

Literature Search

ACR Appropriateness Criteria® Palpable Abdominal Mass

Literature Search Performed on: 8/28/2013

Beginning Date: January 2010

End Date: July 2013

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

Search Strategy:

-
- 1 Abdominal Neoplasms/ (7791)
 - 2 abdominal mas\$.mp. (4895)
 - 3 palpable abdominal mas\$.mp. (491)
 - 4 palpable abdominal tumor\$.mp. (24)
 - 5 abdominal wall mas\$.mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, keyword heading word, protocol supplementary concept, rare disease supplementary concept, unique identifier] (114)
 - 6 palpable.mp. (13693)
 - 7 1 and 6 (105)
 - 8 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 7 (5081)
 - 9 exp Diagnostic Imaging/ (1728980)
 - 10 ultrasound.mp. (150550)
 - 11 9 or 10 (1802716)
 - 12 8 and 11 (1969)
 - 13 limit 12 to (abstracts and english language and humans and yr="2010 -Current") (214)
 - 14 limit 13 to case reports (150)
 - 15 13 not 14 (64)
 - 16 remove duplicates from 15 (59)

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 10 citations in the original bibliography, 8 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 August 2013 to identify additional evidence published since the *ACR Appropriateness Criteria® Palpable Abdominal Mass* topic was finalized. Using the search strategy described above, 59 articles were found. One article was added to the bibliography. Fifty-eight 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 6 citations from bibliographies, websites, or books that were not found in the new literature search.

Two citations are supporting documents that were added by staff.