|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Logo  Description automatically generated | **Animal Care Committee****Scientific Merit Reviewer Comment Form****Confidential** |

In accordance with the Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC) and the Mount Saint Vincent University/Saint Mary’s University Joint Animal Care and Use Program, animal use in research, testing, and monitoring must only be undertaken if expert, independent opinion has attested to the probable scientific value of the research within its field. Animal-based work can then proceed only if the ACC finds the use of animals acceptable ethically and in practice (i.e., the proposed animal-based methods should be appropriate for the work and meet institutional and CCAC guidance and standards).

The Animal Care Committee greatly appreciates the work of expert peer reviewers in providing scientific merit review of proposed animal-based work. Reviewers are asked to complete this Comment Form within two weeks of receipt and return using the address issued in the official communication from the University.

For more information please see:

* [Scientific\_merit\_and\_ethical\_review\_of\_animal-based\_research.pdf (ccac.ca)](https://ccac.ca/Documents/Standards/Policies/Scientific_merit_and_ethical_review_of_animal-based_research.pdf)
* [CCAC frequently asked questions: Scientific merit and ethical review of animal-based research](https://ccac.ca/Documents/Standards/Policies/FAQ-Scientific_merit_and_ethical_review_of_animal-based_research.pdf)

**The review (Section C – only) is provided to the PI for feedback and to the Animal Care Committee.**

**SECTION A**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Title | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| Project PI | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| Reviewer Name | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| Reviewer Title and Affiliation | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| Reviewer Email Address | Click or tap here to enter text. |

**SECTION B**

**Confidentiality Terms**

Reviewers must ensure that all documentation and information entrusted to reviewers is maintained in strict confidence at all times; used only for the purpose for conducting this review; stored in a secure manner to prevent unauthorized access; destroyed in a secure manner following submission of the return of this comment form using the address issued in the official communication from the University. reviewers must not contact the PI for additional information or to disclose information from the review.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Please indicate if you -**  | **YES** | **NO** |
| * are a personal friend or relative of the PI
 |[ ] [ ]
| * are from the same university department/program
 |[ ] [ ]
| * have been a research supervisor or grad student of the PI within the past 6 years
 |[ ] [ ]
| * have provided letters of support for the PI
 |[ ] [ ]
| * have collaborated with the PI within the past six years or have plans to collaborate in the immediate future
 |[ ] [ ]
| * are an employee of a non-academic organization with which the PI has had a collaboration within the past six years
 |[ ] [ ]
| * have any other potential conflict of interest (financial, personal, etc.) (explain below)
 |[ ] [ ]
| *Explanation/comments re above:*Click or tap here to enter text.\*By signing below as the reviewer, you are declaring no conflict of interest and agree to the terms of confidentiality as stated above. |
| **REVIEWER SIGNATURE:** | **DATE: Click or tap to enter a date.**  |
| **SECTION C** |  |
| **Please rate (place a ✓) the proposed research work with animals using the following table:** |  |
|  | ORIGINALITY / POTENTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE | RESEARCH DESIGN / METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH | DATA ANALYSIS | OBJECTIVES | HYPOTHESES |
| EXCELLENT |[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
| ACCEPTABLE |[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
| WEAK |[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
| UNACCEPTABLE |[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
| **Please elaborate on your general rating of the scientific merit of the proposed animal-based research. Attach/continue on additional pages if necessary.** |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |
| **Please indicate your overall recommendation using a check (✓) based on your expert review of this animal-based research for scientific merit.** |
| Proposal has strong evidence of scientific merit and there are no concerns / revisions | Proposal has evidence of scientific merit but there are concerns to be addressed and/or revisions needed | Proposal does not have evidence of scientific merit  |
| 1. Recommend as is:  | 2. Recommend revisions: *Use space below to elaborate* | 3. Recommend reject:  |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |

***Acknowledgement****:* MSVU wishes to extend its appreciation to the Animal Care Committee at Saint Mary’s University a for permission to adapt their form for use by MSVU researchers