

Review of: "An Analysis of Pharmaceutical Inventory Management at a Leading Teaching and Referral Hospital in Kenya"

Eki Ramnaps¹

¹ Slovak Medical University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I commend the authors for the valuable work done. Please see feedback below:

1. I find the article focused on expenditure to acquire the drugs used in the hospital rather than on inventory management, and recommend that the title should be adapted to emphasize this. (Note that the key words do not include inventory management)
2. The study objectives need to be clearly stated. They should be comprehensive and should guide the content of abstract and introduction. For example, I was surprised by the inclusion of morbidity patterns in the data analysis section.
3. ABC, VEN and TC are inventory categorization tools to inform strategies for inventory management but are not inventory management practices themselves and although the article provides references for these tools, It will be helpful to provide a brief explanation about them and clearly state which categorization tool guides the hospital's expenditures. I think this will enrich the reader's understanding and increase the value of this paper.
4. Authors assume it is intuitive to know the meanings of the abbreviations they use in the ABC-VEN matrix but helpful to have them clearly defined.
5. Authors should clarify the study timeline as if study was conducted within timeline stated in the study design section, it is not a retrospective study.
6. Helpful to state reason for the exclusion criteria.
7. Better elaborate on your sampling technique e.g. why the choice of this sampling technique over others? Are data collection forms electronic? Not clear.
8. I recommend that explanation about the KEML should be included in the introduction rather than the data analysis section. Also not clear if the hospital uses it to guide its expenditures.
9. Discussion: Mention findings from literature in the introduction or literature review section while discussion should highlight similarities or differences and explanations for these if available. Also helpful to separate recommendations from discussion of findings
10. Figures and tables:
 1. Figure 1: Title should clearly state that percentages shown are of the total expenditure over the 3 year timeline the study focuses on.

2. Table 1 is not a summary but rather shows the top x% of the 281 drugs that account for y% expenditure. I recommend rephrasing the title accordingly.
3. Figure 2: the legend representing the red bars is missing.
4. Table 2: May be helpful to emphasize only the key take-aways rather than explain the entire table.
5. Table 3: Since the classification of a drug into V, E or N is rather a constant (same in the 3 years studied), I recommend focusing on the expenditures in the years (i.e. remove the 1st 3 columns with repetitive data). Also, only emphasize findings of interest. The insight about the drugs not on the KEML 2019 is great. Please also include the category (V, E or N) they belong to here.
6. Figure 4: Recommend to change the title to better indicate it is a categorization of drugs based on the ABC-VEN matrix. Also note that the explanation provided does not tally with the data displayed.
7. Table 4: I recommend adding a legend to match the ABC-VEN categories to categories I, II and III.