

**IACUC 101 PLUS
Virtual**

PROTOCOL REVIEW

Ernest D. Prentice, Ph.D.
*Professor Emeritus
Dept. Genetics, Cell Biology and Anatomy
University of Nebraska Medical Center*

April 1-2, 2025

1

Outline

- Role of the IACUC
- The Road Uphill for Scientists
- Methods of IACUC Review
- Continuing Review
- IACUC protocol approval criteria
- Conclusion

2

Question
**WHAT IS THE ROLE OF THE
IACUC?**

3

The IACUC

The responsible advancement of science and medicine depends upon the use of *animal subjects* in humane and scientifically important research reviewed and approved by IACUCs that work in *partnership* with investigators in a culture of integrity and caring.

4

THE ROAD UPHILL FOR SCIENTISTS

5

METHODS OF IACUC REVIEW

6

Designated Member Review (DMR)

- The protocol is deemed eligible for DMR in accordance with an IACUC policy.
- All IACUC members are given a copy of each protocol eligible for DMR (best practice).
- DMR begins only after all IACUC members have had *sufficient time* to review the protocol and call for FCR.
- If there is no call for FCR, at least one qualified IACUC member, without a COI, serves as the designated reviewer (DR).
- The DR is appointed by the IACUC Chair.

PHS Policy IV.C.2; 9 CFR 2.31(d)(2)

7

DMR *Cont'd*

- IACUC members do not vote in DMR.
- If DMR involves more than one reviewer, consensus must be achieved.
- Possible actions by the DR:
 - Approve the protocol.
 - Require modifications (to secure approval).
 - Refer the protocol to FCR.
- Recognize the need to maintain review consistency across DRs

PHS Policy IV.C.2; 9 CFR 2.31(d)(2)

8

Full Committee Review (FCR)

- A convened face-to-face, in person, meeting is preferable for complex, invasive protocols.
- Ensure presence of a quorum (*simple majority*).
- Reiterate the review findings (required modifications and questions) for clarity and informed voting.
- No IACUC members with a COI can vote.
- Recognize the need to maintain review consistency across FCR meetings

PHS Policy IV.C.2; 9 CFR 2.31(d)(2)

9

Full Committee Review (FCR) Cont'd

- Possible actions by the FC:
 - Approval
 - Require modification (*to secure approval*)
 - Refer the revised protocol back to FC
 - Have the revised protocol reviewed by DMR
 - Withhold approval

*PHS Policy IV.C.2; 9 CFR 2.31(d)(2);
OLAW FAQ #19*

10

DMR Subsequent to FCR

- Review the revised protocol by either of the following two DMR methods:
 - Method #1: If all IACUC members are present at the FCR, every member must vote to have the revised protocol reviewed using the standard PHS Policy/AWAR DMR process.

*PHS Policy IV.C.2; 9 CFR 2.31(d)(2);
NOT-OD-09-035, January 8, 2009,
FAQ #19*

11

DMR Subsequent to FCR Cont'd

- Method #2: If all IACUC members are not present at the FCR and the IACUC has a policy in compliance with NOT-OD-09-035, a quorum of the IACUC members present at the FCR may decide by unanimous vote to have the revised protocol reviewed by DMR.
 - The IACUC Chair appoints the DR who conducts the review.
 - Any IACUC member, regardless of attendance at the FCR, can request to see the revised protocol and/or request FCR up until the protocol has been approved.

*NOT-OD-09-035, January 8, 2009,
FAQ #19*

12

Question

How should an IACUC decide which protocols warrant FCR vs. DMR?

13

Use of FCR vs. DMR

Consider having a policy specifying research procedures, pain levels and species which require FCR or are eligible for DMR, based upon the anticipated impact of procedures on animal well-being.

FCR

- Major survival surgery
- Radiation sickness
- Tumor induction
- Toxicology
- Infectious disease
-

DMR

- Non-survival surgery
- Tissue collection
- Antibody production
- Telemetry
- Animal behavior obs.
-

Note: The PHS Policy and USDA Regulations do not prescribe research categories which require FCR.

14

Significant Changes

- Significant changes have the potential to directly impact animal welfare.
- Some activities that may not have a direct impact on animal welfare are also considered significant.

*Modified from:
NOT-OD-14-126; August 26, 2014*

15

IACUC Review of Significant Changes

- Changes per the PHS Policy/AWAR which require review and approval by either DMR or FCR (classic methods)
- Changes which are eligible for administrative handling (AH) in accordance with an IACUC policy
- Changes which are eligible for Veterinary Verification and Consultation (VVC) in accordance with an IACUC policy

*NOT-OD-14-126 August 26, 2014
OLAW Guidance on Significant Changes, April 20, 2021*

16

Classic Methods vs. VVC

Requires FCR or DMR	Eligible for VVC	Eligible for AH
Nonsurvival to survival surgery	Changes in anesthesia, analgesia, sedation, experimental substances	Increase in previously approved number of animals
Increase in pain, distress, or invasiveness	Change in AVMA-approved methods of euthanasia	Change in personnel (other than the PI)
Change in study objectives	Change in duration, frequency, type or number of procedures	Correction of typographical and grammatical errors
Change in Principal Investigator		Contact information updates
Change which impacts personnel safety		
Change in housing or use of animals in a location not overseen by the IACUC		
Change in species		

PHS Policy IV.C.2; NOT-OD-14-126, August 26, 2014

17

Why VVC?

- Allows implementation of changes more quickly
- Avoids delays which could compromise research progress
- Reduces PI frustration with the IACUC
- Decreases the workload of the IACUC
- Helps reduce noncompliance

Note: VVC cannot be used to add a new procedure (e.g., blood draw). However, if the blood draw is already an IACUC-approved procedure, the frequency of the blood draws may be increased under VVC.

18

CONTINUING REVIEW

19

Continuing Review Procedures

- Obtain: 1) an up-to-date protocol for review and 2) a Continuing Review Form with a *progress report* that includes:
 - the status of the research
 - unanticipated problems (technical, AEs, mortality)
 - a list of publications and presentations derived from the research
- The re-review must encompass all PHS and AWAR approval criteria as applicable
- Consider using DMR for protocols subject to continuing review without animal welfare issues or other problems.

Note on the OLAW Website:
"Model for Performing ... Continuing Review",
Contemporary Topics 35(5):53-56, 1996; *The Guide*, p. 34

20

Continuing Review Deadlines

- PHS Policy: Complete (de novo) re-review of the protocol *no less* often than once every 3 years.
- USDA: Complete (de novo) re-review of the protocol *no less* often than once every 3 years.

PHS Policy IV.C.5; 9 CFR 2.31(d)(5);
Amended AWAR, effective 12/27/21, 86 FR 66919 (11/24/21)

21

IACUC PROTOCOL APPROVAL CRITERIA

22

Elements of Protocol Review

- Rationale and purpose of proposed use of animals
- Clear, concise, sequential description of procedures
- Availability of alternatives
- Justification for species and number of animals requested
- Unnecessary duplication
- Unusual housing and husbandry requirements
- Impact of proposed procedures on animal wellbeing
- Appropriate sedation, analgesia, anesthesia
- Surgical procedures
- Post-procedural care
- Description and rationale for selected endpoints
- Criteria for humane intervention
- Euthanasia/ disposition of long-lived species
- Adequacy of training/experience of personnel
- Personnel safety (hazards)
- Experimental & humane endpoints
- Unexpected outcomes
- Physical restraint
- Weigh objectives against welfare concerns
- Multiple survival surgeries
- Food and fluid restriction
- Non-pharmaceutical grade substances
- Avoid or minimize discomfort, distress & pain
- Alternatives (for procedures that cause more than momentary or slight pain or distress (*written narrative*))
- Assurance of no unnecessary duplication
- Procedures that may cause more than momentary or slight pain or distress
- Appropriate pain relief
- Humane euthanasia for animals that experience severe or chronic pain
- Living conditions appropriate for the species
- Medical care available and provided by a qualified veterinarian
- Personnel conducting procedures are appropriately trained/qualified
- Surgery
- No more than one major operative procedure with recovery
- Methods of euthanasia must adhere to the AWR definition of euthanasia

John Bradfield, DVM, PhD

23

SECTION I Scientific Aims

24

IACUC Approval Criteria

- The goal of the research is supported by key background information (published and unpublished).
- The specific aims of the research are clear, and their achievement is judged to be feasible.

*PHS Policy IV.D.b.;
The Guide, p. 25;
9 CFR 2.31(e)(2)*

25

SECTION II Animal Subjects

26

IACUC Approval Criteria

- The specific aims of the research cannot be achieved using non-animal models (*replacement*).
- The animal subjects:
 - are a scientifically appropriate species and strain
 - possess the required biological characteristics:
 - sex, age, weight
 - health status, genetic background, source

*PHS Policy IV.D; USGP III; 9 CFR 2.31(d)(e)(1,2);
The Guide, pp. 5, 12, 25-26;
NOT-OD-16-006, October 13, 2015*

27

IACUC Approval Criteria Cont'd

- The animal subjects:
 - Are not a popular companion animal unless the species is key to achievement of the purpose of the research
 - Are the least sentient species (lower vs. higher animal) that is scientifically suitable

*PHS Policy IV.D; USGP III; 9 CFR 2.31(d)(e)(1,2);
The Guide, pp. 5, 12, 25-26;
NOT-OD-16-006, October 13, 2015*

28

SECTION III The Study Design

29

The Study Design

The study design constitutes a scientific framework or "roadmap" used to collect and analyze data to achieve the specific aims of the research.

30

Question

Should an IACUC evaluate the study design for scientific soundness regardless of whether there was prior peer review?

31

GUIDANCE

32

PHS Policy

- The number of animals required is "the minimum number to obtain valid results"

USGP III

33

PHS Policy

"Procedures with animals will avoid or minimize discomfort, distress, and pain to the animals, consistent with sound research design."

PHS Policy IV. C. 1. a.

34

NIH OLAW Guidance

"The PHS Policy and The Guide expect the IACUC to consider whether the research design is sound."


Lab Animal Vol. 49: 29-31, 2020

35

The Guide

"...the IACUC ... should evaluate scientific elements of the protocol... For example, hypothesis testing, sample size, group numbers and adequacy of controls..."

The Guide, p. 26



36

AAALAC Guidance

"Scientific rigor and experimental reproducibility directly impact the welfare and number of animals used in research The IACUC review should confirm [*based on an initial review by a grants panel or as an assigned responsibility to the committee*] that the protocol contains pertinent study design elements ... including randomization, blinding and controls."

AAALAC FAQ on Scientific Reproducibility, 2021

37

IACUC Approval Criteria

- The study design incorporates the necessary scientific elements that fit the protocol:
 - a testable hypothesis
 - experimental and control groups are specified
 - statistically/scientifically justified animal numbers per group
 - procedures are concisely and sequentially described, including flow charts as necessary
 - procedures are clearly linked with the specific aims
 - minimization of bias using randomization and blinding
 - appropriate statistical analysis of resultant data leading to valid conclusions

*PHS Policy IV.D.1.d.; USGP III;
The Guide, pp. 25-27; 9 CFR 2.31(e)(3)*

38

SECTION IV Animal Pain and Distress

39

Pain

"Unless the contrary is established, investigators should consider that procedures that cause pain or distress in human beings may cause pain or distress in other animals."

USGP IV

"A painful procedure applied to any animals means any procedure that would reasonably be expected to cause more than slight or momentary pain or distress in a human being to which that procedure is applied...."

9 CFR 1.1

40

Distress

"An aversive state in which an animal fails to cope or adjust to various stressors with which it is presented."

The Guide, p. 121

41

IACUC Approval Criteria

- The PI has provided a written narrative describing the methods and sources used to determine that no alternatives to procedures that may cause more than momentary or slight pain or distress were scientifically feasible (*AWAR requirement*):
 - Literature database(s) searched (usually at least 2), including the date of search, years covered, and key words
 - Other sources consulted (e.g., named expert)
 - Consideration of reduction, replacement and refinement

9 CFR 2.31(d)(1);

"AWIC" <http://www.nal.usda.gov/awic>

42

IACUC Approval Criteria *Cont'd*

- The PI has provided an *explanation* why any alternatives described in the relevant, up to date, peer reviewed scientific literature cannot be used to achieve the specific aims of the research.
- Application of the AWAR alternative documentation requirement is optional for research subject only to the PHS Policy.

*PHS Policy IV.D.1;
USGP III, IV; 9 CFR 2.31(d)(1);
The Guide, pp. 5, 12, 25-26*

43

IACUC Approval Criteria *Cont'd*

- Procedures will be used that have the least amount of anticipated research induced adverse effects (AEs) in consideration of any justifiable scientific constraints.

*PHS Policy IV.D.1;
USGP III, IV; 9 CFR 2.31(d)(1);
The Guide, pp. 5, 12, 25-26*

44

IACUC Approval Criteria *Cont'd*

- The nature, magnitude, and duration of any anticipated AEs are adequately described *and* consistent with known effects of the procedures applied to the species involved in the research.
- The assigned USDA pain categories (B, C, D, E), as applicable, fit the protocol.

*9 CFR 2.31(d)(IV);
The Guide, pp. 120-121*

45

IACUC Approval Criteria *Cont'd*

- The regimen to treat *anticipated* pain, discomfort or distress involves use of appropriate state of the art sedation, analgesics, and anesthesia administered pre-operative, intra-operative and post-operative, as necessary.
- Any withholding of pain-relieving agents or use of neuromuscular blockers is clearly justified for compelling scientific reasons.

PHS Policy IV.C.1.b; USGP IV; The Guide, pp. 26, 121-123; 9 CFR 2.31(d)(1); Recognition and Alleviation of Pain in Laboratory Animals (NRC 2009a)

46

IACUC Approval Criteria *Cont'd*

- The humane endpoint is set as the *earliest possible* point at which pain and distress will be prevented, terminated or relieved.
- The experiment is designed so that the experimental and humane endpoints are closely linked.
- The species-specific humane endpoint assessment criteria are appropriate.
- The action(s) to be taken upon reaching the humane endpoint is acceptable.

USGP VI; The Guide, pp. 27-28; 9 CFR 2.31(d)(1)(v)

47

SECTION V Post-Procedure Monitoring

48

Monitoring

Careful clinically and scientifically based daily monitoring of animal subjects by a qualified person(s) with timely attention given to any problems should they occur.

The Guide, pp.119-120

49

IACUC Approval Criteria

- The monitoring plan, including frequency of evaluation, use of pain scales and assessment of health status, is appropriate based upon:
 - The nature of the intervention(s)
 - The species
 - The magnitude of anticipated pain, discomfort, or distress
 - The duration of anticipated pain, discomfort, or distress
 - Possible complications
 - The humane endpoint

*PHS Policy; 9 CFR 2.33(b)(3)(5);
The Guide, pp. 27-28, 119-120*

50

SECTION VI Altered Living Conditions

51

IACUC Approval Criteria

- Any departure from species-appropriate living conditions, as set forth in (1) The Guide, (2) applicable USDA Regulations, or (3) scientifically or medically necessary, should:
 - Be fully justified
 - Provide animals with as much choice and control over their environment as possible
 - Provide as much environmental enrichment as possible

*The Guide, pp. 41-103; PHS Policy IV.C.d;
USGP VII; 9 CFR SUB A-F*

52

SECTION VII Euthanasia

53

IACUC Approval Criteria

- The method(s) of euthanasia complies with current AVMA Guidelines, based upon:
 - The specific aims of the research
 - The species, size and age of the animal
 - A minimum of pain and distress associated with the method
 - Ability to quickly produce a loss of consciousness
 - Legitimate logistical considerations
 - Safety of personnel
- Deviations from the AVMA Guidelines are scientifically justified
- The method to confirm death is appropriate

*PHS Policy IV.C.1.g; 9 CFR 2.31(e)(5);
The Guide, pp. 123-124; AVMA Guidelines 2020*

54

SECTION VIII
Scientific Merit

55

Scientific Merit

Scientific merit can be defined as an expected outcome that is a scientifically valuable, important, relevant, and beneficial contribution to knowledge about the biology and behavior of living systems derived from research conducted with scientific rigor involving animals.

Based on NIH Grants Policy, October 24, 2021

56

Question

Should the IACUC evaluate scientific merit of the research regardless of whether there was prior peer review?

57

GUIDANCE

58

PHS Policy

A description of procedures for "... the
conduct of scientifically valuable research"
PHS Policy IV. D.1.d.

59

USGP II

"Procedures involving animals should be designed
and performed with due consideration of their
relevance to human or animal health, the
advancement of knowledge, or the good of
society."

USGP II, PHS Policy, p 4

60

OPRR-AWD Guidance

“The primary focus of the SRG is scientific merit whereas the primary focus of the IACUC is animal welfare. It is evident, however, that there is... overlap of function between the two bodies... The IACUC is expected to... consider in its review the general scientific relevance of the proposal.”

*ILAR News 33 (4): 68-70 (1991);
USGP II; OLAW FAQ #12*

61

NIH Guidance

“The primary role of SRGs is addressing scientific merit while IACUCs focus on evaluating animal welfare ... These functions are not mutually exclusive because it is not entirely possible to separate scientific value from animal welfare”

NOT-OD-22-005, October 18, 2021

62

NIH Guidance *Cont'd*

- “... peer review by SRGs is not intended to supersede or substitute for IACUC review and approval”

NOT-OD-22-005, October 18, 2021

63

USDA

"A proposal ... must contain ... a description of procedures ... for the conduct of scientifically valuable research."


9 CFR 2.31(e)(4)

64

The Guide

"Using animals in research is a *privilege* granted by society to the research community with the expectation that such use will provide either significant new knowledge or lead to improvement in human and/or animal well-being."

The Guide, p. 4.



65

IACUC Approval Criteria

- The research is judged by the IACUC (*with or without the benefit of prior peer review*) to have scientific value and will *potentially* provide:
 - An advancement of knowledge
 - Improvement in human health and well-being
 - Improvement in animal health and well-being
 - A contribution to the good of society

OLAW FAQ #12

66

SECTION IX
Ethical Cost-Benefit Assessment

67

Question

Should the IACUC perform an ethical cost-benefit assessment, regardless of whether there was prior peer review?

68

Ethical Cost-Benefit Assessment

A *nonempirical* assessment of the ethical cost of the research versus the potential (likely, possible) benefits in order for the IACUC to make an *informed judgement* whether the costs experienced by the animal subjects are justified by the possible benefits.

69

Ethical Cost

- The AEs associated with the research constitute an ethical cost or “price” which is *involuntarily* incurred by the animal subjects when there is no prospect of direct benefit to the animals.
- The magnitude of the ethical cost is dependent upon the nature and procedural elements of the research.

70

Ethical Cost *Cont'd*

- The ethical cost increases or decreases depending upon:
 - the species involved
 - nature of the research
 - number of animals used
 - the nature and magnitude of AEs
 - the potential value (importance) of the research

71

Ethical Cost *Cont'd*

- The higher the ethical cost, the greater the need for a higher potential value.
- There are ethically based limits beyond which research should not be approved.
 - Species-related limits
 - Procedure-related limits

72

GUIDANCE

73

The Guide - AAALAC

- "...the IACUC is expected to weigh the objectives of the study against potential animal welfare concerns"

The Guide, p. 27

- AAALAC International expects the IACUC (or comparable oversight body), as part of the review process, "will weigh the potential adverse effects of the study against the potential benefits that are likely to accrue as a result of the research ... This analysis should be a primary consideration in a review process."

AAALAC FAQs on Harm/Benefit Analysis, 2021

74

CIOMS-ICLAS IGP

- "...a system of animal use oversight ... should promote a harm-benefit analysis ... balancing the benefits derived from research ... with the potential pain and/or distress experienced by the animal."

CIOMS-ICLAS IGP X (2012)

75

Ethics from the 1990s

- "Because a living creature serves as the experimental model, it is ultimately necessary to justify the use of animals in terms of an ethical cost-benefit assessment."

*Prentice ED, Crouse DA, and Mann MD.
Scientific Merit Review: The Role of the IACUC.
ILAR vol 34, 1-2, p. 18, 1992*

76

IACUC Approval Criteria

- The ethical cost of the research is minimized to the greatest extent possible.
- There is a *reasonable expectation* (*possibility/likelihood*) that the research will provide sufficient benefit that results in:
 - improved human health and well-being
 - improved animal health and well-being
 - provision of significant new knowledge
 - a contribution to the good of society

77

IACUC Approval Criteria *Cont'd*

- It is reasonable to conclude that the potential benefit (short and/or long term) *justifies* the ethical cost.
- If the research ultimately yields no benefit, the ethical cost is still justified providing the IACUC performed a valid ethical cost-benefit assessment.

78

Conclusion

- The use of animals in research is a privilege, not a right.
- Society expects animal use to be justified, humane and ethical.
- Ethical research is characterized by 8Rs:
 - Replacement
 - Reduction
 - Refinement
 - Respect
 - Rigor
 - Reporting
 - Reproducibility
 - Relevance
