List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: https://exaly.com/author-pdf/10527748/publications.pdf Version: 2024-02-01



#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
1	Surgical versus Nonsurgical Therapy for Lumbar Spinal Stenosis. New England Journal of Medicine, 2008, 358, 794-810.	13.9	1,047
2	Surgical vs Nonoperative Treatment for Lumbar Disk Herniation. JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association, 2006, 296, 2441.	3.8	937
3	Surgical versus Nonsurgical Treatment for Lumbar Degenerative Spondylolisthesis. New England Journal of Medicine, 2007, 356, 2257-2270.	13.9	796
4	Surgical vs Nonoperative Treatment for Lumbar Disk Herniation. JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association, 2006, 296, 2451.	3.8	637
5	Mortality, Disability, and Nursing Home Use for Persons with and without Hip Fracture: A Populationâ€Based Study. Journal of the American Geriatrics Society, 2002, 50, 1644-1650.	1.3	589
6	Surgical Compared with Nonoperative Treatment for Lumbar Degenerative Spondylolisthesis. Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery - Series A, 2009, 91, 1295-1304.	1.4	546
7	Surgical Versus Nonoperative Treatment for Lumbar Disc Herniation. Spine, 2008, 33, 2789-2800.	1.0	522
8	Diagnostic Concordance Among Pathologists Interpreting Breast Biopsy Specimens. JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association, 2015, 313, 1122.	3.8	499
9	National Performance Benchmarks for Modern Screening Digital Mammography: Update from the Breast Cancer Surveillance Consortium. Radiology, 2017, 283, 49-58.	3.6	418
10	Diagnostic Accuracy of Digital versus Film Mammography: Exploratory Analysis of Selected Population Subgroups in DMIST. Radiology, 2008, 246, 376-383.	3.6	412
11	Pathologists' diagnosis of invasive melanoma and melanocytic proliferations: observer accuracy and reproducibility study. BMJ: British Medical Journal, 2017, 357, j2813.	2.4	302
12	Early discontinuation of treatment for osteoporosis. American Journal of Medicine, 2003, 115, 209-216.	0.6	285
13	Surgical Versus Nonoperative Treatment for Lumbar Disc Herniation. Spine, 2014, 39, 3-16.	1.0	252
14	Surgical Treatment of Spinal Stenosis with and without Degenerative Spondylolisthesis: Cost-Effectiveness after 2 Years. Annals of Internal Medicine, 2008, 149, 845.	2.0	216
15	Identifying Women With Dense Breasts at High Risk for Interval Cancer. Annals of Internal Medicine, 2015, 162, 673-681.	2.0	215
16	Collaborative Modeling of the Benefits and Harms Associated With Different U.S. Breast Cancer Screening Strategies. Annals of Internal Medicine, 2016, 164, 215.	2.0	209
17	The Cost Effectiveness of Surgical Versus Nonoperative Treatment for Lumbar Disc Herniation Over Two Years. Spine, 2008, 33, 2108-2115.	1.0	204
18	Cost Effectiveness of Screening Perimenopausal White Women for Osteoporosis: Bone Densitometry and Hormone Replacement Therapy. Annals of Internal Medicine, 1990, 113, 594.	2.0	202

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
19	Design of the Spine Patient Outcomes Research Trial (SPORT). Spine, 2002, 27, 1361-1372.	1.0	197
20	Comparative Effectiveness Evidence From the Spine Patient Outcomes Research Trial. Spine, 2011, 36, 2061-2068.	1.0	195
21	Benefits, Harms, and Cost-Effectiveness of Supplemental Ultrasonography Screening for Women With Dense Breasts. Annals of Internal Medicine, 2015, 162, 157-166.	2.0	175
22	Lumbar Spine: Reliability of MR Imaging Findings. Radiology, 2009, 250, 161-170.	3.6	168
23	Consequences of False-Positive Screening Mammograms. JAMA Internal Medicine, 2014, 174, 954.	2.6	162
24	Cost-Effectiveness of Digital Mammography Breast Cancer Screening. Annals of Internal Medicine, 2008, 148, 1.	2.0	160
25	Degenerative Spondylolisthesis. Spine, 2009, 34, 2351-2360.	1.0	159
26	Variation in Mammographic Breast Density Assessments Among Radiologists in Clinical Practice. Annals of Internal Medicine, 2016, 165, 457.	2.0	148
27	Breast cancer screening using tomosynthesis in combination with digital mammography compared to digital mammography alone: a cohort study within the PROSPR consortium. Breast Cancer Research and Treatment, 2016, 156, 109-116.	1.1	147
28	Association of Digital Breast Tomosynthesis vs Digital Mammography With Cancer Detection and Recall Rates by Age and Breast Density. JAMA Oncology, 2019, 5, 635.	3.4	136
29	Effect of the Women's Health Initiative on women's decisions to discontinue postmenopausal hormone therapy. Obstetrics and Gynecology, 2003, 102, 1225-1232.	1.2	129
30	American College of Radiology Imaging Network Digital Mammographic Imaging Screening Trial: Objectives and Methodology. Radiology, 2005, 236, 404-412.	3.6	123
31	Benefits, Harms, and Costs for Breast Cancer Screening After US Implementation of Digital Mammography. Journal of the National Cancer Institute, 2014, 106, dju092.	3.0	120
32	Breast cancer screening in an era of personalized regimens: A conceptual model and National Cancer Institute initiative for riskâ€based and preferenceâ€based approaches at a population level. Cancer, 2014, 120, 2955-2964.	2.0	119
33	National Performance Benchmarks for Modern Diagnostic Digital Mammography: Update from the Breast Cancer Surveillance Consortium. Radiology, 2017, 283, 59-69.	3.6	102
34	Breast cancer risk factors in relation to breast density (United States). Cancer Causes and Control, 2006, 17, 1281-1290.	0.8	99
35	Using health-related quality-of-life information. Journal of General Internal Medicine, 1994, 9, 576-582.	1.3	98
36	Comparative Effectiveness of Combined Digital Mammography and Tomosynthesis Screening for Women with Dense Breasts. Radiology, 2015, 274, 772-780.	3.6	98

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
37	Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Breast Cancer Mortality in the US: Estimates From Collaborative Simulation Modeling. Journal of the National Cancer Institute, 2021, 113, 1484-1494.	3.0	92
38	Tailoring Breast Cancer Screening Intervals by Breast Density and Risk for Women Aged 50 Years or Older: Collaborative Modeling of Screening Outcomes. Annals of Internal Medicine, 2016, 165, 700.	2.0	90
39	Measuring Preferences for Cost-Utility Analysis. Pharmacoeconomics, 2007, 25, 93-106.	1.7	89
40	Comparison of EQ-5D, HUI, and SF-36-derived societal health state values among Spine Patient Outcomes Research Trial (SPORT) participants. Quality of Life Research, 2005, 14, 1321-1332.	1.5	87
41	Long-Term Results of Surgery Compared With Nonoperative Treatment for Lumbar Degenerative Spondylolisthesis in the Spine Patient Outcomes Research Trial (SPORT). Spine, 2018, 43, 1619-1630.	1.0	82
42	Reliability of Magnetic Resonance Imaging Readings for Lumbar Disc Herniation in the Spine Patient Outcomes Research Trial (SPORT). Spine, 2008, 33, 991-998.	1.0	79
43	Is Surgery for Displaced, Midshaft Clavicle Fractures in Adults Cost-Effective? Results Based on a Multicenter Randomized, Controlled Trial. Journal of Orthopaedic Trauma, 2010, 24, 426-433.	0.7	78
44	Provider Attitudes and Screening Practices Following Changes in Breast and Cervical Cancer Screening Guidelines. Journal of General Internal Medicine, 2016, 31, 52-59.	1.3	78
45	Unifying Screening Processes Within the PROSPR Consortium: A Conceptual Model for Breast, Cervical, and Colorectal Cancer Screening. Journal of the National Cancer Institute, 2015, 107, djv120-djv120.	3.0	76
46	Geographic Access to Breast Imaging for US Women. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 2014, 11, 874-882.	0.9	74
47	Quality-of-Life Assessment in Osteoporosis. Pharmacoeconomics, 2002, 20, 289-303.	1.7	73
48	Changes in Mammography Use by Women's Characteristics During the First 5 Months of the COVID-19 Pandemic. Journal of the National Cancer Institute, 2021, 113, 1161-1167.	3.0	69
49	Screening Performance of Digital Breast Tomosynthesis vs Digital Mammography in Community Practice by Patient Age, Screening Round, and Breast Density. JAMA Network Open, 2020, 3, e2011792.	2.8	68
50	Timely followâ€up of positive cancer screening results: A systematic review and recommendations from the <scp>PROSPR</scp> Consortium. Ca-A Cancer Journal for Clinicians, 2018, 68, 199-216.	157.7	63
51	Patterns of Prescription Drug Use Before and After Fragility Fracture. JAMA Internal Medicine, 2016, 176, 1531.	2.6	61
52	The cost-effectiveness of reverse total shoulder arthroplasty compared with hemiarthroplasty for rotator cuff tear arthropathy. Journal of Shoulder and Elbow Surgery, 2012, 21, 1278-1288.	1.2	56
53	Pathologists' Agreement With Experts and Reproducibility of Breast Ductal Carcinoma-in-Situ Classification Schemes. American Journal of Surgical Pathology, 2000, 24, 651-659.	2.1	55
54	Disparities in the use of screening magnetic resonance imaging of the breast in community practice by race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status. Cancer, 2016, 122, 611-617.	2.0	55

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
55	Magnetic Resonance Imaging Predictors of Surgical Outcome in Patients With Lumbar Intervertebral Disc Herniation. Spine, 2013, 38, 1216-1225.	1.0	54
56	Effect of the Women's Health Initiative on Women's Decisions to Discontinue Postmenopausal Hormone Therapy. Obstetrics and Gynecology, 2003, 102, 1225-1232.	1.2	53
57	Variability in Pathologists' Interpretations of Individual Breast Biopsy Slides: A Population Perspective. Annals of Internal Medicine, 2016, 164, 649.	2.0	52
58	Is the closest facility the one actually used? An assessment of travel time estimation based on mammography facilities. International Journal of Health Geographics, 2016, 15, 8.	1.2	52
59	Decision Analysis and Cost-Effectiveness Analysis. Seminars in Spine Surgery, 2009, 21, 216-222.	0.1	51
60	Addressing Resource Allocation Issues in Recommendations From Clinical Practice Guideline Panels. Chest, 2006, 129, 182-187.	0.4	50
61	Indications for Spine Surgery. Spine, 2014, 39, 769-779.	1.0	50
62	Population-Based Analysis of Histologically Confirmed Melanocytic Proliferations Using Natural Language Processing. JAMA Dermatology, 2018, 154, 24.	2.0	50
63	Long-Term Outcomes and Cost-Effectiveness of Breast Cancer Screening With Digital Breast Tomosynthesis in the United States. Journal of the National Cancer Institute, 2020, 112, 582-589.	3.0	48
64	Development of a diagnostic test set to assess agreement in breast pathology: practical application of the Guidelines for Reporting Reliability and Agreement Studies (GRRAS). BMC Women's Health, 2013, 13, 3.	0.8	42
65	Underutilization of Supplemental Magnetic Resonance Imaging Screening Among Patients at High Breast Cancer Risk. Journal of Women's Health, 2018, 27, 748-754.	1.5	42
66	Strategies to Identify Women at High Risk of Advanced Breast Cancer During Routine Screening for Discussion of Supplemental Imaging. JAMA Internal Medicine, 2019, 179, 1230.	2.6	39
67	Travel Burden to Breast MRI and Utilization: Are Risk and Sociodemographics Related?. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 2016, 13, 611-619.	0.9	37
68	Magnetic Resonance Imaging Interpretation in Patients With Symptomatic Lumbar Spine Disc Herniations. Spine, 2009, 34, 701-705.	1.0	36
69	Effect of Time to Diagnostic Testing for Breast, Cervical, and Colorectal Cancer Screening Abnormalities on Screening Efficacy: A Modeling Study. Cancer Epidemiology Biomarkers and Prevention, 2018, 27, 158-164.	1.1	36
70	Breast Cancer Screening Strategies for Women With <i>ATM, CHEK2</i> , and <i>PALB2</i> Pathogenic Variants. JAMA Oncology, 2022, 8, 587.	3.4	36
71	Quality of Osteoporosis Care of Older Medicare Recipients with Fragility Fractures: 2006 to 2010. Journal of the American Geriatrics Society, 2013, 61, 1855-1862.	1.3	35
72	Evaluating Screening Participation, Follow-up, and Outcomes for Breast, Cervical, and Colorectal Cancer in the PROSPR Consortium. Journal of the National Cancer Institute, 2020, 112, 238-246.	3.0	35

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
73	Variation in Screening Abnormality Rates and Follow-Up of Breast, Cervical and Colorectal Cancer Screening within the PROSPR Consortium. Journal of General Internal Medicine, 2016, 31, 372-379.	1.3	34
74	Preference-Based Health Outcome Measures in Low Back Pain. Spine, 2000, 25, 3161-3166.	1.0	33
75	The diagnostic challenge of low-grade ductal carcinoma in situ. European Journal of Cancer, 2017, 80, 39-47.	1.3	32
76	Setting the Equation. Spine, 2014, 39, S43-S50.	1.0	31
77	A Longitudinal Comparison of 5 Preference-Weighted Health State Classification Systems in Persons with Intervertebral Disk Herniation. Medical Decision Making, 2011, 31, 270-280.	1.2	29
78	Second opinion in breast pathology: policy, practice and perception. Journal of Clinical Pathology, 2014, 67, 955-960.	1.0	29
79	Optimal management strategies for HIV-infected patients who present with cough or dyspnea. Journal of General Internal Medicine, 1992, 7, 261-272.	1.3	28
80	Breast Biopsy Intensity and Findings Following Breast Cancer Screening in Women With and Without a Personal History of Breast Cancer. JAMA Internal Medicine, 2018, 178, 458.	2.6	28
81	Utilization of breast cancer screening with magnetic resonance imaging in community practice. Journal of General Internal Medicine, 2018, 33, 275-283.	1.3	28
82	Assessment of Radiologist Performance in Breast Cancer Screening Using Digital Breast Tomosynthesis vs Digital Mammography. JAMA Network Open, 2020, 3, e201759.	2.8	28
83	Comparative Access to and Use of Digital Breast Tomosynthesis Screening by Women's Race/Ethnicity and Socioeconomic Status. JAMA Network Open, 2021, 4, e2037546.	2.8	28
84	A Randomized Study Comparing Digital Imaging to Traditional Glass Slide Microscopy for Breast Biopsy and Cancer Diagnosis. Journal of Pathology Informatics, 2017, 8, 12.	0.8	28
85	Geographic and Sociodemographic Disparities in PET Use by Medicare Beneficiaries With Cancer. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 2012, 9, 635-642.	0.9	27
86	Pathologist characteristics associated with accuracy and reproducibility of melanocytic skin lesion interpretation. Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology, 2018, 79, 52-59.e5.	0.6	27
87	Use of bone morphogenetic protein among patients undergoing fusion for degenerative diagnoses in the United States, 2002 to 2012. Spine Journal, 2015, 15, 692-699.	0.6	26
88	Assessment of Second-Opinion Strategies for Diagnoses of Cutaneous Melanocytic Lesions. JAMA Network Open, 2019, 2, e1912597.	2.8	26
89	Association of Screening With Digital Breast Tomosynthesis vs Digital Mammography With Risk of Interval Invasive and Advanced Breast Cancer. JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association, 2022, 327, 2220.	3.8	25
90	Second opinion strategies in breast pathology: a decision analysis addressing over-treatment, under-treatment, and care costs. Breast Cancer Research and Treatment, 2018, 167, 195-203.	1.1	24

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
91	Digital Breast Tomosynthesis: Radiologist Learning Curve. Radiology, 2019, 291, 34-42.	3.6	24
92	Quality of Life in the Economic Evaluation of Osteoporosis Prevention and Treatment. Spine, 1997, 22, 58S-62S.	1.0	23
93	Effect of Expectations on Treatment Outcome for Lumbar Intervertebral Disc Herniation. Spine, 2016, 41, 803-809.	1.0	23
94	How Do Women View Risk-Based Mammography Screening? A Qualitative Study. Journal of General Internal Medicine, 2018, 33, 1905-1912.	1.3	23
95	The SPORT Value Compass. Medical Care, 2014, 52, 1055-1063.	1.1	22
96	Interstate Variation in the Burden of Fragility Fractures. Journal of Bone and Mineral Research, 2009, 24, 681-692.	3.1	21
97	Primary Care Providers' Beliefs and Recommendations and Use of Screening Mammography by their Patients. Journal of General Internal Medicine, 2017, 32, 449-457.	1.3	21
98	Cumulative Probability of False-Positive Results After 10 Years of Screening With Digital Breast Tomosynthesis vs Digital Mammography. JAMA Network Open, 2022, 5, e222440.	2.8	21
99	Total cost-effectiveness of mammography screening strategies. Health Reports, 2015, 26, 16-25.	0.6	20
100	Diagnostic Reproducibility: What Happens When the Same Pathologist Interprets the Same Breast Biopsy Specimen at Two Points in Time?. Annals of Surgical Oncology, 2017, 24, 1234-1241.	0.7	19
101	Knowledge and Perception of Breast Density, Screening Mammography, and Supplemental Screening: in Search of "Informed― Journal of General Internal Medicine, 2020, 35, 1654-1660.	1.3	19
102	The need for microsimulation to evaluate osteoporosis interventions. Osteoporosis International, 2005, 16, 353-358.	1.3	18
103	Cumulative Advanced Breast Cancer Risk Prediction Model Developed in a Screening Mammography Population. Journal of the National Cancer Institute, 2022, 114, 676-685.	3.0	18
104	Inadequate Systems to Support Breast and Cervical Cancer Screening in Primary Care Practice. Journal of General Internal Medicine, 2016, 31, 1148-1155.	1.3	17
105	Malpractice Concerns, Defensive Medicine, and the Histopathology Diagnosis of Melanocytic Skin Lesions. American Journal of Clinical Pathology, 2018, 150, 338-345.	0.4	17
106	Understanding the value of minimally invasive procedures for the treatment of lumbar spinal stenosis: the case of interspinous spacer devices. Spine Journal, 2018, 18, 584-592.	0.6	15
107	A Framework for Evaluating Diagnostic Discordance in Pathology Discovered During Research Studies. Archives of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, 2014, 138, 955-961.	1.2	14
108	Effects of a Commercial Insurance Policy Restriction on Lumbar Fusion in North Carolina and the Implications for National Adoption. Spine, 2016, 41, 647-655.	1.0	14

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
109	A Cluster Randomized Trial of a Personalized Multi-Condition Risk Assessment in Primary Care. American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 2017, 52, 100-105.	1.6	13
110	Communication Practices of Mammography Facilities and Timely Follow-up of a Screening Mammogram with a BI-RADS 0 Assessment. Academic Radiology, 2018, 25, 1118-1127.	1.3	13
111	Breast cancer risk, worry, and anxiety: Effect on patient perceptions of false-positive screening results. Breast, 2020, 50, 104-112.	0.9	13
112	Digital Mammography and Breast Tomosynthesis Performance in Women with a Personal History of Breast Cancer, 2007–2016. Radiology, 2021, 300, 290-300.	3.6	13
113	Assessing Health Care Use and Cost Consequences of a New Screening Modality. Medical Care, 2012, 50, 1045-1052.	1.1	12
114	Cost-effectiveness of mammography from a publicly funded health care system perspective. CMAJ Open, 2018, 6, E77-E86.	1.1	12
115	Patterns of Opioid Use in the 12ÂMonths Following Geriatric Fragility Fractures: A Population-Based Cohort Study. Journal of the American Medical Directors Association, 2019, 20, 298-304.	1.2	12
116	Incorporating broadband durability in measuring geographic access to health care in the era of telehealth: A case example of the 2-step virtual catchment area (2SVCA) Method. Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association: JAMIA, 2021, 28, 2526-2530.	2.2	12
117	Hormone Replacement Therapy: Benefit, Risk and Cost Considerations*. Journal of Clinical Pharmacology, 1994, 34, 719-722.	1.0	11
118	Impact of Medication Adherence on Health Care Utilization and Productivity: Self-Reported Data From a Cohort of Postmenopausal Women on Osteoporosis Therapy. Clinical Therapeutics, 2011, 33, 2006-2015.	1.1	11
119	Diffusion of digital breast tomosynthesis among women in primary care: associations with insurance type. Cancer Medicine, 2017, 6, 1102-1107.	1.3	11
120	Change in Breast Cancer Screening Intervals Since the 2009 USPSTF Guideline. Journal of Women's Health, 2017, 26, 820-827.	1.5	10
121	Medical Care Costs Were Similar Across the Low-dose Computed Tomography and Chest X-Ray Arms of the National Lung Screening Trial Despite Different Rates of Significant Incidental Findings. Medical Care, 2018, 56, 403-409.	1.1	10
122	Multilevel Predictors of Continued Adherence to Breast Cancer Screening Among Women Ages 50–74 Years in a Screening Population. Journal of Women's Health, 2019, 28, 1051-1059.	1.5	10
123	Comparing Mammographic Density Assessed by Digital Breast Tomosynthesis or Digital Mammography: The Breast Cancer Surveillance Consortium. Radiology, 2021, , 204579.	3.6	10
124	Intended Versus Inferred Management After PET For Cancer Restaging. Medical Care, 2013, 51, 361-367.	1.1	9
125	Assessment of a Risk-Based Approach for Triaging Mammography Examinations During Periods of Reduced Capacity. JAMA Network Open, 2021, 4, e211974.	2.8	9
126	Trade-Offs Between Harms and Benefits of Different Breast Cancer Screening Intervals Among Low-Risk Women. Journal of the National Cancer Institute, 2021, 113, 1017-1026.	3.0	9

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
127	Screening Mammography Use Among Older Women Before and After the 2009 U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Recommendations. Journal of Women's Health, 2016, 25, 1030-1037.	1.5	8
128	Effects of Digital Mammography Uptake on Downstream Breast-related Care Among Older Women. Medical Care, 2012, 50, 1053-1059.	1.1	7
129	Higher Mammography Screening Costs Without Appreciable Clinical Benefit: The Case of Digital Mammography. Journal of the National Cancer Institute, 2014, 106, dju191-dju191.	3.0	7
130	An Abbreviated MRI Protocol for Breast Cancer Screening in Women With Dense Breasts. JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association, 2020, 323, 719.	3.8	7
131	Medical home transformation and breast cancer screening. American Journal of Managed Care, 2016, 22, e382-e388.	0.8	7
132	Breast cancer screening initiation after turning 40Âyears of age within the PROSPR consortium. Breast Cancer Research and Treatment, 2016, 160, 323-331.	1.1	6
133	Take the money and run? Redemption of a gift card incentive in a clinician survey. BMC Medical Research Methodology, 2016, 16, 25.	1.4	5
134	Multi-level Influences on Breast Cancer Screening in Primary Care. Journal of General Internal Medicine, 2018, 33, 1729-1737.	1.3	5
135	Alignment of breast cancer screening guidelines, accountability metrics, and practice patterns. American Journal of Managed Care, 2017, 23, 35-40.	0.8	5
136	Characteristics associated with requests by pathologists for second opinions on breast biopsies. Journal of Clinical Pathology, 2017, 70, 947-953.	1.0	4
137	Comparative effectiveness of incorporating a hypothetical DCIS prognostic marker into breast cancer screening. Breast Cancer Research and Treatment, 2018, 168, 229-239.	1.1	4
138	Modelling mammography screening for breast cancer in the Canadian context: Modification and testing of a microsimulation model. Health Reports, 2015, 26, 3-8.	0.6	4
139	Costs, Evidence, and Value in the Medicare Program. JAMA Internal Medicine, 2013, 173, 227.	2.6	3
140	Association of Second-Opinion Strategies in the Histopathologic Diagnosis of Cutaneous Melanocytic Lesions With Diagnostic Accuracy and Population-Level Costs. JAMA Dermatology, 2021, 157, 1102.	2.0	3
141	Multilevel follow-up of cancer screening (mFOCUS): Protocol for a multilevel intervention to improve the follow-up of abnormal cancer screening test results. Contemporary Clinical Trials, 2021, 109, 106533.	0.8	3
142	Clinical outcomes of modelling mammography screening strategies. Health Reports, 2015, 26, 9-15.	0.6	3
143	Breast Density Knowledge in a Screening Mammography Population Exposed to Density Notification. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 2022, 19, 615-624.	0.9	3
144	The Cost-Effectiveness of Reverse Total Shoulder Arthroplasty Versus Open Reduction Internal Fixation for Proximal Humerus Fractures in the Elderly. Iowa orthopaedic journal, The, 2020, 40, 20-29.	0.5	1

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
145	A Procedure for Eliciting Women's Preferences for Breast Cancer Screening Frequency. Medical Decision Making, 2022, , 0272989X2110733.	1.2	1
146	Decision quality and regret with treatment decisions in women with breast cancer: Pre-operative breast MRI and breast density. Breast Cancer Research and Treatment, 0, , .	1.1	1
147	Timing of BAL in suspected PCP. Journal of General Internal Medicine, 1994, 9, 356-356.	1.3	Ο
148	Response Letter to Herbert L. Muncie, Jr Journal of the American Geriatrics Society, 2014, 62, 998-999.	1.3	0
149	Use of the Van Nuys Ductal Carcinoma in Situ Classification. American Journal of Surgical Pathology, 2001, 25, 544-545.	2.1	0