We thank all the reviewers for their thoughtful comments and suggestions. We will fix all typos and mechanical errors in the camera-ready and future arXiv versions. Reviewer-specific responses follow.

Reviewer #1 Thank you for pointing us to the interesting work of Esfandiari, Korula and Mirrokni (2018). We will certainly reference this work in the final version.

Regarding our randomized lower bound for ski-rental, our lower bound as stated in Theorem 1.2 holds in the regime of $B \to \infty$. Note that this exactly matches the upper bound from Purohit et al. A full, precise statement that is in terms of B can be found on line 533 (Appendix A).

As for non-clairvoyant scheduling, we give lower bounds for all numbers of jobs n (Theorem 1.3). Furthermore, any lower bound for k jobs translates into the same lower bound for $n \geq k$ jobs. (Note that one can simply "pad" the input with jobs that takes 0 time to complete.) Our tight analysis for $n = 2$ shows that the example we find for 2 jobs is in the hardest one; however, it is not handled optimally by the algorithm of Purhoit et al. Although our focus in this paper is understanding lower bounds, this suggests that there may be more room for future work to improve on the upper bound side, and we indeed suggest an algorithm towards this direction.

Reviewer #2 Thank you for pointing out the distinction between “makespan” and “total completion time”. We will fix that for the full version.

Reviewer #3 Thank you for pointing out the simple proof of the deterministic lower bound for ski-rental. We will mention this in the full version of this paper.

For randomized ski-rental, we mention that our approach is LP-based (instead of relying on an ad-hoc construction of hard distribution). In general, LP-based arguments (e.g., primal-dual method) are common in obtaining *upper bounds* in competitive analysis. However, they are quite rare in proving (tight) lower bounds. Therefore, we think our proof is technically interesting. We do hope that the strategy can be more broadly applied.

Gollapudi and Panigrahi (2019) considers the setting of having multiple predictions for ski-rental. For the special case of one prediction, their result (Theorem 9) subsumes our deterministic lower bound. However, no (tight) tradeoff is given when randomization is allowed. We will add the discussion in the full version.