

## Literature Search

### ACR Appropriateness Criteria® Gestational Trophoblastic Disease

Literature Search Performed on: 8/11/16

Beginning Date: January 2006

End Date: July 2016

Database: Epub Ahead of Print, In-Process & Other Non-Indexed Citations, Ovid MEDLINE(R) Daily and Ovid MEDLINE(R) <1946 to Present>

Search Strategy:

- 
- 1 Gestational Trophoblastic Disease/ (730)
  - 2 Trophoblastic Neoplasms/di, th [Diagnosis, Therapy] (601)
  - 3 exp Hydatidiform Mole/ (4815)
  - 4 epithelial trophoblastic tumor.mp. (1)
  - 5 Choriocarcinoma/di, ra, ri, su, us [Diagnosis, Radiography, Radionuclide Imaging, Surgery, Ultrasonography] (1458)
  - 6 Trophoblastic Tumor, Placental Site/di, ra, ri, su, us [Diagnosis, Radiography, Radionuclide Imaging, Surgery, Ultrasonography] (140)
  - 7 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 (7007)
  - 8 Diagnosis/ (17016)
  - 9 Disease Management/ (24812)
  - 10 treatment.mp. or Therapeutics/ (3891780)
  - 11 Pregnancy Complications/ (81313)
  - 12 Prevalence/ (226628)
  - 13 Epidemiology/ (11903)
  - 14 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12 or 13 (4187542)
  - 15 exp Diagnostic Imaging/ (1931864)
  - 16 7 and (14 or 15) (2511)
  - 17 1 or 16 (2837)
  - 18 limit 17 to (abstracts and english language and humans and yr="2006 -Current") (664)
  - 19 limit 18 to case reports (213)
  - 20 18 not 19 (451)
  - 21 remove duplicates from 20 (442)
  - 22 gestational trophoblastic.mp. (2383)
  - 23 imaging.tw. (591018)
  - 24 ultrasonog\$.tw. (89738)
  - 25 tomogra\$.tw. (312014)
  - 26 MR\$.tw. (791073)
  - 27 angiogra\$.tw. (164839)
  - 28 CT\$.tw. (375342)
  - 29 22 and (23 or 25 or 26 or 27 or 28) (239)
  - 30 limit 29 to (abstracts and english language and yr="2006 -Current") (114)
  - 31 limit 30 to case reports (35)
  - 32 30 not 31 (79)
  - 33 21 or 32 (479)
  - 34 Male/ (7372309)
  - 35 33 not 34 (465)
-

## Summary

Source	#Unique Refs	#Retained Refs
Old bibliography	0	0
Literature Search(es)	465	53
Author Added	19	19
Supporting Docs	8	8
Total		80

References from the literature search that were not retained had a poor study design, were not relevant to the topic, or had unclear or biased results.