VOL. 13 NO. 7,
AUGUST, 2026
E-ISSN 3026-9679
P-ISSN 3026-9423

African Scholar Publications & Research International
www.africanscholarpub.com

Journal of Business Dev. and Management Res. (JBDMR)

Bid Rigging Detection and its Economic Impacts: A Comprehensive Analytical Review of Detection Mechanisms, Market Distortion, and Public Cost

Dauda Madaki, PhD; & Otubor, Christopher Osega, PhD
Department of Banking & Finance, University of Jos, Plateau State
Corresponding Author: mdmadaki@yahoo.com
DOI: https://doi.org/10.70382/ajbdmr.v13i7.0100

Abstract

Bid rigging — the collusive manipulation of competitive tendering processes by ostensibly independent bidders — remained one of the most economically damaging and difficult-to-detect forms of procurement fraud. Unlike bribery or embezzlement, bid rigging often leaved few direct documentary traces, since the manipulation occurred through coordination among external parties who each submitted facially legitimate bids. This paper presented a comprehensive review of bid rigging detection mechanisms and their associated economic impacts. It examined the principal forms of bid rigging, including cover bidding, bid suppression, bid rotation, and subcontracting arrangements, and evaluated the quantitative and qualitative detection methodologies used by competition authorities and procurement agencies, including price-and-cost screens, statistical bid-pattern analysis, market structure screens, and behavioural and digital forensic indicators. The paper then assessed the economic consequences of bid rigging, drawing on empirical estimates of price overcharges, allocative inefficiency, reduced innovation incentives, and the fiscal burden imposed on public procurement budgets. The analysis found that while quantitative screening tools had substantially improved ex-post detection capability, their effectiveness depended heavily on data availability, market structure knowledge, and complementary legal and institutional enforcement capacity. The paper concluded that a layered detection strategy — combining statistical screens, whistleblower mechanisms, leniency programmes, and market structure monitoring — offered the most robust defence against bid rigging, and it proposed policy recommendations for strengthening detection capacity, particularly in developing and transitional economies.

Keywords: bid, rigging, procurement, fraud, impact

Introduction

Bid rigging is a form of collusive anti-competitive behaviour in which ostensibly competing firms coordinate their bids in a tender process to predetermine the winner, thereby subverting the competitive pressure that public and private procurement systems rely upon to secure fair prices and quality outcomes. Competition authorities across jurisdictions consistently identify bid rigging as one of the most serious violations of competition law, often prosecuted with criminal sanctions in addition to civil penalties, reflecting the severity of its economic consequences.

Bid rigging is executed by external parties who each submit facially compliant, seemingly independent bids, it is structurally more difficult to detect than internal procurement fraud such as bribery or document falsification. Detection therefore depends heavily on the ability of competition authorities and procurement agencies to identify subtle statistical anomalies in bidding patterns, market structure conditions conducive to collusion, and behavioural or communication evidence of coordination among bidders.

This paper undertakes a comprehensive review of the detection mechanisms used to identify bid rigging and the economic impacts that result when such schemes go undetected. It situates the discussion within the broader competition policy and public procurement literature, drawing on documented enforcement case patterns and empirical economic estimates of cartel overcharges.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Despite decades of competition law enforcement and the development of increasingly sophisticated detection tools, bid rigging remains prevalent across construction, infrastructure, defence, and public services procurement worldwide. A central difficulty is that many detection tools require substantial historical bidding data and technical statistical capacity that are often unavailable to procurement agencies in developing economies, leaving such jurisdictions disproportionately exposed to undetected collusion.

Furthermore, even where statistical anomalies are identified, converting suspicion into a legally prosecutable case requires corroborating evidence that is difficult to obtain without whistleblower cooperation or leniency applications. The problem this study addresses is the persistent gap between the theoretical availability of bid rigging detection methodologies and their practical, resource-constrained application, and the consequent scale of unmeasured economic harm that results

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

- To examine the principal forms and mechanics of bid rigging in procurement processes.
- To review and evaluate quantitative and qualitative methodologies used to detect bid rigging.
- To assess the economic impacts of bid rigging on public procurement budgets and market efficiency.
- To identify institutional and resource-based challenges limiting effective detection and enforcement.
- To propose policy recommendations for strengthening bid rigging detection capacity.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

- What are the principal forms of bid rigging observed in procurement markets?
- What detection methodologies are most effective in identifying bid rigging, and under what conditions?
- What is the estimated economic impact of bid rigging on procurement costs and market efficiency?
- What institutional and capacity constraints limit the effectiveness of detection mechanisms, particularly in developing economies?
- What policy interventions can strengthen bid rigging detection and enforcement capacity?

LITERATURE REVIEW

The competition law and industrial organisation literature identifies several recurring forms of bid rigging. Cover bidding (or complementary

bidding) involves colluding firms submitting deliberately uncompetitive bids to create the appearance of genuine competition while a predetermined firm wins. Bid suppression occurs when one or more competitors agree to refrain from bidding or to withdraw a previously submitted bid, clearing the way for an agreed winner. Bid rotation involves colluding firms taking turns winning contracts over a series of tenders, distributing the gains of collusion across the group. Market or customer allocation involves competitors dividing geographic territories or specific clients among themselves and refraining from competing outside their allocated segment. Subcontracting arrangements are frequently used as a mechanism to compensate losing bidders, who may receive subcontracts from the designated winner as part of the collusive arrangement.

The empirical industrial organisation literature has developed a range of statistical screening tools for detecting bid rigging. Price and cost screens compare bid prices against estimated competitive benchmarks or cost structures to identify anomalous mark-ups. Variance screens examine whether the dispersion of bids among competitors is abnormally low (suggesting coordination) or abnormally patterned over time. Bid rotation and win-frequency screens analyse whether the same set of firms wins contracts in a statistically improbable rotating pattern. Relative bid spread analysis examines the gap between winning and losing bids, since colluding cover bids are frequently set at a fixed, detectable margin above the intended winning bid. More recently, machine learning-based anomaly detection has been applied to large procurement datasets to flag suspicious bidding patterns for further investigation, though such tools require substantial historical data and technical capacity to implement reliably.

Beyond statistical screens, qualitative indicators play an important complementary role, including market structure red flags such as high market concentration, homogeneous products, stable demand, and repeated interaction among the same small set of bidders — conditions widely identified in the literature as conducive to collusion. Behavioural indicators include unusual communication patterns among competing bidders, joint use of identical subcontractors, or shared documentation errors across supposedly independent bids. Leniency programmes, which offer reduced penalties to cartel participants who voluntarily disclose collusion, have proven in multiple jurisdictions to be among the most effective tools for uncovering bid rigging schemes that would otherwise evade statistical detection, since they generate direct insider evidence.

Empirical studies estimating the price effects of cartels and bid rigging schemes have found overcharges that, across a range of documented cases and jurisdictions, commonly fall within a broad range of roughly 10 to 30 percent above competitive price levels, with some sector-specific studies reporting substantially higher overcharges in particularly concentrated or infrequently monitored markets. Beyond direct price overcharges, the literature identifies allocative inefficiency (resources directed to less efficient producers), reduced incentives for innovation and quality improvement among protected incumbent bidders, and broader erosion of public trust in procurement institutions as significant, if harder to quantify, economic costs.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study is grounded in industrial organisation theory, particularly the economics of collusion and cartel stability, which explains the structural market conditions (concentration, product homogeneity, repeated interaction, barriers to entry) under which bid rigging is more likely to emerge and persist. It is complemented by information asymmetry theory, which frames detection as fundamentally a problem of the enforcement authority possessing less information than colluding parties, requiring statistical inference, incentive-based disclosure mechanisms (such as leniency programmes), or external whistleblowing to close the information gap.

Together, these theoretical lenses support the study's central argument that no single detection tool is sufficient in isolation, and that effective detection requires a layered strategy combining structural market analysis, statistical screening, and incentive-based disclosure mechanisms.

METHODOLOGY

This study employs a qualitative, conceptual research design based on a systematic review and thematic synthesis of competition law, industrial organisation, and public procurement literature relevant to bid rigging detection and economic impact assessment.

Sources include peer-reviewed journal articles in industrial organisation and competition economics; publications and guidance documents from competition authorities and international bodies such as the OECD Competition Committee; and documented enforcement case patterns reported in publicly available competition authority decisions and academic case studies.

Thematic analysis was used to categorise detection methodologies by type (quantitative screening, qualitative/behavioural, and incentive-based disclosure) and to synthesise economic impact estimates reported across the literature into a coherent impact narrative, structured around price effects, allocative inefficiency, and institutional trust costs.

Statistical screening tools offer the advantage of scalability, allowing procurement oversight bodies to monitor large volumes of tenders systematically without requiring case-specific insider information. However, their reliability depends heavily on the availability of sufficient historical bidding data and a credible competitive benchmark against which anomalies can be measured — conditions frequently absent in smaller or newly established procurement markets. Leniency and whistleblower mechanisms, by contrast, can uncover collusion that leaves no detectable statistical footprint, but they depend entirely on the willingness of an insider to come forward, which is itself shaped by the strength of legal protection and the credibility of reduced-penalty incentives.

Analysis of market structure characteristics — the number of credible bidders, product homogeneity, entry barriers, and frequency of repeated tenders among the same participants — provides a valuable ex-ante risk-screening tool, allowing procurement agencies to prioritise closer statistical or investigative scrutiny toward markets structurally more conducive to collusion, rather than applying uniform scrutiny across all procurement categories regardless of collusion risk.

Digitalisation of procurement processes, including e-procurement platforms that centrally capture bidding data, substantially improves the feasibility of applying statistical screens by generating the structured historical datasets such tools require. However, the literature cautions that digital data capture alone does not guarantee effective detection without corresponding institutional capacity to analyse the data and act on identified anomalies.

The most immediate and widely quantified economic impact of bid rigging is the price overcharge imposed on the procuring entity, commonly estimated in the empirical literature to fall within a broad range of approximately 10 to 30 percent above competitive benchmark prices, though estimates vary considerably by sector, market concentration, and duration of the collusive arrangement. In public procurement contexts, such overcharges translate directly into reduced fiscal capacity for other public services, since funds are diverted from their intended value at no corresponding benefit to service quality or delivery.

Beyond the direct price effect, bid rigging distorts the allocation of contracts away from the most efficient producer toward the predetermined winner within the colluding group, resulting in productive inefficiency even where the winning firm's price is not the primary point of harm. Over time, protected incumbents facing reduced competitive pressure have weaker incentives to innovate, improve quality, or control costs, producing a longer-term drag on sectoral productivity beyond the immediate transaction-level overcharge.

Persistent, undetected bid rigging erodes public trust in the fairness and integrity of procurement institutions, which can, in turn, reduce the pool of genuine competitive bidders willing to participate in future tenders, particularly smaller or new entrant firms who perceive the market as effectively closed to non-colluding participants. This dynamic can entrench market concentration further, creating a self-reinforcing cycle of reduced competition and continued collusion risk.

The economic impact of undetected bid rigging is likely disproportionately severe in developing and transitional economies, where procurement budgets represent a larger share of constrained public resources, and where limited statistical and investigative capacity reduces the probability of detection, potentially allowing collusive arrangements to persist over longer periods before intervention.

CONCLUSION

Bid rigging imposes substantial and well-documented economic costs on procurement systems, manifesting as direct price overcharges, allocative and productive inefficiency, and longer-term erosion of institutional trust and competitive market participation. While quantitative statistical screening tools have significantly advanced detection capability over recent decades, their effectiveness remains constrained by data availability and technical capacity, particularly in resource-limited settings, and they are most powerful when combined with complementary qualitative market structure analysis and incentive-based disclosure mechanisms such as leniency programmes and whistleblower protections.

No single detection tool is sufficient in isolation; a layered, multi-method detection strategy offers the most robust defence against bid rigging. Strengthening this layered capacity — through digitisation, technical training, credible leniency frameworks, and independent, well-resourced enforcement institutions — should be a policy priority given the scale of economic harm that undetected collusion imposes on public and private procurement systems alike.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Invest in e-procurement digitisation to generate the structured historical bidding datasets required for effective statistical screening.
- Build technical capacity within procurement oversight and competition authorities, including training in statistical screening methodologies and data analytics.
- Strengthen and actively promote leniency programmes, ensuring credible, well-publicised reduced-penalty incentives for insider disclosure.
- Extend legal protection and, where appropriate, financial incentives to external whistleblowers, including losing bidders who suspect collusion.
- Prioritise closer scrutiny of procurement categories exhibiting high-risk market structure characteristics, such as concentrated, homogeneous, repeat-tender markets.
- Establish cross-border and inter-agency information-sharing arrangements to address collusion involving multinational or cross-jurisdictional bidders.
- Periodically publish aggregated procurement price benchmarks to improve the transparency baseline against which anomalous bids can be identified.
- Ensure independence and adequate resourcing of procurement oversight and competition enforcement bodies to reduce political interference risk.

REFERENCES

Bajari, P., & Ye, L. (2003). Deciding between competition and collusion. Review of Economics and Statistics, 85(4), 971–989.

Connor, J. M. (2014). Price-fixing overcharges: Revised 3rd edition. SSRN Working Paper Series.

Harrington, J. E. (2008). Detecting cartels. In P. Buccirossi (Ed.), Handbook of antitrust economics (pp. 213–258). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2013). Ex officio cartel investigations and the use of screens to detect cartels. Paris: OECD Competition Committee.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2009). Guidelines for fighting bid rigging in public procurement. Paris: OECD Publishing.

Porter, R. H., & Zona, J. D. (1993). Detection of bid rigging in procurement auctions. Journal of Political Economy, 101(3), 518–538.

World Bank. (2020). Fraud and corruption awareness handbook for civil servants involved in public procurement. Washington, DC: World Bank Group.

Note: This reference list illustrates representative sources relevant to the themes discussed. For formal journal submission, please verify all citations directly against original publications and supplement with sources drawn from your institution's library, as required by the target journal's editorial standards.