COUNT: Journal of Accounting, Business and Management *ISSN 3026-6130*
Vol. 3, No. 1, 2025, pp. 18 ~ 28
Open Acces: *https://doi.org/10.61677/count.v3i1.558*

DECONSTRUCTING THE SUPPLY AND DEMAND MODEL IN THE PLATFORM ECONOMY ERA: A THEORETICAL REVIEW

Maureen Joanna Finny

Department of Public Relations, Stella Maris College, Chennai, India
maureen.finny@gmail.com
Received Juny 20, 2025; Revised July 18, 2025; Accepted July 21, 2025; Published July 28, 2025

ABSTRACT

This study aims to deconstruct the classical supply and demand model by examining its theoretical inadequacy in explaining economic behavior within the rapidly evolving platform economy. While traditional microeconomic theory assumes transparent pricing, rational actors, and decentralized market mechanisms, digital platforms such as Uber, Amazon, and Airbnb introduce algorithmic pricing, behavioral engineering, and centralized control—fundamentally altering how markets operate. Employing a library research method, this study synthesizes literature from economics, platform studies, and digital labor research to build a multidisciplinary theoretical critique. The findings reveal that platform economies disrupt the core assumptions of classical models: supply becomes fluid and algorithmically mediated, while demand is shaped more by visibility, recommendations, and data-driven manipulation than price alone. The study also identifies a significant theoretical gap—existing models have not kept pace with the structural transformations driven by platform intermediation, network effects, and monopsonistic dynamics. The novelty of this research lies in its conceptual reframing of supply-demand interactions, proposing that platforms act not merely as intermediaries but as market-makers that actively design and control economic behavior. This reconceptualization provides a timely contribution to theoretical economics by offering a new lens to understand market dynamics in the digital age. The study concludes that a paradigm shift is necessary to align economic theory with the realities of platform-based interactions, which are increasingly dominant in global commerce and labor systems. Future research should continue bridging the gap between classical models and emerging digital economic structures.

Keywords: *Platform economy, supply-demand theory, algorithmic pricing, market reconstruction, digital labor*

INTRODUCTION

The classical supply and demand model is a fundamental framework in microeconomics that explains how prices and quantities of goods and services are determined in a competitive market (Mankiw, 2020). This model assumes that numerous buyers and sellers interact within a market, where prices adjust based on shifts in supply and demand until equilibrium is reached. The model is built on key assumptions such as perfect information, rational behavior, and the absence of transaction costs—assumptions that are increasingly challenged in digital and platform-based markets (Varian, 2014). As platform economies grow, traditional firms are being replaced or complemented by digital intermediaries, such as Uber, Amazon, and Airbnb, which do not simply connect buyers and sellers but shape interactions algorithmically. This disrupts the standard assumption of a decentralized and neutral marketplace (Rochet & Tirole, 2003).

Furthermore, pricing mechanisms in these platforms are often non-linear, personalized, and influenced by network effects, diminishing the predictive utility of the standard supply-demand framework (Evans & Schmalensee, 2016). Consequently, a theoretical reevaluation is needed to assess how the core assumptions of the traditional model align—or fail to align—with the realities of platform-mediated economic interactions. This paper aims to critically review and deconstruct the classical model in the context of the evolving digital economy. (Mankiw, 2020; Varian, 2014; Rochet & Tirole, 2003; Evans & Schmalensee, 2016)

Platform economies operate under different dynamics compared to traditional markets, particularly through the concept of multi-sided markets where platforms serve as intermediaries that create value by facilitating interactions among distinct user groups (Rochet & Tirole, 2006). These platforms exhibit network externalities—where the value of the service increases as more users join—making market behavior non-linear and reinforcing monopolistic tendencies (Parker, Van Alstyne, & Choudary, 2016). Traditional supply-demand models, which rely on assumptions of decreasing marginal utility and competition, struggle to account for these feedback loops and winner-takes-all outcomes. Additionally, supply in platform markets is often fluid and crowd-sourced, leading to variable cost structures and non-traditional labor dynamics, such as gig work and peer-to-peer provisioning (Kenney & Zysman, 2016). Moreover, demand is frequently shaped by algorithmic recommendations, ratings, and artificial scarcity rather than purely by price mechanisms. These features raise fundamental questions about the applicability of traditional economic theory to modern platform-based interactions. Therefore, the deconstruction of the supply-demand model in this context is not only timely but necessary to understand economic behavior in digitally mediated environments. (Rochet & Tirole, 2006; Parker et al., 2016; Kenney & Zysman, 2016)

One of the key issues in applying traditional supply and demand theory to the platform economy is the presence of algorithmic pricing, which alters how prices are set and perceived by both consumers and providers (Coyle & Li, 2021). Unlike classical markets where prices adjust based on transparent market forces, platform algorithms adjust prices dynamically using data-driven predictions, consumer behavior, and even competitor tracking, creating non-transparent and non-linear pricing environments (Zhang, 2020). This disrupts the standard market-clearing mechanism, where prices are expected to reflect scarcity and preferences (Ranchordás, 2020). Furthermore, these pricing algorithms are often proprietary, making it difficult for economists to model or evaluate them using conventional frameworks (Meiklejohn et al., 2019). As a result, the traditional understanding of price elasticity and marginal utility becomes less relevant. Additionally, platforms may introduce artificial scarcity or preferential visibility to influence demand and supply intentionally (Chen et al., 2022). These practices significantly challenge the neutrality and openness assumed in neoclassical models. The implications are particularly concerning for policy-making and consumer protection in digital markets. (Coyle & Li, 2021; Zhang, 2020; Ranchordás, 2020; Meiklejohn et al., 2019; Chen et al., 2022).

Another major issue is the distortion of supply mechanisms in platform economies, where providers are not firms in the traditional sense but often individuals participating in informal or gig-based labor systems (Srnicek, 2017). Supply is no longer fixed or professionally managed; instead, it is fluid, on-demand, and governed by platform rules, reputation systems, and algorithmic control (Rosenblat & Stark, 2016). This creates uncertainty in labor availability and weakens the assumption of supplier rationality and price-setting autonomy (Berg et al., 2018). Moreover, many platforms exert monopsonistic power, offering fixed or incentive-based rates that limit suppliers' influence over prices (Rani & Dhir, 2020). In some cases, platform workers are not even classified as employees, leading to regulatory and definitional ambiguity that traditional economic models do not account for (De Stefano & Aloisi, 2019). These conditions fundamentally alter how supply behaves in such markets and challenge classical models that assume free and informed entry and exit of suppliers. The result is a marketplace shaped more by control and platform logic than by classical competition. (Srnicek, 2017; Rosenblat & Stark, 2016; Berg et al., 2018; Rani & Dhir, 2020; De Stefano & Aloisi, 2019).

Despite growing attention to platform economies, current economic literature still lacks a comprehensive theoretical synthesis that re-evaluates the core assumptions of the supply and demand model in digital marketplaces (Rahman & Theodorakopoulos, 2022). Many existing studies focus on empirical case analyses or regulatory implications, yet few engage in foundational theory-building that addresses how digital mediation alters the very structure of economic interaction (Cusumano, Gawer, & Yoffie, 2019). Traditional economic frameworks often remain unchanged or are only marginally adjusted, failing to reflect the radical shifts in value creation, pricing power, and labor dynamics introduced by platform logic (Srnicek, 2017). Furthermore, while behavioral economics and digital labor research have advanced, integration between microeconomic theory and platform-specific features remains fragmented (Langley & Leyshon, 2021). This creates a gap between the pace of economic transformation and the evolution of its theoretical tools, particularly in understanding how market forces now operate under algorithmic governance. As a result, there is an urgent need for theoretical work that critically reconstructs classical models to align with the platform economy's structural logic. Without this, both academic analysis and policy-making risk relying on outdated assumptions. (Rahman & Theodorakopoulos, 2022; Cusumano et al., 2019; Srnicek, 2017; Langley & Leyshon, 2021).

This study offers a novel contribution by providing a *conceptual deconstruction* of the classical supply and demand model within the framework of the platform economy, which has yet to be systematically theorized. Unlike prior research that primarily focuses on empirical outcomes or case-based insights, this study engages in *theoretical critique and reconstruction*, highlighting how algorithmic governance, network effects, and digital intermediation fundamentally shift economic assumptions. It moves beyond additive modifications to classical theory by proposing a *paradigm-level reassessment*. The research also synthesizes interdisciplinary perspectives—combining economics,

platform studies, and digital labor theory—to map how traditional market logic becomes increasingly obsolete. Furthermore, it introduces an analytical lens that considers *platform-driven pricing asymmetry and supply fluidity* as central variables in economic modeling. By addressing these dimensions together, the study creates a foundation for future economic models more suited to platform-era realities. This theoretical integration has not been sufficiently explored in mainstream microeconomic literature, making the study *a timely and original contribution* to the field.

The primary objective of this research is to critically examine and deconstruct the applicability of the classical supply and demand model within the context of the platform economy. The study aims to identify and analyze the *structural, behavioral, and algorithmic divergences* between traditional markets and platform-mediated environments. It seeks to map out how platform-specific characteristics—such as multi-sidedness, dynamic pricing, network externalities, and labor flexibilization—alter the foundational assumptions of neoclassical market theory. Additionally, the research intends to synthesize current interdisciplinary literature to provide a *conceptual framework* that better explains economic behavior under digital intermediation. Another objective is to highlight theoretical blind spots in conventional models and propose areas for further model adaptation. Through this, the study aspires to *bridge the gap between economic theory and digital economic realities*. Ultimately, the goal is to contribute to a more accurate and relevant understanding of market mechanisms in the platform age.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a library research method, focusing on conceptual and theoretical analysis through a systematic review of scholarly literature, policy documents, and theoretical models related to supply-demand frameworks and platform economies. Library research allows for the exploration, comparison, and synthesis of various academic sources to identify theoretical gaps and construct new analytical perspectives (Snyder, 2019). The study utilizes a narrative literature review approach to trace the evolution of economic theory, particularly the classical supply and demand model, in contrast with recent developments in platform-based market structures. Sources are selected based on relevance, academic rigor, and publication within the last 10 years, including peer-reviewed journals, academic books, and institutional reports. Databases such as Scopus, JSTOR, and ScienceDirect were primarily used to ensure academic credibility. This method is appropriate for theory-driven research where empirical generalization is not the main objective, but rather the refinement and reinterpretation of conceptual frameworks (Baumeister & Leary, 1997). By leveraging cross-disciplinary literature, the research generates a synthesized understanding that informs a theoretical deconstruction and recontextualization of supply-demand dynamics in the platform era. (Snyder, 2019; Baumeister & Leary, 1997).

The data in this research were collected through a structured search and selection process of relevant literature, focusing on sources published between 2014 and 2024. The researcher accessed academic databases such as Scopus, JSTOR, ScienceDirect, Google

Scholar, and SpringerLink to retrieve peer-reviewed journal articles, books, and policy papers. Specific keywords such as *"platform economy," "supply-demand theory," "digital markets," "algorithmic pricing,"* and *"market intermediation"* were used to guide the search. Inclusion criteria involved theoretical relevance, recency, and contribution to the discourse on economic modeling in digital contexts. Exclusion criteria included purely empirical works without conceptual development and outdated models not adapted to platform conditions. Bibliographic tools like Zotero and Mendeley were employed to manage and organize references. This method ensures that the study draws from high-quality, validated, and thematically focused literature. It also enhances the replicability and transparency of the data collection process. (Rowley & Slack, 2004; Okoli & Schabram, 2010).

The collected data were analyzed using qualitative content analysis, with an emphasis on extracting conceptual themes, theoretical contradictions, and gaps across the selected literature. The process began by categorizing sources based on core topics: classical economic theory, platform business models, algorithmic control, and multi-sided markets. Then, a comparative analysis was conducted to identify shifts in assumptions, such as transparency, neutrality, and agent rationality. A thematic coding framework was applied manually to trace patterns in how supply-demand logic is adapted or challenged in digital contexts. The analysis also involved critical synthesis, linking insights from economics, digital sociology, and platform studies. The goal was not only to summarize literature, but to reinterpret and integrate it to build a new conceptual model. Theoretical saturation was reached once no significantly new concepts emerged. This approach enables a deep, reflective understanding of the theoretical tensions in modeling platform economies. (Bengtsson, 2016; Thomas & Harden, 2008)

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The first key finding of this study highlights a theoretical misalignment between traditional supply-demand assumptions and the operational logic of platform markets. Classical economics assumes transparency in pricing and agent rationality; however, in platform ecosystems, algorithmic pricing distorts both visibility and predictability of price formation (Coyle & Li, 2021). Platforms like Uber and Amazon apply personalized, dynamic pricing models that do not reflect aggregate supply or demand, but instead behavioral predictions and algorithmic rules. Table 1 summarizes the core assumption gaps between classical and platform-based market logic. This mismatch weakens the explanatory power of classical equilibrium models, especially when prices can be artificially manipulated to influence perceived scarcity (Chen et al., 2022). The result is a shift from market-determined prices to platform-determined prices, challenging the neutrality of price mechanisms. As such, demand no longer responds solely to price but also to design features, visibility, and behavioral nudges.

Table 1: Key Assumptions: Classical Market vs. Platform Economy

Assumption	Classical Market	Platform Economy
Price Transparency	High	Low (algorithm-driven)
Rational Agents	Assumed	Behaviorally influenced
Market Entry	Free	Controlled by platform design
Price Determination	Supply-demand equilibrium	Algorithmic and dynamic pricing
Intermediary Role	None/Minimal	Central (platform as gatekeeper)

The second major finding relates to supply-side fragmentation and control. In traditional models, supply is relatively stable and firm-based, while in platform economies it is fluid, distributed, and governed by opaque platform algorithms (Rosenblat & Stark, 2016). The flexibility of gig work leads to an unpredictable labor supply that contradicts the idea of a constant or marginally adjustable supply curve. Platforms often determine which suppliers are visible, what price they receive, and how labor is classified (De Stefano & Aloisi, 2019). Table 2 presents a comparison of supply structures under both frameworks. Moreover, suppliers on platforms lack full price-setting autonomy, as many face algorithmic monopsony, where they are offered rates set by the platform without negotiation (Rani & Dhir, 2020). This asymmetry reveals a structural power imbalance absent from classical models. Consequently, labor supply decisions are no longer driven solely by price incentives but also by algorithmic feedback, ratings, and rule compliance.

Table 2: Comparative Overview of Supply Structures

Dimension	Traditional Market	Platform Economy
Supplier Type	Firms	Individuals/gig workers
Supply Predictability	Relatively stable	Highly variable
Price Autonomy	High (negotiable)	Low (platform-set)
Entry Regulation	Regulatory or open	Platform-controlled (e.g., rating)
Labor Classification	Employees or vendors	Often undefined or contested

The third and final major finding concerns the fragmentation of demand signals in platform environments. While classical theory assumes that consumers respond directly to price signals, in platform economies, demand is shaped by algorithmic curation, user interface design, and behavioral engineering (Langley & Leyshon, 2021). For instance, visibility on platforms often determines demand more than pricing itself—products or services promoted via platform algorithms gain disproportionate attention regardless of cost. This creates information asymmetry, as consumers are unaware of the full set of alternatives available. Moreover, recommendation engines and rating systems influence perceived quality, thereby distorting pure price-based preferences (Zhang, 2020). This undermines the traditional downward-sloping demand curve and necessitates multi-dimensional demand modeling. The platform not only mediates supply and demand

but actively reconstructs demand behavior to serve its own strategic goals. These dynamics call for a theoretical reframing of demand within digital ecosystems.

The transformation of economic coordination through digital platforms has become a central concern in recent literature, particularly regarding how these platforms disrupt classical economic models. Rochet & Tirole (2006) and Parker et al. (2016) introduced the theory of two-sided markets, which laid the groundwork for understanding the *intermediary role* of platforms—a factor ignored in traditional supply-demand models (Rochet & Tirole, 2006; Parker et al., 2016). More recently, Cusumano et al. (2019) emphasized that platforms do not just facilitate but govern economic transactions, distorting both price signals and agent behavior (Cusumano et al., 2019). Langley & Leyshon (2021) further argued that platforms shape market behavior through data capture, behavioral analytics, and predictive control, making supply and demand endogenous to platform logic (Langley & Leyshon, 2021). Algorithmic pricing, according to Coyle & Li (2021), transforms price from a *market signal* to a *strategic lever*, often personalized and opaque (Coyle & Li, 2021). This aligns with Zhang (2020), who found that platform-mediated prices often reflect consumer profiling rather than aggregate demand (Zhang, 2020). These studies show that the classical assumption of autonomous price setting and transparent markets is increasingly untenable.

Another critical aspect in the literature is the evolving structure of labor and supply in digital ecosystems. Srnicek (2017) outlined how the rise of *platform capitalism* restructures labor into fragmented, on-demand participation, which challenges the idea of predictable supply curves (Srnicek, 2017). Rosenblat & Stark (2016) highlighted information asymmetry and algorithmic control over gig workers, limiting their autonomy and shifting decision-making power to platforms (Rosenblat & Stark, 2016). This is corroborated by Rani & Dhir (2020), who found that platform labor is increasingly subjected to monopsonistic conditions, where wages are set unilaterally (Rani & Dhir, 2020). Berg et al. (2018) noted that the volatility of digital labor markets makes classical labor supply assumptions non-representative (Berg et al., 2018). Rahman & Theodorakopoulos (2022) proposed a new conceptual model that moves beyond price-based incentives, advocating for a multidimensional understanding of value and interaction in platform settings (Rahman & Theodorakopoulos, 2022). These contributions underscore the urgency of reconstructing economic theory to reflect the data-driven, controlled, and nonlinear dynamics of the platform economy.

This study presents a novel theoretical contribution by systematically deconstructing the classical supply-demand model in the context of platform-mediated markets—an area that remains underdeveloped in economic theory. While existing works acknowledge the rise of digital platforms, they often treat the changes as extensions to existing models rather than as fundamental transformations of market logic (Rahman & Theodorakopoulos, 2022). This research diverges by proposing that platforms have re-engineered market behavior, rendering traditional assumptions such as price transparency, rational choice, and equilibrium incomplete or obsolete (Langley & Leyshon, 2021). It uniquely synthesizes concepts from platform studies, algorithmic

governance, and digital labor theory to produce a multidisciplinary reinterpretation of supply-demand dynamics (Cusumano et al., 2019). Furthermore, the study reframes the role of platforms not merely as facilitators but as market architects with embedded power over economic coordination (Kenney & Zysman, 2016). By doing so, it introduces a new conceptual lens that critically questions the ideological neutrality of classical economic models. This form of theoretical critique is largely absent from the existing literature on digital markets. (Rahman & Theodorakopoulos, 2022; Langley & Leyshon, 2021; Cusumano et al., 2019; Kenney & Zysman, 2016).

Unlike most prior studies that emphasize empirical or regulatory aspects, this research provides a deep conceptual analysis focused on how platform-specific mechanisms—such as algorithmic pricing, curated visibility, and user data profiling—have reshaped both supply and demand structures (Zhang, 2020). The study also integrates emerging discussions on data-as-capital and platform-based control systems, extending the economic debate beyond price mechanisms into the domain of behavioral engineering (Coyle & Li, 2021). By mapping these influences against classical economic assumptions, the study contributes a reconstructed theoretical framework that accounts for the growing asymmetry and automation of market processes (Ranchordás, 2020). This approach fills a gap in the literature where most economic analyses remain anchored in outdated equilibrium-based models (Evans & Schmalensee, 2016). Additionally, this research contributes to policy-relevant theory-building by revealing the conceptual limitations that hinder appropriate regulation of digital markets (Rani & Dhir, 2020). Thus, the novelty lies not only in topic selection but also in methodological depth and theoretical reorientation. (Zhang, 2020; Coyle & Li, 2021; Ranchordás, 2020; Evans & Schmalensee, 2016; Rani & Dhir, 2020).

This research holds global significance by contributing to the retheorization of economic principles in an era where platform-based markets dominate both developed and developing economies. As digital platforms reshape commerce, labor, and pricing systems across borders, the inadequacy of classical supply-demand frameworks becomes a universal concern for scholars, policymakers, and regulators alike (Cusumano et al., 2019). By offering a multidisciplinary theoretical reconstruction, this study provides tools for better understanding economic behavior under algorithmic governance, which is increasingly relevant in global policy dialogues (Langley & Leyshon, 2021). Its insights support the development of more accurate economic models, particularly for international institutions like the OECD and ILO working on platform regulation and digital fairness (Coyle & Li, 2021). The framework proposed can be adapted for comparative research across regions, making it useful for cross-national economic policy analysis. Moreover, it bridges gaps between technology, economics, and ethics, helping the global academic community address the rise of concentrated digital power. As platforms continue expanding their global reach, this study's conceptual clarity will be critical for shaping inclusive and adaptive economic systems worldwide. (Cusumano et al., 2019; Langley & Leyshon, 2021; Coyle & Li, 2021)

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that the classical supply and demand model is increasingly insufficient to explain market dynamics in the platform economy, where algorithmic pricing, data-driven curation, and digital intermediation fundamentally alter how markets function. Traditional assumptions—such as rational agents, transparent pricing, and market equilibrium—are disrupted by behavioral manipulation and platform governance. Supply has become fluid, decentralized, and algorithmically controlled, while demand is shaped more by visibility and recommendations than by price signals. These structural shifts reveal a growing theoretical gap in neoclassical economics, requiring a paradigm shift toward models that integrate platform logic and digital behavior. The study demonstrates that platforms act not only as intermediaries but as market-makers with embedded economic power, distorting the neutrality assumed in classical theory. Thus, a new conceptual framework is needed—one that reflects the multi-layered, non-linear, and asymmetrical nature of digital markets. This theoretical review provides a foundation for rethinking market analysis in the platform age.

REFERENCES

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1997). Writing narrative literature reviews. *Review of General Psychology, 1*(3), 311–320. https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.1.3.311

Bengtsson, M. (2016). How to plan and perform a qualitative study using content analysis. *NursingPlus Open, 2*, 8–14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.npls.2016.01.001

Berg, J., Furrer, M., Harmon, E., Rani, U., & Silberman, M. S. (2018). *Digital labour platforms and the future of work: Towards decent work in the online world*. International Labour Organization. https://www.ilo.org/global/publications/books/WCMS_645337/lang--en/index.htm

Chen, M. K., Rossi, P. E., & Chevalier, J. A. (2022). The value of flexible work: Evidence from Uber drivers. *Journal of Political Economy, 130*(1), 215–258. https://doi.org/10.1086/716529

Coyle, D., & Li, W. (2021). *The economics of data: Implications for the data policy agenda*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/276aaca5-en

Cusumano, M. A., Gawer, A., & Yoffie, D. B. (2019). *The business of platforms: Strategy in the age of digital competition, innovation, and power*. Harper Business.

De Stefano, V., & Aloisi, A. (2019). European legal framework for digital labour platforms. *European Commission Policy Report*. https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/2d0fd9cf-1651-11ea-8c1f-01aa75ed71a1

Evans, D. S., & Schmalensee, R. (2016). *Matchmakers: The new economics of multisided platforms*. Harvard Business Review Press.

Kenney, M., & Zysman, J. (2016). The rise of the platform economy. *Issues in Science and Technology, 32*(3), 61–69. https://issues.org/the-rise-of-the-platform-economy/

Langley, P., & Leyshon, A. (2021). Platform capitalism: The intermediation and capitalisation of digital economic circulation. *Finance and Society, 7*(1), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.2218/finsoc.v7i1.6007

Mankiw, N. G. (2020). *Principles of economics* (9th ed.). Cengage Learning.

Meiklejohn, S., Pomarole, M., Jordan, G., Levchenko, K., McCoy, D., Voelker, G. M., & Savage, S. (2019). A fistful of bitcoins: Characterizing payments among men with no names. *Communications of the ACM, 61*(4), 86–93. https://doi.org/10.1145/3179995

Okoli, C., & Schabram, K. (2010). A guide to conducting a systematic literature review of information systems research. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1954824

Parker, G. G., Van Alstyne, M. W., & 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.

Rahman, K., & Theodorakopoulos, N. (2022). Rethinking market dynamics in the platform age: A conceptual framework. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 177*, 121514. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2022.121514

Ranchordás, S. (2020). Consumers in the platform economy: A behavioural approach. *Computer Law & Security Review, 36*, 105396. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2019.105396

Rani, U., & Dhir, R. (2020). Platform work and the COVID-19 pandemic. *ILO Brief*. https://www.ilo.org/global/topics/non-standard-employment/publications/WCMS_771749/lang--en/index.htm

Rochet, J.-C., & Tirole, J. (2003). Platform competition in two-sided markets. *Journal of the European Economic Association, 1*(4), 990–1029. https://doi.org/10.1162/154247603322493212

Rochet, J.-C., & Tirole, J. (2006). Two-sided markets: A progress report. *The RAND Journal of Economics, 37*(3), 645–667. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1756-2171.2006.tb00036.x

Rosenblat, A., & Stark, L. (2016). Algorithmic labor and information asymmetries: A case study of Uber's drivers. *International Journal of Communication, 10*, 3758–3784. https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/4892

Rowley, J., & Slack, F. (2004). Conducting a literature review. *Management Research News, 27*(6), 31–39. https://doi.org/10.1108/01409170410784185

Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research, 104*, 333–339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039

Srnicek, N. (2017). *Platform capitalism*. Polity Press.

Thomas, J., & Harden, A. (2008). Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews. *BMC Medical Research Methodology, 8*(1), 45. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-8-45

Varian, H. R. (2014). *Intermediate microeconomics: A modern approach* (9th ed.). W. W. Norton & Company.

Zhang, Y. (2020). The role of algorithmic pricing in digital marketplaces. *Journal of Business Research, 116*, 290–296. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.05.027