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Reviewer’s report:

The authors tried to make the manuscript more scientific according to reviewer's suggestion.

However, I still have some points to make sure.

The authors stated this study was prospectively designed. They enrolled subjects using the International Consensus Diagnostic Criteria for Neuromyelitis Optica Spectrum Disorder 2015. If this study prospectively enrolled subjects with the criteria, this study could not have subjects with follow up duration for 40 months. Of course, the criteria were released at many international congresses related to MS and NMOSD from 2014, but it was still impossible to have subjects with follow up period more than about 2 years. So please make sure this is a prospective study or study analyzing clinical characteristics of subjects who was prospectively enrolled for AZA metabolites and genetic polymorphism. In addition, reference # 2 is not about the criteria 2015.

A sentence for limitations was written. Please describe more about reason why the study for efficacy of AZA in especially patients with NMOSD needs longer follow up period.

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

No

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

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