Research on the Construction of Enterprise Ecological Strategy in the Context of Platform Economy

Zhengxuan Li *

Surrey International Institute, Dongbei University of Finance and Economics, 116025, China

* Corresponding Author Email: 2860208306@qq.com

Abstract. Against the backdrop of in-depth digital economic transformation, platform economy has become a core engine reshaping the global industrial pattern and driving high-quality economic development, while the construction of ecological strategy is a key grasp for platform enterprises to break through the bottleneck of single business and build long-term competitive advantages. Taking the "dynamic balance between openness and control" in the construction of platform ecological strategy as the core entry point, this paper accurately defines the core connotation and dimensional characteristics of openness and control in platform ecology, and constructs a special "Dimension-Mechanism-Performance" analytical framework based on core theories such as two-sided market theory and ecosystem theory. By selecting typical multi-track platform enterprises at home and abroad, including Tencent Video, iQiyi, TikTok, and SHEIN, this paper deeply analyzes the typical manifestations and underlying causes of the imbalance between openness and control. Combined with the background of regulated development of platform economy and case practice experience, it proposes phased and multi-dimensional paths to achieve dynamic balance. The research conclusions not only accurately solve the core governance dilemma of platform enterprises of "chaos with excessive openness and rigidity with excessive control", but also provide operable practical guidance for platform enterprises to optimize ecological strategic layout and improve ecological governance efficiency. Meanwhile, it enriches the special research results in the interdisciplinary field of platform economy and enterprise ecological governance, and provides theoretical support for the standardized and high-quality development of platform economy.

Keywords: Platform Economy, Enterprise Ecological Strategy, Openness and Control, Dynamic Balance, Core Contradiction.

1. Introduction

In the critical stage of platform economy's transformation from "scale expansion" to "standardized quality improvement", ecological strategy has become a core component of platform enterprises' core competitiveness. Its essence is to realize the value co-creation and sustainable development of the ecosystem by integrating resources of multiple subjects and coordinating interest demands [1, 2]. However, in practice, most platform enterprises generally fall into the governance paradox of "openness and control": excessive openness is likely to lead to the influx of low-quality resources and chaotic ecological order. For example, some content platforms have problems such as the proliferation of vulgar content and frequent copyright disputes due to excessively low access thresholds for creators, which directly reduce ecological coordination efficiency and user experience; excessive control will inhibit the innovation vitality of participants and lose ecological diversity [3]. For example, some leading platforms restrict the independent development of small and medium-sized participants by monopolizing core resources and setting unreasonable access barriers, which ultimately leads to insufficient ecological innovation motivation and declining vitality. Current academic research on platform ecological strategy mostly discusses the paths and models of ecological construction in a generalized manner from an overall perspective, and lacks in-depth special analysis on the core contradiction of "dynamic balance between openness and control". It also lacks systematic interpretation of the causes of imbalance and targeted solutions, which is difficult to accurately match the actual governance needs of platform enterprises. Based on this, this paper abandons the panoramic review and generalized argumentation, takes the "dynamic balance between openness and control" as the core entry point, focuses on the connotation definition, imbalance

manifestations, underlying causes and solutions of this contradiction, and constructs a dynamic balance implementation system adapting to the characteristics of platform economy through case empirical analysis and theoretical logic deduction, so as to provide targeted solutions for the high-quality development of platform ecology [1].

This paper comprehensively adopts case study method and inductive-deductive method to carry out special research, ensuring the empirical nature and rigor of the research [4]: in terms of case selection, taking into account domestic and foreign, different tracks and different development stages, 3 typical domestic platforms including Tencent Video (long video IP ecology), iQiyi (IP + offline transformation ecology), and Mango TV (artist-core differentiated ecology), as well as 2 overseas benchmark enterprises including TikTok (global content ecology) and SHEIN (cross-border e-commerce supply chain ecology) are selected, covering three core tracks of long video, short video and cross-border e-commerce. It includes both the ecological governance practice of mature platforms and the balance dilemma of rapidly expanding platforms, ensuring the representativeness and comprehensiveness of case analysis; in terms of case analysis dimensions, it systematically sorts out the ecological strategy practice of each platform around 5 core dimensions including access openness, core resource control, rule design, governance effect and imbalance performance, and refines the successful experience and failure lessons in the balance between openness and control. Based on the results of case analysis, it summarizes the common laws and core causes of the imbalance between openness and control in platform ecology, and proposes universal paths to achieve dynamic balance through deduction combined with core theoretical logic. The core innovations of this paper are mainly reflected in three aspects: first, innovation in research perspective, breaking through the limitations of traditional generalized research, taking the core contradiction of "dynamic balance between openness and control" as the entry point, strengthening the pertinence and depth of the research, and making up for the special gap in existing research; second, innovation in argumentation logic, constructing a closed-loop argumentation system of "case empirical analysis - problem extraction - cause analysis - path construction", strengthening the in-depth connection between theory and practice, and avoiding empty argumentation; third, innovation in practical paths, combining the characteristics of the platform ecosystem life cycle, proposing phased and differentiated dynamic balance strategies instead of "one-size-fits-all" path suggestions, adapting to the governance needs of platform enterprises in different development stages [5].

2. Definition of Core Concepts and Construction of Analytical Framework

2.1. Openness and Control of Platform Ecology

The core connotation of openness and control in platform ecology needs to be accurately defined in combination with the network effect, modular characteristics and ecological governance needs of platform economy. The two are not opposites, but an organic whole that complements each other and is dialectically unified. Among them, the core of platform ecological openness is that platform enterprises attract multiple participants (creators, merchants, developers, etc.) and stimulate innovation vitality by lowering access thresholds, opening up core resources and sharing ecological value [6]. Its core dimensions can be refined into three aspects: first, access openness, that is, the height and convenience of the threshold for participants to enter the platform ecology, which directly determines the quantity and quality of ecological participants. For example, the access of creators on content platforms and the entry of merchants on e-commerce platforms both belong to this dimension; second, resource openness, that is, the scope and depth of platform opening up core resources (technology, data, channels, IP, etc.) to participants, which is the key to empowering participants and stimulating innovation vitality. For example, platforms open user portrait data to merchants for precision marketing, and open API interfaces to developers for functional innovation; third, rule openness, that is, the degree of absorption of participants' opinions in the process of formulating and optimizing ecological rules, which directly affects participants' sense of belonging and ecological cohesion.

The core of platform ecological control is that platform enterprises prevent ecological chaos, resource loss and risk diffusion, and ensure the orderly operation of the ecosystem by formulating scientific rules, controlling core links and optimizing interest distribution [7]. Its core dimensions also include three aspects: first, core resource control, that is, the control intensity of key resources supporting the core competitiveness of the ecosystem (core IP, core technology, core channels, etc.), which is the basis for ensuring ecological value and building competitive advantages; second, rule control, that is, regulating participants' behaviors and maintaining ecological order by formulating standardized ecological rules (content review rules, transaction rules, interest distribution rules, etc.); third, risk prevention and control, that is, the identification and control of various risks (compliance risks, security risks, reputation risks, etc.) in the operation of the ecosystem, such as data security risks and the spread risk of bad content. The core essence of dynamic balance is to accurately match the dimensions and intensity of openness and control according to the development stage of the platform ecosystem (start-up period, expansion period, reconstruction period), external environment (policy supervision, industry competition) and core demands (scale expansion, quality improvement, compliance operation), so as to realize the coordinated unity of ecological vitality and orderliness [8].

2.2. Dimension-Mechanism-Performance

Two-sided market theory, ecosystem theory, resource-based view and stakeholder theory together constitute the core theoretical support for the research on the dynamic balance between openness and control in platform ecology. Each theory explains the internal logic of the core contradiction from different dimensions, forming a complementary and coordinated theoretical system: first, the core view of two-sided market theory is that the platform forms cross-network effects by connecting two or more interdependent subjects, and the non-neutral characteristic of its price structure provides the basic logic for the balance between openness and control - the platform needs to attract participants through appropriate openness, and ensure orderly transactions through controlling core links [9]; second, ecosystem theory emphasizes the integrity, dynamics and coordinated evolution of the ecosystem, making it clear that openness is the premise of ecological expansion, and control is the guarantee of ecological coordination [10].

The balance between the two directly determines the stability and evolutionary ability of the ecosystem; third, the resource-based view holds that the competitive advantage of enterprises comes from heterogeneous core resources. The openness of the platform ecosystem must be based on the control of core resources to avoid the loss of core resources leading to the loss of competitive advantages, while control needs to appropriately open up non-core resources to maximize resource value; fourth, stakeholder theory emphasizes the need to take into account the interest demands of multiple subjects. The formulation of balance strategies between openness and control must fully consider the interests of platform enterprises, small and medium-sized participants, users, regulatory authorities and other parties, so as to avoid the maximization of a single subject's interests damaging the overall interests of the ecosystem. Based on the core logic of the above theories and combined with the practical characteristics of platform economy, this paper constructs a special "Dimension-Mechanism-Performance" analytical framework: the dimension level takes six core dimensions of openness and control as the analysis carriers; the mechanism level includes three core mechanisms: matching mechanism, adjustment mechanism, and coordination mechanism; the performance level focuses on three core evaluation indicators: ecological stability, innovation vitality and value co-creation efficiency, forming a closed-loop analytical logic of "dimension support - mechanism guarantee - performance feedback", which provides a scientific analytical tool for subsequent case analysis and problem extraction.

3. Practical Scenario of Ecological Strategy Construction

To accurately analyze the practical status and core pain points of platform ecological strategy construction, 5 typical platform enterprises at home and abroad (domestic: Tencent Video, iQiyi,

Mango TV; foreign: TikTok, SHEIN) are selected, covering different tracks such as long video, short video and cross-border e-commerce, taking into account domestic standardized development and global layout scenarios [11]. In-depth analysis is carried out from dimensions such as ecological positioning, resource integration, boundary control and governance effect, providing practical basis for subsequent problem extraction and path construction. The specific analysis is as follows:

Combined with the above analysis dimensions, the practical performance and imbalance dilemmas of the 5 typical platform enterprises in the balance between openness and control are as follows: among domestic platforms, Tencent Video takes high-quality IP as the core ecological hub, constructing a full-link ecosystem of "content production - online dissemination - offline monetization". In terms of core resource control, it adopts strict control strategies for the development rights and copyrights of top IP, effectively ensuring the core ecological value and competitive advantages. However, in terms of content access openness, in order to quickly expand the scale of creators and enrich content supply, it adopts a low-threshold access strategy, leading to the influx of some low-quality and homogenized content into the platform. This not only reduces user experience, but also intensifies vicious competition among content creators, resulting in a continuous decline in ecological coordination efficiency. Its core problem is the imbalance between the openness dimension (access) and the control dimension (core resources), failing to form a coordinated model of "high-quality access + core control". iQiyi's ecological strategy has experienced a transformation from "comprehensive openness + weak control" to "focusing on core + strengthening control". In the early stage, in pursuit of ecological scale, its business covered multiple tracks such as video, ticketing, games and shopping malls, and adopted a high degree of openness strategy for each business segment. However, due to the lack of effective rule control and resource integration, it led to scattered resources, insufficient coordination among various business segments, and ecological chaos; in the later stage, it narrowed the business scope, focused on core IP value, and strengthened control over core links such as IP development and derivative operation. But it excessively tightened the resource openness authority and provided insufficient empowerment support for small and medium-sized creators, resulting in limited ecological innovation vitality. Its core problem is the failure to dynamically adjust the intensity of openness and control according to the ecological development stage, falling into the paradox of "chaos with openness and rigidity with control". Relying on its unique media genes and star-making system, Mango TV constructs a differentiated ecosystem with artist cultivation and operation as the core. It adopts a strong control strategy for the brokerage contracts and commercial monetization channels of core artists, effectively ensuring the differentiated advantages and core competitiveness of the ecosystem [12, 13].

However, there are obvious deficiencies in the access and resource openness for small and medium-sized creators. The access threshold is relatively high and there is a lack of targeted technology and traffic empowerment, resulting in a single type of ecological participants and insufficient innovation vitality. Essentially, it is a one-sided limitation of the openness dimension, failing to realize the coordination of "core control + diversified openness". Among foreign platforms, TikTok takes AI recommendation algorithm as the core technical support, focusing on the global content ecological layout. In terms of content creation access, it adopts a high degree of openness strategy, attracting a large number of creators worldwide with low thresholds, which effectively stimulates ecological innovation vitality. At the same time, it adopts localized rule control strategies according to the policies, regulations and cultural customs of different countries and regions. However, due to the complex and volatile global regulatory environment, the adaptability of control strategies in some regions is insufficient. For example, the data privacy compliance control in Europe and the United States failed to timely adapt to local policy requirements, leading to frequent compliance risks. Positioned as fast fashion, SHEIN constructs a flexible supply chain ecosystem relying on digital technology. It adopts a strong control strategy for core supply chain links (product quality, production cycle, logistics and distribution), effectively ensuring ecological efficiency and product competitiveness. However, it provides insufficient resource openness and empowerment for upstream small and medium-sized suppliers. Suppliers can only passively accept production orders,

lacking independent innovation and development space, and forming a high degree of one-way dependence on the platform. Once the platform adjusts the cooperation rules, suppliers will face huge operational risks, and the ecological stability is challenged [12, 14, 15].

From the perspective of the above case practices, the core logic of platform ecological strategy construction is to realize "value co-creation and coordinated symbiosis", and the key to success lies in grasping three cores: first, accurately positioning the core driving factors of the ecosystem (IP, technology, supply chain, etc.) to avoid strategic generalization; second, dynamically balancing the boundary between ecological openness and control, taking into account both vitality and order; third, coordinating and considering the interests of multiple subjects to strengthen ecological cohesion. At the same time, the cases also highlight the common dilemmas generally faced in the current construction of platform ecological strategy, laying a practical foundation for the subsequent extraction of core problems.

4. Practical Dilemmas and Core Problems in Ecological Strategy Construction

4.1. Three Typical Manifestations

Combined with the above case practices and the overall development trend of platform economy, the imbalance between openness and control in the current construction of platform enterprise ecological strategy presents three typical manifestations, which have obvious industry commonalities: first, stage adaptation imbalance. Most platform enterprises adopt a "one-size-fits-all" openness and control strategy, failing to dynamically adjust according to the characteristics of the ecosystem life cycle (start-up period, expansion period, reconstruction period). Excessive control in the start-up period leads to slow accumulation of core participants, making it difficult to form network effects; excessive openness in the expansion period leads to the influx of low-quality resources and chaotic ecological order; insufficient control in the reconstruction period leads to the loss of core resources and damage to ecological value. For example, the excessive openness in the early expansion period and excessive control in the later reconstruction period of iQiyi are typical manifestations of stage adaptation imbalance [7, 16].

Second, dimension matching imbalance. Some platform enterprises focus on the openness or control of a single dimension, ignoring the coordinated adaptation between various dimensions. For example, Tencent Video focuses on core resource control and access openness, but ignores the improvement of the rule control dimension, leading to the proliferation of low-quality content; some platforms strengthen core resource control and rule control, but close the resource openness dimension, resulting in insufficient ecological innovation vitality. The complementary and coordinated effect between dimensions is difficult to play. Third, subject coordination imbalance. The formulation of balance strategies between openness and control mostly takes the interests of platform enterprises as the core, failing to fully consider the interest demands of multiple subjects such as small and medium-sized participants and users. Excessive control leads to insufficient innovation motivation of participants, and excessive openness leads to reduced user experience and lack of protection of participants' rights and interests. For example, SHEIN's strong control and weak empowerment of suppliers, and Mango TV's high access threshold for small and medium-sized creators are typical manifestations of subject coordination imbalance. The above imbalance manifestations not only restrict the value release of a single platform ecosystem, but also hinder the standardized and high-quality development of the entire platform economy [11, 12].

4.2. Interpretation Based on the "Dimension-Mechanism-Performance" Framework

Based on the special "Dimension-Mechanism-Performance" analytical framework and combined with the results of case analysis, the underlying causes of the current imbalance between openness and control in platform ecology can be summarized into four aspects, and each cause is interrelated, forming a closed-loop constraint: first, there is a fundamental deviation at the cognitive level. Most platform enterprises regard openness and control as opposites, falling into the dualistic cognitive

misunderstanding of "either openness or control", ignoring the dialectical and unified nature of their mutual complementarity. They either pursue "comprehensive openness" to quickly expand scale, or emphasize "absolute control" to ensure order, failing to establish the core governance concept of "dynamic balance", which is the root cause of the imbalance. Second, there is a lack of a scientific dynamic adjustment system at the mechanism level. Most platforms have not established a sound ecological stage identification mechanism, making it difficult to accurately judge the ecological development stage they are in (start-up period, expansion period, reconstruction period), leading to the lack of scientific basis for the adjustment of openness and control strategies; at the same time, there is a lack of a normalized feedback adjustment mechanism, failing to timely collect the opinions and demands of ecological participants and users, and also failing to establish an effective risk early warning mechanism, making it difficult to quickly identify ecological risks caused by excessive openness or control, leading to the continuous deterioration of imbalance problems [13].

There are core shortcomings at the capability level. Some platform enterprises have insufficient core resource integration capabilities, making it difficult to accurately allocate open resources and control resources, and can only maintain ecological operation through the openness or control of a single dimension; weak ecological governance capabilities, lack of systematicness and adaptability in rule design, and lack of scientific control over the behavior norms and interest distribution of ecological participants; insufficient compliance adaptation capabilities, difficulty in quickly adapting to changes in the policy regulatory environment, leading to the disconnection between control strategies and policy requirements, and exacerbating imbalance problems. Fourth, there are structural defects at the interest coordination level. The ecological interest distribution mechanism is opaque and unfair. Platform enterprises occupy a dominant position in ecological value distribution, and the contributions and benefits of small and medium-sized participants are mismatched. For example, some e-commerce platforms charge high commissions to small and medium-sized merchants, but do not provide corresponding traffic and technical empowerment; at the same time, there is a lack of effective interest communication mechanisms, and there is a lack of normalized interaction between platforms and participants, leading to the difficulty in forming ecological consensus on the adjustment of openness and control strategies, further exacerbating imbalance problems [14, 15].

5. Optimization Paths for Ecological Strategy Construction

In response to the above core causes and imbalance manifestations, combined with the characteristics of the platform ecosystem life cycle and case practice experience, this paper proposes differentiated paths to achieve dynamic balance between openness and control from three aspects: dimension matching, mechanism construction and capability improvement, ensuring the pertinence and operability of the paths: first, optimizing dimension matching strategies in phases to achieve accurate adaptation between openness and control. The core goal of the ecological start-up period is to quickly accumulate core participants and form network effects, and it is necessary to adopt the strategy of "low access openness + strong core resource control". At the access level, lower the access threshold for core participants (high-quality creators, core suppliers), simplify the access process, and quickly expand the scale of core participants; at the core resource level, strengthen the control of key resources such as core technology, core IP and core channels to prevent resource loss and damage to core competitiveness [11, 12].

The core goal of the ecological expansion period is to enrich ecological diversity and improve coordination efficiency, and it is necessary to adopt the strategy of "appropriate openness + standardized control". At the access level, appropriately expand the scope of openness, attract multiple participants to join, and establish differentiated access standards to select high-quality participants; at the resource level, open up non-core resources (basic technology, part of traffic resources) to provide precise empowerment for participants; at the rule level, construct a standardized ecological rule system to regulate participants' behaviors and maintain ecological order [17].

The core goal of the ecological reconstruction period is to improve ecological quality and strengthen core competitiveness, and it is necessary to adopt the strategy of "precision openness + flexible control". At the access level, focus on high-quality participants and eliminate low-quality participants; at the resource level, open up core resources (core data, core technical interfaces) to high-quality participants to deepen collaborative innovation; at the control level, adopt a flexible control model, simplify rule processes, and improve ecological response efficiency. Second, construct a three-dimensional dynamic adjustment mechanism to ensure the effective implementation of balance strategies. Establish an ecological stage identification mechanism, construct a stage identification and evaluation system combined with core indicators such as ecological scale, quantity and quality of participants, core competitiveness and external environment, to accurately judge the ecological development stage; establish a normalized feedback adjustment mechanism, build communication and interaction channels between platforms and participants, users, to timely collect the opinions and demands of all parties and dynamically optimize openness and control strategies; establish a risk early warning mechanism, construct risk identification indicators and early warning models for various risks caused by excessive openness (influx of low-quality resources, chaos) and excessive control (insufficient innovation, compliance risks), to prevent risk diffusion in advance. Third, strengthen the construction of three core supporting capabilities to lay a solid foundation for dynamic balance. Improve resource integration capabilities, establish a classified control system for core resources and open resources, and realize the precise allocation and efficient utilization of resources; improve ecological governance capabilities, optimize rule design and interest distribution mechanisms, take into account the interests of platforms and multiple participants, and strengthen empowerment support for participants; improve compliance adaptation capabilities, establish a dynamic tracking mechanism for policy supervision, timely optimize openness and control strategies, ensure that ecological governance meets policy requirements, and avoid compliance risks [18, 19].

6. Conclusions and Prospects

Taking the "dynamic balance between openness and control" in the construction of platform ecological strategy as the core entry point, this paper forms the following core research conclusions through in-depth analysis of typical cases and deduction of core theoretical logic: first, the dialectical unity and dynamic balance between openness and control are the core prerequisites for the healthy development of platform ecology. The two are not opposites, but an organic whole that needs to be accurately matched according to the ecological development stage, external environment and core demands. Openness is the basis for ecological expansion and innovation, control is the guarantee for ecological order and stability, and imbalance will directly restrict the release of ecological value. Second, the typical manifestations of the current imbalance between openness and control in platform ecology are stage adaptation imbalance, dimension matching imbalance and subject coordination imbalance. The underlying causes are concentrated in four aspects: cognitive deviation, lack of dynamic adjustment mechanism, core capability shortcomings and interest coordination defects. Each cause is interrelated, forming a closed-loop constraint, which needs to be solved systematically. Third, optimizing dimension matching in phases, constructing a three-dimensional dynamic adjustment mechanism and strengthening the construction of three core supporting capabilities are effective paths to achieve dynamic balance between openness and control, which can accurately solve the governance dilemma of platform enterprises of "chaos with openness and rigidity with control"[11, 12, 18].

The research value of this paper is mainly reflected in two aspects: at the theoretical level, breaking through the traditional generalized research perspective, carrying out in-depth special research focusing on core contradictions, constructing a special "Dimension-Mechanism-Performance" analytical framework, making up for the gap in existing research on in-depth special analysis of this core contradiction, and enriching the research results in the interdisciplinary field of platform economy and enterprise ecological governance; at the practical level, the proposed phased and

differentiated dynamic balance strategies are suitable for the actual governance needs of platform enterprises in different development stages and different tracks, providing operable practical guidance for platform enterprises to optimize ecological strategic layout and improve ecological governance efficiency, and also providing important reference for government departments to improve platform economy supervision policies and promote the standardized and high-quality development of platform economy.

This research still has certain limitations: the case selection mainly focuses on the consumer Internet field, and the adaptability to the ecological strategy construction of industrial Internet platforms needs to be further verified; the research is mainly based on qualitative argumentation, and the quantitative test of the implementation effect of the paths is not carried out. Future research can focus on two aspects: first, expand the scope of case coverage, in-depth analysis of the unique laws and practical paths of ecological strategy construction of industrial Internet platforms; second, introduce quantitative research methods, construct an evaluation system for the implementation effect of ecological strategies, and empirically test the effectiveness of optimization paths; third, pay attention to the impact of new technologies such as generative AI and blockchain on the platform ecosystem, and explore ecological strategy models adapting to new technology scenarios.

References

[1] Teece D J. Dynamic capabilities and (digital) platform lifecycles[M]//Entrepreneurship, innovation, and platforms. Emerald Publishing Limited, 2017, 37: 211 - 225.

[2] Cheng L, Xu M, Chang C Y. Exploring network content ecosystem evaluation model based on Chinese judicial discourse of digital platform [J]. International Journal of Legal Discourse, 2023, 8 (2): 199 - 224.

[3] Schmeiss J, Hoelzle K, Tech R P G. Designing governance mechanisms in platform ecosystems: Addressing the paradox of openness through blockchain technology [J]. California Management Review, 2019, 62 (1): 121 - 143.

[4] Eisenhardt K M. Building theories from case study research [J]. Academy of management review, 1989, 14 (4): 532 - 550.

[5] K Robert, Y. (2018). Case study research and applications design and methods. Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data.

[6] Eisenmann T R, Parker G, Van Alstyne M. Opening platforms: How, when and why [J]. Platforms, markets and innovation, 2009, 6: 131 - 162.

[7] Tiwana A. Platform ecosystems: Aligning architecture, governance, and strategy [M]. Newnes, 2013.

[8] Jacobides M G, Cennamo C, Gawer A. Towards a theory of ecosystems [J]. Strategic management journal, 2018, 39 (8): 2255 - 2276.

[9] Costabile C. Digital platform ecosystem governance of private companies: Building blocks and a research agenda based on a multidisciplinary, systematic literature review [J]. Data and Information Management, 2024, 8 (1): 100053.

[10] Tonin A C, Behm A J B, Pinheiro A B. Unlocking value: the moderating role of stakeholder engagement in the relationship between ESG performance and market value [J]. Sustainable Finance Review, 2025: 1 - 15.

[11] Degen K, Gleiss A. Time to break up? The case for tailor-made digital platform regulation based on platform-governance standard types [J]. Electronic Markets, 2025, 35 (1): 5.

[12] Cutolo D, Kenney M. Platform-dependent entrepreneurs: Power asymmetries, risks, and strategies in the platform economy [J]. Academy of management perspectives, 2021, 35 (4): 584 - 605.

[13] Kretschmer T, Leinonen A, Schilling M, et al. Platform ecosystems as meta-organizations: Implications for platform strategies [J]. Strategic Management Journal, 2022, 43 (3): 405 - 424.

[14] Tschang F T. Platform-dependent entrepreneurs: Participants in an expanding universe of platforms? [J]. Academy of Management Perspectives, 2021, 35 (4): 696 - 701.

[15] Kano L, Tsang E W K, Yeung H W. Global value chains: A review of the multi-disciplinary literature[J]. Journal of international business studies, 2020, 51 (4): 577 - 622.

[16] Kretschmer, T., Leiponen, A., Schilling, M., & Vasudeva, G. (2022). Platform ecosystems as meta-organizations: Implications for platform strategies. Strategic Management Journal, 43 (3), 405 - 424.

[17] Duffy B E, Meisner C. Platform governance at the margins: Social media creators' experiences with algorithmic (in) visibility [J]. Media, Culture & Society, 2023, 45 (2): 285 - 304.

[18] Han Y, Xie L. Sustainable Governance of Digital Platform Ecosystem: A Life Cycle Perspective Through Multiple Governance Parties [J]. Sustainability, 2025, 17(8): 3628.

[19] Valdez-De-Leon O. How to develop a digital ecosystem: A practical framework [J]. Technology Innovation Management Review, 2019, 9 (8).