

**TENDER FOR FIXING RATE CONTRACT FOR SUPPLY OF VARIOUS LABORATORY REAGENTS, KITS AND CONSUMABLES TO VARIOUS GOVT. INSTITUTIONS IN THE STATE.**

**TENDER NO. 476/REAGENT/NHM/TNMSC/ENGG/2019, DT. 29.05.2019**  
**RESULTS OF EVALUATION AND FINALLY SHORTLISTED BIDDERS**

**LABORATORY REAGENTS:**

**1. ABSOLUTE ALCOHOL-100000ml**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----
2.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
3.	M/s. Research- Lab Fine Chem Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification of the tender, hence not recommended: a. Grade: Analytical Reagent. b. pH: 7
4.	M/s.M.R. Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
5.	M/s. MJ Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
6.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
7.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Company	Responsive	Responsive	-----
8.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Responsive	Not evaluated	The firm M/s. VIP Surgicals was blacklisted for 3 years in TNMSC letter no. 377/LT/DME-TNJ/TNMSC/ENGG/2020, dt. 13.02.2020

**2. CONCENTRATED HYDROCHLORIC ACID (HCL)- 37500ML**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
2.	M/s. Research Lab Fine Chem Industries	Responsive	Responsive	----

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
3.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
4.	M/s. MJ Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
5.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
6.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Company	Responsive	Responsive	-----
7.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Responsive	Not evaluated	The firm M/s. VIP Surgicals was blacklisted for 3 years in TNMSC letter no. 377/LT/DME- TNJ/TNMSC/ENGG/2020, dt. 13.02.2020

### 3. CONCENTRATED SULPHURIC ACID - 37500ML

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
2.	M/s. Research Lab Fine Chem Industries	Responsive	Responsive	-----
3.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
4.	M/s. MJ Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
5.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
6.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Company	Responsive	Responsive	-----
7.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Responsive	Not evaluated	The firm M/s. VIP Surgicals was blacklisted for 3 years in TNMSC letter no. 377/LT/DME- TNJ/TNMSC/ENGG/2020, dt. 13.02.2020

#### 4. DRAPKIN'S REAGENT - 25000000ml

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown does not have Hb Standard. Also does not meet with the point of repeatability and CV. Hence not recommended.
2.	M/s. Research Lab Fine Chem Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown does not have Hb Standard. Also does not meet with the point of repeatability and CV. Hence not recommended.
3.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample has shown the high CV value of 23.1% (Erratic values). Hence not recommended.
4.	M/s. Mediclone Biotech Pvt Ltd	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
5.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown has high CV value of 21.56% (Erratic values). Sample is in White color bottle against the tender specification of Light protective container. Hence not recommended.
6.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown does not have Hb Standard, hence not recommended.
7.	M/s. MJ Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown does not have Hb Standard. Also does not meet with the point of repeatability and CV. Hence not recommended.
8.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Company	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown does not have Hb Standard. Also does not meet with the point of repeatability and CV. Hence not recommended.

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
9.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown does not have Hb Standard. Also does not meet with the point of repeatability and CV. Hence not recommended.
10.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown does not have Hb Standard. Also does not meet with the point of repeatability and CV. Hence not recommended.
11.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not received. Hence not recommended.
12.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
13.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown has high CV value of 5.32% (Erratic values). Sample does not have kit insert. Hence not recommended.
14.	M/s. VIP Surgicals.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown has high CV value of 8.52% (Erratic values). Sample is in White color bottle against the tender specification of Light protective container and does not have kit insert. Hence not recommended.
15.	M/s. Labcare Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not received. Hence not recommended.

## 5. EDTA Solution -10 %

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended for the following reasons: a. Kit insert is not available. Hence concentration & Percentage of EDTA cannot be gauged. b. pH is not mentioned or shown anywhere. c. Not stable in room temperature.
2.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended for the following reasons: a. Kit insert is not available. Hence concentration & Percentage of EDTA cannot be gauged. b. pH is not mentioned or shown anywhere. c. Not stable in room temperature.
3.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended for the following reasons: a. Kit insert is not available. Hence concentration & Percentage of EDTA cannot be gauged. b. pH is not mentioned or shown anywhere.

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
				c. Not stable in room temperature.
4.	M/s. Research- Lab Fine Chem Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended for the following reasons: a. Kit insert is not available. Hence concentration & Percentage of EDTA cannot be gauged. b. pH is not mentioned or shown anywhere. c. Not stable in room temperature.
5.	M/s. MJ Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended for the following reasons: a. Kit insert is not available. Hence concentration & Percentage of EDTA cannot be gauged. b. pH is not mentioned or shown anywhere. c. Not stable in room temperature.
6.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended for the following reasons: a. Kit insert is not available. Hence concentration & Percentage of EDTA cannot be gauged.

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
				<p>b. pH is not mentioned or shown anywhere.</p> <p>c. Not stable in room temperature.</p>
7.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Company	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	<p>As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended for the following reasons:</p> <p>a. Kit insert is not available. Hence concentration &amp; Percentage of EDTA cannot be gauged.</p> <p>b. pH is not mentioned or shown anywhere.</p> <p>c. Not stable in room temperature.</p>
8.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt LTd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	<p>As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended for the following reasons:</p> <p>a. Kit insert is not available. Hence concentration &amp; Percentage of EDTA cannot be gauged.</p> <p>b. pH is not mentioned or shown anywhere.</p> <p>c. Not stable in room temperature.</p>
9.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	<p>As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended for the following reasons:</p> <p>a. Kit insert is not available. Hence concentration &amp;</p>

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
				Percentage of EDTA cannot be gauged. b. pH is not mentioned or shown anywhere. c. Not stable in room temperature.
10.	M/s. VIP Surgicals.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended for the following reasons: a. Kit insert is not available. Hence concentration & Percentage of EDTA cannot be gauged. b. pH is not mentioned or shown anywhere. c. Not stable in room temperature.
11.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended for the following reasons: a. Kit insert is not available. Hence concentration & Percentage of EDTA cannot be gauged. b. pH is not mentioned or shown anywhere. c. Not stable in room temperature.

**6. FLUORIDE SOLUTION -200000ml**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended for the following reasons: a. 0.5M EDTA.
2.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not received. Hence not recommended.
3.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not received. Hence not recommended.
4.	M/s. Research- Lab Fine Chem Industries	Responsive	Responsive	-----
5.	M/s. MJ Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not received. Hence not recommended.
6.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt LTd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not received. Hence not recommended.
7.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not received. Hence not recommended.
8.	M. VIP Surgicals.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not received. Hence not recommended.

**7. ISOPROPHYL ALCOHOL(SURGICAL SPIRIT)- 25000000ML**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not received. Hence not recommended.
2.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----
3.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample is not

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
				satisfactory on testing. Hence not recommended.
4.	M/s. Research- Lab Fine Chem Industries	Responsive	Responsive	-----
5.	M/s.M.R. Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample is not satisfactory on testing. Hence not recommended.
6.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample is not satisfactory on testing. Hence not recommended.
7.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Company	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample is not satisfactory on testing. Hence not recommended.
8.	M/s. VIP Surgicals.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample is not satisfactory on testing. Hence not recommended.

**8. LUGOL'S IODINE - 1000000ML**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
2.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----
3.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
4.	M/s. Research- Lab Fine Chem Industries	Responsive	Responsive	-----
5.	M/s.M.R. Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
6.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
7.	M/s. MJ Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report
8.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Responsive	Responsive	-----
9.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
10.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Company	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report
11.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Responsive	Not evaluated	The firm M/s. VIP Surgicals was blacklisted for 3 years in TNMSC letter no. 377/LT/DME-TNJ/TNMSC/ENGG/2020, dt. 13.02.2020
12.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
13.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Responsive	Responsive	-----

**9. NORMAL PHYSIOLOGICAL SALINE -0.85 % - 250000ML**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report
2.	M/s. M J Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report
3.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample is not

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
				recommended as there is bacterial growth seen ( Sterility check not passed)
4.	M/s. SS Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample is not recommended as there is bacterial growth seen ( Sterility check not passed)
5.	M/s. Research-Lab Fine Chem Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample is not recommended as there is bacterial growth seen ( Sterility check not passed)
6.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----

**10. POTASSIUM HYDROXIDE SOLUTION – 20%- 5000ML**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
2.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----
4.	M/s. Research-Lab Fine Chem Industries	Responsive	Responsive	-----
5.	M/s. M J Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report
6.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Company	Responsive	Responsive	-----
7.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
8.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report
9.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report

**11. SODIUM HYPOCHLORITE SOLUTION -5%– 2500000ML**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
2.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Company	Responsive	Responsive	-----
3.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd.	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
4.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report
5.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Responsive	Not evaluated	The firm M/s. VIP Surgicals was blacklisted for 3 years in TNMSC letter no. 377/LT/DME-TNJ/TNMSC/ENGG/2020, dt. 13.02.2020
6.	M/s. S.S Chemicals (Nice Chemicals)	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
7.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
8.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----
9.	M/s. Research Lab Fine Chem Industries	Responsive	Responsive	-----
10.	M/s. MJ Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
11.	M/s. Thirupathi Enterprises	Responsive	Responsive	-----
12.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----

**12. ACETIC ACID - 5%– 250000ML**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
2.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----
4.	M/s. Research Lab Fine Chem Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample is not satisfactory on testing, hence not recommended.
5.	M/s. MJ Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
6.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
7.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Company	Responsive	Responsive	-----
8.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
9.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Responsive	Responsive	-----
10.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.

### 13. DISTILLED WATER – 12500000ML

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
2.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Company	Responsive	Responsive	-----
3.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report
4.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report
5.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following point of the technical specification of the tender, hence not recommended. a. Double distilled water.
6.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following point of the technical specification of the tender, hence not recommended. a. Iron Free.
7.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----
8.	M/s. Research Lab Fine Chem Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following point of the technical specification of the tender, hence not recommended. a. Iron Free.
9.	M/s. MJ Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report
10.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following point of the technical specification of the

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
				tender, hence not recommended. a. Double distilled water.

**14. JSB 1&2– 4608000ML**

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended on the following: a. Parasite is not stained. b. Background is stained. c. Smear fixative/fixation is not satisfactory.
2.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended on the following: a. Parasite is not stained. b. Background is stained. c. Smear fixative/fixation is not satisfactory.
3.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended on the following: a. Parasite is not stained. b. Background is stained. c. Smear fixative/fixation is not satisfactory.
4.	M/s. Research Lab Fine Chem Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended on the following: a. Parasite is not stained. b. Background is stained. c. Smear fixative/fixation is not satisfactory.
5.	M/s. MJ Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not received for evaluation
6.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended on the following: a. Parasite is not stained. b. Background is stained.

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
				c. Smear fixative/fixation is not satisfactory.
7.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not received for evaluation.
8.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
9.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not received for evaluation.

**15. 3.8 % SODIUM CITRATE – 2304000ML**

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended on the following: a. No kit insert to specify the % of Sodium citrate. b. Comparison with fully automated & manual methods shows highly erratic values. c. Different controls were used daily to compare the sample with sodium citrate solution shows erratic values with known controls.
2.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended on the following: a. No kit insert to specify the % of Sodium citrate. b. Comparison with fully automated & manual methods shows highly erratic values. c. Different controls were used daily to compare the sample with sodium citrate solution shows erratic values with known controls.

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
3.	M/s. Research Lab Fine Chem Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended on the following: a. No kit insert to specify the % of Sodium citrate. b. Comparison with fully automated & manual methods shows highly erratic values. c. Different controls were used daily to compare the sample with sodium citrate solution shows erratic values with known controls.
4.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended on the following: a. No kit insert to specify the % of Sodium citrate. b. Comparison with fully automated & manual methods shows highly erratic values. c. Different controls were used daily to compare the sample with sodium citrate solution shows erratic values with known controls.
5.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended on the following: a. No kit insert to specify the % of Sodium citrate. b. Comparison with fully automated & manual methods shows highly erratic values. c. Different controls were used daily to compare the sample with sodium citrate solution shows erratic values with known controls.
6.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended on the following: a. No kit insert to specify the % of Sodium citrate.

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
				<p>b. Comparison with fully automated &amp; manual methods shows highly erratic values.</p> <p>c. Different controls were used daily to compare the sample with sodium citrate solution shows erratic values with known controls.</p>
7.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Company	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	<p>As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended on the following:</p> <p>a. No kit insert to specify the % of Sodium citrate.</p> <p>b. Comparison with fully automated &amp; manual methods shows highly erratic values.</p> <p>c. Different controls were used daily to compare the sample with sodium citrate solution shows erratic values with known controls.</p>
8.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	<p>As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended on the following:</p> <p>a. No kit insert to specify the % of Sodium citrate.</p> <p>b. Comparison with fully automated &amp; manual methods shows highly erratic values.</p> <p>c. Different controls were used daily to compare the sample with sodium citrate solution shows erratic values with known controls.</p>
9.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	<p>As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended on the following:</p> <p>a. No kit insert to specify the % of Sodium citrate.</p> <p>b. Comparison with fully automated &amp; manual methods shows highly erratic values.</p> <p>c. Different controls were used daily to compare the sample with sodium citrate solution</p>

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
				shows erratic values with known controls.
10.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended on the following: a. No kit insert to specify the % of Sodium citrate. b. Comparison with fully automated & manual methods shows highly erratic values. c. Different controls were used daily to compare the sample with sodium citrate solution shows erratic values with known controls.
11.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended on the following: a. No kit insert to specify the % of Sodium citrate. b. Comparison with fully automated & manual methods shows highly erratic values. c. Different controls were used daily to compare the sample with sodium citrate solution shows erratic values with known controls.

**16. COOMB'S REAGENT VIAL - DIRECT – 3840ML**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Mediclone Biotech Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown does not meet the quality control

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
				criteria of DAT/IAT with titre 1: 16 only and color of the reagent is very dark to identify floating. Hence not recommended.
2.	M/s. VIP surgical	Responsive	Not evaluated	The firm M/s. VIP Surgicals was blacklisted for 3 years in TNMSC letter no. 377/LT/DME-TNJ/TNMSC/ENGG/2020, dt. 13.02.2020
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the color of the reagent is very dark to identify floating and repeatability inconsistent values. Hence not recommended.
4.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the color of the reagent is very dark to identify floating and repeat inconsistent values. Hence not recommended.

**17. COOMB'S REAGENT VIAL - INDIRECT – 3840ML**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Mediclone Biotech Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown does not meet the quality control criteria of DAT/IAT with titre 1: 16 only and color of the reagent is very dark to identify floating. Hence not recommended.
2.	M/s. VIP surgical	Responsive	Not evaluated	The firm M/s. VIP Surgicals was blacklisted for 3 years in TNMSC letter no. 377/LT/DME-

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
				TNJ/TNMSC/ENG/2020, dt. 13.02.2020
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the color of the reagent is very dark to identify floating and repeat inconsistent values. Hence not recommended.
4.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the color of the reagent is very dark to identify floating and repeat inconsistent values. Hence not recommended.

**18. LEISHMAN'S STAIN – 384000ML**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received is not recommended for the following: a. RBC , WBC & Platelets not properly stained. b. Background staining is present.
2.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received is not recommended for the following: a. RBC , WBC & Platelets not properly stained. b. Background staining is present. c. Buffer solution is not present.
3.	M/s. Research Lab Fine Chem Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received is not recommended for the following: a. RBC , WBC & Platelets not properly stained. b. Background staining is present. c. Buffer solution is not present. d. Kit insert is not available.

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
4.	M/s. MJ Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample not received for evaluation.
5.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received is not recommended for the following: a. RBC & WBC not properly stained. b. Background staining is present. c. Buffer solution is not present. d. Kit insert is not available.
6.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received is not recommended for the following: a. RBC & Platelets not properly stained. b. Background staining is present. c. Buffer solution is not present. d. Kit insert is not available.
7.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received is not recommended for the following: a. RBC & Platelets not properly stained. b. Background staining is present. c. Buffer solution is not present.
8.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received is not recommended for the following: a. RBC & Platelets not properly stained. b. Background staining is present. c. Buffer solution is not present.
9.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Company	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report- Sample not received for evaluation.

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
10.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
11.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received is not recommended for the following: a. RBC & WBC not properly stained.
12.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received is not recommended for the following: a. RBC & Platelets not properly stained. b. Background staining is present. c. Buffer solution is not present. d. Kit insert is not available.
13.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received is not recommended for the following: a. RBC & WBC not properly stained. b. Background staining is present. c. Buffer solution is not present. d. Kit insert is not available.

#### 19. AEC REAGENT –38400 TESTS

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Research Lab Fine Chem Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report- Sample not received for evaluation.
2.	M/s. VIP surgical	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report- Sample not received for evaluation.
3.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample received is not recommended for the following:

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
				a. No kit insert for details. b. Staining quantity is not satisfactory. c. Time duration not mentioned.

**20. MAC CONKEY AGAR MEDIA –192000000 GRAMS**

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. Research Lab Fine Chem Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample is not recommended as bacterial growth was not observed with test sample and QC strains.
2.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
4.	M/s. MJ Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
5.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Responsive	Responsive	-----
6.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
7.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Company	Responsive	Responsive	-----
8.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
9.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.

**21. BLOOD AGAR –192000000 GRAMS**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Research Lab Fine Chem Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, there is lysis of blood during perforation.
2.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
4.	M/s. MJ Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
5.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Responsive	Responsive	-----
6.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
7.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Company	Responsive	Responsive	-----
8.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
9.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.

## 22. UTI AGAR HIMEDIA –192000000 GRAMS

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
2.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
3.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Company	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
4.	M/s. MJ Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
5.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample shows poor color

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
				production. Hence not recommended.
6.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
7.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.

**23. SS AGAR –19200000 GRAMS**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
2.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
3.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Company	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shows absence of growth of Cholerae. Hence not recommended.
4.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
5.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shows absence of growth of Cholerae. Hence not recommended.
6.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
7.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
8.	M/s. Research Lab Fine Chem Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shows absence of growth of Cholerae. Hence not recommended.

### LABORATORY KITS:

#### 1. ALANINE AMINO TRANSFERASE (SGPT) KIT -1210400 ML

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
2.	M/s. Mediclone Biotech Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should use IFCC method.
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
4.	M/s. Jaimitra Biomed	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have long expiry of 18 months & more. b. Manufacturer should have ISO13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE certified.
5.	M/s. Transasia Bio Medicals Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----
6.	M/s. Shan Biotech & Diagnostics	Responsive	Responsive	-----
7.	M/s. Sri Sai Ekdant Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
8.	M/s. General Instruments	Responsive	Responsive	-----
9.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
10.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should use IFCC method.
11.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
12.	M/s. Accurex Biomedical Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have liquid stable reagent.
13.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
14.	M/s. M.C. Dalal & co.	Responsive	Responsive	-----
15.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
16.	M/s. BioLab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should use IFCC method.
17.	M/s. Diasys Diagnostics India Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have long expiry of 18 months and more.

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
18.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
19.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Responsive	Not evaluated	The firm M/s. VIP Surgicals was blacklisted for 3 years in TNMSC letter no. 377/LT/DME-TNJ/TNMSC/ENG/2020, dt. 13.02.2020
20.	M/s. Trivitron Healthcare Pvt Ltd.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
21.	M/s. Labcare Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended.

## **2. ALKALINE PHOSPHATASE KIT -2477600ML**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should use IFCC method. b. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 10IU/L
2.	M/s. Mediclone Biotech Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have liquid stable reagent. b. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 10IU/L
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended:

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
				a. Should have liquid stable reagent. b. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 10IU/L
4.	M/s. Jaimitra Biomed	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should use IFCC method. b. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 10IU/L
5.	M/s. Transasia Bio Medicals Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----
6.	M/s. Shan Biotech & Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
7.	M/s. Sri Sai Ekdant Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
8.	M/s. General Instruments	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 10IU/L
9.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
10.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should use IFCC method. b. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 10IU/L
11.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
12.	M/s. MJ Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
13.	M/s. Accurex Biomedical Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should use IFCC method. b. Should have liquid stable reagent
14.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have long expiry of 18 months & More.
15.	M/s. M.C. Dalal & co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
16.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 10IU/L
17.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should use IFCC method. b. Should have liquid stable reagent.
18.	M/s. Diasys Diagnostics India Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended:

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
				a. Should use IFCC method. b. Should have long expiry of 18 months & more.
19.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
20.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should use IFCC method. b. Should have liquid stable reagent. c. Manufacturer should have ISO13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE certified.
21.	M/s. Trivitron Healthcare Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
22.	M/s. Labcare Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 10IU/L

### 3. ANTI STREPTOLYSIN-O KIT -24200 TESTS

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
2.	M/s. Mediclone Biotech Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
4.	M/s. Jaimitra Biomed	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Manufacturer should have ISO13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE certified.
5.	M/s. Transasia Bio-Medicals Ltd.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
6.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Responsive	Responsive	-----
7.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
8.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have long expiry of 18 months & more.
9.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
10.	M/s. Sri Sai Mercury Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have long expiry of 18 months & more.
11.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
12.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
13.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have long expiry of 18 months & more.
14.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
15.	M/s. Labcare Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----

#### **4. ANTI-HCV ELISA KIT -230784 TESTS**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have long expiry of 12 months and Manufacturer should have ISO13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE certified.
2.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
3.	M/s. Triviron Healthcare Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have long expiry of 12 months and Manufacturer should have ISO13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE certified.
4.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
				does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have long expiry of 12 months and Manufacturer should have ISO13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE certified.
5.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, kit control is not working, hence not recommended.
6.	M/s. Jaimitra Biomed	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
7.	M/s. Transasia Bio-Medicals Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----
8.	M/s. Shan Biotech & Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
9.	M/s. Vivek Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, kit positive control is not satisfactory, hence not recommended.
10.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.

#### **5. ASO KIT(IMMUNO TURBIDOMETRIC METHOD)- 5000 TESTS**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
2.	M/s. Mediclone Biotech Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----
4.	M/s. Jaimitra Biomed	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
5.	M/s. Transasia Bio-Medicals Ltd.	Responsive	Responsive	-----

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
6.	M/s. General Instruments	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 20 IU/mL.
7.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
8.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Responsive	Responsive	-----
9.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
10.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
11.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 20 IU/mL.
12.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
13.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
14.	M/s. VIP Surgicals.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have linearity of 800 IU/mL.

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
15.	M/s. Labcare Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 20 IU/mL.

#### 6. ASPARTATE TRANSAMINASE (SGOT) KIT - 596000ML

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should use Kinetic mode. b. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 2 IU/L. c. Should have long expiry of 18 months & more.
2.	M/s. Mediclone Biotech Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should use Kinetic mode. b. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 2 IU/L. c. Should have long expiry of 18 months & more. d. Should use IFCC method.
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should use Kinetic mode.

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
				b. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 2 IU/L. c. Should have long expiry of 18 months & more.
4.	M/s. Jaimithra Biomed	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should use Kinetic mode. b. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 2 IU/L. c. Should have linearity of 500 IU/L.
5.	M/s. Transasia Bio Medicals Ltd.	Responsive	Responsive	-----
6.	M/s. Shan Biotech & Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should use Kinetic mode. b. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 2 IU/L. c. Should have long expiry of 18 months & more. d. Should have linearity of 500 IU/L.
7.	M/s. Sri Sai Ekdant Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
8.	M/s. General Instruments	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should use Kinetic mode. b. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 2 IU/L.
9.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
				does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should use Kinetic mode. b. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 2 IU/L.
10.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should use Kinetic mode. b. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 2 IU/L. c. Should have linearity of 500 IU/L. d. Should use IFCC method.
11.	M/s. MR Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
12.	M/s. M J Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
13.	M/s. Accurex Biomedical Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should use Kinetic mode. b. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 2 IU/L. c. Should have linearity of 500 IU/L. d. Should have liquid stable reagent.
14.	M/s. SS Chemicals.	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
15.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Responsive	Responsive	-----
16.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
				following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should use Kinetic mode. b. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 2 IU/L. c. Should have linearity of 500 IU/L. d. Should use IFCC method.
17.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should use Kinetic mode. b. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 2 IU/L. c. Should have linearity of 500 IU/L. d. Should have long expiry of 18 months & more.
18.	M/s. Diasys Diagnostics India Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
19.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
20.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should use Kinetic mode. b. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 2 IU/L. c. Should have linearity of 500 IU/L. d. Should have long expiry of 18 months & more.
21.	M/s. Trivitron Healthcare Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
				specification, hence not recommended: a. Should use Kinetic mode. b. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 2 IU/L. c. Should have linearity of 500 IU/L.
22.	M/s. Sri Sai Mercury Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should use IFCC method. b. Should have linearity of 500 IU/L.
23.	M/s. Labcare Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have linearity of 500 IU/L. b. Should use IFCC method.

#### 7. BILIRUBIN TEST KIT (TOTAL AND DIRECT) -16796800ML

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.1 mg/dl.
2.	M/s. Mediclone Biotech Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended:

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
				a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.1 mg/dl.
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.1 mg/dl. b. Should have the linearity of 20 mg/dl.
4.	M/s. Jaimithra Biomedics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.1 mg/dl. b. Should have long expiry of 12 months & more. c. Manufacturer should have ISO 13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE certified.
5.	M/s. Transasia Bio Medicals Ltd.	Responsive	Responsive	-----
6.	M/s. Shan Biotech & Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
7.	M/s. Sri Sai Ekdant Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have linearity of 20 mg/dl.
8.	M/s. General Instruments	Responsive	Responsive	-----
9.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
				does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.1 mg/dl.
10.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.1 mg/dl.
11.	M/s. MR Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
12.	M/s. M J Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
13.	M/s. Accurex Biomedical Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.1 mg/dl.
14.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Responsive	Responsive	-----
15.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.1 mg/dl.
16.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.1 mg/dl.

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
17.	M/s. Diasys Diagnostics India Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
18.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.1 mg/dl.
19.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.1 mg/dl.
20.	M/s. Triviron Healthcare Pvt Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----
21.	M/s. Labcare Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.1 mg/dl.

#### **8. CHIKUNGUNYA IGM ELISA KIT- 9600 TEST**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Jaimitra Biomed	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, calibrator not working, hence not recommended

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
2.	M/s. Sri Sai Ekdant Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
3.	M/s. Vivek Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, low positive control not picked, hence not recommended
4.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
5.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, calibrator not working, hence not recommended
6.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
7.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.

#### **9. CHOLESTEROL TEST KIT-3920400ML**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Jaimitra Biomedics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 10 mg/dl.
2.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
3.	M/s. Mediclone Biotech Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
4.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
5.	M/s. Transasia Bio Medicals Ltd.	Responsive	Responsive	-----
6.	M/s. Shan Biotech & Diagnostics	Responsive	Responsive	-----
7.	M/s. Sri Sai Ekdant Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report
8.	M/s. General Instruments	Responsive	Responsive	-----
9.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
10.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Responsive	Responsive	-----
11.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
12.	M/s. M J Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report
13.	M/s. Accurex Biomedical Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have liquid stable reagent.
14.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
15.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
16.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
17.	M/s. BioLab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
18.	M/s. Diasys Diagnostics India Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
19.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Responsive	Responsive	-----
20.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Responsive	Not evaluated	The firm M/s. VIP Surgicals was blacklisted for 3 years in TNMSC letter no. 377/LT/DME-TNJ/TNMSC/ENGG/2020, dt. 13.02.2020
21.	M/s. Trivitron Healthcare Pvt Ltd.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report
22.	M/s. Labcare Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----

#### **10.C-REACTIVE PROTEIN(CRP) TEST KIT-RAPID -5000 TESTS**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Jaimitra Biomed	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Manufacturer should have ISO13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE certified.
2.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----
4.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
5.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report
6.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report
7.	M/s. MJ Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report
8.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Responsive	Responsive	-----
9.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
10.	M/s. Sri Sai Mercury Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Not working with neat sample. b. Manufacturer should have ISO13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE certified.
11.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report
12.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report
13.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Not working with high titres.
14.	M/s. Mediclone Biotech Pvt Ltd.	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----

#### **11.CREATININE TEST KIT- 15580800 ML**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Jaimitra Biomed	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Common reagent against the tender specification of should contain R1 (Picric acid) and R2 (Sodium Hydroxide) reagents separately.
2.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.1 mg/dl.
3.	M/s. Mediclone Biotech Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.1 mg/dl.
4.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.1 mg/dl. b. Should have linearity of 15 mg/dl.
5.	M/s. Transasia Bio Medicals Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----
6.	M/s. Shan Biotech & Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended:

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
				a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.1 mg/dl.
7.	M/s. Sri Sai Ekdant Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
8.	M/s. General Instruments	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.1 mg/dl.
9.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.1 mg/dl.
10.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.1 mg/dl.
11.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
12.	M/s. MJ Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
13.	M/s. Accurex Biomedical Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
14.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
15.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
				specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.1 mg/dl.
16.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.1 mg/dl.
17.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.1 mg/dl.
18.	M/s. Diasys Diagnostics India Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.1 mg/dl.
19.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Responsive	Responsive	-----
20.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.1 mg/dl.
21.	M/s. Triviron Healthcare Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
22.	M/s. Sri Sai Mercury Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
				following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Common reagent against the tender specification of should contain R1 (Picric acid) and R2 (Sodium Hydroxide) reagents separately.
23.	M/s. Labcare Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.1 mg/dl.

#### **12.C-REACTIVE PROTEIN(CRP) TEST KIT-QUANTITATIVE – 1013000 TESTS**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Accurex Biomedical Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Sensitivity 2mg against the tender specification of should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.5 mg/L.
2.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Sensitivity not provided against the tender specification of should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.5 mg/L.
3.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
4.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Sensitivity 2mg against the tender specification of should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.5 mg/L.
5.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Sensitivity <2mg against the tender specification of should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.5 mg/L.
6.	M/s. General Instruments	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Sensitivity 6mg against the tender specification of should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.5 mg/L.
7.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Sensitivity <2mg against the tender specification of should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.5 mg/L.
8.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
				specification, hence not recommended: a. Sensitivity <2mg against the tender specification of should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.5 mg/L.
9.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
10.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Sensitivity 1mg against the tender specification of should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.5 mg/L.
11.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Sensitivity 1mg against the tender specification of should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.5 mg/L.
12.	M/s. Mediclone Biotech Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received is for CARD TEST, hence not accepted.
13.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Sensitivity 2mg against the tender specification of should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.5 mg/L.

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
14.	M/s. Jaimitra Biomed	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
15.	M/s. Transasia Bio Medicals Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Sensitivity 2mg against the tender specification of should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.5 mg/L.
16.	M/s. Labcare Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Sensitivity not provided against the tender specification of should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.5 mg/L.

### **13.DENGUE IGM ELISA KIT – 1825536 TESTS**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Shan Biotech & Diagnostics	Responsive	Responsive	-----
2.	M/s. General Instruments	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
3.	M/s. Vivek Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
4.	M/s. Jaimitra Biomed	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
5.	M/s. Transasia Bio Medicals Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, no calibrator. Hence not recommended.
6.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
7.	M/s. S.S Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, no calibrator. Hence not recommended.
8.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Responsive	Responsive	-----
9.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
10.	M/s. SD Bio Sensor Healthcare Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, no calibrator. Hence not recommended.
11.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.

#### **14.DENGUE NS1 ELISA KIT – 19200 TESTS**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Shan Biotech & Diagnostics	Responsive	Responsive	-----
2.	M/s. Jaimitra Biomedics	Non Responsive	Not Evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not submitted.
3.	M/s. Transasia Bio Medicals Ltd	Non Responsive	Responsive	As per the sample evaluation report, Calibrator not working, hence not recommended.
4.	M/s. Sri Sai Ekdant Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not Evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, Calibrator not working, hence not recommended.
5.	M/s. General Instruments	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
6.	M/s. Vivek Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: 1. Calibrator is not available. 2. Manufacturer should have ISO 13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE certified.
7.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
8.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
9.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification of the tender, hence not recommended: a. The serological sensitivity of the kit should be > 85% and the specificity should be >95%. b. Manufacturer should have ISO13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE certified.
10.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, calibrators are not working. Hence not recommended.
11.	M/s. SD Bio Sensor Healthcare Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification of the tender, hence not recommended: a. Manufacturer should have ISO13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE certified.
12.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.

**15.GLUPOSE TEST KIT – 23476000ML**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Shan Biotech & Diagnostics	Responsive	Responsive	-----
2.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 10mg/dl.
3.	M/s. Mediclone Biotech Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 10mg/dl.
4.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 10mg/dl.
5.	M/s. Jaimitra Biomed	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 10mg/dl. b. Manufacturer should have ISO13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE certified.
6.	M/s. Transasia Bio Medicals Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended:

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
				a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 10mg/dl.
7.	M/s. Sri Sai Ekdant Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Accessories- Standard to be provided.
8.	M/s. General Instruments	Responsive	Responsive	-----
9.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 10mg/dl.
10.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 10mg/dl.
11.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 10mg/dl. b. Manufacturer should have ISO13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE certified.
12.	M/s. Accurex Biomedical Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
				specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have liquid stable reagent. b. Linearity up to 450mg/dl against the tender specification of 500 mg/dl.
13.	M/s. M J Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
14.	M/s. Diasys Diagnostics India Pvt Ltd.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Linearity of 400mg/dl against the tender specification of 500 mg/dl.
15.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
16.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
17.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
18.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have liquid stable reagent. b. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 10 mg/dl.
19.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
20.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
				specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 10 mg/dl.
21.	M/s. Trivitron Healthcare Pvt Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----
22.	M/s. Sri Sai Mercury Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended

#### 16.HBSAG CARD TEST – 2785200 NOS

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. Mediclone Biotech Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, Quality control samples not answered and does not meet with the point of technical specification that Manufacturer should have ISO13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE certified. Hence not recommended.
2.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----
3.	M/s. Sri Sai Ekdant Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, Quality control and samples not answered and does not meet with the point of technical specification that Manufacturer should have ISO13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE certified. Hence not recommended.

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
4.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, Quality control not satisfactory and does not meet with the point of technical specification that Manufacturer should have ISO13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE certified. Hence not recommended.
5.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, Quality control and test sample not answered and does not meet with the point of technical specification that Manufacturer should have ISO13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE certified. Hence not recommended.
6.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, Quality control and test sample not answered and does not meet with the point of technical specification that Manufacturer should have ISO13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE certified. Hence not recommended.
7.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Responsive	Non Responsive	Not extending the bid validity of the tender.
8.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, control band not satisfactory and does not meet with the point of technical

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
				specification that Manufacturer should have ISO13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE certified. Hence not recommended.
9.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
10.	M/s. SD Bio Sensor Healthcare Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, test samples not answered and does not meet with the point of technical specification that Manufacturer should have ISO13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE certified. Hence not recommended.
11.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, Quality control and test samples not answered and does not meet with the point of technical specification that Manufacturer should have ISO13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE certified. Hence not recommended.
12.	M/s. Trivitron Healthcare Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, Quality control and test samples not answered and does not meet with the point of technical specification that Manufacturer should have ISO13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
				CE certified. Hence not recommended.
13.	M/s. Labcare Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, control band not satisfactory and does not meet with the point of technical specification that Manufacturer should have ISO13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE certified. Hence not recommended.

#### **17.HBSAG ELISA KIT – 19200 TESTS**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the negative control OD not within acceptable limit, hence not recommended
2.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, low positive control not answered, hence not recommended
3.	M/s. Transasia Bio Medicals Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----
4.	M/s. Sri Sai Ekdant Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, positive control samples not picked up, hence not recommended
5.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report
6.	M/s. Trivitron Healthcare Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification of the tender, hence not recommended.

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
				a. Manufacturer should have ISO13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE certified.
7.	M/s. Vivek Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report
8.	M/s. S.S Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, controls not answered, low positive control not answered, hence not recommended

#### 18.HDL CHOLESTEROL KIT – 40000 TESTS

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. Mediclone Biotech Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 5.0 mg/dl.
2.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should use PEG/ CHOD-PAP method. b. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 5.0 mg/dl.
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should use PEG/ CHOD-PAP method. b. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 5.0 mg/dl.

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
4.	M/s. Jaimitra Biomed	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 5.0 mg/dl.
5.	M/s. Transasia Bio Medicals Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----
6.	M/s. Shan Biotech & Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
7.	M/s. Sri Sai Ekdant Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
8.	M/s. General Instruments	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should use PEG/ CHOD-PAP method.
9.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
10.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 5.0 mg/dl.
11.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should use PEG/ CHOD-PAP method.
12.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
				following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have long expiry of 18 months & more.
13.	M/s. MJ Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
14.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should use PEG/ CHOD-PAP method. b. Linearity of 125 mg/dl against the tender specification of 150 mg/dl.
15.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 5.0 mg/dl.
16.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should use PEG/ CHOD-PAP method.
17.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt LTd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 5.0 mg/dl.
18.	M/s. Sri Sai Mercury Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
				following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have kit insert.
19.	M/s. Diasys Diagnostics India Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Accessories- Standard to be provided
20.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have long expiry of 18 months.
21.	M/s. Trivitron Healthcare Pvt Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----
22.	M/s. Labcare Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. It should have the linearity of 150 mg/dl

#### 19. HEPATITIS A IGM ELISA KIT – 9600 TESTS

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. Jaimitra Biomed	Responsive	Responsive	-----
2.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
3.	M/s. Vivek Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
				specification, hence not recommended: a. Manufacturer should have ISO13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE certified.
4.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
5.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.

#### 20. HEPATITIS E IGM ELISA KIT – 9600 TESTS

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. Jaimitra Biomed	Responsive	Responsive	-----
2.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report
3.	M/s. Vivek Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, positive samples not picked up, hence not recommended.
4.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report
5.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report

#### 21. LEPTOSPIRA IGM ELISA KIT-19200 TESTS

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. Jaimitra Biomed	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report
2.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report
3.	M/s. Vivek Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
4.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
5.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, quality control not answered, hence not recommended.
6.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample does not meet with the following point of the technical specification of the tender, hence not recommended: a. Manufacturer should have ISO 13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE certified.
7.	M/s. Shan Biotech & Diagnostics	Responsive	Responsive	-----

## **22.MICROALBUMINURIA KIT -2500 TESTS**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Jaimitra Biomedics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
2.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
3.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
4.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
5.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
6.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
7.	M/s. Transasia Biomedicals Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should use fixed time mode.

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
8.	M/s. Shan Biotech & Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should use Immuno Turbidometric method.
9.	M/s. General Instruments	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have long expiry of 18 months & more.
10.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
11.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended: a. Should have the linearity of 150 mg/dl.
12.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
13.	M/s. Labcare Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.

### 23.PA COLIFORM TEST KITS -4000 NOS

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
2.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Responsive	Responsive	-----

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
3.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.

#### **24.PREGNANCY CARD TEST -2850400 TESTS**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
2.	M/s. Mediclone Biotech Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following: a. Inconclusive result.
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Manufacturer should have ISO13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE Certified.
4.	M/s. Rapid Diagnostics Pvt Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----
5.	M/s. Sri Sai Ekdant Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report- Sample not shown.
6.	M/s. Alpine Biomedicals Pvt Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----
7.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following: a. Inconclusive result.
8.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following: a. Inconclusive result.
9.	M/s. MJ Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report- Sample not shown.

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
10.	M/s. A4 Biotech	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following: a. Inconclusive result.
11.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Responsive	Non Responsive	Not extending the bid validity of the tender.
12.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Manufacturer should have ISO13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE Certified.
13.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following: a. Inconclusive result.
14.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Responsive	Not evaluated	The firm M/s. VIP Surgicals was blacklisted for 3 years in TNMSC letter no. 377/LT/DME-TNJ/TNMSC/ENGG/2020, dt. 13.02.2020
15.	M/s. Labcare Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Manufacturer should have ISO13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE Certified.

#### **25.VDRL/SYPHILIS CARD TEST -951600 TESTS**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample submitted by the bidder is RPR kit, hence not evaluated and not recommended.

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
2.	M/s. Mediclone Biotech Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the test band with both control & test samples not detected, hence not recommended.
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----
4.	M/s. Rapid Diagnostics Pvt Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----
5.	M/.s Shan Biotech & Diagnostics	Responsive	Responsive	-----
6.	M/s. Sri Sai Ekdant Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
7.	M/s. Alpine Biomedicals Pvt Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----
8.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
9.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Responsive	Responsive	-----
10.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended a. Manufacturer should have ISO13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE certified.
11.	M/s. MJ Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
12.	M/s. Yuvraj Biobiz Incubator	Responsive	Responsive	-----
13.	M/s. S.S Chemicals	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
14.	M/s. A4 Biotech	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
15.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Responsive	Non Responsive	Did not extend the bid validity of the tender
16.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
17.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
18.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended a. Manufacturer should have ISO13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE certified.
19.	M/s. Labcare Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----

#### **26.RHEUMATOID FACTOR(RF) TEST KIT – RAPID- 48400 TEST**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Sri Sai Mercury Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample has positive control and not working in low titres.
2.	M/s. MJ Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report
3.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report
4.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Responsive	Responsive	-----
5.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
6.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report
7.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample is not working in low titres, hence not recommended.
8.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
9.	M/s. Mediclone Biotech Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, positive control is not satisfactory, hence not recommended.
10.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, negative control not supplied, hence not recommended.
11.	M/s. Jaimitra Biomed	Responsive	Responsive	-----
12.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report
13.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report
14.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report
15.	M/s. Labcare Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----

#### **27.SCRUB TYPHUS IGM ELISA KIT - 9600 TESTS**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. General Instruments	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
2.	M/s. Vivek Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
3.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Responsive	Responsive	-----
4.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report
5.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report
6.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report

#### **28.TOTAL T3 TEST KIT BY ELISA - 28800 TESTS**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Esteem Scientific Products	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
2.	M/s. Transasia Bio Medicals Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----
3.	M/s. Rapid Diagnostics Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
4.	M/s. Jaimitra Biomed	Responsive	Responsive	-----
5.	M/s. Sri Sai Ekdant Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
6.	M/s. Vivek Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
7.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report
8.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report
9.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Responsive	Responsive	-----
10.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
11.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended

#### **29.TOTAL T4 TEST KIT BY ELISA - 28800 TESTS**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Esteem Scientific Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Manufacturer should have ISO13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE Certified.
2.	M/s. Transasia Bio Medicals Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
3.	M/s. Rapid Diagnostics Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Manufacturer should have ISO13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE Certified. b. Should have long expiry of 12 months.
4.	M/s. Jaimitra Biomed	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
5.	M/s. Sri Sai Ekdant Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
6.	M/s. Vivek Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
7.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report
8.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report
9.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
10.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Should have long expiry of 12 months.
11.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Should have long expiry of 12 months.

### **30.TSH TEST KIT BY ELISA - 213120 TESTS**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Esteem Scientific Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Manufacturer should have ISO13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE Certified.
2.	M/s. Transasia Bio Medicals Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
3.	M/s. Rapid Diagnostics Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification:

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
				a. Manufacturer should have ISO13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE Certified. b. Should have long expiry of 12 months.
4.	M/s. Jaimitra Biomed	Responsive	Responsive	-----
5.	M/s. Sri Sai Ekdant Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Should have long expiry of 12 months.
6.	M/s. Vivek Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
7.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report
8.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Responsive	Responsive	-----
9.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
10.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
11.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report

### 31. TRIGLYCERIDES TEST KIT - 6183200 ML

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
2.	M/s. Mediclone Biotech Pvt Ltd	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
4.	M/s. Jaimitra Biomedics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
5.	M/s. Transasia Bio Medicals Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----
6.	M/s. Shan Biotech & Diagnostics	Responsive	Responsive	-----
7.	M/s. Sri Sai Ekdant Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
8.	M/s. General Instruments	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
9.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
10.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Should have linearity of 1000 mg/dl.
11.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
12.	M/s. MJ Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
13.	M/s. Accurex Biomedical Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Should have linearity of 1000 mg/dl. b. Should have liquid stable reagent.
14.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
15.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Responsive	Responsive	-----
16.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Manufacturer should have ISO 13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE certified.
17.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Should have linearity of 1000 mg/dl.
18.	M/s. Diasys Diagnostics India Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
19.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Responsive	Responsive	-----
20.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Manufacturer should have ISO 13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE certified.
21.	M/s. Trivitron Healthcare Pvt Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----
22.	M/s. Sri Sai Mercury Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
23.	M/s. Labcare Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Manufacturer should have ISO 13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE certified.

### **32.UREA TEST KIT - 20614400ML**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 1.0 mg/dl.
2.	M/s. Mediclone Biotech Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 1.0 mg/dl. b. Should use Urease GLDH method. c. Should have long expiry of 18 months & more.
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 1.0 mg/dl. b. Should have liquid stable reagent.
4.	M/s. Jaimitra Biomed	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 1.0 mg/dl.

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
				b.Should have long expiry of 18 months & more. c. Manufacturer should have ISO13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE certified.
5.	M/s. Transasia Bio Medicals Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----
6.	M/s. Shan Biotech & Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 1.0 mg/dl. b. Should have long expiry of 18 months & more.
7.	M/s. Sri Sai Ekdant Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Should have long expiry of 18 months & more.
8.	M/s. General Instruments	Responsive	Responsive	-----
9.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 1.0 mg/dl. b. Should have linearity of 250 mg/dl. c. Should have long expiry of 18 months & more.
10.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 1.0 mg/dl.

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
11.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 1.0 mg/dl. b. Should have long expiry of 18 months & more.
12.	M/s. MJ Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
13.	M/s. Accurex Biomedical Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Should have liquid stable reagent.
14.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 1.0 mg/dl. b. Should have long expiry of 18 months & more.
15.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 1.0 mg/dl.
16.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 1.0 mg/dl. b. Should have long expiry of 18 months & more.

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
17.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 1.0 mg/dl.
18.	M/s. Diasys Diagnostics India Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 1.0 mg/dl. b. Should have long expiry of 18 months & more.
19.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 1.0 mg/dl. b. Should have long expiry of 18 months & more.
20.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Should have liquid stable reagent b. Should use Urease GLDH method.
21.	M/s. Trivitron Healthcare Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
22.	M/s. Sri Sai Mercury Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 1.0 mg/dl.

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
23.	M/s. Labcare Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended

### 33.URIC ACID TEST KIT -653600ML

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.5 mg/dl.
2.	M/s. Mediclone Biotech Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.5 mg/dl.
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.5 mg/dl.
4.	M/s. Jaimitra Biomedics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.5 mg/dl. b. Manufacturer should have ISO13485 or its equivalent for QMS and the product should be CE certified.
5.	M/s. Transasia Bio Medicals Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----
6.	M/s. Shan Biotech & Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
7.	M/s. Sri Sai Ekdant Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
8.	M/s. General Instruments	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
9.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.5 mg/dl.
10.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.5 mg/dl.
11.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.5 mg/dl.
12.	M/s. MJ Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
13.	M/s. Accurex Biomedical Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.5 mg/dl.
14.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
15.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
16.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
17.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.5 mg/dl.
18.	M/s. Diasys Diagnostics India Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
19.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.5 mg/dl.
20.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.5 mg/dl.
21.	M/s. Triviron Healthcare Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
22.	M/s. Sri Sai Mercury Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
23.	M/s. Labcare Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the following point of the technical specification: a. Should have lower limits of sensitivity 0.5 mg/dl.

**34.URINE – SUGAR/ALBUMIN STRIPS -7611200 NOS.**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
				not recommended for the following: a. No Kit insert. b. Late color change. c. No repeatability.
2.	M/s. Mediclone Biotech Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended for the following: a. No CE Certificate. b. Late color change. c. No repeatability.
3.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended for the following: a. No CE and ISO certificate. b. Late color change. c. No repeatability.
4.	M/s. MJ Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended for the following: a.No repeatability.
5.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended for the following: a. Late color change. b. No repeatability.
6.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended for the following: a. No ISO certificate. b. No repeatability.
7.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended for the following: a. No CE Certificate. b. Late color change. c. No repeatability.
8.	M/s. Jaimitra Biomed	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report- Sample not shown

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
9.	M/s. Transasia Bio Medicals Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----
10.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended for the following: a.No repeatability.
11.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended for the following: a. No ISO Certificate or equivalent. b. Late color change. c. No repeatability.
12.	M/s. Carewell Medidla Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended for the following: a. No ISO Certificate or equivalent. b. Late color change. c. No repeatability.
13.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Responsive	Not evaluated	The firm M/s. VIP Surgicals was blacklisted for 3 years in TNMSC letter no. 377/LT/DME-TNJ/TNMSC/ENGG/2020, dt. 13.02.2020

### **35.URINE MULTI STRIPS- 400000 NOS.**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended for the following: a.No compensation pad market and inbuilt qc check. b. No stability. c. No manual and machine comparison. d. No pad color change compatibility. e. No ascorbic acid effect.

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
2.	M/s. Jaimitra Biomed	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report- Sample not received for evaluation.
3.	M/s. Transasia Bio Medicals Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----
4.	M/s. Rapid Diagnostics Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended for the following: a. No ISO Certificate or equivalent. b. No compensation pad market and inbuilt qc check. c. No stability. d. No manual and machine comparison. e. No pad color change compatibility.
5.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended for the following: a.No compensation pad market and inbuilt qc check. b. No stability. c. No manual and machine comparison. d. No pad color change compatibility. e. No ascorbic acid effect. f. No ISO certificate or equivalent.
6.	M/s. MJ Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report- Sample not received for evaluation.
7.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended for the following: a.No compensation pad market and inbuilt qc check. b. No stability. c. No manual and machine comparison.

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
				d. No pad color change compatibility. e. No ascorbic acid effect. f. No ISO certificate or equivalent.
8.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended for the following: a. No ascorbic acid effect. b. No compensation pad market and inbuilt qc check. c. No stability. d. No manual and machine comparison. e. No ISO or equivalent.
9.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended for the following: a.No compensation pad market and inbuilt qc check. b. No stability. c. No manual and machine comparison. d. No pad color change compatibility. e. No ascorbic acid effect. f. No ISO certificate or equivalent.
10.	M/s. Diasys Diagnosticss India Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended for the following: a. No ascorbic acid effect. b. No stability. c. No manual and machine comparison. d. No pad color change compatibility.
11.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended for the following: a.No compensation pad market and inbuilt qc check.

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
				b. No stability. c. No manual and machine comparison. d. No pad color change compatibility. e. No ascorbic acid effect. f. No ISO certificate or equivalent.
12.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended for the following: a.No compensation pad market and inbuilt qc check. b. No stability. c. No manual and machine comparison. d. No pad color change compatibility. e. No ascorbic acid effect.
13.	M/s. Labcare Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample shown is not recommended for the following: a.No compensation pad market and inbuilt qc check. b. No stability. c. No manual and machine comparison. d. No pad color change compatibility. e. No ascorbic acid effect. f. No ISO certificate or equivalent.

### 36.STAINED SALMONELLA ANTIGEN TEST KIT (WIDAL)- 103040ML.

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
2.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
3.	M/s. Mediclone Biotech Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per sample evaluation report, negative control and slide with applicator sticks

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
				does not meet with the tender requirement, hence not recommended.
4.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----
5.	M/s. Jaimitra Biomed	Responsive	Responsive	-----
6.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report
7.	M/s. MJ Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report
8.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Responsive	Responsive	-----
9.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report
10.	M/s. Sri Sai Mercury Surgicals	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
11.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt LTd	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
12.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report
13.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Responsive	Responsive	-----
14.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per sample evaluation report, negative control and slide with applicator sticks does not meet with the tender requirement, hence not recommended.
15.	M/s. Genuine Biotech Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the known positive sample gives the negative result- QC failed. Hence not recommended.

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
16.	M/s. Labcare Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report

### 37.DELETED

### 38.TOTAL PROTEIN KIT - 576000 ML.

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the reason Linearity and lower limit not available/provided.
2.	M/s. Mediclone Biotech Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the reason Linearity and lower limit not available/provided.
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the reason Linearity and lower limit not available/provided.
4.	M/s. Jaimitra Biomed	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the reason Linearity and lower limit not available/provided.
5.	M/s. Transasia BioMedicals Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----
6.	M/s. Shan Biotech & Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
7.	M/s. Sri Sai Ekdant Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
8.	M/s. General Instruments	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
9.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the reason Linearity and lower limit not available/provided.
10.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the reason Linearity and lower limit not available/provided.
11.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
12.	M/s. MJ Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
13.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
14.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
15.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the reason Linearity and lower limit not available/provided.
16.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the reason Linearity and lower limit not available/provided.
17.	M/s. Diasys Diagnostics India Pvt Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----
18.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Responsive	Responsive	-----
19.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the reason

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
				Linearity and lower limit not available/provided.
20.	M/s. Trivitron Healthcare Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
21.	M/s. Sri Sai Mercury Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the reason Linearity and lower limit not available/provided.
22.	M/s. Labcare Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the reason Linearity and lower limit not available/provided.

### **39.TOTAL ALBUMIN KIT - 518400ML.**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
2.	M/s. Mediclone Biotech Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----
4.	M/s. Jaimitra Biomed	Responsive	Responsive	-----
5.	M/s. Transasia BioMedicals Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----
6.	M/s. Shan Biotech & Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
7.	M/s. Sri Sai Ekdant Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
8.	M/s. General Instruments	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
9.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
10.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
11.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
12.	M/s. MJ Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
13.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
14.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Responsive	Responsive	-----
15.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
16.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
17.	M/s. Diasys Diagnostics India Pvt Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----
18.	M/s. Sri Sai Mercury Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
19.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
20.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
21.	M/s. Trivitron Healthcare Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
22.	M/s. Labcare Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended

#### 40.AMYLASE KIT (MONO VIAL)- 288000 TESTS

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
2.	M/s. Mediclone Biotech Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the reason Linearity up to 1500 U/L against the tender specification of open type liquid stable reagent with higher linearity of 2000 U/L.
4.	M/s. Jaimitra Biomed	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
5.	M/s. Transasia BioMedicals Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----
6.	M/s. Labcare Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
7.	M/s. Shan Biotech & Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the reason Linearity up to 1000 U/L against the tender specification of open type liquid stable reagent with higher linearity of 2000 U/L.
8.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the reason Linearity up to 1500 U/L

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
				against the tender specification of open type liquid stable reagent with higher linearity of 2000 U/L.
9.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the reason Linearity up to 1500 U/L against the tender specification of open type liquid stable reagent with higher linearity of 2000 U/L.
10.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
11.	M/s. MJ Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
12.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
13.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Responsive	Responsive	-----
14.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
15.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
16.	M/s. Diasys Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----
17.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the reason Linearity up to 1500 U/L against the tender specification of open type liquid stable reagent with higher linearity of 2000 U/L.

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
18.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
19.	M/s. Trivitron HHealthcare Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample not recommended for the reason Linearity up to 1200 U/L against the tender specification of open type liquid stable reagent with higher linearity of 2000 U/L.
20.	M/s. Sri Sai Mercury Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended

#### **41.ANTI HCV KIT - 345600 TESTS**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Mediclone Biotech Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, quality control and test samples not answered. Hence not recommended
2.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, quality control not answered. Hence not recommended
3.	M/s. Sri Sai Ekdant Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, quality control not answered. Hence not recommended
4.	M/s. Vivek Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, quality control not answered. Hence not recommended
5.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, quality control not answered. Hence not recommended
6.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, quality control not answered. Hence not recommended
7.	M/s. Yuvraj Biobiz Incubator	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, quality control not

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
				answered. Hence not recommended
8.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, quality control not answered. Hence not recommended
9.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Responsive	Non Responsive	Did not extend the bid validity of the tender
10.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
11.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, quality control not answered. Hence not recommended
12.	M/s. SD Biosensor Healthcare Pvt Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----
13.	M/s. VIP Surgicals.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, quality control not answered. Hence not recommended
14.	M/s. Labcare Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, quality control not answered. Hence not recommended

#### 42.GRAMS STAIN REAGENT KIT - 1488000 ML

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
2.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, only 1 of 4 reagent bottles required for Gram stain was supplied. Hence not recommended.
3.	M/s. MJ Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
4.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
5.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
6.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
7.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample shows gram positive organism in Gram negative test, hence fails in QC. Hence not recommended.
8.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
9.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----

#### **43.CATRIDGES - TB-CB NAAT- 345600 TESTS**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Cepheid India Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.

#### **44.SOLUTION PACK FOR ELECTROLYTE ANALYZER - 3840 ML**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Pathozyne Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
2.	M/s. Transasia Biomedicals Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----
3.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Wrong sample received- As per sample evaluation report.
4.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.

**45.PT INR KIT - 6720ML**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Transasia Biomedicals Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----
2.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample received is not recommended for the following: a. No Stability, Repeatability. b. Clotted. c. Serum not properly sepearted. d. CV- 46.8% (Erratic values) e. No ISO certification.
3.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample received is not recommended for the following: a. No Stability, Repeatability. b. Clotted. c. Serum not properly sepearted. d. CV- 46.8% (Erratic values)
4.	M/s. M R Entepries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report- Sample not received for evaluation.
5.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report- Sample not received for evaluation.
6.	M/s. Labcare Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample received is not recommended for the following: a. No Repeatability. b. CV- 46.8% (Erratic values) c. No ISO certification.

**46.DELETED**

**47. TRONOPIN I KIT -23040 TESTS**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Rapid Diagnostics Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
2.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
3.	M/s. Sri Sai Ekdant Surgicals	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
4.	M/s. Vivek Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
5.	M/s. MJ Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report
6.	M/s. Yuvraj Biobiz Incubator	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
7.	M/s. Diasys Diagnostics India Pvt Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----
8.	M/s. M C Dalal & C o.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
9.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample got QC failed. Hence not recommended
10.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report
11.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
12.	M/s. Labcare Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----

#### **48.ABG (POCT) KIT - 46080 TESTS**

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report

#### **49.TROPONIN T KIT - 23040 TESTS**

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report
2.	M/s. Roche Diagnostics India Pvt Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----

#### **50.POC QUANTITATIVE - 25000 NOS.**

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. Roche Diagnostics India Pvt Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----

#### **51.POC PT/INR STRIPS FOR ROCHE MODEL COAGUCHEK XS SYSTEM)- 18000 NOS**

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. Roche Diagnostics India Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the diagnostic mode is not recommended in the laboratory set up for the following reasons: a. PT/INR is a life saving investigation, where the accuracy of the test cannot be at any cost the compromised. To maintain accuracy, there is a standard

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
				<p>universal protocol, tested and tried for many years performed in laboratories.</p> <p>b. Sample matrix is very important, it should be only serum and not fresh blood as it is in this case. Fresh blood can have factors and chemicals that will interfere with test result.</p> <p>c. There is open interaction of blood with test which should not happen.</p> <p>d. No controls are provided.</p>

#### 52.BLOOD GAS ANALYZER – CALIBRATION SOLUTION - 36000 NOS

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. Roche Diagnostics India Pvt Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----

#### 53.BLOOD GAS ANALYZER – SOLUTION - 36000 TESTS

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. Roche Diagnostics India Pvt Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----

#### 54.SNAPPACK FOR ELECTROLYTE ANALYZER FROM ROCHE MODEL 9180- 90000 TESTS

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. Roche Diagnostics India Pvt Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----

#### 55.MALARIA RDT - 10000 NOS

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Transasia Biomedicals Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----
2.	M/s. Yuvraj Biobiz Incubator	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	<p>As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification and hence not recommended.</p> <p>a. Detects P.Falciparum/PAN.  b. Should have kit storage 4-30 Deg C.  c. Shelf life 24 months.  d. Sensitivity- 100%, Specificity- 99%.  e. Delayed test result against the tender specification of test results within 20 minutes.  f. Same color for test and control against the tender specification of different color for test and control.  g. Serial dilution.</p>
3.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	<p>As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification and hence not recommended.</p> <p>a. Detects P.Falciparum/PAN.  b. Should have kit storage 4-30 Deg C.  c. Shelf life 24 months.  d. Sensitivity- 100%, Specificity- 99%.  e. Delayed test result against the tender specification of test results within 20 minutes.  f. Same color for test and control against the tender specification of different color for test and control.  g. Test strip not visible against the tender specification of Background</p>

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
				diffusion and test strip visibility. h. Serial dilution.
4.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification and hence not recommended. a. Detects P.Falciparum/PAN. b. Should have kit storage 4-30 Deg C. c. Shelf life 24 months. d. Sensitivity- 100%, Specificity- 99%. e. Delayed test result against the tender specification of test results within 20 minutes. f. Same color for test and control against the tender specification of different color for test and control. g. Serial dilution.
5.	M/s. SD Bio sensor Healthcare Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification and hence not recommended. a. Detects P.Falciparum/PAN. b. Should have kit storage 4-30 Deg C. c. Shelf life 24 months. d. Sensitivity- 100%, Specificity- 99%. e. Delayed test result against the tender specification of test results within 20 minutes. f. Same color for test and control against the tender specification of different color for test and control. g. Test strip not visible against the tender specification of Background

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
				diffusion and test strip visibility. h. Serial dilution.
6.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification and hence not recommended. a. Detects P.Falciparum/PAN. b. Should have kit storage 4-30 Deg C. c. Shelf life 24 months. d. Sensitivity- 100%, Specificity- 99%. e. Delayed test result against the tender specification of test results within 20 minutes. f. Same color for test and control against the tender specification of different color for test and control. g. Serial dilution.
7.	M/s. Mediclone Biotech PVt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification and hence not recommended. a. Detects P.Falciparum/PAN. b. Should have kit storage 4-30 Deg C. c. Shelf life 24 months. d. Sensitivity- 100%, Specificity- 99%. e. Delayed test result against the tender specification of test results within 20 minutes. f. Same color for test and control against the tender specification of different color for test and control. g. Serial dilution.

#### **56.DISPOSABLE MICRO TIPS FOR MICRO PLATE READER ELAN 30S**

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. Transasia Biomedicals Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----

**57. TRANSPONDER FOR FULLY AUTOMATED ESR ANALYZER VESMATEC CUBE 80 ESR**

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. Transasia Biomedicals Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	-----

**LABORATORY CONSUMABLES:**

**1. BMW BINS- PEDAL TYPE-RED COLOUR- 10000 NOS.**

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following technical specification and hence not recommended. a. The bins does not open properly against the tender specification of easy manouvability. b. Made up of hard plastic against the specification of special grade plastic. c. Improper lid approximation against the specification of proper lid approximation.
2.	M/s. Thirupathi Entepries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
3.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following technical specification and hence not recommended. a. The bins does not open properly against the tender

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
				<p>specification of easy manouvability.</p> <p>b. Made up of hard plastic against the specification of special grade plastic.</p> <p>c. Improper lid approximation against the specification of proper lid approximation.</p> <p>d. Bio hazard symbol not present against the requirement.</p>
4.	M/s. M J Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
5.	M/s. Solokrafts Industries	Responsive	Responsive	-----
6.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	<p>As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following technical specification and hence not recommended.</p> <p>a. The bins does not open properly against the tender specification of easy manouvability.</p> <p>b. Made up of hard plastic against the specification of special grade plastic.</p> <p>c. Improper lid approximation against the specification of proper lid approximation.</p> <p>d. Bio hazard symbol not present against the requirement.</p>

## 2. BMW BINS- PEDAL TYPE-YELLOW COLOUR- 10000 NOS.

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	<p>As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following technical specification and hence not recommended.</p> <p>a. The bins does not open properly against the tender specification of easy manouvability.</p> <p>b. Made up of hard plastic against the specification of special grade plastic.</p> <p>c. Improper lid approximation against the specification of proper lid approximation.</p>
2.	M/s. Thirupathi Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
3.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	<p>As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following technical specification and hence not recommended.</p> <p>a. The bins does not open properly against the tender specification of easy manouvability.</p> <p>b. Made up of hard plastic against the specification of special grade plastic.</p> <p>c. Improper lid approximation against the specification of proper lid approximation.</p> <p>d. Bio hazard symbol not present against the requirement.</p>

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
4.	M/s. M J Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
5.	M/s. Solokrafts Industries	Responsive	Responsive	-----
6.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.

### **3. BMW BINS- PEDAL TYPE-BLUE COLOUR- 2500 NOS.**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following technical specification and hence not recommended. a. The bins does not open properly against the tender specification of easy manouvability. b. Made up of hard plastic against the specification of special grade plastic. c. Improper lid approximation against the specification of proper lid approximation.
2.	M/s. Thirupathi Entepriises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
3.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following technical specification and hence not recommended. a. The bins does not open properly against the tender specification of easy manouvability.

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
				b. Made up of hard plastic against the specification of special grade plastic. c. Improper lid approximation against the specification of proper lid approximation. d. Bio hazard symbol not present against the requirement.
4.	M/s. M J Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
5.	M/s. Solokrafts Industries	Responsive	Responsive	-----
6.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following technical specification and hence not recommended. a. The bins does not open properly against the tender specification of easy manouvability. b. Made up of hard plastic against the specification of special grade plastic. c. Improper lid approximation against the specification of proper lid approximation. d. Bio hazard symbol not present against the requirement.

**4. CARY-BLAIR MEDIUM- STERILE WITH SWAB - 12500 NOS.**

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
2.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended. a. Single pack containing sterile cary-blair medium with plastic shaft.
3.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
4.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.

#### **5. CAVITY SLIDE - 5000 NOS.**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
2.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----
3.	M/s. Microcil Manufacturers	Non Responsive	Responsive	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
4.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
5.	M/s. S S Chemicals	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
6.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Co.	Responsive	Responsive	-----
7.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
8.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample dimension is <15mm <1mm depth against the tender specification of 76x25x1.25mm. Hence not recommended.

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
9.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----

**6. CONTAINER FOR WATER SAMPLE COLLECTION(STERILE)-150 ML - 12500 NOS.**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
2.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Company	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following point of the technical specification of the tender, hence not recommended. a. Capacity is less than 150ml against the tender specification of 150ml capacity with screw cap lid with measuring volume marks.
3.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following point of the technical specification of the tender, hence not recommended. a. Capacity is less than 150ml against the tender specification of 150ml capacity with screw cap lid with measuring volume marks.
4.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
5.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----

**7. COTTON ROLL – NON ABSORBANT - 100000 GRAM**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following point of the technical specification of the tender, hence not recommended. a. Sample is not white and clean against the tender specification of 100% pure cotton, white and clean, No impurities.
2.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Company	Responsive	Responsive	-----
3.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following point of the technical specification of the tender, hence not recommended. a. Sample is not white and clean against the tender specification of 100% pure cotton, white and clean, No impurities.

#### **8. COVER GLASS - 50000 NOS**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample shown does not meet with the following technical specification of the tender and hence not recommended: a. Thickness & Optical clarity. b. Section cannot be clearly seen against the tender specification of microscope evaluation of histopathological section.
2.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample shown does not meet with the following

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
				technical specification of the tender and hence not recommended: a. Thickness & Optical clarity. b. Section cannot be clearly seen against the tender specification of microscope evaluation of histopathological section.
4.	M/s. Microcil Manufacturers	Non Responsive	Responsive	As per the sample evaluation report, sample shown does not meet with the following technical specification of the tender and hence not recommended: a. Thickness & Optical clarity. b. Section cannot be clearly seen against the tender specification of microscope evaluation of histopathological section. c. No flat bottom against the requirement.
5.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
6.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample shown does not meet with the following technical specification of the tender and hence not recommended: a. Thickness & Optical clarity. b. Section cannot be clearly seen against the tender specification of microscope evaluation of histopathological section. c. No flat bottom against the requirement.
7.	M/s. M J Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
8.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Company	Responsive	Responsive	-----

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
9.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample shown does not meet with the following technical specification of the tender and hence not recommended: a. Thickness & Optical clarity. b. Section cannot be clearly seen against the tender specification of microscope evaluation of histopathological section. c. No flat bottom against the requirement.
10.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample shown does not meet with the following technical specification of the tender and hence not recommended: a. Thickness & Optical clarity. b. Section cannot be clearly seen against the tender specification of microscope evaluation of histopathological section. c. No flat bottom against the requirement.
11.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample shown does not meet with the following technical specification of the tender and hence not recommended: a. Thickness & Optical clarity. b. Section cannot be clearly seen against the tender specification of microscope evaluation of histopathological section.

**9. DISPOSABLE CUP - 1200000 NOS**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
2.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----

#### **10.DISPOSABLE PETRI PLATES-STERILE-10000 NOS**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
2.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----
4.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Responsive	Responsive	-----
5.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
6.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
7.	M/s. M J Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
8.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Company	Responsive	Responsive	-----
9.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
10.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Responsive	Responsive	-----
11.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Responsive	Not evaluated	The firm M/s. VIP Surgicals was blacklisted for 3 years in TNMSC letter no. 377/LT/DME-TNJ/TNMSC/ENGG/2020, dt. 13.02.2020

#### **11.ESR PIPETTES – DISPOSABLE -100000 NOS.**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample received does not meet with the following tender specification and hence not recommended: a. Diameter: 11mm. Apart from the above point, the brand name not mentioned, no kit insert, no calibration certificate and no consistency of values.
2.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample received does not meet with the following tender specification and hence not recommended: a. Diameter: 11mm. Apart from the above point, the brand name not mentioned, no kit insert, no calibration certificate and no consistency of values.
4.	M/s. Shan Biotech and Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
5.	M/s. S S Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample received does not meet with the following tender specification and hence not recommended: a. Diameter: 11mm. Apart from the above point, the brand name not mentioned, no kit insert, no calibration certificate and no consistency of values.
6.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample received does not meet with the following tender specification and hence not recommended: a. Diameter: 11mm. Apart from the above point, the brand name not

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
				mentioned, no kit insert, no calibration certificate and no consistency of values.
7.	M/s. M J Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
8.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Company	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample received does not meet with the following tender specification and hence not recommended: a. Diameter: 11mm. Apart from the above point, the brand name not mentioned, no kit insert, no calibration certificate and no consistency of values.
9.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample received does not meet with the following tender specification and hence not recommended: a. Diameter: 11mm. Apart from the above point, the brand name not mentioned, no kit insert, no calibration certificate and no consistency of values.
10.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample received does not meet with the following tender specification and hence not recommended: a. Diameter: 11mm. Apart from the above point, the brand name not mentioned, no kit insert, no calibration certificate and no consistency of values.
11.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample received does not meet with the following tender specification and hence not recommended: a. Diameter: 11mm. Apart from the above point, the brand name not

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
				mentioned, no kit insert, no calibration certificate and no consistency of values.

**12.FACE MASKS WITH ELASTIC BAND -500000 NOS.**

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
2.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----
3.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample has 2 layers against the tender specification of 3, hence not recommended.
4.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
5.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample has 2 layers against the tender specification of 3, hence not recommended.
6.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
7.	M/s. Bharath Associates	Responsive	Non Responsive	Not furnished end user certificates with supporting documents viz PO/invoice copy along with the affidavit for the supplies made by them as a bidder and also for their manufacturer, Annual turnover certificate, cash credit limit certificate, Manufacturing capacity certificate etc.
8.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Co.	Responsive	Responsive	-----

**13.FLUORIDE TUBE WITH GREY COLOUR CAP-8500000 NOS**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
2.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----
4.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
5.	M/s. S S Chemicals	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
6.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
7.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
8.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Company	Responsive	Responsive	-----
9.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
10.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Responsive	Responsive	-----
11.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample is black in color against the tender specification of white color. Hence not recommended.
12.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.

#### **14.GLASS MARKING PENCIL -50000 NOS**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample is black in color against the tender specification of white color. Hence not recommended.

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
2.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Company	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
3.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
4.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----
5.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample is black in color against the tender specification of white color. Hence not recommended.
6.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
7.	M/s. M J Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
8.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.

#### **15.GLASS SLIDES -5750000 NOS**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
2.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification and hence not recommended: a. Section not clear against the tender specification of Clarity of section intensity of staining haziness.
3.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
4.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample does not meet with the following points of the technical

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
				<p>specification and hence not recommended:</p> <p>a. Opaque and greasy slides against the specification of clear, transparent, grease free glass slides.</p> <p>b. Nicked edges against the specification of Ground edges.</p> <p>c. Hazy, details not clear against the specification of clarity of section intensity of staining haziness.</p>
5.	M/s. Microcil Manufacturers	Non Responsive	Responsive	<p>As per the sample evaluation report, the sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification and hence not recommended:</p> <p>a. Opaque and greasy slides against the specification of clear, transparent, grease free glass slides.</p> <p>b. Nicked edges against the specification of Ground edges.</p> <p>c. Hazy, details not clear against the specification of clarity of section intensity of staining haziness.</p> <p>d. Thickness &gt; 1.3 mm against the specification of 1.3mm.</p>
6.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	<p>As per the sample evaluation report, the sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification and hence not recommended:</p> <p>a. Opaque and greasy slides against the specification of clear, transparent, grease free glass slides.</p> <p>b. Nicked edges against the specification of Ground edges.</p>

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
				c. Hazy, details not clear against the specification of clarity of section intensity of staining haziness. d. Thickness < 1.3 mm against the specification of 1.3mm.
7.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification and hence not recommended: a. Opaque and greasy slides against the specification of clear, transparent, grease free glass slides. b. Nicked edges against the specification of Ground edges. c. Hazy, details not clear against the specification of clarity of section intensity of staining haziness. d. Thickness < 1.3 mm against the specification of 1.3mm.
8.	M/s. M J Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
9.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Company	Responsive	Responsive	-----
10.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification and hence not recommended: a. Opaque and greasy slides against the specification of clear, transparent, grease free glass slides. b. Nicked edges against the specification of Ground edges.

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
				<p>c. Hazy, details not clear against the specification of clarity of section intensity of staining haziness.</p> <p>d. Thickness &lt; 1.3 mm against the specification of 1.3mm.</p>
11.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	<p>As per the sample evaluation report, the sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification and hence not recommended:</p> <p>a. Opaque and greasy slides against the specification of clear, transparent, grease free glass slides.</p> <p>b. Nicked edges against the specification of Ground edges.</p> <p>c. Hazy, details not clear against the specification of clarity of section intensity of staining haziness.</p> <p>d. Thickness &lt; 1.3 mm against the specification of 1.3mm.</p>
12.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	<p>As per the sample evaluation report, the sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification and hence not recommended:</p> <p>a. Opaque and greasy slides against the specification of clear, transparent, grease free glass slides.</p> <p>b. Nicked edges against the specification of Ground edges.</p> <p>c. Very dull view against the specification of clarity of section intensity of staining haziness.</p> <p>d. Thickness &gt; 1.3 mm against the specification of 1.3mm.</p>

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
13.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report

#### **16.GLASS TEST TUBES -500000 NOS**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report
2.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----
4.	M/s. Top Syringe Mfg Co. Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report
5.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification and hence not recommended: a. 12 x 75 mm size against the tender specification of 12 x 100mm size.
6.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Responsive	Responsive	-----
7.	M/s. M J Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report
8.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Co	Responsive	Responsive	-----
9.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
10.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Responsive	Responsive	-----
11.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report
12.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample does not meet with the following

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
				points of the technical specification and hence not recommended: a. 6ml against the tender specification of 10ml size.

#### 17.GLUCOSE POWDER -90000000 GRAM

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. Thirupathi Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following technical specification and hence not recommended: a. Moisture free. b. ISO/FSSAI Certified. c. Pack size: 75 gm/pk
2.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following technical specification and hence not recommended: a. Moisture free. b. ISO/FSSAI Certified. c. Pack size: 75 gm/pk
4.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
5.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following technical specification and hence not recommended: a. Moisture free. b. ISO/FSSAI Certified. c. Pack size: 75 gm/pk
6.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Responsive	Responsive	-----
7.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
8.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following technical

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
				specification and hence not recommended: a. Moisture free. b. ISO/FSSAI Certified.
9.	M/s. Bharath Associates	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.

**18.K2 EDTA TUBE -150000 NOS**

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
2.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following technical specification and hence not recommended: a. No sample stability. b. CBC values- Erratic
3.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
4.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following technical specification and hence not recommended: a. No sample stability. b. CBC values- Erratic
5.	M/s. Sri Sai Ekdant Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following technical specification and hence not recommended: a. No sample stability. b. CBC values- Erratic
6.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following technical specification and hence not recommended: a. No sample stability. b. CBC values- Erratic

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
7.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following technical specification and hence not recommended: a. No sample stability. b. CBC values- Erratic
8.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following technical specification and hence not recommended: a. No sample stability. b. CBC values- Erratic
9.	M/s. S S Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following technical specification and hence not recommended: a. No sample stability. b. CBC values- Erratic
10.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Co	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following technical specification and hence not recommended: a. No sample stability. b. CBC values- Erratic
11.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following technical specification and hence not recommended: a. No sample stability. b. CBC values- Erratic
12.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following technical specification and hence not recommended: a. No sample stability. b. CBC values- Erratic
13.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following technical

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
				specification and hence not recommended: a. No sample stability. b. CBC values- Erratic
14.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following technical specification and hence not recommended: a. No sample stability. b. CBC values- Erratic

#### 19.LANCET -6500000 NOS

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample received does not meet with the tender technical specification of safety cap. Hence not recommended.
2.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample received does not meet with the tender technical specification of sharpness and safety cap. Hence not recommended.
4.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample received does not meet with the tender technical specification of sharpness and safety cap. Hence not recommended.
5.	M/s. M J Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report
6.	M/s.Ganapathy Trading Co	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report
7.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample received does not meet with the tender technical specification of

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
				sharpness and safety cap. Hence not recommended.
8.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample received does not meet with the tender technical specification of sharpness and safety cap. Hence not recommended.
9.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Responsive	Not evaluated	The firm M/s. VIP Surgicals was blacklisted for 3 years in TNMSC letter no. 377/LT/DME-TNJ/TNMSC/ENGG/2020, dt. 13.02.2020
10.	M/s. Bharath Associates	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample received does not meet with the tender technical specification of sharpness and safety cap. Hence not recommended.

#### 20.MICRO TIP BOX-LARGE -4500 NOS

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report
2.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----
4.	M/s. General Instruments	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
5.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Responsive	Responsive	-----
6.	M/s.Ganapathy Trading Co	Responsive	Responsive	-----
7.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
8.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Responsive	Responsive	-----
9.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Responsive	Not evaluated	The firm M/s. VIP Surgicals was blacklisted for 3 years in TNMSC letter no. 377/LT/DME-TNJ/TNMSC/ENGG/2020, dt. 13.02.2020
10.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report

#### **21.MICRO TIP BOX-SMALL -4500 NOS**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report
2.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----
4.	M/s. General Instruments	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
5.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Responsive	Responsive	-----
6.	M/s.Ganapathy Trading Co	Responsive	Responsive	-----
7.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
8.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Responsive	Responsive	-----
9.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Responsive	Not evaluated	The firm M/s. VIP Surgicals was blacklisted for 3 years in TNMSC letter no. 377/LT/DME-TNJ/TNMSC/ENGG/2020, dt. 13.02.2020
10.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report

**22.MICROCENTRIFUGE TUBE -1250000 NOS**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
2.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----
4.	M/s. General Instruments	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
5.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Responsive	Responsive	-----
6.	M/s. Shan Biotech and Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report
7.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
8.	M/s.Ganapathy Trading Co	Responsive	Responsive	-----
9.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
10.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Responsive	Responsive	-----
11.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Responsive	Not evaluated	The firm M/s. VIP Surgicals was blacklisted for 3 years in TNMSC letter no. 377/LT/DME- TNJ/TNMSC/ENGG/2020, dt. 13.02.2020
12.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report
13.	M/s. M J Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report

**23.MICROPIPETTE TIPS - SMALL -1300000 NOS**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
2.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----
4.	M/s. General Instruments	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
5.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Responsive	Responsive	-----
6.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
7.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
8.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Co	Responsive	Responsive	-----
9.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
10.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Responsive	Responsive	-----
11.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Responsive	Not evaluated	The firm M/s. VIP Surgicals was blacklisted for 3 years in TNMSC letter no. 377/LT/DME- TNJ/TNMSC/ENGG/2020, dt. 13.02.2020
12.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report
13.	M/s. M J Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report

**24.MICROPIPETTE TIPS - LARGE -3250000 NOS**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
2.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----
4.	M/s. General Instruments	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
5.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Responsive	Responsive	-----
6.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
7.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
8.	M/s.Ganapathy Trading Co	Responsive	Responsive	-----
9.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
10.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Responsive	Responsive	-----
11.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Responsive	Not evaluated	The firm M/s. VIP Surgicals was blacklisted for 3 years in TNMSC letter no. 377/LT/DME- TNJ/TNMSC/ENGG/2020, dt. 13.02.2020
12.	M/s. M J Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report

**25.NEEDLE WITH SYRINGE-2 ML -7500000 NOS**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Responsive	Not evaluated	The firm M/s. VIP Surgicals was blacklisted for 3 years in TNMSC letter no. 377/LT/DME- TNJ/TNMSC/ENGG/2020, dt. 13.02.2020

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
2.	M/s. Sri Sai Ekdant Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification. Hence not recommended. a. 2ml syringe with needle sterile- No. b. Poor plastic quality against the specification of Barrel and plungers are made of non toxic plastic material. c. Not ISO certified. d. Suction pressure not maintained- Drawing blood was difficult. e. No ease of piston movement. f. Needle fitting with nozzle of syringe not available.
3.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report
4.	M/s. Sri Sai Mercury Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification. Hence not recommended. a. 2ml syringe with needle sterile- No. b. Poor plastic quality against the specification of Barrel and plungers are made of non toxic plastic material. c. Not ISO certified.

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
				<p>d. Suction pressure not maintained- Drawing blood was difficult.</p> <p>e. No ease of piston movement.</p> <p>f. Needle fitting with nozzle of syringe not available.</p>

**26.NEEDLE WITH SYRINGE-5 ML -7500000 NOS**

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Responsive	Not evaluated	The firm M/s. VIP Surgicals was blacklisted for 3 years in TNMSC letter no. 377/LT/DME-TNJ/TNMSC/ENGG/2020, dt. 13.02.2020
2.	M/s. Sri Sai Ekdant Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	<p>As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification. Hence not recommended.</p> <p>a. 5ml syringe with needle sterile- No.</p> <p>b. Poor plastic quality against the specification of Barrel and plungers are made of non toxic plastic material.</p> <p>c. Not ISO certified.</p> <p>d. Suction pressure not maintained- Drawing blood was difficult.</p> <p>e. No ease of piston movement.</p> <p>f. Needle fitting with nozzle of syringe not available.</p>
3.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report
4.	M/s. Sri Sai Mercury Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	<p>As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification. Hence not recommended.</p> <p>a. 5ml syringe with needle sterile- No.</p>

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
				b. Poor plastic quality against the specification of Barrel and plungers are made of non toxic plastic material. c. Not ISO certified. d. Suction pressure not maintained- Leakage of blood back. e. No ease of piston movement. f. Needle fitting with nozzle of syringe not available.

**27. PLAIN TUBE WITH RED COLOUR CAP -2500000 NOS**

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification. Hence not recommended. a. 4ml tube capacity against the tender requirement of 5 ml.
2.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification. Hence not recommended. a. 4ml tube capacity against the tender requirement of 5 ml.
3.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report
4.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification. Hence not recommended. a. 4ml tube capacity against the tender requirement of 5 ml.
5.	M/s. Sri Sai Ekdant Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
				the technical specification. Hence not recommended. a. 4ml tube capacity against the tender requirement of 5 ml.
6.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification. Hence not recommended. a. 4ml tube capacity against the tender requirement of 5 ml.
7.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification. Hence not recommended. a. 4ml tube capacity against the tender requirement of 5 ml.
8.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification. Hence not recommended. a. 4ml tube capacity against the tender requirement of 5 ml.
9.	M/s. S S Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification. Hence not recommended. a. 4ml tube capacity against the tender requirement of 5 ml.
10.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Co	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification. Hence not recommended. a. 4ml tube capacity against the tender requirement of 5 ml.

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
11.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report
12.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Responsive	Responsive	-----
13.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report
14.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report

**28.SODIUM CITRATE TUBE WITH BLACK COLOUR CAP (ESR)- 100000 NOS**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
2.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample shown does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended. a. Blue cap against the specification of Disposable with a black color cap. b. Clotted against the tender specification of clot and lysis. c. No Consistency and repeatability- erratic values.
3.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample shown does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended. a. No brand name. b. Clotted against the tender specification of clot and lysis. c. No Consistency and repeatability- erratic values.
4.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample shown does not meet with the following points of the technical

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
				specification, hence not recommended. a.No Consistency and repeatability- erratic values.
5.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
6.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample shown does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended. a. No brand name. b. No Consistency and repeatability- erratic values.
7.	M/s. S S Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample shown does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended. a. No Consistency and repeatability- erratic values.
8.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Co	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
9.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample shown does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended. a. No Consistency and repeatability- erratic values.
10.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample shown does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended. a. No Consistency and repeatability- erratic values.

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
11.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
12.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.

#### **29.FILTER PAPERS (BT & CT)- 450000 NOS**

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----
2.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Co.,	Responsive	Responsive	-----
3.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification and hence not recommended. a. Filter paper quality no 4 b. Size-<100mm against the specification of size 125mm * 100 circles. c. More sediments.
4.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification and hence not recommended. a. Speed of filtration- slow. c. More sediments.
5.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification and hence not recommended. a. Speed of filtration- slow. c. More sediments.

#### **30.CAPILLARY TUBE GLASS (COLTTING TIME)- 450000 NOS**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----
2.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Co.,	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification and hence not recommended. a. Made of Borosilicate is unsatisfactory. b. Breakability- Not breakable.
3.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification and hence not recommended. a. Made of Borosilicate is unsatisfactory. b. Breakability- Not breakable. c. Ld: 1.15+0.08mm and Wt: 0.25mm-0.02mm- inconclusive.
4.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
5.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification and hence not recommended. a. Made of Borosilicate is unsatisfactory. b. Breakability- Not breakable. c. Ld: 1.15+0.08mm and Wt: 0.25mm-0.02mm- inconclusive.
6.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
				and hence not recommended. a. Made of Borosilicate is unsatisfactory. b. Breakability- Not breakable. c. Ld: 1.15+0.08mm and Wt: 0.25mm-0.02mm- inconclusive.

### 31.PLASTIC BINS - 10000 NOS

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. Thirupathi Enterprises	Responsive	Responsive	-----
2.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
3.	M/s. MJ Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
4.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Co	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
5.	M/s. Solokrafts Industries	Responsive	Responsive	-----
6.	M/s. VIP Surgicals.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.

### 32.SERUM VIALS - 1250000 NOS

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report
2.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----
3.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report
4.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
5.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report
6.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following point of the technical specification, hence not recommended. a. No screw cap against the tender specification of Transparent with screw cap lid.

### **33.SHARP CONTAINER-WHITE - 10000 NOS**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Bidders Quoted</b>	<b>Technical evaluation report</b>	<b>Commercial evaluation report</b>	<b>Reason for rejection</b>
1.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
2.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following point of the technical specification, hence not recommended. a. Made up of hard plastic. b. White with blue lid against the specification of white color.
3.	M/s. MJ Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
4.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following point of the technical specification, hence not recommended. a. Made up of hard plastic. b. White with screw type blue lid against the specification of white color.
5.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Co	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following point of the technical specification, hence not recommended. a. Made up of hard plastic.

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
				b. red color against the specification of white color.
6.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.

#### **34.SPUTUM CONTAINER- NON STERILE - 450000 NOS**

Sl. No	Bidders Quoted	Technical evaluation report	Commercial evaluation report	Reason for rejection
1.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
2.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, container is without snap lid against the tender requirement of container with snap lid. Hence not recommended.
3.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
4.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, container is without snap lid against the tender requirement of container with snap lid. Hence not recommended.
5.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, container is without snap lid against the tender requirement of container with snap lid. Hence not recommended.
6.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, container is without snap lid against the tender requirement of container with snap lid. Hence not recommended.
7.	M/s. M J Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
8.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
9.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.

#### **35.SPUTUM CUP-STERILE - 250000 NOS**

<b>SL. NO</b>	<b>BIDDERS QUOTED</b>	<b>TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>REASON FOR REJECTION</b>
1.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
2.	M/s. M J industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
3.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
4.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----
5.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample has narrow mouth against the tender requirement of wide mouth. Hence not recommended.
6.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
7.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.

### **36.STOOL CONTAINER-NON STERILE - 250000 NOS**

<b>SL. NO</b>	<b>BIDDERS QUOTED</b>	<b>TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>REASON FOR REJECTION</b>
1.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
2.	M/s. M J industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
3.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
4.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----
5.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample has narrow mouth against the tender requirement of wide mouth. Hence not recommended.
6.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----

<b>SL. NO</b>	<b>BIDDERS QUOTED</b>	<b>TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>REASON FOR REJECTION</b>
7.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
8.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample has narrow mouth against the tender requirement of wide mouth. Hence not recommended.
9.	M/s. S.S Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample has narrow mouth against the tender requirement of wide mouth. Hence not recommended.
10.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.

### **37.STOOL CONTAINER- STERILE - 250000 NOS**

<b>SL. NO</b>	<b>BIDDERS QUOTED</b>	<b>TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>REASON FOR REJECTION</b>
1.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
2.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----
4.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample has narrow mouth against the tender requirement of wide mouth. Hence not recommended.
5.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
6.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
7.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample has narrow mouth against the tender requirement of wide mouth. Hence not recommended.

SL. NO	BIDDERS QUOTED	TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT	COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT	REASON FOR REJECTION
8.	M/s. S.S Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample has narrow mouth against the tender requirement of wide mouth. Hence not recommended.
9.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.

### 38.SURGICAL COTTON ROLL - ABSORBENT - 7500000 GRAMS

SL. NO	BIDDERS QUOTED	TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT	COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT	REASON FOR REJECTION
1.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample does not meet the following tender specification. Hence not recommended. a. Not 100% pure cotton. b. Impurities present c. Poor absorbing capacity.
2.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample does not meet the following tender specification. Hence not recommended. a. Not 100% pure cotton. b. Impurities present c. Poor absorbing capacity.
3.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample does not meet the following tender specification. Hence not recommended. a. Not 100% pure cotton. b. Impurities present c. Very poor absorbing capacity.

### 39.TEST TUBE STAND-PP-WITH 96 HOLES - 4500 NOS

SL. NO	BIDDERS QUOTED	TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT	COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT	REASON FOR REJECTION
1.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.

<b>SL. NO</b>	<b>BIDDERS QUOTED</b>	<b>TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>REASON FOR REJECTION</b>
2.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
3.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the product is flimsy and not recommended.
4.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
5.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
6.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Responsive	Not evaluated	The firm M/s. VIP Surgicals was blacklisted for 3 years in TNMSC letter no. 377/LT/DME-TNJ/TNMSC/ENGG/2020, dt. 13.02.2020
7.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the product is flimsy and not recommended.
8.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----
9.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----

#### **40.TEST TUBE(PLASTIC) / RIA VIAL - 12500000 NOS**

<b>SL. NO</b>	<b>BIDDERS QUOTED</b>	<b>TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>REASON FOR REJECTION</b>
1.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----
2.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
3.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
4.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Responsive	Responsive	-----

<b>SL. NO</b>	<b>BIDDERS QUOTED</b>	<b>TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>REASON FOR REJECTION</b>
5.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Responsive	Responsive	-----
6.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Responsive	Not evaluated	The firm M/s. VIP Surgicals was blacklisted for 3 years in TNMSC letter no. 377/LT/DME-TNJ/TNMSC/ENGG/2020, dt. 13.02.2020
7.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
8.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
9.	M/s. Pathozyme Diagnostics	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample was not transparent against the tender specification of clear and transparent without cap/lid.
10.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample was not transparent against the tender specification of clear and transparent without cap/lid.
11.	M/s. MJ Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
12.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample was not transparent against the tender specification of clear and transparent without cap/lid.
13.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample was not transparent against the tender specification of clear and transparent without cap/lid.

<b>SL. NO</b>	<b>BIDDERS QUOTED</b>	<b>TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>REASON FOR REJECTION</b>
14.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.

#### **41.THROAT SWAB IN PLASTIC TUBE-STERILE - 50000 NOS**

<b>SL. NO</b>	<b>BIDDERS QUOTED</b>	<b>TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>REASON FOR REJECTION</b>
1.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----
2.	M/s. M J Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
3.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
4.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
5.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
6.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Responsive	Responsive	-----
7.	M/s. S S Chemicals	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
8.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
9.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
10.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.

#### **42.THROAT SWAB IN WOODEN STICK – 20000 NOS.**

<b>SL. NO</b>	<b>BIDDERS QUOTED</b>	<b>TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>REASON FOR REJECTION</b>
1.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----

<b>SL. NO</b>	<b>BIDDERS QUOTED</b>	<b>TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>REASON FOR REJECTION</b>
2.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
3.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
4.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
5.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
6.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
7.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
8.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
9.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Responsive	Responsive	-----
10.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Responsive	Not evaluated	The firm M/s. VIP Surgicals was blacklisted for 3 years in TNMSC letter no. 377/LT/DME- TNJ/TNMSC/ENGG/2020, dt. 13.02.2020

#### **43.TISSUE PAPER ROLL - 25000 ROLL.**

<b>SL. NO</b>	<b>BIDDERS QUOTED</b>	<b>TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>REASON FOR REJECTION</b>
1.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----
2.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Co.	Responsive	Responsive	-----
3.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Responsive	Not evaluated	The firm M/s. VIP Surgicals was blacklisted for 3 years in TNMSC letter no. 377/LT/DME- TNJ/TNMSC/ENGG/2020, dt. 13.02.2020

<b>SL. NO</b>	<b>BIDDERS QUOTED</b>	<b>TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>REASON FOR REJECTION</b>
4.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
5.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points, hence not recommended: a. Absorption- Not good.

#### **44.TOURNIQUET - 4500 NOS.**

<b>SL. NO</b>	<b>BIDDERS QUOTED</b>	<b>TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>REASON FOR REJECTION</b>
1.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample does not meet with the following points, hence not recommended. a. Unsatisfactory blood sampling. b. Elastic, no double stitching against the tender specification of Velcro with double stitching. c. Plastic material against the specification of thick metal buckling. d. Not reusable.
2.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample does not meet with the following points, hence not recommended. a. Unsatisfactory blood sampling. b. Elastic, no double stitching against the tender specification of Velcro with double stitching. c. Plastic material against the specification of thick metal buckling.

<b>SL. NO</b>	<b>BIDDERS QUOTED</b>	<b>TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>REASON FOR REJECTION</b>
				d. Not reusable.
4.	M/s. MJ Industries	Non Responsive	Non Evaluated.	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample does not meet with the following points, hence not recommended. a. Unsatisfactory blood sampling. b. Elastic, no double stitching against the tender specification of Velcro with double stitching. c. Plastic material against the specification of thick metal buckling.
5.	M/s. M.R. Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample does not meet with the following points, hence not recommended. a. Elastic, no double stitching against the tender specification of Velcro with double stitching. b. No buckles against the specification of thick metal buckling. c. Reusable- Inconclusive.
6.	M/s. Madras Surgicals & Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
7.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample does not meet with the following points, hence not recommended. a. Velcro without double stitching against the tender specification of Velcro with double stitching. b. Metal buckles against the specification of thick metal buckling. c. Elasticity- Velcro.

<b>SL. NO</b>	<b>BIDDERS QUOTED</b>	<b>TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>REASON FOR REJECTION</b>
8.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample does not meet with the following points, hence not recommended. a. Velcro without double stitching against the tender specification of Velcro with double stitching. b. Metal buckles against the specification of thick metal buckling. c. Elasticity- Velcro.
9.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample does not meet with the following points, hence not recommended. a. Velcro without double stitching against the tender specification of Velcro with double stitching. b. Metal buckles against the specification of thick metal buckling. c. Elasticity- Velcro.
10.	M/s. Carewell Medical Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
11.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample does not meet with the following points, hence not recommended. a. Elastic without double stitching against the tender specification of Velcro with double stitching. b. Plastic material against the specification of thick metal buckling.

**45.URINE CONTAINER-NON STERILE - 6000000 NOS.**

<b>SL. NO</b>	<b>BIDDERS QUOTED</b>	<b>TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>REASON FOR REJECTION</b>
1.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
2.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended. a. Not transparent. b. Loose screw cap against the tender specification of non-sterile with tight screw cap.
4.	M/s. Sri Sai Ekdant Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended. a. Not transparent. b. Loose screw cap against the tender specification of non-sterile with tight screw cap.
5.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended. a. Not 50ml capacity. b. Loose screw cap against the tender specification of non-sterile with tight screw cap.
6.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
7.	M/s. M J Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
8.	M/s. S S Chemicals	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----

<b>SL. NO</b>	<b>BIDDERS QUOTED</b>	<b>TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>REASON FOR REJECTION</b>
9.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Co	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended. a. Not 50ml capacity. b. Loose screw cap against the tender specification of non-sterile with tight screw cap.
10.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended. a. Not 50ml capacity. b. Loose screw cap against the tender specification of non-sterile with tight screw cap.
11.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended. a. Not 50ml capacity. b. Loose screw cap against the tender specification of non-sterile with tight screw cap.
12.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended. a. Not 50ml capacity. b. Loose screw cap against the tender specification of non-sterile with tight screw cap.

**46.URINE CONTAINER- STERILE - 100000 NOS.**

<b>SL. NO</b>	<b>BIDDERS QUOTED</b>	<b>TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>REASON FOR REJECTION</b>
1.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended. a. 30ml sterile with screw cap against the tender specification of 50ml.
2.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----
4.	M/s. Sri Sai Ekdant Surgicals	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
5.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
6.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
7.	M/s. M J Industries	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report
8.	M/s. S S Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended. a. 30ml sterile with screw cap against the tender specification of 50ml.
9.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Co	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended. a. 30ml sterile with screw cap against the tender specification of 50ml.
10.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report
11.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet

SL. NO	BIDDERS QUOTED	TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT	COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT	REASON FOR REJECTION
				with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended. a. 30ml sterile with screw cap against the tender specification of 50ml.
12.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report

**47.LATEX EXAMINATION GLOVES - 1500000 NOS**

SL. NO	BIDDERS QUOTED	TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT	COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT	REASON FOR REJECTION
1.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended. a. Large size against the tender specification of medium sized. b. Loose fit for both hands.
2.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended. a. Large size against the tender specification of medium sized. b. Tight fit for both hands. c. Elasticity- Non elastic.
3.	M/s. Sri Sai Ekdant Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended. a. Improper size against the tender specification of medium sized. b. Loose fit for both hands.

<b>SL. NO</b>	<b>BIDDERS QUOTED</b>	<b>TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>REASON FOR REJECTION</b>
4.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended. a. Improper size against the tender specification of medium sized. b. Not appropriate fit for both hands.
5.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended. a. Too large size against the tender specification of medium sized. b. Not appropriate fit for both hands.
6.	M/s. S.S. Chemicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended. a. Large against the tender specification of medium sized. b. Not appropriate fit for both hands. c. Elasticity- Not elastic
7.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Co	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended. a. Too large size against the tender specification of medium sized.

SL. NO	BIDDERS QUOTED	TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT	COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT	REASON FOR REJECTION
				b. Not appropriate fit for both hands.
8.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample received does not meet with the following points of the technical specification, hence not recommended. a. Large size against the tender specification of medium sized. b. Not appropriate fit for both hands.
9.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report.
10.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Responsive	Not evaluated	The firm M/s. VIP Surgicals was blacklisted for 3 years in TNMSC letter no. 377/LT/DME- TNJ/TNMSC/ENGG/2020, dt. 13.02.2020

#### 48.HAND WASH SOLUTION - 3250000 ML

SL. NO	BIDDERS QUOTED	TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT	COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT	REASON FOR REJECTION
1.	M/s. Gesco Healthcare Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample is not recommended since no bacterial reduction after handwash.
2.	M/s. S S Chemicals	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
3.	M/s. Alan Medical & Laboratory Products	Responsive	Responsive	-----
4.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Co	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per sample evaluation report
5.	M/s. Sri Sai Mercury Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample is not recommended since no

SL. NO	BIDDERS QUOTED	TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT	COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT	REASON FOR REJECTION
				bacterial reduction after handwash.
6.	M/s. M R Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
7.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
8.	M/s. Evergreen Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
9.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Responsive	Not evaluated	The firm M/s. VIP Surgicals was blacklisted for 3 years in TNMSC letter no. 377/LT/DME-TNJ/TNMSC/ENGG/2020, dt. 13.02.2020

**49. PLAIN TUBE WITH SILICA CLOT ACTIVATOR WITH HEMOGARD CLOSURE  
4ML - 2500000 NOS**

SL. NO	BIDDERS QUOTED	TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT	COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT	REASON FOR REJECTION
1.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
2.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co	Responsive	Responsive	-----
3.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
4.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Responsive	Not evaluated	The firm M/s. VIP Surgicals was blacklisted for 3 years in TNMSC letter no. 377/LT/DME-TNJ/TNMSC/ENGG/2020, dt. 13.02.2020
5.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Co	Responsive	Responsive	-----
6.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample does not meet with the following

SL. NO	BIDDERS QUOTED	TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT	COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT	REASON FOR REJECTION
				technical specification and hence not recommended. a. Hemogard closure 3ml instead of 4ml.

**50.LITHIUM HEPARIN WITH HEMOGARD CLOSURE 4 ML – 100000**

SL. NO	BIDDERS QUOTED	TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT	COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT	REASON FOR REJECTION
1.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the tender, hence not recommended. a. Lithium heparin with hemogard closure 2ml against the tender specification of 4ml.
2.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
3.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the tender, hence not recommended. a. Lithium heparin with hemogard closure 3ml against the tender specification of 4ml.
4.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample is unsatisfactory, hence not recommended.

**51.K2 EDTA SPRAY DRIES WITH 3.6MG WITH HEMOGARD CLOSURE 2 ML – 1500000**

SL. NO	BIDDERS QUOTED	TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT	COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT	REASON FOR REJECTION
1.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the tender, hence not recommended. a. Clot formation- Clotted. b. Lysis of sample/ Stability- Lysed. c. Leakage of cap present. d. Consistency and Repeatability- Erratic values.

<b>SL. NO</b>	<b>BIDDERS QUOTED</b>	<b>TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>REASON FOR REJECTION</b>
2.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the tender, hence not recommended. a. Clot formation- Clotted. b. Lysis of sample/ Stability- Lysed. c. Leakage of cap present. d. Consistency and Repeatability- Erratic values.
3.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
4.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the tender, hence not recommended. a. Clot formation- Clotted. b. Lysis of sample/ Stability- Lysed. c. Leakage of cap present. d. Consistency and Repeatability- Erratic values.

**52.K2 EDTA SPRAY DRIES WITH 5.4 MG WITH HEMOGARD CLOSURE 3 ML-1500000**

<b>SL. NO</b>	<b>BIDDERS QUOTED</b>	<b>TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>REASON FOR REJECTION</b>
1.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the tender, hence not recommended. a. Leakage of cap present. b. CBC Values- Erratic values.
2.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the tender, hence not recommended. a. Leakage of cap present. b. CBC Values- Erratic values.

SL. NO	BIDDERS QUOTED	TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT	COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT	REASON FOR REJECTION
3.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
4.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the tender, hence not recommended. a. Leakage of cap present. b. CBC Values- Erratic values.

### 53.SODIUM FLUORIDE + EDTA WITH HEMOGARD CLOSURE 2 ML- 100000

SL. NO	BIDDERS QUOTED	TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT	COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT	REASON FOR REJECTION
1.	M/s. M C Dalal & Co	Responsive	Responsive	-----
2.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification of the tender, hence not recommended: a. Sodium fluoride+ EDTA with hemogard closure 2ml.
3.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
4.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification of the tender, hence not recommended: a. No EDTA against the tender specification of EDTA with hemogard closure 2ml.
5.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification of the tender, hence not recommended: a. No Hemogard closure against the tender specification of EDTA with hemogard closure 2ml.

SL. NO	BIDDERS QUOTED	TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT	COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT	REASON FOR REJECTION
6.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
7.	M/s. Ganapathy Trading Co.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification of the tender, hence not recommended: a. No EDTA against the tender specification of EDTA with hemogard closure 2ml.

**54.0.109M(3.2%) SODIUM CITRATE WITH HEMOGARD CLOSURE 1.8 ML-100000**

SL. NO	BIDDERS QUOTED	TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT	COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT	REASON FOR REJECTION
1.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification of the tender, hence not recommended: a. Kit insert not available. b. Erratic CBC values.
2.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
3.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
4.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification of the tender, hence not recommended: a. Kit insert not available. b. Erratic CBC values.
5.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
6.	M/s. M C Dalal & CO.	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, the sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification

SL. NO	BIDDERS QUOTED	TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT	COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT	REASON FOR REJECTION
				of the tender, hence not recommended: a. Kit insert not available. b. Erratic CBC values.

**55.0.109M(3.2%) SODIUM CITRATE WITH HEMOGARD CLOSURE 2.7 ML – 100000**

SL. NO	BIDDERS QUOTED	TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT	COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT	REASON FOR REJECTION
1.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification of the tender, hence not recommended. a. No clot formation and lysis. b. Leakage of cap. c. Erratic values in consistency and repeatability.
2.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
3.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
4.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification of the tender, hence not recommended. a. No clot formation and lysis. b. Leakage of cap. c. Erratic values in consistency and repeatability.
5.	M/s. Biolab Diagnostics (I) Pvt Ltd	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification of the tender, hence not recommended. a. No clot formation and lysis. b. Leakage of cap. c. Erratic values in consistency and repeatability.

**56.SERUM SEPARATION GEL TUBES WITH HEMOGARD CLOSURE 3.5 ML- 100000**

<b>SL. NO</b>	<b>BIDDERS QUOTED</b>	<b>TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>REASON FOR REJECTION</b>
1.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification of the tender, hence not recommended.  a. Serum separation is not satisfactory.
2.	M/s. Amirtha Health	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
3.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
4.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----

**57.SERUM SEPARATION GEL TUBES WITH HEMOGARD CLOSURE 5 ML- 100000**

<b>SL. NO</b>	<b>BIDDERS QUOTED</b>	<b>TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>REASON FOR REJECTION</b>
1.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification of the tender, hence not recommended.  a. Serum separation is not satisfactory.
2.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
3.	M/s. Rex Enterprises	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----

**58.SAFETY NEEDLE WITH SAFETY SHIELD, GREEN – 21GX1.25”- 100000**

<b>SL. NO</b>	<b>BIDDERS QUOTED</b>	<b>TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT</b>	<b>REASON FOR REJECTION</b>
1.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	As per the sample evaluation report, sample does not meet with the following points of the technical specification of

SL. NO	BIDDERS QUOTED	TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT	COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT	REASON FOR REJECTION
				the tender, hence not recommended. a. No safety shield against the tender specification of safety needle with safety shield, Green- 21G x 1.25"
2.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.

**59.SAFETY NEEDLE WITH SAFETY SHIELD, BLACK – 21GX1.25”- 100000**

SL. NO	BIDDERS QUOTED	TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT	COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT	REASON FOR REJECTION
1.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
2.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.

**60.LUER ADAPTER, BLUE-100000**

SL. NO	BIDDERS QUOTED	TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT	COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT	REASON FOR REJECTION
1.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
2.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.

**61.SINGLE USE UNIVERSAL HOLDER-100000**

SL. NO	BIDDERS QUOTED	TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT	COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT	REASON FOR REJECTION
1.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
2.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.

**62.QUICK RELEASE REUSABLE HOLDER-100000**

SL. NO	BIDDERS QUOTED	TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT	COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT	REASON FOR REJECTION
1.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Responsive	Substantially responsive	-----
2.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.

**63.SAFETY LOCK BLOOD COLLECTION SET WITH LUER ADAPTER 21G-100000**

SL. NO	BIDDERS QUOTED	TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT	COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT	REASON FOR REJECTION
1.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
2.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.

**64.SAFETY LOCK BLOOD COLLECTION SET WITH LUER ADAPTER 23G\*1"-100000**

SL. NO	BIDDERS QUOTED	TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT	COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT	REASON FOR REJECTION
1.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
2.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.

**65.SAFETY LOCK BLOOD COLLECTION SET WITH LUER ADAPTER 22G\*1"-100000**

SL. NO	BIDDERS QUOTED	TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT	COMMERCIAL EVALUATION REPORT	REASON FOR REJECTION
1.	M/s. Mediglobe Systems	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.
2.	M/s. VIP Surgicals	Non Responsive	Not evaluated	Sample not received- As per the sample evaluation report.