Review Report Form: 2

The authors thank the editor and the reviewers for reviewing the manuscript and providing constructive comments to improve the quality of the manuscript. The authors have tried their best to respond to reviewer comments and hope the reviewers are satisfied by the responses.

Comment 1: The data should include error (bars) and average values in Fig. 2, 5, 6, and Table 1. Without the error and the average of (density, strength, etc.), we cannot believe and trust the result of mechanical and physical values. Authors should present high magnification photos showing Si3N4 nanoparticles and the interface of Si3N4 particle and the matrix. Unfortunately, all photos have poor resolution under low magnification.

Response to Comment 1: The authors thank the reviewer for his suggestions and agree with the reviewer.

In this current study, for each composition, three samples were tested to ensure repeatable values. The error (bars) are included in the revised Fig. 2, 5, 6 and Table: 1.

As suggested by the reviewer, We have included new SEM images with high magnification for better visibility.

Comment 2: There are too many colloquialisms and wasted words in the text and sentences. Scientific writing is needed and a proof reading by a native speaker is needed.

Response to Comment 2: We agree with the reviewer and have removed such wordings. In the revised manuscript, the English and grammatical errors are corrected and the interpretations and flow have been significantly improved.