Reviewer 2:

We welcome the suggestions of the reviewers that have been added to the final text and that have improved the work.

The corrections are highlighted in the text in red.

Specific items to correct and clarify:

20: Use the acronym CDW after first use of Construction and Demolition Waste

It has been changed in line 20 and others lines

23: Why you substitute 10%-20% and in line 17 you say that the range is 9-15%

Sorry, in this paper, the replacement is 10 and 20%. It has been corrected.

26-29: This lines are repeated in the abstract (20-23).

This lines are deleted.

36, 40, 43 and 50. Include a convenient reference.

Have been added.

61. The PNRU and the PNRCD are dated in 2001 and 2002. How can they culminate the RD 105/2008 which was published seven years later?

Indeed PNRU and PNRCD are RD precursors. It has been corrected in the text.

86. Finish the introduction point with a single paragraph explaining what is the general structure of the paper and why is going to be said in every single point (briefly).

The end of the introduction has been rewritten.

88. Explain (in the Introduction point), in why and in which cases an old ballast is replaced with a new one, and how often it happens.

It has been explained.

98. The acronym OPC has to be explained before it first use in the text (as it is in line 133). Please include a final table after Bibliography with the definition of all the acronyms used in the text.

It has been corrected and the table has been included.

180. Explain why the tendency is logarithmic, because it seems to be quite linear.

Although the trend seems linear, the adaptation to a logarithmic equation meets $R^2$ better.

190. Figure 2 shows an improved resistance to compression for mortars with C additions than other just 100% OPC. That does not concorde with the asseveration in the text.

Has been corrected.

237. Figure 3, and Figure 2 (according to what is said in the text) shows that the performance of the compression and flexotraction strength of the mortar is lower that the one without OPC. Then explain why you make that conclusion.
In mixtures the flexotraction is greater with time it differs little. In Figure 3 OPC and 10% substitution are almost the same values.

237. Need to improve and enrich the conclusions of the paper to make it relevant enough to be considered for publication.

The conclusions have been changed and rewritten.

246. Consider to include some relevant references from Materials MDPI Journal.

Two references on the subject have been included.