

Corrigendum to A randomized trial of synthetic osmotic cervical dilator for induction of labor vs dinoprostone vaginal insert American Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology MFM Volume 4, Issue 4, July 2022, 100628

Janesh K. Gupta, MSc, MD, FRCOG; Alisha Maher, MSc; Clive Stubbs, MSc; Peter Brocklehurst, FRCOG; Jane P. Daniels, PhD; Pollyanna Hardy, MSc; On behalf of the Synthetic Osmotic Cervical Dilator for Induction of Labor in Comparison to Dinoprostone Vaginal insErt (SOLVE) collaborative group

The authors would like to add Max G. Feltham to the collaborators section as:

Janesh Gupta, Peter Brocklehurst, Jane Daniels, Pollyanna Hardy, Max G. Feltham and Clive Stubbs contributed to the delivery and interpretation of the trial.

The authors would like to apologise for any inconvenience caused. ■

Author and article information

From the Institute of Metabolism and Systems Biology, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, United Kingdom

(Professor Gupta); Birmingham Clinical Trials Unit, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, United Kingdom (Ms Maher and Messrs Stubbs and Brocklehurst); Nottingham Clinical Trials Unit, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, United Kingdom (Professor Daniels); National Perinatal Epidemiology Unit Clinical Trials Unit, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom (Ms Hardy).

j.k.gupta@bham.ac.uk

Cite this article as: Gupta JK, Maher A, Stubbs C, et al. Corrigendum to A randomized trial of synthetic osmotic cervical dilator for induction of labor vs dinoprostone vaginal insert American Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology MFM Volume 4, Issue 4, July 2022, 100628. Am J Obstet Gynecol MFM 2022;00:100702.

DOI of original article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ajogmf.2022.100628>

2589-9333/\$36.00

Crown Copyright © 2022 Published by Elsevier Inc. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ajogmf.2022.100702>