# Theory of Constraints, Lean Manufacturing and Six Sigma:

Limits and Possibilities of Integration

Diego Pacheco, Tito Rossi, Amir Kurban Department of Production Engineering, Technological Colleges, FTEC, Porto Alegre, Brazil e-mail: profdajp@gmail.com, rossitito@hotmail.com, amirkurban@ftec.com.br

#### Abstract

The main objective of this study was to analyze the points of convergence and divergence between the Theory of Constraints, Lean Manufacturing and Six Sigma in an integrated manner when used for continuous improvement of operating manufacturing systems. This research also aimed to advance a better understanding of the fundamental principles of such methodologies by performing a comparative analysis of critical issues. The main focus of discussion of this study was to search the literature to identify characteristics of exclusion and similarities between the three approaches when applied in an integrated way in productive systems. To conduct this research, it became a broad literature search from 1995 to 2011, the main base of national and international data, in search of the state of the art on the topic. The results of this study suggest that the Theory of Constraints, Lean Manufacturing and Six Sigma have many complementary elements that overlaps the divergent points and there is a vast field of research to be explored on this issue. As a result, this study presents a critical analysis of 28 comparative criteria relevant to the three approaches.

### 1. Introduction

The main objective of this paper is to investigate the convergence and divergence factors between Lean Manufacturing, Theory of Constraints and Six Sigma methodologies, when they are used together in manufacturing environments for the continuous improvement of processes. The present discussion is based in that the use of approaches focused on continuous improvement is being done by several organizations, and as a rule, such approaches have reached their limit of performance concerning the current competitiveness and complexity of some markets. Moreover, it is necessary to find elements of other approaches that turn more robust the current strategies for continuous improvement adopted by Brazilian companies to withstand global competitiveness.

Thus, some authors have studied the combination of approaches in order to provide integrated models of continuous improvement. Stamm et al. (2009) analyzed the evolution and fundamental differences between TQM, TPM, TOC, Lean and Six Sigma, contrasting these approaches with the Fordist production model. It was found that: i) Lean Manufacturing presents a higher paradigm based on production drawn when compared to that based on pushed production ii) it is possible to develop models integrating Lean and other methodologies of quality management, and iii) the combination of TOC with other approaches indicates superior results when compared to other models. Nave (2002) compared the Theory of Constraints, Lean Manufacturing

and Six Sigma and identified common assumptions among the three philosophies and obstacles to their deployment and pointed that the greatest challenge for organizations is choosing the strengths of each approach.

However, from the literature review in the databases searched, it was not found a comparative study by the standpoint of logic blind review that discussed the specific TOC, Lean and Six Sigma concerning the research possibilities and the limits of integration in order to achieve continuous operating improvement. In order to highlight this gap in operations management lierature, this study researched publications between 1995 and 2012 in the following databases: Emerald, Springer Link, Scopus, Ebsco, Proquest and Scielo International. The blatant gap resulting from the lack of scientific articles discussing these three traditional approaches was therefore one of the main reasons for the development of the present work. By making a critical comparative analysis involving such approaches, this research also sought to objectively show their main similarities and differences and thus contribute to management decision making.

## 2. Methodology and procedures for collecting data

Data collection is a key aspect in qualitative research, especially in researches that perform comparative analysis between different approaches. In scientific research, it is believed that the first step is in general to look for similar concerns in previous work (SILVA, 2009). Thus, an important source of data collection for this study was a systematic review of the literature. According to Gil (2010, p. 29), the literature is prepared based on previously published material, whether printed or digital as: articles, theses, journals, dissertations etc. Virtually all academic research requires some time to carry out a work that could be characterized as literature. For Khan et al. (2001) the main advantage of using a method of systematic review is that it provides information on interventions effectiveness to identify, evaluate, and summarize the results of an amount of data not treatable otherwise. The research presented here used the work of Smith (2009) and the study of Tranfiel et al. (2003) as a basis.

The steps of the procedure adopted here for the literature review were: i) to extract keywords from the search problem: the words selected are: lean manufacturing, Toyota system, lean production, six sigma and theory of constraints; ii) to define the databases where to search for publications. The databases researched were: Emerald, Springer Link, Scopus, Ebsco, Proquest, Scielo International; iii) to set time horizon for the search: the search performed here ranged from year 1995 to 2012; iv) to examine titles and abstracts of publications: 836 papers were analyzed and the number analyzed in each database is detailed in Table 1; v) to decide between the inclusion or exclusion of the publication in the search; vi) to make analysis, synthesis and inclusion of information in the search: this discussion is consolidated in the section four of this paper where the works with their focus aligned to the discussion of this research were chosen. That the research on databases shows a greater number of publications dealing on Lean and Six Sigma than the number of publications on TOC and TOC and Lean and Six Sigma. Integration between TOC and Six Sigma seemed to be recent in the literature so that it brings only a few studies on the subject, that thus becomes an opportunity for further research.

# 3. Discussion

# 3.1 TOC versus Lean

Dettmer (2001) indicated the following points of similarity between the two approaches: they have the common goal of increasing profits; the value is defined by the

customer; the quality factor is essential for both; they support the production in smaller batches, they aim continuous stream and increased capacity, they seek to minimize inventory and the labor force participation plays an important role in the successful deployment of the method and tools.

Some works of computational simulation comparing JIT and TOC were performed by Miltenburg (1997); Chakaravorty and Atwater (1996); Cook (1994) and Watson and Patti (2008); Miltenburg (1997) showed that JIT operates with less inventory and lead times while the TOC generates higher productivity. Chakaravorty and Atwater (1996), concluded that TOC is suitable for systems with variability and downtime (unavailability of produce) relatively high, while JIT is better to lower system variability and downtime. Cook (1994) concluded that the performance of TOC is better and that the JIT would have to eliminate virtually all the variability of the system to make the performance similar to TOC. The work conducted by Sale and Inman (2003), showed that the combined use of JIT and TOC can result in a higher performance if compared to the use of the individual approaches. Patti and Watson (2008) concluded that TOC is more tolerant of variability, has less lead time and need on average 50% less than the JIT inventory for the same productivity.

According to Antunes (1998) the main convergence regarding to logistics approach are: (ix) there two central concerns: the need for synchronization of production and the establishment of a systematic process of continuous improvement, (x) there are specific techniques for addressing the problem of synchronization, logic Drum-Buffer-Rope (DBR) for TOC and kanban for lean production, (xi) both are concerned with the continuous improvement of Productive Systems. In TOC this appears in Step 4 (increase the capacity of restriction) based on the analysis already carried out in Step 1 of TOC (identify constraints). Wih regard to STP, it is totally focused on improvements because it was developed from the systematic elimination of losses, (xii) there is the possibility of synergistic use of the logistics of Theory of Constraints and subsystems and techniques of STP to deploy effective improvements in business, they support the importance of overcoming the inertia to the implementation of new ideas, they make a systematic critique of the use of traditional cost accounting for the purposes of decision making, they emphasize the importance of overcoming the inertia to the implementation of new ideas, they use a common scientific basis through effect-cause-effect relationships and dialectical thinking for Identification, Analysis and Troubleshooting.

As Scheinkopf and Moore (1998) common points between TOC and Lean approach are: (i) the perception of value from the customer perspective: the Lean value is clearly defined in TOC and the customer perceptions of value are a key factor to increase the gain of the product, (ii) Value Stream: Lean adopts the term value stream and TOC adopts the term value added to clarify that the value perceived by the customer is defined by a chain of interdependencies between the factory and the suppliers (iii) flow and pull production: they offer techniques to control flow using the concept of pulling the market demand. Lean pulls sequentially, since the feature is not expected to produce till the resource downstream signal (kanban) is received. Pulling is the essence of TPC to synchronize the neck with market demand and promote the release of material into the system, iv) the pursuit of perfection: according to Goldratt (1984) the only way that a company will prosper after a change is from continuous improvement. This idea is expressed in Step 5 Process Focus of TOC and Lean Kaizen philosophy.

According to Dettmer (2001) TOC and Lean philosophy evolved into a systemic view and suggests that a hybrid of the two approaches is more robust, more productive

and easier to implement and that the main aspect is the selection of elements to the model. Dettmer (2001) suggests the following points of congruence: they are systems methodologies, the continuous improvement and continuous flow are essential, the value stream extends beyond production, the quality is essential, small-batch production, pull production (Make -To-Order instead of Make-To-Stock) and the release of hidden capacities. However, Dettmer (2001) proposes that the greatest differences lie in two aspects: how each one treats the variability and uncertainty and how they treat costs. While Lean aims to reduce fixed and variable costs, for TOC the cost reduction is limited, but the generation of gain is not and the cost reduction does not become a secondary goal. The TOC accepts the variability and instability of demand and strategic operations using lungs (physical, time, capacity), while the Lean constantly seeks to reduce variability. Overall, Dettmer (2001) considers that there is a substantial overlap between the paradigms of lean thinking and TOC, where the TOC provides a framework to guide efforts and Lean avoids the pitfalls of applying them where they are not necessary.

# 3.2 TOC versus Six Sigma

The Six Sigma approach identifies projects driven by the reduction of defects in the process and operational improvements. However, it does not fully involve operators and it lacks a systemic view to understand how these projects will affect the overall system performance. According to Husby (2007) this aspect can lead not only to project prioritization with no financial impact for the company as well as to the elimination of the positive impacts on other processes. Alternatively, Husby (2007) suggests that the five focusing steps of TOC can fulfill this gap. However, the author points out that the thinking process of TOC analysis and troubleshooting makes use of a language that requires complex intellectual guidance by skilled experts and a different approach for management and for operators.

From the point of view of Jin et al. (2009), the focus of Six Sigma is the client and the the focus of TOC is the organization and although they are different philosophies, both have been used by various industries for process improvement because while Six Sigma requires solutions in depth, TOC can reveal bottlenecks and avoid them. According to Nave (2002), the common way of integration between TOC and Six Sigma is to identify the restriction of the company and use Six Sigma to reduce its variation or to solve this problem.

According to Jin et al. (2009), the main advantages of the combination of the two approaches are: (i) the restriction is analyzed, measured and controlled by a set of statistical tools, thus increasing the understanding of the problem and decisions, (ii) the bottleneck is the first point to be analyzed, thus generating increased financial gain for the company and the Six Sigma project will not be chosen by a single business area, but by the overall view that the TOC will generate the project outcomes throughout the system. On the other hand, according to Jin et al (2009), the disadvantages are: (i) not always the variation decrease will increase the restriction capacity (ii) when the variation reduction increase the production rate of the bottleneck, downstream processes can generate higher rates of rejection since the focus was solely laid on the neck, (iii) the uncertainty of applying the principles of TOC and then the six sigma design or vice versa. The integration model of Six Sigma and TOC proposed by Jin et al. (2009) assumes an environment with limited budget for improvements and application of Six Sigma in post-bottleneck resources in order to assure quality and efficiency. This model has been replicated in a motor manufacturing company with satisfactory results.

To Ehie and Sheu (2005) there are similarities between the improvement processes of Six Sigma (DMAIC) and TOC (Five Focusing Steps). The authors proposed an integrated model where the initial step of restriction identification is the same for both approaches; the next step follows the logic of TOC using its capacity to exploit the Six Sigma phases of measure and analyze as a support; the following step also adopts the the capacity to explore of the TOC logic by using the Improve phase of Six Sigma and its statistical tools to eliminate the problems and the causes indicated in the previous step; step four uses Subordinate step of TOC and Control of Six Sigma in order to assure that all actions taken previously are applied in the system; in step five, efforts are made to increase the capacity of the constraint and the last step evaluates the next constraint to avoid the inertia of the system. To refine the model, the authors suggest incorporating the TOC Thinking Process to understand the cause-effect interactions in the system as well as add other approaches aimed at continuous improvement.

# 3.3 Lean versus Six Sigma

According to Arnheiter and Maleyeff (2005) both Lean and Six Sigma implement a culture of continuous improvement at all levels within the company. And the advantage of the approach lies on the use of integrated scientific and quantitative quality provided by Six Sigma, in relation to the techniques of Lean. The Six Sigma projects focus their efforts on reducing the variation from the proposed standard, which can lead to not focusing on the client's requirements, but only in a cost-cutting exercise. Therefore it is suggested to simultaneously adopt the flow view of Lean (Bendell, 2006). For Harrison (2006) the use of this approaches isolated in such way may not be effective, and they can create two subcultures within the company, fighting for the same human and financial resources.

There is a limit of integration because the strategy used for the improvement depends on the problem to be solved, and therefore there must be alignment between the two approaches in order to achieve effective results (BAÑUELAS; ANTONY, 2004). For Sharma (2003), Six Sigma should be used to boost the implementation of Lean efforts. For Bendell (2006), balance is the creation of value from the point of view of the customer in order to focus on the market and, at the same time, reduce the variation to acceptable levels while reducing costs. Bendell (2006) also argues that the two paradigms are catalysts of change and that they can be a powerful tool to align with cultural aspects of Lean Six Sigma projects. There is enormous potential for a sustainable organizational change and process improvement integrating Lean and Six Sigma (BENDELL, 2006).

To Snee (2010) Six Sigma is typically used to solve complex problems for which the solution is unknown. It is important to remember that the goal is to find the causes of the low performance and not just focus on the symptoms. In this case, the view of lean flow contributes to the use of Six Sigma and suggests the simultaneous use of approaches. Snee (2010) listed eight key features that contribute to the performance when Lean and Six Sigma are synergistically applied: they create financial results, they activate the involvement of top leadership, they use a disciplined approach (DMAIC) their projects are quickly concluded, the clear definition of success , the human infrastructure (belts) created, the focus on customers and processes and the use of a statistical approach.

As Montgomery (2010) Lean improvement projects can be managed using the DMAIC. Montgomery (2010) supports the use of Six Sigma and Lean as a model that captures the philosophy of continuous improvement and the system of deep knowledge

proposed by Deming. Higgins (2005) set a difference between the two systems arguing that Six Sigma is run by a few specific individuals within a company, whereas in Lean, training involves all levels of the company to identify and eliminate non-value added activities. Moreover, Arnheiter and Maleyeff (2005) point out the aspects between the approaches: Lean companies should adopt the use of quantitative data to make decisions and a more scientific approach to assess the quality within the system, meanwhile companies using Six Sigma, need a broader systems approach, considering the effects of waste on the system as a whole. Bendell (2006) mentions that Lean and Six Sigma philosophies have become poorly defined, resulting in reduced effectiveness and very often the presented methodologies are put together without a logical explanation and without any explanation or theoretical basis for the choice of techniques. Spector and West (2006) point out that by adopting the Lean and Six Sigma, practitioners can find a variety of projects with insufficient results for the amount of time needed to finish them.

From the above considerations it seems, in short, that: (i) the two approaches are complementary and it is feasible to evaluate the integration between the two approaches, (ii) integration, project management and corporate strategy need to be aligned together in order to avoid having separate systems with Lean and Six Sigma approaches, (iii) it was noticed also that, if Lean is implemented individually, specific tools to leverage its full potential according to the complexity of the problem under analysis will be missing. Likewise, if a Six Sigma project is implemented without a systemic vision of lean, he focus on the global flow is forgotten and the improvement project performance is compromised. Therefore, in order to meet the main objectives of this research that are to analyze the points of convergence and divergence between the three approaches from the standpoint of continuous operational improvement and to broaden the understanding of their fundamental principles, Board 1 was elaborated. From the literature review and the discussions in the previous sections, that table presents a summary of the review comparing the three approaches and showing 28 analysis criteria. It was considered that, a priori, such criteria are fundamental to the understanding of the comparative approaches, thus contributing to academic understanding and decision making managerial integration.

Criteria	Theory of Constraints	Lean Manufacturing	Seis Sigma
1. Source	Goldratt (1980's)	Toyota (Toyoda, Ohno and Shingo-1950's)	Motorola e General Electrics (1980's)
2. Theory	Manage constraints and generate gains	Elimination of losses and increase profit	Reduce variability
3. Application structure	<ol> <li>Identify the constraint</li> <li>Explore the constraint</li> <li>Subordinate</li> <li>Increase the constraint</li> <li>Return to step 1</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Specify value</li> <li>Identify the value stream</li> <li>Flow</li> <li>Pull</li> <li>Seeking perfection</li> </ol>	1.Define 2.Measure 3.Analise 4.Improve 5.Control
4. Focus	In constraints	In the flow	In the problem
5. Goal	Continuous increase in profits	Maximize productivity	Maximize business results
6. Strategic objective	Synchronize	Simplify	Stabilize
7. Assumptions	<ul> <li>Emphasis on speed and volume</li> <li>Analyzes existing systems</li> <li>There is interdependence between processes</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>The reduction of losses increases business performance</li> <li>Several small improvements are better than the overall analysis system</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>There is a problem</li> <li>Statistical tools are used</li> <li>Improvements in the rate of output of the system by reducing the variation in processes</li> </ul>
8. Primary effects	Increases gain rapidly	Flow time reduction	Rate uniform process output
9. Side effects	<ul> <li>Reduction of inventories and losses</li> <li>Gain is the meter system performance</li> <li>Improvement in quality</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Reduces the variability</li> <li>Generates uniform process outputs</li> <li>Reduced inventory. New accounting system</li> <li>Flow meter is the performance of managers</li> <li>Improves quality and productivity</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Reduces losses.</li> <li>Reduces inventory</li> <li>Variability is the meter performance of managers</li> <li>Improves quality</li> <li>Culture change</li> </ul>
10. Deficiencies	Ignore parts of the organization to focus on manufacturing and the restriction	- Do not apply statistical tools or systems analysis - Focus on limited losses	<ul> <li>Does the interdependence within the system</li> <li>Improvements made processes independently.</li> <li>Creates elite employees</li> </ul>
11. Ease of implementation	Greater difficulty	Minor difficulty	Medium difficulty
12. Managerial level application	Top management	First leve	Technical level and middle management
13. Structure implantation	It does not refer	It does not refer	Belts and Champion
14. Effect on the variability	Absorbs variation	Reduces	Reduces
15. Major contributions	Systemic view of the restrictions	Pull, takt time, Heijunka, one-piece flow, value	Organizational structure with experts

# Board 1. Summary of comparative critical analysis of TOC, Lean and Six Sigma

		stream mapping and respect for people	improvements, projects and guided quantification of cost reductions
16. Process Aspects	<ul><li>Metric specific accounting.</li><li>Focus on systematic restriction</li></ul>	<ul><li>Management of the workflow by JIT</li><li>Optimization of processes</li></ul>	<ul><li>Tools specific statistics.</li><li>Specific Terminologies</li><li>Structure specific expert</li></ul>
17. Batch Size	Larger batches for restriction and lower non bottlenecks	Small batches throughout the system	It does not refer
18. Production Control	The algorithm Rope Drum-Buffer-Rope is used to free stuff	Kanban triggers the production release	It does not refer
19. Production Planning	Detailed planning for the restriction and less detailed non-bottlenecks DBR (Drumm, Buffer and Rope)	<ul> <li>Detailed planning of final assembly</li> <li>Other operations are driven to meet the assembly through the Kanban</li> </ul>	It does not refer
20. Distribution of knowledge	Knowledge is centered and focused on constraints	Knowledge is shared as a reduction of losses and is the responsibility of all	Knowledge centered in Belts and training is highly focused
21. Culturally dominant aspects	<ul> <li>Requires a change in approach</li> <li>Extends in all parts of business</li> </ul>	- Culture of minimum waste - Emphasis on continual improvement	<ul><li>Empowerment of employees</li><li>Changes philosophy</li><li>Focus on Customers</li></ul>
22. Leadership style	Leader of driver profile	Leader facilitator profile	Leader of driver profile
23.Data requirements	Amount and accuracy of data is less critical compared to traditional production methods	Amount and accuracy of data is partly critical of traditional production methods	Requires large quantity and accuracy of data for decision making
24. Inventory	<ul> <li>Inventory is needed to facilitate the production, but the goal is to minimize inventory</li> <li>Buffers are placed in front of the neck and the intersection between paths of non-bottlenecks and the path of a bottleneck to their production orders</li> </ul>	Stock is zero and the target depends on the number of kanbans in the system	It does not refer
25. Capacity planning	<ul> <li>Consider finite capacity</li> <li>It is planned by computer simulation</li> </ul>	<ul><li>Did finite capacity</li><li>It is planned by Kanban</li></ul>	It does not refer
26. Information Technology	Computational resources are needed for deployment	Low need	Computational resources used mainly for statistical
27. Stability Requirements for deployment	- Indifferent, but performs best in environments of medium or low stability	Environment with high stability	Indifferent
28. Indicators of performance management	<ul> <li>Global Indicators: Net Profit, Return on Investment, CashFflow;</li> <li>Local Indicators: Gain, Inventory, Operational Expenses</li> </ul>	- Cost Target - Cost-Kaizen	DPMO (Defects Per Million Opportunities)

### 5. Conclusion

This study aimed to analyze the points of convergence between exclusion and Theory of Constraints, Lean Manufacturing and Six Sigma when used with a view to continuous improvement of processes in manufacturing systems. The discussion also tried to contribute to a better understanding of the fundamental principles of such methodologies by performing a comparative analysis of aspects considered critical. After the analyzes, it was found that the purposes of analyzing the points of convergence and exclusion between the three approaches and contribute to a better understanding of its fundamental principles have been met. It was found in general that there are more points than aspects of overlap between the three approaches exclusion and it is viable to think in constructing an integrated facing continuous process improvement which enhance the competitiveness becoming stronger current strategies.

However, there are critical factors that must be considered in constructing models by integrating the three approaches without which the development of a holistic model loses in strength. Among the main critical factors stand out that discussion ever held in the literature still does not have a clear definition on such aspects: i) how to choose the correct elements of each approach according to the real needs of the organization? ii) the company must precisely define what is their priority: reduce variability? reduce losses and improve the flow? Or remove the restrictions? ii) the correct diagnosis on culture, goals, strengths and weaknesses of the organization should also be considered an aspect of the integration of the three approaches and revealed a lack of research on this topic, iv) another critical factor to be considered in the integration of the approaches is the breaking of some useful mental models, such as the non-effective engagement of operators is a characteristic of the culture implementation of TOC and Six Sigma v) the principles of construction of a model incorporating such approaches must necessarily be aligned with the company's strategy and goals.

#### References

- Aboelmaged, M. G. Six sigma quality: a structured review and implications for future research. *International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management*, v. 27, n. 3, p. 268-317, 2010.
- Antunes Junior, J.A.V. Em direção a uma teoria geral do processo na administração da produção: uma discussão sobre a possibilidade de unificação da teoria das restrições e a teoria que sustenta a construção dos sistemas de produção com estoque zero. 1998. 407f. Tese (Doutorado) Programa de Pós-Graduação em Administração, Escola de Administração, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, RS, 1998.
- Arnheiter, E. D.; Maleyeff, J. The integration of lean management and six sigma. *The TQM Magazine*. v.17,n.1, 5-18, 2005.
- Banuelas, R.; Antony, J. Six sigma or design for six sigma? *The TQM Magazine*, York, Inglaterra, GB, v. 16, n. 4, p. 250-263, 2004.
- Bendell, T. A review and comparison of six sigma and the lean organization. *The TQM Magazine*, York, Inglaterra, GB, v. 18, n. 3, p. 255-62, 2006.
- Boyd, L.; Gupta, M. Constraints management: what is the theory? *International Journal* of Operations & Production Management, v. 24, n. 4, p. 370-371, 2004.

- Chakravorty, S.S.; Atwater, B.J. A comparative study of line design approaches for serial production systems. *International Journal of Operations e Production Management*, v. 16, n. 6, p. 91-108, 1996.
- Cook, D. P. A simulation comparison of traditional, JIT and TOC manufacturing Systems in a flow shop with bottlenecks. *Production and Inventory Management Journal*, Falls Church, Va., US, v. 35, p. 73–78, 1994.
- Dettmer, W. Beyond Lean Manufacturing: Combining Lean and the Theory of Constraints for Higher Performance. Goal System International, Port Angeles, USA. 2001. Em: <u>http://www.goalsys.com/books/documents/TOCandLeanPaperrev.1.pdf</u>. Acesso em: 12/5/2011.
- Ehie, I.; Sheu, J. Integrating six sigma and theory of constraints for continuous improvement: a case study. *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management*, v. 16, n. 5, p. 542-553, 2005.
- Ghinato, P. Sistema Toyota de produção: mais do que simplesmente Just-In-Time. Caxias do Sul: Ed. Universidade de Caxias do Sul, 1996.
- Gil, A.C. Como elaborar projetos de pesquisa. São Paulo: Atlas, 2010.
- Goldratt, E. M. A síndrome do Palheiro: Garimpando informações num oceano de dados. São Paulo: Educator, 1991.
- Goldratt, E M.; Cox, J.F. A Meta. 1.ed. São Paulo. Nobel, 1984.
- Gupta, M. C.; Boyd, L. H. Theory of constraints: a theory for operations management, International Journal of Operations & Production Management, Vol. 28 Iss: 10, pp.991 – 1012, 2008.
- Husby, P. Competition or Complement: Six Sigma and TOC. *Material Handling Management*. pp.51-55, 2007.
- Inman, R. A.; Sale, M. L.; W. Green Jr, K. W. Analysis of the relationships among TOC use, TOC outcomes, and organizational performance. *International Journal of Operations e Production Management*, Vol. 29 Iss: 4, pp.341 – 356, 2009.
- Jin,K.J.; Hyder, A.R.; Elkassabgi,Y.; Zhou, H.;Herrera, A. Integrating the Theory of Constraints and Six Sigma in Manufacturing Process Improvement. *Proceedings of world academy of science, engineering and technology*, Vol. 37, 2009.
- Kruger, D. J.; Randass, J. K. Assessment of the Reasons for Failure and Critical Success Factors Implementing CI Projects: Case Study Results from the South African Apparel and Manufacturing Industry. IEEE. 2010.
- Lacerda, D.; Rodrigues, L. H. Compreensão, aprendizagem e Ação: A abordagem do Processo de Pensamento da Teoria das Restrições. SEGeT, Resende-RJ, 2007.
- Miltenburg, J. Comparing JIT, MRP and TOC, and embedding TOC into MRP, International Journal of Production Research, v35, N 4, 1147-1169, 1997.
- Montegomey, D. C. A modern framework for achieving enterprise excellence International, *Journal of Lean Six Sigma*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 56-65, 2010.
- Nave, D. How to compare Six Sigma, Lean and the Theory of Constraints. *Quality Progress*, pp. 73-79,2002.
- Pettersen, J. Defining lean production: some conceptual and practical issues. *The TQM Journal*, Vol. 21 No. 2, pp. 127-142, 2009.
- Pinto, S. B.; Carvalho, M.M.; Ho, L. L. Implementação de programas de qualidade: uma *survey* em empresas de grande porte no Brasil. *Gestão & Produção*, v. 13, n. 2, p. 191-203, 2006.Fryer et al. (2007).

- Pirasteh, R.M. ; Horn, Scott. The many sides of TLS. *APICS Magazine*. May/June 2009. pp 40-43
- Pirasteh, R.M.; Fox, R.E. Profitability with no boundaries. Quality press. 2010
- Sale, M. L.; Inman, R. A. Survey-based comparison of performance and change in performance of firms using traditional manufacturing, JIT and TOC. *International Journal of Production Research*, vol. 41, no. 4, 829–844, 2003.
- Santos, A. B.; Mrtins, M. F. Contribuições do Seis Sigma: estudos de caso em multinacionais. Produção, v. 20, n. 1, p. 42-53, 2010.
- Shah, R.; Ward, P.T. Defining and developing measures of lean production. *Journal of Operations Management*, Vol. 25 No. 4, pp. 785-805, 2007.
- Sharma, U. Implementing Lean principles with the six sigma advantage: how a battery company realized significant improvements. *Journal of organizational Excellence*. Summer, 2003.
- Sheinkopf, L.; Moore, R. Theory of Constraints and Lean Manufacturing; Friend or Foes? Chesapeake Consulting. 1998.
- Shingo, S. O Sistema Toyota de Produção: Do ponto de vista da engenharia de produção. Bookman, 1996.
- Silva, É. R. P. Método para revisão e mapeamento sistemático da literatura (DEI-POLI/UFRJ). Trabalho de conclusão de curso em Engenharia de Produção, 2009.
- Sneee, R. D. Lean Six Sigma: getting better all the time. *International Journal of Lean Six Sigma*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 9-29, 2010.
- Spector, R.E. How constraints management enhances Lean and Six sigma. Supply Chain Management Review. pp 42-46. 2006.
- Stamm, M.L.;Neitzert, T.R.; Darius, P.K. TQM, TPM, TOC, Lean and Six Sigma Evolution of manufacturing methodologies under the paradigm shift from Taylorism/Fordism to Toyotism? *International Annual Euroma Conference*, Gothenburg, Sweden, 2009.
- Trad, S. ; Maximiano, A. C. A. Seis Sigma: Fatores Críticos de Sucesso para sua Implantação. RAC, Curitiba, v. 13, n. 4, art. 7, pp. 647-662, Out./Dez. 2009.
- Tranfield, D.; Denyer, D.; Palminder, S. Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review. *British Journal of Management*, 14, 207–222, 2003.
- Watson, J.K ; Patti, A. A comparison of JIT and TOC buffering philosophies on system performance with unplanned machine downtime. *International Journal of Production Research*, Vol. 46, No. 7, 1 April pp.1869–1885, 2008.