**SCIENTIFIC MERIT PEER REVIEW FORM**

Dear Reviewer,

Thank you for agreeing to conduct a Scientific Merit review of this research proposal involving animal use.

The CCAC policy statement on: scientific merit and ethical review of animal-based research (2013), requires that animal use for research purposes must consequently be subject to two levels of review:

1) an independent, expert peer review of the scientific merit of the research program or project

2) a review by the ACUC (Animal Care and Use Committee) of whether the proposed animal use, as described within an animal use protocol, is acceptable, and whether the proposed animal-based methods are appropriate

For projects that are either internally funded or that are funded by a source not using a peer review mechanism with appropriate independence and expertise, the research ethics office must select at least two independent experts (both of whom should be external to the ACUC) to review the scientific merit of each project. Please confirm your eligibility to conduct this review in the section below, and then complete the following sections to provide your evaluation of the research proposal.

In addition to comments on objectives, experimental design, and other issues relating to the scientific merit, reviewers may also flag ethical/practical issues with respect to the proposed animal use within a research proposal. If you note any such issues, please indicate them in your comments and they will be addressed by the Animal Care and Use Committee.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Research Project Title** | Click here to enter text. Text will populate in header below |
| **Principal Investigator** | Click here to enter text. Text will populate in header below |

|  |
| --- |
| **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 reviewer: * has any personal, professional, or financial interests that would be directly or indirectly impacted by the outcome of the application or funding opportunity under review
* has a professional or personal relationship (relative, close friend) with the applicant(s) or co-applicant(s);
* 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 or co-applicant within the last ten years;
* has had long-standing scientific or personal differences with the applicant;
* believes they are unable to conduct an impartial evaluation of the application for any other reason.
 |
| 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. |

|  |
| --- |
| **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 researcher **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[ ]  **Fair**; major revisions required as per the recommendations above[ ]  **Poor**; should not be pursued |
| Reviewer Name: | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| Signature\*: |  |
| *\* Sending this document from your University /Institution email counts as an electronic signature* |
| Date of review: | Click or tap to enter a date. |