

The Issue of Copyright Protection Boundaries for Iconic Movements in Dance Works-Taking "Only This Green" as an Example

Ruyu Yin

Qilu Institute of Technology, Jinan, Shandong, China

Abstract: Copyright protection of iconic movements in dance works is an emerging issue in copyright law, with core controversies focusing on defining the scope of protection, standards for determining originality, and rules for determining substantial similarity. The widespread adoption of digital communication technologies has continuously expanded the reach of dance works, leading to more diverse and covert forms of infringement involving iconic movements. This paper takes the dance drama "Only This Green" as a case study, examining the creation and dissemination of its iconic movements, such as the "green waist," to clarify the legal definitions and conditions for protection of dance works and iconic movements. It analyzes the challenges in judicial practice, including ambiguous scope of protection, inconsistent determination of originality, lack of rules for determining substantial similarity, and difficulties in distinguishing movements in the public domain. From four dimensions—clarifying the scope of protection, unifying standards of determination, refining determination methods, and defining the boundaries of normative application—this paper proposes specific pathways to improve the boundaries of copyright protection for iconic movements in dance works. This research can provide theoretical reference and practical guidance for judicial practice of dance copyright in China, offer stable legal support for the protection of the rights of dance creators, and promote the healthy development of dance art creation and cultural dissemination.

Keywords: Dance Work; Signature Movements; Copyright Protection; Boundaries of Protection; "Only This Green"

1. Introduction

1.1 Research Background

The rapid development of China's cultural industry has propelled dance art creation into a new stage, with a continuous emergence of original dance works. The dance drama "Only This Green" has become a phenomenon due to its unique artistic style and cultural connotations, with iconic movements such as the "green waist" becoming well-known cultural symbols. The development of digital media and short video platforms has significantly increased the speed of dance work dissemination, leading to frequent instances of iconic movements being copied, adapted, and commercially used without authorization, resulting in a rise in related copyright disputes.

The current copyright law system in China has relatively macro-level rules for the protection of dance works, but has not made detailed provisions on the protection boundaries of iconic movements. In judicial practice, there are considerable disputes on issues such as the scope of protection of iconic movements, the determination of originality, and the standards for infringement judgment^[1]. Dance art has the characteristics of being physical, instantaneous, and comprehensive. Iconic movements include not only individual poses but also the connection of movements and the overall choreography. This is significantly different from the protection logic of literary and artistic works, which further exacerbates the difficulty in determining the protection boundaries. Against this background, clarifying the copyright protection boundaries of iconic movements in dance works and improving the relevant legal application rules in combination with typical cases has become an important topic in copyright law theory research and judicial practice.

1.2 Significance of the Research

From a theoretical perspective, this paper uses "Only This Green" as a specific example to explore the fundamental theories of copyright

protection for iconic dance movements, clarifying their legal positioning and protection logic. This enriches the theoretical system of copyright protection for dance works in China and addresses the shortcomings of existing research on the boundaries of protection for iconic movements. The improvement paths proposed in this paper, combined with the challenges of judicial practice, can provide theoretical support for the refinement and revision of relevant copyright law rules, promoting the deep integration of dance art and legal rules.

From a practical perspective, this research provides clear guidelines for the protection of dance creators' rights, helping them clarify the scope of their rights to signature movements and the avenues for safeguarding those rights, thus effectively protecting their legitimate interests. The unified identification standards and detailed judgment methods proposed in this paper can provide a reference for judicial organs in handling similar cases, reducing inconsistent judgments in similar cases and enhancing the uniformity and credibility of judicial rulings. Clearly defined protection boundaries can regulate the usage behavior of market entities, curb malicious infringement and free-riding, create a cultural environment that respects originality, and promote the healthy and orderly development of China's dance art industry.

1.3 Research Methods

This paper employs a literature review method, consulting relevant copyright laws and regulations, academic monographs, and journal articles to outline the theoretical foundation and current research status of copyright protection for dance works, thus providing theoretical support for the entire study. This paper also collects and organizes judicial precedents in China involving infringement of dance works, focusing on analyzing the adjudication approaches and points of contention in disputes related to signature movements, and summarizing common issues in judicial practice. This article uses a case study approach, taking "Only Green" and its signature green waist movement as the core case. Combining the creative background, movement design, and infringement disputes of the work, it specifically analyzes the practical difficulties and solutions for the copyright protection of signature movements.

This article employs a comparative research method, comparing the rules and practical experience of copyright protection for dance works at home and abroad, drawing on reasonable institutional designs and judicial approaches, and combining them with the current development status of dance art in my country and the needs of judicial practice, to propose appropriate improvement suggestions.

2. Basic Theories of Copyright Protection for Iconic Movements in Dance Works

2.1 Legal Definition of Dance Works and Signature Movements

According to Article 4, Paragraph 6 of the Regulations for the Implementation of the Copyright Law of China, a dance work refers to a work that expresses thoughts and feelings through continuous movements, postures, and expressions. This definition clarifies that the core element of a dance work is continuous physical expression, emphasizing the continuity and integrity of the movements rather than isolated individual movements^[2]. The presentation of a dance work depends on the dynamic interpretation of the human body, integrating movement design, formation changes, music coordination, and emotional expression. It is an intellectual achievement that combines artistry and comprehensiveness. The signature movement is a highly recognizable and unique movement or movement combination in a dance work that can represent the core artistic features of the work. It is the concentrated embodiment of the originality of the dance work and a key link connecting dance art and copyright protection. Signature movements usually have the characteristics of being concise, clear, easy to recognize, and memorable. They can be perceived and disseminated separately from the whole work and become the core cultural symbol of the work^[3]. "Only Green" is based on the famous Song Dynasty painting "A Thousand Miles of Rivers and Mountains". It restores the visual aesthetics of green landscape and the cultural connotations of the Song Dynasty through dance language. The signature movement of the dance, "Green Waist," centers on a challenging backbend, combining limb extension, expressive eye contact, and formation changes within the group dance to create a visually impactful and artistically captivating system. The design of "Green Waist" echoes the

contours and lines of the mountains in the painting, transforming static pictorial art into dynamic body language. It serves as a key identifier distinguishing "Only Green" from other dance works and provides a typical example for studying the copyright protection of signature movements.

2.2 Conditions for Marking Actions to be Protected by Copyright

To obtain copyright protection, a signature movement must meet three core conditions. The first is originality, meaning that the movement or combination of movements must be created independently by the creator and possess uniqueness that distinguishes it from movements in the public domain or existing dance works. This is a prerequisite for copyright protection. Originality does not require the movement to have extremely high artistic value or technical difficulty; it only requires the creator to invest independent intellectual labor to form a differentiated expression from existing movements [4]. The green waist in "Only Green" is not a simple copy of traditional dance movements, but a high-difficulty styling movement innovatively designed by the choreography team based on the visual characteristics of "A Thousand Miles of Rivers and Mountains". Its range of motion, limb extension method, and coordination mode with the group dance are all original, meeting the originality requirements for copyright protection. The second is reproducibility, meaning that the signature movement can be fixed and reproduced in the form of text, images, videos, etc., which meets the requirements of copyright law for intellectual achievements that can be expressed in a certain form. Dance movements have instantaneous characteristics. Movements that are not fixed cannot be presented stably and are difficult to determine for infringement. The "Green Waist" dance can be disseminated through dance videos, movement diagrams, and dance scores, possessing clear reproducibility and thus qualifying as an object of copyright protection. Thirdly, it possesses expressive power of thought and emotion; the signature movements must carry specific artistic ideas and emotional connotations, conveying the core theme of the work. Copyright law protects the expression of ideas, not merely the techniques of movement; purely technical movements lacking emotional and intellectual support cannot be

protected. The "Green Waist," through its upright posture, conveys the grandeur and elegance of green landscapes, showcasing both the restrained elegance of Song Dynasty aesthetics and expressing respect for traditional culture, thus meeting the requirement of expressive power of thought and emotion.

2.3 The core Legal Basis for Protecting Boundaries

The signature movements of dance works comes from the three basic principles of copyright law. The first is the dichotomy of ideas and expression. Copyright only protects expression, not ideas. This principle is the core basis for dividing the scope of copyright protection, which can avoid the monopoly of abstract content such as ideas, creativity, and themes, and reserve space for innovation for subsequent creators [5]. "Only Green" takes green mountains and rivers as its creative theme, which belongs to the category of ideas, while the signature movements such as the green waist are the specific expression of the ideas. The law only provides protection for the latter. Clearly distinguishing between ideas and expressions can reasonably define the boundaries of protection. The second is the principle of originality. This principle clarifies that only unique expressions can obtain copyright protection, preventing the improper monopoly of public domain content. Originality is the core requirement for intellectual achievements to become works, and it is also the key standard for judging whether signature movements can be protected. Signature movements need to be distinguished from the general dance movements in the public domain. They are independently designed and choreographed by the creator to form differentiated expressions. The signature movements of "Only Green" are original and can be protected outside the public domain. The principle of originality provides the core basis for defining the boundaries of protection. Thirdly, there is the principle of limitation of rights. Copyright protection is not absolute and must take into account the public interest. Rules such as the fair use system and the free use of public domain content constitute limitations on the copyright of trademarked actions. The legislative purpose of copyright law is to encourage creation and promote cultural dissemination. Overly expanding the scope of protection will hinder the popularization and inheritance of

culture. The principle of limitation of rights requires that while protecting the rights of creators, the public be allowed to use trademarked actions within a reasonable scope, balancing the rights of creators and the needs of cultural dissemination, and clearly defining the reasonable boundaries of protection.

3. Judicial Practice Challenges in the Copyright Protection of Iconic Movements in Dance Works -Taking "Only This Green" as an Example

3.1 The Protection Scope of the Sign Action Lacks Clear Definition

The current Copyright Law of China does not make specific provisions on the scope of protection for signature movements. The law only protects dance works as a whole, and signature movements with core identification in the work are not listed separately. Judicial decisions tend to go to two extremes when faced with such issues^[6]. Some judges tend to expand the boundaries of protection, directly regard individual signature movements as independent objects of protection, sever the integrity of the dance work, and confuse common movements in the public domain with original movements created by the creator. Other judges take a conservative attitude, attaching signature movements entirely to the work as a whole, and do not recognize their relatively independent protection value. When faced with the act of copying signature movements separately, it is difficult for the rights holder to find a direct basis for rights protection.

The controversies surrounding "Only Green" vividly illustrate this dilemma. Many infringers only extract individual movements from the "Green Waist" dance, deliberately evading infringement by subtly adjusting details, replacing background music, and altering performance scenes, without fully replicating the entire dance drama. When the original rights holder asserts their rights, they struggle to find corresponding support within existing legal provisions. Courts also face challenges in defining the nature of the infringement; recognizing the "Green Waist" as an independent protected object lacks clear legal basis, while including it in the overall protection framework fails to regulate the individual replication of core movements. On short video platforms, numerous users use the "Green Waist" for filming, live

streaming, and commercial promotion; whether such actions constitute infringement remains unclear due to the ambiguous scope of protection, making a quick determination difficult.

3.2 Inconsistent Standards for Originality Assessment

Originality is the core prerequisite for copyright protection of signature movements. Current judicial practice lacks a unified standard for its determination, and different judicial approaches directly impact the final protection outcome. Some courts prioritize the technical difficulty of individual movements when determining originality, equating high-difficulty movements directly with originality. Other courts focus on the overall creativity of the movement combination, judging originality from the perspectives of artistic expression and choreography. These different judgment logics lead to drastically different outcomes in similar cases. The "Green Waist" dance possesses both high-difficulty technical features and overall creative design, yet different courts have shown significant disagreement in their determination of its originality, which has also affected judicial credibility to some extent. Signature movements often incorporate elements of the public domain, requiring judicial judgment to first remove the public domain content before assessing the originality of the remaining parts; however, this filtering process lacks a unified standard. Basic movements in traditional dance are public resources freely available to the entire society; expressions pieced together solely from public domain movements lack originality. The traditional backbend movement has long been in the public domain; whether the "Green Waist" dance loses its originality due to its inclusion of this basic form has been subject to inconsistent conclusions from different courts. Dance creation is highly subjective, and fully documenting the creative process is practically difficult. The burden of proof for rights holders to demonstrate originality is already high. Current judicial practice lacks reasonable rules of proof for such cases, placing almost the entire burden of proof on the rights holder. The creative team behind "Only Green" needed to thoroughly trace the creative process, design concepts, and distinctive features of the "Green Waist" piece. The collection and preservation of relevant materials required significant time and effort, directly increasing the rights holder's

costs for protecting their rights.

3.3 Lack of Unified Rules for Determining Substantially Similar Infringement

Substantial similarity is the key standard for determining the infringement of a dance signature movement. This standard lacks a unified rule of application in judicial practice, and the arbitrariness of infringement determination is quite prominent. The methods used by the courts to compare the similarity of movements are not consistent. Some courts focus on local details and only compare the external form of the signature movement. Some courts adhere to the overall perspective and make a comprehensive judgment by combining elements such as dance style, movement connection, and formation changes. Different comparison methods directly lead to different judgment conclusions [7]. In the infringement dispute involving the green waist, some courts only compare the movement shape, while others combine the choreography logic of the whole work to make a judgment. It is difficult to maintain a consistent judgment standard. The existing judgment rules do not clearly define the judgment dimension and degree of similarity of substantial similarity. Judicial determinations mostly rely on the subjective feelings of ordinary observers and lack objective and stable measurement standards. How much difference in movement details can exclude similarity, and what proportion of overlap of core features can be considered similar? These key questions have no clear answers. The boundary between infringing use and fair use is also not clear enough. Judicial practice has not listed the specific scenarios of fair use of signature movements, and some use behaviors with the nature of free-riding are difficult to accurately define. Whether the use of the "green waist" movement in classroom teaching and its brief reference in commercial advertising constitutes fair use or infringement lacks a unified set of rules, leading to significant differences in court rulings.

3.4 It is Difficult to Distinguish between Fair Use and Public Domain Actions

The fair use doctrine and public domain rules jointly define the protection boundaries of iconic dance movements, but their application in the field of dance works has many gray areas. Article 24 of the Copyright Law, which

stipulates fair use, does not explicitly cover iconic dance movements. Whether the use of iconic movements in teaching research, news reporting, public service announcements, or personal learning is legal remains unclear in judicial practice due to a lack of unified standards. For example, whether using the "green waist" movement in dance textbooks or showcasing it in news reports falls within the scope of fair use has been determined differently by different courts.

The scope and identification standards for public domain movements are also inconsistent. Traditional dance movements, general body movements, and dance movements whose protection period has expired all fall into the public domain, and judicial practice lacks clear identification criteria. Basic movements such as stretching and basic backbends are all in the public domain, but whether the core shape of the "Green Waist" dance contains public domain movements, and what percentage of public domain content would affect the determination of originality, lack stable judgment standards. The division of the burden of proof between fair use and infringement is not clear enough. Users need to prove that their behavior constitutes fair use, but it is difficult to fully prove the legitimacy of the purpose, scope, and manner of use. Rights holders need to prove that the other party's behavior constitutes infringement, and users need to prove that their behavior is legal. The boundaries of the burden of proof for both parties are blurred, making it difficult to efficiently advance the trial of related disputes.

4. Pathways for Improving the Boundaries of Copyright Protection for Iconic Movements in Dance Works

4.1 Define the Scope of Protection for the Sign Action

Legislative bodies can revise the "Regulations for the Implementation of the Copyright Law" to clearly define the scope of protection for iconic dance movements, constructing a protection model based on overall protection and supplemented by independent protection. Iconic movements should be incorporated into the overall protection framework of dance works. The law should clearly define the scope of protection for dance works as covering continuous movement combinations, core iconic movements, and overall artistic expression,

ensuring that the protection of iconic movements is not divorced from the work itself. Simultaneously, it should be clarified that the copyright ownership of iconic movements is consistent with the overall work, reducing disputes over ownership. Legislation should further establish conditions for independent protection of iconic movements. Individual iconic movements possessing high originality, reproducibility, and complete expression of thought and emotion can be protected as independent objects, and the rights holder has the right to assert relevant rights independently. The "Green Waist" movement meets all the conditions for independent protection; the rights holder can directly pursue legal action against the individual reproduction and commercial use of the movement, obtaining more comprehensive legal protection. Legislation also needs to clearly define the scope of exclusions from protection. Movements in the public domain, purely technical movements, and basic physical movements lacking emotional expression should not be included in copyright protection to prevent undue monopoly of public domain resources.

4.2 Standards for Recognizing the Originality of Uniform Signature Movements

Judicial authorities should standardize the rules for determining the originality of iconic movements, establishing stable and predictable standards for adjudication. Courts should judge originality based on the overall creativity of the movement combination, taking into account both technical difficulty and artistic expression, rather than solely relying on technical skill or individual movement forms. The core of originality lies in the creator's independent intellectual investment; any design that differentiates itself from existing expressions should be recognized. In determining the originality of "Qinglu Yao", courts need to comprehensively evaluate the overall movement design, its cultural connection to the painting "A Thousand Miles of Rivers and Mountains," and its artistic expression, fully respecting the unique value of the original choreography. Judicial practice needs to establish a clear public domain movement filtering mechanism, clearly defining the scope of traditional dance movements, general body movements, and industry-specific basic movements through a unified identification list, providing stable references for courts.

Before judging originality, courts should first eliminate the public domain portion of the movement, protecting only the remaining original expression. The basic backbend movement in "Qinglu Yao" falls into the public domain; filtering it before judging the original content such as limb extension angles, styling design, and group coordination allows for a more precise delineation of the protection boundaries. The allocation of the burden of proof can be adjusted more reasonably to appropriately reduce the burden of proof on rights holders. Rights holders can initially complete the burden of proof for originality by submitting materials such as creation records, rehearsal videos, and design manuscripts. Users who claim that their actions originated in the public domain or that their use is legal should bear the corresponding burden of proof, thus balancing the litigation positions of both parties and effectively lowering the threshold for rights holders to protect their rights.

4.3 Refine the Methods for Determining Substantial Similarity Infringement

Legislative and judicial organs should work together to improve the rules for determining substantial similarity and enhance the uniformity and operability of the judgment standards. When comparing similarity, the court should adhere to the combination of overall observation and local comparison. First, judge the similarity of the work style, action arrangement, music coordination and formation changes as a whole, and then focus on the core features of the signature action to carry out detailed comparison, so as to avoid the judgment deviation caused by a single comparison method [8]. In the infringement case involving the green waist, the court first compares the overall arrangement of the accused work with "Only Green" and then focuses on examining the similarity of the core action of the green waist, which can take into account both the integrity of the work and the independence of the signature action. The standard for determining substantial similarity can be further clarified. If the core features of the accused action and the signature action are highly similar and such similarity is sufficient to cause confusion among the general public, it can be determined that substantial similarity exists. The court can make judgments based on objective elements such as core shape, body trajectory and emotional expression, and reduce

subjective arbitrariness. The boundary between infringement and fair use needs to be further clarified. The court should make a comprehensive judgment based on factors such as the purpose of use, scope of use, proportion of use and market impact. Using the green waist in commercial advertisements for profit directly encroaches on the rights holder's market interests and should not be considered fair use. Non-commercial, small-scale use of the green waist in scenarios such as personal learning, classroom teaching, and public service announcements generally falls within the scope of fair use, clearly defining the boundary between legal use and infringement.

4.4 Scope of Application for Standardized Reasonable Use and Actions in the Public Domain

Legislation can improve the relevant provisions of the Copyright Law, clarify the specific scenarios for the reasonable use of dance signature movements, and refine the rules for identifying movements in the public domain, so as to achieve a balance between rights protection and public interest. Teaching research, news reporting, public performances, personal learning, cultural promotion and other situations can be included in reasonable use, while clarifying the proportion of use, purpose of use, method of use and attribution obligations, so as to prevent the scope of reasonable use from being improperly expanded. The use of green waist in classroom teaching should indicate the original source and should not be used for commercial purposes. Non-commercial use in public performances does not require permission from the rights holder. Clarifying the rules can effectively reduce disputes. The identification of movements in the public domain can be standardized by relying on a nationally unified database. The database includes traditional dance movements, general basic movements, movements whose protection period has expired, etc., and is updated regularly in combination with the traditional dance catalog and industry standards, providing the court with intuitive reference ^[9]. The establishment of the database can greatly reduce the difficulty of identifying movements in the public domain and reduce the differences in judgments in similar cases. The rules of evidence can be further simplified. The rights holder only needs to prove that the challenged movement is similar to the signature

movement involved in the case to complete the preliminary evidence. Users who claim their actions constitute fair use or originate from the public domain bear the burden of proof. A clear mechanism for allocating the burden of proof can simplify dispute resolution processes, reduce the burden of proof on rights holders, and promote the rapid and proper resolution of copyright disputes involving trademarks and actions.

5. Conclusion

signature movements in dance works are an important aspect of China's copyright law system that requires continuous improvement. The physical, instantaneous, and comprehensive characteristics of dance art, coupled with the innovative methods of dissemination in the digital age, have made the need for protecting signature movements increasingly urgent, and the lag of current legal rules is becoming increasingly apparent in judicial practice. The controversies surrounding the dance work "Only Green" fully demonstrate that current Chinese law still has shortcomings in areas such as the scope of protection for signature movements, the determination of originality, the judgment of substantial similarity, and the distinction between the public domain and fair use. Inconsistent judgments in similar cases undermine judicial credibility and are detrimental to the protection of the rights of original dance works and the healthy development of the industry. Improving the boundaries of copyright protection for signature movements requires collaborative efforts from both the legislative and judicial branches, based on the dichotomy of idea and expression, the principle of originality, and the principle of limitations on rights, to steadily advance rule optimization. By clarifying the scope of protection and establishing a model that combines overall protection with individual protection, the integrity of the dance work and the independence of its signature movements can be balanced. Unifying the standards for determining originality and standardizing the public domain filtering rules and the allocation of the burden of proof will make judicial decisions more stable and predictable. Refining the methods for determining substantial similarity and clarifying the boundaries between infringement and fair use can effectively curb malicious infringement. Standardizing the scope

of fair use and public domain application can protect originality while preserving reasonable space for cultural dissemination. A multi-pronged approach can truly achieve a balance between creators' rights and the public interest, providing a solid legal guarantee for the continuous innovation of dance art.

In the future, based on the practical experience gained from typical cases such as "Only This Green," judicial interpretations and guiding cases can be continuously improved to gradually build a copyright protection system that aligns with the laws of dance art. Judicial organs can unify judgment standards by issuing guiding cases, and industry associations can promote the registration of dance works and the filing of core movements, providing objective evidence for rights determination. The collaborative participation of multiple stakeholders can continuously improve the rules for protecting the copyright of iconic dance movements, fully safeguarding the legitimate rights and interests of original creators, promoting the widespread dissemination and inheritance of dance culture, and providing sustained and strong legal support for building a culturally strong nation.

References

- [1] Xing Hetong. The Boundaries of Copyright Protection for Dance Works-A Discussion on the Retrial Ruling of the "Moonlight Dance Case" [J]. Peking University Intellectual Property Review, 2024, (00): 303-315.
- [2] Xiang Bo. Judicial Judgment and Argumentation Analysis of Infringement of Copyright of Dance Works [J]. China Copyright, 2025, (03): 41-51.
- [3] Hu Jiacui. Defining the Scope of Protection for Dance Works [D]. East China University of Political Science and Law, 2025.
- [4] Wu Yue. The real dilemma and countermeasures of dance copyright issues [J]. Baihua, 2025, (03): 69-71.
- [5] Zhao Jin. Analysis of the dilemma of copyright protection of Chinese dance works [J]. Shangwu, 2025, (01): 57-59.
- [6] Wang Bing. Opportunities and challenges of dance choreography in the new media era [J]. Drama House, 2024, (33): 141-143.
- [7] Xu Ping. How to determine if a dance work constitutes substantial similarity [N]. China Press and Publication Radio and Television News, 2024-11-29(007).
- [8] Wang Qian. On the scope of dance works - a review of the "Moonlight Dance Case" [J]. Intellectual Property, 2024, (10): 16-36.
- [9] Yang Wenting. The introduction of "dance image": an examination and reconstruction of the scope of copyright protection for dance works [J]. Contemporary Dance Art Research, 2024, 9(03): 64-72.
- [10] Xu Nan, Song Yajun. Determination of infringement based on substantial similarity of dance works [J]. People's Justice, 2024, (17): 89-92.
- [11] Yuan Feng, Xu Bingbing. A Study on the Identification of Copyright Infringement of Dance Works by Static Means-A Commentary on the Moonlight Dance Case [J]. China Copyright, 2024, (03): 53-64.
- [12] Li Weimin, Bao Shuang. An Exploration of Difficult Issues in the Legal Protection of Dance Works-On the Judicial Approach of the Retrial Case of Yang Liping's "Moonlight" Dance [J]. Journal of Beijing University of Political Science and Law, 2024, (01): 99-107.
- [13] Xu Ping. "Moonlight" is beautiful, but unauthorized use of "silhouette" is also an infringement [N]. China Press and Publication Radio and Television News, 2024-02-29(007).
- [14] Wang Haitao, Wang Junjie. Research on the applicable principles of determining substantial similarity in dance copyright [J]. Qilu Art Garden, 2023, (03): 31-38.
- [15] Jiang Zhurong. A Study on the Determination of Substantial Similarity in Dance Works [D]. East China University of Political Science and Law, 2023.
- [16] Zeng Yao. An Analysis of the Originality of Dance Works [D]. Shanghai Jiao Tong University, 2023.
- [17] Wang Junjie. A Study on the Applicable Principles for Determining Substantial Similarity of Dance Works [D]. Chongqing University, 2022.
- [18] Jiang Xiaoxia. A Study on the Identification of Plagiarism in Dance Works [D]. Guizhou University, 2022.