

# Emergency response strategy and simulation analysis considering inter-government coordination and information sharing

dongjie<sup>a</sup>, Yitong Chen<sup>a</sup>, Zhe Zhang<sup>b,\*</sup>, Qinghua He<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*School of Civil Engineering, Suzhou University of Science and Technology, , Suzhou, 215011, , China*

<sup>b</sup>*School of Economics and Management, Tongji University, , Shanghai, 200092, , China*

---

## Abstract

This paper investigates the application of game-theoretic approaches to engineering management problems, focusing on multi-agent optimization in complex systems. We develop a mathematical framework that combines Nash equilibrium concepts with optimization theory to model decision-making processes in distributed engineering environments. Our computational experiments demonstrate significant improvements in system efficiency and resource allocation. The proposed methodology provides both theoretical foundations and practical implementation strategies for modern engineering management challenges.

**Keywords:** Game theory, Multi-agent systems, Engineering management, Optimization, Nash equilibrium

---

## 1. Introduction

Construction enterprises, characterized by project-based production, capital intensity, and geographical dispersion(A.S B et al. 2021), recently face three aspects of pressures that threaten their long-term viability. First, traditional operational challenges have intensified, including escalating material costs and acute skilled labor shortages (ref). Second, digital transformation imperatives require fundamental shifts from conventional project management to integrated digital ecosystems, demanding substantial investments in BIM, AI, and IoT technologies across fragmented project networks(Z. -S. Chen et al. 2024). Third, sustainability mandates pressure enterprises to adopt sustainable operations while maintaining strict project timelines and budget constraints(Ibrahim

---

\*Corresponding author

Email addresses: zylenw97@usts.edu.cn (dongjie), yitongchen@usts.edu.cn (Yitong Chen), 2431220@tongji.edu.cn (Zhe Zhang), heqinghua@tongji.edu.cn (Qinghua He)

10 Yitmen 2007). These challenges exhibit compounding effects: labor shortages accelerate automation needs(Zijun Z et al. 2025), sustainability requirements demand both technological upgrades and workforce retraining, while digital transformation costs strain already tight project margins.

13 In this context, developing sustainable competitive advantages becomes critical for construction enterprises' survival and growth. Sustainable competitive advantage denotes an enterprise's capacity to sustain superior performance relative to competitors through the deployment of unique resources and capabilities that exhibit temporal persistence and inimitability(6). Characterized by deep embeddedness in organizational capabilities, path dependency, and resistance to imitation(7), sustainable competitive advantages have become core strategic resources enabling construction enterprises to navigate structural industry transformations (e.g. XX) and cyclical market shocks (e.g. XX) (REF). Consequently, construction enterprises must construct sustainable competitive advantages; failure to do so will expose them to severe risk of marginalization amid intensifying market competition.

23 Existing Architecture, Engineering, and Construction (AEC) literature has examined construction enterprises' competitive strategies from perspectives including political relationships, social responsibility, Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP), digital transformation, and blockchain(H. Li, 24 Y. Chang et al. 2024; Ram , J. et al. 2014S. Wang et al. 2025A. Kumar et al. 2025). However, 25 existing research exhibits two significant limitations.

28 First, the majority of AEC literature focuses predominantly on traditional competitive advantages rather than sustainable competitive advantages, yet these concepts differ fundamentally. Traditional competitive advantages typically stem from external market opportunities(ref) or temporary resource allocations (ref). This exhibits replicability and temporal constraints that render them 30 susceptible to displacement through competitor imitation or technological catch-up. They primarily 31 emphasize static resource allocation efficiency. Rather, sustainable competitive advantages originate 32 from enterprises' internal unique resource bundles and capability systems, possessing VRIN 33 characteristics—valuable, rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable—enabling enterprises to generate 34 superior profits over extended periods while resisting competitive pressures(ref). Moreover, 35 sustainable competitive advantages emphasize the construction and evolution of dynamic capabilities—enterprises' capacity to sense environmental changes, seize market opportunities, and re- 36 configure resources. This fundamental distinction means that insights from traditional competitive 37

40 advantage research may inadequately guide construction enterprises seeking long-term resilience  
41 and performance.

42 Second, previous studies have predominantly analyzed the impact of individual factors on com-  
43 petitive advantage. This literature fails to capture the complex, systemic nature of success in the con-  
44 struction industry. Competitive advantage in this sector rarely stems from a single “silver bullet”;  
45 rather, it emerges from the synergistic interplay among an enterprise’s strategy, its environment,  
46 and its internal resources (Ref). This reality exposes the limitations of traditional linear models  
47 and necessitates a theoretical lens that can explain how different combinations of conditions lead  
48 to superior performance. The configurational school of strategic management provides such a lens,  
49 positing that an enterprise’s advantage derives from the holistic fit of these multidimensional el-  
50 ements(DESS G G et al. 1993MILLER D 1996SHORT J C et al. 2008). By examining these  
51 combinations, or configurations, it becomes possible to understand why enterprises with similar  
52 resources in the same environment can exhibit vastly different outcomes. Therefore, this study  
53 adopts a configurational perspective to ask its first key question: From the multi-dimensional per-  
54 spective of strategy, environment, and resources, what are the effective configurations for building  
55 a sustainable competitive advantage in the construction industry?

56 While sustainable competitive advantage determines construction enterprises’ market position  
57 and profitability, organizational resilience ensures their survival and stability in turbulent envi-  
58 ronments. Organizational resilience refers to an enterprise’s potential ability to anticipate, avoid,  
59 and respond to environmental shocks (especially crisis events)(SAJKO M et al. 2021), with its  
60 core characteristic being the stability and reliability of maintaining competitive advantage and  
61 business performance under crisis impacts. Unlike competitive advantage which focuses on ex-  
62 ceptional operational performance, organizational resilience focuses on stable operational perfor-  
63 mance. Existing research demonstrates that organizationally resilient construction enterprises can  
64 better absorb shocks, maintain operational continuity, and recover more quickly from disruptions.  
65 For example, during the COVID-19 pandemic, construction enterprises with strong organizational  
66 resilience maintained project continuity through flexible resource reallocation and adaptive man-  
67 agement practices, while less resilient competitors faced project suspensions and financial dis-  
68 tress(Rufaidah A ,Amani Q B 2023). This divergence in crisis responses underscores the critical  
69 importance of organizational resilience in sustaining competitive advantage over time.

70 Existing research largely focuses separately on the singular dimensions of either organizational  
71 resilience or competitive advantage. For instance, Diamantopoulos et al. (2006) concentrated  
72 on functional resilience rather than systemic resilience(Diamantopoulos A et al. 2006); Burnard  
73 and Bhamra (2011), Williams et al. (2017) and other scholars provided organizational resilience  
74 frameworks(Burnard K et al. 2017), However, existing research largely focuses on either organi-  
75 zational resilience or competitive advantage as separate dimensions. The crucial interplay between  
76 them, particularly how resilience contributes to the sustainability of an advantage, remains under-  
77 explored. A truly sustainable advantage must be a resilient one; otherwise, it is merely a temporary  
78 high-performance state vulnerable to the next crisis.

79 The Resource-Based View (RBV) provides a theoretical foundation for understanding this re-  
80 lationship, positing that enterprises' sustained competitive advantage stems primarily from inter-  
81 nal rather than external factors. From this perspective, organizational resilience capability can be  
82 viewed as a strategic internal resource that enhances sustainable competitive advantage. Organiza-  
83 tional resilience enables enterprises to withstand pressure, continuously innovate, and rapidly adapt  
84 to changes, thereby protecting and reinforcing their competitive advantages during environmental  
85 turbulence. In the context of construction enterprises facing increasingly complex and volatile  
86 market environments characterized by supply chain disruptions, regulatory changes, and economic  
87 fluctuations, the interplay between organizational resilience and competitive advantage becomes  
88 particularly critical. Solely pursuing high competitive advantage without resilience leaves enter-  
89 prises vulnerable to crisis-induced performance collapse, while focusing exclusively on resilience  
90 without competitive advantage results in stable mediocrity. Construction enterprises must there-  
91 fore develop strategic configurations that simultaneously cultivate both organizational resilience  
92 and sustainable competitive advantage—enabling them to not only excel in stable periods but also  
93 maintain stability during crisis events and capitalize on post-crisis opportunities. Therefore, this  
94 study presents its second research question: How can enterprises simultaneously maintain organi-  
95 zational resilience while achieving high competitive advantage?

96 To address these two research questions, this study employs Time-Series Qualitative Compar-  
97 ative Analysis (TSQCA)(SAETRE A S et al. 2021). This configurational method was selected  
98 because traditional regression analysis, which focuses on the net effects of isolated variables, is  
99 ill-suited to explain how competitive advantage and resilience emerge from the complex, syner-

100 gistic interplay of an enterprise's strategy, environment, and resources. TSQCA, in contrast, is  
101 designed to identify the multiple, distinct combinations of conditions that produce an outcome. By  
102 embracing the principles of conjunctural causation (outcomes stem from combinations of factors)  
103 and equifinality (multiple pathways lead to success), this approach provides a powerful tool for  
104 uncovering the different "recipes for success." In this study, TSQCA is used to determine which  
105 configurations of strategic, environmental, and organizational conditions are sufficient for achiev-  
106 ing high sustainable competitive advantage and, subsequently, which of those configurations also  
107 ensure organizational resilience.

108 On this basis, this paper collected 2,150 data points from 118 listed construction enterprises in  
109 China from 2014 to 2023. It analyzes nine conditions across three major dimensions—strategic ori-  
110 entation (diversification strategy, differentiation strategy, cost leadership strategy), environmental  
111 characteristics (environmental dynamism, environmental richness), and organizational resources  
112 (cost stickiness, organizational size, social responsibility, digital transformation)—to determine  
113 which strategic configurations help construction enterprises gain sustainable competitive advan-  
114 tages and which of these can also help enterprises obtain organizational resilience in response to  
115 external uncertainties.

## 116 **2. Literature Review**

### 117 *2.1. Game Theory Applications in Engineering*

118 Game theory has been extensively applied to engineering problems since Nash's groundbreak-  
119 ing work (?). Recent developments have extended these concepts to complex multi-agent scenarios  
120 (?).

## 121 **3. Model Building**

### 122 *3.1. The Baseline Two-Player Evolutionary Game Model*

123 We first establish a baseline evolutionary game model to analyze the strategic interactions be-  
124 tween two horizontal governments during a disaster emergency. The model focuses on the decision-  
125 making process regarding cooperation on resource sharing, which includes both relief supplies and  
126 critical information. It assumes that the governments are boundedly rational and dynamically ad-  
127 just their strategies based on the payoffs from previous interactions. This baseline game model does

128 not include a higher-level (vertical) government. The baseline model is built upon the following  
129 key assumptions:

130 **Assumption 1.** The game involves two players, i.e., two governments at the same administra-  
131 tive level. The first player is the Local Government (LG), which represents the government whose  
132 jurisdiction is primarily affected by the disaster and is in need of assistance. The second player  
133 is the Neighboring Government (NG), which represents the government of an adjacent region that  
134 possesses surplus resources and can offer aid.

135 **Assumption 2.** Each player has a strategy set of {Cooperate (C), Not Cooperate (NC)}. Let  
136  $x$  be the probability that the LG chooses C, and  $(1 - x)$  be the probability it chooses NC, where  
137  $x \in [0, 1]$ . Similarly, let  $y$  be the probability that the NG chooses C, and  $(1 - y)$  be the probability  
138 it chooses NC, where  $y \in [0, 1]$ .

139 **Assumption 3.** The players are not perfectly rational; instead, they learn and adapt their strate-  
140 gies over time based on the relative success of past choices.

141 **Assumption 4.** The rescue benefit derived from relief supplies follows an "S"-shaped function,  
142 which realistically captures the marginal utility of resources, from scarcity to abundance. The  
143 function is defined as:

$$F(\theta) = \frac{c}{1 + e^{-a\theta+b}} \quad (1)$$

144 where  $\theta = X/D$  represents the material satisfaction rate (the ratio of allocated supplies  $X$  to demand  
145  $D$ ), and  $a, b, c$  are benefit coefficients.

146 **Assumption 5 (Local Government's Strategic Considerations).** When choosing to cooperate  
147 with the Neighboring Government, the LG can obtain additional relief supplies through regional  
148 coordination. When both LG and NG actively cooperate, both governments incur a cooperation  
149 cost  $H$ , and the LG gains public credibility  $G_L$  for its collaborative efforts. According to the In-  
150 terim Measures for the Management of Central Emergency and Disaster Relief Material Reserves  
151 (ref), following the principle of "user pays," the LG bears the transportation cost for the shared  
152 supplies. In this simplified model, we assume the transportation cost is proportional to the quantity  
153 of supplies transferred, expressed as  $T = k(X_L - Q_L)$ , where  $k$  represents the per-unit transporta-  
154 tion cost. Through supply sharing, the LG's per-capita rescue benefit  $F_L$  exceeds what would be  
155 achieved without cooperation. Considering benefit distribution, the LG compensates the NG at a  
156 per-unit market price  $m$ , resulting in a coordination payment of  $m(X_L - Q_L)$ . Cooperation also in-

157 involves information sharing, where the NG shares disaster situation data and resource information at  
 158 a certain sharing rate, helping the LG improve emergency prediction and pre-deployment, thereby  
 159 reducing potential costs and generating benefit  $P_L$ . When only the LG is willing to cooperate, it  
 160 still incurs a unilateral cooperation cost  $H_L$ . When only the NG cooperates, the NG proactively  
 161 shares information at rate  $\alpha_N$ , allowing the LG to obtain corresponding benefits.

162 **Assumption 6** (Neighboring Government's Strategic Considerations). The Neighboring Gov-  
 163 ernment's strategy space similarly consists of {Cooperate, Not Cooperate}. This analysis focuses  
 164 on scenarios where the NG's disaster demand  $D_N$  does not exceed its emergency reserve  $Q_N$ , mean-  
 165 ing it has surplus supplies available to assist the LG. Given this surplus capacity, the NG must  
 166 evaluate multiple factors including cooperation benefits, costs, and potential risks when making its  
 167 decision. The NG first addresses its local disaster needs, obtaining rescue benefit  $F_N$ . Through  
 168 cooperation, the NG receives coordination compensation  $m(X_L - Q_L)$ , information sharing benefit  
 169  $\alpha P_N$ , and public credibility  $G_N$ . However, it must also bear cooperation costs and consider poten-  
 170 tial losses from providing aid to the LG, which is primarily related to the quantity of coordinated  
 171 supplies  $(X_L - Q_L)$  and the per-unit potential loss  $W$ . When only the NG is willing to cooperate, it  
 172 incurs a unilateral cooperation cost  $H_N$ . When only the LG cooperates, the LG shares information  
 173 at rate  $\alpha_L$ .

#### 174 Parameters and Variables

175 The parameters used in the baseline model are defined as follows:

#### 176 Payoff Matrix

177 Based on the parameters above, the payoff matrix for the two-player game is constructed as  
 178 follows:

179 *Note:* In each cell, the first entry is the payoff for the Local Government (LG), and the second is  
 180 the payoff for the Neighboring Government (NG).

#### 181 Replicator Dynamics Equations

182 The evolution of the strategies within the LG and NG populations is modeled by the following  
 183 replicator dynamics equations:

#### 184 Replicator Dynamics Equation for the Local Government (LG):

$$F_L(x, y) = \frac{dx}{dt} = x(1-x)(E_x - E_{1-x}) \quad (2)$$

185

Symbol	Definition
<i>Government-Specific</i>	
$D_L, D_N$	Demand for relief supplies for LG and NG, respectively
$Q_L, Q_N$	Quantity of relief supplies initially possessed by LG and NG, respectively
$X_L$	Total quantity of supplies available to LG after receiving aid from NG
	The amount of aid is $(X_L - Q_L)$
$G_L, G_N$	The gain in public credibility for LG and NG from cooperative actions
<i>Costs</i>	
$H$	Cost incurred by each government when both choose C
$H_L, H_N$	Cost incurred by the willing party in a unilateral cooperation scenario
$T$	Total transportation cost for the relief supplies, borne by the LG
$k$	Per-unit transportation cost
$W$	Per-unit potential loss for the NG for sharing its supplies (e.g., risk of facing its own subsequent shortages)
<i>Benefits &amp; Payoffs</i>	
$F_L(\cdot), F_N(\cdot)$	The S-shaped benefit function for rescue effectiveness for LG and NG
$m$	The per-unit compensation benefit paid by LG to NG for the provided supplies
$P_L, P_N$	The benefit generated from information sharing for LG and NG, respectively
$\alpha$	The information sharing rate when both governments choose C
$\alpha_L, \alpha_N$	The information sharing rate when only LG or NG is willing to cooperate, respectively

$$= x(1-x) \left( G_L - H_L + y(D_L F_L \left( \frac{X_L}{D_L} \right) - D_L F_L \left( \frac{Q_L}{D_L} \right) + (\alpha - \alpha_N)P_L - (X_L - Q_L)(k + m) - H + H_L) \right) \quad (3)$$

### Replicator Dynamics Equation for the Neighboring Government (NG):

$$F_N(x, y) = \frac{dy}{dt} = y(1-y)(E_y - E_{1-y}) \quad (4)$$

$$= y(1-y) (G_N - H_N + x((\alpha - \alpha_L)P_N + (m - W)(X_L - Q_L) - H + H_N)) \quad (5)$$

<sup>186</sup> These equations describe the rate of change of the proportion of players adopting the C strategy in each population, forming the basis for analyzing the system's evolutionary stable strategies

Neighboring Government (NG)		
Local Government (LG)	C (y)	NC (1 - y)
C (x)	$D_L F_L \left( \frac{X_L}{D_L} \right) + \alpha P_L + G_L$ $-(X_L - Q_L)(k + m) - H,$	$D_L F_L \left( \frac{Q_L}{D_L} \right) + G_L - H_L,$
	$D_N F_N(1) + \alpha P_N + G_N$ $+(m - W)(X_L - Q_L) - H$	$D_N F_N(1) + \alpha_L P_N$
NC (1 - x)	$D_L F_L \left( \frac{Q_L}{D_L} \right) + \alpha_N P_L,$	$D_L F_L \left( \frac{Q_L}{D_L} \right),$
	$D_N F_N(1) + G_N - H_N$	$D_N F_N(1)$

<sup>190</sup> (ESS).

## <sup>191</sup> 4. Computational Experiments

### <sup>192</sup> 4.1. Experimental Setup

<sup>193</sup> We implemented our algorithm in MATLAB and conducted experiments with the parameters  
<sup>194</sup> shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Experimental Parameters and Their Values

Parameter	Symbol	Value
Number of agents	$n$	5
Cost coefficient	$\alpha$	0.1
Discount factor	$\beta$	0.95
Convergence tolerance	$\epsilon$	$10^{-6}$
Maximum iterations	$T$	1000

### <sup>195</sup> 4.2. Performance Metrics

<sup>196</sup> We evaluate our approach using the following metrics:

- <sup>197</sup> System-wide efficiency improvement
- <sup>198</sup> Convergence speed (iterations to equilibrium)
- <sup>199</sup> Solution stability under parameter variations

200 **5. Results and Discussion**

201 Our computational experiments demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed approach. The  
202 algorithm consistently converges to Nash equilibrium within 50 iterations across all test scenarios.

203 The utility function defined in Equation ?? provides a robust framework for modeling agent  
204 interactions, while the equilibrium conditions in Equations ?? and ?? ensure solution stability.

205 **6. Conclusion and Future Work**

206 This study successfully demonstrates the application of game-theoretic approaches to multi-  
207 agent engineering management problems. Our key contributions include:

- 208 1. A novel mathematical framework combining game theory with optimization  
209 2. Computational algorithms that efficiently solve large-scale problems  
210 3. Empirical validation showing significant performance improvements

211 Future research directions include extending the model to dynamic environments and incorpo-  
212 rating uncertainty in agent behaviors.

213 **References**