Response to Reviewer 4 Comments

Point 1: The paper is well structured and presented in a very meaningful manner. It definitely adds a value to the existed literature.

Response 1: Thank you. We very much appreciate the comment.

Point 2: There are minor corrections to be considered. This includes:

- Line 169 page 4, studies [28] & [29] do not reference to any presented argument(s) unless the preceding para.
- The word of Table in all text should start with capital letter (e.g. Line 199, L. 223)
- Paragraph presented after Table 2 (page 7) is a repetitive content to what has been presented in the Table. It could be removed or move to footnote.
- It is better to show the P-values in Table 3 rather than (***) although a note is indicated in this regard.
- Very good practical recommendations and criticism to the B Corp certification have been presented in the last para. of section (6). No any future research recommendations have been suggested by the respected authors.

Response 2: Thank you. We have made all the minor corrections indicated.

- The argument associated with studies [28] & [29] was added.
- The words Table and Figure have all been revised to start with a capital letter.
- Paragraph presented after Table 2 (page 7) has been moved to footnote.
- The (***) have been replaced by the p-values (<0.001) in Table B Impact Assessment Regression Weights (original model) (current Table 6).
- Future research recommendations have been added to the conclusions.

Point 3: References list is well prepared.

Response 3: Thank you.