I reviewed the manuscript, but after some consideration I deem that the changes made by the authors didn't solve the main issues raised by the comments. I'm sorry to reach this conclusion because I think this kind analysis might be very interesting.

I report here the main arguments that led me to take this decision.

First, very little improvement was made about the clarity of the manuscript, as asked in the first general comment (by the way, authors provided no response to the general comments). In this respect, the English writing remains quite poor, and most of the structure of the manuscript remains unchanged. For example, most of the paragraphs in the results section that seemed to be out of place (since they have more of a discussion flavour) have been left there with no change.

Another clarity issue concerns the final part of the introduction. This has been improved a little (for example, with the addition of the knowledge gap), but research questions have been put there quite abruptly (and not in a logical sequence to improve the reader understanding) and repeated two times. The identical paragraph is repeated again in section 2 (where it was in the old version). In my opinion, this signals that authors didn't pay very much attention in considering the suggestions and addressing the comments.

This belief is confirmed by the formulas added in section 2. The first two new formulas are entirely not clear (for example, most of the components described are not in the formulas), while the last formula is exactly the same of equation 1, which has been left there. Another aspect that cast doubts about the attention that authors devoted to the comments is the totally unchanged discussion, despite suggestions were specifically provided. Apart from deciding or not to follow these suggestions (I understand that, in the end, this is an authors' choice), authors didn't even provide an explanation for not having addressed the issues raised.

Other comments that asked for a better explanation of some passages have been answered only in the response file, but no effort was made by the authors to include these clarifications also in the manuscript, where they might have most useful for a reader.

Finally, a severe methodological issue emerges. In responding to comment 28, the authors stated that the analyses were carried out considering all the papers, i.e., not removing possible duplicate entries from different databases. While this choice suits to the first part of the analysis (i.e., comparing different databases), not removing duplicates inevitably biases the analyses in sections 3.3 and 3.4. In fact, duplicate entries (and hence their keywords) will be weighted more, thus likely distorting the results of the time analysis and of the identification of clusters (and of their importance).