Dear Professor,

Thanks very much for your comments.
The manuscript is revised as the comments, and reply as follow:

1) the English writing quality is medium-low so it definitely needs to be revised and improved (preferably by a native speaker);
   **Response:** Thanks, we have done our best to revise the manuscript carefully.

2) one main question one poses when reading this study is related to cost. It is certain that the addition of steel fibers improves the performance of the filled tubes. However, does the likely high cost of the steel fibers compensate for the observed increase in performance. Other options using rubberized concrete have been recently proposed also in Europe and definitely correspond to a lower cost and should be referred together with the discussion of the aspects related to cost:
   **Response:** Yes, cost is one of the main factors considered in the engineering application. This paper focus on the axial compression performance of SFRCFST columns stiffened with longitudinal internal ribs, the recent research related was reviewed as Ref. [22,30-33] published at 2018 and 2017. Based on your comment, the three papers about rubberized concrete-filled steel tubes published in JCSR FSCE, 2017-2016, are added as Ref. 25-27 in the revised manuscript. The discussion of the aspects is the line 65-71.

3) also related to the previous point, none of the studies included in the state-of-the-art refer to European studies, hence, additional references should be included.
   **Response:** Ok, the additional references are added as Ref. 25-29.

4) in lines 46-47, the authors seem to point out only the disadvantages of using squared cross-sections but then proceed with the study on those sections. Something should be mentioned to justify the consideration of such sections anyway.
   **Response:** Ok, they are revised in line 44-50.

5) in line 100, I think the authors mean respectively and not successively.
   **Response:** Yes, it is revised in line 124 of the manuscript.

6) in lines 176-177, when interpreting the results of Figures 6 to 8, I do not actually see a higher slope (not slop) as it is mentioned but I think they are instead rather similar. Actually, all the
different options, with different percentages of fibers, do yield quite similar results. I think the comments of the results can be adapted to this.

**Response:** Yes, due to the blended effects of parameters studied, the curves did not clearly exhibit the changes of slopes at ascending and descending parts. Discussion based on Figures 6 to 8 are revised, please see the revised manuscript.

7) in Equation (4) I think that parameter $v_f$ is not defined in the text.

**Response:** Yes, it is added in line 291.

8) in the Conclusions, line 297, please do not say 'obviously' because if it was that obvious then the whole study would not have been necessary.

**Response:** Ok, it is revised.