pISSN:2349-5707 Volume:12, Issue 10, Octobar-2025 eISSN:2349-5715

Resilient Recovery and Strategic Adaptation in Semiconductor Supply Chains: Integrating Inventory Policies, Multi-Sourcing, and Policy Interventions to Mitigate Disruptions

Dr. Elena Rossi
Department of Operations Management, University of Milan

ABSTRACT This article presents a comprehensive, theory-driven synthesis and original conceptual development addressing resilient recovery and strategic adaptation in semiconductor supply chains. Building strictly on the supplied references, it examines the multi-layered nature of semiconductor vulnerability, the inventory and sourcing policies that influence recovery speed, the role of financial incentives and penalties in restoring flows, and the potential for technological and policy interventions—including reshoring and blockchain—to alter resilience trajectories. The article develops a unified narrative linking classical inventory theory and disruption recovery models with contemporary empirical findings about industry fragility and policy responses. Key contributions include: an articulation of how classical base-stock and emergency replenishment logic combine with modern multi-sourcing and lateral transshipment practices to create robust portfolios of mitigation options; a detailed conceptual taxonomy categorizing mitigation levers into operational, contractual, and policy sets; and an integrative discussion on trade-offs between resilience, cost, and lead-time that encompasses financial assistance instruments and penalty regimes. The methodological approach synthesizes survey and empirical literature, policy reports, and theoretical models into an interpretive framework for managers and policymakers, explicating when particular interventions are likely to be effective. The article concludes with actionable managerial recommendations, policy propositions for strengthening national semiconductor capacity, and an agenda for future empirical research that can validate and refine the conceptual claims. Throughout, claims and arguments are grounded in the referenced literature to ensure fidelity to the empirical and theoretical bases provided.

Keywords: Semiconductor supply chains; resilience; inventory policy; multi-sourcing; reshoring; financial incentives; lateral transshipments

INTRODUCTION

The semiconductor industry sits at the core of modern digital economies and is simultaneously one of the most globally interconnected and operationally delicate manufacturing sectors (SIA, 2020; SIA, 2021). Disruptions in semiconductor supply chains—whether caused by pandemics, capacity constraints, natural disasters, or geopolitical realignments—have cascading consequences across automotive manufacturing, consumer electronics, cloud infrastructure, and national defense supply networks (Siegler, 2021; The White House, 2021). The COVID-19 pandemic and subsequent shortages illuminated how systemic exposure arises from tight coupling of demand surges, thin inventories, specialized production capabilities, and concentrated manufacturing footprints (Simon, 2021; Wagner & Bode, 2006). This context motivates an integrative examination of recovery mechanisms and strategic adaptations specifically tailored to semiconductor supply chains.

Classical inventory and production scheduling theory provides foundational concepts for managing expected variability and certain types of supply interruptions, but these frameworks often require extension to encompass extreme, low-probability high-impact events and the multidimensional policy responses they trigger (Gallego, 1994; Uzsoy et al., 2018). For example, while base-stock policies articulate when to replenish to stabilize cyclic schedules under normal variability (Gallego, 1994), modern disruptions challenge these policies by introducing prolonged capacity shortages, abrupt capacity losses, and sudden demand realignments, thereby necessitating emergency replenishment options, partial backordering accommodations, and risk-sensitive decision rules (Li & Ou, 2020; Li et al., 2016).

Beyond pure inventory rules, the strategic architecture of sourcing—especially multi-sourcing, lateral transshipments, and contract designs that include penalties or financial assistance—plays a crucial role in how quickly and equitably supply chain networks recover (Firouz et al., 2017; Li et al., 2016). Research has shown that lateral transshipments between geographically close facilities and multi-sourced portfolios can reduce local stockouts and expedite recovery, but these mechanisms also induce coordination costs and require carefully designed contracts and information systems (Firouz et al., 2017; Uzsoy et al., 2018). Financially, the interplay between penalties for nonperformance and targeted assistance can alter supplier behaviors during recovery periods; penalty regimes may incentivize performance but also exacerbate fragility if suppliers lack liquidity to respond, whereas financial assistance can accelerate recovery but raises moral hazard concerns and imposes public finance trade-offs (Li et al., 2016; The White House, 2021).

The contemporary policy discourse on semiconductor resilience further introduces system-level interventions such as reshoring of critical production capabilities and public subsidies for domestic capacity expansion (Lulla, 2025; The White House, 2021). These interventions are not panaceas; reshoring involves capital intensity, lead times, and knowledge transfer obstacles that complicate short-term recovery while potentially offering longer-term supply security (Lulla, 2025; SIA, 2021). Moreover, novel technological interventions—such as distributed ledger technologies to improve visibility and contractual enforcement—have been proposed as accelerants to recovery and coordination, though their effectiveness depends on realistic implementation pathways and network adoption thresholds (Manupati et al., 2022).

Despite the proliferating literature on individual elements—inventory models, sourcing strategies, penalty and assistance frameworks, and policy interventions—there is a discernible gap in integrative frameworks that synthesize these strands specifically for semiconductor supply chains. Existing surveys catalog models and practices (Uzsoy et al., 2018), case analyses document pandemic impacts and policy responses (Siegler, 2021; The White House, 2021), and theoretical work offers targeted prescriptions for inventory and replenishment rules (Gallego, 1994; Li & Ou, 2020). What remains underdeveloped is a unified conceptual architecture that prescribes when and how combinations of operational tactics, contractual mechanisms, and policy instruments should be deployed across the temporal phases of disruption—pre-disruption preparation, acute disruption response, recovery, and post-recovery adaptation.

This article addresses that gap by synthesizing the provided literature into a detailed conceptual framework for resilient recovery in semiconductor supply chains. It explicates the theoretical underpinnings linking inventory policies, multi-sourcing strategies, lateral transshipment practices, and financial mechanisms; evaluates the trade-offs inherent in reshoring decisions; and articulates a set of operational and policy recommendations grounded in the referenced empirical and theoretical evidence. By doing so, it provides an evidence-anchored roadmap for managers and policymakers to prioritize interventions that are coherent with the unique technical and economic characteristics of semiconductor production and distribution.

METHODOLOGY

Given the strict restriction to the provided references, the methodological approach of this article is interpretive synthesis anchored in theory-driven conceptual integration. The methodology proceeds through four interlocking analytic activities: systematic reference synthesis, theoretical alignment, scenario-based conceptual modeling, and prescriptive translation.

Systematic reference synthesis begins with a structured reading of each provided source to extract core findings, theoretical propositions, empirical observations, and policy recommendations. Survey and review literature, such as that by Uzsoy et al. (2018), is mined for classifications of model types—distinguishing demand planning, inventory management, and capacity planning models—and for summaries of typical modeling assumptions in semiconductor contexts (Uzsoy et al., 2018). Policy reports and industry overviews (SIA, 2020; SIA, 2021; The White House, 2021; Siegler, 2021) are analyzed for descriptive statistics, policy initiatives, and observed industry responses to disruption. Theoretical and analytical studies (Gallego, 1994; Li et al., 2016; Li & Ou, 2020; Firouz et al., 2017) are examined to identify mechanisms—such as base-stock optimality conditions, penalty/assistance effects on supplier incentives, complementary component ordering, and multi-sourcing with lateral transshipments—that can be composed within a broader recovery framework.

Theoretical alignment maps the extracted mechanisms to canonical operations research concepts. For instance, base-stock policies and their conditions for optimality (Gallego, 1994) are aligned with modern replenishment thinking under disruption. Models dealing with penalty and financial assistance (Li et al., 2016) are juxtaposed with multi-sourcing and lateral transshipment analyses (Firouz et al., 2017) to examine incentive compatibility and coordination implications. Studies on risk measures and backordering (Li & Ou, 2020) provide the risk-sensitive lens necessary to assess recovery policies in the presence of tail risk. The integration also uses supply chain vulnerability and resilience scholarship (Wagner & Bode, 2006; Wieland & Durach, 2021) to situate operational measures within strategic resilience perspectives.

Scenario-based conceptual modeling constructs a small set of stylized disruption scenarios—each consistent with the types of events documented in the industry sources (e.g., pandemic-induced capacity halts, supplier insolvency due to demand collapse, natural disaster-induced facility loss, and geopolitical embargoes). For each scenario, the model identifies plausible sequences of operational failures and recovery actions, the timing of decisions, and the relative efficacy of candidate mitigation levers. This approach does not rely on new empirical data or simulation runs; rather, it produces richly detailed narrative models that specify the causal chains and decision dependencies highlighted in the referenced literature.

Prescriptive translation transforms scenario insights into managerial and policy recommendations. These recommendations are evaluated against the trade-off criteria derived from the literature: cost versus resilience, short-term recovery speed versus long-term structural security, and private incentives versus public interest. The prescriptive section thus synthesizes operational tactics (inventory and transshipment rules), contractual instruments (penalties, financial assistance), and policy measures (reshoring incentives, public capacity investments) into a coherent decision framework for different actor roles—component buyers, Tier-1 integrators, foundries, and policymakers.

Throughout the methodology, adherence to the supplied reference corpus is strict: no external empirical sources, datasets, or theoretical papers are introduced beyond the listed works. Interpretations and conceptual developments are consistently linked to specific references to ensure traceability of claims and to honor the constraint of basing the analysis strictly on the provided material.

RESULTS

This results section organizes synthesized findings along three principal dimensions: (1) structural vulnerabilities and observed impacts in the semiconductor ecosystem; (2) operational and contractual recovery levers and their conditional effectiveness; and (3) policy and strategic interventions, including reshoring and technological coordination tools. Each dimension synthesizes insights across the references and elaborates the nuanced interactions between levers.

Structural vulnerabilities and observed impacts

The semiconductor industry's structural vulnerabilities stem from concentrated manufacturing capacity, long and specialized production lead times, and the criticality of particular process technologies (SIA, 2020; SIA, 2021). Industry reports document that key process nodes and foundry capacity are geographically concentrated, with complex dependencies linking design houses, wafer fabrication facilities, and downstream assembly and test providers (Siegler, 2021; SIA, 2021). These characteristics make substitutes scarce and recovery protracted when capacity is lost or redirected.

Empirical observations from the pandemic period underscore how systemic fragility manifests: sudden demand shape changes (e.g., surges in consumer electronics and declines in automotive demand) combined with intermittent factory shutdowns and logistics constraints produced widespread shortages and extended lead times (Simon, 2021; The White House, 2021). The White House (2021) explicitly links resilience failures to both inadequate supply visibility and insufficient domestic capacity buffers, thereby identifying both operational and strategic root causes of observed supply shortages.

Supply chain vulnerability research provides a theoretical lens for these dynamics by emphasizing network topology and the positioning of critical nodes (Wagner & Bode, 2006). When critical suppliers are central and lack redundancy, localized failures propagate broadly. Wieland and Durach (2021) further refine resilience thinking by distinguishing between the risk management perspective (reducing vulnerability) and the resilience perspective (improving recovery capability), a distinction that is especially salient for semiconductor supply chains where prevention and recovery both matter.

Operational and contractual recovery levers

Inventory policies and replenishment rules: Classical inventory theory indicates conditions for the optimality of base-stock policies in recovering disrupted cyclic schedules, emphasizing inventory positioning and replenishment cadence (Gallego, 1994). Gallego’s conditions help explain why firms that maintained strategic buffer inventories or flexible replenishment plans fared better in mitigating early shortage impacts; yet, such policies have cost implications in industries with high obsolescence risk and capital intensity typical of semiconductors (SIA, 2020).

Emergency replenishment and partial backordering: Where normal replenishment fails, emergency replenishment strategies and partial backordering arrangements provide alternative mechanisms to allocate scarce supply during recovery (Li & Ou, 2020). Li and Ou (2020) introduce risk-aware ordering policies under spectral risk measures and show that such policies, combined with emergency replenishment, can optimize ordering for complementary components subject to partial backordering, thereby offering a risk-sensitive mechanism to prioritize critical flows during disruptions.

Multi-sourcing and lateral transshipments: Multi-sourcing spreads supplier risk across multiple providers, while lateral transshipments allow inventory sharing among nodes to reduce localized stockouts (Firouz et al., 2017). Firouz et al. (2017) demonstrate that an integrated supplier selection and inventory problem that incorporates multi-sourcing and lateral transshipments leads to lower expected shortages and higher service levels under many scenarios; however, they also point to the managerial complexity and coordination costs associated with such arrangements.

Penalty regimes and financial assistance: Li et al. (2016) examine how penalty provisions for nonperformance and financial assistance packages affect supplier behavior in disrupted supply chains. They find that carefully calibrated penalties can ensure contractual performance incentives, but when suppliers face liquidity constraints, penalties may be counterproductive—deterring investment in recovery or precipitating supplier exit. Conversely, targeted financial assistance can accelerate recovery by enabling suppliers to pay for overtime, expedite shipping, or source alternate inputs, but assistance must be designed to avoid long-term distortions of market incentives.

Synthesis of operational levers: The integration of these mechanisms suggests that no single operational policy suffices; rather, resilient recovery requires portfolios of measures that are sequenced and combined based on disruption type and duration. For short, localized disruptions, lateral transshipments and emergency replenishment can be particularly effective; for systemic capacity shortfalls, multi-sourcing and financial assistance become central; and for chronic risk exposure, strategic inventory and domestic capacity expansion may be warranted (Uzsoy et al., 2018; Firouz et al., 2017; Li et al., 2016).

Policy and strategic interventions

Reshoring and domestic capacity expansion: Recent policy debates and academic analyses consider reshoring critical semiconductor production to reduce exposure to international disruptions (Lulla, 2025; The White House, 2021). Reshoring initiatives aim to reconstitute domestic manufacturing sovereignty, but they face logistic, cost, and time hurdles. Lulla's (2025) analysis of reshoring GPU production underscores that factory start-up times, workforce development, and capital costs can be substantial, meaning reshoring is a medium- to long-term strategic option rather than an immediate recovery tool.

Public policy as a coordination and capacity lever: The White House (2021) advocates for public investment to revitalize domestic manufacturing capacity and for policies that build resilient supply chains. This public policy role includes both demand-side incentives (e.g., procurement preferences) and supply-side supports (e.g., grants, tax incentives) that can lower the effective cost of adding domestic capacity. However, such measures require careful design to balance national security objectives with global trade commitments and to ensure that assistance does not simply reallocate rather than add capacity.

Technological enablers and digital coordination: Manupati et al. (2022) propose leveraging blockchain technology as a pre- and post-disruption coordination mechanism to improve traceability, contract enforcement, and rapid reallocation of supplies. While blockchain offers promise for improving transparency and contractual performance, adoption barriers—such as interoperability, governance, and the need for widespread industry participation—limit immediate effectiveness as a standalone recovery instrument.

Financial and incentive trade-offs: The joint use of penalties and financial assistance requires trade-offs between enforcing performance and enabling recovery (Li et al., 2016). From a policy standpoint, assistance can be targeted to critical nodes to preserve systemic functionality, but such targeting raises issues of fairness, selection criteria, and potential competitive distortions. The literature underscores the importance of aligning short-term stabilization measures with long-term incentives for capacity investment.

DISCUSSION

This section interprets the synthesized results, elaborates on the theoretical and managerial implications, examines counter-arguments and limitations, and outlines a research agenda to empirically validate the conceptual claims.

Interpreting the integrated framework

The core interpretive insight from the synthesis is that resilience in semiconductor supply chains is not a single property but an emergent characteristic derived from the alignment of inventory policy, sourcing architecture, contractual incentives, technological coordination, and public policy. Each component interacts with the others such that effectiveness is highly conditional on network topology, the nature of the disruption, and the institutional context.

Inventory policies constitute the first defense layer—buffer inventories and flexible replenishment can absorb transient shocks (Gallego, 1994). However, in semiconductor contexts where capacity and lead times dominate, inventory alone is insufficient. Therefore, the second layer—sourcing architecture—provides redundancy and routing flexibility via multi-sourcing and lateral transshipments (Firouz et al., 2017). The third layer—contractual and financial instruments—modulates supplier incentives and liquidity during recovery (Li et al., 2016). The fourth layer—policy and technology—shapes structural capacity and coordination capabilities over longer horizons (The White House, 2021; Manupati et al., 2022).

A critical theoretical implication is that recovery policies must be both state-contingent and intertemporal. That is, appropriate actions differ between the acute phase of disruption and the medium-to-long-term structural adjustments. For instance, emergency replenishment and lateral transshipments are most valuable during acute shortages to maintain production continuity (Firouz et al., 2017; Li & Ou, 2020). In contrast, reshoring and public capacity investments address medium-term structural vulnerability by increasing domestic supply options, though these measures do not shorten immediate recovery times and carry substantial cost and time lags (Lulla, 2025; The White House, 2021).

Managerial recommendations with theoretical grounding

From an operational standpoint, semiconductor buyers and integrators should cultivate mixed portfolios of mitigation strategies. Specifically, firms should:

1. Maintain risk-adjusted buffer inventories for the most critical components where substitution is difficult and lead times are long, guided by the conditions for base-stock optimality and calibrated to obsolescence risk (Gallego, 1994; Uzsoy et al., 2018).

2. Establish multi-sourcing arrangements for classes of components where substitute suppliers exist and where contract terms enable flexible allocation during disruptions; simultaneously, negotiate lateral transshipment protocols with geographically proximate partners to expedite local redistributions (Firouz et al., 2017).

3. Include contractual clauses that balance penalties and assistance—penalties to enforce credibility under normal conditions, and contingent assistance triggers that provide liquidity during systemic disruptions—to avoid counterproductive supplier failures (Li et al., 2016).

4. Invest in rapid emergency replenishment capabilities, including pre-negotiated expedited logistics contracts and financing arrangements that can be activated during acute shortages (Li & Ou, 2020).

These recommendations align with the practical observation that a portfolio approach—rather than a single technological or policy fix—yields robustness in complex, high-value supply networks (Uzsoy et al., 2018; Wieland & Durach, 2021).

Policy implications and trade-offs

Policy interventions should recognize both the limits of immediate impact and the necessity of long-run capacity building. Public actors can effectively:

1. Provide targeted financial assistance to critical suppliers whose failure would produce systemic disruption, but design assistance as temporary, conditional support coupled with performance metrics to mitigate moral hazard (Li et al., 2016; The White House, 2021).

2. Incentivize domestic capacity through long-run programs that address workforce development, capital investment, and supplier ecosystem formation, recognizing that reshoring is a strategic commitment that takes

years to fully materialize (Lulla, 2025; SIA, 2021).

3. Facilitate industry-wide coordination platforms—potentially leveraging digital technologies such as blockchain—for visibility and rapid reallocation of scarce resources, while acknowledging adoption and governance barriers (Manupati et al., 2022).

Trade-offs are central. Public subsidies for domestic capacity improve strategic autonomy but can be costly and may provoke international trade tensions (The White House, 2021). Penalty regimes enhance contractual performance but risk pushing fragile suppliers into insolvency during crises; assistance mitigates that risk but distorts market incentives if used imprudently (Li et al., 2016). Managers and policymakers thus need decision rules that weigh short-term operational continuity against long-term economic and strategic objectives.

Counter-arguments and nuanced critiques

A potential counter-argument is that overemphasis on domestic capacity and reshoring could lead to inefficiencies and higher costs without significantly improving resilience, particularly for highly specialized process technologies where domestic replication of global expertise is nontrivial (SIA, 2021; Lulla, 2025). This critique is valid: reshoring should not be pursued as a blanket solution but rather as part of a balanced strategy that considers the unique characteristics of specific product families and process nodes. The analysis here supports targeted reshoring for critical nodes that are national security priorities while relying on diversified global sourcing for commoditized components.

Another critique is that multi-sourcing and transshipments increase coordination complexity and may reduce economies of scale for suppliers, potentially raising system-wide costs (Firouz et al., 2017). The response is that such strategies are most appropriate where the marginal resilience gains outweigh coordination costs—particularly for components with outsized criticality and low substitutability—while standardized commodities may remain centralized for efficiency.

Limitations of the analysis

The strict reliance on the provided reference set, while consistent with the task constraints, constrains empirical specificity. The article synthesizes theory and documented observations but does not introduce new empirical estimates or simulation results that could quantify trade-offs precisely. This limitation is not trivial: operational decisions often depend on numeric thresholds (e.g., buffer sizes, contract penalty levels) that require empirical calibration. Future research should empirically estimate the cost-benefit frontiers for combined mitigation portfolios using detailed transaction and lead-time data from semiconductor supply networks.

Another limitation concerns the pace of technological and policy change. The semiconductor industry and related policy landscapes evolve rapidly; analyses anchored to the provided literature provide a solid conceptual foundation but may need updating as new data and programs (e.g., post-2025 initiatives) emerge. Nonetheless, the conceptual framework presented here is designed to be robust to future information by emphasizing decision rules and conditional logic rather than fixed parameter values.

Future research directions

To operationalize and validate the conceptual claims, several empirical and modeling avenues are promising:

1. Empirical case studies of firms that navigated pandemic-era shortages, focusing on the specific combinations of inventory, sourcing, contractual, and policy measures employed, and their impacts on

recovery speed and financial outcomes (Uzsoy et al., 2018; SIA, 2021).

2. Quantitative modeling that integrates disruption probability distributions with capacity expansion lead times and cost structures to estimate optimal mixes of reshoring versus global diversification for different component classes (Gallego, 1994; Li & Ou, 2020).

3. Experimental field trials evaluating conditional financial assistance frameworks that tie disbursements to contractual performance metrics and capacity expansion commitments, thereby assessing moral hazard and efficiency concerns empirically (Li et al., 2016; The White House, 2021).

4. Adoption studies of coordination technologies—such as blockchain—examining network benefits, governance models, and thresholds for systemic adoption in the semiconductor supplier ecosystem (Manupati et al., 2022).

Addressing these research gaps would provide the empirical substrate necessary to translate the conceptual prescriptions of this article into actionable numeric rules for practitioners and policymakers.

CONCLUSION

Semiconductor supply chains demand a nuanced, multi-layered approach to resilience that integrates inventory theory, sourcing strategies, contractual design, and policy interventions. Classical inventory policies remain foundational but must be complemented by multi-sourcing, lateral transshipments, and emergency replenishment strategies to handle the spectrum of disruption types that characterize semiconductor production. Financial instruments—carefully balanced between penalties and assistance—play a critical role in shaping supplier behavior during recovery, while public policy measures such as reshoring and capacity incentives influence long-term structural security.

The evidence synthesized from the provided literature suggests that no single solution is universally optimal. Instead, resilience emerges from portfolios of actions that are contextually tailored to component criticality, network topology, and the temporal profile of disruptions. For managers, this implies investing in contingency arrangements that enable both local flexibility and global optionality. For policymakers, the implication is to design long-term capacity and coordination supports that supplement, rather than substitute for, private sector risk management.

Finally, the path forward requires empirical validation. The conceptual framework offered here provides a structured lens for evaluating mitigation portfolios, but rigorous empirical work—case studies, modeling calibrations, and field experiments—remains necessary to refine decision rules and measure trade-offs precisely. By aligning operational best practices with well-designed policy instruments and emerging coordination technologies, stakeholders can strengthen the resilience of semiconductor supply chains and reduce the likelihood and severity of future systemic disruptions.

REFERENCES

1. Reha Uzsoy & John W. Fowler & Lars Mönch, 2018. "A survey of semiconductor supply chain models Part II: demand planning, inventory management, and capacity planning," International Journal of Production Research, Taylor & Francis Journals, vol. 56(13), pages 4546-4564, July.

2. Li, Yongjian & Zhen, Xueping & Qi, Xiangtong & Cai, Gangshu (George), 2016. "Penalty and financial assistance in a supply chain with supply disruption," Omega, Elsevier, vol. 61(C), pages 167-181.

3. Guillermo Gallego, 1994. "When is a base stock policy optimal in recovering disrupted cyclic schedules?," Naval Research Logistics (NRL), John Wiley & Sons, vol. 41(3), pages 317-333, April.

4. Firouz, Mohammad & Keskin, Burcu B. & Melouk, Sharif H., 2017. "An integrated supplier selection and inventory problem with multi-sourcing and lateral transshipments," Omega, Elsevier, vol. 70(C), pages 77-93.

5. Li, Yanhai & Ou, Jinwen, 2020. "Optimal ordering policy for complementary components with partial backordering and emergency replenishment under spectral risk measure," European Journal of Operational Research, Elsevier, vol. 284(2), pages 538-549.

6. Manupati, V.K. & Schoenherr, Tobias & Ramkumar, M. & Panigrahi, Suraj & Sharma, Yash & Mishra, Prakriti, 2022. "Recovery strategies for a disrupted supply chain network: Leveraging blockchain technology in pre- and post-disruption scenarios," International Journal of Production Economics, Elsevier, vol. 245(C).

7. Lulla, K. (2025). RESHORING GPU PRODUCTION: TESTING STRATEGY ADAPTATIONS FOR US-BASED FACTORIES. International Journal of Applied Mathematics, 38(10s), 2411-2440.

8. SIA. (2020). 2020 State of the U.S. Semiconductor Industry. Semiconductor Industry Association.

9. SIA. (2021). 2021 State of the U.S. Semiconductor Industry. Semiconductor Industry Association.

10. Siegler, J. (2021). Semiconductor Supply Chain.

11. Simon, R. (2021, April 16). Covid-19's Toll on U.S. Business? 200,000 Extra Closures in Pandemic's First Year. The Wall Street Journal. https://www.wsj.com/articles/covid-19s-toll-on-u-s-business-200-000-extra-closures-inpandemics-first-year-11618580619

12. The White House. (2021). Building Resilient Supply Chains, Revitalizing American Manufacturing, and Fostering Broad-Based Growth. Washington: The White House.

13. W.D., R. (1980). Risk Assesment: Approaches and Models. Society, Technology and Risk Assesment.

14. Wagner, S., & Bode, C. (2006). An Empirical Investigation into Supply Chain Vulnerability. Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management, Vol. 12 No. 6, pp. 301-12.

15. Wieland, A., & Durach, C. (2021). Two Perspectives on Supply Chain Resilience. Journal of Business Logistics, 42: 315-322.