

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

**RESULT OF THE Ph.D. SCREENING COMMITTEE – JANUARY 2013 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. K.BARANEEDHARAN	DIABETOLOGY	Topic of the study is “ <b>APPROVED</b> ”	85	150	75	<b>APPROVED</b>
02.	Dr. SHEILA JOHN	OPHTHALMOLOGY	Topic of the study is “ <b>APPROVED</b> ”	92	150	75	<b>APPROVED</b>
03.	Dr. K.SATHIYA	OTORHINOLARYNGOLOGY	Topic of the study is “ <b>APPROVED</b> ”	124	150	75	<b>APPROVED</b>
04.	Dr. KIRAN NATARAJAN	OTORHINOLARYNGOLOGY	Topic of the study is “ <b>APPROVED WITH MODIFICATIONS IN THE TITLE</b> ” .  <b>TITLE : METABOLIC SYNDROME AND HYPOTHYROIDISM IN OBSTRUCTIVE SLEEP APNOEA SYNDROME.</b>	112	150	75	<b>APPROVED</b>
05.	Mr. R.RANJITH	ALLIED HEALTH SCIENCES - AUDIOLOGY	Topic of the study is “ <b>APPROVED</b> ”	107	150	75	<b>APPROVED</b>
06.	Dr. SIDHARTHA GIRI	MICROBIOLOGY	Topic of the study is “ <b>APPROVED</b> ”	111	150	75	<b>APPROVED</b>

SI. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	SPECIALITY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	MARKS AWARDED BY THE COMMITTEE			RESULT
				OBTAINED	MAX.	MIN.	
					150	75	
07.	Dr. IRA PRAHARAJ	MICROBIOLOGY	Topic of the study is “ <b>APPROVED</b> ”.	112	150	75	<b>APPROVED</b>
08.	Dr. RUPASRI DUTT ROY	PHYSIOLOGY	<p>Topic of the study is “<b>APPROVED</b>”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Animal ethical committee clearance letter to be submitted;</li> <li>➤ Permission letter from Sri Ramachandra Medical College to do Ph.D. work should be submitted;</li> <li>➤ Drug Profile, duration and observation of the study on mice to be clearly mentioned;</li> <li>➤ To be reviewed by Pharmacologist for approval since the work involves new drug dose related activities.</li> </ul>	78	150	75	<b>APPROVED WITH SUGGESTIONS</b>
09.	Ms. ANITA AMALADAS	BIOCHEMISTRY	Topic of the study is “ <b>APPROVED</b> ” after verifying the corrections suggested earlier.	123	150	75	<b>APPROVED</b>
10.	Ms. C.RUBINA REICHAL	PHARMACY	Topic of the study is “ <b>APPROVED</b> ” with a condition to submit the renewal certificate of CPCSEA of Ministry of Environment & Forests, Animal Welfare Division, New Delhi.	92	150	75	<b>APPROVED WITH SUGGESTIONS</b>

SI. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	SPECIALITY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	MARKS AWARDED BY THE COMMITTEE			RESULT
				OBTAINED	MAX.	MIN.	
					150	75	
11.	Ms. M.A.AMUTHA GNANA ARASI	PHARMACY	Topic of the study is “ <b>APPROVED</b> ” with a condition to submit the renewal certificate of CPCSEA of Ministry of Environment & Forests, Animal Welfare Division, New Delhi.	93	150	75	<b>APPROVED WITH SUGGESTIONS</b>
12.	Mr. SAI KISHORE PALETI	PHARMACY	Topic of the study is “ <b>APPROVED</b> ” with a condition to submit the renewal certificate of CPCSEA of Ministry of Environment & Forests, Animal Welfare Division, New Delhi.	100	150	75	<b>APPROVED WITH SUGGESTIONS</b>
13.	Mr. SHAIK MOHD. KHASIM	PHARMACY	Topic of the study is “ <b>APPROVED</b> ” with a condition to submit the renewal certificate of CPCSEA of Ministry of Environment & Forests, Animal Welfare Division, New Delhi.	87	150	75	<b>APPROVED WITH SUGGESTIONS</b>
14.	Mr. J.RAMESH	PHARMACY	Topic of the study is “ <b>APPROVED</b> ”	98	150	75	<b>APPROVED</b>
15.	Ms. N.B.SANTHA SHEELA	PHARMACY	Topic of the study is “ <b>APPROVED</b> ”.	95	150	75	<b>APPROVED</b>

SI. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	SPECIALITY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	MARKS AWARDED BY THE COMMITTEE			RESULT
				OBTAINED	MAX.	MIN.	
					150	75	
16.	Mr. VIJAY SHAMRAOJI BORKAR	PHARMACY	<p>Topic of the study is “<b>NOT APPROVED</b>”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ To re-submit with focused work.</li> <li>➤ The title has to be changed and should reflect the work associated with it, since the preliminary Phytochemical &amp; Pharmacological evaluation of both plants have been reported.</li> <li>➤ The candidate should specify the extraction procedure, type of extracts, isolation of new compounds etc., and not dwell on preliminary levels.</li> </ul>	60	150	75	<b>NOT APPROVED</b>
17.	Ms. D.AKILADEVI	PHARMACY	Topic of the study is “ <b>APPROVED</b> ”.	105	150	75	<b>APPROVED</b>

SI. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	SPECIALITY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	MARKS AWARDED BY THE COMMITTEE			RESULT
				OBTAINED	MAX.	MIN.	
					150	75	
18.	Mr. V.DHANAPAL	PHARMACY	Topic of the study is “ <b>APPROVED</b> ”.	91	150	75	<b>APPROVED</b>
19.	Mr. B.EDWIN JOSE	PHARMACY	Topic of the study is “ <b>NOT APPROVED</b> ”.  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Title not appropriate, No focus;</li> <li>➤ Methodology, Plan of study has to be re-written.</li> <li>➤ To re-submit.</li> </ul>	55	150	75	<b>NOT APPROVED</b>
20.	Mr. SABARI SENTHIL	PHARMACY	Topic of the study is “ <b>NOT APPROVED</b> ”.  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Title to be changed;</li> <li>➤ Work focus;</li> <li>➤ Methodology, Plan of study has to be re-written.</li> <li>➤ To re-submit.</li> </ul>	55	150	75	<b>NOT APPROVED</b>
21.	Mr. S.JEBASEELAN	PHARMACY	Topic of the study is “ <b>APPROVED</b> ”.	96	150	75	<b>APPROVED</b>
22.	Ms. G.NALINI	PHARMACY	Topic of the study is “ <b>APPROVED</b> ”.	97	150	75	<b>APPROVED</b>
23.	Mr. GAURAV PANDIT SONAJE	PHARMACY	Topic of the study is “ <b>APPROVED</b> ” with the following condition. Letter of Memorandum of Understanding from IIT-Chennai for using Electron Microscopy and higher facilities.	79	150	75	<b>APPROVED WITH SUGGESTIONS</b>

Sl. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	SPECIALITY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	MARKS AWARDED BY THE COMMITTEE			RESULT
				OBTAINED	MAX.	MIN.	
					150	75	
24.	Ms. K.SONIA	PHARMACY	<p>Topic of the study is “<b>NOT APPROVED</b>”.</p> <p>To re-submit with</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Change of Title;</li> <li>➤ Work focus;</li> <li>➤ Clear methodology;</li> <li>➤ Drugs combination to be narrowed down.</li> </ul>	54	150	75	<b>NOT APPROVED</b>
25.	Mr. V.BASKAR ANANDA RAJ	PHARMACY	Topic of the study is “ <b>APPROVED</b> ”.	89	150	75	<b>APPROVED</b>
26.	Ms. MARYAM GHANBARI ANDARIEH	NURSING	<p><b>Topic of the study is “APPROVED” and advised to incorporate below said suggestions.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ The statement of the problem to be reframed as “ A study to assess the prevalence and evaluate the effectiveness of selected nursing care protocols in bio-chemical variables and possible conception among women with ovulatory disorders in selected settings, Chennai.</li> <li>✓ The objectives to be reframed based on objectives;</li> <li>✓ Application based operational definition to be formulated;</li> </ul>	96	150	75	<b>APPROVED WITH SUGGESTIONS</b>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>✓ Order of operational definition should be based on statement of problem;</li><li>✓ Screening for ovulatory disorders to be carried out;</li><li>✓ Influence of extraneous variables should be noted;</li><li>✓ Type of exercise, type of diet-follow up to be done;</li><li>✓ Inclusion and Exclusion criteria to be mentioned;</li><li>✓ Period of study to be done at least for one year;</li><li>✓ Tool should be formulated for assessing variables;</li><li>✓ Setting for experimental and control group can be different.</li></ul>				
--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

SI. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	SPECIALITY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	MARKS AWARDED BY THE COMMITTEE			RESULT
				OBTAINED	MAX.	MIN.	
					150	75	
27.	Ms. BHAGAVATHY	NURSING	<p>Topic of the study is “APPROVED” and suggested to incorporate below said suggestions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Breast Diseases is a vague term. Try to limit to few diseases;</li> <li>✓ Female is a gender. Change the term either women (menopausal) or adolescent;</li> <li>✓ Assessment of risk factors – Method to be detailed;</li> <li>✓ Practice on Breast Self Examination – Not mentioned in the statement;</li> <li>✓ What practice can be done on breast diseases?</li> <li>✓ The statement to be reframed as “ An experimental study to evaluate the effectiveness of technology enabled learning Programme on Knowledge on prevention of selected breast diseases and practice on BSE among women in selected setting” Thiruvallur District”</li> <li>✓ How &amp; why attitude is expected to be changed related to breast diseases?</li> <li>✓ Variability of age is too vast (15-50 years). It should be limited.</li> </ul>	103	150	75	APPROVED WITH SUGGESTIONS



28.	Ms. SUSAN MATHEW	NURSING	<p><b>Topic of the study is “APPROVED” with a request to incorporate the below mentioned suggestions.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ <b>The statement to be reframed as “ An experimental study to evaluate the effectiveness of an integrated Nursing care package on selected bio-physiological and psycho-social variables of children of people living which HIV in selected setting, Chennai”.</b></li> <li>✓ <b>Health status is too vague to assess all domains.</b></li> <li>✓ <b>Limit to Bio-Physiological and Psycho-social variables;</b></li> <li>✓ <b>Objectives &amp; Hypothesis to be reframed based on the revised statement;</b></li> <li>✓ <b>Co-relation can be done among variables;</b></li> <li>✓ <b>Method of sample selection need to be detailed;</b></li> <li>✓ <b>Sample size calculation to be done;</b></li> <li>✓ <b>Tool has to be developed in consistence with the statement.</b></li> </ul>	88	150	75	<b>APPROVED WITH SUGGESTIONS</b>
-----	------------------	---------	--	----	-----	----	----------------------------------

SI. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	SPECIALITY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	MARKS AWARDED BY THE COMMITTEE			RESULT
				OBTAINED	MAX.	MIN.	
					150	75	
29.	Mrs. J.JEYAREKA	NURSING	<p>Topic of the study is “APPROVED” with a request to incorporate the below mentioned suggestions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Title to include “ girls”;</li> <li>✓ To recalculate sample size based on the expected outcome which should be a quantitative variable based on stress &amp; coping;</li> <li>✓ To describe the intervention clearly - what tools will be used at what frequency and whether individually or in groups;</li> <li>✓ Post-test evaluation should be done after 4-6 months;</li> <li>✓ To ensure that all the scales used have been validated and standardized for use in India;</li> <li>✓ To involve clinical psychologist and psychiatrist in the development and refinement of the tools.</li> </ul>	102	150	75	<b>APPROVED WITH SUGGESTIONS</b>

30.	Mrs. K.MANONMANI	NURSING	<p><b>Topic of the study is “APPROVED” with a request to incorporate the below mentioned suggestions.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Reframe the statement “An experimental study to evaluate the effectiveness of family based education on life style pattern among people living with Diabetes Mellitus in selected settings, Chennai”</li> <li>✓ ‘Client’ – the term should be removed;</li> <li>✓ Life style pattern to be added instead of Life style modifications;</li> <li>✓ Post –test scores can be associated with Demographic variables;</li> <li>✓ Life style cannot be changed in 30 days, atleast one year is needed to change or modify the life style;</li> <li>✓ Sample size calculation to be done;</li> <li>✓ Matching of experimental and control group to be done;</li> <li>✓ Modify the objectives and hypothesis based on revised statement.</li> </ul>	93	150	75	<b>APPROVED WITH SUGGESTIONS</b>
-----	------------------	---------	--	----	-----	----	----------------------------------

SI. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	SPECIALITY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	MARKS AWARDED BY THE COMMITTEE			RESULT
				OBTAINED	MAX.	MIN.	
					150	75	
31.	Mrs. R.VIJAYALAKSHMI	NURSING	<p><b>Topic of Study is Approved.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Reframe the statement – “An experimental study to evaluate the effectiveness of an interventional package on pelvic floor muscle strength and knowledge among women with pelvic floor dysfunction at selected settings, Thiruvallur Dist.</li> <li>✓ Reframe objectives and Hypothesis.</li> <li>✓ Sample size calculation to be done.</li> <li>✓ Attitude need not be assessed since the necessity is minimal.</li> <li>✓ Feasibility of inclusion criteria to be checked</li> </ul>	108	150	75	<b>APPROVED WITH SUGGESTIONS</b>
32.	Mrs. G.SHOBANA	NURSING	---	---	---	---	<b>WITHHOLD</b>
33.	Ms. JOHNSY RANI	NURSING	---	---	---	---	<b>WITHHOLD</b>
34.	Mrs. V.SANTHI LATHA	NURSING	---	---	---	---	<b>WITHHOLD</b>
35.	Mrs. B.ANNAPOORANI	NURSING	---	---	---	---	<b>WITHHOLD</b>
36.	Mrs. D.SHAKILA	NURSING	---	---	---	---	<b>WITHHOLD</b>

Sl. No.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	SPECIALITY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	MARKS AWARDED BY THE COMMITTEE			RESULT
				OBTAINED		MIN.	
						75	
37.	Mrs. D.ANANDHI	NURSING	---	---	---	---	WITHHOLD
38.	Mr. M.BASKARAN	NURSING	---	---	---	---	WITHHOLD

**APPROVED**

: CANDIDATES ARE INSTRUCTED TO SUBMIT THE JOINING REPORT THROUGH THE GUIDE WITHIN 10 WORKING DAYS FROM THE DATE OF PUBLICATION OF THIS RESULT.

**APPROVED WITH SUGGESTIONS**

: CANDIDATES ARE INSTRUCTED TO SUBMIT THE COMPLIANCE REPORT THROUGH THE GUIDE ON OR BEFORE 08.04.2013.

**NOT APPROVED**

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

**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.