

Key Performance Indicators - Comparative Analysis for Major Brands of Pharmaceutical Production Industry in Romania

ABSTRACT

Due to the growing importance of emerging markets in Romania, the supply chains of pharmaceutical companies are forced to reevaluate strategies and improve their production and distribution processes. For this reason, it is of utmost importance for the companies that produce pharmaceutical products to define and measure the progress towards their objectives. By using Key Performance Indicators (KPI) as a measurement tool and by using a comparative approach, this study desires to investigate the financial performance of Romania's major brands in pharmaceutical production industry. Since each pharmaceutical company is different in terms of objectives, activities and services, the study identifies the areas that are prone to further development and offers practical suggestions for additional improvements for the upcoming years.

Keywords: key indicators; major brands; measurement; performance; Romanian pharmaceutical companies.

1. INTRODUCTION

The pharmaceutical industry of Europe is an important sector that contributes to the employment, competitiveness and growth of the economy [1]. It encircles various companies that produce, develop and market pharmaceutical products as well as medicinal and biological. These products can be delivered in many forms such as different solutions (for oral consumption, injections or perfusions), various ointments (lotions, creams, unguents or emollients), powders, capsules or tablets, usually distributed through wholesalers and sold in hospitals, pharmacies and by other channels. Due to the fact that most researchers did not focus yet their interest on this domain, we considered it very attractive and engaging, so our study was focused to reveal the compliance rules of this industry and its impact upon the health sector.

As Romanian articles [2] reports [3] and specialists [4] entail, the drug market from 2013 was favorable for in spite of the economic crisis the pharmaceutical industry continued to develop at a sustained pace. Still, 2014 was not a great year for Romanian pharmaceutical industry, especially in terms of mergers and acquisitions for the drug market has stalled while the concerns of the industry representatives were focusing on claw-back taxes and different ways to ensure patient access to medications. Since its introduction in October 2011, the subject of claw-back tax was debated and its method of computation was argued by the actors of pharmaceutical industry. Originally it was introduced as a temporary tax, however, given that the budget allocated to health does not comply with the needs and the level of tax collection is one of the highest in Romania (about 90%), it was clear that the tax authorities and health representatives will not give it up. A different method to compute the fee for the actors in innovative medicines and generics area was proposed. However, this method favored the latter and was contested by the actors in the innovative medicine. At the beginning of 2015 the Romanian pharmaceutical industry announced the claw-back has increased with 67% in the last 2 years, due to the lack of transparency and its planning mechanism. Not only such an increase was not sustainable but it also infringed the principles of a balanced tax system. Presently, the claw-back tax implies that all drug producers must contribute to finance the public health system with an amount between 5% and 11% of the revenues made from selling the products. Its value at industry level has reached 400 million RON in the first 3 months of 2016 that is 33.6% of the total value of the medicines consumed in that time frame [5]. This aspect is causing serious

problems to the patients suffering from serious disease for it limits their access to compensated medication.

Meanwhile, according to the president of the Generic Drug Manufacturers Association in Romania (APMGR), Romania is relatively a weak performer in terms of healthcare system and the indicators in this field place the country in the last area rankings of Europe, the main problem being the small percentage of GDP allocated to "health" as well as the population's inability to access the medical services. In the last decade the Romanian pharmaceutical industry registered a solid increase in all its segments therefore contributing with more than 1% to the GDP [6]. Although local manufacturers of medicines are found in a restricted number, they expand their production capacity while the "big players" in the pharmaceutical industry, entered the Romanian market by acquiring local manufacturers or by opening various subsidiaries. Even though the total number of medicinal products manufacturers present on the Romanian market is significant (over 184), the first ten, by volume, control around 60% of the market. For companies that are on the market today, the stakes are enormous as powerful innovative products are needed to fuel further growth and to cover losses caused by the expiration of patents or market protection. At the same time, small firms specialize in different segments of value chain, resulting in a power fragmentation between big pharmaceutical companies and specialized firms. The pharmaceutical actors in Romania are either companies specialized in product development, clinical trials and production or those specialized in marketing integrated into the entire value chain of certain products, like vaccines, HIV treatment, hormones or dermatology or oncology.

The challenge for the upcoming years, for the pharmaceutical companies, is to radically rethink their supply chains thus, adapt to rapid market developments and the shift from product to patient. Besides, this industry has become a strategic sector for the Romanian economy being included in the National Strategy for Competitiveness 2014-2020, as the country's strategic priorities will create such conditions that Romania may compete effectively with the rest of European countries. For a long period of time, it was focused on a generic production less competitive, however, the situation has changed lately thus pharmacy has become a sector with competitive potential and smart specialization. Still, the future of the Romanian pharmaceutical companies belongs to those able to integrate revolutionary concepts, technologies, from the medical field, biology, mathematics and physics alongside with product development, clinical trials and production in order to identify new products as well as new fields of application. Also, the Romanian healthcare system offers pharmaceutical companies certain "directions" for future development through the national healthcare programs that guarantee a present and future use for certain medical devices and medications.

This study desires to investigate the financial performance of Romania's major brands in pharmaceutical production industry. Since each pharmaceutical company is different in terms of objective, activities and services, the study identifies the areas that are prone to further development and offers practical suggestions for additional improvements for the upcoming years.

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

Because the pharmaceutical sector in Romania is one of the sectors that thrived even during the crisis and despite the governmental regulations that raised a few barriers, this research is grounded on the analysis of the strongest Romanian pharmaceutical manufacturers that were able to survive the crisis by affording to sustain their investment in areas prone to progress such as research and development [7]. Thus, the paper proposes to present the radiography of the pharmaceutical sector from Romania focusing on the evolution of 5 Romanian pharmaceutical manufacturers in terms of profitability, performance, competitiveness and market impact by comparing the financial statements of the selected companies for a period of 4 years and interviewing their CFO's. Also, the research will offer a detailed analysis and correlation of the financial risks and the indebtedness for the selected pharmaceutical manufacturers.

For the construction of this study both primary as well as secondary data was used. Firstly, data was collected by using the public companies annual reports along with the Ministry of Finance reports and the Romanian Stock Exchange (BVB). In this case the data consisted of the company's financial statements selected for a period of 4 years. The gathered data was analyzed by using statistical tools as well as financial ratios formulas and processed in tables and graphs. Based on the statistical analysis of the data obtained from the companies listed on the BVB and the Ministry of Finance, we also carried on interviews with the 5 CFO's of the selected entities in order to obtain a deeper analysis of their performance [8]. The interview focused on aspects such as external sources of financing,

period of credit, expenses with employee training, advertising, trading relations with suppliers and discounts offered to clients.

In order to make the analysis of the selected companies and to establish their financial and economic performance we used various financial ratios that showed the company's overall strategy for the decision making process of their capital investors [9]. For this purpose we used the most commonly used profitability measure, Return on Equity (ROE). The return on equity will provide information regarding the share of this remuneration and the investments made by the company's shareholders. This rate is one of the important indicators used for assessing the company's financial position on the market, while the increasing remuneration of the invested capital can provide an opportunity for the company to access its financial resources for reinvesting in the business or attract new investors. By computing the financial rate of return we will be able to determine the company's equity ability to generate an excess of value after paying the capital borrowed. Also this means after writing off this due, it enables the payment of capital to the shareholders through dividends and remuneration. In the same time, the leverage indicator was computed for disclosing the global leverage ratio, computed as division between total debt and equity. This ratio presents the degree of the company's financial independence as well as its ability to use new loans.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

3.1 Analysis of the statistical data

In order to create the radiography of the pharmaceutical manufacturing companies from Romania and emphasize their competitiveness from 2012 to 2015, we first established the company's hierarchy by analyzing the net turnover, net income and their average number of employees in the last two years. At the time of the research the BVB [10] listed the following 5 pharmaceutical manufacturers namely, Zentiva S.A. (SCD), Biofarm S.A. (BIO), Antibiotice S.A. (ATB), Ropharma S.A. (RPH) and Farmaceutica Remedia S.A. (RMAH). As illustrated in table 1 and table 2, the hierarchy of the companies have not changed since the leading pharmaceutical manufacturer in 2014 as well as in 2015 is RPH with the net turnover of 420204438 RON respectively 434083007 RON.

Table 1. Top 5 Romanian pharmaceutical manufacturers in 2014

Company's name	Country	Net turnover	Net income	Average no. of employees
ROPHARMA S.A.	Brasov	420204438	7202901	808
ZENTIVA S.A.	Bucharest	394072623	54242886	488
ANTIBIOTICE S.A.	Iasi	320058303	31138739	1465
BIOFARM S.A.	Bucharest	128508851	26559851	380
FARMACEUTICA REMEDIA S.A.	Hunedoara	246842700	3055943	468

Table 2. Top 5 Romanian pharmaceutical manufacturers in 2015

Company's name	Country	Net turnover	Net income	Average no. of employees
ROPHARMA S.A.	Brasov	434083007	8102354	829
ZENTIVA S.A.	Bucharest	396824593	46204961	497
ANTIBIOTICE S.A.	Iasi	325218796	27178823	1458
BIOFARM S.A.	Bucharest	149336199	27226492	394
FARMACEUTICA REMEDIA S.A.	Hunedoara	243811	760325	371

In order to find out how profitable a company can be in relation to the company's total assets, the Return on Assets indicator (ROA) was computed for the 5 selected companies on 4 year time frame (Table 3). Also known as the return on investment, ROA was computed by dividing the companies' yearly earnings to their total assets. This indicator is used to offer information to investors concerning the company's efficiency in changing their investing money into net income. From our 5 selected pharmaceutical manufacturers, Biofarm as well as Zentiva are the ones that registered the highest ROA value in 2015. Based on the evolution from 2012 to 2015 Biofarm was able to continuously

increase their return on assets recording on average a ROA of 12.01%. Zentiva was also able to increase their ROA from 2012 to 2014 when it suffered a decrease until 2015 obtaining on 4 years an average ROA of 11.77%. Similar to Zentiva, the companies Antibiotice along with Remedia suffered a decrease in ROA from 2014 to 2015 as opposed to Ropharma who managed to increase their ROA. Based on the computation of the ROA indicator, Biofarm is better at transforming their investments into profit as opposed to the other four. At the opposite pole Remedia has registered the lowest average ROA of 1.82% confirming its management is not properly allocating their resources.

Table 3. Compared ROA for the 5 selected entities

Entity	2012	2013	2014	2015	Average ROA
BIO	10.60%	12.15%	12.74%	12.55%	12.01%
SCD	9.93%	11.25%	13.96%	11.94%	11.77%
RMAH	2.80%	1.89%	2.02%	0.57%	1.82%
RPH	1.95%	2.10%	2.52%	2.87%	2.28%
ATB	5.27%	6.13%	6.18%	4.99%	5.64%

The next indicator, Return on Equity (ROE) was computed by measuring the 5 companies' profitability to discover how much profit they generate by using the shareholder's money (Table 4). Therefore, ROE was computed by dividing the company's net income to their shareholder's equity in order to show how well the selected companies use their investments to generate a growth in their earnings. Based on the computation Biofarm has successfully managed to increase its ROE from 2012 to 2015 obtaining an average ROE of 13.52% in opposed to Zentiva that has decreased from 2014 to 2015 but still obtained a bigger average ROE of 16.02%. In opposition it seems Remedia has suffered a significant decrease of their return on equity from 2012 to 2015 obtaining an average of 7.69% in the last 4 years. Based on the computation of ROE indicator Zentiva is better at using its investments for increasing their earnings as opposed to Ropharma.

Table 4. Compared ROE for the 5 selected entities

Entity	2012	2013	2014	2015	Average ROE
BIO	7.33%	15.55%	15.10%	16.13%	13.52%
SCD	12.52%	16.08%	19.94%	15.57%	16.02%
RMAH	14.10%	7.33%	7.58%	1.75%	7.69%
RPH	7.66%	6.68%	6.31%	6.62%	6.81%
ATB	9.44%	9.06%	8.93%	7.46%	8.72%

The net profit margin is the indicator that illustrates how much of each monetary unit collected as revenues by our companies' turns into profit. Thus, it is the percentage of revenue that remains after all operating expenses, taxes and interest were deducted from the company's total revenue. This indicator is very important in declaring a company's financial health, and it was computed by dividing the net profit of a company to its revenues. By analyzing Table 5 we can say that on average the most "healthy" pharmaceutical company, from a financial point of view, is Biofarm with an average profit margin of 20.15% followed by Zentiva with 12.14% and Antibiotice with 9.2%. Also, this means Biofarm is one of the companies that are good at converting their revenues into available profit for their shareholders, as opposed to Remedia that registered a low average profit margin ratio compared to Biofarm.

Table 5. Compared net profit margin for the 5 selected entities

Entity	2012	2013	2014	2015	Average net profit margin
BIO	20.05%	21.74%	20.60%	18.23%	20.15%
SCD	13.24%	13.95%	13.76%	11.64%	13.14%
RMAH	2.34%	1.27%	1.24%	0.30%	1.28%

RPH	1.71%	1.75%	1.72%	1.85%	1.75%
ATB	8.92%	9.89%	9.76%	8.23%	9.20%

In order to measure how profitable the 5 companies are able to sell their merchandise or their inventory we computed the gross margin ratio, in other words the profitability of selling the inventory. The purpose for computing this ratio is to identify only the profit that comes from each company after selling their inventory, profit that can be used afterwards to pay operating expenses. This ratio was obtained by extracting the cost of the goods sold from the company's net sales. Based on the data obtained after computing the gross margin rate for the 5 pharmaceutical companies, we can observe a decrease from 2013 to 2014 at Biofarm and Zentiva, and a decrease in their gross margin from 2014 to 2015 for all pharmaceutical manufacturers but Biofarm (Table 6). With an average rate of 22.41% Biofarm has the most favorable ratio followed by Zentiva with 16.48% and Antibiotice with 11.76% as opposed to Ropharma and Remedia that scored low ratios. Having a higher profit percentage means the companies Biofarm, Zentiva and Antibiotice have more money to pay their operating expenses such as rent, utilities and employee's salaries. However often this percentage obtained after selling the inventory can also be used by the companies to fund other sections of their business.

Table 6. Compared gross margin rate for the 5 selected entities

Entity	2012	2013	2014	2015	Average gross margin rate
BIO	22.50%	24.74%	21.14%	21.26%	22.41%
SCD	16.62%	17.83%	16.35%	15.12%	16.48%
RMAH	2.88%	1.46%	1.57%	0.34%	1.56%
RPH	2.24%	2.16%	2.43%	2.30%	2.28%
ATB	10.67%	10.93%	15.76%	9.71%	11.76%

After computing the profitability ratios for the selected entities, the next step sought to identify the company's ability to pay its short term liabilities by using its current assets. Also known as efficiency and liquidity ratio, the current ratio was computed by dividing a company's current assets by its current liabilities. Based on the computation of this index (Table 7), the pharmaceutical companies Biofarm and Zentiva have registered the highest average of 3.83 and 3.63 therefore these companies have approximately 3 times more current assets than current liabilities. Also, this higher ratio would allow the 3 companies (Biofarm, Zentiva and Antibiotice) to make current debt payments, for when their liabilities become due they can easily pay them without selling the assets that generate long term revenues.

Table 7. Compared current ratio for the 5 selected entities

Entity	2012	2013	2014	2015	Average current ratio
BIO	3.99	4.08	3.59	3.67	3.83
SCD	4.28	3.70	3.74	2.81	3.63
RMAH	1.04	1.04	1.05	1.03	1.04
RPH	1.12	1.09	1.15	1.13	1.12
ATB	1.97	2.29	2.76	2.37	2.33

The next ratio that was computed, the quick ratio, is similar to the current ratio only that it focuses on the company's ability to pay its current liabilities only by using their quick assets, such as: cash and cash equivalents, current accounts receivable as well as short term investments or even marketable securities. As presented in Table 8, by dividing quick assets by current liabilities the pharmaceutical company Biofarm has scored the highest value followed by Zentiva and Antibiotice. On average Biofarm and Zentiva have the ability to pay off their obligations without selling off their capital and long term assets. Both Remedia and Ropharma have a quick ratio under 1 meaning they might have to

use their long term assets to generate revenues, aspect that will show the investors that the company's current operations are not generating enough profit to pay the current liabilities.

Table 8. Compared quick ratio for the 5 selected entities

Year	2012	2013	2014	2015	Average quick ratio
BIO	3.49	3.56	3.11	3.11	3.31
SCD	3.74	3.01	3.16	2.32	3.05
RMAH	0.80	0.83	0.71	0.92	0.81
RPH	0.97	0.89	0.78	0.65	0.82
ATB	1.66	1.92	2.28	1.91	1.94

The last ratio of liquidity that was computed is the cash ratio that discloses a company's ability to pay its current liabilities only by using cash and cash equivalents that can easily be used to pay current obligations. For the selected 5 pharmaceutical companies illustrated in Table 9, in 2015, none registered a cash ratio above 1, meaning they need more than their cash reserves to pay off their current debt. This ratio presents a high interest for creditors for they would want to make sure their loans will be repaid. Based on the computation of this index for the 5 selected companies we can say on average Ropharma registered the lowest ratio of 0.09, meaning the company is having difficulties in paying its current liabilities from its cash and cash equivalents.

Table 9. Compared cash ratio for the 5 selected entities

Year	2012	2014	2013	2015	Average cash ratio
BIO	1.56	1.05	1.48	0.87	1.24
SCD	0.78	0.42	0.45	0.06	0.42
RMAH	0.09	0.12	0.14	0.16	0.12
RPH	0.03	0.06	0.22	0.06	0.09
ATB	0.62	0.28	0.06	0.10	0.26

The next ratio that was computed was the debt ratio that showed the companies abilities to pay their liabilities with assets. This solvency ratio measures the financial leverage of a company and it is calculated by dividing the company's total liabilities by its total assets. As presented in Table 10, there is a significant difference between the debt ratios of the 5 selected companies. In this situation, a lower debt ratio such as the ones recorded by Biofarma, Antibiotic and Zentiva implies a stable business activity with a long time potential, as usually a lower ratio implies the company has a low overall debt. Usually a debt ratio of 50% is considered within the normal range.

Table 10. Compared debt ratio for the 5 selected entities

Year	2012	2013	2014	2015	Average debt ratio
BIO	17.11%	16.49%	19.06%	16.03%	17.17%
SCD	22.05%	24.44%	23.63%	29.52%	24.91%
RMAH	79.26%	74.72%	72.38%	69.33%	73.92%
RPH	69.99%	66.67%	57.15%	55.00%	62.20%
ATB	2.71%	31.85%	27.66%	27.91%	22.53%

The next step sought to analyze each company's efficiency in utilizing its assets. For this reason we started by computing the inventory turnover ratio (ITR), the accounts receivable ratio, the suppliers' ratio and the current debt ratio. The inventory turnover ratio (ITR) was used as a tool to evaluate the liquidity of the inventory, such as the number of times a company has sold and replaced its inventory in a period of time. Thus it is computed by dividing the cost of goods sold by the company's average

inventory at cost, in other words net sales divided by inventory. In order to find the average selling period of the inventories we will divide 365 days by the inventory turnover ratio.

The next indicator calculated was the receivable turnover ratio, also known as “accounts receivable turnover” or the “debtor’s turnover ratio”. This indicator shows the efficiency of a company in managing the customer’s issued credits as well the collection of that credit. Because the money owned on the credit agreement does not have interest the longer it takes to a company to collect its credit sales, the biggest is the sum of money that is lost during that period. Thus, the average duration of the accounts receivable was computed by dividing the 365 by the receivable turnover ratio for that given period.

The third indicator that was calculated in this category for the 5 companies was the accounts payable turnover ratio. This indicator was used to measure the rate at which our selected companies pay off their suppliers and was computed by dividing the total purchases made from suppliers by the average accounts payable amount on one year period.

The last indicator that was computed for each company was the current debt rotation ratio which allowed us to find the period on which the company is able to pay its short term debts. It is obtained by dividing the current debts to the sales, computed for one year period. Usually this indicator is important for investors for they are able to identify the most secure company to invest in.

In the situation of Biofarm (Table 11) the average selling period of the inventory for 2012 and 2013 was 54 and 52 days decreasing to 51 and 44 days in 2014 and 2015. Thus it takes on average 46 days for Biofarm to sell and replace its inventory. Based on the computations the average accounts receivable for Biofarm have increased from 2012 to 2014 from 193 days to 210 days. However from 2014 to 2015 they suffered a decrease reaching 185 days. Theoretically this number varies based on the size of the company, usually the smaller the period the better. Still in this situation we can say the high ratio suggests the company is efficient in collecting accounts receivable and they have a high proportion of customers that pay their debts quickly. Based on the computation of the average accounts payable turnover ratio, it seems that the ratio is falling from one year to another, signaling that Biofarm is taking longer in 2014 to pay off its suppliers than in previous years. Still the number registered in 2015 showed Biofarm has improved its turnover ratio meaning they were able to pay off their suppliers faster. By analyzing the current debt rotation ratio of Biofarm we can see the number of days the company is able to pay its short term debts have decreased from 2012 to 2015 from 107 to 83. This is showing the company is improving its ability to pay off its short term debts.

Table 11. Biofarm rotation rates 2012-2015

Indicator	2012	2013	2014	2015
Inventory turnover (days)	54	52	51	46
Average accounts receivables (days)	193	198	210	185
Average accounts payable (days)	91	80	272	67
Current debt rotation (days)	107	100	105	83

In the situation of Zentiva, represented in Table 12, the average selling period of the inventory for 2012 was 44 days, increasing to 62 in 2013 and decreasing to 41 and 45 days in 2014 and 2015. Therefore, it takes on average 45 days for Zentiva to sell and replace its inventory. Based on the computations the average accounts receivable periods for Zentiva have decreased from 2012 to 2014 from 226 days to 190 days. However from 2014 to 2015 they managed to increase the ratio, reaching 185 days. Based on the size of the company we can say the high ratio suggests Zentiva is not so efficient in collecting accounts receivable. After calculating the average accounts payable turnover ratio, it seems that the ratio had some minor fluctuations from 2012 to 2015. However, based on the obtained data from 2015 Zentiva is taking on average around 45 days to pay its suppliers. By analyzing the current debt rotation ratio of Zentiva we can see the number of days the company is able to pay its short term debts have decreased from 90 to 71 days in 2013-2014 and increased from 71 to 93 days in 2014-2015.

Table 12. Zentiva rotation rates 2012-2015

Indicator	2012	2013	2014	2015
Inventory turnover (days)	44	62	41	45
Average accounts receivables (days)	226	223	190	209
Average accounts payable (days)	45	54	37	45
Current debt rotation (days)	82	90	71	93

For the Farmaceutica Remedica, presented in Table 13, the average selling period of its inventory in 2012 was 65 days, decreasing to 37 in 2013 and later increasing to 53 days in 2014. However, in 2015 the average selling period was 14 days indicating either excessive inventories, slow movement or obsolete inventories in stock. Still, maintaining excessive inventories can be a sign of poor inventory management, for these fund allocated to the inventory could have been used in other operations of the company's business activity. Based on the computations the average accounts receivable periods for Remedica have decreased significantly from 2012 to 2014 from 167 days to 93 days. Still, the company managed to increase the rate from 2014 to 2015 to 98 days. Since this ratio is dependent on the size of the company, a decreasing ratio can suggest that the company is improving its collecting processes. After calculating the average accounts payable turnover ratio, it seems that the company managed to decrease the number of days at which they pay their suppliers, from 2012 to 2015. Still, based on the obtained data from 2015 Remedica is taking on average around 124 days to pay its suppliers. By analyzing the current debt rotation ratio of Remedica we can see the number of days the company is able to pay its short term debts have constantly decreased from 2012 to 2015 from 235 to 129. This is showing the company is improving its ability to pay off its short term debts.

Table 13. Remedica rotation rates 2012-2015

Indicator	2012	2013	2014	2015
Average inventory period	56	37	53	14
Average accounts receivables period	167	123	93	98
Average accounts payable (days)	221	170	150	124
Current debt rotation (days)	235	177	157	129

As presented in Table 14, for Ropharma the average selling period of its inventory in 2012 was 32 days and it was constantly improved increasing from 40 in 2013 to 60 days in 2015. The increasing average selling period can indicate a fast moving inventory with no excessive inventories. Analyzing the average accounts receivable periods for Ropharma, it is noticeable that the collecting period has decreased significantly from 200 to 74 days in 2012 - 2015. Even if this ratio is dependent on the size of the company its decrease can suggest that the company has good collecting processes, and good customers. After calculating the average accounts payable turnover ratio, it seems that Ropharma significantly decrease the number of days at which they pay their suppliers, from 2012 to 2014. Based on the obtained data from 2015 Ropharma is taking on average around 97 days to pay its suppliers. By analyzing the current debt rotation ratio of Ropharma we can see the number of days the company is able to pay its short term debts have constantly decreased from 2012 to 2015 from 212 to 126. This is showing the company is improving its ability to pay off its short term debts.

Table 14. Ropharma rotation rates 2012-2015

Indicator	2012	2013	2014	2015
Inventory turnover (days)	32	40	52	60
Average accounts receivables (days)	200	131	102	74
Average accounts payable (days)	170	150	12	97
Current debt rotation (days)	212	197	140	126

For the pharmaceutical company Antibiotice the average selling period of the inventory for 2012 and 2013 was 57 days and increased to 65 and 66 days in 2014 and 2015. Thus it takes on average 66 days for Antibiotice to sell and replace its inventory. By analyzing the average accounts receivable periods for Antibiotice, the company maintained the highest period for collecting their accounts receivable compared to the other pharmaceutical companies analyzed. Even if the collecting period has decreased since 2012 to 2015 the Antibiotice company does not have a high proportion of quality customers that pay their debts quickly. Based on the computed average accounts payable turnover ratio, Antibiotice increased the number of days at which they pay their suppliers, from 2014 to 2015 from 41 days to 68. By analyzing the current debt rotation ratio of Antibiotice we can see the number of days the company is able to pay its short term debts have decreased from 2012 to 2014 but increased from 2014 to 2015 at 141 days. This is showing the company is improving its ability to pay off its short term debts.

Table 15. Antibiotic rotation rates 2012-2015

Indicator	2012	2013	2014	2015
Inventory turnover (days)	57	57	65	66
Average accounts receivables (days)	304	288	262	252
Average accounts payable (days)	58	49	41	68
Current debt rotation (days)	187	156	134	141

3.2 Interview results

After the statistical analysis of the data obtained of the 5 pharmaceutical companies, an interview was carried out with the 5 CFO's of the given entities in order to have more appropriate analysis of their performance. During the interview aspects such as external sources of financing, period of credit, expenses with employee training, advertising, trading relations with suppliers and discounts offered to clients were approached.

According to the results, we confirmed around 60% of the major part of revenues for the companies Biofarm, Zentiva and Antibiotice is obtained from medicines with low sale price such as aspirin and paracetamol while Remedia and Ropharma declared around 50% to 55%. Also all interviewed companies confirmed that for financing their activity they appeal on external sources such as bank loans and leasing. However, as our statistical data provided, in analyzing a company's leverage is the most used mechanism in order to attract external financing sources. This effect grows as the difference between the economic return and the interest rate gets higher. In the case of our 5 pharmaceutical companies, based on the computations and the interview results, the most secured entity proved to be Biofarm.

Concerning the length of the credit all 5 companies appealed both on 1 to 3 years credit as well as over 3 years credit.

Regarding their employees Antibiotice declared they allocate more than 10% of their expenses to personnel training while Biofarm and Zentiva declared they usually do not exceed 10%. Also, Remedia and Ropharma both declared they allocate somewhere around 5-7% of their expenses to personnel training. Still, this information was justified as all companies, no matter the allocated percentage of expenses, consider the training of personnel is definitely an influence over the profit and loss account of that period and not as a capitalized intangible asset. However, in terms of advertising all 5 selected companies confirmed to allocate more than 6% of the operational expenses to advertising.

In terms of trading relations with suppliers of natural or bio raw materials, all 5 participants declared they have. Nonetheless, the top 3 pharmaceutical companies Biofarm, Zentiva and Antibiotice scaled the weight of these natural and bio raw materials to highly significant while the last 2 companies, Remedia and Ropharma scaled their weight as significant.

Discussing about clients, the companies were ask to scale their types on clients in terms of chain or small business personnel. Based on the provided scale Biofarm and Antibiotice declared they deal with chain on middle to high basis and low to medium for small business personnel as opposed to Zentiva that declared middle to high for chain and low for small business personnel. Remedia declared a medium interaction with chains but also with small businesses while Ropharma classified their clients to be on a medium basis represented by chains and low by small business personnel. Cashing in on clients varies from one company to another namely: Biofarm, Zentiva and Remedia

usually over 90 days, Ropharma and Antibiotice between 30 to 90 days. Also in case of online sales Biofarma said they weight more than 20% in their total turnover while the rest agreed around 10 to 20%. Still, in case their clients cash in immediately the companies usually offer around 5% discount aspect that in case of Biofarm these discounts along with rewards results in customer retention and impacts their profitability by increasing their sales. On the other hand in some cases discounts and rewards are not enough to impact the profitability and to increase the sales as declared by the rest of our respondents.

4. CONCLUSION

The continuous economic development of the pharmaceutical markets along with the competitors and the influence of the given legislations and rules are constantly shifting the conditions for the pharmaceutical actors. This study aimed to investigate the financial performance of Romania's major brands in pharmaceutical manufacturing industry by presenting the radiography of the pharmaceutical sector and focusing on 5 companies in terms of profitability, performance and competitiveness. By using the financial statements of the selected companies and their financial and economic reports we were able to compute the economic-financial indicators that measure the performance of the business in terms of their capacity to generate income and profit, in terms of liquidity, concerning their capacity to cover their short term debts and solvability. By using this type of analysis we were able to study the processes and the activities of the selected companies through the results obtained and the resources they consumed in previous years.

Based on the computation of the data obtained from the BVB and from our company's financial reports, the companies have increased their turnover mostly from 2014 to 2015. In terms of profitability, the companies Biofarm and Zentiva proved to be efficient in changing their invested money into net income thereby providing a high ratio of return on assets. Also these two companies have scored the highest ratio on return on equity and showed how well they use their investments to generate a growth in their earnings. Even after all operating expenses, taxes and interest were deducted from the company's total revenue the two companies were by far occupying the leaders' positions in our top 5 showing a big percentage of their revenues turning into profit. Even in terms of liquidity Biofarma, Zentiva and even Antibiotice confirmed the activity of stable businesses with a long time potential. However the small indicators of the other companies such as Ropharma and Remedia do not indicate a weak company or a bad investment but rather a smaller business with a more restricted activity but one that could be prone to development.

For future research we recommend to improve our study by involving more companies and enlarging our data base. As another recommendation we propose the computation of several performance indicators, economic and financial, by taking into account also additional information concerning the exact type of products and services the companies provide, the clients portfolio and their preferences for consumption, the organizational structure and the resources of the company. Only then the method for calculating the key performance indicators can be approached from different perspectives so that we can evaluate and understand through an integrated system the past, the present and the tendencies of financial "health" of a company found in a continuous changing business environment.

REFERENCES

1. Nela Ș. A general overview of the Romanian pharmaceutical market. Annals of the Constantin Brancuși University of Târgu Jiu, Economic Series. 2015;(2):15-20.
2. Colbu IC. Comparison of profitability for pharmaceutical Romanian listed companies using Dupont identity. The USV Annals of Economic and Public Administration. 2013;13(17):78-81.
3. FDR Center. The Romanian health and pharma sector 2014. Sector brief – DEMO. 2014;3-15. Accessed 25 August 2016.
Available: <http://www.frdcenter.ro/assets/Romania-Health-and-Pharma-market-2014-DEMO-by-FRD-Center.pdf>
4. EPIFA Report. The pharmaceutical industry in Figures. 2014;2-25. Accessed 25 August 2016.
Available: http://www.phar-in.eu/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/Figures_2014_Final.pdf
5. Wall-Street. Clawback news. 2015. Accessed 25 August 2016.
Available: <http://www.wall-street.ro/tag/clawback.html>
6. Institute for Economic Forecasting. Industria farmaceutică în România și impactul asupra societății și economiei. 2011;6-14. Accessed 25 August 2016.
Available: <http://oglindadevest.ro/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/Industria-farmaceutica-in-Romania.pdf>

- 465 7. Balteş N, Miculete GD. The analysis of the financial risks in the pharmaceutical industry in
466 Romania. Revista Economică. 2014;66(2):7-14.
- 467 8. Boldeanu DM, Pugna IB. The analysis of the influence factors affecting the performance of
468 pharmaceutical companies. Theoretical and Applied Economics. 2014;21(7):23-39.
- 469 9. Burja C, Burja V. Analysis of the companies' economic performance using the profitability rates.
470 European Research Studies. 2009;12(2):100-108.
- 471 10 <http://www.bvb.ro/FinancialInstruments/Details/FinancialInstrumentsDetails.aspx?s=BVB>
472 <http://m.fin.info/>