

The Optimal Prediction Model for Successful External Cephalic Version

Running head: Comparison of Models for Successful Version

Rahul Sai Yerrabelli^{1,2*}, Peggy K. Palsgaard^{1,3}, Priya Shankarappa, MD^{1,4}, Valerie Jennings, MD, MS^{1,5}

¹ Carle Illinois College of Medicine, The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Champaign, Illinois, United States of America

² Department of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Reading Hospital, Reading, Pennsylvania, United States of America

³ Department of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan, United States of America

⁴ Department of Internal Medicine, Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island, United States of America

⁵ Department of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Carle Foundation Hospital, Urbana, Illinois, United States of America

*** Corresponding Author:**

RSY Email: rahul.yerrabelli@towerhealth.org ORCID: [0000-0002-7670-9601](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7670-9601)

Other author contacts:

PKP Email: peggy.palsgaard@wmed.edu ORCID: [0000-0002-3797-498X](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3797-498X)

PS Email: pshankarappa@lifespan.org

VJ Email: valerie.jennings@carle.com

Abstract

1 **Objective:** The majority of breech fetuses are delivered by Cesarean birth as few physicians are
2 trained in vaginal breech birth. An external cephalic version (ECV) can prevent Cesarean
3 delivery and the associated morbidity in these patients. Current guidelines recommend all
4 patients with breech presentation be offered an ECV attempt. Not all attempts are successful, and
5 an attempt does carry some risks so shared decision-making is necessary. To aid in patient
6 counseling, over a dozen prediction models to predict ECV success have been proposed in the
7 last few years. However, very few models have been externally validated, and thus none have
8 been adopted into clinical practice. This study aims to use data from a United States hospital to
9 provide further data on ECV prediction models.

10 **Study Design:** This study retrospectively gathered data from Carle Foundation Hospital and
11 used it to test six models previously proposed to predict ECV success. These models were Dahl
12 2021, Bilgory 2023, López Pérez 2020, Kok 2011, Burgos 2010, and Tasnim 2012 (GNK-PIMS
13 score).

14 **Results:** 125 patients undergoing 132 ECV attempts were included. 69 attempts were successful
15 (52.2%). Dahl 2021 had the greatest predictive value (AUC 0.779), while Tasnim 2012
16 performed the worst (AUC 0.626). The remaining models had similar predictive values as each
17 other (AUC 0.68-0.71). Bootstrapping confirmed that all models except Tasnim 2012 had
18 confidence intervals not including 0.5. The bootstrapped 95% AUC confidence interval for Dahl
19 2021 was 0.71-0.84. In terms of calibration, Dahl 2021 was well calibrated with predicted
20 probabilities matching observed probabilities. Bilgory 2023 and López Pérez were poorly
21 calibrated.

22 **Conclusion:** Multiple prediction tools have now been externally validated for ECV success.

23 Dahl 2021 is the most promising prediction tool.

24

25 **Keywords:** breech presentation; cesarean section; clinical prediction rule; logistic regression;

26 machine learning; nomogram; obstetrics; prognostic score

27

28 **Key Points**

- 29
- Prediction models can be powerful tools for patient counseling
 - The odds of ECV success can estimated based on patient factors and clinical findings
 - Of the 6 tested models, only Dahl 2021 appears to have good predictive value and calibration
- 30
- 31
- 32

33

34 Introduction

35 Breech presentation complicates approximately 3-4% of term pregnancies, and transverse
36 lie complicates an additional 0.1%-0.2%¹⁻³. The three main options for malpresentation
37 presentation include vaginal breech birth (VBB), Cesarean delivery, or external cephalic version
38 (ECV) followed by cephalic vaginal delivery¹. Vaginal breech births are extremely rare in the
39 United States and only offered in a limited number of centers. External cephalic version is a
40 physical maneuver where physicians press on the mother's abdomen in the third trimester to try
41 to rotate to a cephalic ("head down") position. If successful, the ECV allows for a cephalic
42 vaginal delivery and foregoes the need for a Cesarean delivery or VBB. As such, ECVs are cost
43 effective and noninvasive procedures that decrease Cesarean rates and avoid the associated
44 morbidity for patients². Current American and British guidelines recommend that patients who
45 are near term with breech presentation be offered an ECV if there are no contraindications^{2,4,5}.

46 Wide variation in ECV success rates have been reported, although most estimates are
47 usually around 50-60%^{2,5-7}. Furthermore, not every patient has the same likelihood of procedure
48 success. Some risk factors for ECV failure include low amniotic fluid volume, nulliparity,
49 obesity, descent of the breech into the pelvis, and later gestational age⁸⁻¹¹. Regardless of whether
50 the procedure is successful, the procedure can rarely result in complications, the most severe
51 include placental abruption (0.18%), umbilical cord prolapse (0.18%), fetomaternal hemorrhage
52 (0.9%), rupture of membranes (0.22%), and fetal death (0.19%)⁷. As such, it is recommended
53 that an ECV only be performed in an institution where an emergency Cesarean delivery can be
54 performed and that shared decision making be employed to determine whether to proceed with
55 an ECV vs a scheduled Cesarean birth.. Given the overall risks of the procedure, there has been a

56 significant move in the field to publish models which predict an individual patient's success, to
57 aide patients and practitioners in deciding for or against this intervention.

58 Many statistical models have been published in the last decade which predict the success
59 of an ECV depending on a multitude of variables such as: parity, placental location, amniotic
60 fluid volume, fetal sex, and descent of the presenting part¹². We recently published a systematic
61 review of the 25 models that have been published so far, 14 of which in the last 5 years. The vast
62 majority of models had no external validation and thus were not being used in clinical practice.
63 Because of various statistical biases, it is common for a prediction model to be overfit and appear
64 to perform well in the original study, but be poorly predictive in reality. Thus, it is critical that
65 rigorous external validation be performed before these models are used clinically as acting on
66 incorrect predictions is worse than have no prediction at all. Therefore, in our systematic review,
67 we determined that rather than new models to be developed, there is a need for validation of the
68 existing models to determine their suitability for clinical use¹³. This study aims to fill that gap in
69 the current literature and uses data from a hospital in the United States to externally validate six
70 different existing prediction models for ECV success.

71

72 ***Methods***

73 ***Study design***

74 We performed a retrospective cohort study at Carle Foundation Hospital in Urbana,
75 Illinois, USA. Approval from the institutional review board (IRB) was obtained prior to data
76 collection and the study was deemed exempt. Inclusion criteria were pregnant individuals in
77 whom one or more ECVs were attempted or performed. ECVs in patients with a prior Cesarean

78 section (TOLAC) and in non-breech (e.g., transverse and oblique lie) presentations were
79 included. Twin pregnancies were excluded. Patients were excluded if the ECV or the delivery
80 did not happen at our institution or if the patient did not have any formal ultrasounds available in
81 our EMR.

82 Data was retrieved from maternal medical records including demographic characteristics,
83 pregnancy information, ultrasound information, the success of the ECV attempt, and delivery
84 information. All charts were manually reviewed by the authors to confirm ECV success and final
85 method of delivery. ECV success was defined as cephalic presentation when the physician left
86 the room after the procedure. If the fetus returned to non-cephalic presentation after, then a
87 second attempt was considered a separate ECV altogether. Fetal presentation was obtained from
88 the patient's most recent formal ultrasound before the ECV; if the patient's last ultrasound
89 indicated cephalic presentation, then presentation information was obtained from physician notes
90 at the time of the ECV. REDCap was used to store the data until it was deidentified.

91 Demographic data was collected and tabulated. Pre-gravid BMI (BMI prior to pregnancy
92 or at first prenatal visit) was able to be collected for almost all patients, but BMI before ECV and
93 BMI at delivery was only available for a subset of patients. Many of the models included BMI,
94 but only some specified which BMI was used. The appropriate BMI was used when possible;
95 otherwise, the last available BMI was used. Some patients had other missing data (most
96 commonly for fetal presentation); thus, these patients were only used for evaluating prediction
97 models that did not require that variable.

98 All models except Dahl 2021¹⁴ used amniotic fluid volume; four models used amniotic
99 fluid index (AFI) while Burgos 2010^{15,16} used qualitative terms (e.g. "scarce", "normal", or
100 "abundant"). AFI was collected from patient records. For calculation of the Burgos 2010 model,

101 qualitative criteria were converted to oligohydramnios (AFI<5), normal, and polyhydramnios
102 (AFI≥24)^{17,18}. Five patients did not have an AFI reported, but did have a single deepest pocket
103 (SDP); this was approximated to an AFI value by multiplying by 3.

104 Some models required estimated fetal weight (EFW). The last growth ultrasound was
105 used to obtain the EFW percentile. Then, using the World Health Organization Fetal Growth
106 Charts, the EFW at the time of ECV was calculated using the EFW percentile, gestational age at
107 ECV, and the fetal sex^{19,20} (see <https://github.com/jcarvalho45/whoFetalGrowth> for code and
108 dataset).

109 *Statistical analysis*

110 Six prediction models were chosen from the prior systematic review: Dahl 2021¹⁴,
111 Bilgory 2023^{21,22}, López Pérez 2020¹², Kok 2011²³, Burgos 2010^{15,16}, and Tasnim 2012 (GNK-
112 PIMS score)²⁴. These models were chosen because they did not require any additional
113 measurements (e.g., forebag size, cervical exam before ECV) beyond what is routinely already
114 performed at our institution. The score or predicted probability was calculated for each model.
115 The receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves were calculated for each model by
116 determining the sensitivity and specificity values at each threshold. The area under the curve
117 (AUC) was calculated and used as a predictor of discriminative power, and this was compared
118 between the models.

119 Because the ROC does not naturally have a method to determine confidence intervals,
120 bootstrapping statistical techniques were used to simulate 1000 new datasets from our original
121 dataset by sampling with replacement. This was done for each model and the simulations were
122 used to create confidence intervals for the AUC as well as the ROC curves themselves.

123 Finally, calibration plots were calculated to give a measure of how well the calculated
124 probabilities compared to the observed outcomes²⁵. This was performed by calculating the odds
125 of success at each decile of predicted probability (e.g., in cases with a predicted probability of
126 70-79%, what percent of the time was the ECV actually successful?). Quality of calibration was
127 assessed visually.

128 Calculations were performed with Python version 3.10 using numpy, pandas, and sklearn
129 (scikit-learn) libraries and in Jupyter notebooks hosted by Google colab. Figures were created
130 using plotly 5.15. The code is hosted on GitHub and will be published online after publication of
131 this study. The underlying data was deidentified and cleaned for publication with this manuscript
132 for reproduction or for future analyses.

133

134 **Results**

135 *Population demographics*

136 We ultimately obtained data from 125 patients who underwent a total of 132 ECV
137 attempts, of which 69 were successful (52.2%) as seen in **Table 1** and **Table 2**. 53 of the patients
138 ultimately had a vaginal delivery including 50 of those with successful ECVs and 3 of those with
139 failed ECVs who spontaneously verted afterwards. No patients had vaginal breech births. 107
140 patients were breech, 15 patients were transverse, and 3 were oblique before the first ECV
141 attempt. Our sample had a largely white population, which is consistent with the demographics
142 of our geographical region. No patients had oligohydramnios and six patients had
143 polyhydramnios (AFI ≥ 24), of which five had mild polyhydramnios (AFI < 30) and five had
144 successful ECVs (all except the patient with moderate polyhydramnios).

145 1 patient did not have any recorded BMI values. 116 patients did not have a recorded
146 EFW percentile. Only 40 patients had information of breech type (e.g. frank, complete,
147 incomplete).

148 The underlying data from this study is given in **Supplement 1**.

149

150 *Available models – discrimination ability*

151 The following 6 models were studied: Dahl 2021¹⁴, Bilgory 2023^{21,22}, López Pérez
152 2020¹², Kok 2011²³, Burgos 2010^{15,16}, and Tasnim 2012 (GNK-PIMS score)²⁴. **Table 3** outlines
153 the varying characteristics of these models including the AUC. In our population, all models had
154 at least some predictive value (AUC >0.5), with Dahl 2021 having the greatest AUC at 0.78
155 (**Figure 1**). Bilgory 2023^{21,22}, López Pérez 2020¹², Kok 2011²³, and Burgos 2010^{15,16} all had
156 similar predictive values with AUC 0.68-0.71. Tasnim 2012²⁴ had the lowest predictive value in
157 our study with an AUC of 0.63. When bootstrapping was performed to simulate confidence
158 intervals for the AUC, Tasnim 2012²⁴ was not statistically significant with 0.5 being inside the
159 confidence interval (**Figure 2**). However, the confidence interval was wide for Tasnim 2012
160 because the majority of our data did not have fetal presentation (e.g., frank vs complete vs
161 incomplete breech) recorded and thus was not included in the analysis of Tasnim 2012. The
162 confidence intervals for the AUC overlapped between the majority of the models so confirmation
163 of which model had the best discriminative ability was not able to be done. A bootstrapped ROC
164 curve is shown for Dahl 2021 in **Figure 3** and a table of bootstrapped AUC value for all the
165 models is shown in **Supplement 2**.

166 *Available models – calibration*

167 Dahl 2021¹⁴ was relatively well calibrated in our population (**Figure 4**). Bilgory
168 2023^{21,22} had poor calibration without a specific tendency to over or under calibrate. López
169 Pérez 2020 was consistently under-calibrated. That is, it would consistently underestimate the
170 probability of success in our population by a relatively fixed amount. The remaining three
171 models return score values instead of predicted probabilities. Thus, calibration curves cannot be
172 properly assessed. A probability of success by score value is shown for Kok 2011, Burgos 2010,
173 and Tasnim 2012 in **Figure 5**. The probability of success poorly correlated with score for Kok
174 2011 and Tasnim 2012, but correlated well for Burgos 2010.

175

176 **Discussion**

177 The prediction of ECV success has the potential to be an incredibly powerful tool in
178 counseling patients as they weigh the risks and benefits of the procedure. Prediction models have
179 the opportunity to give specific, personalized information to patients. However, they have the
180 ability to cause harm if they are inaccurate or poorly calibrated. In reality, confidently providing
181 a patient an inaccurate odds of success is worse than providing no prediction at all.

182 Unfortunately, there has not been a clinical consensus on the optimal tool despite dozens of
183 models having been proposed. Our prior systematic review identified lack of external validation
184 studies as a major gap in the literature, prohibiting clinical use of published models.

185 In this article, we set out to validate the 6 models that could be used in our population as
186 they used variables which are already collected as part of routine care at our institution. These
187 models are Dahl 2021¹⁴, Bilgory 2023^{21,22}, López Pérez 2020¹², Kok 2011²³, Burgos 2010^{15,16},

188 and Tasnim 2012 (GNK-PIMS score)²⁴. Our data demonstrates that all of these models have at
189 least some predictive value, with the exception of Tasnim 2012 (which was not statistically
190 significant by bootstrapping, likely because of the small number of patients with sufficient
191 recorded data to calculate this model). Of all the models, Dahl 2021 had the greatest AUC,
192 although the bootstrapped confidence interval still overlapped with the other models. Of the three
193 models that output a specific probability, only Dahl 2021 appeared overall well calibrated. Based
194 off the available evidence from this study, Dahl 2021 appears to overall be the best model for
195 clinical use.

196 This is the first external validation study of Dahl 2021. While it is generally expected that
197 external validation studies will show worse predictive values than the original study because of
198 some degree of unavoidable statistical bias, the opposite was true here. Dahl 2021's AUC in our
199 study was 0.779 (confidence interval of 0.712-0.844), which is higher than the original study,
200 which showed an AUC of 0.667 (confidence interval of 0.634-0.701). Overall, the results are
201 very promising for Dahl 2021.

202 There are some limitations with our study. Due to the retrospective nature of our study,
203 we only evaluated models that used variables routinely measured in our institution. Our
204 institution does not routinely measure uterine tone^{26,27}, cervical exam/fetal station²⁸⁻³⁰ and
205 forebag size³¹, which are components of other models. One of these models may in fact have
206 greater predictive value than the ones we evaluated in our study. On the other hand, these models
207 would also be less practical to implement in clinical practice because they would require
208 measuring additional variables. Additionally, these variables would not be known until close to
209 ECV; thus, it would be hard to counsel patients in advance using one of these models. Since

210 many models required cervical exam or fetal station, we suggest future research study be a
211 prospective trial where cervical exam is performed.

212

213 **Declarations**

214 *Ethics approval and consent to participate*

215 No new unpublished data from humans or other animals was included in this study.

216 *Consent for publication*

217 Not applicable.

218 *Funding*

219 The authors declare that no funds, grants, or other support were received specifically for
220 the preparation of this manuscript. The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

221 *Availability of data and materials*

222 The data is published in the supplemental data. The code is hosted in a GitHub
223 repository, which will be publicly available after publication of this manuscript.

224 *Acknowledgments*

225 We thank artificial intelligence engineer Benjamin M. Pikus for his help in deciding how
226 to evaluate prediction model performance.

227

228

229 **Tables**

230

231 **Table 1. Demographic information and other baseline characteristics**

	Count	%
<i>ECVs Performed</i>		
1	121	97%
2	2	2%
3	1	1%
4	1	1%
<i>Parity</i>		
0	54	43%
1	32	26%
2	24	19%
3	10	8%
≥4	5	4%
<i>Race</i>		
White	85	69%
Black or African American	21	16%
Asian	11	9%
American Indian / Alaskan Native	1	1%
Patient refused	1	1%
All other/none of the above	14	11%
<i>Ethnicity</i>		
Not Hispanic or Latino	111	89%
Hispanic or Latino	13	10%
Unknown/patient refused	1	1%
<i>Fetal Sex</i>		
Female	68	54%
Male	57	46%
<i>Delivery</i>		
Cesarean - Total	82	64%
Low transverse, primary	69	53%
Low transverse, repeat	7	5%
Low transverse, unspecified	5	4%
Vertical, primary	1	1%
Vaginal - Total	47	36%
Vacuum-assisted	3	2.4%
Spontaneous	44	34%
<i>Presentation / Lie</i>		
Breech - Total	107	86%
Frank	25	20%
Footling	7	6%
Complete	7	6%
Incomplete	1	1%
Other/unknown breech	67	54%
Transverse	15	12%
Oblique	3	2%

232

233 **Table 2. Baseline characteristics continued**

Variable	Mean ± SD	Min - Max
Maternal age (yr)	30.2 ± 4.9	18 - 40
Initial BMI (kg/m ²)	28.2 ± 6.7	17.6 - 46.3
Last BMI (kg/m ²)	31.1 ± 6.3	19.9 - 47.3
GA at ECV (wk)	37.9 ± 0.92	36w 4d - 40w 6d
GA at delivery (wk)	39.3 ± 0.86	37w 1d - 41w 3d
ECV to delivery time (days)	9.6 ± 7.34	0 - 27
AFI	14.7 ± 4.96	5.73 - 34.97
EFW at last US (percentile), n=112	46.8 ± 19.9	9 - 95
EFW, calculated at ECV (g), n=112	3121 ± 298	2597 - 4277

234

235 **Table 3. Background on prediction models**


Model	Output	Predictive factors	Prior validation statistics	Current study AUC
Dahl 2021 (Chicago, USA)	Probability (logistic)	Parity, BMI, placenta location, fetal lie	Internal validation AUC: 0.667 [0.634-0.701]	AUC: 0.779 [0.712-0.844]
Bilgory 2023 (Bnei Brak, Israel)	Probability	Parity, AFV	Training data AUC: 0.71 [0.672– 0.748]	AUC: 0.680 [0.611-0.751]
López Pérez 2020 (Murcia, Spain)	Probability	Parity, AFV, placenta location	Training data Accuracy: 74.0% Sensitivity: 98.8%, Specificity: 12.3%	AUC: 0.675 [0.597-0.748]
Kok 2011 (Amsterdam, The Netherlands)	Score (9-22)	Parity, AFV, placenta location, EFW	Internal validation AUC: 0.738 [0.695–0.782] External validation AUC: 0.669 [0.622– 0.716]	AUC: 0.706 [0.628-0.777]
Burgos 2010 (Basque Country, Spain)	Score (4-14)	Parity, AFV, placenta location, breech type	Training data AUC: 0.738 [0.695– 0.782] External validation AUC: 0.669 [0.622– 0.716]	AUC: 0.685 [0.512-0.845]
GNK-PIMS / Tasnim 2012 (Islamabad, Pakistan)	Score (0-10)	Parity, AFV, BMI, GA, breech type	None	AUC: 0.626 [0.471-0.766]

236 All models are logistic regression models or are score charts derived from them. AFV, amniotic
 237 fluid volume; EFW, estimated fetal weight; AUC, area under the ROC curve. Brackets represent
 238 95% confidence intervals.

239


240 Figures

241 **Figure 1. ROC curves of all models.** The predictive ability of all the models is displayed using
242 receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves and the area under the curve (AUC).




243

244 **Figure 2. AUC of models with bootstrapping.** The AUC of all the models is displayed as a bar
245 chart for comparison. 95% confidence intervals were estimated using bootstrapping from 1,000
246 simulated datasets




247

248 **Figure 3 ROC curve for Dahl 2021 with bootstrapping**




249

250 **Figure 4. Calibration curves.** The calibration is displayed for the models that output
 251 probabilities: Dahl 2021, Bilgory 2023, and López Pérez 2020. This figure shows how well the
 252 predicted probabilities match the observed probability. Only Dahl 2021 has a good match.



253

254 **Figure 5 Observed probability by predicted score.** This is shown as an alternative to the
 255 calibration curve for the models (Kok 2011, Burgos 2010, Tasnim 2012) that do not output a
 256 probability score.



257
 258

259 Supplement

260 **Supplement 1 Deidentified patient data to reproduce the analyses.** For yes/no questions, 0:
 261 no, 1: yes. For baby gender, 1: female, 2: male. For ethnicity, 11: Hispanic, 12: not Hispanic, 13:
 262 unknown/patient refused. For language, 1: English, 2: French, 3: Spanish, 15: Portuguese. For
 263 patient race, 1: White, 2: Black, 3: none of the above/all other races, 4: Hispanic, 5: Asian, 6:
 264 American Indian or Alaskan Native, 7: Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian, 8: Patient refused.
 265 EFW at ECV and at delivery were calculated using the percentile from the most recent
 266 ultrasound as described in the methods. ECV success for the first, second, third, and fourth ECV
 267 attempts is given by the variables `ecv_successful_1`, `ecv_successful_2`, etc, respectively.
 268 Maternal age at delivery (`age_delivery`) is given in years. Gestational ages are given in days.
 269 EFWs are given in grams. Patient weights and total weight gain (`twg`) is given in pounds, while
 270 BMI is given in kg/m²

271

272 **Supplement 2 Area under the curve data with bootstrapping.** AUC values >0.5 are
 273 highlighted

	Original Data		1000 Bootstrapped Simulations								
			Center		Percentiles						
	n	AUC	AUC Mean	AUC SD	AUC Min	AUC 1%	AUC 5%	AUC Median	AUC 95%	AUC 99%	AUC Max
Dahl 2021	131	0.7791	0.7794	0.0414	0.6496	0.6797	0.7124	0.7817	0.8437	0.8692	0.8891
Bilgory 2023	132	0.6800	0.6805	0.0433	0.5581	0.5764	0.6108	0.6802	0.7510	0.7723	0.8310
López Pérez 2020	132	0.6754	0.6760	0.0464	0.5161	0.5644	0.5972	0.6775	0.7482	0.7722	0.7960
Kok 2011	116	0.7063	0.7066	0.0456	0.5693	0.5978	0.6282	0.7089	0.7773	0.8018	0.8389
Burgos 2010	40	0.6845	0.6854	0.1021	0.2396	0.4273	0.5116	0.6859	0.8449	0.8899	0.9436
Tasnim 2012	40	0.6265	0.6221	0.0879	0.3177	0.4121	0.4718	0.6225	0.7656	0.8219	0.8860

274


275 **References**


- 276 1. Richmond AK, Ashworth JR. Management of malposition and malpresentation in labour.
277 *Obstet Gynaecol Reprod Med.* 2023;33(11):325-333. doi:10.1016/j.ogrm.2023.08.004
- 278 2. External Cephalic Version: ACOG Practice Bulletin, Number 221. *Obstet Gynecol.*
279 2020;135(5):e203-e212. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000003837
- 280 3. Hill LM. Prevalence of breech presentation by gestational age. *Am J Perinatol.* 1990;7(1):92-
281 93. doi:10.1055/s-2007-999455
- 282 4. ACOG Committee Opinion No. 745: Mode of Term Singleton Breech Delivery. *Obstet*
283 *Gynecol.* 2018;132(2):e60-e63. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000002755
- 284 5. External Cephalic Version and Reducing the Incidence of Term Breech Presentation. *BJOG*
285 *Int J Obstet Gynaecol.* 2017;124(7):e178-e192. doi:10.1111/1471-0528.14466
- 286 6. Nalam RL, Chinnachamy P, Emmanuel P. External Cephalic Version: A Dying Art Worth
287 Reviving. *J Obstet Gynecol India.* 2018;68(6):493-497. doi:10.1007/s13224-018-1090-z
- 288 7. Grootscholten K, Kok M, Oei SG, Mol BWJ, van der Post JA. External cephalic version-
289 related risks: a meta-analysis. *Obstet Gynecol.* 2008;112(5):1143-1151.
290 doi:10.1097/AOG.0b013e31818b4ade
- 291 8. Ben-Meir A, Erez Y, Sela HY, Shveiky D, Tsafrir A, Ezra Y. Prognostic parameters for
292 successful external cephalic version. *J Matern-Fetal Neonatal Med Off J Eur Assoc Perinat*
293 *Med Fed Asia Ocean Perinat Soc Int Soc Perinat Obstet.* 2008;21(9):660-662.
294 doi:10.1080/14767050802244938
- 295 9. Ebner F, Friedl TWP, Leinert E, et al. Predictors for a successful external cephalic version: a
296 single centre experience. *Arch Gynecol Obstet.* 2016;293(4):749-755. doi:10.1007/s00404-
297 015-3902-z
- 298 10. Kok M, Cnossen J, Gravendeel L, van der Post J, Opmeer B, Mol BW. Clinical factors to
299 predict the outcome of external cephalic version: a metaanalysis. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.*
300 2008;199(6):630.e1-7; discussion e1-5. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2008.03.008
- 301 11. Chaudhary S, Contag S, Yao R. The impact of maternal body mass index on external
302 cephalic version success. *J Matern-Fetal Neonatal Med Off J Eur Assoc Perinat Med Fed*
303 *Asia Ocean Perinat Soc Int Soc Perinat Obstet.* 2019;32(13):2159-2165.
304 doi:10.1080/14767058.2018.1427721
- 305 12. López-Pérez R, Lorente-Fernández M, Velasco-Martínez M, Martínez-Cendán JP. Prediction
306 model of success for external cephalic version. Complications and perinatal outcomes after a
307 successful version. *J Obstet Gynaecol Res.* 2020;46(10):2002-2009. doi:10.1111/jog.14385


- 308 13. Yerrabelli RS, Lee C, Palsgaard PK, Lauinger AR, Abdelsalam O, Jennings V. Prediction
309 Models for Successful External Cephalic Version: An Updated Systematic Review. *Am J*
310 *Perinatol*. Published online January 12, 2024. doi:10.1055/a-2211-4806
- 311 14. Dahl CM, Zhang Y, Ong JX, et al. A Multivariable Predictive Model for Success of External
312 Cephalic Version. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2021;138(3):426-433.
313 doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000004518
- 314 15. Burgos J, Melchor JC, Pijoán JI, Cobos P, Fernández-Llebreg L, Martínez-Astorquiza T. A
315 prospective study of the factors associated with the success rate of external cephalic version
316 for breech presentation at term. *Int J Gynecol Obstet*. 2011;112(1):48-51.
317 doi:10.1016/j.ijgo.2010.07.023
- 318 16. Burgos J, Cobos P, Rodriguez L, et al. Clinical score for the outcome of external cephalic
319 version: A two-phase prospective study: Clinical score for external cephalic version. *Aust N*
320 *Z J Obstet Gynaecol*. 2012;52(1):59-61. doi:10.1111/j.1479-828X.2011.01386.x
- 321 17. Reddy UM, Abuhamad AZ, Levine D, Saade GR. Fetal Imaging: Executive Summary of a
322 Joint Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development,
323 Society for Maternal-Fetal Medicine, American Institute of Ultrasound in Medicine,
324 American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, American College of Radiology,
325 Society for Pediatric Radiology, and Society of Radiologists in Ultrasound Fetal Imaging
326 Workshop. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2014;123(5):1070-1082. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000000245
- 327 18. Society for Maternal-Fetal Medicine (SMFM). Electronic address: pubs@smfm.org, Dashe
328 JS, Pressman EK, Hibbard JU. SMFM Consult Series #46: Evaluation and management of
329 polyhydramnios. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2018;219(4):B2-B8. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2018.07.016
- 330 19. Kiserud T, Piaggio G, Carroli G, et al. The World Health Organization Fetal Growth Charts:
331 A Multinational Longitudinal Study of Ultrasound Biometric Measurements and Estimated
332 Fetal Weight. *PLoS Med*. 2017;14(1). doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1002220
- 333 20. Kiserud T, Benachi A, Hecher K, et al. The World Health Organization fetal growth charts:
334 concept, findings, interpretation, and application. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2018;218(2):S619-
335 S629. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2017.12.010
- 336 21. Bilgory A, Minich O, Shvaikovsky M, Gurevich G, Lessing JB, Olteanu I. Predictive Factors
337 for Successful Vaginal Delivery after a Trial of External Cephalic Version: A Retrospective
338 Cohort Study of 946 Women. *Am J Perinatol*. 2023;40(15):1679-1686. doi:10.1055/s-0041-
339 1739505
- 340 22. Bilgory A, Minich O, Shvaikovsky M, Gurevich G, Lessing JB, Olteanu I. Erratum:
341 Predictive Factors for Successful Vaginal Delivery after a Trial of External Cephalic
342 Version: A Retrospective Cohort Study of 946 Women. *Am J Perinatol*. Published online
343 January 4, 2022. doi:10.1055/s-0041-1742110

- 344 23. De Hundt M, Vlemmix F, Kok M, et al. External Validation of a Prediction Model for
345 Successful External Cephalic Version. *Am J Perinatol*. 2012;29(03):231-236. doi:10.1055/s-
346 0031-1285098
- 347 24. Tasnim N, Mahmud G, Javaid K. GNK-PIMS Score: A Predictive Model for Success of
348 External Cephalic Version. *J South Asian Fed Obstet Gynaecol*. 2012;4(2):99-102.
349 doi:10.5005/jp-journals-10006-1184
- 350 25. Van Calster B, Nieboer D, Vergouwe Y, De Cock B, Pencina MJ, Steyerberg EW. A
351 calibration hierarchy for risk models was defined: from utopia to empirical data. *J Clin*
352 *Epidemiol*. 2016;74:167-176. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2015.12.005
- 353 26. Anand K, Keepanasseril A, Amala R, Nair NS. Development and validation of a clinical
354 score to predict the probability of successful procedure in women undergoing external
355 cephalic version. *J Matern-Fetal Neonatal Med Off J Eur Assoc Perinat Med Fed Asia*
356 *Ocean Perinat Soc Int Soc Perinat Obstet*. 2019;34(18):2925-2931.
357 doi:10.1080/14767058.2019.1674803
- 358 27. Wong WM, Lao TT, Liu KL. Predicting the success of external cephalic version with a
359 scoring system. A prospective, two-phase study. *J Reprod Med*. 2000;45(3):201-206.
- 360 28. Zheng LG, Zhang HL, Chen RX, et al. Scoring system to predict the success rate of external
361 cephalic versions and determine the timing of the procedure. *Eur Rev Med Pharmacol Sci*.
362 2021;25(1):45-55. doi:10.26355/eurrev_202101_24345
- 363 29. Hutton EK, Simioni JC, Thabane L. Predictors of success of external cephalic version and
364 cephalic presentation at birth among 1253 women with non-cephalic presentation using
365 logistic regression and classification tree analyses. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand*.
366 2017;96(8):1012-1020. doi:10.1111/aogs.13161
- 367 30. Newman RB, Peacock BS, Peter VanDorsten J, Hunt HH. Predicting success of external
368 cephalic version. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 1993;169(2):245-250. doi:10.1016/0002-
369 9378(93)90071-P
- 370 31. Isakov O, Reicher L, Lavie A, Yogev Y, Maslovitz S. Prediction of Success in External
371 Cephalic Version for Breech Presentation at Term. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2019;133(5):857-866.
372 doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000003196

373
374









Observed Probability


Dahl 2021




Bilgory 2023




López Pérez 2020




Kok 2011




Burgos 2010




Tasnim 2012




Count Observed Probability



Score



Score



Score