

Nils P Johnson

List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: <https://exaly.com/author-pdf/2824457/publications.pdf>

Version: 2024-02-01

68
papers

3,269
citations

304743

22
h-index

149698

56
g-index

68
all docs

68
docs citations

68
times ranked

2854
citing authors

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
1	Prognostic Value of Fractional Flow Reserve. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 2014, 64, 1641-1654.	2.8	513
2	Anatomic Versus Physiologic Assessment of Coronary Artery Disease. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 2013, 62, 1639-1653.	2.8	495
3	Deferral vs. performance of percutaneous coronary intervention of functionally non-significant coronary stenosis: 15-year follow-up of the DEFER trial. European Heart Journal, 2015, 36, 3182-3188.	2.2	406
4	Integrating Noninvasive Absolute Flow, Coronary Flow Reserve, and Ischemic Thresholds Into a Comprehensive Map of Physiological Severity. JACC: Cardiovascular Imaging, 2012, 5, 430-440.	5.3	197
5	Fractional flow reserve-guided percutaneous coronary intervention vs. medical therapy for patients with stable coronary lesions: meta-analysis of individual patient data. European Heart Journal, 2019, 40, 180-186.	2.2	159
6	Standardization of Fractional Flow Reserve Measurements. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 2016, 68, 742-753.	2.8	157
7	Continuum of Vasodilator Stress From Rest to Contrast Medium to Adenosine Hyperemia for Fractional Flow Reserve Assessment. JACC: Cardiovascular Interventions, 2016, 9, 757-767.	2.9	129
8	Coronary Physiology Beyond Coronary Flow Reserve in Microvascular Angina. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 2018, 72, 2642-2662.	2.8	101
9	Repeatability of Fractional Flow Reserve Despite Variations in Systemic and Coronary Hemodynamics. JACC: Cardiovascular Interventions, 2015, 8, 1018-1027.	2.9	83
10	Regional, Artery-Specific Thresholds of Quantitative Myocardial Perfusion by PET Associated with Reduced Myocardial Infarction and Death After Revascularization in Stable Coronary Artery Disease. Journal of Nuclear Medicine, 2019, 60, 410-417.	5.0	83
11	The Influence of Lesion Location on the Diagnostic Accuracy of Adenosine-Free Coronary Pressure Wire Measurements. JACC: Cardiovascular Interventions, 2016, 9, 2390-2399.	2.9	81
12	Coronary Anatomy to Predict Physiology. Circulation: Cardiovascular Imaging, 2013, 6, 817-832.	2.6	79
13	Invasive FFR and Noninvasive CFR in the Evaluation of Ischemia. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 2016, 67, 2772-2788.	2.8	77
14	Regadenoson Versus Dipyridamole Hyperemia for Cardiac PET Imaging. JACC: Cardiovascular Imaging, 2015, 8, 438-447.	5.3	73
15	Accuracy of Fractional Flow Reserve Measurements in Clinical Practice. JACC: Cardiovascular Interventions, 2017, 10, 1392-1401.	2.9	49
16	Predictive factors of discordance between the instantaneous wave-free ratio and fractional flow reserve. Catheterization and Cardiovascular Interventions, 2019, 94, 356-363.	1.7	49
17	Diastolic pressure ratio: new approach and validation vs. the instantaneous wave-free ratio. European Heart Journal, 2019, 40, 2585-2594.	2.2	44
18	Mortality Prediction by Quantitative PET Perfusion Expressed as Coronary Flow Capacity With and Without Revascularization. JACC: Cardiovascular Imaging, 2021, 14, 1020-1034.	5.3	41

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
19	Coronary Branch Steal. <i>Circulation: Cardiovascular Imaging</i> , 2010, 3, 701-709.	2.6	39
20	Pressure gradient vs. flow relationships to characterize the physiology of a severely stenotic aortic valve before and after transcatheter valve implantation. <i>European Heart Journal</i> , 2018, 39, 2646-2655.	2.2	38
21	Performance of electrocardiographic criteria to differentiate Takotsubo cardiomyopathy from acute anterior ST elevation myocardial infarction. <i>International Journal of Cardiology</i> , 2013, 164, 345-348.	1.7	34
22	The cardiac arrest survival score: A predictive algorithm for in-hospital mortality after out-of-hospital cardiac arrest. <i>Resuscitation</i> , 2019, 144, 46-53.	3.0	26
23	Combined Pressure and Flow Measurements to Guide Treatment of Coronary Stenoses. <i>JACC: Cardiovascular Interventions</i> , 2021, 14, 1904-1913.	2.9	22
24	Why Is Fractional Flow Reserve After Percutaneous Coronary Intervention Not Always 1.0? <i>JACC: Cardiovascular Interventions</i> , 2016, 9, 1032-1035.	2.9	20
25	Autoregulation of Coronary Blood Supply in Response to Demand. <i>Journal of the American College of Cardiology</i> , 2021, 77, 2335-2345.	2.8	19
26	What can intracoronary pressure measurements tell us about flow reserve? Pressure-bounded coronary flow reserve and example application to the randomized DEFER trial. <i>Catheterization and Cardiovascular Interventions</i> , 2017, 90, 917-925.	1.7	16
27	Fractional Flow Reserve Returns to Its Origins. <i>Circulation: Cardiovascular Imaging</i> , 2016, 9, .	2.6	15
28	Quantitative myocardial perfusion positron emission tomography and caffeine revisited with new insights on major adverse cardiovascular events and coronary flow capacity. <i>European Heart Journal Cardiovascular Imaging</i> , 2019, 20, 751-762.	1.2	15
29	Coronary Psychology. <i>JACC: Cardiovascular Interventions</i> , 2018, 11, 1492-1494.	2.9	14
30	Physiology of endothelin in producing myocardial perfusion heterogeneity: A mechanistic study using darusentan and positron emission tomography. <i>Journal of Nuclear Cardiology</i> , 2013, 20, 835-844.	2.1	13
31	Optimal Adenosine Stress for Maximum Stress Perfusion, Coronary Flow Reserve, and Pixel Distribution of Coronary Flow Capacity by Kolmogorov-Smirnov Analysis. <i>Circulation: Cardiovascular Imaging</i> , 2017, 10, .	2.6	13
32	Coronary Microcirculation in Aortic Stenosis: Pathophysiology, Invasive Assessment, and Future Directions. <i>Journal of Interventional Cardiology</i> , 2020, 2020, 1-13.	1.2	11
33	Why Can Fractional Flow Reserve Decrease After Transcatheter Aortic Valve Implantation?. <i>Journal of the American Heart Association</i> , 2020, 9, e04905.	3.7	11
34	Pitfalls in quantitative myocardial PET perfusion I: Myocardial partial volume correction. <i>Journal of Nuclear Cardiology</i> , 2020, 27, 386-396.	2.1	9
35	How Do PET Myocardial Blood Flow Reserve and FFR Differ?. <i>Current Cardiology Reports</i> , 2020, 22, 20.	2.9	9
36	Coronary Flow Capacity to Identify Stenosis Associated With Coronary Flow Improvement After Revascularization: A Combined Analysis From DEFINE FLOW and IDEAL. <i>Journal of the American Heart Association</i> , 2020, 9, e016130.	3.7	8

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
37	Stenting “Vulnerable” But Fractional Flow Reserve “Negative Lesions. JACC: Cardiovascular Interventions, 2021, 14, 461-467.	2.9	8
38	Development, validation, and reproducibility of the pullback pressure gradient (PPG) derived from manual fractional flow reserve pullbacks. Catheterization and Cardiovascular Interventions, 2022, 99, 1518-1525.	1.7	8
39	History and Development of Coronary Flow Reserve and Fractional Flow Reserve for Clinical Applications. Interventional Cardiology Clinics, 2015, 4, 397-410.	0.4	7
40	Intracoronary Hypothermia Before Reperfusion to Reduce Reperfusion Injury in Acute Myocardial Infarction: A Novel Hypothesis and Technique. Therapeutic Hypothermia and Temperature Management, 2017, 7, 199-205.	0.9	7
41	Approximate Truth. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 2017, 70, 3097-3101.	2.8	7
42	Integrating Coronary Physiology, Longitudinal Pressure, and Perfusion Gradients in CAD. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 2019, 74, 1785-1788.	2.8	7
43	Stress Aortic Valve Index (SAVI) with Dobutamine for Low-Gradient Aortic Stenosis: A Pilot Study. Structural Heart, 2020, 4, 53-61.	0.6	7
44	Same Lesion, Different Artery, Different FFR!?. JACC: Cardiovascular Imaging, 2019, 12, 718-721.	5.3	6
45	Phasic pressure measurements for coronary and valvular interventions using fluid-filled catheters: Errors, automated correction, and clinical implications. Catheterization and Cardiovascular Interventions, 2020, 96, E268-E277.	1.7	6
46	Coronary Steal: Mechanisms of a Misnomer. Journal of the American Heart Association, 2021, 10, e021000.	3.7	6
47	Shifted Helical Computed Tomography to Optimize Cardiac Positron Emission Tomography “Computed Tomography Coregistration: Quantitative Improvement and Limitations. Molecular Imaging, 2010, 9, 7290.2010.00015.	1.4	5
48	Post-intervention coronary pseudoaneurysm treated with a covered stent. Texas Heart Institute Journal, 2012, 39, 448-9.	0.3	5
49	Hydrostatic Forces. JACC: Cardiovascular Interventions, 2017, 10, 1596-1597.	2.9	4
50	Yellow traffic lights and grey zone fractional flow reserve values: stop or go?. European Heart Journal, 2018, 39, 1620-1622.	2.2	4
51	Angiography-Derived Fractional Flow Reserve Versus Invasive Nonhyperemic Pressure Ratios. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 2019, 73, 3232-3233.	2.8	4
52	2-Dimensional Fractional Flow Reserve. JACC: Cardiovascular Interventions, 2020, 13, 1651-1654.	2.9	4
53	Improving transcatheter aortic valve interventional predictability via fluid-structure interaction modelling using patient-specific anatomy. Royal Society Open Science, 2022, 9, 211694.	2.4	4
54	An Analysis of 3 Common CardioGen-82 82Rb Infusion System Injection Methods and Their Impact on Clinical Volume and Image Counts. Journal of Nuclear Medicine Technology, 2015, 43, 113-116.	0.8	3

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
55	TAG, Youâ€™re Out. JACC: Cardiovascular Imaging, 2019, 12, 334-337.	5.3	3
56	Letter to the Editor regarding â€œPET: Is myocardial flow quantification a clinical reality?â€. Journal of Nuclear Cardiology, 2012, 19, 1243-1244.	2.1	2
57	Coronary Physiology. JACC: Cardiovascular Imaging, 2020, 13, 1986-1988.	5.3	2
58	Design and rationale of the randomized trial of comprehensive lifestyle modification, optimal pharmacological treatment and utilizing PET imaging for quantifying and managing stable coronary artery disease (the CENTURY study). American Heart Journal, 2021, 237, 135-146.	2.7	2
59	Can FFR After Stenting Help Reduce Target Vessel Failure?. JACC: Cardiovascular Interventions, 2021, 14, 1901-1903.	2.9	2
60	Is Target Vessel Failure a Failure?. JACC: Cardiovascular Interventions, 2022, 15, 1044-1046.	2.9	2
61	Rationale and design of SAVI-AoS: A physiologic study of patients with symptomatic moderate aortic valve stenosis and preserved left ventricular ejection fraction. IJC Heart and Vasculature, 2022, 41, 101063.	1.1	2
62	A fundamental principle of coronary pathophysiology for risk stratifying coronary artery disease. European Heart Journal Cardiovascular Imaging, 2021, 22, 647-649.	1.2	1
63	Flow, pressure, anatomy: an eternal golden braid. Cardiovascular Research, 2021, 117, 1426-1427.	3.8	1
64	How shall we judge a PET flow model?. Journal of Nuclear Cardiology, 2022, 29, 2551-2554.	2.1	1
65	Discordance in the Pattern of Coronary Artery Disease Between Resting and Hyperemic Conditions. JACC: Cardiovascular Interventions, 2022, 15, e113-e116.	2.9	1
66	Agreement between two diagnostic tests when accounting for testâ€™retest variation: application to FFR versus iFR. Journal of Applied Statistics, 2016, 43, 1673-1689.	1.3	0
67	Potential errors in interpreting hibernation due to FDG scaling?. Journal of Nuclear Cardiology, 2021, 28, 1740-1744.	2.1	0
68	Retention models: â€™tis the gift to be simple. Journal of Nuclear Cardiology, 2022, 29, 2595-2598.	2.1	0