Suspected Cancer:

recognition and management of suspected cancer in children, young people and adults

Update of clinical guideline 27

Appendix I: Health economics excluded papers list

Developed for NICE by the National Collaborating Centre for Cancer

© 2014 National Collaborating Centre for Cancer

This document contains the list of health economic papers that were excluded during the update of NICE clinical guideline 27 (published June 2005).

This list has been included as part of this update and is highlighted in peach. You are invited to comment on the highlighted text only. Appendix J contains content from the 2005 Evidence Review which is being deleted as it has been updated.

The original NICE guideline and supporting documents are available from http://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/CG27

Bladder and renal

S. S. Garfield, M. B. Gavaghan, S. O. Armstrong, and J. S. Jones. The cost-effectiveness of blue light cystoscopy in bladder cancer detection: United States projections based on clinical data showing 4.5 years of follow up after a single hexaminolevulinate hydrochloride instillation. *Canadian Journal of Urology* 20 (2):6682-6689, 2013.

Reason: Not relevant to guideline as a non-primary care setting is considered

B. A. Gayed, C. Seideman, and Y. Lotan. Cost-effectiveness of fluorescence in situ hybridization in patients with atypical cytology for the detection of urothelial carcinoma. *J.Urol.* 190 (4):1181-1186, 2013.

Reason: Not cost-utility analysis

Y. Tian, R. Wazir, and K. Wang. Re: Cost-effectiveness of fluorescence in situ hybridization in patients with atypical cytology for the detection of urothelial carcinoma: B. A. Gayed, C. Seideman and Y. Lotan J Urol 2013; 190: 1181-1186. *J.Urol.* 191 (5):1472, 2014.

Reason: Response to article by Gayed et al. Not cost-utility analysis

Brain and CNS

S. F. Ahsan, M. N. Syamal, K. Yaremchuk, E. Peterson, and M. Seidman. The costs and utility of imaging in evaluating dizzy patients in the emergency room. *Laryngoscope* 123 (9):2250-2253, 2013.

Reason: Not cost-utility analysis

J. R. Decker, E. K. Meen, R. C. Kern, and R. K. Chandra. Cost effectiveness of magnetic resonance imaging in the workup of the dysosmia patient. *International Forum of Allergy & Rhinology* 3 (1):56-61, 2013.

Reason: Not cost-utility analysis

Heinzel, A et al. Cost-effectiveness analysis of FET PET-guided target selection for the diagnosis of gliomas. *European Journal of Nuclear Medicine & Molecular Imaging* 2012; 39(7): 1089-1096.

Reason: Not cost-utility analysis

Heinzel, A et al. Cost-effectiveness analysis of amino acid PET-guided surgery for supratentorial high-grade gliomas. *Journal of Nuclear Medicine* 2012; 53(4): 552-558.

Reason: Does not match decision problem in the guideline

Medina, LS. When is neuroimaging appropriate in children with headaches? *Pediatric Radiology* 2011; 41: S135

Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis

Smartt, P. Magnetic resonance spectroscopy for the initial diagnosis and staging of prostate, brain, breast and other cancers: horizon scanning report (Structured abstract). *Health Technology Assessment.Database.* 2009;(2)

Reason: Abstract only

Cervical cancer

Becker, S and Henes, M. Diagnosis and primary therapy of cervical cancer. [German]. *Gynakologe* 2012; 45(5): 391-405.

Reason: Non-English language study

Hughes, AA et al. A cost-effectiveness analysis of four management strategies in the determination and follow-up of atypical squamous cells of undetermined significance. *Diagnostic Cytopathology* 2005; 32(2): 125-132.

Reason: Not cost-utillity analysis

Colorectal cancer

Allameh, Z, Davari, M, and Emami, MH. Sensitivity and specificity of colorectal cancer mass screening methods: A systematic review of the literature. *Iranian Journal of Cancer Prevention* 2011; 4(2): 88-105.

Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis

Allen, E., C. Nicolaidis, and M. Helfand. "The evaluation of rectal bleeding in adults. A cost-effectiveness analysis comparing four diagnostic strategies." Journal of General Internal Medicine 20.1 (2005): 81-90.

Reason: Does not match decision problem as it does not include change in bowel habit as the main symptom.

Beggs, A. D., et al. "Straight to colonoscopy: the ideal patient pathway for the 2-week suspected cancer referrals?" Annals of the Royal College of Surgeons of England 93.2 (2011): 114-19.

Reason: Not cost-utility analysis

Bishai, D. M., D. G. Ferris, and M. S. Litaker. "What is the least costly strategy to evaluate cervical abnormalities in rural women? Comparing telemedicine, local practitioners, and expert physicians." Medical Decision Making 23.6 (2003): 463-70.

Reason: Not cost-utility analysis

Field, S. "On cancer detection. Early diagnosis could save lives." Health Service Journal 120.6226 (2010): 12-13.

Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis

Genden, E. M., et al. "Referral guidelines for suspected cancer of the head and neck. [Review] [32 refs]." Auris, Nasus, Larynx 33.1 (2006): 1-5.

Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis

de Haan, MC et al. Diagnostic value of CT-colonography as compared to colonoscopy in an asymptomatic screening population: a meta-analysis. *European Radiology* 2011; 21(8): 1747-1763.

Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis

Hanly, P et al. Cost-effectiveness of computed tomography colonography in colorectal cancer screening: a systematic review. [Review]. *International Journal of Technology Assessment in Health Care* 2012; 28(4): 415-423.

Reason: Review of existing economic papers which were assessed seperately for this review.

Hassan, C and Pickhardt, PJ. Cost-effectiveness of CT colonography. [Review]. *Radiologic Clinics of North America* 2013; 51(1): 89-97.

Reason: Review of existing economic papers which were assessed seperately for this review.

Haug, U et al. Is fecal occult blood testing more sensitive for left- versus right-sided colorectal neoplasia? A systematic literature review. [Review]. *Expert Review of Molecular Diagnostics* 2011; 11(6): 605-616.

Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis

Laheij, R. J. F. Empirical treatment followed by a test-and-treat strategy is more cost-effective in comparison with prompt endoscopy or radiography in patients with dyspeptic symptoms: a randomized trial in a primary care setting 633. Family Practice 21(3):238-243. 2004.

Reason: Abstract only

Lansdorp-Vogelaar, I, Knudsen, AB, and Brenner, H. Cost-effectiveness of colorectal cancer screening. [Review]. *Epidemiologic Reviews* 2011; 33(1): 88-100.

Reason: Review of existing economic papers which were assessed seperately for this review

Littlejohn, C et al. Systematic review and meta-analysis of the evidence for flexible sigmoidoscopy as a screening method for the prevention of colorectal cancer. [Review]. *British Journal of Surgery* 2012; 99(11): 1488-1500.

Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis

Lucidarme, O. Cost-effectiveness modeling of colorectal cancer: computed tomography colonography vs colonoscopy or fecal occult blood tests. *European Journal of Radiology* 2012; 81(7):1413-1419

Reason: Not cost-utility analysis

Lyratzopoulos, G., et al. "Variation in number of general practitioner consultations before hospital referral for cancer: Findings from the 2010 National Cancer Patient Experience Survey in England." The Lancet Oncology 13.4 (2012): 353-65.

Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis

Macleod, U., et al. "Risk factors for delayed presentation and referral of symptomatic cancer: evidence for common cancers." British Journal of Cancer 101 (2009): Suppl-S101.

Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis

Mansson, J., B. Marklund, and P. Carlsson. "Costs in primary care of investigating symptoms suspicious of cancer in a defined population." Scandinavian Journal of Primary Health Care 24.4 (2006): 243-50.

Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis

Ortiz, R., et al. "Effect of early referral to an endocrinologist on efficiency and cost of evaluation and development of treatment plan in patients with thyroid nodules." Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism 83.11 (1998): 3803-07.

Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis

Pickhardt, PJ et al. Colorectal cancer: CT colonography and colonoscopy for detection--systematic review and meta-analysis. [Review]. *Radiology* 2011; 259(2): 393-405.

Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis

Siminoff, L. A., et al. "Doctor, what's wrong with me? Factors that delay the diagnosis of colorectal cancer." Patient Education & Counseling 84.3 (2011): 352-58.

Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis

Tan, Z-G, Xu, H-N, and Sun, X. Accuracy of computed tomographic colonography for the detection of polyps and colorectal tumors: A systematic review and Meta-analysis. [Chinese]. *Chinese Journal of Cancer Prevention and Treatment* 2011; 18(5): 361-366.

Reason: Non-English language study

Endometrial cancer

Bristow, RE et al. Cost-effectiveness of routine vaginal cytology for endometrial cancer surveillance (Provisional abstract). *Gynecologic Oncology* 2006; 103(2): 709-713.

Reason: Abstract only

M. C. Breijer, H. C. Doorn, T. J. Clark, K. S. Khan, A. Timmermans, B. W. Mol, and B. C. Opmeer. Diagnostic strategies for endometrial cancer in women with postmenopausal bleeding: cost-effectiveness of individualized strategies (Provisional abstract). *European Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology and Reproductive Biology* 163 (1):91-96, 2012.

Reason: Abstract only

Clark, TJ et al. Investigating postmenopausal bleeding for endometrial cancer: cost-effectiveness of initial diagnostic strategies. *BJOG.An International Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology* 2006; 113: 502-510.

Reason: Not cost-utility analysis

N. A. M. Cooper, P. M. Barton, M. Breijer, O. Caffrey, B. C. Opmeer, A. Timmermans, B. W. J. Mol, K. S. Khan, and T. J. Clark. Cost-effectiveness of diagnostic strategies for the management of abnormal uterine bleeding (heavy menstrual bleeding and post-menopausal bleeding): A decision analysis. *Health Technol.Assess.* 18 (24):1-201, 2014.

Reason:Not cost-utility analysis

Lung cancer

C. Berg. Cost effectiveness of ct screening. *Journal of Thoracic Oncology* 8:S96, 2013.

Reason: Not cost-utility analysis

Caro, JJ, Klittich, WS, and Strauss, G. Could chest X-ray screening for lung cancer be cost-effective? (Structured abstract). *Cancer* 2000; 89(11 Supplement S): 2502-2505.

Reason: Abstract only

Chen, Y et al. A novel and cost-effective method for early lung cancer detection in immunized serum. *Asian Pacific Journal of Cancer Prevention: Apjcp* 2011; 12(11): 3009-3012.

Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis

Chirikos, TN et al. Screening for lung cancer with CT: a preliminary cost-effectiveness analysis (Structured abstract). *Chest* 2002; 121(5): 1507-1514.

Reason: Abstract only

Cipriano, LE et al. Cost-effectiveness of imaging strategies to reduce radiation-induced cancer risk in Crohn's disease. *Inflammatory Bowel Diseases* 2012; 18(7): 1240-1248.

Reason: Decision problem does not match topics in the guideline

Goulart, BH et al. Lung cancer screening with low-dose computed tomography: costs, national expenditures, and cost-effectiveness. [Review]. *Journal of the National Comprehensive Cancer Network* 2012; 10(2): 267-275.

Reason: Not cost-utility analysis

Harewood, GC. Economic analysis of combined endoscopic and endobronchial ultrasound in the evaluation of patients with suspected non-small cell lung cancer. *Lung Cancer* 2010; 67(3):366-371

Reason: Not cost-utility analysis

C. N. Hurt, K. Roberts, T. K. Rogers, G. O. Griffiths, K. Hood, H. Prout, A. Nelson, J. Fitzgibbon, A. Barham, E. Thomas-Jones, R. T. Edwards, S. T. Yeo, W. Hamilton, A. Tod, and R. D. Neal. A feasibility study examining the effect on lung cancer diagnosis of offering a chest X-ray to higher-risk patients with chest symptoms: Protocol for a randomized controlled trial. *Trials* 14 (1), 2013.

Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis

Laroche, C et al. Role of computed tomographic scanning of the thorax prior to bronchoscopy in the investigation of suspected lung cancer (Structured abstract). *Thorax* 2000; 55(5): 359-363.

Reason: Abstract only

Manser, R et al. Cost-effectiveness analysis of screening for lung cancer with low dose spiral CT (computed tomography) in the Australian setting (Structured abstract). *Lung Cancer* 2005; 48(2): 171-185.

Reason: Abstract only

Mansueto, M et al. Cost-effectiveness analysis in the clinical management of patients with known or suspected lung cancer: (18F)fluorodeoxyglucose PET and CT comparison (Provisional abstract). *Quarterly.Journal of Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Imaging* 2007; 51(3): 224-234.

Reason: Abstract only

Marshall, D et al. Potential cost-effectiveness of one-time screening for lung cancer (LC) in a high risk cohort (Structured abstract). *Lung Cancer* 2001; 32(3): 227-236.

Reason: Abstract only

Tsushima, Y, Aoki, J, and Endo, K. Whether and under what conditions FDG-PET might be cost-effective in evaluating solitary pulmonary nodules depicted on lung cancer screening in Japan. *Nippon Igaku Hoshasen Gakkai Zasshi Nippon acta Radiologica* 2003; 63: 390-398.

Reason: Not cost-utility analysis

Tsushima, Y and Endo, K. Analysis models to assess cost effectiveness of the four strategies for the work-up of solitary pulmonary nodules. *Medical Science Monitor* 2004; 10(5): MT65-MT72.

Reason: Not cost-utility analysis

Verboom, P. Cost-effectiveness of FDG-PET in staging non-small cell lung cancer: the plus study. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging* 2003; 30:1444-1449

Reason: Not cost-utility analysis

Wisnivesky, JP et al. The cost-effectiveness of low-dose CT screening for lung cancer: preliminary results of baseline screening. *Chest* 2003; 124(2): 614-621.

Reason: Not cost-utility analysis

Melanoma

S. M. Goldsmith. Cost analysis suggests overemphasis on biopsy rate for melanoma diagnosis. *J.Am.Acad.Dermatol.* 68 (3):517-519, 2013.

Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis

A. R. Kansal, A. J. Shaul, S. Stern, K. Busam, C. A. Doucet, and D. B. Chalfin. Cost-effectiveness of a FISH assay for the diagnosis of melanoma in the USA. *Expert Review of Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research* 13(3):371-380, 2013.

Reason: Clinical setting does not match that covered in the guideline

Myeloma

N. M. Engel-Nitz, B. Eckert, R. Song, P. Koka, E. M. Hulbert, J. McPheeters, and A. Teitelbaum. Diagnostic testing managed by hematopathology specialty and other laboratories: costs and patient diagnostic outcomes. *BMC Clinical Pathology* 14:17, 2014.

Reason: Not cost-utility analysis

Non-Hodgkin's lymphoma

M. J. Kubik, A. Mohammadi, and M. Rosa. Diagnostic benefits and cost-effectiveness of on-site imprint cytology adequacy evaluation of core needle biopsies of bone lesions. *Diagn.Cytopathol.* 42 (6):506-513, 2014.

Reason: Not cost-utility analysis

Oesophageal cancer

Rogers, SN, Vedpathak, SV, and Lowe, D. Reasons for delayed presentation in oral and oropharyngeal cancer: The patients perspective. *British Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery* 2011; 49(5): 349-353.

Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis

Vakil, N. Cost of detecting malignant lesions by endoscopy in 2741 primary care dyspeptic patients without alarm symptoms. *Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology* 2009; 7(7):756-761

Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis

Pancreatic cancer

Beinfeld, MT, Wittenberg, E, and Gazelle, GS. Cost-effectiveness of whole-body CT screening. *Radiology* 2005; 234(2): 415-422.

Reason: Not cost-utility analysis

Chen, VK et al. A cost-minimization analysis of alternative strategies in diagnosing pancreatic cancer (Structured abstract). *American.Journal of Gastroenterology* 2004; 99(11): 2223-2234.

Reason: Abstract only

O. Ghatnekar, R. Andersson, M. Svensson, U. Persson, U. Ringdahl, P. Zeilon, and C. A. Borrebaeck. Modelling the benefits of early diagnosis of pancreatic cancer using a biomarker signature. *Int.J.Cancer* 133 (10):2392-2397, 2013.

Reason: Clinical setting does not match that covered in the guideline

Rondina, MT et al. A pilot study utilizing whole body 18 F-FDG-PET/CT as a comprehensive screening strategy for occult malignancy in patients with unprovoked venous thromboembolism. *Thrombosis Research* 2012; 129(1): 22-27.

Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis

Sartori, M et al. Cost-effectiveness of fluorescence in situ hybridization (FISH) versus routine cytology (RC) in jaundiced patients with biliary strictures. *Digestive and Liver Disease* 2012; 44: S179

Reason: Abstract only.

Sonnenberg, A, Rodriguez, SA, and Faigel, DO. Diagnostic ascertainment of suspicious pancreatic mass: a threshold analysis (Structured abstract). *Clinical.Gastroenterology and Hepatology* 2008; 6(10): 1162-1166.

Reason: Abstract only

Prostate cancer

Bermudez, TC et al. Cost-effectiveness of percent free PSA for prostate cancer detection in men with a total PSA of 4-10 ng/ml (Provisional abstract). *Urologia.Internationalis.* 2007; 79(4): 336-344.

Reason: Abstract only

Booth, N. Economic evaluation of population-based PSA screening for prostate cancer (Project record). *Health Technology Assessment Database.* 2010;(1)

Reason: Clinical setting does not match that covered in the guideline

Calvert, NW. Effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of prognostic markers in prostate cancer. *British Journal of Cancer* 2003; 88(1):31-35

Reason: Clinical setting does not match that covered in the guideline

C. Castelli, J. Blanchet, R. Mathieu, and S. Vincendeau. Cost evaluation of introducing the prostate health index (PHI) in the management of prostate cancer diagnostic. *Biochimica Clinica* 37:S158, 2013.

Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis

V. Garg, N. Y. Gu, M. E. Borrego, and D. W. Raisch. A literature review of cost-effectiveness analyses of prostate-specific antigen test in prostate cancer screening. *Expert Review of Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research* 13 (3):327-342, 2013.

Reason: Review of existing economic papers which were assessed seperately for this review.

R. Jalil, N. Patel, P. Allchorne, J. O'Neil, and J. Green. Prostate cancer: A feasibility study to perform magnetic resonance imaging before prostate biopsy. *J.Urol.* 189 (4 SUPPL. 1):e898, 2013.

Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis

G. Mowatt, G. Scotland, C. Boachie, M. Cruickshank, J. A. Ford, C. Fraser, L. Kurban, T. B. Lam, A. R. Padhani, J. Royle, T. W. Scheenen, and E. Tassie. The diagnostic accuracy and cost-effectiveness of magnetic resonance spectroscopy and enhanced magnetic resonance imaging techniques in aiding the localisation of prostate abnormalities for biopsy: a systematic review and economic evaluation. [Review]. *Health Technology Assessment (Winchester, England)* 17 (20):vii-xix, 2001.

Reason: Patient population is patients with prior negative biopsy. Not relevant to guideline.

Nichol, MB et al. Cost-effectiveness analysis of a new index for prostate cancer detection. *Value in Health* 2011; 14(3): A82

Reason: Abstract only

Nichol, MB et al. Cost-effectiveness of Prostate Health Index for prostate cancer detection. *BJU International* 2012; 110(3): 353-362.

Reason: Clinical setting does not match that covered in the guideline (screening)

Rooij M. de, S. Crienen, J. A. Witjes, J. O. Barentsz, M. M. Rovers, and J. P. Grutters. Cost-effectiveness of magnetic resonance (MR) imaging and MR-guided targeted biopsy versus systematic transrectal ultrasound-guided biopsy in diagnosing prostate cancer: a modelling study from a health care perspective. *Eur.Urol.*:epub, 2013.

Reason: Clinical setting does not match that covered in the guideline

Shteynshlyuger, A and Andriole, GL. Cost-effectiveness of prostate specific antigen screening in the United States: extrapolating from the European study of screening for prostate cancer. *Journal of Urology* 2011; 185(3): 828-832.

Reason: Clinical setting does not match that covered in the guideline (screening)

Stadlbauer, A et al. [Health-economic evaluation of magnetic resonance imaging before biopsy for diagnosis of prostate cancer]. [German]. *Rofo: Fortschritte auf dem Gebiete der Rontgenstrahlen und der Nuklearmedizin* 2011; 183(10): 925-932.

Reason: Non-English language study

Stomach cancer

M. Broe, M. Barry, S. Patchett, and A. D. Hill. Evaluating the clinical efficacy and cost effectiveness of direct access endoscopy. *Surgeon Journal of the Royal Colleges of Surgeons of Edinburgh & Ireland* 11 (6):304-308, 2013.

Reason: Not cost-utility analysis

Bustamante, M. Accuracy of the initial endoscopic diagnosis in the discrimination of gastric ulcers: is endoscopic follow-up study always needed? *Journal of Clinical Gastroenterology* 2002; 35(1):25-28

Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis

Dan, YY, So, JB, and Yeoh, KG. Endoscopic screening for gastric cancer (Structured abstract). *Clinical.Gastroenterology and Hepatology* 2006; 4(6): 709-716.

Reason: Abstract only

Gupta, N et al. Endoscopy for upper GI cancer screening in the general population: a cost-utility analysis. *Gastrointestinal Endoscopy* 2011; 74(3): 610-624.

Reason: Clinical setting does not match that covered in the guideline (screening)

Mocellin, S and Pasquali, S. Diagnostic accuracy of endoscopic ultrasonography (EUS) for the preoperative locoregional staging of primary gastric cancer. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2012;

Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis

Vakil, N et al. Cost of detecting malignant lesions by endoscopy in 2741 primary care dyspeptic patients without alarm symptoms (Provisional abstract). *Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology* 2009; 7(7): 756-761.

Reason: Abstract only

Yeh, JM. Cost-effectiveness of treatment and endoscopic surveillance of precancerous lesions to prevent gastric cancer. *Cancer* 2010; 116:2941_Çô2953

Reason: Decision problem does not matchany question covered in the guideline

Thyroid cancer

A. S. Can. Cost-effectiveness comparison between palpation- and ultrasound-guided thyroid fine-needle aspiration biopsies (Provisional abstract). *BMC Endocrine Disorders* 9:14 (2), 2009.

Reason: Abstract only

A. N. Khalid, C. S. Hollenbeak, S. A. Quraishi, C. Y. Fan, and B. C. Stack. The cost-effectiveness of iodine 131 scintigraphy, ultrasonography, and fine-needle aspiration biopsy in the initial diagnosis of solitary thyroid nodules (Structured abstract). *Archives.of Otolaryngology.Head and Neck Surgery* 132 (3):244-250, 2006.

Reason: Abstract only

A. N. Khalid, S. A. Quraishi, C. S. Hollenbeak, and B. C. Stack. Fine-needle aspiration biopsy versus ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration biopsy: cost-effectiveness as a frontline diagnostic modality for solitary thyroid nodules (Structured abstract). *Head Neck* 30 (8):1035-1039, 2008.

Reason: Abstract only

M. Najafzadeh, C. A. Marra, L. D. Lynd, and S. M. Wiseman. Cost-effectiveness of using a molecular diagnostic test to improve preoperative diagnosis of thyroid cancer. *Value in Health* 15 (8):1005-1013, 2012.

Reason: Clinical setting does not match that covered in the guideline

D. Vriens, E. M. M. Adang, R. T. Netea-Maier, J. W. A. Smit, J. H. W. De Wilt, W. J. G. Oyen, and L. De Geus-Oei. Cost-effectiveness of FDG-PET/CT for cytologically indeterminate thyroid nodule. *European Journal of Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Imaging* 40:S239-S240, 2013.

Reason: Clinical setting does not match that covered in the guideline

A. Wale, K. Miles, B. Young, C. Zammit, A. Williams, J. Quin, and S. Dizdarevic. Accuracy and potential cost-effectiveness of 99mTc-Methoxyisobutylisonitrile (MIBI) scintigraphy for the assessment of thyroid nodules in the context of the British Thyroid Association (BTA) guidelines. *Nucl.Med.Commun.* 32 (5):435-436, 2011.

Reason: Clinical setting does not match that covered in the guideline

A. Wale, K. A. Miles, B. Young, C. Zammit, A. Williams, J. Quin, and S. Dizdarevic. Combined (99m)Tc-methoxyisobutylisonitrile scintigraphy and fine-needle aspiration cytology offers an accurate and potentially cost-effective investigative strategy for the assessment of solitary or dominant thyroid nodules. *European Journal of Nuclear Medicine & Molecular Imaging* 41 (1):105-115, 2014.

Reason: Not cost-utility analysis

K. Zanocco, L. Pitelka-Zengou, S. Dalal, D. Elaraj, R. Nayar, and C. Sturgeon. Routine on-site evaluation of specimen adequacy during initial ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration of thyroid nodules: A cost-effectiveness analysis. *Ann.Surg.Oncol.* 20 (8):2462-2467, 2013.

Reason: Clinical setting does not match that covered in the guideline