## IRB AND IEC MEET - 18/01/2018

## MINUTES OF THE MEETING.

The Institutional Review Board and Institutional Ethical Committee meet held on 18/01/2018 was attended by the following members:

- PRINCIPAL Dr.Saravanakumar
- Member secretary, IEC Dr. Pratebha
- Member secretary, IRB Dr. Yuvraj
- Internal member- Dr.P.S.Manoharan

External expert Members –

- Dr.M.S.Muthu, Prof&Head, Pedodontics,SRMC, Porur,Chennai chairperson, IEC
- Dr.Gopi Chander, Prof, Prosthodontics, SRM Dental college, Ramapuram, Chennai Clinician member, IEC
- Dr.Balamurali, Prof, Oral Pathology, MGPGI- Basic dental scientist
- Mr.Ezhumalai, Statistician, SBV University Senior Statistician
- Mrs.Uma Udayaraj, Layperson member, English professor,KGNC Lay person
- Mrs.Shahin Sultana, Social scientist
- Dr.Anandh Raj, Dept of Gen Pathology, MGMCRI, Basic medical scientist, IEC,

Meeting incharges: Dr.Padmaraj and Dr.Aniruddh

## Objective:

- To review and approve 15 research projects from UG,PG and faculty.
- To offer suggestions and modifications as necessary.
- To finally certify the projects as approved or otherwise

## Proceedings of the meeting:

- The meeting commenced at 10:00 a.m.
- 15 new research proposals from PGs, UGs and faculty of various departments presented their research proposals followed by discussion for 15 minutes each with emphasis on suggestions and any modification if required.
- The projects were critically evaluated and modifications suggested.
- It was decided by the members the modifications suggested are to be scrutinized by internal IRB following which they will be forwarded to the chairperson for approval and certification
- Apart from the 15 protocols there were three projects which were approved earlier but requiring addition of clinical parameters. It was discussed with the chairperson and it was suggested by him to send the protocols along with the rest of the protocols for approval

• After thanking the members of Institutional Review Board, the session came to a close at 2.00 p.m.

| S.no | Department         | Topic   | Presenter   |
|------|--------------------|---|---|
| 1.   | ORAL PATHOLOGY     | ORAL CANDIDA SPECIES ISOLATION AND THEIR<br>ANTIFUNGAL SUSCEPTIBILITY PATTERN IN HIV<br>PATIENTS  | Dr. Gayathri  |
|      | SPEAKER/MEMBER     | QUERIES/ SUGGESTIONS  | Presenter   |
| 1    | Dr.M.S.Muthu       | Are you comparing the medium?is it an objective Can you differentiate the species? Drug for testing efficacy should be confirmed Title translation to tamil in consent form should be understandable Why Kappa statistics? Some form of documentation for data entry should be there. | No,after allowing it to grow in the medium ,isolate the species in non albicans.  Agreement between two methods |
| 2    | Dr.Gopichander     | WHAT IS THE PATIENT BENEFIT?  | Judicious use of antifungal makes the virus resistant.so particular use of antifungals would be required        |
| 3    | Dr.Balamurali      |   |   |
| 4    | Mr.Ezhumalai       | Sample size is based on convenience sampling, Z test may be added to compare % between 2 drugs  | From key article  |
| 5    | Mrs.Uma Udayaraj   |   |   |
| 6    | Dr.Anand           | Title can be modified, so that HIV patients should not be included(Eg:Patients with retroviral +VE), Categorize the species   |   |
| 7    | Dr.Shahin Sultana  | Nomenclature for HIV patients should be changed. Consent form for taking photographs  |   |
| 8    | Dr.R.Saravanakumar |   |   |
| 9    | Dr.Manoharan       | Separate data sheet for collection, Consent form to be paraphrased  |   |
| 10   | Dr.Pratebha        | Consent form should include consent for photographs, change as patients living with HIV/AIDS  |   |
| 11   | Dr.Yuvraj          |   |   |
|      | Final Remarks      | Accept with modifications METHODOLOGY, CONSENT FORM, DRUGS USED AND DATA SHEET should be modified, patients identity to be blinded  | Accepted with modification for both IRB& IEC  |

| S.no | Department | Topic   | Presenter  |
|------|------------|---------|------------|
| 00   | Department | 1 9 510 | i resenter |

| 2  | OMFS               | COMPARISION OF ROPIVACAINE AND BUPIVACAINE   | Dr. Adersh                             |
|----|--------------------|--|--|
|    |                    | IN POSTOPERATIVE PAIN MANAGEMENT FOR OPEN  |  |
|    |                    | REDUCTION OF MANDIBULAR FRACTURE – DOUBLE  |  |
|    |                    | BLINDRANDOMIZED CLINICAL STUDY   |  |
|    | SPEAKER/MEMBER     | QUERIES/ SUGGESTIONS   | Presenter                              |
| 1  | Dr.M.S.Muthu       | Null hypothesis should be changed.CONSORT guidelines should be   | Once GA effect is lost, usually        |
|    |                    | adhered to. CPRM registry should be done. If planning as RCT it  | bupivacaine is given but in this study |
|    |                    | should be checked with CONSORT.  | ropivacaine is given.                  |
|    |                    | Sample of 28 patients in each group should be similar to the other   |  |
|    |                    | group wrt case selection.  |  |
| 2  | Dr.Gopichander     | What type of fracture?how can you group all mandibular fracture into   |  |
|    |                    | one pain scale?  |  |
| 3  | Dr.Balamurali      | VAS is checked in 4 <sup>th</sup> ,6 <sup>th</sup> ,8 <sup>th</sup> hourly, literature review for routine use of |  |
|    |                    | ropivacaine and bupivacaine  |  |
| 4  | Mr.Ezhumalai       | Simple random sampling cannot be used. Randomization can be done   |  |
|    |                    | not Simple random sampling. Write specifically what statistics you are   |  |
|    |                    | going to do and apply randomization procedure  |  |
| 5  | Mrs.Uma Udayaraj   |  |  |
| 6  | Dr.Anand           | What is scale of measurement used  | VAS                                    |
| 7  | Dr.Shahin Sultana  | Study termination should be clearly mentioned.   |  |
| 8  | Dr.R.Saravanakumar |  |  |
| 9  | Dr.Manoharan       | Operator and evaluator is blinded?Complexity of fracture and   |  |
|    |                    | assessment should be done, inclusion criteria to be defined clearly  |  |
| 10 | Dr.Pratebha        | Information and monitoring to the clinical trial committee, sampling   |  |
|    |                    | technique is wrong, RCT should be block randomization  |  |
| 11 | Dr.Yuvraj          |  |  |
|    | Final Remarks      | Accepted with modification, to report to Clinical trial monitoring   |  |
|    |                    | committee. To be scrutinized by Internal review board for  |  |
|    |                    | modifications suggested by the members   |  |

| S.no | Department     | Topic                                   | Presenter   |
|------|----------------|---|-------------|
| 3    | OMFS           | COMPARATIVE STUDY BETWEEN THREE         | Dr.Ranjitha |
|      |                | DIMENSIONAL TITANIUM DOUBLE Y PLATE AND |             |
|      |                | SQUARE PLATE FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF      |             |
|      |                | PARASYMPHYSIS FRACTURE OF MANDIBLE- A   |             |
|      |                | RANDOMISED CONTROLLED TRIAL             |             |
|      | SPEAKER/MEMBER | QUERIES/ SUGGESTIONS                    | Presenter   |

| 1  | Dr.M.S.Muthu       | Is this randomized controlled trial? If so CTR registry and CONSORT    | Block randomization.               |
|----|--------------------|--|------------------------------------|
|    |                    | guidelines should be done. The outcome should be specific.No           |                                    |
|    |                    | statistics mentioned for the test                                      |                                    |
| 2  | Dr.Gopichander     | Wide age criteria for patients then how can you select patients acc to |                                    |
|    |                    | inclusion criteria?  |                                    |
| 3  | Dr.Balamurali      |  |                                    |
| 4  | Mr.Ezhumalai       | Independent t test should be mentioned in the protocol, statistical    |                                    |
|    |                    | analysis to be modified after consultation                             |                                    |
| 5  | Mrs.Uma Udayaraj   |  |                                    |
| 6  | Dr.Anand           | CTRI registration to be done since clinical trial                      |                                    |
| 7  | Dr.Shahin Sultana  |  |                                    |
| 8  | Dr.R.Saravanakumar |  |                                    |
| 9  | Dr.Manoharan       | Operating time is the outcome?   |                                    |
|    |                    | If already midline discrepancy then intercuspation should be a better  |                                    |
|    |                    | objective  |                                    |
|    |                    | Any specific indications for Y plate or square plate?                  | No it can be interchangeably used. |
| 10 | Dr.Pratebha        | Intercuspation should be chosen instead of Class I occlusion, test for |                                    |
|    |                    | each variable to be included, modify consent forms                     |                                    |
| 11 | Dr.Yuvraj          |  |                                    |
|    |                    |  |                                    |
|    | Final Remarks      | Accepted with modification, title, occlusion details to be             |                                    |
|    |                    | checked,CONSORT guidelines to be checked,describe                      |                                    |
|    |                    | randomization, allocation and concealment and statistical analysis     |                                    |

| S.no | Department     | Topic   | Presenter   |
|------|----------------|---|---|
| 4    | ortho          | ANGULATION ERRORS IN LATERAL CEPHALOGRAM<br>AND ITS INFLUENCE IN ORTHODONTIC DIAGNOSIS<br>– "AN INVITRO STUDY"  | Dr.Arul   |
|      | SPEAKER/MEMBER | QUERIES/ SUGGESTIONS  | Presenter   |
| 1    | Dr.M.S.Muthu   | Will sample size of 3 skulls in each group be sufficient. Study variables should be modified.   |   |
| 2    | Dr.Gopichander |   |   |
| 3    | Dr.Balamurali  | Objectives should be made clear   |   |
| 4    | Mr.Ezhumalai   | In such small cases, resource equation if used 5 can be group size Instead of one observer is going to measure, make intra and inter observer as a objective.  Why repeating for left and right side? | Dolphin software to be plotted.  Not to be repeated for right and left side, it is only for sagittal. |

| 5  | Mrs.Uma Udayaraj   |  |  |
|----|--------------------|--|--|
| 6  | Dr.Anand           | Repeat review with methodology   |  |
| 7  | Dr.Shahin Sultana  | Questionnaire need not be given.why questionnaire?   |  |
| 8  | Dr.R.Saravanakumar |  |  |
| 9  | Dr.Manoharan       |  |  |
| 10 | Dr.Pratebha        | Measurements to be repeated by different examiners(Inter examiner variability)   |  |
| 11 | Dr.Yuvraj          | Inter and intra examiner variability in plotting landmarks can be added  |  |
|    | Final Remarks      | REPEAT REVIEW WITH MODIFICATION; DEFERRED FOR HOD OPINION Objective to be changed,protocol to be modified accordingly.only one skull can be chosen with different examiners plotting |  |

| S.no | Department         | Topic  | Presenter      |
|------|--------------------|--|----------------|
| 5    | Ortho              | COMPARATIVE ASSESSEMENT OF CONVENTIONAL                            | Dr.Pazhanisamy |
|      |                    | AND SELF-LIGATING BRACKETS ON THE EFFECT OF                        |                |
|      |                    | MAXILLARY AND MANDIBULAR INTERMOLAR AND                            |                |
|      |                    | INTERCANINE DISTANCE   |                |
|      | SPEAKER/MEMBER     | QUERIES/ SUGGESTIONS   | Presenter      |
| 1    | Dr.M.S.Muthu       | Patient level blinding does not apply.CONSORT guidelines should be |                |
|      |                    | applied. Methodology should be more specific and outcome           |                |
|      |                    | measures should be stronger.                                       |                |
|      |                    | Categorization according to time                                   |                |
|      |                    | Standardization for inter canine and intermolar width              |                |
| 2    | Dr.Gopichander     |  |                |
| 3    | Dr.Balamurali      | Adhere to CONSORT guidelines                                       |                |
| 4    | Mr.Ezhumalai       | Self ligating and conventional brackets will be intervention not   |                |
|      |                    | variables  |                |
|      |                    | Assessor can be blinded.   |                |
|      |                    | Add variables (maxillary and mandibular)                           |                |
| 5    | Mrs.Uma Udayaraj   |  |                |
| 6    | Dr.Anand           |  |                |
| 7    | Dr.Shahin Sultana  |  |                |
| 8    | Dr.R.Saravanakumar |  |                |
| 9    | Dr.Manoharan       | Standardized measurements should be checked.If not tip of canine   |                |

|    |               | what will be the point?                                       |  |
|----|---------------|---|--|
| 10 | Dr.Pratebha   | Modifications in methodology, add maxillary and mandibular as |  |
|    |               | variables   |  |
| 11 | Dr.Yuvraj     |   |  |
|    |               |   |  |
|    | Final Remarks | REPEAT REVIEW WITH MODIFICATION ,DEFERRED FOR HOD             |  |
|    |               | OPINION, CONSORT Guidelines, methodology,check parameters     |  |
|    |               | chosen and consent form to be translated in regional language |  |

| S.no | Department         | Topic  | Presenter |
|------|--------------------|--|-----------|
| 6.   | ortho              | EVALUATING THE RATE AND EFFICIENCY OF TOOTH MOVEMENT IN PROPEL EXCELLERATOR TREATED AND CONVENTIONALLY TREATED PATIENTS:AN IN VIVO STUDY | Dr.Shanaz |
|      | SPEAKER/MEMBER     | QUERIES/ SUGGESTIONS   | Presenter |
| 1    | Dr.M.S.Muthu       | Expertise would be required for treatment using propel. Ethical issue is strong. Patient informed consent needs to be specific.          |           |
| 2    | Dr.Gopichander     | Consent form to explain the procedure should be detailed   |           |
| 3    | Dr.Balamurali      | Deferred, check feasibility of study methodology needs revision  |           |
| 4    | Mr.Ezhumalai       |  |           |
| 5    | Mrs.Uma Udayaraj   |  |           |
| 6    | Dr.Anand           | Deferred, to clarify on consent form and information sheet   |           |
| 7    | Dr.Shahin Sultana  |  |           |
| 8    | Dr.R.Saravanakumar |  |           |
| 9    | Dr.Manoharan       | How to assess anchorage qualitatively?   |           |
| 10   | Dr.Pratebha        | Modify Study termination details in protocol   |           |
| 11   | Dr.Yuvraj          |  |           |
|      | Final Remarks      | Ethical issue to be addressed. To be deferred as of now  |           |

| S.no | Department | Topic                                      | Presenter   |
|------|------------|--|-------------|
| 7    | PEDO       | COMPARISION OF THE EFFECTS OF CHEWING GUM  | Dr.NARMATHA |
|      |            | CONTAINING CASEIN PHOSPHOPEPTIDE-AMORPHOUS |             |
|      |            | CALCIUM PHOSPHATE(CPP-ACP)ANDXYLITOL ON    |             |
|      |            | SALIVARYCHARACTERISTICSIN 8-10 YEARS       |             |
|      |            | CHILDRENWITH MOLAR INCISOR                 |             |
|      |            | HYPOMINERALISATION: A RANDOMISED           |             |

|    |                    | CONTROLTRIAL  |                                  |
|----|--------------------|---|----------------------------------|
|    | SPEAKER/MEMBER     | QUERIES/ SUGGESTIONS  | Presenter                        |
| 1  | Dr.M.S.Muthu       | Remineralizing ability/indicators for it should be measured.then only | Categorization of mild, severe   |
|    |                    | remineralizing capacity can be found.                                 | group.severe group would be      |
|    |                    | Salivary parameters can be compared ,no need to check efficacy for    | removed.                         |
|    |                    | this.   |                                  |
|    |                    | CONSORT guidelines need to be adhered                                 |                                  |
| 2  | Dr.Gopichander     | Hypo mineralized patients when given block of sugar/salt, unless      |                                  |
|    |                    | some changes happen in the media how can changes be expected in       |                                  |
|    |                    | patients  |                                  |
| 3  | Dr.Balamurali      | Sample selection needs to be addressed.                               |                                  |
| 4  | Mr.Ezhumalai       | Add repeated measures of ANOVA  |                                  |
| 5  | Mrs.Uma Udayaraj   |   |                                  |
| 6  | Dr.Anand           | How ph is tested?is it gold standard method?                          | Using GC check saliva.           |
|    |                    | Validation of chewing gum to be necessary                             |                                  |
| 7  | Dr.Shahin Sultana  | Through the school and parents, permission needs to be obtained.      | From results of prevalent study, |
|    |                    | Why particular school? Socio economic strata might be influential     | schools were chosen.             |
|    |                    | Consent form should be strong.  |                                  |
| 8  | Dr.R.Saravanakumar |   |                                  |
| 9  | Dr.Manoharan       |   |                                  |
| 10 | Dr.Pratebha        |   |                                  |
| 11 | Dr.Yuvraj          |   |                                  |
|    |                    |   |                                  |
|    | Final Remarks      | Title to be modified(efficacy),CONSORT guidelines                     |                                  |

| S.no | Department        | Topic   | Presenter                           |
|------|-------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| 8    | PEDO              | CORRELATION OF CHILD'S COLOUR PERCEPTION TO                         | Dr.Swarna                           |
|      |                   | EMOTION, BEHAVIOUR AND DENTAL ANXIETY                               |                                     |
|      |                   | DURING DENTAL PROCEDURES  |                                     |
|      | SPEAKER/MEMBER    | QUERIES/ SUGGESTIONS  | Presenter                           |
| 1    | Dr.M.S.Muthu      | What is non invasive treatment? Restoration?                        | Only ART type intervention would be |
|      |                   |   | used                                |
| 2    | Dr.Gopichander    | Sample size evaluation  | It is 100, 91 was the original      |
| 3    | Dr.Balamurali     |   |                                     |
| 4    | Mr.Ezhumalai      |   |                                     |
| 5    | Mrs.Uma Udayaraj  |   |                                     |
| 6    | Dr.Anand          | Sample selection ? what about colour blind?                         | Color blind to be excluded          |
| 7    | Dr.Shahin Sultana | Special child would be excluded? To be discussed with HOD.Should be |                                     |

|    |                    | mentioned as children with special health care needs |                                    |
|----|--------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| 8  | Dr.R.Saravanakumar |  |                                    |
| 9  | Dr.Manoharan       | What is the application?                             | Colour might influence the patient |
|    |                    |  | anxiety                            |
| 10 | Dr.Pratebha        |  |                                    |
| 11 | Dr.Yuvraj          |  |                                    |
|    |                    |  |                                    |
|    | Final Remarks      | ACCEPTED and APPROVED                                |                                    |

| S.no | Department         | Topic   | Presenter                      |
|------|--------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| 9    | pedo               | ASSOCIATION BETWEEN TASTE PERCEPTION, FOOD                      | Dr.Eswari                      |
|      |                    | PREFERENCE AND EARLY CHILDHOOD CARIES                           |                                |
|      |                    | AMONG 3-6 YEAR OLD CHILDREN - A CROSS-                          |                                |
|      |                    | SECTIONAL STUDY   |                                |
|      | SPEAKER/MEMBER     | QUERIES/ SUGGESTIONS  | Presenter                      |
| 1    | Dr.M.S.Muthu       | Pictures are specific and data would be voluminous. Development |                                |
| 2    | Dr.Gopichander     | Sample of questionnaire?  | Food groups would be examined. |
| 3    | Dr.Balamurali      | Validation and reliability check of questionnaire               |                                |
| 4    | Mr.Ezhumalai       |   |                                |
| 5    | Mrs.Uma Udayaraj   |   |                                |
| 6    | Dr.Anand           | Accept with modifications                                       |                                |
| 7    | Dr.Shahin Sultana  |   |                                |
| 8    | Dr.R.Saravanakumar |   |                                |
| 9    | Dr.Manoharan       |   |                                |
| 10   | Dr.Pratebha        |   |                                |
| 11   | Dr.Yuvraj          |   |                                |
|      | Final Remarks      | ACCEPTED WITH MODIFICATIONS .Title to include "questionnaire".  |                                |
|      |                    | To validate the questionnaire                                   |                                |

| S.no | Department     | Topic  | Presenter   |
|------|----------------|--|-------------|
| 10   | Cons endo      | COMPARATIVE EVALUATION OF TITANIUM BASED     | Dr.nandhini |
|      |                | AND STAINLESS STEEL BASED ULTRASONIC TIPS IN |             |
|      |                | CREATING SECONDARY FRACTURES DURING          |             |
|      |                | RETRIEVAL OF SEPARATED NITI FILE FRAGMENTS – |             |
|      |                | AN IN VITRO STUDY                            |             |
|      | SPEAKER/MEMBER | QUERIES/ SUGGESTIONS                         | Presenter   |

| 1  | Dr.M.S.Muthu       | Any other parameters can be added which will add value to the study. |   |
|----|--------------------|--|---|
| 2  | Dr.Gopichander     | If already material properties are known why secondary fractures are |   |
|    |                    | checked  |   |
|    |                    | Impact of the study would be low                                     |   |
| 3  | Dr.Balamurali      | Any other modification apart from proven fact.                       |   |
| 4  | Mr.Ezhumalai       |  |   |
| 5  | Mrs.Uma Udayaraj   |  |   |
| 6  | Dr.Anand           |  |   |
| 7  | Dr.Shahin Sultana  |  |   |
| 8  | Dr.R.Saravanakumar |  |   |
| 9  | Dr.Manoharan       | How can it be assessed?standardization?                              |   |
| 10 | Dr.Pratebha        | Prevalence of secondary fractures, Ethical clearance not required    | Niti base takes longer time to fracture |
| 11 | Dr.Yuvraj          |  |   |
|    | Final Remarks      | APPROVED; Ethical clearnance not required. Methodology to be         |   |
|    |                    | scrutinized by internal review board                                 |   |

| S.no | Department         | Topic  | Presenter   |
|------|--------------------|--|---|
| 11   | Periodontics       | INFLUENCE OF TLR (TOLL LIKE RECEPTOR) AND NOD (NUCLEOTIDE-OLIGOMERISATION DOMAIN PROTIEN LIKE) RECEPTORS POLYMORPHISMS IN CHRONIC PERIODONTITIS IN SOUTH INDIAN POPULATION   | Dr.Pratebha   |
|      | SPEAKER/MEMBER     | QUERIES/ SUGGESTIONS   | Presenter   |
| 1    | Dr.M.S.Muthu       | Before raising a flap, routine blood investigation? Odds ratio- to be clarified Would funding be sufficient?   | Yes as part of routine blood investigation this sample would be taken for chronic periodontitis Split up of expenses shown. |
| 2    | Dr.Gopichander     | Why not pilot study for the sample?  |   |
| 3    | Dr.Balamurali      |  |   |
| 4    | Mr.Ezhumalai       | Title of South Indian population, student t test for ILR etc values.  Definition for healthy controls to be given  TNF alpha use mean+- SD  Age in case and control to be same, select matched age and gender controls | If specific other origin patients would be different.   |
| 5    | Mrs.Uma Udayaraj   |  |   |
| 6    | Dr.Anand           |  |   |
| 7    | Dr.Shahin Sultana  |  |   |
| 8    | Dr.R.Saravanakumar |  |   |

|    | Final Remarks | APPROVED AND ACCEPTED . To age match cases and controls |  |
|----|---------------|---|--|
|    |               |   |  |
| 11 | Dr.Yuvraj     |   |  |
| 10 | Dr.Pratebha   |   |  |
| 9  | Dr.Manoharan  |   |  |

| S.no | Department              | Topic   | Presenter                             |
|------|-------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| 12   | Public health dentistry | EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS OF 2% CHITOSAN                             | Dr.Senthil                            |
|      |                         | MOUTHWASH IN- COMPARISON WITH 0.2%                                      |                                       |
|      |                         | CHLORHEXIDINE DIGLUCONATE MOUTHWASH IN                                  |                                       |
|      |                         | PLAQUE REDUCTION – A RANDOMIZED CROSS OVER                              |                                       |
|      |                         | CONTROLLED TRIAL  |                                       |
|      | SPEAKER/MEMBER          | QUERIES/ SUGGESTIONS  | Presenter                             |
| 1    | Dr.M.S.Muthu            | Any method for sample size, wash out period of 1 week(certain areas     | Convenience sampling , residents as   |
|      |                         | 2days) CONSORT guidelines should be followed, trial registry            | sample                                |
|      |                         | Consent form should mention that it is new and side effects, clearance  |                                       |
|      |                         | from FDA  |                                       |
| 2    | Dr.Gopichander          | Availability of mouthwash, molecular weight                             | It is commercially available, low mol |
|      |                         |   | wt, but has to be procured from       |
|      |                         |   | abroad                                |
| 3    | Dr.Balamurali           |   |                                       |
| 4    | Mr.Ezhumalai            | Sample size justification, minimum 30 for parametric test. Based on     |                                       |
|      |                         | review of literature or availability of patients. Research question and |                                       |
|      |                         | hypothesis. Predominately non vegetarian needs to be clarified.         |                                       |
| 5    | Mrs.Uma Udayaraj        |   |                                       |
| 6    | Dr.Anand                |   |                                       |
| 7    | Dr.Shahin Sultana       |   |                                       |
| 8    | Dr.R.Saravanakumar      |   |                                       |
| 9    | Dr.Manoharan            | Efficiency and effectiveness of plaque scores (any one can be used)     |                                       |
| 10   | Dr.Pratebha             |   |                                       |
| 11   | Dr.Yuvraj               |   |                                       |
|      | Final Remarks           | ACCEPTED WITH MODIFICATION: CONSORT guidelines to be                    |                                       |
|      |                         | checked, sample size justification                                      |                                       |

| S.no | Department         | Topic  | Presenter   |
|------|--------------------|--|-------------|
| 13   | orthodontics       | COMPARATIVE EVALUATION OF PLATELET RICH              | Dr.Aniruddh |
|      |                    | FIBRIN WITH DEMINERALIZED FREEZE DRIED BONE          |             |
|      |                    | ALLOGRAFT IN PERIODONTALLY ACCELERATED               |             |
|      |                    | OSTEOGENIC ORTHODONTICS: A THREE ARM                 |             |
|      |                    | RANDOMIZED CLINICAL TRIAL                            |             |
|      | SPEAKER/MEMBER     | QUERIES/ SUGGESTIONS                                 | Presenter   |
| 1    | Dr.M.S.Muthu       | CONSORT guidelines should be followed                |             |
| 2    | Dr.Gopichander     | Consent form to be validated                         |             |
| 3    | Dr.Balamurali      | To increase sample size to 6+ dropout patients       |             |
| 4    | Mr.Ezhumalai       | Add 10-20% drop out; ANOVA followed by Post hoc test |             |
| 5    | Mrs.Uma Udayaraj   |  |             |
| 6    | Dr.Anand           | approved   |             |
| 7    | Dr.Shahin Sultana  |  |             |
| 8    | Dr.R.Saravanakumar |  |             |
| 9    | Dr.Manoharan       |  |             |
| 10   | Dr.Pratebha        | 10-20% attrition rate to be added up(drop outs)      |             |
| 11   | Dr.Yuvraj          |  |             |
|      | Final Remarks      | Accepted with modifications.                         |             |
|      |                    | Consent form to be scrutinized by IEC chairperson    |             |

| S.no | Department              | Topic  | Presenter  |
|------|-------------------------|--|--|
| 14   | Public health dentistry | KNOWLEDGE AND AWARENESS ABOUT EFFECTS OF SESAME OIL PULLING AND ITS HEALTH BENEFITS AMONG DENTAL STUDENTS OF IGIDS, PUDUCHERRY:  | krishnapriya   |
|      |                         | A CROSS SECTIONAL STUDY  |  |
|      | SPEAKER/MEMBER          | QUERIES/ SUGGESTIONS   | Presenter  |
| 1    | Dr.M.S.Muthu            | If only measuring these 2 it should be clarified. Questionnaire was desgined on own? Knowledge questions should have yes/no Existing/validated questionnaire can be used. These questions are general Remove sesame oil from questionnaire | Since not done on dental students,not all questions were chosen from key article |
| 2    | Dr.Gopichander          | Outcome measures to be clarified, qualitative parameters can be added  |  |
| 3    | Dr.Balamurali           |  |  |
| 4    | Mr.Ezhumalai            | Statistics part should be modified, to collect some background   |  |

|    |                    | variable like age,gender,add chi square test                             |  |
|----|--------------------|--|--|
| 5  | Mrs.Uma Udayaraj   |  |  |
| 6  | Dr.Anand           |  |  |
| 7  | Dr.Shahin Sultana  |  |  |
| 8  | Dr.R.Saravanakumar |  |  |
| 9  | Dr.Manoharan       | To check methodology   |  |
| 10 | Dr.Pratebha        | Questionnaire validation can in itself be a study, validation to be done |  |
|    |                    | for this study   |  |
| 11 | Dr.Yuvraj          |  |  |
|    | Final Remarks      | APPROVED WITH MODIFICATIONS . questionnaire to be validated              |  |

| S.no | Department         | Topic  | Presenter |
|------|--------------------|--|-----------|
| 15   | Periodontics       | Assessment of Oral Hygiene, Health and Periodontal Status of             | Ashna     |
|      |                    | Parents of Dental Students – A Cross Sectional Study.                    |           |
|      | SPEAKER/MEMBER     | QUERIES/ SUGGESTIONS   | Presenter |
| 1    | Dr.M.S.Muthu       | To modify methodology,   |           |
| 2    | Dr.Gopichander     | Collect background data of parents(age,gender,rural/urban) and do        |           |
|      |                    | chi square test  |           |
| 3    | Dr.Balamurali      |  |           |
| 4    | Mr.Ezhumalai       | Sample size  |           |
| 5    | Mrs.Uma Udayaraj   |  |           |
| 6    | Dr.Anand           | Qualitative component as a questionnaire can be added                    |           |
| 7    | Dr.Shahin Sultana  |  |           |
| 8    | Dr.R.Saravanakumar |  |           |
| 9    | Dr.Manoharan       | Purpose of this study will it influence the result, the positive results |           |
|      |                    | would mean ? will it be qualitative?                                     |           |
|      |                    | Better oral hygiene might be because of other characteristics than       |           |
|      |                    | students sharing oral hygiene measures with parents                      |           |
| 10   | Dr.Pratebha        |  |           |
| 11   | Dr.Yuvraj          |  |           |
|      | Final Remarks      | ACCEPTED WITH MODIFICATIONS. To be scrutinized by the internal           |           |
|      |                    | review board   |           |

I hereby state that I have verified the minutes of the meeting and found it to be in order.

Dr B Pratebha

Member Secretary, Institutional Ethics Committee, IGIDS, SBV

Date: 14.03.2018

7.5. Wurth

Dr M S Muthu

Chairman, Institutional Ethics Committee, IGIDS, SBV

Date: 15.03.2018