Statement of the Federal Trade Commission known as polyetheretherketone or PE competition, spur innovation, and pro among PEEK suppliers This enforcem dominant firm employexclusionary procompetition

It is well established that exclus on the circumstances.

The Commissiontherefore examine exclusive dealing under the rule of reason to determine whether throbable neteffect of an exclusive dealing policy is to benefit or harm competition. In particular, we focus on evidence that the suspect conduct has affected or is likely to affect pries, output, quality, innovation, and consumer choic ecause its legality turns on its impact on competition, an exclusive dealing licy may be lawful when used by a firm in a competitive market, but unlawful if a monopolist uses the policy to intain the dominant position, for example, by iminishing its rivals' ability to compete We have reason to believe that the latter occurred ere.

Invibio was the first and forseveral years the only PEEK supplier in the market We charge that, when aced with the entry of two new rivals in the late 2000s Solvay Specialty Polymers LLC and Evonik Corporation Invibio sought to lock up its ustomers and lock out these rivals. Invibio recognized that denying olvay and Evonik access to the largest nost influential customers was critical to prevening the two entrants rom validating heir routations in the market and achieving the experience needed to pose a serious threat the ibio's market dominance

As described in our complaint, Invibio had entered into longerm exclusive contracts with nearly every medical device maker proding implants using PEEK. We allege that to t prevent Solvay and Evonik from gaining scope, experience, and supply relationshipsibio tightened