

**Response to Reviewer Feedback (June, 2019)**  
 Manuscript ID ATR-D-18-00640

**ENTREPRENEURIAL LEVERAGING IN LIMINOIDAL OLYMPIC  
 TRANSIT ZONES**

Dear Editor(s) and Reviewers,

Thank you for taking the time to review and provide valuable feedback on the research paper, and for both the encouraging, supportive and critical evaluation of the paper we initially submitted.

In the 'Response to Reviewer Feedback' table below, you will see that we have methodically grouped together the key points raised ('Reviewers' comments'), and provided 55 separate responses ('Authors' response') to each area of feedback, aligned with different aspects of the paper, including: (1) Title/Introduction and Literature Review, (2) Methodology, (3) Findings and Discussions, (4) Conclusions and Recommendations, and (5) Implications for Practice, General Issues and Miscellaneous Items. These responses provide a detailed overview of the significant changes made in response to the constructive feedback we received.

Best wishes,

The author(s).

**Reviewer comments and authors' responses:**

Reviewer #1

Reviewer #2

Reviewer #3

	REVIEWERS' COMMENTS	AUTHORS' RESPONSE
	<b>(1) TITLE/INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	
1	My central concern is the limited weight given to the conceptual and theoretical foundations of the piece. Liminality appears as the first word within the keywords for the paper, and does appear at frequent intervals within the paper; however, it is not substantially grounded, conceptually, in the literature review or the discussion sections. There are a number of occasions where liminality and liminal are used to refer simplistically to some sense of change or, occasionally, transition. Whilst this is not wholly inaccurate, it does not articulate how liminality as part of the conceptual package of the paper is doing any work of substance for the research. If the authors are basing their use of the liminal in Turner then the connection between liminality/liminoid and communitas is not being made. There is an interesting discussion to be had, in the paper, around communitas; of whom, affecting whom etc. etc. This piece is conceptually light and so much more could have been drawn into it to give it the weight the topic/theme deserves.	<p>Thank you for this, we agree, and we have now been much clearer and more detailed regarding the relationship between the liminal, liminoid and communitas concepts. We have also used the concepts more to create a stronger theoretical framework for the paper and used this to strengthen analysis of empirical phenomena. We have integrated this across both the Literature Review, Analysis, Discussion and Conclusions of the article and are now consistent with the concepts and language throughout.</p> <p>As identified by the reviewer, it was also important to strengthen the conceptual focus of the paper by bringing these concepts to the front end of the paper more to ensure the reader is aware of the theoretical framing of this article. We have done this by integrating the concepts into the Abstract, Introduction and paragraph before the Research Questions, and have also re-worded the Research Questions to reflect the theoretical framework more.</p> <p>Specifically, we illustrate how Turner (1974) positioned the liminal and liminoid in a binary relationship and how they should be seen as integrated and complimentary. We detail how Olympic transit zones (OTZs) can be usefully thought of as being both liminal and liminoid, by using Turner's (1974) definition of liminoid. We believe that due to the organic, playful nature of the OTZs observed in the Rio context they can be better understood as liminoid. We discuss how and why across the article and we have changed the title to reflect this deepening of our theoretical contribution.</p>

		<p>We clarify what we mean by ‘Olympic spaces’ below in point [x] and redefine these as ‘Olympic transit zones (OTZs)’. We have used ‘OTZ’ as this is terminology (transit zones) commonly accepted in the liminality field.</p> <p>As opposed to the longitudinal nature of liminal, we emphasise the immediacy of liminoidal and communitas to describe our observations of behaviour in OTZs – reflecting both Turner, Beech and Spiegel’s (2015) notions of the liminoidal. We clearly define communitas and use this to describe the observed OTZs. We have also positioned the use of liminal, liminoidal and communitas using Spiegel (2015) and O’Brien and Chalip’s (2007) work – both of whom use these ideas in events/sports contexts.</p>
2	<p>Whilst I am not recommending all the following could be incorporated, it may be worth considering one or more of the suggested list as a conceptual spine to the work: Michel de Certeau's idea of tactics comes readily to mind at several instances through the text. The theories of the social production of space (Lefebvre; Soja etc.) resonate in several places. Lefebvre's tripartite thematic of space, and their synthesis in theatrical space seems to have a direct bearing on a number of points in the text. There are resonance, also, with Baudrillard's construal of the hyperreal and Deleuzeian conceptualisations of space are also present. McGillivray and Frew (2015) drew on Deleuze, for example, in their piece "Mega events and the territorialisation of urban space", so it is not a stretch to show its relevance to the discussion presented in this paper.</p>	<p>We agree, de Certeau and Deleuze and Guttari are useful and related theoretical approaches. Responding to #1 above and several others comments and suggestions below, we have however decided to strengthen the liminality, liminoidal and communitas framing for this article. We feel that adding other ideas would now run the risk of conceptual inflation and reduce the contribution we now make.</p>
3	<p>I thought the idea of dwelling was very interesting (and if we are talking theory, then there may be scope for drawing on some of Heidegger here: His essay "Building, Dwelling and Thinking" seems relevant to this). See, for example, Ladkin's (2006) discussion "How Heidegger's notion of 'dwelling' might help organisational leaders resolve ethical issues". In addition, the short section shortly before section 5 read as if it needed more development, and weaving into an earlier section - probably the literature review.</p>	<p>Excellent idea, thank you. We have looked at both sources (Heidegger and Ladkin) but for the same reasons we explain in 2 above, we have decided not to elaborate further on dwell. However, the suggested sources have been inspiring and we will seek to include them in other research papers underway.</p>
4	<p>Advantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- identifying and emphasizing a research gap not much noticed in the literature</li> <li>- implying (or implicitly adopting) a critical approach to mainstream research on mega-sport events, focusing on their leveraging effects</li> <li>- questions clearly stated with generally acceptable answers</li> <li>- the story told with rich details</li> <li>- improving existing model of event leveraging by adding detailed knowledge on immediate event leveraging from a specific context</li> </ul>	<p>Thank you to the Reviewer for pointing out these aspects of the paper. We agree regarding the gap in the literature and we have emphasised this in the article. We have also drawn on the ‘rich details’ noted and used these to strengthen the evidence for our assertions in places noted across the article. This was particularly useful for the new liminal, liminoidal and communitas points discussed above.</p>
5	<p>Disadvantages (plus places needing clarification/reconsideration)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2 possible misconceptions: (1) Olympic spaces are closed, commercialized, and privatized; (2) liminal event experiences only occur in the transit zones</li> <li>- problematic ascription: the successful immediate leveraging effects from the Rio Olympics are mainly due to the failure of regulation of this event</li> <li>- sign of self-verification effect: a core conclusion is based on rather subjective, weak evidence; expressions of this kind appearing in numerous parts of the manuscript</li> <li>- theoretical framework inadequacy: more exposure to space politics; better understanding of neoliberalism</li> <li>- quality of answers in need of higher quality: generally, descriptions from an outsider's view (in-depth, emic views not enough)</li> </ul>	<p>Thank you for clearly stating where you see main disadvantages of the article. We have responded to these in more detail in the comments that follow. The article is now thoroughly redrafted and we hope that the quality of the writing is improved.</p>

	- better writing needed: Abstract with missing information; unnecessary repetitions sometimes; research limitation omitted	
6	<p>Abstract</p> <p>-A typical structure of Abstract includes: gap—(aim)—(method)—(results highlighted)—(key contributions). Information in the brackets are missing or unclear.</p> <p>-There is a need to mention the knowledge gap more clearly, by stating for example "Although...the transit zones not well considered."</p> <p>-This sentence "...creates enclaves that bypass communities" can be problematic. See explanations below.</p> <p>-"Analysis illustrates..." seems to be another problem. See explanations below.</p>	<p>Bullet 1) – we have reworked the abstract following this structure.</p> <p>Bullet 2) – we clarify the importance of studying entrepreneurial leveraging in MSEs just before the Research Questions and why this is an important contribution. We believe this is helped by clarifying and better defining OTZs as noted above.</p> <p>Bullet 3 and 4) – these phrases has now been deleted in the redraft of the abstract.</p>
7	- Before putting forward the questions, I expect a summary of progress already made by research (i.e. the 'nascent body of...research' mentioned below) on the same topic.	Our Introduction, with the linkages to O'Brien and Chalip's (2007) and Speigel's (2015) study of liminality and communitas in a sport and event context, is now better positioned. We illustrate more comprehensively and precisely that we build on this and other related research before introducing the Research Questions.
8	-Please clearly state the aim of your study. The questions themselves are empirical ones, not directly targeting at any theoretical interests. However, this study in my eyes attempts to challenge the politically questionable practices of Olympic leveraging by a case study. (However, even this is not clearly stated.)	We have outlined our aim more emphatically just before the research questions aligned with nascent body of evidence identified across the Introduction and noted above in Point 7. Additionally, we have integrated liminal, liminoidal and communitas concepts into the Research Questions to illustrate how we make a theoretical contribution. Thank you for this prompt, and we now think our paper makes a strong theoretical as well as empirical contribution.
9	- Why are Olympic spaces closed, commercialized, and privatized? Mega-sport events, ontologically, are not venues. Olympic spaces can be porous, fluid, and multi-layered. When one lies down on a hotel bed, watching the live show of some games, can we call this room a micro event space too? An Olympic franchised shop? A pedestrian street full of event elements? A marathon trail in town? A highway, subway, etc. built solely for the purpose of hosting the Games? Olympic parks (especially in the post-event period)? Online website, social media, news, etc. induced by the Games? For me, Olympic spaces can be far more complex than those confined within venues.	<p>Very good point, thank you for noting this. As a result we have now made significant changes to the way we treat Olympic spaces.</p> <p>First, we now clarify what we mean by 'Olympic spaces' and redefine these as 'Olympic transit zones (OTZs)' across the paper. We have also changed the title of the paper to reflect this more specific focus. As a result, we delineate OTZs from other Olympic spaces that can be found across the city, nation and indeed in hotel bedrooms, as the Reviewer mentions. Our analysis nevertheless remains fixed on these spaces because we believe this helps focus our contribution.</p>
10	- Section 2.1 cites some research claiming that local communities are marginalized...but your research shows a different story. Do you agree or disagree with the literature cited? If so, this becomes a research gap to fill: although the mainstream research...there is a need to examine...different cases...	Our empirical findings stand in stark contrast to extant research regarding the issue of local community marginalisation. Because of the reasons we explain (reduced security, regulation and control) our case runs contrary to previous research and provides more positive evidence. We neither agree nor disagree with the previous research. We present empirical evidence which provides a different account, and we explain why this is the case. Whilst we emphasise positive outcomes for the OTZs under question, this clearly, given the weight of evidence, was different for other researchers in different contexts. In our view, what these differing accounts show is that examining such events requires detailed localised analysis, evaluation and debate as there are many factors that determine observed phenomena in specific contexts.
11	- Perhaps delete the sentence "In our case, we argue..."(para1/p3). It is better not to provide our assumptions in reviewing others' works. Avoid presenting, implicitly though, your results (i.e. "In turn, failure...small business") before coming to your results section.	Very good point. We have made changes to avoid pre-empting and implicitly presenting our results where appropriate. Thank you for picking this up.
12	- This sentence (plus other similar ones) "In the resulting homogenous...seemingly implausible" reads highly questionable. Liminal event experiences can theoretically take place in all those spaces, not just in the precinct transit zones in the last mile. When I watch some finals in the stadium, I may forget everything other than the games or some star players. For some event spectators, what is happening outside the court (whether it be in the transit zone or not) can mean nothing at all for that particular moment.	Yes, we fully understand what you're saying here. We have toned down the 'implausible' statement and replaced with 'somewhat contradictory'. We have retained this line of argument as we want to convey how determined conditions imposed across Olympic cities are highly restrictive. However, your point about everything remaining possible is insightful and we have added this as a qualifier to our argument. This is in fact very useful as we indeed illustrate that in spaces where we think such activity is constrained, play can be seen. Of

		course liminal spaces will exist elsewhere, but, as we hope we have made clearer in the paper and in Point 9 above, this is not our focus.
13	- Do you really think 'liminality' a pertinent theoretical basis for this study? Admittedly, liminality is helpful for you to conceptualize the Olympic spaces. But this study, for me, aims something relevant to the politics of event spaces. Would Harvey's "structuration", or more generally poststructuralism a better option? Plus, if Olympic spaces are beyond what you call official spaces and the nearby liminal zones, liminality will lose its power in guiding your inquiry.	Very interesting idea about Harvey's 'Structuration' and we will have a good look at this for future analysis and articles – thank you. However, having strengthened the liminality, liminoidal and communitas concepts, our theoretical framework offers a stronger analytical framework. We believe these ideas now offer sufficient power to guide inquiry, explain empirical phenomena and make a strong theoretical contribution. Additionally, as we have clarified and defined our focus on OTZs we are not looking at spaces outside – as we note above. We also note O'Brien and Chalip's work, all of which have used liminality to look at leveraging and entrepreneurial activity in the context of sporting events. Yet, none of this extant work has, (a) discussed liminality and communitas in the context of the hyper-securitisation of the modern mega-event; and, (b) none has demonstrated how liminality has led to the inclusion of typically marginalised community actors. We have made it much clearer in the paper now that this is where we seek to make a contribution, which we more clearly articulate in the Introduction as a result of responding to Reviewer #1's point earlier.
13	- If you trust Beech's idea (the citation), you may not be able to call Olympic experiences in (your definition of) Olympic spaces, liminal; at least, not for event spectators who develop their event experiences in a short period of time.  Also, a conceptual issue: liminality generally means thresholds, why then it also means transition?	Excellent point here – we fully agree with you. Beech attends to more longitudinal experiences and we look at short-term fleeting experiences. We therefore focus more on Beech's note around spaces whereby, "temporary transition through which identity is reconstructed". As noted in the original quote below, Beech uses a 'and/or' to note that such experiences can be short or long term. We emphasise the short in our article, and also draw on Turner's (1974) notion of liminality/liminoidal being fleeting and short-term. We also emphasise that spectators (liminars) are the ones who are 'transitioning' through space and local entrepreneurs are seeking to create the ideal conditions for maximising leveraging through the actions/tactics we discuss in the paper.  Olympic transit zones by definition are zones of "temporary transition", both literally and figuratively. Our depiction of OTZs is an example of what Turner (1974) describes as 'limen' and identifies that thresholds are zones of transition from one space to another (i.e. from the start of a transport hub at the beginning of their journey through OTZs and toward the venue). We do not believe this poses a conceptual issue for the paper, particularly since we have strengthened the theoretical framework and clarified the nature of OTZs. We now make links to several key theoretically-oriented papers to justify why we have used this particular language.
14	- "Less controlled...may..."(para5/p3) should be removed. It reads like unnecessary and repeated assumptions slipping into LR. This applies to all other similar sentences.	Thank you for picking this up, we fully agree, and we have removed and/or toned down unnecessary and repeated assumptions.
14	-And the end of your LR, progress achieved in previous research should be summarized. You cite several works relevant, but we do not exactly the knowledge gaps yet to be filled.	Fully agree. We have provided a further two to three sentences at the very end of the LR outlining the progress achieved in previous research which serves as a useful precursor to the forthcoming sections. Thank you for noting this.
<b>(2) METHODOLOGY</b>		
15	is the researcher western? I get the impression that he or she is, although this is not stated. Certainly they are not native to Rio, so how is it possible to 'mimic the gaze of Rio's residents' (line13)? Can you really suggest that what you saw, how you saw it, what seemed remarkable or not to you, would be similar to a Rio resident?	Thank you for picking this up. This was an error and we did not mean to use 'residents'. We have replaced 'residents' with 'visitor' as this reflects our position as a visitor to the city. We have also removed the word 'mimic' and replaced with 'approximate' as this word better fits our intention.
16	I think there needs to be some discussion of who the researcher is in this field. The use of the vlog is really interesting, but I assume it was in English? So therefore responses are from people who speak some English? How does this potentially affect the view that you got? How does this shape the places you decided to go and what to look at?	Very good point. We now state our position as non-native, English speaking and clarify that data collected via digital platforms are all in English to illustrate the limitation of this. However, we don't claim to be native and we predominantly draw on the researchers' perspective which approximates (or is analogous to) the visitor's gaze. However, the local perspectives we do bring in via interviews <i>are</i> based on native perspectives who live in Rio/Brazil and speak the language. We worked

		with a local Brazilian speaking researcher as part of the project who helped translated and transcribe responses. We use these local perspectives to support some of our own observations as we are aware that we come with a non-local perspective. This helped us in part get over limitations of being non-native and monoglot. The observations of spectators and traders and the photographic and video data does also, to a degree transcend language barriers by allowing us to observe locals and their actions <i>in situ</i> .
17	Interviews - why did you interview this sample? Why not speak to any of the local entrepreneurs themselves? Given the focus of this article, this seems a major point but one that is not engaged with here. The interview participants are all quite high level in local industry, or government, or academia - speaking about 'them' (several quotes use that) i.e. the local entrepreneurs. Why have these officials speak for 'them' and not have any voices from the local entrepreneurs themselves?	We interviewed this sample as they represent organising and/or upper echelons of the tourism field, who offer informed perspectives on the issues at hand in English. We would have loved to speak to the entrepreneurs, however inability to speak the local language and time constraints meant that this was not possible for this study. It is important to note that we do not make claims about the local beyond what we have observed or had reported to us. However, we agree with the reviewer that this would have strengthened the analysis and would have made a very interesting follow up paper. Our focus however, is on exploring the organisational aspects that <i>produced</i> OTZs.
18	In section 3.1, paragraph 1, they write: The lead researcher could thus experience the transformation of urban Rio into an Olympic city in the immediate build-up period, mimicking the gaze of Rio's residents and Olympic visitors. It is unclear to me how the 'visiting' researchers are able to mimic the gaze of Rio's residents unless one of them was a resident. For example - in my home town a Premier Inn is being built on a patch of land that has been vacant for almost 10 years. A visiting research might see a patch of land being developed, there gaze is that of the visitor. A medium term resident will know it was a pub that was destroyed by arson. A longer-term, born in the area, local is more likely to recall it was a cinema, they may remember the pet-shop that was there for a while, may have even bought a pet there when they were younger etc. etc. How can the research grasp the complexity of that 'local'/'resident' gaze?	This is answered above by changing the wording from 'resident' to 'visitor'. This was an error on our part. We note this in point 15 above.
19	At 3.2 there is no mention of research ethics - some indication of this would be of value. I found table 1 particularly uncomfortable in regards to participant confidentiality.	We fully agree. We have made everyone's titles 'Senior Manager' so they cannot be easily identifiable. This still allows the reader to see that they come from a manager's perspective. Additionally, we have added a sentence outlining that we have been through a full ethics application and follow university ethics protocol.
20	- Can you show a map of the observation sites, in the presence of Olympic spaces, transit zones, and major hubs in Rio? In particular, mark the last-mile zones.  -If Nvivo is adopted to identify the themes in the interviews, why we cannot clearly see these themes in Results? And any detailed information on how you develop those themes?	Unfortunately, we do not have a detailed map of the observation sites. We have tried to identify where the routes are to and from the transport hubs and the Olympic stadium, but these are not available online with enough accuracy. Copacabana is simple to provide as this comprised of the beachfront area so is easy to map. However, as the Olympic stadium was embedded within a complex community network of streets we can not be sure exactly the routes taken. We agree this would be useful, but we do not think this would necessarily add anything to our analysis other than practically illustrate where the researcher was observing. Because we provide a number of pictures alongside the analysis we feel that we have, overall, done enough to illustrate the spaces under investigation.  We have clarified how we developed themes in Nvivo aligned with the themes presented in the results and the final RQs that guide this study. In the Methodology we now also state how themes were developed between the authors through a research triangulation approach. Furthermore, through the review process we now believe that there is greater clarity and correspondence between the research themes outlined in the Methodology and those presented in the Analysis.
21	- Vblog is a good idea. But how data collected this way is actually utilized later?	We did not use the vlog as a data set but used it for a variety of other useful reasons as outlined on page 7.
22	- The three questions (and their variations) appear many times. Avoid this type of redundancy.	We now only have the questions explicitly outlined in the Introduction. There are some linkage sentences back to these questions, but only

		where it serves to clarify how a particular point relates to the focus and contribution of this article.
23	- When deciding the interviewees, why not consider event attendees? Of course, this study focuses on local entrepreneurs. But inputs from event attendees can offer valuable data supporting your claims that liminal event experiences in the micro event space are rich, authentic, interactive and the like.	We agree this would make a very interesting focus, but our focus is on exploring the organisational aspects that <i>produced</i> the OTZs and the leveraging efforts that took place within these spaces.
24	-The term "post-Games" (para6/p4) is not clear enough. Please state the specific time.	We now explicitly outline the dates after the Closing Ceremony for clarity- the 21 <sup>st</sup> August, 2016.
<b>(3) FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS</b>		
25	-I don't think Q1 and your operationalized Section 4.1 (para3/p5) well match.	Whilst we have been forthcoming with making changes for most of the comments above, we have to respectfully disagree. Our Research Question 1 (What contextual features enable and constrain local entrepreneurial engagement in immediate forms of event leveraging across OTZs?) closely aligns with our focus for Analysis section 4.1 (the extent to which official event spaces of Rio 2016 enabled or constrained local entrepreneurial activity). We then go on to discuss a range of constraining factors affecting local entrepreneurial engagement, leading onto the more open, liminal/liminoidal conditions observed across Rio's OTZs. We do believe that these contextual features, continually discussed across all sections and evidenced with empirical observations, connect well.
26	- Your answer (i.e. contextual factors) to Q1 reads very subjective. More contextual factors should be considered. More importantly, not all factors are contextual. What about human psychology?	Rich details are provided throughout to indicate how and why contextual factors emerged. We agree with the point that there are many factors that are not contextual, however, examining all factors that determine these spaces and action goes beyond the scope of this study. We believe we provide sufficient explanation as to how and why, but we agree there are variegated reasons why these conditions occurred discussed across the analysis.
27	-This conclusion "...the failure...to provide..." (para1/p.6) lacks evidence and can be illogical.  (1) If we do not see Olympic spaces as confined within venues and the nearby zones, but are scattered around and/or embedded within the host city, even including online event spaces, there will be multiple ways for host-guest interactions. Even when a particular type of such interaction (here in the transit zones) fails, other types may well occur.  (2) If the Games fail to the extent that in extremes terrorist attacks deter most event visitors, what good are all inclusive liminal Olympic spaces (in your definition)? More critically, what is the very evidence supporting this critical judgement? Nothing is mentioned, until in Section 4.2 we come across a citation from an academic #4 (para5/p6). This evidence is too weak, and may be stereotypical, unable to justify your conclusion at all.	We agree with many of these points and detail how and why below alongside any changes made in the manuscript.  First, we have toned down the claim and language surrounding the wording of 'failure'. We agree, this is too strong and absolute. We note various reasons why the extent of regulatory control and compliance was weaker than in other cases. We now write more about the extent of control was less than other Olympic cities for example.  It is important that we note that there is logical chain of evidence that illustrates how entrepreneurs would typically be excluded from Olympic transit zones and we provide evidence to the contrary: evidence based on observation taken during live staging period whilst locals were engaging in productive leveraging efforts. We believe the evidence does support our claim and sufficient evidence is provided to answer our Research Questions. One of the other reviewers notes this as an advantage of our study. We believe this relates to the same issue raised by this reviewer in Point 13: that is, clarifying the definition of what we mean by "transit zones." The reviewer here is again writing of broader "Olympic space," which we address in Point 9 above. To repeat, our explicit focus on Olympic transit zones now aids this.
28	- Reconsider sentences like "Indeed, apparently poorly organized spaces enabled..." (para2/p6).	Thank you for picking this up. In line with our responses above, we have revised these sentences.
29	-The definition of 'transit zone' (para3/p6) should also appear in Introduction, to help the reader to understand your key terms.	Agree. We have added a definition of Olympic transit zones in the Introduction building on previous use of the term 'Last Mile' used specifically during the London 2012 Olympics.
30	- The various tactics adopted (Section 4.2) are not something quite new. We can expect them to happen and have experienced them in most Olympic Games.	We agree that the tactics are not new in and of themselves. However, they are in the context of OTZs since such tactics are typically precluded, as various case studies have shown.

31	<p>-You mentioned fake Olympic souvenirs (para6/p6) were sold. Does this run counter to your claim that the transit zones offer authentic experiences? More generally, how authentic will experiences gained in such zones be, really reflective of Brazilianness?</p>	<p>This is an interesting point. Fake Olympic souvenirs can surely be authentic, just not authentic as official goods? Such fake goods can be authentic of an experience of the informal Rio economy or of a spectators particular Rio Olympic experience. With Rio and Brazil's reliance on informal economies, these fake products could be understood as having Brazilian-ness/Rio-ness since they might be seen as representing locals circumvention of Olympic officialdom and corporate culture. It may be a very subjective judgement here and seemingly paradoxical, but we see authenticity in this fake-ness. Also, this is isolating individual behaviours, when really, the hawking of "genuine" Olympic souvenirs complemented the local street vendors' infiltration of the IOC's sanctioned corporate zone with their own offerings. However, we do understand the point that they are not a cultural artefact of Rio/Brazilianness. However, the food/BBQ, churros, caiparinhas, Samba music are all cultural aspects that may traditionally be understood as traditionally authentic, as we highlight in the findings. We cannot resolve such lines of argument in this article as it is out of the scope, but we do thank the reviewer for bringing to light what is or is not regarded as authentic cultural offerings.</p>
32	<p>-When you mentioned "this rash of informal selling was considered normal", why we cannot hear the voice of event attendees?</p>	<p>As noted earlier, the idea of using event attendee perspectives is an excellent idea and would make an interesting contribution, which we are considering doing exactly this for our forthcoming Tokyo 2020 study. We have reflected on this specifically in our new limitations paragraph in the Conclusion. However, for this article, we believe it is out of scope.</p>
33	<p>"Our observation...suggested that local vendors were more successful..."(para3/p7). In terms of what criteria?</p>	<p>We note conditions allowed for more or less successful outcomes in various ways. Firstly, we see Rio traders as more successful in comparison to reports in other case study evidence, where traders were excluded from engaging in entrepreneurial leverage across transit zones. Examples include the ability to promote themselves in official spaces, selling products, not being forced out, being able to rival official goods etc. We have not measured quantitatively how successful or otherwise the traders were because of the nature of our research design and research objectives, but we do provide clear evidence of different ways local entrepreneurs were able to access opportunity that they would be typically excluded from.</p>
34	<p>-Is it really a good way to insert numerous citations of previous literature when presenting your results? This may confuse our understandings of your findings.</p>	<p>We have reduced some citations and unnecessary virtue signalling across the analysis and referred back to the LR in places. However, we have still connected up analysis with literature so as to bring certain ideas to the fore.</p>
35	<p>(1) -"In this sense, disrupt and subvert..." (para4/p7) needs a reconsideration.</p> <p>(2) What is really gone wrong with neoliberalism? Neoliberalism in the main encourages freedom and deregulation in economic systems. And that's it. It is neoliberalism that actually enables local businesses in your case study to benefit from the Rio Olympics. In fact, what really leads to uneven distribution of event benefit are not neoliberalism, but uneven economic power of the players involved in MSE contexts.</p> <p>(3) I find this conclusion's logic problematic. Does the official global business space in Olympics really work against local businesses? I doubt. For me, hosting the Olympics bring far more opportunities than marginalization of local communities, if you take into account a larger picture of regional or national economy. Even revenues of TOP projects sponsorship enter the economy, not to mention the multiplier effects and other types of short-term/long-term event impacts.</p> <p>(4) The term 'subvert' is too radical in tone. Do official Olympic spaces openly prevent any guest-host contact in the transit zones? Are there warning like "Hey listen up, it is dangerous to trade in</p>	<p>Point 1) We were a little unclear about this, however, this sentence has anyway been changed in the redraft and we hope the concerns you had have been addressed.</p> <p>Point 2) We agree with uneven power of players comments. However, we don't agree with your benevolent view that global neoliberal policies enable local businesses to benefit from Rio Olympics. Political and corporate agents within Brazil and internationally which subscribe to neoliberal ideologies promote the commoditisation of culture and space and protect these spaces for those who have the power/capital to access them. Usually this is <i>not</i> local businesses/entrepreneurs. However, we do agree with the proposition that without neoliberal Rio may not have the event in the first place, which, as we argue looks to have manifested as conditions that local entrepreneurs have been able to leverage for the reasons we outline. So, interestingly, in this case of Rio neoliberalism could be argued to have led to positive outcomes in a roundabout way.</p> <p>However, all being said, we have taken into consideration what you are saying here and we have actually removed all references to neoliberalism as we believe that even as a contextual factor it is too remote from our aim with this research. So, thank you for questioning us on this. It forced us to rethink its place in our argumentation.</p>

	<p>the transit zones 1 mile outside the stadium?" Even if this be the case, can you say the transit spaces subvert the dominance of the official spaces?</p>	<p>Point 3) Respectfully, the argument presented by the reviewer here is contrary to virtually all research published in this field. However, we have now clarified the marginalisation effects that occur. Debates around the positive and negative effects of MSEs turn on which time frame and what measures are included, as well as the methodologies used to that measure them. The medium and longer-term impacts of MSE are not our specific focus of our research and we are not claiming that the Olympics might not have positive effects. We are focused on a debate around how Olympic spaces typically marginalise local communities. The multipliers effects, legacies etc. are out of scope of this article.</p> <p>Point 4) We fully agree and have toned down such terminology here and across the paper. You make a very good point, thank you for noting.</p>
36	<p>-Far more leveraging effects can occur outside the last-mile transit zones (para5/p8). Why do you concentrate only on this narrow space? How many event attendees will actually complain if this narrow space provides little, limited, superficial experiences? Event attendees can be footloose; they can explore any places in/outside the host city. If so, even if leveraging fails in this narrow space, event leveraging effects, many of which can also be absolutely immediate, will still occur.</p>	<p>As noted earlier, we have now more tightly defined OTZs. We concentrate on this space for reasons outlined in the literature and across the paper as this is where hypersecuritised and regulated spaces occur. This is where, in the context of most sporting events, social and economic activity occurs. As illustrated by significant conceptual arguments and empirical evidence we detail, event attendees often do not go beyond official event spaces. Therefore, focusing on the spaces we know attendees will go to and how benefits can be accrued by local entrepreneurs in this case is the pertinence object of research, and where the scholarly debate is focused. We do not state that leveraging effects will not occur outside these spaces, it is just that this was not a focus of investigation.</p>
37	<p>(1)-Also, in presenting your results, what I find are all positive impacts of the Rio Olympics. Why not mention negative ones? Do this mean no such things occurred in the last-mile transit zones you investigated? (Such incidents are crucial, when you are to recommend your policy implications for the event organizers.)</p> <p>(2)-"Hybridized social-limbo" (para5/p8) will be produced, even if nothing happens in the last mile transit zones. This reveals a logic error in your study: based on happenings in a part, you draw conclusions on the whole.</p>	<p>Point 1) Yes, we agree. There are potentially broader negative effects such as how less regulated and securitised spaces may open up issues of spectator health, safety and danger if they are not appropriately securitised. Moreover, local residents, who are not engaging and benefiting from entrepreneurial leverage, might be annoyed and inconvenienced by the disruption of having a party on their doorstep. However, these effects do not relate to the debate at hand in the same way we discuss in point 36 above. We do however discuss in detail the negative effects that typically happen in such spaces. The point of this study is to present and analyse what seems to be an exception to that norm.</p> <p>Point 2) We fully agree, thank you for noting and we have deleted this comment as this did not add anything to our line of argument.</p>
<b>(4) CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>		
38	<p>Theoretical - the concept of liminality is clearly introduced and explained and seems relevant and to be being used throughout the reporting on the empirical findings. However, it rather disappears in the conclusion - not completely, it is mentioned - but the theoretical development and contribution is not clearly stated. These spaces are ones where these local entrepreneurs usually operate, and it is only unusual for them to be there because the Games are on. This is 'their' territory really, so in what ways is this space liminal for them and in their use of it at this time? I think this could be drawn out more clearly.</p>	<p>In line with strengthening our liminal, liminoidal and communitas theoretical frame, we have reflected on these ideas in more detail in the conclusion. We are now much clearer that it is the spectator that is transitioning, that is the liminar. We believe the deepening of our theoretical framing has really helped strengthen all aspects of the paper, including a redraft of many aspects of the Conclusion so we are very grateful for the reviewer(s) for suggesting this.</p>
39	<p>It is mentioned earlier in the paper that the TOP partners are key stakeholders, as are the IOC. They do not feature in the research - why not? How did the IOC respond to this blatant breach of their regulations? What did the sponsors think? The suggestion that this kind of local entrepreneurship be encouraged is one I personally agree with, but what would those sponsors have to say, who are paying extremely high sums? The IOC is in a challenging period for sponsorship, having lost McDonald's after so long, might this discourage other companies from getting involved?</p>	<p>Completely agree and this is a really good and pertinent point. We show the frustrations of the IOC (e.g. the comment about this being the worst organised Olympics) in the Analysis. We didn't gather IOC and sponsor perspectives, although these would have strengthened the research and would no doubt have enhanced our discussion of practical implications. We have directly mentioned this as a point in our new paragraph on limitations in the Conclusion. Thank you for noting this point, we will certainly consider for the future.</p>

40	<p>The authors suggest that event organisers could foster more local-global links and local entrepreneurship. Would this change what is experienced? The sense I get from the empirical data is that this was very spontaneous and locally specific, and that was its real charm - if it is managed and sanctioned by the organising committee does that change it?</p>	<p>Orchestrating more locally orientated spaces in what are usually hypersecuritised/corporatized areas and creating greater dwell and interaction is regarded by many stakeholders to be a positive step. No doubt some strategic planning would be required to apply the lessons of Rio. This would potentially allow for the spontaneous and locally specific entrepreneurship to flourish as you suggest. Any step organisers make to reduce the funnelling of spectators and bypassing of communities that we saw at London 2012, would be an advance. We acknowledge the paradoxical nature of suggesting that the spontaneous might be managed, and now reflect on this more in our conclusion.</p>
41	<p>Why did this happen only in Rio, and not in South Africa for example? Is it imaginable that such local entrepreneurship would manifest in similar ways elsewhere? In Tokyo, for example?</p>	<p>Such an interesting question. Evidence suggests that exclusionary outcomes occur frequently as found in FIFA World Cup 2006 with Hall's (2006) and McGillivray and Frew's (2008) work for example, right through to London 2012. Tokyo is yet to be seen but if we had to hazard a guess, the Olympics there will likely revert to exclusionary type. Perhaps Tokyo will be different and learn from these uneven developmental effects. We are investigating these exact phenomena for Tokyo. So time will tell. We have added some important managerial and policy questions to the paper now, which reflects this and the reviewers other comments.</p> <p>It is important to note that informal economies exist everywhere. However, the absence of such analysis may reflect why it has not been examined in such contexts. We note that even in highly controlled environments, liminal spaces exists. Thus we call for specific idiosyncratic and localised analysis to look at where liminal spaces may exist and abut to across the Olympic city generally and specifically Olympic transit zones.</p>
42	<p>The final sentence of the paper jarred with me. I am not sure (of course) of the nationality of the authors, but 'for the many not for the few' is a political statement in the UK at the moment. This might be deliberate, but I wonder if it perhaps positions the paper oddly, particularly for UK readers.</p>	<p>This was a deliberate political statement as we thought this sums up the conflict between vested and marginalised interests in the context of Games planning and delivery. Upon reflection, we agree it is an odd statement and have changed it such that it is more focused on inclusive and open spaces that facilitate host community opportunities to engage in productive entrepreneurial leveraging.</p>
43	<p>In Section 5 I found the comment in the penultimate paragraph on page 9 disappointing. I would prefer to see something stronger than; The optimist in us says, yes.</p>	<p>We agree. We have now reworked this sentence emphasising that much more connectivity between critical-academic work and policy/practice is required in sport and event governance.</p>
44	<p>-What is the evidence for claim "However, in better-organized neoliberal states-like London..." (para.1/p.9)? Citation?</p>	<p>Evidence is presented across this article. There is significant historical case study work from London for example, which illustrates that London is governed under condition of neoliberal capitalism (e.g. Harvey, 2013), and that the sort of liminoidal phenomena we describe are less likely to be produced. However, we have not removed reference to neoliberalism from the paper as we describe above.</p>
45	<p>- "This in turn allowed marginal actors to capture often global-corporate spaces usually reserved for those that pay for exclusivity" (para2/p9). Must MSEs be a zero-sum game? Why cannot we say more powerful stakeholders may benefit more, but local smaller stakeholders still benefit, due to the sheer size of event attendees, media effects, and other intangible gains? If you hate this, then you should say I hate first-class tickets of any kind anywhere. This is not how our world runs.</p>	<p>We don't state or believe that it is a zero-sum game. We state that the benefits are usually reserved for those who pay for exclusivity inside temporarily constructed stadia protected by Games-time regulations and legal exceptions. But if there is a disruption to this logic – local entrepreneurs may be able to leverage, as illustrated across the article.</p> <p>We don't state that we hate the idea of global corporates benefitting more than local entrepreneurs. We do feel given the evidence of the research in this area that global corporate benefitting more is an inevitable outcome of the way cities seek to develop and host mega-sporting events. The same evidence also suggests that if locals do not leverage, money will remain with corporates, leak out of the economy and fail to have the trickle down effect you suggest naturally occurs. The research evidence of the field we work in is consistence in this critique. Other fields that take a long-term economic perspective might see different effects. This form of analysis is not the field's focus. Moreover, it is important to note that public services like police, health and so on are negatively impacted by the occurrence of mega-sporting events . Furthermore, there is little evidence that we are aware of that</p>

		<p>suggests that mega-sporting events are profit making endeavours for the host – in fact several authors noted across the literature claim the opposite.</p> <p>It seems as though the reviewer is suggesting that mega-sporting events are a positive developmental benefit for local communities. All evidence points the other way, and we have discuss this above at point 35(3) in more detail in relation to the focus of our research work.</p>
46	- "The conditions we have described enabled spectators to dwell for..." (para.2/p.9). The explanation here is inadequate. Geography plus commercial, residential, transportation and many more factors do more jobs I guess. Even if the transit zone is inclusive, without this list of factors the leveraging is unlikely to occur anyway	Yes, we agree that our analysis does not encompass all of the reasons why dwelling occurred. However, what we have presented is, we believe, adequate for the research objectives we have set. We feel that it is unrealistic to expect us to outline every single contributory factors determining dwelling.
47	-I agree that extending ELM is your contribution.	Thank you for pointing out. We agree and have made this clear across the article, including with new additions in the Introduction as outlined above.
48	-It is good to mention some negative impacts of the Games (para3/p10). My concern: which will gain more, deregulation of event spaces to facilitate more immediate levemraging effects vs. regulation of core spaces (venues, precincts, transportation bubs...) while leaving open the less essential event spaces (e.g. zones 1 mile away from the core spaces, many tourist attractions in the host city, and any other possible places where event visitors show up)? I vote for the second. Personally, I find this issue emerging from this discussion very interesting.	Visitors often do not venture beyond safe spaces as we mention above. If visitors spend in highly regulated corporate spaces the money does not go to local economies. The second outcome assumes that visitors are happy to go to sports events in official spaces and then spend the rest of the day exploring the city. The evidence shows that this does not happen. So are we to just let visitors spend in corporate areas? We do not believe so. It is our view, based on the evidence of our own and other's research, that such spaces should have more balanced, a mix of global and local entrepreneurship.
49	-Normally, in the end one should provide limitations of research. But this is missing.	We have now included a short limitations paragraph in the conclusion and we have highlighted how this paragraph refers to some of the points the reviewer(s) above has made.
<b>(5) IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE, GENERAL ISSUES AND MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS</b>		
50	<p>This is a well-written and interesting paper that reports on some surprising and unusual findings in relation to the Olympic Games and local entrepreneurs. The paper is clearly structured and easy to follow and makes a clear contribution to knowledge.</p> <p>I enjoyed reading this paper and think it reports on really important findings. I think with revisions it can make an important contribution.</p>	Thank you very much for highlighting this.
51	Many of the examples offered are very interesting. I hope the pictures are available in high quality as they are quite difficult to see like this as they are presented for review.	Thank you and we will submit as good a quality versions as we have.
52	The term 'neoliberalism' is used excessively and without contextualisation. I would urge caution in use of the word, and reflection on how it is being used throughout this paper.	Thank you for pointing out, we have now removed all mention of this word as it was not adding anything to our analysis.
53	The paper is an interesting one, though before it is accepted it is my view that there is still some work that needs to be done. However, the authors should be encouraged to make revisions and re-submit.	Thank you
54	<p>Proof reading comments:</p> <p>p.1 ln.38: Remove comma after local.</p> <p>p.2 ln.13 &amp; 14: Remove loudly and vibrant, these distract and do not add anything.</p> <p>p.2 ln.46: Add comma after Games in post-London 2012 Games.</p> <p>p.3 ln.2: Insert in in It is light of...</p> <p>p.3 ln.18 &amp; 19: Consider removing "... " from the known, the unknown, and transit zone as it gives the impression these are citations rather than technical terms. Either italicise or use sing '...' marks. (This occurs in a few places - change throughout)</p> <p>p.3 ln.33: Remove first is in citation, it is not in the original.</p> <p>p.3 ln.40: Place page number at the end of the citation, not before it.</p>	We have changed all of this and thank you for taking the time to do this.

	<p>p.4 ln.24: NVIVO should be NVivo (This occurs in a few places - change throughout)</p> <p>p.4 ln.36: Delete al from the end of observational.</p> <p>p.5 ln.45: Reword part of line that reads - spaces under investigation that has been to read - spaces under investigation than has been.</p> <p>p.6 ln.6 &amp; 7: represent occurs twice, either side of the reference. Reword to omit repetition.</p> <p>p.6 ln.55: [Applies to all figures except Figures 6 and 8, which state they are Authors' images] Please check you have the rights/permissions to use these images.</p> <p>p.7 ln.34: official occurs twice, either side of Rio 2016. Reword to omit repetition.</p> <p>p.8 ln.8 &amp; 9: carnivalesque occurs twice in the same sentence. Please reword to omit the repetition.</p> <p>p.9 ln.34 to 36: Punctuation in the sentence that begins The specific entrepreneurial responses... needs revision</p> <p>Consistency of referencing comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Please follow the approved pattern for the ordering of place and publisher in your references to books; e.g. for Armstrong et al (2017) you have publisher then place, but in Boycoff (2012) you have place then publisher</li> <li>- Abridge URLs in the reference section - so, for example, your reference for DCMS (2008) need only be webarchive.nationalarchive.gov.uk in fact the more accurate reference would be the Culture.gov one which appears later into the longer reference you offer.</li> <li>- Ensure you list both place and publisher in references for books. For example, the reference to Shields (2013) lack a place of publication.</li> </ul>	
55	<p>This study examines a less considered yet important phenomenon: business opportunities in the transit zones between Olympic venues and cultural/economic hubs in the host cities. Its major assumption is Olympic spaces are dominated by neoliberalism and local communities (focusing on people involved in local small businesses) are usually marginalized. Under this background, it tells a story in Rio 2016 Games that shows how local entrepreneurs creatively move beyond the restrictions imposed by relevant official regulations and practices to benefit from the Games. While the topic is important, this manuscript needs further revisions.</p>	<p>Thank you and thank you for the comments that we have responded to above.</p>