



PPL Standard Condition 18 Notification Form

Please use this form to notify the Animals in Science Regulation Unit (ASRU) of procedural-related adverse effects that have exceeded or are likely to exceed the severity limitations or controls described in the project licence. ASRU will use this information to determine whether any further action is required.

Do not use to report:

- adverse effects that are due to non-procedural issues;
- potential non-compliance (report by other means);
- issues without adverse welfare consequences.

If you are in doubt whether or not you need to fill in this form, please contact your assigned Inspector.

Please clearly title your document: '**ASRU_establishment name_PPL number_PPLh surname_date_sc18**' and send to your Inspector (e.g. using cjsm) with the subject heading 'PPL SC 18 Notification PPL [Number]

Establishment Licence name	University of Cambridge
Establishment Licence number	X81BD37B1
Name of PPL holder	Ole Paulsen
PPL number	PP0499088
Protocol no	3
Protocol title	In vivo behaviour and neural recording (freely- moving)
Severity classification	Moderate
1. Date of incident	17th April 2024

2. Species	Mouse
3. Brief details of study and how the limits or constraints have been breached	The mouse would have experienced moderate pain following recovery surgery consisting in the implantation of a recording device, which is mitigated by pain management. Then the mouse is carefully trained to be briefly restrained in the hand, which would cause only minor discomfort and stress. • The mouse underwent the operation on Tuesday 9th April and was given metacam as an analgesic. • On the mouse's 1st day of post operative care, Wednesday 10th April, the PIL holder noticed a red spot on the mouse's eye. After consultation with his manager and depute PPL holder (see section 6), ophthalmic gel was applied to the mouse's eye and on each remaining day of post operative care. • This mouse had been handled for around three days after the 5 days of post-operative care. Stress was carefully monitored by the PIL holder (Jessy LEMOINE) and the technician in charge of the room where the mouse was housed. The mouse was housed with a littermate. • On Tuesday 16th April the mouse was briefly (three times less than 1 minutes) restrained in the hand before being returned to its cage. • On Wednesday 17th April, the senior technician of the Combined Animal Facility (Ben JAGGS) after seeing the state of the eye, which, according to him, seemed to have popped out of its socket, deemed it preferable to culled the animal. The mouse was not food or water restricted, there was plenty of food and water available in the cage and its littermate is perfectly healthy. Therefore the breach consists in a potential harm of the mouse eye, which we can not confirm but which could have compromised the experiment, and the fact we should have had the NVS to check on the mouse after we noticed the redness of the eye.

4. Have you taken advice from the Named Animal Care and Welfare Officer/Named Veterinary Surgeon/others?	Our NACWO, Gemini Chu, was informed within the hour the mouse was culled. No post mortem could be performed as the mouse had been culled by cervical dislocation.
5. Cause of Problem, if known	We are unable to clearly identify the cause of this problem. Perhaps during surgery, the PIL holder (Jessy LEMOINE) inadvertently hit the optic nerve causing inflammation.
6. Action that has been or will be taken <i>(For example, formulation of drug changed, supportive treatment given, study design modified). If no action needed, indicate why (for example, none required as study has been terminated and will not be repeated)</i>	This mouse had been carefully checked for stress and potential fighting on the second day of post-operative care. During the 5 days of post-operative care, the PIL holder (Jessy LEMOINE) noticed red marks in the mouse's eye. So he asked his manager and deputy PPL holder (Audrey HAY), for advice. The redness was unusual but the mouse did not show any sign of pain or discomfort (active, good coat condition, good posture, weight gain) therefore we (Jessy and Audrey) did not consider necessary to contact the NVS, which retrospectively we agree we should have done. The PIL holder applied ophthalmic gel to the mouse's eye during each day of post-operative care. This had the effect of greatly improving the condition of the eye, although it did not lead to complete recovery. Pain was carefully monitored by the PIL holder and no signs of pain were noted after this action. We also did not observe the "popping out of the socket" the senior technician saw, leading to the mouse being culled. This action did not notice any change of behaviour, the locomotion was fine, the mouse didn't show any sign of discomfort or pain in the cage and had normal interaction with its littermate. Nevertheless, we will increase our vigilance especially during weekends.
7. Reported by (name)	Jessy LEMOINE
8. Date	22 th April 2024

*****For official use*****

Inspector's comments and recommendations:

Comments and recommendations	Thank you for submitting this PPL SC18 Notification. Please note that this case has been referred to ASRU Enforcement for further investigation. You will be contacted by a member of the Enforcement Team in due course regarding this case. In the meantime, please continue working as necessary within the authorities on your licences, and in accordance with your establishment's internal governance, processes, and standards, unless contacted to say otherwise.
Inspector name	Dr Lynda Noddings
Date	08/05/2024