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**Author’s Statement**

I have read all reviews vary carefully and have tried to do my best to increase the quality of the paper by including the following changes into my original paper:

|  |
| --- |
| **Tha changes requested by the reviewer(s), which have been made:**  **(Please provide the brief enumaration of changes you applied in the papper)** |
| Thank you for your constructive feedback concerning our paper that we recently submitted to you for review. We have done our upmost to take on board those comments.  Specifically:   1. Efforts to address technical requirements have been made including reformating the references to APA format. 2. Efforts to address more literature review have been made. 3. Spelling, typos etc. have been resolved. 4. Efforts to address analysis of the policies discussed have been made.   We strongly believe and respectfully submit, that the paper is relevant to current issues occurring within China and that the level of research into the laws and practice of entrepreneurship (which are written in Mandarin) is detailed. |
| **The suggested corrections by the reviewer(s), which – as the author – I don’t agree:**  **(Please provide the brief justification, why you didn’t include these remarks)** |
| Aside from a few minor issues, we agree we the comments of reviewers A, B, C, and D and have attempted to incorporate all comments. Reviewers A, C and D appear to have a connection to China and understanding of the legal enviroments. We, however, first address a couple concerns of reviewer D where specific data was unavailable. Thereafter, we address concerns of reviewer E whom we thank for his or her thoughtful comments. However, we respectfully believe that while most of the comments are fitting for legal scholarship in a western context, many are not applicalbe to China.  Addressing Concerns of Reviewer D:  While we agree with the reviewer’s comment that “[i]t would become more effective if some figures indicating number of entrepreneurs is increased”, there are no credible numbers available. We have identified a number of contradictory statistics from official and unofficial sources. This is in large part due to the fact that many domestic entrepreneurs neglect to form a valid legal entity.  We also would ordinarily agree with the suggestion that the literature review and methods section be separated. However, as a non-empirical legal article this piece is doctrinal in nature. As doctrinal articles rely on analysing the relevant laws and literature (in a small number of commonly used databases), not collecting empirical data, they traditionally do not have a methodology section. However, the relevant articles are cited.  Addressing Concerns of Reviewer E:  The reviewer suggested addressing the enforcement of laws:  **T**he material covered here pertains to civil law, not criminal law. As such, a discussion of law enforcement is not relevant. Additionally, the operation of the Chinese court system, while relevant, is a distinct topic. In response to one reviewer comment, however, we have added a brief note on the changing demographic of the judiciary.  The reviewer stated that the paper lacks methodology and that court cases are necessary for legal analysis:  As noted above, this is a review of current initiatives relating to entrepreneurship, the research methodology is doctrinal in nature. The relevant literature, laws and normative documents are analysed. This approach, which is standard amoung legal scholarship, is more straight forward compared to a quantitative or empirical study.  We agree with the author that cases are a necessary part of legal analysis in common law countries. However, case law is not binding in China with courts issuing substantially shorter rulings than in common law countries. As such, Chinese cases take a back seat to Chinese laws and normative documents. |
| **Other changes which have been made and changed the original version of the paper:**  **(Please provide the brief enumaration of changes you applied in the papper)** |
| The paper was edited to provide a more logical flow. Additionally, we provided greater disussion and noted impacts of certain initiatives and their correspinding normative documents. |