Toxicity of Dental Adhesive

After finding the PubMed Database on the library website, I searched for “toxicity dental adhesives.” I received about 780 results and after browsing the first page decided to narrow my search by adding “AND” between toxicity and dental. This produced 777 results including one article (Alcaraz, et. al, 2015) that seemed helpful. Next I tried the advanced search for items containing “toxicity” in the title field and “dental adhesive” in all fields. This produced the previous result and several additional results related to toxicity.


Article Request

I started by searching PubMed for Author Dehora and Publication Date 2013-2014, This found no results so I tried “Debora” and found one result but do not believe it the right article. I then tried searching Scout for “debora” in the author field and “2013” as the publication date, as well as “efficacy” in the title, and “February 2013” for date and found no relevant results. I tried medline for author “Debora” and found no “C.B. Debora”. I then tried searching ScienceDirect for “Debora” in author field then “Debora C.” then “Debora” in author and “efficacy” in title. I was able to find the article as the sixth result. The author requested the article prior to publication so the actual publication date was in June of 2013.

PubMed/CINAHL Questions (choose 7 and describe search process)

1. After visiting the CINAHL Plus database, I began searching for CAUTI then the recommended search included prevention so I clicked that instead of completing my intended search for “cautis prevention.” This got 186 hits. The first result looked very relevant so I chose that, then scrolled through the titles and subjects for more articles that looked applicable since the results were already sorted by relevance. I chose 3 of the first 5 articles, then decided to limit my results to 2015 and 2016 to make sure I got mostly recent information and I chose 2 more article. The first two articles should provide the best information and are ; the others are for supplement.


2. First I went to PubMed and searched subjects for “informed consent” and all fields for “san Antonio contraceptive study” but got 0 hits. I retried the search by removing “san antoni” but again found no results. I changed “informed consent” to an all fields search and got about 170 results but after browsing the first page none seemed relevant. Next I tried “informed consent” as a mesh term and all fields for contraceptive study, this brought back 41 results. The second results dealt with a similar topic but was not helpful so I tried adding “1969” in all fields but returned no results. I decided to try mesh headings for “informed consent” and “20th cent history medicine.” I was planning to just enter history but “20th cent..” was a recommendation. The first result “reform of clinical research” looked promising but did not mention the 1969 study. At this point I gave up on PubMed and switched to CINAHL Plus. Here I searched full text for “san Antonio contraceptive study” (recommended by search) and searched “informed consent” in title. This produced two results, after scanning the first I found no relevant information and moved on to the second article. It discussed the event.

In the study, impoverished women were given birth control placebos without being told which led to several placebo group individuals becoming pregnant, under the impression they were on birth control.
More information is available in the article I found (p. 810)
Stevens, P., & Pletsch, P. (2002). Informed consent and the history of inclusion of

The original article for the San Antonio study is
Goldzieher, J. W., Moses, L., Averkin, E., Scheel, C., & Taber, B. (1971). A placebo-
controlled double-blind crossover investigation of the side effects attributed to oral

3. For these I just copied and pasted the information into the PubMed search bar
and each result was pulled up immediately except for (e). I located this article
by browsing the UA e-resources for Neurosurg Rev and found that the article
was not found because it is only on pages 1-5; pages 6 and 7 are for discussion
of the article.

Lasjaunias P (2007). Diffusion tensor magnetic resonance imaging and fiber
tracking in spinal cord lesions: current and future indications. *Neuroimaging Clin N

Available via ILL from UAB Sterne Library

diffusion tensor imaging and fiber tracking in 5 spinal cord astrocytomas. *Am J

Available from American Journal of Neuradiology


Available from American Journal of Roentgenology.

(2007). Diffusion tensor MR imaging of the cervical spinal cord in patients with

Available from SpringerLink


Available from SpringerLink

4. First I used google to find out that ECRI stands for Emergency Care Research Institute. I then went back to PubMed and search for “ecri visitor operating room.” One result “Operating Room Environment” seemed related so I decided to start there. I clicked the mesh terms and added “Operating Rooms”[MAJR] AND visitors AND ecri” to my search. No results. So I removed ECRI and came up with 16 results. Nothing seemed relevant, so I removed visitors instead. Here I found a result published by the ECRI institute and decided to browse their publications on PubMed. Only 52 were found so I browsed all of them but none seemed to be about operating room procedures or visitors so I decided to CINAHL. After searching for ecri and visitors and other combinations with no positive results I decided to try ScienceDirect. There I found an article about finding patient safety resources which led me to the ECRI homepage. I then tried searching Medline for ecri and visitor, again with no usable results. After trying this search in several other databases including ProQuest nursing, HealthSource, and AccessMedicine with no results. I went back to Medline and located an article about OR fires which said the only thing I was able to find directly relaying ECRI opinion about visitors in the OR said to evacuate them quickly during a fire. After a google search for ECRI visitors operating room, I found an article indicating that ECRI believes that visitors are ok in the OR as long as they are closely monitored (http://www.ahcmedia.com/articles/62022-aorn-says-operating-room-visitors-ok-with-guidelines). Further search of PubMed indicates that most authorities agree that visitors can be a distraction and get in the way during surgery and should be limited as much as possible.


5. I first went to CINAHL Plus and search for “3oz” and “water swallow test,” this returned 2 results and neither was full text or contained the answer in the abstract. I then went to PubMed and tried “3oz water swallow test” this returned 1 result, which was full text, and I decided to skim the article to see if it
mentioned steps or cited another work that might. The article had a brief description but I wasn’t sure if it would be sufficient so I found a source that I thought might be better and went back to the library website to see if I had access to the archives of neurology but was overwhelmed with results… then I realized I could copy and paste the last line of the citing (ArchNeurol 1992;49:1259-61) to Pubmed and fortunately the article came up and was available full text from JAMA. Unfortunately it was not available and was a dead end, I checked MeSH terms but didn’t see anything that looked helpful so I changed my phrasing from “3oz” to “3-oz” and tried the search again. After getting 6 results and none appearing useful, I chose the 6th result which was the article I was previously trying to locate and picked similar articles to find the 3-oz water swallow test being done with children. For some reason the link from PubMed did not work but I was able to navigate to the ScienceDirect version using the UA E-resources page, here I found the full text available. The steps, from page 188, are as follows:

[Give] 3 ounces of water and ask to drink from a cup or straw without interruption; results [are] then recorded. Criteria for test failure include.. inability to drink the entire amount and coughing or choking during or up to 1 minute after completion.


6. See these two articles for information about ER violence & perception of armed versus unarmed security.


http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0196-0644(88)80076-3.

For information about violence in ERs following the introduction of metal detectors see-


7. Early ambulation –


9. First I searched PubMed for the keyword then limited my results to free full text. The fourth article was titled litchen nitidus, so I decided to check it out. I checked the MeSH terms and saw that there is a heading for the term but decided to browse the article before searching again with the MeSH term. The article seemed general so I decided to include it as one of my recommended readings, then went back to PubMed and click the MeSH heading for lichen nitidus/pathology. Here I was able to find 38 more sources including th 2nd one I shared here, the others seemed too specific. I searched Ovid/Medline for the term but again the results seemed more specific so I tried sciencedirect. Here I found the remaining articles. I recommend the first two if time is an issue.


10. Yes they do support this fact, the following systemic review discusses 7 such studies.


http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jen.2010.03.009.


doi:10.1111/jocn.12274

13. Entered “scalpel”, “electrosurgery”, and “systematic review” in CINAHL and this was my second result. I also tried “scalpel AND electrosurgery AND systematic review” on PubMed and again found the first article, but also found the second article below.


techniques in open gastrectomy for gastric carcinoma patients: a **systematic review**

do: 10.1371/journal.pone.0103330


http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2013.03.091.


16. Entered 22870869 in the search box for PubMed, result immediately popped up.


17.

A systematic review of the effectiveness of strategies and interventions to improve the transition from student to newly qualified nurse. (2015). International Journal of Nursing Studies, 52(7), 1254-1268 15p. doi:10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2015.03.007


**Bonus**

Searched CINAHL for “J Med Ultrasoneics 24:973-979, 1997” then realized “ultrasoneics” was misspelled, correct that and immediately found an article that reference this article so I browsed the bibliography for the citation. I was unable to locate a full text source but did not try ILL.