Literature Search Summary
ACR Appropriateness Criteria®
Breast Cancer Screening

Literature Search Performed On: 03/02/2016
Beginning Date: January 2011
End Date: February 2016

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

Search Strategy:

1. Breast Neoplasms/ri [Radionuclide Imaging] (3097)
2. exp Diagnostic Imaging/ (1859430)
3. 1 and 2 (1820)
4. dense breast.mp. (424)
5. 2 and 4 (342)
6. 3 or 5 (2139)
7. Tomography, X-Ray Computed/ and Positron-Emission Tomography/ (14587)
8. 6 not 7 (1886)
9. Lymphoscintigraphy/ (671)
10. 8 not 9 (1821)
11. Neoplasm Staging/ or staging.mp. (169331)
12. 10 not 11 (1500)
13. limit 12 to (abstracts and english language and humans and yr="2011 -Current") (286)
14. limit 13 to "all child (0 to 18 years)" (9)
15. 13 not 14 (277)
16. limit 15 to case reports (12)
17. 15 not 16 (265)

Literature Search Performed On: 12/02/2015
Beginning Date: January 2011
End Date: November 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. Breast Neoplasms/ (238338)
2. Risk Factors/ (634095)
3. Mass Screening/ (87793)
4. exp diagnostic imaging/ (1882910)
5. 1 and 2 and 3 and 4 (823)
6. limit 5 to "all child (0 to 18 years)" (29)
7. 5 not 6 (794)
8. limit 7 to (abstracts and english language and humans and yr="2011 -Current") (125)
9. limit 8 to case reports (0)
10. 8 not 9 (125)
11. remove duplicates from 10 (114)
**Literature Search Summary**

Of the 65 citations in the original bibliography, 14 were retained in the final document.

A new literature search was conducted in December 2015 and updated on March 2016 to identify additional evidence published since the ACR Appropriateness Criteria® Breast Cancer Screening topic was finalized. Using the search strategy described above, 379 articles were found. Twenty-four articles were added to the bibliography. The remaining 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 27 citations from bibliographies, websites, or books that were not found in the new literature search.