Ivermectin for COVID-19 in Peru: 14-fold reduction in nationwide excess deaths, $p < 0.002$ for effect by state, then 13-fold increase after ivermectin use restricted

Juan J. Chamie-Quintero,^a Jennifer A. Hibberd,^b David E Scheim^c

Lead author:

Juan J. Chamie, Independent data analyst, Cambridge, MA (USA)
email: jchamieq@eafit.edu.co

Jennifer A. Hibberd

Jennifer A. Hibberd, DDS, MRCDC (email: drjenniferhibberd@gmail.com)
William Osler Health System; Trillium Health Partners Hospital Centres; Instructor at the University of Toronto, Canada

Corresponding author:

David E. Scheim, PhD, US Public Health Service, Commissioned Corps, Inactive Reserve
2516 Ridge Road, Blacksburg, VA 24060 (USA).
Phone 540 320-8013. Fax 540 552-8014.

MeSH terms: COVID-19; ivermectin; Spike Protein, Coronavirus

^a Juan J. Chamie-Quintero (email: jchamieq@eafit.edu.co) is a data analyst in Cambridge, MA, USA.

^b Jennifer A. Hibberd, DDS, MRCDC (email: drjenniferhibberd@gmail.com) is a specialist dental surgeon at William Osler Health System and Trillium Health Partners Hospital Centres and an instructor at University of Toronto.

^c David E. Scheim, PhD (email: dscheim@alum.mit.edu) is a commissioned officer in the US Public Health Service, inactive reserve.

20 **ABSTRACT**

21 **Objective.** We aimed to identify mortality trends associated with COVID-19 deaths in Peru during
22 April through November 2020, when mass treatments with ivermectin (IVM), a drug of Nobel
23 Prize-honored distinction, were autonomously deployed at different times and to different extents
24 in Peru's 25 states under a national policy that authorized these treatments.

25 **Design.** Ecological study of publicly available data. Excess deaths were analyzed state by state.
26 To identify potential confounding factors, Google mobility data, population densities, SARS-CoV-
27 2 genetic variations, seropositivity rates and other auxiliary data were also examined.

28 **Primary outcome.** Reductions in excess deaths, state by state, as compared with extent and time
29 period of IVM treatments.

30 **Participants.** The study population was restricted to ages ≥ 60 to eliminate confounding effects
31 of changing age distributions of COVID-19 incidence.

32 **Results.** The 25 states of Peru were grouped by extent of IVM distributions: maximal (mass IVM
33 distributions through operation *MOT*, a broadside effort led by the army); medium (locally
34 managed IVM distributions); and minimal (restrictive policies in one state, Lima). The mean
35 reduction in excess deaths 30 days after peak deaths was 74% for the maximal IVM distribution
36 group, 53% for the medium group and 25% for Lima. Reduction of excess deaths correlated with
37 extent of IVM distribution by state with $p < 0.002$ using the Kendall τ_b test. Nationwide, excess
38 deaths decreased 14-fold over four months through December 1, 2020, after which deaths then
39 increased 13-fold when IVM use was restricted under a new president.

40 **Conclusion.** Mass treatments with IVM, a drug safely used in 3.7 billion doses worldwide since
41 1987, most likely caused these reductions in deaths during the time periods in which it was
42 deployed. The indicated biological mechanism of IVM, competitive binding with SARS-CoV-2
43 spike protein, is likely non-epitope specific, possibly yielding full efficacy against emerging viral
44 mutant strains.

45 **STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY**

- 46 • The potential impact of mass IVM treatments in Peru, conducted autonomously in its 25 states,
47 was analyzed using publicly accessible mortality data from national health sources.
- 48 • The extent of IVM distributions in Peru's 25 states could be categorized in three tiers: intensive
49 (through operation *MOT*, an army-led effort), moderate (locally managed), and restricted.
- 50 • The correlation of extent of IVM treatments with reductions in excess deaths 30 days after
51 peak deaths was found highly significant using the Kendall τ_b test. For nine *MOT* states that
52 had a unique *MOT* start date, sharp reductions in deaths closely followed IVM treatments.
- 53 • Confounding factors were ruled out by restricting analyses of deaths to ages ≥ 60 , by
54 comparing mortality trends with Google community mobility indices, and by examining other
55 auxiliary data such as seropositivity rates.
- 56 • This analysis is limited by its ecological study design, which precludes conclusions for
57 individual patients. The potential contribution of IVM prophylaxis in addition to treatment
58 could not be isolated.

59 **INTRODUCTION**

60 The COVID-19 pandemic swept through Peru beginning with its first identified case on February
61 26, 2020.¹ The national approval and widespread deployment of a drug for that disease resulted in
62 a remarkable natural experiment. On May 8, 2020, the Peruvian Ministry of Health approved
63 treatment for COVID-19 using ivermectin (IVM),² a drug of Nobel prize-honored distinction used
64 in 3.7 billion doses worldwide since 1987.³⁻⁵ Per that authorization, each of the 25 states of Peru
65 implemented inpatient and outpatient treatments with IVM to different extents and in different
66 timeframes, key parameters of which are precisely known, as detailed below. The government of
67 Peru independently tracked two health statistics, state by state, daily, by which mortality could be
68 assessed: COVID-19 case fatalities and excess all-cause deaths. Adding an additional twist to this
69 epidemiological record, on November 17, 2020, a new president of Peru, Francisco Sagasti, took
70 office.⁶ The government then stopped distributions of IVM, the channel by which most patients
71 had obtained it previously, and allowed its further use only by a doctor's prescription.⁷⁻¹¹

72 The simplest yet least scientifically conclusive aspect of this epidemiological record was the
73 change in the nationwide total of daily excess deaths (7-day moving average, all ages), before and
74 after Peru's mass treatments of COVID-19 with IVM were sharply restricted beginning in mid-
75 November. As shown in Figure 1A, between August 1 and December 1, 2020, nationwide excess
76 all-cause deaths decreased from 660 to 48, a 14-fold reduction.¹² Excess deaths then increased 13-
77 fold over the next two months to 608 on February 1, 2021. To consider whether IVM treatments
78 could explain this 14-fold nationwide decrease in mortality prior to their restriction, the state-by-
79 state record of mortality trends and IVM distributions and treatments was analyzed using the
80 methodology previewed in figures 1B-C.

Peru is divided into 24 *departamentos*, one of these being the Lima capital region, plus the independent *provincia* of Callao, which lies entirely within Lima.¹³ For simplicity of reference, these are designated here as the 25 states of Peru. Mass distributions of IVM for inpatient and outpatient treatments of COVID-19 occurred autonomously in these 25 states through both public and private channels. IVM treatments began in different time periods between April and August 2020 in each of these 25 Peruvian states; in some, beginning even a few weeks before the May 8 national authorization. Details as to IVM distributions from such public and private sources in nine representative states, spanning different latitudes and terrains, have been provided.¹⁴ The 25 states of Peru, with a combined total population of 33 million, span terrain from jungle to desert to mountain, equivalent to an extent from Denmark to Italy and Greece in Europe or from Florida to Minnesota to New York in the United States.

Figure 1. A) Excess all-cause deaths (all ages), national population of Peru. These decreased 14-fold August 1 through December 1, 2020; then, after IVM use was restricted, increased 13-fold through February 1. For A and B, y values are 7-day moving averages; for B and C, ages ≥ 60 . Data are from Peru’s National Death Information System (SINADEF),¹² with associated frozen datasets available from the Dryad data repository.¹⁵ B) Drops in excess deaths for all states of operation MOT, an army-led program of mass IVM distributions, but Pasco, which had them on 3 dates. ● MOT start date; ▲ peak deaths; ■ day of peak deaths + 30 days. Junin also distributed IVM 13 days before MOT start. C) Reductions in excess deaths at +30 days after peak deaths for the 25 states by extent of IVM distributions: maximal-MOT (+), mean -74%; moderate-local distributions (O), mean -53%; and minimal-Lima (x), -25%. These reductions by state correlated with extent of IVM distributions with Kendall $\tau_b = 0.524$ ($p < 0.002$).

A description of IVM distributions and treatments in Peru with state-by-state figures for excess deaths and COVID-19 case fatalities, with additional detail for nine states, was presented in a previous analysis.¹⁶ As reported there, in each state of Peru but Lima, IVM treatments were widely deployed at the time of an initial surge of pandemic cases and deaths; that surge period varied among the states between April and August 2020. The typical IVM dose provided for both COVID-19 inpatients and outpatients was 200 $\mu\text{g/kg}$ for a single day for mild cases, repeated a second day for more serious cases.²

Public compliance with these IVM treatments was achieved due to well-publicized reports of successful outcomes for IVM treatment of COVID-19 by Peruvian celebrities.¹⁶ The level of popular interest in IVM treatment for COVID-19 as spurred by these reports was so high that it

led to an IVM shortage in Peruvian pharmacies,¹⁷ which motivated smugglers¹⁸ and counterfeiters¹⁹ to cover the demand. In the Lima capital region, however, restrictive measures on IVM distribution, including police raids on pharmacies, delayed mass IVM treatments for COVID-19 for four months after the initial pandemic surge in April.^{14,20,21} Finally, after 10,386 COVID-19 case fatalities had been recorded in Lima through July 31, 2020,²² 1.0 per thousand of its total population, IVM distributions and treatments began there in mass quantities in August.¹⁴

IVM was typically distributed through regional health offices, voluntary channels and other private groups, as detailed for several states.¹⁶ But ten states distributed IVM on a mass scale through a national program led by the Ministry of Defense, *Mega-Operación Tayta (MOT)*. Two of these states had confounding factors for their distributions of IVM. Pasco had three different distribution dates, July 23, August 5 and August 25,²³⁻²⁵ while Junín's *MOT* deployment, which began August 4, had been preceded by state distributions of IVM to health centers beginning July 22,^{26,27} 13 days earlier.

Mega-Operación Tayta (MOT), an extension of a precursor program, *Operación Tayta*,²⁸ was spearheaded by the Peruvian Ministry of Defense and Army. Eleven other government agencies partnered in this effort, including the ministries of health, interior, agriculture, and education, while participating personnel included those from the Army, Navy, Air Force, and police.²⁹ *MOT*'s objective was to reach every part of a targeted region using rapid response teams that partnered with local health officials. These teams detected COVID-19 cases house by house, treating patients with IVM and giving them food to encourage their isolation for 15 days.³⁰

In each targeted locality, operation *MOT* began with outreach, including home visits, by local officials to identify people at highest risk for COVID-19 mortality, due to either age or other vulnerabilities.³¹ No IVM was distributed through *MOT* during this preparatory period, but it was freely available everywhere in Peru without a prescription, and people identified as vulnerable had the capability to take it during that time on their own initiative. A week later, field workers from *MOT* then began distribution of IVM to everyone so identified as being at risk, whether they tested positive or were symptomatic for COVID-19 or not.³¹ Other drugs commonly distributed along with IVM were acetaminophen and azithromycin.^{9,32} *MOT* began in late July 2020 and reached these ten states, with *MOT* start dates as specified, designating the beginning of the preparatory week: Cajamarca (July 23),³³ Pasco (July 23, August 5 and August 25),²³⁻²⁵ Moquegua (July 30),^{34,35} Junín (August 4),³⁶ Puno (August 7),^{37,38} Huánuco (August 7),^{32,39} Huancavelica (August 7),⁴⁰ Ayacucho (August 13),⁴¹ Cusco (August 13),⁴¹ and Tacna (August 14).⁴²

Since May 8, 2020, when IVM was authorized for COVID-19 treatment in Peru, inpatient and outpatient treatments of COVID-19 with IVM have been applied in 25 countries.³ with more than 20 randomized clinical trials (RCTs) conducted for such IVM treatments.^{3,43,44} Seven of eight meta-analyses of these IVM treatment RCTs reporting in 2021, all done using Cochrane analysis methodology, found significant⁴⁴⁻⁴⁸ or possible^{49,50} indications of IVM efficacy, with a mean 0.33 relative risk (RR) of mortality vs. controls. The eighth meta-analyses reported no efficacy for IVM, specifying a value of RR=1.1 for mortality,⁵¹ but corrected that to RR=0.37 (a 63% mortality reduction) in a revised version after fixing switched treatment and control values for one key RCT.⁵² One of the few outliers among these 20 RCTs, which reported statistically indistinguishable outcomes for its IVM and control groups,⁵³ had similar serious errors, with 38 doses of IVM mistakenly substituted for placebo and blinding violated with a glucose placebo.⁵⁴ Among the most recent and comprehensive of the eight meta-analyses noted above reported a pooled total of 31 deaths among 1,101 subjects in IVM treatment groups and 91 deaths among 1,064 controls from 11 RCTs, amounting to a 67% reduction in mortality, with a statistical significance for overall effect of $p=0.005$.⁴⁶

Two animal studies of IVM treatment at low human-equivalent doses, one for SARS-CoV-2 in golden hamsters⁵⁵ and another for a related betacoronavirus (MHV-A59) in mice,⁵⁶ found major, highly statistically significant treatment benefits, consistent with those found in the RCTs noted above. The indicated biological mechanism of IVM, competitive binding with SARS-CoV-2 spike protein, as reviewed,^{57,58} is likely non-epitope specific, possibly yielding full efficacy against emerging viral mutant strains. Another key advantage of IVM as a treatment agent is its 34-year record of safety,^{3,4} well tolerated even at a single dose of 2,000 µg/kg, ten times the standard dose of 200 µg/kg.^{59,60} IVM has been used in RCTs for COVID-19 treatment at cumulative doses of 1,500 µg/kg⁵³ and 3,000 µg/kg⁶¹ over five days with only small percentages of mild or transient adverse effects.

METHODS

Patient and public involvement

There was no patient or public involvement in designing the study given the urgent nature of the COVID-19 pandemic and the usage of publicly available data.

Study design

An ecological study design was used. Two sets of health tracking figures were used for analysis, as compiled daily by the *Centro Nacional de Epidemiología, Prevención y Control de Enfermedades* (National Center for Epidemiology, Prevention and Disease Control) and *Instituto Nacional de Salud* (National Institute of Health) in Peru. These were deaths from all natural causes (excluding violent deaths), hereinafter termed “all-cause deaths,” and COVID-19 case fatalities. As discussed in a prior comprehensive analysis of IVM distributions and mortality trends in Peru,¹⁶ case incidence is an unreliable statistic across a national population and was not considered here.

The source for all-cause deaths used in this analysis was the registry of the National Death Information System (SINADEF),⁶² with associated frozen datasets available from the Dryad data repository.¹⁵ Data for populations, by state and by age groups, are from the National Institute of Statistics and Informatics.⁶³ Data for COVID-19 case fatalities are from the Peruvian government’s COVID-19 Open Data Platform.⁶⁴ The databases for both all-cause deaths and COVID-19 case fatalities are subject to occasional retroactive adjustments, for example, if a death in a remote location were to be reported days after it occurred. These occasional adjustments have very small impacts on aggregate statistics, but access dates are cited and frozen database snapshots saved for all figures presented. Information and data for IVM distributions were retrieved from official communications and press releases, as individually cited, and the CENARES drug distribution database.⁶⁵

Excess all-cause deaths were calculated from totals, state-by-state, by subtracting respective baseline means for January through February 2020. This simple normalization procedure was reasonable given the small variation in deaths per month in Peru from January 2017 through February 2020. During this period, monthly all-cause deaths fluctuated with a mean value of 5.2% and a standard deviation of 3.8% (Table S1). However, total deaths for Peru beginning in May 2020 fluctuated by more than double the baseline value for January through February 2020, reflecting the impact of the pandemic (Figure S1). For each of Peru’s 25 states, for ages 60 and above, the date of peak (all-cause) deaths was determined to be the day after March 1, 2020 when the 7-day moving average of deaths reached maximum value in that state’s first wave of rising deaths from the pandemic. Excess deaths were then also tracked at 30 and 45 days following the day of peak deaths. Figure 2 provides examples of graphs of 7-day moving averages of excess deaths for three states, with line segments joining values of excess deaths at the day of peak deaths and 30 days following.

Figure 2. Excess deaths, normalized to peak deaths = 1.0 by state, for one state from each of the three tiers of IVM distribution: maximal, operation *MOT* (Cusco); moderate (Arequipa); and minimal (Lima). ▲ designates peak deaths; ■ day of peak deaths + 30 days. In Lima, after restrictive measures on IVM distribution through July 2020, these distributions and treatments began on a mass basis in August.^{14,20,21} Excess deaths are 7-day moving averages, ages ≥ 60 ; data are from the Peruvian National Death Information System (SINADEF).¹²

The databases for all-cause deaths and for COVID-19 case fatalities were both structured to record each death with one database record containing fields for age, sex, locality, and several other demographic characteristics. To minimize the confounding element of potential changes in percentage of COVID-19 cases across different age groups, all analyses with the exception of the

graph presented in Figure 1A were performed restricted to the population age ≥ 60 , as obtained by filtering these database records by age. Also, an independent analysis of excess deaths compared with COVID-19 case fatalities indicated undercounting of the latter.⁶⁶ Therefore, although case fatality figures by state are shown in Table S2, the more reliable figure of excess deaths is used exclusively here for analysis.

To evaluate possible effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions on changes in excess deaths by state, potential effects of Peruvian policies to limit social interaction were considered. Peru implemented a two-week national lockdown on May 16, 2020, that was extended through the end of June, which ordered the closing of national borders and restriction of domestic travel and all non-essential activity.⁶⁷ Yet as a Latin American policy official summarized, this lockdown “failed completely,” because for 75% of Peruvian residents, “if they do not work one day, they cannot eat.”⁶⁷ However, Google community mobility data from cell phones within a given locality allow objective quantification of social interactions, whatever the intended effect of such official orders.⁶⁸⁻⁷¹ Actual vs. mandated changes in social mobility have indeed been found to vary considerably during the 2020 pandemic period. In some countries such as Sweden, certain mobility restrictions were undertaken on individual initiative,⁶⁹ while in others, official mandates had limited impact on actual mobility.^{70,71}

It was found that in one model of COVID-19 trends over time, inputs for official policies could be ignored and actual community mobility data used exclusively without sacrificing predictive efficacy.⁷¹ COVID-19 transmission was found closely associated with actual mobility patterns in another model.⁶⁸ In localities without strictly enforced lockdowns, for which community mobility data indicated at most modest reductions in social interactions during April through May 2020, reductions in mortality were limited. Sweden, for example, in which certain mobility restrictions were undertaken on individual initiative,⁶⁹ had a 42% reduction in its 7-day moving average of daily deaths from its peak in April to thirty days later in May.⁷² The corresponding figure for the US state of Georgia was a 10% reduction,⁷³ while the US state of Florida had no reduction in daily deaths in this period.⁷⁴ To factor out any potential effects of social isolation policies on mortality trends in Peru, six indices of Google community mobility data were retrieved for each of Peru’s 25 states and compared with mortality trends.

RESULTS

Analysis was performed state by state for excess all-cause deaths, ages ≥ 60 . The 25 states of Peru were grouped by extent of IVM distributions: maximal (mass IVM distributions through operation *MOT*, 10 states); medium (locally managed IVM distributions, 14 states); and minimal (Lima, with restrictive policies). For each state, the date of peak excess deaths in its first wave of the pandemic, as specified in the methods section, was determined. Decreases in excess deaths from date of peak deaths to 30 and 45 days afterwards were then tracked. Note that for Lima, as detailed in a previous analysis,¹⁴ large distributions of IVM beginning in August marked the end of its prior policy of IVM restrictions, and a second peak in excess deaths occurred on August 4, followed by a decline, as shown in Figure 2. However, per the methodology of this analysis, the date of Lima’s first peak in excess deaths, May 30, was used, which occurred during the period in which its IVM distributions were minimal, per restrictions then in place.

Table 1. Peak values of excess all-cause deaths (7-day moving averages, ages ≥ 60) and reductions at 30 and 45 days after day of peak deaths, grouped by maximal, medium or minimal extent of IVM distributions. All values for excess deaths are sums for individual states as shown in Table 2 below by the three categories of states. The Kendall tau and Spearman rho and their associated p values are shown for absolute value of reduction in excess deaths at +30 days and +45 days after peak deaths correlated with tier of IVM distributions, by state.

State	Peak excess deaths	+30 days		+45 days	
		Value	Change	Value	Change
Maximal IVM distributions through operation <i>MOT</i> (10 states)	164.9	42.3	-74.4%	22.7	-86.2%
Medium scale, locally managed IVM distributions (14 states)	396.8	187.3	-52.8%	120.3	-69.7%
Minimum scale, restricted IVM distributions (Lima)	263.6	197.6	-25.0%	197.2	-25.2%
All 25 states, TOTAL	825.3	427.2	-48.2%	340.2	-58.8%
Kendall tau			$\tau_b=0.5238$ $p=0.0019$		$\tau_b=0.4869$ $p=0.0039$
Spearman rho			$\rho=0.6188$ $p=0.0010$		$\rho=0.5764$ $p=0.0026$

Table 2. 7-day moving average of excess deaths for ages ≥ 60 , 30 and 45 days after day of peak deaths, by state. Data are from the Peruvian *Ministerio de Salud*, National Death Information System (SINADEF).⁶² Maximally IVM treated, *MOT* states are shown in blue; medium IVM treated states in black, and Lima, minimally IVM treated during the period of focus due to restrictive policies, in red.

State	Population age ≥ 60	Peak excess deaths		deaths +30 days		deaths +45 days	
		Date	Value	Value	Change	Value	Change
Amazonas	35,174	Jul 25	4.4	0.7	-84.1%	0.9	-79.5%
Ancash	150,716	Jun 15	22.0	13.2	-40.0%	14.6	-33.6%
Apurimac	41,253	Sep 23	5.4	2.3	-57.4%	1.6	-70.4%
Arequipa	212,228	Jul 28	64.3	22.5	-65.0%	9.5	-85.2%
Ayacucho	62,206	Aug 20	6.5	2.5	-61.5%	1.5	-76.9%
Cajamarca	133,274	Jul 30	19.9	7.4	-62.8%	6.9	-65.3%
Callao	178,909	May 21	42.0	28.5	-32.1%	18.8	-55.2%
Cusco	138,969	Aug 21	28.8	4.0	-86.1%	0.0	-100.0%
Huancavelica	30,834	Aug 13	7.2	1.8	-75.0%	1.8	-75.0%
Huánuco	63,505	Aug 12	9.1	1.1	-87.9%	1.8	-80.2%
Ica	118,348	Jul 13	25.5	16.7	-34.5%	10.9	-57.3%
Junín	149,830	Aug 1	25.3	12.5	-50.6%	4.0	-84.2%
La Libertad	257,655	Jun 22	55.0	35.2	-36.0%	22.4	-59.3%
Lambayeque	177,031	May 15	30.4	13.8	-54.6%	8.5	-72.0%
Lima	1,648,028	May 30	263.6	197.6	-25.0%	197.2	-25.2%
Loreto	84,137	May 6	36.3	10.0	-72.5%	6.4	-82.4%
Madre De Dios	15,441	Jun 24	4.8	1.9	-60.4%	1.1	-77.1%
Moquegua	29,157	Aug 10	17.2	1.5	-91.3%	0.9	-94.8%
Pasco	26,384	Aug 7	3.5	0.3	-91.4%	0.5	-85.7%
Piura	234,250	May 24	58.5	24.9	-57.4%	15.7	-73.2%
Puno	144,017	Aug 14	35.3	8.9	-74.8%	4.7	-86.7%
San Martin	79,911	Jun 22	16.4	10.3	-37.2%	5.9	-64.0%
Tacna	49,376	Aug 15	12.1	2.3	-81.0%	0.6	-95.0%
Tumbes	28,166	Jun 2	9.7	4.3	-55.7%	2.0	-79.4%
Ucayali	51,639	May 12	22.1	3.0	-86.4%	2.0	-91.0%

As noted above, operation *MOT* was an intensive effort that engaged the Army, Navy, Air Force and police in partnership with local health officials. Response teams were deployed in each targeted region, conducting mass distributions of IVM to residents with COVID-19. The ten states covered by *MOT* from its inception on July 23, 2020 through August were identified in a previous analysis¹⁶ and are listed above. *MOT* continued after August, but from that point forward, its target locales shifted frequently from one district to another in different states.⁷⁵⁻⁷⁸ These ten *MOT* states

extend from the southern tip to the north of Peru, including coastal and interior regions both adjoining and far from Lima. With its intensity of coordinated effort, the *MOT* program could be assumed, in general, to have resulted in significantly more extensive IVM distributions and treatments than for non-*MOT* states. If IVM were clinically effective against COVID-19, reductions in deaths would be expected to be correlated, state by state, with the extent of IVM distributions. But if IVM were as ineffective as sugar pills, then whichever set of states were selected for intensive distribution by *MOT*, no such effect would be seen.

As shown in Table 1, for the maximal, medium, and minimal IVM distribution states, respectively, the mean reductions in excess deaths 30 days after day of peak deaths were 74%, 53%, and 25%. Figure 1C shows these drops in excess deaths over 30 days for the 25 states, by tier of IVM distribution. At 45 days after peak deaths, these mean reductions were 86%, 70%, and 25%, respectively. For nine of the ten *MOT* states (excluding Pasco, which had three IVM distribution dates), *MOT* start dates were plotted together with dates of peak deaths in Figure 1B. As shown, excess deaths dropped sharply in close time conjunction with *MOT* start dates. Except for Junin, which had additional IVM distributions 13 days before its *MOT* start date, the lag time between *MOT* start date and date of peak deaths varied from 1 to 11 days.

For analysis using the Kendall τ_b correlation, the three groups of states were assigned extent of IVM distribution values of 0 for Lima, 1 for the 14 local IVM distribution states, and 2 for the 10 *MOT* states. For correlations between extent of IVM distributions and reductions in excess deaths (absolute values) at 30 days after peak deaths, the Kendall τ_b was 0.524, with (two-sided) $p < 0.002$. For the extent of IVM distribution correlated with reductions in excess deaths at 45 days after peak deaths, the Kendall τ_b was 0.487, $p < 0.004$.

The stronger correlations for extent of IVM distributions with drops in excess deaths over 30 vs. 45 days is consistent with the expectation that operation *MOT*, with its rapid response teams, would more likely have the most impact over a shorter time period. Nevertheless, for both 30 and 45 days, p values were significantly less than the confidence level of $p = 0.05$ for an established clinical effect. The lack of perfect correlations between extent of IVM distributions and reductions in excess deaths may derive in part from anomalies such as high levels of public and private distributions of IVM in some states such as Loretto,¹⁴ a non-*MOT* state, which had a 73% drop in excess deaths at 30 days after peak. Also, Callao is entirely contained within the state of Lima, having a 32.1% reduction in excess deaths over 30 days, the second lowest after Lima's, which may reflect the same restrictions in IVM distributions through July 2020 as occurred in Lima.

Figure 3. Google community mobility trends⁷⁹ (line graphs) and excess all-cause deaths for ages ≥ 60 (bars).⁶² These mobility indices show percentage changes in different categories relative to the median of these daily figures for January 3 through February 6, 2020. Five of these categories,

all but residential, show (reduced) percentages of trips to various destinations with respect to this baseline, while the residential index tracks hours spent at home; for this category, the sign is switched so that e.g. a 25% increased time at home appears as -25%. These graphs are for two MOT states (Cusco, Puno), two states with local IVM distributions (Ica, Piura), Lima, and all of Peru. These same graphs for each of the 25 states of Peru are shown in Figure S2.

As shown in Figure 3, with these charts for all 25 states shown in Figure S2, in each state, COVID-19 mortality fell sharply after its respective month peak deaths concurrent with a continuing increase in six Google-tracked indices of community mobility. These mobility indices show a similar pattern among states: a sharp decline from March to April 2020, followed by a steady rise through November, with a brief and modest decrease in August. There are no reductions in mobility that can explain the reductions in excess deaths shown in Figure 3.

DISCUSSION

The 25 states of Peru that conducted IVM treatments for COVID-19 at different time periods provide a robust set of subpopulations from which these treatment impacts can be evaluated. For the 10 MOT states, excess deaths dropped most sharply, by 74% at +30 days and by 86% at +45 days after the day of peak deaths. For the 14 states with locally administered IVM distributions, excess deaths dropped by 53% at +30 days and by 60% at +45 days. In Lima, however, where IVM treatments were delayed until August, four months after its initial pandemic surge in April, excess deaths dropped by only 25% at +30 days and also by only 25% at +45 days after its day of peak deaths on May 30. The MOT states had sharp drops in excess deaths after reaching peak values in close time conjunction with MOT start dates (Figure 1B). For the 25 states, reductions in excess deaths correlated with extent of IVM distribution, maximal, medium, or minimal, with $p < 0.002$ using the Kendall τ_b test.

Given the association between IVM treatments and sharp mortality reductions revealed in this analysis, neither random fluctuation nor an unidentified, extraneous cause of these reductions in deaths appears likely. But it is useful to consider the potential confounding influences of social isolation, changing seropositivity rates, variations in viral strains across states, and other factors. To begin with the most straightforward of these considerations, possible distortions caused by varying proportions of younger or older people in any given population were ruled out by including only the population age 60 and above in the analysis. Also, for each of the 25 states of Peru, for ages ≥ 60 , it was found that no more than 2.2% of that population died during the period March through November 2020 (Table S3). Percentages of reductions in total populations age 60 and above of up to 2.2%, by state, were thus very small in comparison to pandemic-related fluctuations of more 200% in deaths in 2020 (Figure S1).

The possibility that a more virulent strain of SARS-CoV-2 caused more fatalities in Lima than elsewhere in Peru was discounted by an analysis of 149 genomes from COVID-19 patients in Peru obtained through July 4, 2020 from diverse geographical regions of the country.⁸⁰ This genomic analysis found that the phylogenetic clades in 11 states had a distribution similar to that of Lima.⁸⁰ Note that no conclusions have been offered, despite a suggestive conjunction, regarding the 13-fold increase in nationwide excess deaths, ages ≥ 60 , over two months through February 1, 2021 that occurred after restrictions on IVM distributions were instituted in November 2020. No state-by-state variations in those IVM restrictions are apparent from which such conclusions might be drawn. Yet the UK variant of SARS-CoV-2, first detected in Peru on January 8, 2021,⁸¹ cannot explain that post-November surge in deaths, since prior to then, excess deaths (all ages) had already tripled from 48 on December 1 to 150 on January 1.¹² A Pan-American survey found that no other mutations of potential interest to public health, including 501Y.V2 and P.1, was detected in Peru as of mid-January, 2021.⁸²

The possibility that varying compliance with social isolation mandates in the different states of Peru could account for varying impacts of the pandemic is discounted by Google community mobility data shown in Figure 3. These data demonstrate that for Lima, the 10 MOT states, and the 14 states with local IVM distributions, mobility patterns from March through November 2020 were roughly the same and that excess deaths fell as mobility rose in all states but Lima in their respective first waves of the pandemic.

The possibility that the development of herd immunity was responsible for the major reductions in excess deaths seen in almost every state of Peru but Lima is discounted by consideration of state-by-state seropositivity rates for November 2020 (Table S4). Although a high seropositivity rate for Loreto, which had reached 75% even by September,⁸³ could explain reduced pandemic impacts there, several other IVM-treated states with low seropositivity rates had sharp drops in COVID-19 mortality. For Cajamarca, Cusco, Huancavelica and Tacna for example, all MOT states, seropositivity rates were only 20%, 18%, 18%, and 15%, respectively, in November 2020.

But within 1 to 8 days after *MOT* start, excess deaths peaked and then dropped over 30 days, respectively, by 63%, 86%, 75% and 81%. For the state-by-state correlation of reduction in excess deaths at peak deaths plus 30 days with seropositivity rate for November 2020, the Pearson's p-value was 0.486, while that correlation for reduction in excess deaths at +45 days had a p value of 0.415, showing no association and discounting any such dependence.

To consider the potential confounding influence of population density, even though Lima has the highest population density per area in Peru, with 10,577 inhabitants per km²,⁸⁴ densities for other cities are not much lower. Inhabitants per km² in Trujillo, the capital of La Libertad, is 9,431; this figure is 8,216 for Piura and 8,195 for Cusco.⁸⁴ As for people living in the same household, a demographic study in 2017 showed that Lima households with more than 5 people represented 27% of the total; in Loreto, that figure was 42%, and in Ucayali, 36% (Table S5).⁸⁵ Thus, neither population densities per area or per household are markedly different in Lima vs. population centers of other states for which this analysis was performed.

It has been proposed that cross-immunity from the dengue virus, which causes dengue fever, could explain lower than expected levels of COVID-19 mortality in some regions of South America, including Brazil.⁸⁶ This theory collapses in Peru, however, with the observation of parallel COVID-19 outbreaks in Peruvian states such as Moquegua, which has not had dengue cases in the last 20 years, and Loreto, the epicenter of dengue in Peru.^{87,88} Finally, one other data artifact could be that several peaks and drops in Lima's different districts could explain the low reduction in excess deaths. However, as shown in Figure S3, the pattern of total deaths, ages ≥ 60 , for most of these districts, those comprising the bulk of the population, is the same: rising deaths to a peak around late May 2020 and then a three-month plateau following.

With potential confounding factors discounted, the remarkable natural experiment that unfolded with the authorization of IVM for COVID-19 in Peru on May 8, 2020 had a conclusive outcome. For the 25 states of Peru, the extent of IVM distributions correlated with reductions in excess deaths over 30 days with $p < 0.002$. The ten states of operation *MOT*, having the greatest extent of IVM distributions, had a mean 74% reduction in excess deaths at 30 days after peak deaths. These reductions, except for one anomaly, occurred within 1-11 days after *MOT* start dates. This 74% reduction in mortality for *MOT* states is consistent with the 67% pooled mortality reduction vs. controls achieved in RCT's for IVM treatment of COVID-19.⁴⁶

The system of large randomized clinical trials as a requirement for new drug approvals has served public health well. These allow screening for dangerous side effects and can determine if important therapeutic gains obtained in relatively small percentages of subjects persist under more rigorous scrutiny. But this methodology is inappropriate for a national decision to deploy IVM against COVID-19 for several reasons. IVM has been used safely in 3.7 billion doses since 1987³⁻⁵ and found well tolerated even at ten times the standard dose of 200 $\mu\text{g/kg}$ ^{59,60} that was used in Peru (repeated a second day for serious cases).² It is already approved by regulatory authorities worldwide. Considering that these results for IVM in Peru align with the pooled mortality reduction of 67% for COVID-19 in several RCTs, it would appear no longer ethical to conduct further RCTs, except to test dose or adjunct effects with IVM, since no other therapy with that degree of expected clinical benefit is available for use in a control arm. Indeed, with mortality benefits for IVM at $p=.002$ for Peru's 25 states, each state having a mean population age ≥ 60 of 165,600, many times the total clinical trial subject pool tested for most drugs, it is questionable why more RCTs might be of significant interest.

Finally, COVID-19 is a life-threatening international emergency. During a prior such medical emergency with the urgent need for treatment of infected battlefield wounds during World War II, production of penicillin was ramped up rapidly. One year after the first small case series of patients treated with that drug, most with successful outcomes, in 1943, it was ready for full battlefield deployment in 1944.¹⁶ Penicillin was then extended for civilian use without any RCT results or even complete data for its battlefield outcomes. In the current international emergency of COVID-19, with significant percentages of US residents, for example, unwilling to be vaccinated,^{89,90} combined with lesser protection from immunizations against mutants and possibly waning of immunity over several months, COVID-19 could persist with $R_0 > 1$ as an enduring menace. Mass deployments of IVM treatments, a safe therapeutic with a compelling track record against COVID-19, can fill in these gaps, bringing COVID-19 deaths below influenza deaths while setting an example of public decision-making based on sound science.

CONCLUSION

Mass treatments with IVM most likely caused the 14-fold reduction in excess deaths in Peru through December 1, 2020, prior to a 13-fold increase after IVM policy was reversed. The appropriate clinical follow-up to IVM treatments for COVID-19 in the 25 states of Peru, with a

combined total population of 33 million, is more national deployments of IVM treatments interim and complementary to immunizations. Since a likely biological mechanism of IVM against SARS-CoV-2 is non-epitope specific competitive binding to viral spike protein, the efficacy of IVM may well prove to be conserved against emerging viral mutant strains.⁵⁷ Given that for the ten MOT states of Peru, mean 74% reductions in mortality were accrued over just 30 days, rapid confirmation would be obtainable for success of such national IVM deployments.

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to Dr. Satoshi Omura for his encouragement of this work and to Drs. David Hankins, Allen Hirsh, Jerome Dancis and Elizabeth McDonel Herr for helpful comments in developing this manuscript.

Contributors

JJC located and extracted the data for this analysis from Peruvian national databases and other sources, developed the analytical approach and performed the main analyses. DES performed additional analyses, including that for the Kendall tau calculation. JAH coordinated the refinement of this manuscript from an earlier version and contributed to the interpretation of the results. All authors participated in drafting this manuscript and edited and approved the final version.

Funding: Juan J. Chamie was funded by the Front Line COVID-19 Critical Care Alliance, a non-profit organization.

Competing Interests: None declared.

Patient consent for publication: Not required; no patients were involved in this study.

Ethics committee approval: Given the study design and the use of publicly available data, no ethical approval was considered necessary.

Data availability statement: All data relevant to the study are included in the article or supplementary tables and figures, with frozen database contents from Peruvian national health sources available from the Dryad repository.

Abbreviations

IVM: ivermectin

MOT: *Mega-Operación Tayta*

References

1. Primer caso de coronavirus en Perú: Los detalles del contagio del piloto | PERU. *Gestión* 2020 2020/03/06.
2. Resolucion Ministerial #270-2020. Lima, Peru: Ministerio De Salud, Salud MD May 8, 2020.
3. Yagisawa M, Foster PJ, Hanaki H, et al. Global Trends in Clinical Studies of Ivermectin in COVID-19. *The Japanese Journal of Antibiotics* 2021;74(1)
4. Campbell WC. History of avermectin and ivermectin, with notes on the history of other macrocyclic lactone antiparasitic agents. *Curr Pharm Biotechnol* 2012;13(6):853-65. [published Online first: 2011/11/02]
5. Crump A. Ivermectin: enigmatic multifaceted 'wonder' drug continues to surprise and exceed expectations. *J Antibiot (Tokyo)* 2017;70(5):495-505. [published Online first: 2017/02/16]
6. Peru Chooses 3rd President in a Week Amid Street Protests. *New York Times* 2020 11/16/2020.
7. Mazzetti sobre ivermectina: Minsa no puede entregar libremente fármacos sin acreditación internacional. *El Comercio* 2021 2021/01/29.
8. Violeta Bermúdez: "Si un médico evalúa a una persona y le receta ivermectina, puede utilizarla". *RPP* 2021 2021/01/22.
9. COVID-19: Vizcarra recomendó uso de ivermectina para tratar enfermedad. *Canal N* 2021 2021/01/09.
10. Gorriti G. El Rompeolas. *IDL Reporteros* 2021 2021/01/20.
11. Gorriti G. Del pañuelazo a la ivermectina. *IDL Reporteros* 2021 2021/02/03.
12. National Death Information System (SINADEF): Ministerio de Salud de Peru. Available from: cloud.minsa.gob.pe/s/NctBnHXDnoccgWAg/download accessed 2/14/2021.
13. Constitución Política Del Perú, 29 de diciembre de 1993, (29 de diciembre de 1993).
14. Chamie JJ, Hibberd JA, Scheim DE. Sharp reductions in COVID-19 case fatalities and excess deaths in Peru in close time conjunction, state-by-state, with ivermectin treatments, Appendix 1: SSRN; 2021. Available from: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=3706347> accessed January 20, 2021.

- 490 15. Chamie-Quintero JJ, Hibberd JA, Scheim DE. Frozen data and data documentation for Ivermectin for
491 COVID-19 in Peru: 14-fold reduction in nationwide excess deaths, $p < 0.002$ for effect by state, then
492 13-fold increase after ivermectin use restricted: Dryad Data Repository; 2021. Available from:
493 <https://datadryad.org/stash/dataset/doi:10.5061/dryad.dv41ns1xr> accessed August 4, 2021.
- 494 16. Chamie JJ, Hibberd JA, Scheim DE. Sharp reductions in COVID-19 case fatalities and excess deaths
495 in Peru in close time conjunction, state-by-state, with ivermectin treatments: SSRN; 2021. Available
496 from: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=3706347> accessed January 20, 2021.
- 497 17. Ivermectina: crece la demanda de fármaco antiparasitario para casos de covid-19. *Realidadpe /*
498 *Noticias relevantes del Perú | Francisco Sagasti, Elecciones 2021, COVID-19, Reactiva Perú, Arranca*
499 *Perú, Cuarentena focalizada* 2020 2020/04/29.
- 500 18. Piura: Detienen a dos personas con más de 200 dosis de ivermectina de contrabando; coronavirus;
501 COVID-19; nnpp; PERU. *El Comercio Perú* 2020 2020/06/19.
- 502 19. San Martín de Porres: incautan 20,000 frascos de ivermectina y detienen a 12 personas. *Andina*
503 *Agencia Peruana de Noticias* 2020 2020/05/27.
- 504 20. Diario El C. Un viaje al mercado negro del COVID-19: Facebook, 2020.
- 505 21. Intervienen farmacia en SJM que vendía ivermectina adulterada y medicamentos sustraídos del
506 Estado. *El Comercio Perú* 2020 2020/06/14.
- 507 22. Datos Abiertos de COVID-19; Plataforma Nacional de Datos Abiertos: Secretaría de Gobierno Digital
508 Presidencia del Consejo de Ministros; 2020. Available from:
509 <https://www.datosabiertos.gob.pe/group/datos-abiertos-de-covid-19> accessed 1/25/2021.
- 510 23. Más de 500 adultos mayores son atendidos por el Mimp durante Operación Tayta en Pasco. *Andina*
511 2020/07/30.
- 512 24. Resolucion Gerencial, No. 133-2020-HMPP-A/GM. Gerencia Municipal, Provincial de Pasco
513 2020/08/05.
- 514 25. Resolucion Gerencial, No. 154-2020-HMPP-A/GM. Gerencia Municipal, Provincial de Pasco
515 2020/08/25.
- 516 26. Junín: gobierno regional elabora ivermectina para tratamiento temprano de covid-19. *Andina,*
517 *Agencia Peruana de Noticias* 2020/07/22.
- 518 27. Hospital Unanue mantiene producción regular de ivermectina. Gobierno Regional de Tacna; 2020
519 2020/08/06/.
- 520 28. Gobierno inicia Operación TAYTA para proteger a la población vulnerable ante COVID-19 en zonas
521 de riesgo. Lima, Peru: Ministerio de Defensa de Peru 2020/06/01.
- 522 29. Plan para el accionar del grupo de trabajo de carácter multisectorial denominado “te cuido Perú,”
523 Ministerio de Defensa, Dirección General de Política y Estrategia, (2020).
- 524 30. Alcalde de Lima debe convocar a empresariado y gobierno para aplicar cercos familiares masivos;
525 Lampadia. *Lampadia* 2020 2020/08/31.
- 526 31. Yumbato A. Coronavirus en Perú: conoce cómo funciona la Operación Tayta. *RPP* 2020/08/12.
- 527 32. Operación tayta llegó a huánuco para fortalecer lucha contra COVID-19. Gobierno Regional de
528 Huánuco; 2020 2020/08/12.
- 529 33. Editora EPdSESA. Covid-19: a más de 22,000 personas atendió Operación Tayta-Yo Me Apunto en
530 Cajamarca. *Andina, Agencia Peruana de Noticias* 2020/08/02.
- 531 34. Moquegua: Llegan otros 45 médicos desde Lima para reforzar lucha contra el coronavirus. *Editorial*
532 *La Republica* 2020 2020/08/05/.
- 533 35. Equipo del Ministerio de Salud realiza Operación Tayta y brinda asistencia técnica en Moquegua.
534 Ministerio de Salud 2020/08/06.
- 535 36. Llantoy C. Mediante empadronamiento ejecutado por 60 brigadistas de la mph y “amachay”. Peru:
536 Municipalidad Provincial de Huancayo 2020/08/06.
- 537 37. Operación Tayta permite fortalecer la atención primaria de casos de COVID-19. Ministro de Defensa
538 2020/08/15.
- 539 38. Puno: Desde mañana implementarán la operación Tayta liderado por el Ejército peruano. *Radio*
540 *Onda Azul* 2020 2020/08/13.
- 541 39. Operación Tayta atenderá a 10,000 personas vulnerables en Huánuco. *Andina, Agencia Peruana de*
542 *Noticias* 2020 2020/08/14.
- 543 40. Gobierno entrega a Huancavelica más de 17 000 unidades de EPP y medicamentos para luchar
544 contra el Covid-19. Ministerio de la Producción; 2020 2020/08/27.
- 545 41. Inician plan mega tayta 2020 en ayacucho para diagnosticar, tratar, aislar y asistir con alimentos a
546 los casos positivos. Gobierno Regional de Ayacucho 2020/08/20.
- 547 42. Covid-19: inició operación Tayta con aplicación de 3,000 pruebas de descarte. *EXITOSA NOTICIAS*
548 2020 2020/08/20.
- 549 43. Kory P, Meduri GU, Varon J, et al. Review of the Emerging Evidence Demonstrating the Efficacy of
550 Ivermectin in the Prophylaxis and Treatment of COVID-19. *American Journal of Therapeutics*
551 2021;28(3):e299-e318.
- 552 44. Hill A, Garratt A, Levi J, et al. Meta-analysis of randomized trials of ivermectin to treat SARS-CoV-2
553 infection. *Open Forum Infectious Diseases* 2021 10.1093/ofid/ofab358

- 554 45. Hariyanto TI, Halim DA, Rosalind J, et al. Ivermectin and outcomes from Covid-19 pneumonia: A
555 systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized clinical trial studies. *Reviews in Medical*
556 *Virology* 2021 <https://doi.org/10.1002/rmv.2265:e2265>.
- 557 46. Karale S, Bansal V, Makadia J, et al. A Meta-analysis of Mortality, Need for ICU admission, Use of
558 Mechanical Ventilation and Adverse Effects with Ivermectin Use in COVID-19 Patients. *medRxiv*
559 2021 doi:10.1101/2021.04.30.21256415
- 560 47. Bryant A, Lawrie TA, Dowswell T, et al. Ivermectin for Prevention and Treatment of COVID-19
561 Infection: A Systematic Review, Meta-analysis, and Trial Sequential Analysis to Inform Clinical
562 Guidelines. *American Journal of Therapeutics* 2021 doi:10.1097/MJT.0000000000001402
- 563 48. Zein AFMZ, Sulistiyana CS, Raffaello WM, et al. Ivermectin and mortality in patients with COVID-19:
564 A systematic review, meta-analysis, and meta-regression of randomized controlled trials. *Diabetes*
565 *& Metabolic Syndrome: Clinical Research & Reviews* 2021
566 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsx.2021.102186:102186>.
- 567 49. Kow CS, Merchant HA, Mustafa ZU, et al. The association between the use of ivermectin and
568 mortality in patients with COVID-19: a meta-analysis. *Pharmacological Reports* 2021
569 10.1007/s43440-021-00245-z
- 570 50. Rodríguez-Gutiérrez R, Raygoza-Cortez K, Garcia-Leal M, et al. Ivermectin in the Prophylaxis and
571 Treatment of Patients with SARS-CoV-2: A Living Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis SSRN 2021.
572 Available from: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=3802499> accessed June 13, 2021.
- 573 51. Roman YM, Burela PA, Pasupuleti V, et al. Ivermectin for the treatment of COVID-19: A systematic
574 review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials (version 1). *medRxiv* 2021
575 doi:10.1101/2021.05.21.21257595v1
- 576 52. Roman YM, Burela PA, Pasupuleti V, et al. Ivermectin for the treatment of COVID-19: A systematic
577 review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *medRxiv* 2021
578 doi:10.1101/2021.05.21.21257595
- 579 53. López-Medina E, López P, Hurtado IC, et al. Effect of Ivermectin on Time to Resolution of Symptoms
580 Among Adults With Mild COVID-19: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA* 2021
581 10.1001/jama.2021.3071
- 582 54. Scheim DE, Hibberd JA, Chamie JJ. Protocol violations in López-Medina et al.: 38 switched ivermectin
583 (IVM) and placebo doses, failure of blinding, ubiquitous IVM use OTC in Cali, and nearly identical
584 AEs for the IVM and control groups: OSF Preprints; 2021. Available from:
585 <https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/u7ewz> accessed June 10, 2021.
- 586 55. Melo GD, Lazarini F, Larrous F, et al. Anti-COVID-19 efficacy of ivermectin in the golden hamster.
587 *bioRxiv* 2020 doi:10.1101/2020.11.21.392639
- 588 56. Arévalo AP, Pagotto R, Pórfido JL, et al. Ivermectin reduces *in vivo* coronavirus infection in a mouse
589 experimental model. *Scientific Reports* 2021;11(1):7132.
- 590 57. Scheim DE. From cold to killer: How SARS-CoV-2 evolved without hemagglutinin esterase to
591 agglutinate, then clot blood cells in pulmonary and systemic microvasculature SSRN. 2020. Available
592 from: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=3706347> accessed March 30, 2021.
- 593 58. Zaidi AK, Dehghani-Mobaraki P. The mechanisms of action of Ivermectin against SARS-CoV-2: An
594 evidence-based clinical review article. *The Journal of Antibiotics* 2021 10.1038/s41429-021-00430-
595 5
- 596 59. Guzzo CA, Furtek CI, Porras AG, et al. Safety, tolerability, and pharmacokinetics of escalating high
597 doses of ivermectin in healthy adult subjects. *J Clin Pharmacol* 2002;42(10):1122-33. [published
598 Online first: 2002/10/05]
- 599 60. Navarro M, Camprubí D, Requena-Méndez A, et al. Safety of high-dose ivermectin: a systematic
600 review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy* 2020;75(4):827-34.
- 601 61. Krolewiecki A, Lifschitz A, Moragas M, et al. Antiviral effect of high-dose ivermectin in adults with
602 COVID-19: A proof-of-concept randomized trial. *EClinicalMedicine* 2021;37
- 603 62. National Death Information System (SINADEF): Ministerio de Salud de Peru. Available from:
604 cloud.minsa.gob.pe/s/NctBnHXDnocgWAg/download accessed 12/13/2020.
- 605 63. Población estimada por edades simples y grupos de edad, según departamento, provincia y distrito.
606 2020. Oficina De gestión de la información, Ministerio De Salud, Instituto Nacional de Estadística e
607 Informática (INEI), Censos Nacionales.; 2020.
- 608 64. Datos Abiertos de COVID-19 | Plataforma Nacional de Datos Abiertos: Secretaría de Gobierno
609 Digital Presidencia del Consejo de Ministros; 2020. Available from:
610 <https://www.datosabiertos.gob.pe/group/datos-abiertos-de-covid-19> accessed 12/13/2020.
- 611 65. CENARES: Ministerio de Salud de Peru. Available from:
612 <http://sol.cenares.minsa.gob.pe:8080/covid19.xhtml> accessed 12/13/2020.
- 613 66. Covid-19: segundo informe para actualizar cifra de fallecidos se conocerá esta semana. *Andina*
614 *Agencia Peruana de Noticias* 2020 2020/07/26.
- 615 67. Welsh T. Inequality and corruption: Why Peru is losing its COVID-19 battle. *Devex* July 1, 2020.
- 616 68. Badr HS, Du H, Marshall M, et al. Association between mobility patterns and COVID-19 transmission
617 in the USA: a mathematical modelling study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 2020;20(11):1247-54.

69. Stokes J, Turner AJ, Anselmi L, et al. The relative effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions on early Covid-19 mortality: natural experiment in 130 countries. *medRxiv* 2020 doi:10.1101/2020.10.05.20206888
70. Oh J, Lee H-Y, Long KQ, et al. How well does societal mobility restriction help control the COVID-19 pandemic? Evidence from real-time evaluation. *medRxiv* 2020 doi:10.1101/2020.10.29.20222414
71. Unwin HJT, Mishra S, Bradley VC, et al. State-level tracking of COVID-19 in the United States. *Nature Communications* 2020;11(1):6189.
72. Worldometer Coronavirus statistics, Sweden 2020. Available from: <https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/country/sweden/> accessed January 3, 2020.
73. Worldometer Coronavirus statistics, US, Georgia 2020. Available from: <https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/usa/georgia/> accessed January 3, 2020.
74. Worldometer Coronavirus statistics, US, Florida 2020. Available from: <https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/usa/florida> accessed January 3, 2020.
75. Operación Tayta aplicará 9,000 pruebas rápidas en tres distritos de Arequipa. *Andina* 2020 2020/09/23.
76. Mega Operación TAYTA se desarrolló en sede de los Juegos Panamericanos. *Redacción Lima* 2019 2020 2020/09/15.
77. Operación “Tayta” finaliza exitosamente en Máncora. *Naval News* 2020 2020/10/19.
78. Mega Tayta de Chepén culmina beneficiando a más de 2,700 personas. *TU Region Informa* 2020 2020/11/02.
79. Google COVID-19 Community Mobility Reports. Available from: <https://www.google.com/covid19/mobility/> accessed 1/10/2020.
80. Juscamayta-López E, Tarazona D, Valdivia F, et al. Phylogenomics reveals multiple introductions and early spread of SARS-CoV-2 into Peru. *bioRxiv* 2020 doi:10.1101/2020.09.14.296814
81. Cervantes M. Peru confirms case of British variant of coronavirus. *Reuters* January 9, 2021.
82. Epidemiological Update: Occurrence of variants of SARS-CoV-2 in the Americas - 26 January 2021. Pan American Health Organization 1/26/2021.
83. Covid-19: seroprevalencia en la ciudad de Iquitos es de 75 por ciento. *Andina Agencia Peruana de Noticias* 2020 2020/09/25.
84. European Commission, Global Human Settlement, Urban centres database 2018 visualisation; Urban Centre Database UCDB R2019A. 2020/11/30.
85. Instituto Nacional de Estadística e Informática (INEI), Censos Nacionales. 2017.
86. Nicolelis MAL, Raimundo RLG, Peixoto PS, et al. How super-spreader cities, highways, hospital bed availability, and dengue fever influenced the COVID-19 epidemic in Brazil. *medRxiv* 2020 doi:10.1101/2020.09.19.20197749
87. Ministerio de Salud, Centro Nacional de Epidemiología, Prevención y Control de Enfermedades, Sala de situación de salud Lima, Peru: Ministerio de Salud, Centro Nacional de Epidemiología, Prevención y Control de Enfermedades; 2020. Available from: <https://www.dge.gob.pe/portal/docs/vigilancia/sala/2020/SE13/dengue.pdf> accessed 12/29/2020.
88. Cabezas C, Fiestas V, García-Mendoza M, et al. Dengue en el Perú: a un cuarto de siglo de su reemergencia. *Revista Peruana de Medicina Experimental y Salud Publica* 2015;32(1):146-56.
89. Said L. U.S. Readiness to Get COVID-19 Vaccine Steadies at 65%. *Gallup* January 12, 2021.
90. Merchant A. I work in a nursing home. Here’s why my colleagues are skipping the vaccine. *Washington Post* February 12, 2021.

FIGURE LEGENDS.

Figure 2. A) Excess all-cause deaths (all ages), national population of Peru. These decreased 14-fold August 1 through December 1, 2020; then, after IVM use was restricted, increased 13-fold through February 1. For A and B, y values are 7-day moving averages; for B and C, ages ≥ 60. Data are from Peru’s National Death Information System (SINADEF),¹² with associated frozen datasets available from the Dryad data repository.¹⁵ B) Drops in excess deaths for all states of operation *MOT*, an army-led program of mass IVM distributions, but Pasco, which had them on 3 dates. ● *MOT* start date; ▲ peak deaths; ■ day of peak deaths + 30 days. Junin also distributed IVM 13 days before *MOT* start. C) Reductions in excess deaths at +30 days after peak deaths for the 25 states by extent of IVM distributions: maximal-*MOT* (+), mean -74%; moderate-local distributions (○), mean -53%; and minimal-Lima (x), -25%. These reductions by state correlated with extent of IVM distributions with Kendall $\tau_b = 0.524$ ($p < 0.002$).

Figure 2. Excess deaths, normalized to peak deaths = 1.0 by state, for one state from each of the three tiers of IVM distribution: maximal, operation *MOT* (Cusco); moderate (Arequipa); and minimal (Lima). ▲ designates peak deaths; ■ day of peak deaths + 30 days. In Lima, after

restrictive measures on IVM distribution through July 2020, these distributions and treatments began on a mass basis in August.^{14,20,21} Excess deaths are 7-day moving averages, ages ≥ 60 ; data are from the Peruvian National Death Information System (SINADEF).¹²

Figure 3. Google community mobility trends⁷⁹ (line graphs) and excess all-cause deaths for ages ≥ 60 (bars).⁶² These mobility indices show percentage changes in different categories relative to the median of these daily figures for January 3 through February 6, 2020. Five of these categories, all but residential, show (reduced) percentages of trips to various destinations with respect to this baseline, while the residential index tracks hours spent at home; for this category, the sign is switched so that e.g. a 25% increased time at home appears as -25%. These graphs are for two *MOT* states (Cusco, Puno), two states with local IVM distributions (Ica, Piura), Lima, and all of Peru. These same graphs for each of the 25 states of Peru are shown in Figure S2.