Reviewer comments:  
  
  
Reviewer #1: I really appreciate the effort and the improvement carried out by the authors in this new version of the paper. However, there is still further work to do before considering acceptable their paper. I think that the authors have to work in the following lines:  
  
- Along the text you indicate several times that this is the first paper in which the containers are not allocated following a pre-defined order. However, this idea is not novel. Please, check the paper 'A Multi-Heuristic Approach for Solving the Pre-Marshalling Problem' by R. Jovanovic et al. in IEEE Computational Intelligence Magazine. This paper must be considered appropriately in your computational experiments and the contributions of the paper.  
  
Minor comments:   
  
- Abstract:  
 + (CPMP), which  
 + improves the performance OF the  
 + It is not correct to say 'enlarged search space' due to the fact you are not considering any extension of it. Instead, most of previous paper have considered shorter versions of the search space.  
  
- Other application fields in which the optimization problem at hand can be applied must be suitably described  
  
- A dot has been forgotten in the last paragraph of the introduction  
  
- Replace 'effective' by 'efficient' in the first paragraph of Section 5  
  
  
  
Reviewer #3: Please, have a look at the following minor issues, mainly related to the language. Below, you will find a few examples. However, please review the entire manuscript to improve readability.  
  
- page 3 of the paper, line 44: "Comprehensive" -> capital "C" is not needed  
- page 13, line 47: "A more choice" should be "A better choice"  
- page 17, line 36: "it need consider..." I find sentences in lines 36-40 a bit confusing.  
- page 17, lines 38, 55, etc.: Have a look at the use of the full stops. I do not think they are appropriately placed.  
- page 27, line 39: "it can be discussed that how to..." -> remove "that"  
  
  
  
  
  
Reviewer #4: The authors have done a good job in improving the paper. I am now comfortable to recommend this manuscript be accepted for publication.