

Dawid Pieper

List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: <https://exaly.com/author-pdf/2737402/publications.pdf>

Version: 2024-02-01

137
papers

4,423
citations

147726

31
h-index

133188

59
g-index

156
all docs

156
docs citations

156
times ranked

5415
citing authors

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
1	Preference between medical outcomes and travel times: an analysis of liver transplantation. <i>Langenbeck's Archives of Surgery</i> , 2022, 407, 707-716.	0.8	0
2	Replicability in the context of systematic reviews: A call for a framework with considerations regarding duplication, overlap, and intentionality. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2022, 142, 313-314.	2.4	5
3	Attitude toward second opinions in Germany – a survey of the general population. <i>BMC Health Services Research</i> , 2022, 22, 76.	0.9	6
4	Safety of dipeptidyl peptidase-4 inhibitors in older adults with type 2 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. <i>Therapeutic Advances in Drug Safety</i> , 2022, 13, 204209862110723.	1.0	7
5	Assessing transferability in systematic reviews of health economic evaluations – a review of methodological guidance. <i>BMC Medical Research Methodology</i> , 2022, 22, 52.	1.4	7
6	Relationship between volume and outcome for gastroschisis: A systematic review. <i>Journal of Pediatric Surgery</i> , 2022, 57, 763-785.	0.8	1
7	When is the evidence conclusive? Analysis of systematic reviews for which Cochrane declared that conclusions will not change with further studies. <i>Research Synthesis Methods</i> , 2022, 13, 478-488.	4.2	7
8	The effect of preoperative stoma site marking on risk of stoma-related complications in patients with intestinal ostomy – A systematic review and meta-analysis. <i>Colorectal Disease</i> , 2022, 24, 904-917.	0.7	12
9	Telemedical Second Opinions in Germany: A Customer Survey of an Online Portal. <i>Telemedicine Journal and E-Health</i> , 2022, 28, 1664-1671.	1.6	1
10	Methodological assessment of systematic reviews of in-vitro dental studies. <i>BMC Medical Research Methodology</i> , 2022, 22, 110.	1.4	10
11	Identifying and addressing conflicting results across multiple discordant systematic reviews on the same question: protocol for a replication study of the Jadad algorithm. <i>BMJ Open</i> , 2022, 12, e054223.	0.8	6
12	Retrieving Cochrane reviews is sometimes challenging and their reporting is not always optimal. <i>Research Synthesis Methods</i> , 2022, 13, 554-557.	4.2	3
13	An adapted –Ottawa–™ method allowed assessing the need to update topic areas within clinical practice guidelines. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2022, 150, 1-11.	2.4	3
14	Additional considerations and response to –graphical representation of overlap for <sc>OVERviews</sc> (<sc>GROOVE</sc> tool)–™. <i>Research Synthesis Methods</i> , 2022, 13, 548-551.	4.2	5
15	Authors should clearly report how they derived the overall rating when applying AMSTAR 2 – a cross-sectional study. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2021, 129, 97-103.	2.4	42
16	Second opinion programmes in Germany: a mixed-methods study protocol. <i>BMJ Open</i> , 2021, 11, e045264.	0.8	9
17	Measuring test-retest reliability (TRR) of AMSTAR provides moderate to perfect agreement – a contribution to the discussion of the importance of TRR in relation to the psychometric properties of assessment tools. <i>BMC Medical Research Methodology</i> , 2021, 21, 51.	1.4	5
18	Reply to letter to the editor by Franco et al. AMSTAR 2 overall confidence rating: A call for even more transparency. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2021, 138, 241-242.	2.4	3

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
19	Analysis of second opinion programs provided by German statutory and private health insurance – a survey of statutory and private health insurers. <i>BMC Health Services Research</i> , 2021, 21, 209.	0.9	6
20	Language restrictions in systematic reviews should not be imposed in the search strategy but in the eligibility criteria if necessary. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2021, 132, 146-147.	2.4	33
21	Using existing systematic reviews for developing vaccination recommendations: Results of an international expert workshop. <i>Vaccine</i> , 2021, 39, 3103-3110.	1.7	2
22	Is reusing text from a protocol in the completed systematic review acceptable?. <i>Systematic Reviews</i> , 2021, 10, 131.	2.5	2
23	No inexplicable disagreements between real-world data–based nonrandomized controlled studies and randomized controlled trials were found. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2021, 133, 1-13.	2.4	8
24	The effect of preoperative stoma site marking on risk of stoma-related complications in patients with intestinal ostomy – protocol of a systematic review and meta-analysis. <i>Systematic Reviews</i> , 2021, 10, 146.	2.5	7
25	Enhanced access to recommendations from the Cochrane Handbook for improving authors' judgments about risk of bias: A randomized controlled trial. <i>Research Synthesis Methods</i> , 2021, 12, 618-629.	4.2	7
26	Perspective of potential patients on the hospital volume-outcome relationship and the minimum volume threshold for total knee arthroplasty: a qualitative focus group and interview study. <i>BMC Health Services Research</i> , 2021, 21, 633.	0.9	3
27	Author queries via email text elicited high response and took less reviewer time than data forms – a randomised study within a review. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2021, 135, 1-9.	2.4	5
28	A new method for testing reproducibility in systematic reviews was developed, but needs more testing. <i>BMC Medical Research Methodology</i> , 2021, 21, 157.	1.4	6
29	Healthcare delivery and information provision in bariatric surgery in Germany: qualitative interviews with bariatric surgeons. <i>BMC Health Services Research</i> , 2021, 21, 659.	0.9	3
30	Managing overlap of primary study results across systematic reviews: practical considerations for authors of overviews of reviews. <i>BMC Medical Research Methodology</i> , 2021, 21, 140.	1.4	71
31	Nearly 80 systematic reviews were published each day: Observational study on trends in epidemiology and reporting over the years 2000-2019. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2021, 138, 1-11.	2.4	94
32	Reporting of methods to prepare, pilot and perform data extraction in systematic reviews: analysis of a sample of 152 Cochrane and non-Cochrane reviews. <i>BMC Medical Research Methodology</i> , 2021, 21, 240.	1.4	5
33	Communication strategies in the prevention of type 2 diabetes and gestational diabetes in vulnerable groups: a scoping review. <i>Systematic Reviews</i> , 2021, 10, 301.	2.5	7
34	Patient Preferences between Minimum Volume Thresholds and Nationwide Healthcare Provision: the Example of Total Knee Arthroplasty. <i>Zeitschrift Fur Orthopadie Und Unfallchirurgie</i> , 2020, 158, 390-396.	0.4	5
35	AMSTAR 2 overall confidence rating: lacking discriminating capacity or requirement of high methodological quality?. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2020, 119, 142-144.	2.4	24
36	More systematic reviews were registered in PROSPERO each year, but few records' status was up-to-date. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2020, 117, 60-67.	2.4	26

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
37	Overall bias methods and their use in sensitivity analysis of Cochrane reviews were not consistent. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2020, 119, 57-64.	2.4	19
38	Inter-review agreement of risk-of-bias judgments varied in Cochrane reviews. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2020, 120, 25-32.	2.4	8
39	Data extraction methods: an analysis of internal reporting discrepancies in single manuscripts and practical advice. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2020, 117, 158-164.	2.4	10
40	An observational study found large methodological heterogeneity in systematic reviews addressing prevalence and cumulative incidence. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2020, 119, 92-99.	2.4	25
41	Development, testing and use of data extraction forms in systematic reviews: a review of methodological guidance. <i>BMC Medical Research Methodology</i> , 2020, 20, 259.	1.4	32
42	Exercise/physical activity and health outcomes: an overview of Cochrane systematic reviews. <i>BMC Public Health</i> , 2020, 20, 1724.	1.2	135
43	Elective removal vs. retaining of hardware after osteosynthesis in asymptomatic patients—a scoping review. <i>Systematic Reviews</i> , 2020, 9, 225.	2.5	16
44	The methodological quality of systematic reviews on the treatment of adult major depression needs improvement according to AMSTAR 2: A cross-sectional study. <i>Heliyon</i> , 2020, 6, e04776.	1.4	41
45	Relationship between volume and outcome for gastroschisis: a systematic review protocol. <i>Systematic Reviews</i> , 2020, 9, 203.	2.5	2
46	How to decide whether a systematic review is stable and not in need of updating: Analysis of Cochrane reviews. <i>Research Synthesis Methods</i> , 2020, 11, 884-890.	4.2	13
47	The role of saline irrigation prior to wound closure in the reduction of surgical site infection: a systematic review and meta-analysis. <i>Patient Safety in Surgery</i> , 2020, 14, 47.	1.1	9
48	What evidence-based medicine researchers can do to help clinicians fighting COVID-19?. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2020, 124, 183-185.	2.4	10
49	Barriers and facilitating factors in the prevention of diabetes type 2 and gestational diabetes in vulnerable groups: A scoping review. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2020, 15, e0232250.	1.1	4
50	Relationship between volume and outcome for surgery on congenital diaphragmatic hernia: A systematic review. <i>Journal of Pediatric Surgery</i> , 2020, 55, 2555-2565.	0.8	8
51	Quality and risk of bias appraisals of systematic reviews are inconsistent across reviewers and centers. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2020, 125, 9-15.	2.4	39
52	Database combinations to retrieve systematic reviews in overviews of reviews: a methodological study. <i>BMC Medical Research Methodology</i> , 2020, 20, 138.	1.4	33
53	Results of a patient-oriented second opinion program in Germany shows a high discrepancy between initial therapy recommendation and second opinion. <i>BMC Health Services Research</i> , 2020, 20, 237.	0.9	6
54	Evidence and Trends in Burn Wound Debridement: An Evidence Map. <i>Plastic Surgery</i> , 2020, 28, 232-242.	0.4	9

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
55	A systematic review and time-response meta-analysis of the optimal timing of elective caesarean sections for best maternal and neonatal health outcomes. <i>BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth</i> , 2020, 20, 395.	0.9	7
56	Hospital volume-outcome relationship in total knee arthroplasty: protocol for a systematic review and non-linear dose-response meta-analysis. <i>Systematic Reviews</i> , 2020, 9, 38.	2.5	6
57	Are patients willing to accept longer travel times to decrease their risk associated with surgical procedures? A systematic review. <i>BMC Public Health</i> , 2020, 20, 253.	1.2	23
58	Icodextrin Versus Glucose Solutions for the Once-Daily Long Dwell in Peritoneal Dialysis: An Enriched Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. <i>American Journal of Kidney Diseases</i> , 2020, 75, 830-846.	2.1	48
59	Limiting the search period in methodological studies. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2020, 123, 175-176.	2.4	2
60	Psychosocial Changes of Bariatric Surgery in Patientsâ€™ Everyday Life: a Scoping Review. <i>Obesity Surgery</i> , 2020, 30, 2949-2956.	1.1	12
61	Inconsistent views among systematic review authors toward publishing protocols as peer-reviewed articles: an international survey. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2020, 123, 9-17.	2.4	5
62	Epidemiology and reporting characteristics of nonâ€Cochrane updates of systematic reviews: A crossâ€Csectional study. <i>Research Synthesis Methods</i> , 2020, 11, 471-483.	4.2	9
63	Assessing context suitability (generalizability, external validity, applicability or transferability) of findings in evidence syntheses in healthcareâ€CAn integrative review of methodological guidance. <i>Research Synthesis Methods</i> , 2020, 11, 760-779.	4.2	10
64	Reporting of methodological studies in health research: a protocol for the development of the Methodological STudy reporting Checklist (MISTIC). <i>BMJ Open</i> , 2020, 10, e040478.	0.8	3
65	What is a meta-epidemiological study? Analysis of published literature indicated heterogeneous study designs and definitions. <i>Journal of Comparative Effectiveness Research</i> , 2020, 9, 497-508.	0.6	15
66	Single screening versus conventional double screening for study selection in systematic reviews: a methodological systematic review. <i>BMC Medical Research Methodology</i> , 2019, 19, 132.	1.4	224
67	Guideline-based quality indicatorsâ€C a systematic comparison of German and international clinical practice guidelines. <i>Implementation Science</i> , 2019, 14, 71.	2.5	14
68	Registration of methodological studies, that is, â€Cresearch-on-researchâ€C studiesâ€C should it be mandatory?. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2019, 115, 35-36.	2.4	5
69	Clowning in children undergoing potentially anxiety-provoking procedures: a systematic review and meta-analysis. <i>Systematic Reviews</i> , 2019, 8, 178.	2.5	10
70	Health Technology Assessment of Public Health Interventions Published 2012 to 2016: An Analysis of Characteristics and Comparison of Methods. <i>International Journal of Technology Assessment in Health Care</i> , 2019, 35, 280-290.	0.2	8
71	A psychometric study found AMSTAR 2 to be a valid and moderately reliable appraisal tool. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2019, 114, 133-140.	2.4	130
72	Definition of a systematic review used in overviews of systematic reviews, meta-epidemiological studies and textbooks. <i>BMC Medical Research Methodology</i> , 2019, 19, 203.	1.4	126

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
73	Challenges in teaching systematic reviews to non-clinicians. <i>Zeitschrift Fur Evidenz, Fortbildung Und Qualitat Im Gesundheitswesen</i> , 2019, 147-148, 1-6.	0.7	0
74	An algorithm for the classification of study designs to assess diagnostic, prognostic and predictive test accuracy in systematic reviews. <i>Systematic Reviews</i> , 2019, 8, 226.	2.5	27
75	Following Cochrane review protocols to completion 10 years later: a retrospective cohort study and author survey. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2019, 111, 41-48.	2.4	16
76	Communication strategies in the prevention of type 2 and gestational diabetes in vulnerable groups: protocol for a scoping review. <i>Systematic Reviews</i> , 2019, 8, 98.	2.5	1
77	Comparison of non-Cochrane systematic reviews and their published protocols: differences occurred frequently but were seldom explained. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2019, 110, 34-41.	2.4	18
78	A descriptive analysis of the characteristics and the peer review process of systematic review protocols published in an open peer review journal from 2012 to 2017. <i>BMC Medical Research Methodology</i> , 2019, 19, 57.	1.4	12
79	The role of icodextrin in peritoneal dialysis: protocol for a systematic review and meta-analysis. <i>Systematic Reviews</i> , 2019, 8, 35.	2.5	4
80	4€...More systematic reviews are being registered in PROSPERO each year, but records are seldom up-to-date. , 2019, , .		0
81	Half of systematic reviews about pain registered in PROSPERO were not published and the majority had inaccurate status. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2019, 116, 114-121.	2.4	20
82	Preferred Reporting Items for Overviews of Reviews (PRIOR): a protocol for development of a reporting guideline for overviews of reviews of healthcare interventions. <i>Systematic Reviews</i> , 2019, 8, 335.	2.5	84
83	Minor differences were found between AMSTAR 2 and ROBIS in the assessment of systematic reviews including both randomized and nonrandomized studies. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2019, 108, 26-33.	2.4	71
84	No differences were found between effect estimates from conventional and registry-based randomized controlled trials. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2019, 105, 80-91.	2.4	4
85	Differences between protocols for randomized controlled trials and systematic reviews. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2018, 98, 144-145.	2.4	8
86	Systematic reviews with published protocols compared to those without: more effort, older search. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2018, 95, 102-110.	2.4	53
87	A systematic decision-making process on the need for updating clinical practice guidelines proved to be feasible in a pilot study. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2018, 96, 101-109.	2.4	11
88	Quality ratings of reviews in overviews: a comparison of reviews with and without dual (co-)authorship. <i>Systematic Reviews</i> , 2018, 7, 63.	2.5	6
89	Study design classification of registry-based studies in systematic reviews. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2018, 93, 84-87.	2.4	24
90	Registry-based randomized controlled trials merged the strength of randomized controlled trials and observational studies and give rise to more pragmatic trials. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2018, 93, 120-127.	2.4	63

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
91	Relationship between volume and outcome for congenital diaphragmatic hernia: a systematic review protocol. <i>Systematic Reviews</i> , 2018, 7, 185.	2.5	9
92	Barriers and facilitating factors in the prevention of diabetes type II and gestational diabetes in vulnerable groups: protocol for a scoping review. <i>Systematic Reviews</i> , 2018, 7, 245.	2.5	5
93	The role of saline irrigation prior to wound closure in the reduction of surgical site infection: protocol for a systematic review and meta-analysis. <i>Systematic Reviews</i> , 2018, 7, 152.	2.5	4
94	How is AMSTAR applied by authors â€” a call for better reporting. <i>BMC Medical Research Methodology</i> , 2018, 18, 56.	1.4	48
95	(Update of a) systematic review on the impact of elective early term (<â€%39th gestational week) caesarean sections on maternal and neonatal health - a protocol. <i>Systematic Reviews</i> , 2018, 7, 119.	2.5	3
96	Health technology assessment of public health interventions: an analysis of characteristics and comparison of methodsâ€”study protocol. <i>Systematic Reviews</i> , 2018, 7, 79.	2.5	11
97	Evaluation of the reliability, usability, and applicability of AMSTAR, AMSTAR 2, and ROBIS: protocol for a descriptive analytic study. <i>Systematic Reviews</i> , 2018, 7, 85.	2.5	38
98	Guideline-based quality indicatorsâ€”a systematic comparison of German and international clinical practice guidelines: protocol for a systematic review. <i>Systematic Reviews</i> , 2018, 7, 5.	2.5	12
99	Comparison of methodological quality rating of systematic reviews on neuropathic pain using AMSTAR and R-AMSTAR. <i>BMC Medical Research Methodology</i> , 2018, 18, 37.	1.4	26
100	The effect of a voucher incentive on a survey response rate in the clinical setting: a quasi-randomized controlled trial. <i>BMC Medical Research Methodology</i> , 2018, 18, 86.	1.4	15
101	Survey of instructions for authors on how to report an update of a systematic review: guidance is needed. <i>Evidence-Based Medicine</i> , 2017, 22, 45-48.	0.6	8
102	Patient education in osteoporosis prevention: a systematic review focusing on methodological quality of randomised controlled trials. <i>Osteoporosis International</i> , 2017, 28, 1779-1803.	1.3	29
103	HEALTH TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH INTERVENTIONS: A SYNTHESIS OF METHODOLOGICAL GUIDANCE. <i>International Journal of Technology Assessment in Health Care</i> , 2017, 33, 135-146.	0.2	18
104	Heterogeneity in application, design, and analysis characteristics was found for controlled before-after and interrupted time series studies included in Cochrane reviews. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2017, 91, 56-69.	2.4	34
105	The risk of bias in systematic reviews tool showed fair reliability and good construct validity. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2017, 91, 121-128.	2.4	46
106	Epidemiology and reporting characteristics of overviews of reviews of healthcare interventions published 2012â€”2016: protocol for a systematic review. <i>Systematic Reviews</i> , 2017, 6, 73.	2.5	16
107	Birth weight and subsequent risk of childhood primary brain tumors: An updated metaâ€”analysis. <i>Pediatric Blood and Cancer</i> , 2017, 64, e26299.	0.8	17
108	Frequency of data extraction errors and methods to increase data extraction quality: a methodological review. <i>BMC Medical Research Methodology</i> , 2017, 17, 152.	1.4	96

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
109	Inter-rater reliability of AMSTAR is dependent on the pair of reviewers. BMC Medical Research Methodology, 2017, 17, 98.	1.4	23
110	Clarifying the distinction between case series and cohort studies in systematic reviews of comparative studies: potential impact on body of evidence and workload. BMC Medical Research Methodology, 2017, 17, 107.	1.4	103
111	Specific barriers to the conduct of randomised clinical trials on medical devices. Trials, 2017, 18, 427.	0.7	66
112	Interventions to increase adherence in patients taking immunosuppressive drugs after kidney transplantation: a systematic review of controlled trials. Systematic Reviews, 2017, 6, 236.	2.5	23
113	A network meta-analysis on the efficacy of targeted agents in combination with chemotherapy for treatment of advanced/metastatic triple-negative breast cancer. Oncotarget, 2017, 8, 59539-59551.	0.8	9
114	The prevalence of chronic pain in orchestra musicians. GMS German Medical Science, 2017, 15, Doc01.	2.7	13
115	Resuming the discussion of AMSTAR: What can (should) be made better?. BMC Medical Research Methodology, 2016, 16, 111.	1.4	45
116	Most overviews of Cochrane reviews neglected potential biases from dual authorship. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 2016, 77, 91-94.	2.4	13
117	Relationship between surgeon volume and outcomes: a systematic review of systematic reviews. Systematic Reviews, 2016, 5, 204.	2.5	244
118	The Global Research Collaboration of Network Meta-Analysis: A Social Network Analysis. PLoS ONE, 2016, 11, e0163239.	1.1	33
119	Avenues for Further Research. , 2016, , 373-388.		0
120	Studies analysing the need for health-related information in Germany - a systematic review. BMC Health Services Research, 2015, 15, 407.	0.9	27
121	A systematic review of the impact of center volume in dialysis. BMC Research Notes, 2015, 8, 812.	0.6	26
122	Systematic review found AMSTAR, but not R(evised)-AMSTAR, to have good measurement properties. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 2015, 68, 574-583.	2.4	131
123	Up-to-dateness of reviews is often neglected in overviews: a systematic review. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 2014, 67, 1302-1308.	2.4	49
124	Can AMSTAR also be applied to systematic reviews of non-randomized studies?. BMC Research Notes, 2014, 7, 609.	0.6	44
125	Impact of choice of quality appraisal tool for systematic reviews in overviews. Journal of Evidence-Based Medicine, 2014, 7, 72-78.	2.4	14
126	Methods for Systematic Reviews of Health Economic Evaluations. Medical Decision Making, 2014, 34, 826-840.	1.2	19

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
127	A systematic review of the impact of volume of surgery and specialization in Norwood procedure. BMC Pediatrics, 2014, 14, 198.	0.7	6
128	Methodological approaches in conducting overviews: current state in HTA agencies. Research Synthesis Methods, 2014, 5, 187-199.	4.2	32
129	Systematic review finds overlapping reviews were not mentioned in every other overview. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 2014, 67, 368-375.	2.4	511
130	Adherence enhancing interventions for oral anticancer agents: A systematic review. Cancer Treatment Reviews, 2014, 40, 102-108.	3.4	65
131	Adherence influencing factors in patients taking oral anticancer agents: A systematic review. Cancer Epidemiology, 2014, 38, 214-226.	0.8	62
132	Adherence-enhancing interventions for active antiretroviral therapy in sub-Saharan Africa: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Sexual Health, 2014, 11, 230.	0.4	15
133	Adherence influencing factors – a systematic review of systematic reviews. Archives of Public Health, 2014, 72, 37.	1.0	139
134	State of Evidence on the Relationship between High-Volume Hospitals and Outcomes in Surgery: A Systematic Review of Systematic Reviews. Journal of the American College of Surgeons, 2013, 216, 1015-1025e18.	0.2	127
135	Overviews of reviews often have limited rigor: a systematic review. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 2012, 65, 1267-1273.	2.4	151
136	Payment methods for hospitals. The Cochrane Library, 0, , .	1.5	7
137	Comparison of protocols and registry entries to published reports for systematic reviews. The Cochrane Library, 0, , .	1.5	3