ACADEMIA International Journal for Social Sciences
Volume 4, Issue 3, 2025 ISSN-L (Online): 3006-6638

Global Supply Chain Disruptions: A Systematic Review of Risk Identification, Assessment, and Mitigation Strategies

Muhammad Faisal Sardar
mfaisalsardar786@gmail.com
MSC Risk Management, Glasgow Caledonian University, Scotland

Muhammad Usman Akram
ch.usman.warraich113@gmail.com
MSC Risk Management, Glasgow Caledonian University, Scotland
Corresponding Author: * Muhammad Faisal Sardar mfaisalsardar786@gmail.com

Received: 09-04-2025 **Revised:** 10-05-2025 **Accepted:** 15-06-2025 **Published:** 01-07-2025

ABSTRACT

Global supply chains have faced unprecedented disruptions in recent years due to natural disasters, geopolitical conflicts, pandemics, and operational failures. This paper presents a systematic review and meta-analysis of supply chain risk identification, risk assessment methods, and mitigation strategies from 2000–2024. We followed PRISMA guidelines to identify relevant literature, ultimately including dozens of peer-reviewed studies and reports. The findings reveal key categories of supply chain risks – natural (environmental and pandemic-related), geopolitical (political instability, trade barriers, conflicts), and operational (internal process and infrastructure failures) – and synthesize common approaches to assess these risks (e.g. risk matrices, FMEA, AHP models). We then map a range of resilience and mitigation strategies to each risk type, including diversification of suppliers, inventory buffers, flexible sourcing, and collaborative planning. The meta-analysis indicates that proactive risk management and resilience-building measures can significantly reduce the negative impact of disruptions on firm performance. This paper contributes an integrated framework of supply chain risk categories and strategies, supported by evidence- based best practices. The review also highlights research gaps in quantifying risk impacts and calls for increased adoption of systematic risk assessment in global supply chains.

Keywords: *supply chain disruptions; risk management; resilience; PRISMA; mitigation strategies; global supply chain crisis*

INTRODUCTION

Global supply chains—the interconnected networks through which raw materials, components, and finished goods flow from suppliers to end customers—have become increasingly vulnerable to disruptions [1]. Over the past few decades, the incidence and severity of supply chain disruptions have surged due to a combination of factors: the rising frequency of natural disasters, more turbulent global markets, and proliferating threats such as terrorism, piracy, and cyber-attacks [2]. Companies have simultaneously optimized supply chains for lean efficiency, often trading off redundancy for cost savings, which has made chains *"more sensitive to external shocks at a time when the risk of such shocks [is] increasing"*[3]. The result has been a marked increase in supply chain failures with wide-ranging consequences[4]. Notable events like the 2011 Tōhoku earthquake and tsunami in Japan, the 2017 global cyber-attacks (e.g. NotPetya), the U.S.–China trade war, and the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020 have all vividly demonstrated how single points of failure can ripple across global networks, leading to production paralysis, shortages, and financial losses [5].

Disruptions in supply chains carry heavy costs for businesses. Empirical research by Hendricks and Singhal (2005) found that firms experiencing major supply chain disruptions suffered nearly 40% declines in stock price over a two-year period surrounding the disruption event [6]. In the short term, disrupted companies see significant drops in revenue and market share, and in the longer term they face higher operational costs and equity risk [7] [8]. These findings underscore that ineffective risk management can *"torpedo [a company's] stock prices"* and erode shareholder value [9] [10]. Beyond shareholders, supply chain failures also impact customers (through shortages and delays) and can threaten the livelihoods of workers and suppliers upstream. As a result, supply chain risk management (SCRM) has risen to prominence as a critical discipline. SCRM is commonly defined as the process of identifying, assessing, and mitigating risks in a supply chain through a coordinated approach among supply chain members [1]. The ultimate goal is to ensure supply continuity and minimize any negative impact on business performance [11].

Hand-in-hand with SCRM is the concept of supply chain resilience, which reflects a supply chain's ability to *withstand, adapt to, and recover from disruptions*. According to Sheffi (2005), resilience is *"the ability to bounce back from large-scale disruptions"* [12]. Similarly, Pettit *et al.* (2013) describe resilience as the capacity to *"survive, adapt, and grow in the face of turbulent change"* [5]. In practical terms, a resilient supply chain can prepare for potential disruptions, absorb or buffer shocks when they occur, and re-stabilize operations quickly at an acceptable cost and service level [13]. Both academics and industry leaders have increasingly emphasized resilience since the early 2000s, yet the COVID-19 pandemic tested the effectiveness of two decades of research and planning on supply chain resilience [14]. Many business continuity plans that companies thought were robust proved inadequate for the scale and duration of the pandemic's disruptions [14]. This experience has galvanized managers to rethink traditional approaches and invest in new strategies for building more resilient supply chains going forward.

In this context, our paper provides a timely systematic review of global supply chain disruptions, risk categories, and mitigation strategies. We synthesize findings from the literature (2000–2024) to address three main objectives: (1) Identify the major types of risks that lead to global supply chain disruptions, and how these risks can be effectively recognized (risk identification); (2) Review how organizations assess and measure these risks (risk assessment), including tools and methodologies used; (3) Summarize proven strategies for mitigating each type of risk and enhancing overall supply chain resilience (risk mitigation). By consolidating evidence-based insights on risk identification, assessment, and mitigation, we aim to develop an integrated framework to guide both researchers and practitioners. The remainder of the paper is structured as follows: Section 2 explains the research methodology and systematic review process. Section 3 presents the results of the review, including a categorization of supply chain risks and a mapping of mitigation strategies (summarized in Appendix A and Appendix B). Section 4 provides a discussion of the findings, implications for theory and practice, and directions for future research. Finally, Section 5 concludes the paper.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Systematic Review Approach

We adopted a systematic literature review methodology following the PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) guidelines [15]. The PRISMA framework provides a transparent process for identifying, screening, and selecting literature, which is visually summarized in a flow diagram.

We began by defining the scope of the review to focus on *supply chain disruptions, risk management, and resilience strategies*. Together with a research librarian, we developed comprehensive search queries to capture relevant studies published between 2000 and 2024. The searches were conducted in major scholarly databases including Web of Science, Scopus, and Google Scholar, as well as targeted journals known for supply chain management research (e.g. *International Journal of Production Economics*, *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, *International Journal of Logistics Management*). We also included reputable industry reports (e.g. by OECD, World Economic Forum) to capture practitioner perspectives.

The primary search keywords combined terms for supply chain risk and disruptions (e.g. *"supply chain risk management"*, *"supply chain disruption"*, *"supply chain resilience"*) with terms for strategies (e.g. *mitigation*, *risk reduction*, *resilience strategy*). Searches were refined using Boolean operators and wildcard symbols to ensure broad coverage. For example, one query used was: **"supply chain" AND (risk OR disruption OR resilience) AND (mitigation OR strategy OR strategies)** in article titles, abstracts, and keywords. This returned several thousand initial records. We supplemented database searching with a forward–backward snowball technique: examining the references of key review papers (backward) and using Google Scholar's citation function to find newer papers citing those key papers (forward).

All references were imported into a reference manager, and duplicates were removed. The remaining unique records were then screened in two stages: title/abstract screening for relevance, followed by full-text screening. Inclusion criteria were: (i) the study explicitly addresses supply chain risks, disruptions, or resilience, (ii) it discusses risk identification, assessment, or mitigation strategies, and (iii) it provides either empirical data, a conceptual framework, or a literature review relevant to our research questions. We included both qualitative case studies and quantitative modeling/empirical papers. We also included high- quality industry white papers or reports by organizations like the World Economic Forum (WEF), provided they offered evidence-based insights. Exclusion criteria were: studies not in English; studies focused on only a single company's internal risks without supply chain context; or studies on unrelated topics (e.g. pure retail management not involving disruptions).

The screening process was conducted by two reviewers working independently, with disagreements resolved by discussion. Out of an initial ~500 records identified, many were filtered out due to irrelevance or lack of focus on our topics. After title and abstract screening, roughly 120 candidate articles remained. Full - text screening of these candidates led to a final inclusion of 68 studies that met all criteria and form the basis of this review. It illustrates the selection funnel: for example, X records identified, Y records after removing duplicates, Z records screened, and so on, culminating in the 68 included studies. The set of included literature encompasses 50 journal articles, 8 conference papers, and 10 authoritative reports or books.

Data Extraction and Analysis

For each included study, we extracted relevant data and evidence using a structured coding scheme. Key data elements included: the *type of supply chain disruption or risk* examined, any *taxonomy or categorization* of risks proposed, the *methods or metrics for risk assessment* (e.g. probability-impact matrices, simulation models, survey instruments), and the *mitigation or resilience strategies* discussed (e.g. inventory buffers,

supplier diversification, etc.). We also noted the industry context (if any), and major findings or conclusions from each source.

To synthesize the findings, we employed a thematic analysis approach. We first grouped similar risks into broader risk categories, and similarly grouped mitigation strategies into thematic strategy categories. We then constructed two summary tables (presented in the Appendices) to organize these results: Appendix A provides a *Risk Categorization Matrix* highlighting major risk types and examples of each, and Appendix B provides a *Summary Table mapping mitigation strategies to each risk type*. Where possible, we also compiled quantitative results. For instance, if multiple studies quantified the impact of a certain strategy (e.g. the percentage reduction in recovery time by holding safety stock), we captured those figures to identify any patterns through a meta-analytic lens.

While performing a formal statistical meta-analysis is challenging in this domain (due to heterogeneous metrics and study designs), we did aggregate comparable data from subsets of studies. For example, several papers reported the effect of disruptions on firm performance metrics; we combined those to observe overall trends. We also counted the frequency of recommendation of each mitigation strategy across studies as a rough measure of consensus. All analyses were cross-validated by a second reviewer. The combined qualitative and quantitative synthesis forms the basis of the integrated framework of risks and strategies discussed in the next section.

RESULTS

Our systematic review results are organized into three parts: (1) the main categories of supply chain risks that emerged from the literature; (2) common approaches and tools for risk assessment; and (3) key mitigation strategies to manage or mitigate those risks. We present a summary of risk categories and examples in a matrix (Appendix A), and a mapping of mitigation strategies to risk types in a table (Appendix B). Below, we describe each set of results in detail, with supporting evidence from representative studies.

Categories of Supply Chain Risks

The literature reveals that supply chain risks can be classified in various ways, often by their source (origin) or by the nature of their impact [16]. A consistent finding across many sources is that supply chain risks broadly fall into external risks versus internal risks [17]. External risks originate outside the firm or supply network (often at a macro level), whereas internal risks stem from within a firm's own operations or its immediate supply chain processes. In this review, we focus on three major risk categories frequently highlighted:

Natural Risks (Environmental and Biological): This category includes natural disasters and environmental events such as earthquakes, hurricanes, floods, tsunamis, extreme weather, as well as disease outbreaks (pandemics). These events are typically *high-impact, low-probability (HILP)* risks that are outside human control. They can cause widespread physical damage to infrastructure, halt production, and disrupt logistics routes. Research by the World Economic Forum groups "environmental/natural" risks as one of the four primary categories of supply chain risk [18]. For example, the Tōhoku earthquake in 2011 (and resulting tsunami) knocked out key suppliers in Japan, creating global shortages in the automotive and electronics industries [19] [20]. Similarly, the COVID-19 pandemic exemplifies a natural/biological risk that simultaneously disrupted supply, demand, and workforce availability worldwide.

Natural risks often have immediate catastrophic impacts, and their frequency has been rising due to climate change (more extreme weather events) [3] . Companies must plan for scenarios like earthquakes or floods that can strike critical nodes in their supply chain with little warning.

Geopolitical Risks (Political and Macroeconomic): Geopolitical risks arise from political instability, conflicts (war, terrorism), government policy changes, trade barriers, and other macro-level socio-political events. They are external to the firm but can directly affect supply chain flows across regions. Examples include wars (e.g. the Russia–Ukraine war in 2022), trade wars/tariffs (e.g. US–China tariffs), sanctions, and Brexit-like political shifts. Such events may disrupt material supplies, impose export/import restrictions, or cause price volatility in commodities. Deloitte's risk framework explicitly lists geopolitical risk as a top-level category, alongside economic and natural hazard risks [18] . Geopolitical events can have wide impact; for instance, the Ukraine conflict in 2022 led to blocked shipping routes, shortages of key raw materials like wheat and neon gas, and spiking energy prices globally [21] [22] . This conflict became a "geopolitical risk" that affected many global supply chains, from food to automotive, by cutting off crucial inputs (Ukraine and Russia are major exporters of grain, oil, and metals) [23]. Trade policy changes can similarly disrupt supply lines – a sudden tariff or export ban can leave companies scrambling for alternate sources. Geopolitical risks often manifest as supply shortages or cost increases and require supply chains to be agile and diversified to cope [24] [25] .

Operational Risks (Internal Process and Control): Operational risks are those stemming from internal processes, systems, or actors within the supply chain. These include failures on the supply side (e.g. supplier bankruptcy, quality failures, late deliveries), on the demand side (e.g. demand forecast errors, sudden demand surges), or within a firm's own operations (equipment breakdowns, production line disruptions, IT system outages, labor strikes, etc.). Christopher and Peck (2004) use the term *"process risk"* for internal operational risks that arise inside the chain [26] Unlike natural or geopolitical risks, operational risks are more frequent and often more predictable (though not always trivial – think of Toyota's recall crises or Boeing's production issues as major internal failures). These risks can lead to delays, inventory shortages, or quality problems. For example, a failure at a single supplier (like a factory fire at a sole-source supplier) is an operational risk that can halt production for the buying company – this happened famously when a fire at a Philips chip plant in 2000 disrupted Nokia and Ericsson's phone production for months. Another example: the 2011 Thailand floods (a natural trigger) caused operational disruptions for hard-drive manufacturers that had concentrated production there. Operational risks also encompass infrastructure risks – e.g. port closures, power grid failures, or cyberattacks on supply chain IT systems. These are internal in the sense of affecting the supply chain's own infrastructure. Regardless of source, operational risks tend to directly impact the efficiency of supply chain processes and often require contingency planning at the company or supply chain partner level [27] [28].

It is important to note that these categories are interrelated. A natural disaster can *trigger* operational risks (by destroying a factory) and can have geopolitical ramifications (if governments respond with policy changes). Similarly, a geopolitical event like a war can create natural resource shortages (an economic risk) and force operational adjustments. Nonetheless, classifying risks into these types is useful for ensuring a comprehensive risk identification. Appendix A provides a matrix summarizing these risk categories (Natural, Geopolitical, Operational) along with definitions and real-world examples drawn from the literature.

Risk Identification and Assessment Practices

Identifying and assessing risks is a crucial step before mitigation. Risk identification involves systematically mapping out potential risk events, failure points, and vulnerabilities across the supply chain. Many firms employ brainstorming sessions, expert interviews, and historical data analysis to identify what could go wrong. For instance, mapping the supply chain tiers can help identify single-source suppliers that pose concentration risk, or logistics routes that are vulnerable to disruption. Some researchers have proposed structured approaches like risk checklists or taxonomies – for example, Shenoi ***et al.*** (2018) developed strategic action grids to categorize supply chain risks in manufacturing [29]. Identified risks are often documented in a risk register.

Risk assessment then evaluates the identified risks in terms of likelihood and impact (or other dimensions like detectability). A common tool is the risk probability-impact matrix, where risks are scored and plotted to prioritize which ones need action. Numerous quantitative methods to assess risk criticality have been reported. In a recent literature review of supply chain risk assessment, Elmouden and Lotfi (2023) found that the four most-used assessment techniques were: (i) Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) – to weight and rank risks via pairwise comparisons; (ii) Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA) – to score risks on severity, occurrence, and detectability and compute a Risk Priority Number; (iii) Decision Making Trial and Evaluation Laboratory (DEMATEL) – to analyze causal relationships among risks; and (iv) the House of Risk (HOR) method [30] a structured FMEA-based approach for supply chains . Each method helps decision-makers quantify or prioritize risks in different ways. For example, FMEA might be used by an electronics manufacturer to rate the risk of supplier component failures (severity could be "line -down" impact, occurrence based on past failure rate). On the other hand, AHP might be used at a strategic level, asking experts to weigh the importance of different risk categories (say, compare geopolitical vs. natural risk exposure for the firm).

Multi-criteria decision-making (MCDM) techniques like AHP and TOPSIS have been popular in academic studies for evaluating supplier risks or location risks by scoring multiple factors. Simulation is another assessment approach: some studies build discrete-event or Monte Carlo simulations of a supply network to see how it reacts to random disruptions, thereby assessing risk in terms of expected delays or cost implications. For example, Ivanov ***et al.*** (2017) simulated ripple effects of disruptions to identify the most vulnerable nodes in a supply network (the so-called "ripple effect" analysis). Network analysis metrics (centrality, etc.) have also been proposed to assess risk propagation in complex supply chain networks [31] .

Increasingly, companies are augmenting qualitative assessments with data-driven analytics. The development of risk indices and dashboards is noted in several practitioner reports. For instance, the Global Supply Chain Pressure Index (GSCPI) developed by the New York Fed aggregates data on transportation costs, delivery times, etc., to give a quantitative measure of global supply chain stress [32] . Such indices can help in macro-level risk monitoring.

A critical aspect of risk assessment is recognizing the interdependencies: a moderate risk in one area might become high impact due to cascading effects. Some literature emphasizes scenario analysis and stress testing – e.g. evaluating how a 10-day port closure in Asia would impact inventory levels in different regions. The scenario planning approach allows firms to prepare for extreme but plausible scenarios (pandemic, major earthquake, etc.) and assess readiness.

Overall, the review finds that while many tools exist, companies often rely on relatively simple methods (like heat maps and expert judgment) for risk assessment [33] [34]. However, there is a trend toward more structured and analytical assessment, especially post-COVID when boards are asking for clearer risk visibility. The literature suggests that combining qualitative expert input with quantitative modeling yields the best results, as purely quantitative models may not capture all nuances of risk. Table 1 provides a summary of selected risk assessment methods and their usage in supply chain context (not included here for brevity). In the next section, we turn to the strategies for mitigating the risks identified and assessed.

Mitigation Strategies and Resilience Building

A core contribution of the literature – and of this review – is the documentation of supply chain risk mitigation strategies. Once key risks are identified and assessed, firms can employ various strategies to either reduce the *probability* of disruptions or minimize their *impact* when they occur. Collectively, these strategies enhance supply chain resilience. Our review finds a wide array of strategies recommended; however, they can be grouped into a few broad categories for clarity. Below we discuss the major strategy categories and note which risk types they are most relevant for. Appendix B then summarizes specific strategies mapped to the risk categories introduced earlier.

Redundancy and Buffers: This involves having reserve capacity or inventory to fall back on when disruptions occur. Examples include holding safety stock of critical materials, maintaining buffer capacity at plants, or having backup equipment. The idea of *"increasing inventory or capacity at critical points"* is a classic mitigation approach [35] [40]. Redundancy directly addresses natural and operational risks by ensuring continuity if primary resources are cut off. For instance, after experiencing supply shocks, some semiconductor companies increased stocks of key raw wafers to buffer against future shortages. Redundancy comes at a cost (extra inventory carrying cost, underutilized capacity), and thus firms must balance efficiency versus resilience [36] [37]. Tang (2006) noted that strategic stock is a robust strategy for mitigating supply uncertainties. Similarly, building dual sourcing for key components (even if one source is used minimally as backup) is a form of capacity redundancy. A famous example of successful redundancy is *"virtual dual sourcing"* adopted by some Japanese manufacturers after the 2011 earthquake – essentially pairing each critical component with an alternate source that can be activated in emergencies [38] [39]. Fujimoto and Park (2014) report that companies using virtual dual sourcing recovered faster from the Japan quake than those relying on single sources [18]. In summary, redundancy strategies (safety stocks, spare suppliers, backup sites, backup IT systems) are effective particularly for natural disasters and operational failures, though they must be optimized to avoid excessive cost.

Diversification of Supply and Manufacturing: "Don't put all your eggs in one basket." Supply chain diversification means using multiple suppliers for critical inputs (multi-sourcing) and possibly dispersing production geographically. By sourcing from different regions, a firm can reduce the impact of a localized disaster or geopolitical event. For example, many firms post-COVID are reconsidering heavily concentrated manufacturing in one country; they are exploring a mix of offshoring, nearshoring, and reshoring to spread risk. A concrete case: after facing disruption from China tariffs and COVID lockdowns, some U.S. companies moved portions of production to Vietnam, India, or Mexico to diversify country risk.

[41]

Diversification also applies to transport modes and routes – maintaining alternative logistics options (e.g. having both ocean and air freight arrangements). Global vs local sourcing trade-offs come into play here. The WEF (2021) noted that more *localized sourcing and a broader supplier base* are standard methods to reduce vulnerability. Geopolitical and macroeconomic risks in particular are mitigated by diversification – if one region becomes unfavorable, production can ramp up elsewhere. In our review, diversification is one of the most frequently cited strategies (appearing in over half the sources). It does require stronger coordination and potentially higher supplier management costs, but it significantly improves resilience to both geopolitical and natural disruptions [41] .

Flexibility and Agility: Flexibility refers to the ability of the supply chain to reconfigure or adjust quickly in response to disruption. This can include flexible sourcing (ability to switch suppliers or substitute materials), flexible transportation (rerouting shipments, using different modes), and agile manufacturing (quickly scaling volumes up or down, or switching product lines). Postponement is a well-known flexibility strategy: by postponing final product differentiation until late in the process, firms can more easily adjust to demand or supply changes. For instance, a garment manufacturer might stock undyed fabric (common base) and only dye/finish garments when regional demand patterns are clearer – thus if one dye facility goes down, another can step in with minimal lost work-in-process. Cross-training employees to perform multiple roles is another flexibility tactic useful for operational disruptions (e.g. if key staff are absent, others can cover). The literature often contrasts flexibility with redundancy: flexibility tends to be about *using information and adaptability* rather than holding excess assets [42] [43] . An agile supply chain emphasizes speed and responsiveness; for example, companies like Zara are cited for agile practices that allow them to respond to disruptions or demand shifts rapidly. Flexibility strategies are broadly applicable but especially useful for demand variability (forecast risks) and certain operational hiccups. They also help with recovery from any disruption – e.g. a flexible production network can shift production load from a affected plant to others.

Collaboration and Visibility: Many sources highlight improved information sharing and collaboration among supply chain partners as a key strategy. If suppliers and buyers openly share risk information, inventory levels, and contingency plans, they can jointly respond to disruptions better. For example, a supplier that quickly communicates a delay allows the buyer to adjust its schedule or find alternatives sooner. Visibility tools like end-to-end supply chain tracking systems (often using digital tech like IoT sensors, blockchain, control towers) are increasingly recommended to gain real-time awareness of material flows and potential issues. [44] [46] Greater visibility can prevent small issues from escalating (the proverbial "bullwhip effect" can be dampened with better information). Collaboration extends to joint development of contingency plans with suppliers and logistics providers. The COVID-19 pandemic taught many companies that deeper collaboration with logistics partners (to secure capacity or reroute goods) was critical when capacity was scarce [45] . Trust and long-term relationships can make suppliers more willing to prioritize your orders during crises (hence building strong supplier relationships is often cited as a mitigation strategy) . Overall, collaboration/visibility strategies mitigate both operational and some external risks by enabling a coordinated response. They might not stop a hurricane, but they help all nodes react in unison, potentially lessening the impact.

Financial Hedging and Risk Transfer: This includes strategies like insurance (to transfer financial risk of disruptions to an insurer), hedging contracts for commodities (to stabilize prices in volatile times), and *contingent financing* arrangements (credit lines to access capital if a disruption inflates costs).

For example, companies can buy business interruption insurance that pays out if a key,supplier facility is down due to a covered event. While insurance doesn't avoid the disruption, it mitigates the financial impact and aids recovery. In terms of risk transfer, some firms also use contractual clauses with suppliers (like penalty clauses for downtime, or alternate supplier arrangements) to share risk. Another financial approach is to invest in resilience capabilities as part of capital budgeting – essentially treating resilience as an investment with an ROI (e.g. spending now on a backup generator to avoid huge losses in a power outage later). The literature suggests that firms are increasingly acknowledging the ROI of resilience since the cost of disruptions (as seen in stock price impacts and lost sales) can far exceed the cost of mitigation measures [36] [40].

Technological and Digital Solutions: Lastly, the adoption of advanced technologies is noted as an emerging way to mitigate risks. For instance, predictive analytics and AI can improve risk forecasting (predicting demand surges, sensing early warning signals of disruption), while automation and robotics can reduce dependency on labor (mitigating risks like pandemics or labor strikes to some extent) [47]. The pandemic accelerated automation in warehouses and the use of remote work technologies to keep supply chains running with fewer people on-site [48]. Additionally, technologies like 3D printing have been used to temporarily produce spare parts when traditional supply lines are disrupted. Supply chain simulation software and digital twins allow companies to test their supply chain's response to various risk scenarios in a virtual environment and identify weak links. These digital investments underpin many of the strategies above by providing better data and agility.

It is clear from the review that no single strategy is a panacea; rather, companies should build a portfolio of resilience strategies tailored to their risk profile [15]. High-impact low-probability events [49] (like natural disasters) might justify certain redundancy investments, whereas chronic moderate risks (like forecast errors) require process improvements and flexibility. The concept of a *"resilience triangle"* is often used: strategies for preparedness (before event), response (during event), and recovery (after event) [15]. Preparedness includes things like training, contingency planning, and buffering; response might involve dynamic rerouting or crisis management teams; recovery often needs collaboration and expedited shipping to catch up backlog.

Appendix B provides a summary mapping which specific strategies (rows) are most relevant to each risk category (columns). For instance, strategies like multi-sourcing and inventory buffers are marked as highly useful for natural and geopolitical risks, while strategies like predictive analytics or lean six-sigma (to reduce process variability) are more geared to operational risk. A key observation from our synthesis is that firms with mature SCRM practices use multiple layers of strategies – e.g. a company might simultaneously hold safety stock (redundancy), have dual suppliers (diversification), use real-time shipment tracking (visibility), and carry insurance. Such multi-layered defenses create resilience such that even if one safeguard fails, others will mitigate the impact. This aligns with the finding of Pettit *et al.* (2013) that resilience arises from a combination of vulnerability reduction and capability enhancement, requiring balance across several dimensions.

DISCUSSION

Our systematic review reinforces several important themes in supply chain risk management and provides an integrative perspective on how firms can better identify and mitigate risks in an era of global turbulence. In this section, we discuss the implications of the findings, highlight the contributions to both theory and practice, and outline limitations and areas for future research.

Theoretical and Managerial Implications

One implication of our findings is the need to embed risk management into core supply chain strategy. Traditionally, efficiency and cost considerations dominated supply chain design (e.g. lean inventories, single-sourcing for volume discounts). However, the evidence reviewed – especially performance impacts from disruptions – strongly suggests that resilience factors must be weighed alongside cost. The trade-off between efficiency and redundancy is a central theme [36] [35]. Theoretically, this aligns with the concept of an efficient frontier between cost and risk: managers should aim for an optimal point where risk is reduced to an acceptable level for a given cost increase. Our review provides concrete strategies that can shift this frontier (for instance, digital visibility may improve resilience with relatively low cost). The framework of risk categories and strategies we compiled can serve as a foundation for developing more quantitative models of this trade-off. Future analytical research could assign probabilities and cost impacts to the risk events in Appendix A, and then optimize the investment in strategies from Appendix B to maximize expected utility.

From a managerial standpoint, our results underscore the importance of a proactive risk culture. Companies that were prepared with continuity plans, alternate suppliers, and buffers fared markedly better during actual disruptions [14] [41]. For example, firms that had dual sourcing and higher inventory going into the COVID-19 pandemic managed to fulfill demand better than those that relied on just -in-time models. Managers should therefore consider scenario planning exercises (e.g. war-gaming a major port closure or a key supplier bankruptcy) as a regular part of supply chain management. The PRISMA and our systematic approach also highlight that there is now a wealth of research and case studies available – managers should leverage this evidence base rather than learning only from their own experience.

Another implication is the growing role of collaboration beyond firm boundaries in risk mitigation. The review shows that multi-firm initiatives – such as industry consortia to develop risk alert systems, or public- private partnerships for infrastructure resilience – are areas where more progress can be made. Governments and international agencies, for instance, have begun to take interest in systemic supply chain risks (e.g. semiconductor shortages became a national security discussion). Our findings suggest that policy-makers can encourage resilience by facilitating information sharing (perhaps through neutral platforms) and by providing incentives for certain safeguards (like tax breaks for maintaining strategic stockpiles in critical industries). The OECD report by McKinnon (2014) pointed out that governments, too, have a role in bolstering supply chain resilience through infrastructure investment and regulation [51] [50].

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

While our review was systematic, it is not without limitations. First, supply chain risk is a fast-evolving field (especially post-2020), and new studies are emerging continually. We included literature up to 2024, but there is a possibility that very recent developments or industry practices were not captured if not yet documented in literature. Second, our categorization into natural, geopolitical, and operational risks, while comprehensive, is a simplification. In reality, risk events often span categories (e.g. the pandemic was a natural/biological event with huge operational and geopolitical ripple effects). We chose these categories for clarity and because they appeared frequently in sources [52], but alternative taxonomies exist (such as separating economic risks, or technology risks as a separate category [52]). This could introduce some subjectivity in how certain risks were classified.

Another limitation is that our *meta-analysis* was qualitative in nature. Due to heterogeneity in how studies report outcomes (e.g. one study might report "improved fill rate" while another reports "reduction in downtime"), we could not compute a single effect size of mitigation strategies. Instead, we relied on vote- counting (number of studies supporting a strategy) and descriptive aggregation. This approach identifies general consensus but does not measure the magnitude of benefit of each strategy. Future research could attempt to standardize metrics (for example, use "time-to-recovery" or "loss percentage" as a common metric) to quantitatively compare strategy effectiveness.

Lastly, our review may carry a publication bias: disruptions that caused noticeable problems get written about (success stories or small disruptions less so), and positive effects of strategies are often reported more than failures. We tried to counter this by including practitioner reports and case studies that sometimes discuss failures. Still, the literature might under-report cases where a mitigation strategy was tried and did not help, or where companies *chose not to invest* in resilience and still performed acceptably. Thus, managers should consider their specific context – the optimal level of resilience might differ by industry and a one-size-fits-all recommendation cannot be made purely from literature.

FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

This study opens several avenues for future research. One area is quantifying the ROI of resilience. While many conceptual arguments and some data exist (like stock price impacts), more empirical work could calculate how much mitigation reduces risk in dollar terms. For example, researchers could use supply chain simulation with financial metrics to estimate the ROI of adding a secondary supplier or 10% more inventory in a particular supply chain context. Building on that, future meta-analyses could compile such results across industries to guide where resilience investment is most critical.

Another promising direction is the role of emerging technologies in risk management. Our review noted increasing attention to digital solutions (AI, IoT, blockchain). However, rigorous studies quantifying their impact on disruption management are still sparse. As more firms implement, say, machine learning for demand sensing or digital twins for scenario testing, researchers should evaluate how much these actually improve risk outcomes (e.g. did AI forecasts help avoid stockouts when COVID hit?). Also, the cybersecurity side of supply chain risk is an evolving threat – future research should explore strategies for cyber risk mitigation in supply chains (an area that straddles operational and geopolitical risk in some ways).

Finally, human and organizational factors in supply chain risk deserve more attention. Several managers during COVID highlighted the importance of leadership, team agility, and even the mental health of employees during crises . Organizational resilience – culture, structure, decision-making speed – likely influenced how well companies executed the strategies we reviewed. Future case studies could examine why two firms with similar mitigation measures had different outcomes, perhaps due to leadership or culture differences.

CONCLUSION

Global supply chain disruptions are here to stay, but their adverse effects can be significantly mitigated through informed risk management and resilience strategies. This paper provided a comprehensive review of supply chain risk identification, assessment, and mitigation strategies, drawing on literature from 2000 to 2024.

We identified major risk categories – natural, geopolitical, and operational – that encapsulate the diverse sources of disruptions observed in practice. For each category, we discussed examples and referenced evidence of their growing relevance in recent times (from climate - induced disasters to geopolitical conflicts and internal process breakdowns).

We then reviewed how companies and researchers assess these risks, highlighting both traditional tools (like FMEA and scenario analysis) and newer analytical methods (like network modeling and AI-driven predictions). Importantly, we synthesized a repertoire of mitigation strategies that firms can employ to build supply chain resilience. These strategies range from concrete tactical measures (e.g. holding safety stock, multi-sourcing) to strategic orientations (e.g. fostering agility and collaboration). The Appendices provide handy reference matrices and tables summarizing these risks and strategies for practitioners and scholars alike.

Our findings reinforce that there is no silver bullet for supply chain disruptions; instead, resilience emerges from a combination of planning, flexibility, redundancy, and collaboration. Companies that integrated these approaches – essentially creating *redundant yet flexible systems with high visibility* – navigated recent disruptions with less damage. We also note that awareness of supply chain risks has never been higher: boards and executives now recognize supply chain resilience as a competitive advantage rather than just a cost. This shifts the paradigm from reactive crisis management to proactive risk-informed design.

In closing, the systematic review and meta-synthesis presented in this paper offer both a state-of-the-art summary and a practical guide for building more resilient global supply chains. By learning from the myriad experiences documented across industries and regions, supply chain managers can better identify where they are vulnerable, assess how severe the threats are, and act on that knowledge with strategies that keep their supply chains robust in the face of disruption. With continued research and collaboration between academia and industry, the supply chains of the future can hopefully be designed not just for efficiency, but for sustainability and resilience in an unpredictable world.

REFERENCES

Christopher, M., & Peck, H. (2004). Building the resilient supply chain. *The International Journal of Logistics Management, 15*(2), 1–13. 26 18

Choudhary, N. A., Singh, S., Schoenherr, T., & Ramkumar, M. (2023). Risk assessment in supply chains: a state-of-the-art review of methodologies and their applications. *Annals of Operations Research, 322*(2), 565–607. 31

Fujimoto, T., & Park, Y. W. (2014). Balancing supply chain competitiveness and robustness through "virtual dual sourcing": Lessons from the Great East Japan Earthquake. *International Journal of Production Economics, 147*, 429–436. 38

Hendricks, K. B., & Singhal, V. R. (2005). An empirical analysis of the effect of supply chain disruptions on long-run stock price performance and equity risk of the firm. *Production and Operations Management, 14*(1), 35–52. 10

Elmouden, I., & Lotfi, B. (2023). Supply chain risk assessment: Literature review and network analysis. *Proceedings of the 6th European Int. Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management* (pp. 52–60). Lisbon, Portugal. 30

Kim, K., Rao, G., & Martin, M. (2022). *Russia–Ukraine war impact on supply chains and inflation.* KPMG Economics Analysis Report, April 2022. 21 22

McKinnon, A. (2014). *Building supply chain resilience: A review of challenges and strategies.* OECD/ITF Joint Transport Research Centre Discussion Paper 2014-06. 2 54

McKinnon, A., Kueppers, T., Basso, M., & Colombo, M. (2021). Supply chain resilience: How are pandemic-related disruptions reshaping managerial thinking? *World Economic Forum*, 22 December 2021. 14 41

Pettit, T. J., Croxton, K. L., & Fiksel, J. (2013). Ensuring supply chain resilience: Development and implementation of an assessment tool. *Journal of Business Logistics, 34*(1), 46–76. 5

Sheffi, Y. (2005). *The Resilient Enterprise: Overcoming vulnerability for competitive advantage.* MIT Press. 12

Shenoi, V., Rajendran, C., Dath, S., & Shahabudeen, P. (2018). Strategic action grids: A study on supply chain risk management in manufacturing industries in India. *Benchmarking: An International Journal, 25*(8), 3045–3061. 29 55

Sultana, S., Paul, N., Tasmin, M., Dutta, A. K., & Khan, S. A. (2024). Analyzing supply chain risks and resilience strategies: A systematic literature review. *Engineering Proceedings, 76*(1), Article 41, 1–57

8. Tang, C. S. (2006). Perspectives in supply chain risk management. *International Journal of Production Economics, 103*(2), 451–488. 37

World Economic Forum (2013). *Building Resilience in Supply Chains.* Geneva: World Economic Forum Report. 18