**Reponses to Reviewers’ Comments about draft of W3008 Multi-State Project**

**Comments**

1. **Peer review comments:**
	1. “Reach out to additional states and programs with onion expertise and interests so that the W3008 project is more inclusive. For example, send requests to participate and instructions on contacting Exp. Sta. Directors to be vetted for the W3008 to the following:”. The comment then lists individuals from TX, CA (2 people), MI, and suggests adding someone from WI.

Response: We have sent invitations to Elu Alabi (Femi) in TX; and Alexander Putman, Tom Turini, and Bob Ehn in CA. Femi Alabi has responded affirmatively, so he was given instructions to contact the appropriate person in his region to join this proposed multistate project. We have not heard back from the others. Mary Hausbeck at MI was invited a year ago to participate in this project, but stated that she is not able to be involved because of other commitments. However, she indicated she is likely to continue to attend most of the meetings with which our multi-state project is involved, including helping serve as the host site for the W3008 meeting in Michigan in Dec. 2017. Mike Havey from WI is affiliated with our project as he’s collaborating with many individuals on this project, although he is not officially a member for similar reasons to those given by Mary Hausbeck.

1. **Summary of reviewers’ comments** from Sarah Lupis, Assistant Director, NIMSS Regional System Administrator, Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors, Colorado State University. “The Western Region Multistate Review Committee approved your proposal with minor revisions. They ask that you more clearly describe how research and findings will be collaborative, indicate level of participation of each entity/institution by objective (please list states that will contribute to each, NOT names of committee members).”

Response:

a) The following has been added to Objective 4 (Facilitate discussions between W3008 participants and onion industry stakeholders that will advance onion pest and disease management). “Our goal is to continue to tie together our collaborative research findings effectively and disseminate the results to stakeholders at annual meetings. We have been successful in the past in this regard and have maximized our interactions with the US onion industry by having joint meetings among W2008, NARC and NOA.”

b) A sentence has been added at the beginning of each of the four objectives indicating which states will be involved.

1. **Last reviewer’s comments**. Clearly describe how research and findings will be collaborative. Indicate the level of participation of each institution/AES and/or other participating entities for each objective. There is some information about states participating in objectives 1 and 3, but this is absent for objective 2. Responsibilities for all objectives need to be explicitly stated so a reviewer knows who is doing what for each objective, and indicate a plan for how the research findings will be tied together and disseminated to the industry in a collaborative manner on a regional basis.

Response:

a) These comments appear to be the ones that Sarah chose to summarize and have been addressed as described above. There does seem to be inconsistency between Sarah’s comments indicating that states that will contribute to each objective, NOT individuals, should be included. In contrast, it seems that the last reviewer wants to know names of people. We prefer referring to states rather than individual people, particularly as there can be some turnover in individuals involved with specific aspects of the work (e.g., from retirements, new hires, students graduating, etc.).

b) Our most effective plan for tying together research findings and disseminating them to the industry in a collaborative manner has been via our annual meetings. This has been articulated clearly in Objective 4.