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Response to Reviewer#1

Title: Associations between perceived and observational physical environmental factors and the use of walking paths: A cross-sectional study

Reviewer's report:
The authors have done a good job in addressing my previous concerns. I have no additional comments.

Response to Reviewer's report:
We appreciate your kind suggestions. Wish you a happy life.
Title: Associations between perceived and observational physical environmental factors and the use of walking paths: A cross-sectional study

Reviewer's report:
I would like to thank the authors for taking the time to address all of the review’s comments. There are just a few minor comments:

Discretionary Revisions:
1. Response to reviewer comment 4 (and perhaps 20)
   The sentence should be revised to:
   Trained interviewers were responsible.... Questionnaires. Those questionnaires with invalid (n= ...) or missing data (n=..) were excluded from the data analysis.
2. Response to reviewer comment 5:
   I think that ‘agreement’ is the incorrect word. Perhaps ‘association’ would be better as an Odds Ratio is not a measure of agreement.
3. Response to reviewer comment 19:
   This sentence is still a bit unclear as it might suggest that the interviewers administered the questionnaire to those who ‘were unable to understand them (questionnaires?) during door-to-door visits.
4. Response to reviewer comment 20:
Person-time refers to the number of people over a time period. Therefore the authors should consider using time in this equation.

5. Response to reviewer comment 35:
The authors should revise the wording so that it is clear that intercept interviews were conducted. ‘Intercept convenient samples’ does not imply intercept interviews.

Once again, I would like to thank the authors for addressing all the comments. I enjoyed reading this manuscript.

Response to Reviewer#2’s report:

1. Response to reviewer comment 4 (and perhaps 20):
The sentence has been revised as follows:”Trained interviewers were responsible for collecting the self-administered questionnaires during door-to-door visits, unless the respondents were unable to understand them. Those questionnaires with invalid or missing data (n=272) were excluded from the data analyses.”

2. Response to reviewer comment 5:
“Agreement” has been revised as “association”.

3. Response to reviewer comment 19:
All questionnaires were collected during door-to-door visits. The sentence has been altered in the revised manuscript as follows:”Trained interviewers were responsible for collecting the self-administered questionnaires during door-to-door visits, unless the
respondents were unable to understand them. “Those questionnaires with invalid or missing data (n=272) were excluded from the data analyses.”

4. Response to reviewer comment 20:
“Person-time” has been revised as “time”.

5. Response to reviewer comment 35:
“Intercept convenient samples” refer to the intercept interviews with 360 people who lived in the community. The 360 individuals were interviewed by intercept investigators. Therefore, “intercept” refers to the method of investigation. For the Neighborhood Environment Walkability Scale for Chinese residents (CNEWS), Cronbach ‘α=0.807, ICC=0.945, and r=0.721. Therefore, the following sentence has been added to the revised manuscript: “An additional convenient sample of 360 residents who lived in the community (>20 years old) from two neighborhoods with different walkable environments were interviewed by intercept investigators.”