Pascal Borry

List of Publications by Year
in descending order

200 papers	6,436 citations	66315 42 h-index	91828 69 g-index
206 all docs	206 docs citations	206 times ranked	5895 citing authors

#	Article	IF	Citations
1	Whole-genome sequencing in health care. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2013, 21, 580-584.	1.4	330
2	Non-invasive prenatal testing for aneuploidy and beyond: challenges of responsible innovation in prenatal screening. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2015, 23, 1438-1450.	1.4	260
3	Responsible implementation of expanded carrier screening. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2016, 24, e1-e12.	1.4	240
4	Presymptomatic and predictive genetic testing in minors: a systematic review of guidelines and position papers. Clinical Genetics, 2006, 70, 374-381.	1.0	209
5	THE BIRTH OF THE EMPIRICAL TURN IN BIOETHICS. Bioethics, 2005, 19, 49-71.	0.7	187
6	Genetic testing in asymptomatic minors. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2009, 17, 711-719.	1.4	167
7	Genetic testing in asymptomatic minors: recommendations of the European Society of Human Genetics. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2009, 17, 720-721.	1.4	142
8	Statement of the ESHG on direct-to-consumer genetic testing for health-related purposes. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2010, 18, 1271-1273.	1.4	125
9	Preconceptional genetic carrier testing and the commercial offer directly-to-consumers. Human Reproduction, 2011, 26, 972-977.	0.4	124
10	Current issues in medically assisted reproduction and genetics in Europe: research, clinical practice, ethics, legal issues and policy. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2013, 21, S1-S21.	1.4	120
11	Legislation on direct-to-consumer genetic testing in seven European countries. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2012, 20, 715-721.	1.4	119
12	Carrier testing in minors: a systematic review of guidelines and position papers. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2006, 14, 133-138.	1.4	100
13	Where are you going, where have you been: a recent history of the direct-to-consumer genetic testing market. Journal of Community Genetics, 2010, 1, 101-106.	0.5	97
14	Rules for processing genetic data for research purposes in view of the new EU General Data Protection Regulation. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2018, 26, 149-156.	1.4	95
15	A review of the key issues associated with the commercialization of biobanks. Journal of Law and the Biosciences, 2014, 1, 94-110.	0.8	87
16	Whole-genome sequencing in newborn screening? A statement on the continued importance of targeted approaches in newborn screening programmes. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2015, 23, 1593-1600.	1.4	87
17	What is the role of empirical research in bioethical reflection and decision-making? An ethical analysis. Medicine, Health Care and Philosophy, 2004, 7, 41-53.	0.9	83
18	Reporting practices for variants of uncertain significance from next generation sequencing technologies. European Journal of Medical Genetics, 2017, 60, 553-558.	0.7	83

#	Article	IF	Citations
19	Attitudes of research participants and the general public towards genomic data sharing: a systematic literature review. Expert Review of Molecular Diagnostics, 2014, 14, 1053-1065.	1.5	82
20	Expanded carrier screening for monogenic disorders: where are we now?. Prenatal Diagnosis, 2018, 38, 59-66.	1.1	77
21	Genetic testing and common disorders in a public health framework: how to assess relevance and possibilities. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2011, 19, S6-S44.	1.4	75
22	Usersâ€™ motivations to purchase direct-to-consumer genome-wide testing: an exploratory study of personal stories. Journal of Community Genetics, 2011, 2, 135-146.	0.5	71
23	â€˜NOBODY TOSSES A DWARF!â€™ THE RELATION BETWEEN THE EMPIRICAL AND THE NORMATIVE REEXAMINED. Bioethics, 2009, 23, 226-235.	0.7	68
24	Legislation of direct-to-consumer genetic testing in Europe: a fragmented regulatory landscape. Journal of Community Genetics, 2018, 9, 117-132.	0.5	68
25	Reflections on the Cost of "Low-Cost" Whole Genome Sequencing: Framing the Health Policy Debate. PLoS Biology, 2013, 11, e1001699.	2.6	67
26	Whole-genome sequencing in health care. Recommendations of the European Society of Human Genetics. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2013, 21 Suppl 1, S1-5.	1.4	66
27	â€œYou hoped we would sleep walk into accepting the collection of our dataâ€: controversies surrounding the UK care.data scheme and their wider relevance for biomedical research. Medicine, Health Care and Philosophy, 2016, 19, 177-190.	0.9	64
28	Developing a policy for paediatric biobanks: principles for good practice. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2013, 21, 2-7.	1.4	63
29	Is there a doctor in the house?. Journal of Community Genetics, 2012, 3, 105-112.	0.5	61
30	Empirical research in bioethical journals. A quantitative analysis. Journal of Medical Ethics, 2006, 32, 240-245.	1.0	60
31	Whole-Genome Sequencing in Newborn Screening Programs. Science Translational Medicine, 2014, 6, 229cm2.	5.8	59
32	Points to consider for laboratories reporting results from diagnostic genomic sequencing. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2018, 26, 36-43.	1.4	58
33	Current issues in medically assisted reproduction and genetics in Europe: research, clinical practice, ethics, legal issues and policy. Human Reproduction, 2014, 29, 1603-1609.	0.4	57
34	Health-related direct-to-consumer genetic testing: a review of companiesâ€™ policies with regard to genetic testing in minors. Familial Cancer, 2010, 9, 51-59.	0.9	56
35	Why do participants enroll in population biobank studies? A systematic literature review. Expert Review of Molecular Diagnostics, 2013, 13, 35-47.	1.5	56
36	One small edit for humans, one giant edit for humankind? Points and questions to consider for a responsible way forward for gene editing in humans. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2018, 26, 1-11.	1.4	55

#	Article	IF	Citations
37	Third party interpretation of raw genetic data: an ethical exploration. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2017, 25, 1189-1194.	1.4	53
38	Analysis of VUS reporting, variant reinterpretation and recontact policies in clinical genomic sequencing consent forms. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2018, 26, 1743-1751.	1.4	53
39	From the principles of genomic data sharing to the practices of data access committees. EMBO Molecular Medicine, 2015, 7, 507-509.	3.3	51
40	Minors and Informed Consent: A Comparative Approach. European Journal of Health Law, 2007, 14, 21-46.	0.1	49
41	AUTHOR, CONTRIBUTOR OR JUST A SIGNER? A QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS OF AUTHORSHIP TRENDS IN THE FIELD OF BIOETHICS. Bioethics, 2006, 20, 213-220.	0.7	48
42	Reflecting on Earlier Experiences with Unsolicited Findings: Points to Consider for Nextâ€Generation Sequencing and Informed Consent in Diagnostics. Human Mutation, 2013, 34, 1322-1328.	1.1	45
43	The challenges of the expanded availability of genomic information: an agenda-setting paper. Journal of Community Genetics, 2018, 9, 103-116.	0.5	45
44	â€œTrust is not something you can reclaim easilyâ€• patenting in the field of direct-to-consumer genetic testing. Genetics in Medicine, 2013, 15, 382-387.	1.1	43
45	Implementation of Electronic Informed Consent in Biomedical Research and Stakeholdersâ€™ Perspectives: Systematic Review. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 2020, 22, e19129.	2.1	43
46	Controlled Access under Review: Improving the Governance of Genomic Data Access. PLoS Biology, 2015, 13, e1002339.	2.6	42
47	Attitudes regarding predictive genetic testing in minors: A survey of European clinical geneticists. American Journal of Medical Genetics, Part C: Seminars in Medical Genetics, 2008, 148C, 78-83.	0.7	41
48	A proposal for a model of informed consent for the collection, storage and use of biological materials for research purposes. Patient Education and Counseling, 2008, 71, 136-142.	1.0	41
49	Predictive genetic testing in minors for adultâ€onset genetic diseases. Mount Sinai Journal of Medicine, 2008, 75, 287-296.	1.9	41
50	Blurring lines. EMBO Reports, 2010, 11, 579-582.	2.0	41
51	Italian appeal court: a genetic predisposition to commit murder?. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2010, 18, 519-521.	1.4	39
52	Evidence-based medicine and its role in ethical decision-making. Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice, 2006, 12, 306-311.	0.9	38
53	Survey of European clinical geneticists on awareness, experiences and attitudes towards direct-to-consumer genetic testing. Genome Medicine, 2013, 5, 45.	3.6	38
54	Are the kids really all right? Direct-to-consumer genetic testing in children: are company policies clashing with professional norms?. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2011, 19, 1122-1126.	1.4	37

#	Article	IF	Citations
55	Psychosocial impact of pediatric living-donor kidney and liver transplantation on recipients, donors, and the family: a systematic review. Transplant International, 2015, 28, 270-280.	0.8	37
56	Interest in expanded carrier screening among individuals and couples in the general population: systematic review of the literature. Human Reproduction Update, 2020, 26, 335-355.	5.2	36
57	Direct-to-consumer genome scanning services. Also for children?. Nature Reviews Genetics, 2009, 10, 8-8.	7.7	34
58	â€œYou want the right amount of oversightâ€¦ interviews with data access committee members and experts on genomic data access. Genetics in Medicine, 2016, 18, 892-897.	1.1	32
59	Participation of Children in Medical Decision-Making: Challenges and Potential Solutions. Journal of Bioethical Inquiry, 2016, 13, 525-534.	0.9	31
60	Toward better governance of human genomic data. Nature Genetics, 2021, 53, 2-8.	9.4	31
61	Attitudes regarding carrier testing in incompetent children: a survey of European clinical geneticists. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2007, 15, 1211-1217.	1.4	30
62	Reporting practices for unsolicited and secondary findings from nextâ€generation sequencing technologies: Perspectives of laboratory personnel. Human Mutation, 2017, 38, 905-911.	1.1	30
63	Personal Genome Testing: Do You Know What You Are Buying?. American Journal of Bioethics, 2009, 9, 11-13.	0.5	29
64	Closure of population biobanks and direct-to-consumer genetic testing companies. Human Genetics, 2011, 130, 425-432.	1.8	29
65	Public Views on Genetics and Genetic Testing: A Survey of the General Public in Belgium. Genetic Testing and Molecular Biomarkers, 2017, 21, 195-201.	0.3	29
66	Is There a Right Time to Know?: The Right Not to Know and Genetic Testing in Children. Journal of Law, Medicine and Ethics, 2014, 42, 19-27.	0.4	28
67	How international is bioethics? A quantitative retrospective study. BMC Medical Ethics, 2006, 7, 1.	1.0	26
68	Challenges of web-based personal genomic data sharing. Life Sciences, Society and Policy, 2015, 11, 3.	3.1	26
69	Points to consider for prioritizing clinical genetic testing services: a European consensus process oriented at accountability for reasonableness. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2015, 23, 729-735.	1.4	26
70	Attitudes of European Geneticists Regarding Expanded Carrier Screening. JOGNN - Journal of Obstetric, Gynecologic, and Neonatal Nursing, 2017, 46, 63-71.	0.2	26
71	The challenge of implementing genetic tests with clinical utility while avoiding unsound applications. Journal of Community Genetics, 2014, 5, 7-12.	0.5	25
72	Attitudes of cystic fibrosis patients and parents toward carrier screening and related reproductive issues. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2016, 24, 506-512.	1.4	25

#	Article	IF	Citations
73	Oversight of Genomic Data Sharing: What Roles for Ethics and Data Access Committees?. Biopreservation and Biobanking, 2017, 15, 469-474.	0.5	25
74	How does carrier status for recessive disorders influence reproductive decisions? A systematic review of the literature. Expert Review of Molecular Diagnostics, 2019, 19, 1117-1129.	1.5	25
75	Forensic Epigenetic Age Estimation and Beyond: Ethical and Legal Considerations. Trends in Genetics, 2018, 34, 489-491.	2.9	24
76	Paternity testing under the cloak of recreational genetics. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2017, 25, 768-770.	1.4	23
77	The role of pharmacogenomics in contemporary cardiovascular therapy: a position statement from the European Society of Cardiology Working Group on Cardiovascular Pharmacotherapy. European Heart Journal - Cardiovascular Pharmacotherapy, 2022, 8, 85-99.	1.4	23
78	Minors and informed consent in carrier testing: a survey of European clinical geneticists. Journal of Medical Ethics, 2008, 34, 370-374.	1.0	22
79	Growing complexity of (expanded) carrier screening: Direct-to-consumer, physician-mediated, and clinic-based offers. Best Practice and Research in Clinical Obstetrics and Gynaecology, 2017, 44, 57-67.	1.4	22
80	Clinical management, ethics and informed consent related to multiâ€gene panelâ€based high throughput sequencing testing for platelet disorders: Communication from the SSC of the ISTH. Journal of Thrombosis and Haemostasis, 2020, 18, 2751-2758.	1.9	22
81	Patient rights in EU Member States after the ratification of the Convention on Human Rights and Biomedicine. Health Policy, 2007, 83, 223-235.	1.4	21
82	Anonymity 2.0: direct-to-consumer genetic testing and donor conception. Fertility and Sterility, 2014, 101, 630-632.	0.5	21
83	Talent in sports. Some reflections about the search for future champions. Movement and Sports Sciences - Science Et Motricite, 2015, , 3-12.	0.2	21
84	Unsolved challenges in pediatric whole-exome sequencing: A literature analysis. Critical Reviews in Clinical Laboratory Sciences, 2017, 54, 134-142.	2.7	21
85	Cliniciansâ€™ attitude towards family planning and timing of diagnosis in autosomal dominant polycystic kidney disease. PLoS ONE, 2017, 12, e0185779.	1.1	21
86	Carrier testing in minors: conflicting views. Nature Reviews Genetics, 2007, 8, 828-828.	7.7	20
87	Direct-to-consumer genetic testing: more questions than benefits?. Personalized Medicine, 2008, 5, 317-320.	0.8	20
88	Could minors be living kidney donors? A systematic review of guidelines, position papers and reports. Transplant International, 2013, 26, 949-960.	0.8	20
89	Crowdsourced direct-to-consumer genomic analysis of a family quartet. BMC Genomics, 2015, 16, 910.	1.2	20
90	Participantsâ€™ Accounts on Their Decision to Join a Cohort Study With an Attached Biobank. Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics, 2016, 11, 237-249.	0.6	20

#	Article	IF	Citations
91	Old Challenges or New Issues? Genetic Health Professionalsâ€™ Experiences Obtaining Informed Consent in Diagnostic Genomic Sequencing. AJOB Empirical Bioethics, 2021, 12, 12-23.	0.8	20
92	Data Sharing in Biomedical Sciences: A Systematic Review of Incentives. Biopreservation and Biobanking, 2021, 19, 219-227.	0.5	20
93	The expansion of newborn screening: is reproductive benefit an appropriate pursuit?. Nature Reviews Genetics, 2009, 10, 666-667.	7.7	19
94	Donation after Uncontrolled Cardiac Death (uDCD): A Review of the Debate from a European Perspective. Journal of Law, Medicine and Ethics, 2008, 36, 752-759.	0.4	18
95	DTC Genetic Services: A Look Across the Pond. American Journal of Bioethics, 2008, 8, 14-16.	0.5	18
96	Examining the role of informal interpretation in medical interviews. Journal of Medical Ethics, 2009, 35, 159-162.	1.0	18
97	International survey on attitudes toward ethics in health technology assessment: An exploratory study. International Journal of Technology Assessment in Health Care, 2011, 27, 50-54.	0.2	18
98	Raw Genomic Data: Storage, Access, and Sharing. Trends in Genetics, 2018, 34, 8-10.	2.9	18
99	Europe to ban direct-to-consumer genetic tests?. Nature Biotechnology, 2008, 26, 736-737.	9.4	17
100	Developing Countries and Bioethical Research. New England Journal of Medicine, 2005, 353, 852-853.	13.9	16
101	Attitudes towards predictive genetic testing in minors for familial breast cancer: A systematic review. Critical Reviews in Oncology/Hematology, 2007, 64, 173-181.	2.0	16
102	To ban or not to ban?. EMBO Reports, 2012, 13, 791-794.	2.0	16
103	Content Analysis of Informed Consent for Whole Genome Sequencing Offered by Direct-to-Consumer Genetic Testing Companies. Human Mutation, 2016, 37, 1248-1256.	1.1	16
104	Readability of informed consent forms for whole-exome and whole-genome sequencing. Journal of Community Genetics, 2018, 9, 143-151.	0.5	16
105	â€œI prefer a child with â€¦â€ designer babies, another controversial patent in the arena of direct-to-consumer genomics. Genetics in Medicine, 2013, 15, 923-924.	1.1	15
106	Who should have access to genomic data and how should they be held accountable? Perspectives of Data Access Committee members and experts. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2016, 24, 1671-1675.	1.4	15
107	Disclosure of genetic information to family members: a systematic review of normative documents. Genetics in Medicine, 2021, 23, 2038-2046.	1.1	15
108	Factors that influence data sharing through data sharing platforms: A qualitative study on the views and experiences of cohort holders and platform developers. PLoS ONE, 2021, 16, e0254202.	1.1	15

#	Article	IF	Citations
109	Personalized and long-term electronic informed consent in clinical research: stakeholder views. BMC Medical Ethics, 2021, 22, 108.	1.0	15
110	Carrier screening: look before you leap: Carrier screening for type 1 Gaucher disease: difficult questions. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2008, 16, 139-140.	1.4	14
111	Pre- and post-testing counseling considerations for the provision of expanded carrier screening: exploration of European geneticistsâ€™ views. BMC Medical Ethics, 2017, 18, 46.	1.0	14
112	Renal Replacement Therapy in children with severe developmental disability: guiding questions for decision-making. European Journal of Pediatrics, 2018, 177, 1735-1743.	1.3	14
113	Genetic health professionals' experiences returning results from diagnostic genomic sequencing to patients. Journal of Genetic Counseling, 2020, 29, 807-815.	0.9	14
114	Non-invasive prenatal testing for aneuploidy and beyond: challenges of responsible innovation in prenatal screening. Summary and recommendations. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2015, , .	1.4	13
115	A systematic analysis of online marketing materials used by providers of expanded carrier screening. Genetics in Medicine, 2018, 20, 976-984.	1.1	13
116	Marginally scientific? Genetic testing of children and adolescents for lifestyle and health promotion. Journal of Law and the Biosciences, 2015, 2, lsv038.	0.8	12
117	Legal approaches regarding health-care decisions involving minors: implications for next-generation sequencing. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2016, 24, 1559-1564.	1.4	12
118	Research ethics review for the use of anonymized samples and data: A systematic review of normative documents. Accountability in Research, 2017, 24, 483-496.	1.6	12
119	Variant data sharing by clinical laboratories through public databases: consent, privacy and further contact for research policies. Genetics in Medicine, 2019, 21, 1031-1037.	1.1	12
120	Polygenic risk scoring of human embryos: a qualitative study of media coverage. BMC Medical Ethics, 2021, 22, 125.	1.0	12
121	Industry involvement in publicly funded biobanks. Nature Reviews Genetics, 2014, 15, 220-220.	7.7	11
122	Biohistorical materials and contemporary privacy concerns-the forensic case of King Albert I. Forensic Science International: Genetics, 2016, 24, 202-210.	1.6	11
123	Regulating the advertising of genetic tests in Europe: a balancing act. Journal of Medical Genetics, 2017, 54, 651-656.	1.5	11
124	â€œItâ€™s our DNA, we deserve the right to test!â€•A content analysis of a petition for the right to access direct-to-consumer genetic testing. Personalized Medicine, 2013, 10, 729-739.	0.8	10
125	Current developments in the regulation of direct-to-consumer genetic testing in Europe. Medical Law International, 2015, 15, 97-123.	0.4	10
126	Designing expanded carrier screening panels: results of a qualitative study with European geneticists. Personalized Medicine, 2016, 13, 553-562.	0.8	10

#	Article	IF	Citations
127	Credit and Recognition for Contributions to Data-Sharing Platforms Among Cohort Holders and Platform Developers in Europe: Interview Study. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 2022, 24, e25983.	2.1	10
128	Do athletes have a right to access data in their Athlete Biological Passport?. Drug Testing and Analysis, 2018, 10, 802-806.	1.6	9
129	Consent insufficient for data release. Science, 2019, 364, 445-446.	6.0	9
130	Doping controls and the â€˜Mature Minorâ€™ elite athlete: towards clarification?. International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics, 2020, 12, 179-187.	1.0	9
131	Genetic health professionalsâ€™ experiences with initiating reanalysis of genomic sequence data. Familial Cancer, 2020, 19, 273-280.	0.9	9
132	Data sharing platforms and the academic evaluation system. EMBO Reports, 2020, 21, e50690.	2.0	9
133	A review of normative documents on preimplantation genetic testing: Recommendations for PGT-P. Genetics in Medicine, 2022, 24, 1165-1175.	1.1	9
134	Direct-to-consumer pharmacogenomic testing. Pharmacogenomics, 2011, 12, 1367-1370.	0.6	8
135	Nonpropositional Content in Direct-to-Consumer Genetic Testing Advertisements. American Journal of Bioethics, 2013, 13, 14-16.	0.5	8
136	Changes on the horizon for consumer genomics in the EU. Science, 2014, 346, 296-298.	6.0	8
137	Time out: ethical reflections on medical disqualification of athletes in the context of mandated pre-participation cardiac screening. British Journal of Sports Medicine, 2018, 52, 1207-1210.	3.1	8
138	Analysis of laboratory reporting practices using a quality assessment of a virtual patient. Genetics in Medicine, 2021, 23, 562-570.	1.1	8
139	Informing relatives of their genetic risk: an examination of the Belgian legal context. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2022, 30, 766-771.	1.4	8
140	Do It Yourself Newborn Screening. JAMA Pediatrics, 2016, 170, 523.	3.3	7
141	Genuine participation in participant-centred research initiatives: the rhetoric and the potential reality. Journal of Community Genetics, 2018, 9, 133-142.	0.5	7
142	Communicating genetic information to family members: analysis of consent forms for diagnostic genomic sequencing. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2020, 28, 1160-1167.	1.4	7
143	Data sharing platforms: instruments to inform and shape science policy on data sharing?. Scientometrics, 2022, 127, 3007-3019.	1.6	7
144	Digitizing the Informed Consent Process: A Review of the Regulatory Landscape in the European Union. Frontiers in Medicine, 2022, 9, .	1.2	7

#	Article	IF	Citations
145	Why eight EU Member States signed, but not yet ratified the Convention for Human Rights and Biomedicine. Health Policy, 2008, 86, 222-233.	1.4	6
146	Direct-to-consumer genetic testing: regulating offer or use?. Personalized Medicine, 2012, 9, 315-317.	0.8	6
147	Europe and direct-to-consumer genetic tests. Nature Reviews Genetics, 2012, 13, 146-146.	7.7	6
148	Attitudes of cystic fibrosis patients and their parents towards direct-to-consumer genetic testing for carrier status. Personalized Medicine, 2015, 12, 99-107.	0.8	6
149	Living tissue and organ donation by minors. Medical Law International, 2016, 16, 58-93.	0.4	6
150	Newspaper coverage of humanâ€pig chimera research: A qualitative study on select media coverage of scientific breakthrough. Xenotransplantation, 2017, 24, e12317.	1.6	6
151	Geolocalisation of athletes for out-of-competition drug testing: ethical considerations. Position statement by the WADA Ethics Panel. British Journal of Sports Medicine, 2018, 52, 456-459.	3.1	6
152	Reproductive autonomy in expanded carrier screening: more than meets the eye?. Expert Review of Molecular Diagnostics, 2018, 18, 993-994.	1.5	6
153	Expanded carrierÂscreening in Flanders (Belgium): an online survey on the perspectives of nonpregnant reproductive-aged women. Personalized Medicine, 2021, 18, 361-373.	0.8	6
154	Parental Authority, Future Autonomy, and Assessing Risks of Predictive Genetic Testing in Minors. Journal of Bioethical Inquiry, 2009, 6, 379-385.	0.9	5
155	The Landscape of the â€œSpirit of Sportâ€• Journal of Bioethical Inquiry, 2019, 16, 443-453.	0.9	5
156	Exploration of genetic health professional - laboratory specialist interactions in diagnostic genomic sequencing. European Journal of Medical Genetics, 2020, 63, 103749.	0.7	5
157	â€˜Itâ€™s much more grey than black and whiteâ€™: clinical geneticistsâ€™ views on the oversight of consumer genomics in Europe. Personalized Medicine, 2020, 17, 129-140.	0.8	5
158	Public attitudes towards the genetic testing in Georgia. Journal of Community Genetics, 2021, 12, 407-414.	0.5	5
159	The social shaping of a diagnosis in Next Generation Sequencing. New Genetics and Society, 2021, 40, 425-448.	0.7	5
160	The author who wasnâ€™t there? Fairness and attribution in publications following access to population biobanks. PLoS ONE, 2018, 13, e0194997.	1.1	5
161	A systematic review of the views of healthcare professionals on the scope of preimplantation genetic testing. Journal of Community Genetics, 2022, 13, 1-11.	0.5	5
162	An Ethical Overview of the CRISPR-Based Elimination of Anopheles gambiae to Combat Malaria. Journal of Bioethical Inquiry, 2022, 19, 371-380.	0.9	5

#	Article	IF	Citations
163	Knowledge, attitudes and preferences regarding reproductive genetic carrier screening among reproductive-aged men and women in Flanders (Belgium). European Journal of Human Genetics, 2022, , .	1.4	5
164	Reasons affecting the uptake of reproductive genetic carrier screening among nonpregnant reproductiveâ€aged women in Flanders (Belgium). Journal of Genetic Counseling, 2022, 31, 1043-1053.	0.9	5
165	Coming of age of personalized medicine: challenges ahead. Genome Medicine, 2009, 1, 109.	3.6	4
166	Empirical Ethics. Ethical Perspectives, 2010, 17, 231-252.	0.1	4
167	Debating the clinical utility of directâ€toâ€consumer genetic testing for addiction susceptibility. Addiction, 2012, 107, 2076-2077.	1.7	4
168	Anonymity of sperm donors under threat. Nature, 2013, 496, 169-169.	13.7	4
169	Ethical considerations for genetic testing in the context of mandated cardiac screening before athletic participation. Genetics in Medicine, 2017, 19, 493-495.	1.1	4
170	Noninvasive prenatal testing: a survey of young (future) parents in Flanders. Personalized Medicine, 2018, 15, 35-43.	0.8	4
171	Should minors and young adults qualify as potential live kidney donors? The views of international transplant professionals. Pediatric Transplantation, 2019, 23, e13526.	0.5	4
172	Challenges in cardiovascular pharmacogenomics implementation: a viewpoint from the European Society of Cardiology Working Group on Cardiovascular Pharmacotherapy. European Heart Journal - Cardiovascular Pharmacotherapy, 2022, 8, 100-103.	1.4	4
173	To ban or not to ban?. EMBO Reports, 2012, 13, 939-939.	2.0	4
174	Newspaper coverage of biobanks. PeerJ, 2014, 2, e500.	0.9	4
175	Genome-based newborn screening: a conceptual analysis of the best interests of the child standard. Personalized Medicine, 2015, 12, 439-441.	0.8	3
176	Participantsâ€™ decision to enroll in cohort studies with biobanks: quantitative insights from two German studies. Personalized Medicine, 2017, 14, 477-485.	0.8	3
177	The athlete biological passport: challenges and possibilities. International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics, 2019, 11, 315-324.	1.0	3
178	Attitudes and experiences of European clinical geneticists towards direct-to-consumer genetic testing: a qualitative interview study. New Genetics and Society, 2019, 38, 410-429.	0.7	3
179	An agenda-setting paper on data sharing platforms: euCanSHare workshop. Open Research Europe, 0, 1, 80.	2.0	3
180	Should you need an organâ€¦ Flemish secondary school studentsâ€™ attitudes toward xenotransplantation and transgenetic organ donation. Xenotransplantation, 2021, 28, .	1.6	3

#	Article	IF	Citations
181	Co-creation with research participants to inform the design of electronic informed consent. Digital Health, 2022, 8, 205520762211090.	0.9	3
182	What are the limits of the duty of care? The case of clinical genetics. Personalized Medicine, 2008, 5, 101-104.	0.8	2
183	Conference Scene: Direct-to-consumer genetic testing in the age of personalized medicine. Personalized Medicine, 2009, 6, 617-619.	0.8	2
184	Clinical Research in Neonates: Redesigning the Informed Consent Process in the Digital Era. Frontiers in Pediatrics, 2021, 9, 724431.	0.9	2
185	The disabling nature of hope in discovering a biological explanation of stuttering. Journal of Fluency Disorders, 2022, 72, 105906.	0.7	2
186	Moss, Lenny. What Genes Can't Do. Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics, 2004, 25, 75-77.	0.4	1
187	Directâ€toâ€consumer genetic testing â€" where should we focus the policy debate?. Medical Journal of Australia, 2013, 198, 499-500.	0.8	1
188	The Use of Samples Originating From Doping Control Procedures for Research Purposes: A Qualitative Study. Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics, 2019, 14, 254-261.	0.6	1
189	Anti-doping research and the Helsinki Declaration: (mis)match?. Accountability in Research, 2020, 27, 179-194.	1.6	1
190	Ethics Review in Anti-Doping Research: Experiences of Stakeholders. AJOB Empirical Bioethics, 2020, 11, 125-133.	0.8	1
191	Return of Results in Population Studies: How Do Participants Perceive Them?. Public Health Ethics, 0, , .	0.4	1
192	An agenda-setting paper on data sharing platforms: euCanSHare workshop. Open Research Europe, 0, 1, 80.	2.0	1
193	The patient with 41 reports: Analysis of laboratory exome sequencing reporting of a â€œvirtual patientâ€• Genetics in Medicine, 2022, 24, 1306-1315.	1.1	1
194	Letter to the Editor. Personalized Medicine, 2008, 5, 425-426.	0.8	0
195	Direct-to-Consumer Genetic Testing Services: Policies and Challenges. , 2013, , 1583-1597.		0
196	Reply to C Harling. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2017, 25, 1030-1030.	1.4	0
197	A Systematic Analysis of Online Marketing Materials Used by Providers of Expanded Carrier Screening. Obstetrical and Gynecological Survey, 2019, 74, 59-61.	0.2	0
198	The Global Kidney Exchange: Revisiting exploitation arguments. Developing World Bioethics, 2021, , .	0.6	0

#	Article	IF	Citations
199	Current Ethical Issues Related to the Implementation of Whole-Exome and Whole-Genome Sequencing. , 2015, , 481-497.		0
200	Combining Empirical Data and Normativity: Possible or Not?. Advancing Global Bioethics, 2020, , 119-129.	0.8	0