Ainsley J Newson

List of Publications by Year
in descending order

Source: https://exaly.com/author-pdf/4052642/publications.pdf

Version: 2024-02-01

		279798	254184
119	2,466	23	43
papers	citations	h-index	g-index

126	126	126	2469
all docs	docs citations	times ranked	citing authors

#	Article	IF	Citations
1	Early disruption of centromeric chromatin organization in centromere protein A (Cenpa) null mice. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 2000, 97, 1148-1153.	7.1	379
2	Will the introduction of non-invasive prenatal diagnostic testing erode informed choices? An experimental study of health care professionals. Patient Education and Counseling, 2010, 78, 24-28.	2.2	113
3	Cascade testing in familial hypercholesterolaemia: how should family members be contacted?. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2005, 13, 401-408.	2.8	98
4	Ethical aspects arising from non-invasive fetal diagnosis. Seminars in Fetal and Neonatal Medicine, 2008, 13, 103-108.	2.3	84
5	Australian Genomics: A Federated Model for Integrating Genomics into Healthcare. American Journal of Human Genetics, 2019, 105, 7-14.	6.2	75
6	Dynamics and ethics of comprehensive preimplantation genetic testing: a review of the challenges. Human Reproduction Update, 2013, 19, 366-375.	10.8	68
7	Known unknowns: buildingÂan ethics of uncertainty into genomic medicine. BMC Medical Genomics, 2016, 9, 57.	1.5	66
8	Should Non-Invasiveness Change Informed Consent Procedures for Prenatal Diagnosis?. Health Care Analysis, 2011, 19, 122-132.	2.2	62
9	Gene selection for the Australian Reproductive Genetic Carrier Screening Project (â€œMackenzieâ€™s) Tj ETQq1 1 0.784314 rgBT /O	2.8	60
10	The Emergence and Global Spread of Noninvasive Prenatal Testing. Annual Review of Genomics and Human Genetics, 2021, 22, 309-338.	6.2	53
11	For Your Interest? The Ethical Acceptability of Using Nonâ€Invasive Prenatal Testing to Test â€˜Purely for Informationâ€™. Bioethics, 2015, 29, 19-25.	1.4	50
12	Artificial gametes: new paths to parenthood?. Journal of Medical Ethics, 2005, 31, 184-186.	1.8	46
13	A Pilot Randomized Controlled Trial of the Feasibility, Acceptability, and Impact of Giving Information on Personalized Genomic Risk of Melanoma to the Public. Cancer Epidemiology Biomarkers and Prevention, 2017, 26, 212-221.	2.5	44
14	Prenatal Diagnosis and Abortion for Congenital Abnormalities: Is It Ethical to Provide One Without the Other?. American Journal of Bioethics, 2009, 9, 48-56.	0.9	38
15	Ethical and legal issues in mitochondrial transfer. EMBO Molecular Medicine, 2016, 8, 589-591.	6.9	38
16	Dynamic Consent: An Evaluation and Reporting Framework. Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics, 2020, 15, 175-186.	1.3	38
17	Ethical considerations for choosing between possible models for using NIPD for aneuploidy detection. Journal of Medical Ethics, 2012, 38, 614-618.	1.8	36
18	Rapid Challenges: Ethics and Genomic Neonatal Intensive Care. Pediatrics, 2019, 143, S14-S21.	2.1	35

#	Article	IF	Citations
19	Public preferences for communicating personal genomic risk information: a focus group study. Health Expectations, 2016, 19, 1203-1214.	2.6	28
20	Partially functional Cenpa-GFP fusion protein causes increased chromosome missegregation and apoptosis during mouse embryogenesis. Chromosome Research, 2003, 11, 345-357.	2.2	26
21	Behavioural Genetics: Why Eugenic Selection is Preferable to Enhancement. Journal of Applied Philosophy, 2006, 23, 157-171.	1.0	26
22	Reforming research ethics committees. BMJ: British Medical Journal, 2005, 331, 587-588.	2.3	25
23	Is informed choice in prenatal testing universally valued? A population-based survey in Europe and Asia. BJOG: an International Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, 2009, 116, 880-885.	2.3	25
24	Gene Structure and Sequence Analysis of Mouse Centromere Proteins A and C. Genomics, 1998, 47, 108-114.	2.9	24
25	Genomic intensive care: should we perform genome testing in critically ill newborns?: TableÂ1. Archives of Disease in Childhood: Fetal and Neonatal Edition, 2016, 101, F94-F98.	2.8	23
26	Is Mitochondrial Donation Germâ€Line Gene Therapy? Classifications and Ethical Implications. Bioethics, 2017, 31, 55-67.	1.4	22
27	Genetics and Insurance in Australia: Concerns around a Self-Regulated Industry. Public Health Genomics, 2017, 20, 247-256.	1.0	22
28	Ethical issues in reproductive genetic carrier screening. Medical Journal of Australia, 2021, 214, 165.	1.7	22
29	Impact of personal genomic risk information on melanoma prevention behaviors and psychological outcomes: a randomized controlled trial. Genetics in Medicine, 2021, 23, 2394-2403.	2.4	22
30	Should Parental Refusals of Newborn Screening Be Respected?. Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics, 2006, 15, 135-46.	0.8	21
31	Distress, uncertainty, and positive experiences associated with receiving information on personal genomic risk of melanoma. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2018, 26, 1094-1100.	2.8	21
32	Patient perspectives on molecular tumor profiling: â€œWhy wouldnâ€™t you?â€. BMC Cancer, 2019, 19, 753.	2.6	21
33	Scanning the body, sequencing the genome: Dealing with unsolicited findings. Bioethics, 2017, 31, 648-656.	1.4	20
34	Reconceptualizing Autonomy for Bioethics. Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal, 2018, 28, 171-203.	0.5	20
35	Acceptability of riskâ€stratified population screening across cancer types: Qualitative interviews with the Australian public. Health Expectations, 2021, 24, 1326-1336.	2.6	20
36	Should We Undertake Genetic Research on Intelligence?. Bioethics, 1999, 13, 327-342.	1.4	19

#	Article	IF	Citations
37	The role of patients in European clinical ethics consultation. Clinical Ethics, 2009, 4, 109-110.	0.7	19
38	The melanoma genomics managing your risk study: A protocol for a randomized controlled trial evaluating the impact of personal genomic risk information on skin cancer prevention behaviors. Contemporary Clinical Trials, 2018, 70, 106-116.	1.8	19
39	Ethics of Reproductive Genetic Carrier Screening: From the Clinic to the Population. Public Health Ethics, 2021, 14, 202-217.	1.0	18
40	Key challenges in bringing CRISPR-mediated somatic cell therapy into the clinic. Genome Medicine, 2017, 9, 85.	8.2	17
41	Australiansâ€™ perspectives on support around use of personal genomic testing: Findings from the Genioz study. European Journal of Medical Genetics, 2019, 62, 290-299.	1.3	17
42	â€œWho is watching the watchdog?â€: ethical perspectives of sharing health-related data for precision medicine in Singapore. BMC Medical Ethics, 2020, 21, 118.	2.4	16
43	Cancer patientsâ€™ views and understanding of genome sequencing: a qualitative study. Journal of Medical Genetics, 2020, 57, 671-676.	3.2	16
44	Exploring the Potential Emotional and Behavioural Impact of Providing Personalised Genomic Risk Information to the Public: A Focus Group Study. Public Health Genomics, 2015, 18, 309-317.	1.0	15
45	Why should ethics approval be required prior to publication of health promotion research?. Health Promotion Journal of Australia, 2015, 26, 170-175.	1.2	15
46	Does personalized melanoma genomic risk information trigger conversations about skin cancer prevention and skin examination with family, friends and health professionals?. British Journal of Dermatology, 2017, 177, 779-790.	1.5	15
47	Knowledge, views and expectations for cancer polygenic risk testing in clinical practice: A crossâ€sectional survey of health professionals. Clinical Genetics, 2021, 100, 430-439.	2.0	15
48	GP attitudes to and expectations for providing personal genomic risk information to the public: a qualitative study. BJGP Open, 2019, 3, bjgpopen18X101633.	1.8	15
49	The PiGeOn project: protocol of a longitudinal study examining psychosocial and ethical issues and outcomes in germline genomic sequencing for cancer. BMC Cancer, 2018, 18, 454.	2.6	14
50	Australiansâ€™ views on personal genomic testing: focus group findings from the Genioz study. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2018, 26, 1101-1112.	2.8	14
51	Australiansâ€™ views and experience of personal genomic testing: survey findings from the Genioz study. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2019, 27, 711-720.	2.8	14
52	Reproductive carrier screening: responding to the eugenics critique. Journal of Medical Ethics, 2022, 48, 1060-1067.	1.8	14
53	The value of clinical ethics support in Australian health care. Medical Journal of Australia, 2015, 202, 568-569.	1.7	13
54	Genomic Testing in The Paediatric Population: Ethical Considerations in Light of Recent Policy Statements. Molecular Diagnosis and Therapy, 2016, 20, 407-414.	3.8	13

#	Article	IF	Citations
55	Whole genome sequencing in children: ethics, choice and deliberation. Journal of Medical Ethics, 2017, 43, 540-542.	1.8	13
56	Human Genetics Society of Australasia Position Statement: Predictive and Presymptomatic Genetic Testing in Adults and Children. Twin Research and Human Genetics, 2020, 23, 184-189.	0.6	13
57	The promise of public health ethics for precision medicine: the case of newborn preventive genomic sequencing. Human Genetics, 2022, 141, 1035-1043.	3.8	13
58	Ethical considerations in gene selection for reproductive carrier screening. Human Genetics, 2021, , 1.	3.8	13
59	Childhood genetic testing for familial cancer: should adoption make a difference?. Familial Cancer, 2010, 9, 37-42.	1.9	12
60	Whither Authenticity?. American Journal of Bioethics, 2005, 5, 53-55.	0.9	11
61	â€œWhat should happen before asymptomatic men decide whether or not to have a PSA test?â€•A report on three community juries. Medical Journal of Australia, 2015, 203, 335-335.	1.7	11
62	Human Genetics Society of Australasia Position Statement: Genetic Testing and Personal Insurance Products in Australia. Twin Research and Human Genetics, 2018, 21, 533-537.	0.6	11
63	Implementation considerations for offering personal genomic risk information to the public: a qualitative study. BMC Public Health, 2020, 20, 1028.	2.9	11
64	Family communication about genomic sequencing: A qualitative study with cancer patients and relatives. Patient Education and Counseling, 2021, 104, 944-952.	2.2	11
65	Communication of Genetic Information within Families: The Case for Familial Comity. Journal of Bioethical Inquiry, 2006, 3, 161-166.	1.5	10
66	The PiGeOn project: protocol for a longitudinal study examining psychosocial, behavioural and ethical issues and outcomes in cancer tumour genomic profiling. BMC Cancer, 2018, 18, 389.	2.6	10
67	Genetic counselors' perceptions of uncertainty in pretest counseling for genomic sequencing: A qualitative study. Journal of Genetic Counseling, 2019, 28, 292-303.	1.6	10
68	Disclosure to genetic relatives without consent â€“ Australian genetic professionalsâ€™ awareness of the health privacy law. BMC Medical Ethics, 2020, 21, 13.	2.4	10
69	Current Ethical Issues in Synthetic Biology: Where Should We Go from Here?. Accountability in Research, 2011, 18, 181-193.	2.4	9
70	<scp>A</scp>ustralians' knowledge and perceptions of directâ€toâ€consumer personal genome testing. Internal Medicine Journal, 2014, 44, 27-31.	0.8	9
71	The need for ethics as well as evidence in evidence-based medicine. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 2016, 77, 7-10.	5.0	9
72	Regulating Risk and the Boundaries of State Conduct: A Relational Perspective on Home Birth in Australia. American Journal of Bioethics, 2016, 16, 19-21.	0.9	9

#	Article	IF	Citations
73	From Expectations to Experiences: Consumer Autonomy and Choice in Personal Genomic Testing. AJOB Empirical Bioethics, 2020, 11, 63-76.	1.6	9
74	Development and use of the Australian reproductive genetic carrier screening decision aid. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2022, 30, 194-202.	2.8	9
75	Depression under stress: ethical issues in genetic testing. British Journal of Psychiatry, 2009, 195, 189-190.	2.8	8
76	Public attitudes towards novel reproductive technologies: a citizensâ€™ jury on mitochondrial donation. Human Reproduction, 2019, 34, 751-757.	0.9	8
77	Correspondence on â€œScreening for autosomal recessive and X-linked conditions during pregnancy and preconception: a practice resource of the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics (ACMG)â€•by Gregg etÂal. Genetics in Medicine, 2022, 24, 1158-1161.	2.4	8
78	â€œI wish that there was more infoâ€: characterizing the uncertainty experienced by carriers of pathogenic ATM and/or CHEK2 variants. Familial Cancer, 2022, 21, 143-155.	1.9	7
79	To offer or request? Disclosing variants of uncertain significance in prenatal testing. Bioethics, 2021, 35, 900-909.	1.4	7
80	Commentary: Consent and confidentiality in publishing--the view of the BMJ's ethics committee. BMJ: British Medical Journal, 2008, 337, a1232-a1232.	2.3	7
81	â€˜There is a lot of good in knowing, but there is also a lot of downsâ€™: public views on ethical considerations in population genomic screening. Journal of Medical Ethics, 2021, 47, e28-e28.	1.8	7
82	Informed choice in prenatal testing: a survey among obstetricians and gynaecologists in Europe and Asia. Prenatal Diagnosis, 2008, 28, 1238-1244.	2.3	6
83	Rethinking Pediatric Ethics Consultations. American Journal of Bioethics, 2015, 15, 26-28.	0.9	6
84	Preferences for return of germline genome sequencing results for cancer patients and their genetic relatives in a research setting. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2022, 30, 930-937.	2.8	6
85	Population screening. , 2011, , 118-142.		5
86	Compensated transnational surrogacy in Australia: time for a comprehensive review. Medical Journal of Australia, 2016, 204, 33-35.	1.7	5
87	Advanced cancer patient preferences for receiving molecular profiling results. Psycho-Oncology, 2020, 29, 1533-1539.	2.3	5
88	The Nature and Significance of Behavioural Genetic Information. Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics, 2004, 25, 89-111.	0.8	4
89	Clinical Ethics Committee Case 9: Should we inform our patient about animal products in his medicine?. Clinical Ethics, 2010, 5, 7-12.	0.7	4
90	Intertwined Interests in Expanded Prenatal Genetic Testing: The Stateâ€™s Role in Facilitating Equitable Access. American Journal of Bioethics, 2022, 22, 45-47.	0.9	4

#	Article	IF	Citations
91	Chromosomal localization of mouse Cenpa gene. Cytogenetic and Genome Research, 1997, 79, 298-301.	1.1	3
92	Who should access germline genome sequencing? A mixed methods study of patient views. Clinical Genetics, 2020, 97, 329-337.	2.0	3
93	The expectations and realities of nutrigenomic testing in australia: A qualitative study. Health Expectations, 2021, 24, 670-686.	2.6	3
94	The perils of a broad approach to public interest in health data research: a response to Ballantyne and Schaefer. Journal of Medical Ethics, 2021, 47, 580-582.	1.8	3
95	Taking seriousness seriously in genomic health. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2022, 30, 140-141.	2.8	3
96	Sharing precision medicine data with private industry: Outcomes of a citizensâ€™ jury in Singapore. Big Data and Society, 2022, 9, 205395172211089.	4.5	3
97	Clinical Genetics and the Problem With Unqualified Confidentiality. American Journal of Bioethics, 2006, 6, 41-43.	0.9	2
98	Obligations and preferences in knowing and not knowing: the importance of context. Journal of Medical Ethics, 2020, 46, 306-307.	1.8	2
99	Ethical aspects of the changing landscape for spinal muscular atrophy management in Australia. Australian Journal of General Practice, 2022, 51, 131-135.	0.8	2
100	Clinician views and experiences of nonâ€invasive prenatal genetic screening tests in Australia. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, 2022, , .	1.0	2
101	Consent to the publication of patient information: Incompetent patients may pose a problem. BMJ: British Medical Journal, 2004, 329, 916.1.	2.3	1
102	Personal Genomics as an Interactive Web Broadcast. American Journal of Bioethics, 2009, 9, 27-29.	0.9	1
103	Clinical Ethics Committee Case 8: Should we carry out a predictive genetic test in our young patient?. Clinical Ethics, 2009, 4, 169-172.	0.7	1
104	Do We Need Ethical Theory to Achieve Quality Critical Engagement in Clinical Ethics?. American Journal of Bioethics, 2016, 16, 43-45.	0.9	1
105	Technical Categories and Ethical Justifications: Why Cwikâ€™s Approach is the Wrong Way Around for Categorizing Germ-Line Gene Editing. American Journal of Bioethics, 2020, 20, 27-29.	0.9	1
106	From Chance to Choice: Genetics and Justice: A Buchanan, D W Brock, N Daniels, et al. Cambridge University Press, 2000, pound17.95, $US29.95, pp 398. ISBN 0521660017. Journal of Medical Ethics, 2002, 28, 60-60.	1.8	0
107	Personhood and Moral Status. , 0, , 277-283.		0
108	Clinical Ethics Committee case 6: Our patient wishes to take an unlisted drug even though we're not sure of his diagnosis. Clinical Ethics, 2009, 4, 59-63.	0.7	0

#	Article	IF	Citations
109	Clinical ethics committee case 7: our young patient is in heart failure but has multiple co-morbidities. How can we best care for him and his family?. Clinical Ethics, 2009, 4, 111-115.	0.7	0
110	Response to Open Peer Commentaries on â€œPrenatal Diagnosis and Abortion for Congenital Abnormalities: Is It Ethical to Provide One Without the Other?â€• American Journal of Bioethics, 2009, 9, W6-W7.	0.9	0
111	Clinical Ethics Committee case 5: Should we discharge our vulnerable patient to a family who seem unable to look after her?. Clinical Ethics, 2009, 4, 6-11.	0.7	0
112	Clinical Ethics Committee Case 10: For the record: Should our patient's relatives be able to record her treatment?. Clinical Ethics, 2010, 5, 57-62.	0.7	0
113	Clinical Ethics Committee Case 16: A request from an accident and emergency department â€“ should we give our patient a blood transfusion?. Clinical Ethics, 2011, 6, 154-158.	0.7	0
114	Clinical Ethics Committee Case 17: a paramedic sustains a bite while attending a callout and the assailant refuses testing for HIV or hepatitis C: what should we do?. Clinical Ethics, 2012, 7, 1-6.	0.7	0
115	Synthetic Biology for Human Health: Issues for Ethical Discussion and Policy-making. Bioethics, 2013, 27, ii-iii.	1.4	0
116	A pilot randomised controlled trial examining the feasibility, acceptability and impact of giving information on personalised genomic risk of melanoma to the public, for motivating preventive behaviours.. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 2016, 34, 1556-1556.	1.6	0
117	Abstract B15: Communicating information about personalised genomic risk of melanoma to family, friends, and health professionals. , 2017, , .		0
118	Human Genetics Society of Australasia Position Statement: Use of Human Genetic and Genomic Information in Healthcare Settings. Twin Research and Human Genetics, 2022, , 1-8.	0.6	0
119	Ethically robust reproductive genetic carrier screening needs to measure outcomes that matter to patients. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2022, , .	2.8	0