

Response to University of Newcastle's Media Release

Humane Research Australia recently published details of an experiment which involved invasive surgery on conscious greyhounds.

<http://www.humaneresearch.org.au/case-studies/invasive-surgery-conducted-on-conscious-greyhounds>

Following the publication of this case study, University of Newcastle issued a press release claiming the following:

"The research in question was conducted prior to 2004 and published in 2011. Dogs have not been used for research at the University of Newcastle for more than ten years."

A full copy of the press release can be found at the above link.

Whether or not the research was conducted prior to 2004 does NOT absolve them from the responsibility of conducting this experiment, however HRA questions why research allegedly over ten years old was published in a 2011 medical journal?

HRA has written to the Chief Editor of *Acta Physiologica*, (Scandinavian Physiological Society) to verify if the journal was aware that the research submitted to them was conducted prior to 2004 and whether they have a policy of accepting data collected within a specified timeframe.

If the claim is indeed true, then there is great concern about the integrity of published Australian research whereby decade-old research is being presented as current. This is not the first occasion in which researchers have laid such claims. (On a previous case study regarding baboon research, conducted by Royal North Shore Hospital and published in The Bone and Joint Journal 2010, it was claimed to have been conducted over 20 years ago). It also raises the question of why publication was so delayed. If indeed the research was considered worthy then why was it not published earlier so that any supposed benefits could be shared and utilised by the scientific community? We understand that researchers exist in a "publish or perish" world, so could it be that they are submitting "old" work for publication simply in order to obtain further funding?

We are still waiting to receive a response from the university on a number of concerns we had with the experiment, including where the animals were sourced from. It is suspected that they are failed racing dogs but we would like clarification.

We have also lodged an FOI request with the university seeking a copy of the AEC Minutes which approved the experiment, as well as the AEC annual report.

23 May 2013