

Monopoly and product quality

Economics Letters

61, 187-194

DOI: [10.1016/s0165-1765\(98\)00173-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0165-1765(98)00173-6)

Citation Report

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
1	Quality and Congestion in Environmental Goods. Journal of Environmental Economics and Management, 2002, 43, 477-496.	4.7	3
2	Quality underprovision by a monopolist when quality is not costly. Economics Letters, 2002, 77, 65-72.	1.9	22
3	On the Theory of the Price- and Quality-Setting Firm with Uncertain Demand. Manchester School, 2003, 71, 626-640.	0.9	0
4	Process and Product Innovation: Complementarity in a Vertically Differentiated Monopoly with Discrete Consumer Types. Japanese Economic Review, 2004, 55, 175-200.	1.3	18
5	The role of inclination and part worth differences across segments in designing a price-discriminating product line. International Journal of Research in Marketing, 2004, 21, 313-320.	4.2	3
6	Technological Advances, Transaction Costs, and Consumer Welfare. Marketing Science, 2004, 23, 335-344.	4.1	55
8	The Effects of Competition on Variation in the Quality and Cost of Medical Care. Journal of Economics and Management Strategy, 2005, 14, 575-589.	0.8	97
9	Quality Competition and Social Welfare in Markets with Partial Coverage: New Results*. Bulletin of Economic Research, 2005, 57, 391-405.	1.1	7
10	Quality discrimination among income constrained consumers. Economics Letters, 2005, 86, 245-251.	1.9	12
11	Self-interested international income redistribution and access to health care innovation. European Journal of Political Economy, 2006, 22, 322-336.	1.8	7
12	Vertical Differentiation: Multiproduct Strategy to Face Entry?. The BE Journal in Theoretical Economics, 2006, 6, 1-14.	0.0	11
13	Vertical differentiation with non-uniform consumers' distribution. International Journal of Economic Theory, 2007, 3, 179-190.	0.6	6
14	PARALLEL IMPORTS, INNOVATIONS AND NATIONAL WELFARE: THE ROLE OF THE SIZES OF INCOME CLASSES AND NATIONAL MARKETS FOR HEALTH CARE. Singapore Economic Review, 2008, 53, 57-79.	1.7	5
15	Spatial differentiation, divisible consumption and the pro-competitive effect of income. Journal of Mathematical Economics, 2010, 46, 71-85.	0.8	3
16	Saving newspapers with public grants – The effects of press subsidies on the provision of journalistic quality. Information Economics and Policy, 2011, 23, 281-286.	3.5	11
17	Optimal pricing and quality choice of a monopolist under Knightian uncertainty. International Journal of Industrial Organization, 2011, 29, 746-754.	1.2	8
19	On tariff and quality innovation in a market with discrete preferences. Economic Modelling, 2012, 29, 917-925.	3.8	3
20	Private Health Care and Drug Quality in Germany – A Game-Theoretical Approach. International Journal of Economics and Finance, 2012, 4, .	0.3	0

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
21	Income based price subsidies and parallel imports. International Review of Economics and Finance, 2012, 22, 25-41.	4.5	1
23	Paying not to sell. Economics Letters, 2013, 121, 137-140.	1.9	1
24	Old Technology Upgrades, Innovation, and Competition in Vertically Differentiated Markets. SSRN Electronic Journal, 2013, , .	0.4	1
25	Trade, Globalization and Development. , 2014, , .		1
26	Food quality in domestic markets of developing economies: a comparative study of two countries. Agricultural Economics (United Kingdom), 2015, 46, 617-628.	3.9	13
27	Training and Product Quality in Unionized Oligopolies. Economica, 2015, 82, 1261-1301.	1.6	3
28	Asymmetric Complements in a Vertically Differentiated Market: Competition or Integration?. Manchester School, 2015, 83, 72-100.	0.9	2
29	Do the Poor Pay for Card Rewards of the Rich?. Review of Economics, 2015, 66, 129-154.	0.6	0
30	Relative quality-related (dis)utility in a vertically differentiated oligopoly with an environmental externality. Environment and Development Economics, 2015, 20, 354-379.	1.5	19
31	Innovation incentives in an integrated market with vertical product differentiation. Indian Growth and Development Review, 2016, 9, 79-99.	1.2	0
32	Product Line Bundling: Why Airlines Bundle High-End While Hotels Bundle Low-End. Marketing Science, 2017, 36, 124-139.	4.1	36
33	Better Product Quality May Lead to Lower Product Price. B E Journal of Theoretical Economics, 2017, 17, .	0.2	14
34	Endogenous Mergers in Markets with Vertically Differentiated Products. B E Journal of Theoretical Economics, 2019, 19, .	0.2	2
35	When better quality or higher goodwill can result in lower product price: A dynamic analysis. Journal of the Operational Research Society, 2019, 70, 726-736.	3.4	16
36	Sourcing product quality for foreign market entry. Review of World Economics, 2020, 156, 669-702.	2.0	5
37	Delegation in Customs Union under Taste Diversity. International Trade Journal, 2022, 36, 123-146.	0.9	0
38	Trade liberalization, export quality, and three dimensions of wage inequality*. Review of Development Economics, 2021, 25, 2157.	1.9	3
39	Income Distribution, Parallel Imports and Innovations in Health Care Markets. SSRN Electronic Journal, 0, , .	0.4	1

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
40	Non-Cost-Raising Discrimination: A Rationale for Functional Separation in Broadband Open Access. SSRN Electronic Journal, 0, , .	0.4	0
41	INCOME DISTRIBUTION, SPILLOVER EFFECTS AND CHOICE OF PRODUCT QUALITY. Journal of Economic Development, 2011, 36, 61-86.	0.3	0
42	A Note on Acquisition of Complements in a Vertically Differentiated Market. SSRN Electronic Journal, 0, , .	0.4	0
43	Anreize der Gesetzgebung zu Arzneimitteln für seltene Leiden – Überlegungen zu Versorgung, Qualität und Effizienz. Schmollers Jahrbuch, 2013, 133, 43-65.	0.2	0
44	Paying Not to Sell. SSRN Electronic Journal, 0, , .	0.4	1
46	An Example of Innovation-Inducing Tariff Protection. India Studies in Business and Economics, 2014, , 63-71.	0.3	0
47	Contract Contingency in Vertically Related Markets. SSRN Electronic Journal, 0, , .	0.4	0
48	Versioning Goods and Joint Purchases with Network Externality. Prague Economic Papers, 2019, 28, 433-448.	0.5	0
49	Dynamic Pricing, Reference Price, and Price-Quality Relationship ROUND 3. Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control, 2022, , 104586.	1.6	2
51	The Economic Impact of Monopolistic Advantage: A Case Study of Microsoft. , 0, 8, 196-204.		0