# Resilient Capacity Sharing under Disruptions: Integrating Trust, Reciprocity, and Intelligent Decision-Making Models

Leonaird Janes
Department of Computer Science, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO, USA.
leonardjones86@colostate.edu

Jerome Lindberg
Department of Computer Science, University of North Texas, Denton, TX, USA.
lindberg1990@unt.edu

Ashwin L. Verma
Department of Computer Science, University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, AL, USA.
ashwin.work@uab.edu

**Abstract**

Capacity sharing among autonomous yet interdependent entities constitutes a foundational mechanism for managing demand volatility and resource scarcity across supply chains, cloud computing platforms, energy grids, and humanitarian logistics. When facing disruptive events, ranging from natural disasters to cyberattacks and geopolitical shocks, the capacity-sharing systems that underpin these infrastructures are pushed far beyond their design envelopes. This paper develops a comprehensive system-level analysis of resilient capacity sharing under disruptions, arguing that robustness and adaptive recovery cannot be achieved by technical optimization alone. Instead, they demand the systematic integration of three pillars: trust, reciprocity, and intelligent decision-making models. Drawing on interdisciplinary perspectives spanning operations management, multi-agent systems, organizational theory, and resilience engineering, the paper examines how trust and reciprocity reshape the incentive landscape for resource pooling, how intelligent algorithms can learn dynamic allocation policies in high-uncertainty environments, and how the governance architecture of capacity-sharing networks must balance central coordination with decentralized autonomy. The analysis foregrounds structural trade-offs among efficiency, fairness, transparency, and adaptability, and discusses the socio-technical implications of embedding algorithmic decision-making into shared infrastructure. Policy considerations regarding accountability, algorithmic auditing, and polycentric governance are elaborated to ensure that resilient capacity sharing remains both operationally effective and normatively legitimate. The paper concludes by identifying pathways for future research that fuse behavioral models of inter-organizational cooperation with self-adapting computational mechanisms, thereby contributing to a more holistic framework for critical resource exchange under stress.

**Keywords**

capacity sharing, resilience, trust, reciprocity, intelligent decision-making, disruptions, socio-technical systems.

## 1. Introduction

Contemporary infrastructures are sustained by intricate webs of capacity-sharing relationships that span organizational and jurisdictional boundaries. From cloud service providers that dynamically reallocate computing resources to handle demand spikes, to manufacturing firms pooling production capacity during supply shocks, and to regional electricity grids managing peak loads through inter-utility agreements, capacity sharing has evolved into a vital mechanism for operational continuity. Yet the very interconnectedness that yields efficiency gains also introduces systemic vulnerabilities. Disruptions triggered by extreme weather events, pandemics, infrastructure failures, or adversarial attacks can propagate rapidly through these shared networks, transforming local shortfalls into cascading failures. The pursuit of resilience in capacity-sharing systems therefore requires more than merely hardening individual nodes or expanding aggregate buffers; it necessitates a fundamental reimagining of how autonomous yet interdependent entities coordinate resource allocation under stress.

The academic discourse on resilience has long emphasized the capacities of systems to absorb disturbances, adaptively reorganize, and sustain core functions. Rooted in ecological sciences [1] and subsequently absorbed into enterprise and supply chain literature [2, 3], resilience thinking has progressively shifted attention from static robustness toward adaptive cycles and self-organization. However, the specific domain of capacity sharing under disruptions remains under-theorized in integrative terms. Most existing studies either adopt an operations-centric perspective, optimizing inventory pooling or backup contracts under stochastic demand [4, 5, 6], or focus on the technical design of decentralized resource allocation protocols in computer systems. Relatively neglected are the socio-cognitive underpinnings—trust, reciprocity, reputation—and the architectural governance choices that determine whether sharing networks can survive and thrive amid crises. This paper addresses that gap by constructing a synthesis across three critical dimensions: the social mechanisms that enable cooperative resource exchange, the intelligent decision-making models that cope with partial information and dynamic disruptions, and the system-level governance frameworks that mediate the tension between centralized control and emergent coordination.

The argument unfolds in a series of analytical layers. Following this introduction, Section 2 contextualizes capacity sharing within its vulnerability landscape, delineating the failure modes that disruptions induce beyond conventional supply-demand mismatches. Section 3 then delves into trust and reciprocity as resilience mechanisms, showing how repeated interactions, relational contracts, and socially embedded expectations transform the calculus of resource sharing. Section 4 examines intelligent decision-making models, from reinforcement learning to robust optimization, that enable adaptive allocation without requiring full knowledge of the network environment. Section 5 analyzes architectural trade-offs, contrasting centralized platforms, fully decentralized mechanisms, and hybrid governance arrangements that seek to blend the strengths of both poles. Section 6 widens the perspective to sustainability, fairness, and socio-technical policy, interrogating the normative consequences of algorithmic resource distribution. The concluding section synthesizes findings and charts directions for future interdisciplinary inquiry.

## 2. The Landscape of Capacity Sharing and Systemic Vulnerability

Capacity sharing represents a deliberate arrangement among participating entities to make available portions of their productive or logistical resources—processing power, warehouse space, production lines, transportation assets, skilled personnel—to partners under predefined or dynamically negotiated conditions. Such arrangements are ubiquitous in contemporary economic organization, ranging from horizontal collaboration between competitors to vertical coordination within supply chains and multi-tier digital service platforms. The theoretical underpinnings of capacity sharing have been profoundly shaped by revenue-sharing and cost-allocation contracts that align incentives and mitigate double marginalization [6]. When disruptions are absent and uncertainty is moderate, these contractual frameworks, complemented by forecasting and inventory pooling, yield substantial efficiency improvements and cost reductions.

Disruptions, whether sudden-onset or gradual, fundamentally alter the parameters that make conventional capacity-sharing contracts viable. A severe supply disruption may render a partner unable to honor commitments not because of opportunism but because of physical incapacity. Demand shocks can simultaneously trigger requests for additional capacity from multiple network members, creating a collective resource crunch that exceeds the pooled buffer. Under these conditions, purely transaction-based mechanisms, even when optimized for stochastic variability, often fail to deliver resilience. The reason is threefold. First, disruptions increase information asymmetry about the true state of each participant, making it difficult to distinguish legitimate need from strategic misrepresentation. Second, the temporal urgency of disruptions compresses decision windows, precluding lengthy negotiation and contracting processes. Third, the distribution of hardship across the network can become profoundly unequal, straining the long-term viability of cooperative arrangements if some members consistently bear a disproportionate burden of rationing.

Empirical studies of major supply chain disruptions illustrate these dynamics. During the flooding in Thailand in 2011, automotive and electronics manufacturers worldwide experienced cascading shortages because critical component suppliers could not shift capacity rapidly enough across the network, despite existing agreements. Similarly, cloud service outages often reveal hidden dependencies wherein capacity reallocation decisions made by localized agents inadvertently destabilize shared infrastructure. These cases underscore that resilience in capacity-sharing networks is not simply a matter of pre-positioning redundant resources but of designing socio-technical processes that sustain cooperative behavior when the environment becomes hostile and uncertain. The next sections examine the two core mechanisms—social and computational—that can enable such sustained cooperation.

## 3. Trust and Reciprocity as Resilience Mechanisms

Trust and reciprocity have been extensively theorized as essential lubricants of inter-organizational exchange, lowering transaction costs and enabling exchanges that are too complex to be fully specified in formal contracts. In the context of capacity sharing, trust refers to the willingness of one party to be vulnerable to the actions of another under conditions of uncertainty, based on the expectation that the latter will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that party [7]. Reciprocity, on the other hand, denotes a behavioral norm of returning beneficial or harmful actions in kind, which over repeated interactions can sustain cooperation even in the absence of binding agreements. The evolutionary stability of indirect reciprocity, where an agent's cooperative behavior toward one partner is reciprocated by a third party based on reputation, further broadens the cooperative envelope beyond dyadic relationships [8].

Integrating trust and reciprocity into capacity-sharing frameworks markedly shifts the analytical lens. Whereas conventional models treat resource allocation as a one-shot or repeated optimization problem under symmetric information and enforceable contracts, trust-aware models recognize that sharing decisions are embedded in ongoing relationships characterized by incomplete contracts and repeated games. Under disruption, the calculus of sharing is transformed. An entity that opts to release scarce capacity to a distressed partner does so not merely on the basis of immediate compensation, but also to invest in relational capital that can be drawn upon when its own disruptions occur. Recent research on capacity sharing formalizes this intuition by demonstrating that firms which incorporate reciprocal motivations and trust-building mechanisms into their capacity allocation policies achieve both higher system-wide fill rates during disruptions and greater long-term stability of the sharing network [9]. This work shows that when agents use strategies conditioned on past cooperative behavior, the network can self-organize into a resilient regime that outperforms purely market-based or centralized allocation under stress.

The interplay between trust and control deserves careful attention. While trust reduces the need for extensive monitoring, excessive reliance on informal norms without institutional safeguards can render networks vulnerable to exploitation. Organizations that consistently free-ride on the cooperative efforts of others can erode trust, triggering a collapse in sharing willingness precisely when collective action is most needed. The governance challenge, therefore, is to design mechanisms that combine the flexibility and low transaction costs of trust-based exchange with credible accountability systems. Research on strategic alliances emphasizes that trust and formal control are not substitutes but complements; well-designed monitoring and transparency mechanisms can actually strengthen trust by providing assurance that partners are acting in good faith [10]. In capacity-sharing networks exposed to disruptions, such complementarity can be realized through reputation systems, transparent capacity-availability reporting, and joint simulation exercises that build mutual confidence before crises strike.

Behavioral economics offers further insights into the conditions under which reciprocity thrives. Public goods experiments consistently reveal that a substantial fraction of individuals are conditional cooperators who contribute to collective resources if they observe others contributing, yet are willing to incur personal costs to punish free-riders [11]. Translating these findings to inter-organizational capacity sharing implies that resilient networks require mechanisms that make cooperation visible and that allow for graduated responses to defection, rather than binary trust-or-exit dynamics. Digital platforms can embed such mechanisms by sharing anonymized reciprocity scores, enabling participating organizations to form expectations about partners' likely behavior during the next disruption. Moreover, the institutional design principles derived from long-enduring common-pool resource systems—clearly defined boundaries, proportional equivalence between benefits and costs, collective-choice arrangements, and conflict resolution mechanisms—provide a robust template for governing shared capacity pools [12]. Embedding these principles into the socio-technical architecture of capacity-sharing platforms aligns the incentive structure with the long-run resilience of the collective.

## 4. Intelligent Decision-Making Models for Adaptive Resource Allocation

The computational backbone of resilient capacity sharing rests on intelligent decision-making models that can operate under severe uncertainty, partial observability, and tight temporal constraints. As disruptions unfold, the state of the network changes rapidly, invalidating static allocation schedules and rendering traditional deterministic optimization brittle. Machine learning, and specifically reinforcement learning (RL), has emerged as a powerful paradigm for learning adaptive policies through interaction with an environment without requiring explicit models of the underlying stochastic processes [13]. Deep reinforcement learning, when instantiated with neural network function approximators, has demonstrated superhuman performance in complex sequential decision tasks with vast state and action spaces [14]. In capacity-sharing contexts, an RL agent serving as a coordinator or a decentralized node can learn to map observed network conditions—available capacities, current demands, backlog statuses, partner reputations—to allocation actions that maximize cumulative resilience over time.

Application of RL to supply chain and inventory management has been gaining traction, with studies showing that deep Q-network-based approaches can outperform classical base-stock policies under demand volatility and lead-time uncertainty [15]. When extended to networked capacity sharing, RL agents can learn to recognize early indicators of impending disruptions and preemptively rebalance resources, all the while adapting to the evolving trustworthiness of partners as inferred from past interactions. Importantly, multi-agent reinforcement learning (MARL) allows each participating organization to be modeled as an autonomous agent that learns a policy conditioned not only on its own state but also on the observed actions and communications of others. This opens the door to emergent cooperative strategies that are neither pre-specified nor enforceable through contracts, but rather arise through repeated interaction and adaptive learning. Nonetheless, MARL poses formidable challenges of non-stationarity, credit assignment, and convergence, particularly when the number of agents is large and disruptions alter the game's payoff structure abruptly.

Beyond learning-based methods, robust optimization provides a complementary approach to resource allocation under deep uncertainty. Rather than assuming a known probability distribution over disruption scenarios, robust optimization constructs decisions that perform acceptably across a prespecified uncertainty set, thus immunizing against worst-case realizations [16]. In capacity sharing, robust formulations can determine how much slack capacity each participant should reserve and how sharing rules should be structured so that no single shock, however severe, renders the network inoperable. The drawback is that purely robust approaches can be overly conservative, sacrificing average-case efficiency for guarantees that may be unnecessary in most operational regimes. This motivates hybrid architectures in which robust guardrails are established through governance rules, while online adaptation is handled by learned policies that exploit statistical regularities during non-crisis periods.

A crucial systems consideration is the interplay between the learning horizon and the temporal scale of disruptions. Disruptions are rare events, which means that training RL agents exclusively from historical transaction data risks overfitting to the benign regime and failing to generalize to catastrophic scenarios. Simulated disruption generators, adversarial scenario crafting, and transfer learning from human-crafted heuristics can mitigate this data sparsity. At the same time, any learning system embedded in a capacity-sharing platform must contend with the reality that its decisions can trigger second-order behavioral effects: if firms observe that the algorithm systematically favors certain partners, trust may be eroded even if the allocation is technically efficient. Thus, intelligent decision-making must be co-designed with the trust and reciprocity mechanisms discussed earlier, ensuring that the algorithm's actions are perceived as fair, explainable, and aligned with long-term relational norms.

## 5. Architectural Governance and Coordination Trade-offs

The structural architecture of a capacity-sharing system—whether it is predominantly centralized, decentralized, or a hybrid of both—determines the allocation of decision rights, information flows, and accountability. A centralized platform, such as a third-party logistics coordinator or a cloud broker, aggregates global information, runs optimization or learning algorithms, and issues allocation directives. This approach can theoretically achieve global optimality, enforce consistent application of fairness criteria, and provide a single point of trust and auditing. However, centralization introduces vulnerabilities of its own: the coordination hub constitutes a critical point of failure that, if compromised or overwhelmed during a major disruption, can paralyze the entire network. Moreover, participants may be reluctant to share granular and commercially sensitive capacity data with a central authority, limiting the quality of inputs and thus the performance of any centralized algorithm.

Decentralized architectures, inspired by peer-to-peer networks and multi-agent systems, distribute decision-making to the autonomous nodes that own the capacity. Each node may run a local intelligent agent that decides how much capacity to offer to which peer based on bilateral trust scores, reciprocity histories, and local demand forecasts. Decentralization enhances robustness by removing single points of failure and preserving the autonomy that many organizations value. Multi-agent trust and reputation frameworks have been extensively developed in artificial intelligence research, with mechanisms for bootstrapping trust, aggregating recommendation, and detecting strategic lying [17]. Blockchain-based solutions have further been proposed to provide immutable, tamper-evident logs of capacity transactions and reputation updates, thereby enabling trust without a central arbiter [18]. The main difficulty is that purely decentralized coordination can lead to suboptimal lock-ins, information cascades, and an inability to achieve network-wide load balancing during sudden disruptions when global information is most valuable.

Hybrid governance models attempt to navigate this trade-off by instituting layered coordination. At the base layer, participants operate autonomously within predefined capacity-sharing policies, bilateral agreements, and trust-aware protocols that govern routine operations and minor disruptions. At a higher layer, a lightweight coordination body—potentially a consortium governance entity or a smart contract-based decentralized autonomous organization—can assume temporary, bounded authority during declared crisis states to orchestrate emergency rebalancing. Resilience engineering principles emphasize that organizations that maintain both loose and tight coupling among components depending on the situation are better able to adapt to disturbances without collapsing into chaos [21]. This architectural flexibility requires carefully crafted interfaces that allow the global coordination layer to draw upon the real-time situational awareness generated by local agents, while respecting predefined limitations on the scope of information that can be accessed without violating privacy or competition boundaries.

The choice of governance architecture also interacts with contractual design. Conventional capacity-sharing contracts, such as revenue-sharing agreements [19, 20], rely on ex ante specification of payment terms, penalty clauses, and dispute resolution procedures. Under disruption, the transaction costs of enforcing such contracts through legal mechanisms often become prohibitive. Relational governance, which relies on trust and reciprocity [9], can serve as a partial substitute, but it flourishes more naturally in architectures where repeated interactions are visible and where collective decision-making processes allow participants to deliberate over rule adaptations. The institutional analysis of common-pool resources suggests that governance systems with nested layers of decision-making—polycentric governance—are particularly effective in managing complex, uncertain resource systems because they allow rules to be tailored to local conditions while still enabling coordination at larger scales [12]. Applying this insight to capacity-sharing networks implies designing platforms that support nested communities of practice, each with its own trust dynamics and operational protocols, yet interoperable through standardized sharing interfaces.

## 6. Socio-Technical Integration: Sustainability, Fairness, and Policy

Capacity sharing decisions, particularly when mediated by algorithms, raise profound questions of fairness, accountability, and longer-term sustainability that extend beyond technical performance metrics. During a disruption, an intelligent allocation system must often make rationing choices that distribute hardship among participants. If the system consistently channels resources toward those with higher bargaining power or more sophisticated AI agents, it can entrench structural inequalities and undermine the collaborative ethos that is essential for post-disruption recovery. The concept of algorithmic fairness, which has received extensive attention in machine learning communities [24], must be translated into the capacity-sharing domain, where fairness definitions can be multidimensional—encompassing equality of outcomes, proportionality to contributions, procedural due process, and protection of the most vulnerable participants.

The sustainability of capacity-sharing ecosystems under prolonged or repeated disruptions hinges on maintaining the willingness of members to continue participating. An entity that perceives the system as unjust may withdraw to a self-sufficient posture, thereby shrinking the collective pool and reducing resilience for all. This highlights the need for socio-technical safeguards: transparency dashboards that make allocation patterns visible, algorithmic auditing mechanisms that allow independent verification of fairness, and participatory design processes in which representatives of diverse network members co-define the value functions that guide learning algorithms. The integration of trust and reciprocity metrics into the objective functions of reinforcement learning agents—for example, penalizing allocations that would cause a sharp decline in a partner's reciprocity score—can hard-code social considerations into the computational core.

Policy and regulatory frameworks must evolve in parallel. Data-sharing regulations, competition laws, and liability regimes for autonomous decision-making shape the institutional environment within which capacity-sharing platforms operate. Normal accident theory reminds us that tightly coupled, interactively complex systems will inevitably experience failures, no matter how sophisticated the control mechanisms [22]. Thus, regulatory policy should focus not on eliminating all disruptions—an impossibility—but on ensuring graceful degradation, equitable burden sharing, and mechanisms for post-event learning and adaptation. Governments and industry consortia can encourage the development of sectoral trust frameworks, similar to the trust-building patterns observed in long-term supplier-manufacturer relationships [23], which can then be codified into industry standards that reduce the negotiation costs of joining a capacity-sharing network.

Cross-domain learning offers valuable insights for policy design. The financial sector's experience with systemic risk and stress testing can inform capacity-sharing networks about the need for regular, realistic disruption exercises and mandatory capacity stress tests. The humanitarian logistics community's approaches to prepositioning and rapid capacity surge can inspire commercial networks to create preparedness compacts. Ultimately, the resilience of capacity sharing cannot be divorced from the resilience of the broader institutional, ecological, and societal systems in which it is embedded. Capacity-sharing platforms that incorporate environmental sustainability metrics—for example, by allocating resources in ways that minimize carbon footprints during crisis-induced rerouting—contribute to the alignment of short-term operational resilience with long-term planetary boundaries. The synthesis of trust-based social coordination, intelligent computation, and polycentric governance thus emerges as a nexus point where technical excellence meets ethical responsibility.

## 7. Conclusion

Resilient capacity sharing under disruptions is inherently an interdisciplinary challenge that defies purely technical or purely social solutions. This paper has argued that sustainable resilience in capacity-sharing networks requires the deliberate integration of three mutually reinforcing pillars: trust and reciprocity, intelligent decision-making models, and adaptive architectural governance. Trust and reciprocity transform the strategic calculus of autonomous entities from myopic self-interest to conditional cooperation, enabling the shared sacrifices and swift mutual aid that disruptions demand. Intelligent decision-making, embodied in reinforcement learning and robust optimization, provides the capacity to navigate complex, fast-changing information landscapes and to learn allocation policies that evolve with the network's social dynamics. Architectural design, spanning centralized, decentralized, and hybrid forms, must balance the efficiency of global coordination against the robustness and autonomy provided by distributed decision-making, all while embedding polycentric governance structures that sustain legitimacy and adaptivity.

The analysis has highlighted structural trade-offs that resist simple resolution. Centralization offers optimality at the cost of fragility and privacy loss; decentralization promises robustness but risks coordination failures. Formal contracts provide legal certainty but become rigid during crises, whereas relational trust is flexible but vulnerable to erosion. Learning-based allocation can discover superior policies but may propagate biases and opacity unless designed with transparency and fairness constraints. Rather than attempting to permanently resolve these tensions, resilient system design must treat them as dynamic balances to be continually negotiated through socio-technical feedback loops. Future research should investigate how the interplay between trust evolution and multi-agent learning algorithms unfolds over extended time horizons, particularly under the irregular occurrence of severe disruptions. Empirical work is needed to test the effectiveness of hybrid governance prototypes in real-world capacity-sharing pilots, incorporating behavioral data from participating organizations. On the policy front, the development of algorithmic fairness standards specific to resource-sharing platforms, coupled with regulatory sandboxes that allow safe experimentation, will be essential. By weaving together behavioral, computational, and institutional threads, the field can move toward a more holistic science of resilient sharing—one that serves human needs even when the systems we depend upon are shaken.

## References


1. Holling, C. S. (1973). Resilience and stability of ecological systems. Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics, 4(1), 1–23.
2. Sheffi, Y. (2005). The resilient enterprise: Overcoming vulnerability for competitive advantage. MIT Press.
3. Christopher, M., & Peck, H. (2004). Building the resilient supply chain. International Journal of Logistics Management, 15(2), 1–14.
4. Tomlin, B. (2006). On the value of mitigation and contingency strategies for managing supply chain disruption risks. Management Science, 52(5), 639–657.

5. Sodhi, M. S., Son, B. G., & Tang, C. S. (2012). Researchers' perspectives on supply chain risk management. Production and Operations Management, 21(1), 1–13.

6. Cachon, G. P., & Lariviere, M. A. (2005). Supply chain coordination with revenue-sharing contracts: Strengths and limitations. Management Science, 51(1), 30–44.

7. Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. Academy of Management Review, 20(3), 709–734.

8. Nowak, M. A., & Sigmund, K. (1998). Evolution of indirect reciprocity by image scoring. Nature, 393(6685), 573–577.

9. Hu, X., & Caldentey, R. (2023). Trust and reciprocity in firms' capacity sharing. Manufacturing & Service Operations Management, 25(4), 1436-1450.

10. Das, T. K., & Teng, B. S. (2001). Trust, control, and risk in strategic alliances: An integrated framework. Organization Studies, 22(2), 251–283.

11. Fehr, E., & Gächter, S. (2000). Cooperation and punishment in public goods experiments. American Economic Review, 90(4), 980–994.

12. Ostrom, E. (1990). Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action. Cambridge University Press.

13. Sutton, R. S., & Barto, A. G. (2018). Reinforcement learning: An introduction (2nd ed.). MIT Press.

14. Mnih, V., Kavukcuoglu, K., Silver, D., Rusu, A. A., Veness, J., Bellemare, M. G., ... & Hassabis, D. (2015). Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning. Nature, 518(7540), 529–533.

15. Oroojlooyjadid, A., Nazari, M., Snyder, L. V., & Takáč, M. (2021). A deep Q-network for the beer game: Deep reinforcement learning for inventory optimization. Manufacturing & Service Operations Management, 24(1), 285–304.

16. Bertsimas, D., & Thiele, A. (2006). A robust optimization approach to inventory theory. Operations Research, 54(1), 150–168.

17. Ramchurn, S. D., Huynh, T. D., & Jennings, N. R. (2004). Trust in multi-agent systems. The Knowledge Engineering Review, 19(1), 1–25.

18. Dubey, R., Gunasekaran, A., Bryde, D. J., Dwivedi, Y. K., & Papadopoulos, T. (2020). Blockchain technology for enhancing swift-trust, collaboration and resilience within a humanitarian supply chain setting. International Journal of Production Research, 58(11), 3381–3398.

19. Anupindi, R., Bassok, Y., & Zemel, E. (2001). A general framework for the study of decentralized distribution systems. Manufacturing & Service Operations Management, 3(4), 349–368.

20. Giannoccaro, I., & Pontrandolfo, P. (2004). Supply chain coordination by revenue sharing contracts. International Journal of Production Economics, 89(2), 131–139.

21. Hollnagel, E., Woods, D. D., & Leveson, N. (Eds.). (2006). Resilience engineering: Concepts and precepts. Ashgate Publishing.

22. Perrow, C. (1984). Normal accidents: Living with high-risk technologies. Basic Books.

23. Dyer, J. H., & Chu, W. (2000). The determinants of trust in supplier–automaker relationships in the US, Japan, and Korea. Journal of International Business Studies, 31(2), 259–285.

24. Dwork, C., Hardt, M., Pitassi, T., Reingold, O., & Zemel, R. (2012). Fairness through awareness. Proceedings of the 3rd Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference, 214–226.