

# Reviewing the information paradigm

Citation for published version (APA):

Barreto Torres de Mendonca Narciso, M. (2022). *Reviewing the information paradigm: the role of online reviews in the regulation of information in EU consumer law*. [Doctoral Thesis, Maastricht University]. ProefschriftMaken. <https://doi.org/10.26481/dis.20220309mb>

## Document status and date:

Published: 01/01/2022

## DOI:

[10.26481/dis.20220309mb](https://doi.org/10.26481/dis.20220309mb)

## Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

## Please check the document version of this publication:

- A submitted manuscript is the version of the article upon submission and before peer-review. There can be important differences between the submitted version and the official published version of record. People interested in the research are advised to contact the author for the final version of the publication, or visit the DOI to the publisher's website.
- The final author version and the galley proof are versions of the publication after peer review.
- The final published version features the final layout of the paper including the volume, issue and page numbers.

[Link to publication](#)

## General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

If the publication is distributed under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license above, please follow below link for the End User Agreement:

[www.umlib.nl/taverne-license](http://www.umlib.nl/taverne-license)

## Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at:

[repository@maastrichtuniversity.nl](mailto:repository@maastrichtuniversity.nl)

providing details and we will investigate your claim.

1. The unreliability of online reviews should not be an obstacle either to their consideration by legal scholarship or to their importance to top-down consumer regulation.
2. The EU consumer law-based information paradigm is underutilized (there is an insufficient body of remedies to support information duties), misinterpreted (some central concepts of the information paradigm – such as the principle of transparency – lack teeth, a uniform definition and delimitation) and misapplied (due to the misinterpretation of information duties, parts of it remain unapplied and, therefore, offer no effective protection to the consumer).
3. The study and definitions of the information paradigm by legal scholars should include information sources beyond legislation or top-down regulation.
4. The information paradigm is not ‘dead’, and it will continue to thrive in EU consumer law in the years to come.
5. Private regulation does not always result in lower levels of consumer protection.
6. One of the undervalued benefits of the rise of the platform economy for legal research is how it dictates that legal scholarship no longer perceive ‘less traditional’ topics as less prestigious, but also accept the study of law and technology as not only important but crucial for the correct development of society.
7. While scholarship producing criticism often shines brighter than that pursuing explanations, it is important to take a step back and assess whether the existing regimes are improvable. In order to criticize and ultimately improve an issue – whether in the field of consumer law or elsewhere – it is always better to thoroughly understand the issue first, empirically when possible.
8. The detailed characterization and delimitation of the information paradigm operated in this thesis can benefit lawmakers both in the creation of new regulations – particularly within the regulation of the platform economy – and in the interpretation and consolidation of existing ones.
9. Diversity in research should be truly embraced, celebrated and stimulated: this should be done not only by benefiting from the different personal backgrounds of researchers (nationalities, languages, cultures) but also by being open to challenge the typically orthodox approaches to legal arguments and by welcoming the input of other disciplines.
10. Overplanning is overrated and feeling lost is part of life. To quote Phoebe Buffay, ‘I don’t even have a pla-’.