Dear Reviewer 1,

I sincerely thank you for your careful review of my manuscript and the constructive feedback provided. Below, I address each of your comments point by point, outlining the revisions made to improve the manuscript.

Comment 1: [Scope confusion: phthalates vs. EDCs]
Response: The manuscript now consistently frames phthalates as a subclass of EDCs, clarified in both the Introduction and Conclusion.

Comment 2: [Policy vs. non-policy interventions]
Response: These terms are now explicitly defined in the Public and Regulatory Responses section.

Comment 3: [Case study mislabeling + risk claim]
Response: Section renamed to Epidemiological Evidence on Health Effects; text revised to emphasize risk minimization, not elimination.

Comment 4: [Terminology issues]
Response: Terms clarified: proactively → directly; public health conditions → adverse health outcomes; existing reference doses defined.

Comment 5: [Unreferenced advocacy claim]
Response: Revised and supported with citation to Sieck et al. (2024).

Comment 6: ["Local tree approaches" unclear]
Response: Revised to "community-level approaches" for clarity.

Comment 7: [Strength of later sections]
Response: Acknowledged and only minor polishing applied for consistency.

Summary: All reviewer concerns have been addressed through clarification of scope, terminology, section titles, and claims, along with the addition of supporting references. These changes have strengthened the manuscript's clarity and contribution.

Reviewer 2

No issues to address.

Response to Handling Editor

Thank you for your review of our article and your valuable comments. We have made corresponding revisions based on the reviewers' suggestions and believe that these changes have further improved the quality of the article. Thank you again for your support and recognition of our work. We are looking forward to the successful publication of this article.