Revise and Resubmit

The journal has requested that this manuscript be revised and resubmitted.

Submit a revised manuscript

Publication Decision from *Findings*

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

Decision made on May 1st, 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 paezha@mcmaster.ca.
No changes to the letter may be made.

Re-send

cancel

Editorial board's determination

Revise and resubmit

Comments from the editor

Dear Antonio Paez

We have a reached a decision on your submission 'An examination of the accessibility implications of a pilot COVID-19 vaccination program in Hamilton, Ontario' to the journal *Findings*.

The paper requires significant changes to be made (see comments below) that better address the scientific substance of the research, but the reviewers believe the core analysis remediable. We look forward to seeing your revised manuscript within 1 month.

In addition, please upload

1. manuscript in .pdf format,

Help

2. manuscript source in .docx or .tex format (the files must be .docx or .tex format), and
3. high resolution .jpeg files (the files must be .jpeg) of *every* image.
4. a letter describing changes in response to the reviewers.

Also ensure all of the article Metadata is correct, including ORCID IDs for each author, and author order, and complete on the electronic article submission forms.

Sincerely,

David Levinson
On behalf of the *Findings* team.

Reviewer 1

Open response questions

Comments to author

This article examines the accessibility implications of a pilot COVID-19 vaccination program for adults age 55+ (focusing on adults age 55–69) in Hamilton, Ontario. It makes a timely contribution to accessibility literature, generally, and to a small but growing body of scholarship more specifically related to accessing the COVID-19 vaccine. This article is certainly publishable, but would benefit from minor revisions. I present some suggestions and comments following that the authors might consider as they revise the piece:

• Please clarify from the outset of the article that you all are measuring “cost of travel” in travel time.
• The initial description of the pilot program is a bit unclear. By my understanding, 20 pharmacies in Hamilton were added as vaccination sites, and people age 55+ qualified to be vaccinated at these 20 pharmacies. People age 55–69 do not qualify at the other 325 locations mentioned, correct? I suggest you all clarify this. Also, the authors very briefly mention mobile vaccination pop-up clinics at the end of the article. Who’s eligible for these? Where are they? How many are there? I think the analysis in your article is scoped appropriately, but I do wonder whether the accessibility “gains” garnered by this pilot program matter too much in the grand scheme, particularly if so many other stationary/mobile clinics are available or are likely to become available to the 55+ age group (or even more age groups) soon. I suppose I’m asking that the authors clarify the importance of understanding and analyzing this pilot program in light of the greater vaccine rollout in the area.
• The authors write, “As Yu et al. (2021) note, good geographical coverage is a key element for a successful vaccination campaign; at the same time, siting vaccinations sites in car-oriented locations may lead to inequities in access.” I understand word count is limited, but I encourage the authors to provide more discussion here of why this “may lead to inequities in access” and

who, exactly, is likely to reap the benefits and bear the costs of these inequities.
• The travel time threshold/walking distance cutoff values seem rather large. Did you test or consider other, smaller values?
• The expected travel time incorporating weighted sums given the modal split in a TAZ is interesting. Did you consider analyzing/presenting findings for different modes discretely, which might highlight intramode inequities more clearly? I'm mostly curious—I do think the authors' approach using the weighted sums capturing, in theory, travel time by all modes is a valid and interesting approach.
• I find it more interpretable and impactful when you all present travel time results measured in minutes rather than in person-hours. I understand needing the person-hours results as a cumulative, individual-based measure to compare across income and region classes. However, as a reader, I do find the person-hours analysis to be harder to understand than the travel time analysis. I suggest the authors put some more thought towards explaining, particularly, the person-hours analysis results clearly.
• I like the idea of the comparison scenario, but wonder how the scenario sites were chosen. Could the three sites feasibly serve as vaccination sites? Were these locations "optimized" in any way to lead to greater reductions in travel time disparities? Were they randomly chosen? I think more is needed to clarify this scenario experiment/analysis for the reader.
• The article would benefit from proofreading for spelling and grammar errors, as well as some issues with general fluency and, especially, clarity of language. For instance, I suggest "do not serve well urban and rural residents," be rephrased as, "do not serve urban and rural residents well." Also, a (potentially important) typo in Methods: "Using the population aged 55 to 59 y.o."—do you all mean 55 to 69 y.o.?
• The authors should note that the Findings guidelines state, "All articles have a maximum of 1000 words of text, exclusive of References. In addition, there is a maximum figure count of 3, and maximum table count of 3." I am not sure of the article's current word count, but I do notice the article includes 4 figures. The authors might consider combining Figures 1 and 2 by layering the vaccination site locations atop the population distribution maps (although, this might look busy). Figure 2 might, alternatively, be included as supplemental information.

I am glad to have had the opportunity to review this interesting paper!

Rating scale questions

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
The paper makes a significant contribution to scholarship.				✓	

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

Reviewer 2

Open response questions

Comments to author

This paper looks at a location allocation issue that has been studied before in geograohy for several decades, where to place new facilities ti reduce travel and increase access to heakthcare in a region. The study finds that rural and low income are poorly srved and big burden of travel falls on these groups and they offer the location of new sites for vaccinations to decrease such burden. The paper depnds ona major assumotion that those who commuted by mode X will commute by the same mode for vaccination, which is not true, if COVID has shiwn us something is new travel behaviour emerge and peopel are switching modes so this assumption need to be highlighted as a major limitation. it could have been better to see a map with the old sites alone, with new sites added and have the background as the collective travel time this will enable the reader to visualize the impact spatially.

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.				✓	
The paper corroborates existing results.			✓		
The paper refutes previous results.			✓		

Jump to section

- Board's determination
- Editor's comments
- Reviewer 1
- Reviewer 2