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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript covers an interesting scientific question and the study is generally well performed. Drawbacks are an overall small and somewhat heterogeneous patient population reflecting clinical practice and lack of longer term follow up.

Other issues are listed below:

- Please specify the definitions of complete, partial, no response and worsening within your method section (EDSS-based, FS based definition?).

- There is an ongoing discussion regarding late effects of methylprednisolone therapy on relapse symptoms. Thus the correct time point for re-evaluation of relapse symptoms and initiation of an escalated relapse therapy is yet not well defined. Because the follow up visit of the presented study was performed in median 14 (IQR 7-38 days) after relapse treatment it might be possible to search for difference in treatment response in regard to time of follow up. I would therefore kindly ask the authors to stratify their patient population into those with early versus late follow up visit and compare treatment responses. Likewise, do the authors have any data on late recovery, e.g. during routine controls 3 and 6 months afterwards?

- When was response to escalating relapse therapy assessed

- Could the overrepresentation of sensory relapses impact their results?

- Given that this was a prospective study the authors should provide information on ethics or a statement/waiver, why a vote/ICF was not necessary.

- How about the patients who were also part of another study? Is this covered by the other study protocol/ICF?
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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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