

PHD THESIS DEFENSE EVALUATION RUBRIC

<u>Student Name:</u>		<u>Registration No:</u>	
<u>Proposal Title:</u>	Promoting Healthy Nutrition among Adolescents through a School-Based Educational Intervention: An Experimental Study in Rawalpindi.		
<u>Supervisor</u>			
<u>Date</u>	<u>31/303/26</u>		

Sr	Chapter No	Comments
	<p>Title</p> <p>Introduction & Literature search (70- 79%)</p>	<p>The title is relevant but may be strengthened by explicitly indicating the study design (e.g., mixed-methods / intervention study) to improve scientific precision</p> <p>Literature review is extensive and well-referenced with global and LMIC evidence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • However the gap is implied but not sharply articulated. • Separate sections are there ,add a dedicated subsection: “Research Gap and Rationale” <p>Include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is already known • What is missing in Pakistan • Why existing interventions are insufficient • How this study uniquely contributes • In Literature review many studies are summarized descriptively. Needs critical appraisal <p>In the systematic review most studies are already systematic reviews. Less studies focussing on interventions in Pakistan . comparison should be with other interventions in Pakistan and what’s the novelty of your intervention</p> <p>End literature chapter with a summary of :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conceptual synthesis • Direct linkage: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Literature → Gap → Objectives → Study Phases

	<p>Methodology (70-79%)</p>	<p>Complex multi-phase study needs visual clarity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CONSORT-Style Flow Diagram Summary- looks incomplete • Its in the Result section should be at the end of methodology section <p>It should be a study flow diagram: should go from start to Phase 1 → Intervention Development → Phase 2 → Phase 3 evaluation</p> <p>Sampling for quantitative study: multistage sampling done but schools were selected through purposive sampling (not random)?? Why 20% non response?(any reference) Page 74</p>
		<p>Intervention:</p> <p>Intervention components described narratively but not reproducibly. It should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • session structure table, duration ,facilitator training and fidelity monitoring • Focus of intervention was on nutrition , rather than other life style behaviors • methods to prevent selection and response bias missing
	<p>Results(70-79%)</p>	<p>Results are detailed and data-rich. However</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interpretation appears inside results sections. Results should show the factual findings only • Explanations should be in discussion chapter.

	<p>Discussion (70-79%)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language some times implies causality • Rather it demonstrates effectiveness"/ association because ,Non- parametric tests are used • Statistical significance alone is insufficient for PhD level. Confidence interval for the mean difference of paired observations not given.(table 13 -14) • Table 10 McNemar test is used in the contingency table many cells have count below 5 so the association should be seen with caution. <p>Integration of methods Phases of study appear sequential rather than integrated. Add a section section: “Integrated Mixed-Methods Findings” e.g Explain convergence/divergence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion effectively contextualizes findings but results repeated
	<p>Conclusion</p> <p>Recommendations :</p>	<p>Repetition of study not needed. To the point conclusions (page 116)</p> <p>Should come from study strongly supported by evidence from multiphasic experimental design. .</p>

appropriate box)

Thesis is recommended without any change.

Thesis is recommended with minor changes verified by Supervisor

Thesis is recommended with Major changes verified by Supervisor/ Examiner

I am not convinced and do not recommend this Thesis

Examiner Name: Prof. Dr Rukhsana Kahn Signature: _____ Date: _____
31/3/27