

### **Animal Welfare Case Study Reaction Paper - Resubmission**

Don's study involves both dogs and humans; thus his study would have to be reviewed by both the university's Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) and its Institutional Review Board (IRB). While Don would claim neither the dogs nor humans would be subject to any direct harm, the dogs and humans may still face unanticipated harm from each other. Since Don did not explain what animal welfare measures he would use or his informed consent procedures, his study would likely not be approved by either group.

First, regarding animal welfare Don ignored two of the "three Rs of alternatives," replacement and reduction. He could have reduced the number of dogs used, reduced the length of the study, and/or have eliminated the use of dogs altogether, replacing them with computer simulations causing similar noise and disruption effects. Don also did not provide any details on how these animals would be fed, housed, and treated by veterinarians during the study, nor did he provide information on the credentials of the shelter staff or himself with regard to conducting animal research and caring for the dogs. Finally, Don did not mention how he intends to obtain informed consent and limit the potential risks to the Channel 9 employees.

If I were Don, I would see first if replacing the dogs with non-animal models was possible. If not, then I would certainly reduce the length of the study and the number of employees and dogs participating, as well as ensure the dogs were fed, housed, treated, and cared for by trained, credentialed veterinarians approved by the IACUC. Finally, I would obtain informed consent from and limit as much as possible the potential risks to the employees. Correcting these ethical mistakes would greatly increase the chances of approval of Don's study by both review boards.