**Comment:** Lack of novelty and inaccuracies: The stated objective adds very little, if anything to the multiple existing papers on the exact same question of the effect of bilingualism by Krizman and colleagues.

**Response:** To best of our knowledge, the effect of bilingualism on the subcortical responses was only studied by Dr. Kraus Lab (Krizman and colleagues). Moreover, they have studied the subcortical responses in bilingual Spanish-English children (average age 14yrs old) but our study was exploring the effect in different population; young bilingual French-English adults (average 22.3 yrs). Canada consider a bilingual country and it would be of interest to explore this phenomen. The official languages in Canada are French and English, and in 2016, French-English bilingualism had attained its highest percentage. Out of these people, approximately 7 out 10 reported speaking either French or English at home. (Linguistic diversity and multilingualism in Canadian homes, 2017).

**Comment:** Furthermore, some of the most critical metrics of the Krizman 2014 paper are not measured here, such as neural consistency and correlation with behavioural measures. The authors seem to have misunderstood the metrics related to one of the key findings from Krizman and colleagues. They incorrectly claim that the neural consistency measure accounts for “the similarities between neural brainstem responses and the stimuli” characteristics, whereas it is a correlation between purely neural measures. (I refer the authors to Hornickel & Kraus, 2013 for more details).

**Response:** We do agree with reviewers’ comments regarding behavioral measures. This limitation was acknowledged in the paper (limitation of the study’s section). We also agree with the reviewer’s comments regarding neural consistency.

Methodological shortcomings:

**Comment:** The methods section does not offer enough details so that the research could be reproduced and fails to justify some choices. For instance, the methods section fails to mention the parameters for the most standard data processing steps such baseline correction, filtering, how alternative polarities were averaged and how were artifacts handed, the latter two being extremely important to avoid stimulus-related artifacts when recording FFRs.

**Response:** Data processed and averaged by BioMAP® software in the Biologic Navigator Pro System (Natus Medical Inc.) Requested Information added to the text

**Comment:** Regarding the stimulus, it is unclear whether it was home-made or borrowed from another group. From the description, it seems similar to the stimulus used by Nina Kraus’ group but references are given to a paper by an author called “Wible” that is unfortunately absent from the references list (last reference in alphabetical order provided is Skoe et al.).

**Response:** We do apologize for not being so precise. The stimulus is a custom /da/ from biological and developed by Dr Kraus’ lab. Wible et al 2004 added to the list.

**Comment:** Furthermore, there is no rationale for why the author used a stimulus that was four times shorter than the original study they were trying to replicate? (40ms vs 170ms).

**Response:** The objective of our study was to explore the effect of bilingualism on the subcortical processing. As mentioned earlier, to best of our knowledge, this effect was only studied by Dr. Kraus Lab (Krizman and colleagues). Krizman’ study was cited since it was the only available studies. With the 40 ms stimuli, we can observe the 7 subcortical waves which is not the case with the 170 ms. For the clinical application, Audiologists would be more familiar with speech ABR recorded with 40 ms (due to some similarities with click-ABR’s waves) than 170 ms. On of the long-term objective of my research program is to transfer a research findings to the clinic; 40 ms would be more suitable for the Audiologists seeking to identify neural biomarkers in clinical population.

**Comment:** Last but not least, important details concerning the spectral analysis are lacking. The manuscript only mentions that “spectral analysis (F0 and F1) was performed”. But what parameters were used? What was considered F0, given that the stimulus transitioned from 103 to 125 Hz. Which time window of the FFR waveform what used for the analysis? Did the method you chose used FFT, if so was padding applied?

**Response**: information added to the 2.3.4 section (Data processing)

**Comment:** Statistical issues: the two groups are of different sizes, which can be overcome, but the statistical assessment of whether those groups were matched is critically missing. (in age, sex and audiometry, all known to affect FFR). Most worrying is the absence of any correction for multiple comparisons, given that 24 separate ANOVAs are conducted for each of the dependent measures. If we were to properly apply for instance a Bonferroni correction, then the few significant results would not survive, further undermining the contributions of this manuscript.

**Response:** Although we recruited more females than males in two groups, the Two groups were matched by age and hearing threshold. By taking the reviewers comments into consideration, results section was completely changed. We applied two-way ANOVA (2 level condition) for the two groups.

**Comment:** Furthermore, the very large difference in baseline activity between the two groups seen on Fig 1 (almost 0.5 uV, why isn’t the data baseline corrected?) further voids any result or conclusion that is based on peak amplitudes analysis.

**Response:** Data was analyzed by specific toolbox borrowed from Dr Kraus’ lab, base line correction was performed automatically on all the data.

**Comment:** Poor overall writing: The paper is not clearly written, the style, formatting and presentation are poor, contain numerous errors and inconsistencies.

**Response:** The paper is now been revised, line by line by a certified/professional editor

**Comment:** The lengthy introduction is unclear and lacks a rationale.

**Response:** Introduction was revised, rational was better justified. Introduction is shortened

**Comment:** Most of the discussion consists of claims that are either not backed up by data or unrelated to the present study.

**Response:** Discussion has revised

**Comment:** The amount of typographical and grammatical errors is unacceptable. The authors could have been more careful in reviewing their manuscript prior to submission.

**Response:** The paper is now been revised, line by line by a certified/professional editor.

**Comment:** Several inconsistencies make the manuscript very hard to decipher for the reader, one of many examples is how figures are referred to in the manuscript. It is written that “results were divided into two sections; transient responses (Figure 1) and periodic sustained responses (Figure 2)”. However, the transient and sustained responses are nowhere to be found! Fig 2 is actually showing spectral information, unlike what is mentioned, and Fig 1 actually shows a full temporal response.

**Response:** Labeling changed, manuscript have been revised.