THE ECONOMICS OF DIGITAL PLATFORMS: MONOPOLIZATION RISKS AND THE

M.Mannapova

Urgent Need for Competition Policy Reform

Senior lecturer at Alfraganus University

Abstract: Digital platforms—such as Google, Amazon, Meta, and Apple—have transformed the global economy, offering unprecedented efficiency, connectivity, and innovation. However, their market structures often lead to extreme concentration, raising serious concerns about monopolization, reduced innovation, and consumer harm. Traditional competition policies, rooted in price-based consumer welfare analysis, are ill-equipped to address non-price harms and structural dominance in digital markets. This thesis argues that the unique economics of digital platforms—driven by network effects, data accumulation, and zero-price models—necessitate a fundamental revision of antitrust frameworks. Proactive, ex-ante regulatory tools, such as the EU's Digital Markets Act, represent a necessary evolution in competition policy to preserve contestability and fairness in the digital economy.

Keywords: digital platforms; monopolization; competition policy; network effects; data-driven markets; antitrust reform.

Introduction. Digital platforms now mediate core economic and social activities—from shopping and communication to news consumption and employment. While they generate significant welfare gains, their tendency to concentrate market power in the hands of a few firms poses systemic risks to competition and democracy[1]. Unlike traditional markets, digital platform economies often exhibit "winner-takes-most" dynamics, where early advantages snowball into durable dominance. This concentration is not always a sign of superior efficiency but frequently stems from structural features inherent to digital markets. Consequently, competition policy must evolve beyond reactive antitrust enforcement toward preventative, structural regulation.

1. Why Digital Platforms Tend Toward Monopoly

Three key economic mechanisms drive monopolization in digital markets.

First, network effects create powerful feedback loops. As more users join a platform (e.g., Facebook), its value increases for all participants, making it difficult for rivals to gain traction[2]. This often leads to market "tipping," where one platform captures the majority of users.

[1] Zuboff, S. (2019). The Age of Surveillance Capitalism. Public Affairs.

[2] Rochet, J.-C., & Tirole, J. (2003). "Platform Competition in Two-Sided Markets." Journal of the European Economic Association, 1(4), 990–1029.

Second, data accumulation functions as a strategic barrier to entry. Dominant platforms collect vast behavioral data, which improves algorithms, personalizes services, and enhances ad targeting. New entrants lack comparable datasets, placing them at a persistent disadvantage[3].

Third, many platforms operate as multi-sided markets, offering free services to one group (e.g., users) while monetizing another (e.g., advertisers). This "zero-price" model masks market power under traditional antitrust metrics that focus on monetary pricing, rendering consumer harm invisible[4].

Together, these features create self-reinforcing cycles of dominance that are difficult to disrupt through organic competition.

2. The Inadequacy of Traditional Antitrust Frameworks

For decades, U.S.-influenced antitrust doctrine has prioritized short-term price effects and narrow consumer welfare standards[5]. In digital markets, where services are often free, this approach fails to capture critical harms:

Non-price harms: Privacy erosion, algorithmic manipulation, and reduced product diversity are significant yet unmeasured by price-centric models[6].

Killer acquisitions: Dominant firms acquire potential rivals early (e.g., Facebook's purchases of Instagram and WhatsApp), eliminating future competition before it challenges incumbents[7].

Self-preferencing and ecosystem lock-in: Vertical integration allows platforms like Amazon to favor their own products or Apple to restrict app distribution, distorting competition without raising prices[8].

Moreover, antitrust enforcement is typically ex-post and slow. By the time a case concludes—often after years—market structures have solidified, and rivals may have exited permanently.

---

[3] Acquisti, A., Taylor, C., & Wagman, L. (2016). "The Economics of Privacy." Journal of Economic Literature, 54(2), 442–492.

[4] Armstrong, M. (2006). "Competition in Two-Sided Markets." RAND Journal of Economics, 37(3), 668–691.

[5] Bork, R. H. (1978). The Antitrust Paradox. Free Press.

[6] Stucke, M. E., & Grunes, A. P. (2016). Competition, Privacy, and Big Data. MIT Press.

[7] Cunningham, C., Ederer, F., & Ma, S. (2021). "Killer Acquisitions." Journal of Political Economy, 129(3), 649–702.

[8] European Commission. (2024). Statement of Objections to Apple on App Store Practices. IP/24/112.

3. Toward a Modernized Competition Policy

Recognizing these limitations, jurisdictions are adopting new regulatory paradigms.

The European Union's Digital Markets Act (DMA), effective 2024, designates large platforms as "gatekeepers" and imposes ex-ante obligations—such as interoperability, data portability, and bans on self-preferencing—without requiring proof of harm in each instance[9]. This shifts the focus from litigation to prevention.

In the United States, the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), under Chair Lina Khan, is reviving structural approaches that scrutinize market concentration itself, not just conduct[10]. Proposed legislation like the American Innovation and Choice Online Act seeks to prohibit discriminatory practices by dominant platforms.

Similarly, China has imposed record fines on Alibaba and mandated interoperability among tech giants, signaling a global shift toward proactive oversight[11].

These reforms reflect a growing consensus: ensuring competition in digital markets requires rules that guarantee contestability—the ability of new entrants to challenge incumbents—even if markets are temporarily concentrated[12].

Conclusion. Digital platforms are not destined to monopolize, but their economics strongly favor concentration. Traditional antitrust tools, designed for industrial-era markets, cannot adequately address the structural power of today's tech giants. To protect innovation, consumer choice, and democratic discourse, competition policy must be reimagined. This includes adopting ex-ante regulations for systemic gatekeepers, updating merger review standards, and integrating non-price dimensions of welfare into enforcement. Without such reforms, the digital economy risks becoming a landscape of entrenched private power—efficient for some, but unjust and uncompetitive for all.

References

1. Acquisti, A., Taylor, C., & Wagman, L. (2016). "The Economics of Privacy." Journal of Economic Literature, 54(2), 442–492.

[9] European Union. (2022). Digital Markets Act (Regulation 2022/1925). Official Journal of the EU.

[10] Khan, L. M. (2021). "The Separation of Platforms and Commerce." Columbia Law Review, 121(4), 973–1033.

[11] SAMR (China). (2021). Penalty Decision on Alibaba Group.

[12] Crémer, J., de Montjoye, Y.-A., & Schweitzer, H. (2019). Competition Policy for the Digital Era. European Commission.

2. Armstrong, M. (2006). “Competition in Two-Sided Markets.” RAND Journal of Economics, 37(3), 668–691.
3. Bork, R. H. (1978). The Antitrust Paradox. Free Press.
4. Crémer, J., de Montjoye, Y.-A., & Schweitzer, H. (2019). Competition Policy for the Digital Era. European Commission.
5. Cunningham, C., Ederer, F., & Ma, S. (2021). “Killer Acquisitions.” Journal of Political Economy, 129(3), 649–702.
6. European Commission. (2024). Statement of Objections to Apple on App Store Practices. IP/24/112.
7. European Union. (2022). Digital Markets Act (Regulation 2022/1925). Official Journal of the EU.
8. Khan, L. M. (2021). “The Separation of Platforms and Commerce.” Columbia Law Review, 121(4), 973–1033.
9. Rochet, J.-C., & Tirole, J. (2003). “Platform Competition in Two-Sided Markets.” Journal of the European Economic Association, 1(4), 990–1029.
10. Stucke, M. E., & Grunes, A. P. (2016). Competition, Privacy, and Big Data. MIT Press.
11. SAMR (China). (2021). Penalty Decision on Alibaba Group.
12. Zuboff, S. (2019). The Age of Surveillance Capitalism. Public Affairs.