Literature Search
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Breast Implant Evaluation

Literature Search Performed on: 11/15/2021
Beginning Date: January 2014
End Date: October 2021
Database: Ovid MEDLINE(R) ALL <1946 to October 27, 2021>

Search Strategy
1  Breast Implants/ or Breast Implantation/ (6597)
2  Sodium Chloride/ (59427)
3  Silicone Elastomers/ (7864)
4  Silicons/ (12690)
5  Silicone Gels/ (1248)
6  Lymphadenopathy/ (1209)
7  Axilla/ (13753)
8  Lymphoma, Large-Cell, Anaplastic/ (2332)
9  Seroma/ (1247)
10 Lymphoma/ (52503)
11 Breast Neoplasms/ (305469)
12 Transgender Persons/ or transgender.mp. or transfem*.mp. or transwom*.mp. (15358)
13 (breast or augmentation).mp. (603922)
14 (saline or saline implant*).mp. (189541)
15 (silicone or silicone implant*).mp. (36082)
16 (intracapsular or extracapsular or rupture).mp. (146769)
17 (Breast Implant Associated Anaplastic Large Cell Lymphoma or Breast Implant Associated Lymphoma or BIA-ALCL).mp. (454)
18 1 and 14 and 16 (66)
19 1 and 2 and 14 and 16 (8)
20 (3 or 4 or 5) and (1 and 15 and 16) (301)
21 (6 or 7) and (1 and 15 and 16) (13)
22 1 and (8 or 9 or 10) (545)
23 1 and 11 (2085)
24 1 and 12 (22)
25 18 or 19 or 20 or 21 or 22 or 23 or 24 (2618)
26 (exp Diagnostic Imaging/ and 25) or ((imaging or evaluat*).mp. and 25) (966)
27 (1 and Disease Susceptibility/) or (Axilla/ and Breast Implantation/) (47)
28 26 or 27 (1006)
29 limit 28 to (abstracts and english language and humans and yr="2014 -Current") (444)
30 limit 29 to "all child (0 to 18 years)" (17)
31 29 not 30 (427)
32 limit 31 to case reports (58)
33 31 not 32 (369)
34 12 and 13 and 16 (2)
35 33 or 34 (371)
36 remove duplicates from 35 (371)

Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>#Unique Refs</th>
<th>#Retained Refs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old bibliography</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Search(es)</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author Added</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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>Supporting Docs</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>