DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE
NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

FOR US POSTAL SERVICE DELIVERY:
Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare
6700B Rockledge Drive, Suite 2500, MSC 6910
Bethesda, Maryland 20892-6910
Home Page: http://grants.nih.gov/grants/olaw/olaw.htm

FOR EXPRESS MAIL:
Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare
6700B Rockledge Drive, Suite 2500
Bethesda, Maryland 20817
Telephone: (301) 496-7163
Facsimile: (301) 402-7065

July 22, 2019

Re: Animal Welfare Assurance
#A3272-01 (OLAW Case 2H]

Dr. Denis Wirtz
Vice Provost for Research
Johns Hopkins University
3400 N. Charles Street
Baltimore, MD 21218

Dear Dr. Wirtz,

On August 15, 2018 the Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare (OLAW) received from People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) allegations of noncompliance with the PHS Policy on Humane Care and Use of Laboratory Animals at Johns Hopkins University. The allegations by PETA concerned work by Dr. Irving Reti of JHU regarding his research with mice and electroshock treatment. On August 20, 2018 I forwarded those concerns to Dr. Nancy Ator.

At the conclusion of our extensive correspondence on this subject, it was clear that the three allegations by PETA were unfounded or outside of OLAW's jurisdiction. Specifically: the allegation that anesthesia was required for mice subjected to electroconvulsive shock was not correct as explained by the PI in the animal use protocol, and; that the allegation that chloral hydrate was used for euthanasia was not correct in that euthanasia was by exsanguination secondary to *in situ* tissue fixation under chloral hydrate anesthesia. Lastly, the allegation that there was a "failure to consider the relevance of the study to human or animal health, the advancement of knowledge, or the good of society" falls outside of OLAW's jurisdiction and is the purview of the NIH peer review process.

We appreciate your institution's cooperation in providing the requested information and we wish to note that Dr. Ator has been very collegial and forthcoming in our correspondence. We find your program to be in compliance with the PHS Policy and find no cause for further action by this office.

Sincerely,

(b) (6)

Brent C. Morse, DVM
Director
Division of Compliance Oversight
Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare

cc: IACUC contact

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE
NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

FOR US POSTAL SERVICE DELIVERY:
Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare
6700B Rockledge Drive, Suite 2500, MSC 6910
Bethesda, Maryland 20892-6910
Home Page: http://grants.nih.gov/grants/olaw/olaw.htm

FOR EXPRESS MAIL:
Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare
6700B Rockledge Drive, Suite 2500
Bethesda, Maryland 20817
Telephone: (301) 496-7163
Facsimile: (301) 402-7065

July 22, 2019

Ingrid Taylor, DVM
Research Associate
Laboratory Investigations Department
People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals
501 Front Street
Norfolk, VA 23510

Emily R. Trunnell, Ph.D.
Research Associate and IACUC Liaison
Laboratory Investigations Department
People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals
501 Front Street
Norfolk, VA 23510

Dear Drs. Taylor and Trunnell,

The Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare (OLAW) has completed its investigation regarding allegations by People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) concerning Johns Hopkins University as contained in your August 15, 2018 letter to our Office. OLAW has determined that the animal activities described in the referenced publication were performed in compliance with IACUC review and approval with scientific justification, the *Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals* and the PHS Policy on Humane Care and Use of Laboratory Animals. Chloral hydrate was not used as a euthanasia agent but for anesthesia of the mice to prepare for *in situ* tissue fixation. Therefore, the method of euthanasia was exsanguination under anesthesia.

Regarding the allegation that there was a "failure to consider the relevance of the study to human or animal health, the advancement of knowledge, or the good of society", this issue is considered the purview of the NIH Scientific Review Groups. The unbiased and rigorous two-tier peer review process of evaluating the scientific merit, animal models and statistical analysis in accordance with the National Institutes of Health (NIH) guidelines falls outside of OLAW's jurisdiction.

We thank you for your interest in animal welfare and no further action will be taken by this Office.

Sincerely,

(b) (6)

Brent C. Morse, DVM
Director
Division of Compliance Oversight
Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare
National Institutes of Health

Morse, Brent (NIH/OD) [E]

From: Morse, Brent (NIH/OD) [E]
Sent: Thursday, May 16, 2019 1:55 PM
To: Dr. Emily Trunnell
Cc: Dean, Diane (NIH/OD) [E]; Dr. Taylor, DVM; Brown, Patricia [OLAW] (NIH/OD) [E]
Subject: RE: Letter to OLAW regarding electroshock experiments in mice

Hello Dr. Trunnell,

OLAW's Division of Compliance oversight continues to investigate PETA's concerns and has been in regular communication with Johns Hopkins University. We will send you and Dr. Taylor official notification when our investigation is completed. Thank you for contacting OLAW.

Sincerely, Brent Morse

Brent C. Morse, DVM, DACLAM
Director
Division of Compliance Oversight
Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare
National Institutes of Health

From: Dr. Emily Trunnell [mailto:EmilyT@peta.org]
Sent: Thursday, May 16, 2019 1:19 PM
To: Morse, Brent (NIH/OD) [E] <morseb@mail.nih.gov>; Brown, Patricia [OLAW] (NIH/OD) [E] <brownp@od.nih.gov>
Cc: Dean, Diane (NIH/OD) [E] <deand@od31em1.od.nih.gov>; Dr. Taylor, DVM <DrTaylor@peta.org>
Subject: RE: Letter to OLAW regarding electroshock experiments in mice

Dr. Morse and Dr. Brown,

I am writing to follow up on OLAW's investigation of NIH-supported research with animals at Johns Hopkins University (D16-00173 (A3272-01)), specifically regarding the use of mice in electroconvulsive shock experiments. A letter from Pat Brown dated August 31, 2018 indicates that an investigation was opened regarding the concerns we raised with these experiments. Has OLAW concluded its investigation and does your office have a response?

Thank you,
Emily R. Trunnell, Ph.D.
Research Associate and IACUC Liaison
Laboratory Investigations Department
People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals
501 Front Street | Norfolk, VA 23510
emilyt@peta.org

From: Morse, Brent (NIH/OD) [E] <morseb@mail.nih.gov>
Sent: Thursday, August 16, 2018 9:35 AM
To: Dr. Taylor, DVM <DrTaylor@peta.org>
Cc: Dean, Diane (NIH/OD) [E] <deand@od31em1.od.nih.gov>
Subject: RE: Letter to OLAW regarding electroshock experiments in mice

Hello Dr. Taylor,

OLAW acknowledges receipt of your email below with attachment. We will evaluate the concerns, investigate if appropriate and take any required actions. We will send you an official response at the conclusion of our evaluation.

Regards, Brent Morse

Brent C. Morse, DVM, DACLAM
Director
Division of Compliance Oversight
Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare
National Institutes of Health

From: Dr. Taylor, DVM [mailto:DrTaylor@peta.org]
Sent: Wednesday, August 15, 2018 2:17 PM
To: Morse, Brent (NIH/OD) [E] <morseb@mail.nih.gov>
Cc: Dean, Diane (NIH/OD) [E] <deand@od31em1.od.nih.gov>
Subject: Letter to OLAW regarding electroshock experiments in mice

Dear Dr. Morse,

I hope this correspondence finds you well. Please see attached a letter from People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) detailing our concerns about electroshock experiments conducted in mice at Johns Hopkins University. Thank you for your time and attention to this issue.

Sincerely,

Ingrid Taylor, DVM
Research Associate
Laboratory Investigations Department
People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals
501 Front Street | Norfolk, VA 23510
DrTaylor@peta.org

Morse, Brent (NIH/OD) [E]

From: Nancy Ator <ator@jhmi.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, October 24, 2018 4:58 PM
To: Morse, Brent (NIH/OD) [E]
Subject: Re: OLAW request

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Dr. Morse--Am happy to supply the answers to these questions.

First, the chloral hydrate was not used as the "euthanasia agent." It was used to anesthetize the mice prior to opening the thoracic cavity for the purpose of intracardiac perfusion with saline, followed by the fixative solution. Thus the method of euthanasia was exsanguination during perfusion.

The use of chloral hydrate as anesthetic itself was specifically approved by our attending veterinarian in the review process. He pointed out that use of chloral hydrate has been associated with ileus in rats, but that is only relevant if the animals are to survive and not a problem for this non-survival procedure.

Please let me know if you need any further information.

Best regards,
Nancy

Nancy A. Ator, Ph.D.
Professor and Director, Division of Behavioral Biology
Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
Johns Hopkins School of Medicine
Chair, Johns Hopkins University Animal Care and Use Committee
(b) (6) or (b) (6)
ator@jhmi.edu

From: Morse, Brent (NIH/OD) [E] <morseb@mail.nih.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, October 24, 2018 2:44 PM
To: Nancy Ator
Subject: RE: OLAW request

Hello Dr. Ator,

Thank you again for providing this helpful information. Before I respond to PETA I do have one question. Regarding PETA's complaint concerning euthanasia, was the IACUC provided with scientific justification for the use of chloral hydrate? Also, pardon me for asking, was the method of euthanasia exsanguination during perfusion? I just need to be clear regarding the method of euthanasia. Thanks again for your help.

Best regards, Brent Morse

Brent C. Morse, DVM, DACLAM

Director
Division of Compliance Oversight
Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare
National Institutes of Health

From: Nancy Ator [mailto:ator@jhmi.edu]
Sent: Monday, September 10, 2018 3:02 PM
To: Morse, Brent (NIH/OD) [E] <morseb@mail.nih.gov>
Subject: Re: OLAW request

Hi Dr. Morse--I have returned from vacation, and as we discussed now can provide you with the ECS information that we discussed in our phone call. It is attached. Please let me know if you have questions.

Best regards,
Nancy

Nancy A. Ator, Ph.D.
Professor and Director, Division of Behavioral Biology
Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
Johns Hopkins School of Medicine
Chair, Johns Hopkins University Animal Care and Use Committee
(b) (6) or (b) (6)
ator@jhmi.edu

From: Morse, Brent (NIH/OD) [E] <morseb@mail.nih.gov>
Sent: Monday, August 20, 2018 7:16 AM
To: Nancy Ator
Subject: RE: OLAW request

Hello Dr. Ator,

Thank you for agreeing to speak with me. I've attached PeTA's complaint letter. I will call you at 1:00 tomorrow. Please let me know which number I should call. Thank you again.

Sincerely, Brent Morse

Brent C. Morse, DVM, DACLAM
Director
Division of Compliance Oversight
Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare
National Institutes of Health

JHU

I direct the Brain Stimulation Program in the Department of Psychiatry. The three brain stimulation modalities on which we are focused are electroconvulsive therapy (ECT), deep brain stimulation (DBS) and transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS). At the pre-clinical level, we are primarily focused on learning more about how brain stimulation modalities work including molecular mechanisms and circuitry harnessed by them. To this end, we are employing mouse models in experiments that will yield information with important translational value. Knowledge gained will potentially lead to pharmacological advances as well as advances in the therapeutic utility of the brain stimulation modalities themselves. We have 2 major projects. The 2 major projects are: (a) The role of Narp in the antidepressant effect of electroconvulsive seizures (ECS) (b) Neuromodulation for intractable self-injurious behavior associated with autism spectrum disorder (ASD)

D – brain surgery, EP
E – FST, TST, restraint stress

Mice undergoing ECS may be subjected to TST, FST or chronic stress and those mice would be in category E. However, the ECS itself is not a reason to have the mice classified in E. Below I describe the procedure in more detail (as I have written to the IACUC in prior years) and specifically discuss issues related to anesthesia and muscle relaxation. Please note that I direct ECT at [our hospital].

Introduction

ECS results in a generalized tonic-clonic seizure during which time the animal is unconscious, in the same way that people are unconscious during a generalized seizure. Although post-ictally, the animal is likely sore, we would not want to give a muscle relaxant or other pain relief that could interfere with assays for brain chemistry. Moreover, no such treatment for muscle soreness is routinely administered to rodents. ECS is widely administered to rodents not just for the study of how ECT works in patients (which is this project's aim), but more commonly as a way of inducing neuronal genes and evaluating expression and function.

Background

Anesthesia was introduced to ECT in the late 1940's when curare became available as a muscle relaxant to minimize the risk of fractures and dislocations. As muscle relaxants also paralyze the diaphragm, it became necessary to anesthetize patients so they did not have the sensation of suffocating and being artificially ventilated. The practice of giving a muscle relaxant and sedating patients with an anesthetic has continued to this day. Anesthesia was not introduced because the seizure causes pain, although patients did and even today sometimes do complain of sore muscles post-treatment. Moreover, patients who received ECT pre-anesthesia in the 30s and 40s did not have recollection of the seizure induction or seizing. (Likewise patients with epilepsy who have generalized seizures do not have recollection of the seizure itself ie they are unconscious.) Moreover, the generalized seizure commences a fraction of a second (probably less than 100ms) after current passes through the brain.

Over the last 15 years I have performed ECS on hundreds of rats and mice without anesthesia and I have never observed any injuries eg limping suggesting dislocation or fracture. In fact within a few minutes, rodents are typically up and walking around apparently without any deficits. In fact, in the pre-anesthesia days, ECT-related fractures and dislocations typically occurred in elderly osteoporotic patients, and we typically only give ECS to young rodents.

I don't recall ever seeing a rodent ECS paper in which anesthetic agent was administered prior to the ECS. One major problem with anesthetic agents (and we have the same difficulty with patients) is that the agents typically raise seizure threshold and make the treatment less effective ie less likely to treat patients' depression. Clearly, these agents could also interfere with ECS efficacy in rodents. Furthermore, these agents could also directly affect the targeted behavior altogether making interpretation of the data much more difficult.

Morse, Brent (NIH/OD) [E]

From: Nancy Ator <ator@jhmi.edu>
Sent: Monday, September 10, 2018 3:02 PM
To: Morse, Brent (NIH/OD) [E]
Subject: Re: OLAW request
Attachments: Information on ECS procedures.pdf

Hi Dr. Morse--I have returned from vacation, and as we discussed now can provide you with the ECS information that we discussed in our phone call. It is attached. Please let me know if you have questions.

Best regards,
Nancy

Nancy A. Ator, Ph.D.
Professor and Director, Division of Behavioral Biology
Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
Johns Hopkins School of Medicine
Chair, Johns Hopkins University Animal Care and Use Committee
(b) (6) or (b) (6)
ator@jhmi.edu

From: Morse, Brent (NIH/OD) [E] <morseb@mail.nih.gov>
Sent: Monday, August 20, 2018 7:16 AM
To: Nancy Ator
Subject: RE: OLAW request

Hello Dr. Ator,

Thank you for agreeing to speak with me. I've attached PeTA's complaint letter. I will call you at 1:00 tomorrow. Please let me know which number I should call. Thank you again.

Sincerely, Brent Morse

Brent C. Morse, DVM, DACLAM
Director
Division of Compliance Oversight
Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare
National Institutes of Health

From: Nancy Ator [mailto:ator@jhmi.edu]
Sent: Friday, August 17, 2018 3:19 PM

To: Morse, Brent (NIH/OD) [E] <morseb@mail.nih.gov>
Subject: Re: OLAW request

Hi Dr. Morse--I can be available early afternoon on Tuesday. I am leaving on vacation later that day. Anytime between 1 and 3 could be okay. I certainly would like to understand what has been alleged, etc. before leaving.

(I will still be in touch with email while I am away, but also our Senior Training and Compliance Coordinator can be helpful in compiling information.)

Best regards,
Nancy

Nancy A. Ator, Ph.D.
Professor and Director, Division of Behavioral Biology
Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
Johns Hopkins School of Medicine
Chair, Johns Hopkins University Animal Care and Use Committee
(b) (6) or (b) (6)
ator@jhmi.edu

From: Morse, Brent (NIH/OD) [E] <morseb@mail.nih.gov>
Sent: Friday, August 17, 2018 3:13 PM
To: Nancy Ator
Subject: OLAW request

Hello Dr. Ator,

We have received a complaint from PeTA against some work by Dr. Irving Reti of JHU. I would like to arrange a time to speak with you to gather some initial information regarding his work with mice and electroshock treatment. Please let me know if you are available Tuesday afternoon or Wednesday morning or other times next week. I can then provide you with details of the allegations. I appreciate your consideration.

Sincerely, Brent Morse

Brent C. Morse, DVM, DACLAM
Director
Division of Compliance Oversight
Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare
National Institutes of Health

A3272-02H

AN INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION DEDICATED TO PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF ALL ANIMALS

PETA

PEOPLE FOR
THE ETHICAL
TREATMENT
OF ANIMALS

Washington, D.C.
1536 16th St. N.W.
Washington, DC 20036
202-483-PETA

Los Angeles
2154 W. Sunset Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90026
323-644-PETA

Norfolk
501 Front St.
Norfolk, VA 23510
757-622-PETA

Oakland
554 Grand Ave.
Oakland, CA 94610
510-763-PETA

Info@peta.org
PETA.org

August 15, 2018

Brent Morse, DVM
Acting Director, Division of Compliance Oversight
Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare
National Institutes of Health
RKL1 BG RM 3615, MSC 7982
6705 Rockledge Drive
Bethesda, MD 20817

Via e-mail: brent.morse@nih.gov

Dear Dr. Morse,

I am writing on behalf of People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) and our more than 6.5 million members and supporters to request that your office investigate possible noncompliance with the Public Health Service Policy on Humane Care and Use of Laboratory Animals (PHS Policy) and the *Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals* (the *Guide*) related to the use and treatment of mice at Johns Hopkins University (JHU; PHS Approved Animal Welfare Assurance # A3272-01), located at 3400 N. Charles Street, Baltimore, Maryland.

In the experiments described in the paper "Narp Mediates Antidepressant-like Effects of Electroconvulsive Seizures,"[1] mice were subjected to repeated electroshock treatments (ECS) apparently without the benefit of anesthesia.[2] Furthermore, euthanasia of the mice was conducted in a manner inconsistent with the recommendations of the *AVMA Guidelines for the Euthanasia of Animals* (*AVMA Guidelines*).

Our concerns regarding the use of mice in this study include the following shortcomings in the experimenters' work:

1. Failure to provide appropriate sedation, analgesia, or anesthesia for procedures with animals that may cause more than momentary or slight pain or distress;
2. Failure to conduct euthanasia in a manner that is consistent with the professional guidance for relieving pain and suffering; and
3. Failure to consider the relevance of the study to human or animal health, the advancement of knowledge, or the good of society.

[1] Chang, AD et al. (2018). Narp mediates antidepressant-like effects of electroconvulsive seizures. *Neuropsychopharmacology* 43, 1088-1098.

[2] The experiments described in the published paper were funded in part by NIH grant #R01DA016303, held by Principal Investigator Irving M. Reti of JHU's Departments of Neuroscience and Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences.

Affiliates:
- PETA Foundation (U.K.)
- PETA Asia-Pacific
- PETA India
- PETA Germany
- PETA Netherlands

I. Failure to provide appropriate sedation, analgesia, or anesthesia for procedures with animals that may cause more than momentary or slight pain or distress

The *Guide* endorses the U.S. Government Principles for Utilization and Care of Vertebrate Animals Used in Testing, Research, and Training, including the principles that counsel the "avoidance or minimization of discomfort, distress, and pain" to animals and the "use of appropriate sedation, analgesia, and anesthesia." The *Guide* further specifies that: "The level of consciousness, degree of antinociception (lack of response to noxious stimuli), and status of the cardiovascular, respiratory, musculoskeletal, and thermoregulatory systems should all be used to assess the adequacy of the anesthetic regimen."

Additionally, the *Guide* recommends the "selection of appropriate anesthetics and analgesics [that] best meet clinical and humane requirements" to address the painful stimuli.

ECS is a painful and distressing procedure. In humans, because of the pain and stress of this procedure, ECS is performed under general anesthesia and the patients are given muscle relaxants prior to initiation of therapy. Even so, people have reported headaches, jaw pain, nausea, and muscle aches after experiencing ECS. Any electrical shock above 10 mA constitutes a painful shock, and the 40 mA used in these experiments would induce a severe level of acute pain, and possible ongoing discomfort after the painful stimulus has ended. The experimenters do not document any form of anesthesia administered to the mice for this distressing experience. The mice were subjected to five daily treatments of ECS. To perform this procedure on conscious mice would cause an unacceptable level of pain and suffering.

II. Failure to conduct euthanasia in a manner that is consistent with the professional guidance for relieving pain and suffering

The *Guide* defines euthanasia as "the act of humanely killing animals by methods that induce rapid unconsciousness and death without pain or distress." The *Guide* further advises: "Unless a deviation is justified for scientific or medical reasons, methods should be consistent with the *AVMA Guidelines on Euthanasia.*"

However, the experiments report the following method for euthanasia: "mice were anesthetized with chloral hydrate prior to perfusion with 4% paraformaldehyde." According to the *AVMA Guidelines*, Section M2.10, p. 31, chloral hydrate, and its longer acting derivative alpha-chloralose, are not acceptable as euthanasia agents due to adverse effects, including slow cerebral effects and progressive depression of the respiratory center, resulting in death by hypoxemia. Additionally, the drug is not FDA approved and must be compounded, which introduces issues associated with quality control, potency, and dosage accuracy. Appendix 3 of the *AVMA Guidelines* (p. 102) states that chloral hydrate is unacceptable as a primary method of euthanasia.

The mice were then perfused with 4% paraformaldehyde. Paraformaldehyde is a powder of polymerized formaldehyde and must be dissolved in water to become formaldehyde. The *AVMA Guidelines*, Section M2.19, p. 34 state that, with the exception of Porifera species, "formaldehyde is unacceptable as a first step or adjunctive method of euthanasia for other animal species." In this experiment, formaldehyde was used as an adjunctive method of euthanasia.

Both the primary and adjunctive methods were unacceptable and potentially caused high levels of suffering in the mice resulting in an inhumane death.

III. Failure to consider the relevance of the study to human or animal health, the advancement of knowledge, or the good of society

The *Guide* endorses the U.S. Government Principles for Utilization and Care of Vertebrate Animals Used in Testing, Research, and Training, including the principle that experiments on animals should be designed and performed "on the basis of relevance to human or animal health, advancement of knowledge, or the good of society."

In their experiments, Reti and colleagues employ notoriously unreliable behavioral tests that, predictably, give them unreliable results. In one test, called the forced swim test, mice are made to swim in a cylinder of water until they stop struggling to find an escape and subsequently float. The more time the mice spend floating, the more 'depressed' they are claimed to be, despite the evidence that floating is actually a learned and adaptive behavior, one that saves energy and is beneficial for survival. Some claim that the forced swim test is a screening tool for antidepressant activity, since, sometimes, mice given drugs like fluoxetine will swim more and float less. In the present study, the authors defend their use of the forced swim test based on these assumptions, even when they were unable to replicate these definitive experiments themselves (see Figure 4). In reality, a mouse's behavior in the forced swim test varies significantly between laboratories and strains. Most importantly, a mouse's swimming behavior bears no resemblance to the complicated and varied experience of human depression. The translational failure of pharmacological therapeutics based on these crude tests demonstrates the futility in relying on mice for human drug development.

The failure to provide adequate anesthesia and analgesia for a painful procedure, the use of an unacceptable and inhumane method for euthanasia, and the failure to consider the relevance of the study to human health all constitute alarming noncompliance with the *Guide*. Moreover, it appears that the IACUC failed to adequately review and monitor this study to ensure that protocols were in accordance with the standards set by the PHS Policy and the *Guide*.

We urge you to investigate the concerns summarized in this letter and, if the claims are substantiated, to take swift and decisive action that includes placing Johns Hopkins University under enhanced monitoring. Moreover, if your investigation determines that taxpayer funds supported activities that failed to comply with federal animal welfare policies and guidelines, we ask that your office initiate action to ensure that those funds are promptly returned to the government. Lastly, considering the severity of potential pain and distress experienced by the mice used in the present study due to investigator Irving Reti's clear noncompliance with the *Guide* and PHS Policy, we ask that awarding of further funds for Reti's current grant, R21HD092915, be suspended until an investigation is conducted and concludes that Reti's current activities involving animals are in compliance with the *Guide* and PHS Policy.

Thank you for your time and attention to these concerns. I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

(b) (6)

Ingrid Taylor, DVM
Research Associate
Laboratory Investigations Department
People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals
501 Front Street Norfolk, VA 23510
Cell: (b) (6)
drtaylor@peta.org

Cc: Diane W. Dean, Director, Division of Grants Compliance and Oversight, National Institutes of Health (diane.dean@nih.gov)

Morse, Brent (NIH/OD) [E]

From: Morse, Brent (NIH/OD) [E]
Sent: Thursday, August 16, 2018 9:35 AM
To: 'Dr. Taylor, DVM'
Cc: Dean, Diane (NIH/OD) [E]
Subject: RE: Letter to OLAW regarding electroshock experiments in mice

Hello Dr. Taylor,

OLAW acknowledges receipt of your email below with attachment. We will evaluate the concerns, investigate if appropriate and take any required actions. We will send you an official response at the conclusion of our evaluation.

Regards, Brent Morse

Brent C. Morse, DVM, DACLAM
Director
Division of Compliance Oversight
Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare
National Institutes of Health

From: Dr. Taylor, DVM [mailto:DrTaylor@peta.org]
Sent: Wednesday, August 15, 2018 2:17 PM
To: Morse, Brent (NIH/OD) [E] <morseb@mail.nih.gov>
Cc: Dean, Diane (NIH/OD) [E] <deand@od31em1.od.nih.gov>
Subject: Letter to OLAW regarding electroshock experiments in mice

Dear Dr. Morse,

I hope this correspondence finds you well. Please see attached a letter from People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) detailing our concerns about electroshock experiments conducted in mice at Johns Hopkins University. Thank you for your time and attention to this issue.

Sincerely,

Ingrid Taylor, DVM
Research Associate
Laboratory Investigations Department
People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals
501 Front Street | Norfolk, VA 23510
DrTaylor@peta.org

Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare

OLAW

Division of Compliance Oversight

Record of Call for Case # A3272-2H

Date & Time	Message	Initials
2/15/19 11:30	Spoke w/ Dr. Ator. I will send chloral hydrate references for PI, her + IACUC to consider.	(b) (6) [redacted]