The American Journal of Interdisciplinary Innovations and Research
ISSN 2642-7478 | Open Access

TYPE Original Research
PAGE NO. 119-126

Check for updates

Enhancing Logistics Performance through Agility, Value-Added Services, and Digital Intelligence: An Integrated Framework

Dr. Emily Carter
Faculty of Engineering & Smart Systems,
Politecnico di Torino, Italy

OPEN ACCESS
SUBMITTED 12 August 2025
ACCEPTED 23 August 2025
PUBLISHED 31 August 2025
VOLUME Vol.07 Issue 08 2025

CITATION

Dr. Emily Carter. (2025). Enhancing Logistics Performance through Agility, Value-Added Services, and Digital Intelligence: An Integrated Framework. *The American Journal of Interdisciplinary Innovations and Research*, 7(8), 119–126.

Abstract: This article develops a comprehensive, publication-ready theoretical and practical framework that synthesizes agility, value-added logistics services, and digital intelligence within contemporary logistics and warehouse operations. Drawing on established and emergent literatures in logistics flexibility, third-party logistics (3PL) strategies, warehouse operational responses to e-commerce and pandemic shocks, big data analytics, digital technologies, RFID contextualization, machine learning forecasting, and environmental logistics, the paper constructs a multi-layered model for evaluating, designing, and improving logistics performance. The structured abstract outlines the problem, methods, principal findings, and implications. First, the problem context is identified: contemporary logistics providers face intensifying demand volatility, service differentiation requirements, and rapid technological change that together strain traditional warehouse and distribution paradigms (Ho & Chang, 2015; Lee et al., 1997). Second, the method synthesizes theoretical constructs and empirical insights from the provided references into a conceptual model that links innovation and service capabilities, logistics flexibility, value-added services, digital technologies, and sustainability outcomes (Gunasekaran et al., 2017; Ivanov et al., 2019). Third, the key findings show that the interplay of organizational capabilities (innovation and service orientation), operational strategies (value-added services and outsourcing), and digital intelligence (big data analytics, IoT, RFID, and machine learning) produces superior logistics performance, resilience to shocks such as pandemics, and opportunities for sustainable improvements when managed coherently (Ho & Chang, 2015; Michel, 2020; Gunasekaran et al., 2017). Finally, implications for practitioners highlight a staged implementation pathway that emphasizes capability assessment, modular service design, data architecture development, workforce upskilling, and sustainability alignment. The article contributes an integrative, citation-grounded roadmap for research and practice while identifying specific avenues for empirical validation.

Keywords: logistics agility, value-added services, digital intelligence, warehouse management, supply chain analytics, RFID, sustainability

INTRODUCTION

The contemporary logistics landscape is characterized by complex, intersecting pressures: escalating e-commerce volumes, heightened customer expectations for speed and customization, more frequent demand shocks, and accelerating technological change (Michel, 2017; Michel, 2020). These pressures demand that logistics providers—ranging from in-house distribution centers to third-party logistics (3PL) firms—reconfigure traditional operational paradigms to achieve greater agility, to expand value-added capabilities, and to harness digital intelligence. This article synthesizes a body of scholarship that spans organizational capabilities (innovation and service capabilities), operational strategies (value-added services and outsourcing), and technological enablers (big data analytics, digital technologies, RFID, and machine learning forecasting) to produce a unified, theoretically rich framework for modern logistics and warehouse management (Ho & Chang, 2015; Aziz et al., 2017; Gunasekaran et al., 2017; Ivanov et al., 2019; Lee et al., 2021).

The impetus for this synthesis arises from two converging trends. First, demand-side volatility—embodied in phenomena such as the bullwhip effect—compels firms to devise responsive and flexible logistics strategies to avoid amplification of variability along the supply chain (Lee et al., 1997). Second, technological advances in data capture, connectivity, and analytics open new possibilities for anticipatory, real-time, and autonomous logistics operations (Gunasekaran et al., 2017; Ivanov et al., 2019). However, technology alone is insufficient: organizational innovation capabilities and service orientation are critical moderators that determine whether digital investments translate into improved corporate and logistics performance (Ho & Chang, 2015; Tian et al., 2010). Thus, any robust framework must account for capabilities, services, and technology in an integrated manner.

Existing studies provide important but fragmented insights. Research on innovation capabilities and service capabilities underscores the strategic importance of organizational competencies in generating performance gains (Ho & Chang, 2015). Studies on logistics flexibility and value-added capabilities demonstrate how responsive operational practices and supplementary services contribute to logistics performance (Aziz et al., 2017; Okorie et al., 2016). Work on big data analytics and digital technologies offers evidence that advanced data processing, IoT, and machine learning can significantly enhance forecasting and decision-making in logistics contexts (Gunasekaran et al., 2017; Ivanov et al., 2019; Lee et al., 2021). Warehouse-specific analyses examine the contextual impact of RFID and the operational shifts triggered by e-commerce and pandemic conditions (Karagiannaki et al., 2011; Michel, 2017; Michel, 2020). These contributions are valuable but largely operate in disciplinary silos or focus on particular technologies or market phenomena. There exists a clear literature gap: a comprehensive, multi-dimensional model that explicates how organizational capabilities, value-added services, and digital intelligence interact to shape logistics and warehouse performance across normal and disturbed operating regimes.

This article addresses that gap by constructing a layered conceptual framework. It articulates the theoretical underpinnings of agility, explicates the strategic role of value-added logistics services, and details how digital intelligence functions as the enabling substrate that converts operational capabilities into measurable performance improvements. The framework emphasizes interactions—how innovation capabilities moderate technology adoption outcomes, and how value-added services create demand for advanced analytics while simultaneously necessitating more flexible operations. Empirically grounded arguments draw on the references to justify model components and expected relationships (Ho & Chang, 2015; Aziz et al., 2017; Tian et al., 2010; Gunasekaran et al., 2017; Ivanov et al., 2019).

Beyond the conceptual framework, the article provides practical guidance—methodological heuristics and staged implementation pathways—for practitioners seeking to operationalize the model within diverse logistics contexts. The guidance addresses capability assessments, modular design of value-added services, digital architecture, data governance, workforce transformation, and sustainability alignment. The paper concludes by identifying promising empirical research directions, including measurement challenges, quasi-experimental evaluation designs, and cross-national comparative studies.

METHODOLOGY

This article adopts a theory-driven synthesis methodology grounded in the provided literature. The methodology proceeds in three logically ordered phases: (1) theoretical extraction and thematic coding, (2) integrative model construction, and (3) analytic elaboration and practical translation.

Phase 1: Theoretical Extraction and Thematic Coding

Each reference provided was carefully examined to extract core constructs, empirical findings, and conceptual linkages relevant to logistics performance, warehouse operations, digital technologies, and sustainability. For example, research on organizational innovation and service capabilities was used to define capability constructs and performance mechanisms (Ho & Chang, 2015). Studies on logistics flexibility and value-added services informed operational strategies and hypothesized performance pathways (Aziz et al., 2017; Okorie et al., 2016). The body of literature on big data and digital technologies served to specify technological enablers and analytic capabilities (Gunasekaran et al., 2017; Ivanov et al., 2019), while works on RFID contextual factors and warehouse surveys provided context-specific evidence for warehouse operations under e-commerce and pandemic pressures (Karagiannaki et al., 2011; Michel, 2017; Michel, 2020). Foundational supply chain theory (Lee et al., 1997) and sustainability perspectives (McKinnon et al., 2015) were used to anchor the framework in established conceptual foundations. Each extraction was coded thematically to identify recurring constructs: agility/flexibility, value-added services, digital intelligence, organizational capabilities, resilience, and sustainability.

Phase 2: Integrative Model Construction

Using the coded constructs, a layered conceptual model was constructed. The model comprises three principal layers: Organizational Capabilities (innovation, service orientation), Operational Strategies (value-added services, flexibility, outsourcing), and Digital Intelligence (big data analytics, IoT, machine learning, RFID). Inter-layer connectors specify hypothesized causal and moderating relationships: for instance, Organizational Capabilities moderate the effectiveness of Digital Intelligence investments; Digital Intelligence enables finer-grained execution of Value-Added Services; Operational Strategies shape data requirements and analytics application domains. The model also integrates environmental contingencies—demand volatility, e-commerce growth, and exogenous shocks like the COVID-19 pandemic—that influence the relative weight of model components (Michel, 2020; Lee et al., 1997). Each relationship in the model is justified with direct citation to the corresponding literature.

Phase 3: Analytic Elaboration and Practical Translation

The conceptual model was translated into actionable heuristics and implementation pathways for practitioners. Drawing on the literature, practical steps were delineated: capability audits, modularization of services, architectural considerations for data integration, selection of analytic techniques, and workforce development strategies (Gunasekaran et al., 2017; Ivanov et al., 2019; Lee et al., 2021). For each heuristic, the literature provided supporting evidence or rationale: for instance, the need for modular service design is supported by studies on 3PL service differentiation and logistics outsourcing trends (Tian et al., 2010; Langley, 2007). Potential risks and limitations—organizational resistance, data quality, and contextual variability—were identified and tied to references addressing contextual influences (Karagiannaki et al., 2011; Mayer et al., 2009).

Methodological Rigor and Limitations

This synthesis follows systematic logic but is not an empirical meta-analysis; it is a theoretically integrative and practice-oriented conceptual article. The methodology emphasizes construct clarity and citation-backed justification for each assertion, thereby ensuring that claims are anchored in the provided literature. The limitation of this methodological choice is that empirical validation is left for future work; the article makes explicit the kinds of empirical designs that would be suitable for testing the proposed relationships (discussed below). The approach of synthesizing across diverse literatures trades off causal precision for breadth and integrative insight; however, this is appropriate given the article’s objective to construct a holistic framework that spans capabilities, operations, and technology.

RESULTS

The results section presents the outcome of the synthesis: (1) a detailed conceptual model with explicated relationships, (2) propositions that operationalize the model, and (3) practical implementation guidelines. All results are descriptive and interpretive—derived from the reviewed literature and integrated logically rather than produced through new data collection.

1.Conceptual Model: Layers, Constructs, and Relationships

The conceptual model comprises three primary layers—Organizational Capabilities, Operational Strategies, and Digital Intelligence—embedded within a context of environmental contingencies and sustainability objectives. Each layer and its key constructs are described below, with associated literature references and explanatory detail.

Organizational Capabilities: Innovation and Service Orientation

Organizational capabilities refer to persistent organizational competencies that enable firms to generate superior outcomes. Innovation capabilities encompass the ability to design new service offerings, reconfigure processes, and adopt novel technologies (Ho & Chang, 2015). Service orientation reflects customer-centric processes, responsiveness to customer needs, and a culture oriented toward service excellence (Tian et al., 2010). These capabilities are foundational: they determine strategic priority-setting, resource allocation for digital investments, and the firm's propensity to co-create value with customers. Ho and Chang (2015) empirically show that innovation and service capabilities positively influence corporate performance in logistics service firms, suggesting that investments in capabilities are necessary preconditions for deriving value from operational changes.

Operational Strategies: Value-Added Services, Flexibility, and Outsourcing

Operational strategies involve the design and execution of logistics processes. Value-added services (VAS) refer to supplementary services—such as kitting, reverse logistics, custom packaging, labeling, quality inspections, and light assembly—that augment basic storage and transport functions and create differentiation (Okorie et al., 2016). Logistics flexibility captures the ability to adapt capacities, route plans, and service offerings in response to demand fluctuations (Aziz et al., 2017). Outsourcing to 3PLs is a strategic choice that impacts the scalability and specialization of operations (Langley, 2007). These strategies are interdependent: offering complex VAS requires both flexibility in operations and potentially coordination with 3PL partners; outsourcing choices affect the firm's control over execution and the data flows necessary for analytics.

Digital Intelligence: Big Data Analytics, IoT, RFID, and Machine Learning

Digital intelligence refers to an ecosystem of technologies and processes that capture, process, and analyze data to generate actionable insights. Key elements include big data analytics for pattern discovery and decision optimization (Gunasekaran et al., 2017), IoT sensors and connectivity for real-time visibility (Ivanov et al., 2019), RFID systems for item-level tracking (Karagiannaki et al., 2011), and machine learning for forecasting and anomaly detection (Lee et al., 2021). The literature indicates that digital intelligence can materially improve forecasting accuracy, inventory control, and responsiveness when appropriately integrated with operational processes (Gunasekaran et al., 2017; Lee et al., 2021; Ivanov et al., 2019). However, technology benefits are moderated by context-specific factors such as warehouse layout, existing IT infrastructure, and data quality (Karagiannaki et al., 2011).

Inter-layer Relationships and Moderation Effects

The model posits specific relationships: Organizational Capabilities → (moderates) Digital Intelligence effectiveness; Digital Intelligence → Operational Strategy execution; Operational Strategies ↔ Organizational Capabilities (bidirectional co-evolution). For instance, innovation capabilities moderate the effectiveness of big data investments because firms with higher innovation orientation are more adept at integrating analytic outputs into service redesign (Ho & Chang, 2015; Gunasekaran et al., 2017). Similarly, value-added services create requirements for more granular, real-time data, thus increasing the demand for IoT and RFID deployment (Okorie et al., 2016; Karagiannaki et al., 2011). Environmental contingencies (demand volatility, e-commerce growth, exogenous shocks) influence the salience of agility and the urgency of digital investments—pandemic conditions amplify the need for resilient and flexible warehouse operations (Michel, 2020).

2.Propositions for Empirical Testing

From the model, several testable propositions emerge. Each is presented with elaboration and literature backing.

Proposition 1: Higher levels of organizational innovation capability lead to greater returns from digital intelligence investments in logistics performance.

Elaboration: The value realized from investments in analytics and IoT is contingent on organizational capacity to reconfigure processes and implement findings. Firms that systematically experiment, learn, and redesign services will translate data insights into process improvements more rapidly and comprehensively (Ho & Chang, 2015; Gunasekaran et al., 2017).

Proposition 2: The provision of value-added services mediates the effect of logistics flexibility on customer-oriented logistics performance.

Elaboration: Flexibility enables the range of VAS a provider can offer; in turn, VAS directly affect customer satisfaction and competitive positioning. Thus, flexibility enhances performance mainly when it is used to expand and reliably deliver VAS (Aziz et al., 2017; Okorie et al., 2016).

Proposition 3: Implementation of RFID and IoT technologies yields greater operational benefits when warehouse contextual factors—such as layout and process alignment—are favorable.

Elaboration: Karagiannaki et al. (2011) highlight that RFID impact depends on contextual elements; thus technological investments should be tailored to physical and operational conditions to maximize ROI.

Proposition 4: Machine learning-based forecasting reduces the bullwhip effect when integrated with collaborative information-sharing practices across supply chain partners.

Elaboration: Forecasting improvements can attenuate order variability, but their benefits are amplified when coupled with information transparency and coordination across the chain (Lee et al., 1997; Lee et al., 2021).

Proposition 5: During systemic shocks (e.g., pandemics), firms with pre-established digital intelligence and value-added service modularity achieve faster operational recovery and maintain higher service levels than those without such infrastructure.

Elaboration: Pandemic-driven disruptions created sudden requirements for flexible fulfillment and safety protocols; firms with digital visibility and modular service bundles could adapt more readily (Michel, 2020; Ivanov et al., 2019).

3.Practical Implementation Guidelines Derived from the Model

The synthesis yields actionable steps for logistics managers. Each guideline is justified by the literature.

Capability Audit and Strategic Alignment

Begin with a rigorous capability audit that assesses innovation orientation, service culture, data literacy, and IT readiness (Ho & Chang, 2015). Align strategic objectives—growth, differentiation, cost leadership—with the capability profile to prioritize investments in VAS or digital technologies (Tian et al., 2010; Langley, 2007).

Modularize Value-Added Services

Design VAS as modular service bundles that can be appended or removed with minimal process disruption. Modularization facilitates scalability, eases integration with 3PLs, and creates clearer data boundaries for analytics (Okorie et al., 2016).

Develop a Data Architecture for Digital Intelligence

Construct a layered data architecture that captures transactional, sensor, and partner-shared data. Emphasize data quality, governance, and interoperability to avoid analytic brittleness. The architecture should support both descriptive dashboards and advanced predictive models (Gunasekaran et al., 2017; Ivanov et al., 2019).

Tailor RFID and IoT Deployments to Warehouse Context

Assess warehouse-specific factors—layout, throughput, SKU characteristics—before large-scale RFID rollouts. Karagiannaki et al. (2011) show that contextual alignment is essential for realizing RFID benefits; pilot studies and staged rollouts reduce implementation risk.

Integrate Machine Learning with Collaborative Forecasting

Implement machine learning forecasting models while fostering information sharing with suppliers and customers. Combining advanced analytics with collaborative mechanisms addresses demand uncertainty and reduces the bullwhip effect (Lee et al., 1997; Lee et al., 2021).

Workforce Upskilling and Change Management

Invest in workforce training and change management to ensure analytic outputs are operationalized. Organizational capability to absorb technology-driven changes is as important as the technology itself (Ho & Chang, 2015; Gunasekaran et al., 2017).

Sustainability Alignment

Leverage digital intelligence to monitor and optimize environmental performance—route optimization, energy use in warehouses, and packaging decisions—aligning operational improvements with green logistics objectives (McKinnon et al., 2015).

DISCUSSION

This section interprets the synthesized model in depth, discusses theoretical implications, examines counter-arguments, acknowledges limitations, and outlines future research directions. The goal is to provide a nuanced, critical reflection on how the integrated framework informs both scholarship and practice.

Theoretical Implications: Bridging Capabilities, Services, and Technology

The primary theoretical contribution of this article is the articulation of a co-evolutionary model in which organizational capabilities, operational strategies, and digital intelligence mutually shape logistics performance. Traditionally, research often treated technology adoption as an exogenous factor or focused on single technologies in isolation (Gunasekaran et al., 2017). This framework posits that technology adoption must be considered alongside organizational readiness and the strategic design of services. In doing so, it echoes capability-based views of the firm while offering operational specificity for logistics contexts (Ho & Chang, 2015). The model extends classic supply chain theory—such as analysis of the bullwhip effect—by showing how digital intelligence can attenuate variability when embedded within collaborative practices (Lee et al., 1997; Lee et al., 2021). Thus, the framework synthesizes organizational and technical lenses and situates them within supply chain dynamics.

Operationalizing Agility: From Concept to Practice

Agility in logistics is often invoked rhetorically but becomes concrete only when operationalized through flexibility, modular services, and digital visibility. Flexibility without data is reactionary; data without flexibility is impotent. Therefore, operational agility emerges from the intersection of flexible process architectures and real-time digital insights. This practical dynamic is supported by evidence that logistics flexibility and value-added services influence logistics performance (Aziz et al., 2017; Okorie et al., 2016), and that digital technologies enable more responsive control systems (Gunasekaran et al., 2017; Ivanov et al., 2019). The model emphasizes the need for deliberate investments in processes—not solely technologies—and recommends modularization of services to enable rapid reconfiguration.

Counter-Arguments and Critical Perspectives

One potential counter-argument is technological determinism: the belief that investment in digital intelligence alone will automatically produce superior logistics performance. The literature contradicts this deterministic view. Ho and Chang (2015) and Karagiannaki et al. (2011) provide evidence that organizational and contextual factors significantly influence the outcome of technological implementations; for instance, RFID benefits are contingent on warehouse context and process alignment. Another counterpoint challenges the scalability of VAS: critics may argue that offering extensive value-added services is cost-prohibitive and may dilute a firm's operational focus. The model addresses this by advocating modular VAS that can be scaled and priced appropriately, and by recommending that VAS strategy be aligned with capability audits and market positioning (Okorie et al., 2016; Langley, 2007). A further critical perspective concerns data privacy and governance—adopting more pervasive sensing and analytics may raise regulatory and ethical concerns, especially when integrating partner-shared data. This article recognizes the importance of robust governance frameworks in the Data Architecture guideline and the need for careful contractual arrangements when outsourcing (Gunasekaran et al., 2017; Tian et al., 2010).

Limitations of the Synthesis Approach

This article's integrative methodology provides breadth and theoretical connectivity but inherently lacks the causal validation that primary empirical work provides.

The propositions herein require testing through multiple empirical methods—experimental pilots, quasi-experiments, longitudinal case studies, and cross-sectional surveys. Another limitation is the reliance on the provided literature, which may not exhaustively represent all domains relevant to logistics innovation—yet the selected references cover key dimensions of capabilities, operations, and technology. Contextual variation is another important limitation: the framework is applicable across many contexts but must be adapted to industry-specific and country-specific institutional differences (Mayer et al., 2009). For instance, warehousing conditions and labor dynamics differ significantly across geographies, affecting RFID or IoT adoption outcomes (Karagiannaki et al., 2011).

Implementation Challenges and Risk Management

Operationalizing the model presents practical challenges. First, data quality and integration remain perennial obstacles; organizations frequently underestimate the effort required to prepare data for analytics (Gunasekaran et al., 2017). Investment in data governance is non-negotiable. Second, workforce and cultural barriers can derail digital transformation; therefore, training, role redesign, and incentive realignment are essential (Ho & Chang, 2015). Third, cost-benefit uncertainties for technologies like RFID demand staged pilots to ascertain ROI under local conditions (Karagiannaki et al., 2011). Fourth, outsourcing relationships with 3PLs must be governed to ensure data sharing and performance alignment—Langley (2007) highlights the nuanced nature of outsourcing arrangements and the need to maintain strategic coherence. Finally, sustainability objectives require holistic monitoring; operations that reduce handling time may nevertheless increase environmental burdens if not optimized for energy use and materials (McKinnon et al., 2015).

Future Research Directions

The article identifies several promising research avenues:

Empirical Validation of the Integrated Model

Rigorous tests of the propositions are required. Mixed-methods studies combining field experiments (pilot technology deployments), quasi-experimental designs (comparing firms with and without modular VAS), and panel data analyses would offer robust evidence.

Measurement and Construct Refinement

Developing validated measurement scales for digital intelligence maturity, VAS modularity, and logistics flexibility will facilitate comparative research. Scales should capture both technological artifacts (sensor penetration, analytic capabilities) and organizational practices (learning routines, service design).

Cross-National Comparative Studies

Institutional and infrastructural differences likely moderate the effectiveness of technologies and service strategies. Comparative studies across regions would clarify boundary conditions (Mayer et al., 2009).

Longitudinal Studies of Pandemic-Era Transformations

The pandemic produced natural experiments in logistics resilience. Longitudinal case studies tracking firms' digital and service adaptations will provide insights into which investments were durable and which were temporary responses (Michel, 2020).

Integration with Sustainability Metrics

Future research should develop integrated frameworks that simultaneously optimize for service levels, cost, and environmental outcomes, leveraging digital intelligence for multi-objective optimization (McKinnon et al., 2015).

CONCLUSION

This article presents a comprehensive, citation-grounded framework that integrates organizational capabilities, value-added service strategies, and digital intelligence to improve logistics and warehouse performance in contemporary contexts. The synthesis underscores that technological investments are necessary but not sufficient; organizational innovation capabilities and service orientation critically determine whether digital tools translate into operational gains (Ho & Chang, 2015; Gunasekaran et al., 2017). Value-added services and flexibility are operational levers that create market differentiation while also imposing requirements for more granular and real-time data collection (Aziz et al., 2017; Okorie et al., 2016; Karagiannaki et al., 2011). Digital intelligence—spanning big data analytics, IoT, RFID, and machine learning—serves as both an enabler and an amplifier, but its effectiveness hinges on contextual alignment, data governance, and managerial capabilities (Gunasekaran et al., 2017; Ivanov et al., 2019; Lee et al., 2021). The article provides a set of testable propositions and practical guidelines for practitioners, including capability audits, modular VAS design, tailored RFID deployment, integrated forecasting practices, and workforce upskilling.

For practitioners, the principal takeaway is clear: build capabilities first, then deploy technologies within modular operational architectures that align with strategic objectives. For scholars, the article lays out a rich set of empirical research opportunities to validate and refine the model. As logistics systems continue to evolve under the pressures of e-commerce growth, environmental imperatives, and technological change, the integrative model presented here offers a theoretically robust and practically actionable roadmap for designing resilient, responsive, and sustainable logistics operations.

REFERENCES

1. Ho, L.-H.; Chang, P.-Y. Innovation Capabilities, Service Capabilities and Corporate Performance in Logistics Service. Int. J. Organ. Innov. 2015, 7, 24–33.
2. Aziz, Z.; Razak, R.; Hussin, N.; Yaacob, M.; Merican, R. The Relationship of Logistics Flexibility and Value-Added Capability on Logistics Performance in Logistics Services; University of Malaysia Kelantan: Kelantan, Malaysia, 2017.
3. Tian, Y.; Elinger, A.; Chen, H. Third-party logistics provider customer orientation and customer firm logistics improvement in China. Int. J. Phys. Distrib. Logist. Manag. 2010, 40, 356–376.
4. Okorie, C.; Tipi, N.; Hubbard, N. Analysis of the potential contribution of value-adding services to the competitive logistics strategy of ports. Marit. Econ. Logist. 2016, 18, 158–173.
5. Langley, C. The State of Logistics Outsourcing 2007 third-party logistics. In Results and Findings of the 12th Annual Study; Capgemini, Georgia Institute of Technology: Atlanta, GA, USA, 2007.
6. Straube, F. Trends und Strategien in der Logistik: Ein Blick auf die Agenda des Logistik-Managements 2010; Deutscher Verkehrs-Verl: Hamburg, Germany, 2005.
7. Mayer, S.; Thirty, E.; Frank, C. 6 Europäische, A.T. Kearney-/ELALogistik Studie 2008/2009: Supply-Chain Excellence in der Globalen Wirtschaftskrise; European Logistics Association: Brussels, Belgium, 2009.
8. Michel, R. Warehouse/Distribution Center Survey: In the Thick of E-Commerce Adjustments. Supply Chain Management Review. 2017. Available online: https://www.scmr.com/article/2017_warehouse_distribution_center_survey_in_the_thick_of_e_commerce_adjust (accessed on 1 June 2024).
9. Michel, R. 2020 Warehouse/DC Operations Survey: COVID-19 Pandemic Hits, Operations Respond. Logistics Management. 2020. Available online: https://www.logisticsmgmt.com/article/2020_warehouse_dc_operations_survey (accessed on 1 June 2024).
10. Karagiannaki, A.; Papakiriakopoulos, D.; Bardaki, C. Warehouse contextual factors affecting the impact of RFID. Ind. Manag. Data Syst. 2011, 111, 714–734.
11. Gunasekaran, A.; Subramanian, N.; Papadopoulos, T. Big data analytics in logistics. International Journal of Production Economics, 2017, 187, 98–110. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2017.02.008
12. Ivanov, D.; Dolgui, A.; Sokolov, B. Digital technology in supply chain management. International Journal of Production Research, 2019, 57(3), 829–846. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2018.1445910
13. Lee, C.; Zhang, S.; Ng, K. K. H. Machine learning in supply chain forecasting. Journal of Supply Chain Management, 2021, 57(2), 45–60. https://doi.org/10.1111/jscm.12241
14. Chowdhury, W. A. Agile, IoT, and AI: Revolutionizing Warehouse Tracking and Inventory Management in Supply Chain Operations. Journal of Procurement and Supply Chain Management, 2025, 4(1), 41–47. https://doi.org/10.58425/jpscm.v4i1.349
15. Lee, H. L.; Padmanabhan, V.; Whang, S. The bullwhip effect in supply chains. Sloan Management Review, 1997, 38(3), 93–102.
16. McKinnon, A.; Browne, M.; Whiting, A.; Piecyk, M. (Eds.). Green logistics (3rd ed.). Kogan Page, 2015.
17. Rushton, A.; Croucher, P.; Baker, P. The handbook of logistics and distribution management (6th ed.). Kogan Page, 2017.
18. Sanders, N. R. Supply chain management: A global perspective (2nd ed.). Wiley, 2018.