IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 5, Issue 1, August 2025
Impact Factor: 7.67

Implementation of Lean Six Sigma in Pharmaceutical Manufacturing

Shravani Pawar[1], Priyanka Patil[2] , Megha Hange[3], Pravin Sable[4]
S S P Shikshan Sanstha's Siddhi College of Pharmacy, Newalevasti, Chikhali, Pune, Maharashtra, India[1-4]

Abstract: *Pharmaceutical manufacturing is one of the most critical and highly regulated industries worldwide. The complexity of production processes, coupled with stringent regulatory requirements, necessitates a focus on quality, efficiency, and cost optimization. Lean Six Sigma (LSS) combines Lean principles for eliminating waste and Six Sigma methodologies for reducing variability, ensuring both quality and efficiency.*

This document explores the comprehensive application of LSS across pharmaceutical processes, including API synthesis, granulation, tablet production, capsule filling, coating, and packaging. The implementation is illustrated through case studies, step-by- step methodology, tables, charts, value stream maps, SIPOC diagrams, FMEA analyses, 5S/Kaizen practices, ROI calculations, and regulatory compliance frameworks.

This document is designed to serve as a full reference for pharma professionals looking to implement LSS in manufacturing, ensuring measurable improvements in defect reduction, cycle time, yield, and cost savings..

Keywords: Lean Six Sigma, Pharmaceutical Manufacturing, DMAIC, Process Optimization, Quality Improvement, FMEA, 5S, SIPOC, Value Stream Mapping

I. INTRODUCTION

Pharmaceutical manufacturing requires precise control over chemical, mechanical, and packaging processes. Even minor deviations can result in defective products, batch rejections, or regulatory non-compliance. LSS provides a structured approach to identify inefficiencies, analyse root causes, and implement sustainable improvements.

1.1 Historical Background of Lean Six Sigma in Pharma

Lean Six Sigma originated in the manufacturing sector but quickly found applications in pharmaceuticals. Early adopters included multinational companies aiming to:

- Reduce cycle times and production bottlenecks
- Minimize defects and rework
- Maintain compliance with FDA, EMA, and WHO guidelines

Key milestones:

- 1990s: LSS implemented in US-based pharma plants for tablet and capsule production.
- 2000s: Statistical process control (SPC) adopted for API synthesis and formulation.
- 2010s: Integration of Lean practices for packaging lines, warehouse operations, and distribution.
- 2020s: Use of digital tools and IoT for real-time monitoring and predictive maintenance.

1.2 Importance of Lean Six Sigma

1. Quality Assurance:

LSS reduces defects, contamination, and product recalls.

2. Operational Efficiency:

Non-value-added steps are eliminated, workflow optimized.

DOI: 10.48175/IJARSCT-28665

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 5, Issue 1, August 2025
Impact Factor: 7.67

3. Cost Optimization:
Reduced scrap, rework, downtime, and overproduction.

4. Regulatory Compliance:
Ensures SOP adherence, consistent batch quality, and audit readiness.

5. Employee Engagement:
Encourages participation through Kaizen events and continuous improvement initiatives.

1.3 Common Challenges in Pharma Manufacturing

Process	Typical Issues	Potential Impact
API Synthesis	Reaction variability, impurities	Low yield, recalls
Granulation	Non-uniform particle size	Poor compressibility, inconsistent blend
Tablet Compression	Weight variation, capping	Batch rejection
Capsule Filling	Under/overfilling	Regulatory non-compliance
Coating	Peeling, uneven coating	Product rejection
Packaging	Mislabelling, damaged packaging	Distribution delays

1.4 Lean Six Sigma Tools Overview

Tool	Purpose	Example
DMAIC	Structured problem-solving	Reduce tablet defects
SIPOC	Process mapping	Packaging line analysis
FMEA	Identify potential risks	API contamination
Pareto Analysis	Identify major defect sources	Tablet weight deviations
Control Charts	Monitor stability	Granulation moisture content
5S	Workplace organization	Raw material storage
Kaizen	Continuous improvement	Operator suggestions

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Global Adoption

• George et al., 2005: Reported 30–50% reduction in cycle times in tablet production.
• Sharma & Joshi, 2016: LSS reduced packaging defects by 40% in Indian pharmaceutical companies.
• Sneer, 2010: Demonstrated LSS improves compliance, reduces variability, and enhances operational efficiency.

2.2 Case Studies Overview

1. Tablet Production: Coating defects reduced by 75%, weight variation reduced, downtime minimized.
2. Packaging: SOPs and automated verification reduced labeling errors by 80%.
3. API Synthesis: Statistical process control improved yield by 18%, reduced rework and impurities.

2.3 Tools and Techniques

Tool	Purpose	Example Application
DMAIC	Problem-solving	Reduce defects in coating process
SIPOC	Identify key inputs/outputs	Packaging line optimization
FMEA	Risk prioritization	Identify critical failure points in granulation
Pareto Chart	Identify top contributors to defects	Tablet weight variation

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429 Volume 5, Issue 1, August 2025 Impact Factor: 7.67

Control Chart	Process monitoring	Tablet moisture, capsule fill weight
5S	Organize workspace	Maintain material storage cleanliness
Kaizen	Continuous improvement	Operator suggestions for machine setup

III. METHODOLOGY

3.1 DMAIC Steps

Define: Identify critical quality issues and operational bottlenecks.

Measure: Collect baseline data on defect rates, cycle times, yields, and costs. Analyse: Identify root causes using Pareto, cause-effect diagrams, and FMEA. Improve: Implement solutions such as SOP standardization, training, preventive maintenance.

Control: Maintain gains with control charts, audits, and SOP compliance monitoring.

3.2 SIPOC – Tablet Production Example

Supplier	Input	Process	Output	Customer
Raw Material Supplier	API, excipients	Granulation → Compression → Coating	Tablets	Distribution centers
Packaging Supplier	Boxes, labels	Labelling → Boxing → Sealing	Packaged tablets	Pharmacies

3.3 FMEA – Tablet Coating Example

Step	Potential Failure	Severity	Occurrence	Detection	RPN	Action
Coating spray	Uneven coating	8	6	5	240	Standardize spray rate
Dryer temp	Overheating	7	4	6	168	Install temperature sensors
Mixing	Non-uniform blend	9	5	6	270	Implement SOP

3.4 SOP Example – Granulation Process

- Target moisture: 3–5%
- Mixing time: 15 minutes
- Milling sieve size: 0.8 mm
- QC checks: Particle size, moisture content, uniformity
- Preventive maintenance: Weekly inspection of mixer blades, drying unit, and sieve

IV. IMPLEMENTATION IN KEY PROCESSES – EXPANDED VERSION

4.1 Tablet Production

4.1.1 Problem Identification

Tablet production is prone to defects such as:

- Uneven coating: Leads to aesthetic issues and uneven drug release.
- Weight variation: Can result in under/over-dosing.
- Capping & lamination: Mechanical failure during compression.
- Downtime: Machine breakdowns or cleaning delays.

Baseline Data (Example from 30 batches):

Parameter	Value Before LSS
Defect Rate (%)	5.2
Average Cycle Time (hrs)	10
Cost per Batch ($)	12,000

DOI: 10.48175/IJARSCT-28665

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 5, Issue 1, August 2025
Impact Factor: 7.67

Yield (%)	82

4.1.2 Step-by-Step DMAIC Application

Define:

• Goal: Reduce defects by 75%, cycle time by 20%, and cost by 15%.

• Scope: Granulation → Compression → Coating.

Measure:

• Collected batch-wise defect data, cycle times, and operator logs.

• Used control charts to track weight variation and coating uniformity.

Analyse:

• Root Cause Analysis (RCA) identified:

o Inconsistent granulation moisture

o Incorrect compression pressure

o Operator variability in coating spray rate

Improve:

• Standardized granulation moisture using inline sensors.

• Set SOPs for compression machine parameters.

• Operator training for coating procedures.

• Introduced automated coating spray monitoring.

Control:

• Daily QC checks on weight variation and coating uniformity.

• Control charts to monitor critical parameters.

• Preventive maintenance schedule implemented.

4.1.3 Case Study – Tablet Line Optimization

Scenario: 50,000 tablets/day production line faced 6% defect rate.

Actions:

• Installed inline moisture sensors during granulation.

• Reduced compression machine downtime via predictive maintenance.

• Implemented operator Kaizen program for coating setup.

Results (After 3 Months):

Parameter	Before LSS	After LSS	Improvement
Defect Rate (%)	6	1.5	75%
Cycle Time (hrs)	10	8	20%
Cost per Batch ($)	12,500	10,625	15%
Yield (%)	82	94	15%

4.1.4 Pareto Analysis – Tablet Defects

Defect Type	Frequency Before	Frequency After
Uneven Coating	40	10

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 5, Issue 1, August 2025
Impact Factor: 7.67

Weight Variation	25	5
Capping	15	3
Lamination	10	2
Downtime	10	1

4.1.5 FMEA – Tablet Production

Step	Potential Failure	Severity	Occurrence	Detection	RPN	Action
Granulation	Moisture variability	9	6	5	270	Install inline moisture sensor
Compression	Weight variation	8	5	5	200	Calibrate compression machine
Coating	Uneven spray	8	6	5	240	Operator training & automated monitoring
Packing	Mislabelling	7	4	6	168	Barcode verification

4.2 Capsule Filling

4.2.1 Problem Identification

Capsule filling involves precise dosing of powders or pellets into hard gelatin or HPMC capsules. Common challenges include:

• Under filling or overfilling: Leads to under/over-dosing, regulatory issues.
• Segregation of blend: Different particle sizes cause inconsistent weight.
• Capsule damage: Cracking during filling or sealing.
• Downtime: Machine stoppages due to misaligned components or jams.

Baseline Data (30 batches example):

Parameter	Value Before LSS
Defect Rate (%)	5.8
Average Cycle Time (hrs)	11
Cost per Batch ($)	13,500
Yield (%)	85

4.2.2 Step-by-Step DMAIC Application

Define:

• Goal: Reduce defect rate by 70–75%, cycle time by 20%, cost per batch by 15%.
• Scope: Capsule filling → capsule sealing → inspection.

Measure:

• Collected weight variation data for each batch.
• Measured blend uniformity and capsule integrity.
• Logged downtime events.

Analyse:

• Root causes identified via Pareto analysis:
o Segregation during transport of powder to filling machine.
o Operator error in adjusting filling depth.
o Machine jams due to improper capsule alignment.

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 5, Issue 1, August 2025
Impact Factor: 7.67

Improve:
• Implemented vibration feeders and closed transfer lines to reduce segregation.
• Automated depth adjustment and weight verification for each capsule.
• Operator training on proper machine handling and preventive maintenance.

Control:
• Daily in-process weight checks.
• Weekly preventive maintenance and calibration logs.
• Control charts to monitor weight variability and capsule integrity.

4.2.3 Case Study – Capsule Filling Line Optimization
Scenario: A line producing 60,000 capsules/day faced 6% defects. Actions Taken:
• Introduced inline check weathers to detect under/overfilled capsules.
• Improved powder handling to prevent segregation.
• Kaizen workshops trained operators to reduce setup errors.

Results (After 3 months):

Parameter	Before LSS	After LSS	Improvement
Defect Rate (%)	6	1.8	70%
Cycle Time (hrs)	11	8.8	20%
Cost per Batch ($)	13,500	11,500	15%
Yield (%)	85	94	10%

4.2.4 Pareto Analysis – Capsule Defects

Defect Type	Frequency Before	Frequency After
Under/Overfilling	40	12
Capsule Cracks	25	5
Segregation	20	4
Downtime	15	2

4.2.5 FMEA – Capsule Filling

Step	Potential Failure	Severity	Occurrence	Detection	RPN	Action
Powder Transport	Segregation	9	6	5	270	Closed transfer system, vibration feeder
Filling	Incorrect depth	8	5	6	240	Automated weight verification
Capsule Handling	Cracks	7	5	5	175	Soft handling guides
Sealing	Improper seal	8	4	5	160	Regular calibration

4.2.6 5S / Kaizen Implementation

5S Step	Action	Impact
Sort	Remove unused tools near filling machine	Reduce clutter

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 5, Issue 1, August 2025
Impact Factor: 7.67

Set in Order	Label feeder stations	Reduce setup errors
Shine	Daily machine cleaning	Reduce contamination
Standardize	SOPs for machine setup & operation	Consistent process
Sustain	Operator audits and rewards	Continuous improvement

4.2.8 SIPOC – Capsule Filling Line

Supplier	Input	Process	Output	Customer
Raw Material Supplier	Powder, excipients, capsules	Blending → Feeding → Filling → Sealing	Filled capsules	Distribution
Packaging Supplier	Bottles, labels	Labelling → Capping	Packaged capsules	Pharmacies

4.2.9 Mini Case Study – Operator Training Impact

• Problem: Operator errors causing 25% of defects.
• Solution: Implemented structured Kaizen training sessions and SOP refreshers.
• Result: Reduced operator-related defects from 25% to 5%.

4.3 Granulation

4.3.1 Problem Identification

Granulation is a critical process in tablet and capsule manufacturing that ensures uniform particle size and blend homogeneity. Common issues include:

• Non-uniform particle size: Leads to poor compressibility and content uniformity.
• Moisture variability: Over- or under-drying affects tablet hardness and dissolution.
• Segregation during transfer: Active ingredients separate from excipients.
• Downtime: Mixer, dryer, and mill malfunctions.

Baseline Data (30 Batches Example):

Parameter	Value Before LSS
Defect Rate (%)	6.2
Average Cycle Time (hrs)	9
Cost per Batch ($)	11,500
Yield (%)	83

4.3.2 Step-by-Step DMAIC Application

Define:

• Goal: Reduce defects by 70%, cycle time by 15%, and cost by 12%.
• Scope: Blending → Wet Granulation → Drying → Milling → Sieving.

Measure:

• Collected particle size distribution and moisture content data.
• Measured weight uniformity and batch yields.
• Logged downtime events and equipment faults.

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 5, Issue 1, August 2025
Impact Factor: 7.67

Analyse:
• Root causes identified:
o Inconsistent liquid addition during wet granulation.
o Over/under drying due to temperature variation.
o Milling inconsistencies causing oversized or undersized granules.

Improve:
• Installed inline moisture sensors in the dryer.
• Standardized liquid addition using peristaltic pumps.
• Implemented calibrated mills and sieves for consistent particle size.
• Operator training on process monitoring and SOP adherence.

Control:
• Daily QC checks for particle size and moisture.
• Weekly equipment calibration and preventive maintenance.
• Control charts for critical process parameters.

4.3.3 Case Study – Granulation Line Optimization
Scenario: A 40,000 kg/day granulation line had 6% defective batches. Actions:
• Installed inline moisture sensors to reduce over/under drying.
• Standardized liquid addition with automated pumps.
• Introduced Kaizen workshops for operators.

Results (After 3 Months):

Parameter	Before LSS	After LSS	Improvement
Defect Rate (%)	6	1.8	70%
Cycle Time (hrs)	9	7.5	17%
Cost per Batch ($)	11,500	10,120	12%
Yield (%)	83	92	11%

4.3.4 Pareto Analysis – Granulation Defects

Defect Type	Frequency Before	Frequency After
Non-uniform particle size	35	8
Moisture variability	30	6
Segregation	20	4
Downtime	15	2

4.3.5 FMEA – Granulation Process

Step	Potential Failure	Severity	Occurrence	Detection	RPN	Action
Blending	Non-homogeneous mix	9	6	5	270	SOP for blending time

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429 Volume 5, Issue 1, August 2025 Impact Factor: 7.67

Wet Granulation	Over/under wetting	8	5	5	200	Peristaltic pump & SOP
Drying	Moisture variation	8	6	5	240	Inline moisture sensor
Milling	Improper particle size	7	5	5	175	Calibrated sieves
Sieving	Oversized particles	6	4	4	96	SOP & QC checks

4.3.6 5S / Kaizen Implementation

5S Step	Action	Impact
Sort	Remove unused granulation tools	Reduce clutter
Set in Order	Label bins and vessels	Faster material handling
Shine	Clean dryer & mill daily	Reduce contamination risk
Standardize	SOPs for liquid addition, drying, milling	Consistent output
Sustain	Weekly operator audits	Continuous quality improvement

4.3.8 SIPOC – Granulation

Supplier	Input	Process	Output	Customer
Raw Material Supplier	API, excipients	Blending → Wet Granulation → Drying → Milling → Sieving	Granules	Tablet/Capsule Production
Utilities	Steam, water	Heating/Drying	Temperature-controlled granules	Internal production

4.3.9 Mini Case Study – Moisture Control

Problem: Moisture variability causing tablet hardness defects.
Solution: Installed inline moisture sensors and automated drying adjustment.
Result: Defect rate from moisture-related issues dropped from 30% to 5%.

4.3.10 ROI Analysis – Granulation Line

- Cost savings per batch: $1,380
- Defect reduction: 70%
- Cycle time reduction: 17%
- Payback period: 6–8 months

4.4 Tablet and Capsule Coating

4.4.1 Problem Identification

Coating is a critical finishing step for tablets and capsules to:

- Protect the active ingredient
- Mask taste
- Improve stability
- Enhance appearance Common challenges include:
- Uneven coating: Causes aesthetic issues and inconsistent drug release.

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 5, Issue 1, August 2025
Impact Factor: 7.67

• Peeling or chipping: Weak adhesion leads to product rejection.
• Prolonged drying time: Increases cycle time and energy costs.
• Downtime: Sprayer or dryer malfunction, cleaning delays.

Baseline Data (30 batches example):

Parameter	Value Before LSS
Defect Rate (%)	5.5
Average Cycle Time (hrs)	8
Cost per Batch ($)	12,000
Yield (%)	84

4.4.2 Step-by-Step DMAIC Application

Define:
• Goal: Reduce coating defects by 70%, cycle time by 15%, and cost by 12%.
• Scope: Tablet/capsule → Coating → Drying → Polishing.

Measure:
• Collected coating thickness, appearance, and adhesion data.
• Measured drying time and energy consumption.
• Logged downtime events and operator deviations.

Analyse:
• Root causes identified:
o Inconsistent spray rate or nozzle blockage
o Uneven pan rotation speed
o Over- or under-drying

Improve:
• Standardized spray parameters using automated controllers.
• Scheduled preventive maintenance for sprayers and pans.
• Operator training on coating techniques.
• Introduced inline monitoring for coating thickness.

Control:
• Daily QC checks for coating uniformity.
• Control charts to track critical parameters (thickness, adhesion).
• Scheduled audits and maintenance logs.

4.4.3 Case Study – Tablet Coating Line Optimization

Scenario: A tablet line producing 40,000 tablets/day experienced 5.5% defect rate due to coating issues.

Actions:
• Introduced automated spray monitoring with inline feedback.
• Trained operators on SOPs and pan rotation consistency.
• Implemented Kaizen workshops for process improvement.

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 5, Issue 1, August 2025
Impact Factor: 7.67

Results (After 3 Months):

Parameter	Before LSS	After LSS	Improvement
Defect Rate (%)	5.5	1.5	73%
Cycle Time (hrs)	8	6.8	15%
Cost per Batch ($)	12,000	10,560	12%
Yield (%)	84	93	11%

4.4.4 Pareto Analysis – Coating Defects

Defect Type	Frequency Before	Frequency After
Uneven coating	45	10
Peeling/chipping	25	4
Over/under-drying	20	3
Downtime	10	1

4.4.5 FMEA – Coating Process

Step	Potential Failure	Severity	Occurrence	Detection	RPN	Action
Spray	Nozzle blockage	8	5	6	240	Preventive maintenance & inline monitoring
Pan rotation	Uneven speed	7	6	5	210	SOP standardization
Drying	Over/under-drying	8	5	6	240	Temperature monitoring & sensors
Polishing	Chipping	7	4	5	140	Operator training

4.4.6 5S / Kaizen Implementation

5S Step	Action	Impact
Sort	Remove unused coating tools	Reduce clutter
Set in Order	Label spray and dryer controls	Faster setup
Shine	Daily pan cleaning	Reduce contamination
Standardize	SOPs for spray, pan speed, drying	Consistent coating quality
Sustain	Weekly audits & operator feedback	Continuous improvement

4.4.8 SIPOC – Coating Line

Supplier	Input	Process	Output	Customer
Raw Material Supplier	Tablets/capsules, coating solution	Coating → Drying → Polishing	Finished coated tablets/capsules	Packaging & Distribution
Utilities	Air, steam	Drying	Correct moisture content	Internal production

4.4.9 Mini Case Study – Coating Efficiency Improvement

Problem: Uneven coating due to manual adjustments and nozzle clogging.

Solution: Installed automated spray controllers and inline monitoring sensors.

Result: Defect rate dropped from 45% of total defects to 10%, cycle time reduced by 15%.

DOI: 10.48175/IJARSCT-28665

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 5, Issue 1, August 2025
Impact Factor: 7.67

4.4.10 ROI Analysis – Coating Line

- Cost savings per batch: $1,440
- Defect reduction: 73%
- Cycle time reduction: 15%
- Payback period: 5–7 months

4.5 Packaging

4.5.1 Problem Identification

Packaging is the final critical step in pharmaceutical manufacturing. It ensures:

- Protection of the product
- Accurate labelling
- Tamper evidence
- Ease of distribution Common challenges include:
- Mislabelling or incorrect batch codes: Leads to regulatory non-compliance.
- Damaged packaging: Boxes, bottles, or blister packs damaged during handling.
- Downtime: Machine jams or misalignment.
- Inefficient workflow: Slower throughput due to manual processes.

Baseline Data (30 batches example):

Parameter	Value Before LSS
Defect Rate (%)	6.0
Average Cycle Time (hrs)	7
Cost per Batch ($)	14,000
Yield (%)	87

4.5.2 Step-by-Step DMAIC Application

Define:

- Goal: Reduce packaging defects by 70%, cycle time by 15%, cost by 12%.
- Scope: Labelling → Filling → Sealing → Cartooning → Palletizing.

Measure:

- Collected defect data on labelling errors, misfiled containers, and damaged cartons.
- Logged downtime events and throughput.
- Measured labelling accuracy and sealing quality.

Analyse:

- Root causes identified via Pareto analysis:
  - o Manual labelling errors
  - o Misalignment of filling nozzles
  - o Operator variability during cartooning

Improve:

- Introduced barcode verification and automated labelling.
- Standardized filling nozzle alignment and sealing temperature.
- Conducted operator training and Kaizen workshops.
- Added inline inspection cameras for carton integrity.

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 5, Issue 1, August 2025
Impact Factor: 7.67

Control:
• Daily QC checks on labelling accuracy, fill volume, and carton quality.
• Control charts to monitor defect rates and throughput.
• Scheduled preventive maintenance on packaging machines.

4.5.3 Case Study – Packaging Line Optimization

Scenario: A line producing 50,000 units/day experienced 6% defects.

Actions Taken:
• Installed barcode readers and automated labeling verification.
• Introduced inline carton inspection cameras.
• Conducted Kaizen sessions for operator workflow improvements.

Results (After 3 Months):

Parameter	Before LSS	After LSS	Improvement
Defect Rate (%)	6	1.7	72%
Cycle Time (hrs)	7	5.9	15%
Cost per Batch ($)	14,000	12,320	12%
Yield (%)	87	95	8%

4.5.4 Pareto Analysis – Packaging Defects

Defect Type	Frequency Before	Frequency After
Mislabelling	40	8
Carton damage	25	4
Fill errors	20	3
Downtime	15	2

4.5.5 FMEA – Packaging Process

Step	Potential Failure	Severity	Occurrence	Detection	RPN	Action
Labelling	Incorrect label	9	5	6	270	Barcode verification & automation
Filling	Over/under fill	8	5	5	200	Standardized nozzle alignment
Sealing	Weak seal	8	4	6	192	Temperature calibration & monitoring
Cartooning	Damaged carton	7	5	5	175	Inline inspection cameras
Palletizing	Mistaking	6	4	5	120	SOP & operator training

4.5.6 5S / Kaizen Implementation

5S Step	Action	Impact
Sort	Remove unused packaging tools	Reduce clutter & errors
Set in Order	Label all bins & tools	Faster setup & fewer mistakes
Shine	Clean machines daily	Reduce contamination & jams

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 5, Issue 1, August 2025
Impact Factor: 7.67

Standardize	SOPs for labelling, filling, sealing	Consistent output
Sustain	Weekly audits & operator feedback	Continuous improvement

4.5.8 SIPOC – Packaging Line

Supplier	Input	Process	Output	Customer
Tablet/Capsule Production	Finished tablets/capsules	Labelling → Filling → Sealing → Cartooning → Palletizing	Packaged units	Distribution & Pharmacies
Packaging Material Supplier	Boxes, labels, bottles, cartons	Feeding → Labelling → Sealing	Packaged goods	Customers/Pharmacies

4.5.9 Mini Case Study – Operator Training Impact

Problem: Operator errors caused 25% of packaging defects.
Solution: Structured Kaizen training, SOP refreshers, and reward system.
Result: Operator-related defects dropped from 25% to 5%, overall defect rate reduced to 1.7%.

4.5.10 ROI Analysis – Packaging Line

- Cost savings per batch: $1,680
- Defect reduction: 72%
- Cycle time reduction: 15%
- Payback period: 5–6 months

4.6 API (Active Pharmaceutical Ingredient) Synthesis

4.6.1 Problem Identification

API synthesis is the core chemical process in pharmaceutical manufacturing. Challenges in this stage directly impact product quality, yield, cost, and compliance. Common issues include:

- Reaction variability: Inconsistent temperature, pH, or reactant addition.
- Impurities: Formation of unwanted by-products leading to batch rejection.
- Yield losses: Due to incomplete reactions or inefficient purification.
- Downtime: Equipment cleaning, maintenance, or unplanned stoppages.
- Regulatory compliance: Documentation errors or process deviations.

Baseline Data (30 batches example):

Parameter	Value Before LSS
Defect Rate (%)	7.0
Average Cycle Time (hrs)	24
Cost per Batch ($)	50,000
Yield (%)	78

4.6.2 Step-by-Step DMAIC Application

Define:

- Goal: Reduce defects by 70–75%, cycle time by 15–20%, improve yield by 10–15%.
- Scope: Reaction → Isolation → Purification → Drying → Packaging.

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 5, Issue 1, August 2025
Impact Factor: 7.67

Measure:
• Collected data on reaction temperature, pH, reaction time, yield, and impurities.
• Measured batch-to-batch variability and process deviations.
• Logged equipment downtime.

Analyse:
• Root causes identified:
o Temperature fluctuation during reaction.
o Impure reactants causing side reactions.
o Inefficient filtration and purification.

Improve:
• Installed inline temperature and pH sensors for process control.
• Standardized raw material quality checks.
• Optimized filtration and purification steps.
• Operator training on reaction monitoring and SOP adherence.

Control:
• Daily QC checks for purity, yield, and impurities.
• Control charts to track reaction parameters and yield.
• Preventive maintenance schedules and SOP audits.

4.6.3 Case Study – API Synthesis Line Optimization
Scenario: A 1,000 kg/day API line had a 7% defect rate due to impurities and yield losses.

Actions:
• Installed inline temperature and pH monitoring.
• Standardized raw material pre-checks.
• Introduced Kaizen workshops for process optimization.

Results (After 3 Months):

Parameter	Before LSS	After LSS	Improvement
Defect Rate (%)	7	2	71%
Cycle Time (hrs)	24	20	17%
Cost per Batch ($)	50,000	42,500	15%
Yield (%)	78	89	11%

4.6.4 Pareto Analysis – API Defects

Defect Type	Frequency Before	Frequency After
Impurities	40	8
Reaction failure	25	5
Filtration issues	20	3
Downtime	15	1

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429 Volume 5, Issue 1, August 2025 Impact Factor: 7.67

4.6.5 FMEA – API Synthesis

Step	Potential Failure	Severity	Occurrence	Detection	RPN	Action
Reaction	Temperature fluctuation	9	6	5	270	Inline temperature sensors
Reactant addition	Impure material	8	5	5	200	Raw material QC
Purification	Inefficient filtration	8	5	5	200	Optimized filtration SOP
Drying	Moisture residual	7	4	5	140	Controlled drying parameters
Packaging	Contamination	8	3	5	120	SOP adherence & cleanroom

4.6.6 5S / Kaizen Implementation

5S Step	Action	Impact
Sort	Remove unused chemical containers	Reduce contamination & clutter
Set in Order	Label all reactors and vessels	Faster setup and fewer errors
Shine	Clean reactors and filters daily	Reduce contamination & reaction failures
Standardize	SOPs for reaction, filtration, drying	Consistent output & quality
Sustain	Weekly audits & operator feedback	Continuous improvement

4.6.8 SIPOC – API Synthesis

Supplier	Input	Process	Output	Customer
Raw Material Supplier	Reactants, solvents	Reaction → Isolation → Purification → Drying	API	Formulation (Tablet/Capsule) Production
Utilities	Steam, water, cooling	Heating/Cooling → Drying	Processed API	Internal production

4.6.9 Mini Case Study – Inline Process Monitoring

Problem: Variability in reaction temperature caused 40% of defects.
Solution: Inline temperature & pH sensors with automated alerts for deviations.
Result: Defects reduced by 70%, yield increased from 78% to 89%.

4.6.10 ROI Analysis – API Synthesis Line

- Cost savings per batch: $7,500
- Defect reduction: 71%
- Cycle time reduction: 17%
- Payback period: 6–8 months

V. KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (KPIS) FOR PHARMACEUTICAL LEAN SIX SIGMA

KPIs are essential to measure, monitor, and continuously improve pharmaceutical manufacturing efficiency and quality.

DOI: 10.48175/IJARSCT-28665

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 5, Issue 1, August 2025
Impact Factor: 7.67

5.1 Common KPIs

KPI	Definition	Target	Measurement Frequency
Defect Rate (%)	% of units failing QC	<2%	Per batch
Yield (%)	Ratio of usable output to total input	>90%	Per batch
Cycle Time (hrs)	Time to complete process from start to finish	Varies per process	Daily / Batch
Cost per Batch ($)	Total cost for producing one batch	Reduce 10–15%	Monthly
Overall Equipment Effectiveness (OEE)	Availability × Performance × Quality	>85%	Weekly
Downtime (hrs)	Total machine stoppage per shift	<2%	Daily
Batch Documentation Compliance (%)	% of error-free batch records	100%	Per batch

5.2 KPI Dashboard Example (Tablet Line)

Tablet Production KPI Dashboard
Defect Rate: 1.5% Target: <2%
Yield: 94% Target: >90%
Cycle Time: 8 hrs Target: 8-9 hrs
Downtime: 1.5 hrs Target: <2 hrs
Cost per Batch: $10,625 Target: < $11,000 O
EE: 87% Target: >85%

5.3 KPI Implementation Best Practices

- Automate data collection using inline sensors and ERP systems.
- Conduct daily and weekly review meetings with production teams.
- Link KPIs to operator performance and continuous improvement programs.
- Use control charts to monitor trends over time.

VI. REGULATORY COMPLIANCE AND AUDITS

Lean Six Sigma in pharmaceutical manufacturing must integrate regulatory compliance with process optimization.

6.1 Regulatory Requirements

- cGMP (current Good Manufacturing Practices): Ensures consistent quality.
- FDA / EMA guidelines: For process validation, batch documentation, and traceability.
- ISO 9001 / ISO 13485: Quality management systems.
- WHO Guidelines: Particularly for APIs and sterile manufacturing.

6.2 LSS Tools for Regulatory Compliance

LSS Tool	Application
Control Charts	Monitor critical parameters to meet regulatory specifications
FMEA	Identify potential compliance failures
SOP Standardization	Ensures consistent operation meeting cGMP

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 5, Issue 1, August 2025
Impact Factor: 7.67

5S	Clean and organized production area for GMP adherence
Documentation Audits	Align with FDA/EMA inspection readiness

6.3 Audit Readiness

• Maintain updated batch records with inline KPI tracking.
• Conduct internal audits using checklist templates.
• Corrective Action and Preventive Action (CAPA) for non-conformances.
• Staff training on audit procedures and LSS principles.

6.4 Case Study – Audit Preparedness

Scenario: Tablet production line faced FDA inspection.
Action: Implemented control charts, real-time monitoring, and standardized SOPs.
Result: Zero critical observations, minor documentation suggestions, demonstrating LSS integration with compliance.

VII. FUTURE SCOPE AND DIGITAL INTEGRATION

7.1 Digital LSS Integration

• Iota sensors: Real-time process monitoring for tablets, capsules, API synthesis.
• MES/ERP Systems: Automatic data collection, analysis, and reporting.
• AI and Predictive Analytics: Predict process failures before they occur.
• Digital Twin: Simulate production scenarios to optimize processes before actual runs.

7.2 Sustainability and Green Manufacturing

• Energy-efficient equipment: Reduce cycle time and energy costs.
• Waste reduction: LSS reduces rejected batches, packaging waste, and chemical disposal.
• Water management: Optimized cleaning-in-place (CIP) and recycling systems.

7.3 Continuous Improvement Culture

• Implement Kaizen and 5S audits regularly.
• Encourage employee suggestions for process improvement.
• Align KPIs with sustainability and efficiency goals.

REFERENCES

[1]. George, M. L., Rowlands, D., Price, M., & Maxey, J. (2005). The Lean Six Sigma Pocket Toolbook. McGraw-Hill.
[2]. Antony, J., & Banuelas, R. (2002). Key ingredients for the effective implementation of Lean Six Sigma. Measuring Business Excellence, 6(4), 20–27.
[3]. FDA. (2020). Guidance for Industry: Process Validation: General Principles and Practices. U.S. Food & Drug Administration.
[4]. EMA. (2018). Guideline on Process Validation for Finished Products. European Medicines Agency.
[5]. Womack, J. P., & Jones, D. T. (2003). Lean Thinking: Banish Waste and Create Wealth in Your Corporation. Free Press.
[6]. Pyzdek, T., & Keller, P. (2014). The Six Sigma Handbook. McGraw-Hill Education.
[7]. WHO. (2011). WHO Good Manufacturing Practices for Pharmaceutical Products. World Health Organization.
[8]. Bamber, C., Sharp, J., & Hides, M. (2016). Lean and Six Sigma in the Pharmaceutical Industry. Pharmaceutical Technology Europe, 28(6), 40–45