ISSN No: 2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25jun133

# Analyzing the Interplay Between International Commodity Prices and Maritime Freight Rates

Todor Dimov Koritarov[1]; Rostislav Dimitrov Dimitrakiev[2]

[1]Assistant Professor, PhD
[2]Master of Science in Industrial Management
[1,2]Nikola Vaptsarov Naval Academy, Varna, Bulgaria

Publication Date: 2025/06/10

**Abstract: This paper examines the post-2010 integration between international commodity markets and the maritime freight market, with a focus on crude oil, iron ore, and grain in the context of the European Union. Drawing on recent scholarly studies and industry reports, the authors summarize theoretical and empirical insights into how commodity price dynamics correlate with and influence freight rates in dry bulk and tanker markets. Methodologically, the reviewed works employ cointegration analysis, vector error-correction models, and other econometric tools to discern long-run relationships and short-run interactions. Key findings indicate that dry bulk freight rates generally move procyclically with bulk commodity prices, reflecting derived demand for shipping in periods of strong commodity trade. In contrast, tanker freight rates show a more complex (often countercyclical or lagged) relationship with crude oil prices. Among commodities, crude oil prices emerge as a leading indicator that transmits shocks across markets. Several factors – including global demand swings, fleet capacity cycles, fuel costs, and geopolitical disruptions – modulate the strength of commodity-freight linkages. The integrated behavior of these markets carries important implications for maritime stakeholders and policymakers: shipping companies and commodity traders benefit from monitoring cross-market signals for better forecasting and hedging, while regulators must consider the inflationary impact of freight cost surges on commodity prices. The paper concludes by highlighting avenues for future research, such as the evolving effects of decarbonization policies and supply-chain reconfigurations on commodity–freight market integration.**

***Keywords:*** *Maritime Freight Market; International Commodity Markets; Freight Rates; Market Integration; Dry Bulk Shipping; Tanker Shipping.*

**How to Cite**: Todor Dimov Koritarov; Rostislav Dimitrov Dimitrakiev (2025) Analyzing the Interplay Between International Commodity Prices and Maritime Freight Rates. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 10(6), 35-40. https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25jun133

## I. INTRODUCTION

The maritime freight market and international commodity markets are inherently interlinked through global trade flows [1], [2]. This is especially true for the European Union (EU), which relies heavily on seaborne imports of crude oil, iron ore, grains, and other raw materials. Since 2010, significant volatility in commodity prices and shipping rates – from the aftermath of the 2008–2009 shipping downturn to the commodity supercycle fluctuations and recent pandemic and geopolitical shocks – has renewed interest in understanding the degree of market integration between these sectors. Market integration, in this context, refers to the co-movement or interdependence of price signals across commodity and freight markets, such that developments in one market are systematically transmitted to the other. This paper provides a comprehensive review of academic and industry research on the integration of crude oil, iron ore, and grain markets with their corresponding freight markets (primarily tanker shipping for oil, and dry bulk shipping for iron ore and grains) in the EU-centric trade environment post-2010. The objectives are to synthesize theoretical foundations, summarize empirical evidence of integration, identify key influencing factors, and discuss implications for maritime industry stakeholders and policymakers. By focusing on dry bulk and tanker freight markets – the main carriers of the commodities in question – the study offers insights into how closely freight rates track commodity price dynamics in recent years and what this implies for the European and global maritime sectors.

## II. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS AND CONCEPTS

At its core, the demand for maritime transport is a derived demand stemming from the trade of physical commodities. Classic maritime economics holds that freight rates are determined by the balance of shipping supply (fleet capacity) and demand (volume of cargoes to be moved)[2], which in turn is driven by commodity production and consumption. In theory, an efficient integration of commodity and freight markets would manifest as correlated price movements and possibly cointegration (a stable long-run

ISSN No: 2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25jun133

equilibrium relationship) between commodity prices and freight rates [3]. For example, if iron ore prices rise due to surging steel industry demand, the derived demand for bulk carriers to transport iron ore should also increase, putting upward pressure on dry bulk freight rates. Conversely, if crude oil supply shocks drive oil prices down, one might expect reduced crude trade volumes or changed shipping patterns, potentially lowering tanker rates. However, the relationship is complex because freight rates also reflect shipping-specific factors [4] like vessel availability and bunker fuel costs, which can cause deviations from simple commodity-linked pricing.

Several key concepts frame the understanding of these market linkages. Price discovery and lead–lag effects are often observed: one market may serve as a leading indicator for the other. Notably, crude oil prices have been identified as a pivotal leading signal that transmits information to freight markets [5]. This is partly because oil prices influence global economic activity (and thus commodity trade volumes broadly) and also directly affect shipping operational costs (fuel prices). Furthermore, the integration can be asymmetric – research suggests freight and commodity prices might be more tightly correlated during downturns or crises than in booms, reflecting higher co-movements "*in extreme periods*" in long run and "*in an economic boom*" in short run [6]. Another concept is **the law of one price** in spatial arbitrage[7], [8]: in fully integrated markets, price differences of a commodity between regions should equalize once accounting for transport (freight) costs. If a gap persists beyond shipping cost, it implies frictions or lags in market integration. Lastly, the development of financial derivatives (commodity futures, freight forward agreements) has created financial linkages between the markets, allowing cross-hedging and potentially tighter integration as participants in one market monitor and react to price changes in the other. These theoretical notions set the stage for examining how integration plays out empirically in the post-2010 period.

## III. EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE OF MARKET INTEGRATION

A growing body of empirical research post-2010 has investigated the extent and nature of co-movement between commodity prices and freight rates. Overall, studies confirm that significant integration exists, though the strength and direction of relationships can differ by commodity sector and market conditions. Focusing first on dry bulk markets, iron ore – a primary cargo for Capesize bulk carriers – exhibits a notable positive linkage with freight rates. Recent analyses using data from the 2010s demonstrate that iron ore price increases tend to drive up dry bulk freight rates on major routes [9].

For instance, Gong et al. employ a nonlinear autoregressive model and find that higher iron ore prices positively influence freight rates, with the effect amplified during optimistic market sentiment periods [9]. This aligns with the intuitive procyclicality between dry commodity markets and shipping: strong demand for iron ore (often tied to China's steel production) pushes both the commodity price and the volume of seaborne trade upward, tightening vessel utilization and raising freight costs. In a similar vein, Michail and Melas indicate that commodity price levels can significantly influence freight rates for various bulk vessel categories, particularly in the case of different agricultural commodities, including grains [10]. Their vector error-correction analysis of 2010–2019 weekly data finds robust long-run relationships linking agricultural commodity price indices and freight indices, reinforcing the view that these markets do not operate in isolation but rather influence each other's equilibrium [10]. Cointegration tests in such studies frequently detect long-run associations. For example, one long-run analysis found that iron ore prices, China's GDP (a proxy for demand), and bulk freight rates were co-integrated over the commodity boom and afterwards [3], indicating a stable equilibrium binding commodity demand and shipping rates in the long term.

Interestingly, not all empirical findings point to straightforward positive correlations. Some studies highlight inverse or more complex effects, especially once short-run dynamics and feedback loops are accounted for. Lim examines the iron ore trade to China and finds that, when controlling for simultaneity, an increase in iron ore price can negatively affect the freight rate on that route [11]. This counterintuitive result is explained by the demand elasticity and substitution effects: a price spike in iron ore may dampen the quantity demanded (and shipped), or encourage sourcing from alternate producers, thereby reducing shipping demand and freight rates. Such nuances underscore that the commodity–freight relationship can shift depending on whether price changes are driven by demand-pull (which would raise both commodity trade and freight) or supply shocks and cost-push factors. Moreover, variance decomposition from dynamic models suggests that while commodity and freight markets influence each other, a large portion of freight rate volatility remains idiosyncratic, driven by shipping-specific factors. For instance, one study noted that only a single-digit percentage of variance in certain grain freight indices could be explained by movements in agricultural commodity prices [10] - implying that vessel supply, seasonal logistical bottlenecks, and other factors play dominant roles in freight rate fluctuations.

In the tanker (wet bulk) sector, the empirical evidence also confirms integration but with notable differences in pattern. Because oil is both the commodity being transported and a determinant of fuel cost, the oil price–freight rate nexus can be complex. A broad finding is that crude oil prices lead tanker freight rates in terms of information flow. Angelopoulos, Sahoo, and Visvikis identify crude oil as a central price discovery leader among a large set of commodities and freight indices, meaning changes in oil prices tend to precede and predict adjustments in freight markets [5]. In practice, a surge in oil prices might initially raise bunker fuel costs (increasing voyage costs for ship operators) and could temper shipping supply (as operators slow-steam to save fuel), while sustained higher oil demand (e.g. more crude being traded to satisfy consumption) eventually pushes tanker rates up. However, empirical studies often find inverse contemporaneous correlations: during certain periods, high crude oil prices coincided with lower spot

ISSN No: 2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25jun133

tanker rates, indicating a countercyclical relationship [11], [12], [13]. This was evident in the early-to-mid 2010s when an oversupply of tankers meant that even record oil prices did not translate into higher freight, and conversely, the oil price collapse in 2014–2015 provided cost relief that helped buoy tanker earnings. Formal econometric tests underscore this complexity. For example, a study on tanker market dynamics found that while Granger causality runs from oil prices to freight (oil price changes help predict tanker rate movements), there is no consistent long-run cointegration between the two [14]. In other words, oil and tanker markets can drift apart for extended periods even as short-run adjustments link them. The evidence also points to regime-dependent behavior: one research effort using copula models discovered asymmetric dependence, with stronger oil–freight co-movement in downturns (when falling oil prices accompany slumps in freight demand) than in upturns [6].

Concrete episodes further illustrate these empirical patterns. The commodity and freight markets' tandem behavior was dramatically displayed during the 2020–2022 period. In 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic initially caused both commodity demand and freight rates to plummet; by late 2020 into 2021, massive stimulus-led recoveries sent bulk commodity prices (from iron ore to grains) soaring alongside freight indices (e.g., the Baltic Dry Index reached decade highs in 2021[15]). In early 2022, the Russia-Ukraine conflict shocked both grain and energy markets and disrupted Black Sea shipping. As a result, grain prices spiked and so did dry bulk freight costs on alternate routes. As reported by UNCTAD, the expense of transporting dry bulk commodities (such as grains) increased by almost 60% from February to May 2022, coinciding with a rise in grain prices [16], [17]. This concomitant rise was so strong that it was estimated to add almost 4% to global food consumer prices, underscoring the tight integration of commodity cost and freight cost in that crisis scenario [16], [17]. Such real-world cases align with empirical research findings that shocks propagate between commodity markets and freight markets, especially when they originate in fundamental demand/supply disruptions.

## IV. FACTORS INFLUENCING COMMODITY-FREIGHT MARKET INTEGRATION

The degree of integration between commodity prices and freight rates is not static; it is moderated by various factors and conditions. Key factors identified in the literature and industry observations include:

- *Global Demand and Economic Cycles:*

The overall health of the world economy (and the EU economy) can amplify or dampen integration. During strong economic expansions, surging demand for raw materials tends to simultaneously raise commodity prices and bulk shipping volumes, tightening the link between the two. In contrast, during recessions or demand shocks, both commodity prices and freight rates may collapse together – a high correlation driven by the demand side. China's commodity import boom, for example, was a principal driver integrating iron ore prices with dry bulk rates in the early 2010s [3]. Conversely, policy-driven demand reductions (such as China curbing coal imports mid-2010s) saw both commodity prices and freight indices decline in tandem[3].

- *Fleet Supply and Shipping Capacity:*

The state of the shipping supply curve critically influences price integration. In periods of fleet overcapacity, freight rates can remain depressed even if commodity trade is growing, thus weakening the usual positive correlation. The early 2010s offer evidence: from 2008 to 2013, the global dry bulk fleet tonnage expanded by about 84% while trade demand grew only by 33%, creating a glut of ships [18]. This oversupply meant that iron ore and coal volumes could rise (supporting commodity prices) without a commensurate increase in freight rates – effectively decoupling the markets. Conversely, when fleet capacity is tight or utilization is near maximum, any uptick in commodity shipments quickly translates into higher freight rates, strengthening integration. Fleet dynamics (newbuilding deliveries, scrapping, and lay-ups) thus modulate how closely freight responds to cargo demand fluctuations.

- *Bunker Fuel Prices (Energy Costs):*

Fuel is a major operating cost for ships, and its price (closely tied to crude oil) affects freight rates independent of cargo demand. High bunker prices increase voyage costs, which can push freight rates upward (shipowners demand higher freight to cover costs) even if commodity prices are not rising. This can cause a temporary divergence or introduce a cost-push link from oil to freight. For example, the marine fuel price surge in 2022 (global average very-low-sulphur fuel oil up 64% year-on-year by May 2022) boosted freight rates across all segments as shipping became more expensive to perform [16]. In the long run, however, extremely high fuel costs might reduce effective shipping supply (slow steaming, fewer voyages), indirectly tightening the market and coupling with commodity demand trends. Thus, energy prices create both direct and indirect connections between commodity and freight markets.

- *Geopolitical and Policy Shocks:*

Events such as trade wars, conflicts, and sanctions can simultaneously perturb commodity availability and reroute shipping. Geopolitical disruptions often increase commodity price volatility and freight rate volatility together. The Ukraine conflict exemplified this: sanctions and conflict disrupted oil and grain flows, driving up commodity prices while also lengthening transport distances and raising freight rates due to vessel shortages on alternate routes [16], [17]. Similarly, changes in trade policy (tariffs or export quotas) can alter trade volumes and freight demand. EU-specific policies like agricultural export restrictions or stockpiling, and OPEC's oil production decisions, can either reinforce or weaken integration by changing the synchronized movement of trade and prices. Regulatory measures (for instance, the EU's environmental regulations on shipping fuels and carbon emissions) can also play a role by affecting shipping costs and practices, thereby influencing how freight rates respond to commodity trade pressures.

ISSN No: 2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25jun133

➢ *Substitution and Alternative Supply Sources:*

Integration between a particular commodity price and a freight route may be mitigated if buyers can switch sources or transport modes. For grains and ores, importers can sometimes pivot to different exporting countries (e.g. sourcing grain from South America instead of the Black Sea, or iron ore from Australia vs. Brazil) based on freight cost differences. Such substitution effects mean that if freight rates on one route surge, commodity buyers might change trade patterns, moderating the direct price linkage. Michail and Melas observe that for certain agricultural commodities where a price change showed no impact on freight, substitution between shipping routes or commodity alternatives could be the reason [10]. Likewise, the development of overland transport (rail pipelines for oil, etc., in the EU-Asia context) might in the future temper seaborne freight–commodity integration by providing alternatives when ocean freight costs spike.

➢ *Market Expectations and Financialization:*

The sentiment and expectations of market participants can influence integration. Commodities and freight markets both have futures derivatives; speculative or hedging activity can cause prices to move in anticipation of future conditions. If investors expect a commodity boom, they may also bid up freight futures (e.g., dry bulk Forward Freight Agreements), tightening the contemporaneous correlation even before physical trade volumes rise. Conversely, divergent speculative pressures (for example, a bearish outlook in one market but not the other) can cause short-term decoupling. Information flow through news and indices – such as a Shipping Sentiment Index derived from news analytics – has been shown to predict freight rate movements [9], indicating that information and expectations link the markets beyond just physical supply-demand.

In summary, commodity–freight market integration is conditioned by a matrix of economic, operational, and strategic factors. High integration tends to occur when demand-side forces dominate under tight shipping supply, whereas excess capacity, alternative sourcing, or cost shocks can introduce lags and inversions in the relationship.

## V. IMPLICATIONS FOR MARITIME STAKEHOLDERS AND POLICY MAKERS

The integrated nature of commodity and freight markets carries important implications for various maritime stakeholders and policy makers, particularly in the EU context where stable trade and transport costs are vital for economic security:

➢ *Shipowners and Operators:*

For shipping companies (in dry bulk and tanker sectors), understanding commodity market trends is crucial for decision-making. Since freight earnings are closely tied to commodity trade cycles, shipowners can use commodity price indicators as a barometer for charter rate prospects [5]. For example, a surge in iron ore or grain prices may signal upcoming increases in shipping demand and freight rates – an opportunity for operators to secure longer-term charters or adjust pricing strategies. Conversely, if oil prices are expected to slump significantly (indicating potential OPEC cuts or recession), tanker owners might anticipate weaker transport demand. Integrated markets also encourage shipowners to hedge risks: tools like Freight Forward Agreements (FFAs) can be employed alongside commodity futures by companies that have exposure to both (e.g., an agribulk trader with its own vessels can hedge bunker and freight costs when hedging grain prices). Ultimately, greater market integration means shipping firms need to be as vigilant about commodity market intelligence as they are about traditional shipping metrics.

➢ *Commodity Producers, Traders, and Charterers:*

For producers and traders of crude oil, iron ore, grain and other commodities, freight costs are a key component of delivered product prices. Integrated markets imply that commodity procurement strategies cannot ignore freight market conditions. For instance, an EU grain importer might advance purchases of grain when freight rates are low to capitalize on lower landed cost, or use shipping futures to lock in transport costs when commodity prices are fixed in forward contracts. The positive correlation between commodity prices and freight rates during boom periods also means input-cost pressure: rising freight rates can erode the margins of commodity buyers and raise prices for end consumers [16], [17]. Traders must manage this by diversifying supply sources or negotiating voyage charters in advance[19]. In volatile times (such as the 2021–2022 swings), some commodity traders even took control of shipping (e.g., chartering additional vessels) to secure logistics – blurring the line between the two markets. Integrative strategies like these are increasingly seen as best practice for commodity firms in the EU that aim to ensure supply chain resilience against synchronized price spikes.

➢ *Investors and Financial Institutions:*

The co-movement of commodities and freight also affects investment and finance. Shipping equities and freight derivatives often correlate with commodity prices; for example, the stock prices of bulk shipping companies tend to rise with mineral and grain price indices, as both reflect global trade strength. Investors can thus use commodity market signals as a leading indicator for shipping sector performance. However, the integration also means higher systemic risk – a collapse in commodity markets (as in a global recession scenario) can simultaneously depress freight markets, reducing the diversification benefit. Banks and lessors financing ships need to account for commodity market outlooks when assessing credit risk, especially in the EU where many shipping banks are exposed to energy and commodity cycles. On the positive side, integrated markets create opportunities for new financial instruments (e.g. index-linked freight contracts, commodity-shipping cross-hedging funds) that could be developed to help manage the joint volatility.

➢ *Policy Makers and Regulators:*

For governments and international organizations, the linkage between commodity prices and freight costs has direct implications for economic policy, trade facilitation, and regulation. In the EU, recent experience has shown that spikes in freight rates can feed into inflation, particularly food and

ISSN No: 2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25jun133

energy inflation [16]. Policy makers, therefore, monitor shipping costs as part of strategic commodity security. For example, during the Ukraine conflict, EU authorities coordinated "*solidarity lanes*" [20] (land routes) to mitigate the impact of lost Black Sea shipping on grain import costs – an acknowledgment of the freight–commodity price nexus. More generally, ensuring competitive and efficient shipping services (through regulations that prevent cartelization or excessive surcharges) becomes important to avoid magnifying commodity price shocks. Regulators might also push for transparency in freight pricing and encourage the development of risk management tools [21] for smaller commodity importers (e.g., through exchanges or public mechanisms) to hedge freight rate exposure. Environmental policies introduce another dimension: as the EU implements maritime emissions trading and fuel standards, there could be increases in freight costs which, if mirrored by rising commodity prices, could stress consumers. Policymakers must balance sustainability goals with the potential for tighter commodity-freight integration to transmit costs to economies. In summary, integrated markets mean policy responses to commodity crises must consider logistics and vice versa – a siloed approach would be ineffective when the markets move together.

## VI. CONCLUSION AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

In conclusion, the post-2010 evidence strongly indicates that international commodity markets (notably for crude oil, iron ore, and grains) and freight markets are highly interconnected. The dry bulk sector in particular demonstrates a pronounced co-movement with commodities: freight rates rise and fall in alignment with commodity demand cycles, barring periods of extreme fleet oversupply or substitution effects [10]. The tanker sector also reflects integration, though crude oil's dual role as cargo and fuel leads to more nuanced dynamics and occasionally inverse relationships [11]. For Europe, as a major trading hub, these linkages underscore the importance of holistic strategies in trade and transport – volatility in one domain invariably impacts the other. Integrated markets can transmit shocks quickly, but they also allow informative signals (e.g., oil prices forecasting freight movements [5]) that stakeholders can harness.

Looking ahead, several avenues for future research emerge. One important direction is to analyze how decarbonization and energy transition efforts might alter commodity-freight integration. As the EU and other regions implement carbon pricing on shipping and invest in alternative energy, the cost structure of freight could change independently of commodity prices, potentially weakening traditional correlations or creating new ones (for instance, carbon cost integration between fuel markets and freight rates). Another promising area is the study of high-frequency and network effects – using granular data (daily freight indexes, real-time commodity prices) and network models to detect lead–lag relationships and spillovers in different market conditions. This could include examining integration in periods of financial stress or extreme events (pandemics, conflicts) to improve predictive models. Additionally, future research could expand the commodity scope (e.g., integrating new critical commodities like lithium or hydrogen and their transport markets) and assess whether the patterns observed for oil, iron ore, and grains hold for other sectors. Finally, case studies focusing on the European context – such as the impact of EU transport infrastructure investments or shifts in import sources on commodity-freight price linkages – would provide valuable insights for regional policy formulation. By pursuing these lines of inquiry, researchers and practitioners will better understand and anticipate the evolving interplay between international commodity markets and the freight market in the coming decades.

## REFERENCES

[1]. S. Dimitrakieva, C. Atanasova, and O. Kostadinov, "FORMATION OF THE CONTRACT FOR MARITIME TRANSPORT SERVICES; FORM OF THE CHARTER PARTY; CHARTER PARTY UNDER TEMPORARY CONDITIONS AS PER ENGLISH MARITIME LAW," Proceedings - University of Ruse "Angel Kanchev," vol. 62, no. 4.2, pp. 127–132, 2023, [Online]. Available: https://conf.uni-ruse.bg/bg/docs/cp23/4.2/4.2-18.pdf

[2]. S. Dimitrakieva, O. Kostadinov, and C. Atanasova, "Multilevel Demand For Sea Transportation. Correlation Between Baltic Dry Index (Bdi) And Coaster Shipping Prices For Sea Routes Between Baltic Seaports And Mediterranean Seaports," Pedagogika-Pedagogy, vol. 93, no. 7s, pp. 141–148, Aug. 2021, doi: 10.53656/ped21-7s.12corr.

[3]. L. Wårell, "An analysis of iron ore prices during the latest commodity boom," Mineral Economics, vol. 31, no. 1–2, pp. 203–216, May 2018, doi: 10.1007/s13563-018-0150-2.

[4]. С. Димитракиева, К. Атанасова, and О. Костадинов, "Пулове в трамповото корабоплаване и правилата относно конкуренцията с оглед на чл. 101 от Договора за функционирането на Европейския съюз," Стратегии на образователната и научната политика, vol. 31, no. 3s, pp. 140–147, 2023, doi: 10.53656/str2023-3s-11-poo.

[5]. J. Angelopoulos, S. Sahoo, and I. D. Visvikis, "Commodity and transportation economic market interactions revisited: New evidence from a dynamic factor model," Transp Res E Logist Transp Rev, vol. 133, p. 101836, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.tre.2019.101836.

[6]. K.-H. Choi and S.-M. Yoon, "Asymmetric Dependence between Oil Prices and Maritime Freight Rates: A Time-Varying Copula Approach," Sustainability, vol. 12, no. 24, p. 10687, Dec. 2020, doi: 10.3390/su122410687.

[7]. P. L. Fackler and B. K. Goodwin, "Chapter 17 Spatial price analysis," in Handbook of Agricultural Economics, vol. 1, Elsevier, 2001, pp. 971–1024. doi: 10.1016/S1574-0072(01)10025-3.

[8]. K. Falahati, "Time, Arbitrage, and the Law of One Price: The Case for a Paradigm Shift," J Econ Issues, vol. 53, no. 1, pp. 115–154, Jan. 2019, doi: 10.1080/00213624.2019.1573082.

ISSN No: 2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25jun133

[9]. Y. Gong, Y. Peng, L. Xu, K. Chen, and W. Shi, "Shipping news sentiment as a predictor of iron ore freight rates: Hybrid evidence from lexicon-based analysis and threshold autoregression modelling," Transp Policy (Oxf), vol. 169, pp. 178–190, Aug. 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.tranpol.2025.05.003.

[10]. N. A. Michail and K. D. Melas, "Market interactions between agricultural commodities and the dry bulk shipping market," The Asian Journal of Shipping and Logistics, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 73–81, Mar. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.ajsl.2020.07.003.

[11]. K. G. Lim, "Endogeneity of commodity price in freight cost models," Journal of Commodity Markets, vol. 26, p. 100217, Jun. 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.jcomm.2021.100217.

[12]. A. H. Alizadeh and N. K. Nomikos, "Cost of carry, causality and arbitrage between oil futures and tanker freight markets," Transp Res E Logist Transp Rev, vol. 40, no. 4, pp. 297–316, Jul. 2004, doi: 10.1016/j.tre.2004.02.002.

[13]. P. K. Pouliasis and C. Bentsos, "Oil price uncertainty and the relation to tanker shipping," International Journal of Finance & Economics, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 2472–2494, Apr. 2024, doi: 10.1002/ijfe.2792.

[14]. C. Dirzka, "AN ECONOMETRIC MODEL OF TANKER SPOT FREIGHT RATES," Thesis , Copenhagen Business School , 2017. Accessed: May 31, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://research-api.cbs.dk/ws/portalfiles/portal/60758558/309492_An_econometric_model_of_tanker_spot_freight_rates_chdi15ad.pdf

[15]. S. Rebaudo, "Supply chain disruption: is the worst over?," Reuters, Nov. 03, 2021. Accessed: Jun. 01, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.reuters.com/business/global-markets-supply-pix-2021-11-03/

[16]. UN Trade and Development (UNCTAD), "Maritime Trade Disrupted: The war in Ukraine and its effects on maritime trade logistics," Jun. 2022. [Online]. Available: https://unctad.org/system/files/official-document/osginf2022d2_en.pdf

[17]. UN Trade and Development (UNCTAD), "War in Ukraine raises global shipping costs, stifles trade," UN Trade and Development (UNCTAD). Accessed: Oct. 17, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://unctad.org/news/war-ukraine-raises-global-shipping-costs-stifles-trade

[18]. C. Rex, M. Andersen, N. Kristensen, and S. Janus, "SHIPPING MARKET REVIEW," May 2014. Accessed: Apr. 01, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://skibskredit.dk/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/shipping-market-review-may-2014.pdf

[19]. S. Dimitrakieva, O. Kostadinov, and C. Atanasova, "Comparative Analysis Of The Contracts For Maritime Transport Services. Chain Of Charter Parties," Pedagogika-Pedagogy, vol. 93, no. 6s, pp. 51–62, Aug. 2021, doi: 10.53656/ped21-6s.04com.

[20]. © European Union - European Commission, "EU-Ukraine Solidarity Lanes," © European Union - European Commission. Accessed: Jun. 01, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://commission.europa.eu/topics/eu-solidarity-ukraine/eu-assistance-ukraine/eu-ukraine-solidarity-lanes_en

[21]. G. Tikaradze and O. Kostadinov, "SOME LEGAL AND COMMERCIAL ASPECTS OF THE ELECTRONIC BILL OF LADING," Annali d'Italia, no. 54, pp. 3–6, 2024, doi: 10.5281/zenodo.11061862.