HUMANE ENDPOINTS FOR RESEARCH ANIMALS

Animal pain, distress, or suffering is generally not necessary for animal experiments. In fact, animals in pain, suffering or in distress can significantly complicate research data and may confuse the findings of an otherwise well designed study, while also wasting the time and resources of the researcher, not to mention the obvious and unacceptable condition for the animals. Careful consideration of clear study endpoints, after which animals will be provided with analgesia, removed from the study, or euthanized — will maximize the reliability of outcome data while assuring humane attention to creatures which can feel pain and can suffer. Employing humane endpoints in the design and performance of animal research activities is, for many reasons, the right thing to do!

According to federal regulations (USDA 9th CFR; PHS Policy; various federal laws), the Institutional Animal Care & Use Committee (IACUC) must consider whether the animals enrolled in a specific study are provided with appropriate analgesia, are assigned reasonable humane endpoints, and are protected from unnecessary pain or distress. In fulfilling its federal mandate, the IACUC will review all uses of animals which may involve procedures that cause clinical symptoms or morbidity in animals; more specifically, the IACUC must determine whether the researcher has sufficiently considered the impact of the study upon the animal being used in the study.

See Humane Endpoints …. Page 8

DUKE LIBRARY READY TO ASSIST WITH LITERATURE SEARCHES

Duke Librarian, Emily Mazure, was recently appointed to the Duke IACUC and as such becomes a ready and welcome resource for the Duke animal care & use community. Emily has worked with the IACUC for several months reviewing, discussing, and preparing for the newly enhanced requirement for alternatives searching (the 8th edition of The Guide). A primary role for Emily will be review of protocols having a potential for pain or distress and assisting the Duke research community with fulfilling the federal mandate for an effective ‘alternatives’ search. The Medical Center has set up a web page which will guide you through the process of alternatives searching. You can also reach Emily through the web page. Click the image to go to the web page.

Office of Animal Welfare Assurance

2424 Erwin Road
Suite 606
Durham, NC 27705
Phone: 919.668.6720
FAX: 919.668.6725
Email: iacuc@duke.edu

Upcoming Dates & Deadlines

August 11 Amendment Deadline
August 21 Amendment Meeting
August 28 New Protocol Meeting
September 2 New Protocol Deadline
September 4 Amendment Meeting
September 8 Amendment Deadline
September 18 Amendment Meeting
September 25 Amendment Deadline
September 25 New Protocol Meeting

Deadlines are 5 PM on the date listed!
The compelling saga of the two American medical workers who contracted Ebola in West Africa provides a dramatic case study in the value of current animal research.

Dr. Kent Brantly, believed to be just hours from death, became the first human ever to be given an experimental medication that had only before been tested in animals. Within an hour, his condition dramatically improved - in the words of doctors on the scene, "miraculously". After being airlifted to the U.S., Brantly was able to walk out of the ambulance and into the isolation facility at Emory University, where he continues to recover.

Nancy Writebol, a medical missionary working with Brantly, has received two doses of the medication and has also shown "significant improvement", according to sources. She is expected to arrive at Emory later today.

The medication, zMapp, was developed by the small San Diego biotech Mapp Biopharmaceutical, which has been working with NIH and the Department of Defense for several years in a quest to develop a treatment for Ebola. zMapp is a three-mouse monoclonal antibody: mice were exposed to fragments of the Ebola virus and then the antibodies generated within the mice's blood were harvested to create the medicine. The drug reportedly had shown promise in primates, but even in those experiments, just eight monkeys with Ebola received the treatment within 48 hours of being infected. They all survived, however, a monkey treated outside of that exposure window did not survive. So little is yet known about the safety and effectiveness of this treatment, it's speculated that the FDA might have allowed it to be used by the two medical missionaries under the 'compassionate use' exemption.

In media interviews, Dr. Anthony Fauci, Director of the National Institute for Allergy Infectious Diseases, said it is too early to know if the drug is successful - that it couldn't be proven until the treatment is tested in "a clinical trial with a whole bunch of people." He noted that NIAID is developing an Ebola vaccine candidate that has been effective in protecting monkeys from Ebola. NIAID plans to start Phase I clinical trials next month.

CNN's Sanjay Gupta was the first to comprehensively report on the role zMapp apparently played in this medical drama, and its implications for future Ebola treatment.

Despite the results reported in these two cases, there is still a long road ahead, with many logistical and economic challenges, before for any Ebola treatment will be approved for widespread use.

Here are some links to further reading/viewing:

CNN's Sanjay Gupta was the first to comprehensively report on the role zMapp apparently played in this medical drama, and its implications for future Ebola treatment. Gupta's video report on Brantly's treatment, and a Q&A about ZMapp and other medicines and vaccines in the pipeline. There's also a more detailed report by Gupta on the decision to administer zMapp to Brantly and Writebol.

John Timmer, Science Editor for Ars Technica, has an article detailing Mapp Biopharmaceutical's research. The article also offers a link to scientific papers published by Mapp, and points to this most recent one published by Science Translational Medicine a year ago. The first author of that report is James Pettitt of the U.S. Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases (USAMRIID), which issued a press release on the paper's publication last year. Bloomberg features an article on the tiny Mapp Biopharmaceutical, as well as reactions of several American scientists to the use of zMapp for the medical missionaries.

Top science writer Maggie Fox, now with NBC, reports on the economic and logistical challenges of bringing an Ebola treatment or vaccine to market. The Center for Disease Control offers a page of updates on the outbreak in W. Africa.
PI MANAGED FACILITIES: REPORTING HEALTH CONCERNS

If you work in an area that has been approved by the Duke IACUC as a PI-Managed facility, you are responsible for reporting animal health issues to the DLAR Veterinary Staff. When animals appear ill or injured, or when there are abnormal changes in the animal’s behavior, PI-Managed operations are obligated to report the animal to the DLAR Veterinary Staff.

The steps for reporting abnormal behavior or suboptimal health are:

⇒ Complete a RED Veterinary Examination card and place it on the animal’s cage. Red cards are available from DLAR.
⇒ Page the ‘Veterinarian On-Call’ at 970-9410 and wait for a response. If there is no response after 5-10 minutes, page the Veterinarian again.
⇒ Report the animal's condition and wait for instructions.
⇒ Stay with the animal until the Veterinarian relieves you of that responsibility.
⇒ Complete Section A of the Investigator Managed Colonies Request for Health Check. (forms available on line).

The DLAR veterinary staff will examine the animal and consult with the PI regarding treatment options, up to and including euthanasia. The DLAR veterinary staff will write treatment instructions on red card and discuss any care issues with you. The veterinary staff will remove the red card when treatments are complete (you should NOT remove the red card).

Probably the most critical issue is to be aware of animals in need. If treatment information is not written on the red card within 24 hours after you have placed the card on the cage / tank, then call:

Dr. Yohannes Asfaw 919.812.2349
Dr. Angela Garner 336.317.1689
Dr. Clay Rouse 919.724.6479
Dr. Francis Sun 919.358.9114
Dr/ Jai Tubbs 919.943.5904
Dr. Kyha Williams 919.323.6438
Dr. Randall Reynolds 919.812.1240
Dr. John Norton 919.812.1807

STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURE REQUIREMENTS FOR ABSL2 CONTAINMENT AT DUKE

The Principal Investigator (PI) has the responsibility to inform the laboratory personnel of the appropriate research procedures. When using hazardous or regulated biological agents the PI must prepare a written Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) outlining the necessary precautions to safely conduct research. An SOP is a set of specific guidelines designed to address the methods that will be used and the safe handling of biological agents. The SOP must be available in the laboratory.

The SOP is a valuable tool and worth the preparation time. A well-written SOP can be used to satisfy several compliance requirements. SOP should be written for all procedures that pose an identified potential risk to the health and safety of the laboratory personnel, although a separate SOP does not need to be written for each individual experiment, procedures with the same hazards can be combined into one SOP.

The process of writing SOPs requires an individual to think through all steps of a procedure and perform a risk assessment before work has begun. The best approach to writing an SOP is to do it, write it and test it. Be brief and succinct; the shorter the better. A SOP template is available on OESO Biosafety Web Site: (URL: safety.duke.edu/BioSafety/Animals.htm)

OESO HAS SEVERAL GUIDELINES FOR SOP DEVELOPMENT OF HAZARDOUS AGENT USE IN ANIMAL PROTOCOLS

OESO Biosafety Division has a great web site which assists researchers with specific SOP development! For example:

- Guide for Developing an SOP for the use of Biohazards in Animals
- Guide for Developing SOP for the use of Hazardous Drugs
- SOP for the use of Toxic Chemicals in Animals
- Guidelines for the Safe Handling of Animals Exposed to LPS in Research
- Radiation Safety Animal Care and Use Protocol Wizard

You can reach this site and use this links be going to the OESO Biosafety site.
POLICY UPDATE

Acclimation / Stabilization of Animals. This is a brief policy that has a huge impact on animal welfare. Transportation can be very stressful on an animal and affect them physically and physiologically. This can make them more prone to injury and illness, and can be a research variable. Having a dedicated period of rest at their new housing location is important to allow restoration of homeostasis and physiologic parameters. Typically this is 48 hours.

If you want a policy refresh, read this and other Duke animal program policies at http://vetmed.duhs.duke.edu/ProgramPolicies.html

FALL 2014 IACUC SEMIANNUAL SITE VISIT SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST 7TH</td>
<td>LSRC SANDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST 14TH</td>
<td>GSRB2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST 21ST</td>
<td>BRYAN VSH CARY NANALINE DUKE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER 4TH</td>
<td>GSRB2 ANNEX JONES GSRB1 ENGINEERING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER 11TH</td>
<td>MARINE LAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER 18TH</td>
<td>CARL EYE CENTER DLAR FARM INDEPENDENCE PARK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER 2ND</td>
<td>CCIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER 9TH</td>
<td>FOSTER ST. BIOLOGY FRENCH SCIENCE CIEMAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER 16TH</td>
<td>DUKE NORTH GHRB DUKE SOUTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER 30TH</td>
<td>VIVARIUM MSRB1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER 6TH</td>
<td>LEMUR CENTER MESOCOSM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name the Procedure

Question: What is happening to this animal?

Answer: Application of ophthalmic ointment to the cornea. Anesthesia or sedation causes a decrease in blinking and usually a decrease in tear production. If you have ever had a dry eye or a speck of dirt in your eye, you know how much it hurts! To prevent eye discomfort in research animals, always protect the corneas by using an ophthalmic ointment. It is not so critical what type of ophthalmic ointment is used (e.g., antibiotic or simple lubricant), but the preferred ointment should not have a steroid in it. Avoid touching the eye with the tip of the ointment dispenser. It is important to double check the ointment and be sure it is approved for use in the eye. There are many types of ointments; but only those that state ‘FOR OPTHALMIC USE’ should be used in the eye.

If you have questions, just call the DLAR or OAWA. Don’t forget: Animal welfare is EVERYONE’s obligation!
Tips for Writing an NIH Grant  
(Vertebrate Animal Section <VAS>)

There shouldn’t be a mystery with what information the NIH is seeking when reviewing your VAS. Let’s take a brief review of the issue and items of interest. This article is borrowed heavily from the NIH’s Checklist for VAS review, and modified to reflect the Duke research perspective (http://grants.nih.gov/grants/olaw/VASchecklist.pdf).

**Performance site (s):** Generally, Duke; if Duke is not the performance site or if more than one performance site is planned, include a description of animal care and use for each site. If you are sub-contracting to a researcher at an institution which lacks a PHS Assurance, an Assurance must be negotiated prior to transfer of funds from Duke to the sub-contracting institution. Our institution’s policy is to collaborate only with PHS Assured institutions when using federal funds. Exceptions to this Duke policy may be considered in special circumstances. If you are sub-contracting for work at a foreign performance site, then Duke must confirm the foreign performance site has a Foreign Assurance with the PHS; and you must provide verification of approval of the animal care and use protocol by Duke’s IACUC.

**Description of animal use:** A concise, but complete description, including sufficient information for evaluation of procedures is required to validate the appropriate use of animals.

**No vertebrate animals:** If animal tissue used in the study is obtained from tissue repository or from animals euthanized for an unrelated purpose, the application may be classified as “no vertebrate animals used.” A statement indicating the source of the tissues is required in the VAS to validate the coding as “no vertebrate animals.”

**Tissue harvest / antibody generation:** If animals are manipulated prior to euthanasia or obtained specifically for tissue harvest as part of the proposed research, this is classified as “use of live vertebrate animals.” Activities, such as the generation of custom antibodies, constitutes using live vertebrate animals and must be classified as “use of live vertebrate animals.”

**Animals to be used:** List the Species; Strain; Ages; Sex; and Estimated Number of animals to be used (remember the IACUC protocol requires exact animal numbers proposed).

**Justification:** Investigators must justify the use of animals in their research:

- The justification must indicate why alternatives to animals (e.g., computer models, cell culture) cannot be used, and should indicate the potential benefits and knowledge to be gained.
- Rationale for the choice of species must be provided. The rationale should indicate the advantages of the species chosen and why alternative species are not appropriate. In the case of non-human primates (NHP), thorough justification for the choice of species is required; comparison of the species chosen to other NHP species may be appropriate. The use of NHP should be noted during review.
- Estimates for the number of animals to be used should be as accurate as possible. Justification for the number of animals to be used should include considerations of animal availability, experimental success rate, inclusion of control groups and requirements to reach statistical significance.

Justification questions that the reviewer may ask (and therefore you should address in your application) include:

- Can the proposed research be conducted without animal experimentation?
- Does the proposed approach minimize the number of animals to be used, and do the methods minimize animal distress, discomfort and pain?
- Does the proposed research involve animal pain or distress? If so, are procedures to alleviate pain and distress described adequately, and are they justified by the anticipated advances in knowledge or health care?
- Is particular care taken to describe and justify research involving non-human primates (NHP) or companion animals (e.g., cats, dogs)?

Continued Next Page ...
Euthanasia: The grant review is expecting a clear discussion of the method(s) for euthanasia. It is critical that you choose methods approved in the AVMA Guidelines for Euthanasia (a copy is available on the animal program website). For the method chosen, you should justify why this method is preferred. For ‘routine’ euthanasia, a barbiturate overdose or, for rodents only, CO2 followed by bilateral thoracotomy is the best option. At all times, your method of euthanasia must be consistent with recommendations of the AVMA Guidelines on Euthanasia, or an approved exception by the IACUC.

Other VAS-related items:

♦ PHS Assurance Number: The reviewer will require Duke’s Assurance Number, which is A3195-01. The animal program publishes a FUNDING AGENCY STATEMENT which includes all relevant regulatory information, and which you may submit with your grant. You can obtain a copy by requesting a copy at the email IACUC@DUKE.EDU.

♦ IACUC Approval: While the grant will be reviewed without an IACUC approved protocol, no funds for animal work can be released until there is an IACUC approved protocol for ALL of the animal procedures described in the grant. If you do not have an IACUC approved protocol when submitting your grant, simply note ‘PENDING’ as the status of the IACUC approval.

♦ AAALAC Accreditation: Although not required by the NIH, noting Duke’s AAALAC (Association for the Assessment and Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care, International) accreditation may provide a worthy advantage during the review process. Since the NIH requires all grantee institutions be assured as a category I or II program (AAALAC accreditation is classified as category I), such designation will save you significant additional explanation in your grant submission.
North Carolina Association for Biomedical Research (NCABR)

Founded in 1989 by North Carolina’s leading bioscience research institutions (including Duke), the North Carolina Association for Biomedical Research (NCABR) is the only organization in the state dedicated to advancing all North Carolinians’ appreciation for the remarkable benefits of bioscience research and careers.

As a statewide nonprofit organization, NCABR’s members include academia, industry, government, hospitals, nonprofit research, voluntary health and other nonprofit organizations, as well as the general public. NCABR plays a leading role in North Carolina and the nation by providing objective, timely and authoritative advice and information to students and educators, representatives from government and the media, as well as members of the research community and the general public.

Since 1989, NCABR has launched innovative science education outreach programs and has designed a variety of bioscience education and career-related publications many of which are the first of their kind in the country and are now used nationally. NCABR’s ongoing efforts to promote public understanding of biomedical research were recognized in 1999 when Research America, a national nonprofit public education and advocacy alliance of 450 research organizations, honored NCABR with its prestigious national award for "An Organization that has Distinguished Itself By Its Advocacy" for bioscience research. NCABR received this award in a ceremony in the United States Senate along with NBC news anchor Katie Couric and former Oregon Senator and Governor Mark Hatfield.

To date, more than 2,000 North Carolina K-12 teachers have participated in NCABR’s science education programs, more than a thousand North Carolinians have attended an NCABR public forum to debate biomedical research issues, and dozens of members of the North Carolina and national media have attended an NCABR science journalism program. For more information about our own biomedical research organization, visit their website at: http://www.ncabr.org/

AMERICANS FOR MEDICAL PROGRESS (AMP)

Americans for Medical Progress (AMP) protects society’s investment in research by nurturing public understanding of and support for the humane, necessary and valuable use of animals in medicine. Threats by animal rights extremists hurt medical progress. AMP provides accurate and incisive information to foster a balanced public debate on the animal research issue, ensuring that among the voices heard are those whose lives have been touched by research and those who work in the field. Through various specialty publications, outreach initiatives and the media, AMP informs the public of the facts of animal-based research. AMP also distributes timely and relevant news, information and analysis about animal rights extremism to the research community through its news service. For more information on AMP, visit their website at http://www.amprogress.org/site/c.jrLUK0PDLoF/b.913145/k.4502/Americans_for_Medical_Progress.htm

Foundation for Biomedical Research

The Foundation for Biomedical Research (FBR) provides free resources on their website http://fbresarech.org/education/index.htm

Brochures

- Facts vs Myths (pdf)
- Proud Achievements of Animal Research (pdf)
- The Importance of Being a Mouse (pdf)

Species Sheets

- Rats and Mice (pdf)
- Dogs and Cats (pdf)
- Non-Human Primates (pdf)
- Other Species (pdf)

Opinions About Animal Research From:

- Scientists
- Religions
- Organizations
- Opponents

Other Resources

- AIDS and Animal Research
- Facts About Animal Research
- Nobel Prizes
- Animal Research 101
For example, the IACUC will evaluate:

- The expected and possible adverse effects the research animals may experience in the study (e.g. pain, distress, illness, etc.);
- The most likely time course / progression of adverse effects (e.g. is tumor metastasis likely? Does infection often following this procedure?);
- The earliest or most predictive indicators of present or impending adverse effects (e.g. Is anemia likely 15 days after treatment? Does pneumonia generally occur after 20 days of this therapy?);
- The researcher proposed endpoints (e.g. what will occur of an animal reaches a specified painful condition); or
- Any argument that scientific requirements justify modification of the humane endpoints.

The effective use of study endpoints requires properly qualified individuals perform both general and study-specific observations of the research animals at appropriate time points. However, such observations require a clear understanding of normal behavior in the animal and a reasonable expectation of the progression of disease or an increasingly in-firmed condition of the animal.

Optimally, live animal studies are terminated when animals begin to exhibit clinical signs of disease; especially if this endpoint is compatible with meeting the research objectives. Termination of animal studies prior to causing the animal significant pain or distress is necessary both for minimizing unnecessary pain and distress in the research subject, and because such performance is the ethical and appropriate thing to do. Termination of the animal’s participation in the study upon observation of animal pain or distress is preferable to death due to suffering caused by research activities.

**Experimental vs. Humane Endpoints:** Except in the very few cases where the IACUC has approved a ‘death as an endpoint’ study, no animal should be allowed to ‘die naturally.’ In research where there is a high likelihood of animals dying if the disease is allowed to proceed unmitigated, there will routinely be a point where the data obtained from the animal begins to decline in quality – a point research data is no longer useful. This point is the experimental endpoint. The humane endpoint should generally be reached prior to or at the experimental endpoint.

The only exception is when the IACUC has issued a exception (also called category E) for pain unrelied in an animal.

But for 99% of animal use protocols the researcher should determine what level of animal condition is likely to cause less reliable data, and at least by that point, consider euthanizing the animals.

**Moribund:** Of all terms describing animal condition, moribundancy is one of the most difficult to accurately define. The moribund condition is defined as a clinically irreversible condition leading inevitably to death. As a general rule, proposals where moribundancy is a potential outcome for the animal subject should consider the following:

**Criteria that establish when the endpoint has been reached:** There are several examples that might be considered as an outline for selection of clear end point criteria:

- **Body Condition (BC) Scoring for determining moribundancy:**
  - **BC1: Emaciated**
    - Skeletal structure prominent
    - Ribs prominent
    - Little to no fat covering
    - Vertebrae distinctly segments
  - **NOTE:** BC 1 would be classified as moribund and would require euthanasia!
  - **BC2: Under conditioned:**
    - Skeletal structure observable
    - Ribs observed but soft appearing
    - Minimal fat
    - Vertebrae evident; pelvis palpable
  - **BC 3: Well conditioned:**
    - Skeletal structure not seen
    - Ribs not seen
    - Smooth rounded appearance
    - Vertebrae / pelvis palpable with slight pressure
  - **BC 4: Over conditioned**
    - Rounded body shape
    - No skeletal structure observed
    - Vertebrae / pelvis palpable with firm pressure
  - **BC 5: Obese**
    - Bulky body shape

**Continued … Next Column**
General Appearance Assessment for determining moribundancy: Moribund (requiring euthanasia) could be classified as have 5 or more of the following signs:
- Loss of skin turgor (dehydrated)
- Ruffled, unkempt fur
- Dull eyes
- Dry cracked nose or mouth
- Rapid abdominal respiration
- Zero to minimal urine over a 24 hour cycle
- No feces within 24 hours
- No locomotion or painful locomotion
- Body weight less that 85% of normal
- Measurable clinical signs, depending on severity and duration, that may independently constitute an endpoint, or might be included in the assessment criteria. These include, but are not limited to:
  - Sudden unexpected weight loss (tumor studies may see weight gain)
  - Diarrhea, especially if debilitating
  - Progressive dermatitis, especially if pruritic
  - Rough hair coat, hunched posture, lethargy or persistent recumbency
  - Coughing, labored breathing, nasal discharge
  - Jaundice and/or anemia
  - Neurological signs
  - Bleeding from any orifice
  - Self-induced trauma (often an indicator of pain)
  - Unprovoked behavior of biting or vocalizations
  - Strong adverse response to external stimuli
  - Any condition interfering with eating or drinking (e.g. difficulty with ambulation)
  - Excessive or prolonged hyper (or hypo) thermia

Additional signs for neoplasia studies: These signs may constitute an endpoint:
- Mice with tumors 2000 mm3 in size (which is roughly 10% baseline body weight) or greater, or rats with tumors 5000 mm3 in size or greater. NOTE: Tumors may be measured using the following formula: $TV = [(\text{Width})^2 \times \text{Length}] / 2$.
- Tumors that are ulcerated. If an exemption is provided for this condition, then the affected animals are required to be single housed (may require protocol amendment and / or alternate environmental enrichment or medical treatment).
- Tumors where the animals chew on the lesion or pay undue attention to the ulcer.
- Tumors that interfere with 'normal' animal functions (e.g. eat, drink, or ambulate).

A plan for monitoring the animals both before and after the period where the above signs may be observed: Daily monitoring is the baseline for all animal care and use. Daily monitoring also includes assessment on weekends and holidays. During periods when signs of disease or progression of disease are likely, the frequency of assessment must be increased. The plan for monitoring must be included in the animal protocol proposal.

Identification of personnel responsible for evaluation of humane endpoints: The IACUC will want to know who will serve as the responsible individual to assure humane endpoints are maintained as approved by the IACUC. Checklists, spreadsheets, or score sheets may be helpful to ensuring the required observations are performed as approved; interpreted as required; and documented as necessary.

HUMANE ENDPOINT REFERENCES
- Canadian Council on Animal Care, Guidelines on: Choosing an appropriate endpoint in experiments using animals for research, teaching and testing. Ottawa, Canada.
Safeguarding animal welfare is the responsibility of every individual associated with the Duke Animal Program.

**REPORT ANIMAL HEALTH EMERGENCIES**

to DLAR using the Veterinary Pager (24 hrs/day): **919-970-9410**

**REPORT OTHER ANIMAL WELFARE CONCERNS**

to the Office of Animal Welfare Assurance (24 hrs/day)

via the Animal Welfare Hotline: **919-684-3535**

or to the IACUC at [iacuc@duke.edu](mailto:iacuc@duke.edu)

The identity of any person making a report is always kept confidential. Individuals making reports are protected against reprisals.

Go to [http://vetmed.duhs.duke.edu/AnimalWelfareHotline.html](http://vetmed.duhs.duke.edu/AnimalWelfareHotline.html) for more information, including anonymous reporting options.

Remember: Animal welfare is EVERYONE'S BUSINESS!

**JUST COPY THIS ONE OFF AND POST IT!**

Missing Your Animal Program Reporting Poster?

Want another one for a separate section of the lab?

Got 'stuff' on the current one and need a replacement?