# GHS

[1] <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/epidemiology-and-infection/article/global-health-security-index-and-joint-external-evaluation-score-for-health-preparedness-are-not-correlated-with-countries-covid19-detection-response-time-and-mortality-outcome/B070CA592218E283C68F9BF5AA787C21>

GHS did not predict countries’ COVID-19 detection times and morality outcome over the period of the study. They analyzed detection time and mortality rate from Dec 31 to July 1

[2] <https://gh.bmj.com/content/5/10/e003648.full>

GHS cannot and do not predict how countries respond to outbreaks, nor how many cases or deaths a country will report during an outbreak. This is not a proper use of GHS, which should be used as entry points into deeper analysis of health system capacities and performance.

[3] <https://gh.bmj.com/content/5/4/e002477.abstract>

GHS, while comprehensive, has questions about the skew of some indicators towards high income countries, the validity of some indicators, and the scoring and weighting system. These concerns are independent of GHS’s accuracy in the COVID-19 pandemic.

[4] <https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3582746>

GHS was found to be a significant predictor of COVID-19 pandemic control. This paper primarily analyzed the maximum 14-day cumulative incident rate per 100,000 and rate of incidence increase per 100,000 starting from a date when 100 confirmed cases had been reported.

[5] <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0239398>

The GHS rankings were not a predictor of effective pandemic control when viewing total cases, total deaths, recovery rate, and total tests performed.

[6] <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7207133/>

The GHS rankings were not a significant factor in a country’s testing rate. Additionally, the GHS and COVID-19 data was inversely related (meaning the predictions were the opposite of the result).

# OxCGRT

[1] <https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3602004>

The greater the strength of government response at the early stage of the pandemic was correlated with reducing the deaths. Strong early actions were needed.

[2] <https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3679608>

Amongst OECD countries, there was no evidence that female leaders enacted stricter measures than male leader. However, they did enact their maximum shutdown measures earlier.

[3] <https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3743993>

The early start of high-level response is associated with early arrival of the peak number of daily new cases (the turning point in the pandemic outbreak).

# Supply Chain

[1] <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s42214-020-00074-6>

Calls for supply chain diversification and regionalization have come before, but have never seriously been adopted; however COVID-19 will likely be different. The author notes that considering the such decisions are a double-edged sword and may be motivated by other actors.

[2] <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00207543.2020.1750727>

Supply chain resilience to extraordinary events must be considered at a viability level. One possible solution to this would be an intertwined supply network (ISN).

[3] <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0040162520312737>

Every single sector was not immune to a COVID-19 level disruption. In particular, global supply chains are particularly vulnerable. In particular, a firm’s recovery (in manufacturing) would be dependent on their ability to quickly remobilize their supply chain.

[4] <https://www.businessperspectives.org/images/pdf/applications/publishing/templates/article/assets/13783/PPM_2020_02_Veselovska.pdf>

Early in the pandemic, the most common response to the new market developments was the changing operating volumes. The most successful measure was developing new supply chain partnerships.

[5] <https://www.mdpi.com/2305-6290/4/4/23/htm>

Supplier diversification was a key component of firm success during COVID-19 and there was a shift towards regionalize (especially when China was the source). However, such regionalism will likely remain to complement existing global supply chain infrastructure leading to diversification as opposed to leaving china.

[6] <https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3617015>

This paper acknowledged the need for geographic supply chain diversification to existing resilience models. They designed a model to add such a factor to the framework. (couldn’t read the full paper)

[7] [Ivanov2020\_Article\_ViableSupplyChainModelIntegrat (3).pdf](file:///C:\Users\theod\Downloads\Ivanov2020_Article_ViableSupplyChainModelIntegrat%20(3).pdf)

This paper suggests the usage of a Viable Supply Chain model (VSC). Such a model would help firms re-build after a global, long-term crisis.

[8] [Strange2020\_Article\_The2020Covid-19PandemicAndGlob.pdf](file:///C:\Users\theod\Downloads\Strange2020_Article_The2020Covid-19PandemicAndGlob.pdf)

This paper concluded that regionalization post-COVID-19 would be temporary and an inferior choice to further geographic diversification of supply chains. Furthermore, geographic diversification would also lover unsystematic risk in the supply chain.