

Document Title	Ros Atkins on... BBC	
Lead Authors	Ros Atkins	
Body	BBC News	
Status	Broadcast	
Peer reviewed	N/A	
Broadcast	16 September 2021, 7:30pm	
Summary	<p><b>A misleading piece intent on painting ivermectin as “dangerous horse paste”.</b></p> <p><b>Let’s be clear: Ivermectin is also used for animals.</b> Just like aspirin and antibiotics are used for animals, ivermectin is a very effective human medication. It is FDA and MHRA approved and a <b>WHO “Essential Medicine”</b>, eradicating horrific illnesses through 4 billion doses given to people over 40 years. It continues to protect millions and in normal doses is not ‘dangerous’; it is very safe, <u>a hundred times safer than aspirin</u>.</p> <p>Ivermectin has strong antiviral and anti-inflammatory properties and features in early covid treatment protocols from expert clinicians worldwide - not ‘right wing anti-vax extremists’ as Atkins maliciously portrayed advocates.</p> <p><b>He falsely claimed</b> that there is ‘no evidence’ for ivermectin for Covid. There is lots of it; over 64 studies so far. 45 are peer-reviewed and 35 are RCTs, involving 26,509 patients. Conducted by world-class researchers and medical professionals, they include gold standard meta-analyses in published and peer-reviewed journals supporting ivermectin for covid. All have failed to be noticed by Atkins’ team.</p> <p>The real truth is that the introduction of (human) ivermectin could save countless lives and remove many of the restrictions surrounding covid, just as health authorities in India, Mexico and many other countries have discovered.</p> <p>But these inconvenient facts don’t suit Atkins’ ‘horse paste’ narrative – provocatively making 30 references to animals. The article by the New York Times he quotes has been debunked. This programme is poorly researched and biased. <b>The BBC needs to uphold its responsibilities as a public broadcaster or continue to lose the public trust.</b></p>	

## Problems with the Report:

Ros Atkins:	Analysis	Further information
<p><i>Obsessive focus on dangers especially 'large' doses of the animal version of ivermectin.</i></p>	<p><b>We 100% agree, don't use animal medicines.</b> No serious advocate of ivermectin is suggesting that.</p> <p>Strangely, the editorial team chose to tell this as mainly an animal medicine story following a now debunked press release in the USA.</p> <p>Horses, cows and other animals are mentioned or depicted 30+ times. Peppered with emotional tags such 'goo', 'de-wormer' and 'paste', the intention appears to overtly and subliminally repulse the viewer against ivermectin rather than apply any kind of objectivity or further understanding.</p> <p>Atkins brushed over the fact that ivermectin is safely used for humans. 4 billion times - transforming and saving their lives. It is safer than aspirin and works well with pretty much every other medicine.</p> <p>By focusing on the danger of medicines that have animal versions, this would imply people should avoid taking aspirin, antibiotics and other common medications.</p>	<p>Useful video to understand the difference between animals and humans and ivermectin. <a href="https://youtu.be/blbVs8eBUk">https://youtu.be/ blbVs8eBUk</a></p> <p>Ivermectin is safe up to 10 times recommended dosage <a href="https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12362927/">https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12362927/</a></p> <p>Chris Whitty describes as 'safe': <a href="https://academic.oup.com/jid/article/202/1/113/888773">https://academic.oup.com/jid/article/202/1/113/888773</a></p>
<p><i>"There is no data for ivermectin for covid" as if it was a fact.</i></p>	<p><b>Untrue, there's loads of data</b></p> <p>64 Studies – 45 are peer-reviewed - with 26,500 participants plenty of <a href="#">data</a> from multiple sources from around the world by world-eminent scientists.</p> <p>On average the data show a reduction of deaths from covid by 68% for early treatment and 86% in prevention when using ivermectin. There are seven meta analyses from highly credible researchers from all over the world.</p> <p>The report didn't acknowledge any of them. Credible journalism should acknowledge their existence and their findings.</p>	<p>Summary of data <a href="https://c19ivermectin.com/">https://c19ivermectin.com/</a></p> <p>Meta analysis <a href="https://journals.lww.com/americantherapeutics/Abstract/9000/ivermectin_for_Prevention_and_Treatment_of_98040.aspx">https://journals.lww.com/americantherapeutics/Abstract/9000/ivermectin_for_Prevention_and_Treatment_of_98040.aspx</a></p> <p>Debunking criticism: <a href="https://osf.io/peqci/">https://osf.io/peqci/</a></p>
<p><i>"228% increase US National Poison Data System"</i></p>	<p><b>The numbers are just plain wrong:</b></p> <p>Adverse reports to AAPCC and the National Poison Data System (NPDS) Bulletin from Jan to August 2021 showed an increase of 708 year on year. 435 to 1143. That's 162%</p> <p>But what was completely missed out was that this increase is a <b>fraction</b> of 2,344% increase in reported usage – 88,000 prescriptions were mentioned. You would expect adverse reports to rise by a similar amount but they didn't. VAERS (adverse drug reactions) reports also didn't increase.</p> <p>Why are six telephone calls to poison control about Ivermectin newsworthy, yet over 100,000 calls to poison control on Tylenol/Paracetamol each year are not. Moreover, no one dies of Ivermectin in a typical year, yet Tylenol accounts for 56,000 annual emergency room visits, 2,600 hospitalisations, and almost 500 deaths.</p> <p>To be clear, none of the 1143 Ivermectin-related telephone calls made to Poison Control across the United States from January 1, 2021 through August 31, 2021 dealt with a severe reaction to veterinary</p>	<p><a href="https://trialsitenews.com/u-s-poison-control-ivermectin-data-analyzed-by-trialsite-some-surprises/">https://trialsitenews.com/u-s-poison-control-ivermectin-data-analyzed-by-trialsite-some-surprises/</a> <a href="#">Desert Review</a></p> <p><a href="https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15239078/">https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15239078/</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.thedesertreview.com/news/the-ivermectin-deworming-hoax---part-iii-poison-control-exposed/article_a553b7f2-1a31-11ec-881a-a7df53e98d65.html">https://www.thedesertreview.com/news/the-ivermectin-deworming-hoax---part-iii-poison-control-exposed/article_a553b7f2-1a31-11ec-881a-a7df53e98d65.html</a></p>

Ros Atkins:	Analysis	Further information
	Ivermectin. Not one. Yet, if you read the media reports, you would be led to believe this was a significant problem. It isn't.	
<i>"It doesn't work"</i>	<p><b>It does work, in fact.</b></p> <p>Real-world examples: Cases in Uttar Pradesh (pop &gt; 230 million) have dropped from 37,944 on April 24 to 5,964 on May 22 - a decline of 84%. despite only 15% vaccination rates.</p> <p>In Peru the same, when ivermectin was rolled out it drastically shrunk the death and hospitalisation toll. When it was stopped, by politicians, they rose again.</p> <p>Perhaps a cursory glance by the editorial team would have surfaced the 60+ studies that show efficacy of the human version in humans, rather than the recycled and debunked story in the US media about the animal version in humans. Indian lawyers are even <b>suing WHO</b> for advocating deprivation of life-saving medication.</p>	<p><a href="https://www.thedesertreview.com/opinion/letters_to_editor/is-ivermectin-the-new-penicillin/article_b6b7afd8-bd77-11eb-8259-af11e3c83aea.html">https://www.thedesertreview.com/opinion/letters_to_editor/is-ivermectin-the-new-penicillin/article_b6b7afd8-bd77-11eb-8259-af11e3c83aea.html</a></p> <p><a href="https://indianexpress.com/article/cities/lucknow/uttar-pradesh-government-says-ivermectin-helped-to-keep-deaths-low-7311786/">https://indianexpress.com/article/cities/lucknow/uttar-pradesh-government-says-ivermectin-helped-to-keep-deaths-low-7311786/</a></p> <p><a href="https://manilastandard.net/opinion/columns/crossroads-by-j-a-delacruz/358374/indian-bar-association-sues-who.html">https://manilastandard.net/opinion/columns/crossroads-by-j-a-delacruz/358374/indian-bar-association-sues-who.html</a></p>
<i>You quote New York Times article saying 'No Evidence'</i>	<p><b>The NY times retracted that article before the broadcast.</b></p> <p>Atkins' researchers didn't mention that. The NY Times is a known opponent of ivermectin judging from all their articles on the subject. None of them are unbiased.</p> <p>Yes, there is research which is neutral of ivermectin for covid. But, these are heavily outnumbered by those that show a strong, positive outcome. Currently 86% effective overall. None of them show that ivermectin causes any harm.</p> <p>Even so, we believe in science over politics and we still acknowledge the non-positive reports exist.</p> <p>Also worth noting that the NYT printed a serious error overstating calls to poison control centre by 35 times. Rather than print a retraction they just deleted the info. Perhaps, not the most reliable of sources.</p>	<p><a href="https://politicofire.com/2021/09/18/new-york-times-issues-major-correction-to-story-with-erroneous-claim-about-ivermectin-ingestion-poof-but-damage-done/">https://politicofire.com/2021/09/18/new-york-times-issues-major-correction-to-story-with-erroneous-claim-about-ivermectin-ingestion-poof-but-damage-done/</a></p> <p><a href="https://resistthemainstream.org/nyt-finally-corrects-claim-about-ivermectin/?utm_source=telegram">https://resistthemainstream.org/nyt-finally-corrects-claim-about-ivermectin/?utm_source=telegram</a></p>
<i>Erosion of Trust in Politics and Science, Business (and media)</i>	<p><b>We agree!</b> The discussion with Ros and Jennifer Reich about the loss of trust in institutions over many years was interesting. However, they omitted to mention the media bears much responsibility. The lack of public confidence is not surprising with media reports such as this which do not provide correct information or journalistic balance and can easily be shown up for their falsehoods.</p>	<p>Pharma is in the driving seat</p> <p><a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=z_W3yRA9I8">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=z_W3yRA9I8</a></p>

## Open Invitation to the Authors

**We invite the authors to review their report and will be happy to discuss these facts with them at any time.**

[corrections@bird-group.org](mailto:corrections@bird-group.org)

**About Us**

The principle aim for Bird Group and the FLCCC is the health and welfare of people suffering from Covid everywhere. The evidence across many studies which clearly points to an effectiveness of ivermectin and as medical professionals it is our duty to ensure that studies are fair regardless of their conclusions.

More information at [bird-group.org](http://bird-group.org) and [flccc.net](http://flccc.net)