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Reviewer’s report:

The paper is a meta-analysis of the effect of RTX in NMO patients.

Despite the previous publication of this meta-analysis in JAMA Neurol 2016 by Damato and colleagues, this confirmatory study includes more studies and offers additional data validating the use of RTX in this pathology.

Subgroup analysis includes a comparison of the RTX effect versus the dosage used. This dataset is not usable as presented here because the most important is clearly not only the dosage used during the induction phase, but also during the maintenance period. The comparison of the group according to that must be done (1g / 6months vs 2g / 6months for example).

Another subgroup analysis will be interesting and is currently being discussed in clinical practice which is the use of RTX in the first line or second line. This comparison will add substantial data to the knowledge in that field.

Please list the causes of death. I will be very surprised at the lack of relationship between RTX and this side effect.

Please correct Ze'phir by Zephir

Discussion:

Please discuss the comparison between the submitted study and the Damato meta-analysis.

please correct: RTX is not expensive: in Europe, it costs about 700 euros the lot of 500 mg. This product has been biosimilarized.

please correct: no randomized trials in NMO : wrong, at least satralizumab and eculizumab have recently successfully completed a phase III study.

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 recommend additional statistical review

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