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Reviewer's report:

Comments to Author:

This small pilot randomized controlled trials, compares the inpatient with outpatient balloon catheter cervical ripening.

Its strength is in the logical background and clinical need, for the use of the balloon catheter cervical ripening in an outpatient low risk pregnant women, and in the questions, ideas and parameters it explores. These factors can be used by a future, larger, randomized controlled study powered to give a statistical significance.

Its major weakness is in the small population recruited, and as stated "..not powered for statistically significant differences..".

The study is well written and it is a small pilot study, which can give some ideas of what to be expected in a larger and powered study.

I recommend the publication of this paper, with some revisions.

Abstract:
Well written and there are no comments.

Background:
1. Line 65 - GTC – should be stated as Cardiotocography in the text and not in the end.

Methods:
Well written and there are no comments.

Results:
1. Line 181, unfortunately, I did not get the Figure-1, that is mentioned, so I cannot give comments regarding this Figure.
2. Table 1 – WAS - Abbreviation ???
3. Table 2 –
   - ARM - Abbreviation ???
   - Rupture of membranes - in the Outpatient column 4+ 30 = 34, while there were only 33 outpatients.
4. Table 3 –
- There is no mention in the text as for the data in Table-3, it should be pointed at line 199.
- Some of the data given in Table 3 overlaps the data in Table 2, such as the "Apgar <7", and the "Special care nursery ".
5. The authors should think to replace Table 3 in a new one regarding the data regarding the acceptability of the catheter to women and clinicians.

Discussion & conclusion:
1. Well written, in line 342 – ".. with the.." is repeated twice.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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