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.

**Literature Search**

ACR Appropriateness Criteria®

Infective Endocarditis

Literature Search Performed on: 06/14/2018
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. exp endocarditis, bacterial/ (20125)
2. exp angiography/ (228020)
3. exp nuclear magnetic resonance/ (200261)
4. magnetic resonance imaging/ (356216)
5. echocardiography/ (79340)
6. echocardiography, transesophageal/ (18694)
7. exp radionuclide imaging/ (197991)
8. *echocardiography/ (26564)
9. Tomography, X-Ray Computed/ (347601)
10. exp diagnostic imaging/ (2439501)
11. 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 (2634962)
12. 1 and 11 (4106)
13. limit 12 to "all child (0 to 18 years)" (795)
14. 12 not 13 (3311)
15. limit 14 to (abstracts and english language and humans and yr="2013 -Current") (338)
16. limit 15 to case reports (261)
17. 15 not 16 (77)
18. remove duplicates from 17 (76)
19. exp Nuclear Medicine/ (5339)
20. exp Positron-Emission Tomography/ (49878)
21. 1 and (19 or 20) (61)
22. limit 21 to "all child (0 to 18 years)" (3)
23. 21 not 22 (58)
24. limit 23 to (abstracts and english language and humans and yr="2013 -Current") (23)
25. limit 24 to case reports (11)
26. 24 not 25 (12)
27. 18 or 26 (76)
28. remove duplicates from 27 (76)

**Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>#Unique Refs</th>
<th>#Retained Refs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old bibliography</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Search(es)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author Added</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Docs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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