Overall, the writing quality of this manuscript is very poor and it needs extensive review for language and technical aspects. In addition, the contributions are vague and the proposed methodology is not well developed. In the following, I provide detailed comments on each section of the manuscript. The manuscript requires high level of major revision and it needs a hard work from the author side in order to improve the quality of their work.

Abstract

In general, the abstract contains long sentences that make it hard to follow the text. This also occurs though the manuscript sections. For example, the first sentence in the abstract is very long.

The abstract must be rewritten to show the contributions of this work to existing literature and how the proposed method and obtained results can provide benefits to port management.

The quality of the writing needs to be improved. For example, in the abstract '*a risk matrix method was used for risk assessment and those found..*' it is not well written sentence. It should be 'a risk matrix method was used for identifying the risks with high severity...'

Introduction

There exists also some inconsistencies and wrong terminologies. For example, in the first line of the introduction, the authors used port container terminals that is not correct and should be container terminal or container port.

The same line contains grammatical error. For example, '*The container terminal port plays an important role in both the transportation and trade sectors and also serve as visible indications of a country's economic growth.*' The word 'serve' should be 'serves'.

The contribution of this study is vague and the reviewer could not find the contributions of the paper in the introduction or the abstract

In line 59, the author used the abbreviation (AHP) without mentioning what this means.

Risk analysis methodology

The author should mention the references from which they got this methodology.

It is also necessary to explain what are the formal safety assessment and the fault tree analysis.

Also, please explain why these two methods were used specifically. It is highly needed that the authors review other methods for risk assessment in literature and why the authors used the proposed methods specifically

Line 84 :' *or container ports and placed under the auspices of PT. Indonesia Port Company (IPC) managed by PT. Tanjung Priok Port (PTP).*' This sentence is an example of poor writing quality.

In the data collection section, the authors did not mention what types of data were collected by observations and interviews.

In section 2.2., why the authors classified the risks identified into these categories specifically. A justification is needed.

At the same section, the author mentioned a method for calculating percentages of accident causes. Is this method from literature? If yes, please add references if no, the author should mention if it is a new method and why it is better than other methods in literature.

In section 2.3, the first sentence is as follows: '*Severity is the result of an incident usually stated as a loss of risk and assessed through the use of a numerical table.*' a loss of a risk should be due to risk. In addition, can you mention examples of these losses?

In section 2.6

'*The FTA method used describes and analyzes the cause of risk up to the root and this is the reason it is mostly applied as a tool for analysis, system evaluation, and decision.*' There is grammatical error as 'the reason it is' should be 'the reason why'

In section 3.1

The author stated that '*Over the past five years, 117 accidents classified into 25 types were recorded at the container terminal.what are the 25 types and also,..*' this sentence contains grammatical error and needs revision.

In figure 1, the title of the horizontal axis is missing

In table 3, what do K, B, N designate for?

The word 'faktor' in table 3 should be corrected

The format of table 3 is not good. For example, some words are divided into two lines

The quality of writing is poor and I could not follow the text and results in this section

In section 3.3.

The author stated that '*These risks were subsequently analyzed using the Fault Tree Analysis method to determine the root causes of each risk category. It was conducted through a top-down approach of a Top Event followed by the detail reasons for its failure. The six risk categories were analyzed into one using this approach due to the insignificant similarities and differences between them.*'

Why did you use top-down approach specifically?

From where you got this method, add reference

You reduced the fault tree analysis into FTA, so use this abbreviation through all sections of paper

In section 3.3.1

The author stated that ' *Every fire accident at the port, from the dock, yard and gate operations were included in this category with the focus on fire incidents on loading and unloading equipment, buildings, vehicles or other non-human things which were classified risk to the property. Table 6 shows the common causes of fire over the five years studied.*'

This sentence is badly written and contains huge amount of grammatical errors as indicated in red color.

The quality of figure 2 needs improvement.

In section, 3.4 how do the author identify the RCOs for root causes?

In table 13, what is the meaning of PD? It does not make sense to abbreviate root cause by PD as indicated at the end of the table

In section 3.5

The authors mentioned that they performed cost-benefit analysis but they showed only the benefits without showing the cost.

Finally, the conclusion section lacks explaining the results and what managerial insights can be provided from the obtained results. Also, there are grammatical errors in the conclusion section for example (*The risk control option (RCO) is was formulated based on the benefits gained in a certain period.*)

There is no future work mentioned in the conclusion section.