**ANIMAL CARE COMMITTEE**

**REVIEWER FORM FOR SCIENTIFIC MERIT FOR THE USE OF ANIMALS IN RESEARCH**

The Canadian Council on Animal Care, which oversees animal use for research, teaching, and testing, requires that prior to the approval of animals used in research at UFV, the protocol must undergo a review of scientific merit to ensure that animals are only used as necessary. For animal-based projects not subjected to competitive peer review processes with appropriate independence and expertise, the Senior Administrator responsible for animal care will solicit two expert peer reviews of scientific merit to review the protocol.

In order to perform the review, a project description that explains the objectives, hypotheses, potential contributions, and methodological approach of the study has been submitted to you along with this form.

The webpage of the CCAC may be helpful when reviewing replacement, refinement, and reduction strategies submitted by the researcher: <https://ccac.ca/en/three-rs/>

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Research project title: | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| Researcher(s): | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| Research Objectives |
| a)Are the objectives **clearly described**? | [ ]  YES[ ]  NO | Comments:Click or tap here to enter text. |
| b)Are the objectives realistically **achievable**, given the methodology and experimental design? | [ ]  YES[ ]  NO  | Comments:Click or tap here to enter text. |
| c)Does the knowledge expected to be gained from this study have **scientific importance**?  | [ ]  YES[ ]  NO | Comments:Click or tap here to enter text. |
| General comments on the study objectives:Click or tap here to enter text. |
| Research Project Quality |
| a) Do the proposed activities show evidence of good understanding of current **scientific literature** and **knowledge** of the issue? | [ ]  YES[ ]  NO | Comments:Click or tap here to enter text. |
| b) Is the research **hypothesis/hypotheses** clearly formulated? | [ ]  YES[ ]  NO | Comments:Click or tap here to enter text. |
| c) Is the **experimental design** appropriate to test the research hypothesis/hypotheses? | [ ]  YES[ ]  NO | Comments:Click or tap here to enter text. |
| d) Are sufficient details provided in the methodology to evaluate the likelihood of successful **reproducibility**? | [ ]  YES[ ]  NO | Comments:Click or tap here to enter text. |
| e) Is the proposed **statistical data analysis** appropriate for the experimental design described?  | [ ]  YES[ ]  NO | Comments:Click or tap here to enter text. |
| **Overall impression** (summarize your impression of the quality of research proposal and make any recommendations that you believe would be appropriate):Click or tap here to enter text. |

|  |
| --- |
| Final Decision on Scientific Merit |
| With regard to the scientific merit of the described research, how would you rate the proposed study: | [ ]  **Excellent**; approve “as is”[ ]  **Good**; minor revisions suggested as per the recommendations above; may approve without reviewing again.[ ]  **Fair**; major revisions required as per the recommendations above; must review the revised scientific summary.[ ]  **Poor**; should not be pursued |
| Conflict of Interest |
| A conflict of interest is a conflict between a person’s duties and responsibilities with regard to the review process, and that person’s private, professional, business or public interests.There may be a real, perceived or potential conflict of interest when the external reviewer: * would receive professional or personal benefit resulting from the funding opportunity or application being reviewed;
* has a professional or personal relationship with the applicant or co-applicant; or
* has a direct or indirect financial interest in a funding opportunity or application being reviewed.

A conflict of interest may be deemed to exist or perceived as such when the reviewer: * is a relative or close friend, or has a personal relationship with the applicant(s);
* is from the same immediate department, institution, organization or company as the applicant, and interacts with the applicant in the course of their duties at the institution;
* has collaborated, published or been a co-applicant with the applicant, within the last five years;
* has been a student or supervisor of the applicant within the last ten years;
* has had long-standing scientific or personal differences with the applicant;
* is in a position to gain or lose financially from the outcome of the application; or
* for any other reason feels that s/he cannot provide an objective review of the application.
 |
| If you believe you might be in a conflict of interest, please explain briefly:Click or tap here to enter text. |

|  |
| --- |
| [ ]  I certify that I have no real, perceived, or potential conflict of interest in relation to this research proposal. |
| Reviewer name:Date of review: | Click or tap here to enter text. Click or tap here to enter text. |
| An email from the above reviewer with the approved Scientific Merit attached will be considered “signed” as approval unless otherwise stated. |

*Please forward this form to the senior administrator responsible for scientific merit review, who will forward it to the researcher(s) and the animal care committee.*