

Dear Rebecca,

We would first like to thank you for your time and effort in handling the editorial process for this submission so far, and for your comments which have provided constructive guidance for our revisions.

We have taken on board the comments of both referees, and those made by yourself and have made some substantial additions/changes to the manuscript. The main changes introduced being: 1) a more global picture of geology's colonial past (by including activities of the southern European colonial powers and introducing their role in laying the foundations for the modern geological canon); 2) a more global picture of decolonising the curriculum and its context within wider decolonial theory; 3) more engagement with some of the foundational concepts/debates of decolonisation and colonialism – we hope here that we have provided plenty for interested readers to get to grips with whilst keeping the manuscript accessible to readers who are simply interested in finding out what Decolonising the Curriculum is (most probably including a fair share of “sceptics”!). By providing a suggested reading list we hope that those readers who are interested in learning more about decol have a ready set of resources with which they can do so.

Providing a line-by-line account of the revisions we have made would probably take longer to read than the manuscript itself(!) so we have compiled a list of point-by-point responses to your editor comments (in red below) and linked these to examples of where we have actioned the suggestions (the page and line numbers given correspond to the Track Changes version – where all the revisions can be seen).

With regard to Reviewer 1:

There are a few topics reviewer 1 asks you to expand on that you say you don't have space for here, but that you will be writing future papers on. Can you mention that in this paper somewhere? Eg at the end of the introduction, or at the end of the paper, you could say, 'future papers will focus on ...' to let readers know that you are aware of these issues and there is more to come (eg colonial present, case studies).

We have included sentences which better explain this manuscript's framing (e.g. as a scene setting/introductory step – and have contextualised decolonising the geology curriculum within the much larger decolonisation discourse) – and highlighted some of the areas that the authors, our collaborators etc., are working on or towards (e.g., pg 2 ln 39-43; pg2-3 ln 51-68). Hopefully some of the readers might contribute to these areas too!

With regard to the reviewer's comment on 'interpretive frameworks' I think this is a self-explanatory term and safe to use.

I want to respond to your comment on the teaching of the history of geology being rare – I certainly remember being taught the history of geology in New Zealand in the late 1980s! It possibly was mostly covered in my physical geography/geomorphology classes, rather than my geology classes, but just a reminder that your audience for this paper is international, not just geology academics in the UK, and there will be breadth to their own experiences.

We have expanded the introduction to this section to outline that there is some history of geology taught in most courses – but that it generally focuses on the contributions of certain individuals, and rarely the systems and circumstances under which those contributions are made. The section on historical geology has been moved after the discussion on what Decolonising the Curriculum is about. (Pg, 11 ln 349-355)

With regard to your query as to 'discussions around core chronologies, typologies, circuits of knowledge production etc being out of place for the target audience' – I would urge you not to underestimate your audience. If you can find a way to include this in the paper, even a paragraph, I think this would improve the paper and an understanding of this could be revelatory for your audience.

We have included several areas expanding on the more theoretical discussions of decolonisation and what is and isn't canon – and who decides that - but we have tried to keep the discussion on this introductory in line with the scope of the piece (we have expanded the glossary explanations in places to ensure that everyone should have the info to unravel unfamiliar terms) (e.g. Pg 4 ln 124-130; pg 5 ln 134-147; pg 6 ln 179-182; pg 7 ln 194-198; pg8 ln 249-254)

The reviewer made a comment about p11, line 355 that you've not responded to.

Sorry – that one slipped through! We have explained "more impactful" as the authors of the cited paper did; they essentially claim citations = impact (we have extended this a little to include general use as we do not agree that citation = impact...) We have also included indigenous scholars and broader knowledge systems to this section (pg 18 ln 579-584)

I agree that you can leave the Anthropocene out of this paper.

This would make a very interesting paper, possibly one for the future!

Definitely include *Decolonizing Geography* in your reading list, it might also be worth finding out if you can see an advance copy of Radcliffe's book, given the crossover between geology and physical geography there might be something useful here for you.

Included, and looking forward to it arriving in the library!

With regard to Reviewer 2:

1. I think you're doing your readers a disservice by saying some of these topics will disengage them. Please consider putting some of this more challenging material into its own section, so that those who are up for this more sort of material can read it? The geologists I work with are up for it and want this paper, and I wouldn't worry about challenging them.

There are definitely geologists who are up for the challenge, but there are also definitely those who are unsure or openly sceptical/hostile to initiatives like decolonisation – we hope that this revised version can cater for both groups – and that for those coming away wanting to know more, the recommended reading should hopefully provide a good place to start. We have included several additional references highlighting some recent work in this area, which may also be useful for geologists looking to explore further.

6. Again, you think readers will disengage ... why? Don't underestimate your readers.

We have made some significant changes based on this paragraph of feedback, including moving what was 4.2 to be 4.1 (and vice versa). Several examples are included where we highlight that the current canon exists because of the wilful ignorance, erasure or theft of indigenous knowledge – and this is an area that some of the authors are working in to highlight some of these stories in some detail. We have included some examples of indigenous and local geological knowledge to highlight that these exist, and we have tried to question why this knowledge is at "odds" with geological canon. We have included examples of knowledge that isn't typically considered geological canon (politics for example – pg 8 ln 249-255)

8. I endorse the idea to bring your background into the piece but of course would not want you to do anything that might lead to a risk of harassment? But I'm also surprised by this comment. Your names are already on the paper, so anyone who wants to know more about you can look each of you up online. It would be helpful to know something about the authors, and would be an honest and transparent thing to do to put this in the paper, and relevant to this topic. If you don't want to identify individuals, you could outline your backgrounds as part of a list – from the info on the paper I can see that you are five scholars who are based in the UK. Are you all geologists? Or are some from other disciplines? Are any of you indigenous – if so to what country? No need to say who is who if you put all the information together like this (I've done similar things in papers that I've co-authored).

Your suggestion of a list is a welcome one – we certainly agree that situating ourselves and our relationship with knowledge production is important. We have also included why we have written such a piece. (But yes, sadly there are quite a few cases of some reasonably aggressive “push back” to discourse suggesting that geology has negative parts, particularly on social media...) (Pg 2 ln 45-53)

As a general comment, as you undertake your revision I would urge you not to be too defensive: rather than thinking of your audience as geologists likely to be resistant to the topic, inclined to harassment, write for the geologists who are hungry for this information, want to engage with this topic, and need some guidance on how to go about it. Don't let people who are resistant to change define what this paper could be. And also remember this paper is for an international audience and the people likely to find and read it are likely to be the people who are already beginning to be engaged in this topic and want guidance.

Hopefully this revised version is much more geared towards those wanting to engage rather than those who might be resistant (whilst being of potential use to both groups – the hope is that the former group might be able to use it to help inform/engage the latter). The addition of some more examples of geologies colonial past (particularly Spanish/Portuguese Empire expansion) (eg pg 3 ln 86-91; pg 13 ln 392-402), the recognition of settler colonial nations tending to be “further along” the decol journey (with examples/references) and better explanation of coloniality, postcolonial decolonisation hopefully better caters for an international audience – and most certainly provides a good platform for further discussion around Decolonising the Curriculum in postcolonial vs external colonial nations vs settler colonial nations, and provides a foundation for further exploration of specific international geological knowledge systems. (e.g. pg 5 ln 155-158; pg 10 ln 303-312)

We feel that the revisions have greatly improved the manuscript, so again we extend our thanks to the reviewers and yourself for your constructive comments. We look forward to hearing from you.

Best wishes, the author team.