

International Journal of Research in Marketing Management and Sales



E-ISSN: 2663-3337
P-ISSN: 2663-3329
IJRMMS 2021; 3(1): 01-07
Received: 02-11-2020
Accepted: 08-12-2020

Amit Kumar Sharma
Lovely Professional
University, Phagwara,
Punjab, India

Vishwajit Nerkar
Lovely Professional
University, Phagwara,
Punjab, India

Vijay Bhojane
Lovely Professional
University, Phagwara,
Punjab, India

A Jyotishwari
Lovely Professional
University, Phagwara,
Punjab, India

Popatkar Manjuraja Dilip
Lovely Professional
University, Phagwara,
Punjab, India

Analysis of TBL approach of pharmaceutical industries

Amit Kumar Sharma, Vishwajit Nerkar, Vijay Bhojane, A Jyotishwari and Popatkar Manjuraja Dilip

Abstract

In this paper we focused on analyzing the sustainability of selected companies and ranked them as per their sustainable growth in the last three years. Companies with the highest or top ranking was analysed for its dynamic capabilities and sustainability over the years and the same was suggested to the other companies at lower step. The study was to compare the sustainable business performance of selected pharmaceutical companies and to identify unique suggestions and recommendations for sustainable pharmaceutical companies. The proposed paper shows the comparison between various company sustainability and their performance over the years.

Keywords: TBL approach, pharmaceutical industries

Introduction

The paper focuses on comparing the selected companies based on their sustainability over the years in pharmaceutical industry. The TBL is a bookkeeping system that consolidates three elements of execution which is social, ecological and economical. This varies from conventional revealing systems as it incorporates natural and social estimates that can be hard to dole out suitable methods for estimation. The TBL measurements are additionally ordinarily called individuals, planet and benefits. Through this research it is estimated that strategies such as large-scale Research & Development (R&D), patent work installation, contract production, contract research, non-living growth strategy through acquisition, corporate marketing and partnership licenses have helped the Indians. The pharmaceutical industry is expanding as a global player. However, there are also challenges ahead of India's pharmaceutical industry with changes in global trends and trade.

Related Work

To understand the sustainability and to compare it with other companies, it is divided into three further elements which are economic, social and ecological. Now there are three different categories based on which ranking is possible. All this data of these companies is available on their profiles. These three categories are further divided into sub categories and then the ranking is done by taking an average of the results.



Corresponding Author;
Amit Kumar Sharma
Lovely Professional
University, Phagwara,
Punjab, India

Stating about the work of the pharma companies from the Ecological point of view as we can see in the attached excel table various work parameters as been considered based on our research and analytics, those are carbon footprint, water consumption, energy consumption and water recycling.

Here every parameter has been respected and taken in consideration in every possible manner that how every pharma companies i.e Sun Pharma, Pirmal Pharma, Dr Reddy's, Lupin, Cipla, Biocon and Glenmark have contributed and worked for the betterment of Environment and for better human life in Future. From Sociological point of view, the work of the pharma companies is executed in best possible manner in talks about parameters. The executed parameter is education, poverty, rural development, skill development, employability, health, and women empowerment.

Here every parameter has been respected and taken in consideration in every possible manner that how every pharma companies i.e Sun Pharma, Pirmal Pharma, Dr Reddy's, Lupin, Cipla, Biocon and Glenmark have contributed and worked for the betterment of human life weather its about focusing on Rural Sector or contributed towards uplift from poverty by proving employability and education.


Proposed Method

For starters, underdand this, there are various methods through comparison can be made. In this report, while determining sustainability, there are three elements chosen through which sustainability can be described. Economic, social and ecological, these sub categories are further divided into sub categories and then their average is calculated for each sub category and later on a total average which would determine the rank according to their performance from previous years.

For understanding the economic sustainability, there are four factors taken into consideration. These four factors are:

- P/E Ratio
- RECO
- Dividend Delivered

Graphs



- Delivery of Growth

For Social and Ecological Factors, the Evaluations has been done in These Manners.

Parameters for Ecological factors

1. Company name
2. Year
3. Carbon footprint
4. Water consupcion
5. Energy conservation
6. Waste recycling
7. Average of 3,4,5 and 6.
8. Rank of the company

Parameters for Social factors


1. Company name
2. Year
3. Education
4. Poverty
5. Rural development
6. Skill development
7. Employability
8. Health
9. Women empowerment
10. Average of 3,4,5,6,7,8,9
11. Rank of the company

Ratings has been evaluated in the following manner for Sociological and Ecological factors:


Ratings

- 1 = DISAGREE
- 2 = Neutral (Neither Agree nor Disagree)
- 3 = Agree
- 4, 5 = Strongly Agree

Economic



Social



Dataset Used

All the companies which are under comparison have their data available on their official sites or taken from reliable sources. To study these, the data from the past five years have been taken for this report. Doing that it gets very clear how the company is doing for the past five years plus it gets easier to get a pattern to see how they are going to do in future. Now the five year data is compare within the sub categories and their average determine a rank for them.

Metrics

All the above factors are the major reason for a growth of a company and we are using the concept of average so that the result we come up with is not biased due to any factor. The price-earnings ratio (P/E ratio) relates a company's

share price to its earnings per share. A high P/E ratio could mean that a company's stock is over-valued, or else that investors are expecting high growth rates in the future. Return on capital employed (ROCE) is a financial ratio that can be used in assessing a company's profitability and capital efficiency

Result and Discussion

Sun Pharmaceuticals has got the highest P/E Ratio while Glenmark has the lowest. Similarly, the ROCE of Piramal Enterprises is the lowest amongst the competitors we have chosen. So, consider the other factors in a similar manner the concept of normalisation helps us to reach an appropriate conclusion. Piramal Enterprises is ranked at top followed by Dr. Reddy while Biocon comes at the last rank.

Ecological Data Sheet

1. Economical

Company Name	Year	P/E Ratio(%)	ROCE(%)	Dividend Delivered(%)	Delivery of Growth(%)	Total Average (%)	Conversion of Avg into No	Rank According Total Average
Sun Pharma	2016	43.39	18.35	100	76.94	73.902	0.73902	5
	2017	23.73	21.7	350	64.81			
	2018	55.01	11.13	200	5.99			
	2019	43.14	11.78	275	16.32			
	2020	22.44	10.6	100	27.71			
	Average	37.542	14.712	205	38.354			
Piramal	2016	19.65	4.39	875	34.22	320.588	3.20588	1
	2017	26.18	4.21	1050	37.53			
	2018	8.63	10.05	1250	44.06			
	2019	38.27	12.42	1400	36.89			
	2020	824.12	12.17	700	23.97			
	Average	183.37	8.648	1055	35.334			
Dr. Reddy	2016	24.3	15.17	400	14.4	116.62	1.16619	2
	2017	33.95	12.07	400	3.09			
	2018	36.45	9.13	400	-2.50			
	2019	23.66	14.37	400	-0.39			
	2020	25.53	12.04	500	11.08			
	Average	28.78	12.56	420	5.14			
Lupin	2016	29.44	19.26	375	21.07	90.73	0.907275	4
	2017	25.49	17.99	375	24.05			
	2018	132.35	10.42	250	11.22			
	2019	55.15	9.38	250	1.87			
	2020	-99.10	11.85	300	-5.91			
	Average	28.67	13.78	310	10.46			
Cipla	2016	30.24	14.48	100	29.06	44.8125	0.448125	7
	2017	47.36	7.82	150	19.38			
	2018	31.12	9.78	150	15.58			
	2019	27.88	11.13	50	8.93			
	2020	22.03	12.32	150	9.1			
	Average	31.73	11.11	120	16.41			
Cadila	2016	16.51	27.27	320	21.77	99.1525	0.991525	3
	2017	30.42	15	320	13.93			
	2018	21.78	14.82	350	17.31			
	2019	19.22	16.02	350	18.18			
	2020	23.26	14.27	350	23.29			
	Average	22.238	17.476	338	18.896			
Biocon	2016	2.87	8.8	100	16.06	27.497	0.27497	8
	2017	18.16	7.93	100	16.29			
	2018	47.06	4.74	20	15.52			
	2019	39.91	11.91	20	28.35			
	2020	42.81	11.61	10	27.92			
	Average	30.162	8.998	50	20.828			
Glenmark	2016	15.04	20.13	200	77.12	67.6835	0.676835	6
	2017	11.23	24.45	200	87.57			
	2018	14.64	10.77	200	12.46			
	2019	11.26	11.41	200	1.54			
	2020	4.29	10.7	250	-8.94			
	Average	11.292	15.492	210	33.95			

2. Ecological

Company Name	YEAR	CARBON FOOTPRINT	WATER CONSUPTION	ENERGY CONSERVATION	WASTE RECYCLING	AVERAGE OF C,D,E,F	RANK OF THE COMPANY
Sun Phama	2016	2.5	1	2	3	2.29	5
	2017	2	1	3.5	2		
	2018	2	1.5	3	2		
	2019	2.8	1	3.6	3.2		
	2020	3	1	3	2.7		
	AVERAGE	2.46	1.1	3.02	2.58		
Piramal	2016	1	1	4	2.8	2.565	3
	2017	2	2	3.7	3		
	2018	2	2	4	3		
	2019	2.5	1	3.5	2.5		
	2020	3	2.5	3	2.8		
	AVERAGE	2.1	1.7	3.64	2.82		
Dr. Reddy	2016	3	3.5	2.8	3.5	3.115	1
	2017	2.8	3	1	4		
	2018	2	3	3	4.2		
	2019	3	3.2	3.5	3.2		
	2020	2.8	3.5	2.8	4.5		
	AVERAGE	2.72	3.24	2.62	3.88		
Lupin	2016	2	1	2	3.2	2.1475	8
	2017	1	2	2.5	3		
	2018	1	1	2.6	3		
	2019	1	2.5	2.6	2.6		
	2020	1	3	3			
	AVERAGE	1.2	1.9	2.54	2.95		
Cipla	2016	2	2	1	1	2.255	6
	2017	3	2.5	1	2.5		
	2018	2.5	2.5	2	2		
	2019	2.5	2.5	2	2		
	2020	3	2.6	3	3.5		
	AVERAGE	2.6	2.42	1.8	2.2		
Cadila	2016	1	2.5	1	2.5	2.155	7
	2017	1	2.5	3.5	2.5		
	2018	2	2.8	3	2.6		
	2019	1	1	3.2	2.6		
	2020	1	1	3.8	2.6		
	AVERAGE	1.2	1.96	2.9	2.56		
Eiocon	2016	3	2.8	4.2	3	3.075	2
	2017	3.2	1	4	3.5		
	2018	3.3	3	3.8	3.8		
	2019	3.5	2	3	3.1		
	2020	3.8	2.5	3	2		
	AVERAGE	3.36	2.26	3.6	3.08		
Glenmark	2016	2.8	2.8	3	1	2.47	4
	2017	1	3	3.5	2		
	2018	1	2.5	4	4.5		
	2019	1	2	4	2		
	2020	2.5	2	2.8	2		
	AVERAGE	1.66	2.46	3.46	2.3		

3. Social

Company Name	YEAR	EDUCATION	POVERTY	Rural Development	Skill Development	Employability	Health	Women Empowerment	AVERAGE OF C,D,E,F,G,H,I	RANK OF THE COMPANY
Sun Pharma	2016	3	2	2	2	2	5	1	2.685714286	8
	2017	5	3	2	3	2	5	1		
	2018	3	2	2	2	2	5	1		
	2019	5	2	5	5	2	5	1		
	2020	2	2	2	2	2	2	2		
	AVERAGE	3.6	2.2	2.6	2.8	2	4.4	1.2		
Piramal	2016	5	2	2	4	2	5	5	3.628571429	2
	2017	5	2	2	4	2	4	5		
	2018	5	5	5	5	2	5	5		
	2019	5	5	5	5	2	5	5		
	2020	2	2	2	2	2	2	2		
	AVERAGE	4.4	3.2	3.2	4	2	4.2	4.4		
Dr. Reddy	2016	5	5	5	1	2	5	1	3.714285714	1
	2017	4	2	4	5	2	4	1		
	2018	5	5	5	5	2	5	1		
	2019	5	5	5	5	2	5	1		
	2020	5	5	5	5	2	4	2		
	AVERAGE	4.8	4.4	4.8	4.2	2	4.6	1.2		
Lupin	2016	5	2	5	2	2	5	1	3.4	4
	2017	5	2	5	2	4	5	1		
	2018	5	2	5	2	4	5	1		
	2019	5	2	5	3	4	5	1		
	2020	5	2	5	3	4	3	2		
	AVERAGE	5	2	5	2.4	3.6	4.6	1.2		
Cipla	2016	5	4	2	5	2	5	1	3.457142857	3
	2017	5	4	4	2	2	5	1		
	2018	4	4	2	5	2	5	1		
	2019	5	4	2	5	2	5	1		
	2020	5	4	4	5	2	5	2		
	AVERAGE	4.8	4	2.8	4.4	2	5	1.2		
Cadila	2016	4	2	2	3	2	5	1	2.914285714	7
	2017	5	2	2	3	2	4	1		
	2018	5	5	2	3	2	5	1		
	2019	5	3	2	3	2	5	1		
	2020	3	3	2	3	2	5	2		
	AVERAGE	4.4	3	2	3	2	4.8	1.2		
Biocon	2016	4	2	3	2	2	5	1	3.142857143	6
	2017	4	2	3	4	2	3	1		
	2018	5	2	3	4	2	5	1		
	2019	5	5	2	2	4	2	5		
	2020	4	5	5	2	2	5	2		
	AVERAGE	4.4	3.2	3.2	2.8	2.4	4	2		
Glenmark	2016	5			5	2	5	1	3.25952381	5
	2017	3	4	5	5	2	5	1		
	2018	3		3	5	2	5	1		
	2019	3	5	5	5	3	5	1		
	2020	2	2	2	2	2	2	2		
	AVERAGE	3.2	3.66666667	3.75	4.4	2.2	4.4	1.2		

References

1. Alhaddi H. Triple bottom line and sustainability 2015.
2. Colbert BA, Kurucz EC. Three conceptions of triple bottom line business sustainability and the role for HRM. *People and Strategy* 2007;30(1):21.
3. Henriques A, Richardson J. (Eds.). *The triple bottom line: Does it all add up* 2013.
4. Routledge Jamali D, Mezher T, Bitar H. Corporate social responsibility and the challenge of triple bottom line integration: insights from the Lebanese context. *International journal of environment and sustainable development* 2006;5(4):395-414.
5. Nikolaou IE, Evangelinos KI, Allan S. A reverse logistics social responsibility evaluation framework based on the triple bottom line approach. *Journal of cleaner production* 2013;56:173-184.
6. Norman W, MacDonald C. Getting to the bottom of "triple bottom line". *Business ethics quarterly* 2004, 243-262.
7. Schulz SA, Flanigan RL. Developing competitive advantage using the triple bottom line: A conceptual framework. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing* 2016.