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Reviewer's report:

1. What was the duration of diabetes in prevalent T2D at baseline?

2. In Table 1: The T2D subjects seems to be older than the non T2D at baseline and when they were followed up, the incident T2D during follow up were much younger than the prevalent T2D at baseline. Explain.

3. In Table 1: Under Education, were nobody had 11 years of education or not included by mistake?

4. In Table 2: the total N of all the column seems to be wrong. Kindly correct it.

5. Were the T2D participants were age categorized and tested for the association with walkability? Since, at baseline, the prevalent T2D were older than the incident T2D, the authors need to split them into different age categories and check their association with walkability measures.

6. Since the studies took place between 2002 and 2016, were there any changes in the Geoinformation system Map in German?

7. Was there any statistically significant difference between the prevalent T2D at baseline and non T2D in the three walkability measures such as Impedance, Transit stations and Points of interest. Kindly mention the same.

8. The authors need to explain in detail about how the walkability measures were assessed and how they were scored and used in the analysis.

9. More studies need to be referenced and discussed in the discussion section.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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