The Legal Boundaries of Anti-Dilution Clauses in Start-Up Financing

Zhou Yuanan[1*]

[1] Hunan University of Technology and Business, Hunan, China
* Correspondence: Hunan University of Technology and Business, Hunan, China.

https://doi.org/10.53104/curr.res.law.pract.2026.03004

Citation: Zhou, Y. (2026). The Legal Boundaries of Anti-Dilution Clauses in Start-Up Financing. *Current Research in Law & Practice*, *4*(1), 32-41.

Abstract: Anti-dilution clauses are common in start-up financing. They protect early investors when the company later raises funds at a lower valuation. These clauses have a reasonable commercial purpose because start-up valuation is often uncertain. Early investors may face real loss in a down round. But anti-dilution protection cannot be unlimited. If the clause gives the investor a fixed return, shifts all valuation risk to the founders, or uses company assets without legal conditions, it may conflict with company law and creditor protection rules. This essay discusses the legal boundaries of anti-dilution clauses from the perspectives of contract freedom, company capital, shareholder equality, creditor protection, and corporate governance. It argues that courts should not judge these clauses only by their name. The real effect of the clause, the party bearing the duty, and the method of performance should be examined. A reasonable anti-dilution clause should have clear triggering conditions, a clear calculation method, excluded events, a time limit, and a compensation cap. Weighted-average protection is usually more balanced than full-ratchet protection because it reflects the actual effect of dilution more closely.

Keywords: anti-dilution clauses; start-up financing; venture capital; down round; company law; shareholder protection; creditor protection

1. Introduction

Start-up financing often depends on uncertain valuation. A young company may have a promising idea, but it may not have stable profit, clear assets, or a long business record yet (Gompers & Lerner, 2004). Investors accept this risk because they expect the company to grow in the future. This risk also brings a common concern. If the company raises money later at a lower price, the earlier investor may face dilution. The value of its shares may fall. Its control position may also become weaker.

Anti-dilution clauses are used to deal with this problem. These clauses give earlier investors some protection when a later financing round is completed at a lower valuation. The protection may appear in different forms. The investor may receive more shares. The conversion price may be changed. The founders may transfer part of their shares. The company may also need to provide some form of compensation. These arrangements are common in start-up financing because they help investors accept the uncertainty of early investment.

The legal issue is not whether anti-dilution clauses should exist. In many cases, they have a reasonable business purpose. Investors need a way to protect themselves from a sharp drop in valuation. Founders may also accept these clauses to obtain financing. The real issue is the legal boundary of this protection. A clause that adjusts economic interests within a reasonable range may be acceptable. A clause that gives the investor a fixed return, shifts all risk to the founders, or uses company assets without proper legal basis may create serious problems.

This issue is closely connected with contract law and company law. From the view of contract law, the parties should be allowed to arrange their rights and duties by agreement. From the view of company law, the agreement cannot ignore company capital, creditor protection, shareholder equality, and corporate governance procedures. Start-up financing is not only a private deal between investors and founders. It may also affect the company, later investors, employees, and creditors.

2. The Basic Meaning of Anti-Dilution Clauses

Anti-dilution clauses are common in start-up financing. They protect earlier investors when the company later raises money at a lower price (Metrick & Yasuda, 2021). In start-up investment, the value of a company is often hard to judge (Gompers & Lerner, 2004). A company may have a strong business plan, but it may not have stable income yet. Its future growth may look attractive, but the result is still uncertain. So the price set in an early financing round may later turn out to be too high.

When a company raises money again at a lower valuation, earlier investors may face dilution. Their shares may still exist, but the economic value of those shares may fall. Their voting power or control position may also become weaker if new shares are issued. This situation is often called a down round. Anti-dilution clauses are used to deal with this kind of loss.

The commercial function of an anti-dilution clause is to allocate valuation risk (Cumming & Johan, 2013). It gives earlier investors a form of protection against later price changes. Without this protection, some investors may be unwilling to invest at an early stage. For founders, accepting an anti-dilution clause may help the company obtain needed funds. In this sense, the clause can support start-up financing. It helps the parties reach a deal when the company's future value is still unclear.

Anti-dilution protection may appear in different forms. A full-ratchet clause gives the investor strong protection (National Venture Capital Association, 2020). If the company later issues shares at a lower price, the earlier investor's purchase price or conversion price is adjusted to that lower price. This method is simple, but it may put heavy pressure on founders and later investors. A small down round may also lead to a large adjustment.

A weighted-average clause is more moderate. It looks at the lower price in the later financing round. It also looks at the size of that financing. If the company issues only a small number of shares at a lower price, the adjustment will usually be limited. This method is often seen as more balanced because it does not pass all valuation risk to other parties.

Pre-emptive rights may also serve a similar function. Under this arrangement, an existing investor has the right to buy new shares before outsiders do. By buying more shares, the investor can keep its shareholding percentage. This form of protection is different from price adjustment. It does not directly change the earlier investment price. It gives the investor a chance to maintain its position through further investment.

Some anti-dilution clauses require founders to provide compensation. The founders may need to transfer part of their shares to the investor. They may also need to make other agreed adjustments. This kind of clause treats dilution as a risk shared by the investor and the founders. It is often easier to understand as a private arrangement among shareholders.

Other clauses require the company to provide compensation. The company may need to issue extra shares, pay money, or provide another benefit to the investor. This type of arrangement creates higher legal risk. The company is not only a contracting party. It also has its own capital, creditors, employees, and later shareholders. If the company uses its assets to protect one investor, the interests of other parties may be affected.

Anti-dilution clauses are not only financial terms. They may change the ownership structure of the company. They may affect control rights, voting power, and later financing plans. A strong anti-dilution clause may make new investors more cautious. It may also increase the burden on founders. So the legal meaning of the clause cannot be judged only by its commercial name.

3. The Legal Basis of Anti-Dilution Clauses

Anti-dilution clauses are based on private agreement. In start-up financing, investors, founders, and the company need to decide how to share future risks. The value of a start-up is not easy to measure. A young company may grow fast, but it may also fail to meet its expected value. Because of this, the parties often use contract terms to deal with possible changes after investment.

Freedom of contract gives the parties space to make this kind of arrangement. If the investor accepts a high-risk investment, it may ask for special protection. If the founders need capital, they may agree to give the investor certain rights. The company may also accept these terms in order to complete the financing round. When the agreement is made through real consent, the anti-dilution clause has a basic legal foundation.

Freedom of contract does not mean that every term should be enforced without limit. Anti-dilution protection may affect more than the investor and the founders. It may affect company capital, later financing, other shareholders, and creditors. A contract term cannot be used to avoid mandatory legal rules. It also cannot be used to turn an equity investment into a risk-free transaction.

Fairness is another important basis for reviewing anti-dilution clauses. The clause should protect the investor from a real dilution risk. It should not make the founders bear all losses. Start-up investment always contains business risk. If the investor can recover its loss in every case, the nature of the investment may become unclear. The investor would enjoy the benefit of equity investment but avoid the risk that normally comes with it.

Good faith also limits the use of anti-dilution clauses. The parties should not use a broad or unclear clause to gain an unfair advantage after the deal is signed. For example, an investor should not use a small price adjustment in a later financing round to demand a large transfer of founder shares. Founders should not avoid the clause through artificial transaction design. The company should not hide later financing terms from the investor. Each party should act in a way that fits the purpose of the agreement.

Company capital rules create another legal boundary. A start-up is a separate legal person. Its property does not belong directly to the investor or the founders. If an anti-dilution clause only adjusts rights between shareholders, the legal risk may be lower. If the clause requires the company to pay cash, return investment funds, or issue shares without proper procedure, the risk becomes higher. Company assets must also support business operation and debt payment.

Creditor protection is closely connected with company capital. Creditors often rely on company assets when they decide whether to trade with the company. If the company uses its assets to compensate one investor after a down round, creditors may be placed in a weaker position. This is why company compensation needs stricter review than founder compensation. The law should not allow a private financing term to quietly reduce the protection given to creditors.

Shareholder equality also matters (Kraakman et al., 2017). Anti-dilution clauses usually give special rights to earlier investors. These rights are not always improper. Investors may need them because they enter the company at an early and risky stage.

But special rights should have a clear scope. They should not take away the basic rights of other shareholders. They should not allow one investor to control major company decisions without proper agreement or procedure.

Corporate governance rules also affect the validity and performance of anti-dilution clauses. If the clause requires new share issuance, amendment of articles, change of registered capital, or transfer of shares, the company must follow the required internal procedure. A private investment agreement cannot replace all company decisions. The board, shareholders' meeting, articles of association, and registration rules may all be relevant.

The legal basis of anti-dilution clauses is built on both permission and restriction. The law allows parties to allocate valuation risk through contract. The law also requires the clause to respect fairness, good faith, company capital, creditor protection, shareholder equality, and corporate governance procedure.

4. The Validity Limits of Anti-Dilution Clauses

The validity of an anti-dilution clause depends on its purpose, scope, and actual effect. The clause may be accepted when it protects the investor from a real down round. It may face legal limits when it removes normal investment risk or harms the company's capital structure. The review should focus on what the clause does in practice, not only on its name.

The purpose of the clause should be legitimate. In start-up financing, a down round may reduce the value of an earlier investor's shares (Metrick & Yasuda, 2021). It is reasonable for the investor to ask for some protection against this risk. This protection can help the investor accept the uncertainty of early investment. It can also help the company complete financing when its future value is still unclear.

Yet the clause should not guarantee that the investor will always make a profit. Equity investment is different from a loan (Easterbrook & Fischel, 1991). The investor may enjoy future growth, but it must also bear business risk. If the clause allows the investor to recover all losses in every situation, the arrangement may no longer look like normal equity investment. It may become a disguised promise of fixed return.

The triggering conditions should be clear. The parties should define what counts as a down round. A later financing price lower than the earlier price is usually the main condition. The clause should explain whether the number of shares, the financing amount, and the type of investor matter. Without clear conditions, the parties may later disagree on whether the clause has been triggered.

The clause should deal with excluded events. Employee equity incentives should not always trigger anti-dilution protection. Share issuance in a merger, restructuring, or debt-to-equity swap may need separate treatment. Some strategic financing may be approved by existing investors in advance. If these events are not clearly excluded, the clause may be applied too broadly. This may create pressure on the company. It may also make later financing harder.

The calculation method should be clear. A full-ratchet clause gives strong protection. Once the company issues shares at a lower price, the earlier investor's price is adjusted to that lower price. This method is easy to understand, but it may create harsh results. A small later financing round may lead to a large adjustment. The founders may lose more shares than expected. Later investors may worry that their investment will trigger heavy compensation.

A weighted-average clause is usually more moderate. It considers the lower price and the size of the later financing round. If the later issuance is small, the adjustment will be limited. This method links the protection to the real impact of the down round. It is easier to defend because it does not shift all valuation risk to the founders or later investors.

The obligor should be clearly identified. The legal risk changes when the duty is placed on different parties. If the founders provide compensation, the clause is closer to a private arrangement between shareholders. The founders may transfer part of their shares or accept a change in their economic interests. This type of arrangement still needs to be fair, but it usually does not directly reduce company assets.

If the company bears the duty, the review should be stricter. The company may be asked to issue new shares, pay cash, or give another benefit to the investor. New share issuance must follow company law procedures. Cash compensation may affect company capital and creditor interests. The company's assets are not a pool of money that can be freely used to protect one investor. They also support the company's business and debt payment.

A clause that requires repurchase or fixed return carries higher legal risk. If the company promises to buy back the investor's shares at a fixed price after a down round, the arrangement may conflict with capital maintenance rules. If the investor can always recover its principal and expected return, the clause may weaken the risk-sharing nature of equity financing. The law should be cautious with this type of protection.

The method of performance should be lawful. A clause may be valid as a contract, but it may not be performed in the exact way written in the agreement. If performance requires capital reduction, share issuance, amendment of articles, or use of company funds, the company must follow the required legal procedure. A private agreement cannot replace corporate approvals or mandatory company law rules.

This distinction is important in practice. It allows the law to respect the parties' agreement, but it also prevents the agreement from bypassing company law. An anti-dilution clause should not be rejected only because it protects investors. It should be restricted when its performance damages company capital, harms creditors, unfairly burdens founders, or disrupts the normal order of corporate governance.

5. Situations Where Anti-Dilution Clauses Should Be Restricted

Anti-dilution clauses may have legal value, but they should not be used without limit. In start-up financing, the investor needs protection. The company also needs capital stability. Founders, later investors, employees, and creditors may all be affected by the clause. If the clause gives too much protection to one investor, it may damage the basic balance of the financing relationship. In these cases, the clause should be restricted.

A clause should be restricted when it damages company capital. Some anti-dilution clauses require the company to return investment funds or pay fixed cash compensation to the investor. This kind of arrangement may reduce the company's assets. For a start-up, cash is often used for product development, staff payment, market expansion, and daily operation. If the company must use this money to compensate one investor, its normal business may be harmed.

The problem becomes clearer when the company has no distributable profit. Equity investment is not the same as ordinary debt. The investor becomes a shareholder and should normally bear business risk. If the company must pay money to the investor even when it has no profit, the clause may place the investor above other shareholders. It may also weaken the company's ability to continue operating. In this case, the court should not only ask whether the clause was signed. It should also ask whether performance would damage the company's capital base.

A clause should also be restricted when it harms creditor interests. Company assets do not only serve shareholders. They also support debt repayment. Creditors may provide goods, services, loans, or other support because they believe the company has enough assets to meet its duties. If an investor receives priority compensation from company assets after a down round, creditors may face greater risk.

This risk is not always easy to see at the time of signing. In early financing, the company may appear to have enough funds. Later, the company may face business pressure or debt pressure. If the anti-dilution clause still requires the company to pay the investor before dealing with other debts, the clause may reduce creditor protection. The law should not allow an investment agreement to quietly move company assets away from the reach of creditors.

A clause may also be restricted when it creates disguised withdrawal of capital. In form, the investor holds equity. In substance, the investor may recover the investment principal and fixed return through the clause. This kind of arrangement changes the nature of the investment. The investor enjoys the possible benefit of being a shareholder, but avoids the basic risk of being a shareholder.

Disguised withdrawal of capital is especially likely when the clause requires the company to pay cash, repurchase shares at a fixed price, or provide guaranteed compensation after a down round. The label of the clause may still be "anti-dilution," but its real function may be capital return. The court should pay attention to the actual effect of the clause. If performance would allow the investor to take back capital in a way that harms the company or creditors, full performance should not be supported.

A clause should be restricted when it places excessive limits on later financing. Start-ups often need several rounds of funding. A company may not survive if it cannot raise new capital. Strong anti-dilution protection may make later investors unwilling to invest. Later investors may worry that their investment will trigger large compensation to earlier investors. They may also worry that the ownership structure will become unstable after the adjustment.

Full-ratchet clauses create this problem more easily. Under this method, even a small down round may lead to a large adjustment for the earlier investor. Founders may lose a large part of their shares. Later investors may receive a weaker position than expected. The company may find it harder to negotiate a new financing round. If the clause blocks the company's normal financing needs, its legal effect should be limited.

A clause should also be restricted when it creates a serious imbalance of interests. Some clauses require founders to bear unlimited compensation liability. Some clauses allow the investor to demand a large amount of shares or money after a small change in valuation. These arrangements may go beyond the real loss caused by dilution. They may turn risk protection into pressure against founders.

Founders often accept strict terms because the company urgently needs funds. This does not mean every strict term should be enforced in full. A reasonable anti-dilution clause should match the actual impact of the down round. It should not punish founders for every change in market conditions. It should not make founders carry a burden that is far beyond their control.

A clause may also need restriction when it conflicts with listing or regulatory requirements. If the company plans to go public, special investor rights may face closer review. Anti-dilution clauses may affect equity clarity, shareholder equality, and corporate governance stability. Repurchase rights, fixed return promises, and special compensation terms may also raise concerns before listing.

A company preparing for listing usually needs a clear and stable ownership structure. If an investor can still demand share adjustment or cash compensation before listing, the rights of other shareholders may become uncertain. The company may also need to remove or suspend special rights to meet regulatory expectations. So anti-dilution clauses should usually include clear termination rules before listing or before formal filing.

6. Judicial Review of Anti-Dilution Clauses

Judicial review of anti-dilution clauses should focus on the real content of the clause. The court should not decide the case only by the wording used by the parties. A clause called "anti-dilution" may only adjust the investor's economic interest. It may also require the company to return funds, issue new shares, or give the investor a fixed return. These situations have different legal effects. The court should examine the clause step by step.

The court needs to examine whether the contract was validly formed. This includes the identity of the parties, the signing process, and the authority of the person who signed the agreement. In start-up financing, the agreement may be signed by the company, founders, existing shareholders, and investors. If one party signs on behalf of the company, the court should check whether that person had proper authority. If the clause affects shareholder rights, the court should also check whether the required shareholders gave consent.

True consent is also important. Anti-dilution clauses may be complex. Some founders may accept them because the company needs money urgently. This does not mean the clause is invalid. But the court should still examine whether the main risks were clearly disclosed. If the clause was hidden in a long agreement, or if its effect was not made clear, the court may treat it with more caution. A valid agreement should be based on a clear understanding of the main rights and duties.

The court should also examine whether the clause violates mandatory legal rules. Contract freedom cannot be used to avoid company law. If the clause only requires founders to transfer shares under agreed conditions, the legal risk may be lower. If the clause requires the company to pay cash, return investment funds, repurchase shares, or issue new shares, the court should review it more strictly. These forms may affect company capital, profit distribution, share repurchase rules, and capital increase procedures.

The name of the clause should not control the result. Some clauses look like anti-dilution protection, but their actual effect is to guarantee the investor's principal and return. This may turn equity investment into a fixed-income arrangement. The investor would enjoy the possible benefit of being a shareholder, but avoid the normal risk of investment. If the clause has this effect, the court should not support full performance without further review.

The court also needs to examine the impact on third parties. A clause between an investor and founders may be valid between those parties. The position changes when performance affects the company, other shareholders, later investors, or creditors. For example, if the company must issue new shares to one investor, the shareholding ratio of other shareholders may change. If the company must pay cash compensation, company assets may be reduced. If the company already has debts, creditors may face greater risk.

Third-party impact is especially important when the company is in financial difficulty. At that point, company assets should support business operation and debt payment. If one investor uses an anti-dilution clause to obtain priority payment, the burden may shift to creditors and other shareholders. The court should not treat the dispute as a simple contract dispute when the result affects the company's capital base.

The reasonableness of compensation should be reviewed. Anti-dilution protection should match the real loss caused by a down round. If a later financing round causes only a small dilution effect, the compensation should not be too large. If the clause requires unlimited compensation, a fixed return, or a large transfer of founder shares, the court should examine whether the result is fair. The clause should protect against dilution. It should not punish founders for every change in market conditions.

The court may support reasonable compensation. A weighted-average adjustment is often easier to justify because it considers price and financing size. A full-ratchet adjustment needs closer review because it may create a heavy burden after a small down round. If the protection is stronger, the court should examine its effect more carefully.

Internal company procedures are necessary. If the clause requires new share issuance, amendment of articles, capital increase, share transfer registration, or adjustment of shareholder rights, the company must complete the required procedure. A private investment agreement cannot replace a shareholders' meeting, board approval, amendment of articles, or registration process when the law requires them.

The court should separate contractual validity from actual performance. An anti-dilution clause may be valid between the parties, but the requested performance may still be blocked by company law rules. This approach respects private agreement. It also prevents the parties from using contract terms to harm company capital, creditors, or the basic order of corporate governance.

7. Reasonable Design of Anti-Dilution Clauses

A reasonable anti-dilution clause should protect investors without placing unfair pressure on founders or the company. The clause should be clear, limited, and possible to perform. It should not serve only the investor's interest. It should leave space for later financing, company operation, and normal corporate governance.

A weighted-average clause should be used as the main model. This type of clause gives the investor protection when a down round happens, but it does not adjust the earlier investment price in a harsh way. It considers the lower price in the later financing round. It also considers the number of shares issued in that round. If the later issuance is small, the adjustment will be limited. This makes the result closer to the real effect of dilution.

A full-ratchet clause should be used with caution. It may look simple, but it can create heavy results. If the company issues a small number of shares at a lower price, the earlier investor may still receive a large adjustment. Founders may lose a large part of their shares. Later investors may become unwilling to invest. This may hurt the company's ability to raise new funds. For a start-up, this risk is serious because later financing is often needed for survival and growth.

The clause should define excluded events. Not every share issuance should trigger anti-dilution protection. Employee equity incentives should usually be excluded. These incentives are used to attract and retain staff. If they trigger anti-dilution adjustment, the company may find it harder to build its team. Adjustment of the employee option pool should also be treated carefully. It is often part of the company's internal incentive plan, not a real down round.

Strategic financing approved by investors may also be excluded. A company may bring in a strategic investor for business cooperation, technology support, market access, or supply chain resources. The price may not fully reflect ordinary financial valuation. If existing investors have approved this arrangement, it is not reasonable for them to later use the same transaction to claim anti-dilution protection.

Share issuance in mergers, restructuring, or debt-to-equity swaps should have separate treatment. These transactions may serve special business needs. They may be used to solve debt pressure, adjust business structure, or complete a larger transaction. They are different from ordinary equity financing. If they are treated as normal down rounds, the anti-dilution clause may be applied too broadly.

A clear time limit is necessary. Anti-dilution rights should not last forever. A start-up's value may change many times. If an early investor keeps anti-dilution protection for a long time, the company's equity structure may remain unstable. Later investors may worry that old rights will affect their investment. The clause may end after a qualified financing round, before IPO filing, or after a fixed period after the investment date.

The clause should set a compensation cap. Protection should have a limit. The parties may set a cap on the number of shares that can be adjusted. They may also set a cap on the amount of cash compensation or the percentage of founder shares that can be transferred. A cap can prevent extreme results. It can make the legal effect of the clause easier to predict.

The duty of founders and the duty of the company should be clearly separated. If founders bear the duty, the agreement should state that it is their personal obligation. The method of performance should also be clear. They may transfer shares, accept dilution of their own interest, or provide agreed compensation within a limited scope. The clause should not use unclear wording that later shifts founder duties to the company.

If the company bears the duty, the clause should be more careful. The agreement should state that performance depends on legal conditions and company procedures. New share issuance may require shareholder approval, amendment of articles, capital registration, or other internal steps. Cash compensation may depend on distributable profit, capital maintenance rules, and creditor protection. The company should not promise a result that it cannot legally perform.

The investment agreement should be coordinated with the articles of association and the shareholders' agreement. If the anti-dilution clause affects shareholding ratio, voting rights, share transfer, or special investor rights, it may not be enough to write it only in the investment agreement. The same arrangement may need to appear in the articles of association or a shareholders' agreement. This can reduce conflict between documents.

The wording of the clause should be simple and precise. It should define the triggering event, calculation method, excluded events, time limit, compensation cap, obligor, and performance procedure. The clause should avoid broad expressions such as "all losses shall be compensated" or "the investor shall suffer no dilution under any condition." Such wording may create unfair results. It may make the clause harder to enforce.

A reasonable design should keep anti-dilution protection within its proper function. It should deal with valuation risk caused by a down round. It should not become a promise of fixed return. It should not remove all investment risk. It should not use company assets in a way that harms creditors or other shareholders.

8. Conclusion

Anti-dilution clauses have a real place in start-up financing. Early investors often enter the company when its value is uncertain and its business is not stable yet. A later down round may reduce the value of their shares and weaken their position in the company. So some form of anti-dilution protection can be reasonable.

The legal problem starts when this protection goes beyond its proper function. Anti-dilution clauses should deal with valuation risk. They should not turn equity investment into a risk-free arrangement. They should not allow the investor to recover principal and fixed return in every case. They should not use company assets in a way that harms capital stability, creditors, or other shareholders.

The key issue is not the name of the clause, but its actual effect. A clause that only adjusts the conversion price within a limited range may be acceptable. A clause that requires founders to provide reasonable share compensation may also be enforceable if the scope is clear. A clause that requires the company to pay cash, repurchase shares, or provide fixed returns needs stricter review. The company is a separate legal person, and its assets cannot be treated as a private guarantee for one investor.

Judicial review should separate validity from performance. An anti-dilution clause may be valid as an agreement between the parties, but its performance may still be limited by company law. If performance requires share issuance, amendment of articles, capital change, or use of company funds, the required legal procedures must be followed. Contract freedom cannot replace corporate approval or mandatory legal rules.

A reasonable anti-dilution clause should be clear and limited. The triggering event, calculation method, excluded events, time limit, compensation cap, obligor, and performance procedure should all be stated in plain terms. Weighted-average protection is usually more suitable than full-ratchet protection because it reflects the actual effect of dilution more closely. Founder obligations and company obligations should also be separated.

The legal boundary of anti-dilution clauses lies in this balance. Investors may receive protection against unfair dilution, but they should still bear the normal risk of equity investment. Founders may accept special investor rights, but they should not carry unlimited liability for every change in valuation. The company may support financing arrangements, but it must preserve its capital, governance order, and ability to continue operation.

References

Cumming, D., & Johan, S. (2013). *Venture Capital and Private Equity Contracting: An International Perspective*. Academic Press.

Easterbrook, F. H., & Fischel, D. R. (1991). *The economic structure of corporate law*. Harvard University Press.

Gompers, P., & Lerner, J. (2004). *The Venture Capital Cycle* (2nd ed.). MIT Press.

Kraakman, R., Armour, J., Davies, P., Enriques, L., Hansmann, H., Hertig, G., Hopt, K. J., Kanda, H., Pargendler, M., Ringe, W.-G., & Rock, E. (2017). *The anatomy of corporate law: A comparative and functional approach* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Metrick, A., & Yasuda, A. (2021). *Venture Capital and the Finance of Innovation* (3rd ed.). Wiley.

National Venture Capital Association. (2020). *Model Legal Documents*.