

**SUMMARY of the Decision of the Inquiries, Complaints and Reports Committee  
(the Committee)**  
(Information is available about the complaints process [here](#) and about the Committee [here](#))

**Dr. Yves Gerard Petcho (CPSO# 84928)**  
**Family Medicine**  
**(the Respondent)**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The College received information about the Respondent from two former employees of the clinic where they all used to work. The former employees expressed concerns mostly with respect to the Respondent's alleged lack of compliance with public health measures and the College recommendations related to the COVID-19 pandemic, including contravening public health guidelines and masking and COVID-19 vaccine protocols.

The Committee approved the Registrar's appointment of investigators to review the Respondent's care and conduct.

## **DISPOSITION**

The Committee considered this matter at its meeting of August 8, 2023. The Committee required the Respondent to appear before a Panel of the Committee to be cautioned regarding the importance of maintaining public trust and following public health and College guidance.

The Committee also decided to accept an undertaking from the Respondent, that included professional education.

## **COMMITTEE'S ANALYSIS**

As part of the investigation, the Committee retained two independent assessors. Assessor 1, a specialist in family medicine, concluded that the Respondent's use of non-recommended therapies in the treatment of COVID-19 did not meet the standard of practice of the profession, that it demonstrated a lack of knowledge, skills and judgment, and that the Respondent's clinical practice was likely to expose his patients to harm or injury.

The Respondent provided a medical opinion by a family physician who practices family medicine, complementary medicine, and alternative medicine, who reviewed the safety profiles of ivermectin and hydroxychloroquine. The review did not involve any charts

**SUMMARY of the Decision of the Inquiries, Complaints and Reports Committee  
(the Committee)**  
(Information is available about the complaints process [here](#) and about the Committee [here](#))

and was general in its conclusions around using off-label medications and informed consent when doing so.

The Committee subsequently retained Assessor 2, an internal medicine and infectious diseases specialist, who opined that the Respondent's prescribing of ivermectin, using an outdated consent, as well for indications outside of acute COVID-19 infection, demonstrated a lack of knowledge and skill. While no harm was documented, prolonged courses of ivermectin with little clinical monitoring had the potential to introduce harm in patient interactions.

The Respondent stated that he and the clinic took the COVID-19 pandemic seriously and implemented appropriate measures to keep his staff and patients safe. He felt that his use of ivermectin was for the benefit of his patients and that he did his best to balance the risks and benefits in every individual case.

The Committee accepted the Assessors' opinions and was of the view that remediation and improvement were required to achieve the following educational goals:

- to respect the College policies, public health guidance, and Ministry of Health directives during a declared pandemic;
- to communicate with respect and professionalism in the workplace;
- to understand how health misinformation spreads, its impact on public health, and ways to combat it;
- to improve critical appraisal skills in public health evidence – while mindful of confirmation bias;
- to review the prevention and treatment of COVID-19 in the outpatient setting;
- to ensure that complementary or alternative treatments are supported by sound clinical judgments, informed by evidence and scientific reasoning, and accompanied by informed consent;
- to ensure medical records systems meet the requirements set out in College policy and legislation.

The Committee acknowledged the Respondent's cooperation in this investigation and his willingness to seek a resolution that involved remediation.

In light of the above, the Committee determined that it was appropriate to caution the Respondent and accept his undertaking, as outlined above.