

Structured literature reviews on strategic issues in SCM and logistics: Part 2

Systematic literature reviews (SLRs) serve a valuable role in current and future research. SLRs can classify and synthesize the extant literature and furnish important directions for future research. This second installment of the special issue on “structured literature reviews on strategic issues in SCM and logistics” includes six manuscripts. A total of 12 manuscripts are published across the two parts of the special issue, after processing about 70 submissions. This special issue is a follow-up of Saenz and Koufteros (2015) that reflects new developments in this vast literature. As noted in Part 1, the published papers here have gone through at least three rounds of evaluation. We thank the authors and reviewers for their time, effort, and wisdom.

The first manuscript focuses on the literature on urban consolidation centers (UCC). Björklund and Johansson present their findings on UCCs via a structured literature review that analyzes 44 peer-reviewed and published manuscripts. The authors utilize Browne *et al.*'s (2005, p. 4) definition for guidance. Specifically, a UCC is defined as “a logistics facility that is situated in relatively close proximity to the geographic area that it serves, be that a city centre, an entire town or a specific site (e.g. shopping centre), from which consolidated deliveries are carried out within that area.” The authors found that a large number of the manuscripts identified have been published during the last three years, suggesting significant growth in interest and publications on this topic. Mathematical modeling and case study are the prevalent methodological approaches. In order to discover categories and themes, the authors rely on the principles of content analysis. Five common categories are identified: stakeholders, design of distribution structures, design of transport resources, environmental and social considerations, and economic considerations. An additional series of themes are identified within each category and several gaps that require future research are advanced.

In the second paper, Tuni, Rentizalas, and Duffy use quantitative methods to develop an environmental performance measurement for green supply chain management. This paper addresses the following research questions: what environmental performance metrics are adopted at the supply chain level? What extent of the supply chain, both upstream and downstream from the focal firm, are environmental performance measurement methods and related metrics addressing? What are the quantitative methods adopted to measure the environmental performance of supply chains? And is there a relationship between the type of method and the extent of supply chain covered or the scope of the work? The authors review 78 articles published in academic journals from the perspectives of the environmental aspects being considered, namely, the main purpose of measurement, model types and the extent of supply chain covered by performance measurements. The analysis finds that the major environmental performance measurement focus is on natural resources, energy, and emissions to air. However, the visibility and traceability of environmental aspects are not fully investigated in the previous literature. This paper contributes to environmental performance measurement in green supply chain management literature by identifying three major streams of research in green supply chain management based on different scopes, and to practice by identifying which measurement methods are applicable for various types of supply chain.

The third paper by Zhu, Liu, Feng and Sarkis focuses on the linkages and the mutual theories used in extant research concerning green supply chain management



(GSCM) and the circular economy (CE). An analysis of 182 papers studying GSCM and 64 papers studying the CE published prior to 2017, details five major elements of GSCM: green purchasing, eco-design, internal environmental management, customer cooperation for environmental concerns, and investment recovery in addition to three practice levels related to CE: micro level, meso level, and macro level. These elements are evaluated to show linkages between GSCM and CE and their theoretical foundations. The paper addresses four research questions: which theories are portable? Which can be applied to either area? Which theoretical perspectives may be conveyed from one perspective to the other when seeking to understand various phenomena? Which theories can be more effective in understanding other fields? The authors also propose that theories currently applied only in GSCM research have significant potential in CE research, while theories used only in CE research could also help to better explain GSCM.

The fourth paper by Fritz and Silva analyzes 354 papers from 107 journals that were discovered using four Latin American databases. The authors focused specifically on sustainability and supply chain management concepts in Latin America with the objective of comparing and contrasting the literature in Latin America with the literature in more developed countries. Resting on current developments in institutional theory, the literature on sustainability was examined via four dimensions: environmental, social, economic, and governance. The authors also relied on the knowledge of five experts who helped them to interpret the research findings. Most of the manuscripts emanate from Brazil with Mexico and Argentina also contributing significantly. Papers related to governance accounted for about half of the manuscripts while qualitative methodology was most commonly utilized. The authors note that the Latin American papers tend to be largely atheoretical. Ultimately, the authors identify three major triggers for sustainability and supply chain management in emerging economies: the role of focal company, the role of other stakeholders, and the role of the institutional environment.

In the fifth paper, Gonul Kochan and Nowicki conduct a thorough review of the supply chain resilience (SCRES) literature. In doing so, they enhance our understanding of supply chain capabilities and their relationship to SCRES-related outcomes. The authors analyze 150 articles, published between 2000 and 2016, in order to develop their proposed typological framework. The review of the literature includes an investigation of supply chain capabilities, their relationship to SCRES outcomes, and the supporting theoretical mechanisms describing the relationship. The authors deploy the context-interventions-mechanisms-outcomes (CIMO) logic to organize and synthesize the literature. The research objectives of this paper are to: identify and define SCRES factors; examine the antecedents and consequences of SCRES applying the CIMO-logic; develop a typological framework; and identify gaps and future research directions. The findings outline significant gaps in the SCRES literature and provide implications for future SCRES research and practice. Surprisingly, the authors report that only 24 papers use theory to explain SCRES.

In the final paper, Nitsche *et al.* develop an insightful conceptual framework of supply chain volatility (SCV) based on a review of 364 sources. Their multi-method literature analysis process results in five distinct dimensions of SCV based on 20 meta-level sources. The five distinct dimensions of SCV are: market-related volatility, organizational volatility, vertical volatility, institutional and environmental volatility and behavioral volatility. A classification scheme is proposed to delineate each dimension's effect on SCV in terms of relative deviating impact, repetitiveness and influenceability. Based on their findings, the authors develop 15 propositions regarding SCV.

Structured literature reviews have the potential to stimulate future research. We hope that these 12 manuscripts will serve this purpose and direct attention to numerous gaps which were identified in the literature.

Xenophon Koufteros

*Department of System Information and Operations Management, Texas A&M University,
College Station, Texas, USA*

Alan Mackelprang

*Department of Logistics and Supply Chain Management, Georgia Southern University,
Statesboro, Georgia, USA*

Benjamin Hazen

*Department of Operational Sciences, Air Force Institute of Technology, Wright-Patterson
Air Force Base, Ohio, USA, and*

Baofeng Huo

School of Management, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China

References

- Browne, M., Sweet, M., Woodburn, A. and Allen, J. (2005), "Urban freight consolidation centres final report", Transport Studies Group, University of Westminster.
- Saenz, M.J. and Koufteros, X. (2015), "Special issue on literature reviews in supply chain management and logistics", *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management*, Vol. 45 Nos 1/2.