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This is a list of health economic papers that were excluded during the update of NICE guideline CG27 (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.
Bladder and renal


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


Reason: Not cost-utility analysis


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

Brain and CNS


Reason: Not cost-utility analysis


Reason: Not cost-utility analysis


Reason: Not cost-utility analysis


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


Reason: Non-English language study


Reason: Not cost-utility analysis

Colorectal cancer


Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis


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


Reason: Not cost-utility analysis


Reason: Not cost-utility analysis


Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis


Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis


Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis

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


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


*Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis*


*Reason: Abstract only*


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


*Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis*


*Reason: Not cost-utility analysis*


*Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis*


*Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis*
Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis


Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis


Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis


Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis


Reason: Non-English language study

Endometrial cancer


Reason: Abstract only


Reason: Abstract only


Reason: Not cost-utility analysis


Reason: Not cost-utility analysis

Lung cancer

Reason: Not cost-utility analysis


Reason: Abstract only


Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis


Reason: Abstract only


Reason: Decision problem does not match topics in the guideline


Reason: Not cost-utility analysis


Reason: Not cost-utility analysis


Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis


Reason: Abstract only


Reason: Abstract only

*Reason: Abstract only*


*Reason: Abstract only*


*Reason: Not cost-utility analysis*


*Reason: Not cost-utility analysis*


*Reason: Not cost-utility analysis*


*Reason: Not cost-utility analysis*

**Melanoma**


*Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis*


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

**Myeloma**


*Reason: Not cost-utility analysis*

**Non-Hodgkin’s lymphoma**

*Reason: Not cost-utility analysis*

**Oesophageal cancer**


*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**


*Reason: Not cost-utility analysis*


*Reason: Abstract only*


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


*Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis*


*Reason: Abstract only.*


*Reason: Abstract only
Prostate cancer


*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*


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


*Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis*


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


*Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis*


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


*Reason: Abstract only*


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

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


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


*Reason: Non-English language study*

**Stomach cancer**


*Reason: Not cost-utility analysis*


*Reason: Not cost-effectiveness analysis*


*Reason: Abstract only*


*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*


*Reason: Abstract only*
Yeh, JM. Cost-effectiveness of treatment and endoscopic surveillance of precancerous lesions to prevent gastric cancer. *Cancer* 2010; 116:2941-C2953

*Reason: Decision problem does not match any question covered in the guideline*

**Thyroid cancer**


*Reason: Abstract only*


*Reason: Abstract only*


*Reason: Abstract only*


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


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


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


*Reason: Not cost-utility analysis*

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