

Literature Search
ACR Appropriateness Criteria®
Suspected Spine Infection

Literature Search Performed on: 03/16/2020

Beginning Date: January 2010

End Date: February 2020

Database: Ovid MEDLINE(R) ALL <1946 to March 12, 2020>

Search Strategy

- 1 spinal infections.mp. and exp Diagnostic Imaging/ (127)
- 2 (spin\$ and infection\$).tw. and (magnetic resonance imaging/ or postoperative/ or diagnosis/) (1625)
- 3 (spin\$ and infection\$).mp. and (magnetic resonance imaging/ or postoperative/ or diagnosis/) (2536)
- 4 1 or 2 or 3 (2583)
- 5 limit 4 to (abstracts and english language and humans and yr="2010 -Current") (846)
- 6 (Bacterial Infections/ or Osteomyelitis/ or discitis/ or spondylitis/ or epidural abscess/ or spondylodiscitis/) and exp Diagnostic Imaging/ (11156)
- 7 (Bacterial Infections/ or Osteomyelitis/ or discitis/ or spondylitis/ or epidural abscess/ or spondylodiscitis/) and (magnetic resonance imaging/ or postoperative/ or diagnosis/) (2971)
- 8 6 or 7 (11193)
- 9 limit 8 to (abstracts and english language and humans and yr="2015 -Current") (800)
- 10 5 or 9 (1527)
- 11 limit 10 to case reports (738)
- 12 10 not 11 (789)
- 13 limit 12 to "all child (0 to 18 years)" (236)
- 14 12 not 13 (553)
- 15 ((Epidural Abscess/ or Osteomyelitis/di) and Practice Guidelines as Topic/) or (Case for Imaging the Entire Spine or CT-guided biopsy of the spine or risk factors for mortality of vertebral osteomyelitis or Imaging in Spinal Infections or Guided Biopsy in Spinal Lesions or patients with spinal infection or preclinical spinal implant infection model).tw. (58)
- 16 limit 4 to (guideline or meta analysis or practice guideline or "systematic review" or systematic reviews as topic) (15)
- 17 14 or 15 or 16 (617)

Summary

| Source | #Unique Refs | #Retained Refs |
|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|
| Old bibliography | 0 | 0 |
| Literature Search(es) | 617 | 56 |
| Author Added | 20 | 16 |
| Supporting Docs | 1 | 1 |
| Total | | 73 |

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.

1 of the author added references were outside the search date range.