## Mark A Helvie

List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: https://exaly.com/author-pdf/4509580/publications.pdf

Version: 2024-02-01

45 papers 2,105 citations

331670 21 h-index 254184 43 g-index

45 all docs

45 docs citations

45 times ranked

2442 citing authors

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
1	Mass detection in digital breast tomosynthesis: Deep convolutional neural network with transfer learning from mammography. Medical Physics, 2016, 43, 6654-6666.	3.0	232
2	Computerized analysis of mammographic microcalcifications in morphological and texture feature spaces. Medical Physics, 1998, 25, 2007-2019.	3.0	184
3	Computer-aided detection of mammographic microcalcifications: Pattern recognition with an artificial neural network. Medical Physics, 1995, 22, 1555-1567.	3.0	180
4	Digital Mammography Imaging: Breast Tomosynthesis and Advanced Applications. Radiologic Clinics of North America, 2010, 48, 917-929.	1.8	170
5	Improvement of mammographic mass characterization using spiculation measures and morphological features. Medical Physics, 2001, 28, 1455-1465.	3.0	166
6	Genome-wide association study identifies multiple loci associated with both mammographic density and breast cancer risk. Nature Communications, 2014, 5, 5303.	12.8	109
7	Sensitivity of Noncommercial Computer-aided Detection System for Mammographic Breast Cancer Detection: Pilot Clinical Trial. Radiology, 2004, 231, 208-214.	7.3	107
8	Reduction in lateâ€stage breast cancer incidence in the mammography era: Implications for overdiagnosis of invasive cancer. Cancer, 2014, 120, 2649-2656.	4.1	101
9	Classification of mass and normal breast tissue on digital mammograms: Multiresolution texture analysis. Medical Physics, 1995, 22, 1501-1513.	3.0	98
10	Breast cancer deaths averted over 3 decades. Cancer, 2019, 125, 1482-1488.	4.1	86
10	Breast cancer deaths averted over 3 decades. Cancer, 2019, 125, 1482-1488.  Mammographic Screening of TRAM Flap Breast Reconstructions for Detection of Nonpalpable Recurrent Cancer. Radiology, 2002, 224, 211-216.	4.1 7.3	86
	Mammographic Screening of TRAM Flap Breast Reconstructions for Detection of Nonpalpable		
11	Mammographic Screening of TRAM Flap Breast Reconstructions for Detection of Nonpalpable Recurrent Cancer. Radiology, 2002, 224, 211-216.  Comparison of recommendations for screening mammography using CISNET models. Cancer, 2017, 123,	7.3	81
11 12	Mammographic Screening of TRAM Flap Breast Reconstructions for Detection of Nonpalpable Recurrent Cancer. Radiology, 2002, 224, 211-216.  Comparison of recommendations for screening mammography using CISNET models. Cancer, 2017, 123, 3673-3680.  Novel Associations between Common Breast Cancer Susceptibility Variants and Risk-Predicting	7.3 4.1	79
11 12 13	Mammographic Screening of TRAM Flap Breast Reconstructions for Detection of Nonpalpable Recurrent Cancer. Radiology, 2002, 224, 211-216.  Comparison of recommendations for screening mammography using CISNET models. Cancer, 2017, 123, 3673-3680.  Novel Associations between Common Breast Cancer Susceptibility Variants and Risk-Predicting Mammographic Density Measures. Cancer Research, 2015, 75, 2457-2467.  False-positive reduction technique for detection of masses on digital mammograms: Global and local	7.3 4.1 0.9	81 79 55
11 12 13	Mammographic Screening of TRAM Flap Breast Reconstructions for Detection of Nonpalpable Recurrent Cancer. Radiology, 2002, 224, 211-216.  Comparison of recommendations for screening mammography using CISNET models. Cancer, 2017, 123, 3673-3680.  Novel Associations between Common Breast Cancer Susceptibility Variants and Risk-Predicting Mammographic Density Measures. Cancer Research, 2015, 75, 2457-2467.  False-positive reduction technique for detection of masses on digital mammograms: Global and local multiresolution texture analysis. Medical Physics, 1997, 24, 903-914.  A regional registration technique for automated interval change analysis of breast lesions on	7.3 4.1 0.9	81 79 55 52
11 12 13 14	Mammographic Screening of TRAM Flap Breast Reconstructions for Detection of Nonpalpable Recurrent Cancer. Radiology, 2002, 224, 211-216.  Comparison of recommendations for screening mammography using CISNET models. Cancer, 2017, 123, 3673-3680.  Novel Associations between Common Breast Cancer Susceptibility Variants and Risk-Predicting Mammographic Density Measures. Cancer Research, 2015, 75, 2457-2467.  False-positive reduction technique for detection of masses on digital mammograms: Global and local multiresolution texture analysis. Medical Physics, 1997, 24, 903-914.  A regional registration technique for automated interval change analysis of breast lesions on mammograms. Medical Physics, 1999, 26, 2669-2679.  Current Issues in the Overdiagnosis and Overtreatment of Breast Cancer. American Journal of	7.3 4.1 0.9 3.0	<ul> <li>81</li> <li>79</li> <li>55</li> <li>52</li> <li>41</li> </ul>

#	Article	IF	Citations
19	Automated registration of breast lesions in temporal pairs of mammograms for interval change analysis-local affine transformation for improved localization. Medical Physics, 2001, 28, 1070-1079.	3.0	29
20	Computerâ€eided detection of clustered microcalcifications in multiscale bilateral filtering regularized reconstructed digital breast tomosynthesis volume. Medical Physics, 2014, 41, 021901.	3.0	25
21	Characterization of Breast Masses in Digital Breast Tomosynthesis and Digital Mammograms. Academic Radiology, 2017, 24, 1372-1379.	2.5	22
22	Improving Mammographic Interpretation: Double Reading and Computer-Aided Diagnosis. Radiologic Clinics of North America, 2007, 45, 801-811.	1.8	19
23	Overdiagnosis and Risks of Breast Cancer Screening. Radiologic Clinics of North America, 2021, 59, 19-27.	1.8	18
24	Multichannel response analysis on 2D projection views for detection of clustered microcalcifications in digital breast tomosynthesis. Medical Physics, 2014, 41, 041913.	3.0	17
25	Linear motion correction in three dimensions applied to dynamic gadolinium enhanced breast imaging. Medical Physics, 1999, 26, 707-714.	3.0	16
26	Risks of feature leakage and sample size dependencies in deep feature extraction for breast mass classification. Medical Physics, 2021, 48, 2827-2837.	3.0	16
27	Harms of Restrictive Risk-Based Mammographic Breast Cancer Screening. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2018, 210, 228-234.	2.2	11
28	Breast cancer screening in average and high-risk women. Best Practice and Research in Clinical Obstetrics and Gynaecology, 2022, 83, 3-14.	2.8	11
29	Automated pectoral muscle identification on <scp>MLO</scp> â€view mammograms: Comparison of deep neural network to conventional computer vision. Medical Physics, 2019, 46, 2103-2114.	3.0	10
30	Breast Imaging Outcomes following Abnormal Thermography. Academic Radiology, 2018, 25, 273-278.	2.5	9
31	Deep Learning for Mammographic Breast Density Assessment and Beyond. Radiology, 2019, 290, 59-60.	7.3	9
32	Retrospective Review of a Mobile Mammography Screening Program in an Underserved Population within a Large Metropolitan Area. Academic Radiology, 2022, 29, S173-S179.	2.5	7
33	Design and evaluation of an external filter technique for exposure equalization in mammography. Medical Physics, 1999, 26, 1655-1669.	3.0	5
34	Digital Breast Tomosynthesis Slab Thickness: Impact on Reader Performance and Interpretation Time. Radiology, 2020, 297, 534-542.	7.3	5
35	Digital Mammography Has Persistently Increased High-Grade and Overall DCIS Detection Without Altering Upgrade Rate. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2021, 216, 912-918.	2.2	5
36	Prospective Imaging Trial Assessing Gadoteridol Retention in the Deep Brain Nuclei of Women Undergoing Breast MRI. Academic Radiology, 2020, 27, 1734-1741.	2.5	4

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
37	Surgical biopsy is still necessary for BI-RADS 4 calcifications found on digital mammography that are technically too faint for stereotactic core biopsy. Breast Cancer Research and Treatment, 2015, 154, 557-561.	2.5	3
38	Does Direct Radiologist-Patient Verbal Communication Affect Follow-Up Compliance ofÂProbably Benign Assessments?. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 2016, 13, 279-285.	1.8	3
39	Assessment of mammographic breast density after sleeve gastrectomy. Surgery for Obesity and Related Diseases, 2018, 14, 1643-1651.	1.2	3
40	Effect of Dose Level on Radiologists' Detection of Microcalcifications in Digital Breast Tomosynthesis: An Observer Study with Breast Phantoms. Academic Radiology, 2022, 29, S42-S49.	2.5	3
41	Reply to flawed assumptions used to defend screening mammography. Cancer, 2015, 121, 321-323.	4.1	2
42	Using Single-View Wide-Angle DBT with AI for Breast Cancer Screening. Radiology, 2021, 300, 537-538.	7.3	2
43	A Similarity Study of Interactive Content-Based Image Retrieval Scheme for Classification of Breast Lesions. IEICE Transactions on Information and Systems, 2016, E99.D, 1663-1670.	0.7	1
44	Reply to Opportunity cost of annual screening mammography. Cancer, 2018, 124, 1298-1299.	4.1	0
45	Reply to Distinguishing between CISNET model results versus CISNET models. Cancer, 2018, 124, 1084-1084.	4.1	O