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Reviewer's report:

This is a very well written manuscript

All tables require a column with the European cohort to allow comparisons that are referred throughout the manuscript. If the authors wish to simplify the tables, then displaying one of the Asian subgroups would be sufficient and stating in the results that there was no difference. Since the Japanese subgroup is inclusive in the Asian subgroup, it doesn't seem necessary to present both in tables. I will leave this to the authors decision, but I would insist on seeing the european cohort details.

Table 3: New/enlarging T2 lesions are determined relative to a previous scan. There are MRI scans every 4 weeks. What is the comparison scan used for week 24 results? Is this any new/enlarging T2 lesions at anytime from baseline through to week 24? Looking at the data I suspect this is the case, but it needs to be clearly stated.

Safety (table 4) there is an increase rate of nasopharyngitis in asian patients not discussed in the manuscripts. Yet the discussion that flushing is less common lacks a p value to know if this is potentially real. Both points need clarification. Again, having columns for the european subgroup is essential for this type of discussion

Data supports efficacy conclusions - no concerns.

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.

Yes
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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