

On the Bolt Report 9 September you discussed a new US study on Hydroxychloroquine and claimed it could save hundreds of Australians with COVID-19 but blamed a hatred of Donald Trump and the politicisation of the drug as a key reason why it was being denied to Australian patients.

As you told viewers, “one culture war, in particular, could have just killed hundreds of Australians.”

The study from Dr Chadwick Prodromos, reviewing 43 other studies, found that Hydroxychloroquine was effective against COVID 19, particularly if used early.

<https://www.palmerfoundation.com.au/hydroxychloroquine-is-effective-and-safe-for-the-treatment-of-covid-19-and-may-be-universally-effective-when-used-early-before-hospitalization-a-systematic-review/>

We’ve asked a number of experts to look at the study and they’ve all dismissed it. They’re critical of its methodology, call it “not trustworthy” and one summed it up as “rubbish”

Given Donald Trump is no longer spruiking Hydroxychloroquine, and that major studies have found it ineffective, do you still argue the drug could save hundreds of Australian lives?

And if so, why do you passionately support a drug which has been shown not to work?

Response from Andrew Bolt:

I do not “passionately support” hydroxychloroquine. Your bias is showing. I passionately support being fair in reporting the facts.

I noted the many studies in the past two months that have suggested it works. They include five studies in just one week last August - a Hackensack University Medical Center one which said people given hydroxychloroquine were a third less likely to later need hospitalisation; a study in the European Journal of Internal Medicine which said patients needing hospital care, when hydroxychloroquine is less effective, still had “a 30 per cent lower risk of death” when given the drug; a study in the International Journal of Antimicrobial Agents of 8000 hospitalised patients which said the death rate was cut by a third; a Spanish study of 9644 patients which found “hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin (an antibiotic) correlated with a lower mortality rate”; and a French study by Aix Marseilles University of 226 sick residents in an aged-care home which said hydroxychloroquine halved the death rate.

I have often said I do not know if hydroxychloroquine works, and have said other studies say it does not work. I have pointed to flaws in some of those studies, notably the Recovery study which inexplicably gave patients a massive overdose, and was given late and without

zinc: <https://www.google.com.au/amp/s/amp.heraldsun.com.au/news/andrew-bolt->

[morrison-government-banning-hydroxychloroquine-makes-no-sense/news-story/178d6f912298066a4ad529bfcf42ae83](https://www.abc.net.au/news/2020-10-12/morrison-government-banning-hydroxychloroquine-makes-no-sense/news-story/178d6f912298066a4ad529bfcf42ae83)

My main concern is the refusal of many media outlets - not least the ABC - to at least report on the fact that there studies for this drug as well as against it. They have turned a health argument into an ideological one, as you are doing now.

One other concern I have is that some medical authorities have refused to allow doctors to assess the information themselves and make what they consider is the best decision for their patients.

You also seem to imply that I believe hydroxychloroquine is the best possible treatment. That is false. There are several treatments available - clearly Trump believes he's found one better - and I do not know which I would pick if I got sick.

I should add that I have long said that Hydroxychloroquine, by the way, seems not very effective when given late to patients, and apparently is most effective when given with zinc.