Literature Search

ACR Appropriateness Criteria®
Acute Pelvic Pain in the Reproductive Age Group

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 3 2013>

Search Strategy:
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
1     exp Diagnostic Imaging/ (962747)
2     Appendicitis/ (5646)
3     Pregnancy/ (285646)
4     Pelvic Pain/ (3069)
5     Colic/ and Kidney Diseases/ (366)
6     Renal Colic/ (120)
7     Ovary/ and Venous Thrombosis/ (74)
8     ovarian vein thrombosis.mp. (93)
9     Torsion Abnormality/ (2616)
10    2 and 3 (308)
11    3 and 4 (363)
12    3 and 6 (10)
13    5 or 12 (376)
14    7 or 8 (111)
15    3 and 14 (48)
16    Ovarian Diseases/ (1938)
17    9 or 16 (4294)
18    3 and 17 (498)
19    Acute Disease/ and *Pelvic Pain/ (51)
20    10 or 11 or 13 or 15 or 18 or 19 (1591)
21    1 and 20 (439)
22    limit 21 to (abstracts and english language and humans and yr="2010 -Current") (49)
23    limit 22 to case reports (13)
24    22 not 23 (36)

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 41 citations in the original bibliography, 37 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® Acute Pelvic Pain in the Reproductive Age Group topic was finalized. Using the search strategy described above, 36 articles were found. Seven articles were added to the bibliography. Twenty-nine 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 43 citations from bibliographies, websites, or books that were not found in the new literature search.

Four citations are supporting documents that were added by staff.