Response to Reviewer 1 Comments

Point 1: Thank you for giving the opportunity to read such an interesting paper.

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

Point 2: For a better and accurate model I recommend the authors to eliminate from the model the extreme value. For example in Fig 2. - workers values greater then 40, community greater than 58, environment 45, customers 46 (the bullets), in Fig 3 - values with global score greater than 130, in Fig. 5 also all the bullets. Then repeat all the statistical analysis.

Response 2: Thank you for your suggestion. An analysis of extreme values was carried out, using univariate and multivariate detection methods. The analysis resulted in the elimination of 34 univariate extreme values and 2 multivariate extreme values. All statistical analysis was repeated considering a database of 520 companies.

Point 3: In lines 391-395 I would prefer an Sk and Ku between -1 and 1. You have some values that are not included in this interval - maybe because of the outliers from the figures above that I recommend to exclude.

Response 3: Thank you for your suggestion. We researched more literature on the subject and adopted a more moderate perspective for assessing normality (|Sk|>2-3, |Ku|>7-10 and |KuMult|>10). As you mention, with the elimination of the extreme values, the skewness and kurtosis values improved significantly, approaching the range -1 to 1.

Point 4: Overall the information presented it makes sense to me.

Response 4: Thank you.