

Ensaio Clínico Aleatório

LILACS via Bireme **VALIDADA RED**

((Pt randomized controlled trial) OR (Pt controlled clinical trial) OR (Mh randomized controlled trials) OR (Mh random allocation) OR (Mh double blind method) OR (Mh single blind method) AND NOT (Ct animal) AND NOT (Ct human and Ct animal) OR (Pt clinical trial) OR (Ex E05.318.760.535\$) OR (Tw clin\$) AND (Tw trial\$) OR (Tw ensa\$) OR (Tw estud\$) OR (Tw experim\$) OR (Tw investiga\$) OR (Tw singl\$) OR (Tw simple\$) OR (Tw doubl\$) OR (Tw doble\$) OR (Tw duplo\$) OR (Tw trebl\$) OR (Tw trip\$) AND (Tw blind\$) OR (Tw cego\$) OR (Tw ciego\$) OR (Tw mask\$) OR (Tw mascar\$) OR (Mh placebos) OR (Tw placebo\$) OR (Tw random\$) OR (Tw randon\$) OR (Tw casual\$) OR (Tw acaso\$) OR (Tw azar) OR (Tw aleator\$) OR (Mh research design) AND NOT (Ct animal) AND NOT (Ct human and Ct animal) OR (Ct comparative study) OR (Ex E05.337\$) OR (Mh follow-up studies) OR (Mh prospective studies) OR (Tw control\$) OR (Tw prospectiv\$) OR (Tw volunt\$) OR (Tw volunteer\$) AND NOT ((Ct animal) AND NOT (Ct human and Ct animal)))

Results 2011: 2.599

Results 2011: 250.094

Results 2011: 106.273

Todas as cores 2011: 286.878

Pode ser utilizada no formulário avançado no idioma Inglês ou no Português, proporciona mesmo resultado.

MEDLINE via Pubmed **VALIDADA RED**

(randomized controlled trial [Publication Type] OR controlled clinical trial [Publication Type] OR randomized controlled trials [MeSH Terms] OR random allocation [MeSH Terms] OR double blind method [MeSH Terms] OR single blind method [MeSH Terms] OR clinical trial [Publication Type] OR clinical trials [MeSH Terms] OR (clinical* [Text Word] AND trial* [Text Word]) OR single* [Text Word] OR double* [Text Word] OR treble* [Text Word] OR triple* [Text Word] OR placebos [MeSH Terms] OR placebo* [Text Word] OR random* [Text Word] OR research design [MeSH Terms] OR comparative study [MeSH Terms] OR evaluation studies [MeSH Terms] OR follow-up studies [MeSH Terms] OR prospective studies [MeSH Terms] OR control* [Text Word] OR prospectiv* [Text Word] OR volunteer* [Text Word])

Results 2011: 4.845.655

EMBASE via Ovid

#Search History 1. Randomized controlled trial/ 2. Controlled study/ 3. Randomization/ 4. Double blind procedure/ 5. Single blind procedure/ 6. Clinical trial/ 7. (clinical adj5 trial\$.ti,ab,hw. 8. ((doubl\$ or singl\$ or tripl\$ or trebl\$) adj5 (blind\$ or mask\$)).ti,ab,hw. 9. Placebo/ 10. Placebo\$.ti,ab,hw. 11. Random\$.ti,ab,hw. 12. Methodology.sh. 13. latin square.ti,ab,hw. 14. crossover.ti,ab,hw. 15. cross-over.ti,ab,hw. 16. Crossover Procedure/ 17. Drug comparison/ 18. Comparative study/ 19. (comparative adj5 trial\$.ti,ab,hw. 20. (control\$ or prospectiv\$ or volunteer\$).ti,ab,hw. 21. exp "Evaluation and Follow Up"/ 22. Prospective study/ 23. or/1-22 24. animal/ not (human/ and animal/) 25. 23 not 24

((Randomized controlled trial) or (Controlled study) or Randomization (double blind procedure) or (single blind procedure) or (Clinical trial) or (clinical trials) or double or single or triple or (blind or mask) or Placebo or Random or (Methodology latin square) or crossover or (cross over) or (Crossover Procedure) or (Drug comparison) or (Comparative study) (comparative trial) or (comparative trials) or (control or controls or prospective or volunteer or volunteers) or (Evaluation and Follow Up) or (Prospective study))

Fontes

Castro AA, Clark OA, Atallah AN. Optimal search strategy for clinical trials in the Latin American and Caribbean Health Science Literature Database (LILACS database): Update [Letter]. Sao Paulo Med J/Rev Paul Med 1999;117(3):138-9.

Castro AA, Clark OA, Atallah AN. Optimal Search Strategy for Clinical Trials in the Latin American and Caribbean Health Science Literature Database (LILACS). Sao Paulo Med J/ Rev Paul Med 1997;115(5):1423-6. Medline Record

Dickersin K, Scherer R, Lefebvre C. Identifying relevant studies for systematic reviews. BMJ 1994;309:1286-9. Medline Record

Clarke M, Oxman AD, editors. Optimal search strategy for RCTs. Cochrane Reviewers' Handbook 4.0 [updated July 1999]; Appendix 5c. Section 4. In: Review Manager (RevMan) [Computer program].

Version 4.0. Oxford, England: The Cochrane Collaboration, 1999. From Dickersin K, Larson K. Establishing and maintaining an international register of RCTs. In: The Cochrane Library. Oxford: Update Software, 1996.

Estudos de Acurácia

LILACS via Bireme **VALIDADA RED**

(Ex E01\$ OR Ex E05.318.740.872\$ OR Ex E05.318.780.800\$ OR Ex G03.850.520.830.872\$ OR Ex G03.850.520.840.800\$ OR Ex H01.548.832.852\$ OR Ex N05.715.360.750.725\$ OR Ex N05.715.360.780.700\$ OR (Tw predictive AND Tw value\$))

Results 2011: 89.437

MEDLINE via Pubmed **VALIDADA RED**

(DIAGNOSIS (PX) OR INVESTIGATIVE TECHNIQUES (PX) OR "Epidemiologic Methods" [MeSH Terms] OR "sensitivity and specificity" [MESH] OR "ROC Curve" [MeSH Terms] OR "sensitivity and specificity" [MESH] OR "sensitivity" [WORD] OR ("diagnosis" [SH] OR "diagnostic use" [SH] OR "specificity" [WORD] OR ("predictive" [WORD] AND "value" [WORD]))*

Results 2011: 7.066.022

Fontes

McKibbin KA, Walker-Dilks CJ. Beyond the ACP Journal Club: How to harness MEDLINE for diagnostic problem. ACP J Club 1994;sep/Oct A10-12. Website: http://www.cche.net/principles/howto_all.asp

Irwing L, Tosteson ANA, Gatsonis C, Lau J, Colditz G, Chalmers TC, Mosteller F. Guidelines for meta-analyses evaluating diagnostic tests. Ann Intern Med 1994;120(8):667-676. Website: <http://hiru.mcmaster.ca/cochrane/cochrane/Sadtdoc1.htm>

Haynes RB, Wilczynski N, McKibbin KA, Walker CJ, Sinclair JC. [Developing optimal search strategies for detecting clinically sound studies in MEDLINE.](#) J Am Med Inform Assoc 1994 Nov-Dec;1(6):447-58.

Revisão Sistemática e Metanálise

LILACS via Bireme **VALIDADA RED PARA USAR NO ENGLISH FORM**

(Pt meta-analysis OR Tw meta-anal\$ OR Tw metaanal\$ OR ((Tw quantitativ\$ OR Tw cuantitativ\$) AND (Tw review\$ OR Tw overview\$ OR Tw revis\$ OR Tw evaluation\$)) OR ((Tw systematic\$ OR Tw sistemats\$) AND (Tw review\$ OR Tw overview\$ OR Tw revis\$ OR Tw evaluation\$)) OR ((Tw methodologic\$ OR Tw metodolog\$) AND (Tw review\$ OR Tw overview\$ OR Tw revis\$ OR Tw evaluation\$)) OR (Pt review AND (Tw medline OR Tw pubmed OR Tw IMLA OR Tw lilacs)))

Resultados 2011: 8.634

MEDLINE via Pubmed VALIDADA RED

("meta-analysis" [publication type] OR meta-anal* [Text Word] OR metaanal* [Text Word] OR metanal* [Text Word] OR ((quantitativ* [Text Word] OR systematic* [Text Word] OR methodologic* [Text Word]) AND (review* [Text Word] OR overview* [Text Word] OR evaluation* [Text Word])) OR ("review" [publication type] AND (medline [Text Word] OR pubmed [Text Word] OR cochrane [Text Word]))

Resultados 2011: 203.519

EMBASE via Ovid

#Search History 1 (meta-analysis or meta-analyses or meta-anal\$ or metaanal\$ or metanal\$).ti,ab,hw. 2 ((quantitativ\$ or cuantitativ\$) and (review\$ or overview\$ or revis\$ or evaluation\$)).ti,ab,hw. 3 ((systematic\$ or sistemat\$) and (review\$ or overview\$ or revis\$ or evaluation\$)).ti,ab,hw. 4 ((methodologic\$ or metodolog\$ or medline or pubmed or IMLA or lilacs or embase) and (review\$ or overview\$ or revis\$ or evaluation\$)).ti,ab,hw. 5 1 or 2 or 3 or 4

FontesCastro AA, Atallah AN, Clark OA. Locating and Appraising Systematic Reviews [letter, comment]. Ann Intern Med 1998;128(4):322-3. Comment on: Ann Intern Med 1998;126(7):532-8.
Jadad AR, Moher M, Browman GP, Booker L, Sigouin C, Fuentes M, Stevens R. Systematic reviews and meta-analyses on treatment of asthma: critical evaluation. BMJ 2000 Feb 26;320(7234):537-40.

Diretrizes Clínicas

Lilacs via Bireme VALIDADA RED SEM USO DE PARENTESSES EXTERNOS

Pt guideline OR Pt practice guideline OR Tw guideline\$ OR Tw recommend\$ OR Tw consensus OR Tw standards OR Tw parameter\$ OR Tw diretriz\$

Results 2011: 30.415

Medline via Pubmed VALIDADA RED

(practice guideline [Publication Type] OR guideline* [Text Word] OR recommend* [Text Word] OR consens* [Text Word] OR standards [Text Word] OR parameter* [Text Word] OR diretriz* [Text Word])

Results 2011: 1.482.738

Avaliação Econômica

EMBASE via Ovid

#Search History 1 economics.sh. 2 exp "costs and cost analysis"/ 3 economic value of life.sh. 4 exp "economics, dental"/ 5 exp "economics, hospital"/ 6 exp "economics, medical"/ 7 exp "economics, nursing"/ 8 economics, pharmaceutical.sh. 9 exp "fees and charges"/ 10 exp "budgets"/ 11 (cost or costs or costed or costly or costing).ab,ti,kw,kp. 12 (economic\$ or pharmacoeconomic\$ or price\$ or pricing).ab,ti,kw,kp. 13 or/1-12 14 letter.pt. 15 editorial.pt. 16 16. historical article.pt. 17 14 or 15 or 16 18 13 not 17 19 "animal"/ 20 "human"/ 21 19 not (19 and 20) 22 18 not 21

Fonte

NHS Centre for Reviews and Dissemination, University of York. Making cost-effectiveness information accessible: the nhs economic evaluation database project. CRD guidance for reporting critical summaries of economic evaluations. CRD Report 6, December 1996. Disponível em: URL: Website: <http://www.york.ac.uk/inst/crd/report6.doc>

Estudos Coortes (Prognóstico)

Medline via Pubmed **VALIDADA RED**

(incidence[MeSH:noexp] OR mortality[MeSH Terms] OR follow up studies[MeSH:noexp] OR prognos*[Text Word] OR predict*[Text Word] OR course*[Text Word]) OR prognos*[Title/Abstract] OR (first[Title/Abstract] AND episode[Title/Abstract]) OR cohort[Title/Abstract] OR (controlled trial\$*) OR (randomised controlled trial\$*)

Results 2011: 2.126.195

Etiologia

Medline via Pubmed **VALIDADA RED**

(risk*[Title/Abstract] OR risk*[MeSH:noexp] OR risk * [MeSH:noexp] OR cohort studies[MeSH Terms] OR group*[Text Word])

Results 2011: 3.746.850