



SRI DEVARAJ URS ACADEMY OF HIGHER EDUCATION & RESEARCH  
SRI DEVARAJ URS MEDICAL COLLEGE  
Tamaka, Kolar



UNIVERSITY LIBRARY & LEARNING RESOURCE CENTRE

Online Newspaper Clipping Service

Dtd- Thursday, 15<sup>th</sup>, September- 2017

Pg.No.13

THE TIMES OF INDIA

# Belagavi's KLE institute is 4th cleanest university

TIMES NEWS NETWORK

New Delhi: OP Jindal Global University, Sonapat, and Kongu Arts and Science College Erode, Tamil Nadu emerged as the cleanest university and college respectively in the country. A total of 3,500 institutions took part in the ranking scheme out of which 25 best institutions were selected under four categories.

Announcing the "Swachhta Ranking 2017" for higher educational institutes on Thursday, Union minister for human resource development Prakash Javadekar said, "Indians are ahead in personal hygiene but they are not when it comes to keeping their neighbourhoods clean. This is the reason PM Narendra Modi initiated the Swachh Bharat mission and stressed on constructing toilets in schools and homes".

The other winners in the university category in descending order are Manipal University, Jaipur; Chitkara University, Kalu Jhanda, Solan; KLE Academy of Higher Education and Research, Belagavi and Dayalbagh Educational Institute, Agra, while in the category of colleges are Vidya Pratishthans Arts, Commerce



Javadekar said Indians are ahead in personal hygiene but they are not when it comes to keeping their neighbourhoods clean

and Science College; MIDC Baramati, Pune; Ramakrishna Mission Vivekananda College, Chennai; S N R Sons College, Coimbatore and K G College of Arts and Science, Coimbatore.

University, college, technical institutions and government institutions, were the four categories in which the educational institutes were ranked. In the technical institutions category Amrita Vishwa Vidyapeetham, Coimbatore topped the list, while G B Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar was on top of the list in the government institutions category.

Tamil Nadu had the largest representation in the awards, winning four out of five places in the colleges category and

five out of seven places in the technical institute category.

Congratulating the awardees, Javadekar said that the "Swachh Bharat Abhiyan" is the most significant cleanliness campaign by the Government of India. Under this mission more than four crore and eighty lakhs toilets were constructed in India since October 2, 2014 and more than two lakhs villages are now open defecation free.

Parameters for a clean campus were formulated, like student toilet ratio, kitchen hygiene, availability of running water, modernity of toilet and kitchen equipment, campus green cover, garbage disposal in hostels and academic buildings, disposal techniques, water supply systems and also a certain weightage to whether the institutions has adopted any neighbouring locality or village to spread awareness and activities in Swachhta. About 3,500 HEIs responded to the invitation, submitting all their details. The top 174 institutions were shortlisted as per criteria and officials from UGC and AICTE inspected the premises of all 174 institutions. Finally, the top 25 institutions across various categories were selected and awarded.



# ಸ್ವಚ್ಛ ವಿದ್ಯಾಲಯ: ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಮುಖಭಂಗ

ನವದೆಹಲಿ: ಉನ್ನತ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವಚ್ಛತೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಡೆಸಲಾದ ಮೊದಲ ಸಮೀಕ್ಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಖಾಸಗಿ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾಲಯಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳು ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ವಿದ್ಯಾಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹಿಂದಿಕ್ಕಿವೆ. ಸೋನಿಪತ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಒ.ಪಿ. ಜಿಂದಾಲ್ ಗ್ಲೋಬಲ್ ಯುನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಅತ್ಯಂತ ಸ್ವಚ್ಛ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆ ಎಂಬ ಗೌರವಕ್ಕೆ ಪಾತ್ರವಾಗಿದೆ. ಮಣಿಪಾಲ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾಲಯದ ಗುಜರಾತ್ ಕ್ಯಾಂಪಸ್‌ಗೆ ಎರಡನೇ ಸ್ಥಾನ ದೊರಕಿದೆ.

ಮಾನವ ಸಂಪನ್ಮೂಲ ಸಚಿವಾಲಯವು ನಾಲ್ಕು ವರ್ಗಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಸಮೀಕ್ಷೆಯನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಿತ್ತು. ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾಲಯ, ಕಾಲೇಜು, ತಾಂತ್ರಿಕ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳು ಎಂಬ ವರ್ಗೀಕರಣ ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಒಟ್ಟು 3,500 ವಿದ್ಯಾಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳು ಸಮೀಕ್ಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸಿದ್ದವು.

‘ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡಗಿಸಿಡುವಂತಹುದೇನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳ

## ಕೆ.ಎಲ್.ಇಗೆ ಸ್ಥಾನ

ಬೆಳಗಾವಿಯ ಕೆ.ಎಲ್.ಇ ಅಕಾಡೆಮಿ ಆಫ್ ಹೈಯರ್ ಎಜುಕೇಷನ್ ಎಂಡ್ ರಿಸರ್ಚ್ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾಲಯಗಳ ವಿಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾಲ್ಕನೇ ಸ್ಥಾನ ಪಡೆದಿದೆ.

ಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಹೀಗೆಯೇ ಇದೆ. ಮೊದಲ 50ರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಸ್ಥಾನವನ್ನೂ ಪಡೆಯಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದ ಕಾರಣ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಿಗಾಗಿಯೇ ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕ ವರ್ಗವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಲಾಯಿತು ಎಂದು ಮಾನವ ಸಂಪನ್ಮೂಲ ಸಚಿವ ಪ್ರಕಾಶ್ ಜಾವಡೇಕರ್ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಸ್ವಚ್ಛತೆಯ ರ್ಯಾಂಕಿಂಗ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ತಮಿಳುನಾಡಿನ ವಿದ್ಯಾಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳೇ ಮುಂದಿವೆ. ಕಾಲೇಜು, ತಾಂತ್ರಿಕ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳ ವರ್ಗಗಳ ಮೊದಲ ಐದು ಸ್ಥಾನಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ತಮಿಳುನಾಡಿನ ಒಟ್ಟು 11 ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳು

ಸ್ಥಾನ ಪಡೆದಿವೆ.

ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾಲಯ ಮತ್ತು ವಿದ್ಯಾಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸೃಷ್ಟಿಯಾಗುವ ತ್ಯಾಜ್ಯವನ್ನು ಸುಸ್ಥಿರವಾದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಲೇವಾರಿ ಮಾಡಲು ದಾರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕಂಡುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ತ್ಯಾಜ್ಯದಿಂದ ವಿದ್ಯುತ್ ಉತ್ಪಾದನೆಯಂತಹ ಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ತಮ್ಮ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬರುವ ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಪಟ್ಟಣ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಿಗೂ ಸ್ವಚ್ಛತೆ ಕಾಪಾಡಲು ನೆರವಾಗಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಜಾವಡೇಕರ್ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

‘ಇಂಥನ ಉಳಿಸಿ, ವಿದ್ಯುತ್ ಉಳಿಸಿ, ತ್ಯಾಜ್ಯವನ್ನು ಸುಸ್ಥಿರವಾಗಿ ವಿಲೇವಾರಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಮತ್ತು ಜಾಣ ವಿದ್ಯಾಸಂಸ್ಥೆ ಎನಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಿ’ ಎಂದು ಅವರು ಕರೆ ನೀಡಿದರು. ಮುಂದಿನ ವರ್ಷದ (2018) ಸ್ವಚ್ಛ ರ್ಯಾಂಕಿಂಗ್‌ಗೆ ಈ ಮೂರು ಅಂಶಗಳೇ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಚೌಕಟ್ಟಾಗಿರುತ್ತವೆ ಎಂದು ಅವರು ತಿಳಿಸಿದರು.





OPINION

**SANTWANA BHATTACHARYA**

Political Editor, The New Indian Express  
Email: santwana@newindianexpress.com

Our varsities have never been insulated from politics. But rarely have we seen student leaders become instant celebrities like they do now

# UNIVERSITY AS THE MINI-NATION

**T**hankfully, one is not in a campus of today. It may seem one is indulging in the typically self-satisfied prattle of an old-timer, but yes, in the eighties, university elections were indeed fought on the strength of an argument. In a strange way, they were both more honestly political and yet, at the same time, partly in a world of their own, filled with vitality. Neither was a fully utilitarian, industry-linked model of factory-like education yet born, nor did they play at being mini-versions of national politics. But yes, the ideas are what dominated. The focus was not the quality of canteen food or hostel facilities or how to get funding for the film, theatre or photography club. We were equally engaged with World Bank policies, India's debt situation, food and fuel policy, war and peace—even Nicaragua. Indeed, we behaved as if the world turned on its axis based on our views! Revolution was a possibility, but we were quite satisfied with the occasional rebellion.

At the coffee house in the evening, everyone shared tables irrespective of the political divide. We paid for each other's tea, coffee and cutlets. Professors were friendly mentors, not feared. Poet Shankha

Ghosh's classes were always overcrowded, with students from all streams drawn to his mesmerising lectures. Seminars with foreign scholars were invariably well attended, not because anyone was forced to, but because we were brimming with questions to ask and never pretended to know all the answers. A good fight meant a good debate.

Are our campuses the same today? One doubts it. In institutions where there are no elections, students are busy chasing credits and improving their CVs for the job market, or applying to campuses abroad. Do they unwind? Yes, they do—fests and impromptu concerts make the evenings lively. But everything in studied portions, never losing sight of the overall credit that needs to be accrued. Thankfully, we could score just by reading and assimilating the texts and the contexts (and the Bakhtins). Whether we played basketball or were office-bearers at the university clubs did not matter much. And our elections certainly did not bother the chief minister, nor was it a telling message on the prime minister's popularity.

Should universities be insulated from politics? Should the campuses be seen as idyllic is-



The Left has retained campuses in Tripura too. But far more stunning is the rise and spread of BAPSA (Birsa Ambedkar Phule Students' Association)—the Dalit student body that's making its presence felt across campuses from Delhi to Hyderabad

lands of learning and intellectual growth? No, it was never the case—neither here, nor elsewhere, across geographies and time-zones. As recently as when the Telangana movement peaked, campuses showed their innate capacity to turn into protest zones. At FTII, a 'student agitation' was an annual event (not devaluing the one against Gajendra Chauhan) and has always been a headache for the institute's director. During his stint, Girish Karnad had to call up his friend Shyam Benegal to get the then fire-brand student leader Naseeruddin Shah a role in *Manthan* (which he was shooting in Gujarat)—so as to break the campus agitation! Shah made a stunning debut in a tiny role and the rest is history. Things were far more serious during the Emergency or during the height of the Naxal movement in Bengal, or the Mandal agitation. Much of our present political leadership emerged from those zones.

But rarely have we seen student leaders become instant celebrities like they do now, thanks to social/visual media. If it seems as if it's upon them to create the national counter-narrative, the blame lies with the Opposition abdicating its

job. There's no denying there's an intense churning, a bitter ideological battle that's on. Take the JNU elections, for instance. The victory of a Left that had to join ranks (SFI-AI-SADSF)—and the ABVP's emergence as the largest force despite being trounced—are read in a context far larger than the campus itself. There are strong echoes here of the *mahagathbandhans*, the whispers of Akhilesh Yadav and Mayawati coming together, the CPM-Congress compact in Bengal—all converging against the spectre of a BJP in hyper-growth mode. In other words, the trends on the campuses almost exactly mirror national politics.

Should that occasion mirth or contemplation? Leaving that aside, we could look seriously at it and the possible interpretations. The SFI has made inroads in campuses across Rajasthan, from Jodhpur to Sikar and Hanumangarh, too—again with the ABVP maintaining its lead in Jaipur etc. and the NSUI just putting in odd wins. The Left has retained campuses in Tripura too. But far more stunning is the rise and spread of BAPSA (Birsa Ambedkar Phule Students' Association)—the Dalit student body that's making its presence felt across

campuses from Delhi to Hyderabad and elsewhere. All of it presents a fascinating microcosmic picture.

In the end, perhaps the ABVP's hyper-nationalism, the fact that (in JNU) it appeared to be on the side of the V-C's bit-too-shrill tank politics, went against it. And in what could be a warning sign, everywhere it's up against not just a united Left and NSUI but also BAPSA. Similarly, the NSUI, exulting after it won two crucial posts in Delhi University (affording Congress president Sonia Gandhi a rare chance to smile after a long time), needs to be worried about the extraordinary rise of NOTA voters. The disillusioned liberal youth are evidently still not seduced by its charms. If the NSUI is celebrating DUSU and the sweep in Punjab University polls as a sign of revival, perhaps it should also factor in Assam, whether Guwahati or Dibrugarh, where the AASU retains its hold. It's drawing solace from the fact that Chief Minister Sarbananda Sonowal, a former AASU leader, could not swing it for the ABVP. Does all this foretell anything about 2019? Thankfully, I'm not in the campus today and don't have the burden of being a shadow-boxer for a national election.

n



# Pharma companies may be inflating R&D costs: Study

## Findings Of New Study Raise Questions About Drug Prices

Rema.Nagarajan  
@timesgroup.com

A recent study in the Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA) has concluded that R&D costs a company just \$648 million on average to bring a cancer drug to the market — a small fraction of the \$2.7 billion the industry claims is the average cost of drug discovery.

Though the study was restricted to cancer drugs, it raises questions about whether R&D costs are much lower than claimed by the pharma industry and if so whether patent terms need to be so long and drug prices this high to recover these costs.

The study published on Monday showed that within about four years of drug approval, revenue from the sale of the drugs studied was on average nine-fold higher than the R&D spending. Even accounting for what the money would have earned if invested in the market, the returns are seven times the costs.

The paper authored by Dr Vinay Prasad of the Knight Cancer Institute, Oregon Health and Science University in Portland, and Dr Sham Mankody of Memorial Sloan

### CANCEROUS GROWTH?

Drug	Total R&D cost	Revenue since approval	Revenue as %age of R&D cost
million (\$)			
Eculizumab	8176	12,987.8	1,589
Pralatrexate	178.2	304.8	171
Brentuximab	899.2	1,034.3	115
Ruxolitinib	1,097.8	2,251.5	205
Enzalutamide	473.3	21,068.3	4,451
Vincristine liposome	157.3	204.1	130
Cabozantinib	1,950.8	341.9	18
Ponatinib	480.1	5,457.9	1,137
Ibrutinib	328.1	22,275.0	6,789
Irinotecan liposome	815.8	1,065.2	131
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7,198.2</b>	<b>66,990.8</b>	<b>931</b>

Kettering Cancer Center in New York analysed filings of R&D expenditure by 10 publicly traded pharma companies with the US Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC).

Prior estimates for the cost to develop one new drug ranged from \$320 million, as estimated by the civil society group Public Citizen, to \$2.7 billion, as estimated by the industry-funded Tufts Center for the Study of Drug Development. Since the Tufts study used private data provided by 10 pharmaceutical firms, it lacked transparency and in-

dependent replication.

Public Citizen used publicly available US SEC R&D filings for all major pharmaceutical firms during a seven-year period, but divided the total expenditure across all companies by the number of new drugs approved for them in the subsequent seven years.

The authors of the latest study argued that this did not reflect the actual spending to bring these drugs to market.

Hence, they focused on companies that had brought a single drug to the market so that they could total R&D

filings that led to a single approval. Their analysis included the cost of pursuing a portfolio of candidate compounds to yield one drug, thereby accounting for the cost of failed attempts.

The study was conducted from December 10, 2016, to March 2, 2017. From the time of approval of a drug to December 2016 (or until the compound was sold or licensed to another company), the total revenue of the 10 drugs studied was \$67.0 billion, against a total cost of \$7.2 bn — or \$9 billion if the cost of capital was taken into account.

"Some companies boasted more than a 10-fold higher revenue than R&D spending, a sum not seen in other sectors of the economy," the authors observed. With market exclusivity in oncologic drugs averaging 14.3 years, these revenues would continue to increase over time, they said.

An editorial in the same journal stated: "The implications of the present study seem clear: Current pharmaceutical industry pricing policies are unrelated to the cost of research and development. Policymakers can safely take steps to rein in drug prices without fear of jeopardizing innovation."



# How To Do Drugs

Pg.No.08

*The patient in India must be the main beneficiary of a prudent pharma policy*

Sanjiv Kaul



The Indian pharma industry with a FY16 revenue of nearly \$35 billion has two major streams of business, international (about \$18 billion) and the rest domestic. The operating margin in international business is only 15% while that in domestic business is 30%. It is the more profitable domestic business that subsidises the international business and provides an investment platform for companies to become aggressive internationally.

The net result of having a strong domestic base has led the industry to become a formidable player globally, supplying 30% of generics in volume terms and earning valuable foreign exchange surplus in excess of \$10 billion. So any policy that has a negative bearing on the domestic business will weaken the industry on the international front. One doesn't kill the hen that lays golden eggs.

Pharma industry was the first indigenous sector (even before ITeS came of age) that proved to the world 'Make in India' was possible, and became a key factor in helping countries reduce their health expenditure. It is a matter of pride for every Indian that every third tablet or fourth capsule consumed in regulated markets comes from India. PM Modi and his able team of ministers and bureaucrats need to be cognisant of this fact. 'Skill India' and 'Make in India' programmes could well learn from the Indian pharma industry that has been implementing them since the mid-80s.

A responsible government should ensure its citizens have access to quality medicines at affordable prices. Accordingly, a prudent pharma policy should revolve around accessibility, affordability, availability and quality. The regulator should play a central role in the monitoring and approval mechanism as well as abolishing corrupt practices in the company-doctor-chemist nexus. In India, we have over 10,000 pharma companies who market over 2,00,000 brands. There is no regulatory authority in the world that can handle this load to ensure quality, lower prices and prevent corrupt practices.



Changing immediately the branded generic nature of the domestic market to a pure generic one is fraught with danger. The proposed industry recalibration should be a time bound programme spread over a 10-year timeframe, but first we must create the regulatory infrastructure with utmost urgency. For the patient in India, generics today are not significantly cheaper while the chemist-doctor-marketer nexus makes a huge profit.

In the short term, the focus should be on reducing the number of brands and players. Government should look to do away with marketing companies who only depend on contract manufacturers for sourcing and an unholy nexus with chemists and doctors for selling. We need to bring down the number of players in India to 500 and the number of brands to 25,000. OCODOBOP (one company, one drug, one brand, one price) should be compulsorily implemented. Contract manufacturers who have at the minimum a WHO GMP certification, should be exempted from the OCODOBOP clause. The prevailing practice of co-marketing through multiple brands of the same molecule should be

**One doesn't kill the hen that lays golden eggs. 'Skill India' and 'Make in India' could learn from the pharma industry that has been implementing them since the mid-80s**

changed to co-promotion of a single brand to streamline pricing across the distribution channel.

With lesser number of players, all product approvals should be compulsorily centralised at the DCI's office and with lesser number of brands, NPPA can ensure better monitoring and implementation of prices. The state level FDAs must be focussed on quality checks and price monitoring. MoH should be a one stop nodal ministry which houses the DCI, state FDAs, NPPA and DOP.

Government must consider making significant investments to strengthen the regulatory infrastructure. The pharma industry would be more than happy to par-

take in this endeavour. Government should replace the 2% CSR allocation of profits with a 2% of profits cess annually that will be made available exclusively to MoH for building the regulatory infrastructure.

Presently, there are over 1,200 GMP certified formulations manufacturing units in India with surplus capacity for quality control. Without additionally burdening their existing setup of QC laboratories, state FDAs can avail the services of pharma companies by picking products from chemists on a random basis and sending the same masked as blind samples to the manufacturers for analysis. This will ensure heightened quality assurance on part of the manufacturers, failing which punitive penalties can be imposed.

An anti-discounting policy including abolishing bonus offer practices with fixed percentages for stockists and chemists will go a long way in reducing prices. NPPA should not only be armed with determining end point prices for NLEM products but also monitor invoicing practices across the distribution channel to ensure that patients benefit in terms of cost of medicines. With lesser number of brands and a vigilant, empowered NPPA, prices could come down by 10-15% by streamlining the channel pricing.

Government should give the industry three years to reform itself during which vanilla marketers must set up their own manufacturing units; contract manufacturers must obtain the GMP/GLP accreditation and be encouraged to market their products as generics; all pharma companies should have their own in-house manufacturing setup (as they do for exports) if they have to market non-patented products as brands in India. All new products that get introduced with immediate effect should have the BA/BE approvals in place and over the next three years, all existing products must necessarily be bioequivalent.

Regulatory authorities have to play a more forthcoming, central and proactive role in enabling the pharma industry. The industry in turn must rally around government initiatives of providing quality medicines at affordable prices.

*The writer is Partner, ChrysCapital Private Equity. Views are personal.*