information services
gwasanaethau gwybodaeth

Title
Alemtuzumab versus natalizumab, fingolimod and interferon β for multiple sclerosis

Authors and affiliations
Tomas Kalincik, MD; Department of Medicine, University of Melbourne, 300 Grattan St, Melbourne, 3050, Australia; Department of Neurology, Royal Melbourne Hospital, 300 Grattan St, Melbourne, 3050, Australia

James William Lyle Brown, MD; NMR Research Unit, Queen Square Multiple Sclerosis Centre, University College London Institute of Neurology, Queen Square, London WC1N 3BG, UK; Department of Clinical Neurosciences, University of Cambridge, Downing Street, Cambridge, CB2 3EB, UK

Neil Robertson, MD; Department of Neurology, Institute of Psychological Medicine and Clinical Neuroscience, Cardiff University, University Hospital of Wales, Heath Park, Cardiff, CF14 4XW, UK

Mark Willis, MD; Department of Neurology, Institute of Psychological Medicine and Clinical Neuroscience, Cardiff University, University Hospital of Wales, Heath Park, Cardiff, CF14 4XW, UK

Neil Scolding, MD; Department of Neurology, Southmead Hospital, Southmead Rd, Westbury-on-Trym, Bristol, BS10 5NB, UK; School of Clinical Sciences, University of Bristol, Bristol, BS2 8DZ, UK

Claire M Rice, MD; Department of Neurology, Southmead Hospital, Southmead Rd, Westbury-on-Trym, Bristol, BS10 5NB, UK; School of Clinical Sciences, University of Bristol, Bristol, BS2 8DZ, UK

Alastair Wilkins, MD; Department of Neurology, Southmead Hospital, Southmead Rd, Westbury-on-Trym, Bristol, BS10 5NB, UK; School of Clinical Sciences, University of Bristol, Bristol, BS2 8DZ, UK

Owen Pearson, MD; Abertawe Bro Morgannwg University Local Health Board, Seaway Parade, Swansea, SA12 7BR, UK

Tjalf Ziemssen, MD; Center of Clinical Neuroscience, Department of Neurology, MS Center Dresden; Center of Clinical Neuroscience, University Hospital Carl Gustav Carus, Dresden University of Technology, Fetscherstraße 74, 01307, Dresden, Germany

Michael Hutchinson, MD; School of Medicine and Medical Sciences, University College Dublin, and St Vincent's University Hospital, Elm Park, Merrion Rd, Dublin 4, Ireland

Christopher McGuigan, MD; School of Medicine and Medical Sciences, University College Dublin, and St Vincent's University Hospital, Elm Park, Merrion Rd, Dublin 4, Ireland

Vilija Jokubaitis, PhD; Department of Medicine, University of Melbourne, 300 Grattan St, Melbourne, 3050, Australia; Department of Neurology, Royal Melbourne Hospital, 300 Grattan St, Melbourne, 3050, Australia

Tim Spelman, PhD; Department of Medicine, University of Melbourne, 300 Grattan St, Melbourne, 3050, Australia; Department of Neurology, Royal Melbourne Hospital, 300 Grattan St, Melbourne, 3050, Australia

Dana Horakova, MD; Department of Neurology and Center of Clinical Neuroscience, General University Hospital and Charles University in Prague, Katerinska 30, Prague, 12808, Czech Republic

Eva Havrdova, MD; Department of Neurology and Center of Clinical Neuroscience, General University Hospital and Charles University in Prague, Katerinska 30, Prague, 12808, Czech Republic

Maria Trojano, MD; Department of Basic Medical Sciences, Neuroscience and Sense Organs, University of Bari, Via Calefati 53, Bari, 70122, Italy

Guillermo Izquierdo, MD; Hospital Universitario Virgen Macarena, Amador de los Rios 48-50. 4a, Sevilla, 41003, Spain

Alessandra Lugaresi, MD; Department of Biomedical and Neuromotor Sciences, University of Bologna, Via dei Vestini, Bologna, 66100, Italy; IRCCS Istituto delle Scienze Neurologiche di Bologna, Via dei Vestini, Bologna, 66100, Italy

Alexandre Prat, MD; Hopital Notre Dame, 1560 Sherbrooke East, Montreal, H2L 4M1, Canada; CHUM and Universite de Montreal, Montreal, Canada

Marc Girard, MD; Hopital Notre Dame, 1560 Sherbrooke East, Montreal, H2L 4M1, Canada; CHUM and Universite de Montreal, Montreal, Canada

Pierre Duquette, MD; Hopital Notre Dame, 1560 Sherbrooke East, Montreal, H2L 4M1, Canada; CHUM and Universite de Montreal, Montreal, Canada

Pierre Grammond, MD; CISSS Chaudière-Appalache, 9500 blvd Centre-Hospitalier, Levis, G6X 0A1, Canada

Raed Alroughani, MD; Amiri Hospital, P.O.Box 1661. Qurtoba, Kuwait City, 73767, Kuwait

Eugenio Pucci, MD; Azienda Sanitaria Unica Regionale Marche - AV3, Via Santa Lucia 2, Macerata, 62100, Italy

Patrizia Sola, MD; Nuovo Ospedale Civile Sant'Agostino/Estense, via giardini 1355, Modena, 41100, Italy

Raymond Hupperts, MD; Zuyderland Ziekenhuis, Walramstraat 23, Sittard, 6131 BK, Netherlands

Jeannette Lechner-Scott, MD; University Newcastle, Lookout Road, Newcastle, 2305, Australia

Murat Terzi, MD; Medical Faculty, 19 Mayis University, Kurupelit, Samsun, 55160, Turkey

Vincent Van Pesch, MD; Cliniques Universitaires Saint-Luc, avenue Hippocrate, 10 UCL10/80, Brussels, 1200 BXL, Belgium

Csilla Rozsa, MD; Jahn Ferenc Teaching Hospital, Köves u. 1., Budapest, 1101, Hungary

Francois Grand'Maison, MD; Neuro Rive-Sud, 4896 boul. Taschereau, suite 250, Quebec, J4V 2J2, Canada

Cavit Boz, MD; KTU Medical Faculty Farabi Hospital, Karadeniz Technical University, Trabzon, 61080, Turkey

Franco Granella, MD; University of Parma, Via Gramisci, 14, Parma, 43100, Italy

Mark Slee, MD; Flinders University, Flinders Drive, Adelaide, 5042, Australia

Daniele Spitaleri, MD; Azienda Ospedaliera di Rilievo Nazionale San Giuseppe Moscati Avellino, Contrada Amoretta, Avellino, 83100, Italy

Javier Olascoaga, MD; Hospital Universitario Donostia, Paseo de Begiristain, San Sebastián, 20014, Spain

Roberto Bergamaschi, MD; C. Mondino National Neurological Institute, via Mondino 2, Pavia, 27100, Italy

Freek Verheul, MD; Groene Hart Ziekenhuis, Bleulandweg 10, Gouda, 2800 BB, Netherlands

Steve Vucic, MD; Westmead Hospital, Hawkesbury Rd, Sydney, 2145, Australia

Pamela McCombe, MD; Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital, 33 North Street, Brisbane, QLD 4000, Australia

Suzanne Hodgkinson, MD; Liverpool Hospital, Elizabeth St, Sydney, 21, Australia

Jose Luis Sanchez-Menoyo, MD; Hospital de Galdakao-Usansolo, Barrio Labeaga s.n., Galdakao, 48660, Spain

Radek Ampapa, MD; Nemocnice Jihlava, Vrchlickeho 59, Jihlava, 58633, Czech Republic

Magdolna Simo, MD; Semmelweis University Budapest, Balassa, Budapest, 1083, Hungary

Tunde Csepany, MD; University of Debrecen, Moricz Zs. krt 22., Debrecen, 4032, Hungary

Cristina Ramo, MD; Hospital Germans Trias i Pujol, Crtra de Canyet s/n, Badalona, 8916, Spain

Edgardo Cristiano, MD; Hospital Italiano, Guise 1870, Buenos Aires, 1425, Argentina

Michael Barnett, MBBS; Brain and Mind Centre, 100 Mallett, Camperdown, 2050, Australia

Helmut Butzkueven*, MBBS; Department of Medicine, University of Melbourne, 300 Grattan St, Melbourne, 3050, Australia; Department of Neurology, Royal Melbourne Hospital, 300 Grattan St, Melbourne, 3050, Australia; Department of Neurology, Box Hill Hospital, Monash University, Arnold Street, Melbourne, 3128, Australia

Alasdair Coles*, MD; Department of Clinical Neurosciences, University of Cambridge, Downing Street, Cambridge, CB2 3EB, UK

on behalf of the MSBase Study Group[#]

* These authors contributed equally to the manuscript.
[#] Contributing members of the MSBase Study Group are listed in supplementary Table S1.

Corresponding author
Tomas Kalincik; L4 Centre, Melbourne Brain Centre at Royal Melbourne Hospital, Grattan St, Parkville VIC 3050, Australia; Tel: +61 3 9342 4402, Fax: +61 3 9349 5997; email: tomas.kalincik@unimelb.edu.au

Word count, manuscript: 2,727
Word count, abstract: 244
References: 24
Figures: 4
Tables: 1
The manuscript includes online supplementary material.

Keywords
disease modifying therapy, relapses, disability, propensity score

ABSTRACT
Background: Alemtuzumab, an anti-CD52 antibody, is proven to be more efficacious than interferon beta-1a in treating relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis, but its efficacy relative to more potent immunotherapies is unknown.

Methods: We compared effectiveness of alemtuzumab vs. natalizumab, fingolimod and interferon β up to five years in propensity-matched patients with relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis from MSBase and four other observational cohorts. Annualised relapse rates, disability accumulation and disability improvement events were compared with clustered weighted models. Secondary analyses examined patients with high pre-treatment relapse rate or on-treatment relapses.

Findings: The cohorts consisted of 189 (alemtuzumab), 2155 (interferon), 828 (fingolimod) and 1160 (natalizumab) patients. Compared to interferon, alemtuzumab was associated with lower annualised relapse rate (0·19 vs. 0·53, P<0·001) and similar disability outcomes in the overall cohort, and lower risk of disability accumulation (hazard ratio=0·64, P=0·018) and a higher rate of disability improvement in patients with prior highly active disease (hazard ratio=4, P=0·03). Compared to fingolimod, relapse rate was lower on alemtuzumab (0·15 vs. 0·34, P<0·001). Importantly, no differences in relapse rate (0·20 vs. 0·19, respectively, P=0·78) and disability accumulation rates were found between alemtuzumab and natalizumab. Disability improvement rates were lower on alemtuzumab (hazard ratio=0·36, P<0·001) than natalizumab, particularly during the first year after commencing therapy. The results were largely confirmed by four sensitivity analyses.

Inerpretation: Alemtuzumab and natalizumab showed similar effects on relapse activity and disability accumulation rates in relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis but natalizumab was associated with a greater chance of early disability improvement. Alemtuzumab was superior to fingolimod in mitigating relapse activity.

Funding: This study was financially supported by National Health and Medical Research Council and University of Melbourne.

TEXT
INTRODUCTION
Alemtuzumab, an anti-CD52 humanised monoclonal antibody, is a highly effective immunotherapy for relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis (MS).[1-3] Through a profound pan-lymphocyte depletion and sustained modification of lymphocyte repertoire,[4] it achieves long-term disease stabilisation in most patients with previously active disease.[5,6] Pivotal trials have demonstrated its superior effect on relapse activity and disability accrual compared with interferon β.[2,3]

Recent onset of highly active MS, escalation of therapy to natalizumab or alemtuzumab following failure of oral medications[7] or switch from natalizumab to alemtuzumab or fingolimod due to a high risk of progressive multifocal leukoencephalopathy[8,9] are common scenarios in which alemtuzumab is used in clinical practice. However, there is presently no information about the effectiveness of alemtuzumab in comparison to the more potent disease modifying therapies. Mixed-treatment analyses of alemtuzumab versus other licensed agents were performed during submissions to reimbursement agencies (e.g. the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, UK) but public versions of these documents are heavily redacted. This much needed evidence is unlikely to emerge from randomised trials as the cost of such long-term multi-arm trials is prohibitive.

Well characterised observational cohorts collect substantial amounts of longitudinal information representative of clinical practice. Several cohorts have recently generated valuable evidence regarding comparative treatment effectiveness, which is highly concordant with clinical trials.[10] We have shown that in active MS, highly potent therapies, such as natalizumab or fingolimod, are more effective than injectable immunotherapies.[11,12]

The present study compares relapse activity, disability accumulation and disability improvement between patients treated with alemtuzumab vs. other immunotherapies. First, we aimed to replicate the results of the pivotal trials of alemtuzumab vs. interferon β. Then, we explored the effectiveness of alemtuzumab in comparison with natalizumab or fingolimod over up to five years of treatment.

METHODS
The MSBase cohort study (registered with WHO ICTRP, ID ACTRN12605000455662) was approved by the Melbourne Health Human Research Ethics Committee, and by the site institutional review boards (or exemptions were granted, according to local regulations). Written informed consent was obtained from enrolled patients, as required.

Patients and follow-up
Longitudinal clinical data from 96 MSBase centres in 30 countries and patients treated with alemtuzumab from six MS centres in Cambridge,[5] Cardiff, Bristol, Swansea,[6] Dublin and Dresden[13] were extracted between November 2015 and June 2016 and evaluated for inclusion criteria. These consisted of the following: definite relapsing-remitting MS,[14,15] exposure to one of the study therapies, no prior exposure to hematopoietic stem cell transplantation, no participation in randomised clinical trials, minimum required recorded follow-up (12 months prior to treatment start and two on-treatment disability scores ≥6 months apart) and minimum dataset (consisting of sex, age, time of first MS symptom, dates of clinical relapses, clinical MS course, disability score at treatment commencement (-6 months to +3 months), ≥6-month persistence on study therapy, ≥1 relapse experienced within the year before treatment, age ≤65

years, time from first MS symptom ≤10 years and Expanded Disability Status Scale (EDSS) score ≤6·5.

Treatment protocols, which involved alemtuzumab (12-24mg i.v. daily for five days (cycle 1) or three days (cycle 2)), interferon β-1a (44µg s.c. thrice weekly), fingolimod (0·5mg oral daily) and natalizumab (300µg i.v. every four weeks) were described elsewhere.[5,6,11] Baseline was defined as the first commencement of the study therapy and patients were censored at discontinuing therapy, commencing the first post-baseline disease modifying therapy or at the last recorded EDSS, whichever occurred first.

The analysed data were recorded as part of quality clinical practice, mostly at tertiary MS centres, with data entry at the time of clinical visits. The MSBase protocol stipulates minimum annual updates of the minimum dataset, but patients with less frequent visits were not excluded. Data entry portals included iMed, MSBase online data entry system, PatientCare, MSDS or local data entry systems. Rigorous quality assurance procedure was applied (Table S2).[16]

Study endpoints

The primary endpoint was the on-treatment annualised relapse rate. Secondary endpoints consisted of the cumulative hazard of relapses, disability accumulation events and disability improvement events.

A relapse was defined as occurrence of new symptoms or exacerbation of existing symptoms persisting for ≥24 hours, in the absence of concurrent illness/fever, and occurring ≥30 days after a previous relapse. Confirmation of relapses by EDSS was not required. Individual annualised relapse rate between baseline and censoring was calculated.

Disability was scored by accredited EDSS scorers (Neurostatus certification was required at the participating centres), excluding any score recorded within 30 days of a previous relapse. The definitions of disability accumulation and improvement required confirmation over ≥6 months, as described elsewhere.[17]

Matching and statistical analysis

Matching and statistical analysis were conducted using R (version 3·0·3)[18], in three separate paired matched analyses of alemtuzumab vs. interferon β, fingolimod or natalizumab. Individual patients were matched on their propensity of receiving either of the compared therapies.[12,19] Individual propensity scores were calculated using a multivariable logistic improvement model of treatment allocation that utilised demographic and clinical variables available at the time of treatment assignation as independent variables: sex, age, time from first MS symptom, EDSS, number of relapses in the prior 12 months, number of prior MS therapies, and the perceived most effective prior MS therapy.

Patients were matched in a variable 2:1 ratio using nearest neighbour matching within a narrow caliper (0·1 standard deviations of the propensity score), without replacement. All subsequent analyses were designed as paired models with weighting to adjust for the variable matching ratio. A maximum cumulative weight for each matched patient was 1. The common on-treatment follow-up was determined in each matched pair as the shorter of the two patient follow-up periods (pairwise censoring), in order to control attrition bias.[10]

Tests of statistical inference were carried out at α=0·05 with familywise Benjamini-Hochberg correction for false discovery rate. After assessing normality of data distribution, annualised relapse rates were compared with a weighted negative binomial model with cluster effect for matched patient pairs and adjusted for visit

frequency. Relapse rates at years 1-5 were compared with weighted paired t-tests. Cumulative hazards of relapses, EDSS accumulation and improvement events were analysed with weighted conditional proportional hazards models with robust estimation of variance (Andersen-Gill) adjusted for visit frequency. The proportions of patients free from relapse, EDSS accumulation and with EDSS improvement were evaluated with weighted conditional proportional hazards models (Cox) adjusted for visit frequency. Where the proportionality of hazards assumption was violated (assessed with Schoenfeld's global test), interaction term for treatment and time was included in the multivariable models.

Robustness of the statistically significant differences to unidentified confounders was quantified with Hodges-Lehmann Γ.[20] Where no statistically significant differences were observed, analytical power was quantified as the minimum effect magnitude detectable within the available cohort at $1-\beta=0.8$ using simulations (n=200).

Secondary and sensitivity analyses

Two secondary analyses and four sensitivity analyses were completed. The secondary analyses compared the therapies (i) among patients with high pre-baseline relapse activity (defined as ≥2 relapses within 12 months or ≥3 relapses within 24 months pre-baseline, irrespective of treatment status) and (ii) any prior on-treatment break-through relapses. The former used a 10:1 variable matching ratio in order to maximise analytical power. The sensitivity analyses evaluated the robustness of the results to potential confounders, including matching (using 10:1 variable matching within a caliper of 0·4), pre-baseline follow-up (matching on the number of relapses in the prior 24 months), MS phenotype (allowing inclusion of patients with secondary progressive MS), follow-up duration (including patients with ≥2-year on-treatment follow-up) and confirmation of EDSS accumulation/improvement events over ≥12 months.

Role of the funding source

The study (including study design, the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data, writing of the report, and in the decision to submit the paper for publication) was conducted separately and apart from the guidance of the sponsors.

RESULTS

A total of 189, 2155, 828 and 1160 patients fulfilling the inclusion criteria and treated with alemtuzumab (from 1999), interferon β (from 1994), fingolimod (from 2010) and natalizumab (from 2006) were identified, respectively (Figure 1, Table S3). One hundred and five (55%) patients treated with alemtuzumab received two treatment cycles and 84 patients (45%) required additional treatment cycles. As expected, the four unmatched groups differed in their baseline characteristics (Table S4). As shown by the logistic regression models used to calculate propensity scores, patients commenced alemtuzumab earlier after their first MS presentation, at a younger age, and tended to have higher EDSS scores and pre-baseline relapse activity compared to the three other therapies (Table S5).

The numbers of patients retained in the matched cohorts for all three pairwise primary analyses are shown in Table 1. The matching procedure significantly decreased the between-group differences in propensity scores from 0·24-0·44 to 0·0001-0·0026, corresponding to a >99·4% improvement in the balance between the compared groups. This is reflected by their close match on individual characteristics with standardised differences of ≤15% (Table 1). The median differences between baseline date and the date of the baseline EDSS were comparable between the matched

cohorts (-14-0 days [quartiles -71 to +12], standardised difference 0.02-0.19). As a result of pairwise censoring, on-treatment follow-up was identical in the matched groups. The groups were not matched on the follow-up visit density, therefore all subsequent analyses were adjusted for visit frequency.

Patients treated with alemtuzumab experienced a lower annualised relapse rate compared with interferon β (mean [95% confidence intervals] 0·19 [0·14-0·23] vs. 0·53 [0·46-0·61], respectively, P<0·001; Figure 2). While a consistent decline in the relapse rate was observed in the interferon β group over the five years on treatment (representing time-dependent decline in relapse activity[21]), the difference between the groups remained significant throughout the follow-up. Cumulative hazard of relapse events was lower in the alemtuzumab group (hazard ratio 0·60, P=0·005). The primary analysis did not show any differences in the cumulative hazards of disability accumulation or improvement (P≥0·66). However, the secondary analyses (in addition to confirming the differences in relapse outcomes) showed that alemtuzumab was associated with a lower hazard of disability accumulation than interferon β in patients with high pre-baseline relapse activity and higher probability of disability improvement in patients with previous on-treatment break-through relapses (Table S6).

Similarly, patients treated with alemtuzumab showed lower annualised relapse rate compared with fingolimod (mean [95% confidence intervals] 0·15 [0·10-0·20] vs. 0·34 [0·26-0·41], P<0·001; Figure 3). This observation was consistent during years 1-3, for which sufficient cohorts were available. The difference in cumulative hazard of relapses failed to reach the level of statistical significance (P=0·18). No between-group differences in the cumulative hazards of disability accumulation or improvement were observed.

The comparison between alemtuzumab and natalizumab showed similar on-treatment annualised relapse rates over four years (mean [95% confidence intervals] 0·20 [0·14-0·26] vs. 0·19 [0·15-0·23], P=0·78; Figure 4), confirmed by equivalence in the cumulative hazard of relapses (P=0·83) and probability of remaining relapse free (P=0·65). Cumulative hazard of disability accumulation events was also similar (P=0·60). However, alemtuzumab was associated with lower cumulative probability of disability improvement than natalizumab (hazard ratio 0·35, P<0·001). This difference in disability outcomes was also confirmed among patients with high pre-baseline relapse activity.

Sensitivity analyses have confirmed the outcomes of the primary and secondary analyses (with the exception of disability outcomes in the comparison of alemtuzumab vs. interferon β). The comparisons of the rates of disability accumulation and improvement events confirmed over 6-months were also largely replicated in the sensitivity analysis requiring a 12-month confirmation interval. Modifying the matching ratio and caliper, pre-baseline observational period, inclusion of secondary progressive MS and minimum on-treatment follow-up did not significantly change the overall relapse and disability outcomes (see Table S6).

Where the primary analysis did not show any significant differences between the compared groups, analysis of the minimum detectable effect size was carried out (Table S7). The analyses were sufficiently powered to detect minimum differences of 0·13 relapse per year, 51-53% cumulative hazard of relapses, 35-66% cumulative hazard of disability accumulation and 39-42% cumulative probability of disability improvement. The differences in annualised relapse rates observed for alemtuzumab vs. interferon β and fingolimod were resistant to unknown confounders with relative magnitudes of >100% and 60% of the reported effect of treatment (Hodges-Lehmann Γ), respectively.

DISCUSSION

In this large combined observational propensity score-matched study of patients with relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis, alemtuzumab and natalizumab were equally effective in reducing relapse frequency and preventing confirmed disability accumulation over four years. However, natalizumab was more likely to lead to disability improvement, particularly during the first year after commencing therapy. Compared to fingolimod, alemtuzumab was superior in reducing relapse activity. No differences were found between alemtuzumab and fingolimod in their ability to modulate the risk of disability accumulation or improvement events over three years.

In order to enable interpretation of these results in the context of the original pivotal clinical trials, we have first conducted a comparison of alemtuzumab vs. high-dose interferon β-1a. This study has partially replicated the results of these pivotal trials: alemtuzumab is superior to interferon β in suppressing relapse activity and reducing disability accrual in patients with previously highly active MS. The observed on-treatment annualised relapse rates (0·19 vs. 0·53, alemtuzumab vs. interferon β, respectively) are comparable to the relapse rates reported by the CAMMS223 (0·16 vs. 0·54), CARE-MS1 (0·18 vs. 0·39) and CARE-MS2 (0·26 vs. 0·52) trials. The proportion of patients who experienced 6-month confirmed accumulation of disability at two years was similar between the present study (7% vs. 12%, alemtuzumab vs. interferon β, respectively) and the CARE-MS1 trial (8% vs. 11%), with neither being significantly different. However there was a treatment effect on disability accumulation events in the CAMMS223 (6% vs. 16%) and CARE-MS2 (13% vs. 20%) trials at two years. It should be noted that the cohorts are not directly comparable; the alemtuzumab trials recruited patients with ≥2 relapses during the preceding two years, while inclusion into our primary analysis was based on ≥1 relapse during the preceding one year. Our secondary analyses, which only included patients with high pre-baseline activity (≥2 relapses during the one year or ≥3 relapses during the two years pre-baseline) and previous break-through on-treatment relapses showed improved disability outcomes in alemtuzumab compared with interferon β (decreased cumulative hazard of disability accumulation and increased probability of disability improvement, respectively). Thus, our results from patients with highly active MS are concordant with those produced in the relevant comparative alemtuzumab versus interferon β trials.

The on-treatment annualised relapse rates observed in the natalizumab and fingolimod groups (0·19 and 0·34, respectively) are in keeping with the previously reported on-treatment MS activity form MSBase[11,12] and the pivotal trials for natalizumab (0·20-0·24)[22] and are higher than the annualised relapse rates reported in the pivotal trials for fingolimod (0·16-0·20)[23,24]. In keeping with our previous observation of superior control of disease activity after escalating therapy to natalizumab compared with fingolimod, alemtuzumab was comparable to natalizumab but superior to fingolimod in preventing MS relapses. Both effects were sustained over at least 3-4 years following the commencement of therapy. While the hazard of disability accumulation was similar for alemtuzumab and both natalizumab and fingolimod, treatment with natalizumab increased the probability of confirmed disability improvement more than alemtuzumab. This extends prior observations that natalizumab, unlike fingolimod, is likely to increase the probability of partial recovery from the previously accumulated neurological disability, in particular during the initial years after first MS presentation.[12,25]

In the present study, we maximised analytical power by combining several high-quality longitudinal observational MS cohorts.[5,6] Cumulative follow-up and generalisability were maximised by inclusion of a broad spectrum of patients with the minimum follow-

up requirements necessary to evaluate confirmed disability outcomes. Both, treatment-naïve patients and patients previously exposed to immunotherapies were included.

Because the assembled study cohort is, by definition, multicentric, we have undertaken multiple steps to mitigate the potential biases, including matching, pairwise censoring and adjusting the statistical models,[10] an approach whose efficacy was demonstrated in our previous studies.[11,12] The alemtuzumab cohorts were enriched for patients with early, highly active disease. Given the large number of patients treated with natalizumab, fingolimod or interferon β available from the MSBase cohort, we were able to achieve close match on their demographic and clinical characteristics. Because the probability of capturing treatment discontinuation was relatively lower in the alemtuzumab cohort, we have mitigated the risk of differential follow-up duration by pairwise censoring. It is arguable that our approach was underpowered to detect some clinically significant treatment effects.

The main limitation, in comparison to controlled studies, is the lack of systematic and comparable acquisition of safety data and of radiological outcomes. Magnetic resonance imaging is an important indicator of subclinical disease activity, with potential impact on disease management. If unreported and systematically different between the compared cohorts, it could represent an unidentified confounder. Another potential confounder is the effect of treating centre. Due to the limited overlap between the centres reporting patients treated with alemtuzumab and the three comparator therapies, we were not able to match on or adjust for centre, but we have mitigated the effect by adjusting the analyses for visit frequency, which served as an indicator of follow-up density. Importantly, we have shown that our results were robust to hypothetical unidentified confounders of the magnitude >60% of the difference in treatment effects. The definition of MS relapses used in our study did not require confirmation by change in EDSS, which reflects usual clinical practice; this was different from several clinical trials which required EDSS confirmation. This study compared treatment outcomes in observational data over 3-5 years. It is worth noting that disability accumulation events confirmed over 6-12 months are highly indicative of long-term disability outcomes.[17] Comparative evaluation of the long-term safety of alemtuzumab and natalizumab is warranted, as treatment safety represents an important component of disease management strategy.

In conclusion, we show that - over three to five years - alemtuzumab is a highly effective disease modifying therapy in relapsing-remitting MS, with a treatment effect largely comparable to natalizumab, and with greater effect on relapse rate than fingolimod or interferon β-1a.

Marc Girard received consulting fees from Teva Canada Innovation, Biogen, Novartis and Genzyme Sanofi; lecture payments from Teva Canada Innovation, Novartis and EMD Serono. He has also received a research grant from Canadian Institutes of Health Research.

Pierre Duquette served on editorial boards and has been supported to attend meetings by EMDSerono, Biogen, Novartis, Genzyme, and TEVA Neuroscience. He holds grants from the CIHR and the MS Society of Canada and has received funding for investigator-initiated trials from Biogen, Novartis, and Genzyme.

Pierre Grammond is a Novartis, Teva-neuroscience, Biogen and Genzyme advisory board member, consultant for Merck Serono, received payments for lectures by Merck Serono, Teva-Neuroscience and Canadian Multiple sclerosis society, and received grants for travel from Teva-Neuroscience and Novartis.

Raed Alroughani received hononoria from Biologix, Biogen, Bayer, Genpharm, Genzyme, Merck-Serono, GSK and Novartis, and served on advisory board for Biologix, Biogen, Bayer, Genpharm, Genzyme, Novartis, Genzyme, Merck-Serono and Novartis.

Eugenio Pucci served on scientific advisory boards for Merck Serono, Genzyme and Biogen; he has received honoraria and travel grants from Sanofi Aventis, UCB, Lundbeck, Novartis, Bayer Schering, Biogen, Merck Serono, Genzyme and Teva; he has received travel grants and equipment from "Associazione Marchigiana Sclerosi Multipla e altre malattie neurologiche".

Patrizia Sola served on scientific advisory boards for Biogen Idec and TEVA, she has received funding for travel and speaker honoraria from Biogen Idec, Merck Serono, Teva, Sanofi Genzyme, Novartis and Bayer and research grants for her Institution from Bayer, Biogen, Merck Serono, Novartis, Sanofi, Teva.

Raymond Hupperts received honoraria as consultant on scientific advisory boards from Merck-Serono, Biogen, Genzyme-Sanofi and Teva, research funding from Merck-Serono and Biogen, and speaker honoraria from Sanofi-Genzyme and Novartis.

Jeannette Lechner-Scott accepted travel compensation from Novartis, Biogen and Merck. Her institution receives the honoraria for talks and advisory board commitment from Bayer Health Care, Biogen, Genzyme Sanofi, Merck, Novartis and Teva, has been involved in clinical trials with Biogen, Novartis and Teva.

Murat Terzi received travel grants from Merck Serono, Novartis, Bayer-Schering, Merck-Serono and Teva; has participated in clinical trials by Sanofi Aventis, Roche and Novartis.

Vincent Van Pesch received travel grants from Biogen, Bayer Schering, Genzyme, Merck, Teva and Novartis Pharma. His institution receives honoraria for consultancy and lectures from Biogen, Bayer Schering, Genzyme, Merck, Roche, Teva and Novartis Pharma as well as research grants from Novartis Pharma and Bayer Schering.

Csilla Rozsa received speaker honoraria from Bayer Schering, Novartis and Biogen, congress and travel expense compensations from Biogen, Teva, Merck Serono and Bayer Schering.

Francois Grand'Maison received honoraria or research funding from Biogen, Genzyme, Novartis, Teva Neurosciences, Mitsubishi and ONO Pharmaceuticals.

Cavit Boz received conference travel support from Biogen, Novartis, Bayer-Schering, Merck-Serono and Teva; has participated in clinical trials by Sanofi Aventis, Roche and Novartis.

Franco Granella served on scientific advisory boards for Biogen Idec, Novartis and Sanofi Aventis and received funding for travel and speaker honoraria from Biogen Idec, Merck Serono, and Almirall.

Mark Slee has participated in, but not received honoraria for, advisory board activity for Biogen, Merck Serono, Bayer Schering, Sanofi Aventis and Novartis.

Daniele Spitaleri received honoraria as a consultant on scientific advisory boards by Bayer-Schering, Novartis and Sanofi-Aventis and compensation for travel from Novartis, Biogen, Sanofi Aventis, Teva and Merck-Serono.

Javier Olascoaga serves on scientific advisory boards for Biogen, Genzyme and Novartis; has received speaker honoraria from Biogen, Bayer-Schering, Genzyme, Merck-Serono, Novartis and Teva and research grants from Biogen, Merck Serono, Novartis and Teva.

Roberto Bergamaschi received speaker honoraria from Bayer Schering, Biogen, Genzyme, Merck Serono, Novartis, Sanofi-Aventis, Teva; research grants from Bayer Schering, Biogen, Merck Serono, Novartis, Sanofi-Aventis, Teva; congress and travel/accommodation expense compensations by Almirall, Bayer Schering, Biogen, Genzyme, Merck Serono, Novartis, Sanofi-Aventis, Teva.

Freek Verheul is an advisory board member for Teva Biogen Merck Serono and Novartis.

Steve Vucic did not declare any competing interests.

Pamela McCombe did not declare any competing interests.

Suzanne Hodgkinson received honoraria and consulting fees from Novartis, Bayer Schering and Sanofi, and travel grants from Novartis, Biogen Idec and Bayer Schering.

REFERENCES

1.   Coles AJ, Compston DA, Selmaj KW, et al. Alemtuzumab vs. interferon beta-1a in early multiple sclerosis. *N Engl J Med* 2008; **359**(17): 1786-801.

2.   Coles AJ, Twyman CL, Arnold DL, et al. Alemtuzumab for patients with relapsing multiple sclerosis after disease-modifying therapy: a randomised controlled phase 3 trial. *Lancet* 2012; **380**(9856): 1829-39.

3.   Cohen JA, Coles AJ, Arnold DL, et al. Alemtuzumab versus interferon beta 1a as first-line treatment for patients with relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis: a randomised controlled phase 3 trial. *Lancet* 2012; **380**(9856): 1819-28.

4.   Hill-Cawthorne GA, Button T, Tuohy O, et al. Long term lymphocyte reconstitution after alemtuzumab treatment of multiple sclerosis. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2012; **83**(3): 298-304.

5.   Tuohy O, Costelloe L, Hill-Cawthorne G, et al. Alemtuzumab treatment of multiple sclerosis: long-term safety and efficacy. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2015; **86**(2): 208-15.

6.   Willis MD, Harding KE, Pickersgill TP, et al. Alemtuzumab for multiple sclerosis: Long term follow-up in a multi-centre cohort. *Mult Scler* 2015.

7.   Wingerchuk DM, Carter JL. Multiple sclerosis: current and emerging disease-modifying therapies and treatment strategies. *Mayo Clin Proc* 2014; **89**(2): 225-40.

8.   Alping P, Frisell T, Novakova L, et al. Rituximab versus fingolimod after natalizumab in multiple sclerosis patients. *Ann Neurol* 2016.

9.   Jokubaitis VG, Li V, Kalincik T, et al. Fingolimod after natalizumab and the risk of short-term relapse. *Neurology* 2014; **82**(14): 1204-11.

10.   Kalincik T, Butzkueven H. Observational data: Understanding the real MS world. *Mult Scler* 2016.

11.   He A, Spelman T, Jokubaitis V, et al. Comparison of switch to fingolimod or interferon beta/glatiramer acetate in active multiple sclerosis. *JAMA Neurol* 2015; **72**(4): 405-13.

12.   Kalincik T, Horakova D, Spelman T, et al. Switch to natalizumab vs fingolimod in active relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis. *Ann Neurol* 2015; **77**: 425-35.

13.   Ziemssen T, Engelmann U, Jahn S, et al. Rationale, design, and methods of a non-interventional study to establish safety, effectiveness, quality of life, cognition, health-related and work capacity data on Alemtuzumab in multiple sclerosis patients in Germany (TREAT-MS). *BMC Neurol* 2016; **16**: 109.

14.   Polman CH, Reingold SC, Edan G, et al. Diagnostic criteria for multiple sclerosis: 2005 revisions to the "McDonald Criteria". *Ann Neurol* 2005; **58**(6): 840-6.

15.   Polman CH, Reingold SC, Banwell B, et al. Diagnostic criteria for multiple sclerosis: 2010 revisions to the McDonald criteria. *Ann Neurol* 2011; **69**(2): 292-302.

16.   Kalincik T, Kuhle J, Pucci E, et al. Data quality evaluation for observational multiple sclerosis registries. *Mult Scler* in press.

17.   Kalincik T, Cutter G, Spelman T, et al. Defining reliable disability outcomes in multiple sclerosis. *Brain* 2015; **138**(Pt 11): 3287-98.

18.   Team RDC. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2011.

19.   Rosenbaum PR, Rubin DB. Reducing bias in observational studies using subclassification on the propensity score. *Journal of American Statistical Association* 1984; **79**(387): 516-24.

20.   Rosenbaum PR. Observational studies. 2nd ed. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag; 2002.

21.   Kalincik T, Vivek V, Jokubaitis V, et al. Sex as a determinant of relapse incidence and progressive course of multiple sclerosis. *Brain* 2013; **136**(Pt 12): 3609-17.

22.   Polman CH, O'Connor PW, Havrdova E, et al. A randomized, placebo-controlled trial of natalizumab for relapsing multiple sclerosis. *N Engl J Med* 2006; **354**(9): 899-910.

23.   Kappos L, Radue E-W, O'Connor P, et al. A Placebo-Controlled Trial of Oral Fingolimod in Relapsing Multiple Sclerosis. *N Engl J Med* 2010; **362**(5): 387-401.

24.   Cohen JA, Barkhof F, Comi G, et al. Oral fingolimod or intramuscular interferon for relapsing multiple sclerosis. *N Engl J Med* 2010; **362**(5): 402-15.

25.   Phillips JT, Giovannoni G, Lublin FD, et al. Sustained improvement in Expanded Disability Status Scale as a new efficacy measure of neurological change in multiple sclerosis: treatment effects with natalizumab in patients with relapsing multiple sclerosis. *Mult Scler* 2011; **17**(8): 970-9.

RESEARCH IN CONTEXT
Evidence before this study
Alemtuzumab, is a highly effective therapy for multiple sclerosis. Similar to natalizumab, another highly effective multiple sclerosis therapy, it has shown an effective control of multiple sclerosis activity and reduction in disability accrual. In a number of scenarios, clinicians and their patients are faced with the decision between alemtuzumab or natalizumab (such as early active treatment in aggressive multiple sclerosis, escalation of therapy following failure of other therapies or switch from natalizumab to alemtuzumab due to a high risk of natalizumab-associated serious adverse events). No evidence comparing the efficacy of alemtuzumab and natalizumab is available to guide these clinical decisions.

Added value of this study
This study provides a conclusive evidence comparing effectiveness of alemtuzumab vs. natalizumab and fingolimod (another novel immunotherapy) for multiple sclerosis. Alemtuzumab and natalizumab show similar effects on relapse activity and disability accumulation but natalizumab is associated with a greater chance of early disability reduction. Alemtuzumab is superior to fingolimod in mitigating relapse activity.

Implications of all the available evidence
While alemtuzumab is superior in controlling multiple sclerosis activity relative to fingolimod, its efficacy is largely comparable to that of natalizumab. Therefore, treatment decisions between alemtuzumab and natalizumab should be primarily governed by the therapies' safety profiles.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1
CONSORT diagram of patient disposition

EDSS, Expanded Disability Status Scale; MS, multiple sclerosis

Figure 2
Comparison of the treatment outcomes for alemtuzumab vs. interferon β

Figure 3
Comparison of the treatment outcomes for alemtuzumab vs. fingolimod

Figure 4
Comparison of the treatment outcomes for alemtuzumab vs. natalizumab

Table 1
Characteristics of the matched patient groups at baseline

	alemtuzumab	interferon β	d	alemtuzumab	fingolimod	d	alemtuzumab	natalizumab	d
patients, nr (% female)	124 (73%)	218 (74%)		114 (72%)	195 (73%)		138 (70%)	223 (66%)	
age, yr, mean ± SD	33 ± 8	33 ± 9	0·01	33 ± 8	34 ± 10	0·09	33 ± 9	33 ± 10	0·02
disease duration, yr, median (quartiles)	3·2 (2-6·2)	2·6 (1·2-6·4)	0·01	3·9 (2·4-6·6)	4·2 (1·6-8·1)	0·13	3·3 (2·1-6·3)	2·7 (1-7·6)	0·13
relapses 12 months pre-baseline, mean ± SD	2 ± 1·2	1·9 ± 0·9	0·06	1·8 ± 1·1	1·7 ± 0·8	0·03	2 ± 1·3	2 ± 1	0·03
disability, EDSS step, median (quartiles)	3 (2-4)	3 (2-4)	0·12	3 (1·6-4)	3 (1·5-4·5)	0·00	3 (2-4·5)	3 (2-4·5)	0·01
inter-visit interval, months, median (quartiles)	9 (7-13)	4 (2-7)	0·72	9 (6-12)	3 (2-5)	1·17	9 (6-12)	3 (1-5)	1·12
previous therapies, nr, median (quartiles)	0 (0-1)	0 (0-1)	0·01	1 (0-1)	1 (0-2)	0·11	0 (0-1)	0 (0-1)	0·15

most active previous therapy, patients									
Interferon β/Glatiramer acetate	31 (25%)	62 (28%)		46 (40%)	85 (44%)		47 (34%)	97 (43%)	
Teriflunomide	0	0		0	0		0	0	
Dimethyl fumarate	0	0		0	0		0	0	
Fingolimod	0	0		0	0		2 (1%)	4 (2%)	
Natalizumab	3 (2%)	4 (2%)		14 (12%)	22 (11%)		0	0	
Mitoxantrone	3 (2%)	4 (2%)		2 (2%)	5 (3%)		0	0	
other	0	0		0	0		0	0	
none	87 (70%)	148 (68%)		52 (46%)	83 (43%)		89 (64%)	122 (55%)	
post-baseline pairwise-censored follow-up on study therapy, yr, median (quartiles)	2·1 (1·0-3·9)	2·1 (1·0-3·9)	0·00	1·7 (1·1-2·3)	1·7 (1·1-2·3)	0·00	2·1 (1·4-3·4)	2·1 (1·4-3·4)	0·00

d, standardised difference (Cohen's d); SD, standard deviation; EDSS, Expanded Disability Status Scale

Combined cohort:	MSBase cohort		
Cambridge Cardiff Bristol Swansea Dublin Dresden MSBase			
Definite MS, Commenced <u>alemtuzumab</u> n=209	**Definite MS, Commenced <u>interferon β</u>** n=8,348	**Definite MS, Commenced <u>fingolimod</u>** n=3,761	**Definite MS, Commenced <u>natalizumab</u>** n=3,465
↓	↓	↓	↓
No exposure to excluded therapies n=209	**No exposure to excluded therapies** n=8,355	**No exposure to excluded therapies** n=2,989	**No exposure to excluded therapies** n=3,259
↓	↓	↓	↓
Sufficient follow-up n=195	**Sufficient follow-up** n=3,287	**Sufficient follow-up** n=1,656	**Sufficient follow-up** n=1,612
↓	↓	↓	↓
Relapsing- remitting MS n=191	**Relapsing- remitting MS** n=2,879	**Relapsing- remitting MS** n=1,479	**Relapsing- remitting MS** n=1,436
↓	↓	↓	↓
EDSS 0-6.5, age 0-65 years, MS duration <10 years n=189	**EDSS 0-6.5, age 0-65 years, MS duration <10 years** n=2,155	**EDSS 0-6.5, age 0-65 years, MS duration <10 years** n=828	**EDSS 0-6.5, age 0-65 years, MS duration <10 years** n=1,160

A Overall Annualised Relapse Rate

P<0·001

B Annual Relapse Rate at Years 1-5

Alemtuzumab
Interferon ß

*P<0·05

C Cumulative Hazard of Relapses

Hazard ratio for relapses, 0·60 (95% CI 0·44-0·81),   P=0·005

Proportion of patients free from relapses at year 5:
Interferon β-1a   31%
Alemtuzumab   74%

Number at risk:
Alemtuzumab: 156   118   82   56   38   20
Interferon β: 282   220   152   104   70   37

D Cumulative Hazard of Disability Accumulation Events Confirmed at 6 Months

Hazard ratio for accumulation of disability,
        0·66 (95% CI 0·36-1·22),   P=0·37

Proportion of patients free from accumulation
of disability at year 5:
Interferon β-1a   77%
Alemtuzumab   78%

Number at risk:
Alemtuzumab: 156   132   111   94   70   52
Interferon β: 282   239   202   173   127   93

E Cumulative Probability of Disability Improvement Events Confirmed at 6 Months

Hazard ratio for improvement of disability,
        0·98 (95% CI 0·65-1.49),   P=0·93

Proportion of patients with improvement
of disability at year 5:
Interferon β-1a   19%
Alemtuzumab   15%

Patients with available EDSS:
Alemtuzumab:156   135   88   65   42   16
Interferon ß: 282   231   124   84   52   18

Alemtuzumab
Interferon ß

Number at risk:
Alemtuzumab: 156   132   111   94   70   52
Interferon β: 282   239   202   173   127   93

A Overall Annualised Relapse Rate

P<0·001

B Annual Relapse Rate at Years 1-3

■ Alemtuzumab
■ Fingolimod

*P<0·05

C Cumulative Hazard of Relapses

Hazard ratio for relapses, 0·62 (95% CI 0·37-1·04),   P=0·18

Proportion of patients free from relapses at year 3:
    Fingolimod   65%
    Alemtuzumab   81%

Number at risk:
Alemtuzumab: 114   90   46   16
Fingolimod: 195   153   76   25

D Cumulative Hazard of Disability Accumulation Events Confirmed at 6 Months

Hazard ratio for accumulation of disability,
        1·27 (95% CI 0·60-2·70),   P=0·67

Proportion of patients free from accumulation
of disability at year 3:
    Fingolimod   92%
    Alemtuzumab   81%

Patients with available EDSS:
Alemtuzumab: 114   97   59   29
Fingolimod: 195   159   78   34

Number at risk:
Alemtuzumab: 113   66   28   10
Fingolimod: 194   111   45   15

E Cumulative Probability of Disability Improvement Events Confirmed at 6 Months

Hazard ratio for improvement of disability,
        0·50 (95% CI 0·25-1·01),   P=0·18

Proportion of patients with improvement
of disability at year 3:
    Fingolimod   22%
    Alemtuzumab   23%

Alemtuzumab
Fingolimod

Number at risk:
Alemtuzumab: 113   66   28   10
Fingolimod: 194   111   45   15

A Overall Annualised Relapse Rate

P=0·78

B Annual Relapse Rate at Years 1-4

Alemtuzumab
Natalizumab

C Cumulative Hazard of Relapses

Hazard ratio for relapses, 0·96 (95% CI 0·78-1·38), P=0·83

Proportion of patients free from relapses at year 4:
Natalizumab 70%
Alemtuzumab 70%

Number at risk:
Alemtuzumab: 138   118   74   42   20
Natalizumab: 223   190   118   66   34

D Cumulative Hazard of Disability Accumulation Events Confirmed at 6 Months

Hazard ratio for accumulation of disability,
0·81 (95% CI 0·47-1·39), P=0·68

Proportion of patients free from accumulation
of disability at year 4:
Natalizumab 79%
Alemtuzumab 80%

Patients with available EDSS:
Alemtuzumab: 138   119   89   48   31
Natalizumab: 223   177   118   58   32

Number at risk:
Alemtuzumab: 137   100   72   43   23
Natalizumab: 222   160   113   68   37

E Cumulative Probability of Disability Improvement Events Confirmed at 6 Months

Hazard ratio for improvement of disability, 0·35 (95% CI 0·20-0·59), P<0·001

Proportion of patients with improvement
of disability at year 4:
Natalizumab 22%
Alemtuzumab 14%

Alemtuzumab
Natalizumab

Number at risk:
Alemtuzumab: 137   100   72   43   23
Natalizumab: 222   160   113   68   37

Supplementary Appendix

Table of contents

Table S1
List of contributors
The following contributors participated in data acquisition:
From Hospital Universitario Virgen de Valme, Spain, Dr Ricardo Fernandez Bolaños.
From Ospedali Riuniti di Salerno, Italy, Dr Gerardo Iuliano.
From Péterfy Sandor Hospital, Hungary, Dr Krisztina Kovacs.
From Veszprém Megyei Csolnoky Ferenc Kórház zrt., Hungary, Dr Imre Piroska.
From CIREN, Havana, Cuba, Dr Jose Antonio Cabrera-Gomez.
From MS Clinic, Hopital Tenon, Paris, France, Dr Etienne Roullet.
From University Hospital Nijmegen, Nijmegen, Netherlands, Dr Cees Zwanikken.
From Francicus Ziekenhuis, Roosendaal, Netherlands, Dr Leontien Den braber-Moerland.
From Hospital Fernandez, Capital Federal, Argentina, Dr Norma Deri.
From INEBA - Institute of Neuroscience Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires, Argentina, Dr Maria Laura Saladino.
From Instituto de Neurociencias Cordoba, Cordoba, Argentina, Dr Elizabeth Alejandra Bacile.
From Sanatorio Allende, Cordoba, Argentina, Dr Carlos Vrech.
From Geelong Hospital, Geelong, Australia, Dr Cameron Shaw.
From St Vincents Hospital, Fitzroy, Melbourne, Australia, Dr Neil Shuey.
From Monash Medical Centre, Melbourne, Australia, Dr Ernest Butler.
From The Alfred, Melbourne, Australia, Dr Olga Skibina.
From Austin Health, Melbourne, Australia, Dr Richard Macdonell.
From Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital, Brisbane, Australia, Dr Pamela McCombe.
From CSSS Saint-Jérôme, Saint-Jerome, Canada, Dr Julie Prevost.
From Jewish General Hospital, Montreal, Canada, Dr Fraser Moore.
From Hospital Clinico San Carlos, Madrid, Spain, Dr Celia Oreja-Guevara.
From Craigavon Area Hospital, Craigavon, United Kingdom, Dr Stella Hughes.
From Royal Victoria Hospital, Belfast, United Kingdom, Dr Gavin McDonnell.
From South East Trust, Belfast, United Kingdom, Dr Orla Gray.
From Josa András Hospital, Nyiregyhaza, Hungary, Dr Tunde Erdelyi.
From Petz A. County Hospital, Gyor, Hungary, Dr Gabor Rum.
From BAZ County Hospital, Miskolc, Hungary, Dr Attila Sas.
From Szent Imre Hospital, Budapest, Hungary, Dr Eniko Dobos.
From Assaf Harofeh Medical Center, Beer-Yaakov, Israel, Dr Shlomo Flechter.
From Bombay Hospital Institute of Medical Sciences, Mumbai, India, Dr Bhim Singhal.
From Isfahan University of Medical Sciences, Isfahan, Iran, Dr Vahid Shaygannejad.
From University of Florence, Florence, Italy, Dr Maria Pia Amato.
From Clinic of Neurology Clinical Center, Skopje, Macedonia, Dr Tatjana Petkovska-Boskova.
From Jeroen Bosch Ziekenhuis, Den Bosch, Netherlands, Dr Erik van Munster.
From Hospital São João, Porto, Portugal, Dr Maria Edite Rio.
From Central Military Emergency University Hospital, Bucharest, Romania, Dr Carmen Sirbu.
From New York University Langone Medical Center, New York, United States, Dr Ilya Kister.
From G. d'Annunzio University, Chieti, Italy, Dr Giovanna De Luca, Dr Valeria Di Tommaso, Dr Daniela Travaglini, Dr Erika Pietrolongo, Dr Maria di Ioia, Dr Deborah Farina, Dr Luca Mancinelli.
From Box Hill Hospital, Melbourne, Australia, Ms Jodi Haartsen.
From Azienda Sanitaria Unica Regionale Marche - AV3, Macerata, Italy, Dr Matteo Diamanti, Dr Elisabetta Cartechini.
From Nuovo Ospedale Civile Sant'Agostino/Estense, Modena, Italy, Dr Diana Ferraro, Dr Francesca Vitetta, Dr Anna Maria Simone.
From Jahn Ferenc Teaching Hospital, Budapest, Hungary, Dr Krisztian Kasa.
From Hospital Italiano, Buenos Aires, Argentina, Dr Juan Ingacio Rojas.

Administrative and technical support was provided by:
From the MSBase Administrations Dr Jill Byron, Ms Lisa Morgan and Ms Eloise Hinson.
From Rodanotech, Geneva, Switzerland; Mr Samir Mechati, Mr Matthieu Corageoud, Mr Alexandre Bulla.

Table S2
Data quality procedure

- Duplicate patient records were removed.
- Centres with <10 patient records were excluded.
- Patients with missing date of birth were excluded.
- MS onset dates after the MSBase data extract date were removed.
- Patients with missing date of the first clinical presentation of MS were excluded.
- The dates of MS onset and the first recorded MS course were aligned.
- Patients with the age at onset outside the 0-100 range were excluded.
- A logical sequence of the MS courses (e.g. clinically isolated syndrome, relapsing-remitting MS, secondary progressive MS) was assured.
- Records of the initiation of the progressive MS prior to its clinical onset were excluded.
- Visits with missing visit date or the recorded date before the clinical MS onset or after the date of MSBase data extract were removed.
- EDSS scores outside the range of possible EDSS values were removed.
- Duplicate visits were merged.
- MS relapses with missing visit date or the recorded date after the date of MSBase data extract were removed.
- Duplicate MS relapses were merged.
- Relapses occurring within 30 days of each other were merged.
- Visits preceded by relapses were identified and time from the last relapse was fcalculated for each visit.
- Therapies were labelled as discontinued or continuing.
- Therapies with erroneous date entries were removed (e.g. commencement date > termination date, commencement after the MSBase data extract date, commencement of disease modifying therapy before the year 1980).
- MS disease modifying therapies were identified and labelled.
- Duplicate treatment entries were removed.
- Where multiple disease modifying therapies were recorded simultaneously, treatment end date of the previous therapy was imputed as the commencement date of the following therapy.
- Consecutive entries for certain disease modifying therapies were merged into a continuous treatment entry, given that the gap between the entries did not exceed 190 days for mitoxantrone, 365 days for cladribine, 90 days for other disease modifying therapies.
- The default duration of treatment effect was recorded as 190 days (mitoxantrone), 5 years (alemtuzumab) or 365 days (cladribine) from treatment commencement.

Table S3
Patient disposition per centre

Centre	Patients
Hospital Fernandez, Capital Federal, Argentina	3
INEBA - Institute of Neuroscience Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires, Argentina	5
Instituto de Neurociencias Cordoba, Cordoba, Argentina	1
Hospital Italiano, Buenos Aires, Argentina	14
Sanatorio Allende, Cordoba, Argentina	3
Brain and Mind Centre, Sydney, Australia	10
University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia	117
University Newcastle, Newcastle, Australia	74
Geelong Hospital, Geelong, Australia	8
St Vincents Hospital, Fitzroy, Melbourne, Australia	3
Monash Medical Centre, Melbourne, Australia	1
Liverpool Hospital, Sydney, Australia	18
Box Hill Hospital, Melbourne, Australia	100
Westmead Hospital, Sydney, Australia	23
Flinders University, Adelaide, Australia	47
Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital, Brisbane, Australia	22
The Alfred, Melbourne, Australia	5
Austin Health, Melbourne, Australia	5
Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital, Brisbane, Australia	2
Cliniques Universitaires Saint-Luc, Brussels, Belgium	60
CSSS Saint-Jérôme, Saint-Jerome, Canada	7
Jewish General Hospital, Montreal, Canada	5
Hopital Notre Dame, Montreal, Canada	166
CISSS Chaudière-Appalache, Levis, Canada	147
Neuro Rive-Sud, Quebec, Canada	53
General University Hospital and Charles University in Prague, Prague, Czech Republic	721
Nemocnice Jihlava, Jihlava, Czech Republic	16
Kommunehospitalet, Arhus C, Denmark	38
Hospital Universitario Virgen de Valme, Seville, Spain	64
Hospital Universitario Donostia, San Sebastián, Spain	34
Hospital Clinico San Carlos, Madrid, Spain	29
Hospital Universitario Virgen Macarena, Sevilla, Spain	300
Hospital de Galdakao-Usansolo, Galdakao, Spain	17
Hospital Germans Trias i Pujol, Badalona, Spain	15
MS Clinic, Hopital Tenon , Paris, France	2
Craigavon Area Hospital, Craigavon, United Kingdom	5
Royal Victoria Hospital, Belfast, United Kingdom	5
South East Trust, Belfast, United Kingdom	3
University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom	84
University Hospital of Wales, Cardiff; Southmead Hospital, Bristol; Abertawe Bro Morgannwg University Local Health Board, Swansea, United Kingdom	82
University Hospital Carl Gustav Carus, Dresden, Germany	9
Veszprém Megyei Csolnoky Ferenc Kórház zrt., Veszprem, Hungary	14
Jahn Ferenc Teaching Hospital, Budapest, Hungary	59
Semmelweis University Budapest, Budapest, Hungary	16
University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary	16
Péterfy Sandor Hospital, Budapest, Hungary	18
Josa András Hospital, Nyiregyhaza, Hungary	7
Petz A. County Hospital , Gyor, Hungary	6
BAZ County Hospital, Miskolc, Hungary	8
Szent Imre Hospital, Budapest, Hungary	9
Assaf Harofeh Medical Center, Beer-Yaakov, Israel	14
Bombay Hospital Institute of Medical Sciences, Mumbai, India	3
St Vincent's University Hospital, Dublin, Ireland	8
Isfahan University of Medical Sciences, Isfahan, Iran	4
Ospedale Clinicizzato, Chieti, Italy	173
Azienda Sanitaria Unica Regionale Marche - AV3, Macerata, Italy	83

University of Bari, Bari, Italy	560
University of Florence, Florence, Italy	14
C. Mondino National Neurological Institute, Pavia, Italy	32
Ospedali Riuniti di Salerno, Salerno, Italy	29
University of Parma, Parma, Italy	49
Azienda Ospedaliera di Rilievo Nazionale San Giuseppe Moscati Avellino, Avellino, Italy	47
Nuovo Ospedale Civile Sant'Agostino/Estense, Modena, Italy	79
Amiri Hospital, Kuwait City, Kuwait	94
Clinic of Neurology Clinical Center, Skopje, Macedonia	4
University Hospital Nijmegen, Nijmegen, Netherlands	29
Francicus Ziekenhuis, Roosendaal, Netherlands	4
Zuyderland Ziekenhuis, Sittard, Netherlands	79
Jeroen Bosch Ziekenhuis, Den Bosch, Netherlands	1
Groene Hart Ziekenhuis, Gouda, Netherlands	25
Hospital São João, Porto, Portugal	11
Central Military Emergency University Hospital, Bucharest, Romania	1
KTU Medical Faculty Farabi Hospital, Trabzon, Turkey	50
19 Mayis University, Samsun, Turkey	64
New York University Langone Medical Center, New York, United States	3

Table S4
Characteristics of the included unmatched patients at baseline

	alemtuzumab	interferon β	fingolimod	natalizumab
patients, nr (% female)	189 (69%)	2155 (72%)	828 (73%)	1160 (71%)
age, yr, mean ± SD	33 ± 8	34 ± 9	38 ± 10	36 ± 9
disease duration, yr, median (quartiles)	3.2 (1.8-5.9)	3.6 (1.3-7.9)	7.8 (3.8-14.1)	7.4 (3.3-12.4)
relapses 12 months pre-baseline, mean ± SD	2.3 ± 1.4	1.5 ± 0.7	1.4 ± 0.7	1.7 ± 0.9
disability, EDSS step, median (quartiles)	3.5 (2-5.5)	2 (1.5-3)	2.5 (1.5-4)	3 (2-4)
visit interval, months, median (quartiles)	9 (6-12)	3 (1-5)	4 (3-5)	3 (1-5)
treatment cycles, patients				
1	12 (6%)	-	-	-
2	93 (49%)	-	-	-
3	60 (31%)	-	-	-
4	15 (8%)	-	-	-
5	9 (5%)	-	-	-
previous therapies, nr, median (quartiles)	0 (0-1)	0 (0-1)	1 (1-2)	1 (1-2)
most active previous therapy, patients				
Interferon β / Glatiramer Acetate	49 (26%)	523 (24%)	566 (68%)	956 (82%)
Teriflunomide	0	0	2 (0.002%)	5 (0.004%)
Dimethyl fumarate	0	0	4 (0.005%)	2 (0.002%)
Fingolimod	2 (1%)	3 (0.001%)	0	51 (4%)
Natalizumab	15 (8%)	4 (0.002%)	112 (14%)	0
Mitoxantrone	3 (2%)	18 (1%)	20 (2%)	0
other	2 (1%)	4 (0.002%)	1 (0.001%)	0
none	118 (62%)	1606 (75%)	123 (15%)	146 (13%)
post-baseline follow-up on study therapy, yr, median (quartiles)	5.4 (3.5-7.5)	2.8 (1.5-5.1)	1.9 (1.3-2.7)	2.2 (1.6-3.6)

SD, standard deviation; EDSS, Expanded Disability Status Scale

Table S5
Logistic regression models used to estimate the propensity scores
Alemtuzumab (reference) vs. Interferon β

	Coefficient	Std.Error	z	Pr(>|z|)	
(Intercept)	4.83479	0.41071	11.772	< 2e-16	***
sex [male]	-0.10662	0.19113	-0.558	0.576955	
age	0.01367	0.01016	1.346	0.178415	
disease duration	0.07927	0.02336	3.393	0.000692	***
baseline disability, EDSS	-0.61612	0.05615	-10.974	< 2e-16	***
relapses, previous 1 year	-0.66905	0.08348	-8.014	1.11e-15	***
previous treatment starts	-0.68819	0.21652	-3.178	0.001481	**
the most active previous therapy					
[azathioprine]	-17.17696	571.95611	-0.030	0.976042	
[cladribine]	11.20600	882.74346	0.013	0.989872	
[fingolimod]	-2.05513	1.11778	-1.839	0.065978	.
[interferon/glat.acetate]	0.59337	0.34280	1.731	0.083463	.
[mitoxantrone]	0.91399	0.80023	1.142	0.253388	
[natalizumab]	-2.90462	0.83616	-3.474	0.000513	***

Alemtuzumab (reference) vs. Fingolimod

	Coefficient	Std.Error	z	Pr(>|z|)	
(Intercept)	0.78359	0.47883	1.636	0.101741	
sex [male]	0.14652	0.23931	0.612	0.540369	
age	0.05385	0.01332	4.043	5.28e-05	***
disease duration	0.09866	0.02669	3.697	0.000218	***
baseline disability, EDSS	-0.62584	0.07279	-8.598	< 2e-16	***
relapses, previous 1 year	-0.75061	0.11190	-6.708	1.97e-11	***
previous treatment starts	0.50871	0.18517	2.747	0.006011	**
the most active previous therapy					
[azathioprine]	-17.84382	1569.65081	-0.011	0.990930	
[cladribine]	13.22411	2399.54476	0.006	0.995603	
[fingolimod]	-19.28791	1661.61895	-0.012	0.990738	
[interferon/glat.acetate]	1.53649	0.34143	4.500	6.79e-06	***
[mitoxantrone]	0.07270	0.90885	0.080	0.936245	
[natalizumab]	0.54180	0.58717	0.923	0.356151	
[dimethyl fumarate]	15.78815	1130.34093	0.014	0.988856	
[teriflunomide]	15.24303	1577.02981	0.010	0.992288	

Alemtuzumab (reference) vs. Natalizumab

	Coefficient	Std.Error	z	Pr(>|z|)	
(Intercept)	0.75124	0.45410	1.654	0.098059	.
sex [male]	0.34616	0.21922	1.579	0.114319	
age	0.02076	0.01122	1.851	0.064215	.
disease duration	0.06619	0.02457	2.693	0.007071	**
baseline disability, EDSS	-0.28078	0.06028	-4.658	3.19e-06	***
relapses, previous 1 year	-0.33535	0.08911	-3.763	0.000168	***
previous treatment starts	0.36423	0.21001	1.734	0.082855	.
the most active previous therapy					
[azathioprine]	-17.84255	1668.79190	-0.011	0.991469	
[fingolimod]	1.97703	0.84384	2.343	0.019135	*
[interferon/glat.acetate]	2.00707	0.36181	5.547	2.90e-08	***
[mitoxantrone]	-17.40004	1343.03379	-0.013	0.989663	
[natalizumab]	-17.88766	591.72883	-0.030	0.975884	
[dimethyl fumarate]	15.61481	1686.86823	0.009	0.992614	
[teriflunomide]	15.16167	1053.31694	0.014	0.988515	

Table S6
Results of the secondary and sensitivity analyses

alemtuzumab vs. interferon β-1a	n, unmatched		n, matched		annualised relapse rate	cumulative hazard of relapses	cumulative hazard of the first relapse
analysis	alemtuzumab	interferon β	alemtuzumab	interferon β			
primary analysis	**189**	**2155**	**156**	**282**	**0.19 vs 0.53, p=3.5e-16**	**HR=0.6, p=0.0052**	**HR=0.59, p=0.072**
secondary analyses							
high pre-baseline activity (>=3 relapses over 24 months or >=2 relapses over 12 months pre-baseline), 1:10 match	150	1053	118	696	0.19 vs 0.58, p=9.8e-80	HR=0.38, p=1.5e-09	HR=0.27, p<0.001
an on-DMT relapse recorded pre-baseline	28	491	17	148	0.36 vs 0.58, p=0.011	HR=0.61, p=0.3	HR=0.34, p=2.6e-06
sensitivity analyses							
1:10 match with broad caliper (0.4)	189	2155	159	1049	0.18 vs 0.51, p=2.4e-16	HR=0.4, p=5.2e-14	HR=0.25, p<0.001
matching on 24-month pre-baseline relapse activity	189	2155	150	270	0.14 vs 0.52, p=1.6e-41	HR=0.31, p=3.9e-12	HR=0.23, p<0.001
relapsing and secondary progressive MS	191	2201	159	290	0.16 vs 0.52, p=1.5e-38	HR=0.35, p=1.1e-08	HR=0.26, p<0.001
minimum of 2-year on-treatment follow-up	168	1391	124	218	0.16 vs 0.38, p=3e-17	HR=0.46, p=7.3e-06	HR=0.35, p=2.7e-11

alemtuzumab vs. interferon β-1a	cumulative hazard of disability accumulation events		cumulative hazard of the first disability accumulation event		cumulative hazard of disability improvement events		cumulative hazard of the first disability improvement event	
analysis	confirmed at 6 months	confirmed at 12 months	confirmed at 6 months	confirmed at 12 months	confirmed at 6 months	confirmed at 12 months	confirmed at 6 months	confirmed at 12 months
primary analysis	**HR=0.66, p=0.37**	**HR=0.59, p=0.31**	**HR=0.69, p=0.42**	**HR=0.63, p=0.33**	**HR=0.98, p=0.93**	**HR=0.84, p=0.65**	**HR=1.4, p=0.4**	**HR=1.1, p=0.76**
secondary analyses								
high pre-baseline activity (>=3 relapses over 24 months or >=2 relapses over 12 months pre-baseline), 1:10 match	HR=0.64, p=0.018	HR=0.65, p=0.029	HR=0.92, p=0.71	HR=0.74, p=0.096	HR=0.98, p=0.94	HR=0.68, p=0.41	HR=2.1, p=0.00047	HR=1.9, p=0.0033
an on-DMT relapse recorded pre-baseline	HR=1.1, p=0.93	HR=1.1, p=0.93	HR=0.83, p=0.86	HR=0.83, p=0.86	HR=3.9, p=0.035	HR=3.9, p=0.03	HR=4.2, p=0.0037	HR=4.2, p=0.0037
sensitivity analyses								
1:10 match with broad caliper (0.4)	HR=0.82, p=0.21	HR=0.79, p=0.15	HR=1, p=0.93	HR=0.77, p=0.065	HR=0.99, p=0.96	HR=0.51, p=0.013	HR=1.3, p=0.14	HR=1.2, p=0.46
matching on 24-month pre-baseline relapse activity	HR=0.97, p=0.89	HR=0.91, p=0.74	HR=1.4, p=0.28	HR=1.1, p=0.73	HR=1, p=0.92	HR=1.1, p=0.9	HR=1.2, p=0.72	HR=1.2, p=0.74
relapsing and secondary progressive MS	HR=0.9, p=0.69	HR=0.82, p=0.56	HR=1.3, p=0.46	HR=0.99, p=1	HR=1.1, p=0.71	HR=1.1, p=0.87	HR=1.4, p=0.33	HR=1.4, p=0.35
minimum of 2-year on-treatment follow-up	HR=0.9, p=0.77	HR=0.87, p=0.79	HR=0.89, p=0.78	HR=0.88, p=0.79	HR=0.89, p=0.75	HR=0.76, p=0.52	HR=1.1, p=0.84	HR=0.96, p=0.9

The table shows observed annualised relapse rate or hazard ratios (HR) for the evaluated outcomes, together with the corresponding p values. Of the two compared disease modifying therapies (DMT), interferon β served as a reference. The p values (adjusted for false discovery rate) ≤0.05 are highlighted in red.

alemtuzumab vs. fingolimod	n, unmatched		n, matched		annualised relapse rate	cumulative hazard of relapses	cumulative hazard of the first relapse
analysis	alemtuzumab	fingolimod	alemtuzumab	fingolimod			
primary analysis	**189**	**828**	**114**	**195**	**0.15 vs 0.34, p=1.4e-11**	**HR=0.62, p=0.18**	**HR=0.59, p=0.065**
secondary analyses							
high pre-baseline activity (>=3 relapses over 24 months or >=2 relapses over 12 months pre-baseline), 1:10 match	150	372	82	261	0.16 vs 0.32, p=7e-07	HR=0.63, p=0.24	HR=0.62, p=0.039
an on-DMT relapse recorded pre-baseline	28	646	22	173	0.23 vs 0.28, p=0.92	HR=0.83, p=0.94	HR=0.78, p=0.66
sensitivity analyses							
1:10 match with broad caliper (0.4)	189	828	116	532	0.15 vs 0.3, p=1.3e-14	HR=0.7, p=0.27	HR=0.51, p=4.6e-06
matching on 24-month pre-baseline relapse activity	189	828	95	167	0.15 vs 0.34, p=0.00039	HR=0.49, p=0.0054	HR=0.39, p=0.00023
relapsing and secondary progressive MS	191	862	115	192	0.15 vs 0.31, p=0.0016	HR=0.68, p=0.3	HR=0.67, p=0.21
minimum of 2-year on-treatment follow-up	168	388	77	107	0.13 vs 0.27, p=0.00025	HR=0.67, p=0.36	HR=0.74, p=0.49

alemtuzumab vs. fingolimod	cumulative hazard of disability accumulation events		cumulative hazard of the first disability accumulation event		cumulative hazard of disability improvement events		cumulative hazard of the first disability improvement event	
analysis	confirmed at 6 months	confirmed at 12 months	confirmed at 6 months	confirmed at 12 months	confirmed at 6 months	confirmed at 12 months	confirmed at 6 months	confirmed at 12 months
primary analysis	**HR=1.3, p=0.67**	**HR=0.38, p=0.29**	**HR=1.7, p=0.39**	**HR=1.2, p=0.85**	**HR=0.5, p=0.18**	**HR=0.48, p=0.19**	**HR=0.5, p=0.17**	**HR=0.61, p=0.36**
secondary analyses								
high pre-baseline activity (>=3 relapses over 24 months or >=2 relapses over 12 months pre-baseline), 1:10 match	HR=0.93, p=0.94	HR=0.78, p=0.7	HR=1.1, p=0.81	HR=0.82, p=0.76	HR=0.6, p=0.4	HR=0.66, p=0.57	HR=0.73, p=0.54	HR=0.63, p=0.38
an on-DMT relapse recorded pre-baseline	HR=0.94, p=1	HR=1.7, p=0.7	HR=1, p=0.97	HR=1.5, p=0.9	HR=1.1, p=1	HR=0.75, p=0.94	HR=0.96, p=0.98	HR=1, p=1
sensitivity analyses								
1:10 match with broad caliper (0.4)	HR=0.89, p=0.94	HR=1.1, p=0.95	HR=0.95, p=0.93	HR=0.82, p=0.61	HR=0.54, p=0.12	HR=0.59, p=0.26	HR=0.6, p=0.095	HR=0.62, p=0.12
matching on 24-month pre-baseline relapse activity	HR=1.4, p=0.73	HR=1.3, p=0.73	HR=1.7, p=0.44	HR=1.3, p=0.74	HR=0.64, p=0.53	HR=0.61, p=0.51	HR=0.72, p=0.7	HR=0.77, p=0.71
relapsing and secondary progressive MS	HR=0.71, p=0.63	HR=0.62, p=0.58	HR=1, p=1	HR=0.71, p=0.66	HR=0.69, p=0.5	HR=0.71, p=0.63	HR=0.77, p=0.65	HR=1, p=1
minimum of 2-year on-treatment follow-up	HR=1.7, p=0.53	HR=1.7, p=0.55	HR=1.3, p=0.81	HR=1.5, p=0.82	HR=0.41, p=0.088	HR=0.41, p=0.097	HR=0.4, p=0.096	HR=0.45, p=0.17

The table shows observed annualised relapse rate or hazard ratios (HR) for the evaluated outcomes, together with the corresponding p values. Of the two compared disease modifying therapies (DMT), fingolimod served as a reference. The p values (adjusted for false discovery rate) ≤0.05 are highlighted in red.

alemtuzumab vs. natalizumab	n, unmatched		n, matched		annualised relapse rate	cumulative hazard of relapses	cumulative hazard of the first relapse
analysis	alemtuzumab	natalizumab	alemtuzumab	natalizumab			
primary analysis	**187**	**1160**	**138**	**223**	**0.2 vs 0.19, p=0.78**	**HR=1, p=0.83**	**HR=0.87, p=0.65**
secondary analyses							
high pre-baseline activity (>=3 relapses over 24 months or >=2 relapses over 12 months pre-baseline), 1:10 match	148	711	103	382	0.17 vs 0.2, p=0.25	HR=0.97, p=0.92	HR=0.97, p=0.93
an on-DMT relapse recorded pre-baseline	28	953	19	188	0.28 vs 0.3, p=0.16	HR=0.83, p=0.97	HR=0.5, p=0.012
sensitivity analyses							
1:10 match with broad caliper (0.4)	187	1160	139	662	0.18 vs 0.19, p=0.49	HR=1, p=0.93	HR=0.78, p=0.093
matching on 24-month pre-baseline relapse activity	187	1160	111	181	0.21 vs 0.23, p=0.73	HR=1.1, p=0.93	HR=0.9, p=0.73
relapsing and secondary progressive MS	189	1198	141	226	0.19 vs 0.2, p=0.65	HR=1, p=1	HR=0.74, p=0.3
minimum of 2-year on-treatment follow-up	166	684	106	160	0.18 vs 0.17, p=0.86	HR=1.2, p=0.76	HR=0.83, p=0.68

alemtuzumab vs. natalizumab	cumulative hazard of disability accumulation events		cumulative hazard of the first disability accumulation event		cumulative hazard of disability improvement events		cumulative hazard of the first disability improvement event	
analysis	confirmed at 6 months	confirmed at 12 months	confirmed at 6 months	confirmed at 12 months	confirmed at 6 months	confirmed at 12 months	confirmed at 6 months	confirmed at 12 months
primary analysis	**HR=0.81, p=0.6**	**HR=0.92, p=0.84**	**HR=1.1, p=0.84**	**HR=0.71, p=0.53**	**HR=0.35, p=0.00058**	**HR=0.46, p=0.061**	**HR=0.73, p=0.57**	**HR=0.59, p=0.34**
secondary analyses								
high pre-baseline activity (>=3 relapses over 24 months or >=2 relapses over 12 months pre-baseline), 1:10 match	HR=0.83, p=0.68	HR=0.88, p=0.79	HR=0.98, p=0.95	HR=0.5, p=0.047	HR=0.44, p=0.0023	HR=0.54, p=0.069	HR=0.74, p=0.38	HR=0.79, p=0.52
an on-DMT relapse recorded pre-baseline	HR=1.2, p=0.82	HR=1.3, p=0.82	HR=1, p=1	HR=1, p=0.98	HR=1.2, p=0.88	HR=1.7, p=0.31	HR=1.2, p=0.92	HR=1.3, p=0.92
sensitivity analyses								
1:10 match with broad caliper (0.4)	HR=0.81, p=0.58	HR=0.92, p=0.92	HR=1, p=0.95	HR=0.64, p=0.092	HR=0.35, p=0.00032	HR=0.46, p=0.038	HR=0.54, p=0.0012	HR=0.56, p=0.0049
matching on 24-month pre-baseline relapse activity	HR=0.77, p=0.75	HR=0.92, p=0.91	HR=0.62, p=0.41	HR=0.6, p=0.45	HR=0.43, p=0.01	HR=0.4, p=0.01	HR=0.62, p=0.3	HR=0.54, p=0.17
relapsing and secondary progressive MS	HR=0.81, p=0.65	HR=0.86, p=0.7	HR=0.79, p=0.64	HR=0.52, p=0.22	HR=0.34, p=2e-04	HR=0.47, p=0.069	HR=0.59, p=0.2	HR=0.59, p=0.23
minimum of 2-year on-treatment follow-up	HR=0.79, p=0.79	HR=0.84, p=0.73	HR=0.35, p=0.017	HR=0.33, p=0.015	HR=0.69, p=0.35	HR=0.56, p=0.21	HR=0.91, p=0.83	HR=0.86, p=0.72

The table shows observed annualised relapse rate or hazard ratios (HR) for the evaluated outcomes, together with the corresponding p values. Of the two compared disease modifying therapies (DMT), natalizumab served as a reference. The p values (adjusted for false discovery rate) ≤0.05 are highlighted in red.

Table S7
Results of the power analyses

	annualised relapse rate	cumulative hazard of relapses	cumulative hazard of disability progression	cumulative probability of disability regression
interferon β	-	-	40%	42%
fingolimod	-	53%	66%	39%
natalizumab	0.13	51%	35%	-

The table shows minimum detectable differences for alemtuzumab vs. interferon β, fingolimod or natalizumab, for the disease outcomes whose analyses did not reach the predefined level of statistical significance. The differences are shown as relapses per year (for annualised relapse rate) or proportion of the cumulative hazard (for the cumulative hazard of relapses, disability progression or disability regression).