Response to Reviewers

Reviewer 1

*Due to the limited descriptions of the technical approaches, it is difficulty to accurately rate the*

*technical approach, but in general, all the methods discussed should be feasible and provide*

*valued information. The global approach that can be achieved through the collaborative efforts will provide information on all levels - cow and genetic management and cellular/molecular*

*mechanisms at the tissue/cell/embryo level, which should help improve reproductive efficiencies.*

No revisions requested. We did group experiments based on topic to better explain technical approaches

Reviewer 2

*Well written proposal from a productive group. Projects planned should meet goals and enable*

*excellent research to be conducted and published. Most multistate groups are developing*

*symposia at regional or national meetings where extension educators will be present to aid*

*outreach efforts. Plans for at least one symposia and potential for extension educators or industry representatives should be mentioned in outreach efforts. While field days and workshops are mentioned --no specific ones are named that this group participates in. At least naming where a symposia or field day/workshop, etc would be helpful to determine who might be the participants and would enhance the outreach goals.*

Specific information was added to the outreach section regarding specific interactions with stakeholders. This includes the existing extension symposia led by members of the group. There is also a goal to increase private-public partnerships to reach more extension educators and producers across the multiple experiment stations.

Although it does not directly impact stakeholders, the collaborative course is an important component of student training with the expectation that after graduation these students will be able to effectively communicate to extension educators and industry representatives.

Reviewer 3

*This is a very well written multi-state project proposal. My only real concern is that under each*

*objective there is a very detailed list of sub-objectives that could lead the new member to think that there is not a place for their work. I would recommend a statement before each list indicating that these are some of the anticipated activities to accomplish the objective, while other approaches would be welcome (considered).*

This point is well taken. Revisions were made in the methods to make it easier for potential members to see how their work will fit into the group. Instead of the list of experiments, they were grouped under broad categories (e.g., gamete quality, uterine-conceptus interactions, and targeted management). We feel that this identifies areas of interest in the group with examples of current projects listed below each sub-objective.