Responses to Reviewers' comments

General Comments:

The authors are thankful for the useful comments received from the reviewers that have helped to improve our paper, especially regarding the methodology and Discussion sections. All the recommendations have carefully been incorporated into the manuscript, and we decided to redefine our research questions and hypotheses to better clarify it, according to second reviewer, as result, we also changed the manuscript title and key words. Table 1 below shows received **comments** and **given responses** from authors for further review. Parts of the revised article highlighted (red) indicate the modifications.

Reviewer 2	
Comments	**Responses**
1. There are no clearly defined research questions or hypotheses in this paper. This would have hopefully provided more guidance to the authors because they seemed to get distracted part way through the paper.	1. We appreciated very much your comments. Based on this comments we decided extensively to redefine our research questions and hypotheses to better clarify it, in addicion that, we also changed the manuscript title and key words.
2. When putting the sample together, why did the authors decide to use 21? That seems to be a very random number and no explanation is provided as to why. There were only 100 companies listed in the database they used to begin with, why not look at all 100? Using a random sample resulted in a sample very skewed towards one industry (banks), 12 out of 21. It would have been better to either look at the entire population of 100 companies or have done a stratified sample.	2. We appreciated your question. We have explained in the Methodology the criteria how these companies were selected. Our main goal was to select the industries, so we selected 6 main industries in our sample, in these 6 industries included 21 companies. Because of we didn't look at all industries in our sample, we considered as a one of the limitation of this article.
3. Could the authors looked at other accounting documents to find the R&D and Charity budgets, I do think these would have been interesting numbers to look at.	3. This is an interesting observation, we also concerned about it, the reason why we didn't find these informations in annual reports, neither sustainable reports, that's why we didn't included these information in our data analysis. It's also one of our limitations. Only a few companies reported their CSR/philanthropic or R&D budget in their annual reports.
4. The authors state that they will be using a multiple linear regression and give a very elaborate equation before spending three pages ignoring the equation and focusing on the SDGs that their different industries address.	4. We appreciated your observation. We significantly revised it.

5. Given that over half of their sample is made up of banks, and the rest of the industries have no more than three companies represented, generalizing about the most common SDGs in these industries based on such a small sample makes no sense.	5. This is an interesting observation, we also concerned about it, it's also one of our limitations. The current research focused on the industries that are listed in the Corporate Knights Index
6. The authors also spend a lot of time and writing looking at the most common SDGs by industry and not really looking the firm performance and the impact of CSR as purported in their title. They spend about three pages of a just over nine page article on this and do not spend enough time on the other aspects of the purpose of the paper. The last few pages of the article feel rushed, like the authors realized they had been spending too much time on discussing the pattern of SDG adoption but industries and realized they needed to look at the original purpose of the paper.	6. We are grateful for all the comments pointed out. We extensively to redefined our research questions and hypotheses to better clarify it, in addition that, we also changed the manuscript title and key words.
7. Grammatical issues: No need to put parentheses around author's name when build into the sentence, just around the year of publication. Page two lines 94 and 95 use Furthermore to start two consecutive sentences, makes it repetitive. Better to spell out numbers in the text, such as the 3 on page five line 233	7. We are grateful for all the comments pointed out The typos have been corrected.