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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Unfortunately I suspect a serious flaw in the presented analysis. The Authors claim the application of odds ratio (OR) to find the incidence IBD-VTE. Let's mark cases with IBD and VTE as a; Cases with IBD and without VTE as b; Cases without IBD but with VTE as c; Cases without IBD neither VTE as d; Then OR=(a/c)/(b/d) and if OR=1 IBD does not affect odds of outcome (VTE) if OR>1 IBD is associated with higher odds of outcome (VTE) if OR<1 IBD is associated with LOWER odds of outcome (VTE) For the most analysed cases OR is not presented. However, 95 % confidence interval is calculated based on OR. So OR is ALWAYS within CI range. For the majority of presented analysis CI lower and upper limit are below 1 and close to 0 e.g. 95 % CI: 0.01-0.03. It means OR<1 so IBD lowers odds of VTE. My conclusion is opposite to presented in the article but it is based on results presented there. I would suggest to widen the references by the items based on statistics, present some exemplary calculations (also for lower and upper limit of OR), explain why p=0.1 is assumed as important (the most statisticians assume max p=0.05 for stitistic importance of the results). Refering to the title of the article, it should be presented, discussed how the results of OR, CI can be understood in terms of RISK (the core term in the title). Then discussion and conclusions can be different.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. The title was complete and engaging and well written.
2. The keywords are basically three to five, here are 7 cords that need to be reduced.
3. It is stated in the method that it has been used to extract data from cohort studies and clinical work, but in the abstract it is only written observational studies. Please correct the contradiction between these two sections.
4. The introduction was appropriate, but newer references should be used if new studies are available.
5. Please describe the search strategy in more detail.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The presented manuscript “Risk of venous thromboembolism in children and adolescents with inflammatory bowel disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis” is interesting and well-written, it raises an important medical question and would be of interest to researchers and physicians, however, I have some minor comments.  

1. Please, use a larger font for figures 2-5, with the current one it is not possible to read!  
2. For all Figures it is necessary to add in footnotes full forms of every inscription.  
3. Please, add a List of abbreviations.  
4. The association with VTE subtypes deserves much better and deeper discussion.