UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
University Biomedical Services

Minutes

Date Wednesday, 27/01/2021
Time 1pm
To Standing Committee
At Meeting Room, UBS
Subject AWERB Standing Committee
Our Ref Doc.UBS.AWERB.27.01.21

In attendance: [redacted]

Scientists in attendance for 1a) [redacted] **1b)** [redacted] **1c)** [redacted] **1d)** [redacted]

Apologies:

1. Project Licences

a) New licence: [redacted]

The committee discussed the following:

- Reword the Non-technical summary [NTS] so it is easier to read.
- NTS Benefits: Who or what will benefit from these outputs, and how? Revise the wording regarding diabetes.
- Suggest including Diabetes UK in NTS Benefits.
- NTS: Project harms. Suggest equating the removal of the mouse toe to what this might mean in human terms.
- Expand on the achievements prior to this application in Technical details.
- The committee discussed the use of tamoxifen.
- Suggest checking the application to ensure that the Protocols using GA animals have the necessary authority.
- Clarify the reason for the difference in the amount of animals in two protocols.
- Recommend mention of the pain monitoring and scoring system in Protocols where it is appropriate to do so.
- Suggested including diagrams showing where the amputation will be made.
- Remove comment regarding the NVS determine humane endpoints where they appear. As per the standard Home Office protocols, replace the first two paragraphs in the relevant Animal experience humane endpoints box with ‘See General constrains’.
- Provide justification in the Experimental design section for the high numbers requested on one protocol.

b) New licence: [redacted]

The committee discussed the following:

- Check the application for typographical errors.
- Reword the Non-technical summary [NTS] so that it is easier to read.
- NTS Reduction and/or Replacement: Suggested mentioning the use of mesenspheres and how they contribute to reduction and/or replacement.
- Suggest giving information regarding the animal models and methods used in NTS Refinement: section. Give information regarding the saphenous sampling route.
- In the Protocols, clarify what the animals will experience when undergoing experiments.
- In the Protocols, suggest developing and documenting a monitoring and scoring system.

c) New licence: [redacted]

The committee discussed the following:

- Suggested adding more detail in a number of areas, using information provided to the committee to clarify your intentions and requirements.
- Suggested including information on training expertise, both in the UK and overseas.
- Clarify the training offered.
- Recommend that the licence be reread carefully to ensure the correct spelling of words.
- Review the suitability of including reference to the GMC and amend if necessary.

d) New licence: [redacted]

The committee discussed the following:

- Suggested rewriting the NTS so it easier to understand.
- NTS: Refinement: in the box about animal models and methods to be used. The committee recommended removing the last sentence.
- Experience: Provide more detail about work that was undertaken under the previous licence.
- Funding section: Include the information that was provided during AWERB meeting.
- Scientific background: Suggested an outline of the evolution of the product and product combinations and include information about where *in vitro* work has been undertaken. Suggested the inclusion of a diagram to improve understanding.
- Scientific background: Suggested you insert the word ‘surgical’ into the first sentence in this box between the words ‘acceptable’ and ‘treatment’.
- General principles: Suggested more thought needed to be given to the use of both sexes.
- Benefits: Provide an insight into how affordable this new treatment is likely to be and therefore how accessible when licensed for use.
- Protocol: Procedure steps: Suggest more thought should be given to what you actually need to do and why.
- Protocol: Provide more information about expected adverse effects and clarify humane end points.
- The committee recommended the use of Body Condition Scoring and suggested a diagram be inserted to illustrate this.
- Protocol: Experimental design: Provide more information about pilot studies.
- Clarify how the numbers of animals required was determined.
- Clarify how you use pilot and cadaveric studies prior to *in vitro* studies.
- Protocol justification: Provide more information about why what is proposed is the most refined. Advise considering refinements from an animal perspective.

- Project harms: Explain how animals will be housed.

2. Retrospective Reviews

(a) [redacted]

- Section 2.1: Since the reported animal numbers for the breeding protocols are lower than the estimated numbers, the committees both suggested this information is taken into consideration when determining the number of animals required when preparing a new project application.
- Complete the table in Section 2.2.

3. Minutes of last meeting

The minutes were not available

4. Any other business

- Two Non-Regulated Procedure requests were reviewed by the committee. They agreed both should be supported and signed by the AWERB chair however one required further information added before being signed by the AWERB chair.
- Osborne amendment. It was noted that the primary availability for this licence had now moved to UEA and additional availability remained with University of Cambridge to enable the transition between establishments
- It was noted after the AWERB meeting [redacted] responded and revised her Retrospective Review promptly, for which she was commended.

Date of next meeting: 05 February 2021