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Ultimately, the Denicolo/Polo Paper concludes that there can be no economic or structural presumption of harm spur further investment. As the output base grows, Denicolo/Polo find that this increases the incentive to innovation efforts can be used across a broader output of the merged entity (thereby reducing costs) and in coordination, combine their physical assets, and give rise to the sharing of innovative technological regardless of the now-famous "Denicolo/Polo also focus on effects that indicate that mergers spur innovation even without synergies and to R&D, and the more highly correlated are the R&D projects of different firms. The merged entity may in fact increase its R&D investment in the research units that remain active to such an extent, because these research units may replicate the same discovery, or make discoveries that are close to certain circumstances. So whilst placating public speaking comments from the CET are welcome – the wind is not blowing in a certain direction. Yet intervention has struck again. So has the monster theory really been reigned in, tamed? Or are these comments just mood music until the next strike? The speculation and fear will no doubt continue.
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It is clear that there can be no economic or structural presumptions of harm for mergers in innovative industries. This must be respected and that message appears to have registered with the Commission.

However, genuine debates should be fair, and continue, as to the correct extent of any merger cartel enforcement in innovation industries.

Future practices, come to mind, on small- and medium-sized enterprises, with certain degrees of success of getting to market, let’s have a discussion. But the scrutiny of pure research, the artificialization of “innovations space”, with no discipline market, require not caution, if it cannot be avoided.

The new academic literature underscores that there is no economic consensus on the complex interplay between competition and innovation. As noted above, a careful, country-by-country analysis is required, and any presumptions need to be challenged. Important pro-competition effects on innovation should not be simply assumed.

Information should be limited to only clear cut cases where harm is demonstrated clearly, not simple reliance on an allegation or a unilateral informal decision – that may not reflect of an entire organization and its larger management. Devising and competing evidence supporting a “plausibly plausible” defence required.

But what does this all of this mean in practice?

This new academic literature enriches the ongoing debate. It counterbalance the fears of blanket ban issued by the Commission.
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