

THE TAMIL NADU Dr.M.G.R. MEDICAL UNIVERSITY, CHENNAI-32

RESULTS OF THE Ph.D. SCREENING COMMITTEE - JULY 2012 SESSION

SI. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	SPECIALITY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	MARKS AWARDED BY THE COMMITTEE			RESULT
				OBTAINED	MAX.	MIN.	
					150	75	
01.	Dr.ROHINI BADRAN	PLASTIC SURGERY & NEURO SURGERY	All the committee members objected to permit her as full-time Ph.D. student in the Department of Madras Medical College without proper consent from the Director of Medical Education through Proper Channel.	---	150	75	NOT APPROVED
02.	Dr.R.ARUNMOZHI	COMMUNITY MEIDICINE	Topic of the study is " APPROVED " with the following suggestions: Social Factors, Father and family members also be counselled Your role as a ? facilitator or ? auditor of the already existing programmes. What better impact your counselling will have than that of the UHNs? Instructed to get the necessary permission of the corporation authorities before commencing the field survey. To extend the surveillance upto six months of the neonatal period.	80	150	75	APPROVED WITH SUGGESTIONS
03.	Dr.SAIKAT DAS	RADIOTHERAPY	Topic of the study is " WELL APPROVED "	115	150	75	WELL APPROVED
04.	Dr.I. GURUBHARATH	RADIODIAGNOSIS	Well presented. Topic of the study is " APPROVED "	116	150	75	APPROVED

SI. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	SPECIALITY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	MARKS AWARDED BY THE COMMITTEE			RESULT
				OBTAINED	MAX.	MIN.	
					150	75	
05.	Dr.P. RISHI MUGESH KANNA	ORTHOPAEDICS	<p>Topic of the study is “APPROVED” with the following suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ To exclude those cases with severe Vitamin D3 deficiency, Haemangioma Vertebrae and HIV; ➤ To do DNA study at Hongkong (MOU) Memorandum of Understanding to be signed. 	90	150	75	APPROVED WITH SUGGESTIONS
06.	Dr.P. KATHIRAVAN	ORTHOPAEDICS	<p>Topic of the study is “APPROVED” with the following suggestion:</p> <p>To include C.T. scan and MRI also as diagnostic tools in evaluation of cervical spondylosis. To get DME’s consent & Approval.</p>	90	150	75	APPROVED WITH SUGGESTIONS
07.	Ms. ANITA AMALADAS, M.SC.,	BIO - CHEMISTRY	<p>Topic of the study is “NOT APPROVED”.</p> <p>To re-submit after proper modifications.</p>	60	150	75	NOT APPROVED
08.	Dr.L. ANAND	SURGICAL GASTRO ENTEROLOGY	Approved with advice to increase the sample size.	105	150	75	APPROVED WITH SUGGESTIONS

SI. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	SPECIALITY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	MARKS AWARDED BY THE COMMITTEE			RESULT
				OBTAINED	MAX.	MIN.	
					150	75	
09.	Dr.RAMANUJAM	PHARMACOLOGY	Suggested to remark sample size and study design and add few more parameters like tolerance assay , oregano phosphorus etc and Resubmit	60	150	75	NOT APPROVED
10.	Dr.K.S. SUDHA	PHARMACOLOGY	Absent	--	--	--	AAA
11.	Dr.V.G. SRIVATSA	PSYCHIATRY	Topic of the study is “ APPROVED ” with the following suggestion: Title to be modified as determinants of BPS in urban elderly population.	83	150	75	APPROVED WITH SUGGESTIONS
12.	Mr. ROBIN PENUGULA LAZARUS	MICROBIOLOGY	Topic of the study is “ APPROVED ” with the following suggestion: Title to be modified as “Evaluation of Immune response to Rotavirus vaccination in Indian infants using Zinc and Probiotics.”	87	150	75	APPROVED WITH SUGGESTIONS
13.	Ms. ROSEMOL VARGHESE	MICROBIOLOGY	Topic of the study is “ APPROVED ” with the following suggestions: Title to be modified as ” Epidemiological Characterization of Steptococcus pneumoniae using Multilocus sequence typing across India.” In the methodology, study design–purposive sampling to be included.	88	150	75	APPROVED WITH SUGGESTIONS

SI. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	SPECIALITY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	MARKS AWARDED BY THE COMMITTEE			RESULT
				OBTAINED	MAX.	MIN.	
					150	75	
14.	Ms. U. INBAMALAR ARUL SELVI	MICROBIOLOGY	Topic of the study is “ APPROVED ” with the following suggestion: Title to be modified as “IMMUNOLOGICAL BIOLOGICAL AND GENETIC MARKERS IN THE RE-ACTIVATION OF LATENT TUBERCULOSIS IN IMMUNO COMPROMISED PATIENTS WITH RHEUMATOID ARTHRITIS & TYPE-II DIABETES MELLITUS”	92	150	75	APPROVED WITH SUGGESTIONS
15.	Dr.S. MURUGESAN	SIDDHA	Topic of the study is “ NOT APPROVED ”. To re-submit – Candidate is requested to produce affidavit from competent person from his Institution stating that all the necessary Hormone study/assays are done in their Laboratory. [Thyroid Hormones T3, T4 & TSH, Gonadal Hormones, Estrogen, Testosteroides, Prolactin, LH & FSH] and will help in this study.	--	150	75	NOT APPROVED
16.	Dr.P.SARAVANAKUMARAN	SIDDHA	Topic of the study is “ NOT APPROVED ”. Not able to answer what is Autoimmune process and various diseases. Not able to tell what is exactly wrong in the Myasthenia gravis. Poor preparation.	--	150	75	NOT APPROVED

SI. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	SPECIALITY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	MARKS AWARDED BY THE COMMITTEE			RESULT
				OBTAINED	MAX.	MIN.	
					150	75	
17.	Dr.G. BHARATHKUMAR	SIDDHA	Topic of the study is “ APPROVED ”.	95	150	75	APPROVED
18.	Dr.K. BALAGURUSAMY	SIDDHA	Topic of the study is “ APPROVED ”.	85	150	75	APPROVED
19.	Mr.S.BOOPATHY	ANATOMY	To recalculate sample size with a clear hypothesis; To include both control and diabetic individuals; To include nerves from lower limb also; To correct grammatical and spelling mistakes in proposal; To re-submit revised summary of the proposed research for review by the panel. Topic of the study is “ NOT APPROVED ”.	60	150	75	NOT APPROVED
20.	Mr. DHANAPAL	PHARMACY	1. The proposal is poorly focused with no mention of the plant planed to be studied. 2. The proposal does not give any details of methodology. 3. The candidate is advised to focus on one plant, which has not been studied with regard to a particular activity/activities and provide details about the relevant methodology. 4. Not approved: To resubmit	45	150	75	NOT APPROVED

SI. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	SPECIALITY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	MARKS AWARDED BY THE COMMITTEE			RESULT
				OBTAINED	MAX.	MIN.	
					150	75	
21.	Ms. AMUTHA GNANA ARASI	PHARMACY	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No mention about the plant selected either in the proposal nor in the presentation. 2. Proposal can be resubmitted with focused work including work done. 3. Not approved : To resubmit. 	50	150	75	NOT APPROVED
22.	Ms. TAMILSELVI	PHARMACY	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Minor change to include two drugs only out of four (Esogabin and Zolpidin) to include in the study. 2. To include Ames test or any test to observe toxicity of degraded molecules . 3. Topic of the study is Approved with minor change 	110	150	75	APPROVED WITH SUGGESTIONS
23.	Ms .SUBHADRA DEVI	PHARMACY	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In vitro antioxidant profiles can be removed. 2. Study can be focused on specific extract based on in vitro results. 3. In vivo experiments chronic alcohol induced and galactosamine model have to be included. 4. The dose of toxicants, specific assays to proof hepatoprotective activity can be emphasized. 5. The project title approved with modifications. 	95	150	75	APPROVED WITH SUGGESTIONS

SI. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	SPECIALITY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	MARKS AWARDED BY THE COMMITTEE			RESULT
				OBTAINED	MAX.	MIN.	
					150	75	
24.	Ms. RUBINA REICHAL	PHARMACY	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proposal can be resubmitted focusing OD preparation, and pharmacokinetic aspects in vitro and in vivo models. 2. Specific drug name has to be given stating rationale for selecting the drugs. 3. Type II diabetic model like zucker rats or obese rats can be used if available. 4. The title of the project has to change appropriately. 5. Not approved : to resubmit 	45	150	75	NOT APPROVED
25.	Mr.SAI KISHORE PALETI	PHARMACY	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The synopsis to resubmit with modification. 2. To include bio availability studies for the synthesized compounds. 3. To delete anti bacterial, in vitro and in vivo antioxidant studies. 4. To fix the specific targets for docking studies. 5. To include specific marker related to cancer growth. For all the studies cur cumin effects has to be compared with synthesized molecules 	55	150	75	NOT APPROVED

SI. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	SPECIALITY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	MARKS AWARDED BY THE COMMITTEE			RESULT
				OBTAINED	MAX.	MIN.	
					150	75	
26.	Mr. SHAIK MOHAMMED KHASIM	PHARMACY	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To resubmit the proposal with new plant or new active phyto constituents. 2. The plants presented acacia catechu and wright a tinctoria already reported for anti cancer activity and several active principles have been identified. 3. Anti cancer activity model has to be focused for specific claim. 4. Project not approved and resubmit with modifications. 	60	150	75	NOT APPROVED
27.	Ms. AMUTHA ISWARYA DEVI	PHARMACY	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The candidate is advised to limit the study to one target. 2. The cell lines should include immortalized human cell line and preferable two cancer cell lines with considerable difference in the levels of the target. 3. In vivo study should be done in nude or SCID mice and not the DMH assay. 4. Should modify proposal and submit; the topic is approved. 	92	150	75	APPROVED WITH SUGGESTIONS

SI. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	SPECIALITY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	MARKS AWARDED BY THE COMMITTEE			RESULT
				OBTAINED	MAX.	MIN.	
					150	75	
28.	Mr. K.C. ARUL PRAKASAM	PHARMACY	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The study need to have intervention followed by follow up study which has not been mentioned in the proposal. 2. The sample size calculation is still in adequate. 3. The candidate needs help of a statistician. 4. The Topic has not been Approved 	55	150	75	NOT APPROVED
29.	MS. B. JAYALAKSHMI	PHARMACY	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The candidate has no knowledge on the biological experiments. 2. No details have been given in methodology Not Approved	52	150	75	NOT APPROVED
30.	Ms. K.SUMATHI	PHARMACY	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In vitro analysis of anti cancer for activity cell lines both cancer and immortalized cells name has to be specified. 2. The candidate has to mention the active principle looking for the activity guided fractionation. 3. The title is approved with minor modification. 	95	150	75	APPROVED WITH SUGGESTIONS

SI. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	SPECIALITY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	MARKS AWARDED BY THE COMMITTEE			RESULT
				OBTAINED	MAX.	MIN.	
					150	75	
31.	Ms. DEVI	PHARMACY	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Target can be narrow down to one specific target. 2. Many different scaffolds chemical molecules can be synthesized to address the target inhibition for anti TB activity. 3. The title is Approved. 	107	150	75	APPROVED WITH SUGGESTIONS
32.	Ms. SURYA	PHARMACY	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Candidate can restrict to one specific reliable target 2. The number of scaffolds can be increased to target the enzyme. 3. Enzyme specific assays has to be performed before going for end point assays. 4. The title has been approved with minor modification. 	102	150	75	APPROVED WITH SUGGESTIONS
33.	Mr. D. SAKTHIVEL	PHARMACY	Topic is Approved.	105	150	75	APPROVED

SI. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	SPECIALITY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	MARKS AWARDED BY THE COMMITTEE			RESULT
				OBTAINED	MAX.	MIN.	
					150	75	
34.	Mr.V.BASKAR ANANDA RAJ	PHARMACY	<p>1. The specificity of animal model to screen psoriasis to include.</p> <p>2. The phytochemical standardization of the herbs has to be done.</p> <p>3. The proposed plants anti psoriasis activity already been published.</p> <p>4. The candidate has poor scientific integrity.</p> <p>5. Not Approved.</p> <p>6. This candidate had published the work on Girotia moluccana bark in the journal Int J Pharmaceutical Research and Development, 2012; Vol.4:148-154. He has also another publication on Givotia moluccana leaves in the journal Int J Pharmacognosy and Pyto chemical Research, 2012; Vol.4:74-78. The micro-colour photographs used in both publications is the same, although they refer to 2 different work.</p> <p>This indicates a dishonest and poor integrity in the candidate. When questioned he did not deny it.</p> <p>Copies of both publications are enclosed. The articles can also be assessed online.</p>	45	150	75	NOT APPROVED

SI. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	SPECIALITY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	MARKS AWARDED BY THE COMMITTEE			RESULT
				OBTAINED	MAX.	MIN.	
					150	75	
35.	Mr. P.GIRIRAJ	PHARMACY	Absent	--	--	--	AAA
36.	Mr. SIRAJUDHEEN MUKRIUAN KALLUNGAL	PHARMACY	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The candidate is advised to choose 2 drugs which are currently in use and which have short half life, as well as not having impediments to the study (eg. Light sensitive nature of nifedipine). He should have in vivo studies done to evaluate drug levels in suitable animal model. Topic Approved. 	85	150	75	APPROVED WITH SUGGESTIONS
37.	Mr. P.P. NASEEF	PHARMACY	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The candidate can choose one of the 5 ht3 antagonist. He should evaluate drug levels in a suitable animal model, after applying the TDDS Topic Approved. 	97	150	75	APPROVED WITH SUGGESTIONS
38.	Mr. GAURAV PANDIT SONAJE	PHARMACY	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The study is poorly focused; does not have details. The study proposed requires proper characterization which may be difficult in the current situation. Not Approved. <p>He will need to be attached to an Institution prior to submitting the proposal. A bonafide certificate needs to be produced.</p>	55	150	75	NOT APPROVED
39.	Mr .SHAH DARSHIT BHARATKUMAR	PHARMACY	Topic Approved.	125	150	75	APPROVED

SI. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	SPECIALITY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	MARKS AWARDED BY THE COMMITTEE			RESULT
				OBTAINED	MAX.	MIN.	
					150	75	
40.	Mr. S. ARAMUDAN	PHARMACY	Topic Approved.	116	150	75	APPROVED
41.	Mr. A. VASANTHAN	PHARMACY	Absent	--	--	--	AAA
42.	Dr.M.S. SENTHIL KUMAR (UNDERGOING M.Ch. & Ph.D. UNDER DUAL DEGREE SYSTEM)	ENDOCRINE SURGERY	Topic Approved.	80	150	75	APPROVED
43.	Dr.K. POONGKODI (UNDERGOING M.Ch. & Ph.D. UNDER DUAL DEGREE SYSTEM)	ENDOCRINE SURGERY	Topic Approved.	80	150	75	APPROVED
44.	Ms. R. VIJAYALAKSHMI	NURSING	Re submit. To reframe the sentences to carry correct meaning in the topic objective of the study and aims. 1.Topic of pelvic floor management is not apt & to be changed. 2. Pelvic floor well being is not correct terminology to be changed to healthy pelvic floor. 3. The pelvic floor exercises are not adequate. To prepare well and come. 4. Sample size should be more than 150 in each group. 5. pelvic floor disorder to be changed to dysfunction. 6. video assisted teaching is it positive?	--	150	75	NOT APPROVED

SI. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	SPECIALITY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	MARKS AWARDED BY THE COMMITTEE			RESULT
				OBTAINED	MAX.	MIN.	
					150	75	
45.	Ms. K. MANONMANI	NURSING	<p>Re submit. To reframe the study and come with clear ideas <u>Suggestions made:-</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the topic instead of community based, changed is to be family based. 2. Method of study: Instead of advising the diabetic patients every week regarding diet attitude. Exercises, all should be done in one sitting and post test. regarding improvement should be done after one month and again after Three months. 3. Instructor should undergo training in counseling, exercise programme before hand. <p>Minimum sample size advised is 250 diabetic instead of 125</p>	--	150	75	NOT APPROVED
46.	Ms. D. ANANDHI	NURSING	<p>Not Approved. Topic of the study to be changed as the Nursing intervention are not going to alter much.</p>	--	150	75	NOT APPROVED

SI. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	SPECIALITY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	MARKS AWARDED BY THE COMMITTEE			RESULT
				OBTAINED	MAX.	MIN.	
					150	75	
47.	Ms.JOSE EAPEN JOLLY CECILY	NURSING	<p>Approved. <u>Suggested alteration:-</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To increase the sample size to 300 2. In exclusion criteria to add the TAH with BSO Total Abodominal Histerectmic with Bilateral Salpingo Wopherectomy 3. To teach all at one sitting instead of splitting it into three with post test interval at one month, three months and six months. 	90	150	75	APPROVED WITH SUGGESTIONS
48.	Ms. S. BHAGAVATHY	NURSING	<p>Not Approved – To resubmit To prepare adequately and come</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To include one more variable - practice apart from knowledge and attitude 2. To gain adequate knowledge about breast diseases before starting. 3. To teach all at once after the pre-test not in parts. 	--	150	75	NOT APPROVED
49.	Ms. J JEAYAREKA	NURSING	<p>Re submit.</p> <p>Feasibility of the study is questionable To select some other subject. Sample selection is quite difficult.</p>	--	150	75	NOT APPROVED

SI. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	SPECIALITY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	MARKS AWARDED BY THE COMMITTEE			RESULT
				OBTAINED	MAX.	MIN.	
					150	75	
50.	Ms.SUSAN MATHEW	NURSING	Re submit. To study only In homogenous (Focussed) group. Resubmit with concrete proposal comprehensive integrated health model is not upto the standard	--	150	75	NOT APPROVED
51.	Ms. M. VETRISELVI	NURSING	Not Approved. To get Ethical Committee clearance before starting the study.	--	150	75	NOT APPROVED
52.	Dr.C.S.MANI	SURGICAL ONCOLOGY	Excellent presentation. Good Work. Clear ideas, Feasibility (Fund) also positive. Already preliminary work has been done and co-ordinating with other centres for genetic and molecular studies will throw light on the idea. To select different co-guide from the surgical Department.	137	150	75	APPROVED WITH SUGGESTIONS
53.	Ms. G.SHOBANA	NURSING	Resubmit To come with feasible asanas (yoga) for menopausal women. To resubmit with clear proposals.	--	150	75	NOT APPROVED
54.	Ms. MARYAM GHAUBARI ANDARIEH	NURSING	Resubmit To select a study that will be done exclusively in Tamil Nadu. Resubmit with fresh proposal To complete State Nursing Council Registration.	--	150	75	NOT APPROVED

SI. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	SPECIALITY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	MARKS AWARDED BY THE COMMITTEE			RESULT
				OBTAINED	MAX.	MIN.	
					150	75	
55.	Mr. M.BASKARAN	NURSING	Resubmit with fresh proposal. To have a focused study either on boys or girls students. To focus on three criteria for mental health instead of six mentioned.	--	150	75	NOT APPROVED
56.	Ms.T.JAYADEEPA	NURSING	To Submit fresh proposal. Proposal lacks concept and not able to explain clearly what makes relief.	--	150	75	NOT APPROVED
57.	Ms. B.ANNAPOORANI	NURSING	Resubmit Feasibility is questionable. To Take different topic.	--	150	75	NOT APPROVED
58.	Ms. V. SANTHI LETHA	NURSING	Resubmit Hypothetical proposals cannot be cleared. Concept does not hold any clear ideas.	--	150	75	NOT APPROVED
59.	Ms.T.JOHSY RANI	NURSING	Resubmit To study the topic adequately.	--	150	75	NOT APPROVED

APPROVED WITH SUGGESTIONS

:CANDIDATES ARE INSTRUCTED TO SUBMIT THE COMPLIANCE REPORT THROUGH THE GUIDE ON OR BEFORE 24-12-2012.

NOT APPROVED

:CANDIDATES ARE INSTRUCTED TO SUBMIT PROPOSALS (FOUR COPIES) THROUGH THE GUIDE WITHIN ONE MONTH FROM THE DATE OF PUBLICATION OF THIS RESULTS.

NOTE: ALL THE SERVICE CANDIDATES ARE INSTRUCTED TO SUBMIT THE CONSENT OF THE DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL EDUCATION AS PER THE Ph.D. REGULATIONS 2010.

**Sd/-
VICE-CHANCELLOR.**

