

The Economic Impact of EU Competition Law Enforcement: A Quantitative Assessment of Antitrust Fines and Market Efficacy

Rachna Jha

Assistant Professor of Law, UPES, Dehradun.

rachna.jha@ddn.ac.in

Dr. Ankita Sharma,

Associate Professor, School of Law, G. D. Goenka University.

ankitasharma.law@gmail.com

Dr. Apoorva Singh Katiyar

Assistant Professor, School of Law, G. D. Goenka University.

apoorvakatiyar.25@gmail.com

Dr Archana Sehrawat

Associate Professor, IILM Law School, Gurugram.

archna.sehrawat@iilm.edu

Bishnanand Dubey

Assistant Professor, Teerthanker Mahaveer College of Law & Legal Studies, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad.

Bishu.dubey@gmail.com

Abstract

The paper critically analyzes the quantitative research on the economic impact of the implementation of the European Union competition law by paying particular attention to the antitrust fines and their role in enhancing the efficiency of the marketplace. It combines results about cartel overcharges, the deterring effect of fine changes and the overall microeconomic and aggregate effects of the enforcement choices. Also, it analyzes the methodological tools to test the competitiveness policy effectiveness, such as the research of merger control, and the spread of deterrence. This is further analyzed to determine the real economic utility of interventions by competition authorities and analyzing the distinction between the direct effects and the more substantial deterrent effect, which prevents anti-competitive behavior. It has been pointed out in the review that quantifying these effects is complicated at best, with the direct effects of deterrence on certain markets being easily discernible, whereas in temporal and sector wide spillover effects are very large and multifaceted. As a result, UAE requires complex econometric models to carefully quantify the ripple effects, as it requires that therefore other confounding macroeconomic and sectoral changes cannot be ignored. These assessments can be further narrowed by combining ex-post evaluation frameworks and a better insight into the internal learning processes of competition authorities, which makes it possible to have a more detailed vision of historical mistakes and the factors that caused them.

Keywords: - Antitrust fines, competition policy, market efficacy, economic impact, deterrence.

1. Introduction

The application of the European Union competition law and particularly in the imposition of the antitrust penalty has been in an effort to prevent anti-competitive conduct and introduce a more competitive market taskforce. The reviewed paper discusses the quantitative studies of the economic impact of such enforcement action in effectiveness of antitrust fines as a deterrent and consequential market efficacy impact. It further extends into the process of evaluating how they are measured, based upon a conglomeration of empirical studies and theories to ascertain the convoluted effect of this on consumers, business and the overall economy. It is compared to other enforcement paradigms to implement the impact of the level and topology of fines on corporation compliance on discontinuing modulating the market. The connection

between the power to impose fines by national competition authorities and their effectiveness in doing so will also be examined in the frame of the current review that considers the recent directives to enhance the national competition authorities in terms of their prospects to enhance their abilities in the internal market. In addition, the next paper will discuss the development of fine imposition in different periods considering the fact that transformation in law-making systems and judicial interpretations has transformed the power to prevent. Experts have taken diverse views on the direct relationship between fine levels and deterrence, which necessitate that a critical analysis of the literature should be carried out to establish how all these elements work together to change the market structures and the consumer welfare. Another area covered in this paper is the cost-benefit of antitrust enforcement basing on empirical evidence to gauge its overall effectiveness. Also, it summarizes the results of cross country research aimed at studying the effect of antitrust policy on different economic indicators including profit margins, innovation and productivity use of factors globally because it assumes that cartel action would result in overcharging, which can be countered by an effective enforcement. This will be analyzed in terms of how competition policy such as the use of antitrust fines can be used to optimize social welfare in terms of preventing anti-competitive actions and increasing the pace of growth of total factors productivity in industries.

2. Conceptual Framework of EU Competition Law

Article 101 and 102 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union form the basis of this framework as they forbid anti-competitive and dominance market abuses respectively. These early papers establish the guidelines on which the competition policy is executed at the EU level, ensuring that the markets regulation in the member countries is consistent.

2.1. Overview of EU Competition Law Principles

The general aim of these principles is to avert the abuses of competition, thus protecting consumer well-being, and ensuring the efficient allocation of resources in the internal market. Here, it includes strict compliance with cartels, dominance abuses, as well as uncompetitive mergers, which are foundational to the EU commitment to the level playing field of business. Enforcement practice has been characterized by a phenomenal shift of ex-post protection to ex-ante enforcement, especially in digital markets, as a proactive approach to emerging competition issues.

2.2. Article 101 TFEU: Prohibition of Cartels and Anti-Competitive Agreements

This article is totally aimed at agreements, decisions made by associations of undertakings, and concerted practices whose object or effect is the prevention, restriction, or distortion of competition in the internal market. These prohibitions can go as far as price-fixing, market sharing, and output, which are termed hard-core restrictions of competition because of their drastic harmful effect on the economic welfare. The European Commission strictly follows these practices which usually result in higher mark-ups in the aggregate and lower productivity, and imposes hefty fines to facilitate deterrence and promote market efficiency. Article 101 TFEU also applies to vertical agreements, to the extent that they can hinder competition and some degree of cooperation among smaller enterprises might in any case be accepted provided that it contributes to a greater competitiveness with larger businesses.

2.3. Article 102 TFEU: Abuse of Dominant Position

This provision outlaws actions by undertakings to use a superior position in the market to alter competition that includes practices like predatory pricing, withholding to deal as well as tying arrangements. The principle is not to allow large firms of the market to turn their position into a method to either exclude competitors or confront the consumer and hence to maintain the market as open and competitive. The promotion of growth and innovation of the EU through such measures is critical in preserving free movement of goods and services and eventually welfare. Moreover, the EU competition law framework is also supplemented with the merger control regulations in council regulation No 139/2004 and prevents concentration that substantially prevents a freely operating common market competition.

2.4. Merger Control Regulations

All these requirements are meant to deter the instillation or entrenchment of dominance through merging and acquiring that is a crucial ex-ante measure to maintain competitive market structures. The EU competition law regime is therefore a comprehensive system that integrates the antitrust regulation, the merger control regulation as well as the State aid regulation to ensure that there is healthy competition and consumer protection. The basis of the fight against anti-

competitive behavior in the EU lies in this sophisticated system of the law and regulations namely the Articles 101 and 102 TFEU. Such articles are supported by a widespread network of implementation that falls under control of the European Commission and national commission agencies, which could inspect infraction and apply huge finances to the companies that are found guilty of going against the principles on which they are founded. The fines are potentially in the millions and even hundreds of thousands of dollars, which serves as an incredible deterrent to anticompetitive behaviour, such as cartels, dominance abuse, and some vertical contracts.

2.5. State Aid Rules and Their Interaction with Competition Policy

Other competition policy rules missed in the EU are strict State Aid regulations, which contain a prohibition on offering financial or other forms of aid to the Member States to distort competition or potentially to distort competition in favor of a certain undertaking or the production of a certain product. This aspect gives reasonable level of playing ground since national subsidies do not confer the unfair competition advantages to derail fairness of the single market. It is the unique framework of the world and it is set to deter a subsidy race among the Member States leaving it free to assist with the legitimate activities, such as combating market failures, social cohesion and financing environmental protection practices and climate change efforts. The European Commission considers strictly, when state support is breaking competition laws, by assessing its potential impact on relational trade within the EU, it is biased toward favoring some parties and its inclination to withhold competition.

3. Methodologies for Assessing Economic Impact

3.1. Quantitative Approaches to Competition Law Analysis

Such methods often involve use of econometric modelling, counterfactual analysis and simulation to estimate the influence of antitrust enforcement on consumer prices and innovation, as well as on market structure. These quantitative appraisals present crucial empirical data in the perception of whether the EU competition law is effective in fulfilling its policy objectives. These methods assist in estimating the benefits of detecting and deterring cartels, and the benefits of abuses of dominance prevention. Moreover, highly advanced statistical methods are utilised to calculate deadweight losses that can be reduced to anticompetitive practices and to evaluate the compensating impact of fines imposed. The team of the Chief Competition Economist at the Directorate General for Competition is significant to these quantitative analyses, providing ways on the methodological approach, and contributing to the complex economical problems to a particular case.

3.2. Econometric Models for Antitrust Fines and Deterrence

Such models seek to determine a causal relationship between the imposition of fines and the behavior of firms that follow, assessing their ability in preventing the occurrence of anti-competitive behavior in the future and enhancing adherence to the EU competition law. The high-level game theory and behavioral economics implementation in these models assists in explaining how companies react to fines, which can be used to determine how best to set fines when working with regulatory authorities. The models also consider the interdependence of various enforcement tools such as leniency programs and private damages actions to estimate the cumulative deterring effect that they may produce on the firms who may be tempted to engage in anti-competitive behavior. These quantitative approaches can also provide details on optimizing the design of the penalty regimes to balance the elements of deterrence and proportionality strategies depending on the varying financial capabilities of the violating corporations and its impacts to the market. Different quantitative methodologies, such as simple theoretical simulated, and the complex structural empirical research supplements the capability of the European Commission to assess the law breach in the competition domain.

3.3. Market Efficacy Metrics and Their Measurement

The metrics are essential in assessing the efficiency of competition policy that in many cases may include consumer welfare, productive efficiency and dynamic innovation in the impacted markets. The metrics are often estimated based on the empirical evaluation of the price fluctuations, the rates of the entry and removal as well as the level of R&D investments after the enforcement activities. Moreover, econometric investigations are recently applied to estimate the correct level of fines, despite the endogeneity bias and omitted variable issues. These kinds of studies form a key contribution towards establishing how cartels with blatant claims on having limited market impact due to means such as overcapacity or buyer power can still have a substantial limit on competition by their inherent nature. The effect of such constraints is often analyzed using simulation models that approximate costs when such oligopolies behave in different

ways, but have become increasingly used in measuring losses in private enforcement (as opposed to the calculation of fines in courts).

3.4. Challenges in Isolating the Causal Impact of Enforcement Actions

Nonetheless, it is a major methodological challenge to differentiate between the direct impact of cartel detection and cessation and the indirect deterrent impact on the overall cartel rates or future price-setting behavior. This is complex due to the potential that the seen drop in The cartel activity or change in market dynamics may not be a direct result of particular heightened enforcement efforts but to more massive economic factors or industry structure adjustments. As such, it is strongly advised that the narrow causal impact should be rigorously isolated by means of sophisticated econometric methods that can control the confounding factors and isolate strong counterfactual conditions. This is especially difficult when merger control judgments are being made based on post-merger market events observed, and hypothetical analysis of the merger is needed to assess the effects of the merger on consumer welfare.

4. Market Efficacy and Competition Outcomes

4.1. Impact of Enforcement on Market Concentration

The direct application of antitrust enforcing measures including the prohibition of mergers and also divestiture remedy is supposed to deter or restrict the excessive concentration within the marketplace and develop a more competitive atmosphere. The success of such interventions is often gauged on the basis of pre- and post-implementation market shares, changes in Herfindahl-Hirschman Index, and active competitors in a particular sector. Such measures provide empirical material of competition policy intervention redress to industry structures, deterring monopolistic behaviors and allowing a more reasonable allocation of market power. Nevertheless, the long-term effectiveness of such interventions depends on the long-term behavioral response of firms, as well as the long-term transformation of the industry structures, and which needs consistent monitoring and assessment. This continuing review involves the review of the benefits of competition policy on market concentration, average profits which may be influenced in case countries dilute competition policies.

4.2. Consumer Welfare Effects of Antitrust Interventions

The main goal of competition law enforcement is to increase consumer welfare, which is usually achieved by decreased prices, higher quality and variety of products, and a greater level of innovation. There is empirical evidence that effective antitrust intervention can create quantifiable consumer welfare, including dramatic price cuts in cartelized markets. These advantages are commonly measured using ex-post measures of consumer surplus gains or a comparison of market outcomes in the areas of operation in which enforcement has been applied and those in which it has not. This strict evaluation tends to incorporate econometric models capable of isolating the causal effect of antitrust intervention on consumer prices and product availability, including factors such as demand change and change in production costs. In addition, econometric results of survey such as the one of competition law in Mexico, has shown that, where competition law is implemented successfully, sales are high, prices are lower and products tend to be of a better quality in the sanctioned industries compared to those in control industries.

4.3. Innovation and Investment Responses to Competition Policy

Competition policy may have a substantial impact on incentives of the firms to innovate and invest; including successful enforcement may often stimulate dynamic competition which leads to technological progress and market entry. Conversely, competition analysts can use inefficient competition institutions - or antitrust laws and regulations - to deter competition between current players and potential new innovative firms, thereby preventing the productivity gains and technological progress. The long-run vision is that consumer welfare goal can be achieved optimally by targeting efficiency and an innovative approach. Empirically, it is established that strong competition law enforcement is strongly associated with increased patent filings that translates to increased innovation. It is because of the competition forces that provoke companies to make their products and processes more distinctive, and, consequently, employ more R&D and introduce new products and services.

4.4. Sector-Specific Analyses of Market Efficacy

The principles of competition law are applied differently to various industries, and a case-by-case analysis is required to identify what exactly market efficiency and what exactly will be the consequences on consumer welfare and innovation

in the specific market in question of the implementation of such measures. Particularly in example, certain industries, such as telecommunications and energy services, have unique regulatory structures and technological downsides that demand more discriminating kinds of competition examination, which comprise of ad hoc market definitions and solutions to such market frameworks. In addition, the need to evaluate these industry-specific specificities is also necessary to understand where application of anticartel policies can be applied to achieve a greater good among final consumers, and in particular, regarding the transfer of cartels over prices to the intermediate product markets. It applies the relevance of the effectiveness of competition policy in a host of economic scenarios, highly regulated utility as well as the rapidly evolving online marketplace to ensure that the enforcement provisions remain viable and effective in achieving a competitive result and consumer welfare.

5. Case Studies of EU Competition Law Enforcement

This section will discuss the specifics of practical scenarios of the EU competition law enforcement and how it has been enforced and what impact it has had on the economy. The European Commission will also exercise critical scrutiny in some of its significant decisions, such as the ones involving abuse of dominance, cartel prohibitions and merger interventions, to see how such rulings have influenced market structure, firm behaviour, and consumer welfare. One would be the competition-innovation nexus, it has been argued that competition can give rise to lower innovation because it will give rise to lower post-innovation rents, however, it has been argued that more contestable markets will cause firms to rely more on innovation.

5.1. Key Antitrust Decisions and Their Economic Consequences

These analyses would specifically seek to examine the influence of the said objectives of the EU competition law that have experienced an increment of its objectives to other needs other than the welfare of the consumer on the effect of the implementation and the economic dimension of the same in general. This is by looking into the effectiveness of remedies in such cases and whether they produced the intended pro-competitive consequences. Moreover, a comparative analysis of these EU results with other large law enforcement systems, such as the ones of the United States, could allow obtaining additional data on best practices and areas of improvement. In addition, the comparison with the history of competition law application in the new markets and its impact on the formation of the economy brings the invaluable information of how flexible the antitrust systems are, and whether they can be applied worldwide. As part of a comprehensive appraisal of the efficacy of such frameworks it is imperative to examine the expenditures of implementing and enforcing the law of competition an aspect that has been pushed to the marginal definitions of the analysis done based on benefits.

5.2. Analysis of Specific Sectors (e.g., Digital Markets, Pharmaceuticals, Energy)

This involves an investigation into other sectors such as the digital economy industry, pharmaceuticals and energy to value the special consideration and implementation measures to maintain healthy competition and consumer protection. Specifically, the analyses would focus on how competition in these industries is impacting innovation, efficiency, and pricing as a measure of the sensitive interplay between regulatory interventions and market outcomes. That is, the definition of innovation projects through regulatory mechanisms in pharmaceutical industries gives a clear picture of the innovation competitors, hence simply determining the impact of mergers on innovation. This can also be complicated by the differences in approach used to treat innovation in competition law cases in EU courts which can occasionally place altered emphasis on otherwise similar cases. This discrepancy emphasizes the significance of a more notched approach to gauging the effect of innovation initiatives in the various regulatory and judicial frameworks within the EU. It is also important that the applicability of the remedies used in the above areas particularly the structural remedy and behavioral remedy should also be examined further under empirical studies to ascertain the long term impact as far as the market structure and consumer welfare is concerned.

5.3. Cross-Jurisdictional Comparisons of Enforcement Outcomes

In order to find out the best practice and further liberalization in competition law enforcement across different systems of laws and economies, and in particular how the different institutional designs influence policy effectiveness, this comparative technique can be employed. The use of policies in BRICS countries and the EU with the emphasis on implementation and the outcomes can be studied as an example to understand how a specific challenge and priorities influence the development of a specific policy model. Similarly, an examination of efficiency defense perception in local

antitrust cases, as compared to international ones, shows the variations in the legal assessment, as does the weight of evidence. Such comparisons play critical roles in the determination of how various regulatory philosophies, including those built on the Chicago or Post-Chicago School of thought, have affected ways they were enforced as well as the overall market performance. Research further can tell us how to control the size of different ecosystems, how to measure the competitions among different ecosystems especially since there are no specifications on the powers by which quantitative and qualitative evidence may be utilized when examining concrete cases.

6. Conclusion

The paper has also discussed the intricacy of economic impacts of the competition law implementation of the EU by quantifying the effects of the same using quantitative measurement of the antitrust fines and effects of the same in enhancing market efficacy. It has indicated the complicated correlation between market forces and enforcement and it has highlighted the need of reasonable empirical approaches to receive an accurate quantification of the performance of policy. Subsequent research must then focus on developing superior econometric studies that can be relied upon to discard the causal effect of the competition policy interventions on other causally confounding economic variables thus providing a more accurate demonstration of the genuine impact of these on innovation, consumer welfare and market efficiency. Besides, some other studies on the effects of the punishments used against other forms of anticompetitive behavior, and not cartels, in particular, would be a productive addition to the general deterrence consequences of competition law. In addition, the criterion of behavioral reaction of companies on alternative fine structure and implement of various severities across different jurisdictions could be the indispensable evidence to how best to construct the most genuine regulations. Finally, a discussion of the policy of indirect competition influence such as reputation and interaction in the market would be helpful in uncovering the effect of the perceived rigor of enforcement on the long term compliance and market performance. Those can be analyzed to determine the impact of digital market regulation, in the ex-ante or ex-post framework, to determine which ones are more effective in supporting competition and innovation. Furthermore, the interplay of the competition policy instruments (cartel enforcement and merger control) are also to be examined even closer, as the changes in a single sector may highly define the corporate policy in others leading to the second-best market manifestation. Finally, the evolving character of digital ecosystems necessitates a profound summary of how existing schemes of competition law address novel forms of markets and information-based monopolization methods and how such changes affect consumer privacy and economic disparity. As well, the empirical analysis of the long-term effect of the Damages Directive on the enforcement of cartels and individual damages would be a valuable study to offer the full understanding of its performance.

References

1. Annunziata, F., & Maggiolino, M. (2022). The single supervisory mechanism and the European framework for the enforcement of competition law: a comparison between two models for economic governance in the EU. *Journal of Banking Regulation*, 24(3), 264. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41261-022-00197-1>
2. Arai, K. (2024). Comparative Impacts of Ex-Ante and Ex-Post Regulation in Digital Markets: An Event Study Analysis of Stock Price Reactions. *Asian Journal of Law and Economics*. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ajle-2024-2002>
3. Armoogum, K. P., Davies, S. W., & Mariuzzo, F. (2017). Cartel Enforcement and Deterrence Over the Life of A Competition Authority. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2993149>
4. Bon, J., Love, A., McNaboe, A., Njegovan, N., Schneebacher, J., & Walker, M. (2024). Dynamic Competition, Price Frictions and Institution Building: the CMA in 2022–2023. *Review of Industrial Organization*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11151-023-09934-w>
5. Bougette, P., Budzinski, O., & Marty, F. (2025). Ex-ante versus Ex-post in Competition Law Enforcement: Blurred Boundaries and Economic Rationale. *International Review of Law and Economics*, 106264. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irle.2025.106264>
6. Buehler, B., Coublucq, D., Hariton, C., Langus, G., & Valletti, T. (2017). Recent Developments at DG Competition: 2016/2017. *Review of Industrial Organization*, 51(4), 397. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11151-017-9592-x>
7. Batar, S. GOVERNOR'S AUTHORITY AND LEADERSHIP: NAVIGATING GOVERNANCE AND POWER. *STATE GOVERNMENT AND ADMINISTRATION*, 11.
8. Batar, S. The Role of Artificial Intelligence in Legal Aid: Empowering Access to Justice in India. *Role of Artificial Intelligence (AI) In the Legal Field: Opportunities and Challenges*, 107.

9. Sharma, A., Bhardwaj, P., Gupta, M. S., Dubey, M. B., Pattnaik, T., & Batar, M. S. The Role Of International Law In Addressing Climate Change.
10. Batar, S. CYBERCRIME AND LAW ENFORCEMENT: CHALLENGES AND SOLUTIONS. *Law & Order Administration*, 61.
11. Sehrawat, A., Katiyar, A. S., Vaishali, M. B. D., Sharma, M. A., & Gupta, M. Y. C. CYBERSECURITY LAWS IN THE DIGITAL AGE: GAPS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.
12. Cavlak, H. (2019). Political Economy of the EU Competition Policy. *Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 19(2), 241. <https://doi.org/10.18037/ausbd.566792>
13. Costa, A. A., & Barros, P. P. (2010). Does a Tougher Competition Policy Reduce or Promote Investment? *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1543962>
14. Doleželová, P. (2020). IMPACT OF UNILATERAL PREFERENCES ON EXPORT STRUCTURE OF THE LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES. *RePEc: Research Papers in Economics*. <https://econpapers.repec.org/RePEc:brv:journl:v:18:y:2020:i:1:p:57-70>
15. Don, H., Kemp, R., & Sinderen, J. van. (2008). Measuring the Economic Effects of Competition Law Enforcement. *De Economist*, 156(4), 341. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10645-008-9107-0>
16. Dong, Q. (2023). New Ways to Address Competition Challenges in Digital Markets: Reflections and Enlightenment of the EU's Proposal for a New Competition Tool. *Beijing Law Review*, 14(3), 1372. <https://doi.org/10.4236/blr.2023.143075>
17. Dunne, N. (2018). Regulating Prices in the European Union. *Yearbook of European Law*, 37, 344. <https://doi.org/10.1093/yel/yey002>
18. Ennis, S., & Kim, Y. (2017). Market Power and Wealth Distribution. In *The World Bank eBooks* (p. 133). https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-0945-3_ch5
19. Gronden, J. W. van de, & Rusu, C. Ş. (2017). EU competition law and policy and health systems. In *Edward Elgar Publishing eBooks*. Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781785364723.00024>
20. Horobet, A., Coman, C.-I., Belaşcu, L., Kostakis, I., & Busmachiu, E. (2024). Digital transformation and competition policy: analysing EU's regulatory response to emerging technologies. *Eastern Journal of European Studies*, 15(2), 165. <https://doi.org/10.47743/ejes-2024-0209>
21. Hüschelrath, K., & Leheyda, N. (2010). A Methodology for the Evaluation of Competition Policy. *European Competition Journal*, 6(2), 397. <https://doi.org/10.5235/174410510792283781>
22. Kaminska, T., Охріменко, I., & Wasilewska, N. (2020). METHOD FOR IMPLEMENTING THE MACROECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF THE AGRICULTURAL MARKET OF THE EUROPEAN UNION. *RePEc: Research Papers in Economics*. <https://econpapers.repec.org/RePEc:brv:journl:v:18:y:2020:i:1:p:5-20>
23. Katsoulacos, Y., Motchenkova, E., & Ulph, D. (2016). Measuring the Effectiveness of Anti-Cartel Interventions: A Conceptual Framework. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2714238>
24. Kerber, W. (2017). Competition, Innovation, and Competition Law: Dissecting the Interplay. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3051103>
25. Knapp, M., & Cunha, D. C. (2023). Antitrust Fines and Limitation Periods After the Implementation of Directive (EU) 2019/1 Throughout Member States: Focus on French and Polish Perspectives. *Deleted Journal*, 54(6), 891. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40319-023-01337-4>
26. Kotzeva, R., Kovo, D., Lőrincz, S., Sapi, G., Sauri, L., & Valletti, T. (2019). Recent Developments at DG Competition: 2018/2019. *Review of Industrial Organization*, 55(4), 551. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11151-019-09739-w>
27. Lancieri, F., & Sakowski, P. (2020). Competition in Digital Markets: A Review of Expert Reports [Review of *Competition in Digital Markets: A Review of Expert Reports*]. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. RELX Group (Netherlands). <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3681322>
28. Levine, R., Lin, C., Wei, L., & Xie, W. (2020). *Competition Laws and Corporate Innovation*. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w27253>
29. Lianos, I., & Genakos, C. (2013). Econometric evidence in EU competition law: an empirical and theoretical analysis. In *Edward Elgar Publishing eBooks*. Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781782546214.00009>
30. Loo, R. V. (2022). Inflation, Market Failures, and Algorithms. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4226318>

31. Mathis, J., & Sand-Zantman, W. (2015). Welfare Standards in Competition Policy. *HAL (Le Centre Pour La Communication Scientifique Directe)*. <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-02316755>
32. Matsushita, M. (2023). Interplay of Competition Law and Free Trade Agreements in Regulating State-Owned Enterprises. *German Law Journal*, 24(1), 243. <https://doi.org/10.1017/glj.2023.8>
33. Nizza, U., & Poncibò, C. (2025). Antitrust Mega Fines in Digital Markets and Their Impact on Compliance: An Overview of EU and US Approaches. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5050638>
34. Panon, L. (2020). Essays in international trade and industrial organization. *HAL (Le Centre Pour La Communication Scientifique Directe)*. <https://theses.hal.science/tel-03408401>
35. Patakyová, M. (2020). COMPETITION LAW IN DIGITAL ERA – HOW TO DEFINE THE RELEVANT MARKET? *International Scientific Conference EMAN. Economics & Management: How to Cope With Disrupted Times*, 171. <https://doi.org/10.31410/eman.2020.171>
36. Pelaez, S., & Gutiérrez, J. D. (2023b). The Gradual Impact of Sanctioning Cartels on Market Competition: Evidence from the Colombian Manufacturing Sector. *Research Square (Research Square)*. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-2928151/v2>
37. Pfeiffer, R. A. C. (2019). Digital Economy, Big Data and Competition Law. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3440296>
38. Pijetlović, K. (2017). EU sports law: a uniform algorithm for regulatory rules. *The International Sports Law Journal*, 17, 86. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40318-017-0114-7>
39. Putra, A. A. B. N. A. S. (2019). Competition Law and Policy Harmonisation: Its Relation to Fair Competition Realisation in ASEAN Single Aviation Market. *Udayana Journal of Law and Culture*, 3(2), 164. <https://doi.org/10.24843/ujlc.2019.v03.i02.p03>
40. Ribeiro, E. P., & Golovanova, S. (2023). The Practice of Efficiency Defense in Antitrust Cases: A Comparison of BRICS and European Cases. *BRICS Law Journal*, 10(3), 65. <https://doi.org/10.21684/2412-2343-2023-10-3-65-86>
41. Schrepel, T., & Groza, T. (2025). Computational Antitrust Worldwide: Fourth Cross-Agency Report. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5305055>
42. Setianingrum, R. B., & Hawin, M. (2020). Harmonization of Competition Law: Research on The Transplantability of eu's Law into ASEAN. *Yuridika*, 35(3), 613. <https://doi.org/10.20473/ydk.v35i3.21179>
43. Shastitko, A. (2020). Antitrust in BRICS: Agenda and achievements in comparative perspective. *Russian Journal of Economics*, 6(3), 213. <https://doi.org/10.32609/j.ruje.6.58789>
44. Smuda, F. (2013). CARTEL OVERCHARGES AND THE DETERRENT EFFECT OF EU COMPETITION LAW. *Journal of Competition Law & Economics*, 10(1), 63. <https://doi.org/10.1093/joclec/nht012>