International Journal of Web of Multidisciplinary Studies
(Peer-Reviewed, Open Access, Fully Refereed International Journal)
website: http://ijwos.com
Volume.03 Issue.01.
OPEN ACCESS
E-ISSN : 3049-2424
DOI: https://doi.org/10.71366/ijwos

PLATFORM BUSINESS MODEL DYNAMICS AND NETWORK EFFECTS IN WINNER-TAKE-ALL MARKETS

Vaishali Nikalje[1], Dr. Jayashree Vivek Patole[2], Pooja Das[3]
[1,2,3] *Assistant Professor, Ramachandran International Institute of Management, Pune.*

Article Info

Article History:

Published:31 Jan 2026

Publication Issue:
Volume 3, Issue 01
January-2026

Page Number:
754-768

Corresponding Author:
Vaishali Nikalje

Abstract:

The digital economy has witnessed unprecedented transformation through platform business models that leverage network effects to achieve market dominance. This research examines the dynamics of platform ecosystems and their tendency toward winner-take-all outcomes through comprehensive analysis of contemporary market data from 2020-2024. The study investigates how network externalities, data network effects, and ecosystem orchestration contribute to platform success, using real market data from major technology platforms including Google, Amazon, Meta, and Apple. Findings reveal that while traditional network effects theory suggests natural monopolization, emerging evidence indicates more nuanced competitive dynamics influenced by regulatory intervention, platform differentiation, and multi-homing behaviors. The research contributes to understanding modern platform competition by analyzing market concentration trends, examining the role of data in competitive advantage, and evaluating the sustainability of winner-take-all dynamics in increasingly regulated digital markets.

Keywords: Platform business models, network effects, winner-take-all markets, digital ecosystems, market concentration

1. INTRODUCTION

Platform business models have emerged as the dominant organizational form in the digital economy, fundamentally reshaping how value is created, delivered, and captured across industries. These platforms, exemplified by companies like Google, Amazon, Meta, and Apple—collectively generating over $1.5 trillion in combined revenue in 2024—operate across nearly every continent and have diversified far beyond their original market focuses. The success of these platforms is primarily attributed to network effects, where the value of the platform increases with each additional user, creating self-reinforcing growth cycles that often lead to market concentration and winner-take-all dynamics.

The concept of winner-take-all markets in platform economies has gained significant attention from researchers and policymakers alike. Markets subject to network effects are often characterized as winner-take-all because the platform with the highest market share tends to be more successful in the long run, with market share likely to grow even more substantially. This phenomenon is particularly evident in digital advertising, where Google, Meta, Amazon, and YouTube collectively hold over 50% of the global market share, demonstrating the concentrated nature of platform-mediated industries.

However, recent research suggests that the winner-take-all narrative may be more complex than previously understood. Studies indicate that online users are, on average, no better off with a single dominant platform compared to two competitors, with this net effect resulting from two counterbalancing forces: network effects and platform differentiation. This complexity necessitates a

deeper examination of platform dynamics, competitive strategies, and the role of regulation in shaping market outcomes.

1.1 *Research Objectives*

This study aims to:

- Analyze contemporary platform business model dynamics using real market data from 2020-2024
- Examine the mechanisms through which network effects drive winner-take-all outcomes
- Investigate the role of data network effects in sustaining competitive advantages
- Evaluate the impact of regulatory interventions on platform market concentration
- Assess the sustainability of winner-take-all dynamics in evolving digital markets

1.2 *Research Methodology*

This research employs a mixed-methods approach combining quantitative analysis of market data with qualitative assessment of platform strategies. Primary data sources include market research reports from established firms, financial disclosures from public companies, and academic publications from 2020-2024. The study focuses on major technology platforms to ensure data availability and relevance to winner-take-all dynamics.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 *Platform Business Model Evolution*

Platform business models represent a fundamental shift from traditional linear value chains to ecosystem-based value creation. Organizations with digital platforms in their portfolios, like Apple, Google, Amazon, and Microsoft, rank among the world's most valuable firms, as platforms simultaneously facilitate transactions between different market sides and act as innovation engines for the development and provision of platform-based applications or services. This dual role enables platforms to create exponential value through network orchestration rather than direct product creation.

The evolution of platform thinking has progressed significantly since 2020. Recent research by IESE's Llewellyn D.W. Thomas finds that simply getting more actors to participate in a platform business is no guarantee of generating positive network effects, as there could be unanticipated negative effects. This insight challenges traditional assumptions about network growth and highlights the importance of understanding different types of network interactions.

2.2 *Network Effects Typology*

Contemporary research has identified multiple dimensions of network effects that influence platform dynamics. The Network Effects Manual identifies 16 different types of network effects, including physical, protocol, personal utility, personal, and market network effects. Each type creates different competitive dynamics and barriers to entry, suggesting that winner-take-all outcomes are not uniform across platform types.

For digital industrial platforms, network effects are measured across three key dimensions: ecosystem utility, co-creation mechanisms, and platform governance structures. This multidimensional approach reveals that network effects operate differently in business-to-business versus business-to-consumer contexts, with industrial platforms showing more fragmented competitive landscapes.

2.3 *Data Network Effects*

The role of data in creating and sustaining network effects has become increasingly important. Data network effects denote that utility increases with the amount and variety of data available to the platform, leading to high barriers to entry and potential oligopoly or monopoly situations. This is particularly relevant for platforms that leverage artificial intelligence and machine learning to improve user experiences and matching algorithms.

Amazon's emergence as a dominant force in digital advertising represents the first major threat to Google and Meta in the past decade, largely due to Amazon's commanding presence in U.S. e-commerce (controlling roughly 40% as of 2024) and its unique access to consumer purchase data. This example illustrates how data network effects can enable rapid competitive repositioning even in established winner-take-all markets.

2.4 *Winner-Take-All Dynamics*

The winner-take-all hypothesis suggests that network effects create natural monopolization tendencies in platform markets. Network effects create a virtuous cycle where growth begets growth, with marginal costs of serving additional users approaching zero for digital platforms, enabling unprecedented global scaling. This mathematical relationship between user growth and value creation has been fundamental to understanding platform economics.

However, empirical evidence reveals more nuanced competitive dynamics. Research shows that industry-specific factors can hinder the winner-take-all hypothesis, reducing the effect of the installed base and thus total network size, which is consistent with the current IIoT platform market state where fragmentation persists despite network effects. This suggests that winner-take-all outcomes may be industry-dependent rather than universal platform characteristics.

3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1 *Network Effects Theory*

Network effects theory posits that the value of a product or service increases with the number of users who adopt it. In platform contexts, this relationship becomes more complex due to multi-sided market dynamics where different user groups derive value from each other's participation. The theoretical foundation rests on Metcalfe's Law, which suggests that the value of a network grows exponentially with the number of connected users.

However, recent research challenges the simple application of Metcalfe's Law to platform ecosystems. The research defines various types of platform interactions in a 2x2 matrix that charts different types of platform exchanges, helping practitioners understand competitive dynamics and potential positioning challenges. This framework suggests that the relationship between network size and value creation varies significantly across platform types and interaction patterns.

3.2 *Platform Ecosystem Orchestration*

Platform ecosystem orchestration involves the strategic coordination of multiple stakeholders to create and capture value. Literature on platform governance has evolved to recognize network-driven platform ecosystems where stakeholders share platform ownership and decision rights, as exemplified by European data spaces like Catena-X in the automotive industry. This shared governance model represents an alternative to the traditional keystone organization approach.

The orchestration challenge becomes particularly complex in emerging platform ecosystems. Network-driven platform ecosystems represent a shift in focus by allowing stakeholders to share platform ownership and decision rights, requiring interorganizational networks to coordinate themselves to jointly govern platform ecosystems. This collaborative governance model may reduce the tendency toward winner-take-all outcomes by distributing control across multiple organizations.

3.3 *Competitive Dynamics in Platform Markets*

Platform competition differs fundamentally from traditional product-based competition. Platform competition creates winner-take-all dynamics in many markets, but platforms can coexist when they serve different use cases or user segments, with differentiation through specialization, user experience, or unique supply being key to coexistence. This suggests that market segmentation and differentiation strategies can moderate winner-take-all tendencies.

Multi-homing behavior, where users participate in multiple platforms simultaneously, affects competitive dynamics significantly. Examples include drivers working for both Uber and Lyft, and sellers listing on both Amazon and eBay, requiring platforms to create switching costs or unique value to maintain user loyalty. Multi-homing reduces the exclusivity that traditionally drives winner-take-all outcomes, creating more competitive platform markets.

4. METHODOLOGY

4.1 *Research Design*

This study employs a comprehensive analytical approach combining quantitative market analysis with qualitative assessment of platform strategies and outcomes. The research design integrates multiple data sources to provide a holistic view of platform business model dynamics and network effects in winner-take-all contexts.

4.2 *Data Collection and Sources*

Primary data sources include:

- Financial reports and regulatory filings from major technology platforms (2020-2024)
- Market research reports from established research firms
- Academic publications and working papers from leading business schools
- Regulatory documents and policy reports from competition authorities
- Industry analysis reports from consulting firms and trade associations

The study focuses on major technology platforms including Google (Alphabet), Amazon, Meta, Apple, and Microsoft due to their market significance and data availability. Additional analysis includes emerging platforms and regional competitors to provide comparative context.

4.3 *Analytical Framework*

The analysis employs three complementary approaches:

- Market Structure Analysis: Examination of market concentration ratios, competitive dynamics, and entry barriers across different platform segments
- Network Effects Assessment: Quantitative analysis of user growth patterns, engagement metrics, and value creation mechanisms

- Strategic Positioning Evaluation: Qualitative assessment of competitive strategies, differentiation approaches, and ecosystem development initiatives

4.4 *Limitations*

Research limitations include:

- Reliance on publicly available data may limit access to proprietary platform metrics
- Focus on large technology platforms may not represent all platform business model variations
- Temporal scope (2020-2024) may not capture long-term competitive evolution patterns
- Regional concentration on North American and European markets may limit global applicability

5. EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

5.1 *Market Concentration Trends*

Analysis of market concentration across platform-mediated industries reveals varying degrees of winner-take-all outcomes. In digital advertising, Alphabet, Amazon, and Meta control over half of the global advertising market and continue to increase their market share. This concentration has intensified since 2020, with Meta generating over USD 160 billion in advertising revenue during 2024, representing approximately 98% of its overall revenue.

Figure 1: Digital Platform Market Concentration by Segment (2020-2024)

This figure illustrates the evolution of market concentration across key platform segments including search, social media, e-commerce, and cloud computing. The visualization shows how winner-take-all dynamics vary by industry vertical and competitive intensity.

The search market demonstrates the most pronounced winner-take-all characteristics. Google's search engine maintains a market share of roughly 90 percent, serving as the primary conduit for information access for billions of online users, with Microsoft's Bing holding only a single-digit market share. This near-monopoly position has remained stable despite emerging competitive threats from AI-powered search alternatives.

5.2 *Network Effects Quantification*

Quantitative analysis reveals the relationship between network size and platform value creation across different sectors. Amazon holds 37.6% of the U.S. e-commerce market share, significantly ahead of Walmart at 6.4% and Apple at 3.6%. This market concentration reflects strong network effects driven by seller selection, buyer liquidity, and logistical infrastructure investments.

Cloud computing markets show different competitive dynamics despite network effects. Amazon Web Services retains leading global market share with 2024 revenues exceeding $100 billion, but Amazon, Microsoft, and Google collectively account for only around two-thirds of the global cloud services market. This suggests that network effects alone do not guarantee winner-take-all outcomes when switching costs are manageable and differentiation opportunities exist.

Table 1: Platform Market Share Analysis (2024-2024)

Platform Segment	Leader	Market Share	Second Place	Market Share	Third Place	Market Share
Search Engines	Google	90.0%	Microsoft Bing	8.5%	Others	1.5%
Social Media (MAU)	Meta	3.8B users	YouTube	2.7B users	TikTok	1.5B users
E-commerce (US)	Amazon	37.6%	Walmart	6.4%	Apple	3.6%
Cloud Services	AWS	32.0%	Microsoft Azure	23.0%	Google Cloud	11.0%
Digital Advertising	Google	28.4%	Meta	13.8%	Amazon	12.1%
Mobile OS	Android	72.0%	iOS	27.0%	Others	1.0%

Note: Data compiled from various industry sources for 2024-2024 period. Market share calculations may vary by methodology and geographic scope.

5.3 *Data Network Effects Impact*

The analysis reveals that data network effects have become increasingly important in sustaining competitive advantages. Amazon's insights are based on actual purchase data rather than inferred user interests, giving advertisers a direct line to consumers who are in a buying mindset. This data advantage has enabled Amazon to achieve retail media revenue growth of 16.1% to $60.6 billion, capturing more than one-third of global retail media spending.

The emergence of AI-powered platforms has intensified data network effects. Large language model artificial intelligence tools such as OpenAI's ChatGPT present a new and different way to search, find, and retrieve information, representing the most significant challenge and disruption in the online search market. This technological shift demonstrates how data network effects can create new competitive vectors even in established winner-take-all markets.

5.4 *Regulatory Impact on Market Dynamics*

Regulatory intervention has begun to influence winner-take-all dynamics across platform markets. Policymakers worldwide express concerns about the economic power and potential distortion of competition associated with data cross-use, leading to policy interventions including data-siloing restrictions and mandated data-sharing with competitors.

The European Union's Digital Markets Act represents the most comprehensive regulatory response to platform market concentration. The DMA requires dominant platforms to offer more modularity and limit control of different ecosystem layers, potentially affecting the central mode of operation of digital platforms including openness and governance. Early evidence suggests these regulations may moderate winner-take-all tendencies by reducing barriers to entry and enabling greater platform interoperability.

5.5 *Platform Differentiation Strategies*

Analysis of competitive strategies reveals various approaches to challenging winner-take-all dynamics. Successful platform strategy is not just about the size or structure of the platform, but also the specific nature of interactions among users, with some platforms persisting in markets where others achieve winner-take-all dominance.

Specialization and niche focus represent effective differentiation strategies. Platform outcomes suggest that competition and platform variety can coexist, with benefits of network effects potentially offset by reduced competition at the market level. This finding challenges the assumption that network effects inevitably lead to market monopolization.

Figure 2: Network Effects Strength vs. Market Competition Intensity

This graph displays the relationship between network effects strength and competitive intensity across different platform segments, illustrating how market structure varies based on the type and magnitude of network externalities.

5.6 *Emerging Platform Ecosystem Models*

Recent developments in platform ecosystem governance suggest alternatives to traditional winner-take-all structures. Network-driven platform ecosystems like European data spaces distribute ownership and decision rights among stakeholders, representing a shift toward more collaborative platform governance models. The Catena-X initiative in the automotive industry, encompassing over 800 developers from more than 150 organizations, exemplifies this collaborative approach.

Industrial platforms demonstrate different competitive dynamics compared to consumer-focused platforms. The fragmented and relatively immature digital industrial platform market reflects insufficient exploitation of network effects, with intensive competition between industrial incumbents and platform natives for complementary innovation. This fragmentation suggests that winner-take-all dynamics may be less pronounced in industrial contexts due to specialized requirements and established supplier relationships.

6. DISCUSSION

6.1 *Winner-Take-All Dynamics Reconsidered*

The empirical analysis reveals that winner-take-all dynamics in platform markets are more nuanced than traditional theory suggests. While network effects remain a powerful force for market concentration, several factors moderate these tendencies:

Multi-sided Market Complexity: Platform markets involving multiple user groups with different value propositions create opportunities for specialization and differentiation. Different types of platform exchanges create varying network dynamics, with some platforms emphasizing identicality of experience while others focus on variety and heterogeneity.

Data Network Effects as Competitive Differentiators: The analysis shows that access to unique data sets can enable competitive repositioning even in established markets. Amazon's entry into digital advertising demonstrates how platform-specific data advantages can challenge existing winner-take-all positions.

Regulatory Intervention: Policy measures designed to promote competition and data portability are beginning to impact market dynamics. The early implementation of regulations like the Digital Markets Act suggests that government intervention can moderate natural monopolization tendencies in platform markets.

6.2 *Network Effects Evolution*

Contemporary network effects operate differently than originally theorized due to technological evolution and changing user behaviors:

AI-Enhanced Network Effects: Machine learning and artificial intelligence capabilities amplify traditional network effects by improving matching algorithms, personalization, and predictive capabilities. Meta's investments in advertising technology powered by AI have enabled automated campaign creation and optimization features that strengthen network effects.

Cross-Platform Network Effects: Users increasingly participate in multiple platforms simultaneously, creating network effects that span platform boundaries. This multi-homing behavior reduces the exclusivity that traditionally drives winner-take-all outcomes.

Quality vs. Quantity Trade-offs: Research highlights the importance of thinking beyond quantity in network effects analysis, emphasizing the need to consider variety and interaction quality rather than simply user numbers.

6.3 *Implications for Platform Strategy*

The findings have significant implications for platform strategy development:

Ecosystem Orchestration: Successful platforms must balance openness with control to maximize network effects while maintaining quality and security. Too much openness leads to quality problems and fraud, while too much control stifles innovation and limits growth.

Data Strategy: Platforms must develop distinctive data advantages rather than simply accumulating user numbers. The most successful platforms create unique data sets that improve user experiences and create barriers to entry.

Regulatory Compliance: Platform strategies must increasingly account for regulatory constraints and requirements for data sharing, interoperability, and user choice. Proactive compliance may become a competitive advantage.

6.4 *Market Structure Implications*

The analysis suggests that platform markets may evolve toward more competitive structures than previously anticipated:

Coexistence vs. Dominance: Evidence suggests that online users may be no better off with a single dominant platform compared to multiple competitors, with network effects potentially offset by reduced competition.

Industry-Specific Variations: Winner-take-all dynamics vary significantly across industries, with some sectors showing persistent fragmentation despite network effects. Industrial platforms, in particular, demonstrate different competitive patterns than consumer-focused platforms.

Technology-Driven Disruption: Emerging technologies like AI, blockchain, and edge computing create new competitive vectors that can disrupt established winner-take-all positions.

7. POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND REGULATORY CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 *Competition Policy Evolution*

The analysis reveals that traditional competition policy frameworks may be inadequate for platform markets characterized by network effects and data advantages. Regulatory interventions including data-siloing restrictions and mandated data-sharing represent targeted approaches to addressing competitive concerns in digital markets.

Key policy considerations include:

Data Portability Requirements: Enabling users to transfer data between platforms can reduce switching costs and moderate network effects. However, implementation challenges include technical complexity, privacy protection, and incentive alignment.

Interoperability Mandates: Requiring platforms to enable interoperability with competitors can reduce winner-take-all tendencies by allowing users to maintain relationships across platforms. The effectiveness depends on technical standards development and enforcement mechanisms.

Algorithmic Transparency: Requiring platforms to disclose algorithmic decision-making processes can help ensure fair competition and user choice. However, trade-offs exist between transparency and intellectual property protection.

7.2 *Market Structure Optimization*

The research suggests that optimal market structures may involve multiple competing platforms rather than single dominant platforms. Analysis of platform mergers indicates that users may derive greater

benefit from competition between platforms than from network effects generated by market consolidation.

Policy interventions should consider:

Merger Review Standards: Competition authorities may need enhanced analytical frameworks for evaluating platform mergers that account for network effects, data advantages, and innovation impacts.

Market Definition Challenges: Traditional market definition approaches may be inadequate for multi-sided platform markets with complex competitive interactions.

Innovation vs. Competition Trade-offs: Policies must balance the benefits of innovation and efficiency that emerge from large platforms against competitive concerns and consumer choice.

7.3 *Global Regulatory Coordination*

Platform markets are inherently global, requiring coordinated regulatory approaches. The analysis reveals different regulatory strategies across jurisdictions:

European Union: Comprehensive ex-ante regulation through the Digital Markets Act United States: Antitrust enforcement and proposed legislation focusing on specific practices Asia-Pacific: Varied approaches ranging from promotion of domestic platforms to international cooperation

Effective regulation may require greater international coordination to address cross-border platform operations and prevent regulatory arbitrage.

8. FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

8.1 *Emerging Technology Impacts*

Future research should investigate how emerging technologies affect platform competition and network effects:

Artificial Intelligence Integration: How AI capabilities change the nature of network effects and competitive advantages Blockchain and Decentralization: Whether decentralized platform models can challenge traditional winner-take-all dynamics
Edge Computing: How distributed computing architectures affect platform scalability and competitive positioning

8.2 *Long-term Market Evolution*

Longitudinal studies are needed to understand how platform markets evolve over time:

Platform Lifecycle Analysis: How competitive dynamics change as platforms mature Technology Disruption Patterns: How new technologies disrupt established platform winners User Behavior Evolution: How changing user preferences and behaviors affect network effects

8.3 *Regulatory Effectiveness Assessment*

Research is needed to evaluate the effectiveness of different regulatory approaches:

Policy Impact Studies: Quantitative assessment of regulatory interventions on market competition and innovation International Comparative Analysis: Cross-jurisdictional studies of different regulatory approaches and outcomes Industry-Specific Regulation: Analysis of how regulatory approaches should vary across different platform sectors

8.4 *Platform Ecosystem Governance*

Further investigation is needed into alternative platform governance models:

Collaborative Governance Structures: Analysis of network-driven platform ecosystems and shared ownership models Stakeholder Coordination Mechanisms: How multi-stakeholder platforms can achieve effective governance and decision-making Public-Private Platform Models: Exploration of hybrid platform models that combine public and private sector participation

9. CONCLUSIONS

This research provides comprehensive analysis of platform business model dynamics and network effects in winner-take-all markets, based on contemporary market data from 2020-2024. The findings reveal that while network effects remain a powerful force for market concentration, winner-take-all dynamics are more nuanced and contextual than traditional theory suggests.

9.1 *Key Findings*

Market Concentration Varies by Sector: Analysis reveals significant variation in winner-take-all outcomes across platform sectors. Search and social media markets show high concentration, while cloud computing and industrial platforms demonstrate more competitive structures.

Data Network Effects Drive Competitive Repositioning: Unique data advantages can enable rapid competitive repositioning even in established winner-take-all markets, as demonstrated by Amazon's success in digital advertising.

Regulatory Intervention Moderates Winner-Take-All Tendencies: Early evidence suggests that comprehensive regulatory frameworks like the Digital Markets Act may reduce barriers to entry and promote more competitive market structures.

Platform Differentiation Enables Coexistence: Specialized platforms can coexist with dominant generalist platforms by serving specific user segments or use cases, moderating winner-take-all dynamics through market segmentation.

9.2 *Theoretical Contributions*

This research contributes to platform business model theory by:

Expanding Network Effects Typology: Demonstrating that different types of network interactions create varying competitive dynamics and market outcomes.

Integrating Data Network Effects: Highlighting the role of data advantages in creating and sustaining competitive positions in platform markets.

Contextualizing Winner-Take-All Dynamics: Showing that winner-take-all outcomes depend on industry characteristics, regulatory environment, and competitive strategies.

9.3 *Practical Implications*

The findings have significant implications for platform strategy development:

Ecosystem Strategy Focus: Successful platforms must develop comprehensive ecosystem orchestration capabilities rather than simply pursuing user growth.

Data Strategy Differentiation: Platforms should focus on creating unique data advantages rather than general data accumulation.

Regulatory Compliance Integration: Platform strategies must increasingly integrate regulatory compliance as a competitive consideration.

9.4 *Policy Implications*

The research supports evidence-based policy development for platform markets:

Targeted Regulatory Intervention: Policy measures should be tailored to specific platform characteristics and market dynamics rather than applying uniform approaches.

Innovation-Competition Balance: Regulatory frameworks should balance innovation benefits from large platforms against competitive concerns and user choice.

International Coordination: Global platform markets require coordinated regulatory approaches to be effective.

9.5 *Future Research Agenda*

This research opens several avenues for future investigation:

Longitudinal Market Evolution Studies: Long-term analysis of how platform competitive dynamics evolve over technology cycles.

Regulatory Effectiveness Assessment: Quantitative evaluation of different regulatory approaches and their impact on market outcomes.

Emerging Technology Disruption Analysis: Investigation of how AI, blockchain, and other emerging technologies affect platform competition.

The digital economy continues to evolve rapidly, with platform business models at the center of economic transformation. Understanding the nuanced dynamics of network effects and winner-take-all markets is crucial for businesses, policymakers, and researchers navigating this complex landscape. This research provides a foundation for evidence-based strategy development and policy formulation in the platform economy.

References

1. Basaure, A., Töyli, J., & Mähönen, P. (2024). Regulating data platforms from a value of data approach. *Digital Policy, Regulation and Governance*, 27(3), 369-385.
2. Bjorkegren, D. (2020). Competition in Network Industry: Evidence from the Rwandan Mobile Phone Network. *Working Paper*.
3. Cennamo, C. (2019). Competing in digital markets: A platform-based perspective. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 33(2), 265-291.
4. Farronato, C., Fong, J., & Fradkin, A. (2020). Dog Eat Dog: Measuring Network Effects Using a Digital Platform Merger. *NBER Working Paper 28047*.
5. Gawer, A. (2020). Digital platforms' boundaries: The interplay of firm scope, platform sides, and digital interfaces. *Long Range Planning*, 53(4), 102045.
6. Hein, A., Schreieck, M., Riasanow, T., Setzke, D. S., Wiesche, M., Böhm, M., & Krcmar, H. (2020). Digital platform ecosystems. *Electronic Markets*, 30, 87-98.
7. Kammerlander, N., König, A., & Richards, M. (2018). Why do incumbents respond heterogeneously to disruptive innovations? The interplay of domain identity and role identity. *Journal of Management Studies*, 55(7), 1122-1165.
8. Lueth, K. L. (2019). The IoT platform market: What you need to know about the current state and future of IoT platforms. *IoT Analytics Research Report*.
9. Marheine, C., & Petrik, D. (2021). Complementor strategies in platform-based markets: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 23(4), 459-478.
10. McIntyre, D. P., & Srinivasan, A. (2017). Networks, platforms, and strategy: Emerging views and next steps. *Strategic Management Journal*, 38(1), 141-160.
11. Möller, F., Hamann, T., & Otto, B. (2024). Data spaces as enablers of multi-sided platform business models: Exploring network effects in industrial data ecosystems. *Electronic Markets*, 34, 23-41.
12. NFX Team. (2023). The Network Effects Manual: 16 Different Network Effects (and counting). Retrieved from https://www.nfx.com/post/network-effects-manual
13. Parker, G., Van Alstyne, M., & Choudary, S. P. (2016). *Platform Revolution: How Networked Markets Are Transforming the Economy and How to Make Them Work for You*. W. W. Norton & Company.
14. Pauli, T., Fielt, E., & Matzner, M. (2021). Digital industrial platforms. *Business & Information Systems Engineering*, 63(2), 181-190.
15. Petrik, D., & Herzwurm, G. (2020). IoT ecosystem development through boundary resources: A Siemens MindSphere case study. *IseB*, 18, 573-593.
16. Ritala, P. (2023). Strategic management in the era of ecosystems. *Strategic Management Journal*, 44(13), 3053-3075.
17. Schreieck, M., Wiesche, M., & Krcmar, H. (2022). Governing nonprofit platform ecosystems–An information processing perspective. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 39(2), 381-412.
18. Song, P., Xue, L., Rai, A., & Zhang, C. (2018). The ecosystem of software platform: A study of asymmetric cross-side network effects and platform governance. *MIS Quarterly*, 42(1), 121-142.
19. Thomas, L. D., Karhu, K., Heiskala, M., & Ritala, P. (2024). Managing network effects in platform business models: Getting beyond the 'more is better' mindset. *Academy of Management Perspectives*.
20. Tiwana, A. (2014). *Platform Ecosystems: Aligning Architecture, Governance, and Strategy*. Morgan Kaufmann.
21. Van Alstyne, M., Parker, G., Gawer, A., Tiwana, A., & Zhu, F. (2024). Platforms and Ecosystems. In *MIS Quarterly Research Curations*. Retrieved from https://www.misqresearchcurations.org/blog/2024/6/22/platforms-and-ecosystems

22. Warc Global Ad Trends. (2024). *Global Advertising Forecast*. Warc Limited.
23. Yoo, Y., Henfridsson, O., & Lyytinen, K. (2010). Research commentary—the new organizing logic of digital innovation: an agenda for information systems research. *Information Systems Research*, 21(4), 724-735.
24. Kumar, A. & Brar, V. (2012). Measurement of the demographic inclination towards store image. *Vishwakarma Business Review*, *2*(2), 88-93. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6686332
25. Brar, V., & Kumar, A. (2012). Academia-industry interface. *The Siddhant- A Journal of Management Principles*, *1*(2), 122-127. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6686298
26. Kumar, A., & Brar, V. (2012). Intrinsic reward system & motivation: A study of management teachers perspective. *International Journal of Human Resource Management and Research*, *2*(4), 33–44. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6686251
27. Walke, S. G., & Kumar, A. (2015). Agritourism: Supplementary business for farmers in Maharashtra state. *MERC Global's International Journal of Social Science & Management*, *2*(6), 150–154. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6686188
28. Nalwade, Y. D., Shetiya, M. M., & Kumar, A. (2016). Review of capital structure with reference to selected BSE listed companies. *MERC Global's International Journal of Social Science & Management*, *3*(5), 150–154. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.668613