

Daniel R Shanahan

List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: <https://exaly.com/author-pdf/5548694/publications.pdf>

Version: 2024-02-01

31
papers

1,869
citations

933447

10
h-index

839539

18
g-index

32
all docs

32
docs citations

32
times ranked

4757
citing authors

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
1	Accuracy in detecting inadequate research reporting by early career peer reviewers using an online CONSORT-based peer-review tool (COBPeer) versus the usual peer-review process: a cross-sectional diagnostic study. BMC Medicine, 2019, 17, 205.	5.5	27
2	Should research ethics committees police reporting bias?. BMJ: British Medical Journal, 2017, 356, j1501.	2.3	1
3	A protocol of a cross-sectional study evaluating an online tool for early career peer reviewers assessing reports of randomised controlled trials. BMJ Open, 2017, 7, e017462.	1.9	9
4	Sharing and reuse of individual participant data from clinical trials: principles and recommendations. BMJ Open, 2017, 7, e018647.	1.9	116
5	Simple decision-tree tool to facilitate author identification of reporting guidelines during submission: a beforeâ€“after study. Research Integrity and Peer Review, 2017, 2, 20.	5.2	15
6	CONSORT 2010 statement: extension to randomised pilot and feasibility trials. BMJ, The, 2016, 355, i5239.	6.0	1,491
7	Guidelines for reporting embedded recruitment trials. Trials, 2016, 17, 27.	1.6	47
8	Auto-correlation of journal impact factor for consensus research reporting statements: a cohort study. PeerJ, 2016, 4, e1887.	2.0	12
9	Better reporting for better research: a checklist for reproducibility. GigaScience, 2015, 4, 32.	6.4	10
10	Better reporting for better research: a checklist for reproducibility. Genome Biology, 2015, 16, 141.	8.8	8
11	A living document: reincarnating the research article. Trials, 2015, 16, 151.	1.6	14
12	Better reporting for better research: a checklist for reproducibility. BMC Neuroscience, 2015, 16, 44.	1.9	11
13	Linked publications from a single trial: a thread of evidence. Trials, 2014, 15, 369.	1.6	21
14	Opening peer-review: the democracy of science. Journal of Negative Results in BioMedicine, 2014, 13, 2.	1.4	9
15	Whose fault is it anyway?. Journal of Wound Care, 2013, 22, 339-339.	1.2	0
16	Not precisely accurate. Journal of Wound Care, 2013, 22, 51-51.	1.2	1
17	Donâ€™t panic!. Journal of Wound Care, 2013, 22, 219-219.	1.2	0
18	Defining â€“appropriateâ€™. Journal of Wound Care, 2013, 22, 291-291.	1.2	0

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
19	Inaugural professorial lecture: the progression of trauma wound care—why delay wound closure?. Journal of Wound Care, 2013, 22, 194-196.	1.2	3
20	The challenge of integrity. Journal of Wound Care, 2013, 22, 107-107.	1.2	0
21	If the cap fits— . Journal of Wound Care, 2013, 22, 387-387.	1.2	0
22	The Explorer study: the first double-blind RCT to assess the efficacy of TLC-NOSF on DFUs. Journal of Wound Care, 2013, 22, 78-82.	1.2	7
23	Packing a punch. Journal of Wound Care, 2013, 22, 451-451.	1.2	0
24	The Act is here: Deal with it. Journal of Wound Care, 2012, 21, 515-515.	1.2	0
25	Ask a better question. Journal of Wound Care, 2012, 21, 307-307.	1.2	0
26	The basis for competition. Journal of Wound Care, 2012, 21, 587-587.	1.2	0
27	Over the hills and far away. Journal of Wound Care, 2012, 21, 259-259.	1.2	0
28	Statistically speaking. Journal of Wound Care, 2012, 21, 207-207.	1.2	0
29	To hit a moving target. Journal of Wound Care, 2012, 21, 418-419.	1.2	0
30	For the write reason. Journal of Wound Care, 2012, 21, 467-467.	1.2	0
31	A different kind of “normal”™. Journal of Wound Care, 2012, 21, 355-355.	1.2	0