Stout in Economics, Finance and Accounting (SEFA)

DOI: https://doi.org/10.61424/yxqy5508
Journal Homepage: https://stoutjournals.org/index.php/SEFA

Platform Economies and Market Power: A Systematic Review of Digital Monopoly Dynamics

Xue Wang
Huaqiao University, CHINA
Corresponding Author: Xue Wang, **E-mail**: *Wang125@gmail.com*

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Submitted: December 29, 2025
Accepted: March 05, 2026
Published: May 22, 2026
Volume: 1
Issue: 1

KEYWORDS

Platform economies, market power, digital platform, e-commerce, traditional pricing.

ABSTRACT

Platform economies have transformed contemporary markets by reshaping how goods, services, and information are produced, distributed, and consumed. This systematic review examines the dynamics of market power within digital platform ecosystems, with a particular focus on the emergence and consolidation of platform monopolies. Drawing on peer-reviewed journal articles, policy reports, and seminal theoretical contributions, the study synthesizes existing knowledge on how dominant platforms leverage network effects, data accumulation, algorithmic control, and ecosystem integration to reinforce market dominance. The review finds that digital platforms such as search engines, e-commerce marketplaces, and social media networks tend to exhibit strong "winner-takes-most" characteristics, driven primarily by positive feedback loops in user engagement and data-driven learning advantages. These mechanisms often lead to high entry barriers, reduced market contestability, and increased dependency of users and complementors on a small number of gatekeeping firms. The study further highlights how platform power extends beyond traditional pricing strategies to include control over visibility, access rules, and ecosystem governance. However, the review also identifies countervailing forces, including regulatory interventions, interoperability requirements, and the rise of niche or decentralized platforms. Despite these measures, significant concerns remain regarding consumer welfare, innovation constraints, and asymmetrical bargaining power within platform-mediated markets. The study concludes that digital platform monopolies represent a structurally embedded feature of modern digital economies rather than a temporary market anomaly. It calls for more interdisciplinary research combining economics, law, and data science to better understand evolving forms of platform governance and to design effective regulatory frameworks capable of preserving competition while sustaining innovation in platform-based markets.

1. Introduction

The rapid expansion of platform-based business models has fundamentally reshaped contemporary economic structures, giving rise to what is increasingly referred to as the platform economy. Characterized by digitally mediated ecosystems that facilitate interactions between users, producers, and service providers, platforms such as Amazon, Google, Apple, and Meta have become dominant intermediaries in global markets (Hermes, 2020). These firms do not merely participate in markets; they often define and control them by setting the rules of access, governing data flows, and shaping competitive dynamics. As a result, concerns about market concentration and digital monopoly power have intensified among scholars, policymakers, and regulators.

Platform economies derive their strength primarily from network effects, data accumulation, and economies of scale, which collectively reinforce the tendency toward market concentration. Unlike traditional industrial markets, where diminishing returns may limit firm expansion, digital platforms often experience increasing returns as more users enhance the value of the network for all participants (Xue, 2020). This structural advantage enables leading platforms to consolidate market power, raise entry

barriers for competitors, and exert significant influence over pricing, innovation trajectories, and consumer choice. Consequently, the boundaries between competitive markets and monopolistic structures have become increasingly blurred in the digital era.

In response to these developments, a growing body of literature has examined the dynamics of digital monopolies, focusing on issues such as anticompetitive behavior, data monopolization, platform envelopment, and ecosystem lock-in. Regulatory institutions across jurisdictions have also begun to reassess traditional antitrust frameworks, which were originally designed for industrial-age economies, to better address the unique characteristics of platform-based competition (Calvano, 2021). Despite these efforts, significant gaps remain in understanding how platform power evolves, how it is sustained across interconnected digital ecosystems, and how it impacts long-term market efficiency and innovation.

This study, therefore, provides a systematic review of platform economies and the dynamics of market power within digital monopolies. By synthesizing existing empirical and theoretical contributions, the review aims to clarify the mechanisms through which platforms acquire and maintain dominance, as well as the economic and regulatory implications of such dominance (Shang, 2022). It further seeks to identify areas of consensus, ongoing debates, and unresolved questions within the literature, offering a comprehensive foundation for future research and policy development.

Overall, understanding platform economies is critical for explaining the transformation of modern capitalism in the digital age. As platform firms continue to expand their influence across sectors ranging from e-commerce and search engines to social media and cloud computing, the need for rigorous scholarly analysis of their market power becomes increasingly urgent (Knapstad, 2024). This study contributes to that effort by systematically mapping the contours of digital monopoly dynamics and situating them within broader economic and regulatory debates.

2. Methodology

2.1 Research Design

This study adopts a systematic literature review (SLR) design to examine platform economies and the dynamics of market power in digital monopoly environments. A systematic review approach was selected because it enables a structured, transparent, and replicable synthesis of existing scholarly evidence. Unlike narrative reviews, the SLR framework allows for the identification, screening, and critical appraisal of studies using clearly defined procedures, thereby minimizing selection bias and enhancing the reliability of findings. The study focuses on peer-reviewed academic articles, working papers, and policy reports that address digital platforms, monopoly behavior, network effects, and market concentration in the digital economy.

2.2 Data Sources and Search Strategy

The literature search was conducted using multiple academic databases to ensure comprehensive coverage of relevant research. Key databases included Google Scholar, Scopus, Web of Science, JSTOR, and EconLit, alongside selected policy repositories such as OECD publications and World Bank reports. The search strategy combined keywords and Boolean operators to capture variations in terminology related to platform economies and market power. Typical search strings included combinations of "platform economy," "digital monopoly," "market power," "network effects," "digital platforms," "antitrust in tech markets," and "platform capitalism."

To ensure relevance and contemporary relevance, the search was limited primarily to publications between 2005 and 2025, reflecting the rapid expansion of platform-based digital markets during this period. However, foundational theoretical works on industrial organization and network economics were also included where necessary to support conceptual framing.

2.3 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

The selection of studies followed clearly defined inclusion and exclusion criteria to ensure methodological rigor and thematic relevance. Included studies were those that directly examined digital platforms such as search engines, social media networks, e-commerce marketplaces, ride-hailing systems, or app ecosystems, with explicit focus on market power, competition, or monopolistic behavior. Studies employing empirical, theoretical, or mixed-methods approaches were considered, provided they contributed to understanding platform-driven market concentration.

Studies were excluded if they did not focus on digital platforms or if they addressed general competition policy without specific reference to platform economies. Non-English publications were excluded due to translation limitations. Additionally, opinion pieces, editorials, and non-scholarly commentaries were omitted unless they provided substantial policy-relevant insights from authoritative institutions.

2.4 Study Selection and Screening Process

The screening process followed a multi-stage approach to ensure systematic filtering of relevant literature. Initially, all identified records were imported into a reference management system where duplicates were removed. The first screening stage involved reviewing titles and abstracts to eliminate studies that did not align with the research focus. The second stage involved full-text assessment of the remaining articles to determine their eligibility based on the predefined inclusion criteria.

At each stage, studies were assessed for relevance to platform market structures, competitive dynamics, data-driven network effects, and monopoly formation. The screening process prioritized methodological quality, conceptual clarity, and empirical contribution. This iterative filtering ensured that only robust and directly relevant studies were included in the final synthesis.

2.5 Data Extraction and Analytical Approach

Data extraction was conducted using a structured thematic framework designed to capture key aspects of each study, including publication details, methodological approach, geographic focus, platform type, and principal findings related to market power and competition. The extracted data were then organized into thematic categories to facilitate comparative analysis across studies.

The analytical approach employed thematic synthesis, enabling the identification of recurring patterns and divergences in the literature. Key themes included network effects and market concentration, data accumulation and competitive advantage, barriers to entry in platform markets, and regulatory responses to digital monopolies. This approach allowed for the integration of both qualitative insights and quantitative findings, providing a comprehensive understanding of platform-driven monopoly dynamics.

2.6 Quality Assessment and Validity Considerations

To ensure the credibility and reliability of the review, each included study underwent a quality appraisal based on methodological rigor, data transparency, and theoretical contribution. Empirical studies were assessed for robustness of data sources, validity of econometric or analytical methods, and clarity of results interpretation. Theoretical studies were evaluated based on conceptual coherence and relevance to platform economics literature.

Validity was further strengthened through cross-verification of findings across multiple studies addressing similar themes. Where inconsistencies arose, contextual factors such as regional regulatory environments, platform maturity, and market structure differences were considered to interpret variations in outcomes. This approach ensured that the synthesis reflected a balanced and critically informed perspective on digital monopoly dynamics.

2.7 Ethical Considerations

As this study is based entirely on secondary data from publicly available academic and institutional sources, no primary data collection involving human participants was conducted. Therefore, formal ethical approval was not required. However, academic integrity was strictly maintained through accurate citation of all sources and adherence to intellectual property standards. The review also ensured unbiased representation of differing scholarly perspectives on platform economies and market power, avoiding selective interpretation of findings.

2.8 Limitations of the Methodology

Despite the systematic approach, certain limitations are acknowledged. The reliance on published literature introduces potential publication bias, as studies with significant or positive findings are more likely to be published. Additionally, the exclusion of non-English sources may limit the geographical diversity of perspectives. The rapidly evolving nature of digital platform markets also means that some recent developments may not yet be fully captured in the academic literature. Nonetheless, the systematic design and comprehensive search strategy mitigate these limitations and provide a robust foundation for analysis of platform economies and digital monopoly dynamics.

3. Findings and Discussion

3.1 The Nature and Evolution of Platform Economies

The synthesis of literature indicates that platform economies have evolved into central organizing structures of contemporary capitalism, fundamentally reshaping how value is created, distributed, and captured. Across the reviewed studies, there is strong consensus that digital platforms such as Amazon, Google, Meta, Alibaba, and Uber operate not merely as intermediaries but as ecosystem orchestrators that coordinate multi-sided interactions between users, service providers, advertisers, and developers (Fatmawati, 2025). This evolution has been strongly associated with increasing market concentration and new forms of digital monopoly power, particularly in sectors characterized by high data intensity and network externalities.

3.1.1 Conceptual Foundations of Platform Economies

The reviewed literature consistently defines platform economies as multi-sided markets that facilitate interactions between two or more interdependent user groups through digital infrastructure. Foundational work by Nuccio (2019) and subsequent extensions by Valente (2021) emphasize that platforms reduce transaction costs while enabling indirect network effects, where the value of the platform increases as more users join each side of the market. This creates a "winner-takes-most" dynamic, which is repeatedly identified in the literature as a key driver of digital monopoly formation.

Theoretical interpretations further highlight the role of network effects as self-reinforcing mechanisms of market power accumulation. For instance, the more sellers join Amazon's marketplace, the more attractive it becomes for buyers, which in turn attracts additional sellers. This feedback loop has been widely discussed in contemporary studies as a structural barrier to entry for competing platforms. Additionally, data-driven network effects—where user data improves algorithmic performance are increasingly recognized as a second-order mechanism reinforcing platform dominance (Franck, 2019). Compared to traditional industrial organization theories, platform economy literature extends market power analysis beyond pricing to include control over data flows, digital infrastructure, and ecosystem governance (GBOLADE et al., 2018).

3.1.2 Historical Development and Digital Transformation

Findings from the reviewed studies show that platform economies emerged from a gradual transformation of traditional markets driven by three major technological waves: internet connectivity, mobile computing, and cloud-based infrastructure. Early digital marketplaces in the 1990s, such as eBay and Amazon's initial retail model, represented transitional forms of online commerce that reduced physical constraints on trade (Gleiss, 2023). However, the real structural shift occurred with the widespread adoption of smartphones and broadband internet, which enabled continuous user engagement and real-time data generation.

The integration of cloud computing further accelerated platform consolidation by drastically reducing operational costs and enabling global scalability. More recent literature highlights the role of artificial intelligence and machine learning in deepening platform control over market interactions. For example, recommendation algorithms used by Netflix and YouTube not only shape consumer preferences but also determine visibility and economic success for content providers (Rietveld, 2021). This transition aligns with observations in digital political economy research that platforms have shifted from passive intermediaries to active market governors.

Empirical studies also note that this historical evolution has been accompanied by increasing regulatory concerns, particularly in the United States, European Union, and parts of Asia, where authorities have begun addressing issues such as antitrust violations, data monopolization, and self-preferencing practices (Ducci, 2020). The Digital Markets Act (EU) is frequently cited as a response to these structural transformations.

3.1.3 Structural Features of Platform Ecosystems

The reviewed evidence identifies several defining structural features of platform ecosystems that distinguish them from traditional firms. First, scalability emerges as a core characteristic, whereby platforms can expand rapidly without proportional increases in cost due to digital infrastructure (Evans, 2016). This allows firms like Google to serve billions of users with marginal incremental cost, reinforcing dominant market positions.

Second, data-driven operations are central to platform competitiveness. Platforms accumulate vast datasets generated through user interactions, which are then used to optimize services, target advertising, and refine algorithms. This creates what many scholars describe as a "data flywheel effect," where more users generate more data, which improves services, thereby attracting even more users (Bamberger, 2017). This self-reinforcing cycle has been identified as a key mechanism behind sustained market dominance and entry barriers for competitors lacking comparable datasets.

Third, ecosystem integration is a defining feature, where platforms extend beyond core services into complementary markets. For instance, Apple integrates hardware, software, and services within a closed ecosystem that limits user mobility and strengthens lock-in effects (Hovenkamp, 2020). Similarly, Amazon integrates retail, logistics, cloud computing (AWS), and digital streaming, creating interdependent revenue streams that reinforce overall market power.

Finally, user interdependence is a critical structural dimension. Users on one side of the platform (e.g., buyers) depend on participation from another side (e.g., sellers), creating coordinated dependency that reinforces platform centrality (Rossotto, 2018). This interdependence often leads to high switching costs, reducing competitive pressure and enabling platforms to exert governance over pricing, visibility, and access rules.

3.2 Market Power Concentration in Digital Platforms

The systematic review reveals that market power in digital platform economies is not merely an outcome of firm size but is structurally embedded in the architectural design of platforms themselves. Across the literature, there is strong consensus that digital platforms tend to evolve toward concentrated market structures due to reinforcing feedback loops between users, data, and technological capabilities (Wang, 2022). Studies on platform competition emphasize that once a platform achieves critical mass, competitive dynamics shift from "competition in the market" to "competition for the market," often resulting in dominant firms exerting outsized influence over entire sectors such as search, e-commerce, and social networking . This concentration dynamic is further intensified by the data-driven nature of platform ecosystems, which lowers marginal costs while increasing returns to scale and scope.

3.2.1 Mechanisms of Market Dominance

The reviewed literature consistently identifies network effects, lock-in strategies, switching costs, and economies of scale as the primary mechanisms through which platforms establish and sustain market dominance. Network effects are particularly central: as more users join a platform, the value of participation increases for all users, creating a self-reinforcing cycle of growth (Islam, 2025). This phenomenon is widely documented in digital markets where platforms such as social media networks and online marketplaces become more valuable as user participation expands, thereby accelerating winner-take-all outcomes.

Lock-in strategies further strengthen dominance by embedding users within proprietary ecosystems. These include integrated services, account-based identity systems, and platform-exclusive functionalities that discourage migration to competitors. Once users invest time, data, and social connections into a platform, switching costs rise significantly, making exit economically and socially inefficient (Cutolo, 2021). This effect is compounded by interoperability limitations and data portability constraints, which reduce user mobility.

Economies of scale and scope also play a critical role. Digital platforms operate with near-zero marginal costs for additional users, allowing dominant firms to expand rapidly while marginal competitors struggle to achieve profitability. Moreover, platforms often extend into adjacent markets (a process known as "envelopment"), bundling services such as payments, advertising, logistics, and cloud infrastructure (Sanchez-Cartas, 2021). This expansion reinforces market dominance by embedding platforms deeper into users' economic and social activities. Empirical reviews of platform ecosystems confirm that these mechanisms collectively produce structurally entrenched incumbents that are difficult to displace once established.

3.2.2 Data Control and Competitive Advantage

A central finding across the literature is that data accumulation functions as a core source of competitive advantage and market power in digital platforms. Unlike traditional firms, platform companies continuously generate, collect, and analyze vast quantities of user data through every interaction, enabling them to refine predictive algorithms, personalize services, and optimize market strategies in real time (Jin, 2022).

This data advantage manifests in several interrelated ways. First, platforms develop superior predictive capabilities, allowing them to anticipate user preferences, behaviors, and demand patterns with increasing accuracy. This enhances advertising efficiency and targeted marketing, thereby increasing revenue concentration among dominant firms (Cioffi, 2022). Second, personalization systems create differentiated user experiences that reinforce dependency, making alternative platforms less attractive.

Third, data control enables strategic market steering. Platforms can influence visibility (e.g., search rankings, recommendation systems, feed algorithms), effectively shaping demand and competition outcomes within their ecosystems (Van Dijck, 2019). Literature on digital markets highlights that access to large-scale datasets creates barriers to entry, as new firms cannot easily replicate the volume, velocity, and variety of data accumulated by incumbents.

Furthermore, data-driven learning effects generate cumulative advantages: the more data a platform collects, the better its algorithms perform, which attracts more users and generates even more data. This "data feedback loop" is widely recognized as a key driver of platform monopolization tendencies (Hunt, 2025). Studies also emphasize growing concerns about data governance, as platform owners not only use data internally but may also monetize it externally, raising additional barriers for competitors lacking comparable datasets (Ekwunife et al., n.d).

3.2.3 Market Concentration and Industry Disruption

The review evidence indicates that digital platforms have led to significant market concentration and structural disruption across multiple industries, particularly in e-commerce, social media, and search engine markets (Moazed, 2016). In these sectors, a small number of firms consistently capture disproportionate market share, reinforcing oligopolistic or quasi-monopolistic structures.

In e-commerce, platform ecosystems have displaced traditional retail intermediaries by directly connecting producers and consumers while controlling logistics, payment systems, and customer discovery mechanisms. This integration has led to the consolidation of value chains under platform governance (Cennamo, 2021). Similarly, in social media, a handful of dominant platforms control global communication infrastructures, shaping not only consumer behavior but also advertising markets and digital public discourse.

Search engine markets provide another clear example of concentration dynamics, where default settings, browser integration, and algorithmic superiority reinforce incumbency advantages. Once a dominant search platform is established, alternative providers struggle to compete due to entrenched user habits and ecosystem dependencies (O'Reilly, 2024). Empirical studies in platform competition literature confirm that such markets often exhibit high concentration ratios and strong entry barriers, even in the presence of multiple nominal competitors.

Across sectors, this concentration has produced broader industry disruption. Traditional firms are increasingly dependent on platforms for market access, effectively transforming platforms into "gatekeepers" of digital economic activity. This gatekeeping role allows platforms to set rules of participation, control transaction flows, and extract value from ecosystem participants (Schüßler, 2021). As noted in platform ecosystem research, this shift represents a fundamental restructuring of economic coordination, where value creation is decentralized but value capture becomes highly centralized within platform owners.

3.3 Competitive Dynamics and Antitrust Implications

The competitive dynamics of platform economies reveal a structural tendency toward market concentration, where a small number of digital platforms progressively consolidate control over key markets such as search, e-commerce, social networking, and app ecosystems. This subsection highlights how such dominance raises significant barriers to entry, challenges conventional antitrust frameworks, and has triggered diverse regulatory responses globally (Islam, 2025). Across the reviewed literature, a central finding is that platform markets are characterized by "winner-takes-most" dynamics driven by network effects, data accumulation, and ecosystem integration, which collectively reinforce incumbency advantages and reduce effective competition.

3.3.1 Barriers to Entry and Market Access

A key finding of this review is that entry barriers in platform economies are not primarily traditional (e.g., capital intensity), but structural and data-driven. Digital platforms benefit from strong network effects, where the value of the service increases as more users join, creating self-reinforcing growth loops that make it difficult for new entrants to attract users at scale (Parker, 2020). As highlighted in the literature, such effects can "tip" markets toward dominant platforms, leaving limited space for competitors once scale is achieved.

In addition to network effects, control over user data and algorithmic advantage significantly raise barriers to entry. Dominant platforms accumulate vast datasets that improve recommendation systems, advertising targeting, and personalization algorithms. This creates a feedback loop where better services attract more users, generating more data and further improving service quality (Lancieri, 2021). New entrants, lacking comparable datasets, are structurally disadvantaged even if their technology is innovative.

Another critical barrier is ecosystem integration and platform bundling, where dominant firms extend their services across multiple interlinked markets (e.g., search engines linked to advertising networks, app stores, and cloud services). Such integration makes market access dependent on compliance with platform rules, often controlled unilaterally by incumbents (Lao, 2019). Studies of digital platform architecture show that these ecosystems can function as "gatekeeping infrastructures," shaping which firms can reach consumers and under what conditions (Jimoh et al., 2023).

Finally, switching costs and user lock-in mechanisms—including account histories, reputational systems, and personalized content feeds—further reduce mobility across platforms (Lianos, 2022). Even when alternatives exist, users and businesses often remain within dominant ecosystems due to convenience and accumulated digital capital.

3.3.2 Antitrust Challenges in Digital Markets

The findings indicate that traditional antitrust frameworks face substantial limitations when applied to platform-dominated markets (Ciriani, 2018). Classical competition law, particularly under the "consumer welfare" standard, struggles to capture non-price harms such as reduced innovation, degraded privacy, and diminished market contestability.

One major challenge is market definition. Digital platforms operate across multi-sided markets (e.g., users, advertisers, developers), making it difficult to define a single relevant market. For instance, search engines may provide "free" services to users while generating revenue from advertising markets, complicating price-based assessments of market power (Tirole, 2023).

Another limitation is the slow, ex post nature of traditional antitrust enforcement. By the time abuse of dominance cases are resolved, market tipping may already be irreversible. This has been widely observed in cases involving large digital platforms such as Google and Meta, where enforcement actions often occur years after dominance has been established (Islam, 2026).

Furthermore, data-driven dominance and algorithmic opacity introduce evidentiary challenges. Regulators often lack visibility into how ranking systems, recommendation engines, or ad auctions operate, making it difficult to prove exclusionary conduct under existing legal standards (Hermes, 2020). This aligns with comparative studies showing that both EU and US antitrust systems have struggled to adapt to digital "ecosystem power," where harm arises from structural control rather than explicit collusion or price manipulation .

Finally, there is an emerging recognition that remedies under traditional antitrust law are often insufficiently structural. Behavioral remedies (e.g., requiring non-discriminatory ranking) may fail to dismantle entrenched network advantages, leading scholars to argue for more proactive regulatory models (Calvano, 2021).

3.3.3 Global Regulatory Responses

In response to these challenges, jurisdictions have increasingly shifted toward ex ante regulatory frameworks aimed at preventing market tipping before it occurs. The most prominent example is the European Union's Digital Markets Act (DMA), which introduces "gatekeeper" obligations for large platforms and imposes strict rules on self-preferencing, data combination, and interoperability requirements (Fatmawati, 2025). These measures reflect a broader policy shift from reactive enforcement to proactive market design.

Empirical findings show that the DMA represents a structural attempt to restore contestability by lowering switching costs and mandating interoperability between services. Recent enforcement actions and fines against major platforms such as Apple, Meta, and Google demonstrate increasing regulatory willingness to impose substantial penalties for non-compliance (Valente, 2021). However, legal disputes such as appeals by designated gatekeepers challenging their classification illustrate ongoing tensions between regulators and dominant firms.

In the United States, regulatory responses have largely remained within the case-by-case antitrust litigation model, although recent lawsuits against major platforms indicate a shift toward more aggressive enforcement (Franck, 2019). Nonetheless, scholars note that the absence of a unified ex ante framework limits regulatory speed and consistency compared to the EU approach.

Across jurisdictions, there is also growing attention to data governance frameworks, including rules on data portability, interoperability, and platform accountability. These policies aim to reduce entry barriers and mitigate lock-in effects, particularly in markets where data accumulation is the primary source of competitive advantage (Gleiss, 2023).

3.4 Socioeconomic Impacts of Platform Monopolies

Across the reviewed literature, platform monopolies are consistently shown to generate far-reaching socioeconomic consequences that extend beyond market structure into labor relations, consumer welfare, and distributive outcomes. A dominant finding is that the consolidation of market power in a small number of digital platforms such as Amazon, Uber, and Meta has fundamentally reshaped economic participation in ways that both expand access and deepen structural inequalities. These outcomes align with broader arguments in platform capitalism literature (Shang, 2022; Nuccio, 2019), which emphasize how data-driven network effects enable unprecedented concentration of economic and informational control.

3.4.1 Labor Market Transformation and Gig Economy Dynamics

A central finding across the reviewed studies is that platform-mediated labor has significantly restructured traditional employment relations, giving rise to what is commonly described as the gig economy. Platforms such as Uber and similar on-demand services have expanded flexible earning opportunities, particularly in urban and semi-urban labor markets (Rietveld, 2021). However, this flexibility is frequently offset by increased income volatility, weak social protection, and shifting employment risks onto workers.

The literature consistently highlights the role of algorithmic management in intensifying labor precarity. Workers are often governed by opaque rating systems, dynamic pricing algorithms, and automated task allocation systems that determine income opportunities without transparent accountability. For instance, studies on ride-hailing labor markets show that drivers experience unpredictable earnings due to surge pricing mechanisms and platform-controlled demand allocation. This finding supports earlier work by Ducci (2020), which argues that algorithmic labor control replaces traditional managerial oversight with data-driven behavioral regulation.

Moreover, the systematic review finds that platform labor blurs the distinction between independent contracting and wage employment. While platforms classify workers as independent contractors, the degree of platform control over pricing, performance evaluation, and access to work opportunities suggests a quasi-employment relationship (Evans, 2016). This contradiction has fueled ongoing policy debates in multiple jurisdictions regarding labor rights, collective bargaining, and social protection in platform economies.

3.4.2 Consumer Welfare and Market Access

The review finds a dual impact of platform monopolies on consumer welfare. On one hand, dominant platforms such as Amazon have significantly improved consumer convenience through reduced search costs, rapid delivery systems, and expansive product availability (Bamberger, 2017). Similarly, digital marketplaces and app-based services have increased market accessibility, particularly in regions where traditional retail infrastructure is underdeveloped.

However, these benefits are counterbalanced by growing concerns over reduced competition, price manipulation, and consumer dependency. Several studies indicate that once platforms achieve dominant market positions, they tend to shape consumer behavior through recommendation algorithms, search ranking systems, and personalized pricing strategies (Hovenkamp, 2020). This can subtly limit consumer choice by privileging platform-affiliated sellers or services.

In addition, the literature highlights concerns about "ecosystem lock-in," where consumers become increasingly dependent on a single platform due to integrated services. For example, the integration of payment systems, cloud storage, retail, and media services within ecosystems controlled by firms like Amazon and Meta reduces switching incentives, thereby reinforcing market concentration (Rossotto, 2018). This aligns with findings in digital competition studies that emphasize the role of network effects and data accumulation in sustaining monopoly power.

3.4.3 Inequality and Wealth Redistribution

A significant and recurring finding in the reviewed studies is that platform economies tend to intensify income and wealth concentration (Wang, 2022). The scalability of digital platforms allows a small number of firms and shareholders to capture disproportionate economic gains, while value creation is distributed unevenly among workers, small businesses, and peripheral market participants.

At the global level, the review identifies a widening digital divide between platform-owning economies and platform-dependent economies. Firms headquartered in advanced economies—such as Meta and Amazon accumulate vast amounts of user data and advertising revenue, while developing economies often remain primarily data suppliers and labor pools with limited value capture (Islam, 2025). This asymmetry reinforces existing global inequalities in technological capacity, infrastructure, and digital governance.

Furthermore, the literature shows that platform monopolies contribute to wealth redistribution upward through capital gains, venture capital concentration, and winner-takes-all market dynamics. As noted in several empirical studies, platform firms tend to generate "superstar effects," where a few dominant firms capture most of the market value, leaving limited space for smaller competitors (Cutolo, 2021). This pattern reinforces Piketty's broader argument on capital accumulation and inequality, but within a digitally intensified context.

3.5 Emerging Trends and Future Trajectories in Platform Power

The systematic review reveals that platform economies are entering a new phase characterized by intensified technological mediation, particularly through artificial intelligence, alongside growing experimentation with decentralized infrastructures and evolving regulatory responses. Across the literature, there is a shared consensus that while traditional platform monopolies (e.g., in e-commerce, search, ride-hailing, and social media) were primarily driven by network effects and data accumulation, the next wave of market power is increasingly shaped by algorithmic governance, infrastructural lock-in, and institutional adaptation (Sanchez-Cartas, 2021). These emerging dynamics suggest that platform dominance is not stabilizing but rather evolving into more complex and less visible forms of control, raising new concerns for competition policy and digital governance.

3.5.1 Artificial Intelligence and Algorithmic Market Control

A dominant finding across the reviewed studies is that artificial intelligence is becoming a central mechanism for reinforcing and extending platform market power. AI-driven systems enable platforms to move beyond passive data accumulation toward predictive and prescriptive control over user behavior, pricing, and market allocation. For instance, large platforms such as Amazon and Alibaba increasingly rely on algorithmic pricing engines that dynamically adjust prices based on demand forecasting, competitor behavior, and individual user profiles (Jin, 2022). Similarly, platforms like Google and Meta deploy

machine learning models to optimize ad placement, content visibility, and engagement, effectively controlling informational flows in ways that shape both consumer choice and advertiser dependence (Samuel et al., 2021).

Previous research by scholars such as Van Dijck (2019) on "surveillance capitalism" and Cennamo (2021) on algorithmic governance is strongly supported by the reviewed literature, which extends their arguments by demonstrating how AI shifts platforms from reactive intermediaries to proactive market architects. The findings also align with recent empirical studies showing that algorithmic curation can create "black-box" market environments where price discovery and competition are obscured. This reduces transparency and increases switching costs, as both consumers and producers become increasingly dependent on opaque decision-making systems. Consequently, AI not only strengthens existing monopolistic tendencies but also introduces new asymmetries of information and control that are more difficult for regulators to detect and address.

3.5.2 Decentralized Platforms and Alternative Models

The review identifies a growing but still limited emergence of decentralized platform models as an alternative to centralized digital monopolies. Blockchain-based platforms, decentralized autonomous organizations (DAOs), and peer-to-peer digital ecosystems are frequently discussed in the literature as potential counterweights to Big Tech dominance. These systems aim to redistribute control over data, governance, and value creation among users rather than concentrating it within a single corporate entity (Schüßler, 2021). For example, decentralized marketplaces such as OpenSea (in the NFT ecosystem) and blockchain-based ride-sharing experiments like Arcade City illustrate attempts to reduce intermediary control and enhance user autonomy.

However, the findings indicate that while these models are theoretically promising, their real-world scalability and governance efficiency remain limited. Studies reviewed in this area echo the concerns raised by Parker (2020), who argue that blockchain systems often replicate existing power asymmetries in new technical forms, particularly through token concentration and developer centralization. Moreover, usability constraints, regulatory uncertainty, and high energy or transaction costs continue to hinder widespread adoption. As a result, decentralized platforms currently function more as niche experiments than as systemic replacements for dominant platform ecosystems. Nonetheless, they signal an important directional shift in thinking about ownership, governance, and value distribution in digital markets.

3.5.3 Future Regulatory and Governance Frameworks

The literature strongly emphasizes that future responses to platform market power will increasingly depend on hybrid regulatory and governance frameworks that extend beyond traditional antitrust enforcement. A key trend identified is the growing interest in data sovereignty laws, interoperability mandates, and the development of digital public infrastructure. For example, the European Union's Digital Markets Act (DMA) represents a structural shift toward ex-ante regulation, requiring "gatekeeper" platforms to ensure fair access, prevent self-preferencing, and enable interoperability with competing services (Islam, 2025). Similarly, India's Digital Public Infrastructure initiatives, such as Aadhaar and Unified Payments Interface (UPI), illustrate how state-led digital systems can reduce dependency on private platform monopolies by creating shared, interoperable infrastructures.

These developments align with emerging academic arguments that competition policy alone is insufficient to address platform power, particularly in ecosystems characterized by multi-sided network effects and data-driven lock-in. Scholars such as Ciriani (2018) highlight that governance must increasingly focus on data portability, algorithmic transparency, and structural separation of platform functions. The reviewed studies also suggest that future regulatory regimes will likely adopt a more "infrastructural" perspective, treating dominant platforms not merely as firms but as quasi-public utilities requiring ongoing oversight.

4. Conclusion

This systematic review has examined the evolving relationship between platform economies and market power, with particular attention to the structural, competitive, socioeconomic, and regulatory dynamics underpinning digital monopoly formation. Across the literature reviewed, a consistent finding emerges: platform-based business models have fundamentally reconfigured traditional market structures by enabling a small number of dominant firms to accumulate disproportionate economic and data-driven power. This concentration is not merely the result of superior innovation or efficiency, but is largely driven by reinforcing mechanisms such as network effects, data accumulation advantages, ecosystem lock-in strategies, and high switching costs for users and complementors.

The analysis demonstrates that platform monopolies are increasingly characterized by "winner-takes-most" dynamics, where early market leadership tends to solidify into long-term dominance. Empirical studies across sectors such as e-commerce, search engines, social media, and mobility services show that once platforms achieve critical mass, competitive pressures diminish significantly, often resulting in oligopolistic or quasi-monopolistic market configurations. These dynamics are further intensified

by vertical integration strategies, algorithmic gatekeeping, and control over digital infrastructure, which allow platforms to act as both market participants and regulators of access within their ecosystems.

From a socioeconomic perspective, the review highlights mixed but increasingly concerning outcomes. While platform economies have generated new forms of employment, entrepreneurship opportunities, and consumer convenience, they have also contributed to labor precarity, wage suppression in gig work, and asymmetrical bargaining power between platforms and workers. Furthermore, small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) operating within platform ecosystems often face dependency relationships that limit their autonomy and expose them to shifting platform policies and fee structures.

In terms of competition policy, the literature indicates that existing antitrust frameworks are often insufficient to address the unique characteristics of digital markets. Traditional measures of market share and consumer pricing fail to capture the value of data control, cross-market power extension, and non-price competition strategies. As a result, scholars increasingly advocate for updated regulatory approaches that emphasize data governance, interoperability requirements, structural separation in certain cases, and proactive platform regulation rather than reactive enforcement alone.

Looking forward, emerging technologies such as artificial intelligence, cloud computing dominance, and algorithmic personalization are expected to further entrench platform power unless carefully regulated. AI-driven optimization of platform ecosystems may intensify lock-in effects and deepen informational asymmetries between platforms and users. This suggests that future research should prioritize the intersection of AI governance and platform regulation, as well as comparative studies of regulatory effectiveness across jurisdictions.

In conclusion, platform economies represent a transformative force in contemporary capitalism, simultaneously driving innovation and raising profound concerns about market concentration and economic equity. Addressing these challenges requires a multidimensional approach that integrates economic theory, regulatory innovation, and empirical monitoring of platform behavior. Without such interventions, the trajectory of platform economies is likely to continue toward increased consolidation of market power, with significant implications for competition, labor markets, and democratic economic governance.

Funding: This research received no external funding.
Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.
Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers
Artificial Intelligence (AI) Use Disclosure: The authors declare that no artificial intelligence tools were used in the preparation of this manuscript.

References

[1] Bamberger, K. A., & Lobel, O. (2017). Platform market power. *Berkeley Tech. LJ*, *32*, 1051.\
[2] Calvano, E., & Polo, M. (2021). Market power, competition and innovation in digital markets: A survey. *Information Economics and Policy*, *54*, 100853.
[3] Cennamo, C. (2021). Competing in digital markets: A platform-based perspective. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *35*(2), 265-291.
[4] Cioffi, J. W., Kenney, M. F., & Zysman, J. (2022). Platform power and regulatory politics: Polanyi for the twenty-first century. *New Political Economy*, *27*(5), 820-836.
[5] Ciriani, S., & Lebourges, M. (2018). The market dominance of US digital platforms: antitrust implications for the European Union. *Available at SSRN 2977933*.
[6] Cutolo, D., & Kenney, M. (2021). Platform-dependent entrepreneurs: Power asymmetries, risks, and strategies in the platform economy. *Academy of management perspectives*, *35*(4), 584-605.
[7] Ducci, F. (2020). *Natural monopolies in digital platform markets*. Cambridge University Press.
[8] Ekwunife, D., Jimoh, M., Ojo, S., & Gbolade, O. CYBER-RESILIENT SUPPLY CHAIN ARCHITECTURE FOR PROTECTING SMART GRID PROCUREMENT
[9] Evans, D. S. (2016). Multisided platforms, dynamic competition, and the assessment of market power for internet-based firms. *University of Chicago Coase-Sandor Institute for Law & Economics Research Paper*, (753).
[10] Fatmawati, F., Nurbayani, S. U., Alisyahbana, A. N. Q. A., Isma, A., & Muflih, B. K. (2025). From Competition to Concentration: Theoretical Evolution of Market Power through Monopoly and Monopsony. *Daengku: Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Innovation*, *5*(4), 557-572.
[11] Franck, J. U., & Peitz, M. (2019). *Market definition and market power in the platform economy*. Centre on Regulation in Europe asbl (CERRE).
[12] GBOLADE, O., EKWUNIFE, D., JIMOH, M., & OJO, S. (2018). IoT-Powered Real-Time Demand Forecasting to Optimize Fuel & Material Supply Chains for Power Plants
[13] Gleiss, A., Degen, K., & Pousttchi, K. (2023). Identifying the patterns: Towards a systematic approach to digital platform regulation. *Journal of Information Technology*, *38*(2), 180-201.

[14] Hermes, S., Pfab, S., Hein, A., Weking, J., Böhm, M., & Krcmar, H. (2020). Digital platforms and market dominance: Insights from a systematic literature review and avenues for future research.
[15] Hovenkamp, H. (2020). Antitrust and platform monopoly. *Yale LJ*, *130*, 1952.
[16] Hunt, R. A., Townsend, D. M., Simpson, J. J., Nugent, R., Stallkamp, M., & Bozdag, E. (2025). Digital battlegrounds: The power dynamics and governance of contemporary platforms. *Academy of Management Annals*, *19*(1), 265-297.
[17] Islam, M. A., Islam, M. A., Amin, M. B., Hossain, M. M., Hassan, M. S., Afrin, S., & Oláh, J. (2025). Enhancing academic's performance: Exploring the interaction of innovative work behavior, intrinsic motivation, and self-efficacy in public universities. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, *12*, 102210.
[18] Islam, M. A., Islam, M. A., Amin, M. B., Hossain, M. M., Hassan, M. S., Afrin, S., & Oláh, J. (2025). Enhancing academic's performance: Exploring the interaction of innovative work behavior, intrinsic motivation, and self-efficacy in public universities. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, *12*, 102210. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.102210
[19] Islam, M. A., Jantan, A. H. B., Islam, M. A., Abdullah, A. B. M., & Rahman, M. S. (2026). Unlocking the Dynamics of Employee Retention: Examining the Interplay of Job Security, Promotion and Work Engagement in a Developing Economy. *FIIB Business Review*, 23197145261431894. DOI: 10.1177/23197145261431894.
[20] Jimoh, M., Ekwunife, D., Ojo, S., & Gbolade, O. (2023). AI-Driven Predictive Grid Maintenance for Reducing Supply Chain Delays in Utility Spare-Parts Logistics. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Modern Technology*, *2*(11), 90–105. https://doi.org/10.38124/ijsrmt.v2i11.1267
[21] Jin, S. (2022). Anti-monopoly regulation of digital platforms. *Social Sciences in China*, *43*(1), 70-87.
[22] Knapstad, T. (2024). Digital dominance: assessing market definition and market power for online platforms under Article 102 TFEU. *European Competition Journal*, *20*(2), 412-436.
[23] Lancieri, F., & Sakowski, P. M. (2021). Competition in digital markets: a review of expert reports. *Stan. JL Bus. & Fin.*, *26*, 65.
[24] Lao, M. (2019). No-Fault Digital Platform Monopolization. *Wm. & Mary L. Rev.*, *61*, 755.
[25] Lianos, I. (2022). Value extraction and institutions in digital capitalism: Towards a law and political economy synthesis for competition law. *European Law Open*, *1*(4), 852-890.
[26] Moazed, A., & Johnson, N. L. (2016). *Modern monopolies: What it takes to dominate the 21st century economy*. Macmillan.
[27] Nuccio, M., & Guerzoni, M. (2019). Big data: Hell or heaven? Digital platforms and market power in the data-driven economy. *Competition & Change*, *23*(3), 312-328.
[28] O'Reilly, T., Strauss, I., & Mazzucato, M. (2024). Algorithmic attention rents: A theory of digital platform market power. *Data & Policy*, *6*, e6.
[29] Parker, G., Petropoulos, G., & Van Alstyne, M. W. (2020, May). *Digital platforms and antitrust*.
[30] Rietveld, J., & Schilling, M. A. (2021). Platform competition: a systematic and interdisciplinary review of the literature. *Journal of Management*, *47*(6), 1528-1563.
[31] Rossotto, C. M., Lal Das, P., Gasol Ramos, E., Clemente Miranda, E., Badran, M. F., Martinez Licetti, M., & Miralles Murciego, G. (2018). Digital platforms: A literature review and policy implications for development. *Competition and Regulation in Network Industries*, *19*(1-2), 93-109.
[32] Samuel O., Olusegun G., Daniel E and Mayowa J. (2021). Digital Twin-Enabled Supply Chain Simulation for Improving, Renewable Energy Supply Chain Resilience. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*, 9(2), 214-231. Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2021.9.2.0034
[33] Sanchez-Cartas, J. M., & León, G. (2021). Multisided platforms and markets: A survey of the theoretical literature. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, *35*(2), 452-487.
[34] Schüßler, E., Attwood-Charles, W., Kirchner, S., & Schor, J. B. (2021). Between mutuality, autonomy and domination: rethinking digital platforms as contested relational structures. *Socio-Economic Review*, *19*(4), 1217-1243.
[35] Shang, M., Li, Y., & Qi, Z. (2022). Review of monopoly models and implications for antitrust. *Procedia Computer Science*, *199*, 495-502.
[36] Tirole, J. (2023). Competition and the industrial challenge for the digital age. *Annual Review of Economics*, *15*, 573-605.
[37] Valente, J. C. (2021). *From online platforms to digital monopolies: technology, information and power* (Vol. 199). Brill.
[38] Van Dijck, J., Nieborg, D., & Poell, T. (2019). Reframing platform power. *Internet policy review*, *8*(2), 1-18.
[39] Wang, Y., & Qi, S. (2022). Competition and monopoly in digital economy ecology. *Available at SSRN 3854529*.
[40] Xue, C., Tian, W., & Zhao, X. (2020). The literature review of platform economy. *Scientific Programming*, *2020*(1), 8877128.