

# **Peer Review: Mapping community capital: Revealing local gaps in rural access**

Christopher J. Seeger<sup>1</sup> , & Bailey A. Hanson<sup>1</sup> 

*Collaborators: Jessica Breen + 2 other reviewers*

---

<sup>1</sup> Iowa State University Extension and Outreach, Ames, Iowa, USA

## **Transparent Peer Review**

- [View reviewer summaries](#)
- [View initial submission with reviewer comments](#)

## **Recommended Citation**

Seeger, C. J., and B. A. Hanson. 2026. Mapping community capital: Revealing local gaps in rural access. Stacks Journal: 26012.

<https://doi.org/10.60102/stacks-26012>.

**Accepted by 3 of 3 reviewers**

### **Conflicts of Interest**

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

### **Publishing History**

Submitted April 27 2026

Accepted July 7 2026

Published October 2 2026

### **Corresponding Author**

Christopher J. Seeger  
cjseeger@iastate.edu



Open Access



Peer-Reviewed



Creative Commons



# Reviewer Summaries

## Tim Bailey

### Initial Submission

**Do you have any conflicts of interest that could bias your ability to provide an independent review?**

no

**What did the authors do a good job with?**

The authors did a good job aligning the geospatial assets with the model of social capital

**How do you think this research will contribute to the field?**

Yes, this is an interesting implementation

**Regarding the study design and methods, what do the authors need to fix or improve upon to be fit for publication?**

The authors identified an issue, the train tracks as a boundary, that complicates social access in their small sample area but the dataset does not show the effects well do to its construction. Demonstrating the method in a more complex landscape would be useful. Also the length scale for walkability is very large and arbitrary. That would be worth discussion

**Regarding the analysis and interpretation of their findings, what do the authors need to fix or improve upon to be fit for publication?**

Better discussion of the methods for determination of appropriate length scale for nearby assets would improve the paper.

**Is there anything else you think the authors need to fix in their article to be fit for publication?**

*Not answered*

**Do you have any concerns about the ethics of this research?**

no

**Do you believe the article, in its current form, is fit for publication?**

This paper requires minor revisions but does not need further peer review

**Would you like to be listed as a Collaborator on the final publication?**

No, I do not want to be listed as a Collaborator

## Jessica Breen

### Initial Submission

**Do you have any conflicts of interest that could bias your ability to provide an independent review?**

no

**What did the authors do a good job with?**

They did a good job of clearly explaining the CCF and its significance. The methods were clearly explained.

**How do you think this research will contribute to the field?**



It is a case study that contributes to the evidence that open source software is up to the challenge of the type of GIS work done in community research.

**Regarding the study design and methods, what do the authors need to fix or improve upon to be fit for publication?**

There's no explanation given for why they make use of OSM data when there is authoritative, no-cost data available from the municipality itself. Is the idea to fill in potential missing data? Do they feel the authoritative data is lacking in some way? Are they comparing the utility of OSM data to the authoritative data in this workflow?

**Regarding the analysis and interpretation of their findings, what do the authors need to fix or improve upon to be fit for publication?**

There is very little analysis or interpretation here. I agree with result #2, the utility of free and open source software in this analysis, but there really isn't anything to back up claim #1, that this method reveals gaps. Given the length constraints, it might be useful for the authors to focus this piece on their successful substitution of open source software for the commercial software in their previous work. There's also mention of proposing spatial capital as an eighth capital in the CCF, that isn't backed up by the content of this paper.

**Is there anything else you think the authors need to fix in their article to be fit for publication?**

No, I think focusing the results section on what is actually covered in the paper and addressing the issue of "Why OSM data?" would be sufficient. It's a generally good paper.

**Do you have any concerns about the ethics of this research?**

No

**Do you believe the article, in its current form, is fit for publication?**

This paper requires minor revisions but does not need further peer review

**Would you like to be listed as a Collaborator on the final publication?**

Yes, please list me as a Collaborator

## Raechel Portelli

### Initial Submission

**Do you have any conflicts of interest that could bias your ability to provide an independent review?**

no

**What did the authors do a good job with?**

The methods were clear and easy to understand as was the framework they were using in their work.

**How do you think this research will contribute to the field?**

The value in this work is its practical application for planning and spatial analysis of capital indicators.

**Regarding the study design and methods, what do the authors need to fix or improve upon to be fit for publication?**

The authors mentioned a inconsistency in the OSM tags across cities, but I wonder if there is inconsistency within cities as well that might impact their work. I would also ask for a statement on how they performed with their analysis if they completed one- just one or two sentences would suffice.

**Regarding the analysis and interpretation of their findings, what do the authors need to fix or improve upon to be fit for publication?**



In the first outcome under results they state "tudies demonstrate 1) how regional access to services varies across rural places—and how, within those places, spatial analysis reveals localized gaps in access to essential assets like healthcare, broadband, and public infrastructure." I would have like to have read more about what that actually looked like for the city they worked in or reword the outcome to "a method to map" regional access which is more specific to the paper contribution as it reads now.

**Is there anything else you think the authors need to fix in their article to be fit for publication?**

The concept of "Spatial Capital" as the authors use it is similar to how spatial capital has been conceptualized in broader urban planning literature. Does this relate to those conceptualizations or are you defining something that is different? If its adopting the same, I would suggest a citation for that concept.

**Do you have any concerns about the ethics of this research?**

No

**Do you believe the article, in its current form, is fit for publication?**

This paper requires minor revisions but does not need further peer review

**Would you like to be listed as a Collaborator on the final publication?**

No, I do not want to be listed as a Collaborator