

1 Published benefits of ivermectin 2 use in Itajaí, Brazil for COVID-19 3 infection, hospitalisation, and 4 mortality are entirely explained by 5 statistical artefacts

6 Robin Mills ¹, Ana Carolina Peçanha Antonio ², Greg Tucker-Kellogg ³ ✉

7 ¹AI Horizon, The Netherlands; ²Adult Intensive Care Unit, Hospital de Clínicas de
8 Porto Alegre, Brazil; ³Department of Biological Sciences, National University of
9 Singapore, Singapore

✉ For correspondence:
dbsgtk@nus.edu.sg

Data and code availability:
All data is publicly available from previous publications or public databases of the Brazil Ministry of Health. Links are provided at the end of the Methods section. Source code to reproduce the analyses here is available at <https://github.com/gtuckerkellogg/itajai-reanalysis>.

Funding: No funding was received for this work.

Competing interests: GTK receives revenue from YouTube for content on scientific misinformation and received conference travel support from the Institute for Clinical Research (Malaysia) for a talk given at the 15th National Conference for Clinical Research (NCCR). ACPA and RM declare no competing interests.

Ethics approval: The Institutional Review Board of the National University of Singapore waived ethical approval of this work based on sole use of previously approved and publicly available subject data. Reference NUS-IRB-2023-474.

11 Abstract

12 Background

13 Two recent publications by Kerr et al. (Cureus 14(1):e21272; Cureus 14(8): e28624) reported
14 dramatic effects of prophylactic ivermectin use for both prevention of COVID-19 and
15 reduction of COVID-19-related hospitalisation and mortality, including a dose-dependent
16 effect of ivermectin prophylaxis. These papers have gained an unusually large public
17 influence: they were incorporated into debates around COVID-19 policies and may have
18 contributed to decreased trust in vaccine efficacy and public health authorities more broadly.
19 Both studies were based on retrospective observational analysis of city-wide registry data
20 from the city of Itajaí, Brazil from July-December 2020.

21 Methods

22 Starting with initially identified sources of error, we conducted a revised statistical analysis of
23 available data, including data made available with the original papers and public data from
24 the Brazil Ministry of Health. We identified additional uncorrected sources of bias and errors
25 from the original analysis, including incorrect subject exclusion and missing subjects, analysis
26 of longitudinal data with cross-sectional design, an enrolment time bias, and multiple sources
27 of immortal time bias. In models assuming no actual effect from ivermectin use, we
28 conducted Monte Carlo simulations to estimate the contribution of these biases to any
29 observed effect.

30 Results

31 Untreated statistical artefacts and methodological errors alone lead to dramatic apparent
32 risk reduction associated with ivermectin use in both studies. The magnitude of apparent risk
33 reduction from these artefacts is comparable to the results reported by the studies
34 themselves, including apparent protection from infection, hospitalisation, and death, and
35 including the reported apparent dose-response relationship.

36 Conclusions

37 The inference of ivermectin effect reported in both papers is unsupported, as the observed
38 effects are entirely explained by untreated statistical artefacts and methodological errors.
39 Our re-analysis calls for caution in interpreting highly publicised observational studies and
40 highlights the importance of common sources of bias in clinical research.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

42 Introduction

43 The first half of 2020 was marked by both the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic and frantic
44 efforts around the globe to prevent and contain its spread. Most of those initial efforts relied
45 on non-pharmaceutical interventions (e.g., social distancing, masks, travel restrictions, and re-
46 gional lockdowns) to “flatten the curve” and reduce the strain on healthcare systems before
47 effective treatments and vaccines became available [1, 2]. As the pandemic unfolded, health-
48 care systems worldwide rapidly became overburdened with an increasing number of severely
49 ill patients and high COVID-19 mortality rates.

50 In Brazil, there was immense interest in early COVID-19 treatment during the initial phase
51 of the pandemic, including the potential use of the anti-parasitic drug ivermectin [3]. While
52 there was no clinical evidence of ivermectin efficacy for COVID-19, initial *in vitro* studies at the
53 time had shown potential antiviral activity of ivermectin in cell culture [4], which fuelled interest
54 in its use. Starting in July 2020, the city of Itajaí (in the southern Brazil state of Santa Catarina)
55 [5, 6] implemented a controversial city-wide program in July 2020 as a potential COVID-19 pro-
56 phylaxis. Eligible residents were offered ivermectin pills with an intermittent dosing schedule
57 of 0.2 mg/kg of body weight (up to a maximum 24 mg for those above 90 kg body weight) each
58 day for two consecutive days, repeated every 15 days.

59 In two closely related retrospective analysis studies of the Itajaí program, Kerr, Cadeiani
60 et al. [7, hereafter KC22] and Kerr, Baldi et al. [8, hereafter KB22] made dramatic claims of iver-
61 mectin benefit. KC22 concluded that using ivermectin in the Itajaí program resulted in a 44%
62 reduction in COVID-19 infections. Among all infected individuals, KC22 reported 37% reduction
63 in hospitalisation and 43% reduction in mortality associated with ivermectin use. These already
64 dramatic results were even larger after the application of propensity score matching (PSM) and
65 adjustment for other covariates. Furthermore, KB22 presented an even more startling dose-
66 dependent benefit among infected individuals: the so-called “strictly regular” ivermectin users
67 experienced a 92% reduction in mortality compared to non-users and an 82% reduction com-
68 pared to irregular users.

69 These two papers gained significant public attention and contributed to ongoing public
70 policy debates, both about COVID-19 treatment and prevention, and about trust in the medical
71 and scientific establishment. Each paper has an Altmetric score in the top five per cent of *all*
72 scientific research, has been the subject of news reporting, and has been shared on social
73 media or viewed at the journal site hundreds of thousands of times. KC22 and KB22 have also
74 attracted the attention of fact-checkers, but published critiques to date have mostly focused
75 either on the limits of observational studies in general or on missing covariates and superficial
76 peer review of these papers specifically [9–11]. In response, the Editor in Chief of Cureus has
77 defended the peer review process and subsequent publication of these studies [12].

78 Given the widespread dissemination and discussion of these papers, it is crucial to pro-
79 vide an unbiased critique to foster a more informed public debate on scientific and medical
80 research, ultimately helping to protect the public from scientific misinformation [13, 14]. This
81 unbiased critique is particularly significant for influential papers addressing polarising topics
82 of public interest, such as the use of ivermectin as a treatment for COVID-19 [15].

83 In this work, we take a direct approach by reanalysing the data available from KC22 and
84 KB22 and combining it with public data from the Brazilian Health Ministry. We identify a va-
85 riety of important statistical fallacies and other errors, and use simulations to estimate the
86 consequences of leaving these issues untreated. Our analysis demonstrates that the seem-
87 ingly dramatic benefits of prophylactic ivermectin for COVID-19, as reported in both KC22 and
88 KB22, can be entirely attributed to unresolved statistical fallacies present in the original analy-
89 ses. The code for all analyses presented in this manuscript can be found on GitHub, ensuring
90 the reproducibility of our findings.

91 Results

92 The data from KC22 and KB22

93 The analyses of KC22 and KB22 compared events (infections, hospitalisations, and deaths) be-
94 tween participants in the program (who volunteered to take ivermectin as a *prophylactic* agent)

95 and non-participants within a fixed study period (from July 7 through December 2, 2020). KC22
96 described the data set as *excluding* individuals who tested positive from the registry data prior
97 to July 7, 2020.

98 KC22 combined two data sets: one of the participants in the ivermectin prophylaxis pro-
99 gram and the other from a citywide population registry to retrieve non-participants' data. As
100 we received no response about the availability of original data sets after contacting both the
101 city authorities in Itajaí and the authors of KC22 and KB22, we restricted our analysis to KC22
102 supplementary data on OSF posted with KC22 by the corresponding author Flavio Cadegiani
103 and official public data from the Brazil Ministry of Health.

104 KC22 claimed virtually no missing values in the data because of mandatory reporting and
105 indeed, most fields for each individual record were completely filled in. However, crucial infor-
106 mation was missing for *all* participants in the data. For example, the amount of medicine for
107 an individual was a function of weight (≤ 0.2 mg ivermectin/kg body weight/day for two days
108 every 15 days), but neither body weight nor dosage category were reported. The KC22 data
109 also failed to include any dates other than the date of birth; dates of program enrolment, med-
110 ication collection, infection, hospitalisation, or death were all missing.

111 Data entry errors in KC22 data were not uncommon. For example, while the maximum
112 possible total ivermectin usage over the study period was 80 tablets, hundreds of users were
113 recorded as having more than 80, and in some cases thousands, of tablets.

114 **KC22 mistakenly included prior infections and hospitalisations, primarily in the** 115 **non-user group**

116 The authors describe the data as representing "all events" of COVID-19 infection, hospitalisa-
117 tion (in public hospitals), and deaths within the study period (7 July and 2 December 2020). The
118 dates of these events, however, were neither used in the original analysis nor contained in the
119 supplementary data. Fortunately, official public data from the Brazilian Health Ministry's Uni-
120 fied Health System (DATASUS) provides detailed information for hospitalisations and deaths
121 of COVID-19 patients across Brazil, including event dates. To understand the distribution of
122 events in the KC22 data, we matched city-level Itajaí data with records from the KC22 data
123 based on the date of birth, sex, and 2020 COVID-19 hospitalisation and death.

124 The majority of recorded deaths and hospitalisations in KC22 were matched to DATASUS
125 data (132/141 deaths, 94%, and 43/93 hospitalised survivors, 46%). To our surprise, COVID-19
126 symptom onset occurred before July 7, 2020 in 45 of the matched individuals, and 87% of those
127 (39/45) were classified as non-users in the KC22 analysis (Table 1A, $p < 0.001$ for association
128 between exposure group and mistaken inclusion). When we looked at subgroups by mortality
129 for those individuals, the bias for mistaken inclusion of early infections in the non-user group
130 was more severe for those who died (31 non-users, 2 users, 94% non-user, $p < 0.001$) than for
131 those who survived (8 non-users, 3 users, 73% non-user, $p = 0.088$ Table 1B).

132 Because the DATASUS records during the study period are primarily hospitalisations and
133 deaths, we do not currently have strong direct evidence that the biased inclusion of pre-study
134 infections in the non-participant group extends to non-hospitalised subjects. However, the
135 mistaken pre-study enrolment of non-users accounted for 40% of matched non-users, and all
136 infected non-users were included in the propensity score matching of KC22, so the impact of
137 this mistake alone was dramatic.

138 **KC22 data was biased towards a subset of early infections**

139 KC22 and KB22 under-reported deaths and severely under-reported hospitalisations from
140 COVID-19 in Itajaí. While KC22 reports 141 deaths, DATASUS records 186 adult COVID-19
141 deaths among Itajaí residents during the study period, and 183 reported deaths following
142 symptom onset in the same period, 30% higher than in KC22. KC22 reported 185 total hos-
143 pitalisations from a study population of 159,560 (0.12% hospitalised); official government data
144 reports 651 Itajaí resident adult hospitalisations for COVID-19 from infections in the second
145 half of 2020, of whom 479 had symptom onset during the KC22 study period (a hospitalisation
146 rate 259% greater than that reported in KC22).

A: All uniquely mapped hospitalised KC22 study subjects, unstratified.

	non-user ¹	IVM user ¹	p-value ²
All Brazilian Health Ministry-mapped individuals (178 total)			<0.001
Covid onset on or after 7 July 2020	58 (60%)	72 (92%)	
Covid onset before 7 July 2020	39 (40%)	6 (7.7%)	

¹n (%)

²Fisher's exact test

B: Subgroup analysis of uniquely mapped KC22 hospitalised study subjects, stratified by Covid-19 death outcome.

	non-user ¹	IVM user ¹	p-value ²
Alive (43)			0.088
Covid onset on or after 7 July 2020	13 (62%)	19 (86%)	
Covid onset before 7 July 2020	8 (38%)	3 (14%)	
Dead (135)			<0.001
Covid onset on or after 7 July 2020	46 (60%)	56 (97%)	
Covid onset before 7 July 2020	31 (40%)	2 (3.4%)	

¹n (%)

²Fisher's exact test

Table 1. Mistaken inclusion of pre-study infections in the non-user group. KC22 study participants uniquely mapped with Brazil Health Ministry (SUS) individuals as described in the text. Parts (a) and (b) show overall and subgroup analysis, respectively.

147 The death/hospitalisation ratio was also much higher for KC22 (141/185, 76.1%) than
 148 for Itajaí as a whole (183/479, 38.5%). KC22 included only hospitalisations in public hos-
 149 pitals, which may partially account for the difference among hospitalised survivors and
 150 death/hospitalisation ratio but raises fundamental unaddressed issues of confounding. The
 151 under-reporting of hospitalisations and deaths cannot be attributed to the reported ivermectin
 152 effects claimed by KC22.

153 To further understand this issue, we compared the dates of COVID-19 symptom onset, hos-
 154 pitalisation, and death for the 175 records mapped between KC22 and DATASUS (Fig. 1A, top).
 155 Dates of death were almost entirely contained within the study period, consistent with KC22's
 156 claim to have analysed events during this period. The same is true of hospitalisation dates for
 157 hospitalised survivors. However, dates of hospitalisation for matched deaths (Fig. 1A, middle)
 158 and dates of symptom onset for both hospitalisations and deaths (Fig. 1A, bottom) occurred
 159 well before the beginning of the study period.

160 Strikingly, the KC22 data not only mistakenly included hospitalisations and deaths with
 161 symptom onset *before* the study period, but almost all of the remaining matched hospitalised
 162 individuals experienced symptom onset in the first half of the study period (Fig. 1A, bottom).
 163 KC22 thus almost entirely neglected the second wave of COVID hospitalisations, which peaked
 164 at the end of the study period (Fig. 1B). Indeed, symptom onset among the *uncounted* deaths
 165 primarily occurred at the tail end of the study period, when the December 2020 wave was
 166 getting under way (Fig. S1).

167 The KC22 analysis appears to treat the data as cross-sectional, analysing (as described in
 168 KC22) "all events as they occurred during the citywide governmental COVID-19 prevention with
 169 ivermectin program, from July 7, 2020, to December 2, 2020". In reality, the data is inherently
 170 longitudinal: hospitalisations precede deaths and infections precede hospitalisations. Includ-
 171 ing all deaths within a fixed time period, as described in KC22, would lead to mistaken inclusion
 172 of prior hospitalisations and infections (as seen in Fig. 1A); including all hospitalisations would
 173 have inevitably included prior infections. The opposite problem would appear near the end
 174 of the study period, where hospitalisations and deaths would be excluded from analysis even
 175 if the infections that preceded them occurred during the study period. This is exactly what is
 176 observed (see Fig. S1), in addition to the under-counting of events late within the study period.




Figure 1. Symptom onset and study group allocation. A. Event dates for 132 matched Covid deaths and 43 matched hospitalised survivors mapped to the SUS data from KC22. The three sub-panels show recorded dates of death, hospitalisation, and symptom onset. B. Official Brazilian Health Ministry entries for records of death or hospitalisation among adult residents of Itajaí. C. The probability of an individual considered in the study being allocated to the non-user group changes dramatically over time during the allocation of participants in KC22. Enrolment was estimated using data from contemporaneous Itajaí municipal bulletins and news reporting. See Methods for details.

177 **Enrolment to the ivermectin program continued during the study period**

178 Both KC22 and KB22 compared events between adult residents of Itajaí who did or did not
 179 participate in the ivermectin program over the entire study period. KC22 claimed “[t]his strict
 180 interval avoids differences in terms of periods of exposure”. This *cannot* be true, however, as
 181 not all 113,845 participants started exactly on July 7, 2020. Consider an individual who reported
 182 symptoms on July 8, but had not yet joined the ivermectin distribution program. That individ-
 183 ual would be ineligible for inclusion in the KC22 study as an ivermectin user, but would instead
 184 be treated in the analysis of KC22 as an infected non-user. The biased allocation of new infec-
 185 tions into the non-user group (Fig. 1C) would continue for as long as the distribution program
 186 enrolled new participants. This alone is a classic case of immortal time bias [16], but because
 187 the most rapid enrolment occurred during the peak infection period in July 2020 (Fig. 1B), it
 188 also coincides with substantial chronological bias [17]. We describe the immortal time bias
 189 and chronological bias during enrolment collectively as “enrolment bias” to distinguish these
 190 two sources of bias from other sources of bias described later.

191 **Enrolment bias, incorrect inclusion of already infected participants, and biased** 192 **sampling led to large apparent protection against infection, hospitalisation,** 193 **and death in KC22**

194 We estimated the effects of the issues above using Monte Carlo simulation. We simulated the
 195 KC22 study under a model of no actual ivermectin effect but successively including enrolment
 196 bias, the incorrect inclusion of subjects with symptomatic onset prior to the study, and the
 197 empirically biased sampling towards the beginning of the study. We simulated symptom onset

198 in individual patient data cohorts each the size of the data set in KC22. To simulate the dates of
 199 symptom onset, we used daily Itajaí notifications of infection from the Brazil Health Ministry. To
 200 simulate enrolment over time, we used contemporaneous local municipal bulletins and news
 201 reports of program enrolment and assumed participants began taking ivermectin immediately.

202 We developed multiple models to estimate the individual and cumulative effects of the
 203 identified biases and errors. Each model used the numbers reported in KC22:7231 infections
 204 within a cohort of 159,560 individuals (infection rate of approximately 4.5%). Additionally, we
 205 simulated hospitalisations and deaths to match KC22 totals, using dates sampled from the
 206 Brazil Health Ministry records, as detailed in the Methods and Materials section. Results are
 207 reported based on 1000 simulations of each model and compared to reported values from
 208 KC22. Hospitalisations and deaths reported among infected individuals and compared to the
 209 infected individuals from KC22 prior to propensity score matching.

210 The enrolment bias present in KC22 leads to an estimated fictitious risk reduction for infec-
 211 tion of 17% for users of an ineffective medicine. This result stems from our first model (i-ENR),
 212 in which we randomly sampled infections from the distribution of onset dates between July 7
 213 and December 2, 2020. In addition to the enrolment bias, the incorrect inclusion of subjects
 214 with symptomatic onset prior to the study period leads to an additional 10% fictitious risk re-
 215 duction for infection. In our second model (i-INF), we simulated incorrect inclusion by sampling
 216 from symptom onset dates where the notification date was between July 7 and December 2,
 217 2020. The i-INF model thus encompassed both enrolment bias and the mistaken inclusion of
 218 early infections.

219 Lastly, an additional 24% fictitious risk reduction for infection is caused by the biased sam-

	Simulation				Literature
	i-NEG	i-ENR	i-INF	i-KC22	KC22 [7]
has enrolment bias		✓	✓	✓	✓
includes prior infections			✓	✓	✓
has missing data				✓	✓
Infection					
Rate (non-user)	4.53%	5.14%	5.62%	7.15%	6.64%
Rate (user)	4.53%	4.29%	4.10%	3.48%	3.69%
Risk ratio		0.834	0.729	0.487	0.555
95% CI		[0.80–0.88]	[0.70–0.76]	[0.47–0.51]	[0.53–0.58]
<i>p</i>		<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Risk reduction		17%	27%	51%	44%
Hospitalisation					
Rate (non-user)	0.12%	0.14%	0.16%	0.20%	0.22%
Rate (user)	0.12%	0.11%	0.09%	0.08%	0.08%
Risk ratio		0.750	0.588	0.398	0.349
95% CI		[0.56–1.03]	[0.44–0.80]	[0.28–0.56]	[0.26–0.47]
<i>p</i>		0.039	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Risk reduction		25%	41%	60%	65%
Death					
Rate (non-user)	0.09%	0.11%	0.13%	0.17%	0.17%
Rate (user)	0.09%	0.08%	0.07%	0.06%	0.05%
Risk ratio		0.707	0.541	0.335	0.315
95% CI		[0.50–1.02]	[0.39–0.77]	[0.25–0.47]	[0.22–0.43]
<i>p</i>		0.026	0.002	<0.001	<0.001
Risk reduction		29%	46%	66%	68%

Table 2. Apparent protection provided by biases and errors in KC22. Apparent protection against infection, hospitalisation, and death due to enrolment bias, mistaken inclusion of prior infections, and missing data. Comparisons are between users and non-users, as defined in KC22. Three different simulation strategies were used to simulate the isolated effects of biases identified in [7] along with a negative control (i-NEG). i-KC22 and the published KC22 data set include all three biases. Simulations are as described in the text.

220 pling towards the beginning of study observed in KC22. In the third model family (i-KC22), we
221 simulated the sampling bias in Fig. 1B by sampling infections using the distribution of infection
222 dates of matched individuals. Details are discussed in the methods section. The i-KC22 model
223 family most closely matched the errors and biases so far discussed in KC22.

224 The results of the models, alongside the published results of KC22 and a trivial negative
225 model (i-NEG, with neither ivermectin effect nor any biases) are shown in Table 2. Each source
226 of bias reduced the apparent incident rates of infection, hospitalisation, and death of iver-
227 mectin users and, hence, increased the apparent risk reduction of the exposure. Biases in the
228 design and execution of KC22 account for virtually all of the reported protection attributed to
229 ivermectin.

230 The estimated effect of enrolment bias in the i-ENR model is conservative, since we as-
231 sumed optimistically that news reporting was accurate and that ivermectin use began imme-
232 diately for all participants. In addition, we did not include uncertainty in the model parame-
233 ters, so confidence intervals are likely under-estimated. While we have direct evidence for the
234 temporal-biased sampling in the case of hospitalisation and death, the effect of temporal sam-
235 pling bias for infections in i-KC22 is indirectly estimated based on assumed consistency with
236 hospitalisations and deaths. Full details of the simulation methods are found in the Methods
237 and in the GitHub repository accompanying this paper.

238 **KC22 hospitalisation and mortality results introduced attrition bias by design**

239 COVID-19 outcome events occur in sequence: hospitalisation usually precedes COVID-19
240 death; COVID-19 symptom onset always precedes COVID-19 hospitalisation and COVID-19
241 death. KC22 stated they had included “all events” from July 7–December 2, 2020, so hospi-
242 talisations and deaths *after* the study period following symptom onset *during* the study period
243 were ignored. The enrolment bias described above thus leads not just to a fictitious protection
244 against infection, but to differences between exposure groups in the distribution of infections
245 over time: non-user infections accumulate earlier in the study period, and infections among
246 users accumulate later. Indeed, the median symptom onset date for the non-user group over
247 1000 simulations of i-ENR was September 4, 2020, while that for the user group was October 2,
248 almost a month later. The temporal difference in symptom onset leads to additional bias for
249 later hospitalisations and deaths due to attrition [18, 19].

250 Attrition from events after the study period can occur in both exposure groups. We es-
251 timated attrition rate from failure to count post-study events in each exposure group in all
252 simulation models, and calculated a risk ratio for hospitalisation and death within each group
253 by comparing the case without attrition (no cutoff for event counting) to the case with attrition
254 (events after December 2, 2020 not counted). As shown in Table 3, attrition bias provides ap-
255 parent (though fictitious) protection against hospitalisation and death in all cohorts, and in all
256 cases the fictitious protection is greater in the user group than the non-user group. Adding
257 the possibility of pre-study inclusion in the i-INF model (Table 3B) lowers the protection in the
258 non-user group when compared to the enrolment-bias only i-ENR model. Attrition bias in the
259 i-KC22 model was estimated by including unmatched late deaths (Fig. S1) in the model.

260 Fig. 2 illustrates the basis of this finding in detail. In KC22, infections tended to occur earlier
261 in the non-user group because of the delayed enrolment in the user group and the July 2020
262 infection peak (Fig. 2A). Death events after the follow-up period are lost to attrition as a rule in
263 any given cohort, but this attrition is more likely among users than non-users in KC22, as shown
264 for a single simulated cohort in Fig. 2B. A higher percentage of deaths than hospitalisations
265 are lost to attrition in both groups (Fig. 2C) but the ivermectin user group is more likely to
266 have uncounted hospitalisations and deaths than the non-user group. This translates to an
267 increased risk of attrition in the ivermectin group, a relative risk that is higher for deaths than
268 for hospitalisations (Fig. 2D) Note that the protection shown in Fig. 2D is relative protection of
269 users compared to non-users, as opposed to the apparent protection provided from attrition
270 within each group shown in Table 3. Attrition bias for the i-INF and i-KC22 models are shown
271 in Figs. S2 and S3, respectively.

A: i-ENR model (1000 simulations)

	outcome	Risk Ratio	95% CI	p	rate of lost events
non-user	hospitalisation	0.94	0.88–0.99	0.120	6%
user	hospitalisation	0.92	0.87–0.97	0.002	8%
non-user	death	0.80	0.70–0.90	<0.001	20%
user	death	0.74	0.66–0.81	<0.001	26%

B: i-INF model (1000 simulations)

	outcome	Risk Ratio	95% CI	p	rate of lost events
non-user	hospitalisation	0.95	0.91–1.00	0.154	5%
user	hospitalisation	0.92	0.87–0.97	0.003	8%
non-user	death	0.84	0.75–0.93	<0.001	16%
user	death	0.74	0.65–0.82	<0.001	26%

C: i-KC22 model (1000 simulations)

	outcome	Risk Ratio	95% CI	p	rate of lost events
non-user	hospitalisation	0.93	0.87–0.99	0.051	7%
user	hospitalisation	0.84	0.76–0.92	<0.001	16%
non-user	death	0.84	0.77–0.91	<0.001	16%
user	death	0.64	0.55–0.73	<0.001	36%

Table 3. Attrition bias provides apparent protection against hospitalisation and death in all cohort. Risk ratios indicate apparent protection from adverse outcomes by loss of events occurring after the study period. Note that the apparent protection in all models is greater for death than for hospitalisation, and greater in the user group than in the non-user group.

272 **The “regular ivermectin user” distinction in KB22 created additional immortal**
273 **time bias**

274 We now turn to the second paper from the Itajaí study (KB22), which considered the “regular
275 use” of ivermectin. Because actual ivermectin use was not measured, KB22 treated the re-
276 turn to collect medication over time as a surrogate measure for the actual ivermectin intake.
277 KB22 further subdivided ivermectin users into exposure groups based on the total amount of
278 medication distributed: regular users (those who had received at least thirty 6 mg ivermectin
279 tablets, or 180 mg total), irregular users (those who had received no more than 10 tablets), and
280 non-users. According to KC22, newly diagnosed COVID-19 patients were recommended “not
281 to use ivermectin” and that “The city did not provide or support any specific pharmacological
282 outpatient treatment for subjects infected with COVID-19”. The citywide ivermectin program
283 was, as KC22 and KB22 made clear, the use of ivermectin as a prophylactic for COVID-19, not
284 as a treatment.

285 The central claim of KB22 was a dose-response relationship between ivermectin use and
286 protection from infection, hospitalisation, and death. The exposure groups in KB22, however,
287 were assigned retrospectively based on the amount of medication distributed over time. More-
288 over, both the language of KC22 and contemporary news reports suggest that users would
289 have stopped ivermectin use upon infection, but the analysis of KB22 assumes the opposite,
290 treating ivermectin usage as an independent variable.

291 How long would someone have to take ivermectin to be classified as a regular user in KB22?
292 The maximum dosage in the Itajaí program was 4 tablets a day for two days, or 8 tablets every
293 15 days from day 2 of usage. This would require a minimum of 46 days after enrolment to
294 be classified as a regular user. The more typical 3-tablet dosage would require 61 days. This
295 entire time period is “immortal” time for regular users who stopped ivermectin use upon infec-
296 tion: infections during that time period would result in their allocation to other groups and an
297 apparent reduction of the infection rate in regular users.




Figure 2. Attrition bias in hospitalisations and deaths in KC22 stemmed from enrolment bias.

Results are shown for the iENR simulation model; A. Empirical distributions of simulated infection dates over 1000 runs of the i-ENR model. Note the delayed early peak of infections in the ivermectin user group. B. Example from one typical simulation of uncounted deaths among ivermectin users. Each line segment represents an individual in the simulation who was infected and later died, with infection and death dates at the end points. The study end date is marked with a vertical line. C. Hospitalisations and deaths are lost to attrition more frequently in the user group (1000 simulations of the i-ENR model). D. The ivermectin user group has apparent (but fictitious) protection from hospitalisation and death compared to non-users because hospitalisations and deaths are more likely to occur after the end of the study period for the user group. (Results under the other models are shown in Figures S2-S3.)

298 We simulated the effects of these biases by randomly allocating intended usage among iver-
 299 vermectin users using the total tablet distribution from KC22 data, and truncating to simulated
 300 actual usage based on how long an individual participated in the study without infection. We
 301 assumed a body weight between 60-90 kg, so 3 tablets per day of use. Because actual changes
 302 in usage upon infection are unknown, we considered two distinct scenarios. In the determinis-
 303 tic scenario, all infected users stopped ivermectin upon infection. In the probabilistic scenario,
 304 we used the regularity groupings of KB22 as a proxy for commitment: regular users receiving
 305 ≥ 30 tablets would stop on infection with a probability of 5%, irregular users would stop with a
 306 probability of 30%. As there is no evidence that ivermectin was offered to COVID-19 inpatients
 307 at the time, all users would stop taking ivermectin on hospitalisation.

308 The immortal time bias provided by the “regular user” definition in KB22 leads to a strong
 309 fictitious dose-response relationship under the assumption of ineffective medicine (Figures 3,
 310 S4, and S5.) In the deterministic stopping scenario the dose-response relationship was even
 311 stronger than reported in KB22. In the probabilistic setting, which models a very small change
 312 in user behaviour upon infection, our simulations closely match the dose-response relation-
 313 ship found in KB22 (see Table 4).

Summary statistics	Simulation				KB22/KC22				'Corrected'			
	RR	95% CI	Risk Red.	p.val	RR	95% CI	Risk Red.	p.val	RR	95% CI	Risk Red.	p.val
Infection												
non-user vs user	0.49	0.47-0.51	51%	<0.001	0.56	0.53-0.58	44%	<0.001	1.14	1.07-1.22	-14%	1.000
non-user vs irregular	0.64	0.60-0.68	36%	<0.001	0.68	0.64-0.73	32%	<0.001	1.07	0.98-1.16	-7%	0.987
non-user vs regular	0.37	0.33-0.43	63%	<0.001	0.51	0.45-0.57	49%	<0.001	1.38	1.15-1.65	-38%	1.000
irregular vs regular	0.59	0.51-0.67	41%	<0.001	0.75	0.66-0.85	25%	<0.001	1.29	1.07-1.55	-29%	0.999
Hospitalisation												
non-user vs user	0.40	0.28-0.56	60%	<0.001	0.35	0.26-0.47	65%	<0.001	0.93	0.58-1.41	7%	0.294
non-user vs irregular	0.74	0.49-1.09	26%	0.045	0.52	0.34-0.74	48%	<0.001	0.76	0.42-1.27	24%	0.073
non-user vs regular	0.15	0.01-0.39	85%	<0.001	0.00	0.00-0.00	100%	<0.001	NaN	NaN	NaN	NA
irregular vs regular	0.21	0.01-0.56	79%	<0.001	0.00	0.00-0.00	100%	<0.001	NaN	NaN	NaN	NA
Death												
non-user vs user	0.34	0.24-0.47	66%	<0.001	0.32	0.22-0.44	68%	<0.001	1.00	0.60-1.56	0%	0.457
non-user vs irregular	0.67	0.45-0.98	33%	0.018	0.49	0.31-0.74	51%	<0.001	0.80	0.42-1.37	20%	0.113
non-user vs regular	0.08	0.00-0.23	92%	<0.001	0.14	0.00-0.38	86%	<0.001	Inf	Inf-Inf	-Inf%	1.000
irregular vs regular	0.13	0.00-0.37	87%	<0.001	0.28	0.00-0.79	72%	0.070	Inf	Inf-Inf	-Inf%	1.000

Table 4. i-KC22 model with probabilistic stop on infection. Stop probability: 0.30 (irregular), 0.05 (regular). Statistics for hospitalisations and deaths are reported for all individuals in the cohort.

Immortal time bias protection of infected 'regular' users




Figure 3. KB22’s “regular” use group [8] created more immortal time bias. A. Simulated dates of hospitalisation in i-ENR for individuals grouped by exposure according to KB22-defined usage groups. The study end date is marked with a vertical line. B. Dates of death. C. Relative risk of hospitalisation and death for “regular” ivermectin users compared to “irregular” and non-users. Risk ratios are calculated and plotted for each of 1000 simulations. Dates of hospitalisation and death are shown for all individuals across 1000 simulations. (Corresponding results under the i-INF and i-KC22 models are shown in Figures S4 and S5, respectively.)

314 Discussion

315 Re-analysis of KC22 and KB22 shows no benefit from ivermectin use on infec- 316 tions, hospitalisations, or death

317 A comparison between the key findings in KC22 and KB22 and our re-analysis is found in Ta-
318 ble 4. The apparent risk reduction from documented artefacts — including well-known biases
319 and sampling errors — accounts for all of the reported benefits of ivermectin claimed in both
320 KC22 and KB22. As the key findings from Table 4 underlie all subsequent analyses in KC22 and
321 KB22, none of the results reported in either paper holds up to scrutiny.

322 The errors in KC22 and KB22 are pervasive. Should they have been obvious?

323 The biases and failings in KC22 and KB22 originate from a mix of sources, as outlined in Fig. 4.
324 However, all of the issues except for missing data late in the study period (Fig. 4G) are a con-
325 sequence of the study design itself. In addition, all of the issues with the possible exception
326 of excluding private hospitalisations (Fig. 4H) lead to fictitious benefit to the ivermectin user
327 group.

328 While each issue can be considered independently, it is important to note that many of
329 them also interact. For instance, excluding late hospitalisations and deaths (Fig. 4E-F) does
330 not on its own benefit the ivermectin user group, but enrolment bias (Fig. 4A-B) shifts the
331 distribution of non-user infections earlier than user infections, so attrition bias from late events
332 (Fig. 4E-F) provides more apparent protection to users than non-users against hospitalisation
333 and death. All of these biases should be evident, immediately or after some thought, to any
334 scientific or medical professional with training and experience in clinical study design.

335 Understanding other sources of bias in KC22 and KB22 requires data. To appreciate the
336 chronological bias during enrolment, for example, one must at least be aware of public data
337 such as reported case rates over time. Still other issues, such as potential missing data, require
338 careful examination, cross-tabulation, and analysis of available data to identify the extent of
339 particular issues.

340 Another striking bias in KC22 and KB22, not addressed by our analysis, is the complete lack
341 of attention to health inequity. This is hard to fathom given the likelihood of socioeconomic




Figure 4. Schematic overview of different biases and errors in the design and analysis of KC22 and KB22. Red icons represent mistaken inclusion of events; gray icons represent missing, dropped, or wrongly excluded events. **A-H.** Biases and errors in KC22. **I** Additional biases and errors in KB22 (which also includes all issues in KC22).

342 differences between participants and non-participants. Participation in the Itajaí program required individuals to take proactive steps: they needed to travel to distribution centres, sign up for the program, register their information, receive medication, and return periodically for medication refills. KC22 and KB22 included known *prognostic* factors in propensity score matching after infection. However, neither KC22 nor KB22 accounted for any socioeconomic factors as potential covariates affecting either infection risk or prognosis, even though impoverished and vulnerable populations are known to have higher risk and worse outcomes for many diseases and to be harder to reach and recruit for clinical studies [20, 21]. These well-known inequities were magnified during the early phases of COVID-19 because of stresses in public health systems [22–25]. Furthermore, health inequity — including during the COVID-19 pandemic — is an area of active study in Brazil, with greater risk of hospitalisation and death from social inequity and disadvantage [26–28]. Indeed, health inequity is an unavoidable concern for these study if for no other reason than the fact that hospitalisations are only reported for public hospitals (Fig. 4H).

356 In our view, the issues above should have been recognised and addressed by the authors, and most of them should have been recognised and questioned by the reviewers.

358 They were not. Instead, each paper was submitted, revised, and accepted in a matter of days, and immediately entered public discussion with a primary focus on the large size of the study population and the large magnitude of reported risk reduction, as if a large reported risk reduction must be true if the study itself is large. Unfortunately the opposite may hold if a study is built on a fallacious design. In such a case both the reported treatment effect and the apparent confidence (especially when reported as “statistical significance”) may increase with a larger study population [29–31], even if there is no actual effect of treatment. This appears to be the situation with KC22 and KB22.

366 **The growing consensus and persistent divide on use of ivermectin for Covid-19**

367 Ivermectin has been known to have different mechanisms in vertebrates and nematodes for
368 over 30 years [32]. Ivermectin's mechanism and safety as an antiparasitic stems from its potent
369 targeting of glutamate-gated chloride channel receptors essential for nematodes but not found
370 in vertebrates [33]. When ivermectin was first suggested for COVID-19 based on *in vitro* exper-
371 iments [4], the suggestion was not altogether unreasonable: some of the same researchers
372 had reported a possible antiviral mechanism through the nuclear α/β 1 importin complex[34,
373 35]. However, those studies were undertaken in cell lines such as Vero E6 or HeLa (both widely
374 used for viral assays); when careful comparison studies were carried out in more relevant hu-
375 man bronchial epithelial cells, ivermectin had no effect on SARS-CoV-2 replication [36]. There
376 were other reasons to be sceptical of the initial enthusiasm; the well-studied pharmacokinetics
377 and pharmacodynamics of ivermectin strongly imply that it would be impossible to replicate
378 in humans the concentrations required for *in vitro* activity [37, 38].

379 Some doctors began prescribing ivermectin based on preliminary and preclinical studies,
380 even as most mainstream public health authorities encouraged waiting for clinical trials. As a
381 result, hundreds of studies of ivermectin for COVID-19 have been published in the last three
382 years, including dozens of clinical trials, numerous cell biology and biochemical studies, mech-
383 anistic speculation based on molecular docking, and competing reviews. Some of the earli-
384 est high-profile studies reporting large effects of ivermectin have been retracted or otherwise
385 flagged for ethical concerns [39, 40]. Meta-analyses that included such flawed analysis have
386 also been retracted [41] and reviews advocating for the immediate use of ivermectin [42] have
387 been criticised as deeply problematic [43]. One possible lesson from both ivermectin meta-
388 analysis and vaccine clinical trials is to require use of anonymised individual patient data, rather
389 than summary data alone, for assessment of bias in meta-analysis [44, 45].

390 Recent rigorous randomised clinical trials have largely not found clinical benefit for iver-
391 mectin use in COVID-19 [46–50], strengthening the growing scientific and clinical consensus
392 not to recommend clinical use of ivermectin for COVID-19 treatment or prophylaxis [51]. This
393 consensus remains persistently rejected by ivermectin advocates citing smaller RCTs or obser-
394 vational studies that appear to show an enormous effect of ivermectin. As with any area of
395 active research, interpretations regarding ivermectin's efficacy might differ based on the cho-
396 sen data sets and their assessments, underscoring the need for more thorough and objective
397 analysis of the available literature. What began as a scientific disagreement has become a
398 challenge for effective science communication in the context of public health.

399 This work focuses on the fallacies in KB22 and KC22 specifically, rather than any general
400 question of ivermectin for COVID-19. Readers interested in that question should refer to [51].
401 Our work highlights the dangers posed by scientific misinformation. Not only have the un-
402 founded conclusions of these papers been used to spread misinformation, methodological crit-
403 icism of them leads to aggressive and misleading attacks, as happened upon the initial release
404 of this study as a preprint [52, 53]. Regional, national, and international organisations¹ have
405 sprung up to advocate for ivermectin and other non-proven or weakly supported treatments
406 for COVID-19, and strive to influence public opinion. Ivermectin-for-COVID advocacy groups
407 maintain their position and influence through mechanisms including promoting “science by
408 preprint”, exploiting perfunctory peer review, aggressively using social media, and cultivating
409 socio-political alliances including the anti-vaccination movement. Observational studies are
410 particularly vulnerable to misinterpretation and use as misinformation.

411 **The use of simulation to solve statistical fallacies**

412 Statistical fallacies or ‘statistical lies’ affect our lives in many ways: we read them in newspapers,
413 we hear them in conversation, we inadvertently make them ourselves, and they are unfortu-
414 nately common in science. The fallacies often go hand-in-hand with cognitive heuristics that
415 bias our perception of reality [54]. For instance, salience bias (the tendency to focus on remark-
416 able events or prominent features) leads people to overestimate risk of rare events and make

¹These include the Front Line COVID-19 Critical Care Alliance (FLCCC) and America's Frontline Doctors in the United States, Médicos Pela Vida in Brazil, and the World Council for Health.

417 decisions that appear irrational and incur a cost to themselves and to society [55, 56].

418 Despite the review process, biases and statistical fallacies also arise in scientific literature
419 [19, 57], and proliferation of these fallacies carries the potential for disaster: the incorrect
420 conclusions of KC22 and KB22 for instance, were used to support arguments that ivermectin
421 was at least as effective as vaccination against COVID-19 related death, potentially increasing
422 vaccine hesitancy and thereby increasing the global death toll due to COVID-19.

423 One of the most famous statistical fallacies is seen in the Monty Hall problem, named for the
424 original host of the American television show "Let's Make a Deal", where a variant of this puzzle
425 appeared in every episode. In this puzzle, a player is presented three closed doors and asked
426 to choose one. Behind one of these doors is a prize which the player will win if they choose
427 the correct door. Once the player has chosen a door, the host reveals which of the other two
428 doors does not contain the prize, and subsequently asks the player if they would like to stick
429 with their initial choice or switch to the other closed door. When presented for the first time,
430 most people assume that switching their choice will not affect the likelihood of winning a prize
431 [58] The answer, however² is that the likelihood of winning a prize after switching is two thirds,
432 whereas the likelihood of winning is only one third when the participant doesn't switch doors.

433 Remarkably, even when people are shown explanations, simulations and mathematical
434 proofs, many - including renown statisticians - still refuse to accept the answer of the puzzle [58,
435 59]. Studies using repeated simulations of the Monte Hall problem show a remarkable adop-
436 tion of the correct answer. Herein participants play the game over and over on the computer,
437 and get feedback on how often they won the prize. The Monte Carlo simulation that we use
438 here is basically an automation of this process. Akin to the Monte Hall problem, researchers
439 may falsely reason that it is correct to include participants that got infected by COVID-19 before
440 registering/consuming ivermectin as non-users in a rolling registration context. But simulating
441 the process unveils that an artificial efficacy emerges for the treatment group. We hope there-
442 fore that our work extends beyond a correction of these two papers, and helps researchers of
443 observational trials in general not to repeat these fallacies.

444 **Methods and materials**

445 **Starting data**

446 We used data made available by the authors of KC22 at DOI 10.17605/OSF.IO/UXHAF. This data
447 was missing critical information, which we addressed as follows. City-wide monthly infections
448 and deaths were taken from [43], which in turn obtained them from the Brazilian Health Min-
449 istry. We also used the Brazilian Health Ministry resource to obtain national reporting data
450 for individuals including dates of symptom onset, hospitalisation, and death, though this was
451 largely limited to hospitalised patients during the time of the study. We downloaded this data
452 on 26 September 2022. While the study began enrolling participants on July 7, 2020, the KC22
453 data does not indicate when any individual patient joined the program and was provided iver-
454 mectin. We used an estimate of program enrolment over time by following municipal bulletins
455 from Itajaí as well as contemporaneous articles in the local Itajaí press (e.g. [60]). Sources for
456 each estimate are in the GitHub repository.

457 **Analysis of overlap between KC22 and Brazilian Health Ministry data**

458 Data from KC22 was cross-tabulated with public data from the Brazilian Health Ministry. Af-
459 ter identifying variables that were available in both data sets, we identified matches between
460 infected individuals (both users and non-users) from KC22 and infected individuals from the
461 health ministry data. Matches were counted only if they were identical for all of the variables
462 considered (birth date, hospitalisation status, sex, and death outcome). We considered records
463 of deaths and hospitalised survivors separately. When matching on deaths, we ignored hos-
464 pitalisation because hospitalisation details were apparently incorrect for many records of de-
465 ceased individuals in the KC22 data. Specifically, 95% of death records in the Itajaí citywide

²in the simplest case, assuming that the host always opens the wrong door and always gives the player a choice to switch

466 data from DATASUS were marked as hospitalised, but only 65% of deaths in the KC22 data
467 were marked as hospitalised.

468 A few entries in KC22 had more than one match to the health ministry data, which could be
469 due to data errors or multiple infections. We included only the single match with the latest date
470 of symptom onset in order to avoid over-counting pre-study inclusion in KC22 and to minimise
471 the estimate of immortal time bias.

472 **Allocation to exposure and outcome groups**

473 For each simulation experiment, repeated Bernoulli trials were conducted for each of the
474 159,560 individuals to assign them to exposure groups (users or non users) as well as out-
475 comes (infections, hospitalisations, deaths). Hospitalisation was always preceded by infection,
476 and death was always preceded by hospitalisation. All allocation probabilities were fixed based
477 on the number of users, non-users, infections, hospitalisations, and deaths reported in KC22
478 (e.g. probability to be an ivermectin user is $113,844 / 159,560$).

479 **Simulation of event times and ivermectin usage**

480 For each simulated individual that contracted COVID-19, was hospitalised, or died, the event
481 date was sampled from the empirical distributions of official government records. In the case
482 of missing data, we used complete cases to confirm published reports that time periods in the
483 progression of COVID-19 were well-approximated by a Weibull distribution [61–63], and then
484 created an objective function using the empirical mean and standard deviation of time delays
485 to numerically optimise the Weibull scale and shape parameters to impute missing event dates.

486 In the i-ENR and i-INF models, the empirical distribution of symptom onset times were used
487 identically, but limited pre-study onset (< 1 month) was possible in the i-INF model provided
488 the notification date was within the study period. In the case of the i-KC22 model, we sampled
489 onset dates for matched records for those marked as hospitalised or deceased. For those not
490 marked as hospitalised or deceased, imputed onset dates from a smooth (loess) distribution
491 of onset dates from the matched records. We included unmatched late (post-study period)
492 hospitalisations and deaths in order to estimate the impact of these biases in Table 3.

493 Intended ivermectin usage was truncated to actual usage as follows. In probabilistic trun-
494 cation, infected users with high intended usage (≥ 30 pills) were less likely ($p = 0.05$) to stop
495 usage on infection than those with lower intended usage ($p = 0.3$). In deterministic truncation,
496 all infected users stopped ivermectin use upon infection. In all cases, infected users stopped
497 upon hospitalisation. Ivermectin users were split into irregular (≤ 10 pills) and regular users
498 (≥ 30 pills) based on simulated actual usage.

499 **Calculation of simulated estimates**

500 Risk ratios were calculated using unconditional maximum likelihood (Wald statistic), while con-
501 fidence intervals and p values estimated from 1000 bootstraps using the `riskratio.boot` func-
502 tion from the `epitools` package in R [64]. Summary statistics from KC22 and KB22 were re-
503 estimated the same way for consistency. For summary statistics after correction, we assumed
504 any true effects of ivermectin were independent of apparent effects from artefacts and errors.
505 Risk ratios, confidence intervals, and p values after correction were calculated by 1000 boot-
506 straps of simulated and reported data for each simulation.

507 **Data and code availability**

508 All data is publicly available at either DOI 10.17605/OSF.IO/UXHAF (posted by Kerr et
509 al), the Brazil Ministry of Health (<https://www.gov.br/saude/pt-br>), or Our World in Data
510 (<https://ourworldindata.org/COVID-cases>). R code to reproduce the analysis is available at
511 <https://github.com/gtuckerkellogg/itajai-reanalysis>.

512 **Author contributions**

513 RM conducted the research required to uncover all fallacies mentioned in the manuscript (de-
514 layed registrations, missing data, incorrect inclusion of prior infections, all biases). GTK inde-

515 pendently uncovered and estimated the immortal time bias, enrolment bias, and attrition bias.
516 RM and GTK wrote the simulation and analysis code. GTK in particular, RM, and ACPA con-
517 tributed to writing and reviewing the manuscript. ACPA acquired the data from the Brazilian
518 Health Ministry. ACPA has been in frequent contact with Itajaí City Hall in an attempt to get
519 access to missing raw data. RM has been in frequent contact with the KC22 and KB22 authors
520 in an attempt to discuss the issues in their work before publishing this manuscript. RM has
521 additionally been in frequent contact with the authors following the initial preprint release,
522 attempting to address the incorrect public statements made by the authors of KC22 and KB22.

523 Acknowledgements

524 We thank Gideon Meyerowitz-Katz, Lisa Tucker-Kellogg, Andrew Gelman, Amichai Perlman, and
525 Annelot Mills for their valuable comments and feedback. We would like to thank Daniel Victor
526 Tausk for identifying issues related to DATASUS filtering in our preprint and for recommending
527 more precise methods to match DATASUS with data from KC22.

528 References

- 529 [1] Seth Flaxman et al. "Estimating the effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions on
530 COVID-19 in Europe". In: *Nature* 584.7820 (Aug. 2020). Number: 7820 Publisher: Nature
531 Publishing Group, pp. 257–261.
- 532 [2] Patrick G. T. Walker et al. "The impact of COVID-19 and strategies for mitigation and
533 suppression in low- and middle-income countries". In: *Science* 369.6502 (July 24, 2020).
534 Publisher: American Association for the Advancement of Science, pp. 413–422.
- 535 [3] Leonardo Furlan and Bruno Caramelli. "The regrettable story of the "Covid Kit" and the
536 "Early Treatment of Covid-19" in Brazil". In: *The Lancet Regional Health - Americas* 4 (Dec.
537 2021), p. 100089.
- 538 [4] Leon Caly et al. "The FDA-approved drug ivermectin inhibits the replication of
539 SARS-CoV-2 in vitro". In: *Antiviral Research* 178 (June 1, 2020), p. 104787.
- 540 [5] *Decree 11940 2020 of Itajaí SC. Regulamenta a Distribuição do Medicamento Ivermectina no*
541 *Município de Itajaí*. July 7, 2020. URL: <https://web.archive.org/web/20221022092413/https://leismunicipais.com.br/a/sc/i/itajai/decreto/2020/1194/11940/decreto-n-11940-2020-regulamenta-a-distribuicao-do-medicamento-ivermectina-no-municipio-de-itajai> (visited on
542 10/22/2022).
- 543
544
- 545 [6] "The Brazilian city being turned into a coronavirus "lab experiment"". In: *Coda Story*
546 <https://www.codastory.com/waronscience/brazil-covid19-ivermectin/> (Aug. 27, 2020).
- 547 [7] Lucy Kerr et al. "Ivermectin Prophylaxis Used for COVID-19: A Citywide, Prospective,
548 Observational Study of 223,128 Subjects Using Propensity Score Matching". In: *Cureus*
549 14.1 (Jan. 15, 2022). Publisher: Cureus.
- 550 [8] Lucy Kerr et al. "Regular Use of Ivermectin as Prophylaxis for COVID-19 Led Up to a 92%
551 Reduction in COVID-19 Mortality Rate in a Dose-Response Manner: Results of a
552 Prospective Observational Study of a Strictly Controlled Population of 88,012 Subjects".
553 In: *Cureus* 14.8 (Aug. 31, 2022). Publisher: Cureus.
- 554 [9] Catalina Jaramillo. "Clinical Trials Show Ivermectin Does Not Benefit COVID-19 Patients,
555 Contrary to Social Media Claims". In: *FactCheck.org* (Sept. 15, 2022).
- 556 [10] "Fact Check-Gaps in study claiming that ivermectin reduces risk of COVID-19 death by
557 92%". In: *Reuters* (Sept. 20, 2022).
- 558 [11] "Study claiming that ivermectin reduces COVID-19 mortality by 92% has important
559 methodological problems". In: *Health Feedback* (Sept. 7, 2022).
- 560 [12] Author Adam Marcus. *Journal says ivermectin study met standard for 'credible science'*.
561 Retraction Watch. Sept. 19, 2022. URL: <https://retractionwatch.com/2022/09/19/journal-says-ivermectin-study-met-standard-for-credible-science/> (visited on 04/25/2023).
562

- 563 [13] Sander van der Linden. "Misinformation: susceptibility, spread, and interventions to
564 immunize the public". In: *Nature Medicine* (Mar. 10, 2022). Publisher: Nature Publishing
565 Group, pp. 1–8.
- 566 [14] Gordon Pennycook et al. "Shifting attention to accuracy can reduce misinformation
567 online". In: *Nature* 592.7855 (Apr. 2021). Number: 7855 Publisher: Nature Publishing
568 Group, pp. 590–595.
- 569 [15] Kamila Janmohamed et al. "Interventions to Mitigate COVID-19 Misinformation: A
570 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis". In: *Journal of Health Communication* 26.12
571 (Dec. 2, 2021). Publisher: Taylor & Francis _eprint:
572 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10810730.2021.2021460>, pp. 846–857.
- 573 [16] Catalog of Bias Collaboration, H Lee, and D Nunan. "Immortal time bias". In: *Catalog of*
574 *Bias*. May 16, 2020.
- 575 [17] Catalog of Bias Collaboration, EA Spencer, and C Heneghan. "Chronological bias". In:
576 *Catalog of Bias*. July 18, 2017.
- 577 [18] Catalog of Bias Collaboration et al. "Attrition bias". In: *Catalog of Bias*. July 20, 2017.
- 578 [19] D. L. Sackett. "Bias in analytic research". In: *Journal of Chronic Diseases* 32.1 (1979),
579 pp. 51–63.
- 580 [20] Grace Keegan, Angelena Crown, and Kathie-Ann Joseph. "Diversity, Equity, and
581 Inclusion in Clinical Trials". In: *Surgical Oncology Clinics of North America* 32.1 (Jan. 2023),
582 pp. 221–232.
- 583 [21] Stacy J. UyBico, Shani Pavel, and Cary P. Gross. "Recruiting Vulnerable Populations into
584 Research: A Systematic Review of Recruitment Interventions". In: *Journal of General*
585 *Internal Medicine* 22.6 (June 2007), pp. 852–863.
- 586 [22] Abigail LaPlante et al. "Enrollment, retention, and strategies for including
587 disadvantaged populations in randomized controlled trials: a systematic review
588 protocol". In: *Systematic Reviews* 10.1 (Aug. 18, 2021), p. 233.
- 589 [23] Alein Y. Haro-Ramos et al. "Frontline work and racial disparities in social and economic
590 pandemic stressors during the first COVID-19 surge". In: *Health Services Research*
591 (Jan. 31, 2023).
- 592 [24] Ricardo E. da Silva et al. "Factors Contributing to Exacerbating Vulnerabilities in Global
593 Clinical Trials". In: *Frontiers in Pharmacology* 8 (2017), p. 999.
- 594 [25] Daniel T. Lackland et al. "Impact of COVID-19 on Clinical Research and Inclusion of
595 Diverse Populations". In: *Ethnicity & Disease* 30.3 (2020), pp. 429–432.
- 596 [26] Paulo Ricardo Martins-Filho et al. "COVID-19 fatality rates related to social inequality in
597 Northeast Brazil: a neighbourhood-level analysis". In: *Journal of Travel Medicine* 27.7
598 (Nov. 9, 2020), taaa128.
- 599 [27] Carlos Dornels Freire de Souza, Rodrigo Feliciano do Carmo, and
600 Michael Ferreira Machado. "The burden of COVID-19 in Brazil is greater in areas with
601 high social deprivation". In: *Journal of Travel Medicine* 27.7 (Nov. 9, 2020), taaa145.
- 602 [28] Gabriela Drummond Marques da Silva et al. "Influência da desigualdade
603 socioeconômica na distribuição das internações e dos óbitos por covid-19 em
604 municípios brasileiros, 2020: um estudo ecológico Influência da desigualdade
605 socioeconômica na distribuição das internações e dos óbitos por covid-19 em
606 municípios brasileiros, 2020: um estudo ecológico". In: *Epidemiologia e serviços de saúde*
607 *: revista do Sistema Unico de Saude do Brasil* 32.1 (2023). Place: Brazil, e2022303.
- 608 [29] Sander Greenland et al. "Statistical tests, P values, confidence intervals, and power: a
609 guide to misinterpretations". In: *European Journal of Epidemiology* 31 (2016),
610 pp. 337–350.
- 611 [30] Jimmie Leppink, Kal Winston, and Patricia O'Sullivan. "Statistical significance does not
612 imply a real effect". In: *Perspectives on Medical Education* 5.2 (Apr. 1, 2016), pp. 122–124.

- 613 [31] C. L. Bandt and J. R. Boen. "A prevalent misconception about sample size, statistical
614 significance, and clinical importance". In: *Journal of Periodontology* 43.3 (Mar. 1972),
615 pp. 181–183.
- 616 [32] M. J. Turner and J. M. Schaeffer. "Mode of Action of Ivermectin". In: *Ivermectin and*
617 *Abamectin*. Ed. by William C. Campbell. New York, NY: Springer, 1989, pp. 73–88.
- 618 [33] Mohammed Atif et al. "Effects of glutamate and ivermectin on single glutamate-gated
619 chloride channels of the parasitic nematode *H. contortus*". In: *PLoS Pathogens* 13.10
620 (Oct. 2017). Publisher: PLOS.
- 621 [34] Kylie M. Wagstaff et al. "Ivermectin is a specific inhibitor of importin α/β -mediated
622 nuclear import able to inhibit replication of HIV-1 and dengue virus". In: *Biochemical*
623 *Journal* 443.3 (Apr. 16, 2012), pp. 851–856.
- 624 [35] Sundry N. Y. Yang et al. "The broad spectrum antiviral ivermectin targets the host
625 nuclear transport importin α/β 1 heterodimer". In: *Antiviral Research* 177 (May 1, 2020),
626 p. 104760.
- 627 [36] Nilima Dinesh Kumar et al. "Moxidectin and Ivermectin Inhibit SARS-CoV-2 Replication
628 in Vero E6 Cells but Not in Human Primary Bronchial Epithelial Cells". In: *Antimicrobial*
629 *Agents and Chemotherapy* 66.1 (Jan. 18, 2022). Publisher: American Society for
630 Microbiology, e01543–21.
- 631 [37] Ricardo Peña-Silva et al. "Pharmacokinetic considerations on the repurposing of
632 ivermectin for treatment of COVID-19". In: *British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology* 87.3
633 (2021). _eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/bcp.14476>,
634 pp. 1589–1590.
- 635 [38] Aránzazu González Canga et al. "The Pharmacokinetics and Interactions of Ivermectin
636 in Humans—A Mini-review". In: *The AAPS Journal* 10.1 (Jan. 25, 2008), pp. 42–46.
- 637 [39] Sara Reardon. "Flawed ivermectin preprint highlights challenges of COVID drug studies".
638 In: *Nature* 596.7871 (Aug. 2, 2021). Bandiera_abtest: a Cg_type: News Number: 7871
639 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group Subject_term: Research data, SARS-CoV-2, Public
640 health, Publishing, pp. 173–174.
- 641 [40] Gideon Meyerowitz-Katz et al. "Unethical studies of ivermectin for covid-19". In: *BMJ* 377
642 (Apr. 14, 2022). Publisher: British Medical Journal Publishing Group Section: Editorial,
643 o917.
- 644 [41] Andrew Hill et al. "Retraction to: Meta-analysis of Randomized Trials of Ivermectin to
645 Treat SARS-CoV-2 Infection". In: *Open Forum Infectious Diseases* 9.3 (Mar. 2022), ofac056.
- 646 [42] Pierre Kory et al. "Review of the Emerging Evidence Demonstrating the Efficacy of
647 Ivermectin in the Prophylaxis and Treatment of COVID-19". In: *American Journal of*
648 *Therapeutics* 28.3 (June 2021), e299.
- 649 [43] Gabriela Buffet, Raul Mendoza-Sassi, and Marinos Fysekidis. "Inaccurate Real-World
650 Data Does Not Provide Real-World Answers". In: *American Journal of Therapeutics* 28.5
651 (June 29, 2021), e596–e598.
- 652 [44] Jack M. Lawrence et al. "The lesson of ivermectin: meta-analyses based on summary
653 data alone are inherently unreliable". In: *Nature Medicine* 27.11 (Nov. 2021). Number: 11
654 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group, pp. 1853–1854.
- 655 [45] Kyle A. Sheldrick, Gideon Meyerowitz-Katz, and Greg Tucker-Kellogg. "Plausibility of
656 Claimed Covid-19 Vaccine Efficacies by Age: A Simulation Study". In: *American Journal of*
657 *Therapeutics* (2022).
- 658 [46] Steven Chee Loon Lim et al. "Efficacy of Ivermectin Treatment on Disease Progression
659 Among Adults With Mild to Moderate COVID-19 and Comorbidities: The I-TECH
660 Randomized Clinical Trial". In: *JAMA Internal Medicine* (Feb. 18, 2022).
- 661 [47] Gilmar Reis et al. "Effect of Early Treatment with Ivermectin among Patients with
662 Covid-19". In: *New England Journal of Medicine* 0.0 (Mar. 30, 2022). Publisher:
663 Massachusetts Medical Society _eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2115869>, null.

- 664 [48] Susanna Naggie et al. "Effect of Ivermectin vs Placebo on Time to Sustained Recovery in
665 Outpatients With Mild to Moderate COVID-19: A Randomized Clinical Trial". In: *JAMA*
666 328.16 (Oct. 25, 2022), pp. 1595–1603.
- 667 [49] Carolyn T. Bramante et al. "Randomized Trial of Metformin, Ivermectin, and
668 Flvoxamine for Covid-19". In: *The New England Journal of Medicine* 387.7 (Aug. 18, 2022),
669 pp. 599–610.
- 670 [50] Susanna Naggie et al. "Effect of Higher-Dose Ivermectin for 6 Days vs Placebo on Time
671 to Sustained Recovery in Outpatients With COVID-19: A Randomized Clinical Trial". In:
672 *JAMA* 329.11 (Mar. 21, 2023), pp. 888–897.
- 673 [51] Maria Popp et al. "Ivermectin for preventing and treating COVID-19". In: *Cochrane*
674 *Database of Systematic Reviews* 6 (2022). Publisher: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- 675 [52] Redação MPV. *Greg Tucker-Kellogg publishes fraudulent study to attack ivermectin.*
676 *Medicos Pela Vida*. Aug. 17, 2023. URL:
677 [https://medicospelavidacovid19.com.br/editoriais/greg-tucker-kellogg-publishes-fraudulent-](https://medicospelavidacovid19.com.br/editoriais/greg-tucker-kellogg-publishes-fraudulent-study-to-attack-ivermectin/)
678 [study-to-attack-ivermectin/](https://medicospelavidacovid19.com.br/editoriais/greg-tucker-kellogg-publishes-fraudulent-study-to-attack-ivermectin/) (visited on 09/24/2023).
- 679 [53] Redação MPV. *Médica publica estudo fraudulento para atacar pesquisa da ivermectina em*
680 *Itajaí*. *Medicos Pela Vida*. Aug. 17, 2023. URL:
681 [https://medicospelavidacovid19.com.br/editoriais/medica-publica-estudo-fraudulento-para-](https://medicospelavidacovid19.com.br/editoriais/medica-publica-estudo-fraudulento-para-atacar-pesquisa-da-ivermectina-em-itajai/)
682 [atacar-pesquisa-da-ivermectina-em-itajai/](https://medicospelavidacovid19.com.br/editoriais/medica-publica-estudo-fraudulento-para-atacar-pesquisa-da-ivermectina-em-itajai/) (visited on 09/24/2023).
- 683 [54] A. Tversky and D. Kahneman. "Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases". In:
684 *Science* 185.4157 (1974), pp. 1124–1131.
- 685 [55] Pedro Bordalo, Nicola Gennaioli, and Andrei Shleifer. "Saliency Theory of Choice Under
686 Risk". In: *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 127.3 (Aug. 1, 2012), pp. 1243–1285.
- 687 [56] Pedro Bordalo, Nicola Gennaioli, and Andrei Shleifer. "Saliency and consumer choice".
688 In: *Journal of Political Economy* 121.5 (2013). Publisher: University of Chicago Press
689 Chicago, IL, pp. 803–843.
- 690 [57] Andrew Gelman and Eric Loken. "The statistical crisis in science". In: *American Scientist*
691 102.6 (2014). Publisher: Sigma XI-The Scientific Research Society, p. 460.
- 692 [58] Peter Mueser and Donald Granberg. *The Monty Hall Dilemma Revisited: Understanding*
693 *the Interaction of Problem Definition and Decision Making*. Experimental. University
694 Library of Munich, Germany, 1999.
- 695 [59] Lore Saenen et al. "Why Humans Fail in Solving the Monty Hall Dilemma: A Systematic
696 Review". In: *Psychologica Belgica* 58.1 (June 1, 2018). tex.ids=
697 saenenWhyHumansFail2018a, pp. 128–158.
- 698 [60] "TCE pede explicações à prefeitura de Itajaí sobre distribuição de ivermectina; médicos
699 dividem opinião sobre uso contra Covid-19". In: *globo.com* (July 31, 2020),
700 [https://g1.globo.com/sc/santa-catarina/noticia/2020/07/31/tce-pede-explicacoes-a-](https://g1.globo.com/sc/santa-catarina/noticia/2020/07/31/tce-pede-explicacoes-a-prefeitura-de-itajai-sobre-compra-e-distribuicao-de-antiparasitario-medicos-dividem-opinio-sobre-uso-contr-covid-19.ghtml)
701 [prefeitura-de-itajai-sobre-compra-e-distribuicao-de-antiparasitario-medicos-](https://g1.globo.com/sc/santa-catarina/noticia/2020/07/31/tce-pede-explicacoes-a-prefeitura-de-itajai-sobre-compra-e-distribuicao-de-antiparasitario-medicos-dividem-opinio-sobre-uso-contr-covid-19.ghtml)
702 [dividem-opinio-sobre-uso-contr-covid-19.ghtml](https://g1.globo.com/sc/santa-catarina/noticia/2020/07/31/tce-pede-explicacoes-a-prefeitura-de-itajai-sobre-compra-e-distribuicao-de-antiparasitario-medicos-dividem-opinio-sobre-uso-contr-covid-19.ghtml).
- 703 [61] Ke Men et al. "Estimate the incubation period of coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19)." In:
704 *Computers in biology and medicine* 158 (May 2023). Place: United States, p. 106794.
- 705 [62] Long V. Bui et al. "Estimation of the incubation period of COVID-19 in Vietnam." In: *PloS*
706 *one* 15.12 (2020). Place: United States, e0243889.
- 707 [63] Giacomo Grasselli et al. "Hospital-Acquired Infections in Critically Ill Patients With
708 COVID-19." In: *Chest* 160.2 (Aug. 2021). Place: United States, pp. 454–465.
- 709 [64] Tomas J. Aragon. *epitools: Epidemiology tools*. manual. 2020.