

Common Threads from Common Ownership

Miguel Antón* Florian Ederer†
Mireia Giné* Bruno Pellegrino‡
Martin Schmalz§

*IESE

†Boston University, CEPR, ECGI, NBER

‡Columbia Business School

§Oxford, CEPR, ECGI, C-SEB

DICE Competition Policy Conference
December 7, 2024



Delta Air Lines	[%]	Southwest Airlines Co.	[%]	American Airlines	[%]
Berkshire Hathaway	8.25	PRIMECAP	11.78	T. Rowe Price	13.99
BlackRock	6.84	Berkshire Hathaway	7.02	PRIMECAP	8.97
Vanguard	6.31	Vanguard	6.21	Berkshire Hathaway	7.75
State Street Global Advisors	4.28	BlackRock	5.96	Vanguard	6.02
J.P. Morgan Asset Mgt.	3.79	Fidelity	5.53	BlackRock	5.82
Lansdowne Partners Limited	3.60	State Street Global Advisors	3.76	State Street Global Advisors	3.71
PRIMECAP	2.85	J.P. Morgan Asset Mgt.	1.31	Fidelity	3.30
AllianceBernstein L.P.	1.67	T. Rowe Price	1.26	Putnam	1.18
Fidelity	1.54	BNY Mellon Asset Mgt.	1.22	Morgan Stanley	1.17
PAR Capital Mgt.	1.52	Egerton Capital (UK) LLP	1.10	Northern Trust Global Inv	1.02
United Continental Holdings	[%]	Alaska Air	[%]	JetBlue Airways	[%]
Berkshire Hathaway	9.20	T. Rowe Price	10.14	Vanguard	7.96
BlackRock	7.11	Vanguard	9.73	Fidelity	7.58
Vanguard	6.88	BlackRock	5.60	BlackRock	7.33
PRIMECAP	6.27	PRIMECAP	4.95	PRIMECAP	5.91
PAR Capital Mgt.	5.18	PAR Capital Mgt.	3.65	Goldman Sachs Asset Mgt.	2.94
State Street Global Advisors	3.45	State Street Global Advisors	3.52	Dimensional Fund Advisors	2.42
J.P. Morgan Asset Mgt.	3.35	Franklin Resources	2.59	State Street Global Advisors	2.40
Altimeter Capital Mgt.	3.26	BNY Mellon Asset Mgt.	2.34	Wellington	2.07
T. Rowe Price	2.25	Citadel	1.98	Donald Smith Co.	1.80
AQR Capital Management	2.15	Renaissance Techn.	1.93	BarrowHanley	1.52

The Rise of Common Ownership




Figure: Common ownership profit weights κ over time (Backus et al., 2021b)

The Common Ownership Hypothesis

- “When large investors own shares in many firms within the same industry, those firms may have reduced incentives to compete.”
 - ▶ Firms produce fewer units, raise prices, reduce investment, innovate less, limit entry, ...
 - ▶ Long intellectual history starting with theoretical contributions by [Rubinstein and Yaari \(1983\)](#) and [Rotemberg \(1984\)](#)
 - ▶ But only empirically relevant due to tremendous increase in common ownership over the past 3 decades ([Azar, 2012](#); [Backus et al., 2021b](#))
 - ▶ Empirical evidence is growing and varies across industries, firm choices, methodologies, ...
- Important questions include:
 - ▶ “Does common ownership affect corporate conduct?” ([Azar et al., 2018](#); [Backus et al., 2021a](#))
 - ▶ “How do common owners influence firm strategy?” ([Antón et al., 2023](#); [Forsbacka, 2024](#))
 - ▶ “Does common ownership affect innovation?” ([López and Vives, 2019](#); [Gibbon and Schain, 2023](#); [Antón et al., 2024](#); [Shelegia and Spiegel, 2024](#))
- How big of a problem is common ownership for competition, aggregate welfare, and the distribution of surplus?

Some people thought about this problem 30 years ago



Large Shareholder Activism, Risk Sharing, and Financial Market Equilibrium

Anat R. Admati and Paul Pfleiderer


Stanford University

Josef Zechner

University of Vienna

One fundamental issue concerns what is or should be the objective function of the firm in an economy in which investors hold diversified portfolios and in which some investors might be able to affect managerial decisions in several firms. Suppose, for example, that all investors hold the market portfolio. Then firms that act in the interests of shareholders might well refrain from competing against each other in the product market. Note, however, that the shareholders are also consumers and might therefore be hurt by such behavior. Moreover, stakeholders in the firm include its employees, suppliers, and so forth.

Many people have thought about this problem more recently



Policy Importance

SEC

Common Ownership: The Investor Protection Challenge of the 21st Century



Commissioner Robert J. Jackson Jr.

New York, NY

Dec. 6, 2018

Testimony Before the Federal Trade Commission
Hearing on Competition and Consumer Protection

FTC, DOJ, OECD, EC

Institutional investors often hold shares of competing firms. Recent scholarship has considered whether such common ownership has anticompetitive effects. Antitrust theorists have long suggested that the interests of a common concentrated owner (CCO) differ from those of an owner of a single firm and that a CCO might be able to induce firms in which it holds a stake to further these interests.¹ Recent empirical evidence, finding that CCOs are associated with higher prices and lower output, seems to support this theory.²

This new evidence, along with the dramatic growth in institutional investors' holdings over the last several decades, has stimulated a major rethinking of antitrust enforcement. The Department of Justice has acknowledged concerns about the anticompetitive effects of common ownership and investigated common ownership of competing airlines.³ In 2018, the Federal Trade Commission took these concerns a step further, conducting an all-day hearing on the subject.⁴ In Europe, antitrust enforcers have taken a more aggressive approach: in addi-

2023 Merger Guidelines

U.S. Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission



[View the Guidelines PDF](#)

Issued: December 18, 2023

2.11. Guideline 11: When an Acquisition Involves Partial Ownership or Minority Interests, the Agencies Examine Its Impact on Competition.

In many acquisitions, two companies come under common control. In some situations, however, the acquisition of less-than-full control may still influence decision-making at the target firm or another firm in ways that may substantially lessen competition. Acquisitions of partial ownership or other minority interests may give the investor rights in the target firm, such as rights to appoint board members, observe board meetings, influence the firm's ability to raise capital, impact operational decisions, or access competitively sensitive information. The Agencies have concerns with both cross-ownership, which refers to holding a non-controlling interest in a competitor, as well as common ownership, which occurs when individual investors hold non-controlling interests in firms that have a competitive relationship that could be affected by those joint holdings.

Partial acquisitions that do not result in control may nevertheless present significant competitive concerns. The acquisition of a minority position may permit influence of the target firm, implicate strategic decisions of the acquirer with respect to its investment in other firms, or change incentives so as to otherwise dampen competition. The post-acquisition relationship between the parties and the independent incentives of the parties outside the acquisition may be important in determining whether the partial acquisition may substantially lessen competition. Such partial acquisitions are subject to the same legal standard as any other acquisition.⁵³

The Agencies recognize that cross-ownership and common ownership can reduce competition by softening firms' incentives to compete, even absent any specific anticompetitive act or intent. While the Agencies will consider any way in which a partial acquisition may affect competition, they generally focus on three principal effects:

Antitrust Lawsuits

Texas, other states sue BlackRock, Vanguard for 'conspiring' to restrict US coal market

The lawsuit alleged the firms are using the influence gained through their stock holdings to pressure coal companies to reduce output in alignment with the asset managers' net-zero goals.

Published Dec. 3, 2024



Lamar Johnson
Reporter



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

[Español](#) [About](#) [News](#) [Opinions](#) [Careers](#) [Contact Us](#)



[HOME](#) [NEWS](#) [NEWS RELEASES](#)

ATTORNEY GENERAL KEN PAXTON SUES BLACKROCK, STATE STREET, AND VANGUARD FOR ILLEGALLY CONSPIRING TO MANIPULATE ENERGY MARKETS, DRIVING UP COSTS FOR CONSUMERS

November 27, 2024 | Press Release

Attorney General Ken Paxton Sues BlackRock, State Street, and Vanguard for Illegally Conspiring to Manipulate Energy Markets, Driving Up Costs for Consumers

Attorney General Ken Paxton sued BlackRock, State Street Corporation, and Vanguard Group, three of the largest institutional investors in the world, for conspiring to artificially constrict the market for coal through anticompetitive trade practices.

Over several years, the three asset managers acquired substantial stockholdings in every significant publicly held coal producer in the United States, thereby gaining the power to control the policies of the coal companies. Using their combined influence over the coal market, the investment cartel collectively announced in 2021 their commitment to weaponize their shares to pressure the coal companies to accommodate "green energy" goals. To achieve this, the investment companies pushed to reduce coal output by more than half by 2030.

Blackrock, Vanguard, and State Street utilized the Climate Action 100 and the Net Zero Asset Managers Initiative to signal their mutual intent to reduce the output of thermal coal, which predictably increased the cost of electricity for Americans across the United States.

Common Owners Influence Strategy (Shekita, 2022)

Interventions by Common Owners

[Get access >](#)

Nathan Shekita ✉

Journal of Competition Law & Economics, Volume 18, Issue 1, March 2022, Pages 99–134,

<https://doi.org/10.1093/joclec/nhab006>

Published: 06 May 2021



“ Cite 🔑 Permissions ➦ Share ▼

Abstract


Common ownership exists when investors concurrently hold partial and significant shares in related firms. In this paper, I compile, document, and taxonomize 30 separate cases of intervention to demonstrate how common owners influence firm behavior. Although previous literature has identified a

A portfolio manager at Hodges Capital Management noted he would "like to see [Southwest Airlines] boost their fares but also cut capacity. That's what the market wants. That's what the market is telling everyone." Hodges owned shares in rival airlines including United, Continental, Delta, American, and Southwest. Other investors had also called for airlines to rein in capacity growth. Evidence from earning calls also showed CEOs reiterating the message of capacity reduction.

Common ownership raises airline prices (Azar et al., 2018) ...



... but not RTE cereal markups (Backus et al., 2021a)



Direct Mechanisms of Common Ownership → Markup Effects



Investors



Directly set p_i to maximize

$$\phi_i = \pi_i + \sum_j \kappa_{ij} \pi_j$$

~~Productive
Inefficiency~~



Product Prices

Markup
Effects

Do you need a direct mechanism? No!




Investors

$$\phi_i = \pi_i + \sum_j \kappa_{ij} \pi_j$$



Product Prices

Indirect Mechanism (Antón et al., 2023) → Productive Inefficiency



Are there any procompetitive effects of common ownership?



International Journal of Industrial Organization

Volume 99, July 2023, 102900



Rising markups, common ownership, and technological capacities ☆

Alexandro J. Gibboni , Jan Philip Schain 

Show more 

+ Add to Mendeley  Share  Cite

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijindorg.2022.102900>

Get rights and content 

Highlights

- This large-scale study investigates the impact of common ownership by institutional investors on firm-level markups and citation-weighted patents in European manufacturing markets.
- The cartelisation effect of common ownership leads to an increase in firm markups as a result of reduced incentives to compete through rival profit internalisation.
- Common ownership can lead to an increase in innovation activities for firms directly held by common owners.
- Consistent with theory, both effects are more pronounced in sectors characterised by higher technological spillovers.

Home > Management Science > Ahead of Print >

Innovation: The Bright Side of Common Ownership?

Miguel Antón, Florian Ederer , Mireia Giné, Martin Schmalz

Published Online: 16 Aug 2024 | <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2024.04363>

Abstract

Firms have inefficiently low incentives to innovate when other firms benefit from their inventions and the innovating firm therefore does not capture the full surplus of its innovations. We show that, in theory, common ownership of firms mitigates this impediment to corporate innovation. By contrast, without technological spillovers, innovation has the effect of stealing market share from rivals and in that case more common ownership reduces innovation. Empirically, the association between common ownership and innovation inputs and outputs decreases with product market proximity and increases with technology proximity. The sign and magnitude of the overall relationship between common ownership and corporate innovation thus varies considerably across the universe of firms depending on their relative proximity in technology and product market space. Some of these results persist if we use only variation from BlackRock's acquisition of BGI. Our findings inform the debate about the welfare effects of increasing common ownership among U.S. corporations.


What are the economy-wide effects?(Ederer and Pellegrino, 2024)

- What are the welfare and distributional implications of common ownership?
- How do corporate governance assumptions affect these conclusions?
- Theory
 - ▶ A novel **structural IO-style** general equilibrium model of oligopoly with common ownership
 - ▶ Hedonic demand to model competition among differentiated oligopolists with market power
 - ▶ Different firm objective functions based on ownership and corporate governance arrangements
- Empirical Results
 - ▶ Deadweight loss of common ownership increased from 1.4% in 1995 to 12.4% in 2021
 - ★ Alternative governance assumptions: deadweight loss ranges between 3.5% and 13.2% in 2021
 - ★ Results hold for private and foreign firms, multi-product firms, physical complements, overlap in consumption baskets, decreasing returns to scale, non-tradables ...
 - ▶ Rise of common ownership resulted in a significant reallocation of
 - ★ profits across firms
 - ★ surplus from consumers to producers

Generalized Hedonic Linear (GHL) Demand (Pellegrino, 2019)

- $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ oligopolistic firms
 - ▶ No industry boundaries
 - ▶ Product differentiation and productivity differences
- Hedonic demand
 - ▶ Each firm's product is a bundle of characteristics (Lancaster, 1966; Rosen, 1974; Epple, 1987)
- 1 unit of product i provides
 - ▶ 1 unit of an idiosyncratic characteristic i
 - ▶ a unit-length vector a_i of k common characteristics

A Basic Example: 2 firms, 2 (common) characteristics



Representative Agent Utility

- Representative agent with quadratic utility

$$U(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{q}, H) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \alpha \cdot \sum_{j=1}^m \left(b_j^x x_j - \frac{1}{2} x_j^2 \right) + (1 - \alpha) \sum_{i=1}^n \left(b_i^q q_i - \frac{1}{2} q_i^2 \right) - H$$

- ▶ b_j^x and b_i^q are characteristic-specific preference shifters determining *vertical differentiation*
- ▶ $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ is the utility weight of common characteristics determining *horizontal differentiation*
- Representative agent has a budget constraint $H + \sum_{i=1}^n \pi_i \geq \sum_{i=1}^n p_i q_i$
 - ▶ H are hours worked in perfectly competitive labor market
 - ▶ Total firm profits $\sum_{i=1}^n \pi_i$ accrue to the representative agent
- Because $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{q}$, this can be rewritten in terms of \mathbf{q}
- Representative agent faces price vector \mathbf{p} and chooses \mathbf{q}

Inverse Demand

$$\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{b} - (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{\Sigma})\mathbf{q}$$

where

$$\mathbf{\Sigma} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \alpha(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{I})$$

- $\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A}$ is the matrix of *cosine similarities* for common characteristics between firms
 - ▶ We assume $\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A}$ to be exogenous (but time-varying).
 - ▶ Market structure and common ownership may (in practice) influence product positioning.
- [Hoberg and Phillips \(2016\)](#) dataset provides an estimate of this object.
 - ▶ Presence of the idiosyncratic characteristics adds a degree of freedom to the demand system

Cournot Common Ownership

The *Cournot Common Ownership* allocation \mathbf{q}^Φ is defined as

$$\mathbf{q}^\Phi \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \arg \max_{\mathbf{q}} \Phi(\mathbf{q})$$

and is given by

$$\mathbf{q}^\Phi = \left(2I + \underbrace{\Delta}_{\text{Scale Economies}} + \underbrace{\Sigma}_{\text{Network Position}} + \underbrace{\mathbf{K} \circ \Sigma}_{\text{Common Ownership}} \right)^{-1} \underbrace{(\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{c})}_{\text{Marginal Surplus at } q_i = 0}$$

Ballester et al. (2006) show that another way to interpret this equation is as the Katz-Bonacich network centrality measure.

Data

- Compustat Firm Financials
- Text-based Product Similarity ([Hoberg and Phillips, 2016](#))
 - ▶ Based on text analysis of SEC form 10-K product description
 - ▶ **Who competes with whom**
- Profit Weights
 - ▶ Obtained from parsing SEC forms 13(f)
 - ▶ **Who is owned by whom**


Product Similarity Data

- [Hoberg and Phillips \(2016\)](#) construct similarity scores by text mining the “Business Description” section of 10-K filings
 - ▶ Already standard practice in financial economics to use for (binary) industry classification
 - ▶ We use **raw scores** rather than binary HP industry classifications.
- Approach solves long-standing problems with NAICS/SIC
 - ▶ Static, binary, and do not really reflect product market competition
- Construction and normalization to obtain empirical counterpart of \mathbf{a}_i :


$$\mathbf{v}_i = \begin{bmatrix} v_{i,1} \\ v_{i,2} \\ \vdots \\ v_{i,61146} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{a}_i = \frac{\mathbf{v}_i}{\|\mathbf{v}_i\|}.$$

- Validation in [Hoberg and Phillips \(2016\)](#) that this predicts competitive interactions

Network Visualization of the HP dataset: $A'A$ ($5,000 \times 5,000$)




Network Visualization of the Ownership Matrix: \mathbf{K} ($5,000 \times 5,000$)




IO vs GHL Elasticities

Market	Firm i	Firm j	IO	GHL
Auto	Ford	Ford	-4.320	-5.197
Auto	Ford	General Motors	0.034	0.056
Auto	Ford	Toyota	0.007	0.017
Auto	General Motors	Ford	0.065	0.052
Auto	General Motors	General Motors	-6.433	-4.685
Auto	General Motors	Toyota	0.008	0.005
Auto	Toyota	Ford	0.018	0.025
Auto	Toyota	General Motors	0.008	0.008
Auto	Toyota	Toyota	-3.085	-4.851
Cereals	Kellogg's	Kellogg's	-3.231	-1.770
Cereals	Kellogg's	Quaker Oats	0.033	0.023
Cereals	Quaker Oats	Kellogg's	0.046	0.031
Cereals	Quaker Oats	Quaker Oats	-3.031	-1.941
Computers	Apple	Apple	-11.979	-8.945
Computers	Apple	Dell	0.018	0.025
Computers	Dell	Apple	0.027	0.047
Computers	Dell	Dell	-5.570	-5.110

Network Evolution - Product Similarity




1995




2021

Network Evolution - Ownership




1995



2021


Profits and Consumer Surplus over Time




Common ownership differentially affects corporate profits

- Common ownership raises aggregate profits by \$1.133 trillion from \$2.167 trillion to \$3.300 trillion.
- Aggregate increase obscures that common ownership differentially affects corporate profits
 - ▶ Vast majority of companies has higher profits
 - ▶ Small minority (around 1%) has *lower* profits under common ownership
- ① Different companies have different levels of common ownership
- ② Position in network of product market rivalry matters
- ③ Common ownership reallocates market shares towards more productive firms

Distributional Effects of Common Ownership




Deadweight Loss of Common Ownership



Alternative Corporate Governance Assumptions

- Baseline model assumes that each firm i fully internalizes the **proportional** profit weights κ_{ij} of its investors when choosing q_i ([Rotemberg, 1984](#))
- Alternative corporate governance assumptions (due to agency conflicts, voting models, or investor inattention) lead to different firm objective functions
- We investigate alternative versions of the model with different objective functions.
 - ▶ Super-proportional weights
 - ▶ Blockholder weights ([Edmans and Holderness, 2017](#))
 - ▶ Investor inattention ([Gilje et al., 2020](#))
 - ▶ Firm-specific mitigation parameter due to managerial entrenchment ([Azar and Ribeiro, 2022](#))


Common Ownership DWL: Alternative Governance



Extensions

- Private and foreign firms ✓
- Multi-product firms ✓
- Physical complements ✓
- Overlap in consumption baskets of corporate managers and worker-consumers ✓
- Decreasing returns to scale ✓
- Excluding non-tradable industries ✓

Common Ownership DWL: Extensions



Conclusion

- Results

- ▶ Common ownership leads to **substantial deadweight loss**
- ▶ **Significant reallocation of surplus** from consumers to firms
- ▶ Sizeable effects even under **conservative assumptions about corporate governance**

- Caveats ... and a Road Map!

- ▶ Analysis does **not** consider common ownership effects on **endogenous shareholdings, product differentiation, labor market power, innovation, entry, cost efficiencies, or incentives to collude**

- Results have implications for

- ▶ Future work at the intersection of corporate finance and industrial organization
- ▶ Antitrust policy and financial regulation

The background image shows a dimly lit conference room. Several people are seated around a large, dark conference table, their silhouettes visible against the bright light from the screens. Two large curved screens on the left and right walls display a grid of various logos, including ARES, UOOE, GAMSE, COMPINE, ZENCC, and others. The text "Thank You!" is centered in the upper half of the image in a large, black, sans-serif font.

Thank You!



Papers available at <https://florianederer.github.io/research>

References I

- Antón, Miguel, Florian Ederer, Mireia Giné, and Martin Schmalz**, “Common ownership, competition, and top management incentives,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 2023, 131 (5), 1294–1355.
- , —, —, and —, “Innovation: the bright side of common ownership?,” *Management Science*, 2024.
- Azar, José**, “A new look at oligopoly: Implicit collusion through portfolio diversification,” *Ph.D. Thesis, Princeton University*, 2012.
- and **Ricardo M Ribeiro**, “Estimating Oligopoly with Shareholder Voting Models,” *SSRN Working Paper*, 2022.
- , **Martin Schmalz**, and **Isabel Tecu**, “Anticompetitive effects of common ownership,” *Journal of Finance*, 2018, 73 (4), 1513–1565.
- Backus, Matthew, Christopher Conlon, and Michael Sinkinson**, “Common Ownership and Competition in the Ready-To-Eat Cereal Industry,” *NBER Working Paper*, 2021.

References II

- , —, and —, “Common Ownership in America: 1980–2017,” *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, 2021, 13 (3), 273–308.
- Ballester, Coralio, Antoni Calvó-Armengol, and Yves Zenou**, “Who’s Who in Networks. Wanted: The Key Player,” *Econometrica*, 2006, 74 (5), 1403–1417.
- Ederer, Florian and Bruno Pellegrino**, “A tale of two networks: Common ownership and product market rivalry,” *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 2024.
- Edmans, Alex and Clifford G Holderness**, “Blockholders: A survey of theory and evidence,” *The handbook of the economics of corporate governance*, 2017, 1, 541–636.
- Epplé, Dennis**, “Hedonic prices and implicit markets: estimating demand and supply functions for differentiated products,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 1987, 95 (1), 59–80.
- Forsbacka, Tove**, “The Proxy Advice Industry and Common Owners’ Coordination,” *European Corporate Governance Institute Finance Working Paper*, 2024.
- Gibbon, Alexandra J and Jan Philip Schain**, “Rising markups, common ownership, and technological capacities,” *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 2023, 89, 102900.

References III

- Gilje, Erik P, Todd A Gormley, and Doron Levit**, “Who’s paying attention? Measuring common ownership and its impact on managerial incentives,” *Journal of Financial Economics*, 2020, 137 (1), 152–178.
- Hoberg, Gerard and Gordon Phillips**, “Text-based network industries and endogenous product differentiation,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 2016, 124 (5), 1423–1465.
- Lancaster, Kelvin J.**, “A New Approach to Consumer Theory,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 1966, 74 (2), 132–157.
- López, Ángel L. and Xavier Vives**, “Overlapping Ownership, R&D Spillovers, and Antitrust Policy,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 2019, 127 (5), 2394–2437.
- Pellegrino, Bruno**, “Product Differentiation and Oligopoly: A Network Approach,” *WRDS Research Paper*, 2019.
- Rosen, Sherwin**, “Hedonic Prices and Implicit Markets: Product Differentiation in Pure Competition,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 1974, 82 (1), 34–55.

References IV

- Rotemberg, Julio**, "Financial transaction costs and industrial performance," *MIT Sloan Working Paper*, 1984.
- Rubinstein, Ariel and Menahem E. Yaari**, "The competitive stock market as cartel maker: Some examples," *LSE STICERD Working Paper*, 1983.
- Shekita, Nathan**, "Interventions by Common Owners," *Journal of Competition Law & Economics*, 2022.
- Shelegia, Sandro and Yossi Spiegel**, "Horizontal Partial Cross Ownership and Innovation," *The Journal of Industrial Economics*, 2024.