Reviewer #2 (Remarks to the Author):  
  
The reviewer thanks that author for addressing the comments brought up in the initial review. In addressing these comments, and many of the suggestions made by reviewers 1 and 3, this seems to be a more balanced manuscript, and I would recommend it for publication with very minor modifications.   
  
Specific comments:

Line 73-75: I would consider changing or elaborating the statement ‘though mega-cities are fast growing in most areas’. This is true, but leaves out the important and widely accepted point that what you have classified as medium cities will be those that see the largest overall population growth between now and 2050. This omission reduces the legitimacy/credibility of this statement.

Good point, we have changed the text as follows:

“Although mega-cities are fast-growing in most regions, so are small and medium sized cities (Supplementary Figure 1). The current ~~this~~ unbalanced focus leaves smaller urban centres consistently under-represented in all regions apart from North America.”

The language is more careful than the reviewer suggests, because in our data medium cities (0.3-1m) in Africa and Asia are projected to have smaller populations than small (<0.3m) or large (1-10m) cities. We suspect this is due to a different population categorisation and earlier projection date (2030) we chose. In any case, it doesn’t change the central point: mega-cities are overrepresented.

Looking through the next two paragraphs (finishing line 106) there are several places were small cities are referenced as under-represented in literature (significant due to high rate of expected growth, referenced above) where it would be relevant to change this to small and medium sized cities, as they are expected to experience this same rapid growth in Asia and Africa.

At Line 102 we changed the text to:

Redressing the lack of focus on ~~smaller~~ small and medium-sized cities emerges as a second priority.

There are still several places in the paper where the language is colloquial or a bit casual. Three examples are below, but a general read through to tighten language a bit more is suggested.   
Line 148-149: … at least in the mitigation focused literature we identified from Web of Science and Scopus.

This has been changed to:

“- with the caveat that we focus only on climate mitigation literature identified in the Web of Science and Scopus”

Line 178: …topics are spread thin.

Changed to:

“… individual topics are poorly developed.”

Line 184: Mapping out the literature… (out can be removed!)

Done.  
  
Line 206-209: The point at the end of this sentence is unclear and as writed not particularly compelling, and could potentially be emitted.

Changed to, simply:

“The dominance of North American and European universities in scientific publishing, as well as institutional funding biases, limited scientific capacities in the global South, and everyday travel limitations are all possible factors that confound the ideal selection of cases ~~on strong theoretical merit~~.”

Line 221: The use of the word risks in this sentence results in confusion in the rest of the paragraph. I would change this word to clarify the point being made in this paragraph.

We have changed this to:

“There are therefore many benefits to be derived from individual cases, but also ~~risks~~ barriers to a wider project of learning.”

One final comment which could be a useful point to address in the conclusion, are there any insights or recommendations relating to how case studies conducted in small and medium sized cities in the Africa and Asia could become more widely published in the peer reviewed literature?

We have added the statement:

“Journal editors, funding bodies and assessment processes all have an important role in generating demand for more cases in small and medium sized cities in Africa and Asia.”

Reviewer #3 (Remarks to the Author):  
  
I was truly impressed by the response to the reviewers comments and given the seriousness of the approach of the authors and I would not dream of suggesting anything else. As they clearly point out, for a perspective paper this article takes a very nuanced and rich approach while also recognising the limitations of the approach. Thank you for such a thoughtful and engaged work.  
  
We are grateful for this very positive response.

**In addition to the edits above, we have shortened the introductory paragraph (abstract) to meet Nature Climate Change formatting requirements:**

Climate mitigation research puts increasing emphasis on cities, but much more could be learned from urban case studies. The overall size, geographic scope and topic content of cases remains unknown, resulting in few attempts to synthesise the bottom-up evidence. We use scientometric and machine learning methods to produce a comprehensive map of the literature. Our database of 4,051 case studies provides a wealth of evidence to search, compare and review. We find that cities in world regions with the highest future mitigation relevance are systematically underrepresented. A map of the evidence allows case studies to be matched with urban typologies in new and more ambitious forms of synthesis, bringing together traditionally separate strands of qualitative and quantitative urban research.