Reviewer #4: This work concerns the container pre-marshalling problem and proposed a generic feasibility-based, greedy and speedy heuristic (GASP) to solve for a good working plan.  
  
The basic concept of the scheme is to properly move and fix the containers one by one, until all the containers are laid out in a manner that additional reshuffling is not needed in the subsequent retrieval process. Under this concept, the entire scheme is based on "state", which corresponds to a layout of the bay of interest, and a fix vector which specifies the number of fixed containers of each stack. Starting from there, the research devoted considerable attention to, and studied in detail, the feasibility of states, as well as some other related issues. Most of them are presented in sections 5 and 6 of the manuscript.  
  
It is of no doubt that these results contribute to the literature. However, there are two major concerns, both of them need to be properly addressed before this work can be considered for publication.  
  
First, the presentation needs to be enhanced. The current manuscript has many loose ends, making it hard to follow. For example, page 7 stated that "containers in the reachable tiers can be permuted into any wanted arrangement", and in page 10, it reads "it is a natural fact that when S>=3, the reachable tiers can be permuted into any wanted placement." The condition "S>=3" was not mentioned when the property was first stated on page 7. Moreover, this property needs a careful proof, or at least some justification. Also related to this issue, the three propositions given in the manuscript need proofs as well. Another example appears on page 12, section 6.2. The first line in this section mentioned a "container-stack pair", which seems to be a "task" to me. More careful and precise writing could help the reader understand the issue more easily. Similar situations occur when "solvable" seems to refer to the same concept as "feasible", and when the term "tricky state" pops out  
without definition. In general, the presentation makes the results appear far more complicated than they really are.  
  
The second concern refers to sections 6 and 7, where the techniques are developed and assembled to form the greedy and speedy heuristic, GASP. Five algorithms are presented in detail, but insights are insufficient. In other words, the manuscript described in detail what the algorithms do, but did not provide sufficient information to explain tO the readers why they are designed that way. On top of all these, the manuscript should justify the basic idea of fixing the containers one by one. This idea seems reasonable to me, but it needs a careful justification. After all, the purpose of publication is to contribute to the body of knowledge, in addition to providing pseudo code for programmers to follow.