The American Journal of
Engineering and Technology
ISSN 2689-0984 | Open Access

TYPE Original Research
PAGE NO. 21-28

Integrating Blockchain, AI, and Sustainability in Healthcare and Agricultural Supply Chains: A Multidimensional Framework for Resilience, Social Responsibility, and Environmental Performance

Dr. Aurelian Mendes
Global Institute for Sustainable Logistics, University of Lisbon, Portugal

OPEN ACCESS

SUBMITTED 18 November 2025
ACCEPTED 25 November 2025
PUBLISHED 05 December 2025
VOLUME Vol.07 Issue 12 2025

CITATION

Dr. Aurelian Mendes. (2025). Integrating Blockchain, AI, and Sustainability in Healthcare and Agricultural Supply Chains: A Multidimensional Framework for Resilience, Social Responsibility, and Environmental Performance. *The American Journal of Engineering and Technology*, 7(12), 21–28.

Abstract:

Background: Modern supply chains—especially in healthcare and agriculture—face mounting pressures from sustainability imperatives, technological disruption, public-health requirements, and complex social responsibilities (Duque-Uribe et al., 2019; Haji et al., 2022). Emerging technologies such as blockchain and artificial intelligence (AI) offer transformative potential, yet their adoption raises novel operational, ethical, and governance questions (Dutta et al., 2020; Elufioye et al., 2024).

Aim: This article develops a publication-ready, theory-informed, and practice-oriented integrative framework that synthesizes sustainable supply chain management (SSCM) principles with blockchain-enabled transparency and AI-driven predictive analytics to improve environmental, social, and operational performance in healthcare and agricultural supply chains (Mani et al., 2016; Elabed et al., 2019).

Methods: Using a rigorous, narrative-synthesis approach anchored in the provided literature, the study constructs conceptual linkages across sustainability dimensions, technology affordances, stakeholder partnerships, and measurement approaches. The method entails deep theory elaboration, cross-referencing of empirical and conceptual studies, and development of testable propositions and managerial pathways (Hsu et al., 2013; Govindan et al., 2015).

Results: The resulting framework identifies four integrative pillars—Governance & Partnerships; Technological Transparency (Blockchain); Predictive & Prescriptive Analytics (AI); and Social-Environmental Performance Management—each mapped to specific mechanisms, barriers, and evaluation metrics. The framework explicates how blockchain can reduce waste and increase traceability (Chowdhury, 2025; Dutta et al., 2020), how AI can optimize demand forecasting and reduce resource inefficiencies (Elufioye et al., 2024), and how combined solutions support resilience against disruption while advancing social sustainability and patient safety (Grumiller et al., 2022; Kanokphanvanich et al., 2023).

Keywords: Sustainable supply chains; blockchain; artificial intelligence; healthcare logistics; agricultural supply chains; social sustainability; resilience.

Introduction

The architecture of supply chains across sectors has evolved from narrowly operational value chains into sprawling socio-technical systems with far-reaching environmental, health, and social implications (Duque-Uribe et al., 2019; Mani et al., 2016). Contemporary pressures—climate imperatives, pandemics, increasing regulatory scrutiny on drug and food safety, and stakeholder demands for ethical procurement—have elevated sustainability from a peripheral objective to a central requirement for legitimacy and operational continuity (Haji et al., 2022; Hughes et al., 2019). At the same time, the digital transformation of logistics—exemplified by blockchain and AI—offers unprecedented opportunities to reconfigure transparency, traceability, and decision-making in ways that could materially reduce waste and improve safety and equity (Dutta et al., 2020; Elufioye et al., 2024). Yet scholarly and practitioner literatures remain fragmented: sustainability scholars emphasize governance, metrics, and stakeholder inclusivity (Hutchins & Sutherland, 2008; Mani et al., 2018), technological literatures dwell on protocol design and implementation challenges for blockchain (Dutta et al., 2020; Ejairu et al., 2024), and AI research tends to focus on forecasting accuracy and operational optimization without fully integrating social and environmental externalities (Elufioye et al., 2024). This fragmentation creates a pressing need for an integrated, theoretically robust framework that binds sustainability principles to specific technological affordances and governance modalities, particularly in healthcare and agriculture where the stakes for human well-being and ecological impact are high (Elabed et al., 2019; Goodarzian et al., 2021).

Problem statement. Existing studies have advanced discrete insights: systematic reviews highlight the dynamics of SSCM practices in hospitals (Duque-Uribe et al., 2019), analyses of blockchain sketch promise and limitations for logistics and procurement (Dutta et al., 2020; Ejairu et al., 2024), and AI literature demonstrates benefits for forecasting in agricultural contexts (Elufioye et al., 2024). Yet there is limited synthesis that operationalizes these strands into actionable architectures for real-world implementation that explicitly address social sustainability, resilience to disruptions, and the ethical implications of digital technologies in regulated sectors such as health (Kanokphanvanich et al., 2023; Grumiller et al., 2022). Without this, organizations risk deploying point technologies that improve narrow KPIs while exacerbating inequities, privacy risks, and unintended environmental consequences (Hutchins & Sutherland, 2008; Holmner et al., 2014).

Literature gap. The literature lacks a structured framework that (1) maps blockchain and AI affordances onto measurable sustainability outcomes for healthcare and agricultural supply chains, (2) delineates governance and partnership mechanisms necessary for ethical and inclusive implementation, and (3) integrates social sustainability metrics alongside environmental and economic performance measures. This gap constrains both academic theory-building and managerial praxis (Mani et al., 2016; Eweje et al., 2021). The present article addresses this gap by synthesizing multi-disciplinary insights into a detailed framework and offering testable propositions and practical pathways.

Contributions. The paper offers three principal contributions. First, it develops a multi-dimensional conceptual framework connecting technological affordances (blockchain, AI) to SSCM objectives in healthcare and agriculture, emphasizing traceability, waste reduction, and patient/consumer safety (Chowdhury, 2025; Haji et al., 2022). Second, it elaborates governance and partnership models—including public sector procurement reforms and multi-stakeholder partnerships—to operationalize technologies while safeguarding social sustainability and equity (Eweje et al., 2021; Hughes et al., 2019). Third, it provides an integrative measurement approach blending environmental footprints, social sustainability indicators, and operational KPIs, while discussing methodological and ethical constraints (Hutchins & Sutherland, 2008; Kazancoglu et al., 2018).

Methodology

This study follows a rigorous narrative-synthesis methodology oriented toward conceptual development and managerial inference rather than empirical hypothesis testing. The approach draws upon systematic review techniques and integrative framework construction common in SSCM scholarship (Duque-Uribe et al., 2019; Govindan et al., 2015), augmented by technology-focused reviews on blockchain (Dutta et al., 2020; Ejairu et al., 2024) and AI in agricultural forecasting (Elufioye et al., 2024). The goal is to produce a cohesive theory-to-practice mapping grounded in the provided literature.

Data sources and scope. The analysis is strictly bounded to the references supplied in the user input. These include systematic reviews, industry-focused analyses, methodological contributions on multi-criteria decision making, and recent empirical and conceptual papers on social sustainability, circular economy, and technology-enabled logistics (Duque-Uribe et al., 2019; Dutta et al., 2020; Mani et al., 2016; Kazancoglu et al., 2018). The scope centers on healthcare and agricultural supply chains due to the critical public-health and food-safety implications present across the literature (Elabed et al., 2019; Haji et al., 2022).

Analytical procedure. The study proceeds in three analytical phases. First, thematic extraction identifies recurrent constructs—traceability, waste reduction, patient safety, supplier social sustainability, governance, and technological transparency—across sources (Duque-Uribe et al., 2019; Mani et al., 2018; Hsu et al., 2013). Second, cross-domain mapping links technological affordances (immutable ledgers, smart contracts, machine learning prediction) to SSCM mechanisms (transparency, incentives, risk-sharing) using deductive reasoning and theory elaboration (Dutta et al., 2020; Elufioye et al., 2024). Third, the framework is operationalized by proposing measurement clusters and managerial strategies with attention to known barriers and mitigation options documented in the literature (Govindan et al., 2015; Kazancoglu et al., 2018).

Validity and limitations of method. While narrative synthesis provides rich integrative insights, it cannot establish causal claims that require empirical testing (Duque-Uribe et al., 2019). This method relies on the interpretive integration of published findings and is subject to selection and interpretation biases; however, grounding all claims in the provided references and applying transparent reasoning mitigates these limitations (Govindan et al., 2015). The framework is therefore presented as a robust, theory-backed proposition set and managerial blueprint to be empirically evaluated in subsequent research.

Results

The central output is a multi-pillar integrative framework that operationalizes sustainability goals through technological and governance levers. Each pillar is described in depth with mechanisms, expected outcomes, barriers, and indicators.

Pillar 1: Governance & Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships

Mechanisms and rationale. Sustainable outcomes in supply chains are heavily dependent on governance structures and inclusive stakeholder engagement (Eweje et al., 2021; Hughes et al., 2019). Multi-stakeholder partnerships—comprising public agencies, private suppliers, civil-society organizations, and academic partners—serve as catalysts for aligning incentives, pooling resources, and enforcing ethical standards (Eweje et al., 2021). In healthcare and agriculture, procurement rules and public-sector governance often determine supplier behavior and investment in sustainability (Hughes et al., 2019; Hsu et al., 2013). Effective governance mechanisms include contractual clauses for social and environmental performance, certification schemes, and collaborative platforms for joint risk-sharing (Hsu et al., 2013; Mani et al., 2018).

Outcomes. Strong governance and partnerships can lead to higher supplier compliance with sustainability standards, improved social safeguards (e.g., labor practices), and integration of smallholder producers into ethical procurement channels (Mani et al., 2016; Mani et al., 2018). In hospital supply chains, governance shapes the adoption of sustainable practices for equipment lifecycle management and medical waste reduction (Duque-Uribe et al., 2019; Elabed et al., 2019).

Barriers. Barriers include misaligned incentives across actors, information asymmetries, limited institutional capacity in emerging economies, and enforcement deficits in complex global networks (Hughes et al., 2019; Grumiller et al., 2022). Addressing these requires tailored capacity-building, co-financing models, and transparent monitoring mechanisms.

Indicative metrics. Metrics under this pillar include the number and quality of partnership agreements, procurement contracts with sustainability clauses, reported supplier compliance rates, and measures of capacity-building investments (Eweje et al., 2021; Hughes et al., 2019).

Pillar 2: Technological Transparency—Blockchain for Traceability and Waste Reduction

Mechanisms and rationale. Blockchain technology provides immutable ledgers, tamper-evident records, and programmable smart contracts that can enhance provenance and automated enforcement of supply chain rules (Dutta et al., 2020; Ejairu et al., 2024). For healthcare and agriculture, blockchain can record cold-chain temperature logs, certificate issuance (e.g., quality or fair-trade certificates), and transactional data needed for recalls and safety audits (Chowdhury, 2025; Dutta et al., 2020). The immutable record reduces information asymmetry and enables downstream actors and regulators to verify claims about product origin, handling, and compliance.

Outcomes. Expected outcomes include reduced product spoilage through improved traceability and timely interventions; faster and more accurate recall processes for pharmaceuticals and contaminated foods; and enhanced consumer and regulator trust due to transparent provenance (Chowdhury, 2025; Dutta et al., 2020). Empirical comparisons between different regulatory contexts suggest that blockchain adoption patterns vary, with advanced economies experimenting with pilot projects while African contexts face unique infrastructural and governance constraints (Ejairu et al., 2024).

Barriers and mitigations. Significant barriers include scalability limitations, energy consumption concerns for some consensus protocols, interoperability across legacy systems, and legal uncertainties regarding data sovereignty and privacy (Dutta et al., 2020; Ejairu et al., 2024). Mitigation strategies include adopting permissioned ledgers with energy-efficient consensus mechanisms, establishing interoperability standards, and embedding privacy-preserving designs (e.g., off-chain storage for sensitive health data) alongside governance frameworks (Dutta et al., 2020).

Indicative metrics. Traceability scorecards (percentage of products with full provenance), reduction in spoilage/waste rates post-blockchain implementation, mean time-to-recall for safety incidents, and stakeholder trust indices derived from survey instruments are proposed metrics (Chowdhury, 2025; Dutta et al., 2020).

Pillar 3: Predictive & Prescriptive Analytics—AI for Demand Forecasting and Optimization

Mechanisms and rationale. AI and machine learning algorithms enable predictive analytics that can forecast demand, detect anomalies (e.g., deviations in cold-chain temperatures), and optimize inventory and routing decisions (Elufioye et al., 2024; Goodarzian et al., 2021). In agricultural supply chains, AI-driven forecasting improves matching between production and market demand, reducing post-harvest losses and improving price realization for producers (Elufioye et al., 2024). In healthcare, AI models can predict demand for critical supplies, enabling proactive procurement and allocation strategies that minimize shortages and waste (Goodarzian et al., 2021).

Outcomes. Accurate forecasts reduce overstocking and understocking, lower holding costs, and decrease resource wastage. For perishable goods and vaccines, predictive models can optimize replenishment cycles and allocate cold-chain resources more efficiently (Goodarzian et al., 2021; Elufioye et al., 2024).

Barriers and mitigations. Challenges include data quality and availability, algorithmic bias that may disadvantage marginalized producers, and workforce skill gaps for model deployment and interpretation (Elufioye et al., 2024; Hutchins & Sutherland, 2008). To mitigate these, organizations should invest in data governance, inclusive model training datasets, and upskilling programs alongside participatory model validation processes that include supplier and community representatives (Elufioye et al., 2024; Mani et al., 2016).

Indicative metrics. Forecast accuracy (e.g., MAPE—mean absolute percentage error—although expressed here descriptively), reduction in stockouts and overstocks, decrease in spoilage rates attributable to optimized replenishment, and measures of equity in model outcomes (e.g., differential error rates across supplier groupings) are recommended indicators (Elufioye et al., 2024).

Pillar 4: Social-Environmental Performance Management and Circularity

Mechanisms and rationale. Social sustainability—labor conditions, community welfare, and equitable supplier relationships—must be integrated alongside environmental metrics like carbon footprint and waste generation for truly sustainable supply chains (Hutchins & Sutherland, 2008; Mani et al., 2016). Circularity principles encourage redesigning systems to minimize virgin resource use, extend product lifecycles (remanufacturing and repair), and reclaim value from waste streams (Kazancoglu et al., 2018). In healthcare, equipment lifecycle management and safe disposal practices significantly influence environmental impact and public health outcomes (Elabed et al., 2019). Telemedicine and digital health interventions also present opportunities to lower carbon footprints by reducing travel and physical infrastructure needs (Holmner et al., 2014).

Outcomes. Integrated social-environmental management can reduce waste, lower carbon footprints through logistics optimization and telehealth alternatives, improve supplier livelihoods, and decrease the incidence of unethical labor practices within supply networks (Holmner et al., 2014; Mani et al., 2016).

Barriers and mitigations. Key barriers include difficulty in measuring social metrics reliably, the potential for greenwashing without robust verification, and financial constraints faced by small suppliers in adopting circular practices (Hutchins & Sutherland, 2008; Kazancoglu et al., 2018). Mitigations involve adopting multi-criteria decision-making tools for supplier evaluation (Govindan et al., 2015), establishing phased financing for circular transitions, and leveraging blockchain-enabled proof-of-compliance to minimize greenwashing risks (Dutta et al., 2020; Govindan et al., 2015).

Indicative metrics. Social sustainability indices (labor compliance rates, living-wage adoption), environmental footprint measures (carbon intensity per unit delivered, waste per unit), circularity ratios (percentage of materials reclaimed), and combined sustainability-performance dashboards are recommended (Hutchins & Sutherland, 2008; Kazancoglu et al., 2018).

Synthesis: Interactions and System Dynamics
The four pillars interact dynamically: blockchain transparency strengthens governance by providing verifiable evidence for contractual enforcement and certification; AI enhances operational efficiency, enabling better utilization of blockchain-provided provenance; governance structures shape the equitable distribution of benefits and ensure social safeguards when digital systems are deployed (Dutta et al., 2020; Elufioye et al., 2024; Eweje et al., 2021). For instance, temperature sensors linked to blockchain entries can trigger AI-powered alerts that prompt corrective actions, thereby reducing spoilage and improving patient safety in vaccine distribution (Dutta et al., 2020; Goodarzian et al., 2021). However, these synergies are conditional upon inclusive governance that addresses privacy, data ownership, and access disparities (Ejairu et al., 2024; Hughes et al., 2019).

Discussion
This section delves into nuanced interpretations, theoretical implications, managerial guidance, and limitations, with a view toward future research.

Theoretical interpretation and contributions. The framework advances SSCM theory by explicitly integrating digital technologies as mediating mechanisms between governance arrangements and sustainability outcomes. It expands prior conceptualizations of green supply chain drivers (Hsu et al., 2013) by embedding technology-specific affordances—immutability and programmable contracts for blockchain; pattern recognition and forecasting for AI—within multi-criteria performance evaluation typologies (Govindan et al., 2015; Kazancoglu et al., 2018). Social sustainability, often treated as a secondary concern, is elevated to a core dimension, thereby aligning with emerging scholarship that calls for richer measures of social outcomes in supply chains (Mani et al., 2016; Hutchins & Sutherland, 2008). The integrated framework also contributes to resilience literature by specifying how real-time transparency and predictive analytics together shorten response times during disruptions, thereby enhancing system robustness (Grumiller et al., 2022).

Managerial implications and pathways to implementation.

1. **Adopt phased pilots with clear social safeguards.** Organizational leaders should pilot blockchain-AI integrations in bounded supply chain segments (e.g., pilot vaccine cold-chain lanes or a selected agricultural commodity) and simultaneously design governance protocols that protect sensitive data and ensure equitable benefit sharing (Dutta et al., 2020; Ejairu et al., 2024).

2. **Invest in data governance and capacity building.** Success depends on accurate, high-quality data and interpretive skills. Training programs and supplier capacity-building must accompany technical deployments to prevent asymmetries and algorithmic marginalization (Elufioye et al., 2024; Mani et al., 2018).

3. **Design performance dashboards integrating social and environmental KPIs.** Avoid optimizing single metrics (e.g., delivery time) at the expense of social outcomes; instead, use multi-criteria decision frameworks to balance trade-offs (Govindan et al., 2015; Kazancoglu et al., 2018).

4. **Use permissioned blockchain architectures and privacy-preserving designs.** Health data is particularly sensitive; permissioned ledgers combined with off-chain storage can balance traceability with privacy and legal compliance (Dutta et al., 2020; Ejairu et al., 2024).

5. **Engage multi-stakeholder platforms for financing and governance.** Public procurement reforms and multi-stakeholder partnerships can mobilize funding and mandate compliance across suppliers (Eweje et al., 2021; Hughes et al., 2019).

Policy implications. Policymakers should encourage interoperable standards for provenance data and incentivize pilot projects through grant funding or preferential procurement for suppliers demonstrating verified social and environmental performance (Hsu et al., 2013; Eweje et al., 2021). Regulatory frameworks should clarify liability rules for blockchain records and set privacy norms to protect patient and consumer data (Dutta et al., 2020).

Ethical and equity considerations. Digital transformations can inadvertently exacerbate inequalities if small suppliers lack access to requisite technologies or if algorithmic decision-making embeds biases (Elufioye et al., 2024; Hutchins & Sutherland, 2008). Ethical design mandates participatory evaluation of AI models, transparent governance, and redistributive measures (capacity-building funds, subsidized access to digital infrastructure) to avoid concentrating benefits among large incumbents (Mani et al., 2016).

Limitations of the framework. The framework is grounded in conceptual and review literature rather than primary empirical testing; causal assertions remain to be validated in field studies (Duque-Uribe et al., 2019). Additionally, technology performance—especially blockchain scalability and AI generalizability—varies by context and depends on evolving standards and hardware constraints (Dutta et al., 2020; Elufioye et al., 2024). Finally, the heterogeneity of healthcare and agricultural systems across countries limits one-size-fits-all prescriptions; contextual adaptation is essential (Ejairu et al., 2024; Grumiller et al., 2022).

Future research agenda

To empirically operationalize and test the framework, several research streams are recommended:

1. **Controlled field pilots with mixed-method evaluations.** Implement pilots that combine blockchain-enabled provenance tracking with AI-based forecasting in healthcare cold-chain corridors and selected agricultural value chains; evaluate outcomes using quasi-experimental designs and qualitative process tracing to understand causal mechanisms (Dutta et al., 2020; Goodarzian et al., 2021).
2. **Comparative studies across regulatory contexts.** Comparative research between high-income and low- and middle-income country contexts can illuminate institutional bottlenecks and transferability of technological solutions (Ejairu et al., 2024; Grumiller et al., 2022).
3. **Algorithmic fairness and inclusion metrics.** Develop and test indicators that quantify the distributional impacts of AI on marginalized suppliers, including error-rate disparities and access differentials (Elufioye et al., 2024; Hutchins & Sutherland, 2008).
4. **Life-cycle environmental assessments of digital deployments.** Evaluate the net carbon and resource impacts of blockchain and AI when integrated into supply chains—considering device lifecycles, energy use, and potential reductions from improved logistics (Holmner et al., 2014; Dutta et al., 2020).
5. **Governance experiments with procurement levers.** Test procurement-based interventions, such as sustainability-linked tendering and supplier development funds, to assess how policy can accelerate equitable adoption (Hughes et al., 2019; Eweje et al., 2021).

Conclusion

Sustainable supply chain transformation in healthcare and agriculture requires a synthesis of governance innovation, technological transparency, predictive analytics, and rigorous social-environmental performance management. Blockchain and AI are not panaceas; rather, when embedded within inclusive governance arrangements and accompanied by capacity-building and ethical safeguards, they can materially reduce waste, enhance traceability, and improve patient and consumer safety (Dutta et al., 2020; Elufioye et al., 2024; Chowdhury, 2025). The integrative framework developed here operationalizes these linkages into four actionable pillars—Governance & Partnerships; Technological Transparency; Predictive Analytics; and Social-Environmental Management—each with concrete mechanisms, barriers, and metrics. Moving forward, robust empirical testing through field pilots, cross-contextual comparisons, and evaluative research on distributional outcomes is essential to transform the theoretical promise into societally beneficial practice. Policymakers, practitioners, and researchers should collaborate within multi-stakeholder platforms to ensure that technological adoption reinforces equity and environmental stewardship while strengthening resilience against an increasingly uncertain global landscape (Eweje et al., 2021; Grumiller et al., 2022).

References

1. Duque-Uribe, V., Sarache, W., & Gutiérrez, E.V.

(2019). Sustainable supply chain management practices and sustainable performance in hospitals: a systematic review and integrative framework. Sustainability, 11(21), 5949.

2. Dutta, P., Choi, T.M., Somani, S., & Butala, R. (2020). Blockchain technology in supply chain operations: Applications, challenges and research opportunities. Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review, 142, 102067.
3. Ejairu, E., Mhlongo, N.Z., Odeyemi, O., Nwankwo, E., & Odunaiya, O.G. (2024). Blockchain in global supply chains: A comparative review of USA and African practices. International Journal of Science and Research Archive, 11(1), 2093–2100. https://doi.org/10.30574/ijsra.2024.11.1.0278
4. Elabed, S., Belal, A., & Shamayleh, A. (2019, October). Sustainability of medical equipment in the healthcare industry: An overview. In 2019 Fifth International Conference on Advances in Biomedical Engineering (ICABME) (pp. 1-4). IEEE.
5. Elufioye, O.A., Odeyemi, O., Usman, F.O., & Mhlongo, N.Z. (2024). Ai-Driven predictive analytics in agricultural supply chains: a review: assessing the benefits and challenges of ai in forecasting demand and optimizing supply in agriculture. Computer Science & IT Research Journal.
6. Eweje, G., Sajjad, A., Nath, S.D., & Kobayashi, K. (2021). Multi-stakeholder partnerships: A catalyst to achieve sustainable development goals. Marketing Intelligence & Planning, 39(2), 186-212.
7. 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
8. Gimeno, P. S., & Teraphonghom, N. (2013). Innovative Logistics Practices for Sustainable Transportation-Drivers and Barriers.
9. Grumiller, J., Grohs, H., & Raza, W. (2022). Resilience in sustainable global supply chains: evidence and policy recommendations.
10. Haji, M., Kerbache, L., & Al-Ansari, T. (2022). Food quality, drug safety, and increasing public health measures in supply chain management. Processes, 10(9), 1715.
11. Holmner, Å., Ebi, K.L., Lazuardi, L., & Nilsson, M. (2014). Carbon footprint of telemedicine solutions-unexplored opportunity for reducing carbon emissions in the health sector. PloS One, 9(9), e105040.
12. Hsu, C.C., Choon Tan, K., Hanim Mohamad Zailani, S., & Jayaraman, V. (2013). Supply chain drivers that foster the development of green initiatives in an emerging economy. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 33(6), 656-688.
13. Hughes, A., Morrison, E., & Ruwanpura, K.N. (2019). Public sector procurement and ethical trade: Governance and social responsibility in some hidden global supply chains. Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, 44(2), 242-255.
14. Hutchins, M.J., & Sutherland, J.W. (2008). An exploration of measures of social sustainability and their application to supply chain decisions. Journal of Cleaner Production, 16(15), 1688-1698.
15. Kanokphanvanich, C., Rattanawong, W., & Vongmanee, V. (2023). A new model for a sustainable healthcare supply chain prioritizes patient safety: using the fuzzy Delphi method to identify healthcare workers' perspectives. Sustainability, 15(9), 7123.
16. Mani, V.; Gunasekaran, A.; Papadopoulos, T.; Hazen, B.; Dubey, R. Supply chain social sustainability for developing nations: Evidence from India. Resour. Conserv. Recycl. 2016, 111, 42–52.
17. Mani, V.; Gunasekaran, A.; Delgado, C. Supply chain social sustainability: Standard adoption practices in Portuguese manufacturing firms. Int. J. Prod. Econ. 2018, 198, 149–164.
18. Mani, V.; Gunasekaran, A.; Delgado, C. Enhancing supply chain performance through supplier social sustainability: An emerging economy perspective. Int. J. Prod. Econ. 2018, 195, 259–272.
19. Govindan, K.; Rajendran, S.; Sarkis, J.; Murugesan, P. Multi criteria decision making approaches for green supplier evaluation and selection: A literature review. J. Clean. Prod. 2015, 98, 66–83.
20. Kazancoglu, Y.; Kazancoglu, I.; Sagnak, M. Fuzzy DEMATEL-based green supply chain management performance. Ind. Manag. Data Syst. 2018, 118, 412–431.
21. dos Santos, B.M.; Godoy, L.P.; Campos, L.M.S.

Performance evaluation of green suppliers using entropy-TOPSIS-F. J. Clean. Prod. 2019, 207, 498–509.

22. Wu, H.-H.; Chang, S.-Y. A case study of using DEMATEL method to identify critical factors in green supply chain management. Appl. Math. Comput. 2015, 256, 394–403.

23. Rostamzadeh, R.; Govindan, K.; Esmaeili, A.; Sabaghi, M. Application of fuzzy VIKOR for evaluation of green supply chain management practices. Ecol. Indic. 2015, 49, 188–203.

24. Pourjavad, E.; Shahin, A. The Application of Mamdani Fuzzy Inference System in Evaluating Green Supply Chain Management Performance. Int. J. Fuzzy Syst. 2017, 20, 901–912.

25. Kazancoglu, Y.; Kazancoglu, I.; Sagnak, M. A new holistic conceptual framework for green supply chain management performance assessment based on circular economy. J. Clean. Prod. 2018, 195, 1282–1299.

26. Islam, M.S.; Tseng, M.-L.; Karia, N.; Lee, C.-H. Assessing green supply chain practices in Bangladesh using fuzzy importance and performance approach. Resour. Conserv. Recycl. 2018, 131, 134–145.

27. Stevenson, M.; Cole, R. Modern slavery in supply chains: A secondary data analysis of detection, remediation and disclosure. Supply Chain Manag. Int. J. 2018, 23, 81–99.

28. Mani, V.; Agrawal, R.; Sharma, V. Social sustainability in the supply chain: Analysis of enablers. Manag. Res. Rev. 2015, 38, 1016–1042.

29. Goodarzian, F., A. A. Taleizadeh, P. Ghasemi, and A. Abraham. (2021). An Integrated Sustainable Medical SupplyChain Network During Covid-19. Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence, 100: 104188.

30. Hahn, G. J. (2020). Industry 4.0: A Supply Chain Innovation Perspective. International Journal of Production Research, 58(5), 1425–1441.

31. Han, X., and X. Yan. (2021). Optimal Entry Strategy of a Remanufacturer and Its Impact on Carbon Reductions with Online Consumer Reviews. International Journal of Logistics Research and Applications. doi:10.1080/13675567.2021.1926947.

32. He, X. H., W. J. Liu, W. F. Hu, and X. H. Wu. (2021). Coalitional Strategies of the Pharmaceutical Supply Chain with an Option Contract to Cope with Disruption Risks. International Journal of Logistics-Research and Applications. doi:10.1080/13675567.2021.1949700.

33. Hendiani, S., H. Liao, and C. J. C. Jabbour. (2020). A New Sustainability Indicator for Supply Chains: Theoretical and Practical Contribution Towards Sustainable Operations. International Journal of Logistics Research and Applications. doi:10.1080/13675567.2020.1761308.

34. Hsu, C.-C., K.-C. Tan, and S. H. M. Zailani. (2016). Strategic Orientations, Sustainable Supply Chain Initiatives, and Reverse Logistics Empirical Evidence from an Emerging Market. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 36(1), 86–110.

35. Huang, Y.-C., E. Q. Borazon, and J.-M. Liu. (2021). Antecedents and Consequences of Green Supply Chain Management in Taiwan’s Electric and Electronic Industry. Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management, 32(5), 1066–1093.

36. Jabbour, C. J. C., and A. B. L. De Sousa Jabbour. (2016). Green Human Resource Management and Green Supply Chain Management: Linking Two Emerging Agendas. Journal of Cleaner Production, 112, 1824–1833.

37. Kazancoglu, I., Y. Kazancoglu, A. Kahraman, E. Yarimoglu, and G. Soni. (2020). Investigating Barriers to Circular Supply Chain in the Textile Industry from Stakeholders’ Perspective. International Journal of Logistics Research and Applications. doi:10.1080/13675567.2020.1846694.

38. Khan, S. A. R., Z. Yu, S. Sarwat, D. I. Godil, S. Amin, and S. Shujaat. (2021). The Role of Block Chain Technology in Circular Economy Practices to Improve Organisational Performance. International Journal of Logistics Research and Applications. doi:10.1080/13675567.2021.1872512.