Literature Search

ACR Appropriateness Criteria®
Staging of Testicular Malignancy

Literature Search Performed on: 4/29/2015
Beginning Date: January 2011
End Date: March 2015

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

Search Strategy:

1. Testicular Neoplasms/ (21009)
2. testicular cancer.mp. (4627)
3. scrotal mass$.mp. (591)
4. testis tumor$.mp. (399)
5. testes tumor$.mp. (96)
6. testicular tumor$.mp. (3529)
7. Seminoma/ (2353)
8. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 (23544)
9. exp diagnostic imaging/ (1787330)
10. 8 and 9 (2445)
11. Testicular Neoplasms/ra, ri, us [Radiography, Radionuclide Imaging, Ultrasonography] (1222)
12. 10 or 11 (2987)
13. Neoplasm Staging/ (129101)
14. 12 and 13 (295)
15. 1 and 13 (195)
16. 14 or 15 (1963)
17. limit 16 to "all child (0 to 18 years)" (499)
18. 16 not 17 (1464)
19. limit 18 to (abstracts and english language and humans and yr="2011 -Current") (111)
20. limit 19 to case reports (15)
21. 19 not 20 (96)
22. remove duplicates from 21 (94)

Notes:
exp = explode (retrieves results using the selected term and all of its more specific terms)
* = focus (limits search to those documents in which the subject heading is considered the major point of the article)
.mp = multi-purpose (retrieves results that have this keyword in several fields)

Literature Search Summary

Of the 69 citations in the original bibliography, 59 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 April 2015 to identify additional evidence published since the ACR Appropriateness Criteria® Staging of Testicular Malignancy topic was finalized. Using the search strategy described above, 94 articles were found. One article was added to the bibliography. Ninety-three 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 10 citations from bibliographies, websites, or books that were not found in the new literature search.