Reviewer 4:

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.

1. Introduction is weak without showing logic of experimental design and lack of relevant studies.

Consulted the bibliography no references to the application of ballast residues have been found. References have been incorporated on the use of granite and marble ornamental rock waste.

2. Did not show mechanical tests in Methods.

The methods of mechanical tests according to UNE EN 196-1 standard have been added.

3. No XRD results.

A diffractogram of the ballast waste has been added (Figure 1).

4. I do not see any discussion that support last conclusion “the substitution level at 10% to prepare type IV (pozzolanic) cements.”. I expect to see why using discarded ballast waste is comparable to traditional type IV cements.

The reason for comparing with a type II / A cement has been incorporated into the results.

5. Mix proportion is not provided. Instead of OPC better to use a traditional type IV cement as control set.

The proportion of the addition is 10 and 20%, the first one being more favorable.

6. Discussion only presents results without any mechanism or depth.

Results discussion is completed.