March 31, 2023

Dear Dr. Peter Gittins,

Associate Editor,

The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation

re: Submission of Revised Manuscript ID IEI-23-0210

We would like to thank the reviewers for their second thorough and constructive critique of our manuscript titled "The Pronounced Embeddedness of Commercial and Social Entrepreneurship in Rural Communities." Their insightful feedback has been instrumental in enhancing the quality of our research.

Following the reviewers' comments, we highlighted the research contributions throughout. The difference between entrepreneurship in the village and entrepreneurship in the city. This criterion is essential for contextualizing our findings within the broader framework of rural entrepreneurship. In addition, due to the word limit, we are attaching here our answer to reviewer 1 regarding the codes according to which we coded the findings and found themes. In the body of the article, we mentioned this briefly.

According to the reviewers' recommendations, we have meticulously revised the manuscript, incorporating their suggestions. A comprehensive summary of these revisions accompanies this submission, and the changes within the manuscript are distinctly marked and highlighted for ease of review.

Following major comments, we summarized the novelty and contributions of this study in the beginning of the section of the ‘implication and contributions’, and elaborated on the study methodology. In accordance to your request, we edited the article and significantly reduced the number of words in it. However, in order to respond to the reviewers' comments there is still a deviation from the 8000 words allowance, but we believe that the increased depth and rigor of the study justify this departure.

To improve the manuscript further, we engaged in professional linguistic editing, including the reference (Sage Home), thereby ensuring the clarity and coherence of the article.

Following your submission guidelines, we have removed the original files from our submission and ensured that this revised manuscript was submitted within the 12-week deadline following receipt of the second feedback (13-Feb-2024).

We are confident that these revisions meet with the high standards of The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation and eagerly anticipate the potential inclusion of our work in your esteemed journal.

Thank you for your consideration of our revised manuscript.

Sincerely,

The Authors

Here are our answers to the reviewer’s comments in a table for facilitated finding of the updates/changes:

Reviewer: 1

Thank you for your detailed comments. We have reviewed and made corrections accordingly, including adjustments in phrasing and terminology, along with other remarks. Detailed changes are presented in the attached table:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Comments to the Author - Overall Impression |  |
| This is a much-improved submission. The article flows better but at times the writing could be tighter and phrasing more succinct – this would help reduce the wordcount. You make some interesting observations, but these are mostly points which have already been discussed in extant literature. You state you have ‘novel’ arguments. I would like to these having more prominence throughout your article. Also, check you are using consistent font sizes and referencing formatting throughout. | Thanks. We tightened the phrasing and this did helps to reduce the word count. We highlighted the novel findings from the article in the abstract and throughout the article.  Also, according to your comment, we checked the editing throughout the article. |
| –       Your proposition “We argue that the phenomenon of an entrepreneur's embeddedness in place is more pronounced in rural localities than in large cities.” Is not a new argument - what is your novel finding/contribution? I would like to see this included in your abstract. | Thank you. The novel findings and contributions of the article are emphasized throughout, including in the abstract and especially in the sub-chapter 'Implications and Contributions. “The study’s freshness lies in its exploration of the difference between urban and rural entrepreneur’s embeddedness… … various services and social activities. “ |
| –       This section is more focused, better explains the context of your study and your conceptualisations of the key terms. | Thanks for the feedback on the introduction. |
| –       These is a conflict in your writing regarding “Warehouses and freight-forwarding centers in villages can take advantage of the proximity and quick access to highways to move goods quickly” (Pg 6 line 7) with “old and decrepit traffic infrastructure that make transport difficult, high transportation costs for supplies and products” (Pg 6 line 30), I would like this to be resolved | Due to the lowering of the comparison between villages near and far from the city (changed following the reviewers' previous comments), we deleted the sentences that created a conflict. |
| –       Hance, should be hence Pg 8 line 31. | Thank you for your comment. We have changed it. |
| –       You have included a better explanation of why you chose a phenomenological approach. | Thank you |
| –       From the expanded table 1 it would be interesting if you could provide your insight into what the demographic trends in the participant cohort tell you, E.g. Older ag profile? | As you requested, we added some insight into the demographic trends in the participant cohort: “Most of the business owners in the sample have families, are age 30-50 and most of the businesses are in the low-tech field such as: services, tourism, agriculture and trade."  In addition, we calculated the averages of the parameters reviewed in Table 1. |
| –       When discussing your data analysis, you do not provide information about how many codes and themes emerged, how you arrived at you four themes and how often they occurred during your interviews. You simply state the number of quotes used in the discussion -this is interesting but does not add significant value to your methodology. | In response to your comment, we added and detailed the coding process by subject and frequency in the appendix to this document because of the word limit. In the body of the article, we detailed the process of analyzing the codes, categories and themes.  “... The code frequency analyzed various aspects of business operations, reasons for business establishment, advantages and disadvantages of operating in peripheral areas, nature of community connections, and entrepreneur's perspectives. “ |
| –       “The research elucidated the embedded relationship between rural entrepreneurship and community dynamics, showcasing its significant influence on social and economic aspects, as outlined in the studies.” (Pg 21 line 17) - which studies? | The wording has been corrected. Thanks for the comment. This is a finding of this study. |
| –       Why is your novel finding (Pg 21 line 55) important?  ~~“~~As for the village management, a novel finding emerged from our results that highlighted the mutual relations between the entrepreneur and the village management: the village management encourages the establishment of the business in the village, understanding that the enterprise's success in addressing the needs of the community residents raises the appeal and allure of that particular village.” | The relationship between the entrepreneur and the village management is essential for the village's recovery from the economic crisis. Therefore, part of the article's novelty is that the village administration should encourage entrepreneurship in the village as part of the exit from the economic crisis. |
| –       “Thus, an entrepreneur in the village can have a vastly different This illustrates the difference in the interaction that an entrepreneur has with people in his village vs. that of an entrepreneur who provides a service in the city” (Pg 23 line 34) this is incomplete - what is vastly different? | The difference is significant between an entrepreneur in the village and an entrepreneur in the city due to all the differences noted throughout the article. This paragraph is mainly intended for the economic contribution to the village of the rural entrepreneur as will be detailed later. |
| –       “The economic crisis necessitated organizational changes, primarily in privatization, which had profound implications for the rural business landscape. These changes are now collectively shaping the future of rural entrepreneurship” (Pg 24 line 51) the final sentence is an interesting observation, how and why are these changes shaping the future of rural entrepreneurship? | Thanks for the comment.  Building on the research findings, rural entrepreneurs have a significant impact on recovering from economic crises in the village, and they are now a source of income for both the entrepreneurs and residents working in these ventures. Opening the village to customer traffic and business owners from outside the inner circle that existed before privatization has initiated organizational and cultural change processes that connect the village to the space outside it, metaphorically shortening the distance between the village and the city. Unlike his city counterpart, the village entrepreneur has an additional role in developing his community. |

Reviewer: 2

Thank you for your comments. We have reviewed and made corrections accordingly. Attach corrections to comments in the body of the document:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Page & line** | **Comment** | **Correction** |
| 4 | Rural areas | Thank you. Corrected |
| 5 | Unlike commercial enterprise, social entrepreneurs | Thank you. Corrected |
| 7 | HANCE | Thank you for your comment. We have deleted it. |
| 8 | Does this paragraph belong here? It is not about SE | You are right. The paragraph that starts with: “The notion that all rural enterprises add value to the rural economy is challenged by Wilson et al. (2022). …”  is the summary of the theoretical part and is not related to social entrepreneurs. |

Once again, we appreciate the help of the editors and the two anonymous reviewers in upgrading the manuscript.

The authors

Appendix A - Frequent the code analysis result:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Code Types | Characterization | | | |
| Conceptual codes/subcodes | **Key conceptual domains** | **Frequent** | | |
| The characteristics of the business | Hospitality and tourism | 7 | | |
| food production | 3 | | |
| Services | 7 | | |
| agriculture | 1 | | |
| consultation | 4 | | |
| Education | 1 | | |
| The reasons for establishing the business | Worked there before | 6 | | |
| A dream he wanted to fulfill | 10 | | |
| Offered to him by the Village management | 4 | | |
| ideology | 3 | | |
| Advantages (+) and disadvantages (-) of living in the periphery (more than one possible answer for each business owner) | Distance from the center (quiet, less pressure) | +3 | | |
| Lower rental costs | 4+ | | |
| work within the settlement (less travel) | 7+ | | |
| Close to family | 5+ | | |
| Professional employee | -3 | | |
| Transport costs | -4 | | |
| The support of the region (council) | +3 | | |
| Relationship codes | **Links among conceptual codes/subcodes** | **Frequent** | | |
| Formal connection to the community (contracts, etc.) | 6 | | |
| Informal connection to the community (volunteering, outside of working hours) | 9 | | |
| The connection to the community was not described | 8 | | |
| Participant perspective | **Directional views (positive (+), negative (-), or indifferent) of participants** | **Frequent** | | |
| Related to the local community | 12  (indifferent) | -2 | +8 |
| Related to the surrounding community | 21 (indifferent) | 0 | +2 |
| compared to the community in the city | 13 (indifferent) | -8 | 0 |

Total of 23 businesses

We believe we have addressed all of your comments and thank you again for helping us to improve the manuscript.

Sincerely,

The authors