



**UNIVERSITY ANIMAL CARE COMMITTEE
Scientific Merit Peer Review Form**

In accordance with the [CCAC Policy on the Importance of Independent Peer Review of the Scientific Merit of Animal-Based Research Projects \(2000\)](#), a proposal not reviewed by external, peer-reviewed agencies, must receive peer review to ensure that scientific merit has been demonstrated. Where evidence of good peer review is absent, TWO knowledgeable scientists who are not collaborating with the applicant in the said protocol and who are NOT on the UACC must review the proposal.

Purpose of this form: This form is used to document the scientific merit peer review as per CCAC policy.

Instructions for this form: After completing this form, e-mail to ethics@uwinnipeg.ca

Protocol Number	
Protocol Title	
Principal Investigator	

1. Comment on the objectives and potential contribution(s) of this study to scientific knowledge.	
2. Comment on the hypotheses of the study and appropriateness of the experimental design involving animals.	
3. Comment on the animal-based methods.	
4a. Are the numbers of animals proposed appropriate to the research proposed? (select one)	<input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate <input type="checkbox"/> Too many <input type="checkbox"/> Too few
4b. If too many or too few, please explain.	
5. Is the species of animal/model appropriate? (select one)	<input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate <input type="checkbox"/> Not appropriate
5b. If not appropriate, please explain.	

6a. Are there alternative experimental procedures which would address the same research questions which would decrease or eliminate the use of experimental animals? (select one)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
6b. If yes, please explain	
7. Other comments	

8. Signature By signing, the reviewer verifies that they have read this protocol including the objectives, hypotheses, methods and contributions of the project and have determined that this proposal has scientific merit.	
Reviewer name	
Reviewer signature	
Date	