

RESULT OF THE Ph.D. STUDENTS - SCREENING COMMITTEE – January & July 2020 SESSION

Sl. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	FACULTY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	RESULT
1.	Dr. Nikita J Mehra	Medical	----	Accepted
2.	Dr.Sabarinathan S.	Dental	<p>1. Study design lacks Clarity. It is mentioned as 'double blinded, randomized trial' but, there is <u>NO</u> control group.</p> <p>2. It is suggested to do a 'pilot study', considering the new formulation used.</p> <p>3. Subsequently, a 'cohort study' can be planned.</p> <p>4. In the current format, this proposal cannot be accepted.</p>	Not Accepted
3.	Dr. Joephin Sounder S.I.	Dental	-----	Absent
4.	Dr. Mudassar Sharief, R.	Dental	<p>The proposal in the current format is <i>NOT ACCEPTED</i> due to the following shortcomings:</p> <p>1. Study design with respect to hypothesis, sample selection and methodology.</p> <p>2. While taking 'control' the concept of field Cancerisation has to be considered.</p> <p>3. The variables to be measured are to be clearly mentioned along with timeline of study.</p>	Not Accepted

Sl. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	FACULTY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	RESULT
5.	Dr.Madan Kumar, P.D.	Dental	<p>1. No need for Phase 1</p> <p>2. In methodology, mention has to be made on :</p> <p>a) ruling out disease states with elevated gastrin level and</p> <p>b) diseases (like colon malignancy) known to have elevated progastrin level.</p>	Accepted with Recommendations
6.	Dr.L. Kavitha	Dental	---	Accepted
7.	Dr. Divyasree Bhat K.	--	<p>1. In children of 1-5 years, acquiring HBV is mostly through vertical transmission. Other modes of infection are less likely.</p> <p>2.Prevalence of HBV in this age group will not be a reflection of the same of the general population.</p> <p>3. Analysis of risk factors/likely mode of infection would add weightage of the research.</p>	Accepted with Recommendations
8.	Mr. Rahul S Nair	Bio-Medical Sciences	<p>1. Candidate has no clarity in the proposed research work. The methodology and procedures of the various enzyme assays from tissue as well as PBMC culture is not provided and also not clear by the candidate.</p> <p>2. The proteins / metabolome to be studied by NMR studies is not provided.</p> <p>3. Recommended to resubmit with complete details.</p>	Not Accepted

Sl. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	FACULTY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	RESULT
9.	Miss. Nikhitha Mariya John	Bio-Medical Sciences	Recommended to 1. Add pregnant women with complications (ex: Eclampsia) as another group. 2. To increase sample size from 30 which is inadequate.	Accepted with Recommendations
10.	Mr.Kakhangchung Panmei	Bio-Medical Sciences	----	Accepted
11.	Mr. Karthick N.	Bio-Medical Sciences	----	Accpeted
12.	Mr. John Dickson Calvin D.	Bio-Medical Sciences	----	Accepted
13.	Mr. Tammanna Bhajantri	Bio-Medical Sciences	The following correction need to be made: 1. Inclusion & exclusion criteria need to be spelt out clearly. Drug sensitive and Drug resistant patients need to be clearly defined. 2. Since the study is on CXCR4 & CCR 5 receptor expression, was this factored into sample size calculations? 3. The CXCR4 antagonist AMD 3100 has been shown to also affect dual receptors (CXCR4 & CCR 5). He would be better off using monoclonal antibodies which inhibit CXCR4 function. 4. Can look at CXCR4 & CCR 5 mutation status in sensitive and resistant cases. 5. Need to purify cells from PBMC and use monocyte-	Accepted with Recommendations

			<p>macrophages and CD4 T-cells.</p> <p>6. Need to sign MOU with collaborating institution, who should be given a detailed SOP for sample collection. The collaborating centers should have their Ethical Committee clear it.</p> <p>7. The culture experiments need to be in triplicates with SD provided.</p> <p>Title may be modified as suggested to be appropriate “The Expression of Macrophage coreceptor CXCR4 in Drug susceptible and Drug Resistant HIV-1 infections”.</p>	
14.	Dr. Anbarasan. B	Siddha	----	Absent
15.	Dr.Uthrapathi. S	Siddha	---	Absent
16.	Dr. Radhika Madhavan	Siddha	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The particular type of NHL under evaluation may be spelled out. 2. The response evaluator of the primary outcome from the participatory Institution of the Oncology department may be engaged as Co-guide. 3. Regimen evaluation may be considered with consultation of Research guide. 4. Safety evaluation of the Chandamaratha Chenduram may be done with extended period of evaluation. (viz. 90 days – 180 days) 	Accepted with Recommendations.

Sl. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	FACULTY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	RESULT
17.	Dr. Ajayan, T	Homoeopathy	Title Change – Constitutional treatment word may be replaced with specific remedy and potency to make it precise.	Accepted with Recommendation.
18.	Dr.Santhosh Kumar	Homoeopathy	1. To remove the word prevention in the objective and outcome. 2. To revise the title in line with the Aim of the study.	Accepted with Recommendations.
19.	Dr. Hari Sankar V.	Homoeopathy	1. Specify the Hypothesis, Objectives in precise manner. 2. Age group criteria can be precise. 3. Register with Clinical Trial Register of India.	Accepted with Recommendations.
20.	Mr. Thirumal, P.	Pharmacy	-----	Accepted
21.	Mr. Selvakumar S	Pharmacy	1. Aim can be made more clear, it is not very specific. 2. Preliminary studies especially toxicity studies can be carried out before proceeding further. 3. A more in depth study will be appreciated.	Not Accepted
22.	Mrs. Vijayalakshmi S.	Pharmacy	1. Suggested to incorporate in Vivo efficacy studies. The MTT assay may not reveal much about the efficacy of targeted delivery. 2. The title can include the name of the anticancer drug.	Accepted with Recommendations

Sl. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	FACULTY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	RESULT
23.	Mrs. Vijayalakshmi C.	Pharmacy	1. The candidate wants a change in the topic – the term “Ischemia” to be changed to “hypoxia”. 2. The term change is accepted by the Committee.	Accepted
24.	Mrs. Vanitha S.	Pharmacy	Preliminary phytochemical work should be done to first establish the presence of quassinoids in the leaves and the lack of their permeability to be demonstrated.	Accepted with Recommendations
25.	Mr. Rukari Tushar Ganpat	Pharmacy	The study lacks depth and is of a PG level.	Not Accepted
26	Mr. Durgesh Toliram Gautam	Pharmacy	Title can include the plant names.	Accepted
27.	Mr.Sureshkumar M.	Pharmacy	---	Absent
28.	Mrs.Sangeetha P.T.	Pharmacy	1. Similar activity has already been reported. 2. No novelty in the work.	Not Accepted
29.	Mr.Jambukumar G.	Pharmacy	Lack of background knowledge and clarity regarding the proposed work.	Not Accepted
30.	Mr. Dhanapal Y.	Pharmacy	---	Accepted

Sl. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	FACULTY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	RESULT
31.	Mrs. Christobel Jesintha, J	Nursing	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sampling Technique – Separate setting for control and Experimental group has to be taken. 2. Uniformity of the setting to be taken care. 3. Hypothesis to be modified as per the objectives. 4. In the statement of the problem more emphasis has to be given on the cognition and Depression instead of Quality of Sleep. 5. Based on the Primary Objective Sampling Size has to be calculated. 6. Register your intervention study with Clinical Trials Registry – India (CTRI). 	Accepted with Recommendations.
32.	Mrs. Kansal Mahariba S.	Nursing	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the statement of the problem one aspect of the assessment can be concentrated <i>instead of</i> two and supporting rationale to be attached. 2. In the sampling technique, 2 (Two) groups can be taken <i>instead of</i> 3 (Three) groups, also proper justification of sample size to be given. 3. Focus should be given on the Primary Outcome. 	Accepted with Recommendations.

Sl. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	FACULTY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	RESULT
33.	Mrs. Anuradha, C.	Nursing	<p>1. Setting Explanation is needed. It can be restricted to one District.</p> <p>2. Sample – Nurses with 1-3 or 5 years experience can be taken.</p> <p>3. Uniformity of the setting (Hospitals) for Experimental and Control group to be taken care.</p> <p>4. Competency to be explained further.</p> <p>5. Register your intervention study with Clinical Trials Registry – India (CTRI).</p>	Accepted with Recommendations.
34.	Mrs. Thilagavathi N.	Nursing	<p>1. Modify the title focusing on one single intervention package only, then this study can be proceeded. (Thereby focusing the whole proposal).</p>	Accepted with Recommendation.
35.	Mrs. Salomi Sangeetha, J.	Nursing	<p>1. As the vulnerable group is involved, No adequate scientific proof in regard to Lymphatic Drainage being effective for Stereotyped Behavior, the Committee recommends to Stick on to Behavioral Interventions alone.</p> <p>2. The wider age group (3-18 years) to be reduced and focused to one single age group (ex: Children/Adolescence)</p> <p>3. A dose response analysis can never be effective for a short duration (2 months) intervention and so that the Committee recommends to conduct intervention for the Experimental group alone.</p>	Accepted with Recommendations.

Sl. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	FACULTY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	RESULT
36.	Mrs. Angel Rajakumari G.	Nursing	---	Absent
37.	Mrs. Saranya V.	Nursing	----	Absent
38.	Mrs.Mallika Devi A	Nursing	1. Repetition of work done already. 2. To submit a proposal with original idea/innovation.	Not Accepted
39.	Mrs. Kavitha P.	Nursing	1. Intervention should be – Nurse led Tai chei – and videos to be used only as a supportive tool. 2. To redo sample size calculation with adequate allowance for attrition.	Accepted
40.	Mrs. Uma Ranga	Nursing	1. Lack of original idea and 2. Lack of knowledge on research methods.	Not Accepted
41.	Mrs. Kanchana G.	Nursing	1. No scope for nursing interventions and 2. Repetition of proven concepts.	Not Accepted
42.	Mrs. Anitha R.	Nursing	1. Redo the methodology especially in the following areas: i) Inclusion and exclusion criteria ii) Nature of Intervention – Nurse administered vs Self administered. iii) Duration of intervention. 2. To submit proof for availability of sterile and medically approved activated charcoal for topical use. 3. To formulate Siddha pharmacopia approved garlic preparation for topical use.	Accepted with Recommendations
43.	Mrs. Kanimozhi M.	Nursing	1. No need to repeat known results. 2. To develop original and innovative research questions.	Not Accepted

Sl. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	FACULTY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	RESULT
44.	Mrs. Pandiselvi R.	Nursing	1. Statement, Objectives, setting, intervention methodology to be modified based on recommendations given by the Committee and presented for approval.	Accepted with Recommendations
45.	Mrs. Kayalvizhi S.	Nursing	1. Modifications as suggested by the Committee to be incorporated in the following: i) Title ii) Sample size iii) Biochemical and reproductive parameters iv) Specific interventions 2. Measures to control sample contamination among groups.	Accepted with Recommendations
46.	Mrs. Irin Anitha M.	Nursing	1. Quantum of work by the Researcher is less. To add more components to make the study more effective and authentic. 2. Increase sample size / settings.	Accepted with Recommendations
47.	Mrs. Hatlin Sugi M.	Nursing	1. Methodology to be streamlined. 2. Correlation between competency development of midwives to be strengthened. 3. Self competency development needs to be done. 4. Clarity is required on the design and sample selection.	Accepted with Recommendations
48.	Mrs. Kezia Margaret, J.	Nursing	1. Problem statement to be modified and very specific. 2. Objectives needs to be modified. 3. Methodology needs to be corrected.	Not Accepted

Sl. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	FACULTY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	RESULT
49.	Mrs. Nasira S.	Nursing	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Problem statement needs to be modified. 2. Methodology needs to be modified accordingly. 3. Can focus on sexuality alone. 4. Practicality of getting spouses together for study to be assessed. 	Accepted with Recommendations
50.	Mrs. Usharani, L.	Nursing	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Setting should be specific to either Government or Private setting. 2. Methodology needs clarity. 3. Intervention authenticity to be supported with review of studies. 4. Intervention to be specific and limited. 	Accepted with Recommendations
51.	Mrs. Subasri, S.	Nursing	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Modifications of the statement is needed 2. Specificity in the intervention and outcome should be there. 3. Out come variables to be limited. 4. Appropriate settings to be selected. 	Accepted with Recommendations
52.	Mrs. Muneeswari J.	Nursing	----	Absent
53.	Mrs. Bency Prabha, Y.	Nursing	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Design and sampling – clarification is required. 2. All the questions raised by the Committee to be answered. 	Not Accepted.
54.	Mrs. Porselvi, M.	Nursing	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Modifications on the care bundle as suggested. 2. Methodology to be modified 	Accepted with Recommendations

Sl. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	FACULTY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	RESULT
55.	Mrs. Elizebeth Rani, V.	Nursing	1. Methodology needs to be more clarified. 2. Inclusion and Exclusion criteria needs clarity. 3. Accessibility of the samples for the study duration. 4. Attrition rates needs to verified.	Accepted with Recommendations
56.	Mrs. Beulah Jayaselvi, J.	Nursing	---	Absent
57.	Mrs. Sagaya Mary, A.	Nursing	1. Well presented. 2. Need to modify 'time line'. 3. Proposal is duplicated by both candidates of the guide. Modify workings and re-send.	Accepted with Recommendations
58.	Mrs. Grace Lydia M.	Nursing	1. No new knowledge. 2. Review of literature not submitted in paragraph.	Not Accepted
59.	Mrs. Muthuselvi, V.	Nursing	Change the objective, revise and submit again.	Accepted with Recommendations
60.	Mrs. Avanthika, S.	Nursing	1. Objectives and methodology to be changed as per recommendation. 2. Tramcy	Accepted with Recommendations
61.	Mr. Karthi, R.	Nursing	1. Review of literature to be strengthened 2. Sample newly diagnosed 3. Change the title, objectives and methodology.	Accepted with Recommendations

Sl. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	FACULTY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	RESULT
62.	Mr. Ganesan R.	Nursing	1. Review of literature gaps to be specified. 2. Change methodology and objectives.	Accepted with Recommendations
63.	Mrs. Thangapappa B	Nursing	Change the Title and methodology	Accepted with Recommendations
64.	Mrs. Deepa M.	Nursing	Revise the proposal and submit.	Accepted with Recommendations
65.	Mrs. Sathyapriya J.	Nursing	Objective and methodology to be changed.	Accepted with Recommendations
66.	Mrs. Nirmala, V.S.	Nursing	1. Title to be change. 2. Review of literature to be strengthened 3. Methodology to be changed.	Accepted with Recommendations
67.	Mrs. Maheswari, S.	Nursing	Revise the title, methodology and objectives	Accepted with Recommendations
68.	Mrs. Alice Deinah Margarate	Nursing	Change the Sample, Title, Objective and Methodology with good review of literatre.	Accepted with Recommendations

Sl. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	FACULTY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	RESULT
69.	Mrs. Sorna Daya Rani. D	Nursing	----	Absent
70.	Mrs. Sasikala S.	Nursing	----	Absent

BREMARKS:

ACCEPTED : Candidates are instructed to submit the joining report along with necessary fees through the Guide within 10 working days from the date of publication of result.

ACCEPTED WITH RECOMMENDATIONS : Candidates are instructed to submit the Compliance Report through the Guide within 30 working days from the date of publication of results.

NOT ACCEPTED : Candidates are instructed to submit proposals (Four copies) through the Guide within three months from the date of publication of result.

Prof. Dr. SUDHA SHESHAYYAN
VICE-CHANCELLOR

/True Copy/

Sd/-
ACADEMIC OFFICER (FAC)