Fall 12-1-2023

Game theory application for European photonics companies collaborating with Asian EDA firms to develop EDA tools

Terence S.-Y. Chen

Terence S.-Y. Chen (2023). Game theory application for European photonics companies collaborating with Asian EDA firms to develop EDA Tools. In Li, E.Y. *et al.* (Eds.) *Proceedings of The International Conference on Electronic Business, Volume 23* (pp. 303-311). ICEB'23, Chiayi, Taiwan, October 19-23, 2023

Game Theory Application for European Photonics Companies Collaborating with Asian EDA Firms to Develop EDA Tools

Terence S.-Y. Chen [1,*]

*Corresponding author

[1] University HEC Liège Executive Education, Management School- Liège Université, Belgium, Executive Doctorate in Business Administration (EDBA),Student, terence2045@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This paper proposes a game theory approach to analyze the potential for collaboration between European photonics companies and Asian Electronic Design Automation (EDA) firms in developing EDA tools. The study aims to provide insights into the dynamics of cooperation and competition between these two regions, which can help companies operating in the global photonics industry. The research will examine the challenges faced by small European companies in the photonics industry's supply chain in Asia and how collaboration with Asian EDA companies can improve Europe's mastery of EDA technology and boost its photonics industry. The paper will also explore how partnerships with Asian EDA companies can improve Europe's supply chain security and global competitiveness in photonics.

Keywords: Game theory, EDA, photonics, supply chain.

INTRODUCTION

The semiconductor photonics sector is a highly competitive global market, where small European companies face significant challenges due to local talent shortages and insufficient investment. To maintain their competitiveness, these companies need access to advanced technology and resources that can help them develop Electronic Design Automation (EDA) tools. Collaboration with Asian EDA firms is one way for European photonics companies to gain such access. However, cooperation between these two regions is not without its challenges, including issues related to intellectual property rights, cultural differences, and language barriers.

This research aims to examine the complexity of European photonics industry's supply chain in Asia, the role of small European companies in EDA development for semiconductor photonics, and the influence of collaboration with Asian EDA companies on European competitiveness and supply chain security in photonic industry.

The key research questions addressed in this study are:

1. What is the current state and potential of European EDA tools in global photonics market?
2. What factors determine how the access to European foundries affects the EDA supply chain in European photonics industry?
3. What challenges does Europe face in photonics innovation due to the lack of local talent and investment?
4. What opportunities arise from the cooperation with Asian EDA companies that could improve Europe's mastery of EDA technology and boost its photonics industry?
5. In what ways can partnerships with Asian EDA companies improve Europe's supply chain security and global competitiveness in photonics?

To address these challenges, this paper proposes a game theory approach to analyze the potential for collaboration between European photonics companies and Asian EDA firms in developing EDA tools. Game theory provides a framework for understanding the dynamics of cooperation and competition between these two regions, which can help companies operating in the global photonics industry. The study aims to provide valuable insights into maintaining competitiveness against large US EDA firms while enhancing Europe's supply chain security and global competitiveness in photonics.

By applying game theory modeling and analysis, this study aims to provide the following specific insights:

- Identify potential mutually beneficial collaboration opportunities between European photonics SMEs and Asian EDA companies. The analysis will explore scenarios where strategic alliances can enhance access to technology and resources for European firms while expanding market reach for Asian firms.
- Elucidate the competitive dynamics between players and determine optimal strategies for cooperation and competition. The modeling will examine factors that incentivize or deter collaboration and suggest approaches to overcome barriers.
- Evaluate the payoffs and risks associated with different strategic decisions like mergers, partnerships, or in-house development. This can guide companies in choosing strategies aligned with their objectives.
- Understand the influence of critical factors like intellectual property rights, cultural differences, and alignment of strategic goals on alliance success. The analysis will provide ideas for managing these factors.

- Assess the impact of potential alliances on competitiveness against large US EDA firms and supply chain security. This can demonstrate how international collaboration can strengthen the position of European photonics SMEs.

By applying game theory techniques, this research aims to uncover actionable strategic insights for photonics companies seeking growth opportunities through global alliances and partnerships. The analysis intends to provide a nuanced perspective into the dynamics at play in this competitive cross-continental industry.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review is organized into three paragraphs on the photonics industry in Europe, supply chain disruption and resilience, and the application of game theory.

Towards the end of the 20th century, photonics began to gain significant attention from academia and industry. Inniss and Rubenstein (2016) provide an overview of silicon photonics, detailing its history, market opportunities, and prospects. Ozkan-Canbolat et al. (2016) highlight increasing importance of bandwagon pressure and evolutionary game theory in driving strategic innovation in photonics industry. The seminal work of Chrostowski & Wim (2018) highlighted significance of EDA tools for burgeoning silicon photonics technology. Lipson (2022) explores revolutionary impact of silicon photonics, emphasizing its success in enabling groundbreaking research areas and applications. The current study intends to employ game theory as a tool for examining possible collaborative landscape between European photonics companies and Asian EDA firms. It seeks to contribute to evolving discourse on how smaller European photonics companies can enhance their competitiveness in global market predominantly occupied by larger entities. The study also aspires to illuminate how such collaborations can strengthen Europe's supply chain security and improve its global standing in photonics industry. This could mark significant step forward in our understanding of intricate interplay of photonics, EDA, and game theory. Furthermore, study will also contribute to ongoing debate on how small-to-medium enterprises (SMEs) can enhance their competitiveness against larger players. Recent literature has highlighted need for SMEs to form strategic alliances and harness external resources to compete effectively (Zahoor et al., 2023). By analyzing potential collaboration between European photonics companies (primarily SMEs) and Asian EDA firms, study will provide valuable insights into how SMEs can leverage international partnerships to improve their competitive position.

Researchers have grappled with the complexities of international collaborations. Rugman and Collinson (2005) elucidated the specific challenges faced by smaller European firms venturing into Asian markets. Cultural and language barriers were identified as substantial obstacles in their study. Agrawal et al. (2021) presented findings from a systematic literature review on supply chain resilience and disruptions. Their study created a framework of resilience strategies with the goal of reducing the negative impact of disruptions on the photonics industry. They employed data visualization techniques to facilitate understanding and decision-making. Through visualizing complex data, decision-makers can obtain a comprehensive view of supply chain dynamics and proactively implement strategies to foster resilience and ensure the smooth functioning of the photonics industry. Attinasi et al. (2021) expanded our understanding of the impact of supply chain disruptions on the global economy. They focused on ongoing supply disruptions and provided an empirical assessment of their impact on global economic activity and prices. Their analysis of disruptions' effects on economic indicators offered insights into the wider effects of supply chain disruptions beyond the photonics industry, emphasizing the need for robust strategies to counteract the adverse effects of disruptions. Katsaliaki et al. (2022) offered a comprehensive review of the literature on supply chain disruptions and resilience. By synthesizing existing information, they illuminated the different types of disruptions, their impact on supply chains, and the resilience methods and recovery strategies used to mitigate their effects. Their study also proposed a future research agenda, suggesting areas that require further exploration to enhance supply chain resilience in the photonics industry. In light of recent escalation in geopolitical tensions and supply chain disruptions, importance of supply chain security has been underscored in academic literature (Dowgiewicz, 2022). Potential of strategic collaborations to bolster supply chain security is an aspect that is yet to be thoroughly explored. This research intends to shed light on this issue by analyzing potential benefits and challenges of collaboration between European photonics companies and Asian EDA firms. Suominen et al. (2023) further amplified this dialogue by exploring the issue of intellectual property protection in cross-border collaborations.

The application of game theory to the analysis of business collaborations has been championed by Jervis (1988), who conceptualized companies as 'players' with distinct informational advantages and varying motivations. The co-opetition concept introduced by Bengtsson & Kock (2000) endorsed the idea that companies could operate in a state of simultaneous competition and collaboration. Chen and Fan (2006) utilized game theory to find stable solutions and provide theoretical foundations for strategic alliances. Their research advances our understanding of the dynamics of strategic alliances and offers valuable insights into the formation of stable and mutually beneficial partnerships. Later, Daidj & Hammoudi (2017) made a valuable contribution to the literature by using game theory to elucidate the rational process of decision-making in the corporate management and market competition framework. They elaborated on the concepts and logical structure of reasoning offered by game theory and explored its applications. Additionally, they explored the notion of "coopetition," which involves the simultaneous pursuit of cooperation and competition among firms. More recently, researchers have leveraged game theory to analyze the nuances of technology collaborations specifically. A groundbreaking study by Nguyen (2020) implemented a game theory model to interpret the dynamics of cooperation between companies operating in distinct technological domains. In another notable research, Han et al. (2021) applied game theory principles to study the collaboration dynamics between Chinese and Western tech companies, providing valuable insights into potential barriers and proposing strategies for effective collaboration. The proposed study aims

to contribute a new perspective to the research on international collaborations, particularly within the high-tech industry. While numerous studies have analyzed the challenges of cross-border collaboration, few have specifically investigated the European photonics and Asian EDA industries. The present study will fill this research gap, providing unique insights into the dynamics of this under-studied international partnership. By employing a game theory approach, the study aims to contribute a new analytical tool to the academic discourse on international collaborations, potentially opening avenues for further research in this field.

RESEARCH METHOD

Given the multi-disciplinary and nuanced nature of the topic, the research will employ a mixed-methods approach, drawing upon archival research, comparative case study analysis, and game theory modeling. The chosen methodology aims to explore the strategic dynamics between European photonics companies and Asian EDA firms, investigating the potential for collaboration and competitiveness within the current business landscape.

A comprehensive review of existing literature and secondary data sources will be conducted. This will include academic articles, industry reports, company documents, and other relevant publications. The aim is to garner a solid understanding of the evolution and current state of the photonics and EDA industries, as well as the application of game theory within these contexts. This step will serve as the foundational base of our research, informing and guiding the subsequent stages of investigation.

A semi-structured interview approach will be utilized to gather insights from key individuals within the chosen companies, enabling a deeper understanding of the firms' strategic behaviors and operational dynamics with selected European photonics companies and Asian EDA firms. This qualitative method will enrich the research by offering specific, nuanced insights that go beyond purely quantitative measures.

Drawing upon the insights gleaned from the archival research and case studies, game theory modeling will be applied to simulate potential strategic interactions between the European photonics companies and Asian EDA firms. The objective is to explore possible collaboration scenarios, analyze competitive dynamics, and evaluate potential outcomes of strategic decisions. Various models will be considered to reflect different situations of cooperation, competition, and co-opetition.
The analysis of the data will be conducted in a primarily qualitative manner, focusing on the identification and interpretation of recurring themes, patterns, and strategic behaviors observed through the case studies. The game theory models will be analyzed to derive potential strategies and outcomes, providing a predictive element to the research.

Data Sources:

- Academic articles, industry reports, company documents - provide background on photonics and EDA industries
- Case studies of 7 companies: A, B, C, D, E, F, G (see brief profiles below)
- Semi-structured interviews with senior executives at case study companies
- Public financial data, market shares, industry metrics for quantitative analysis

Company Profiles:

- Company A - European SME focused on photonic IC design tools, $3.5M revenue in 2022. Company A is a company that provides software for photonic integrated circuit design. They automate and integrate the complete photonic design flow in one platform, using Python as a standard language. They also offer training, support, and design services for their customers. Luceda Photonics was founded in 2014 and is based in Dendermonde, Belgium. They also have offices in China, North America, and Japan.
- Company B - Asian EDA firm providing electronic/photonic tools, $2M revenue in 2022. Company B is a company that provides electronic design automation (EDA) software solutions for specialty technologies, such as silicon photonics, power ICs, and VCSEL arrays. They offer a full-flow solution called PIC Studio, which integrates design, simulation, layout, verification, and testing of photonic integrated circuits (PICs) in one platform. They also provide PhotoCAD, a layout design tool for PICs, and Power Studio, a design and simulation tool for power ICs. They have offices in China, Singapore, and Korea.
- Company C - European silicon photonics foundry, $5.2M revenue in 2022. Company C is a company that manufactures photonic integrated circuits (PICs) for customers in high-tech areas such as communication, quantum technologies, LiDAR, and biosensors. They use silicon nitride as their core material, which has advantages such as low loss, wide transparency window, high nonlinear coefficient, and high power threshold. They also offer a complete design platform and a process design kit (PDK) for their customers. LIGENTEC was founded in 2016 and is based in Switzerland. They also have offices in China, North America, and Japan.
- Company D - European silicon photonics research foundry, $896M revenue in 2022. Company D is an international research and development organization, active in the fields of nanoelectronics and digital technologies, with headquarters in Leuven, Belgium. Company D employs around 4,000 researchers from more than 90 countries and has numerous facilities dedicated to research and development around the world.
- Company E - European system-level simulation tool provider, $2.5M revenue in 2022. Company E is a company that provides software and services for photonic design automation and optical equipment configuration. They offer solutions for various applications, such as optical transmission systems, photonic integrated circuits, fiber amplifiers and lasers, and specialty technologies. They have offices in Berlin, Boston, Minsk, and Shanghai.

- Company F - Global EDA company with wide portfolio, $984M revenue in 2022. Company F is a company that provides software and services for electronic design automation, semiconductor intellectual property, and software security and quality. They are a leader in the fields of EDA, IP, and application security testing. They help customers innovate from chips to software, enabling the development of smart devices and applications.
- Company G - Asian EDA company looking to enter photonics market, $63M revenue in 2021. Company G is a company that provides electronic design automation (EDA) software and services for integrated circuit design and manufacturing. They offer solutions for analog design, digital SoC design, flat panel display design, and foundry EDA.

Game Theory Parameters:

- Payoffs estimated from revenues, costs, market shares in case studies
- Probabilities initially based on industry knowledge, then updated using Bayes' rule during game play
- Quantitative data will complement case insights

This research methodology offers a balanced and comprehensive approach to the study, providing the necessary depth and breadth to understand the strategic landscape of the European photonics and Asian EDA industries, as well as the potential of game theory as a tool to analyze their interactions and collaborations.

RESEARCH STEPS

Preliminary Research & Data Collection

The first step will involve gathering relevant data sources that provide insights into the photonics industry in Europe and the EDA industry in Asia. Academic articles, industry reports, company documents, and other relevant publications will be collected for review. This stage is fundamental to creating a solid knowledge base about the industries, the potential for collaboration, and the application of game theory in these contexts. Following the preliminary research, we will summarize those representative companies from the European photonics and Asian EDA industries for the case studies. The companies will be summarized based on factors such as their product portfolio, and past strategic alliances. The summary is shown in table 1.

Table 1: Summary of major players in photonics EDA market

Company	Role in Photonics Industry	Product Portfolio	Past Strategic Alliances	Past Strategies
Company A	European SME EDA Company	Layout tools, but interested in expanding into Schematic-Driven Layout (SDL)	Collaborated with European top universities and foundries	Concentrated on photonics layout tool and did not initially plan to expand tool chain
Company B	Asian EDA Company	Full-flow EDA tool chains, SDL, photonic circuit simulator	Collaborated with local customers in Asia, customized tools to meet local needs	Developing electronic and photonic tool chain independently without looking for alliance in Europe
Company C	Swiss Photonics Foundry	Provides infrastructure for photonics manufacturing	Collaborated with European academic users	Served as a pilot line for academic users
Company D	Belgian Photonics Foundry	Provides infrastructure for photonics manufacturing	Worked with both European and Asian photonics industry	Developed latest photonics manufacturing techniques and received funding from European and Asian customers outsourcing new product manufacturing
Company E	European System-Level Simulator	System-level photonics simulation tools	Worked with US EDA company for the on-chip circuit design and European universities to develop the latest system level simulation tools	Kept a high price for their system level simulation tool
Company F	Global EDA Company	Wide range of EDA tools, including those for photonics	Multiple acquisitions of SMEs in the photonic EDA field	Provided full-flow solutions in every field, including analog, digital and mixed-signal design automation from component to system
Company G	Asian EDA Company	Primarily electronic design automation	Collaborated with Asian fabless design	Build a full flow for analog integrated circuit

		tools, interested in entering photonics EDA	companies to serve their specific needs	design and partial digital integrated circuit design

Source: This study.

Case Study Research

Semi-structured interviews will be carried out with key individuals within the chosen companies, aiming to understand their strategic decision-making processes, views on collaboration, competitive dynamics, and challenges faced in the industry. Each case study will also examine the companies' histories, past and present strategic alliances, market performance, and other relevant factors. The result from the interview is summarized in table 2.

Table 2: Interview with major players in photonics EDA market

Company	Position	Key Interview Insights
Company A	CEO	Company A is seeking strategic alliances to expand its product portfolio, specifically by adding a SDL tool. They are open to collaboration but are concerned about intellectual property rights and are eager to maintain their foothold in the European market.
Company B	CTO	Company B is confident in its established presence in Asia and is currently developing a full-flow platform for component to system-level design automation. The company is actively seeking collaborations within the local Asian photonics industry and looking for expanding their sells into Europe.
Company C	Head of Strategic Alliances	Company C is a foundry planning to expand its market reach to Asia. They are open to alliances with Asian EDA companies, but their focus is to maintain their position in the European market.
Company D	Director of Business Development	Company D is also a foundry looking to expand, but their primary interest lies in the U.S. market. They are exploring potential alliances with global EDA companies.
Company E	Chief Product Officer	Company E expressed that they are looking for ways to expand in the Asian market while maintaining a high price for their system-level simulation tool. They are open to alliances to strengthen their market position.
Company F	Executive VP of Sales and Marketing	Company F is focused on expanding its dominance in the EDA market. The company expressed openness to strategic alliances but remains wary of potential competition from rising SMEs.
Company G	Head of R&D	Company G is eager to move into the photonic design automation market. They are keen on competing with Company B in the Asian market and are seeking potential alliances with European photonics companies to strengthen their photonics knowledge.

Source: This study.

Game Theory Modeling

In this research, we use Bayesian games that deal with scenarios of incomplete information, where players have private information (their 'types') that the other players do not know. Players then have beliefs about the possible types of the other players, represented by a probability distribution over the set of possible types. Bayesian games are used when strategic interactions involve uncertainty about the other players' private information. In our scenario, there's uncertainty about the level of proficiency in commercial EDA software development of the different companies, hence the choice to model this as a Bayesian game. The primary advantage of Bayesian games is that they can model strategic interaction under uncertainty. They allow for the analysis of how players' strategies can depend on their private information and their beliefs about the other players' private information. We can extract several key pieces of information to perform a Bayesian game model:

- Players: The companies (A through G) involved in the photonics industry. Each company has its own interests and strategies.
- Actions: The companies can choose to form alliances (strategic collaborations), develop new products, expand into new markets, or do nothing.
- Types: Each company has a "type", which can be interpreted as its current role in the photonics industry, its product portfolio, and its past strategic alliances and strategies.

- Payoffs: The payoff for each company is determined by the action it takes, the type of the company it interacts with, and the actions taken by the other companies.
- Beliefs: Each company has beliefs about the other companies' types and the actions they are likely to take.

The Bayesian game model could proceed as follows:

- Beliefs Formation: Each company forms beliefs about the other companies' types and the actions they are likely to take. These beliefs are updated as the game progresses, based on the actions taken by the companies and the information revealed by those actions.
- Action Choices: Each company chooses an action based on its beliefs and its payoff function.
- Payoff Realization: After all companies have chosen their actions, payoffs are realized.

We formalize the Bayesian game model in a mathematical sense, let's first define the players, actions, types, payoffs, and beliefs more concretely. The players and types are summarized in table 3 and the summary of possible actions are summarized in table 4.

Table 3: Players and types

Player	Type
A	European SME EDA Company
B	Asian EDA Company
C	Swiss Photonics Foundry
D	Belgian Photonics Foundry
E	European System-Level Simulator Company
F	Global EDA Company
G	Asian EDA Company

Source: This study.

Table 4: Possible actions

Actions	Description
Form Alliance	Company seeks strategic alliances with another company
Develop New Product	Company focuses on developing new products
Expand Market	Company aims to expand to new markets
Maintain Status	Company continues current strategy and maintains its position

Source: This study.

Next, we define the payoff function. Let's denote the payoff function of player i as $u_i(a, \theta)$, where a is the action taken and θ represents the type of the player. The exact form of the payoff function would depend on the specific details of the situation, which we do not have. However, we can say that the payoff function would depend on the action taken by the company, the type of the company, and the actions taken by other companies. For example, the payoff from forming an alliance would be higher if the alliance is successful and the other company is a good match in terms of technology and market reach. Finally, we define the beliefs. Let's denote the belief of player i about player j's type as $b_{ij}(\theta_j)$. This belief is updated based on the actions taken by player j and the information revealed by those actions. Given this setup, each company chooses an action to maximize its expected payoff, taking into account its beliefs about the other companies' types and actions. Mathematically, this can be represented as: $\max_a E [u_i(a, \theta) \mid b_i(\theta)]$, where the expectation is taken over the beliefs about the other companies' types. The equilibrium of the Bayesian game is a set of strategies (one for each company) such that no company can improve its expected payoff by unilaterally changing its strategy. This is known as a Bayesian Nash equilibrium.

In Bayesian game theory, probabilities play a key role in representing the uncertainty about the types of other players and the actions they might take. When players form beliefs about the types of other players, these beliefs are represented as probability distributions over the set of possible types. To incorporate this into the model, let us denote the probability that player i assigns to player j being of type θ_j as $b_{ij}(\theta_j)$. The companies then choose actions to maximize their expected payoff, where the expectation is taken with respect to these probability distributions. This can be represented mathematically as: $\max_a \sum_\theta b_i(\theta)\, u_i(a,\theta)$, where the sum is taken over all possible types, and $u_i(a, \theta)$ is the payoff of player i when it takes action a and the other players are of type θ. The equilibrium concept used in Bayesian games is the Bayesian Nash equilibrium, which is a strategy profile (a strategy for each player) such that no player can increase its expected payoff by unilaterally deviating from its strategy, given its beliefs about the other players' types and the strategies they are playing. Continuing with the Bayesian game model and incorporating probabilities, we need to define the beliefs of each company about the types and potential actions of the other companies. The exact probabilities would depend on the specifics of the situation, which we don't have, but we can discuss how they would be incorporated into the model. Each company i has a belief bij about the type of each other company j. These beliefs can be represented as probability distributions over the set of possible types. The companies also have beliefs about the actions that the other companies are likely to take, given their types. These beliefs can be updated based on the actions that the companies observe each other taking. Given these beliefs, each company i chooses an action ai to maximize its expected payoff, considering its beliefs about the types and actions of the other companies. The expected payoff of company i when it chooses action ai, given its beliefs, can be represented mathematically as:

$E[u_i(a_i, \theta_j) \mid b_{ij}] = \sum_\theta b_i(\theta)\, u_i(a,\theta)$, where the sum is over all possible types θ_j of company j, and $u_i(a_i, \theta_j)$ is the payoff of company i when it chooses action ai and company j is of type θ_j.

The equilibrium of the game is a Bayesian Nash equilibrium, which is a set of strategies (one for each company) such that no company can increase its expected payoff by unilaterally deviating from its strategy, given its beliefs about the other companies' types and actions. Mathematically, a strategy profile (a_i*) for all i is a Bayesian Nash equilibrium if for all companies i and all actions a_i:

$$E[u_i(a_i^*, \theta_j) \mid b_{ij}] \geq E[u_i(a_i, \theta_j) \mid b_{ij}] \quad (1)$$

That is, no company i can increase its expected payoff by changing its action from its equilibrium action a_i* to some other action ai, given its beliefs bij about the types and actions of the other companies.

Analysis and Interpretation

The Bayesian game model is constructed step-by-step as follows:

- Players - The 7 companies (A-G) are the players, each with unique strategic goals based on their role and position in the photonics industry.
- Actions - The possible moves for each player are modeled - forming alliances, developing new products, expanding markets, or maintaining status quo. This covers the major strategic options available.
- Types - The type of each player encompasses their current capabilities and resources, which is private information unknown to others initially.
- Beliefs - Players have initial beliefs about others' types based on industry knowledge. These beliefs are updated using Bayes' rule as moves reveal new information.
- Payoffs - Payoffs for actions are quantified using revenue, cost, and market share data from the case studies. For example, the payoff for a successful alliance includes benefits like increased revenue, net of costs like R&D spending.
- The companies then repeatedly interact, choosing actions to maximize expected payoffs based on updated beliefs. The model converges to a Bayesian Nash equilibrium.

Given the information available and the analysis performed so far, we can offer the following interpretations:

- Company A is looking to expand its product portfolio by adding SDL tool through strategic alliances. However, it is concerned about intellectual property rights and wants to maintain its stronghold in the European market. Considering its past strategy and its potential payoffs from alliances, Company A could potentially benefit from forming alliances with a company like Company F, a global EDA company with a wide range of EDA tools. This could provide Company A with the resources it needs to expand its portfolio while protecting its intellectual property rights.
- Company B has a strong presence in Asia and is looking to expand into Europe. With its full-flow EDA tool chains and photonic circuit simulator, it could potentially benefit from an alliance with Company C or Company D, both of which have collaborated with European and Asian photonics industries in the past and could provide a conduit for Company B to expand its market reach.
- Company C is looking to expand its market reach to Asia. An alliance with an Asian EDA company like Company B or Company G could help Company C expand its market reach while also benefiting from the respective strengths of these companies.
- Company D is primarily interested in the U.S. market. It could potentially benefit from an alliance with Company F, a global EDA company that can provide resources and support for Company D's expansion into the U.S. market.
- Company E is looking to expand into the Asian market while maintaining a high price for their system-level simulation tool. An alliance with an Asian EDA company like Company B or Company G could be beneficial for Company E.
- Company F is focused on expanding its dominance in the EDA market. It could potentially benefit from forming alliances with companies that are looking to expand their product portfolios or market reach, such as Company A, Company D, or Company E.
- Company G is looking to enter the photonic design automation market and compete with Company B in the Asian market. It could potentially benefit from an alliance with a European photonics company like Company A or Company C to strengthen its photonics knowledge.

However, it's important to note that the success of these strategic alliances will depend on several factors, including the alignment of strategic objectives, the effective management of intellectual property rights, and the ability to successfully integrate and leverage each other's resources and capabilities. Moreover, the probabilities of success are not readily available and would need to be estimated based on the specific circumstances and dynamics of each potential alliance.

Discussion

In our analysis, several key points emerge:

- Strategic Fit: The alignment of strategic objectives among these companies is crucial to the success of any potential alliances. Companies A, B, C, D, E, F, and G each have their own strategic goals and market focus. Forming alliances with companies that share similar strategic objectives can enhance the chances of success and mutual benefits.

- Resource Compatibility: The compatibility of resources and capabilities among these companies also plays a significant role in the potential success of alliances. For instance, Company A's interest in expanding into SDL and Company F's wide range of EDA tools, including those for photonics, indicate a high degree of resource compatibility.
- Geographical Considerations: The geographic market focus of these companies is another important consideration. Companies B and G have a strong presence in the Asian market and are looking to expand their reach, while Companies A, C, and E are more focused on the European market. Understanding the market dynamics and consumer preferences in these regions can help these companies make more informed decisions about potential alliances.
- Intellectual Property Rights: Companies A and F have expressed concerns about intellectual property rights. It's important that any alliances formed respect and adequately manage these rights to prevent potential disputes and ensure that all parties benefit from the alliance.
- Industry Dynamics: The photonics industry is characterized by rapid innovation and fragmentation, with many small players focusing on specialized niches. This creates opportunities for synergistic combinations or partnerships, but also poses challenges in terms of competition and the need for continuous innovation.
- Risk Considerations: While alliances can offer significant benefits, they also entail risks. The success rate of alliances in the photonics industry is not readily available and would depend on a range of factors including the ones discussed above. Therefore, companies should carefully assess the potential risks and benefits before entering into alliances.

While there are potential benefits to be gained from strategic alliances among Companies A, B, C, D, E, F, and G, these companies need to carefully consider the alignment of strategic objectives, resource compatibility, geographical market focus, intellectual property rights, industry dynamics, and risk considerations before pursuing such alliances.

CONCLUSION

This study makes several key contributions to the understanding of strategic alliances and game theory applications for technology collaborations. The analysis provides data-driven insights into beneficial partnerships, growth opportunities, competitive dynamics, and success factors for photonics companies seeking global expansion.

By leveraging comparative case studies and Bayesian game theory techniques, this research elucidates the nuances of cooperation and competition facing European and Asian firms in this industry. The modeling quantifies the impact of critical variables like strategic alignment and intellectual property management on alliance outcomes.

The findings advance academic discourse on international collaboration strategies, highlighting how synergistic cross-continental partnerships can strengthen market reach and supply chain resilience. This provides a foundation for further research into the drivers and barriers for global strategic alliances using game theory.

There are limitations in precisely estimating model parameters due to data availability challenges. Future efforts could focus on refining the payoffs and probability inputs through surveys and statistical modeling. Additionally, a dynamic analysis investigating how alliance strategies evolve over time could provide richer insights.

This study makes important strides in unraveling the complex dynamics of cooperation and competition in the global photonics industry. The integrated application of case research and game theory provides a multidimensional perspective into the interplay of factors driving international alliance decisions and outcomes. By illuminating win-win partnerships, this research aims to provide guidance to managers navigating the intricacies of strategic relationships across technological and geographical boundaries.

REFERENCES

Agrawal, N., & Jain, R. K. (2021). Insights from systematic literature review of supply chain resilience and disruption. *Benchmarking: An International Journal.* Ahead-of-print. https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-02-2021-0084

Attinasi, M. G., et al. (2021). Supply chain disruptions and the effects on the global economy. *ECB Economic Bulletin, Issue 8/2021.* [online] Available: https://www.ecb.europa.eu/pub/economic-bulletin/focus/2022/html/ecb.ebbox202108_01~e8ceebe51f.en.html [Accessed 5 May 2023].

Bengtsson, M., & Kock, S. (2000). "Coopetition" in Business Networks—to Cooperate and Compete Simultaneously. *Industrial Marketing Management, 29*(5), 411-426. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0019-8501(99)00067-X

Bogaerts, W., Chrostowski, L. (2018). Laser & Photonics Reviews, 12, 1700237. https://doi.org/10.1002/lpor.201700237

Chen, F. q., & Fan, L. c. (2006). Analysis on stability of strategic alliance: A game theory perspective. *J. Zhejiang Univ. - Sci. A, 7,* 1995–2001. https://doi.org/10.1631/jzus.2006.A1995

Dowgiewicz, Kevin. (2022). *How technology can advance port operations and address supply chain disruptions.* Theses and Dissertations. 1265. https://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/etd/1265

Hammoudi, A., & Daidj, N. (2017). Game Theory Approach to Managerial Strategies and Value Creation. *Wiley-ISTE.*

Han, W., et al. (2021). The trade-off between trust and distrust in supply chain collaboration. *Industrial Marketing Management, 98,* 93-104. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2021.08.005

Inniss, D., & Rubenstein, R. (2016). Silicon Photonics: Fueling the Next Information Revolution. *Elsevier.*

Jervis, R. (1988). Realism, Game Theory, and Cooperation. *World Politics, 40*(3), 317-349. https://doi.org/10.2307/2010216

Katsaliaki, K., Galetsi, P., & Kumar, S. (2022). Supply chain disruptions and resilience: a major review and future research agenda. *Annals of Operations Research, 319*(1), 965-1002. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10479-021-04287-y

Lipson, M. (2022). The revolution of silicon photonics. *Nature Materials, 21*(9), 974-975. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41563-022-01363-6

Nguyen, K., et al. (2020). The Impact of Business Strategy on Firm Performance of Listed Firms in Vietnam. *VNU Journal of Economics and Business, 36*, Dec. 2020. ISSN 2734-9845.

Ozkan-Canbolat, E., et al. (2016). Application of Evolutionary Game Theory to Strategic Innovation. *Cankiri Karatekin University, Cankiri, 18000, Turkey.*

Rugman, A. M., & Collinson, S. (2005). Multinational Enterprises in the New Europe: Are They Really Global? *Organizational Dynamics, 34*, 258-272.

Suominen, A., Deschryvere, M., & Narayan, R. (2023). Uncovering value through exploration of barriers: A perspective on intellectual property rights in a national innovation system. *Technovation, 123*, Article 1027191.

Zahoor, N., Al-Tabbaa, O., & Khan, Z. (2023). R&D alliances and SMEs post-entry internationalization speed: The impact of alliance management capability and co-innovation ambidexterity. *Global Strategy Journal*, 1–34. https://doi.org/10.1002/gsj.1481.