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**SCIENTIFIC MERIT**

**Review Form**

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 the UNBC Animal Care and Use Committee (ACUC).

Please submit a **signed** **electronic version** of this application to [acuc@unbc.ca](mailto:acuc@unbc.ca).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Research Project Title: |  | | |
| Researcher(s): |  | | |
| **RESEARCH OBJECTIVES** | | | |
| a. Are the objectives clearly described? | YES  NO | Comments: | |
| b. Are the objectives realistically achievable, given the experimental design and associated methods? | YES  NO | Comments: | |
| c. Does the knowledge expected to be gained from this study have scientific importance | YES  NO | Comments: | |
| General comments on the study objectives: | | | |
| **RESEARCH PROJECT QUALITY** | | | |
| a. Are the proposed research activities consistent with or supported by the current scientific literature and general knowledge of the research topic? | 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 to evaluate the efficacy and ethical application of study methods? | YES  NO | Comments: | |
| e. Is the proposed statistical data analysis appropriate for the experimental design? | YES  NO | Comments: | |
| Overall Impression: please summarize your impression of the scientific quality of research proposal and make any recommendations to improve the study design relative to the use of animals (i.e., reduce or replace animal subjects or refine methods to reduce risk or impact): | | | |
| **FINAL DESCISION 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 the 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; * 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 on a grant with the applicant within the last five years; * Has been a student or supervisor of the applicant within the last ten years; * Has a long-standing scientific or personal difference with the applicant; * Is able to gain or lose financially from the outcome of the application; * For any other reason feel that s/he cannot provide an objective review of the application. | | | |
| If you believe you might be in a conflict of interest, please briefly explain why: | | | |
| I certify that I have no real, perceived or potential conflict of interest in relation to this research proposal. | | | |
| Reviewer Name: | | | Date: |
| Reviewer Affiliation: | | | |
| Signature: | | | |