

RESULT OF THE Ph.D. STUDENTS - SCREENING COMMITTEE – July 2021 SESSION

Sl. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	FACULTY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	RESULT
1.	Dr. Karthik G.	Medical	----	Accepted
2.	Dr.Jeyashanth Riju	Medical	-----	Accepted
3.	Dr. Soundar Rajan D.	Medical	1. To ascertain the normalcy of the articular cartilage MRI-Cartilage mapping may be done and the same may be included in the methodology	Accepted with Recommendation
4.	Dr. Mudassar Sharief, R.	Dental	1. Oropharyngeal cancer patients have to be excluded from the study. 2. Given the fact that Stage III & Stage IV have worse prognosis due to extension of the tumour, impact of telomerase cannot be assessed with certainly. 3. Statistical method are <u>NOT</u> appropriate for the research question. After getting response for the above comments, re-assessment may be done.	Not Accepted
5.	Mrs. Malathi Manuel	Bio-Medical Sciences	-----	Accepted

Sl. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	FACULTY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	RESULT
6.	Mr. Ayyanraj	Bio-Medical Sciences	----	Accepted
7.	Mrs.M. Anitha	Bio-Medical Sciences	<p>The proposed research involves clinical analysis, radiological analysis, therapeutics, sophisticated genetic studies, metabolomics and cell-culture techniques.</p> <p>Such an all-encompassing research warrants multiple skills and expertise.</p> <p>The candidate's academic qualifications and professional experience are <u>NOT</u> commensurate with requisites of the proposed research.</p>	Not Accepted
8.	Dr.D. Subathra	Siddha	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comparative Study -- Compare with existing standard treatment. 2. Drug will be purchase from GMP certified company. 	Accepted with Recommendation
9.	Dr.V. Poorna Pushkala	Siddha	Dysbiosis with diabetic and diabetic -- Two models to be used for comparison.	Accepted with Recommendation
10.	Dr.B. Manikandan	Siddha	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Include Pilot study (CLINICAL) 2. Cow urine – Fresh and Market available compare 3. For Hematinic - Standard drug is Siddha / Ayurvedha drug. 	Accepted with Recommendation
11.	Dr.P. Senthil Kumar	Siddha	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Include Pilot Study (CLINICAL) 2. Pharmacological study – Standard drug must be Siddha / Ayurvedha drug 	Accepted with Recommendations.

Sl. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	FACULTY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	RESULT
12.	Dr.T. Bhuvaneshwari	Siddha	Pharmacological Study - Standard drug must be Siddha / Ayurvedha drug	Accepted with Recommendation
13.	Dr.C. Meenakshi	Siddha	Include Pilot Study - (CLINICAL)	Accepted with Recommendation
14.	Dr.M. Revathi	Siddha	1. Valai Rasam must be used 2. After toxicity study, In-vivo model included in Pharmacological Study	Accepted with Recommendation
15.	Dr.C. Sherin Sheeba	Homoeopathy	1. No. of cases included in this study is too less. 2. Important risk conditions are not included – (DM & BP – above 140 / 100 (age group - upto 55).	Not Accepted
16.	Dr.Justine Jose D.	Homoeopathy	1. No Clarity 2. No specific reference / Statistical reference 3. No relevant data for direct relationship between Hypothyroid & Bronchial Asthma (Thyroid Dysfunction)	Not Accepted
17.	Dr. Priyanka P.S.	Homoeopathy	-----	Accepted
18.	Dr.D. Augustin Jebaraj	Homoeopathy	1. Increase the number of cases 2. Include pregnant women for this study	Accepted with Recommendation
19.	Dr. Balan M.S.	Homoeopathy	-----	Accepted
20.	Mr. Selvakumar S	Pharmacy	1. Focus to be given to establish the molecular mechanism of the selected activity for the isolated compounds from the plants 2. Relevant methodology should be included.	Accepted with Recommendation

Sl. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	FACULTY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	RESULT
21.	Mr. Rukari Tushar Ganpat	Pharmacy	-----	Absent
22.	Mrs.Sangeetha P.T.	Pharmacy	Methodology for Docking studies for the selected activity shall be included (for the isolated compounds)	Accepted with Recommendations
23.	Mr.G.Jumbukumar	Pharmacy	1. No Novelty in the present work. 2. Similar studies already been carried out. 3. Title is not included with the Formulation (nanoparticle) and evaluation of active constituents. 4. Detailed methodology of formulation studies to be included.	Not Accepted
24.	Mrs.S.L. Laura	Pharmacy	1. Unable to substantiate the objective of the work like conversion of Znsoy-Zno 2. It is repetition of work and its given by the candidate itself. 3. The Individual is not clear about Research work.	Not Accepted
25	Mrs.A. Mythili	Pharmacy	1. Modify the Aim & Objectives to the tune Methodology in line with objectives.	Accepted with Recommendation
26.	Mrs.J. Shyamala	Pharmacy	1. Not clear about the topic and research work. 2. No proper Literature survey	Not Accepted
27	Mrs.K. Leelavathy	Pharmacy	-----	Absent
28	Mr.V. Parthasarathy	Pharmacy	Needs thorough Literature review To build a proper case to undertake a study	Not Accepted
29	Mr.R. Saravanan	Pharmacy	To do much more literature review to arrive the formulation	Not Accepted

Sl. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	FACULTY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	RESULT
30	Mrs.T. Kalpana	Pharmacy	No novelty in the Ph.D. proposals Need further development	Not Accepted
31	Mr.R. Rajkumar	Pharmacy	Not worth for Ph.D.	Not Accepted
32	Mr.J. Prakash	Physiotherapy	1. Study justification to be arrived at based on review of existing literature. 2. To consider combining the two interventions proposed and study the combination as third Limb. 3. Proper sample size estimation needs to be done based on effect size (from literature review). 4. Objectives to be properly classified as primary and secondary (Based on sample size estimation)	Accepted with Recommendation
33.	Mrs.A. Brammatha	Physiotherapy	1. To stratify for brunstrom's score (IV & II) and do stratified randomisation. 2. To blind assessor for outcome measurement. 3. To redo sample size estimation with primary outcome scores as ordinal variables / categorical variables. 4. To consider two groups (Intervention Vs control) against three groups (Two interventions and One control)	Accepted
34.	Mrs.A.P. Kalpana	Physiotherapy	Major limitations noted in the following areas: 1. Novelty / Innovation in the interventions 2. Ethical considerations of denying & standard intervention to the Control Group 3. Lack of objectivity in the outcome measurements. Candidate can rework on these limitations and submit a revised draft for consideration	Accepted with Recommendation

Sl. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	FACULTY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	RESULT
35.	Mr. Rahul S Nair	Bio-Medical Sciences	-----	Accepted
36.	Mrs. Grace Lydia M.	Nursing	1. To remove the 4 th objectives 2. To replace word “determine” with “evaluate”	Accepted with Recommendations.
37.	Mrs. Priscilla Roselyn I.	Nursing	Spirituality and Sexuality can be removed from study and Title, to get Nutrition Scale	Accepted with Recommendations.
38.	Mrs. Reena Rachel George	Nursing	Change in Title and Objectives, concentrate on infection control than cost effectiveness.	Accepted with Recommendation.
39.	Mrs. Jailani K.	Nursing	-----	Absent
40.	Mrs.Abednego Peter Johnson	Nursing	Inclusion criteria – Head Injury with moderate GCS stroke patient Hemiplegia + hemiparesis to be removed. To get signature from new guide.	Accepted with Recommendation
41.	Mrs.M. Prabhu	Nursing	Exclusion Criteria – 30-50 age to be removed Literature Study can be attended. Inclusion criteria – 20-50 age to be added, education qualification and technical skill to be added.	Accepted with Recommendation
42.	Mrs. Ramamurthy Mala	Nursing	Inclusion Criteria – age group of the Children to be mentioned. Children who have depressed with Asthama duration 1 year. Work out Sample Group.	Accepted with Recommendation
43.	Mrs.D. Geetha	Nursing	Objective to be changed.	Accepted with Recommendation
44.	Mrs.A. Padmavahy	Nursing	Inclusion Criteria – need clarification. Severe Asthma Patients to be avoided. II & III objectives to be written together.	Accepted with Recommendation

Sl. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	FACULTY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	RESULT
45.	Mrs. Lilly G.	Nursing	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Problem statement to be clear, one primary research question to be addressed 2. Accordingly frame objectives, (knowledge → Skill → Outcome) 3. Hypothesis not clear. 4. Develop the protocol as per standard guidelines (SPIRIT) 5. Statistical package to be specific to the study. 	Accepted with Recommendation
46.	Mrs.G. Sivagami	Nursing	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Title not clear (experimental in title, Quasi experimental in Pg.13) conceptual Research Question has not been stated clearly. 2. Objectives not clear – no primary objectives. 3. Redesign the study design. 4. Methodology – mention specific intervention / topics in SBL. 	Accepted with Recommendations
47.	Mrs.V. Vanitha	Nursing	<p>Not upto the mark for a scholarly Ph.D. study. No Rational & Novelty in problem selected. Primary Question and objective not clear.</p>	Not Accepted
48.	Mrs.J. Anitha	Nursing	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Novelty missing in the problem statement. 2. Question and methods are not rigourously thought and formulated. 3. Two question have to be addressed separately Quantitative & Qualitative. 4. Experiment lacks all details needed to judge and accept the methodology. 	Accepted with Recommendation

Sl. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	FACULTY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	RESULT
49.	Mrs.B. Ramya Bharathi	Nursing	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Research question have not been addressed separately. 2. Methodology to be developed for design use and validation of intervention package separately for experimental design. 3. Sample size need to be justified. 4. Suggest SPIRIT (for standard guidelines). 	Accepted with Recommendations
50.	Mrs.M. Mumtaz	Nursing	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Research question have not been formulated clearly. 2. Methodology to be developed for design use and validation of intervention package separately experimental design. 3. Sample size need to be justified. 4. Suggest standard guidelines for tool development in Indian context. 	Accepted with Recommendations
51.	Mrs.M. Manimegalai	Nursing	Research question needs modification since it is very extensive, accordingly methodology to be framed.	Accepted with Recommendations
52.	Mrs. H. Anto Suji	Nursing	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development of the research tool, intervention package, outcome measurement has to be part of the research work, (objective & methodology). 2. Cluster randomized trial may be considered. 	Accepted
53.	Mrs.J. Kezia Margaret	Nursing	<p>Suggested in problem statement to remove the term risk reduction and reframe.</p> <p>Modify objectives and methodology accordingly.</p>	Accepted with Recommendation

Sl. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	FACULTY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	RESULT
54.	Mrs.J. Muneeswari	Nursing	Methodology to be modified for consistency in intervention and follow up.	Accepted with Recommendation
55.	Mrs. Bency Prabha Y.	Nursing	-----	Absent
56.	Mrs. Nithya Kalaivani	Nursing	Following changes are recommended in the methodology: 1. Restrict objectives to few focused ones 2. To submit standard tools that will be used for i) Assessment of factors associated with self medication. ii) Quantifiable pre test and post test tools for assessing knowledge on self medication. iii) Teaching tools for both Nurse led and peer led education. 3. To redo sample size estimation using appropriate reference study or pilot data. 4. To consider randomised / quasi randomised allocation of participants to the two intervention arms.	Accepted with Recommendations
57.	Mrs. Angel Rajakumari G.	Nursing	Compassion, Music Therapy and Birthing Ball are proven and standard interventions in delivery room care. The study is not Justified	Not Accepted
58.	Mrs.Umaranga	Nursing	No modification has been done to the previously submitted Research proposal, which was not accepted. (The same draft submitted again).	Not Accepted
59.	Mrs. G. Kanchana	Nursing	1. To prepare and submit standardised teaching tool for the intervention limb (which is approved by Cardiologists) 2. To measure retention of knowledge in the intervention group at 3 monthly intervals.	Accepted.

Sl. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	FACULTY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	RESULT
60.	Mrs. M. Kanimozhi, M.	Nursing	1. To consider including all forms of arthritis (Except inflammatory arthritis) To increase enrolment. 2. To measure outcomes upto 6 months from enrolment (3 months after stopping intervention). 3. To have objective tools to ensure patient adherence for 3 months in intervention group.	Accepted

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. Further, the date and Session of the Provisional Registration will be fixed after the approval of your compliance report by the members of the Screening Committee

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)