The manuscript addresses an important topic: Public and Regulatory Responses to decrease exposure of the public to adverse health effects of EDCs (Endocrine Disrupting Chemicals).

Below are some of my specific comments:

1.The authors give an inadequate review of the adverse health effects. They consistently refer to "Phthalates and Endocrine Disruptors", obviously not understanding that phthalates are one class of EDCs. The authors should decide whether they choose to relate to Public and Regulatory Responses to EDCs (including phthalates) or to phthalates only. Either alternative would be acceptable.

2.Regarding the sections on Public and Regulatory Responses, the authors need to clarify what they mean by "policy interventions" and "non-policy-related interventions".

3.The section on "Case Studies on Health Effects" is mis-named since only epidemiological studies are presented. Also in this section, the authors imply that regulation of chemicals can ensure "no risk to users." This should be re-written since risk mitigation policy does not guarantee no risk, but aims to minimize risk ("risk management").

4. A few terms are used incorrectly (or are not clear) and can be easily corrected or defined more clearly, i.e. "proactively" (in first paragraph); "public health conditions" (section on Adverse health effects); "existing reference doses" (in section on Case Studies on Health Effects).

5. The authors write that "One of the most effective means of advocacy for safer products and environments would be awareness-raising". However, they give no reference to this statement.

6. In the section on "Case Studies on Regulatory and Advocacy Efforts", they mention "local tree approaches" without defining its meaning and without a reference.

7.The sections on Public and Regulatory Responses, Challenges in Regulation, Historical Context of Regulatory Efforts, Need for Public Education and Advocacy, Case Studies on Regulatory and Advocacy Efforts, Economic Implications of Regulations, Future Direction and Recommendations and the Conclusion are well-written and important.

The current title is not acceptable since it implies that Phthalates are not Endocrine Disruptors. Possible Alternative Titles:

"Phthalate Exposure: Implications for Public Health, Policy and Regulatory Challenges"

"Endocrine Disruptors: Implications for Public Health, Policy and Regulatory Challenges"

As I wrote above, the authors need to decide whether they are addressing Phthalates only or all Endocrine Disruptors.

Rather than writing that they **examine** the adverse health effects, I recommend that they write that they **review** adverse health effects

The word "government" should be included in sentence which ends with "underscoring the complex interplay between public health, industry interests, and policy."

Depending upon the decision of the authors to address only Phthalates or all Endocrine Disruptors in their revision of their paper, they will need to combine/stream-line the sections on Adverse Health Effects on Phthalates, Adverse Health Effects of Endocrine Disruptors and Case Studies on Health Effects.

The first sentence of the Introduction begins with phrase, "Of the myriad chemicals covered in the previous modules..."

I have never seen such a phrase in a published article. What did the authors mean or imply by this phrase?

I leave it to the Editors to decide whether the authors need to issue a Disclaimer if this manuscript was previously use as a "module" in a course.