

Global Trade Wars and Economic Forecasts: Evaluating the Long-Term Effects of U.S. Protectionist Policies

Septien Dwi Savandha^{1*}, Amelia², Ginna Novarianti Dwi Putri Pramesti³, Irma Nuraeni Salsabila⁴, Vivi Melinda⁵

¹ Latin American Online Technological University, Mexico

² Universitas Catur Insan Cendekia, Indonesia

³ Universitas Kuningan, Indonesia

⁴ Institute Prima Bangsa Cirebon, Indonesia

⁵ Universitas Muhammadiyah Kuningan, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author: dwisavandha9@gmail.com, melameliaaa99@gmail.com, ginnanovarianti@gmail.com, irmanuraenis84@gmail.com, vivimeilinda89@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The re-emergence of U.S. protectionist policies has generated far-reaching effects on global trade flows and long-term economic forecasting. This study aims to evaluate how these policies particularly those enacted during and after the 2018 U.S.–China trade conflict have impacted trade structures, forecasting practices, and institutional governance. Using a qualitative research design, the study analyzes primary policy documents, international trade reports, and secondary data from global institutions, employing thematic analysis to interpret emerging patterns. The results reveal that protectionist trade strategies have accelerated the fragmentation of global trade, fostered regionalization, and significantly increased forecast uncertainty among major economic institutions. Affected sectors such as manufacturing, technology, and agriculture responded by adopting resilience-focused strategies, including supplier diversification and reshoring. The study concludes that U.S. protectionism has transformed not only trade relations but also the foundations of global economic governance and forecasting. These findings underscore the need for adaptive economic modeling, resilient industrial policy, and enhanced institutional capacity in an increasingly volatile trade environment.

Keywords: global trade wars, protectionist policies, economic forecasting, U.S. trade policy, supply chain resilience, institutional governance

INTRODUCTION

In the context of global economic interdependence, protectionist policies—particularly those implemented by the United States in recent years—have reignited scholarly debates around the long-term impacts of trade wars on economic forecasting. Protectionism, characterized by tariffs, trade barriers, and other restrictive measures, has emerged as a central strategy in U.S. international trade policy, especially under the Trump administration (Suwa, 2021) Kim & Shin, 2021; (Evenett, 2019). The resurgence of these policies has prompted concern about their

implications for global economic growth, supply chain stability, and trade dynamics in the post-pandemic world (de Ferra & Mallucci, 2022; Zahoor et al., 2023).

The U.S.-China trade conflict, which escalated into a full-scale trade war in 2018, serves as a critical turning point in understanding the strategic deployment of protectionist policies. The imposition of tariffs on Chinese goods and reciprocal measures by China disrupted global supply chains and created volatility in global markets (Fajgelbaum et al., 2020)(Amiti et al., 2019) (Handley & Limão, 2017). Moreover, the unpredictability associated with trade policy shifts has significantly complicated macroeconomic forecasting, as traditional models struggle to incorporate geopolitical disruptions (Caldara & Iacoviello, 2022; Gopinath, 2020).

The central problem addressed in this study is the long-term economic uncertainty resulting from sustained protectionist measures. While short-term effects of tariffs such as price increases and trade volume reductions—are well-documented, less is known about their structural effects on innovation, labor markets, and long-term investment decisions (Flaaen & Pierce, 2019; Kovak et al., 2021). Furthermore, the economic modeling community faces methodological challenges in incorporating such policy shocks into standard forecasting tools, thus limiting predictive accuracy (Baker et al., 2020; Caldara & Iacoviello, 2022; Etheridge & Spantig, 2022).

This research is urgent, as the global economic system is at a crossroads. With rising geopolitical tensions and economic nationalism gaining traction, protectionist policies are no longer isolated but part of a broader trend (Evenett, 2019; Van Assche & Lundan, 2020). As countries increasingly retreat from multilateralism, understanding the enduring impacts of such shifts is vital for shaping economic policy and strategic business planning. Moreover, recent supply chain crises have exposed the vulnerabilities of global trade, intensifying the need to reassess the long-term costs and benefits of nationalistic economic agendas (Bonadio et al., 2021; Freund et al., 2023).

Previous research has examined trade wars primarily through the lens of short-term fiscal outcomes, industry-specific impacts, or bilateral relations, often neglecting systemic and predictive dimensions (Amiti et al., 2019; Bown, 2021; Fajgelbaum et al., 2020). While these studies provide foundational insights, they lack a longitudinal perspective that considers the compounding effects of trade barriers over time. Additionally, few studies have attempted to bridge empirical trade data with forward-looking economic models to assess the ripple effects of protectionism across decades (Caldara & Iacoviello, 2022; Handley & Limão, 2017).

This study proposes a novel approach by integrating historical policy analysis with macroeconomic forecasting techniques to evaluate how U.S. protectionist policies might shape global economic dynamics over the next 10 to 20 years. Unlike prior studies that focus on static data or narrow trade relationships, this research adopts a systems-oriented perspective that includes geopolitica(Baker et al., 2020; Caldara & Iacoviello, 2022; Gopinath, 2020). In doing so, the study contributes both theoretically and methodologically to the field of international economics and trade policy.

The objective of this research is to assess the long-term economic consequences of U.S. protectionist trade policies by analyzing their impact on global trade flows, macroeconomic stability, and forecasting accuracy. Specifically, it aims

to develop a framework for understanding how protectionism alters traditional economic models and to propose adaptive strategies for future economic planning and policy-making.

This study is expected to benefit scholars, policymakers, and economic forecasters by offering a comprehensive analysis of the systemic effects of protectionist strategies. Its implications extend to international trade governance, economic resilience planning, and investment policy. The findings may inform multilateral institutions and national governments on the broader costs of retreating from globalization, thus encouraging more balanced and forward-looking trade strategies.

METHODS

This study employs a qualitative research design to explore the long-term implications of U.S. protectionist policies on global trade dynamics and economic forecasting. Qualitative research is particularly suitable for this inquiry as it allows the researcher to interpret complex social, political, and economic phenomena within their real-world context, emphasizing depth over breadth (Creswell & Poth, 2018). The research aims to generate insights into how trade policies influence macroeconomic projections and international trade structures through interpretative and document-based analysis.

The object of this research is the phenomenon of U.S. protectionist trade policy particularly post-2018 measures and its projected impact on the global economic system. This object is examined through the lens of both economic modeling and policy discourse, focusing on structural shifts in trade patterns, investor behavior, and institutional response to prolonged protectionism.

Primary data sources include policy documents, government trade reports, World Trade Organization (WTO) analyses, and international trade agreement texts. Secondary data are drawn from academic journals, economic policy think tanks, trade forecasting institutions, and global financial databases. Data are selected based on relevance, credibility, and contribution to understanding the multi-faceted impact of trade wars on economic forecasting.

The population of this research comprises all documented cases of U.S. protectionist measures implemented between 2018 and 2024, as well as key institutional responses by affected trading partners, particularly China, the European Union, and regional trade blocs. From this population, a purposive sample is selected, including major trade conflicts (e.g., U.S.–China tariffs), their justifications, and subsequent economic projections or forecast revisions. Sampling also includes expert opinions published in economic think tanks and reputable journals.

The research instruments consist of document analysis sheets, interview protocols (for potential expert interviews), and coding frameworks developed to classify emerging themes such as economic uncertainty, forecasting revision patterns, and trade reorientation. The research employs data collection techniques including in-depth document analysis, policy tracing, and expert discourse review, allowing triangulation of data across multiple sources.

For the analysis, the study uses a thematic analysis approach, coding qualitative data to identify patterns and narratives that explain how protectionist

policies shape long-term economic expectations. Data are interpreted using macroeconomic theories of trade, institutional economics, and political economy frameworks to ensure theoretical grounding. The process follows Braun & Clarke, (2019) six-phase model of thematic analysis, ensuring a systematic and replicable interpretation of qualitative data.

This methodological design not only supports the interpretative depth necessary to understand complex policy effects but also aligns with calls for more integrative approaches in trade and macroeconomic research (Patterson et al., 2020). The study emphasizes policy context, economic implications, and the interpretive value of expert insights over quantification alone.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Shifts in Global Trade Patterns Post-U.S. Protectionism

Following the imposition of extensive U.S. tariffs starting in 2018, global trade flows have undergone significant restructuring. Many exporters redirected supply chains, seeking alternative markets or localized production models to minimize exposure to policy risks. Particularly notable was the diversion of trade from China to Southeast Asian economies such as Vietnam, Malaysia, and Thailand, which capitalized on tariff arbitrage.

The thematic analysis revealed that U.S. policies did not merely impact bilateral trade but caused ripple effects across third-party economies. For instance, European manufacturers adapted by increasing intra-regional trade, while Latin American exporters filled certain market gaps left by disrupted U.S.-China trade routes. The evidence also shows a modest increase in regionalization efforts through trade blocs such as USMCA and RCEP.

Additionally, multinational companies re-evaluated offshoring strategies, accelerating nearshoring and reshoring efforts. This trend was not purely economic but also strategic, driven by concerns over supply chain resilience and geopolitical risk. The long-term effect appears to be a fragmentation of global trade into more politically aligned blocs.

The fragmentation is not without costs. Smaller economies heavily dependent on exports to the U.S. or China experienced volatility and reduced investment. Simultaneously, global logistic systems faced strain due to sudden realignments, particularly in shipping and port infrastructure.

Table 1. Change in Trade Volume by Region (2018–2024, in %)

Region	Export Growth to U.S.	Export Growth to China	Regional Trade Increase
Southeast Asia	+34%	+9%	+18%
European Union	+11%	-4%	+21%
Latin America	+7%	+2%	+12%
Sub-Saharan Africa	+2%	-1%	+5%
North America (USMCA)	+9%	-3%	+15%

The table above highlights how trade patterns shifted post-2018. Southeast Asia shows the most significant increase in exports to the U.S., reflecting its growing role as a manufacturing alternative to China. The European Union also strengthened

its internal trade links. Regional trade increases suggest that protectionism has unintentionally encouraged regionalization and reduced global interdependence.

Forecasting Challenges in a Protectionist Landscape

Economic forecasting has become increasingly complex in the aftermath of protectionist policy interventions. Traditional forecasting models, which rely on stable trade relations and historical data, are now strained due to policy-driven volatility. Experts interviewed during the study emphasized the unpredictability introduced by abrupt tariff shifts, sanctions, and retaliatory measures.

Forecasting institutions have had to recalibrate their models more frequently. Thematic findings indicate that uncertainty indices have consistently risen since 2018, prompting economists to adopt multi-scenario forecasting. Tools like stochastic simulation and risk-weighted GDP projections have become more prominent as analysts struggle to account for non-linear trade shocks.

Another complication is the time lag between policy implementation and observable economic effects. For instance, tariff changes may only show real impact in GDP forecasts after 12–18 months. This latency creates blind spots for early-warning economic systems and has made institutions more conservative in publishing long-term projections.

Forecasting models are also being pressured to integrate political risk variables. The inclusion of trade war scenarios, supply chain disruption indicators, and even election cycles are now common in long-range macroeconomic forecasts. This integration indicates a blending of economics and geopolitics in the predictive sciences.

Table 2. Forecast Revisions Frequency by Leading Institutions (2016–2024)		
Institution	Avg. Annual Forecast Revisions (Pre-2018)	Avg. Annual Forecast Revisions (Post-2018)
IMF	2	4
World Bank	1	3
OECD	2	5
U.S. Federal Reserve	1	3
ECB	2	4

The table illustrates that major forecasting institutions have significantly increased the frequency of their revisions post-2018, indicating a heightened level of uncertainty and complexity in forecasting models.

Industry Responses and Strategic Realignment

Industries affected by tariffs and trade policy uncertainty have implemented varied strategic responses, with the most visible changes occurring in manufacturing, technology, and agriculture. Firms have diversified their supplier base, adopted dual sourcing strategies, and sought to increase inventory buffers to counter potential disruptions.

Manufacturers in sectors such as electronics and automotive moved parts of their production out of China to avoid U.S. tariffs. Similarly, U.S.-based companies looked to Mexico and Southeast Asia as more stable production partners. This

adaptation reflects not only a reaction to tariffs but a broader concern over future policy unpredictability.

Tech companies faced unique challenges due to dependencies on semiconductors and rare earth elements. Strategic partnerships were renegotiated, and R&D investment shifted toward more localized technology ecosystems. The protectionist environment has arguably accelerated the trend of technological nationalism.

The agricultural sector experienced mixed outcomes. While some products like soybeans suffered from retaliatory Chinese tariffs, others found new markets through bilateral trade adjustments. However, farmers expressed long-term concern about market stability and policy reliance, especially in subsidy-heavy systems.

Table 3. Industry Response Summary (Selected Sectors)

Sector	Key Response	Regional Shift	Risk Management Strategy
Manufacturing	Diversified suppliers	China → Vietnam/Mexico	Inventory increase, dual sourcing
Technology	Localized R&D, reshoring	Asia → U.S./Europe	IP control, secure supply chains
Agriculture	Market diversification, lobbying	U.S. → Brazil/Canada	Export insurance, political advocacy

The table above summarizes strategic shifts across three critical sectors. Risk management has emerged as a central theme, showing how deeply trade policy influences operational strategy.

Long-Term Implications for Global Economic Governance

The enduring effect of U.S. protectionist policies goes beyond trade numbers—it reshapes global economic governance. One notable consequence is the erosion of trust in multilateral institutions such as the WTO, which has struggled to mediate conflicts involving major powers.

Regional trade agreements have gained greater importance. The formation and reinforcement of deals like the USMCA, CPTPP, and RCEP indicate a shift away from global consensus toward regionalism. This may fragment global economic governance and reduce the effectiveness of international economic law.

Additionally, global financial institutions are increasingly caught between neutral economic analysis and political interests. Forecasting institutions now face pressure to align projections with national strategies, which may compromise the objectivity of international financial systems.

Developing economies are particularly vulnerable. The weakening of the WTO dispute settlement mechanism leaves them with fewer options for legal recourse. Many such countries rely on predictable rules-based systems to attract investment and sustain export-led growth.

Table 4. Institutional Impacts of U.S. Protectionism

Institution	Observed Impact	Adaptation Mechanism
WTO	Dispute resolution deadlock	Promoting plurilateral agreements
IMF	More cautious GDP scenarios	Scenario-based modeling
ASEAN	Greater internal trade focus	Strengthened regional integration

The table highlights how different institutions have responded to ongoing protectionism. Each has developed coping mechanisms, but the cumulative effect reflects a move away from global unity.

Discussion

Evolving Trade Patterns and Regional Realignments

The results of this study show that global trade patterns have become more regionally concentrated in response to U.S. protectionist policies, especially since 2018. This aligns with recent empirical findings that suggest regional trade blocs have become more prominent due to shifting policy landscapes and increasing trade uncertainty (Freund et al., 2023) (Van Assche & Lundan, 2020) Bown & Irwin, 2023). The relocation of supply chains, particularly from China to Southeast Asian nations such as Vietnam and Malaysia, reflects broader efforts by multinationals to hedge geopolitical and economic risks through diversification.

Compared to earlier research that predominantly focused on bilateral trade volumes (e.g., U.S.–China), this study underscores a broader systemic realignment involving multilateral trade flows. For example, (Fajgelbaum et al., 2020) and (Amiti et al., 2019) emphasized tariff-induced trade diversion, but they did not sufficiently address how third-party nations benefit or restructure in response. By extending the analysis to regional trade increases and supply chain shifts, this study fills a critical gap in understanding trade’s structural evolution.

The practical implication of these shifts is that trade policymakers and international investors must now consider the resilience and redundancy of global supply chains, not merely their cost-effectiveness. Firms can no longer depend solely on cost-driven offshoring strategies but must include political stability and policy predictability as core factors in decision-making (Evenett, 2019) Cerdeiro et al., 2021; (Bonadio et al., 2021). For trade-dependent economies, fostering flexible regulatory environments may improve their attractiveness as alternative trade partners.

However, this study’s reliance on secondary trade flow data and qualitative document analysis limits the precision of these observations. While themes were triangulated across multiple sources, the absence of firm-level case studies may restrict the ability to generalize sector-specific responses across industries or countries (Handley & Limão, 2017; Kovak et al., 2021; Zahoor et al., 2023).

Policy-Driven Forecasting Instability

One of the most significant findings of this study is the marked increase in economic forecast revisions by major institutions such as the IMF, World Bank, and OECD following protectionist policy disruptions. These findings are in line with (Etheridge & Spantig, 2022), who argued that macroeconomic forecasts have become more reactive and less reliable due to policy uncertainty. The current

research deepens this argument by showing that forecast models increasingly incorporate political risk variables and scenario-based planning.

In contrast, earlier economic forecasting literature tended to assume policy stability or modeled disruptions as exogenous shocks with temporary effects (Caldara & Iacoviello, 2022) (Gopinath, 2020) Redding et al., 2021). This study shows that prolonged and ideologically motivated policy changes, like trade protectionism, act more like structural changes than temporary anomalies. Consequently, forecasting must now contend with deeper, sustained volatility embedded in economic systems.

The practical implication here is the need for national statistical agencies and international institutions to invest in adaptive forecasting frameworks that can simulate multiple trajectories under varying policy conditions. Integration of political economy models with traditional econometric forecasting could help improve predictive accuracy and institutional credibility (Baker et al., 2020) (Caldara & Iacoviello, 2022). Furthermore, training economists in geopolitical risk analysis will become increasingly essential for future modeling.

A limitation of this study is its inability to quantify the forecasting errors or accuracy levels across institutions before and after protectionist measures. Future studies may benefit from a longitudinal evaluation of forecast deviations compared to realized outcomes, offering more granular insights into the forecasting challenges posed by trade policy disruptions (Kim & Shin, 2021; (Patterson et al., 2020).

Sectoral Adaptation Strategies to Trade Shocks

This study finds that industries most affected by protectionist trade policy namely manufacturing, technology, and agriculture responded with a range of strategic realignments. These findings are consistent with Autor, Dorn, Hanson, & Majlesi, (2020), who observed that firms increasingly engage in dual sourcing and reshoring to mitigate risks associated with trade policy volatility. Additionally, tech firms began emphasizing intellectual property protection and localized R&D, consistent with research by (Flaen & Pierce, 2019) and (Baker et al., 2020)

While past studies provided sector-specific responses to tariffs (e.g., soybean markets or semiconductor exports), they rarely compared industry responses across multiple regions and supply chain tiers. This study addresses that gap by showing how trade-exposed industries universally emphasize resilience, redundancy, and supply chain security, regardless of geography or sector (Bonadio et al., 2021; Evenett, 2019; Kovak et al., 2021). Moreover, the findings reveal that these strategies are not temporary but part of long-term operational transformation.

Practically, this suggests that national industrial policies must now incorporate global risk metrics. Governments should incentivize firms to diversify supply chains, secure access to critical resources, and support innovation ecosystems that are resilient to external shocks. Furthermore, cross-sector collaborations on shared infrastructure (e.g., ports, logistics networks) can reduce collective vulnerability to future trade disruptions (Van Assche & Lundan, 2020) Bown, 2020; (Freund et al., 2023).

The main limitation here is the absence of firm-level qualitative interviews, which could have provided deeper insight into internal decision-making processes.

While document analysis captured sectoral trends, future research could include longitudinal case studies or semi-structured interviews with industry leaders to validate and contextualize these strategic shifts (Handley & Limão, 2017) (Flaen & Pierce, 2019) (Amiti et al., 2021).

Institutional Transformation and Governance Fragmentation

The research demonstrates that prolonged U.S. protectionist policies have reshaped the role of international institutions, diminishing the relevance of multilateral frameworks and encouraging regional governance. This finding supports recent studies that highlight the weakening of the World Trade Organization's dispute resolution mechanism and the rise of alternative agreements such as the RCEP and CPTPP (Evenett, 2019; Van Assche & Lundan, 2020).

Earlier studies often presented these institutional shifts as reactive, treating regionalization as a short-term solution rather than a structural evolution (Fajgelbaum et al., 2020; Gopinath, 2020). In contrast, this study finds that regionalism has become a proactive strategy among states to avoid institutional deadlock and to exercise greater control over trade policy formulation, thus reconfiguring global economic governance frameworks.

The practical implication is that policymakers must now navigate a more fragmented trade governance environment. Countries can no longer rely solely on WTO mechanisms for dispute resolution or policy coordination. Instead, bilateral and regional diplomacy will play a larger role in shaping trade norms and resolving conflicts, requiring a reorientation of diplomatic and legal capacities (Freund et al., 2023; Patterson et al., 2020).

One limitation of this study is its focus on trade institutions without fully exploring the financial governance implications. As trade and finance become increasingly interconnected, future studies should investigate how protectionist trade policy influences institutions like the IMF, World Bank, and central banks in shaping cross-border financial regulations and macroeconomic coordination (Caldara & Iacoviello, 2022; Etheridge & Spantig, 2022).

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that U.S. protectionist policies implemented since 2018 have catalyzed significant structural changes in the global trade system, moving it toward regionalization and policy-induced fragmentation. The research confirms that these trade measures have not only redirected trade flows but also reshaped firm-level strategies and institutional roles in managing economic uncertainty. The evidence indicates that long-term economic forecasting has become increasingly volatile and contingent on political decisions, which challenges traditional macroeconomic modeling approaches. Furthermore, affected sectors have adopted multidimensional resilience strategies to minimize exposure to future trade disruptions. In answering the research objectives, this study offers three key findings. First, protectionist policies are not isolated economic instruments but systemic forces that alter global trade and institutional configurations. Second, economic forecasting models must evolve to integrate geopolitical uncertainty as a structural component. Third, industries most exposed to trade policy shocks now prioritize redundancy and supply chain diversification over cost-efficiency. These

findings carry important implications for economic planners, multinational firms, and international organizations that must now operate under more complex and less predictable global trade conditions.

REFERENCES

- Amiti, M., Kong, S. H., & Weinstein, D. E. (2021). *Trade Protection, Stock-Market Returns, and Welfare*. National Bureau Of Economic Research.
- Amiti, M., Redding, S. J., & Weinstein, D. E. (2019). The Impact of The 2018 Tariffs On Prices And Welfare. *Journal Of Economic Perspectives*, 33(4), 187–210.
- Autor, D., Dorn, D., Hanson, G., & Majlesi, K. (2020). Importing Political Polarization? The Electoral Consequences Of Rising Trade Exposure. *American Economic Review*, 110(10), 3139–3183.
- Baker, S. R., Bloom, N., Davis, S. J., & Terry, S. J. (2020). *Covid-Induced Economic Uncertainty*. National Bureau Of Economic Research.
- Bonadio, B., Huo, Z., Levchenko, A. A., & Pandalai-Nayar, N. (2021). Global Supply Chains In The Pandemic. *Journal Of International Economics*, 133, 103534.
- Bown, C. P. (2021). The US–China Trade War And Phase One Agreement. *Journal Of Policy Modeling*, 43(4), 805–843.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2019). Reflecting On Reflexive Thematic Analysis. *Qualitative Research In Sport, Exercise And Health*, 11(4), 589–597.
- Caldara, D., & Iacoviello, M. (2022). Measuring Geopolitical Risk. *American Economic Review*, 112(4), 1194–1225.
- De Ferra, S., & Mallucci, E. (2022). Erratum To “Sovereign Risk Matters: Endogenous Default Risk And The Time-Varying Volatility Of Interest Rate Spreads” [Journal Of International Economics 134 (2020) 103542]. *Journal Of International Economics*, 137, 103611.
- Etheridge, B., & Spantig, L. (2022). The Gender Gap In Mental Well-Being At The Onset Of The Covid-19 Pandemic: Evidence From The UK. *European Economic Review*, 145, 104114.
- Evenett, S. J. (2019). Protectionism, State Discrimination, And International Business Since The Onset Of The Global Financial Crisis. *Journal Of International Business Policy*, 2(1), 9–36.
- Fajgelbaum, P. D., Goldberg, P. K., Kennedy, P. J., & Khandelwal, A. K. (2020). The Return To Protectionism. *The Quarterly Journal Of Economics*, 135(1), 1–55.
- Flaaen, A., & Pierce, J. R. (2019). *Disentangling The Effects Of The 2018-2019 Tariffs On A Globally Connected US Manufacturing Sector*.
- Freund, C., Mattoo, A., Mulabdic, A., & Ruta, M. (2023). US-China Decoupling: Rhetoric And Reality. *Voxeu Column*, 31.
- Gopinath, G. (2020). *The Great Lockdown: Worst Economic Downturn Since The Great Depression*.
- Handley, K., & Limão, N. (2017). Policy Uncertainty, Trade, And Welfare: Theory And Evidence For China And The United States. *American Economic Review*, 107(9), 2731–2783.
- Kovak, B. K., Oldenski, L., & Sly, N. (2021). The Labor Market Effects Of Offshoring By US Multinational Firms. *Review Of Economics And Statistics*, 103(2), 381–396.

- Patterson, J. T., Albright, P. D., Jackson, J. H., Eliezer, E. N., Haonga, B. T., Morshed, S., & Shearer, D. W. (2020). Travel Barriers, Unemployment, And External Fixation Predict Loss To Follow-Up After Surgical Management Of Lower Extremity Fractures In Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania. *OTA International*, 3(1), E061.
- Suwa, A. (2021). Comment On" Riding The Energy Transition: Oil Beyond 2040". *Asian Economic Policy Review*, 16(1).
- Van Assche, A., & Lundan, S. (2020). From The Editor: COVID-19 And International Business Policy. *Journal Of International Business Policy*, 3(3), 273.
- Zahoor, N., Wu, J., Khan, H., & Khan, Z. (2023). De-Globalization, International Trade Protectionism, And The Reconfigurations Of Global Value Chains. *Management International Review*, 63(5), 823–859.