

Dataset Reference	Patient characteristics: Mean $\pm$ SD, Mean [Range], or Count (%), unless otherwise stated						Outcome		
	Maternal age (y)	Gestational age at ECV (wks)	BMI (kg/m ²)	AFI (cm)	Nulliparous	Sample Size (N)	Overall success rate (%)	Adverse events reported?	Outcome for model
Lau 1997	28.5 [Range: 17-43]	38 [Range: 36-43]	26.04 $\pm$ 3.01**	11.20 $\pm$ 3.95**	128 (52.7%)	243	ECV: 169 (69.5%)	No	P(ECV)
Wong 2000	29.95**	37.96 $\pm$ 1.23**	Not reported	12.10 $\pm$ 3.14** (Ph. 1 only)	75 (53.6%)**	140 pts, 141 ECVs (Ph. 1: 53; Ph. 2: 87,88)	ECV: 88 (62.4%)** VD: 13 (14.7%)**	Yes	P(ECV)
Aisenbrey 1999	Not reported	37w in 100 (78.1%) $\geq$ 38w in 28 (21.9%)	Not reported	<8 in 20 (15.6%), $\geq$ 8 in 108 (84.3%)	36 (28.1%)	128	ECV: 78 (60.9%) VD: 58 (74.3%)	Yes	P(ECV)
Dahl 2021	32.7 $\pm$ 4.7	37.6 $\pm$ 0.9	28.9 $\pm$ 5.1	Normal in 806 (96.8%) a	657 (57.7%)	1138	ECV: 462 (40.6%)	Yes	P(ECV) n
Newman 1993	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported	46 (17.3%) (Ph. 2 only)	372 (Ph. 1: 106; Ph. 2: 266)	ECV: 166 (62.4%)	No	P(ECV)
Tasnim 2012	26.04 $\pm$ 4.13**	38.34 $\pm$ 0.64**	Median: 25-30 (100, 60.2% in range)** b	Median: 7-10 (99, 59.6% in range)** b	86 (51.8%)**	166	ECV: 82 (49.4%)	No	P(ECV)
Silva 2018	30.31 $\pm$ 4.89**	Median: 37w (134, 39.9% in range)	26.48 $\pm$ 4.60	12.89 $\pm$ 4.13**	224 (66.5%)	337	ECV: 147 (43.6%)	Yes (briefly)	P(ECV)
Burgos 2011	32.32 $\pm$ 4.37 (Ph. 1 only)	37.49 $\pm$ 0.89 (Ph. 1 only)	28.33 $\pm$ 4.13 (Ph. 1 only)	Normal in 452 (90.4%) (Ph. 1 only) c	334 (66.8%) (Ph. 1 only)	1000 (Ph. 1: 500; Ph. 2: 500)	ECV: 51.7% (Ph. 1: 52.2%; Ph. 2: 51.2%)	No	P(ECV)
Burgos 2012	32.32 $\pm$ 4.37 (Ph. 1 only)	37.49 $\pm$ 0.89 (Ph. 1 only)	28.33 $\pm$ 4.13 (Ph. 1 only)	Normal in 452 (90.4%) (Ph. 1 only) c	334 (66.8%) (Ph. 1 only)	1000 (Ph. 1: 500; Ph. 2: 500)	ECV: 51.7% (Ph. 1: 52.2%; Ph. 2: 51.2%)	No	P(ECV)
Burgos 2015 u	33.3 $\pm$ 4.3	37wga in 451 (72.9%)	28.1 $\pm$ 4.1	Not reported	364 (58.1%)	627	VD: 535 (85.3%)	Some t	P(VD ECV+CAD) p
López-Pérez 2020	31.7 $\pm$ 5.6	$\leq$ 38w in 255 (80.4%), >38w in 62 (19.6%)	Median: 25-29.9 (125, 42.7% in range) e	Normal in 284 (90.4%) e	156 (49.2%)	317	ECV: 229 (72.2%) VD: 163/212 (76.9%)	Yes	P(ECV) q
Kok 2011	35.34 $\pm$ 4.53**	37.01 $\pm$ 0.87**	24.75 $\pm$ 4.45**	AFI<10 in 57 (26.4%) AFI $\geq$ 10 in 159 (73.6%)	161 (51.9%)	310	ECV: 121 (39.0%)	Yes (in Kok 2008 article)	P(ECV) r
De Hundt 2012	31 [Range: 18-42]	36.9 [Range: 35.7-40.4]	22 [Range: 17-41]	AFI<10 in 123 (39%), AFI $\geq$ 10 in 196 (61%)	198 (61.9%)	320	ECV: 117 (36.6%)	Stated no short-term adverse events	P(ECV) r
Velzel 2018	32 $\pm$ 4.1	36.2 $\pm$ 0.94	Median: 23.1 [Range 16-48] v	Median: 15 [Range 3-40] v	511 (62%)	818	ECV: 303 (37.0%)**	Yes (in Velzel 2017 and thesis)	P(ECV) r
Hutton 2017	Not reported m	Not reported m	Not reported m	Not reported m	742 (59.2%)	1253	ECV+CAD: 557 (44.5%)	Yes (in prior articles)	P(ECV+CAD) s
Ebner 2015	31.4 $\pm$ 4.1	Median: 36.6**	Median: 27.3	Normal in 97 (82.2%) f	88 (74.6%)	118	ECV: 33 (28.0%) VD: 22 (66.7%)	Yes (briefly)	P(ECV)
Cobec 2022	31.69 $\pm$ 4.44	37.40 $\pm$ 0.71	Not reported	14.88 $\pm$ 3.58	70 (61.9%)	113	ECV: 62 (54.9%) VD: 50 (80.6%)	Yes	P(ECV)
Svensson 2021	Median: 30-34y (787, 34.1% in range) g	Median: 37w (1155, 50.0% at value) g	<25 in 1249 (55.7%) g	Normal in 1366 (96.8%) g	1084 (47.7%)	2331	ECV: 1245 (53.4%)	No	P(ECV)
Isakov 2019 and erratum	30.90 $\pm$ 5.29**	39.23 $\pm$ 0.99**	25.62 $\pm$ 3.32**	13.67 $\pm$ 2.26**	Between 49-85 (19.6-34.4%)**	250	ECV: 162 (64.8%) VD: 107 (66.0%)	Only NICU admissions and APGAR scores	P(ECV)
Bilgory 2021 and erratum	Median: 28.0 [IQR: 24.0–33.0]	Median: 38.0 [IQR: 37.0–39.0]	Not reported	8-19.9cm in 756 (79.9%) h	227 (24.0%)	946	ECV+CAD: 717 (75.8%) VD: 663 (92.5%)	Yes	P(ECV+CAD+VD)
Anand 2019	25.2 $\pm$ 4.1	38.5 $\pm$ 1.3	24.8 $\pm$ 3.6	<7 in 65 (10.6%), $\geq$ 7 in 546 (89.4%)	312 (51.1%)	611	ECV: 430 (70.4%) VD: 334 (77.7%)	Yes	2019: P(ECV) 2021: P(VD ECV)
Palepu 2021	25.2 $\pm$ 4.1	38.5 $\pm$ 1.3	24.8 $\pm$ 3.6	<7 in 65 (10.6%), $\geq$ 7 in 546 (89.4%)	312 (51.1%)	611	ECV: 430 (70.4%) VD: 334 (77.7%)	Yes	2019: P(ECV) 2021: P(VD ECV)
Zheng 2021	28.99 $\pm$ 3.96**	Median: 37w5d (Success group) 37w6d (Failed group) m	25.54 $\pm$ 3.25**	Median: 14 (Success group) 12 (Failed group) m	Between 88-154 (32.6-57.0%)**	270	ECV: 191 (70.7%) VD: 147 (77.0%)	Yes	P(ECV)
Lin 2022	31.56 $\pm$ 3.79** (Ph. 1 only)	36.80 $\pm$ 0.56** (Ph. 1 only)	25.73 $\pm$ 2.74** (Ph. 1 only)	13.01 $\pm$ 2.83** (Ph. 1 only)	79 (52.0%) (Ph. 1 only)	185 (Ph. 1: 152; Ph. 2: 33)	ECV: 95 (62.5%) (Ph. 1 only)	Yes	P(ECV)
Dong 2021	Median: 30-32y (107, 31.2% in range) j	Median: 37w (196, 57.1% in range) j	Median: 24-27 (151, 44.2% in range) j	Median: 8-18 (165, 77.8% in range) j	207 (60.3%)	350	ECV: 232 (66.3%) VD: 173/231 (74.9%)	Only etiologies for subsequent CS	Model 1: P(ECV) Model 2: P(VD ECV)

P(ECV) = Probability of ECV success (i.e. cephalic presentation at the end of the ECV attempt)

P(ECV+CAD) = Probability of ECV success **AND** cephalic presentation at delivery

P(ECV+CAD+VD) = Probability of ECV success **AND** cephalic presentation at delivery **AND** vaginal delivery (i.e. successful ECV attempt and vaginal delivery of cephalic fetus)

P(VD | ECV) = Probability of vaginal delivery **GIVEN** successful ECV

P(VD | ECV+CAD) = Probability of vaginal delivery **GIVEN** successful ECV **AND** cephalic presentation at delivery

CAD = cephalic at delivery. This can be measured as whether the fetus had cephalic presentation on the day of delivery or whether the ultimately delivery (vaginal or C-section) was a breech delivery.

IQR = interquartile range (25th-75th percentile). "Range" otherwise refers to the min to max range. SD = standard deviation.

* This represents a value that was not directly reported, but could be calculated from information reported in the article (e.g. if the overall mean was not reported, but the means of various subgroups were)

a Dahl et al. did not report means: 11 (1.3%) oligo, 806 (96.8%) normal, 16 (1.9%) poly. Presumably, missing data for all but 833 (11+806+16)

b Tasnim et al. reported BMI in categories: BMI<25 (47, 28.3%**), BMI 25-30 (100, 60.2%**), BMI>30 (19, 11.4%*). Amniotic fluid: AFI<7 (10, 6.0%*), AFI 7-10 (99, 59.6%*), AFI>10 (57, 34.3%*)

c Burgos et al.'s 2011 and 2012 articles reported amniotic fluid amounts in categories: 33 (6.6%) Scarce, 452 (90.4%) normal, 15 (3.0%) abundant (Ph. 1 only)

d Burgos et al.'s 2015 article reported GA in categories: 451 (72.9%) at 37w, 34 (5.4%) earlier, 140 (22.9%) later

e López-Pérez et al. did not report a mean for BMI. Instead, they reported categories: 64 (21.8%) at <25, 125 (42.7%) at 25-29.9, 70 (23.9%) at 30-34.9, 34 (11.6%) at $\geq$ 35. Amniotic fluid: 18 (5.7%) at oligohydramnios, 284 (90.4%) at normal, 12 (3.8%) at polyhydramnios

f Ebner et al. did not report a mean for amniotic fluid. Instead, they reported categories: 15 (12.7%) reduced, 97 (82.2%) normal, 4 (3.4%) increased

g Svensson et al. did not report mean values for maternal age, GA at ECV, BMI, and amniotic fluid amount. Instead, they reported categories:
Maternal age: 260 (1.3%) at $\leq$ 24y, 753 (32.7%) at 25-29y, 787 (34.1%) at 30-34y, 389 (16.9%) at 35-39y, 116 (5.0%) at $\geq$ 40y.
GA at ECV: 18 (0.8%) at $\leq$ 35w, 535 (23.2%) at 36w, 1155 (50.0%) at 37w, 307 (13.3%) at 38w, 163 (7.1%) at 39w, 69 (3.0%) at 40w, 62 (2.7%) at $\geq$ 41w.
BMI: 1249 (55.7%) at BMI<25, 624 (27.8%) at BMI 25-30, 370 (16.5%) at BMI $\geq$ 30.
Amniotic fluid amount: 19 (1.3%) at SDP<2/AFI<5, 1366 (96.8%) normal, 26 (1.8%) at SDP>8/AFI>25.

h Bilgory et al. did not report a mean for AFI. Instead, they reported categories: 66 (7.0%) at 5-7.9cm, 756 (79.9%) at 8-19.9cm, 124 (13.1%) at $\geq$ 20cm

j Dong et al. did not report mean values for maternal age, GA, BMI, and AFI. Instead, they reported categories:
Maternal age: 72 (21.0%) at <28y, 77 (22.4%) at 28-29y, 107 (31.2%) at 30-32y, 87 (25.4%) at 33y.
GA: 45 (13.1%) at 36w, 196 (57.1%) at 37w, 85 (25.7%) at 38w, 17 (5.2%) at $\geq$ 39w.
BMI: 95 (27.8%) at <24, 151 (44.2%) at 24-27, 96 (28.1%) at >27, 1 missing data.
AFI: 27 (12.7%) at <8, 165 (77.8%) at 8-18, 20 (9.4%) at >18, 131 missing data.

k Silva et al. did not report a mean for GA. Instead, they reported categories: 132 (39.3%) at 36w, 134 (39.9%) at 37w, 70 (20.8%) at 38w k

m Hutton et al. did not report mean values for maternal age, GA at ECV, BMI, and AFI. Instead, they reported the medians of 4 subgroups, which cannot be used to calculate an overall mean. The same situation happened for Zheng et al.'s GA at ECV and AFI values, but with only two subgroups (failures vs successes)

n Dahl et al.'s model outcome was cephalic presentation at the end of the ECV attempt and persistence until hospital discharge

p Burgos et al. 2015 predicted vaginal delivery given a successful and uncomplicated ECV, cephalic presentation at delivery, and delivery at same institution.

q López-Pérez et al.'s model outcome was cephalic presentation at the end of the ECV attempt. They specifically stated that this was regardless of any complications including emergency CS.

r The outcome for Kok 2011's, De Hundt 2012's, and Velzel 2018's articles (all published by the same investigational team) was cephalic presentation after the ECV attempt that was maintained for $\geq$ 30 min.

s Hutton et al. included multiple ECV attempts in the same pregnancy. Thus, their model outcome was cephalic presentation BOTH at the end of the last ECV attempt AND at birth (Group A+)

t Burgos et al.'s 2015 article only reported adverse events that were an indication for IOL/delivery or a specific delivery method (e.g. PROM)

u Burgos et al.'s 2015 article used a dataset significantly overlapping the datasets presented in Burgos et al.'s 2011 and 2012 articles.

v Velzel et al.'s Table 1 did not clarify whether the reported values were means and min-max ranges or medians and min-max ranges. We assume the former based on wording in the methods.