Dear Editor,

We would like to express our gratitude for the great effort you have put in. We hope our revision meets with your satisfaction, and we look forward to your favorable response.

Regards,

Ning Wang

Bo Jin

Andrew Lim

Editor’s comments

If you visit OMEGA website you will notice that during the last couple of years we published extensively on this topic. Please ensure that you have included recent and relevant papers from OMEGA and other OR journals.

Reviewer 1

The comparison of the computational results of the lower bound show that there is almost no improvement

compared with Bortfeldt & Forster (2 of 3 bounds are identical, one bound is improved from 57.231 to 57.233).

Minor issues

1. Page 3: "Transfer lanes are called dummy stacks": The temporary stacks that are located at the transfer lanes are called dummy stacks.

2. Page 3: Figure 2: There are two trucks in 2(a). These trucks are on di\_erent lanes. As far as I know, there are parking and driving lanes. Maybe, the authors should mark the lane, they are calling transfer lane. Are both lanes transfer lanes?

3. Page 3: "hence, they cannot be implemented directly at terminal layouts as shown in Figure 2(a)": Algorithms for CPMP can be implemented for these layouts. They do not use any dummy stack, but these algorithms are able to \_nd feasible solutions for CPMP.

4. Page 5 (and other): "S \_H": In my opinion, the \_-symbol is misleading. I always read it as the Cartesian product. Better is "S \_ H".

5. Page 15: ". . . guarantees a solution for any feasible instance.": What is a feasible instance and how is it de\_ned? Do the authors mean "'. . . guarantees a feasible solution for any instance."?

6. Page 18: "The second evaluation scheme prefers small two-tuple (f(c; s); h(s) uf(s)). . . ": How do the authors compare two-tuples? They have to de\_ne something like "(a; b) < (c; d); i\_ a < c \_ a = c; b < d"

Reviewer 2

1. The added results show that the new lower bound yields hardly any improvement compared with bounds proposed in earlier papers (see Table 2) and I therefore recommend that the authors reduce the praising of their bound in the abstract and the conclusions.

Another minor issue is to replace 'receptively' by 'respectively' on page 18. Since the new method outperforms the so-far available methods and because the practicability of the new approach is clearly shown in this paper, I recommend accepting this submission for publication.