

Responses to Reviewer Comments

S_TEMP3662 Industrial Hemp Production, Processing, and Marketing in the U.S.

Reviewer #1

Comment 1: we have removed all references to CBD and cannabinoids from the proposal. We agree that clinical work must be conducted prior to broad work on cannabinoid production.

Comment 2: we do have at least two molecular biologists on-board with this project, and we expect others to join the project when finalized and official.

Reviewer #2

There are no comments offered from Reviewer #2 that require or expect responses. We appreciate the support and thoughtfulness of Reviewer #2 comments.

Reviewer #3

Comment 1: we do have at least two agricultural economists (one from Mississippi State U. and one from U. of Kentucky) that are project participants. As such, we respectfully request to leave "Marketing" in the title and scope of the project.

Comment 2: (suggestions 1, 2, and 3). As suggested, we removed all references and literature cited related to CBD and cannabinoids. This addressed concerns expressed in suggestions 1, 2, and 3.

Suggestion 4: we don't have an overview section as we followed the standard template/protocol. And again, we have removed all references to cannabinoids from the proposal which has improved the location of our project goals within the proposal.

Comment 3: We are not sure why this statement was made. Few references to UK are made in the proposal. There are several participants from UK, but that is a function of the progress of the program in Kentucky, and not any type of goal of this proposal. We welcome participation from any qualified individuals or entities. Concerning suggestion 2, early external review suggested more detail in experimental methods. After editing, the proposal team agreed that additional detail was more desirable than a more generalized approach. We respectfully request to keep the level of detail provided.