Thank you for taking the time to read this manuscript, and for being such a champion of our work. Below we have responded to your comment and have indicated how we have changed the manuscript (which, for ease of use, we have written in blue text) as a result of these suggestions.

**EC1:** While the abstract is clear and concise, it leads the reader to expect a more robust discussion about specific recommendations for increasing diversity within geoscience academic programs. However, the article is scattered and attempts to cover too much ground in the limited amount of space allowed, especially with regards to couching the recommendations within the context of bias, racism, ethics, and barriers to inclusion. As a result, the recommendations are not as strong and well-formed as they could be, and the depth of discussion needed for explaining clearly how those recommendations fit within and solve the issues of bias, racism, ethics, and barriers to inclusion is lacking. Furthermore, the strength of the recommendations is significantly diminished by the adversarial tenor of the article and the dearth of robust support for the assertions cited by the authors as the causes for low diversity within geoscience academic programs. While diversity continues to be a long-standing issue for the geosciences, the drivers are more complex than what the authors assert.

Response: We have adjusted the abstract and the introduction to include lines that directly address the manifesto.

In the abstract, “We join fellow community voices in calls for improved diversity, equity, inclusion, and justice in the geosciences. Herein this manifesto, we present a list of opportunities for educators to bring about this cultural shift within higher education: 1)…”

In the introduction, “In this manifesto, we call for six specific points of reflection and action that individual higher education geoscience educators can undertake to recognise and unlearn their biases to support geoscience education diversity (Figure 1).”