Literature Search

ACR Appropriateness Criteria®
Radiologic Management of Thoracic Nodules and Masses

Literature Search Performed on: 12/16/2013
Beginning Date: January 2010
End Date: November 2013
Database: Ovid MEDLINE(R) without Revisions <1996 to July Week 1 2013>
Search Strategy:
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
1    *Biopsy, Needle/ (6048)
2    *Thoracoscopy/ (2452)
3    *Biopsy, Fine-Needle/ (2514)
4    *Thoracotomy/ (2384)
5    *Lung Neoplasms/ (65756)
6    *Pleura/ (1058)
7    5 or 6 (66737)
8    Fluorodeoxyglucose F18/ and Positron-Emission Tomography/ (9028)
9    Tomography, X-Ray Computed/ (183510)
10    8 and 9 (3420)
11    1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 10 (16630)
12    7 and 11 (1462)
13    limit 12 to (guideline or meta analysis or practice guideline) (7)
14    limit 12 to "all adult (19 plus years)" (1048)
15    13 or 14 (1053)
16    limit 15 to (abstracts and english language and yr="2010 -Current") (296)
17    limit 16 to case reports (65)
18    16 not 17 (231)
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Notes:
* = focus (limits search to those documents in which the subject heading is considered the major point of the article)

Literature Search Summary

Of the 39 citations in the original bibliography, 28 were retained in the final document. Articles were removed from the original bibliography if they were more than 10 years old and did not contribute to the evidence or they were no longer cited in the revised narrative text.

A new literature search was conducted in December 2013 to identify additional evidence published since the ACR Appropriateness Criteria® Radiologic Management of Thoracic Nodules and Masses topic was finalized. Using the search strategy described above, 231 articles were found. Five articles were added to the bibliography. Two hundred twenty-six articles were not used due to either poor study design, the articles were not relevant or generalizable to the topic, the results were unclear, misinterpreted, or biased, or the articles were already cited in the original bibliography.

The author added 31 citations from bibliographies, websites, or books that were not found in the new literature search.