

AI Driven Collaborative Innovation Model for Logistics Supply Chains in an E-commerce Environment

Yao Jianbin*

City University of Macau, Macau, China;

*corresponding author: T26092110536@cityu.edu.mo.

Abstract: The expansion of e-commerce has increased the frequency of demand changes, shortened order-response windows, and distributed logistics decisions across platforms, sellers, warehouses, carriers, and service partners. These conditions expose the limits of collaboration based on periodic data exchange and bilateral contracts. Artificial intelligence offers a different coordination mechanism by converting operational data into shared forecasts, allocation recommendations, exception signals, and learning routines. Yet the use of isolated forecasting or routing tools does not by itself produce supply-chain synergy. This paper examines how AI can support collaborative innovation across e-commerce logistics supply chains and develops a model that links data-sharing, joint decision processes, operational applications, and governance controls. Literature synthesis, comparative analysis, and inductive reasoning are used to define the model, compare conventional and AI-supported collaboration, distinguish three implementation modes, and identify recurring barriers. The analysis indicates that fragmented data rights, incompatible semantics, uneven analytical capability, weak incentive alignment, and limited accountability prevent firms from converting technical output into coordinated action. The proposed model therefore combines a federated data foundation, shared prediction and optimization services, cross-organizational decision protocols, application modules for forecasting, inventory, fulfillment, transport, and returns, and a governance layer covering access, model performance, risk, and value allocation. Its operating logic follows a repeated cycle in which partners sense demand and capacity conditions, formulate joint plans, execute distributed tasks, evaluate outcomes, and update models and rules. The paper also specifies differentiated adoption paths for platform-led networks, focal-firm networks, and federated ecosystems. Each path assigns data control, integration responsibility, and approval authority in a form consistent with the network's power structure and information sensitivity. The model treats AI as an interorganizational coordination capability rather than a stand-alone automation tool. It provides a structured basis for designing data agreements, allocating decision rights, selecting operational use cases, and evaluating collaborative value in e-commerce logistics networks.

Keywords: artificial intelligence; e-commerce logistics; supply-chain collaboration; data sharing; predictive analytics; operational innovation; platform governance

1. Research Introduction

E-commerce logistics networks coordinate a high volume of small orders across marketplaces, merchants, fulfillment centers, line-haul operators, last-mile carriers, and return-service providers^[1]. Demand is volatile at product, region, and time-slot levels, while customers expect accurate availability information and short delivery windows^[2]. The operating problem is therefore distributed: one participant observes browsing and order data, another controls inventory, and another owns transport capacity. Product launches and promotional events can alter order geography within hours, while warehouse labor and line-haul capacity are committed earlier. Cross-border orders add customs, documentation, and variable lead-time constraints. Conventional coordination relies on periodic forecasts, fixed service-level agreements, and

manual exception handling. Such arrangements react slowly when promotions, weather, traffic, or seller behavior changes the balance between demand and capacity. AI can support a more responsive form of collaboration by producing common demand estimates, detecting deviations, recommending inventory transfers, matching orders with facilities and carriers, and learning from execution results^[3]. It can also align promised delivery dates with observed processing and transport conditions. The relevant unit of analysis is not an individual algorithm. It is the network of data, decisions, incentives, and operating routines through which algorithmic outputs are accepted and acted upon.

The research value lies in connecting technical applications with interorganizational design. Existing discussions often examine demand forecasting, warehouse automation, vehicle routing, or customer-service systems as separate use cases. This separation understates the dependence of each application on upstream data quality and downstream partner response^[5]. A forecast has limited operational value when sellers do not disclose promotion plans, warehouses cannot reserve labor, or carriers receive revised volumes too late. This paper organizes these dependencies within a collaborative innovation model and distinguishes the mechanisms through which AI affects joint visibility, coordinated decisions, and process redesign. For managers, the model supports decisions about data scope, governance, capability investment, and use-case sequencing. For researchers, it provides constructs that can be tested through network-level data rather than firm-level adoption measures alone.

The study applies literature synthesis, comparative analysis, and inductive reasoning. It follows the sequence of concept definition, operating-logic specification, mode comparison, barrier diagnosis, model construction, and development assessment. The purpose is to explain how e-commerce logistics partners can convert distributed data and AI services into repeatable collaborative innovation.

2. Core Connotation Operating Logic and Research Status

2.1 Core Concepts and Model Characteristics

AI-driven collaborative innovation in an e-commerce logistics supply chain refers to coordinated process and service development based on shared data, machine learning, optimization, and agreed decision rights among legally separate organizations. It differs from internal digitalization because model inputs, operational constraints, and implementation actions are distributed across firms. The proposed model contains five connected layers. A data foundation standardizes events related to orders, inventory, capacity, location, cost, and service. An intelligence layer provides forecasting, anomaly detection, optimization, and simulation services. A decision layer defines who approves, overrides, and implements recommendations. An application layer embeds these services in planning and execution. A governance layer assigns access rights, performance obligations, liability, and value-sharing rules. Collaborative innovation occurs when these layers support a new cross-firm routine rather than a local efficiency gain.

The model has four defining characteristics. Network-level sensing combines demand, inventory, transport, and external-event data at operational frequencies suited to each decision. Distributed intelligence allows sensitive data or models to remain with their owners while selected features, predictions, or parameters are exchanged. Joint optimization evaluates service, cost, capacity, and emissions across organizational boundaries instead of improving one participant's objective at another's expense. Closed-loop learning links forecasts and recommendations to execution outcomes, exception causes, human overrides, and settlement records. These characteristics make collaboration measurable. Partners can assess forecast improvement, inventory displacement, order-cycle variation, capacity utilization, exception-resolution time, and the distribution of gains among participants.

2.2 Operating Logic in E commerce Supply Chains

The operating logic is a repeated sense-plan-execute-evaluate cycle. Platforms and sellers contribute demand signals such as searches, carts, orders, promotion calendars, and cancellations. Warehouses and logistics providers contribute stock positions, processing rates, vehicle capacity, delivery scans, and disruption events. AI services transform these inputs into shared short-horizon forecasts and risk estimates^[4]. Partners then apply pre-agreed decision rules to inventory reservation, replenishment, fulfillment-node selection, carrier allocation, route adjustment, and return disposition. Execution data are compared with predicted outcomes, and deviations are classified as data errors, model errors, capacity failures, or policy conflicts^[7]. This classification matters because each cause requires a different response. The cycle supports operational innovation when partners revise workflows, contracts, and resource commitments in response to accumulated evidence, rather than merely retraining a model.

2.3 Review of Research and Practice

Research on AI in supply-chain management has developed around predictive analytics, prescriptive optimization, autonomous planning, digital twins, and human-machine decision processes. In e-commerce logistics, common applications include demand sensing, dynamic safety-stock estimation, slotting, labor planning, order batching, estimated-time-of-arrival prediction, route planning, and return-risk classification. A separate stream examines information sharing, supply-chain integration, platform governance, and collaborative planning. These streams identify complementary requirements but often use different levels of analysis. Technical studies report model accuracy or processing time, whereas collaboration studies emphasize trust, contracts, and relationship quality. Operations research also specifies allocation and routing objectives, but often assumes that required data and decision authority are available to one planner. Platform studies question that assumption by showing how access and control are distributed. Network performance depends on both. Prediction quality affects the decision, while organizational arrangements determine whether a recommendation is timely, accepted, and executed.

Practice has moved from isolated pilots toward shared control towers, logistics data spaces, API-based event exchange, and platform-provided decision services. Large platforms can integrate order, warehouse, and delivery data within a common infrastructure, but smaller partners may have limited bargaining power and limited access to model explanations. Focal retailers can coordinate strategic carriers and suppliers through shared planning systems, although integration costs rise as the network expands. Federated approaches reduce the need to pool raw data, yet they require common identifiers, model-monitoring rules, and secure computation capabilities. Across these arrangements, technical maturity is uneven. Many networks have real-time dashboards but retain sequential planning, manual reconciliation, and bilateral exception handling. The gap between visibility and coordinated action remains a central design problem.

3. Multi dimensional Comparative Analysis of Collaborative Innovation Models

Two comparisons clarify the proposed model. The first contrasts conventional logistics collaboration with AI-driven collaborative innovation across seven design dimensions. The second distinguishes three implementation modes found in e-commerce networks. The comparisons are qualitative because the suitability of a model depends on network structure, data concentration, bargaining relations, and regulatory conditions. They provide a basis for selecting governance and capability arrangements before individual algorithms are deployed.

3.1 Comparison between Conventional Collaboration and AI Driven Collaborative Innovation

Conventional collaboration is usually organized around forecasts, orders, shipment notices, and service reports

exchanged at fixed intervals. Decision rules remain within each firm, and cross-firm adjustment occurs after a deviation becomes visible. The AI-driven model uses higher-frequency events, shared predictions, and defined response protocols to coordinate planning and execution. Its value depends on whether participants change operating routines and incentives along with the technical system. The main differences are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1 Comparison between Conventional Collaboration and AI Driven Collaborative Innovation

Comparison Dimension	Conventional E commerce Logistics Collaboration	AI Driven Collaborative Innovation Model
Coordination Basis	Periodic forecasts, purchase orders, shipment notices, and bilateral service agreements; adjustments follow reported deviations.	Shared event data, common predictions, and response protocols; adjustments can be initiated before service failure occurs.
Data Arrangement	Data remain in organizational systems with limited standardization; exchange is batch based and purpose specific.	Governed event standards, APIs, lineage records, and central or federated access selected according to sensitivity and latency.
Planning Method	Each firm prepares local forecasts and capacity plans; reconciliation is manual and periodic.	Demand and capacity estimates are aligned across planning horizons and used in joint scenario analysis and resource commitment.
Operational Decisions	Inventory, fulfillment, and carrier decisions are optimized separately by each participant.	Order, inventory, warehouse, transport, and return decisions use network constraints and agreed objective weights.
Exception Management	Partners identify disruptions through reports or complaints and coordinate resolution through manual escalation.	Models detect anomalies, estimate service risk, propose actions, and route cases according to predefined authority thresholds.
Performance Evaluation	Local cost and service measures dominate; cross-firm effects and transferred costs are weakly observed.	Technical, operational, relational, and distributional measures trace network value and its allocation among partners.
Innovation Process	Process changes are episodic projects led by individual firms and separated from routine execution.	Execution outcomes, overrides, and exceptions support repeated revision of models, workflows, contracts, and service designs.

3.2 Comparison of Mainstream Implementation Modes

Three implementation modes can be distinguished by the location of data control and decision authority: platform-led orchestration, focal-firm coordination, and federated ecosystem collaboration. Each can support AI-based innovation, but each creates a different distribution of integration cost, analytical control, and governance risk. Network size, partner

dependence, data sensitivity, and the need for local autonomy determine the appropriate mode, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2 Comparison of Mainstream AI Driven Collaboration Modes

Implementation Mode	Core Arrangement	Main Advantages	Main Limitations	Suitable Network Conditions
Platform led Orchestration	The e-commerce platform integrates transaction and logistics events and provides shared forecasting, allocation, and monitoring services.	Low integration friction for connected participants; high data frequency; decisions can be coordinated across a large seller and carrier base.	Concentrated data and model control; limited transparency for partners; risk that optimization reflects platform objectives more than network value.	Large marketplace or logistics platform with common interfaces, repeated transactions, and authority to set operating rules.
Focal firm Coordination	A retailer, brand owner, or lead logistics provider coordinates selected suppliers, warehouses, and carriers through shared planning and execution services.	Clear business owner and use-case scope; contracts can link recommendations to capacity and service commitments; process redesign is easier within a stable network.	Expansion beyond strategic partners is costly; dependence on the focal firm remains high; models may omit conditions outside the contracted network.	Stable supply chain with a dominant buyer or logistics integrator, strategic partners, and identifiable end-to-end flows.
Federated Ecosystem Collaboration	Partners retain sensitive data and selected models while exchanging approved features, predictions, parameters, and decision messages through common standards.	Greater local autonomy; lower need to pool raw data; applicable to competitors or regulated data owners that share logistics resources.	Higher technical and governance complexity; common semantics and monitoring are demanding; decision speed may be lower.	Distributed network with balanced power, sensitive data, shared capacity problems, and sufficient technical capability among participants.

4. Practical Barriers and Their Causes

4.1 Fragmented Data Ownership and Inconsistent Operational Semantics

E-commerce logistics data are divided among platforms, sellers, warehouse operators, carriers, payment providers, and return partners. Legal ownership does not automatically confer permission to reuse data for network optimization, and commercial sensitivity limits disclosure of prices, customers, capacity, and service failures. Even where access is permitted, records often use incompatible product, location, time, status, and exception codes^[10]. A delivered-order event may refer to customer receipt, carrier confirmation, or platform settlement, producing inconsistent labels for model training and performance assessment. Batch interfaces also create temporal mismatch between demand signals and capacity records. These conditions increase feature-engineering costs and encourage participants to build local datasets that reproduce existing information gaps. Without a common event model, data lineage, quality thresholds, and purpose-specific access rights, shared AI services produce disputed outputs and weak operational commitment. The same

defect also weakens settlement accuracy when partners calculate service credits from different event histories.

4.2 Uneven Analytical Capability and Limited Model Transferability

Network participants differ sharply in data engineering, model development, process control, and cybersecurity capability. Large platforms may operate high-frequency prediction and optimization services, while small sellers and regional carriers depend on spreadsheets or vendor portals. This asymmetry affects both adoption and bargaining. Partners that cannot examine model inputs or error patterns may treat recommendations as non-negotiable platform instructions, reducing their willingness to disclose sensitive data^[11]. Transferability is another constraint. Models trained on high-volume urban routes or stable product categories may perform poorly for rural delivery, seasonal assortments, bulky items, or newly onboarded merchants. Demand shifts, promotions, carrier changes, and fulfillment-node openings further alter input distributions. Network deployment therefore requires segment-specific validation, drift monitoring, fallback rules, and human review for decisions with material service or financial effects. Capability support should therefore include shared validation tools and training for operational analysts, not only model access.

4.3 Misaligned Incentives and Incomplete Value Sharing

Joint optimization can improve total network performance while imposing costs on particular participants. A carrier may hold reserve capacity to protect delivery reliability, a warehouse may accept additional workload to reduce total distance, or a seller may disclose promotion data that benefits competing capacity users. If contracts reward only local cost or throughput, participants have reason to ignore recommendations that transfer effort without compensation^[6]. Data contribution also creates appropriation concerns. Firms may fear that a platform will use operational data to renegotiate rates, rank partners, or develop substitute services. Many pilot projects avoid these questions and measure aggregate savings without tracing who supplied data, who changed behavior, and who received the gain. Sustainable collaboration requires baseline definitions, contribution records, gain-sharing formulas, service credits, and procedures for revising terms when model behavior changes. Partner-level contribution accounting makes these transfers visible before they become a source of withdrawal or data withholding.

4.4 Unclear Decision Rights and Weak Accountability for Algorithmic Actions

AI-supported coordination blurs responsibility when prediction, approval, and execution occur in different organizations. A platform may recommend rerouting orders, a retailer may approve the change, and a carrier may execute it using local constraints that the model did not observe. When service fails, contracts may not identify whether liability follows the data source, model provider, decision owner, or executing partner. Human overrides create a similar problem if the reason is not recorded. Some networks respond by keeping every recommendation advisory, but this limits response speed and makes performance evaluation difficult. Others automate low-risk decisions without defining escalation thresholds. Effective accountability requires a decision register that records model version, input timestamp, recommendation, confidence, rule applied, approver, override reason, execution status, and outcome. This record supports audit, dispute resolution, and model correction^[11]. Authority matrices must also cover emergency conditions in which normal approvals would delay recovery beyond the customer promise.

4.5 Inadequate Infrastructure and Short Term Project Governance

Collaborative applications depend on reliable interfaces, event processing, identity management, security controls, monitoring, and recovery procedures. Many participants possess only partial infrastructure, so integration relies on custom files and manual reconciliation. Pilot funding often covers model development but excludes master-data repair,

interface maintenance, partner onboarding, and staff training. Project teams then report a successful prototype while operational users continue to work around missing data and unstable recommendations. Short-term governance also produces use-case proliferation without common architecture. Forecasting, routing, and return models are purchased separately, each with different identifiers and performance definitions. The result is duplicated integration work and inconsistent decisions. A shared technical baseline, staged operating budget, service ownership, and retirement rules for ineffective models are needed to support continuing network use. Common onboarding tests can reduce this burden by checking interface behavior, data completeness, and recovery procedures before production use.

5. Systematic Construction of the AI Driven Collaborative Innovation Model

5.1 Establish a Federated Data Foundation and Shared Semantic Standards

The model begins with a governed data foundation that supports exchange without requiring all raw data to be centralized. Partners should define a minimum event set for demand, orders, inventory, fulfillment, transport, delivery, and returns, together with common identifiers and timestamp rules. Data contracts should specify purpose, fields, frequency, quality thresholds, retention, permitted model uses, and revocation conditions. An event catalog and lineage register allow users to trace a recommendation to its source records. Federated learning, secure aggregation, or feature-level exchange can be used where raw commercial or personal data should remain with the owner^[9]. The choice should follow the sensitivity of the data and the decision latency, not a general preference for centralization or decentralization. Data-quality incidents should enter the same exception workflow as operational failures because they directly affect forecasts and allocations. A certification process should confirm that each partner applies the agreed codes and supplies complete events before joining shared decisions.

5.2 Build Shared Prediction Optimization and Simulation Services

A shared intelligence layer should provide reusable services rather than separate models for every partner and process. Demand sensing can combine order history with price, promotion, browsing, calendar, and local-event variables. Capacity prediction can estimate warehouse workload, line-haul demand, delivery density, and return volumes at compatible spatial and temporal levels. Optimization services can then recommend inventory positioning, order allocation, carrier selection, delivery windows, and reverse-logistics routes under agreed constraints. Simulation and digital-twin functions allow partners to test promotion plans, capacity reductions, facility outages, or policy changes before execution^[8]. Each service requires documented training scope, target variable, error measure, refresh frequency, confidence output, and fallback rule. Shared evaluation datasets should include low-volume and disruption cases so average accuracy does not conceal weak performance in costly operating conditions. Versioned interfaces allow several applications to reuse these services while preserving consistent definitions and performance records.

5.3 Define Cross Organizational Decision Protocols and Incentive Mechanisms

Prediction becomes collaboration only when partners agree how decisions will be made. For each use case, the network should specify the recommendation owner, approval threshold, execution party, response time, override authority, and escalation path. Low-risk and reversible actions, such as adjusting pick-wave priorities within a defined range, may be automated. Capacity commitments, customer promise changes, and rate-affecting reallocations may require approval. Contracts should align local incentives with network objectives by combining service measures, cost effects, and contribution to shared capacity. Gain sharing can be based on verified changes from an agreed baseline, with separate treatment for data provision, reserved resources, and executed actions. Dispute procedures should permit model

replay using retained inputs and versions. These protocols reduce uncertainty for smaller partners and prevent technical control from silently becoming commercial authority. Decision logs should be accessible to affected partners at a level that protects personal and commercially restricted information.

5.4 Integrate AI into Planning Fulfillment Transport and Returns

Implementation should follow connected operating flows. In planning, shared demand and capacity forecasts support promotion review, replenishment, labor scheduling, and carrier reservations. In fulfillment, order orchestration selects nodes by inventory availability, cut-off time, workload, distance, service risk, and handling capability, while warehouse models adjust slotting, batching, and task release. In transport, volume forecasts inform line-haul plans and dynamic tendering; estimated-arrival and route models support exception intervention and customer communication. In returns, classification models estimate disposition, consolidation, resale, repair, or recycling options before items reach a processing site. Cross-flow integration prevents one model from shifting costs downstream, such as reducing outbound transport cost while increasing split shipments or returns. Deployment should begin with use cases that share data and decision owners, allowing common infrastructure and learning routines to develop. Process owners should verify end-to-end effects after each release and suspend recommendations that create repeated downstream exceptions.

5.5 Create Continuous Evaluation Risk Control and Learning Mechanisms

The governance layer should evaluate technical, operational, relational, and distributional outcomes. Technical measures include prediction error, calibration, drift, latency, and data-quality failure. Operational measures include order-cycle time, stockouts, split shipments, capacity utilization, on-time delivery, cost per order, return recovery, and emissions where data are available. Relational measures track response time, override frequency, dispute rate, data-contract compliance, and participation continuity. Distributional assessment compares costs and gains by partner group to identify value transfer that may weaken cooperation. A cross-organizational committee should review exceptions, approve model changes, and retire applications that do not meet agreed thresholds. Post-decision records should feed periodic process reviews as well as model training. This combination supports learning at two levels: algorithms improve predictions, and partners revise rules, contracts, and operating responsibilities. Thresholds should be reviewed by use case because a tolerable forecasting error may be unacceptable for customer promise changes.

6. Conclusion and Prospect

6.1 Research Conclusion

This paper develops an AI-driven collaborative innovation model for logistics supply chains operating in an e-commerce environment. The analysis defines collaborative innovation as a network capability built from shared data, analytical services, decision rights, operational applications, and governance controls. Comparison with conventional collaboration shows that higher-frequency data and better predictions are insufficient unless partners agree how recommendations affect resource commitments and execution. Three implementation modes were distinguished: platform-led orchestration, focal-firm coordination, and federated ecosystem collaboration. Their suitability depends on where data and decision authority are concentrated and how much autonomy partners require. Five barriers recur across the modes: fragmented data and semantics, uneven analytical capability, misaligned incentives, unclear accountability, and weak infrastructure governance. The proposed construction path addresses these barriers through a federated data foundation, shared prediction and optimization services, cross-organizational decision protocols, connected applications across planning and execution, and continuous evaluation. The model offers a basis for empirical work that measures

collaborative outcomes at network level and for managerial work that sequences use cases according to data readiness, decision interdependence, and the ability to distribute value.

6.2 Development Prospect

Further development is likely to center on four areas. Multimodal models may combine transaction records, text, images, video, sensor streams, and geospatial data to improve exception diagnosis in warehouses and transport operations. Agent-based planning systems may negotiate orders, capacity, and delivery options within explicit authority and budget limits, making audit records and intervention rules more important. Privacy-preserving computation and federated model training may support collaboration where competition law, personal-data protection, or commercial sensitivity restrict central pooling. Digital twins may also move from facility simulation toward network experiments that represent inventory, labor, transport, and customer response together. Research should test these developments using longitudinal, multi-partner data and should report the allocation of costs and benefits, not only aggregate performance. Attention is also needed for model concentration, partner dependence, cyber risk, and workforce effects. The durable unit of innovation will remain the operating agreement through which participants interpret and act on analytical output. Technical progress will improve that agreement only when data rights, decision authority, and accountability develop at the same pace.

References:

- [1] N. Boysen, R. de Koster, and F. Weidinger, "Warehousing in the e-commerce era: A survey," *European Journal of Operational Research*, vol. 277, no. 2, pp. 396–411, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2018.08.023>
- [2] S. F. W. T. Lim, X. Jin, and J. S. Srari, "Consumer-driven e-commerce: A literature review, design framework, and research agenda on last-mile logistics models," *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management*, vol. 48, no. 3, pp. 308–332, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPDLM-02-2017-0081>
- [3] R. Toorajipour, V. Sohrabpour, A. Nazarpour, P. Oghazi, and M. Fischl, "Artificial intelligence in supply chain management: A systematic literature review," *Journal of Business Research*, vol. 122, pp. 502–517, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.09.009>
- [4] M. A. Waller and S. E. Fawcett, "Data science, predictive analytics, and big data: A revolution that will transform supply chain design and management," *Journal of Business Logistics*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 77–84, 2013. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jbl.12010>
- [5] G. Culot, M. Podrecca, and G. Nassimbeni, "Artificial intelligence in supply chain management: A systematic literature review of empirical studies and research directions," *Computers in Industry*, vol. 162, article 104132, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compind.2024.104132>
- [6] T. M. Simatupang and R. Sridharan, "An integrative framework for supply chain collaboration," *The International Journal of Logistics Management*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 257–274, 2005. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09574090510634548>
- [7] G. Baryannis, S. Validi, S. Dani, and G. Antoniou, "Supply chain risk management and artificial intelligence: State of the art and future research directions," *International Journal of Production Research*, vol. 57, no. 7, pp. 2179–2202, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2018.1530476>
- [8] D. Ivanov and A. Dolgui, "A digital supply chain twin for managing the disruption risks and resilience in the era of Industry 4.0," *Production Planning & Control*, vol. 32, no. 9, pp. 775–788, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09537287.2020.1768450>
- [9] T. Li, A. K. Sahu, A. Talwalkar, and V. Smith, "Federated learning: Challenges, methods, and future directions," *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 50–60, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MSP.2020.2975749>
- [10] F. Kache and S. Seuring, "Challenges and opportunities of digital information at the intersection of big data analytics and supply chain management," *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 10–36, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOPM-02-2015-0078>
- [11] A. Rai, "Explainable AI: From black box to glass box," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 137–141, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-019-00710-5>