Literature Search Performed on: 06/04/2018
Beginning Date: January 2013
End Date: May 2018
Database: Ovid MEDLINE(R) Epub Ahead of Print, In-Process & Other Non-Indexed Citations, Ovid MEDLINE(R) Daily and Ovid MEDLINE(R) <1946 to Present>

Search Strategy

1 Vaginal Bleeding/ (9110)
2 dysfunctional vaginal bleeding*.mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms] (3)
3 abnormal vaginal bleeding*.tw. (540)
4 Menometrorrhagia.tw. (312)
5 Menorrhagia.tw. (3067)
6 Metrorrhagia.tw. (948)
7 dysfunctional uterine bleeding.tw. (825)
8 irregular menstrual cycle.tw. (81)
9 irregular menstrual bleeding.tw. (65)
10 irregular vaginal bleeding.tw. (206)
11 postmenopausal bleeding*.tw. (962)
12 uterine bleeding.tw. (3950)
13 abnormal uterine bleeding*.tw. (1836)
14 endometrial neoplasms.tw. (115)
15 uterine hemorrhage/ (9110)
16 endometrial polyps.tw. (1042)
17 leiomyoma/dg or leiomyoma.tw. (9868)
18 leiomyosarcoma/dg or leiomyosarcoma.tw. (8566)
19 carcinosarcoma.tw. (3368)
20 endometrial stromal sarcoma.tw. (901)
21 endometriosis.tw. (20445)
22 adenomyosis.tw. (2342)
23 premenopausal bleeding.mp. (22)
24 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12 or 13 or 14 or 15 or 16 or 17 or 18 or 19 or 20 or 21 or 22 or 23 (58640)
25 exp diagnostic imaging/ (2433605)
26 exp Ultrasonography/ (396904)
27 exp Magnetic Resonance Imaging/ (393329)
28 exp Elastography/ (6480)
29 24 and (25 or 26 or 27 or 28) (9864)
30 limit 29 to case reports (4703)
31 29 not 30 (5161)
32 limit 31 to (abstracts and english language and humans and yr="2013 -Current") (807)
33 limit 32 to review (139)
34 32 not 33 (668)
35 remove duplicates from 34 (653)
36 Pregnancy/ (819348)
37 35 and 36 (112)
38 35 not 37 (541)

Summary

Literature Search
ACR Appropriateness Criteria®
Abnormal Uterine Bleeding
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>#Unique Refs</th>
<th>#Retained Refs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old bibliography</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Search(es)</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author Added</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Docs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>