

Authors' responses to reviewer4 comments and suggestions

The paper is well written and well structured. However, despite this, I suggest a few changes that will in my opinion improve the quality of the article.

- The abstract should contain 2-3 statements of justification, answering the question – why Authors decided to select the topic of their research. The aim of the paper should be clearly stated in the abstract. According to the principles of abstract construction, after formulating the aim, the research methodology and findings should be briefly described.

Response: Thank you very much for your comments. The abstract has significantly improved.

- The literature review should more justify the need to formulate research problems indicated by the authors of paper.

Response: We have addressed and improved the justification for the research questions to clearly formulate the research problems. Since 1991, several hundred works on SRC have been published in prestigious journals, but there are no bibliometric studies on these particular research questions. Therefore, it will be interesting now for academia to examine the state of the art and current status of the different themes that have evolved. The analyses carried out, the dynamic nature of these concepts, as well as the global crisis that we are experiencing, have allowed us to redefine the concept of SRCB (see also the Conclusions section).

- The research methodology has been described in a clear way. I like the idea of the strategic diagram - Figure 1.

Response: In any case, we have slightly improved the wording of the description of the extraction and the depuration of the bibliographic database records.

- Presentation of results - I am not sure if there should be both Table 3 and Figure 9 in the article if they contain similar content?

Response: Thank you very much for the comments. Taking a more quantitative approach, Table 3 presents an unlinked list of topics and their corresponding importance in each time period. In other words, it presents the productivity and impact of each theme trans-sectionally. On the other hand, in a mainly qualitative and longitudinal approach (as a continuum), Figure 9 shows the thematic structure and dynamic evolution of the field throughout the three periods, and the relationships between themes and, finally, draws together connected groups of themes.

Therefore, we believe that both optics have complementary content and are important for the identification of future research lines.

- The "Discussion" section should be completed with a references. This part of the article should, in principle, contain a reference of own research results to the research of other authors, with the indication whether the results obtained are similar or different.

Response: In response to the first comment and another made by reviewer 1, the authors discussed the results in light of those obtained by previous works and the results of the co-word analysis. As a consequence, this last section has now been considerably improved.

- It is worth supplementing the list of references with publications from the journal to which the authors submits the text.

Response: Many thanks for your comment. As a result of a new literature review we have added the works of Lakatos et al. (2018), Becchetti, and Salustri (2019) and Shen (2014).