Response to Reviewer 1 Comments

Dear Reviewer 1

Thank you very much for checking our article. Your comments helped to improve the article. We have answered your comments in the table below. We hope it will be accepted by you.

No.	Point	Response
In general		
1	It is difficult to understand the last paragraph of section 2.8 and whether it should be linked to Table 3.	Thank you for your attention. Yes, the position of table 3 was wrong. Table 3 is the link to the last paragraph of section 2.2.2 (their headings and numbering were revised and changes were found) and moved to the last paragraph of section 2.2.2.
2	Page 5 line 175. The first mention of ETA in the text should be explained	Thanks for your comment. The explanation about ETA was placed at the beginning of the paragraph, and the first line was moved to the line 212 and explained.
3	Chart's name should be center-aligned.	Thank you for your attention, done.
4	The serial number of the tank should be marked in Figure 2.	Thank you for your attention, done.
5	Please check errors in the serial numbers of the tables in the full text.	Thank you for your attention, done.
6	Please check the reference format.	Thank you for your attention, done.
7	It is suggested to further explain the differences between the ecological risk assessment framework proposed in this paper and those proposed by previous authors—highlight innovation points.	Your comment was very useful and we thank you. The relevant explanation was placed on p 3 from line 106.
8	How were the important elements of the key phases of the ERA framework selected?	The important procedure of our work was to be comprehensive, consistent, doable according to the available data, not to be faced with difficulties, to be done by others, based on accepted and documented methods, answerable to the case study. Therefore, the main foundation was established according to the three basic steps of EPA's ecological risk assessment, including problem formulation, risk analysis and risk description. Basic SPR method was also used for risk analysis because our study objective includes the course of risk, including the beginning (occurrence of the incident) and the end (consequences). More details of other scientific studies were examined and brainstormed in the workshop sessions of the study team.

No.	Point	Response
9	The limitations and the potential application scenarios of this study need more explanation.	Thanks for your comment. The text was improved. In the lines 402 to 428.
10	The conclusions of the study are not clear enough and a further summary is recommended.	Thanks for your comment. The text was improved. In the lines 487 to 500.
11	It is recommended that the graphical representation of ETA be explained.	Thanks for your good advice. The relevant explanation in the lines 219 to 226 is given.
12	What is the source of the data in Table 3?	There is no source that specifically shows level of dispersion of contamination. In fact, Table 3 is part of the innovation of the study and has an information gap. Therefore, by study the accidents that have occurred around the world and specifically the accidents recorded on the CSB website, scientific studies and articles and finally with expert opinion during the workshop sessions are presented in Table 3. These explanations were added in the text of the article lines 254 to 259. Thank you for your opinion.
	Details	
1	Page 3 line 102 : "[11,16,26,30] the present" needs to be replaced with "[11,16,26,30]. The present".	Thanks for your review, it has been corrected on the line 120.
2	Page 5 line 180. It seems ambiguous.	Thanks for your consideration. This sentence was improved from the line 206.
3	Table 3 and Table 4: "No" needs to be replaced with "No.".	Thanks for your review, it has been corrected.
4	Page 7 line 229: "2.0.2" needs to be replaced with "2.10.2".	The heading were completely revised.
5	Page 11 Equation (3) : "F2 and M2" need to be adjusted with "F^2 and M^2".	Thank you for your attention, it has been corrected.
6	Page 11 line 295: "F&E" needs to be replaced with "F&EI".	Thank you for your attention, it has been corrected on the line 338.
7	Page 12 line 316: "F&E" needs to be replaced with "F&EI".	Thank you for your attention, it has been corrected on the line 360.
8	Page 16, lines 359 to 368 have duplicate serial numbers.	Thank you for your attention, it has been corrected on the lines 402 to 418.
9	Page 16 lines 355 : "3019 meters" should be revised to "3019 square meters".	Thank you for your attention, it has been corrected on the line 399.
10	Table 1 : "than130" should be revised to "than 130".	Thank you for your attention, it has been corrected at Table 1.
	Grammar problem	
1	Page 3 line 110: "Formulation" needs to be replaced with "formulation".	Thank you for your attention, it has been corrected on the line 131.

No.	Point	Response
2	Page 5 line 168 and line 169: "e.g., stored fuel, firewater, and other extinguishing agents." needs to be replaced with "(e.g., stored fuel, firewater, and other extinguishing agents.)" or ", e.g.,".	Thank you for your attention, it has been corrected on the line 194.
3	Page 11 line 305: "investigation of" needs to be replaced with "investigation into".	Thank you for your attention, it has been corrected on the line 348.
4	Page 16 line 375 to 376. Note the distinction between a hyphen and a dash.	Thanks for your attention, we used parentheses (lines 436 & 437). We thought it might be better this way.