup> of February, 2021, and sent their endorsement of the recommendation via email. We continue to accept endorsements.