

Accepted Manuscript

Title: Questions about methodological and ethical quality of a vaccine adjuvant critical paper

Author: David Hawkes

PII: S0300-483X(17)30176-2
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1016/j.tox.2017.06.009>
Reference: TOX 51902

To appear in: *Toxicology*

Author: Joanne Benhamu

PII: S0300-483X(17)30176-2
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1016/j.tox.2017.06.009>
Reference: TOX 51902

To appear in: *Toxicology*



Please cite this article as: Benhamu, Joanne, Questions about methodological and ethical quality of a vaccine adjuvant critical paper. *Toxicology* <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tox.2017.06.009>

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Title: Questions about methodological and ethical quality of a vaccine adjuvant critical paper

Authors: David Hawkes^{a,b} and Joanne Benhamu^{c,d}

^a Victorian Cytology Service, 265 Faraday Street, Carlton, Victoria, 3053, Australia

^b Department of Pharmacology and Therapeutics, Medical Building 181, The University of Melbourne, Parkville, Victoria, 3010, Australia

^c Austin Health, 145 Studley Road, Heidelberg, Victoria, 3084, Australia

^d Monash Bioethics Centre, Menzies Building, 20 Chancellors Walk, Monash University, Victoria, 3800, Australia

Corresponding author: David Hawkes : dhawkes@unimelb.edu.au

Joanne Benhamu – jobenhamu@gmail.com

A recent manuscript published in Toxicology by Crepeaux and colleagues (Crepeaux et al. 2017) highlights a number of issues that have been appearing, particularly in the vaccine-critical peer-reviewed literature.

- A lack of clarity around the process undertaken for gaining ethical approval for both human and animal experiments.
- A lack of clarity in the methods undertaken, in terms of both the protocols followed and the biological relevancy of the methods used
- Funding and Conflict of Interest statements which lack clarity

RESEARCH ETHICS

There is no clear statement identifying ethics approval gained for the experiments involving mice. Whilst the article does state that “All the experiments on animals were performed in respect to the guidelines provided by the European Union (Directive 2010/63/EU)” it remains unclear as to which institutional/local ethics committee approved these experiments. Directive 2010/63/EU Article 36 states under Project authorisation “1. Member States shall ensure, without prejudice to Article 42, that projects are not carried out without prior authorisation from the competent authority” (2010). This would suggest that for animal experiments to be carried out, prior authorisation from an institutional/local ethics committee is necessary to state that experiments were “performed in respect to the guidelines”.

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/5561734>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/5561734>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)