IRSHAD

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW AND POLICY

Breach of Contract Classification Consequences and Contractual Remedies

[Ali Hamza Sandhu][1]

[1]*Lahore Leads University. Pakistan*

Keywords:

Breach Of Contract, Contractual Remedies, Breach Classification, Anticipatory Breach, Material Breach, Damages, Contract Termination

ABSTRACT

Breach of contract does not produce one fixed legal outcome. Courts classify breach as minor, material, or anticipatory, each triggering different consequences. This research examines how classification determines available contractual remedies across commercial, consumer, and employment contracts. Existing scholarship treats remedies as isolated tools rather than a connected framework, leaving courts without clear guidance. This study aims to connect breach classification directly to remedy selection through qualitative doctrinal and document analysis. Legal texts, treaties, and scholarly literature were examined across multiple jurisdictions, including common law, civil law, and international sales conventions. Findings show that classification, not harm alone, determines whether compensation, termination, or suspension applies. Anticipatory breach remains inconsistent across courts, while penalty clauses and mitigation duties complicate outcomes. This research recommends clearer statutory standards and extending classification principles to digital and preliminary agreements. These findings offer courts, lawyers, and policymakers a unified framework for resolving breach disputes more fairly.

How to Cite: Sandhu, A. (2026). Breach of Contract Classification Consequences and Contractual Remedies. *International Journal of Law and Policy, 4*(9), 96-117. https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.550

I. Introduction

What happens when a business partner breaks a signed promise? Every contract carries an implied duty that both sides will perform. When that duty fails, the law must decide what happens next. Breach of contract is not a single event with one fixed outcome. Courts classify breaches differently, and each type carries distinct legal consequences. A minor breach may allow only partial compensation to the injured party. A material breach can end the contract and trigger full remedies. This classification shapes which remedy a wronged party may lawfully claim. Remedies range from damages to specific performance and contract rescission. Choosing the correct remedy depends on how a breach is classified. Businesses lose significant value every year through unresolved contract disputes. Legal systems worldwide keep refining rules for anticipatory breach. These distinctions protect contracting parties from unnecessary financial losses. This article examines how breach classification determines available contractual remedies (Adunola, 2022).

Contract law has long relied on remedies to correct broken promises. Ancient legal systems already recognized that unmet obligations demand some response. Modern jurisdictions built detailed rules around breach and its consequences over time. Scholars have studied damages, performance, and rescission as separate remedial tools. Much research treats these remedies as isolated topics rather than a connected framework. Fewer studies examine how breach classification directly shapes remedy selection across systems. Comparative work on minor and material breach remains limited in legal scholarship. Anticipatory breach receives attention, yet its remedial consequences are often treated briefly. Many jurisdictions apply inconsistent standards when classifying breach severity in disputes. This inconsistency creates uncertainty for parties seeking appropriate legal remedies. Existing literature rarely links classification criteria to remedy outcomes systematically. This gap leaves practitioners without clear guidance on remedy selection. This study addresses that gap by connecting breach classification to contractual remedies directly (Arvind, 2022).

Legal scholars already know that breach classification strongly affects remedy availability itself. Minor and material breaches trigger varied legal responses across most modern courts today worldwide. Damages, specific performance, and rescission serve distinct remedial purposes for injured parties. Restitutionary remedies also apply where a breaching party gains unfair benefit. Yet no consistent framework links breach type directly to remedy choice. Courts often decide remedy suitability case by case without clear guiding criteria. This inconsistency creates unpredictable outcomes for parties facing similar contractual breaches. Practitioners still need clear standards connecting classification to specific remedial outcomes. Anticipatory breach adds further complexity to already inconsistent remedial reasoning. This research addresses that missing connection between classification and remedy selection. It asks how breach severity should determine which remedy applies. It also asks whether current remedial rules adequately serve contracting

parties. Answering these questions will clarify remedy selection for future contract disputes fairly (Burrows, 2019).

Existing literature on breach classification remains scattered across separate legal traditions. Early scholarship focused mainly on defining breach types without connecting them to remedies. Later work examined damages and specific performance as independent remedial categories. Few studies compared how different legal systems classify breach severity consistently. This gap leaves practitioners uncertain about which remedy fits which breach type. Recent scholarship has started restating English contract law more systematically than before. This restatement clarifies distinctions between breach categories and available remedial responses. It also highlights inconsistencies in how courts apply remedy rules. Such inconsistencies show that classification frameworks still lack full doctrinal clarity. Comparative legal analysis remains underdeveloped despite growing interest in remedy harmonization. Many jurisdictions borrow remedial concepts without adapting them to local classification systems. This borrowing creates further confusion when courts interpret breach severity differently. These gaps show classification and remedy selection need a clearer theoretical link (Burrows, 2020).

Employment contract disputes reveal additional gaps in breach and remedy scholarship. Common law traditionally treated employment breaches under general contract principles alone. Recent developments show courts adapting remedies specifically for employment relationships instead. These developments recognize that employment breaches carry distinct practical consequences for workers. Termination without notice, for example, raises different remedial questions than ordinary breach. Wrongful dismissal remedies increasingly diverge from standard contractual damages frameworks today. This divergence suggests classification systems need context-specific remedial categories, not uniform rules. Scholars have begun mapping how liability standards shift across different contract types. Yet this mapping remains incomplete for many specialized contractual relationships. Commercial contracts, consumer agreements, and employment contracts each demand distinct remedial thinking. Current frameworks rarely address how these categories interact within classification systems. This inconsistency limits practical guidance for courts handling mixed contractual disputes. Addressing these specialized gaps clarifies the link between breach type and remedy (Cabrelli, 2016).

The literature review shows strong coverage of individual remedies for breach. It also shows weak coverage of how classification systematically guides remedy choice. Comparative analysis across commercial, consumer, and employment contracts remains particularly underdeveloped. Studies rarely connect breach severity to specific remedial outcomes across contract types. Employment scholarship hints at context-specific remedies but stops short of a framework. General contract scholarship restates remedies without fully linking them to classification. This leaves a clear gap between classification theory and remedy selection. No current study offers a unified framework spanning multiple contract categories. Future research should build a framework connecting breach type to specific remedies. This

framework should apply across commercial, consumer, and employment contract settings. It should also clarify how courts can apply classification criteria consistently. Such clarity would reduce unpredictable outcomes across different contractual disputes. This research fills that gap by proposing a unified classification-remedy framework (Devenney & Shaw-Mellors, 2024).

To examine how breach of contract is classified across commercial, consumer, and employment contracts.

To analyze how breach classification determines the choice of available contractual remedies.

To propose a unified framework linking breach severity to specific remedial outcomes across contract types.

How does the classification of breach of contract determine the selection and effectiveness of contractual remedies across commercial, consumer, and employment contracts?

This research holds academic significance by linking breach classification to remedy theory. It fills a gap between doctrinal classification and practical remedy selection in courts. Scholars gain a unified framework applicable across commercial, consumer, and employment contracts. This contribution advances contract law scholarship beyond isolated remedial discussions today. Practically, this research helps courts apply classification criteria more consistently across disputes. Consistent application reduces unpredictable outcomes for parties facing contractual breaches. Lawyers and judges benefit from clearer guidance when selecting appropriate remedies. Businesses gain confidence in predicting remedial consequences before entering contractual relationships. Employment relationships particularly benefit from clearer breach and remedy connections. Workers and employers alike gain from reduced uncertainty in dispute resolution. Societally, predictable contract remedies strengthen trust in commercial and employment transactions. This trust supports economic stability across contracting parties and modern legal systems. The study therefore justifies its pursuit through academic, practical, and societal value (Ewing, 1993).

II. Methodology

This research follows a qualitative research design suited to legal analysis. Qualitative methods allow careful interpretation of statutes, case law, and academic commentary. Quantitative methods are less useful because breach classification is a conceptual, not numerical, question. The research population consists of laws and doctrines governing breach of contract and remedies. This includes common law rules, civil law codes, and international sales conventions. The sample narrows this population to specific legal instruments and jurisdictions. These instruments include the Vienna Convention, French Civil Code reforms, and English contract doctrine. Scholarly literature and case commentary form a second sample of sources drawn from recognized journals. This combination

supports a thorough qualitative analysis of legal doctrine. It allows this research to trace how classification principles developed across legal traditions. The approach also supports comparing doctrinal reasoning across jurisdictions without numerical measurement. This method suits legal research, where meaning matters more than statistical patterns.

Data collection relied on targeted keyword searches across recognized legal databases. Keywords included breach of contract, anticipatory breach, contractual remedies, and damages classification. These searches covered databases such as Oxford Academic, HeinOnline, and SSRN. Statutory and treaty texts were retrieved directly from official government websites. International instruments were retrieved from organizations such as the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law. This dual approach combined primary legal sources with secondary scholarly interpretation. Primary sources establish what the law states in each specific jurisdiction. Secondary sources explain how courts and scholars interpret those same provisions. Combining both source types strengthens confidence in the accuracy of legal claims. It also helps identify where scholarly interpretation diverges from strict statutory wording. This divergence often reveals genuine gaps within existing legal doctrine. Official websites ensured legal texts remained current and accurately cited throughout. This careful sourcing process supports the reliability of this research's findings.

Validity was maintained by prioritizing articles published within five recent years. Laws referenced throughout this research remain currently in force. Older sources were included only where they carried lasting doctrinal significance. Reliability was supported by selecting peer-reviewed articles from recognized legal scholars. The analysis relied on doctrinal analysis alongside document analysis of sources. Doctrinal analysis examined statutory text, judicial reasoning, and legal principles closely. Document analysis examined scholarly arguments, comparative commentary, and recent contributions. Ethical considerations remained limited since this research used only public documents. Every scholarly article referenced in this research received proper citation. This citation practice attributes original ideas correctly to their authors. This research also acknowledges limitations tied to evolving digital contract technology. Laws referenced throughout this research may still be amended after publication. The study was delimited to breach classification within commercial, consumer, and employment contracts. Tort-based and criminal liability frameworks fall outside this research’s scope.

III. Results

This section presents the findings on breach classification and contractual remedies. It answers how classification shapes remedy availability across different contract types. The findings draw on close doctrinal analysis of minor, material, and anticipatory breach. Each category carries distinct legal consequences that influence which remedy applies. Minor breach permits only limited compensation while the contract remains fully enforceable.

Material breach justifies termination alongside access to a broader remedial range. Anticipatory breach allows early remedy access, though courts apply this inconsistently. These findings also address distinct remedy patterns across commercial and employment contracts. International frameworks, including the CISG, illustrate how classification guides remedy selection. Such frameworks confirm that classification, not harm alone, drives remedial outcomes. The results below directly respond to each research question raised earlier. They show why a unified classification-remedy framework remains genuinely necessary today. Together, these findings clarify how courts should approach breach and remedy issues (Katz, 2005).

Breach of contract falls into three main categories recognized across legal systems. Minor breach occurs when a party fails a small part of performance. The contract still stands, and the injured party receives limited compensation. Material breach involves a serious failure that defeats the contract's central purpose. This breach allows the injured party to terminate the agreement entirely. It also opens access to a fuller range of contractual remedies. Anticipatory breach happens when a party signals refusal before performance is due. Courts treat this signal as an immediate breach rather than a future concern. The injured party may then seek remedies without waiting for the deadline. Each category carries different legal thresholds for courts to apply. These thresholds determine which specific damages or remedies become available. Classification therefore shapes both the timing and scope of contractual remedies. This structured approach mirrors distinctions found across most major legal traditions (Ficetola, 2011).

Minor breaches involve small failures that do not defeat the contract's central purpose. Courts treat these failures as less severe than material breaches generally. The underlying contract remains valid and legally binding on both parties. Termination is not an available remedy for a simple minor breach. Instead, courts grant partial remedies that address the specific failure only. Reduced damages compensate the injured party for the limited financial harm suffered. These damages reflect actual financial loss rather than the full contract value. Specific performance rarely applies since the contract continues without major disruption. Parties must still complete their remaining obligations under the original signed agreement. This approach protects contractual stability while still addressing minor unfairness. Courts balance fairness to the injured party against contract continuity. This balance prevents parties from ending agreements over relatively trivial contract failures. Minor breach remedies therefore preserve the contract while correcting limited harm caused (Furmston, 2017).

Material breach occurs when a failure defeats the contract's essential central purpose. This failure strikes at the heart of what the parties originally intended. Courts recognize material breach as serious enough to justify termination. The injured party may end the contract without further performance obligations. Termination releases both parties from remaining duties under the signed agreement. Beyond termination, courts open access to a full range of remedies. Damages compensate the injured party for financial losses caused by the breach. These damages aim to restore the position that existed before the breach.

Rescission cancels the contract entirely and restores parties to their original positions. This remedy suits situations where continuing the contract serves no real purpose. Courts choose between damages and rescission based on specific case circumstances. The severity of material breach justifies this broader remedial response for parties. Material breach therefore triggers stronger consequences than minor contractual failures (Giri, 2024).

Anticipatory breach happens when a party clearly signals a refusal to perform. This signal arrives well before the actual scheduled performance date arrives. Courts allow the injured party to treat this signal as immediate breach. The injured party may then seek remedies without waiting any further. This early remedy access protects parties from prolonged contractual uncertainty ahead. Courts nonetheless apply this rule with noticeable inconsistency across different legal jurisdictions today. Some courts require clear and unequivocal refusal before recognizing anticipatory breach. Other courts accept weaker signals as sufficient grounds for early remedies. This inconsistency creates unpredictable outcomes for parties facing potential breach. Relational contracts, such as ongoing employment agreements, complicate this analysis even further. Ongoing relationships make courts hesitant to treat early warning signals as breach. This hesitation delays remedy access for employees facing likely job termination. Anticipatory breach doctrine therefore needs clearer and more consistent judicial application (Golding, 2021).

Remedy selection depends heavily on how a court classifies the breach. Two parties may suffer similar financial harm yet receive very different remedies. This difference arises because classification, not harm, guides the remedial choice made. A court first decides whether the breach is minor or material. This classification determines whether termination or partial compensation becomes legally available. Harm alone rarely justifies rescission without a corresponding material classification present. Courts also consider whether the breach was anticipatory in nature. This particular factor can shift remedy timing even when harm stays constant. The Uniform Commercial Code illustrates this classification-driven approach for goods contracts. It ties specific remedies directly to clearly defined categories of breach. This structure shows that remedies flow from legal categories, not damage alone. Parties therefore cannot predict their remedies by measuring harm in isolation. Classification remains the central factor shaping every contractual remedy decision made (Hunter et al., 2023).

IV. Discussion

A. Breach of Contract is Classified into Three Main Categories Minor, Material, and Anticipatory Each Triggering Distinct Legal Consequences

This research asked how breach classification shapes the choice of remedy. The results confirm that classification, not mere harm, drives most remedy outcomes. Minor breach limits remedies to partial compensation for the injured party. Material breach opens

access to termination and a much fuller remedial range. Anticipatory breach shifts remedy timing but still faces inconsistent judicial recognition. These patterns matter because parties plan their conduct around predictable legal outcomes. Predictability lets businesses estimate risk before entering contractual arrangements formally. It also lets injured parties know what recovery they can reasonably expect afterward. Mitigation duties further shape how much a party can actually recover. Courts expect injured parties to limit their losses after a breach occurs. Failure to mitigate can reduce the damages a court finally awards. This expectation adds another practical layer to classification-based remedy analysis. Together, these findings answer the research question with clear, practical, useful detail (Michaud, 2019).

Economic analysis supports this classification-based approach to contractual remedies. Remedies function partly as tools for sharing legal risk between parties. Damages transfer the cost of breach from the injured party to the breacher. This transfer encourages parties to allocate risk carefully during contract formation. When classification is predictable, parties can price this risk into agreements. Uncertain classification makes risk allocation harder and increases contracting costs. Businesses respond by adding detailed breach clauses to reduce this uncertainty. Such clauses attempt to define breach severity before disputes ever arise. Courts still retain discretion when interpreting these contractual definitions. This discretion can undermine the predictability parties tried to secure. Economic theory therefore favors clearer default rules for breach classification. Clearer rules would reduce transaction costs tied to contract drafting. They would also lower litigation costs when disputes eventually reach court. These economic insights reinforce the practical value of the current findings (Polinsky, 1981).

Doctrinal accounts of contract remedies reveal both agreement and disagreement among scholars. Most scholars agree that material breach justifies termination. They also agree that minor breach limits parties to partial remedies. Disagreement grows around how courts should treat borderline breach cases. Some scholars argue courts favor flexible, fact-specific classification over fixed rules. Others argue this flexibility produces unpredictable and inconsistent judicial outcomes. This contradiction reflects a real tension in contract remedy doctrine. Flexibility protects fairness in unusual cases that fixed rules might miss. Fixed rules protect certainty that businesses need for contract planning. Recent commentary tries to balance these competing goals through structured guidance. Structured guidance offers courts factors to weigh without eliminating judicial discretion entirely. This compromise approach appears increasingly common in contemporary contract textbooks. It suggests scholars now favor guided discretion over rigid classification rules. These developments support the framework proposed by this research (Poole et al., 2017).

Comparative legal analysis shows classification frameworks differ across national legal systems. Thai contract law, for example, applies different criteria for breach severity. It places greater weight on good faith than many common law systems. This cultural factor influences how courts classify certain contractual failures. English and American courts rely more heavily on objective performance standards. These differing approaches produce

different remedy outcomes for similar factual situations. A party who breaches a contract may face termination there. The same conduct might warrant only partial remedies elsewhere instead. This variation complicates cross-border commercial transactions and dispute resolution. Businesses operating internationally must account for these classification differences. Harmonization efforts, such as international sales conventions, attempt to reduce this variation. Yet local legal traditions continue shaping classification in meaningful ways. These comparative insights highlight why context matters alongside general classification rules. This research therefore accounts for jurisdictional variation in its proposed framework (Pongsapan, 2016).

Recent developments in digital commerce test traditional breach classification models further. Digital service agreements often involve automated rather than human performance. This automation complicates identifying when a breach becomes material or minor. A software outage might qualify as either category depending on impact. Emerging legal commentary calls for updated classification standards suited to digital contracts. These standards would consider factors like data loss and service downtime duration. Traditional categories built around physical goods do not translate cleanly here. This gap represents a real limitation in current classification frameworks. Existing doctrine was largely developed before widespread digital service contracting existed. Policymakers in several jurisdictions now discuss reforms addressing digital contract remedies. Such reforms could clarify remedy availability for consumers facing platform failures. This research's framework offers a useful foundation for extending classification into digital contexts. Applying these principles to digital agreements remains an area for further study (Putra & Djajaputra, 2024).

These findings carry clear implications for courts, lawyers, and contracting parties. Courts benefit from a structured approach linking classification to remedy choice. This structure reduces guesswork when deciding if termination is justified. Lawyers can advise clients more confidently once classification criteria become clearer. Clients gain better ability to predict outcomes before pursuing costly litigation. Contract drafters can use these insights when writing breach provisions. Clear provisions defining minor and material breach reduce future interpretive disputes. Termination clauses benefit from this classification-based reasoning approach. Parties can specify in advance which failures justify ending their agreement. This specification lowers litigation risk and supports smoother relationships. The findings apply broadly across commercial, consumer, and employment settings alike. They also extend usefully into emerging areas like digital service contracts. Future research should test this framework against additional jurisdictions and contract types. Such testing would strengthen the framework's use across diverse legal systems (Rowan, 2012).

B. Minor Breaches Generally Permit Only Partial Remedies, Such as Reduced Damages, While the Underlying Contract Stays Enforceable

This section asks why minor breach produces only partial remedies. The answer lies in proportionality between breach severity and the legal response applied. Minor breach causes

limited harm, so the law limits available remedies. Comparative legal traditions confirm this proportionality principle across different legal systems. Islamic and Arab contract law also links remedy scope to breach severity. Under these systems, small failures rarely justify ending an entire agreement fully. Instead, courts award compensation that matches the actual harm suffered. This approach mirrors common law treatment of minor breach cases quite closely. Both traditions protect contract stability by avoiding disproportionate remedial responses. Proportionality prevents parties from exploiting small failures to escape larger obligations. It also protects injured parties from receiving remedies exceeding their actual loss. This balance reflects a shared legal instinct found across diverse jurisdictions. The comparison strengthens confidence in proportionality as a guiding remedial principle for courts (Saleh, 1989).

Philosophical accounts of contract remedies explain why proportion matters so much in practice. Contract law aims to protect promised expectations, not to punish parties. Punitive responses to minor failures would exceed this protective purpose entirely. Philosophers argue remedies should restore the injured party, not penalize the breacher. This restorative goal supports limiting minor breach remedies to actual loss. Awarding more than actual loss would shift remedies toward punishment instead. Courts generally reject punitive damages within most ordinary contract dispute settings. This rejection reflects a deliberate legal choice about contract law's purpose. Contract law differs sharply from tort law in this specific legal respect. Tort law sometimes permits punitive damages for particularly reckless conduct. Contract law instead favors compensatory remedies closely matched to actual harm suffered. This philosophical distinction justifies limiting minor breach remedies appropriately in practice. It also explains why courts hesitate to expand remedies beyond fair compensation (Smith, 2014).

Practical legal scholarship supports treating minor breach with limited remedies. Studies surveying many contract disputes show courts consistently award reduced damages here. These damages typically reflect the actual cost of fixing the failure. Courts rarely allow termination when the breach affects only minor contract terms. This pattern appears consistently across commercial sale and service contracts. Buyers facing small delivery delays usually receive price reductions rather than cancellation rights. Similarly, minor delays in service delivery rarely justify ending an entire contract. Courts instead calculate damages based on measurable inconvenience or additional cost. This measurable approach keeps remedies proportionate and administratively manageable for courts. It also gives businesses a predictable basis for resolving small disputes quickly. Predictability encourages settlement rather than lengthy and costly litigation processes. Settlement reduces court burden while still compensating injured parties fairly and quickly. This growing evidence confirms that minor breach remedies remain narrow by design (Tirkey, 2018).

Scholars sometimes disagree about how minor breach applies under international sales law. Some commentators argue the relevant convention treats breach severity differently from domestic law. They suggest international rules focus more on fundamental breach than

gradual severity. This focus creates tension when applying domestic minor breach principles internationally. Other commentators argue the convention still permits proportionate remedies for smaller failures. This disagreement highlights genuine interpretive uncertainty within international contract remedy scholarship. Courts applying international rules must navigate these competing academic interpretations carefully. Jurisdictional differences deepen this uncertainty when disputes cross multiple legal systems. A buyer and seller from different countries may expect different outcomes. This mismatch complicates predictability in genuinely cross-border commercial transactions today. Scholars continue debating how best to reconcile these competing interpretive approaches. Resolving this debate would improve consistency for future international contract disputes. This contradiction remains an open and unresolved issue within current remedy scholarship (Torsello, 2005).

Recent scholarship explores gain-based remedies as an alternative remedial approach entirely. These remedies focus on profits the breaching party gained through breach. Traditional minor breach remedies instead focus solely on the victim's loss. This emerging approach questions whether loss alone captures full contractual harm. A breaching party might still profit even when the victim suffers little loss. Gain-based remedies would require that party to surrender those unfair profits. This idea remains controversial for minor breach specifically, given its limited harm. Critics worry gain-based remedies could over-punish otherwise trivial minor contractual failures. Supporters argue such remedies discourage strategic and deliberately calculated minor breaches. Some jurisdictions now discuss incorporating gain-based principles into commercial contract policy. These policy discussions signal ongoing evolution within contemporary contract remedy scholarship generally. Minor breach doctrine may eventually need to accommodate these new emerging pressures. For now, loss-based compensation remains the dominant remedial standard widely applied (Zatorski, 2023).

This analysis carries certain limitations worth acknowledging directly. Minor breach classification often depends on subjective judicial assessment of harm. Different courts may weigh similar facts differently, producing inconsistent outcomes. Contractual defenses and damages-limiting clauses further complicate this classification exercise. Parties often include clauses capping damages regardless of breach classification itself. Such clauses can override default remedies courts would otherwise apply. This interaction between contract terms and default rules deserves closer examination. Denial of breach altogether also complicates classification before remedies even arise. A party disputing that any breach occurred delays remedy analysis considerably. These procedural complications limit how cleanly classification frameworks apply in practice. Despite these limitations, the findings offer meaningful practical guidance. Courts, lawyers, and drafters can apply these principles while remaining aware of exceptions. Future research should examine how limiting clauses interact with breach classification. Such research would strengthen the practical applicability of this remedial framework (Cartwright, 2022).

C. Material Breaches Justify Termination of the Contract Along with a Full Range of Remedies, Including Damages and Rescission

This section asks why anticipatory breach allows remedies before performance falls due. Anticipatory breach occurs when a party clearly refuses future performance in advance. International sales law directly addresses this early refusal through specific rules. These rules let the injured party treat the refusal as an immediate breach. The injured party need not wait until the actual performance date arrives. This approach prevents delay and reduces avoidable additional losses. It also lets injured parties seek substitute performance from other sources quickly. Waiting until the deadline could leave parties without any practical remedy. Early recognition therefore serves both efficiency and fairness in commercial dealings. Yet applying this rule requires courts to assess how clear the refusal was. Ambiguous statements create genuine difficulty in recognizing anticipatory breach reliably. This difficulty explains why courts apply the rule with notable inconsistency. This tension clarifies why the research question stays genuinely important (Nasir Albalawee, 2023).

Recent legal reforms support recognizing breach before the performance date arrives. French contract law underwent significant statutory reform addressing breach and its remedies. The 2016 reform clarified when a party may act before actual non-performance. This reform reflects a broader legislative trend favoring early remedy access. Lawmakers recognized that waiting for actual breach often harms injured parties needlessly. Codifying early remedy rights gives courts far clearer statutory guidance to apply. This guidance reduces reliance on inconsistent case-by-case judicial interpretation alone. Other civil law jurisdictions have watched this reform with considerable legal interest. Some have proposed similar codification efforts within their own legal systems. This trend suggests growing international acceptance of early remedy principles generally. Codified rules also help businesses anticipate remedy availability during contract negotiation. This predictability supports smoother cross-border commercial planning and legal risk assessment. These reforms provide meaningful evidence supporting the value of early remedy recognition (Ismail, 2022).

Korean contract law offers a useful comparison for anticipatory breach doctrine. Korean rules link remedies closely to a debtor's demonstrated fault or intent. This approach contrasts with systems that focus purely on objective refusal signals. Under fault-based reasoning, a party's motive can affect remedy availability directly. This creates a genuine contradiction with objective approaches used elsewhere. Objective approaches ask only whether refusal occurred, not why it happened. Fault-based approaches instead examine the breaching party's underlying reasoning and intent. These different starting points can produce opposite outcomes on similar facts. A party refusing performance for unavoidable reasons might avoid liability under fault rules. The same refusal could still trigger early remedies under objective rules. This contradiction complicates efforts to build one universal anticipatory breach standard. Legal systems must therefore choose which underlying

philosophy their rules should reflect. This comparison highlights a genuine and unresolved theoretical divide in remedy doctrine (Lee, 2025).

Other factors also shape how courts evaluate anticipatory breach claims. Non-pecuniary loss, such as distress or reputational harm, adds complexity here. Traditional remedy frameworks focus mainly on measurable financial losses to parties. Non-pecuniary harm resists easy quantification, making courts hesitant to award it. Yet early breach recognition may itself cause reputational or relational harm. A business publicly refusing performance can damage its commercial standing quickly. Courts must decide whether such harm deserves recognition alongside financial damages. Some jurisdictions cautiously extend remedies to cover limited non-pecuniary consequences. Others remain firmly restricted to compensating only measurable financial losses. This divergence reflects differing cultural attitudes toward contractual harm generally. It also reflects practical concerns about proving non-financial harm convincingly. These influencing factors add further complexity to anticipatory breach remedy analysis. Courts must weigh them alongside timing and refusal clarity carefully. This complexity contributes to the inconsistency observed across different legal systems (Kryla-Cudna, 2018).

This analysis carries limitations worth noting honestly and directly here. Most anticipatory breach scholarship concentrates on commercial sale and service contracts. Fewer studies examine how similar early remedy principles apply elsewhere. International investment law offers one such underexplored comparative context today. There, sanctions and regulatory measures sometimes resemble anticipatory refusal by states directly. Remedies in that field often rely on non-pecuniary measures beyond simple damages. This difference suggests anticipatory breach principles may not transfer cleanly everywhere. Applying commercial contract logic to state conduct risks oversimplifying complex realities. Investment disputes involve public policy considerations absent from ordinary commercial contracts. This bias toward commercial contexts limits how broadly these findings can generalize. Future research should test anticipatory breach principles against these different legal contexts directly. Doing so would clarify where early remedy logic holds and where it breaks down. Acknowledging this limitation strengthens rather than weakens the present research analysis (Marzal, 2025).

These findings carry clear practical implications for courts and contracting parties alike. Recognizing early breach only matters if injured parties actually mitigate losses. International sale of goods rules require parties to limit damages promptly. A party who fails to seek substitute goods may recover far less compensation. This mitigation duty connects directly to early remedy recognition discussed earlier. Injured parties who act quickly after refusal reduce their total financial exposure. Courts should therefore weigh mitigation efforts when assessing anticipatory breach remedies. Lawyers can advise clients to document early refusal and mitigation steps carefully. This documentation strengthens claims and clarifies remedy calculations before litigation begins. Businesses drafting contracts can include clauses clarifying anticipatory breach triggers explicitly. Clear triggers reduce disputes over whether

refusal was sufficiently definite. These practical steps apply across commercial contracts involving goods and services. Together, these implications support more consistent application of anticipatory breach doctrine (Oviedo Albán, 2018).

D. Anticipatory Breach Allows the Non-Breaching Party to Seek Remedies Before the Performance Date Arrives, But Courts Apply this Rule Inconsistently

This paragraph interprets why courts recognize breach before performance is due. Anticipatory breach arises when conduct or words clearly indicate future refusal. Legal systems increasingly define the exact threshold that such conduct must meet. Vague or hesitant statements usually fall short of this required legal threshold. Clear cancellation notices or open refusal typically satisfy the legal test. Once satisfied, the injured party gains an immediate right to remedies. This right matters because delay often increases the eventual scale of loss. Businesses facing likely non-performance need practical options before deadlines actually pass. Recognizing breach early lets injured parties arrange alternative supply or performance. Without this recognition, parties would remain contractually trapped until deadlines expire. This trapped position could cause avoidable financial and serious operational harm. The doctrine therefore serves a protective function for injured contracting parties. Its consequences reach beyond theory into practical daily commercial decision-making today (Sulistianingsih et al., 2024).

Recent scholarship calls for modernizing notice rules tied to breach remedies. Outdated notice requirements can prevent injured parties from claiming their timely remedies. Strict deadlines sometimes bar valid claims over minor procedural technicalities alone. Reform proposals suggest replacing rigid deadlines with more flexible notice standards. Flexible standards would still require prompt notice but allow reasonable exceptions. This shift aims to preserve remedies without abandoning fairness toward breaching parties. Modernized rules could also clarify what counts as sufficient early notice. Clearer standards would help injured parties comply confidently after facing refusal. Legislatures in several jurisdictions have already begun reviewing similar notice provisions recently. These reviews reflect growing recognition that outdated rules undermine legitimate remedy claims. Aligning notice rules with anticipatory breach doctrine strengthens remedy access broadly. Such alignment reduces the risk of losing valid claims on technical grounds. This scholarship provides direct support for reforming anticipatory breach procedures today (Plass, 2024).

Judicial practice in Nepal offers a useful point of comparison here. Nepalese courts often calculate damages using far broader discretionary standards than common law. This discretion allows judges to weigh fairness alongside strict legal formulas. Common law courts instead prefer precise formulas tied to measurable loss. This contrast produces different outcomes even when the facts remain similar. A Nepalese court might award damages reflecting the hardship experienced by parties. A common law court would likely limit damages to calculable financial loss. This divergence shows how local legal culture shapes anticipatory breach remedy calculations. Neither approach is inherently superior,

though each serves different underlying values. Discretionary approaches prioritize fairness in individual circumstances over strict predictability. Formula-based approaches instead prioritize legal consistency and predictability over case-specific fairness. This comparison illustrates the wider global variation surrounding breach remedy calculation. Recognizing this variation helps explain persistent inconsistency found across different legal systems (Rawal, 2025).

Another important factor shaping remedy outcomes is the substitute transaction rule. This rule lets injured parties calculate damages using a comparable replacement transaction price. After recognizing anticipatory breach, a party may purchase goods elsewhere immediately. The price difference between contracts becomes the measurable basis for damages. This rule works well when substitute goods are readily available nearby. It becomes harder to apply when substitutes are scarce or unique. Unique goods or specialized services complicate finding a comparable substitute transaction. Courts then must estimate damages using less precise valuation methods instead. This uncertainty introduces additional inconsistency into anticipatory breach remedy calculations. Market volatility can also affect how courts apply the substitute transaction rule. Rapid price changes may distort what counts as a fair substitute price. These practical complications show why remedy outcomes vary beyond simple legal doctrine. Market conditions therefore influence remedies alongside classification and the timing of refusal (Rong, 2026).

This analysis also faces real limitations tied to unsettled negotiating-damages doctrine. Courts sometimes award damages based on what parties might have negotiated. This approach applies when actual financial loss proves difficult to measure. A landmark commonwealth decision narrowed when courts may use this approach. That decision restricted negotiating damages mainly to cases involving lost proprietary rights. This restriction creates uncertainty about whether it extends to anticipatory breach cases. Scholars remain sharply divided on how broadly courts should apply this limitation. Some argue anticipatory breach rarely involves proprietary rights, limiting relevance here. Others argue certain commercial refusals still resemble the rights-based scenarios covered. This unresolved debate limits how confidently this analysis can generalize its findings today. Courts may continue applying inconsistent damages methods until clearer guidance emerges. This uncertainty represents a genuine limitation within current anticipatory breach scholarship. Readers should treat these remedy calculations as evolving, not fully settled (Shevchuk, 2019).

These findings apply broadly across many jurisdictions calculating anticipatory breach damages. Chinese law, for instance, provides detailed statutory rules for damages calculation. These rules specify factors courts must weigh when determining compensation amounts. Such statutory clarity offers a useful model for reducing anticipatory breach inconsistency. Jurisdictions relying heavily on judicial discretion could adopt similar statutory guidance. Clearer statutory factors would help courts apply anticipatory breach doctrine consistently. Lawyers advising clients could reference these factors when estimating likely damages.

Businesses negotiating contracts could draft clauses referencing recognized damages calculation methods. This alignment between contract drafting and statutory guidance reduces future litigation risk. Policymakers considering reform could look to these statutory models for guidance. Adopting clearer calculation rules would benefit courts, lawyers, and commercial parties alike. These implications extend across goods contracts, services contracts, and cross-border transactions. This comparative evidence supports greater statutory clarity in anticipatory breach remedies (Sun & Sun, 2025).

E. Remedy Selection Depends Heavily on How a Court Classifies the Breach, Not on the Harm Alone

Recent scholarship revisits anticipatory breach by refining its underlying conceptual boundaries. Scholars now distinguish premature breach from breach involving certain future non-performance. This distinction matters because each triggers a genuinely different remedial pathway for parties. Premature breach may still allow performance if circumstances later change favorably. Certain future non-performance leaves no realistic possibility of eventual compliance. Courts treat these situations differently even when resulting harm looks similar. This refined classification shows why harm alone cannot determine remedy choice. Two parties suffering identical financial loss may receive different remedies entirely. The determining factor remains how courts categorize the underlying breach itself. This conceptual refinement strengthens the argument that classification drives remedy outcomes. It also clarifies boundaries that earlier doctrine left somewhat vague and unsettled. This added clarity matters directly for how courts resolve future breach disputes (Touaibia & Kiram, 2026).

International sales law provides clear direct evidence supporting classification-driven remedies. It grants parties a right to suspend performance during anticipatory breach situations. This suspension right applies before any financial harm has actually occurred. A party may pause deliveries simply because future non-performance seems genuinely likely. This particular remedy exists regardless of whether measurable damage has yet arisen. Suspension protects parties from committing further resources toward an increasingly doubtful contract. It functions as a preventive remedy rather than a compensatory response. This preventive function only makes sense within a classification-based framework. Harm-based reasoning alone could not justify remedies before any loss occurs. Classification, by contrast, focuses on the nature of the anticipated failure. This focus explains clearly why suspension becomes available at such an early stage. The rule therefore offers strong evidence that classification governs remedy availability. It confirms that legal categories, rather than measured harm, unlock specific remedies (Zdravković, 2023).

German civil law offers a comparative angle that highlights genuine contradictions. German courts often tie damages closely to specific statutory breach categories. Each category carries its own defined calculation method under the civil code. This structured approach contrasts sharply with more flexible common law reasoning. Common law courts

often calculate damages case by case without fixed categories. Judges there weigh multiple factors before settling on an appropriate remedy. This flexibility can produce inconsistent results across seemingly similar breach situations. German statutory precision instead promises more predictable, uniform remedy outcomes generally. Yet rigid categories can sometimes fail to capture unusual factual circumstances. A breach that fits poorly within existing categories may receive an awkward remedy. This tension between flexibility and predictability appears across many legal traditions. Neither system fully resolves the underlying difficulty of matching remedy to breach. This comparison reveals a genuine and lasting contradiction within remedy scholarship (Zakharov, 2025).

Contractual penalty clauses represent another important factor influencing remedy outcomes. Parties sometimes agree in advance on fixed sums payable after breach. These clauses can override default remedies that classification alone would otherwise provide. Courts must decide whether such clauses reflect genuine pre-estimated loss accurately. Some penalty clauses grow large enough to raise real fairness concerns for courts. Excessively large penalties may conflict with broader principles of civil law. Courts sometimes reduce these penalties despite the parties' original contractual agreement. This judicial intervention shows classification alone does not fully control remedy outcomes. Freedom of contract competes directly with protective civil law principles here. This competition adds real, meaningful complexity beyond simple breach classification analysis. Parties drafting penalty clauses must therefore anticipate possible future judicial reduction later. This possibility affects how businesses structure risk allocation within their signed contracts. Penalty clauses illustrate how contractual choices interact with classification-based remedy rules (Vasyliev, 2022).

This analysis faces limitations when applied to preliminary agreements. Preliminary agreements sit somewhere between negotiation and a fully binding contract. Classification frameworks built for finished contracts do not fit neatly here. Courts must decide whether breaking a preliminary agreement even counts as breach. Some jurisdictions treat this failure as a distinct form of liability entirely. This distinct liability does not always map onto minor or material categories. Damages calculations for preliminary agreements often remain narrower than full contract damages. Courts limit recovery to reliance losses rather than full expectation damages. This narrower scope reflects the incomplete nature of preliminary commitments themselves. The classification framework proposed here may therefore need separate adaptation. Extending it directly to preliminary agreements risks oversimplifying a distinct legal category. This limitation suggests future work should treat preliminary agreements as their own category. Acknowledging this gap keeps the present framework honest about its scope (Wang, H., 2025).

These findings still carry useful implications for many pre-contractual liability disputes. Courts increasingly need clearer standards defining the scope of pre-contract damages. Classification-based reasoning can help even where full contracts have not formed. Courts might classify pre-contractual conduct along a similar severity spectrum. Minor negotiation failures could warrant limited compensation for wasted preparatory expenses. Serious bad-

faith conduct during negotiations could warrant much broader remedial responses instead. This extension would bring pre-contractual liability closer to established contract remedy logic. Lawyers advising clients during negotiations could better predict potential liability exposure. Businesses could then structure their negotiations with clearer expectations about legal consequences. Policymakers reforming pre-contractual liability rules could adopt this classification-inspired approach. Such reform would reduce uncertainty currently surrounding pre-contract damages calculations generally. These implications extend the present framework's relevance well beyond fully formed contracts. This broader applicability strengthens the practical value of a classification-based approach for courts (Wang, Z., 2026).

F. Implication

These findings push classification-based reasoning beyond its traditional common law boundaries. Existing frameworks treated minor, material, and anticipatory breach as largely separate doctrinal categories. This research instead connects them within one unified remedial structure. That connection challenges scholarship treating remedies as isolated responses to isolated harm. Courts benefit from clearer guidance when deciding whether termination or compensation applies. Lawyers gain a framework for predicting outcomes before pursuing costly litigation. Businesses drafting contracts can define breach severity more precisely within their agreements. Employment relationships benefit from remedies tailored to their relational character. Consumers facing digital service failures gain a pathway for extending classification principles further. Lawmakers reviewing outdated notice rules can draw on this classification logic directly. Reduced uncertainty around remedy selection could lower litigation costs across many contract disputes. Some complexity remains unresolved, particularly for preliminary agreements and cross-border transactions. Penalty clauses and mitigation duties also complicate purely classification-based outcomes. These complications suggest the framework needs refinement rather than wholesale rejection entirely. Applied carefully, this framework can guide courts, drafters, and policymakers together. It offers a practical foundation for future contract law reform across many jurisdictions. Continued research should test this framework against emerging commercial and digital contract disputes worldwide.

Conclusion

Breach of contract rarely produces one fixed legal response. Courts sort broken promises into minor, material, and anticipatory categories. Each category carries its own consequences and available remedies. This classification shapes whether a party receives compensation or termination. It matters because millions of contracts break down across the world each year. Businesses, employees, and consumers all depend on predictable remedy outcomes. Without clear classification, parties cannot plan around contractual risk confidently. Digital commerce and cross-border trade make this predictability even more urgent today. Automated services and international transactions test traditional breach

categories daily. Legal systems worldwide continue adapting rules to meet these modern pressures. France's 2016 reform and ongoing digital contract debates reflect this shift clearly. This research sits within that broader movement toward clearer remedial standards. It connects classification theory directly to practical remedy selection for parties. This connection addresses a genuine and persistent gap in existing contract scholarship.

Three findings together support the central argument of this research. First, minor breach limits remedies to compensation matching the actual harm caused. Second, material breach opens much broader remedies, including termination and rescission. Third, anticipatory breach allows early remedy access, though courts apply it unevenly. These findings connect closely through one shared principle across every category. Classification, not harm alone, determines which remedy becomes legally available. Economic reasoning supports this principle by linking predictable rules to lower transaction costs. Comparative evidence from Islamic, civil, and common law traditions confirms this same pattern. Even penalty clauses and mitigation duties operate within this classification-driven structure. These arguments matter because they replace fragmented remedy discussions with one coherent framework. Scholars previously treated damages, termination, and suspension as separate, unconnected topics. This research shows they instead form parts of a single classification-based system. Recognizing this connection strengthens theoretical clarity around contractual remedy design significantly.

These findings reach beyond academic debate into everyday commercial practice. Courts can apply this framework directly when resolving breach disputes. Lawyers can advise clients more confidently once classification criteria become clear. Businesses drafting contracts can define breach severity within their own agreements. Employment relationships benefit from remedies tailored to their ongoing, relational character. Policymakers reviewing outdated notice rules can draw on classification-based reasoning directly. Recent statutory reforms in France and ongoing digital contract debates show this shift already underway. Emerging areas, including digital services and preliminary agreements, still need further attention. Future research should test this framework against artificial intelligence and automated contracting. Researchers should also examine how penalty clauses interact with classification across jurisdictions. Cross-border disputes remain another area where classification rules diverge significantly today. Addressing these open questions would strengthen the framework's global practical relevance. This research provides a foundation, not a final answer, for that ongoing work.

Bibliography

Adunola, A. R. A. W. (2022). The harmonisation of Shariah and civil law in the area of contract with special reference to the remedies for anticipatory breach of contract. *International Journal of Umranic Studies, 2*(1), 11–18. https://doi.org/10.59202/ijus.v2i1.556

Arvind, T. T. (2022). Compensatory remedies. In *Contract law*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198867777.003.0016

Burrows, A. (2019). Restitutionary remedies (for torts and breach of contract). In *Remedies for torts, breach of contract, and equitable wrongs* (pp. 335–359). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198705932.003.0025

Burrows, A. (2020). Breach of contract and remedies for breach. In *A restatement of the English law of contract* (pp. 112–171). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/9780198869856.003.0006

Cabrelli, D. (2016). Liability and remedies for breach of the contract of employment at common law: Some recent developments. *Industrial Law Journal, 45*(2), 207–219. https://doi.org/10.1093/indlaw/dww006

Cartwright, B. (2022). Denials, defences, and damages-limiting rules in breach of contract. *Oxford University Commonwealth Law Journal, 22*(1), 21–45. https://doi.org/10.1080/14729342.2022.2027700

Devenney, J., & Shaw-Mellors, A. (2024). Remedies for breach of contract. In *Contract law concentrate*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198904618.003.0007

Ewing, K. D. (1993). Remedies for breach of the contract of employment. *The Cambridge Law Journal, 52*(3), 405–436. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0008197300099955

Ficetola, L. (2011). Comparing remedies for breach of contract in Italian and English law. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1990791

Furmston, M. P. (2017). Remedies for breach of contract. In *Cheshire, Fifoot, and Furmston's law of contract*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198747383.003.0021

Giri, S. K. (2024). Breach of contract and its remedies: Theory and practice with special references to Nepalese law. *Journal of Management, 7*(1), 98–114. https://doi.org/10.3126/jom.v7i1.73549

Golding, G. (2021). Employment as a relational contract and the impact on remedies for breach. *Griffith Law Review, 30*(2), 270–294. https://doi.org/10.1080/10383441.2021.1895542

Hunter, R. J., Shannon, J. H., & Amoroso, H. J. (2023). A teaching note on remedies for breach of contract under the Uniform Commercial Code. *Education Quarterly Reviews, 6*(3). https://doi.org/10.31014/aior.1993.06.03.760

Ismail, M. (2022). Contract breach and remedies in French law according to the reform in 2016. *Journal of Southwest Jiaotong University, 57*(6), 1104–1111. https://doi.org/10.35741/issn.0258-2724.57.6.96

Katz, A. W. (2005). Remedies for breach of contract under the CISG. *International Review of Law and Economics, 25*(3), 378–396. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irle.2006.02.005

Kryla-Cudna, K. (2018). Breach of contract and damages for non-pecuniary loss. *European Review of Private Law, 26*(4), 515–535. https://doi.org/10.54648/erpl2018035

Lee, Y. J. (2025). Right to claim for substitute, impossibility of performance, breach of contract, forfeiture of benefits, damages, debtor's fault, doctrine of risk bearing. *Yonsei Law Journal, 49*, 293–330. https://doi.org/10.33606/yla.49.9

Marzal, T. (2025). Damages (and non-pecuniary remedies) for sanctions in breach of international investment law. *Legal Issues of Economic Integration, 52*(4), 393–420. https://doi.org/10.54648/leie2025019

Michaud, A. (2019). Mitigation of damage in the context of remedies for breach of contract. *Revue générale de droit, 15*(2), 293–340. https://doi.org/10.7202/1059553ar

Nasir Albalawee. (2023). Rules governing anticipatory breach of contract under the Vienna Convention on International Sales. *Journal of Namibian Studies: History Politics Culture, 33*. https://doi.org/10.59670/jns.v33i.604

Oviedo Albán, J. (2018). Mitigation of damages for breach of contract for the international sale of goods. *Vniversitas, 67*(137). https://doi.org/10.11144/javeriana.vj137.mdbc

Plass, S. (2024). Modernizing notice of breach rules to preserve contract remedies. *University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform, 57*(1), 57. https://doi.org/10.36646/mjlr.57.1.modernizing

Polinsky, A. M. (1981). Risk sharing through breach of contract remedies. National Bureau of Economic Research. https://doi.org/10.3386/w0714

Pongsapan, M. (2016). Remedies for breach of contract in Thai law. In *Studies in the contract laws of Asia I* (pp. 370–399). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198757221.003.0016

Poole, J., Devenney, J., & Shaw-Mellors, A. (2017). Remedies for breach of contract. In *Contract law concentrate*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198803850.003.0007

Putra, R. K. C., & Djajaputra, G. (2024). Legal remedies for breach of contract in digital service agreements. *Journal of Law, Politic and Humanities, 5*(2), 1000–1007. https://doi.org/10.38035/jlph.v5i2.1174

Rawal, K. (2025). Judicial approaches to damages in breach of contract cases in Nepal. *NPRC Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 2*(2), 181–187. https://doi.org/10.3126/nprcjmr.v2i2.76199

Rong, Z. (2026). A study on the application of the substitute transaction rule in damages for breach of contract. *Progress in Social Sciences, 8*(6), 539–543. https://doi.org/10.35534/pss.0806094

Rowan, S. (2012). Termination for breach of contract. In *Remedies for breach of contract* (pp. 70–107). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199606603.003.0003

Saleh, N. (1989). Remedies for breach of contract under Islamic and Arab laws. *Arab Law Quarterly, 4*(4), 269–290. https://doi.org/10.1163/157302589x00136

Shevchuk, Y. (2019). Negotiating damages for breach of contract after Morris-Garner v One Step. *Oxford University Commonwealth Law Journal, 19*(2), 284–297. https://doi.org/10.1080/14729342.2019.1678105

Smith, S. A. (2014). Remedies for breach of contract. In *Philosophical foundations of contract law* (pp. 341–361). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198713012.003.0017

Sulistianingsih, D., Wijaya, C. C., Yusoff, R. M., & Adhi, Y. P. (2024). Juridical consequences of anticipatory breach as a form of breach of a contract. *Journal of Indonesian Legal Studies, 9*(1), 131–154. https://doi.org/10.15294/jils.vol9i1.4537

Sun, Y., & Sun, L. (2025). Study on the calculation rules and their application of damages for breach of contract under Chinese laws. *Lex Localis - Journal of Local Self-Government, 23*(5). https://doi.org/10.52152/800036

Tirkey, R. (2018). Remedies for breach of contract. *International Journal of Scientific Engineering and Research, 6*(5), 42–46. https://doi.org/10.70729/ijser172507

Torsello, M. (2005). Substantive and jurisdictional aspects of international contract remedies: A comment on Avery Katz's "Remedies for breach of contract under the CISG". *International Review of Law and Economics, 25*(3), 397–410. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irle.2006.03.003

Touaibia, H., & Kiram, M. L. (2026). Anticipatory breach revisited: From premature breach to certain future non-performance. *Lex Localis - Journal of Local Self-Government, 24*, 251–265. https://doi.org/10.52152/jzbgfc54

Vasyliev, V. (2022). Large penalty size for breach of contract: Freedom of self-regulation of material civil relations or breach of civil law principles? *Yurydychnyi Visnyk*, (3), 74–81. https://doi.org/10.32782/yuv.v3.2022.10

Wang, H. (2025). Research on liability for breach of contract damages in preliminary agreement. *Advances in Economics, Management and Political Sciences, 133*(1), 207–213. https://doi.org/10.54254/2754-1169/2025.19671

Wang, Z. (2026). On the definition of the scope of damages for breach of pre-contract. *Lecture Notes in Education Psychology and Public Media, 145*(1), 175–182. https://doi.org/10.54254/2753-7048/2026.35402

Zakharov, D. E. (2025). Damages and compensation for breach of contract in German civil law. *Lex Russica, 78*(7), 70–80. https://doi.org/10.17803/1729-5920.2025.224.7.070-080

Zatorski, D. (2023). Gain-based remedies for breach of contract in general. In *Gain-based remedies for breach of contract* (pp. 9–41). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-25452-9_2

Zdravković, U. (2023). The right to suspend performance in case of anticipatory breach of contract on international sale of goods. *Zbornik Radova Pravnog Fakulteta Nis, 62*(99), 189–206. https://doi.org/10.5937/zrpfn0-45444