

Response to Reviewers' comments and description of changes in the revised manuscript number: polymers-1984990

General comments:

Authors' general comments to Editor and Reviewer:

We are grateful to the Editor and Reviewers for the time dedicated to revising our paper and their comments. We have done our best to implement all suggested changes to the manuscript and we are certain this has helped improve its quality. Our responses to the review comments are below, and changes that we have made to the paper are highlighted in the revised manuscript submission.

Reviewer #2:

In the article there is presented a very interesting problem of used hybrid fibers on the fresh, physical and mechanical properties of concrete. To make the content of the article more clear to a reader authors should take into consideration the following points:

1. Why have not been tested the samples as fiber concrete? Exist norm for test concrete with fibre. Why have not been tested residual strength? This is one of the basic properties of FRC.

Response:	We, the authors, do apologize as the question was not clear
-----------	---

2. How many compressive strength, tensile strength, modulus of elasticity, modulus of rupture and e.t.c specimen were used? For example, how many specimens used to consider compressive strength after 7th day?

Response:	TA sentence was added to show the number of samples that tested at each age. "For mechanical priorities testing, three samples were cast to be tested at each age."
Notes/actions:	Lines between 145-146

3. What is the standard deviation for average compressive strength, tensile strength, modulus of elasticity and etc (figure 1, 2, 3, 5, 7)? How big is the dispersion of results?

Response:	All results for all samples were in acceptable range, however the standard deviation was not suggested to e presented as the main aim for the study is studying the restrained shrinkage of the produced concrete. Thus, was not suggested to discuss more issues related to the results of the mechanical properties of the produced concrete, especially that many other papers discussed the mechanical properties, but very few discussed the restrained shrinkage.
-----------	---

4. There are no correlation coefficients (r) in Figure 8 and 9. What is the function of Steel Ring Strain in different concrete. Why the research was discontinued on day 56. The values on the chart keep growing.

Response:	There is no certain correlation can be presented in Figure 8 and Figure 9, as they present a real result of strain (for steel and concrete, respectively) through 56 days. For the 56 days, it was chosen as the general behavior can be specified during this period as well as the study was part of master study that limited in a certain period.
-----------	--

5. Please supplement the literature about study on fibre reinforced fine aggregate concrete based on waste sand. Especially, the effect of small amount of fibers in concrete based on waste sand, on the shrinkage strains.

Response:	The authors believe that adding more variables in the literature may interrupt the reader as there are different types of fibers were discussed with different behavior of each specifically when they are used in low volume fraction. However, we appreciate your point, and it would be a good topic for further research
-----------	--

