

Minutes

Date Wednesday, 02/12/2020

Time 09.00am

To Committee Members

At Virtual via Microsoft Teams

Subject AWERB 3Rs Committee

In Attendance:

Apologies:

1. Minutes

The previous minutes were approved

2. Matters Arising

3. Retrospective Reviews

The committee discussed the following:

- [REDACTED] - Mechanisms of adipose (fat) tissue dysfunction

The committees recommend you consider addressing the following points please:

- In section 3.1 point 2, the committee noted that the use of MEFs and EMSCs resulted in a reduction in animals used. Therefore, they ask if this could be added to the reduction section, 3.2? If so, could an indication be given, perhaps as a percentage, of the number of fewer animals needed after this reduction?
- In section 2.7, it is noted that 50% of offspring were used in experiments but this does not seem to align with what is represented in section 2.1. Could this discrepancy be clarified?
- [REDACTED] - Transplantation of regenerative cellular therapies
- The committee would like to commend [REDACTED] on the quality of this RR and request its use as an example to be put on the UBS website. To this end, could we ask that a spellcheck is run through the document. We would also ask that in section 4.8, the publications 1, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 9 be highlighted in bold as especially relevant for the 3Rs.
- [REDACTED] - Spinal Cord Injury and Repair



- This RR included documents from [REDACTED] who has also held the PPL

The committees recommend you consider addressing the following points please:

- In section 3.2, a number of animals are described as having been reported as 'mild' but this is not reflected in section 3.1. Are the animals described as 'sub-threshold' in 3.1 actually 'mild'?
- [REDACTED] - Misfolded proteins in neurodegenerative disease

The committee would like to commend [REDACTED] on the use of DigiGate and wanted to know whether there was any plan to publish this?

The committees recommend you consider addressing the following points please:

- In section 1, could the option in bold have a tick in the box before the statement.
- In section 2.1, for protocol 10, the total and the entries do not align. If the actual severity of these mice was all mild, could this be reported on in section 2.2?
- In section 3.2, could an estimate be made of the number of animals that were not used by the implementations of the reductions described?
- In section 3.7, the final sentence is unfinished.

4. Amendments

- [REDACTED] - Targeting the immune response in cardiovascular diseases

The committees recommend you consider addressing the following points please:

- The committee would like clarification on whether the training for the blood pressure monitoring can be done on non-Marfan type mice?
- The committee wondered whether the use of modern DVC monitoring cages would help monitor these animals, and has this been considered?
- The committee would like to have the endpoint for 'breathing difficulties' to be clarified.
- Are there any additional harms associated with the protocol that ought to be included in the 'Project Harms' section?

5. Project Licence Applications

- [REDACTED] - Ageing and therapy in mouse models for neurodegenerative diseases

The committee thank [REDACTED] for a well-prepared application and interesting presentation. They note the funding is relatively modest and only extends to 2024, but recognised the group has a good funding record so expect [REDACTED] will be able to secure the necessary funds to complete this ambitious programme of work.

The committees recommend you consider addressing the following points please:



- Following extensive discussion the committee suggests that [REDACTED] add a little more to the Background section, which sets the research within the context of others who work and publish in this area.
- Thank you for explaining that there is a PhD student currently working on the Vitras mouse, characterising the pathological changes and that it will not be possible until after this is completed to decide how best to investigate the neuronal transportation of these abnormal proteins. The committee does not expect any changes to be made to the application in relation to this part of the AWERB discussion.
- The committee discussed with you the possibility that the pro-inflammatory dietary changes may affect off target organ systems and suggested you take this into consideration when designing experiments where your aim is to alter gut physiology.
- In the section: What were your, or your group's, main achievements that are relevant to this application? under bullet point 1) in sentence 3, you say that a drug is 'now in advanced clinical trials'. Following discussion, the committee recommends that you amend this because the text suggests the drug has reached Phase III trials, which you confirmed is not yet the case.
- The committee thanks [REDACTED] for her clear explanation of the expected clinical signs and description of the linear way in which these develop in your mice. Before submission to the Home Office, please review protocols where these progressive clinical signs are detailed, to see if you can improve your narrative. To do so could reduce comment from the inspector who will assess your application.
- In the Benefits section, in the Who or what will benefit from these outputs, and how? box, please consider expanding what you have written to provide more information about the expected benefits which your inspector will use to offset the harms caused to your animals. The committee suggested you might consider moving the last two sentences from the box immediately above into this box.

In the same box: Second sentence: The committee felt that this sentence should be reworded because they felt it was misleading because treatments have been used where the core processes of the disease being treated were unknown. In the same box three sentences from the end you refer to 'complementary techniques' and while the committee understood what you meant, they felt that a lay reader might not.
- In the 3Rs section, in the box: How will you stay informed about advances in the 3Rs, and implement these advances effectively, during the project?, please remove '<https://www.ubs.admin.cam.ac.uk/user>'.
- The committee complimented you on the language used in your Non-Technical Summary. However, they recommended readability could be improved further, by shortening long sentences to more manageable bite size lengths.
- Your Aim statement, which appears at the beginning of your application, could be improved if you inserted into this statement names of the diseases you work on.
- Finally, the committee felt that you should ask a lay-person to read your Non-Technical Summary to make sure your summary can be understood by people who do not have a scientific background.

6. Severe Severity licence reviews

7. Standard Condition 18 reports

8. 3Rs information/reports

9. Feedback from previous Retrospective Reviews*

None

10. Minutes of AOC meeting*

None

11. Minutes of AWERB Standing meeting*

None

12. Any Other Business

Date of next meeting: Wednesday 6th Jan 2021

***Items for information only unless un-starred by committee member**