Reviewer #2

Comments and Suggestions for Authors	Reply and Revision
1.I previously gave several references to strength the citations [4-5] but it seems that the author cited more references with no relation to chemical attacks. The following references must be cited because none of the references [5-9] is about chemical attacks, Ren, J., L. Zhang, B. Walkley, J.R. Black, and R. San Nicolas, *Degradation resistance of different cementitious materials to phosphoric acid attack at early stage.* Cement and Concrete Research, 2022. **151**: p. 106606; Ren, J., L. Zhang, Y. Zhu, Z. Li, and R. San Nicolas, *A Comparative Study on the Degradation of Alkali-Activated Slag/Fly Ash and Cement-Based Mortars in Phosphoric Acid.* Frontiers in Materials, 2022. **9**; Fahim Huseien, G., J. Mirza, M. Ismail, S.K. Ghoshal, and A. Abdulameer Hussein, *Geopolymer mortars as sustainable repair material: A comprehensive review.* Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 2017. **80**: p. 54-74.	As a reviewer's comment, references have been newly added.
2.What was the amount of HRWRA and VMA used? I didn't find the answer in the revised manuscript.	On the line 102, the amounts of VMA and HRWRA are indicated in red text in Table 3.
3. Section 4.1., why the compressive strength of specimens with higher fiber contents was not higher? You should give some mechanisms about this. You should give a dot-by-dot response to my previous comments.	On the line 154-159, the effect of fiber content on the compressive behavior of specimens was newly described.