Literature Search

ACR Appropriateness Criteria®

Pretreatment Planning of Invasive Cancer of the Cervix

Literature Search Performed on: 12/20/2013
Beginning date: January 2010
End date: November 2013

Database: Ovid MEDLINE(R) without Revisions <1996 to July Week 1 2013>
Search Strategy:

1     Uterine Cervical Neoplasms/ (27973)
2     Radiology/ (7487)
3     Radiotherapy/ (14284)
4     radiation therapy.mp. (28997)
5     Fluorodeoxyglucose F18/ and Positron-Emission Tomography/ (9028)
6     exp Tomography, X-Ray Computed/ (198156)
7     exp Magnetic Resonance Imaging/ (244866)
8     Magnetic Resonance Spectroscopy/ (76577)
9     Diffusion Magnetic Resonance Imaging/ (9193)
10     Contrast Media/ and Magnetic Resonance Imaging/ (14880)
11     Neoplasm Staging/ (85221)
12     1 and 11 (3521)
13     2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 (517412)
14     12 and 13 (686)
15     limit 14 to (guideline or meta analysis or practice guideline) (10)
16     limit 14 to "all adult (19 plus years)" (511)
17     15 or 16 (518)
18     limit 17 to (abstracts and english language and humans and yr="2010 -Current") (119)
19     limit 18 to case reports (3)
20     18 not 19 (116)

Notes:
exp = explode (retrieves results using the selected term and all of its more specific terms)
.mp = multi-purpose (retrieves results that have this keyword in several fields)

Literature Search Summary

Of the 67 citations in the original bibliography 46 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® Pretreatment Planning of Invasive Cancer of the Cervix topic was finalized. Using the search strategy described above, 116 articles were found. Twelve articles were added to the bibliography. One hundred four 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 11 citations from bibliographies, websites, or books that were not found in the new literature search.