



## Scientific Merit Review for Animal Care and Use in Research

### Reviewer's Report

The Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC), which oversees animal-based activities in research, teaching and testing, requires that all animal-based research projects undergo scientific peer review by at least two independent experts prior to their review by an animal care committee.

In order to perform the review, a project description that explains the objectives, hypotheses, potential contributions, and methodological approach of the study must be provided by the researcher(s). Animal use protocols typically do not include all the necessary scientific information and lack the structure to provide these details. As a result, the researcher(s) is responsible for making this information available.

Research project title:		
Researcher(s):		
<b>Research Objectives</b>		
a) Are the objectives <b>clearly described</b> ?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	Comments:
b) Are the objectives realistically <b>achievable</b> , given the methodology and experimental design?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	Comments:
c) Does the knowledge expected to be gained from this study have <b>scientific importance</b> ?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	Comments:

General comments on the study objectives:

### 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:

b) Is the research **hypothesis/hypotheses** clearly formulated?

- YES  
 NO

Comments:

c) Is the **experimental design** appropriate to test the research hypothesis/hypotheses?

- YES  
 NO

Comments:

d) Are sufficient details provided in the methodology to evaluate the likelihood of successful **reproducibility**?

- YES  
 NO

Comments:

e) Is the proposed **statistical data analysis** appropriate for the experimental design described?

- YES  
 NO

Comments:

**Overall impression** (summarize your impression of the quality of research proposal and make any recommendations that you believe would be appropriate):

## 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
- Fair**; major revisions required as per the recommendations above
- 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:

I certify that I have no real, perceived or potential conflict of interest in relation to this research proposal.

Reviewer name:

Signature:

Date of review:

*Once completed, please forward this form to the Associate Dean of Research who assigned you as a reviewer for this project through the Animal Care Committee Coordinator (meritreview@mun.ca). Your comments, but not your name, will then be submitted to the researcher(s), the Institutional Animal Care Committee and the Office of the Vice-President (Research).*