

Response to reviewer comments

Comment: Good narrative and objectives.

Response: Thank you

Comment: I am concerned over the Participants list; it is rather small and does not represent many states.

Response: We disagree with this assessment, there are 55 participants at 49 universities from 45 states, we believe that this is excellent representation. The participant list has been added as a table to the document.

Comment: The statement regarding 'recent integration of plant breeding and 'omics' technologies has revolutionized the field, resulting in increased breeding efficiency and potential' is strong, but there was not much discussion on involvement and integration of various 'omics' into the project.

Response: This has mostly been integrated into the project through the education and survey portion of the project. The project has helped quantify how public programs are using 'omics technologies and how they are teaching 'omics technologies, and what students need to know about 'omics technologies.

Comment: Lastly, I would like to see some form of measured Impacts like the number of released cultivars, number of commodities covered, number of acres planted to public cultivars, number of new traits introduced, number of breeding agreements with private breeding entities, public germplasm in the pedigree of private cultivars, etc. If there is not a numerical way of measuring it, then it is not an Impact.

Response: The PBCC does not directly breed plants, it quantifies how public plant breeding is doing for all of the metrics mentioned, provides a platform for public plant breeders to discuss their needs, and provides education to public organizations/government agencies/companies that want to know more about the process of plant breeding. The numerical measurements that answer your questions are in in the PBCC authored survey authored by Coe et al. (2020) which is cited in the renewal document.