After having reviewed the manuscript, I deem the authors did a good work in improving some sections (especially the definition of the objectives and the first part of the methods), while still devoting low attention to others. I report here the issues from the previous reports that, in my opinion, were not adequately addressed by the authors. I also add a few other issues that I found in reading the manuscript. I apologize to add them only in this round. However, I consider all of them as minor.

The authors are obviously free to follow or not the suggestions below, but I'd like they provide a clear explanation if they decide not to accept a comment.

1. Lines 254-258: The duplicate research questions have been (correctly) dropped from the introduction but not from here.
2. Figure 1: Please translate "Bases de datos" in English. I suggest controlling also the other Tables and Figures for possible remaining Spanish words.
3. Line 305: How is the geographical origin defined? In the first response file you provided the answer to this question. Can you (succinctly) add it also in the manuscript?
4. Lines 491-496: This sentence continues to seem out of place to me. In the first response file you stated that you improved it, but actually it remained identical in all the versions.
5. Lines 514-515: The fact that the colours have a temporal meaning ("indicating with yellow color the most recent issues") should be stated before the first of this kind of figures (Figure 3).
6. Lines 520-524: As already stated in the first report, this paragraph is useful to understand what is shown by the figures. Again, in your response it was stated that the information was put in the methods, but it is still in the same place as in the original version.
7. Figure 13: The time range differs between the different panels (e.g., 2008-2016 for (a), 2008-2014 for (b), 2012-2018 for (c). It would be much better to have the same scale across all the panels, otherwise the comparison is cumbersome.
8. Title of figure 16: maybe it should read 2010-2019, not 2000-2009.
9. Lines 736-737: As I reported in the first round, you state, in Figure 16, that "the field of rural development emerges categorized within the basic topics". However, looking at Figure 15, I see "rural development" in the basic topics as well. Therefore, in a strict sense, "rural development" it is not a new cluster that emerges in the basic topics. It was still there before. Is this correct or is there something I'm missing?
10. In both previous reports there was a comment concerning the discussion section. It seems they have not been addressed in any of the revisions, nor an explanation was provided for not having addressed them (actually, in the second response file, this comment was completely ignored). Please, either address the points raised in comment 36 of the first report or explain why you decided to leave the discussion unchanged.