Dear Editor,

We would like to express our gratitude for the great effort you and the anonymous referees have put in. We found most of the critiques and feedback very constructive. We have strived to address all the issues as thoroughly as possible. Consequently, we have rewritten many sections of the manuscript. The main changes are summarized as follows:

1. We added a section (Section 8) to discuss how to handle infeasible instances and how to extend our approach to multiple priority classes.

2. We rewrote Sections 4, 5, 6 and 7 to explain our algorithm better.

3. We reorganized the computational experiment section.

We hope our revision meets with your satisfaction, and we look forward to your favorable response.

Regards,

Ning Wang

Bo Jin

Andrew Lim

Reviewer 1

1. In section 4.2.1, on page 8, line about 48 (the numbers on the left do not match the lines of the text in my version): The authors say "If a stack has zero immovable container, then add *H*-*im* to element *SG*. Notation *im* is the number of immovable containers in a stack...". In other words *im* = 0 in this case. Lemma 1 says, that *im* is the same for all stacks. In my opinion, in this case it should be *SG* = H × S, because there are zero immovable containers in all stacks. The formulation used by the authors seems to be right but misleading.

Answer: We have modified the statement about the case *im*=0 in Section 4.2.1. For any instance with *im*=0, it can be concluded that the instance is feasible.

2. In section 4.3.2, on page 11, *LP* number 4: The authors write "*xi* ϵ {0, 1}; *i* = 1,…,S". In my opinion it should be either *xi* ϵ {0, 1}; *i* = {1,…,S} or *xi* ϵ {0, 1}; *i* = 1,…,S.

Answer: We have revised the error in typing this expression and similar ones.

3. The authors present a lower bound for (CPMP) and (CPMPDS). For (CPMP) their lower bound consists of three parts. Two of them are already presented by Bortfeldt and Foster. The third part is new. The authors claim, that their lower bound dominates the lower bound of Bortfeldt and Foster, but they do not substantiate this claim. Further, they propose a maximum knapsack method to approximate their third part of the lower bound. Again, they claim, that even their approximated lower bound dominates the one of Bortfeldt and Foster without any substantiation.