Dear Dr. Ramsay

We would like to thank you and the external reviewer for constructive comments and suggestions. We have taken them seriously and have made significant revisions.

The review noted that the manuscript suffers from 2 main faults:

***1. Confusing that the manuscript is a research note and related, that the focus is on triangulation to over come issues with using PCCF+ and postal codes.***

To address this concern, we revised the title of the paper, reworked the introduction, and reorganized the paper’s structure the flow of arguments in a clear and concise manner. We now provide background information and problems of geolocation at the start of the research note and feature this as the core problem addressed throughout it.

***2. The manuscript does not contain any description of the triangulation methods used or present any numeric results that the reader can use to assess the effectiveness of these methods.***

Additional information has been provided within the methods of this paper detailing the process of triangulation. An Appendix has been added detailing the triangulation methods and geocoding results.

***Additionally we were sent a detailed mark up of out manuscript, with specific comments.***

We have addressed the following detailed comments throughout the research note, as follows:

1. We have revised the title of the paper to: “Triangulating Neighborhoods: A Research Note on Improving Links Between People and Places in Smaller Cities and Rural Areas.” We believe it is a more accurate reflection of the research note.
2. In turn, the abstract of the research note has also been revised.
3. To reflect the additional work done in paper by those adjusting the note, we have also reordered the authors to: Barber, McLay, Rainham, and Ramos.
4. The introductory paragraph has been revised to clearly explain the purpose of this research note.
5. A connecting sentence has been added to join paragraphs one and two.
6. The reference (Longley, 2012) in paragraph two has been removed.
7. References have been added to paragraph two illustrating limitations of geocoding with postal codes.
8. Use of the term “survey design” has been addressed through the entire research note to indicate we are discussing use of survey questions.
9. A description of the survey design has been added on page two.
10. Background information has been moved to the beginning of the research note.
11. Appendix A has been added to provide additional information detailing the triangulation methods and geocoding results. See reference on page 2 and Excel sheet. Please let us know if this can be hosted on the journal’s web site. If not, we can also host on the PerceptionsofChange.ca web site. Alternately is space permits it could be added to the research not and published.
12. The “linkage type code” is on page 27 of the cited article, Table 4.16 within the Statistics Canada (2017) reference.

We also have significantly re-edited the prose to be more efficient and re-ordered some of the information to provide a clearer structure to the research note. It is out belief these changes have made the research note stronger and look forward to seeing it published in JRCD.

All the best,

Howard Ramos, Brittany Barber, Rachel McLay, Daniel Rainham