The medical proof doesn’t get much better than VMMC
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The editorial on voluntary medical male circumcision (VMMC) has many scientific inaccuracies and ignores the latest literature. Previous ‘scientific’ challenges on the VMMC evidence have had rebuttals co-signed by many local prevention scientists.1,2 Ncayiyana does not acknowledge that despite the long presence of the prevention ‘abstain, be faithful and condomise’ (ABCs), the impact on HIV prevention progress has been slow, resulting in hundreds of thousands of mostly young South Africans dying. Substantially lowering incidence will only be achieved with the introduction and scale-up of new technologies.

To argue that VMMC has not been ‘field tested’ is inaccurate. The editorial’s opening sentence quotes the ‘real world’ evidence. In Orange Farm, where many men were circumcised, a study demonstrated a 76% decrease in new HIV infections among those circumcised. Uganda reported a similar post-trial result (73%).1 This builds on the observational evidence quoted in the editorial. It is unclear why neonatal VMMC is ‘proscribed’ in South Africa, as the editorial and many anti-VMMC groups claim; it occurs for cultural, religious and health reasons, and there is no law barring it. To ask for long-term evidence of the efficacy for HIV prevention of VMMC in neonates will take over 20 years to measure. It is biologically implausible that it would not have the same effect as in adults, and not implementing it would mean we do not protect the next generation of young men from a life-threatening illness. No similar evidence is requested for interventions such as hepatitis B or human papillomavirus vaccines.

Independent safety boards terminated the three VMMC efficacy studies, and not the researchers. Not to offer a proven (around 60% protective) intervention to the control group on stopping the studies violates clinical research ethics. Ncayiyana selectively quoted a statement by the Australian Federation of AIDS Organisations that ‘correct and consistent condom use, not circumcision, is the most effective means of reducing female-to-male transmission, and vice-versa.’ But there is no published evidence comparing the two interventions. Additionally, the organisation’s (2007) statement later states that the epidemiology of HIV transmission completely differs between Australia and Africa, and its website stated in 2011 ‘Circumcision significantly reduces the rate of HIV acquisition (50-70%) in men with HIV-positive female partners.’ The ‘scathing critique’ of the MMC data by Van Howe and Storms referred to by Ncayiyana makes very little sense. They claim that ‘Conservative for the three trials, 89 of the 205 infections (43.1%) were sexually transmitted.’ How were the other infections acquired? The choices would seem to be injection drug use or contact with blood and blood products. The evidence for the predominantly heterosexual transmission of HIV in sub-Saharan Africa is overwhelming. Furthermore, if the infections were not sexually transmitted, how would the condom use data discrepancy argued in the editorial as a weakness of the three studies then prevent them? The discussion on the various differential rates regarding VMMC and observed HIV prevalence in different South African communities relies on circumcision self-reports, which are unreliable when assessing culturally performed circumcision, in which the amount of foreskin removed varies. These observational studies are rendered irrelevant by good randomised control trial and follow-up community evidence.
We found no reference to the assertion that black Americans have the highest rates of circumcision among American men, rather the opposite. The argument that VMMC does not protect women from HIV is peculiar. Reducing the pool of HIV among men, in a predominantly heterosexual epidemic, will mean fewer men with HIV, who will expose fewer women. It also appears to reduce circulating HPV, and therefore likely to reduce cervical cancer rates, as demonstrated in other communities where MMC is the norm. The risk disinhibition data from properly conducted studies does not suggest any additional risk taking.

South Africa has some of the world’s top HIV prevention scientists, and almost all of the biomedical breakthroughs in the field have either occurred in South Africa or included South Africans, including VMMC. The call for VMMC implementation came from South Africans after the Orange Farm study results were announced, was considered by the Department of Health (DoH), and was discussed extensively by all 19 sectors within the South African National AIDS Council (SANAC). The VMMC consensus involved prominent South Africans beyond the health sector, including Deputy President Motlanthe, who chairs the SANAC. Only after careful consideration of the science and the social and cultural issues around VMMC did the DoH and the SANAC decide to include VMMC in the 2012-2016 National Strategic Plan. This intervention is regarded as a game changer in South Africa’s HIV prevention efforts and all provinces are prioritising efforts to accelerate access. The DoH has committed large budgets to VMMC rollout, and contrary to the editorial, is not kowtowing to donor agency agendas for support. Funding for VMMC from donors was requested from the South African government and granted, much like other support to ART and vaccine rollout. This national decision aligns with international recommendations from the WHO and UNAIDS.

No one argues that any one HIV prevention intervention will work alone, or that VMMC is 100% protective. Drivers of the HIV epidemic are complex and there is no ‘one size fits all’ prevention. However, the ABCs have proved insufficient in South Africa or elsewhere, in terms of reversing the HIV epidemic or addressing the complex drivers of HIV transmission. We need additional interventions to make an impact, using the combination prevention approach now adopted internationally and locally. Modelling studies strongly suggest increasingly striking implications of scaling up of VMMC in averting millions of infections and deaths and saving billions of rands in the long run. Further delay will be a major failure to capitalise on scientific evidence to save lives and improve the quality of life of our population. Circumcision has an evidence base for efficacy, especially for protecting men, rivalling the best proved interventions in medicine. Its implementation will be complex, challenging and costly, but it works, and is needed as part of our prevention toolbox.


Voluntary male medical circumcision – Dan Ncayiyana responds

I thank the above authors, all acknowledged HIV/AIDS experts, for their robust responses. South Africa and the SA HIV/AIDS research community have indeed been at the forefront of the global effort to better understand and to contain the HIV/AIDS epidemic, and there is no gainsaying the motive of the VAMCA proponents to control and ultimately to eradicate the disease. That said, the envisaged mass roll-out of a surgically invasive prophylactic intervention is without historical parallel, and it is only appropriate that the VMMC project is deliberated within the medical profession beyond the immediate circles of the panels and committees driving the initiative.

The significance of the evidence from the three African randomised controlled trials (RCTs) is not at issue. However, this evidence seems to have acquired considerable interpretation creep along the way, with inferences of ‘lifelong protection’, and of benefits of neonatal circumcision that are not self-evident from the RCTs. Clark with inferences of ‘lifelong protection’, and of benefits of neonatal circumcision that are not self-evident from the RCTs. Clark with inferences of ‘lifelong protection’, and of benefits of neonatal circumcision that are not self-evident from the RCTs.
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The significance of the evidence from the three African randomised controlled trials (RCTs) is not at issue. However, this evidence seems to have acquired considerable interpretation creep along the way, with inferences of ‘lifelong protection’, and of benefits of neonatal circumcision that are not self-evident from the RCTs. Clark et al. boldly assert in respect of sub-Saharan Africa that ‘Mandating [my emphasis] neonatal male circumcision is an effective therapy that has minimal risks, is cost efficient and will save human lives. Neonatal male circumcision is medically necessary and ethically imperative’. There is no good evidence to back this up. Based on their interpretation of the Children’s Act 38 of 2005, paediatric surgeon and ethicist Sidler and colleagues hold the view that ‘infant circumcision as an intervention in search of a malady, they remind us that ‘Superficially convincing justifications for this surgery have abounded since the mid-19th century’ to prevent masturbation, insanity, idiocy, epilepsy, TB, STIs, cervical cancer, and penile cancer. Certainly, circumcision should be readily accessible to individuals who, forearmed with full information on the potential benefits, the caveats and the unknowns, make a personal choice to be circumcised. To argue that ‘despite the long presence of the ABCs, HIV
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