

Criteria	Dahl 2021	Tasnim 2012	Silva 2018	Burgos 2015 a*	López-Pérez 2020	Velzel 2018	Hutton 2017	Ebner 2015	Cobac 2022	Svensson 2021	Isakov 2019 (and erratum)	Bilgory 2021	Anand 2019 b	Palepu 2021 b	Zheng 2021	Lin 2022	Dong 2021	Group total for:		
																		Yes	Partly	No
Study participation																				
Description of setting and study period	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	17	0	0
Description of inclusion and exclusion criteria	Yes	Partly	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partly	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	15	2	0
Consecutive patient selection	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	17	0	0
Number of patients reported c*	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	17	0	0
Success rate reported d*	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	17	0	0
Clear description of patient characteristics	Yes	Partly	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	16	1	0
Predictor variables																				
Clear definition of all predictor variables evaluated	Yes	Partly	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	16	1	0
Description of proportion of missing data	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	12	0	5
Outcome measures																				
Clear definition of outcome	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	17	0	0
Analysis																				
Description of evaluation measures	Yes	Partly	Partly	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partly	Partly	Partly	Yes	Partly	Yes	Yes	Partly	Yes	Yes	10	7	0
Description of model-building strategies	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	10	0	7
Overall e*																				
Counts: Yes / Partly / No	11/0/0	5/4/2	9/1/1	11/0/0	10/0/1	11/0/0	11/0/0	9/1/1	9/1/1	8/2/1	11/0/0	9/1/1	10/0/1	10/0/1	8/1/2	11/0/0	11/0/0	164	11	12
Overall risk of bias	Low	High	Med	Low	Low	Low	Low	Med	Med	Med	Low	Med	Low	Low	Med	Low	Low			
Overall quality	High	Low	Med	High	High	High	High	Med	Med	Med	High	Med	High	High	Med	High	High			

It was acceptable if the information needed was available in a cited article.

a* Burgos 2011, Burgos, 2012, and Burgos 2015 are three successive papers by the same team that include progressively larger datasets. Only Burgos 2011 and 2012 were included in Velzel 2015's systematic review.

b* Anand 2019 and Palepu 2021 articles use the same data sets

c* Reporting the number of ECVs instead of the number of patients was also acceptable

d* The reported success rate could be for any ECV outcome. Possibilities include cephalic presentation immediately after the procedure, ultimately having a vaginal delivery, and having a vaginal delivery given cephalic presentation immediately after the procedure.

e* Overall assessments only concern the operationalized items mentioned in this table. Other aspects will be discussed in the discussion.
At least 10 "Yes" were required for a low risk of bias/high quality article and at least 6 for a medium risk of bias/medium quality article.