**Original: https://sudaca.pe/2021/01/26/ivermectina-vacunas-y-anticiencia/**

**Google translate:**

By promoting ivermectin as a cure for Covid-19 without scientific evidence, our authorities have undermined their own credibility in promoting the safety of vaccines against the disease.

The recent national Ipsos survey shows that 48% of those interviewed would not be vaccinated when vaccines against Covid-19 are massively offered in Peru. It also shows that 13% of these believe that vaccines are not necessary, since ivermectin can cure this disease. There is much scientific evidence in favor of the safety and efficacy of vaccines, and very little and insufficient to show the effectiveness of ivermectin. What has been the position of the Peruvian government regarding the latter?

Despite the lack of evidence, until October 2020 our government officially included ivermectin in its protocols to treat Covid-19. One might think that our authorities would have bet on it because there was nothing to lose and a lot to gain: it is not known if it is effective, but at least it is harmless and economical. But this was not the message that transpired. On the contrary, a few weeks ago former President Martín Vizcarra said that, although there is no scientific evidence, somehow he knew that ivermectin worked. Likewise, the Peruvian Medical College (CMP) has spread ambiguous messages, emphasizing, for example, that Dr. Ciro Maguiña took ivermectin before he was cured of Covid-19, to later affirm that there is no scientific evidence on the efficacy of this drug . Reading this, the laypeople obviously wonder: How does Vizcarra know that ivermectin works? Does Vizcarra have “unscientific” evidence, which would be as acceptable as scientific evidence in this context? And what does Dr. Maguiña know that the world scientific "establishment" does not? Perhaps it can be argued that the bet on ivermectin would be defensible in an emergency context, especially during the initial months of the pandemic, but the open disdain for the evidence shown by the government and the CMP could have dire social consequences. Despite the policy change by the Ministry of Health regarding the use of ivermectin, the damage has already been done.

But what would this damage be? Isn't it, after all, a harmless medicine? In the first place, more needs to be studied if it is really harmless in Covid-19 situations. But more importantly, the claims and measures have created a time bomb, undermining the credibility of medical institutions. By promoting ivermectin without evidence, the government (and the CMP and all who support it) have openly questioned the recommendations of internationally reputed bodies such as the American Center for Disease Control and Prevention, and the World Health Organization. It is precisely these organisms that defend the safety of vaccines. What will happen then when the vaccines arrive in Peru? How is the government going to justify that vaccines are safe? Will you say that the safety has been scientifically proven? The government has closed that door to itself, because how are they going to explain to the population that when it comes to ivermectin, you don't need scientific evidence, but when it comes to vaccines, you should trust the medical authorities? By having implemented ivermectin as public policy using ambiguous messages, the government has assumed the role of a suprascientific tribunal, thus politicizing a debate that should have remained at the scientific level.

What can be done? Trust in science must be promoted. Critical spirit yes, but criticism has to be reasonable and not based on mere speculation. The first thing then is to coordinate a clear and honest message about ivermectin and other possible treatments against Covid-19. The second is to disseminate information on the scientific studies that are being carried out. The third is to take advantage of this opportunity to educate the population about the details that are behind the construction of scientific knowledge. Our authorities have to trust that Peruvians can understand complex situations. But above all, they have to stop generating confusion, and focus on providing clarity in these uncertain times.
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