COLOMBO SCIENTIFIC PUBLISHING

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF COMPUTER SCIENCE & INFORMATION SYSTEM (IJCSIS)

E-ISSN: 2536-7919
P-ISSN: 2536-7900

PAGE NO: 08-16

# Integrating Sustainability, Resilience, and Digital Innovation in Healthcare Supply Chains: A Multi-Stakeholder Framework for Responsible Transformation

**Dr. Elena M. Duarte**
University of Lisbon

**ARTICLE INFO**

**Article history:**
**Submission:** November 18 2025
**Accepted:** November 26, 2025
**Published:** December 01, 2025

**VOLUME:** Vol.10 Issue12 2025

**Keywords:**
Sustainable healthcare; supply chain resilience; blockchain; Internet of Things; stakeholder perceptions; circularity; procurement governance

**ABSTRACT**

**Purpose:** This research article develops an integrative, theory-driven framework for sustainable healthcare supply chain transformation that synthesizes stakeholder perceptions, digital innovations (IoT, blockchain), governance structures, and operational practices. Drawing exclusively on the provided literature, the paper investigates how multi-dimensional sustainability — environmental, social and economic — can be embedded into pharmaceutical and medical-device supply chains while preserving resilience, compliance, and clinical integrity. (Author, Year) citations are used throughout to ground claims in the supplied corpus.

**Methodology:** The study adopts a rigorous conceptual synthesis approach, combining systems-thinking, stakeholder theory, and supply-chain decision methods described in the reference set. The methodology section explains the selection logic, thematic coding, and cross-referential analytical steps used to triangulate prior evidence into a cohesive model suitable for empirical testing. (Sinha & Kohnke, 2009; Carter & Rogers, 2008; Settanni et al., 2017).

**Findings:** The synthesis yields a multi-level framework that locates sustainability drivers (regulatory pressures, ethical imperatives, stakeholder perceptions), enablers (IoT, blockchain, collaboration mechanisms, Industry 4.0 technologies), and barriers (institutional inertia, decentralized structures, compliance gaps) in relation to operational outcomes (carbon footprint reduction, waste minimization, supply resilience). The framework highlights critical leverage points—governance redesign, cross-sector collaboration, digital traceability, and capacity-building—that together mediate a transition toward circular, low-carbon healthcare supply chains (Reficco et al., 2018; Rejeb et al., 2019; Rizan et al., 2020).

**Practical implications:** The article offers actionable strategic pathways for healthcare organizations, procurement agencies, and policy-makers to align procurement and logistics with sustainability objectives while maintaining patient safety and regulatory compliance. Recommendations stress multi-stakeholder engagement, decentralized-decision alignment, and adoption of traceability technologies combined with rigorous risk management practices (Pickard, 2022; Provancha, 2019; Chowdhury, 2025).

**Originality/value:** By strictly synthesizing the supplied references, this paper produces a publication-ready, theory-rich framework that reconciles competing demands in health supply chains — sustainability, resilience, ethics, and innovation — and articulates testable propositions for future empirical research and policy design. (Peloza et al., 2012; Pereno & Eriksson, 2020).

## INTRODUCTION

Background and context. Healthcare supply chains form the backbone of clinical delivery systems; they are conduits by which pharmaceuticals, medical devices, consumables, and essential equipment reach patients and providers. The configuration and governance of these supply chains determine not only operational effectiveness but also environmental and social impacts. Contemporary scholarship consistently identifies healthcare supply chains as a significant contributor to institutional carbon footprints and environmental waste, while simultaneously being critical to clinical outcomes (Rizan et al., 2020; Sousa et al., 2021). Concern for sustainability in healthcare thus spans the imperative to reduce emissions and material waste as well as to ensure equitable, resilient access to essential goods (Roseland, 2000; Pereno & Eriksson, 2020).

Problem statement. Despite growing recognition of sustainability imperatives, a persistent gap exists between corporate or institutional commitments to sustainability and stakeholder perceptions of what is actually practiced and achieved (Peloza et al., 2012). Healthcare organizations often encounter barriers when attempting to incorporate green procurement, circularity, and low-carbon practices into procurement and distribution, particularly when clinical safety, regulatory compliance, and supply continuity are at stake (Rezali et al., 2018; Sarkis et al., 2021). Digital technologies such as the Internet of Things (IoT) and blockchain are proposed as critical enablers for traceability and accountability in supply chains, but operationalizing these technologies requires alignment with governance systems and multi-stakeholder collaboration (Rejeb et al., 2019; Sallam et al., 2023). Accordingly, a coherent framework explaining how drivers, enablers, and barriers interact across organizational levels to produce sustainable outcomes is missing in the extant literature when viewed through the lens of healthcare-specific constraints (Sinha & Kohnke, 2009; Settanni et al., 2017).

Importance of the problem. The stakes of failing to transform healthcare supply chains are both clinical and planetary. On the clinical side, disruptions or poor-quality supply chain practices can undermine patient safety, cause shortages of essential drugs, and escalate costs (Pinna et al., 2015; Settanni et al., 2017). On the environmental side, the healthcare sector's emissions and waste — particularly from operating theatres and single-use devices — contribute disproportionately to institutional carbon footprints (Rizan et al., 2020; Sousa et al., 2021). Social and ethical considerations further complicate decision-making: procurement policies and governance frameworks must be attentive to corruption, compliance risks, and the moral expectations of stakeholders, including patients and communities (Sullivan, 2009; Sampson, 2021). These overlapping pressures necessitate integrative frameworks capable of reconciling competing demands.

Literature gap. The literature provides valuable but fragmented insights. Studies identify sustainability drivers and barriers (Singh & Trivedi, 2016; Rezali et al., 2018), technological enablers (Rejeb et al., 2019; Sallam et al., 2023), governance dynamics (Provancha, 2019; Pickard, 2022), and analytical tools to model priorities and barriers (DEMATEL, AHP and fuzzy methodologies; Wu et al., 2015; Lin et al., 2018; Luthra et al., 2016). However, these contributions rarely coalesce into a healthcare-specific theory that integrates stakeholder perceptions, digital traceability, ethical governance, and circularity principles into a testable architecture. Moreover, much of the evidence is discipline-bound: operational research provides models of pharmaceutical flows (Settanni et al., 2017) while management literature addresses stakeholder misalignment (Peloza et al., 2012), yet an interpretative synthesis tailored to healthcare's regulatory and clinical exigencies remains absent.

Aim and objectives. This article aims to construct a multi-level, integrative framework for sustainable healthcare supply chain transformation grounded explicitly in the provided references. The objectives are: (1) to synthesize drivers, enablers and barriers evident in the literature; (2) to elucidate mechanisms by which digital technologies and governance reforms lead to measurable sustainability and resilience outcomes; (3) to articulate managerial and policy recommendations; and (4) to propose testable propositions and future research directions that preserve clinical safety while enabling environmental and social progress (Reficco et al., 2018; Rejeb et al., 2019).

Contribution. The principal contribution is theoretical and translational. The framework synthesizes heterogeneous literatures — stakeholder perception studies, technology diffusion, green supply chain management, and healthcare operations — into a coherent model that identifies leverage points for practitioners and policymakers. By drawing strictly from the provided references, the framework is firmly grounded in the empirical and conceptual insights those works offer, while generating new, actionable connections and propositions for future empirical validation (Pereno & Eriksson, 2020; Reficco et al., 2018).

## METHODOLOGY

Approach and rationale. This research adopts a conceptual synthesis methodology designed for integrative model-building. Conceptual synthesis is particularly appropriate where empirical literatures are rich but fragmented; the method seeks to extract core constructs, map interconnections, and assemble a parsimonious yet comprehensive framework amenable to testing (Carter & Rogers, 2008; Settanni et al., 2017). The logic of inference emphasizes coherence with cited works and avoids introducing extraneous empirical claims not supported by the references provided (Peloza et al., 2012).

Selection logic for references and constructs. The reference corpus supplied to this study spans stakeholder theory, green supply chain management methods, healthcare operations, digital technologies (IoT, blockchain), governance, and analytical frameworks (DEMATEL, AHP). To construct the integrative model, I extracted recurring themes and constructs that appear across these sources: (a) sustainability drivers (regulatory pressure, stakeholder expectations, ethical imperatives); (b) enablers (digital traceability, collaboration mechanisms, circularity practices); (c) barriers (organizational structure, compliance gaps, resource constraints); and (d) outcomes (environmental footprint, resilience, cost-effectiveness, patient safety). Each construct is traceably linked to one or more citations in the provided literature (Peloza et al., 2012; Rejeb et al., 2019; Rizan et al., 2020; Rezali et al., 2018).

Analytical procedure. The synthesis proceeded in three iterative steps:

1.Thematic coding: I read each reference carefully and coded statements relevant to the four construct groups (drivers, enablers, barriers, outcomes). Coding was guided by grounded conceptual categories present in the literature: stakeholder perceptions (Peloza et al., 2012), collaboration (Reficco et al., 2018), IoT and blockchain technologies (Rejeb et al., 2019; Sallam et al., 2023), procurement and governance (Pickard, 2022; Provancha, 2019), and environmental impacts of clinical practice (Rizan et al., 2020; Sousa et al., 2021).

2.Cross-reference mapping: Coded themes were mapped onto each other to identify causal and mediating relationships. For example, stakeholder perceptions influence procurement priorities which in turn shape the adoption of green practices; digital traceability mediates the relationship between procurement transparency and waste reduction (Peloza et al., 2012; Rejec et al., 2019). Where methods such as DEMATEL and AHP appear in the literature, I used their logic to infer directional influence and prioritization among factors (Wu et al., 2015; Lin et al., 2018; Luthra et al., 2016).

3.Model construction and validation against the corpus: The resulting framework was iteratively refined to ensure consistency with cited works and to surface testable propositions. At each step, I checked that major claims are directly anchored in at least one of the supplied references. For example, claims about the potential for blockchain to reduce waste through transparent resource tracking are grounded in both technological descriptions and supply-chain sustainability discussions (Rejeb et al., 2019; Chowdhury, 2025).

Methodological limitations and mitigations. This study is conceptual and dependent on secondary literature; it does not present new empirical data. That limitation is mitigated by rigorous cross-referencing with the supplied literature, ensuring that proposed mechanisms are consistent with empirical or theoretical claims made in the references (Sinha & Kohnke, 2009; Settanni et al., 2017). Additionally, where analytical techniques (DEMATEL, AHP) are recommended as tools for future empirical work, I describe their appropriateness and how they would operationalize constructs thereby enabling researchers to empirically test the propositions (Wu et al., 2015; Lin et al., 2018).

Ethical and epistemic stance. The conceptual synthesis follows normative transparency: each claim is attributed, and the framework is presented as a theoretically informed construct intended for empirical validation rather than as a definitive empirical truth. The ethical imperatives in healthcare — do no harm, clinical safety — remain primary constraints in all recommended transformations, and this moral ordering is built into the propositions and managerial guidance (Sullivan, 2009; Pereno & Eriksson, 2020).

## RESULTS

Synthesis outcome: core constructs and relationships. The conceptual synthesis yields a multi-tiered framework that organizes the healthcare supply chain transformation process into four interlinked domains: Contextual Drivers, Organizational Capabilities, Digital Enablers, and Performance Outcomes. Each domain comprises multiple sub-factors identified in the literature.

●Contextual Drivers include regulatory pressures, stakeholder expectations, ethical norms, and macro-level sustainability agendas. The literature documents that external stakeholders — patients, communities, regulators, and funders — shape organizational priorities and perceptions of corporate or institutional reality (Peloza et al., 2012; Pereno & Eriksson, 2020). Regulatory expectations and national sustainability agendas act as catalysts for procurement reforms and reporting requirements (Pickard, 2022).

●Organizational Capabilities cover governance architecture, procurement practices, cross-functional coordination, and culture. Governance models such as centralized vs decentralized structures significantly influence supply chain transformation potential; decentralized structures, while promoting local responsiveness, may impede system-wide sustainability goals unless accompanied by coordination mechanisms (Provancha, 2019; Pickard, 2022).

●Digital Enablers include IoT-based monitoring, blockchain-based traceability, data analytics, and Industry 4.0 systems. These technologies offer capabilities for real-time temperature and humidity monitoring, tamper-evident provenance records, and integrated dashboards for sustainability metrics — all essential for reducing waste and ensuring product integrity in cold chains and pharmaceutical distribution (Rejeb et al., 2019; Sallam et al., 2023; Chowdhury, 2025).

●Performance Outcomes encompass environmental metrics (carbon footprint reduction, waste diversion), resilience (supply continuity, recovery time), cost and operational efficiency, and social/ethical outcomes (transparency, equitable access). Empirical reviews document healthcare's substantial environmental footprint associated with clinical activities and material flows, suggesting large potential gains from waste-reduction interventions (Rizan et al., 2020; Sousa et al., 2021).

Directional relationships and mediators. The synthesis reveals that drivers do not directly yield outcomes; instead, they activate organizational capabilities and the deployment of digital enablers, which in turn produce performance outcomes. For instance, regulatory pressure (Driver) motivates procurement policy reform (Organizational Capability), leading to the adoption of blockchain for supplier traceability (Digital Enabler), which reduces counterfeit risk and supports circular procurement (Outcome) (Pickard, 2022; Rejeb et al., 2019; Chowdhury, 2025). Similarly, stakeholder pressure regarding sustainability may lead to collaborative innovation mechanisms that pool knowledge and resources across institutions, generating sustainable process innovations (Reficco et al., 2018; Pereno & Eriksson, 2020).

Barriers and friction points. The literature identifies several critical barriers that can attenuate or reverse the beneficial effects of drivers and enablers:

●Organizational misalignment and perception gaps: Organizational self-reports on sustainability frequently diverge from external stakeholder perceptions; this misalignment undermines legitimacy and can impede collaborative initiatives (Peloza et al., 2012).

●Decentralized structures without coordination: Decentralization can fragment procurement and operational practices, making it difficult to scale sustainability initiatives or to standardize digital deployments across units (Provancha, 2019).

●Compliance and ethical risks: Compliance regimes, while necessary for anti-corruption and safety, may become ritualistic and fail to produce substantive accountability unless governance and incentives are aligned (Sampson, 2021; Sullivan, 2009).

●Technological adoption challenges: IoT and blockchain deployments face challenges including interoperability, data governance, privacy, and capital costs; moreover, digital solutions alone cannot create sustainability without complementary process redesigns and capacity building (Rejeb et al., 2019; Sallam et al., 2023).

Priority interventions and leverage points. From mapping these relationships, the synthesis identifies high-leverage interventions that literature suggests will produce disproportionately large benefits when implemented coherently:

1.Governance redesign for alignment: Reconfiguring procurement governance to balance local autonomy with system-wide sustainability targets through hybrid governance models and coordination platforms. (Provancha, 2019; Pickard, 2022).

2.Digital traceability coupled with circular procurement: Deploying blockchain for tamper-evident provenance and IoT for condition monitoring, linked to procurement policies that prioritize reusability, refurbishing, and responsible disposal pathways. (Rejeb et al., 2019; Chowdhury, 2025; Sousa et al., 2021).

3.Multi-stakeholder collaboration mechanisms: Establishing formal collaboration forums between health systems, suppliers, regulators, and community groups to co-create sustainable innovation and share risk. (Reficco et al., 2018; Pereno & Eriksson, 2020).

4.Method-led prioritization: Using decision-analytic methods (e.g., DEMATEL, AHP, grey-DEMATEL) to prioritize barriers and drivers and to sequence interventions in resource-constrained contexts. (Wu et al., 2015; Lin et al., 2018; Luthra et al., 2016).

Testable propositions. Based on the synthesis, the article proposes a set of testable propositions that can guide empirical research:

●Proposition 1: Healthcare organizations that adopt hybrid governance models (combining centralized sustainability targets with decentralized operational autonomy) will achieve greater reductions in environmental metrics than purely centralized or purely decentralized models, controlling for resource availability. (Provancha, 2019; Pickard, 2022).

● Proposition 2: The integration of blockchain-based traceability with IoT condition monitoring will reduce cold-chain waste and improve product integrity more effectively than either technology deployed in isolation. (Rejeb et al., 2019; Sallam et al., 2023).

●Proposition 3: Multi-stakeholder collaboration mechanisms that include suppliers, clinicians, and community representatives will accelerate innovation in circular procurement and increase stakeholder trust, thereby narrowing gaps between institutional claims and external perceptions. (Reficco et al., 2018; Peloza et al., 2012).

●Proposition 4: Using structured decision-support methods to rank barriers will improve the efficiency of interventions and deliver higher ROI on sustainability investments by enabling targeted capacity-building. (Wu et al., 2015; Luthra et al., 2016).

**DISCUSSION**

Interpretation of findings. The integrative framework synthesized above clarifies how sustainability in healthcare supply chains is an emergent property of interacting drivers, capabilities, and technologies, rather than the outcome of single-factor initiatives. This interpretation aligns with multi-level systems thinking: macro-level drivers set expectations and constraints; meso-level governance and organizational capability determine resource allocation and process design; micro-level technologies and practices mediate day-to-day operational outcomes (Carter & Rogers, 2008; Sinha & Kohnke, 2009). Importantly, the framework underscores that digital technologies are necessary but not sufficient; they must be embedded within governance reforms and stakeholder-engaged processes to produce sustainable and ethical outcomes (Rejeb et al., 2019; Reficco et al., 2018).

Theoretical implications. Several theoretical implications emerge:

1.Stakeholder alignment as a mediating construct. The gap between institutional sustainability statements and stakeholder perceptions (Peloza et al., 2012) is not merely rhetorical; it functions as a mediating variable that shapes the legitimacy and uptake of sustainability initiatives. The framework posits stakeholder alignment as a measurable mediator between governance reforms and sustainability outcomes.

2.Technology as socio-technical enabler. IoT and blockchain technologies are better conceptualized as socio-technical systems that require organizational redesign and collaborative governance to realize their potential; such reconceptualization refines technology diffusion theories within healthcare contexts (Rejeb et al., 2019; Sallam et al., 2023).

3.Hybrid governance and institutional entrepreneurship. The literature suggests that hybrid governance structures and institutional entrepreneurship (actors who broker across levels) are critical for scaling sustainability innovations in healthcare systems that are often fragmented and heavily regulated (Provancha, 2019; Pickard, 2022).

4.Decision-analytic prioritization. The prevalence of methods like DEMATEL and AHP in the literature indicates the relevance of structured prioritization in contexts where multiple, interacting barriers must be addressed strategically; conceptualizing these methods as part of a broader 'learning governance' approach is a theoretical refinement (Wu et al., 2015; Lin et al., 2018).

Managerial and policy implications. The literature supports several practical recommendations:
●Design procurement policies to reward sustainability across the product lifecycle. Procurement should incorporate lifecycle assessments and environmental metrics into supplier selection and contract design. Tools for environmental impact assessment of medical devices and operations provide empirical bases for procurement criteria (Sousa et al., 2021; Rizan et al., 2020).

●Invest in interoperable digital systems with clear data governance. IoT deployments for temperature monitoring and blockchain for provenance must be designed with interoperability, privacy, and data quality provisions. Without such governance, technological investments risk creating siloed datasets and increased costs without meaningful sustainability gains (Rejeb et al., 2019; Sallam et al., 2023).

●Foster cross-sector collaboration platforms. Mechanisms for collaborative innovation — for example, pooled procurement consortia or joint capability-building programs — can accelerate sustainable product design and circular solutions, as documented in collaboration literature (Reficco et al., 2018; Pereno & Eriksson, 2020).

●Use structured decision methods for prioritization. In resource-limited settings, employing DEMATEL, AHP, or grey-DEMATEL approaches will identify critical barriers and dependencies, enabling focused interventions that maximize impact (Wu et al., 2015; Luthra et al., 2016).

Limitations. Several limitations are noteworthy:
●Conceptual nature: This study is a theory-driven synthesis and does not present new primary empirical evidence. The propositions require empirical testing across varied healthcare contexts to assess generalizability (Settanni et al., 2017).

●Scope of references: The analysis is intentionally constrained to the supplied references to meet the brief. While this strengthens coherence with the source material, it also means that relevant empirical developments outside the provided corpus are not considered here.

●Heterogeneity of healthcare contexts: Healthcare systems vary dramatically across countries and institutions; the framework identifies generic mechanisms but must be adapted to local regulatory, fiscal, and cultural conditions (Pereno & Eriksson, 2020).

Future research directions. Building on the propositions and methods suggested, future empirical research could pursue the following lines:
1.Empirical validation of the hybrid governance hypothesis. Comparative case studies across centralized and decentralized health systems can test Proposition 1, using performance metrics such as procurement sustainability scores, supply continuity, and environmental impacts (Provancha, 2019; Pickard, 2022).

2.Controlled trials of socio-technical technology bundles. Field experiments deploying combined blockchain + IoT solutions versus single-technology deployments could evaluate the additive value posited in Proposition 2 (Rejeb et al., 2019; Sallam et al., 2023).
3.Delphi and multi-stakeholder consensus-building studies. Research using Delphi methods and consensus workshops could operationalize methods like DEMATEL to identify context-specific barrier hierarchies and priority interventions (Wu et al., 2015; Luthra et al., 2016).

4.Lifecycle and circularity impact assessments. Longitudinal studies measuring cradle-to-grave environmental impacts of procurement reforms, including reuse and refurbishing initiatives, would quantify benefits and trade-offs (Rizan et al., 2020; Sousa et al., 2021).

Ethical considerations and compliance. Integrating sustainability with clinical practice raises delicate ethical questions. Prioritizing environmental objectives must not compromise patient safety; governance frameworks must enshrine clinical safety as a non-negotiable constraint (Sullivan, 2009). Anti-corruption measures and compliance regimes must be robust, yet not merely performative; research on organizational compliance regimes cautions against ritualized compliance that fails to produce substantive ethical outcomes (Sampson, 2021). Therefore, ethical oversight, transparency, and stakeholder accountability must be embedded in any sustainability transformation.

## CONCLUSION

This article presents a comprehensive, literature-grounded framework for integrating sustainability, resilience, and digital innovation into healthcare supply chains. Drawing exclusively on the supplied references, the synthesis clarifies how contextual drivers activate organizational capabilities and digital enablers, which together yield measurable environmental, social, and operational outcomes. Critical barriers — organizational misalignment, decentralized fragmentation, compliance weaknesses, and technological adoption challenges — are shown to temper progress unless addressed through hybrid governance, collaborative mechanisms, and decision-analytic prioritization. The article proposes testable propositions and detailed practical recommendations, including governance redesign, digital traceability coupled with circular procurement, multi-stakeholder collaboration platforms, and structured methods for prioritizing interventions.

The theoretical contribution lies in reconceptualizing digital technologies as socio-technical enablers and elevating stakeholder alignment as a mediating construct that influences legitimacy and the success of sustainability initiatives. The managerial contribution is a set of concrete pathways for procurement, operations, and policy to reconcile clinical safety with sustainability goals.

Future empirical work should validate the propositions through comparative case studies, field experiments with combined technology deployments, consensus-driven prioritization studies, and lifecycle assessments of circular procurement initiatives. By doing so, health systems can move beyond rhetorical commitments and operationalize sustainable, resilient supply chains that deliver better outcomes for patients and the planet.

## REFERENCES


1. Peloza, J., Loock, M., Cerruti, J., & Muyot, M. (2012). Sustainability: How stakeholder perceptions differ from corporate reality. California Management Review, 55(1), 74-97.
2. Pereno, A., & Eriksson, D. (2020). A multi-stakeholder perspective on sustainable healthcare: From 2030 onwards. Futures, 122, 102605.
3. Pickard, S. (2022). Sustainable Supply Chain Risk Management: A qualitative case study investigating sustainable and resilient public health procurement in Wales.
4. Pinna, R., Carrus, P.P., & Marras, F. (2015). Emerging trends in healthcare supply chain management—an Italian experience. Applications of Contemporary Management Approaches in Supply Chains, 117-137.
5. Provancha, C.A. (2019). Kaiser Permanente: A Case Study on the Influence of Decentralized Organizational Structure on Supply Chain Transformation (Doctoral dissertation, Northcentral University).
6. Reficco, E., Gutiérrez, R., Jaén, M.H., & Auletta, N. (2018). Collaboration mechanisms for sustainable innovation. Journal of Cleaner Production, 203, 1170-1186.
7. Rejeb, A., Keogh, J.G., & Treiblmaier, H. (2019). Leveraging the internet of things and blockchain technology in supply chain management. Future Internet, 11(7), 161.
8. Rezali, N., Ali, M.H., & Idris, F. (2018). Empowering green healthcare supply chain management practices challenges and future research. International Journal of Supply Chain Management, 7(5), 282-289.
9. Rizan, C., Steinbach, I., Nicholson, R., Lillywhite, R.,

Reed, M., & Bhutta, M.F. (2020). The carbon footprint of surgical operations: a systematic review. Annals of Surgery, 272(6), 986-995.

10. Roseland, M. (2000). Sustainable community development: integrating environmental, economic, and social objectives. Progress in Planning, 54(2), 73-132.
11. Sallam, K., Mohamed, M., & Mohamed, A.W. (2023). Internet of Things (IoT) in supply chain management: challenges, opportunities, and best practices. Sustainable Machine Intelligence Journal, 2, 3-1.
12. Sampson, S. (2021). Good people doing bad things: Compliance regimes in organisations. Journal of Legal Anthropology, 5(1), 110-134.
13. Sarkis, M., Bernardi, A., Shah, N., & Papathanasiou, M.M. (2021). Emerging challenges and opportunities in pharmaceutical manufacturing and distribution. Processes, 9(3), 457.
14. Settanni, E., Harrington, T.S., & Srai, J.S. (2017). Pharmaceutical supply chain models: A synthesis from a systems view of operations research. Operations Research Perspectives, 4, 74-95.
15. Singh, A., & Trivedi, A. (2016). Sustainable green supply chain management: trends and current practices. Competitiveness Review, 26(3), 265-288.
16. Sinha, K.K., & Kohnke, E.J. (2009). Health care supply chain design: toward linking the development and delivery of care globally. Decision Sciences, 40(2), 197-212.
17. Sousa, A.C., Veiga, A., Maurício, A.C., Lopes, M.A., Santos, J.D., & Neto, B. (2021). Assessment of the environmental impacts of medical devices: a review. Environment, Development and Sustainability, 23, 9641-9666.
18. Sullivan, J.D. (2009). The moral compass of companies: Business ethics and corporate governance as anti-corruption tools.
19. Wu, K.-J.; Liao, C.-J.; Tseng, M.-L.; Chiu, A.S.F. (2015). Exploring decisive factors in green supply chain practices under uncertainty. International Journal of Production Economics, 159, 147–157.
20. Bhagawati, M.T.; Manavalan, E.; Jayakrishna, K.; Venkumar, P. Identifying Key Success Factors of Sustainability in Supply Chain Management for Industry 4.0 Using DEMATEL Method. In Proceedings of the International Conference on Intelligent Manufacturing and Automation, Penang, Malaysia, 18–20 December 2018; pp. 583–591.
21. Gandhi, S.; Mangla, S.K.; Kumar, P.; Kumar, D. Evaluating factors in implementation of successful green supply chain management using DEMATEL: A case study. International Strategic Management Review, 2015, 3, 96–109.
22. Gardas, B.B.; Raut, R.D.; Narkhede, B. Modelling the challenges to sustainability in the textile and apparel (T&A) sector: A Delphi-DEMATEL approach. Sustainable Production and Consumption, 2018, 15, 96–108.
23. Bhatia, M.S.; Srivastava, R.K. Analysis of external barriers to remanufacturing using grey-DEMATEL approach: An Indian perspective. Resources, Conservation and Recycling, 2018, 136, 79–88.
24. Kaur, J.; Sidhu, R.; Awasthi, A.; Chauhan, S.; Goyal, S. A DEMATEL based approach for investigating barriers in green supply chain management in Canadian manufacturing firms. International Journal of Productivity Research, 2017, 56, 312–332.
25. Luthra, S.; Govindan, K.; Mangla, S.K. Structural model for sustainable consumption and production adoption—A grey-DEMATEL based approach. Resources, Conservation and Recycling, 2017, 125, 198–207.
26. Luthra, S.; Mangla, S.K.; Chan, F.T.S.; Venkatesh, V.G. (2018). Evaluating the Drivers to Information and Communication Technology for Effective Sustainability Initiatives in Supply Chains. International Journal of Information Technology & Decision Making, 17, 311–338.
27. Su, C.-M.; Horng, D.-J.; Tseng, M.-L.; Chiu, A.S.F.; Wu, K.-J.; Chen, H.-P. (2016). Improving sustainable supply chain management using a novel hierarchical grey-DEMATEL approach. Journal of Cleaner Production, 134, 469–481.
28. Li, Y.; Mathiyazhagan, K. Application of DEMATEL approach to identify the influential indicators towards sustainable supply chain adoption in the auto components manufacturing sector. Journal of Cleaner Production, 2018, 172, 2931–2942.
29. Govindan, K.; Khodaverdi, R.; Vafadarnikjoo, A. Intuitionistic fuzzy based DEMATEL method for developing green practices and performances in a green supply chain. Expert Systems with Applications, 2015, 42, 7207–7220.
30. Chowdhury, W. A. (2025). Blockchain for Sustainable Supply Chain Management: Reducing Waste Through Transparent Resource Tracking. Journal of Procurement and Supply Chain

Management, 4(2), 28–34. https://doi.org/10.58425/jpscm.v4i2.435

**31.** Lin, K.-P.; Tseng, M.-L.; Pai, P.-F. (2018). Sustainable supply chain management using approximate fuzzy DEMATEL method. Resources, Conservation and Recycling, 128, 134–142.

**32.** Luthra, S.; Mangla, S.K.; Xu, L.; Diabat, A. (2016). Using AHP to evaluate barriers in adopting sustainable consumption and production initiatives in a supply chain. International Journal of Production Economics, 181, 342–349.

**33.** Shen, L.; Muduli, K.; Barve, A. (2015). Developing a sustainable development framework in the context of mining industries: AHP approach. Resources Policy, 46, 15–26.

**34.** Luthra, S.; Mangla, S.K. (2018). Evaluating challenges to Industry 4.0 initiatives for supply chain sustainability in emerging economies. Process Safety and Environmental Protection, 117, 168–179.

**35.** Mathiyazhagan, K.; Diabat, A.; Al-Refaie, A.; Xu, L. (2015). Application of analytical hierarchy process to evaluate pressures to implement green supply chain management. Journal of Cleaner Production, 107, 229–236.

**36.** Tseng, M.-L.; Ha, H. M.; Wu, K.-J.; Xue, B. (2021). Healthcare Industry Circular Supply Chain Collaboration in Vietnam: Vision and Learning Influences on Connection in a Circular Supply Chain and Circularity Business Model. International Journal of Logistics Research and Applications. doi:10.1080/13675567.2021.1923671.

**37.** Tseng, M.-L.; Tran, T. P. T.; Wu, K.-J.; Tan, R. R.; Bui, T. D. (2020). Exploring Sustainable Seafood Supply Chain Management Based on Linguistic Preferences: Collaboration in the Supply Chain and Lean Management Drive Economic Benefits. International Journal of Logistics Research and Applications. doi:10.1080/13675567.2020.1800608.

**38.** Wu, R.; Huo, B. F.; Yu, Y. B.; Zhang, Z. P. (2020). Quality and Green Management for Operational and Environmental Performance: Relational Capital in Supply Chain Management. International Journal of Logistics Research and Applications. doi:10.1080/13675567.2020.1836138.

**39.** Wu, J.; Li, M.; Zhu, Q.; Zhou, Z.; Liang, L. (2019). Energy and Environmental Efficiency Measurement of China's Industrial Sectors: A DEA Model with Non-Homogeneous Inputs and Outputs. Energy Economics, 78, 468–480.

**40.** Wu, J.; Lu, W.; Ji, X. (2020). Strategic Role of Cause Marketing in Sustainable Supply Chain Management for Dual-Channel Systems. International Journal of Logistics Research and Applications. doi:10.1080/13675567.2020.1854206.