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Reviewer's report:

This paper provides a basic description of the phenotype and genotype data generated as part of the 1000IBD project. It does not, in itself, contain any new findings, but the cohort described will no doubt be used by the submitting authors and others to generate a wide range of interesting analyses.

I have a few specific questions:

1. It's not clear to me why only a subset of the data generated is being released at this stage (e.g. 314 of the 1015 patients with Immunochip data). This could be better explained in the manuscript.

2. The website for EGA is https://ega-archive.org (i.e. without the www)

3. The website https://1000ibd.org is not live. The Molgenis github page (https://github.com/molgenis/molgenis-projects) suggests the address should be https://1000ibd.com, but again this is not live.

4. I would have liked to see some top-level summary statistics of the cohort presented (e.g. diagnoses, age at diagnosis, sex, Montreal classification, disease duration at recruitment, medication exposure, disease activity, etc.)

5. As new, unpublished instruments, details on the FFQ and environmental questionnaire is rather limited.

6. When are these patients recruited? At diagnosis? Opportunistically? How are they selected? What are the inclusion/exclusion criteria?

7. Are patients recallable for resampling? If so, is this available to external researchers, or just to the UMCG group?
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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

Unable to assess

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

Yes

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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

Acceptable

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?
If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests' below

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal