

← Go back to manuscript

🖨 Print decision

Publication Decision from *Findings*

"An examination of the accessibility implications of a pilot COVID-19 vaccination program in Hamilton, Ontario"

Decision made on May 13th, 2021

Are you sure you want to re-send this decision to the author?

The original decision letter will be re-sent to the author at paczha@mcmaster.ca.
No changes to the letter may be made.

Re-send

cancel

Editorial board's determination

Accepted

If you have any questions, you may contact the journal directly at editor@transportfindings.org

Comments from the editor

Dear Antonio Paez.

We are pleased to accept 'An examination of the accessibility implications of a pilot COVID-19 vaccination program in Hamilton, Ontario' for publication in the journal *Findings*.

Thank you for your contribution. Our publications team may come back to you with editorial queries as the article moves through the publication process.

Sincerely,

David Levinson

On behalf of the *Findings* team.

Reviewer 1

Help

Open response questions

Comments to author

I thank the authors for carefully addressing my comments, and feel the paper is now certainly publishable! Thank you all, again, for making this important contribution. And for making the code and data necessary to reproduce the analysis openly available. I hope to see more great work from these authors and others examining access to health care (and equity implications) during and after the pandemic, as even in “post-pandemic” times it’s likely we’ll see more mass health service delivery efforts (i.e., booster vaccine rollouts).

Rating scale questions

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
The paper makes a significant contribution to scholarship.					✓
The paper is professionally written, easy to read and free from grammatical or spelling errors.				✓	
The paper asks a new research question or poses a new hypothesis.				✓	
The data is appropriate to the research question and methods.				✓	
The paper employs new data.			✓		
The research methodology for the study is appropriate and applied properly.				✓	
The paper uses a new research methodology.				✓	
The paper presents new findings.					✓

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
The paper corroborates existing results.				✓	
The paper refutes previous results.		✓			

Reviewer 2

Open response questions

Comments to author

the paper is much better in this round, just one point the text on page 5 needs some revision as it is confusing, so concentrate in explaining each figure and table below in a simpler way for the findings, and highlight the findings that adding these three sites will make a substantial difference, this is also needed in the abstract. The author might consider adding a legend to explain the difference between the triangle and circles in figure 1 rather than being text in the heading of the figure. also in the last figure with the scenario the three additional pharmacies should be in a different colors to enable spotting them as they clearly make a substantial difference.

Rating scale questions

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
The paper makes a significant contribution to scholarship.		✓			
The paper is professionally written, easy to read and free from grammatical or spelling errors.		✓			

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
The paper asks a new research question or poses a new hypothesis.			✓		
The data is appropriate to the research question and methods.					✓
The paper employs new data.				✓	
The research methodology for the study is appropriate and applied properly.				✓	
The paper uses a new research methodology.		✓			
The paper presents new findings.			✓		
The paper corroborates existing results.				✓	
The paper refutes previous results.			✓		

Jump to section

 [Board's determination](#)

 [Editor's comments](#)

 [Reviewer 1](#)

 [Reviewer 2](#)

