**Proforma for Evaluation of Ph.D Proposals by External / Internal Reviewers**

To be filled by the post graduate office.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** |  |
| **Title** |  |
| **Registration No.** |  |
| **Date of Registration** |  |

To be filled by the reviewer.

**Literature Review**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria Evaluation** | **Deficient** | **Satisfactory** | **Good** | **Excellent** |
| Relevance to research topic |  |  |  |  |
| Covering state of the art |  |  |  |  |
| Quality of literature |  |  |  |  |
| Breadth of literature coverage |  |  |  |  |
| Discussion regarding current state of knowledge |  |  |  |  |

**Problem Statement (**Use as much space as required**)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Is the problem statement definedclearly? |  |
| Is its significance highlighted? |  |
| Are specific problem(s) elaborated? |  |
| Does it discuss any assumptions made to define the problem? |  |

**Objectives (**Use as much space as required**)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Are the objectives well defined? |  |
| Are they achievable? |  |
| How narrow/broad are the objectives? |  |
| Are any objectives contradictory? |  |

**Methodology**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Does the methodology propose any new technique? |  |
| Are the relevant tools being used? |  |
| Does it meet the outlined objectives? |  |
| Are methods for validation discussed? |  |
| Highlight limitations, if any, of the proposed methodology. |  |

**Any Other Remarks**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Overall Evaluation**

1. Acceptin its original form
2. Minor revision required
3. Major revision required, resubmit to the evaluator for further evaluation
4. Reject

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Signature Date**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluator Name:** |  |
| **Designation:** |  |
| **Affiliation:** |  |