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Reviewer’s report:

Regarding the Manuscript PRCH-D-18-01262

First of all, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to review the manuscript.

It is very well written.

It is very relevant, includes a very interesting population and methods are well carried out.

However there some points that should come to attention:

- In the abstract, in line 35, you state that a proportion of inductions end in emergency cesarean deliveries. This is true, but some of them also end in c-sections because of failed induction, or because long inductions may lead doctors and patients to decide for ending inductions and opting for cesarean. So the sentence would be more exact removing the Word "emergency".

- There is a limitation and that should be more detailed in the discussion session. This is the fact that the only variable of the Bishop Score used in the model was cervical dilation.


In the discussion section, in lines 244-246, when you described the inclusion only of the cervical dilation in the model, it seems this was an option and not something that occurred because these characteristics were not available.

In lines 266-268 this limitation is pointed out, but very superficially. Since this is something that may compromise the model, we feel that should be more detailed.
-Were all the cesareans, emergency cesareans? Were there no failed inductions? All women achieved active labor? Were there no other indications for c-sections other from emergency situations? This could be detailed in the result section and the flowchart.
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