Reviewer #1: First of all, the paper's aims and scope match those of EJOR, so the topic is adequate for this journal. The proposal is slightly appealing and interesting, and the method deserves some consideration. However,  
  
- The authors need to clearly demonstrate adequate understanding of the relevant literature. The authors need to include a good literature survey to show exactly what is novel about their approach. In this regard, I would like a clear discussion on the current literature versus the contributions of the paper. Now, only a few references are considered in the literature review.  
  
- In the conclusion section, the authors need to clearly discuss their theoretical contributions in Operations Research compared to those in related papers found in the literature. Additionally, the authors need to discuss and supply at least 4-5 solid and insightful future research directions for the operations research community.  
  
- I would like authors to add a paragraph in the introduction discussing the optimization problem from an "operations research" point of view. The introduction does not clearly place the paper in that area.  
  
- After reading the paragraph dedicated to describe the contributions of the paper in the introduction, I think that most of the readers could not to obtain a clear idea of what the paper proposes. Specifically, only a set of novel terms are provided with no context in the research field. Consequently, the contributions must be clearly introduced.  
  
- It would be desirable to provide some including remarks to further discuss the proposed methods, for example, what are the main advantages and limitations in comparison with existing methods?  
  
- The abstract in current form is superficial. Specifically, the abstract must be rewritten to point out significance and impact of the paper for EJOR. For instance, check the following phrases: 'We propose a generic feasibility-based heuristic scheme for the CPMP, which is  
a departure from the traditional heuristic strategy. An implementation of the heuristic scheme, the greedy and speedy heuristic, is also proposed, in which four well designed heuristic techniques are applied.' I wonder why the scheme is generic? are other proposals that consider infeasibility? why is a departure from 'traditional heuristic strategy'?, etc. Answers for these and similar questions are not provided in the remainder of the paper.  
  
- Moreover, the paper does not clearly communicate neither what has been done nor what is its significance. It is extremely hard to follow the description of the heuristic scheme without providing illustrative examples and a suitable introduction of the notations used along the whole paper. In this regard, the authors must to carry out a great effort in communicating their proposal clearly. I would say that in general it lacks many explanations and contextualization of the scheme.  
  
- I do not like the order of sections 3 and 4. Introducing notations concerning a problem that is not yet presented is very confusing. The reader must perform an effort to devise concepts such as 'order-p demand', 'interim stack', and so forth.