Literature Search
ACR Appropriateness Criteria®
Noninvasive Clinical staging of Primary Lung Cancer

Literature Search Performed on: 09/28/2016
Beginning Date: January 2012
End Date: August 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     exp Carcinoma, Bronchogenic/ (51051)
2     exp Diagnostic Imaging/ (1948167)
3     1 and 2 (6026)
4     Neoplasm Staging/ (143819)
5     3 and 4 (1862)
6     limit 5 to "all child (0 to 18 years)" (23)
7     5 not 6 (1839)
8     limit 7 to case reports (131)
9     7 not 8 (1708)
10     limit 9 to (abstracts and english language and humans and yr="2012 -Current") (464)
11     Carcinoma, Small Cell/ (17106)
12     Lung Neoplasms/ (185455)
13     4 and 11 and 12 (1363)
14     2 and 13 (196)
15     limit 14 to (abstracts and english language and humans and yr="2012 -Current") (9)
16     10 or 15 (470)
17     remove duplicates from 16 (448)
18     lung cancer.mp. (116006)
19     staging.mp. (181077)
20     adenocarcinoma in situ.mp. (1084)
21     18 and 19 and 20 (44)
22     prognostic factors.mp. (50883)
23     18 and 19 and 22 (998)
24     limit 23 to (abstracts and english language and yr="2016") (3)
25     limit 23 to (abstracts and english language and yr="2016") (28)
26     10 or 15 or 24 or 25 (500)
27     remove duplicates from 26 (477)
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>#Unique Refs</th>
<th>#Retained Refs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old bibliography</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Search(es)</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author Added</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Docs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.