# Reply to reviewers’ comments.

Our comments are highlighted yellow.

## Reviewer 1

The results from the research might have more impact if a few

categories of questions/themes were reported and analyzed. In this way, results can be

presented with the methods, background and context that each theme needs in order

for the importance of the results to be understood.

We deleted the last section on spelling with Figure 14. We also deleted Figure 12 and merely reported that EOI had no significant correlation. Negative results need not be fully fledged out

As pluricentric theory is a key point for analysis, more explication of this concept should

be presented in order for the reader to assess its application to the data and north

American context.

We added a definition of pluricentricity from Clyne 1995 and explained the theory (yellow highlighting on pages 1 and 2).

The current status of Englishes in north America should also be

described and supported with current research. The author should explain what they

mean by ‘dominant’ as this can mean many things in the context of attitudes to

language variation and language planning.

Here we decided to delete the section (on page 1, around the Trudgill & Hannah quote) in which we brushed the issue: it’s a larger, more complicated questins that we’d better leave aside.

· The author should consider consulting Freake (2023), a national study of the

perceptions of Canadians of Canadian English.

Freake has been included.

· The questionnaire should be included as an appendix rather than a link to a

site.

Happy to do so if the editors think that there is space.

· The paper should be edited for clarity and typos.

Yes, thank you.

## Reviewer 2

Great to have such a large and geographically spread population in the survey (from

coast to coast to coast) - Query reference to “North America” in the title, since that term geographically speaking includes “Canada, the US, Mexico and the countries of Central America” in the OED definition. If the intention is simply to refer to just Canada and the US, it’s still not ideal, since there’s little discussion of AmE itself in the paper. Could the title be adjusted to the “pluricentricity of Canadian English?”

The North America issue keeps coming up, which confirms our decision to remove this discussion completely. “Pluricentricity of Canadian English” would not work, as we’re not talking about several standards in Canada. So, since “pluricentrcity in North America” is confusing to an international audience, we, once more, to delete the geographical location: the new, shorter title is: “Canadian language attitudes from “coast to coast to coast”: on the pluricentricity of English”