**Scientific Merit peer Reviewer Form**

In compliance with the Guidelines from the Canadian Council on Animal Care, all research protocols involving live, non-human vertebrate animals must be reviewed for scientific merit before referral for ethics review through the Animal Care Committee. For most (external) grant-funded protocols, it is accepted that scientific merit review takes place during the peer review process. For research not subject to prior peer review (including internal grants, pilot studies, thesis research, and certain contract research) the Research Services Office has established a scientific review process that considers the hypotheses/objectives, methods, and contributions of the proposed research to ensure that the involvement of animals is warranted.

To perform the review, the researcher has provided a summary with the project description that explains the objectives, hypothesis, potential contributions, and methodological approach of the study. (*The animal use protocol does not include all the necessary scientific information and is not structured to provide this information.*)

We appreciate your willingness to conduct a Scientific Merit review of this research proposal involving animal use. Please confirm your eligibility to conduct this review in the section below, then complete the following sections to provide your evaluation of the research proposal.

*Researchers are encouraged to submit requests for Scientific Merit Review well before ACC deadlines as this review must be completed before the ACC will review Animal Use Protocols*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Research Project Title:** | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| **Principal Investigator:** | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| **Department:** | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| **Student Investigator(s):** | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| **Collaborator(s):** | Click or tap here to enter text. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **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 benefits 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:  Click or tap here to enter text. |
| I certify that I have no real, perceived, or potential conflict of interest concerning this research proposal |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Research Objectives** | | |
| Are the objectives **clearly described**? | | Yes  No  Comments: Click or tap here to enter text. |
| Are the objectives realistically **achievable**, given the methodology and experimental design? | | Yes  No  Comments: Click or tap here to enter text. |
| 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. | | |
| 1. **Research Project Quality** | | |
| Do the proposed activities show evidence of a good understanding of current **scientific literature and knowledge** of the issue? | | Yes  No  Comments: Click or tap here to enter text. |
| Is the research **hypothesis/hypotheses** clearly formulated? | | Yes  No  Comments: Click or tap here to enter text. |
| Is the **experimental design** appropriate to test the research hypothesis/hypothesis? | | Yes  No  Comments: Click or tap here to enter text. |
| Are sufficient details provided in the methodology to evaluate the likelihood of successful **reproducibility**? | | Yes  No  Comments: Click or tap here to enter text. |
| 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 the research proposal and make any recommendations that you believe would be appropriate):  Click or tap here to enter text. | | |
| 1. **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 are required as per the recommendations above  **Poor**; should not be pursued |
| **Reviewer name:** Click or tap here to enter text.  **Date of Review:** Click or tap to enter a date. | | |
| **Signature\*:** |  | |

**Please forward the completed form to the Research Ethics Office (REO) by email to** [**vwalker@yukonu.ca**](mailto:vwalker@yukonu.ca)**. The REO will forward this information to the researcher and the Animal Care Committee.**

**\****sending this document from your University / Institution email counts as an electronic signature.*