Global Multidisciplinary Journal
eISSN: 2791-173X pISSN: 2791-2760

VOLUME04 ISSUE11
Published 30-11-2025 *Page No. 128-136*

Resilience and Reconfiguration: Managing Semiconductor-Induced Disruptions in Automotive and Critical Supply Chains

Dr. Asha R. Menon

Global Institute for Supply Chain Resilience, University of Toronto

ABSTRACT

The global semiconductor shortage precipitated by the COVID-19 pandemic exposed deep structural vulnerabilities in interdependent supply networks, particularly affecting the automotive sector and other industries reliant on advanced integrated circuits. This paper presents a comprehensive conceptual and analytical treatment of supply chain resilience strategies tailored to semiconductor-driven disruptions. Drawing from empirical analyses of the 2020–2022 shortages and a synthesis of operations research, inventory theory, and systemic risk perspectives, the study constructs an integrated framework that links disruption typologies, propagation mechanisms (ripple effects), and strategic interventions spanning pre-positioning, sourcing design, production-inventory control, and policy-level reshoring and infrastructure investment. The methodology combines theory-driven modeling approaches—inventory and EOQ-based decision analysis, Markov-modulated disruption modeling, and macro-level resource allocation principles—with scenario-based descriptive results that illuminate trade-offs among cost, responsiveness, and resilience. Results highlight the critical role of diversified sourcing, multi-stage hybrid supplier selection, targeted pre-positioning of critical components, flexible service outsourcing in emergency logistics, and adaptive pricing-credit mechanisms to stabilize demand and supply interactions. We further argue that resilience investments must be prioritized using systemic-risk-aware allocation rules that account for network centrality and the non-linear amplification of disruptions. The discussion addresses limitations of current models—particularly the challenge of quantifying geopolitical and policy-driven risks—and outlines a rich research agenda that integrates stochastic control, game theory, and empirical supply network mapping. The paper concludes with actionable managerial recommendations and policy implications, including when reshoring or capacity investment makes strategic sense versus when network augmentation and contractual innovations are superior. The contribution lies in translating fragmented empirical observations and disciplinary approaches into a coherent, prescriptive body of knowledge for managing semiconductor-induced systemic disruptions.

KEYWORDS

semiconductor shortage, supply chain resilience, ripple effect, pre-positioning, supplier selection, EOQ pricing, reshoring, disruption propagation

INTRODUCTION

The COVID-19 pandemic and its aftermath generated one of the most salient supply chain stress-tests in recent memory, revealing how localized production shocks can cascade through tightly coupled global networks and lead to systemic shortages with extensive economic and social consequences (Ramani, Ghosh & Sodhi, 2022;

Ivanov & Dolgui, 2021). Among the most impactful manifestations was the widespread shortage of semiconductors—components foundational to automobiles, consumer electronics, industrial machinery, and critical infrastructure—which disrupted production schedules, altered inventory policies, and prompted emergency governmental and corporate interventions (BCG X SIA, 2021; Biden, 2021). The semiconductor shock is especially instructive because it combines demand-side volatility (sudden surges for consumer electronics), supply-side concentration (capabilities tightly clustered in advanced foundries), and long production lead times, producing a complex, multi-scalar problem where traditional inventory heuristics frequently fail (Bauer et al., 2020; Ramani, Ghosh & Sodhi, 2022).

This paper addresses the urgent need for an integrated, academically rigorous, and managerially actionable understanding of how to prepare for, respond to, and recover from semiconductor-induced disruptions. The literature on disruption management is rich and varied: analytical studies focus on inventory-firm decisions under disruptions (Li, Yang, Shi, Teng & Lai, 2021; Li, He & Chen, 2017), stochastic process models analyze lead time variability and failure risks (Hekimoğlu, van der Laan & Dekker, 2018), and systemic-risk perspectives highlight how failures propagate through networks (Scheibe & Blackhurst, 2018). Complementing these, empirical and policy-oriented works describe the geopolitical and industrial policy responses, including reshoring initiatives and infrastructure investments (Lulla, 2025; BCG X SIA, 2021; Biden, 2021). Yet the field lacks a unified framework that connects these strands into a prescriptive roadmap specifically calibrated to semiconductor shocks—one that situates inventory and pricing policies within a networked, systemic-risk-aware view and translates theoretical insights into operational tactics and policy levers.

The problem statement guiding this study is twofold. First, how can firms and public actors design robust tactical and strategic interventions to mitigate semiconductor-driven disruption risk while balancing cost and responsiveness? Second, what analytical structures best capture the unique features of semiconductor supply chains—long lead times, technological concentration, demand substitutability limits, and geopolitical exposure—so that optimal decisions can be both theoretically grounded and operationally relevant? Addressing these questions requires synthesizing inventory theory, supply chain risk management, systemic risk allocation, and policy analysis into a coherent set of recommendations.

This paper makes three main contributions. Conceptually, it develops an integrated resilience architecture that maps disruption types to intervention sets, explicitly recognizing propagation mechanisms and the role of strategic capacity and stock decisions. Analytically, it aligns EOQ-based pricing and credit decisions, pre-positioning logistics, Markov-modulated spare parts thinking, and multi-stage hybrid supplier selection into operationalizable guidance—highlighting trade-offs, complementarities, and sequencing. Empirically and managerially, it derives specific intervention priorities for automotive and adjacent sectors, grounding prescriptions in documented case studies and sectoral analyses of the semiconductor crisis (Ramani, Ghosh & Sodhi, 2022; BCG X SIA, 2021; Biden, 2021). Finally, the paper delineates a forward-looking research agenda to close persistent model–practice gaps.

METHODOLOGY

The methodology of this pa=per is deliberately multi-paradigmatic, reflecting the interdisciplinary nature of the problem. Rather than presenting one empirical dataset or simulation experiment, the paper uses theory-driven reasoning, cross-disciplinary model synthesis, and scenario-based descriptive analysis to derive recommendations. This is consistent with calls for pluralistic methods in operations and supply chain research to capture complex realities (Boyer & Swink, 2008). The approach comprises four analytical pillars: (1) mapping disruption typologies and propagation pathways; (2) synthesizing inventory and pricing policy tools; (3)

incorporating stochastic lead-time and disruption-risk models; and (4) formulating resource allocation and resilience investment heuristics. For each pillar, methodological choices align with specific strands of the literature, and each major claim is grounded in the provided references.

Disruption typology and propagation mapping. Building on systemic risk and ripple effect literature, the study first constructs a descriptive taxonomy of disruptions relevant to semiconductor supply chains: demand surges, supply-side capacity shocks, process disruptions (e.g., factory fires or pandemic-induced workforce shortages), and policy or geopolitical shocks (trade restrictions, export controls). Each disruption type is linked to known propagation mechanisms such as supplier-to-customer interruption, capacity reallocation, and cross-sector demand shifts (Scheibe & Blackhurst, 2018; Ivanov & Dolgui, 2021). The mapping highlights nodes of amplification—firm-specific chokepoints—and the temporal dynamics of propagation, which are critical for timing interventions (Azad & Hassini, 2019).

Inventory and pricing-policy synthesis. The second pillar integrates EOQ (Economic Order Quantity) based decision frameworks with pricing and customer credit levers, under the lens of supplier payment and lead-time uncertainty (Li et al., 2021). The methodological innovation here is to treat pricing and credit as demand-shaping tools that interact with inventory policies during disruptions. This integration draws from classical inventory-control theory and recent work showing the strategic role of ordering, pricing, and outsourcing choices when supply reliability is compromised (Li et al., 2021; Xin Yao et al., 2018). The analysis evaluates how firms can use contractual terms, price adjustments, and customer-credit offerings to smooth demand, prioritize scarce components, and preserve profitability without undermining market position.

Stochastic lead-time and disruption modeling. The third pillar incorporates Markov-modulated models and stochastic lead-time analysis to capture random lead times and disruption risks. Hekimoğlu, van der Laan and Dekker's (2018) Markov-modulated spare-parts work provides methodological guidance on representing time-varying transition probabilities between operational and disrupted states. This informs a class of qualitative scenario analyses—ranging from temporary outages to prolonged capacity losses—that illuminate expected inventory shortfalls, service-level impacts, and replenishment dynamics under different intensities of disruption.

Resource allocation and resilience investment heuristics. The fourth pillar leverages systemic-risk allocation frameworks inspired by risk-analysis and resource prioritization literature (MacKenzie & Zobel, 2016). This involves translating resilience objectives into prioritization heuristics for investments (e.g., which nodes to fortify, where to pre-position inventory, or when to subsidize supplier capacity). The methodology stresses the need to incorporate network centrality measures, demand criticality metrics, and non-linear amplification potential to avoid naive equal-distribution allocations that under-invest in systemic chokepoints (MacKenzie & Zobel, 2016; Scheibe & Blackhurst, 2018).

Synthesis and scenario-based descriptive results. After building the conceptual and analytical interconnections, the paper proceeds with scenario-based descriptive analyses that apply the integrated framework to representative semiconductor-driven disruption cases—particularly the automotive sector. These scenarios are not numerical simulations; rather, they are detailed narrative analyses that trace intervention sequences, expected outcomes, and trade-offs. The reasoning is consistently grounded in cited literature, ensuring that claims about strategy effectiveness and trade-offs are supported by prior empirical or theoretical work (Ramani, Ghosh & Sodhi, 2022; Ivanov & Dolgui, 2021; Kaur & Singh, 2021).

Validity and limitations of methodology. The chosen methodology prioritizes theoretical coherence and managerial relevance over purely quantitative precision. This aligns with the need to generate actionable insights during high-uncertainty episodes where precise parameter estimates may be unavailable (Boyer & Swink, 2008). The paper is transparent about the limitations of non-quantitative scenario analysis and articulates where future empirical and simulation work is necessary to calibrate parameters and test policy impacts.

RESULTS

This section presents the descriptive analytical findings yielded by applying the integrated framework to semiconductor-induced disruptions, with particular emphasis on automotive supply chains, which were among the hardest hit (Ramani, Ghosh & Sodhi, 2022). The results are organized by intervention domain: pre-positioning and logistics, sourcing and supplier selection, inventory and pricing-credit decisions, capacity and reshoring considerations, and systemic allocation of resilience investments.

Pre-positioning and service outsourcing. Pre-positioning inventory and strategically outsourcing services emerge as critical tactical levers for short-term resilience. Xin Yao et al. (2018) demonstrate that pre-positioning relief materials—analogous to maintaining strategic component reserves—can substantially reduce unmet demand and response times in relief supply chains. Translating these insights to semiconductor-dependent firms, maintaining long-lead-time buffer stocks of critical microcontrollers or substrate materials can markedly reduce production stoppages when foundry output temporarily declines. However, pre-positioning faces cost and obsolescence risks—particularly acute for rapidly evolving semiconductor nodes. Therefore, the result highlights a hybrid pre-positioning strategy: maintain strategic quantities of functionally generic components amenable to multiple product lines and complement with service outsourcing arrangements (e.g., contract manufacturing or assembly services) that can be scaled during emergencies (Xin Yao et al., 2018). This combination balances the immediacy of stock availability with flexibility from external capacity.

Sourcing design and multi-stage hybrid models. Multi-stage hybrid supplier selection and order allocation that explicitly account for disruption risks and disruptive technologies provide durable resilience benefits (Kaur & Singh, 2021). The analysis finds that reliance on a single-source model for leading-edge nodes—common for cost and capability reasons—greatly amplifies systemic vulnerability. Kaur and Singh (2021) propose hybrid models that blend diversified sourcing, technology risk assessment, and contingency weightings. The result is a strategic posture that deliberately accepts redundancy and cost premiums in exchange for reduced systemic exposure. Importantly, such hybrid sourcing must be dynamic: allocations should be re-optimized periodically to reflect technological shifts, capacity expansions, and geopolitical changes.

Inventory policy, pricing, and customer credit interplay. Integrating EOQ-based inventory thinking with pricing and customer credit interventions yields nuanced demand-shaping pathways during shortages (Li et al., 2021). The descriptive result is threefold. First, firms can use temporary price adjustments and customer-credit deferrals to modulate demand spikes that strain constrained semiconductor supplies without permanently damaging demand elasticity relationships (Li et al., 2021). Second, EOQ principles guide the timing and scale of emergency orders with constrained lead times; firms with better payment terms or vendor relationships can strategically place expedited orders at higher cost to preserve throughput. Third, service-level prioritization can be enforced by offering preferential credit or contract terms to high-priority customers, thus aligning commercial incentives with operational constraints. The caveat is that aggressive price-based rationing may erode customer goodwill and should be paired with transparent communication and contractual promises to avoid long-term brand damage.

Stochastic lead times and disruption risk modeling insights. Markov-modulated analyses of spare parts systems reveal that random lead times and disruption risks significantly elevate the required safety stock to achieve target service levels (Hekimoğlu, van der Laan & Dekker, 2018). Applied qualitatively to semiconductor contexts, the implication is that firms must adjust standard safety-stock heuristics upward to compensate for the possibility of prolonged factory outages—especially when the supplier network exhibits correlated failure modes. The result emphasizes that single-parameter safety-stock rules are insufficient: firms need multi-state safety strategies that consider both moderate, frequent disruptions and rare, severe outages, reflecting Markovian state transitions between "normal", "stressed", and "failed" operation modes.

Recovery strategies from major supply disruptions. Recovery strategies must differ by whether networks are single-sourcing or multi-sourcing. Azad and Hassini (2019) compare recovery paths for single and multiple sourcing networks and show that multiple sourcing provides greater post-disruption recovery agility, albeit with higher operating costs. The results thus suggest that firms should invest in layered recovery options: maintain at least partial secondary sources and contractual frameworks enabling rapid scaling (e.g., capacity reservation clauses, flexible lead-time windows). Recovery also benefits from cross-sector cooperation when demand surges are systemic; industry-wide prioritization frameworks and mutual aid pacts can expedite allocation during crises (Azad & Hassini, 2019).

Systemic risk allocation and resilience investment. Resource allocation to enhance resilience should be informed by systemic risk perspective rather than naive equal distributions (MacKenzie & Zobel, 2016; Scheibe & Blackhurst, 2018). The descriptive analysis reveals that investments concentrated on network chokepoints—such as advanced foundries or wafer fabrication facilities—yield disproportionate system-wide returns by reducing propagation potential. For example, subsidizing capacity upgrades or backup power installations at strategically central foundries will often provide greater systemic benefit than proportionately funding many peripheral nodes. MacKenzie and Zobel (2016) demonstrate that allocation frameworks considering impact distribution and likelihood of failure yield superior risk reduction per invested dollar.

Reshoring, capacity investments, and policy instruments. The debate between reshoring versus building networked resilience emerges as complex and context-dependent. Lulla (2025) examines reshoring GPU production and argues that while reshoring can reduce geopolitical risk exposure, it often requires massive capital and long lead times and may not be cost-competitive. Policy instruments such as the U.S. Executive Order on America's Supply Chains (Biden, 2021) and sector analyses by BCG X SIA (2021) emphasize that an optimal policy mix—public investments in domestic capacity for strategically critical nodes combined with incentives for global diversification—typically outperforms unilateral reshoring. The result thus advises a calibrated approach: support domestic capacity where national security or essential infrastructure depends on localized supply, while maintaining internationally diversified supplier networks for commercial products where cost and innovation benefits from global competition are substantial (Biden, 2021; BCG X SIA, 2021).

Managerial trade-offs and timing. Across intervention domains, the results converge on a central trade-off: immediate tactical options (pre-positioning, expedited orders, price rationing) provide short-term relief but can be costly and erode margins, whereas strategic options (reshoring, capacity expansion, multi-sourcing) require long-term commitments and may be misaligned if disruptions are temporary or sector-specific. Thus, firms must adopt a tiered response architecture: tactical measures that buy time and protect critical throughput, and strategic investments prioritized by systemic risk heuristics for long-term robustness (Ivanov & Dolgui, 2021; MacKenzie & Zobel, 2016).

DISCUSSION

The findings illuminate both practical and theoretical implications and raise nuanced considerations for managers and policymakers. This section interprets the results, discusses limitations, articulates policy implications, and outlines future research directions.

Interpreting strategic complementarities. A key interpretive insight is that resilience measures are often complementary rather than substitutes. For instance, pre-positioning inventory becomes more effective when paired with diversified sourcing, because it reduces the required buffer size and lowers obsolescence risk (Xin Yao et al., 2018; Kaur & Singh, 2021). Similarly, pricing and credit policies complement inventory policies by shaping consumption patterns during shortages (Li et al., 2021). Recognizing these complementarities helps managers design multi-layered strategies that exploit synergies: combine a lean baseline operating model with targeted resilience add-ons (e.g., strategic buffer stocks for critical, long-lead components).

The role of information and transparency. Transparent communication and real-time information sharing across supply networks emerge as critical enablers of effective mitigation. Scheibe and Blackhurst (2018) highlight how lack of visibility exacerbates the ripple effect; when firms cannot see upstream volatility, they tend to overreact, amplifying demand fluctuations and misallocating inventory. Investing in demand-sensing systems, supplier transparency agreements, and cross-company dashboards can reduce reactionary behaviors and enable calibrated, system-aware interventions (Scheibe & Blackhurst, 2018). Information investments are particularly valuable where lead times are long and forecasting uncertainty is high.

Policy levers and the public sector's role. The semiconductor shortage demonstrated that private incentives alone may under-provide strategically valuable resilience, especially when national security or critical infrastructure is at stake (Biden, 2021; BCG X SIA, 2021). Public policy tools—subsidies for capacity, R&D support, strategic stockpiles, and trade policy coordination—can correct market failures by internalizing externalities associated with systemic disruptions. Nevertheless, policy design must be careful to avoid lock-in to suboptimal technologies: public investments should be structured to be technology-agnostic and to support scalability and modularity in production (Bauer et al., 2020; BCG X SIA, 2021).

Operationalizing systemic-risk-aware investment. Translating systemic-risk analysis into operational budgets remains challenging. MacKenzie and Zobel (2016) provide a starting point by proposing allocation frameworks that prioritize high-impact nodes. Practically, firms should combine network mapping (identifying central nodes and alternative paths) with scenario-driven optimization that estimates loss-of-service under different failure scenarios. Importantly, the allocation logic should consider correlated failures—e.g., climate or geopolitical events affecting multiple nodes simultaneously—because such correlations drastically alter optimal investment portfolios (MacKenzie & Zobel, 2016).

Ethical and distributive implications. Resilience strategies also raise ethical questions about allocation—who gets priority when supply is insufficient? Pricing-based rationing can efficiently allocate scarce resources based on willingness to pay, but it risks disadvantaging vulnerable stakeholders and critical public services. Alternative allocation mechanisms—such as priority contracts for essential services and transparent, needs-based criteria—should be considered when societal welfare implications are large (Azad & Hassini, 2019).

Limitations and model caveats. Several limitations constrain the paper's prescriptive sharpness. First, the absence of calibrated empirical simulation limits the ability to specify exact buffer sizes or precise pricing adjustments; the qualitative guidance must be complemented by firm-specific modeling. Second, geopolitical risk quantification remains notoriously hard, which complicates reshoring versus diversification calculus. Third, the pace of technological change in semiconductors implies that stockpiled components may quickly become obsolete, reducing the efficacy of long-term pre-positioning unless components are functionally generic (Bauer et al., 2020). Finally, the paper's reliance on published literature and descriptive scenarios means the insights should be treated as theoretically grounded recommendations rather than prescriptive formulas.

Future research directions. The integrated framework opens several rich research avenues. First, computational models that couple Markov-modulated disruption processes with dynamic pricing and EOQ policies could yield actionable decision rules and optimal control policies. Second, empirical network mapping of semiconductor supply chains—leveraging transaction data, customs records, and firm disclosures—would enable precise identification of systemic chokepoints and better allocation heuristics. Third, behavioral studies on how firms perceive and act upon supply risk information could illuminate common cognitive biases that amplify ripple effects (Scheibe & Blackhurst, 2018). Fourth, comparative policy evaluation—assessing outcomes of reshoring subsidies, strategic stockpiles, and international coordination—would inform public investment priorities. Finally, interdisciplinary work that brings together operations researchers, political economists, and technologists is necessary to design resilient yet innovation-friendly supply ecosystems.

Managerial recommendations. Synthesizing the analyses yields pragmatic managerial recommendations. Prioritize visibility: invest in supplier transparency and demand-sensing systems. Layer resilience: combine tactical pre-positioning with strategic diversification and contractual capacity options. Use demand levers responsibly: apply pricing and credit tools to modulate non-essential demand, paired with transparent communication. Apply systemic-prioritization heuristics: invest resilience dollars where network analysis indicates highest systemic impact. Coordinate with public actors: engage policymakers to align private investments with national resilience objectives but retain flexibility to capitalize on global innovation.

Policy implications. Policymakers should recognize that while reshoring can be part of the solution for strategic industries, it is not a universal remedy. Instead, policy should focus on targeted capacity investments, incentives for diversification, and international coordination mechanisms that reduce the probability of correlated shocks. Moreover, governments can play a pivotal role in enabling information sharing platforms and in subsidizing resilience investments where market returns fail to capture social value (Biden, 2021; BCG X SIA, 2021).

CONCLUSION

The semiconductor shortage was a clarifying event: it demonstrated how tightly coupled, technology-dependent supply chains can be vulnerable to multifaceted shocks that propagate and amplify through global networks (Ramani, Ghosh & Sodhi, 2022; Ivanov & Dolgui, 2021). This paper synthesizes diverse streams of literature—inventory and pricing theory, stochastic lead-time modeling, multi-stage supplier selection frameworks, and systemic risk allocation methods—into an integrated resilience architecture tailored for semiconductor-induced disruptions. The core message is that no single intervention suffices; firms must deploy a layered strategy combining tactical measures (pre-positioning, expedited orders, temporary pricing levers) with strategic investments (diversified sourcing, capacity upgrades, and public-private collaboration) and prioritization rules informed by systemic-risk analysis.

Practically, managers should invest in visibility, preserve flexibility through contractual options and service outsourcing, and use pricing-credit tools judiciously to shape demand during crises. Policymakers should focus on targeted capacity support and international coordination, recognizing that reshoring is one tool among many and often costly. Future research should aim to operationalize the integrated framework through calibrated simulations, empirical network mapping, and interdisciplinary studies that bridge operational models with geopolitical and technological realities.

The path forward requires scholarly rigor, managerial prudence, and public policy imagination. If supply networks are to support resilient, innovation-driven economies, stakeholders must embrace strategies that acknowledge complexity, value redundancy where necessary, and invest where systemic returns justify the cost. The semiconductor shortage provided a painful but instructive lesson; the work now is to translate that lesson into enduring resilience.

REFERENCES

1. Ramani, Vinay & Ghosh, Debabrata & Sodhi, ManMohan S., 2022. Understanding systemic disruption from the Covid-19-induced semiconductor shortage for the auto industry. Omega, Elsevier, vol. 113(C).
2. Xin Yao & Ruting Huang & Malin Song & Nishikant Mishra, 2018. Pre-positioning inventory and service outsourcing of relief material supply chain. International Journal of Production Research, Taylor & Francis Journals, vol. 56(21), pages 6859-6871, November.
3. Li, Ruihai & Yang, Hui-Ling & Shi, Yan & Teng, Jinn-Tsair & Lai, Kuei-Kuei, 2021. EOQ-based pricing and customer credit decisions under general supplier payments. European Journal of Operational Research, Elsevier, vol. 289(2), pages 652-665.
4. Li, Shanshan & He, Yong & Chen, Lujie, 2017. Dynamic strategies for supply disruptions in production-inventory systems. International Journal of Production Economics, Elsevier, vol. 194(C), pages 88-101.
5. Kaur, Harpreet & Prakash Singh, Surya, 2021. Multi-stage hybrid model for supplier selection and order allocation considering disruption risks and disruptive technologies. International Journal of Production Economics, Elsevier, vol. 231(C).
6. Hekimoğlu, Mustafa & van der Laan, Ervin & Dekker, Rommert, 2018. Markov-modulated analysis of a spare parts system with random lead times and disruption risks. European Journal of Operational Research, Elsevier, vol. 269(3), pages 909-922.
7. Azad, Nader & Hassini, Elkafi, 2019. Recovery strategies from major supply disruptions in single and multiple sourcing networks. European Journal of Operational Research, Elsevier, vol. 275(2), pages 481-501.
8. Kevin P. Scheibe & Jennifer Blackhurst, 2018. Supply chain disruption propagation: a systemic risk and normal accident theory perspective. International Journal of Production Research, Taylor & Francis Journals, vol. 56(1-2), pages 43-59, January.
9. Cameron A. MacKenzie & Christopher W. Zobel, 2016. Allocating Resources to Enhance Resilience, with Application to Superstorm Sandy and an Electric Utility. Risk Analysis, John Wiley & Sons, vol. 36(4), pages 847-862, April.
10. Ivanov, Dmitry & Dolgui, Alexandre, 2021. OR-methods for coping with the ripple effect in supply chains during COVID-19 pandemic: Managerial insights and research implications. International Journal of Production Economics, Elsevier, vol. 232(C).
11. Lulla, K., 2025. RESHORING GPU PRODUCTION: TESTING STRATEGY ADAPTATIONS FOR US-BASED FACTORIES. International Journal of Applied Mathematics, 38(10s), 2411-2440.
12. Bauer, H., Burkacky, O., Kenevan, P., Lingemann, S., Pototzky, K., & Wiseman, B., 2020. Semiconductor design and manufacturing: Achieving leading-edge capabilities. McKinsey & Company Advanced Electronics.
13. BCG X SIA, 2021. Strengthening the Global Semiconductor Supply Chain in an Uncertain Era. The Semiconductor Industry Association.
14. Biden, P. J., 2021. Executive Order on America's Supply Chains. Washington DC: The White House.
15. Blos, M., Quaddus, M., Wee, H., & Watanabe, K., 2009. Supply Chain Risk Management: A Case Study of Automotive and Electronic Industries in Brazil. Supply Chain Management: An International Journal, Vol. 14

No.4, pp. 247-52.

16. Boyer, K., & Swink, M., 2008. Empirical Elephants: Why Multiple Methods Are Essential to Quality Research in Operations and Supply Chain Management. Journal of Operations Management, No. 26, pg. 337-48.

17. Eisenstein, P., 2021, April 12. U.S. Needs to Invest in Semiconductor "Infrastructure", Biden Tells Business Leaders Facing Criplling Shortages. Retrieved from NBC News: https://www.nbcnews.com/business/business-news/biden-auto-executives-chip-makers-meet-bid-solve-crippling-shortages-n1263847.