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Author’s response to reviews:

1. Abstract; you abbreviate IOL in earlier places, but then in the 3rd line of Results you revert to full term ‘induction of labour’ and in Conclusions also. It is better to be consistent in use of either full term or the abbreviated version (after first noting as abbreviation). For the abstract, I believe it is better to avoid abbreviations altogether, but use in the main manuscript.

Thank you very much, changes throughout the manuscript were made accordingly.

2. Background Line 55; are these rates for IOL based on global studies? If so might be worth amending the sentence for clarity to something like; Currently, average rates of induction of labor (IOL) based on international studies are approximately 20-25% of all pregnancies

Done. Thank you for this proposal.

3. I found the description of the quantitative method of calculating EBL confusing; is this across the same 24 hour period? And if so, how regularly were pads weighed, and bag blood loss measured? Was the bag left in place for 24hrs – which would seem a bit unusual as pads are being used and the woman could be mobile? Thus the process of measuring EBL needs clarity regarding duration/length of time on which this was calculated.

Thank you for this input. We worked on this section to increase clarity.
4. As with abstract, need to be consistent with use of IOL or ‘induction of labour’ throughout (see outcomes section where you revert back to using induction of labour rather than IOL); there are also places where other abbreviations and full terms are used interchangeably (e.g. PPH and EBL).

Done.

5. The Discussion is good, but it could do with some minor editing for English language syntax and grammatical accuracy.

Thank you! The discussion was edited for style, syntax and grammar.