



McGill

Professor Denis Thérien

Vice-Principal (Research & International Relations)
McGill University
James Administration Bldg
845 Sherbrooke Street West, room 419
Montreal, Quebec, Canada H3A 2T5
Fax: (514) 398-8257
Tel.: (514) 398-3991
Email: denis.therien@mcgill.ca

Vice-principal (recherche et relations internationales)
Université McGill
Pavillon James de l'administration
845, rue Sherbrooke ouest, bureau 419
Montréal, (Québec), Canada H3A 2T5
Télec. : (514) 398-8257
Tél.: (514) 398-3991
Courriel : denis.therien@mcgill.ca

Friday, March 28, 2008

Ms. Jumoke Fasoyinu
Manager of Assessment Communications
Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC)
1510-130 Albert Street
Ottawa, ON K1P 5G4

RE: UACC Policy on Peer Review for Scientific Merit

Dear Ms. Fasoyinu,

In compliance with a recommendation from the CCAC, I enclose a copy of the *UACC Policy on Peer Review for Scientific Merit*. This policy was recently approved by the University Animal Care Committee. The implementation date is to be June 1st, 2008.

Yours sincerely,

Denis Thérien

c.c. Rima Rozen, Associate Vice-Principal (Research and International Relations)
Lorraine Chalifour, Chair, University Animal Care Committee
Jim Gourdon, Interim Director of the Animal Compliance Office and Director of the
Animal Resources Centre
Suzanne Smith, Assistant Director of the Animal Compliance Office

McGill University UACC Policy on Peer Review for Scientific Merit

1. In accordance with Canadian Council on Animal Care and McGill University policy, all research projects involving the use of animals must be peer reviewed for scientific merit.
2. In cases where project funding comes from non-peer reviewed sources, it is the Faculty or Institute's responsibility to provide the Facility Animal Care Committee with appropriate peer review.
3. Documentation must come from two qualified individuals. Reviewers must refuse to do the review when in conflict of interest when they:
 - a. are from the same immediate department or unit as the applicant, and who interact with the applicant in the course of their duties at the institution,
 - b. have collaborated, published or been a co-applicant with the applicant, within the last five years,
 - c. have been a student or supervisor of the applicant within the last ten years,
 - d. are a close personal friend or relative of the applicant,
 - e. have had long-standing scientific or personal differences with the applicant,
 - f. are in a position to gain or lose financially from the outcome of the application or for some other reason feel that they cannot provide an objective review of the application.
4. The Principal Investigator must provide a written description of the project (as for a grant) including the background, rationale, specific aims, methodology and significance of the proposed experiments, justifying the science behind animal use. The proposal can be up to five pages.
5. The reviewers must comment on the following points:
 - a. Importance/relevance of the proposed study.
 - b. Originality of proposed research.
 - c. Quality of research design and methodology.
 - d. Species of animal/model (appropriate, not the most appropriate; more appropriate species).
 - e. Other relevant points.
6. The decision of the reviewer will be: approval, conditional approval or refusal. Justification and concerns to be addressed are to be communicated to the Faculty or Institute who will send the reviews to the Principal Investigator.
7. The review must be documented on a scientific merit review form (see addendum for example).
8. The Faculty or the Institute will inform the appropriate FACC that the scientific merit has been established to the satisfaction of the reviewers. Where concerns are revealed the Faculty or Institute must inform the Facility Animal Care Committee.

4. Comments on the animal model used:

5. Other Comments: