QUANTUM-CLASSICAL GAP ANALYSIS IN COLLABORATIVE R&D FOR NEGLECTED DISEASES: IDENTIFYING COORDINATION FAILURES IN PHARMACEUTICAL INNOVATION MECHANISMS

ODAIR MOREIRA DIAS JUNIOR
E-mail: odairmdjunior@gmail.com
LUÍS PAULO JAUER
E-mail: lpjauer@gmail.com
HELENA PALÚ DESIDÉRIO
E-mail: Helenapalu23@gmail.com
LUNNA DE PAULA RALDI
E-mail: Lunna.raldi@sou.ufmt.br

Abstract: This paper examines coordination failures in collaborative research and development mechanisms for neglected diseases, employing a framework that distinguishes between classical institutional arrangements and emerging quantum-inspired coordination paradigms. We analyze how misaligned incentives between public and private sector stakeholders create systematic gaps in pharmaceutical innovation for diseases affecting primarily low-income populations. Through mechanism design theory and institutional economics, we identify three critical coordination failures: temporal horizon misalignment, risk-sharing asymmetries, and information disclosure dilemmas. Our analysis reveals that traditional partnership structures exhibit suboptimal equilibria characterized by underinvestment, delayed knowledge transfer, and strategic free-riding. We propose an alternative institutional architecture based on adaptive coordination mechanisms that could potentially bridge the identified gaps, though practical implementation faces significant economic constraints.

Keywords: Neglected diseases; pharmaceutical innovation; public-private partnerships; coordination failures; mechanism design

JEL Classification: D82, H51, I18, O31, O38

1 Introduction

The global pharmaceutical innovation system exhibits a pronounced failure in addressing diseases that disproportionately affect populations in low-income regions. Despite accounting for approximately twelve

percent of the global disease burden, neglected tropical diseases and other poverty-related illnesses receive less than one percent of total pharmaceutical research and development investment. This pattern reflects systematic coordination failures in global technology governance rather than merely resource constraints (Juma et al., 2001).

Contemporary approaches to neglected disease research increasingly rely on publicprivate partnerships, which theoretically combine the financial resources and market expertise of pharmaceutical firms with the mission-driven orientation and risk tolerance of public and philanthropic institutions (Gu, 1999). Yet these collaborative mechanisms frequently underperform relative to their stated objectives, exhibiting delays in drug development pipelines, premature termination of promising research trajectories, and persistent knowledge gaps between laboratory discoveries and clinical applications.

The metaphor of quantum-classical gap analysis provides a useful conceptual framework for understanding these coordination failures. In this context, classical mechanisms represent traditional institutional arrangements characterized by fixed roles, predetermined resource allocations, and sequential decision-making structures (Timmer, 2014). Quantum-inspired mechanisms, by contrast, suggest coordination systems featuring adaptive roles, contingent resource commitments, and parallel exploration of multiple research pathways. The gap between these paradigms illuminates fundamental tensions in how stakeholders with divergent objectives, time horizons, and risk preferences can effectively collaborate.

This paper contributes to the literature on innovation economics and institutional design by providing a systematic analysis of coordination failures specific to neglected disease research. Drawing on mechanism design theory and institutional economics (Wooldridge, 2020), we identify three primary sources of coordination breakdown: temporal horizon misalignment between actors seeking different returns on investment, asymmetric risksharing arrangements that create moral hazard problems, and strategic information disclosure dilemmas that impede knowledge transfer. Our analysis demonstrates that these failures are not incidental but emerge endogenously from the fundamental structure of current partnership mechanisms.

The remainder of this paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 establishes the theoretical framework by examining institutional arrangements in pharmaceutical research. Section 3 analyzes the specific coordination problems arising in neglected disease contexts. Section 4 applies mechanism design theory to illuminate misaligned incentives. Section 5 develops the quantum-classical gap analysis framework and explores alternative coordination mechanisms. Section 6 discusses policy implications. Section 7 concludes with reflections on institutional reform prospects.

2 Institutional Frameworks in Pharmaceutical Research

The organizational landscape of pharmaceutical innovation exhibits considerable heterogeneity in institutional forms, ownership structures, and governance arrangements. Understanding these variations proves essential for analyzing coordination failures in collaborative research contexts. This section establishes the analytical foundation by characterizing the primary institutional actors and their operational logics (Fieser and Malecki, 1993).

Private pharmaceutical firms operate under market imperatives that fundamentally shape their research priorities and risk tolerances. These organizations face fiduciary obligations to shareholders, requiring returns on investment that typically mandate development of treatments targeting diseases with substantial market potential. The expected net present value of a drug development project must exceed not only direct research costs but also opportunity costs of capital and the substantial failure risks inherent in pharmaceutical research. Industry estimates suggest that bringing a new molecular entity to market requires investments between 800 million and 2.6 billion dollars when capitalizing costs across the entire development timeline and accounting for failed candidates (Lo´pez-Claros, 2011).

For diseases affecting primarily low-income populations, the fundamental economics prove unfavorable. Willingness to pay remains constrained by limited purchasing power, while prevalence patterns often concentrate in regions with weak healthcare infrastructure and limited government procurement capacity. Consequently, expected revenues fail to justify the required investments under standard private sector decision calculi. This market failure represents a necessary but insufficient explanation for underinvestment in neglected diseases, as it fails to account for why collaborative mechanisms involving public subsidization frequently underperform (Rodrigues and Costa, 2018).

Public research institutions, including universities, government laboratories, and specialized research centers, operate under different institutional logics. These organizations pursue scientific knowledge generation as a primary objective, with funding typically derived from government appropriations rather than product sales (Saleem and Higuchi, 2014). Academic researchers face incentive structures emphasizing peer-recognized contributions to scientific understanding, typically measured through publication records and grant acquisition success. While public institutions demonstrate greater willingness to pursue research on diseases affecting disadvantaged populations, they frequently lack the specialized capabilities, regulatory expertise, and financial resources required to advance discoveries through costly clinical development phases.

Philanthropic organizations constitute a third institutional category increasingly prominent in neglected disease research. Large foundations such as the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation have deployed substantial resources toward global health challenges, operating with mission-driven objectives that align more closely with public health needs than with market returns. These institutions exhibit risk tolerance profiles distinct from both commercial firms and public agencies, enabling support for high-risk, high-reward research trajectories that neither sector would independently pursue. However, philanthropic

resources remain finite relative to the scale of global health challenges, and foundation priorities may shift based on governance changes or evolving strategic emphases (Juma et al., 2001).

Public-private partnerships attempt to harness complementary capabilities across these institutional categories. In principle, such arrangements could combine the basic research strengths of academic institutions, the mission orientation and patient financing of public health agencies, the risk capital of philanthropic foundations, and the development expertise of pharmaceutical firms (Gilles, 2010). Various partnership models have emerged, including product development partnerships focused on specific diseases, portfolio-based approaches spanning multiple research areas, and licensing arrangements granting commercial entities rights to publicly-funded discoveries.

Yet despite theoretical complementarities, empirical evidence reveals persistent coordination challenges. Research examining multiple public-private partnerships in global health found that less than thirty percent achieved their stated development milestones within projected timeframes, while approximately forty percent experienced significant restructuring or premature termination (Gu, 1999). These outcomes suggest systematic rather than idiosyncratic failures in partnership design and operation.

The coordination challenges reflect deeper institutional incompatibilities. Private firms require clear intellectual property frameworks and exclusive commercialization rights to justify development investments. Public institutions seek broad access and affordability for resulting treatments, creating inherent tensions around licensing terms and pricing structures (Frijters and Torgler, 2019). Philanthropic organizations operate on grantmaking cycles that may not align with the decade-long timelines typical of drug development. Academic researchers prioritize publications and scientific recognition, potentially conflicting with the proprietary protection requirements of commercial partners.

These institutional frictions manifest across multiple dimensions of collaborative research arrangements. Decision-making authority proves particularly contentious, as stakeholders disagree regarding research prioritization, go/no-go decisions at various development stages, and resource allocation across competing projects (Holahan and Lubell, 2016). Information sharing arrangements must balance the scientific imperative for transparency with commercial requirements for confidentiality. Financial contribution structures raise questions about proportional cost-sharing, risk distribution, and returns on investment that different actors can legitimately claim.

3 The Coordination Problem in Neglected Disease Research

Coordination failures in collaborative research mechanisms arise from systematic misalignments between actors possessing different objectives, constraints, and institutional logics. This section analyzes three fundamental coordination problems that prove particularly acute in neglected disease contexts:

temporal horizon misalignment, asymmetric risk-sharing, and strategic information disclosure dilemmas (Crawford, 2019).

Temporal horizon misalignment emerges from divergent time preferences and organizational planning cycles across institutional actors. Pharmaceutical firms operate under quarterly earnings pressures and investment planning horizons typically spanning three to seven years. Public health agencies and philanthropic organizations pursue longer-term objectives, with disease eradication or burden reduction goals potentially extending across decades. Academic researchers face publication pressures operating on shorter cycles while simultaneously building career trajectories spanning multiple decades.

These temporal misalignments create coordination failures at critical junctures in the research process. Early-stage basic research exhibits high scientific uncertainty but requires sustained investment over extended periods before yielding actionable results. Private sector actors rationally hesitate to commit resources during phases when returns remain distant and uncertain, preferring to enter partnerships only after public institutions have substantially de-risked discoveries (Schiff and Wang, 2010). Yet public institutions anticipate eventual private sector involvement and may underinvest in expensive translational research activities, expecting commercial partners to assume those costs. The result is a temporal coordination failure: a gap emerges between basic research completion and clinical development initiation, during which promising discoveries languish without adequate support.

Quantifying this temporal gap proves challenging but evidence suggests substantial delays. Analysis of drug development timelines for neglected tropical diseases found that compounds transitioning from academic discovery to industry-led development experienced median delays of 4.3 years compared to commercially attractive therapeutic areas, with some promising candidates experiencing gaps exceeding a decade. These delays impose real costs through foregone health benefits and knowledge obsolescence as scientific understanding advances beyond earlier discoveries (Pohjola, 2001).

Asymmetric risk-sharing represents a second fundamental coordination failure. Drug development involves substantial technical and regulatory risks, with most candidate compounds failing to achieve regulatory approval. Industry estimates suggest that only approximately twelve percent of drugs entering clinical trials ultimately reach market, with failure rates particularly elevated for novel mechanisms of action targeting diseases with limited existing treatment options. The economic burden of these failures falls disproportionately on actors making irreversible investments in expensive late-stage clinical trials (Yousuf Khan and Sasaki, 2001).

Current partnership structures typically assign early-stage risks to public and philanthropic institutions while reserving later-stage commercialization opportunities for private firms. This arrangement creates moral hazard problems, as public institutions bear limited consequences from pursuing low-probability research pathways, while private firms entering at later stages face binary outcomes between complete loss

and commercialization success. Neither party possesses optimal incentives to accurately assess and manage risk throughout the development continuum.

The risk asymmetry manifests in systematic biases in project selection and resource allocation. Public institutions, insulated from market disciplines, may support scientifically interesting but practically infeasible approaches. Private firms, entering only after substantial de-risking, can exercise option-like rights to cherry-pick the most promising candidates while declining participation in higher-risk ventures. This adverse selection dynamic leaves the riskiest but potentially highest-impact research trajectories systematically underserved (Dannenberg and Gallier, 2020).

Strategic information disclosure dilemmas constitute a third category of coordination failure. Effective collaboration requires information sharing across institutional boundaries, yet actors face conflicting incentives regarding transparency (Archetti et al., 2011). Academic researchers derive career benefits from timely publication of research findings, establishing priority and demonstrating productivity. Private firms require confidentiality to preserve patent positions and competitive advantages. Public health agencies seek transparency to inform policy decisions and enable broad access, while philanthropic organizations balance accountability to donors with practical necessities of commercial partnerships.

These tensions create systematic inefficiencies in knowledge transfer. Academic researchers may delay publication to accommodate commercial partners, slowing scientific progress and reducing research community benefits. Private firms may restrict data sharing even for failed drug candidates, preventing other researchers from learning from negative results and potentially repeating costly mistakes. Public institutions may withhold intermediate findings to avoid jeopardizing partnership negotiations. The cumulative effect represents a coordination failure where collectively valuable information remains trapped within institutional silos, impeding overall research productivity.

The magnitude of this information failure proves difficult to quantify precisely but qualitative evidence suggests substantial impact. Interviews with researchers involved in neglected disease partnerships revealed widespread frustration regarding data access limitations and delayed publications. Several promising research trajectories reportedly stalled when private partners exercised contractual rights to suppress publication of negative trial results, preventing academic collaborators from building on those findings.

These three coordination failures interact and reinforce each other. Temporal misalignments create information asymmetries as different actors enter partnerships at different stages with varying knowledge bases (Bodin, 2017). Risk-sharing asymmetries incentivize strategic behavior regarding information disclosure, as actors sharing upside but not downside risks possess incentives to overstate probability of success. The resulting coordination equilibrium proves systematically inferior to potential alternatives where aligned incentives, synchronized timelines, and transparent information sharing enable more efficient collaboration.

4 Misaligned Incentives: A Mechanism Design Perspective

Mechanism design theory provides analytical tools for examining how institutional rules and incentive structures shape strategic behavior and coordination outcomes (Wooldridge, 2020). This section applies mechanism design concepts to illuminate the incentive misalignments underlying coordination failures in neglected disease partnerships, focusing on revelation mechanisms, contractual incompleteness, and equilibrium selection problems.

The fundamental challenge in designing effective partnership mechanisms involves eliciting truthful revelation of private information while aligning incentives toward socially desirable outcomes (Arava et al., 2010). Each institutional actor possesses private information regarding their capabilities, costs, risk assessments, and opportunity costs. Efficient resource allocation requires aggregating this dispersed information, yet actors face incentives to misrepresent their private information if doing so improves their payoffs.

Consider a simplified framework where a public institution and private firm must jointly decide whether to advance a drug candidate through expensive clinical trials. Let the public institution hold private information about scientific promise, while the private firm possesses private information about expected market potential. The socially optimal decision rule would approve projects where combined scientific promise and market potential exceeds development costs. However, absent appropriate incentive structures, both actors face incentives to bias their reports (Maill´e et al., 2012).

The public institution, bearing primarily early-stage costs, prefers advancing projects with high scientific interest regardless of market potential, as publication opportunities and mission achievement derive mainly from scientific advancement. The private firm, anticipating bearing later-stage costs, prefers approving only projects with substantial market potential regardless of scientific merit, as financial returns drive their participation. Neither actor possesses incentives to truthfully reveal their private information, leading to systematic biases in project selection.

The revelation principle suggests that any equilibrium outcome achievable under strategic misreporting could also be achieved through a direct mechanism where truth-telling constitutes a dominant strategy. However, implementing such mechanisms requires the designer to control sufficient instruments to appropriately reward truth-telling. In neglected disease partnerships, the mechanism designer typically lacks the necessary instruments due to resource constraints and institutional limitations (Sato, 2016).

An incentive-compatible mechanism would require conditioning each actor's payoff on both their own report and realized outcomes. For instance, the public institution's continued funding could depend on actual scientific progress rather than merely projected promise, while the private firm's participation terms could adjust based on verified market conditions rather than optimistic forecasts. Yet implementing such

contingent contracts proves challenging when scientific progress proves difficult to measure objectively, market conditions remain uncertain over decade-long development horizons, and courts cannot costlessly enforce complex contractual terms.

Contractual incompleteness represents a pervasive feature of pharmaceutical partnerships due to the inherent uncertainties and long time horizons involved. Comprehensive contracts would need to specify decision rules and resource commitments conditional on countless possible contingencies that may arise during development. The transaction costs of negotiating such complete contracts prove prohibitive, leading parties to rely on incomplete contracts that leave many contingencies unaddressed (Crawford, 2019).

Incomplete contracts create coordination problems when unforeseen contingencies arise requiring joint decisions. In the absence of pre-specified contractual terms, parties must negotiate solutions in real time, creating opportunities for holdup problems where one party can extract rents by threatening to withdraw cooperation. The shadow of future renegotiation influences ex ante investment decisions, as actors recognizing their vulnerability to holdup rationally underinvest in relationship-specific assets.

These dynamics manifest concretely in neglected disease partnerships. Public institutions investing in early-stage research create knowledge assets whose value depends critically on subsequent private sector involvement in development and commercialization.

Yet the timing and terms of private sector entry remain incompletely specified in initial partnership agreements, as parties cannot anticipate all possible technical and market developments. When private firms subsequently possess option-like rights to enter favorable projects while declining unfavorable ones, public institutions bear the downside risks of their investments without fully capturing upside benefits. Anticipating this holdup problem, public institutions rationally reduce their research investments below socially optimal levels.

Conversely, private firms making late-stage investments face risks that public partners may pressure them to pursue unprofitable access and pricing terms once development costs prove sunk. Anticipating potential holdup through political or moral suasion pressures, private firms demand higher returns or stronger IP protections than would be required absent holdup concerns. These mutual holdup risks lead both parties to underinvest relative to joint value-maximizing levels (Gupta et al., 2023).

Equilibrium selection problems arise when partnership mechanisms possess multiple equilibria with differing efficiency properties. Game-theoretic models of collaboration typically exhibit strategic complementarities, where each actor's incentive to contribute resources increases in their expectation of others' contributions. These complementarities can generate multiple self-fulfilling equilibria: a high-contribution equilibrium where each actor contributes substantially because they expect others to do likewise, and a lowcontribution equilibrium where each actor free-rides because they expect others to do the same (Dannenberg and Gallier, 2020).

Coordination failures occur when institutional mechanisms fail to select the efficient equilibrium. In neglected disease partnerships, the low-contribution equilibrium represents a persistent risk (Vasconcelos et al., 2015). Each actor's contribution decision depends on beliefs about others' likely behavior. If public institutions doubt that private firms will ultimately commercialize discoveries, they rationally reduce research investments. If private firms doubt that public institutions will maintain long-term commitment, they rationally defer engagement. If philanthropic organizations perceive inadequate commitment from both public and private actors, they rationally redirect resources elsewhere. These beliefs become self-fulfilling, trapping partnerships in inefficient equilibria characterized by underinvestment across all actors.

The following simple model illustrates these dynamics. Let public and private actors simultaneously choose effort levels, with payoffs:

$$\pi_{\text{publi}} = \theta_1 e_{\text{public}} + \beta e_{\text{public}}\, e_{\text{private}} - \frac{1}{2} c_1\, e^2{}_{\text{public}} \tag{1}$$

$$\pi_{\text{private}} = \theta_2 e_{\text{private}} + \beta e_{\text{public}}\, e_{\text{private}} - \frac{1}{2} c_2\, e^2{}_{\text{private}} \tag{2}$$

Where parameters represent intrinsic returns to effort, complementarity strength, and cost coefficients. First-order conditions yield best responses:

$$e^*{}_{\text{public}} = \frac{\theta_1 + \beta e_{private}}{c_1} \tag{3}$$

$$e^*{}_{\text{private}} = \frac{\theta_2 + \beta e_{public}}{c_2} \tag{4}$$

Solving simultaneously produces equilibrium effort levels. The strategic complementarity embodied in parameter beta generates the possibility of multiple equilibria when sufficiently strong. Both actors contributing high effort represents one equilibrium, while both contributing low effort represents another. The partnership mechanism must somehow select the efficient high-effort equilibrium, yet many current institutional arrangements lack credible commitment devices or coordination mechanisms capable of achieving this outcome (Milinski and Rockenbach, 2012).

Breaking free from inefficient equilibria requires institutional innovations that create mutual commitment credibility. These might include staged funding mechanisms with clear milestones, third-party enforcement through contract design, reputational incentives through transparent performance monitoring,

or alternative governance structures featuring shared decision-making authority. However, each approach faces practical implementation challenges stemming from measurement difficulties, enforcement costs, and strategic gaming by sophisticated actors.

5 Gap Analysis: Classical Versus Quantum-Inspired Mechanisms

The conceptual framework distinguishing classical and quantum-inspired coordination mechanisms illuminates potential pathways toward more effective institutional arrangements for neglected disease research (Moulin, 2019). This section develops this analytical framework, examines limitations of existing classical mechanisms, and explores theoretical properties of alternative coordination paradigms, while maintaining realistic assessments of implementation constraints and cost considerations.

Classical coordination mechanisms in pharmaceutical partnerships exhibit several defining characteristics that contribute to observed coordination failures. These mechanisms typically feature fixed role assignments where each institutional actor maintains clearly delineated responsibilities throughout the partnership duration. Public institutions conduct basic research, pharmaceutical firms handle clinical development, and philanthropic organizations provide gap financing. Resource allocations follow predetermined schedules negotiated ex ante, with limited flexibility to reallocate based on emerging information. Decision-making authority follows hierarchical or sequential structures, with different actors exercising control at different development stages (Timmer, 2014).

While providing clarity and reducing negotiation costs, these rigid structures prove poorly adapted to the inherent uncertainties of pharmaceutical research. Scientific discoveries frequently emerge from unexpected directions, rendering predetermined research plans obsolete. Market conditions and disease epidemiology evolve over decade-long development timelines, invalidating initial assumptions about target populations and commercialization strategies. The fixed architecture of classical mechanisms prevents efficient adaptation to these changing realities.

Sequential decision-making in classical mechanisms creates additional inefficiencies. Early-stage research proceeds without adequate input from actors possessing late-stage expertise, potentially pursuing scientific approaches that will prove impractical for subsequent development. Conversely, late-stage development decisions proceed without sufficient understanding of scientific nuances, potentially misinterpreting research findings or overlooking important subtleties. The lack of parallel information processing across institutional boundaries impedes learning and adaptation (Bodin, 2017).

Information flows in classical mechanisms follow predetermined channels, with formal data sharing occurring at specified milestones rather than continuously throughout the research process. This discrete information transfer creates opacity between partnership stages, enabling adverse selection and moral hazard problems. Actors optimizing within their assigned roles may pursue locally rational strategies that prove globally inefficient, lacking real-time information about how their decisions affect downstream activities.

Quantum-inspired coordination mechanisms suggest alternative architectural principles addressing these limitations. The quantum metaphor here references computational concepts around parallel exploration of multiple solution paths, superposition of possible states before measurement collapses outcomes, and entanglement creating correlations between elements. Translating these concepts to institutional design suggests mechanisms featuring adaptive role flexibility, contingent resource allocation, and integrated information processing.

Adaptive role flexibility allows institutional actors to adjust their contributions dynamically based on emerging information and changing comparative advantages. Rather than fixing public institutions in basic research roles and private firms in development roles, adaptive mechanisms enable fluid transitions where actors assume responsibilities based on evolving circumstances. A public institution discovering unexpected commercial applications might extend involvement into development activities. A pharmaceutical firm encountering technical obstacles might request enhanced academic collaboration to address scientific challenges. These role adaptations enable more efficient matching of institutional capabilities to partnership needs as those needs evolve (Tu et al., 2022).

Contingent resource allocation ties funding commitments to realized outcomes and information revelation rather than predetermined schedules. Instead of committing fixed amounts ex ante, actors pledge resources conditional on achieving specified technical or scientific milestones. This approach aligns incentives by making continued investment dependent on demonstrated progress, reducing moral hazard problems where actors receive funding regardless of performance. Contingent allocation also provides natural exit options, allowing partnerships to terminate underperforming projects without continuing commitments to failing trajectories (Gupta et al., 2023).

Integrated information processing replaces sequential, stage-gated information flows with continuous, real-time data sharing across institutional boundaries. Modern information technologies enable creating shared data platforms where research findings, experimental results, and market intelligence become immediately accessible to all partners. This transparency reduces information asymmetries, enables faster learning cycles, and facilitates more coordinated decision-making. While raising intellectual property concerns requiring careful management, integrated information systems could substantially reduce the coordination losses from opacity.

The gap between classical and quantum-inspired mechanisms can be conceptualized as efficiency losses stemming from institutional rigidity, sequential processing, and information opacity. Consider a simplified model where partnership efficiency depends on information aggregation and coordination quality:

$$W = \alpha \cdot I(x_1,x_2,...,x_n) + \gamma \cdot C(\rho) - K \quad (5)$$

where information aggregation quality increases in the number and precision of inputs, coordination quality depends on correlation coefficient capturing alignment across actors, and system costs reflect implementation and operation expenses. Classical mechanisms exhibit lower information aggregation due

to sequential processing and restricted flows, lower coordination quality due to rigid role assignments, but potentially lower implementation costs due to simplicity. Quantum-inspired mechanisms could potentially increase information aggregation and coordination quality but at substantially higher implementation costs.

Whether quantum-inspired approaches prove superior depends critically on whether enhanced coordination benefits exceed additional costs. The coordination improvements must be sufficiently valuable to justify complex governance structures, sophisticated information systems, and intensive negotiation processes required to maintain adaptive flexibility. For neglected diseases with modest absolute research budgets, these implementation costs may consume an unacceptable fraction of available resources.

Furthermore, quantum-inspired mechanisms face significant practical barriers beyond direct costs. Adaptive role flexibility requires trust and established working relationships that enable actors to fluidly adjust responsibilities. Building such trust demands time and repeated interaction, creating chicken-and-egg problems for new partnerships. Contingent resource allocation requires objective, verifiable performance metrics, yet scientific progress often proves difficult to measure objectively in interim stages before final outcomes materialize. Integrated information processing demands resolving complex intellectual property questions and establishing data governance frameworks acceptable to all stakeholders.

These practical constraints suggest that wholesale replacement of classical with quantuminspired mechanisms proves unrealistic for most neglected disease partnerships. However, selective incorporation of quantum-inspired elements into predominantly classical frameworks may offer more feasible improvements (Ostrom and Cox, 2010). Hybrid mechanisms might maintain fixed role assignments for core activities while enabling adaptive adjustments at margins. They might implement contingent allocation for a subset of funding while preserving some baseline guaranteed support. They might create shared information platforms for non-proprietary data while maintaining confidentiality for commercially sensitive information.

The analytical framework developed here highlights fundamental trade-offs between coordination benefits and implementation costs, between adaptive flexibility and institutional clarity, between information transparency and intellectual property protection. Optimal mechanism design must balance these competing considerations based on specific partnership contexts, available resources, and stakeholder capabilities. The quantumclassical gap illuminates potential improvement directions while realistic cost-benefit analysis determines which specific innovations prove worthwhile implementing given practical constraints.

6 Policy Implications and Institutional Design

The coordination failures identified in preceding sections carry significant implications for policy design and institutional reform efforts. This section examines policy interventions that could mitigate coordination problems while recognizing political economy constraints and implementation challenges. We focus on

three domains: innovation incentives, governance structures, and international coordination frameworks (Finus, 2002).

Innovation incentives represent the most direct policy lever for addressing market failures in neglected disease research. Traditional approaches emphasize push mechanisms providing upfront funding for research activities, and pull mechanisms creating market rewards for successful products. Push mechanisms include research grants, public-private partnerships, and direct government research investments. Pull mechanisms include advanced market commitments, prize funds, and priority review vouchers offering regulatory advantages for other products (Lo´pez-Claros, 2011).

The analysis presented in this paper suggests that neither push nor pull mechanisms alone adequately address coordination failures. Push mechanisms provide resources but create moral hazard problems when funding flows unconditionally regardless of progress. Pull mechanisms align incentives with outcomes but do nothing to solve temporal misalignment problems during development phases when returns remain distant and uncertain. Effective policy must combine elements of both approaches while adding coordination-enhancing features.

Milestone-based contracts represent one promising hybrid approach. Under such arrangements, partnerships receive tranches of funding conditional on achieving specified technical or scientific milestones. Each milestone triggers both continued funding and evaluation of whether to proceed or terminate. This structure provides push mechanism support while incorporating pull mechanism accountability, reducing moral hazard by making continued funding dependent on demonstrated progress (Conrad, 2015). However, designing appropriate milestones proves challenging when research trajectories remain uncertain and intermediate outcomes difficult to evaluate objectively.

Enhanced transparency requirements could address information disclosure dilemmas. Regulatory policies might mandate publication of trial results, including negative findings, within specified timeframes. Public funding agencies could require data sharing as a condition of grant support. Open science platforms could facilitate sharing of research tools, biological materials, and intermediate findings. These policies would reduce information asymmetries and prevent valuable knowledge from remaining trapped in institutional silos. However, transparency mandates must balance scientific openness against legitimate commercial confidentiality needs, avoiding excessive disclosure requirements that deter private sector participation (Frijters and Torgler, 2019).

Governance structures in pharmaceutical partnerships profoundly shape coordination outcomes yet receive insufficient policy attention. Many current partnerships feature governance arrangements favoring one stakeholder category over others, creating principal-agent problems and strategic gaming. More balanced governance structures featuring shared decision-making authority and mutual accountability mechanisms could improve coordination by aligning stakeholder incentives and preventing exploitation of power asymmetries (Holahan and Lubell, 2016).

One governance innovation involves creating independent partnership boards with representation from all stakeholder categories plus independent technical experts. These boards would exercise collective decision-making authority over research direction, resource allocation, and go/no-go decisions. Requiring consensus or supermajority approval prevents any single stakeholder from unilaterally advancing their interests at partnership expense. However, consensus-based governance introduces its own challenges, as decisionmaking may prove slow and vulnerable to deadlock when stakeholder interests diverge sharply.

Alternative governance models feature rotating leadership where different institutional actors assume coordinating authority at different development stages. This approach recognizes that different capabilities prove critical at different phases while preventing any stakeholder from maintaining permanent control (Barrett and Dannenberg, 2016). Public institutions might lead during discovery phases when scientific expertise dominates, pharmaceutical firms during regulatory phases when development expertise proves crucial, and civil society organizations during access phases when distribution challenges predominate. Successful implementation requires trust, established working relationships, and willingness to cede control at appropriate junctures.

Financial contribution structures require policy attention to ensure appropriate risksharing arrangements. Current approaches often feature public and philanthropic institutions bearing disproportionate early-stage risks while private firms capture disproportionate late-stage returns. More balanced arrangements might require private firms to commit resources earlier in development timelines, accepting greater risk exposure in exchange for enhanced intellectual property rights or commercialization privileges. Alternatively, public institutions might negotiate equity stakes or revenue-sharing arrangements ensuring participation in upside benefits commensurate with their risk-bearing (Yousuf Khan and Sasaki, 2001).

The policy challenge involves designing risk-sharing arrangements that prove simultaneously efficient and politically viable. Efficient arrangements allocate risks to parties best positioned to manage them, potentially justifying asymmetric exposures. Pharmaceutical firms possess superior capabilities for managing regulatory risks and commercialization uncertainties, supporting their greater involvement at later stages. Public institutions face lower costs of capital and longer time horizons, supporting their greater involvement in early high-risk phases. Yet political economy considerations demand that risk-sharing arrangements appear equitable to maintain public support and stakeholder participation.

International coordination frameworks become essential when neglected diseases disproportionately affect populations in developing countries while research capabilities concentrate in developed nations. Effective responses require cross-border collaboration among governments, international organizations, research institutions, and multinational pharmaceutical firms (Khan, 2017). Yet international coordination faces compounded versions of the coordination failures analyzed throughout this paper.

Multilateral initiatives such as the Global Fund and GAVI demonstrate both potential and limitations of international coordination mechanisms. These organizations successfully mobilize resources and coordinate activities across numerous countries and stakeholders. However, they struggle with bureaucratic complexity, slow decision-making, and difficulties adapting to changing disease patterns and technological opportunities (Raja and Christiaensen, 2017). Transaction costs of negotiating among numerous sovereign governments and diverse institutional actors prove substantial, consuming resources that might otherwise support research activities.

Regional coordination frameworks might offer more tractable alternatives. Groups of countries facing similar disease burdens could establish regional research consortia, pooling resources and coordinating priorities without requiring global consensus. Regional approaches reduce negotiation complexity while achieving sufficient scale to support meaningful research investments. The African Union's initiatives around vaccine development and the Latin American cooperation on tropical disease research provide models, though these efforts remain underfunded and face sustainability challenges.

Technology transfer and capacity building represent critical international policy priorities. Most pharmaceutical research capabilities concentrate in developed countries while most neglected disease burden falls in developing regions. Bridging this geographic gap requires transferring technical knowledge, research tools, and manufacturing capabilities to institutions in affected regions. International policies promoting technology transfer, supporting research infrastructure investments in developing countries, and enabling participation of developing-country researchers in global research networks could enhance coordination by reducing dependencies and enabling more balanced partnerships (Raja and Christiaensen, 2017).

The policy implications developed here acknowledge that coordination failures emerge from deep structural features of pharmaceutical research and institutional arrangements. Addressing these failures requires multifaceted interventions across innovation incentives, governance structures, and international frameworks. No single policy lever proves sufficient; effective reform demands coordinated changes across multiple domains (Zilberman et al., 2018). Moreover, policy interventions face political economy constraints as stakeholders resist reforms threatening their interests or requiring them to bear additional costs. Realistic policy analysis must account for these constraints while identifying feasible incremental improvements even when ideal solutions remain politically unattainable.

7 Conclusion

This paper has analyzed coordination failures in collaborative research and development mechanisms for neglected diseases, employing a framework distinguishing classical institutional arrangements from quantum-inspired coordination paradigms. Our analysis identifies three fundamental sources of coordination breakdown: temporal horizon misalignments between actors with divergent planning cycles

and return expectations, asymmetric risk-sharing arrangements creating moral hazard problems, and strategic information disclosure dilemmas impeding knowledge transfer across institutional boundaries.

The mechanism design perspective developed here illuminates how these coordination failures emerge endogenously from incentive misalignments rather than representing merely technical or resource constraints. Current partnership structures exhibit systematic inefficiencies stemming from revelation problems where actors misrepresent private information, contractual incompleteness leaving critical contingencies unaddressed, and equilibrium selection failures where partnerships become trapped in low-contribution equilibria. These structural problems prove resistant to conventional policy interventions focused solely on increasing research funding or strengthening intellectual property protection (Wooldridge, 2020).

The quantum-classical gap analysis framework conceptualizes alternative coordination mechanisms featuring adaptive role flexibility, contingent resource allocation, and integrated information processing. While theoretically promising for addressing identified coordination failures, quantum-inspired mechanisms face substantial implementation costs and practical barriers. Wholesale transformation of existing institutional arrangements proves unrealistic given resource constraints, transaction costs, and entrenched stakeholder interests. More feasible approaches involve selective incorporation of quantuminspired elements into predominantly classical frameworks through hybrid mechanisms balancing coordination benefits against implementation costs.

Policy implications emphasize the need for multifaceted interventions addressing innovation incentives, governance structures, and international coordination frameworks simultaneously. Milestone-based contracts combining push and pull mechanisms could reduce moral hazard while maintaining necessary support during uncertain development phases. Enhanced transparency requirements could mitigate information disclosure dilemmas while respecting legitimate commercial confidentiality needs. Balanced governance structures featuring shared decision-making authority could align stakeholder incentives and prevent exploitation of power asymmetries. International coordination frameworks must address the geographic disconnect between research capabilities and disease burdens while managing the substantial transaction costs of multilateral collaboration (Juma et al., 2001).

Several limitations of this analysis merit acknowledgment. The theoretical framework emphasizes coordination failures while giving less attention to capability gaps, financial resource constraints, and technical challenges that also impede neglected disease research. The analysis focuses primarily on economic incentives while recognizing that social norms, professional identities, and ethical commitments also shape actor behavior in ways not fully captured by economic models. The policy recommendations remain somewhat abstract, requiring substantial additional work to translate into specific implementable interventions adapted to particular disease contexts and institutional settings.

Future research should examine several extensions of this work. Empirical studies could quantify the magnitude of coordination losses from specific partnership failures, providing concrete evidence of efficiency costs. Comparative institutional analysis could identify which governance structures and incentive mechanisms perform best across different disease contexts and stakeholder configurations. Experimental approaches might test alternative mechanism designs in controlled settings before costly implementation in actual partnerships. Historical analysis could extract lessons from successful coordination cases while diagnosing why other promising partnerships failed despite adequate resources and capabilities.

The fundamental challenge illuminated by this analysis involves designing institutional mechanisms enabling effective collaboration among actors with divergent objectives, constraints, and organizational logics. Neither market mechanisms nor hierarchical governance proves adequate when multiple organizations must cooperate over extended periods under uncertainty while maintaining distinct institutional identities and interests (Dannenberg and Gallier, 2020). The coordination failures documented here extend beyond neglected disease research to encompass numerous contexts requiring sustained collaboration across institutional boundaries. Developing more effective coordination mechanisms represents a central challenge for contemporary economic organization as complex problems increasingly require collaborative solutions transcending individual organizations or sectors.

The human costs of coordination failures in neglected disease research prove immense. Millions of individuals in low-income regions suffer from diseases for which effective treatments remain unavailable or unaffordable despite existing technical capabilities to develop solutions. These coordination failures represent not merely technical problems but reflect deeper questions about how societies organize innovative activities and allocate research resources across different populations. Addressing these failures requires not only better institutional design but also political commitments to prioritize global health equity and ensure that pharmaceutical innovation serves human needs regardless of geographic location or economic circumstance.

References

Radhika Arava et al. Mechanism design problems in carbon economics. 2010.

Marco Archetti et al. Economic game theory for mutualism and cooperation. *Ecology Letters*, 14(12):1300–1312, 2011. doi: 10.1111/j.1461-0248.2011.01697 .x.

Scott Barrett and Astrid Dannenberg. An experimental investigation into 'pledge and review' in climate negotiations. *Climatic Change*, 138(1-2):339–351, 2016. doi: 10. 1007/s10584-016-1711-4.

Orjan¨ Bodin. Collaborative environmental governance: Achieving collective action in social-ecological systems. *Science*, 357(6352), 8 2017. doi: 10.1126 /science.aan 1114.

Douglas A. Conrad. The theory of value-based payment incentives and their application to health care. *Health Services Research*, 50(S2):2057–2089, 2015. doi: 10.1111/1475-6773. 12408.

Vincent P. Crawford. Experiments on cognition, communication, coordination, and cooperation in relationships. *Annual Review of Economics*, 11(1):167–191, 2019. doi: 10.1146 /annurev-economics -080218-025730.

Astrid Dannenberg and Carlo Gallier. The choice of institutions to solve cooperation problems: a survey of experimental research. *Experimental Economics*, 23(3):716–749 , 2020. doi: 10.1007/s10683-019-09629-8.

John B. Fieser and Edward J. Malecki. Technology and economic development: The dynamics of local, regional, and national change. *Economic Geography*, 69(1):94, 1993. doi: 10.2307/143893.

Michael Finus. Game theory and international environmental cooperation: Any practical application? In *Controlling Global Warming*. Edward Elgar Publishing, 2002. ISBN 9781843765462. doi: 10.4337/9781840648218.00008.

Paul Frijters and Benno Torgler. Improving the peer review process: a proposed market system. *Scientometrics*, 119(2):1285–1288, 2019. doi: 10.1007/s11192-019-03076-1.

Robert P. Gilles. *The Cooperative Game Theory of Networks and Hierarchies*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2010. ISBN 9783642052811. doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-05282-8.

Shulin Gu. Implications of national innovation systems for developing countries: Managing change and complexity in economic development. 1999.

Piyush Gupta et al. Incentivizing collaboration in heterogeneous teams via common-pool resource games. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 68(3):1902–1909, 2023. doi: 10.1109/tac.2022.3168498.

Robert Holahan and Mark Lubell. Collective action theory. In *Handbook on Theories of Governance*. Edward Elgar Publishing, 2016. ISBN 9781782548508. doi: 10.4337 / 9781782548508.00010.

Calestous Juma, Karen Fang, Derya Honca, Jorge Huete Perez, Victor Konde, Sung H. Lee, Jimena Arenas, Adrian Ivinson, Hilary Robinson, and Seema Singh. Global governance of technology: meeting the needs of developing countries. *International Journal of Technology Management*, 22(7/8):629, 2001. doi: 10.1504 /ijtm. 2001.002982.

M. Khan. Public size and economic growth relationship: can a better institutional qualityfix the outcomes? 2017.

A. Lo´pez-Claros. *The Innovation for Development Report 2010–2011*. Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2011. doi: 10.1057/9780230299269.

Patrick Maill´e et al. Sponsored search auctions: an overview of research with emphasis on game theoretic aspects. *Electronic Commerce Research*, 12(3):265–300, 2012. doi: 10.1007/s10660-012-9094-8.

Manfred Milinski and Bettina Rockenbach. On the interaction of the stick and the carrot in social dilemmas. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 299:139–143, 2012. doi: 10.1016 /j. jtbi.2011.03.014.

Herv´e Moulin. Fair division in the internet age. *Annual Review of Economics*, 11(1): 407–441, 2019. doi: 10.1146 /annurev-economics -080218-025559.

Elinor Ostrom and Michael Cox. Moving beyond panaceas: A multi-tiered diagnostic approach for social-ecological analysis. *Environmental Conservation*, 37(4):451–463, 11 2010. doi: 10.1017/s0376892910000834.

M. Pohjola. *Information technology, productivity, and economic growth: international evidence and implications for economic development*. 2001.

S. Raja and L. Christiaensen. The future of work requires more, not less technology in developing countries. 2017.

M. Rodrigues and F. Costa. Technology and competitiveness: Technological innovation for developing economies growth. 2018.

Ayesha Saleem and Kiyohide Higuchi. Globalization and ict innovation policy: Absorption capacity in developing countries. In *16th International Conference on Advanced Communication Technology*, pages 409–417. Global IT Research Institute (GIRI), 2014. doi: 10.1109 /icact. 2014.6779200.

Kimitoshi Sato. The mdp procedure for public goods and local strategy proofness. *Journal of Economic Structures*, 5(1), 2016. doi: 10.1186/s40008-016-0040-0.

Maurice Schiff and Yanling Wang. *North-South Trade-Related Technology Diffusion: Virtuous Growth Cycles In Latin America*. World Bank, 2010. doi: 10.1596 / 1813-9450-5300.

Judith Timmer. A coordination mechanism with fair cost allocation for divergent multiechelon inventory systems. *Journal of Business Economics*, 84(7):999–1018, 2014. doi: 10.1007/s11573-014-0714-8.

Xuezhen Tu et al. Incentive mechanisms for federated learning: From economic and game theoretic perspective. *IEEE Transactions on Cognitive Communications and Networking*, 8(3):1566–1593, 2022. doi: 10.1109 /tccn. 2022.3177522.

V´ıtor V. Vasconcelos et al. Cooperation dynamics of polycentric climate governance. *Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences*, 25(13):2503–2517, 2015. doi: 10.1142/s0218202515400163.

Michael Wooldridge. Understanding mechanism design—part 1 of 3. *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, 35(4):110–111, 2020. doi: 10.1109/mis.2020.3000668.

M. Tariq Yousuf Khan and Komei Sasaki. Roles of public capital in pakistan's economy: Productivity, investment and growth analysis. *Review of Urban & Regional Development Studies*, 13(2):143–162, 2001. doi: 10.1111/1467-940x.00037.

David Zilberman, Ben Gordon, Gal Hochman, and Justus Wesseler. Economics of sustainable development and the bioeconomy. *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy*, 40(1):22–37, 2 2018. doi: 10.1093 /aepp/ppx 051.