The manuscript concerns the confidence intervals of means of normal, exponential, and Poison distribution in the presence of type I left-censored observations. The asymptotic and Bootstrap BCa confidence intervals were constructed based on the MLE of the means. The methods used in the draft are standard asymptotic inferences and straightforward. The following are a few major comments and some minor comments and suggestions.

Major comments:

1. The imputed data with simple imputation altered the distribution of the original data, the underlying parametric and Bootstrap BCa confidence intervals in both simulation studies and use cases still assumed the original distribution. Does this mean that misspecification of the distribution of the underlying data will not affect the (asymptotic) parametric confidence intervals? The authors need to justify why the obsolete SI (replacement methods with no theoretical base) is still used to compare with theoretically sound (asymptotic) parametric and bootstrap BCa confidence intervals.

2. In use cases, three data sets were _assumed_ to be randomly sampled from normal, exponential, and Poisson populations respectively. How to justify that these data sets are _actually_ sampled from the three corresponding populations? Since there are practical application problems, the authors need to justify the validity of the results in the case study without validating the underlying distributions in use cases. It seems that goodness-of-fit tests are necessary to validate the underlying distributions.

3. In the case of two censoring limits c_1 and c_2, how the bootstrap sampling was designed to mimic the data generation process? For example, two devices with different detection limits (c_1 and c_2) take samples from the sample population (e.g., normal or exponential population) and then pool the two independent subsamples to obtain the random sample with two detection limits. Does the bootstrap design reflect the actual data generation process?

4. For SI-based bootstrap intervals, the simulation section did not mention the order of bootstrapping and imputing (replacement): imputing the sample first then bootstrapping or bootstrapping first then imputing the bootstrap sample? This concerns from what population the bootstrap samples were drawn. The rationale for choosing the specific order of sampling the censored data with replaced observations. Whether the results will be dependent on the order of sampling and imputing.

5. It may be interesting to see the impact of misspecification (of the underlying probability distribution) on the coverage probability through simulation studies.

Minor Comments:

1. Eqs. 8, 10, and 11 are the same. They are simply the sample means of imputed data. Eq. 9 is the sample variance. These expressions were not used for any inferential procedure. Including these equations makes the presentation unnecessarily complex.

2. Can all comparisons and comments on the SI-based confidence intervals be generalized? Need some justifications.