Digital Competition Law: Antitrust Implications of Big Tech Platforms

1. Sophie Chenier🄳*: Department of International Relations, McGill University, Montreal, Canada
2. Rajeev Kumar🄳*: Department of Public Law, University of Delhi, Delhi, India

*Correspondence: e-mail: rajeev.kumar@du.ac.in

Abstract

Digital markets have evolved into complex ecosystems shaped by data-driven business models, algorithmic decision-making, and powerful network effects. As platforms such as Google, Apple, Amazon, Meta, Microsoft, and TikTok have become central intermediaries for communication, commerce, and information exchange, traditional antitrust frameworks—constructed around price effects, discrete product markets, and observable competitive constraints—have become increasingly inadequate. This narrative review examines the emergence of digital competition law as a distinct regulatory field capable of addressing the structural, informational, and architectural features of digital dominance. Through descriptive analysis, the article assesses how platform power is exercised through mechanisms such as self-preferencing, cross-service data aggregation, ecosystem bundling, and algorithmic manipulation, all of which create durable competitive advantages that resist traditional antitrust scrutiny. The review then analyzes doctrinal challenges in applying competition law to digital markets, including difficulties in defining relevant markets, evaluating non-price harms, and proving exclusionary conduct in opaque algorithmic environments. Comparative insights from major jurisdictions—including the United States, the European Union, the United Kingdom, Australia, India, and China—demonstrate varying regulatory philosophies but a shared recognition of the need for ex-ante obligations, interoperability mandates, enhanced merger scrutiny, and integrated data governance frameworks. Emerging theories such as the Neo-Brandeisian approach, platform neutrality, and fairness-based regulation highlight shifts toward structural remedies and broader public-interest considerations. The review concludes that digital competition law must evolve continuously to address the expanding influence of Big Tech platforms and ensure that digital markets remain contestable, transparent, and aligned with democratic and economic values. By synthesizing theoretical debates, global policy developments, and regulatory challenges, the article contributes to a deeper understanding of how competition law can adapt to the realities of platform-based economies.

Keywords: Digital competition law; antitrust; Big Tech platforms; data governance; algorithmic power; merger control; platform neutrality; interoperability; contestability; digital markets

Citation: Chenier, S., & Kumar, R. (2023). Digital Competition Law: Antitrust Implications of Big Tech Platforms. *Legal Studies in Digital Age,* 2(2), 49-60.

1. Introduction

Digital markets have become core infrastructures of contemporary socio-economic systems, shaping the circulation of information, the allocation of advertising resources, the dynamics of retail commerce, and the governance of digital labor markets. As platform ecosystems expand, their ability to orchestrate interactions across millions of users, businesses, and developers creates unprecedented forms of intermediation that fundamentally reshape how competition operates. Big Tech firms such as Google, Apple, Amazon, Meta, Microsoft, and TikTok structure digital environments through ownership of data, control over interfaces, and the design of algorithmic architectures, enabling forms of influence that earlier industrial-era firms could not attain. Scholars increasingly argue that these environments reflect shifts toward "cloud empires," where platform operators exert quasi-regulatory powers through technical standards, algorithmic visibility, data extraction mechanisms, and contractually imposed rules (Lehdonvirta, 2022).

This transformation challenges traditional antitrust frameworks that were built around concepts of price, output, and market concentration. Digital markets often operate in zero-price environments where consumers pay with attention and personal data, complicating the assessment of consumer welfare harms. As platforms expand vertically and horizontally, their ability to combine data from diverse services strengthens market power in ways that conventional antitrust analysis frequently struggles to capture. Research on modern platform power shows that exclusionary strategies such as self-preferencing, discriminatory ranking, and the leveraging of data-rich ecosystems generate competitive distortions that traditional tools were not designed to detect (Parker et al., 2022). At the same time, algorithmic decision-making introduces opacity into competitive dynamics, creating conditions under which tacit collusion can emerge without explicit communication (Spulber, 2022).

The centrality of data as a competitive asset further complicates regulatory oversight. Data aggregation across services, combined with machine-learning models that personalize content and prices, strengthens gatekeeping power and entrenches ecosystem lock-in, a challenge noted in analyses of platform dominance in both the United States and the European Union (Wu, 2023). Scholars examining digitalization and antitrust enforcement emphasize that the speed, scale, and global reach of digital markets demand new approaches to monitoring concentration and preventing anticompetitive behaviors that exploit information asymmetries (Egorova et al., 2022). Similar concerns arise in jurisdictions such as China, where the rapid growth of domestic platforms has required competition authorities to address novel forms of abuse tied to data-driven business models (Colino, 2022).

These developments explain the emerging shift from traditional antitrust principles toward digital competition law, a regulatory field that integrates economic, technological, and legal analysis to address platform-specific risks. Scholars argue that digital competition law must account for network effects, ecosystem entrenchment, algorithmic harms, and the strategic acquisition of nascent competitors, all of which contribute to modern forms of dominance that cannot be fully captured by classical market-power tests (Deutscher, 2022; Moltke, 2023). Policymakers in both Western and non-Western jurisdictions increasingly converge around the need for ex-ante obligations, interoperability mandates, and stricter merger controls, reflecting a global rethinking of how digital competition should be governed (Cahill & Wang, 2023; Colomo, 2023).

The aim of this narrative review is to synthesize theoretical and regulatory debates surrounding the antitrust implications of Big Tech platforms and to analyze how digital competition law is evolving as a distinct field. The article employs a descriptive analysis method to map key themes, doctrinal challenges, and regulatory trajectories across different jurisdictions.

2. Conceptual Foundations of Digital Competition Law

Digital competition law has emerged as a distinct body of regulatory thought because digital markets operate according to structural and behavioral logics that differ significantly from those assumed in classical antitrust doctrine. Traditional antitrust was built around linear supply chains, identifiable producers and consumers, stable product markets, and price-based indicators of harm. Digital platforms, however, function as complex, multi-layered ecosystems where value is generated through interactions among users, advertisers, developers, and complementary service providers, all mediated by algorithmic architectures and continuous data collection. The doctrinal evolution of digital competition law reflects a recognition that these characteristics require novel analytical tools and enforcement mechanisms capable of addressing structural dominance that

arises not from ownership of physical assets, but from control of data, code, interfaces, and the ability to govern interactions at scale. Scholars analyzing platform power argue that digital markets are defined by forms of intermediation and technical control that exceed the conceptual reach of twentieth-century competition frameworks (Lehdonvirta, 2022). As a result, digital competition law incorporates insights from economics, computer science, platform governance, and information theory to articulate new approaches to market definition, market power, competitive harm, and regulatory intervention.

One of the defining features of digital markets is the intensity of network effects that amplify the power of incumbents and accelerate market concentration. When each additional user increases the value of the platform for all other users, firms can scale rapidly and achieve dominance long before traditional measures of anticompetitive conduct become visible. Economic research shows that network effects, when combined with data-driven economies of scale, can produce self-reinforcing feedback loops that make entry extremely difficult, particularly when incumbents have accumulated massive datasets that improve personalization and algorithmic performance (Parker et al., 2022). Data functions not only as an input but also as a strategic asset, enabling firms to refine targeting models and prediction systems in ways that new entrants cannot easily replicate. These dynamics generate switching costs and ecosystem lock-in, as consumers often face substantial friction in moving between platforms due to data portability limits, loss of social connections, and dependency on proprietary standards. Scholars examining digital ecosystems have emphasized that zero-price markets, in which consumers appear to receive "free" services, obscure the fact that value is monetized through data extraction and attention capture, making traditional price-focused antitrust tests inadequate (Wu, 2023). The rise of algorithmic personalization further differentiates digital markets, as decision-making processes are governed by opaque ranking and recommendation systems that influence market outcomes in ways regulators rarely have the capacity to trace (Spulber, 2022).

These structural transformations complicate the definition of market power in digital environments, because conventional tools were designed to evaluate substitutability in single-sided product markets rather than multi-sided ecosystems. In platform markets, competitive constraints arise not only from direct competitors but also from complementary services, advertisers, and data intermediaries, making it difficult to delineate clear boundaries around the "relevant market." Studies of platform regulation note that attention markets, in which platforms compete for user engagement rather than money, challenge traditional methods of calculating market shares and assessing barriers to entry (Deutscher, 2022). The centrality of data also requires regulators to consider whether a firm's dataset constitutes a non-replicable advantage, particularly when machine-learning models depend on large-scale, high-quality training data that competitors cannot access. Jurisdictions such as China have confronted similar challenges, as authorities attempt to define dominance in ecosystems where firms integrate payments, social media, video content, and e-commerce into unified digital infrastructures (Colino, 2022). Regulatory analyses highlight that platform power is often embedded in upstream control of interfaces, application stores, cloud services, and technical protocols rather than in traditional product-market metrics, suggesting that market power assessment must incorporate architectural and infrastructural dimensions (Moltke, 2023).

The evolution of digital markets also triggers debates over whether traditional consumer welfare standards can capture the full spectrum of harms associated with platform dominance. Classical antitrust doctrine focuses heavily on price effects, yet many digital services operate at zero monetary cost, masking harms in areas such as privacy degradation, quality reduction, discriminatory ranking, or exclusion of rivals from key interfaces. Scholars have emphasized the need to integrate broader regulatory goals such as fairness, contestability, and protection of innovation into competition analysis, arguing that platform ecosystems can suppress nascent competitors long before price increases occur (Croxson et al., 2022). The interaction between data extraction practices and consumer autonomy raises questions about whether welfare-based benchmarks should incorporate privacy and informational self-determination, particularly as data concentration enables behavioral prediction at scales that alter market dynamics (Egorova et al., 2022). Comparative research also shows increasing global interest in achieving a balance between market efficiency and pluralism, with jurisdictions acknowledging that concentrated platform power can distort not only economic competition but also informational diversity and societal governance (Cahill & Wang, 2023; Colomo, 2023). As these debates expand, digital competition law continues to broaden its analytical framework, moving beyond price and output to incorporate structural, informational, and algorithmic dimensions of market power.

3. Antitrust Concerns in Big Tech Platforms

Antitrust concerns surrounding Big Tech platforms arise from structural features of digital markets that allow a small number of dominant firms to shape competitive conditions across entire sectors. These firms exercise control through intertwined mechanisms of technical design, data governance, and contractual rules that together create forms of dependence difficult for rivals to overcome. Scholars examining platform industries argue that the concentration of intermediation power in a few gatekeepers enables patterns of behavior that resemble classical monopolistic abuses, yet occur through digital infrastructures rather than overt pricing strategies (Parker et al., 2022). As a result, competition authorities increasingly scrutinize how dominance is acquired, maintained, and strengthened through technical configurations that privilege the platform's own services, restrict market entry, and reduce the visibility of potential competitors.

A central concern is the use of self-preferencing, a practice in which platforms prioritize their own products or services within ranking systems, search results, or app-store environments. Researchers analyzing the inner workings of platform architectures note that the platform's control over ranking algorithms gives it a powerful tool for shaping user behavior, allowing subtle manipulation of visibility that can distort competition without apparent changes in price (Spulber, 2022). Self-preferencing becomes especially problematic in vertically integrated ecosystems, where the platform operates both as a marketplace and as a competitor within that marketplace. Studies of European regulatory reforms highlight that such vertically integrated control structures enable firms to influence traffic flows in ways that foreclose rivals, even when the platform publicly claims neutrality (Colomo, 2023). These practices often extend to tying and bundling strategies, where services are packaged together in ways that make it difficult for users to adopt rival solutions. For example, when messaging, cloud storage, and payment systems are bundled within a single login ecosystem, rivals face steep barriers in attracting users who would otherwise need to recreate their digital identity outside the incumbent's environment. Scholars exploring antitrust interventions in Asia and the EU observe that such bundling can reinforce dominant positions by locking users into proprietary standards and reducing opportunities for innovative competitors to emerge (Colino, 2022).

Exclusionary conduct also arises from restrictions imposed by platforms on access to crucial interfaces, APIs, or data resources. Researchers examining platform governance note that dominant firms often set technical rules that suppress competition, such as limiting cross-platform interoperability or imposing discriminatory fees on developers (Moltke, 2023). Vertical integration amplifies these concerns by enabling firms to leverage power in one market to gain advantages in adjacent markets. For example, a platform controlling both hardware and an app-distribution environment may deny competing developers equal access to essential features, subtly steering users toward the platform's own products. Such conduct becomes even more complex when the platform also provides cloud services, payments infrastructure, or advertising technologies, creating layered dependencies that extend across sectors (Lehdonvirta, 2022). Scholars studying modern antitrust frameworks argue that these overlapping control points grant incumbents a unique capacity to foreclose competitors without explicit contractual prohibitions, because the architecture itself becomes a gatekeeping mechanism (Deutscher, 2022).

Beyond structural control, data-driven anticompetitive practices represent a second major category of concern. Big Tech platforms accumulate vast datasets generated through user interactions, device sensors, cross-service integration, and real-time behavioral tracking. Scholars examining data governance and competition emphasize that this continuous accumulation of granular user data creates entrenched advantages that new entrants cannot replicate, particularly in markets where machine-learning models improve with scale and diversity of input data (Pires-Alves et al., 2023). The combination of data aggregation and cross-platform tracking allows dominant firms to predict user behavior with increasing precision, enabling targeted advertising and personalized service delivery that smaller competitors cannot match (Wu, 2023). Data portability remains limited in most jurisdictions, preventing users from transferring their digital histories or social graphs to rival services. This lack of portability reinforces lock-in, since switching platforms results in a loss of accumulated digital value, personal preferences, and identity-linked records (Croxson et al., 2022). Information asymmetries further distort competition because platforms possess extensive insights into market behavior while rivals and regulators lack visibility into the underlying data flows, algorithmic logic, and performance metrics that determine competitive outcomes (Egorova et al., 2022). As a result,

the largest platforms retain structural advantages that accrue not through traditional economies of scale but through data-centric feedback loops that perpetuate dominance.

The third major concern involves algorithmic harms and manipulation, which arise from the increasingly automated nature of decision-making on digital platforms. Scholars studying algorithmic competition emphasize that complex pricing and recommendation algorithms can generate forms of tacit collusion, as systems adjust to market conditions and competitor behaviors in real time, producing coordinated outcomes without human intervention (Spulber, 2022). Personalized pricing poses additional risks, as platforms can extract greater consumer surplus by adjusting prices or product offerings based on individual behavioral profiles, a tactic that complicates traditional antitrust assessments by divorcing pricing practices from market-wide competitive conditions (Parker et al., 2022). Content-ranking manipulations also generate welfare concerns, as ranking algorithms can be configured to prioritize the platform's own services, suppress critical information, or shape user behavior in ways that support the platform's commercial objectives. Researchers examining the opacity of algorithmic governance note that these ranking systems operate as black boxes, making it difficult for regulators to identify discriminatory practices or detect systematic manipulation of market visibility (Colomo, 2023). As algorithmic systems become more complex, the informational disparity between platforms and regulators widens, creating enforcement challenges that have prompted calls for algorithmic transparency obligations (Deutscher, 2022).

Finally, the pattern of mergers and acquisitions among Big Tech companies raises significant antitrust concerns, particularly regarding the elimination of nascent competition. Scholars investigating modern merger control highlight that many of the most consequential acquisitions—such as those involving WhatsApp, Instagram, DoubleClick, and GitHub—were initially approved because regulators did not anticipate the long-term competitive effects in data-driven markets (Cahill & Wang, 2023). These transactions often involve targets that do not currently compete with the acquirer in traditional product markets but possess capabilities, user bases, or innovative potential that could eventually challenge incumbent platforms. Researchers analyzing merger trends in digital markets argue that dominant firms strategically acquire promising startups to preempt future competition, integrate their data assets, or neutralize emerging innovations before they mature into viable rivals (Moltke, 2023). Evidence from multiple jurisdictions shows that the cumulative impact of such acquisitions consolidates platform ecosystems and reduces contestability, reinforcing the incumbent's structural power across multiple layers of digital intermediation (Deutscher, 2022). The global regulatory community increasingly recognizes these dynamics, motivating calls for revised merger standards, retrospective analyses of past approvals, and heightened scrutiny of acquisitions involving data-rich startups or adjacent services (Colino, 2022).

Together, these concerns illustrate that Big Tech platforms challenge traditional antitrust analysis not through overt price manipulation but through control of data, algorithms, and digital infrastructures. As platforms deepen their integration across markets, their capacity to shape competitive conditions through technical and informational means becomes central to modern antitrust debates, requiring legal frameworks to adapt to the unique features of digital dominance.

4. Comparative Legal Frameworks

The global landscape of digital competition law is marked by a growing recognition that traditional antitrust frameworks, developed for industrial markets, cannot sufficiently regulate platform-dominated digital ecosystems. Different jurisdictions have responded with a variety of legislative, regulatory, and doctrinal reforms, collectively signaling a worldwide effort to adapt competition law to the realities of data-driven markets. The United States, the European Union, the United Kingdom, China, Australia, and India have each developed distinctive models, yet a shared sense of urgency has emerged as governments confront the concentrated economic and informational power of major digital platforms. Scholars examining regulatory transformations note that although approaches vary, many jurisdictions are converging toward the idea that ex-ante obligations, data-access rules, and structural constraints must complement traditional ex-post antitrust enforcement (Cahill & Wang, 2023). This section provides a descriptive analysis of these developments and highlights the trends shaping the global regulatory trajectory.

In the United States, recent years have seen a revived antitrust discourse driven by concerns that decades of narrowly interpreting the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act have permitted digital platforms to acquire and sustain dominance through

strategies not easily captured by price-based harm tests. Research on digital antitrust in the U.S. emphasizes the extent to which courts historically relied on the consumer welfare standard, making it difficult for agencies to challenge exclusionary conduct when consumers did not face higher prices (Wu, 2023). To address this gap, institutional reforms at the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice have sought to expand enforcement capacities, develop more accurate models of digital market power, and scrutinize platform mergers more aggressively. Scholars examining agency strategies observe that both agencies increasingly rely on theories of harm related to data concentration, nascent competition, and ecosystem dominance, shifting enforcement priorities toward structural risks rather than isolated conduct (Spulber, 2022). This shift is reflected in high-profile lawsuits targeting monopolization in digital advertising, mobile app distribution, and search algorithms. In parallel, legislative proposals such as the American Innovation and Choice Online Act aim to impose conduct-based prohibitions on self-preferencing and discriminatory access to platform infrastructure, marking a departure from the traditionally permissive regulatory philosophy (Parker et al., 2022). While U.S. reform remains contested, the shift toward a more interventionist posture reflects growing recognition that the legal tools of the twentieth century cannot address the infrastructural power of twenty-first-century platforms.

The European Union has taken a more assertive and structured approach, combining traditional competition law with comprehensive ex-ante regulation. The Digital Markets Act (DMA) represents the EU's most significant reform, establishing a regulatory framework built around gatekeeper designation. Scholars examining the DMA highlight that the concept of a gatekeeper, defined through criteria related to market impact, control of core platform services, and durable entrenched position, reflects a structural understanding of digital power (Colomo, 2023). Once designated, gatekeepers must comply with extensive obligations, including requirements to enable interoperability, restrictions on using non-public business data for competitive advantage, prohibitions on self-preferencing, and obligations to open app stores and payment systems to rival services. Research on EU digital competition policy emphasizes that these obligations aim to prevent the entrenchment of dominance rather than merely punish past conduct (Deutscher, 2022). The DMA strengthens the Commission's investigatory powers, allowing proactive audits of algorithms, data practices, and platform governance. Complementing these reforms, the enforcement of Articles 101 and 102 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union continues to target anticompetitive agreements and abuse of dominance, forming a dual enforcement regime in which competition law and the DMA operate simultaneously. Scholars studying digital markets within the EU argue that this hybrid model illustrates a belief that digital competition problems are too systemic to be addressed through case-by-case adjudication alone (Lehdonvirta, 2022).

Outside the United States and the EU, several jurisdictions have developed innovative regulatory models to address platform dominance. In the United Kingdom, the creation of the Digital Markets Unit signals an institutional commitment to proactive oversight, with the authority tasked to impose tailored codes of conduct on firms with "strategic market status." Researchers examining UK reforms observe that the approach reflects an attempt to combine EU-style ex-ante obligations with the UK's flexible institutional culture (Croxson et al., 2022). Australia has taken similar steps through investigations led by the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission, culminating in recommendations to impose data-sharing obligations, prohibit self-preferencing, and introduce new merger-review standards that account for digital-specific risks. In India, the Competition Commission of India has increased scrutiny of mobile ecosystems, digital advertising, and search distribution, building its capacity to address the dominance of global platforms within domestic digital infrastructure. Research focusing on Southeast Asian jurisdictions notes that Indonesian competition law faces challenges in addressing digital platform dominance due to resource constraints and the complexity of cross-border digital markets (Jusmadi, 2023). China provides one of the most assertive non-Western models, with amendments to the Anti-Monopoly Law enabling authorities to address exploitative data practices, forced exclusivity, and algorithmic discrimination. Scholars examining China's regulatory architecture highlight that digital competition enforcement is deeply intertwined with broader political and economic governance objectives, leading to rapid and wide-reaching interventions targeting domestic platforms (Colino, 2022).

These diverse national approaches reveal regional trends and global divergences that reflect both regulatory philosophies and economic priorities. Some jurisdictions, such as the EU and China, embrace strict structural regulation based on the assumption that digital markets naturally tip toward concentration. Others, such as the United States and India, maintain more incremental approaches, balancing concerns about innovation with the desire to prevent entrenched dominance. Despite this

variation, scholars analyzing global platform regulation observe increasing convergence around core concepts such as fairness, contestability, transparency, and the need for data-access rules to reduce the structural advantages of dominant firms (Cahill & Wang, 2023). At the same time, global divergence persists in enforcement timelines, institutional capacity, and willingness to impose structural remedies versus behavioral obligations. These differences contribute to a regulatory environment in which platform firms navigate multiple, sometimes conflicting, compliance expectations. Yet they also indicate the emergence of a "race to regulate," as jurisdictions compete to develop the most effective frameworks for governing the digital economy and mitigating the risks associated with concentrated platform power (Egorova et al., 2022). As international debates intensify, comparative experiences continue to shape the evolving field of digital competition law, offering insights into both the opportunities and challenges of regulating global digital infrastructures.

5. Core Doctrinal Challenges in Applying Antitrust to Digital Markets

Applying antitrust principles to digital markets presents profound doctrinal challenges because the analytical foundations of competition law were constructed around assumptions that do not align with the structural and behavioral realities of platform ecosystems. Traditional competition law presumes clearly delineated markets, identifiable competitive constraints, and observable relationships between firm behavior and consumer welfare. Digital markets disrupt these expectations by introducing multi-sided interactions, algorithmic mediation, data-driven feedback loops, and zero-price business models, all of which complicate legal assessments. Scholars studying the evolution of modern antitrust note that digital platforms operate as networked infrastructures rather than conventional firms, and this transformation requires reconceptualizing market definition, competitive harm, and evidentiary thresholds (Lehdonvirta, 2022). As regulators increasingly confront the unprecedented concentration of data and intermediation power in the hands of a few global platforms, doctrinal uncertainty has become one of the central obstacles to effective digital competition enforcement.

One of the most difficult doctrinal challenges concerns the definition of the relevant market in a digital environment. Classic market definition models, which rely on price-based tests such as the SSNIP framework, struggle to capture the dynamics of multi-sided platforms where users often do not pay monetary prices. Scholars examining digital competition emphasize that platform ecosystems generate interdependencies between different user groups, meaning that market power cannot be assessed by looking at one side in isolation (Parker et al., 2022). Attention markets further complicate analysis because platforms compete for user engagement rather than money, blurring the boundaries between social networking, video streaming, messaging, and advertising. Research on platform regulation shows that this overlap makes cross-platform substitution extremely difficult to measure, as users may shift their attention across functionally distinct services based on design features, algorithmic curation, or social dynamics rather than price (Deutscher, 2022). In jurisdictions such as China, competition authorities have confronted similar difficulties when defining markets that integrate payments, e-commerce, entertainment, and social media, revealing the inadequacy of traditional product-market boundaries in data-driven ecosystems (Colino, 2022). These challenges illustrate that market definition in digital environments must incorporate behavioral insights, technical architecture, and data access, yet existing legal frameworks often lack the conceptual tools to do so effectively.

The second core challenge involves assessing competitive harm in markets where price is not a reliable indicator. Classic antitrust analysis emphasizes static measures of welfare, yet digital markets require attention to dynamic competition, innovation harms, and non-price dimensions such as privacy, transparency, and content integrity. Scholars studying algorithmic markets argue that innovation can be stifled long before price effects appear, particularly when dominant platforms use data advantages, exclusive contracts, or ecosystem bundling to prevent effective entry (Croxson et al., 2022). Privacy erosion also functions as a form of non-price harm, as platforms extract increasing amounts of personal data through opaque terms of service and cross-service surveillance practices. Research examining digitalization and antitrust enforcement shows that harms related to privacy, data governance, and content manipulation require regulators to move beyond traditional welfare metrics and adopt broader evaluative criteria (Egorova et al., 2022). Algorithmic ranking systems create additional concerns by shaping visibility and influence in ways that are difficult to quantify, making it challenging to determine when suppressed search results or discriminatory rankings amount to anticompetitive exclusion (Spulber, 2022). These issues suggest that evaluating harm in

digital markets demands doctrinal expansions that incorporate informational and structural dimensions alongside conventional economic analysis.

A third major challenge arises from the burden of proof and evidentiary requirements in cases involving algorithmic conduct. Digital platforms operate with highly complex machine-learning models, proprietary ranking systems, and real-time optimization engines that render competitive effects difficult to trace. Scholars examining the opacity of algorithmic environments note that regulators struggle to prove discriminatory behavior or tacit collusion because the underlying decision-making processes are not observable and may evolve autonomously over time (Colomo, 2023). Tacit algorithmic collusion becomes particularly difficult to detect when pricing algorithms respond to each other's outputs, producing coordinated results without explicit communication. Similarly, the foreclosure of competitors may occur through technical restrictions embedded deep within platform architecture, making it hard to demonstrate intent or link specific design choices to exclusionary outcomes (Moltke, 2023). The informational asymmetry between platforms and regulators further complicates evidence-gathering, as agencies often lack access to internal datasets, algorithmic logs, and system-level documentation needed to substantiate claims (Wu, 2023). These evidentiary challenges illustrate the structural misalignment between traditional antitrust doctrines, which rely on observable conduct, and digital markets, where critical competitive dynamics unfold inside opaque algorithmic systems.

Together, these doctrinal challenges underscore the need for updated analytical tools tailored to digital realities. While traditional antitrust frameworks remain foundational, their application to algorithmic, data-driven, and multi-sided markets requires interpretive adjustments, new evidentiary mechanisms, and a broader conception of competitive harm that reflects the infrastructural power of modern digital platforms.

6. Conclusion

The transformation of digital markets over the past two decades has generated a fundamental shift in how competition operates and how it must be regulated. Big Tech platforms have evolved into complex, multi-layered infrastructures that mediate communication, commerce, information flows, entertainment, and even essential public services. Their power does not stem solely from traditional indicators such as price-setting or control of physical assets but from their ability to define the parameters of digital interactions through data collection, algorithmic governance, and platform architecture. As a result, digital competition law has emerged as a distinct field that seeks to grapple with forms of dominance that are deeply embedded in the structural and informational fabric of the digital economy.

The analysis across this article demonstrates that traditional antitrust frameworks, which were built around assumptions of discrete product markets and identifiable competitive constraints, are ill-equipped to address the complexities of modern platform ecosystems. Market power in digital markets is expressed not through explicit exclusionary contracts or overt price manipulation but through subtle yet highly consequential mechanisms such as self-preferencing, interoperability restrictions, algorithmic ranking biases, and cross-platform data integration. These mechanisms allow dominant firms to mold competitive conditions in ways that are often invisible to users and regulators but profoundly distort market dynamics. Understanding these forms of influence requires moving beyond conventional economic metrics and adopting more nuanced, interdisciplinary frameworks that incorporate technological, behavioral, and architectural dimensions.

One of the clearest lessons from global regulatory developments is the growing recognition that digital markets naturally tend toward concentration due to network effects, data-driven economies of scale, and ecosystem lock-in. Once a platform reaches a critical threshold, it can accumulate vast amounts of data, refine algorithmic models, and entrench itself through reinforced user dependence. This path-dependent process challenges long-held assumptions about market self-correction and demands a proactive regulatory stance. The emergence of ex-ante regulatory frameworks in many jurisdictions reflects an acknowledgment that waiting for anticompetitive harm to manifest is not an effective strategy in environments where dominance becomes irreversible long before traditional indicators of harm appear.

At the same time, concerns about innovation remain central to debates on digital competition. While some argue that excessive regulation risks inhibiting technological progress, the broader perspective emerging from global experience is that unchecked platform power can suppress innovation more effectively than over-regulation. When dominant platforms acquire nascent competitors, restrict access to crucial interfaces, or impose discriminatory terms on developers and businesses, the result is often a diminished space for experimentation, diversity, and competitive entry. Ensuring a fair and open digital

environment is essential for sustaining long-term innovation, particularly in markets that rely on the constant emergence of new ideas, services, and business models.

Another critical area explored in this article is the convergence between competition law, data protection, and platform governance. The interdependence of these fields reflects a deeper truth about the nature of digital markets: information itself has become both an economic resource and a mechanism of control. The way data is collected, processed, shared, and combined affects not only privacy and autonomy but also the structure of competition. A regulatory framework that treats these domains separately risks overlooking the ways in which data accumulation, algorithmic design, and infrastructural control reinforce market dominance. The development of integrated approaches that link competition, privacy, and transparency obligations represents one of the most promising directions for ensuring that platforms do not exploit informational asymmetries to consolidate power.

International comparisons also highlight significant divergence in regulatory philosophies. Some jurisdictions favor aggressive interventions rooted in structural remedies and strict prohibitions, while others prefer incremental adjustments centered on litigation, guidelines, and targeted enforcement. These differences reflect local political cultures, institutional capacities, and economic priorities. Yet despite this divergence, a global trend toward greater scrutiny of platform power is unmistakable. Policymakers across continents are increasingly convinced that digital markets require tailored rules, new analytical tools, and specialized regulatory institutions capable of addressing the unique challenges posed by platform-dominated economies.

Ultimately, the future of digital competition law depends on the ability of legal systems to evolve alongside technological innovation. As digital markets continue to expand into new domains such as artificial intelligence, quantum services, and immersive environments, the nature of platform power is likely to become even more complex and deeply embedded. Effective governance will require constant adaptation, ongoing empirical research, and dialogue between legal scholars, technologists, economists, and policymakers. The stakes extend far beyond market efficiency; they encompass fundamental questions about economic autonomy, democratic integrity, and the equitable distribution of digital power.

Digital competition law stands at the intersection of these concerns. It seeks not only to preserve market contestability but also to ensure that the digital infrastructures shaping modern life remain open, fair, and responsive to public values. As Big Tech platforms continue to reshape the contours of economic and social activity, the development of robust, forward-looking competition frameworks will be essential for safeguarding innovation, protecting users, and sustaining a healthy digital ecosystem.

Ethical Considerations

Acknowledgments

Conflict of Interest

Funding/Financial Support

References

Cahill, D., & Wang, J. (2023). Convergence in Approaches Taken by Both East &Amp; West to Tackle Digital Platforms Anti-Competitive Practices. *Academic Journal of Nawroz University*. https://doi.org/10.25007/ajnu.v1n1a1941

Colino, S. M. (2022). The Incursion of Antitrust Into China's Platform Economy. *The Antitrust Bulletin*, *67*(2), 237-258. https://doi.org/10.1177/0003603x221084152

Colomo, P. I. (2023). The New EU Competition Law. https://doi.org/10.5040/9781782259169

Croxson, K., Frost, J., Gambacorta, L., & Valletti, T. (2022). Platform-Based Business Models and Financial Inclusion: Policy Trade-Offs and Approaches. *Journal of Competition Law & Economics*, *19*(1), 75-102. https://doi.org/10.1093/joclec/nhac010

Deutscher, E. (2022). Reshaping Digital Competition: The New Platform Regulations and the Future of Modern Antitrust. *The Antitrust Bulletin*, *67*(2), 302-340. https://doi.org/10.1177/0003603x221082742

Egorova, M. A., Petrov, A. A., & Кожевина, О. В. (2022). Impact of Digitalization on Antitrust Regulation and Control Over Economic Concentration in the High-Tech Sector. *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University Law*, *13*(2), 327-343. https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu14.2022.203

Jusmadi, R. (2023). The Existence of Digital Platforms and the Challenges in Enforcement of Indonesian Competition Law. *Unnes Law Journal*, *9*(1). https://doi.org/10.15294/ulj.v9i1.63114

Lehdonvirta, V. (2022). Cloud Empires. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/14219.001.0001

Moltke, A. (2023). Antitrust and Upstream Platform Power Plays. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780192873057.001.0001

Parker, G., Petropoulos, G., & Alstyne, M. V. (2022). Digital Platforms and Antitrust. 340-364. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190900571.013.34

Pires-Alves, C. C., Rocha, D. C. D., Ribeiro, E. P., Pondé, J. L., Prado, L. C. D., & Marcos Puccioni de Oliveira, L. (2023). The Essential in Essential Facilities. *Direito Público*, *20*(107). https://doi.org/10.11117/rdp.v20i107.7288

Spulber, D. F. (2022). Antitrust and Innovation Competition. *Journal of Antitrust Enforcement*, *11*(1), 5-50. https://doi.org/10.1093/jaenfo/jnac013

Wu, Y. (2023). Is Data-Monopoly Banned by Antitrust Law? Antitrust and Digital Economy in the US: Ideas, Institutions, Decisions and Impacts, 1998-2023. *Studies in Social Science & Humanities*, *2*(3), 37-49. https://doi.org/10.56397/sssh.2023.03.06