

Table 1. Literature Search strategy for 2019 American Radium Society® Appropriate Use Criteria for Management of Uterine Carcinosarcoma

Literature Search Performed on: 8/3/2018

Beginning Date: 1/1/2008

End Date: 8/3/201/2018

Database: Ovid MEDLINE(R) without Revisions <1996 to October Week 2 2018>

Search Strategy:

-
- 1 exp Carcinosarcoma/ (5764)
 - 2 exp Uterine Neoplasms/ (122356)
 - 3 exp Uterus/ (111971)
 - 4 2 or 3 (216365)
 - 5 1 and 4 (821)
 - 6 Mixed Tumor, Mullerian/ (494)
 - 7 malignant mixed Mullerian tumor\$.mp. (438)
 - 8 uterine carcinosarcoma\$.mp. (373)
 - 9 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 (1564)
 - 10 limit 9 to (english language and yr="1990 -Current") (1199)
 - 11 random:.tw. or clinical trial:.mp. or exp health care quality/ or placebo:.mp. or double-blind:.tw. (6864559)
 - 12 manage\$.mp. (1241588)
 - 13 (guideline or meta analysis or practice guideline).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] (234091)
 - 14 surgery.mp. (2397009)
 - 15 adjuvant.mp. (151225)
 - 16 Radiotherapy/ (40162)
 - 17 11 or 12 or 13 or 14 or 15 or 16 (8909986)
 - 18 10 and 17 (729)
 - 19 uter\$.mp. (297139)
 - 20 18 and 19 (515)

Literature Search Summary

Of the 40 citations in the original bibliography, 36 citations were retained in the final document. Articles were removed from the original bibliography if they were they were no longer cited in the revised narrative text.

To update results of important randomized studies, a new literature search was conducted in December 2018 to identify additional evidence published since the *ARS Appropriate Use Criteria for Uterine carcinosarcoma draft* topic was finalized. Using the search strategy described above, 1006 articles were found. Three references were updated. No new articles were added to the bibliography 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.