Reviewer 1:

The authors have clearly defined their project and they report simple but well conceived tests of their hypothesis. The samples they chose illustrate fairly the potential advantages as well as the limitations of the brute force prepolarization they envision. The results are not much of a surprise as the "zero crossing" effect has been observed for many types of prepolarization experiment.

Answer: Thank you. We agree that the "zero crossing" effect is not surprising, but feel that it should be mentioned nonetheless.

The authors could expand on the reason that better enhancement was achieved at 2 m. The caption for Table 2 states that enhancement is better for 2 m than 3 m because of the higher field and its "better T1". This is probably true, but as this is the main result of the paper, it would be helpful to expand on the significance and maybe give a reference for $T1 \propto B_o^{1/3}$.

Answer: Thank you, we agree with your comment. We will highlight the significance of the transfer field in the revision.

Many readers may ask: why stop at prepolarizer? Why not just make an HTS NMR magnet? I am hopeful that NMR-quality magnets can be made from HTS materials. However, I admit that there are issues with the tape format and resulting eddy currents that are a challenge. The paper would be stronger if these issues were mentioned and referenced.

Answer: Thank you. We agree with your comment, and will take this up in the revision. We are working on a full HTS NMR magnet in another project, but prefer not to mention our progress in this paper.