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Reviewer's report:

The Authors have responded to each point satisfactorily. However, I have still a minor concern: "...the study protocol did not specify whether to include relapses among adverse events or not. Among relapses that occurred during the study period, only 4 were considered to be adverse by the treating neurologists according to their clinical judgement". I think that this might be misleading for the readers. The Authors should have established a priori if consider as an adverse event the relapses occurred during their observational study. Otherwise, they should specify if the four relapses considered as adverse events led to hospitalization, and then were correctly interpreted as adverse events.
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If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
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