THE TAMIL NADU DR. M.G.R. MEDICAL UNIVERSITY, CHENNAI

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (Ph.D.)

SCREENING COMMITTEE RESULT – JANUARY 2015 SESSION

S.NO.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	SPECIALITY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	RESULT
01	DR. CHIBULE SANJAY KASHINATHJI MAYATAI	SURGICAL SPECIALITIES	❖ Advised to make Registration with National Apex Committee, New Delhi	ACCEPTED WITH RECOMMENDATION
02	DR. RAMARAJU KARTHIKEYAN	MEDICAL SPECIALITIES	❖ Common Antibiotic Policy for COPD exacerbation ❖ Inhaled corticosteroid safety card to be issued ❖ AECOPD with diabetes - steroids could be IV Methyl prednisolone or Deflazacort	ACCEPTED
03	DR. SRIDHARAN A	MEDICAL SPECIALITIES		ACCEPTED
04	DR. PADMAVATHY R	BASIC MEDICAL SCIENCES	❖ There is a need to compare with controls to clearly elucidate the role of HPV in causing breast cancer ❖ There is no need for sequencing the product. Since, genotype specific primers are being used, the tissue may be processed separately with each genotype specific primers ❖ Please include other risk factors such as family history smoking, etc ❖ E6 and E7 in mRNA expression can be measured to identity the HPV association ❖ Modify Random case selection. Specify especially exclusion criteria ❖ True cut Bx specimen may be nonspecific and inadequate ❖ Control esp. Negative samples study to be included	ACCEPTED WITH RECOMMENDATION

THE TAMIL NADU DR. M.G.R. MEDICAL UNIVERSITY, CHENNAI

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (Ph.D.)

SCREENING COMMITTEE RESULT – JANUARY 2015 SESSION

S.NO.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	SPECIALITY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	RESULT
			❖ E6, E7 gene product expression assessment. A specific marker for HPV activity how to assess ❖ ER/PR/Her2-neu receptor correlation – No quantitative method described. Hence suggested observation by a panel of specialists (minimum 3)	
05	MS. LORRAINE V MARY ROCHA	BASIC SCIENCES	❖ Candidate does not have experience in CD34 cell separation. ❖ Methodology presented is different from that submitted to university. ❖ Candidate has not yet clarified the tracers to be selected. ❖ The follow up duration and criteria is not clear. ❖ The bone marrow harvesting methodology not familiar. ❖ Stem cell manipulation (separate labelling, etc.) not elaborated.	NOT ACCEPTED
06	MR. PARANDHAMAN A	BASIC SCIENCES	❖ Title to include cytogenetic abnormalities in mentally challenged children with or without physical disability. ❖ To exclude metabolic screening. ❖ To add maternal and perinatal history in Proforma ❖ Asphyxiated children to be in exclusion criteria	ACCEPTED WITH RECOMMENDATION
07	MS. GUNJA GUPTA	BASIC SCIENCES	❖ Study should include region matched controls for comparison	ACCEPTED WITH RECOMMENDATION

THE TAMIL NADU DR. M.G.R. MEDICAL UNIVERSITY, CHENNAI

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (Ph.D.)

SCREENING COMMITTEE RESULT – JANUARY 2015 SESSION

S.NO.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	SPECIALITY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	RESULT
08	MS. ANNA VARGHESE	BASIC SCIENCES		ACCEPTED
09	MR. MOHAMATHU RAFIC K	BASIC SCIENCES		ACCEPTED
10	MR. SATHISH KUMAR	BASIC SCIENCES		ACCEPTED
11	MR. EBENEZER SUMAN BABU S	BASIC SCIENCES		ACCEPTED
12	MR. REBECCA MONOHAR	BASIC SCIENCES	❖ The investigator mentioned that bit of iris tissue is removed during cataract surgery in Institution. Is it a regular procedure done in all patients (or) only in patients under study needs clarification . If it is so has it been put forth to Ethics Committees for approval? Needs clarification	ACCEPTED WITH RECOMMENDATION
13	MS. SARANYA V	BASIC SCIENCES		ACCEPTED
14	MR. SANTHOSH KUMAR D	BASIC SCIENCES		ACCEPTED
15	MS. DHIVIYA PRABAA	BASIC SCIENCES		ACCEPTED
16	MR. ANAND K	BASIC SCIENCES		ACCEPTED
17	MS. VEENA VADHINI R	BASIC SCIENCES		ACCEPTED
18	MS. NITHYA B	BASIC SCIENCES		ABSENT
19	MR. HEMANTH KUMAR	BASIC SCIENCES	❖ Focus on AML ❖ Choose appropriate cell lines ❖ Do targeted resequencing for known mutations associated with drug resistance; needs to be done on presentation sample, followed by samples at the end of 2nd cycle and at relapse. ❖ Correlate data with survival ❖ Try to establish primary leukaemia & leukaemia stromal cell lines ❖ Modify title to reflect Bone marrow microenvironment	ACCEPTED WITH RECOMMENDATION

THE TAMIL NADU DR. M.G.R. MEDICAL UNIVERSITY, CHENNAI

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (Ph.D.)

SCREENING COMMITTEE RESULT – JANUARY 2015 SESSION

S.NO.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	SPECIALITY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	RESULT
20	DR. SHYAMALA RAJKUMAR	SIDDHA	❖ The title of the Topic to be changed as KARUPPAI NAR THASI KATTY	ACCEPTED WITH RECOMMENDATION
21	MR. MAHESH M	PHARMACY	❖ Suggested that compound characterization need to be done simultaneously ❖ Choose anti malarial activity as the focus compare with one existing drug ❖ To avoid plagiarism while submitting proposal modify the proposal	ACCEPTED WITH RECOMMENDATION
22	MS. DHANALAKSHMI S	PHARMACY	Compound characterization to be done, simultaneously ❖ To focus on anti malarial activity ❖ To avoid plagiarism while submitting proposal modify the proposal	ACCEPTED WITH RECOMMENDATION
23	MR. THIRUMALAI V	PHARMACY	❖ Project and candidate not suited for faculty of Pharmacy. ❖ Advised – Basic Sciences faculty in a suitable centre including a Medical College	NOT ACCEPTED
24	MR. KAMALAKANNAN D	PHARMACY	❖ Impurity characterization to be done after forced degradation studies for the selected drugs.	ACCEPTED WITH RECOMMENDATION
25	MS. DHANALAKSHMI M	PHARMACY	❖ Mention what biomarkers will be identified through RTPCR, flow cytometry & Western Blot	ACCEPTED WITH RECOMMENDATION
26	MR. JAMBULINGAM M	PHARMACY	Suggestion sequence of work : In silico first →Synthesis → Bio- evaluation ▪ For biological evaluation of MTB please check the methods → LJ medium not be the best. PCR methods may be more suitable	ACCEPTED WITH RECOMMENDATION
27	MR. MRINMOY GAUTAM	PHARMACY		ACCEPTED

THE TAMIL NADU DR. M.G.R. MEDICAL UNIVERSITY, CHENNAI

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (Ph.D.)

SCREENING COMMITTEE RESULT – JANUARY 2015 SESSION

S.NO.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	SPECIALITY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	RESULT
28	MS. LAVANYA V	PHARMACY		ACCEPTED
29	MR. ARULANANDHAM A	PHARMACY	❖ Need to Homogenize the group ❖ Confounders like ▪ Food (Diet ▪ Exercise To be taken care of	ACCEPTED WITH RECOMMENDATION
30	MR. PANKAJ KUMAR	PHARMACY	❖ Details of methodology to be included ❖ References to be properly written ❖ Ethical committee recommendation and In vivo experiment methods	ACCEPTED WITH RECOMMENDATION
31	MR. PANKAJ BHATEJA	PHARMACY	❖ Details of methodology need to be clearly spelt out especially In vivo & stability status ❖ Animal ethics committee recommendation to be enclosed	ACCEPTED WITH RECOMMENDATION
32	MR.NATHE KIRAN RAMESH	PHARMACY		ACCEPTED
33	MS. LEENA J	NURSING	The applicant (investigator) has not submitted even basic information regarding the study ❖ Method of assessment of pre-intervention knowledge status is **not** furnished ❖ Methodology of intervention **not** discussed at all ❖ Post intervention assessment methods **NOT** mentioned The proposal lacks even the basic requirements of research	NOT ACCEPTED

THE TAMIL NADU DR. M.G.R. MEDICAL UNIVERSITY, CHENNAI

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (Ph.D.)

SCREENING COMMITTEE RESULT – JANUARY 2015 SESSION

S.NO.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	SPECIALITY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	RESULT
34	MS. RUFA MITSU	NURSING		ACCEPTED
35	MS. ASHA PACKIA LET	NURSING	❖ Definition of diabetes / Pre- diabetes needs clarification ❖ Fasting blood sugar of up to 130 mg/dl is included as pre diabetes ❖ Anecdotal experience of benefit of a herb – in one individual cannot form basis for a Ph.D research	NOT ACCEPTED
36	MS.VIJILA BERLIN SELVARAJ	NURSING	Following points need clarification / explanation ❖ Has the 'eye exercise intervention' of the study been validated? if so, by whom? ❖ Definition of 'responder', 'partial responder' and 'non-responder' to vision therapy ❖ The potential confounders – duration of TV / Computer watching, naturally occurring changers in refraction during study period (it can happen in children) / etc., have to be studied A pilot study may be conducted as mentioned in the discussion which would standardise and validate 'vision therapy' intervention	NOT ACCEPTED

THE TAMIL NADU DR. M.G.R. MEDICAL UNIVERSITY, CHENNAI

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (Ph.D.)

SCREENING COMMITTEE RESULT – JANUARY 2015 SESSION

S.NO.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	SPECIALITY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	RESULT
37	MS. REENA M	NURSING	❖ The study question (Indian perspective of blood donation behaviours) involves behavioural aspects of community. Hence, sampling the study population has to be broad based, should have adequate sample size encompassing all age categories ❖ More documentation of behavioural pattern has been done in many previous studies.	NOT ACCEPTED
38	MS. BANUMATHI K	NURSING		ACCEPTED
39	MS. GOMATHI V	NURSING	The investigator has not submitted even the basic information of the study ❖ How 'child agent' will be selected ❖ How the 'child agent' will be trained? ❖ Pre and post intervention questionnaire ❖ How the children's responses will be validated	NOT ACCEPTED
40	MS. JERIN KUMAR	NURSING	The following issues have to be clarified: ❖ Identifying 'ideal' gatekeeper (School ? College Teachers) ❖ Is training the 'gate keeper' for a duration specified in the proposal enough? (identifying 'suicidal ideation' signs warrants more training) ❖ Teachers in schools/colleges are identified as 'gate keepers'. How to ensure they would have enough time to counsel/identify suicidal warning signs among their students?	NOT ACCEPTED

THE TAMIL NADU DR. M.G.R. MEDICAL UNIVERSITY, CHENNAI

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (Ph.D.)

SCREENING COMMITTEE RESULT – JANUARY 2015 SESSION

S.NO.	NAME OF THE CANDIDATE	SPECIALITY	REMARKS OF THE SCREENING COMMITTEE	RESULT
41	MS. SUGANTHI D	NURSING	❖ Sample size to be estimated with power analysis ❖ Hypotheses to be devised in according to objectives ❖ Randomization plan to be selected by the context manager ❖ Type of cerebral palsy may be opted as a matching variable ❖ Matching should be done also on the basis of prior training received	ACCEPTED WITH RECOMMENDATION
42	MS. JASMIN SHYLAJA H	NURSING		ACCEPTED
43	MS. STELLA MARY I	NURSING		ACCEPTED
44	MS. FEMILA P	NURSING	❖ For this candidate, Guide & Co-Guide are from Erode, while she is doing her Ph.D. work at Neyyoor, Kanyakumari. ❖ Therefore, another Co-Guide from Neyyoor is required before the registration ❖ Ethical committee composition & approval - Not as per national recommendations	ACCEPTED
45	MS. ANGEL PRIYA T	NURSING	❖ Guide & Co-Guide are from Erode, which the candidate is from Kanyakumari. Suggested that a co-Guide is from Kanyakumari (Nagarcoil) ❖ Ethical committee composition & approval - Not as per national norms	ACCEPTED

THE TAMIL NADU DR. M.G.R. MEDICAL UNIVERSITY, CHENNAI

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (Ph.D.)

SCREENING COMMITTEE RESULT – JANUARY 2015 SESSION

ACCEPTED:	CANDIDATES ARE INSTRUCTED TO SUBMIT THE JOINING REPORT THROUGH THE GUIDE WITHIN 10 WORKING DAYS FROM THE DATE OF PUBLICATION OF THE RESULT ALONG WITH THE NECESSARY FEES.
ACCEPTED WITH RECOMMENDATION:	CANDIDATES ARE INSTRUCTED TO SUBMIT THE COMPLIANCE REPORT THROUGH THE GUIDE ON OR BEFORE 31.08.2015
NOT ACCEPTED:	CANDIDATES ARE INSTRUCTED TO SUBMIT PROPOSALS (FOUR COPIES) THROUGH THE GUIDE WITHIN THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF PUBLICATION OF THIS RESULT.