

Dear Daniel, dear Editors,

>Thank you for submitting your revised manuscript. As the reviewers noticed, this work does not aim to
>present original work, but focuses on the limited scope of a pedagogical and historical presentation of
>a selected number of concepts related to long-lived states NMR spectroscopy.

Thank you for the letter, we answered the last points indicated with the following changes:

>However, I would like to point out that some comments in the manuscript (e.g. lines 276-282) do not
>really contribute to a better understanding of LLS spectroscopy

Indeed, these lines initially included a subjective point. This was removed, leaving only a factual statement on the publication timeline of reviewed papers.

>line 170 and below : the symbol t should be a « tau » to remain consistent with figure 1

The symbol $\langle t \rangle$ was corrected by $\langle \tau \rangle$ throughout ; parenthesis were added to sine() and cos() arguments

>line 176 « right-hand side », line 317 « pulse »

corrected

> line 433 the reference should be corrected

corrected

Dear Authors,

Thank you for submitting your revised manuscript. As the reviewers noticed, this work does not aim to present original work, but focuses on the limited scope of a pedagogical and historical presentation of a selected number of concepts related to long-lived states NMR spectroscopy.

In this respect, this manuscript pertains to the « mini-review », rather than the « research paper » kind of work. The editors of this special issue have agreed to accept such contributions that present a discussion of concepts as well as their implementations.

That being said, you have addressed the points raised by both reviewers, and I am glad to accept your manuscript for publication in Magnetic Resonance.

However, I would like to point out that some comments in the manuscript (e.g. lines 276-282) do not really contribute to a better understanding of LLS spectroscopy, and would probably be more relevant in

an "opinion" kind of paper, which this manuscript is clearly not meant to be. I would suggest to avoid such comments, the relevance of which for such a paper seems somewhat out of scope.

Besides, a few corrections should be done.

line 170 and below : the symbol t should be a « tau » to remain consistent with figure 1

line 176 « right-hand side »

line 317 « pulse »

line 433 the reference should be corrected

Finally, I wish to thank you again for submitting your manuscript to this special issue of Magnetic Resonance.

Best regards,

Daniel Abergel