

Dear Rick,

Thank you for the reviews of our multistate proposal “Harnessing Chemical Ecology to Address Pest and Pollinator Priorities”.

In consultation with Jan Nyrop, the Administrative Advisor for the project, and the major writers of the proposal, we have revised the proposal in response to the reviewer comments. The major critique of the proposal was that we did not identify specific questions and methodological approaches. We realize that we did not adequately explain the overall approach of this multistate project. In this case, the purpose is not to identify a specific set of experiments that all participants follow, but rather to provide a cohesive umbrella to allow the participation of many chemical ecologists from diverse land grants, contributing to pest and pollinator problems in the northeast and the rest of the country. The umbrella model was chosen to allow us to have the broadest possible level of participation and to promote nimbleness in obtaining external funding to support the multistate goals.

We have adjusted the proposal to more clearly explain this approach in two introductory paragraphs (top of page 2) and in several places in the proposal. For example, we point out that the Chemical Ecology facility has allowed researchers to apply for non-multistate funding to obtain new equipment and provide for sample fees (pg 8). In another example (pg 5), we point out that we are studying the role of elicitors in multiple crop and pest systems to provide a general test of their effectiveness.

We have also revised the proposal with the minor comments in mind, more effectively pointing out some of the multistate collaborations that have already and will continue to result from this project, and removing some typos from the previous proposal.

Thank you for your consideration,

Jennifer