Elizabeth S Burnside

List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: https://exaly.com/author-pdf/5554267/publications.pdf Version: 2024-02-01



#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
1	A Population-Based Study of Genes Previously Implicated in Breast Cancer. New England Journal of Medicine, 2021, 384, 440-451.	27.0	414
2	Differentiating Benign from Malignant Solid Breast Masses with US Strain Imaging. Radiology, 2007, 245, 401-410.	7.3	288
3	Quantitative MRI radiomics in the prediction of molecular classifications of breast cancer subtypes in the TCGA/TCIA data set. Npj Breast Cancer, 2016, 2, .	5.2	266
4	The ACR BI-RADS® Experience: Learning From History. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 2009, 6, 851-860.	1.8	257
5	Toward Best Practices in Radiology Reporting. Radiology, 2009, 252, 852-856.	7.3	186
6	Use of Microcalcification Descriptors in BI-RADS 4th Edition to Stratify Risk of Malignancy. Radiology, 2007, 242, 388-395.	7.3	168
7	Comparison of Logistic Regression and Artificial Neural Network Models in Breast Cancer Risk Estimation. Radiographics, 2010, 30, 13-22.	3.3	136
8	Prediction of clinical phenotypes in invasive breast carcinomas from the integration of radiomics and genomics data. Journal of Medical Imaging, 2015, 2, 041007.	1.5	126
9	Effects of Screening and Systemic Adjuvant Therapy on ER-Specific US Breast Cancer Mortality. Journal of the National Cancer Institute, 2014, 106, .	6.3	120
10	Breast cancer risk estimation with artificial neural networks revisited. Cancer, 2010, 116, 3310-3321.	4.1	103
11	Optimal Breast Biopsy Decision-Making Based on Mammographic Features and Demographic Factors. Operations Research, 2010, 58, 1577-1591.	1.9	94
12	Bayesian Network to Predict Breast Cancer Risk of Mammographic Microcalcifications and Reduce Number of Benign Biopsy Results: Initial Experience. Radiology, 2006, 240, 666-673.	7.3	91
13	Circulating serum xenoestrogens and mammographic breast density. Breast Cancer Research, 2013, 15, R45.	5.0	86
14	Differential Value of Comparison with Previous Examinations in Diagnostic Versus Screening Mammography. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2002, 179, 1173-1177.	2.2	82
15	Probabilistic Computer Model Developed from Clinical Data in National Mammography Database Format to Classify Mammographic Findings. Radiology, 2009, 251, 663-672.	7.3	82
16	A Logistic Regression Model Based on the National Mammography Database Format to Aid Breast Cancer Diagnosis. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2009, 192, 1117-1127.	2.2	74
17	The National Mammography Database: Preliminary Data. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2016, 206, 883-890.	2.2	66
18	Using computerâ€extracted image phenotypes from tumors on breast magnetic resonance imaging to predict breast cancer pathologic stage. Cancer, 2016, 122, 748-757.	4.1	58

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
19	The Use of Batch Reading to Improve the Performance of Screening Mammography. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2005, 185, 790-796.	2.2	57
20	CT Colonography Reporting and Data System (C-RADS): Benchmark Values From a Clinical Screening Program. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2014, 202, 1232-1237.	2.2	54
21	Information Extraction for Clinical Data Mining: A Mammography Case Study. , 2009, , 37-42.		53
22	Automatic classification of mammography reports by BI-RADS breast tissue composition class. Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association: JAMIA, 2012, 19, 913-916.	4.4	49
23	The Effect of Budgetary Restrictions on Breast Cancer Diagnostic Decisions. Manufacturing and Service Operations Management, 2012, 14, 600-617.	3.7	48
24	Long-Term Outcomes and Cost-Effectiveness of Breast Cancer Screening With Digital Breast Tomosynthesis in the United States. Journal of the National Cancer Institute, 2020, 112, 582-589.	6.3	48
25	Association of Patient Age With Outcomes of Current-Era, Large-Scale Screening Mammography. JAMA Oncology, 2017, 3, 1134.	7.1	47
26	Risk of Breast Cancer Among Carriers of Pathogenic Variants in Breast Cancer Predisposition Genes Varies by Polygenic Risk Score. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 2021, 39, 2564-2573.	1.6	47
27	The Mammographic Density of a Mass Is a Significant Predictor of Breast Cancer. Radiology, 2011, 258, 417-425.	7.3	46
28	Axial-Shear Strain Imaging for Differentiating Benign and Malignant Breast Masses. Ultrasound in Medicine and Biology, 2010, 36, 1813-1824.	1.5	45
29	Computer-aided diagnostic models in breast cancer screening. Imaging in Medicine, 2010, 2, 313-323.	0.0	45
30	ACR BI-RADS Assessment Category 4 Subdivisions in Diagnostic Mammography: Utilization and Outcomes in the National Mammography Database. Radiology, 2018, 287, 416-422.	7.3	45
31	Using automatically extracted information from mammography reports for decision-support. Journal of Biomedical Informatics, 2016, 62, 224-231.	4.3	44
32	Movement of a Biopsy-Site Marker Clip after Completion of Stereotactic Directional Vacuum-assisted Breast Biopsy: Case Report. Radiology, 2001, 221, 504-507.	7.3	38
33	Utility of BI-RADS Assessment Category 4 Subdivisions for Screening Breast MRI. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2017, 208, 1392-1399.	2.2	38
34	Cancer Yield and Patterns of Follow-up for BI-RADS Category 3 after Screening Mammography Recall in the National Mammography Database. Radiology, 2020, 296, 32-41.	7.3	38
35	Artificial Neural Networks in Mammography Interpretation and Diagnostic Decision Making. Computational and Mathematical Methods in Medicine, 2013, 2013, 1-10.	1.3	34
36	Interpreting Data from Audits When Screening and Diagnostic Mammography Outcomes Are Combined. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2002, 178, 681-686.	2.2	33

Elizabeth S Burnside

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
37	Screening Breast MRI Outcomes in Routine Clinical Practice. Academic Radiology, 2017, 24, 411-417.	2.5	33
38	Optimal Policies for Reducing Unnecessary Follow-Up Mammography Exams in Breast Cancer Diagnosis. Decision Analysis, 2013, 10, 200-224.	2.1	32
39	Circulating Sex Hormones and Mammographic Breast Density among Postmenopausal Women. Hormones and Cancer, 2011, 2, 62-72.	4.9	30
40	Bayesian networks. Academic Radiology, 2005, 12, 422-430.	2.5	29
41	Utility of 6-month Follow-up Imaging after a Concordant Benign Breast Biopsy Result. Radiology, 2011, 258, 380-387.	7.3	29
42	Breast MRI radiomics: comparison of computer- and human-extracted imaging phenotypes. European Radiology Experimental, 2017, 1, 22.	3.4	29
43	Variation in Diagnostic Performance among Radiologists at Screening CT Colonography. Radiology, 2013, 268, 127-134.	7.3	28
44	An Integrated Approach to Learning Bayesian Networks of Rules. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2005, , 84-95.	1.3	27
45	Fluorescence Spectroscopy: An Adjunct Diagnostic Tool to Image-Guided Core Needle Biopsy of the Breast. IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering, 2009, 56, 2518-2528.	4.2	26
46	The Impact of Alternative Practices on the Cost and Quality of Mammographic Screening in the United States. Clinical Breast Cancer, 2001, 2, 145-152.	2.4	24
47	A Probabilistic Expert System That Provides Automated Mammographic–Histologic Correlation:Initial Experience. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2004, 182, 481-488.	2.2	24
48	Healthcare Intelligence: Turning Data into Knowledge. IEEE Intelligent Systems, 2014, 29, 54-68.	4.0	23
49	Impact of axillary ultrasound and core needle biopsy on the utility of intraoperative frozen section analysis and treatment decision making in women with invasive breast cancer. American Journal of Surgery, 2012, 204, 308-314.	1.8	22
50	Modeling the natural history of ductal carcinoma in situ based on population data. Breast Cancer Research, 2020, 22, 53.	5.0	22
51	The vitamin D pathway and mammographic breast density among postmenopausal women. Breast Cancer Research and Treatment, 2012, 131, 255-265.	2.5	21
52	Association between Screening Mammography Recall Rate and Interval Cancers in the UK Breast Cancer Service Screening Program: A Cohort Study. Radiology, 2018, 288, 47-54.	7.3	21
53	Risk of Late-Onset Breast Cancer in Genetically Predisposed Women. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 2021, 39, 3430-3440.	1.6	21
54	A Comprehensive Methodology for Determining the Most Informative Mammographic Features. Journal of Digital Imaging, 2013, 26, 941-947.	2.9	20

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
55	Key Elements of Mammography Shared Decision-Making: a Scoping Review of the Literature. Journal of General Internal Medicine, 2018, 33, 1805-1814.	2.6	20
56	Development of an online, publicly accessible naive Bayesian decision support tool for mammographic mass lesions based on the American College of Radiology (ACR) BI-RADS lexicon. European Radiology, 2015, 25, 1768-1775.	4.5	19
57	Modeling Ductal Carcinoma In Situ (DCIS): An Overview of CISNET Model Approaches. Medical Decision Making, 2018, 38, 126S-139S.	2.4	19
58	Support Vector Machines for Differential Prediction. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2014, 8725, 50-65.	1.3	19
59	Image-based screening for men at high risk for breast cancer: Benefits and drawbacks. Clinical Imaging, 2020, 60, 84-89.	1.5	18
60	Feasibility of near-infrared diffuse optical spectroscopy on patients undergoing imageguided core-needle biopsy. Optics Express, 2007, 15, 7335.	3.4	17
61	What Is the Optimal Threshold at Which to Recommend Breast Biopsy?. PLoS ONE, 2012, 7, e48820.	2.5	17
62	A preliminary report on the role of spatial frequency analysis in the perception of breast cancers missed at mammography screening1. Academic Radiology, 2004, 11, 894-908.	2.5	16
63	Mammography Screening: Gaps in Patient's and Physician's Needs for Shared Decision-Making. Breast Journal, 2017, 23, 210-214.	1.0	16
64	Enhancing reproducibility using interprofessional team best practices. Journal of Clinical and Translational Science, 2021, 5, e20.	0.6	16
65	American College of Radiology/Society of Breast Imaging Curriculum for Resident and Fellow Education in Breast Imaging. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 2006, 3, 879-884.	1.8	15
66	Validation of Results from Knowledge Discovery: Mass Density as a Predictor of Breast Cancer. Journal of Digital Imaging, 2010, 23, 554-561.	2.9	15
67	Socioeconomic disparities in the decline in invasive breast cancer incidence. Breast Cancer Research and Treatment, 2010, 122, 873-878.	2.5	14
68	Comparing CISNET Breast Cancer Incidence and Mortality Predictions to Observed Clinical Trial Results of Mammography Screening from Ages 40 to 49. Medical Decision Making, 2018, 38, 140S-150S.	2.4	13
69	Knowledge discovery from structured mammography reports using inductive logic programming. AMIA Annual Symposium proceedings, 2005, , 96-100.	0.2	13
70	New genetic variants improve personalized breast cancer diagnosis. AMIA Summits on Translational Science Proceedings, 2014, 2014, 83-9.	0.4	13
71	Extracting BI-RADS features from Portuguese clinical texts. , 2012, , 1-4.		12
72	Operationalization, implementation, and evaluation of Collaboration Planning: A pilot interventional study of nascent translational teams. Journal of Clinical and Translational Science, 2021, 5, e23.	0.6	12

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
73	Addressing the Challenge of Assessing Physician-Level Screening Performance: Mammography as an Example. PLoS ONE, 2014, 9, e89418.	2.5	11
74	Predicting invasive breast cancer versus DCIS in different age groups. BMC Cancer, 2014, 14, 584.	2.6	11
75	Comparing Mammography Abnormality Features to Genetic Variants in the Prediction of Breast Cancer in Women Recommended for Breast Biopsy. Academic Radiology, 2016, 23, 62-69.	2.5	11
76	Relationships Between Human-Extracted MRI Tumor Phenotypes of Breast Cancer and Clinical Prognostic Indicators Including Receptor Status and Molecular Subtype. Current Problems in Diagnostic Radiology, 2019, 48, 467-472.	1.4	11
77	Age-based versus Risk-based Mammography Screening in Women 40–49 Years Old: A Cross-sectional Study. Radiology, 2019, 292, 321-328.	7.3	11
78	Genetic variants improve breast cancer risk prediction on mammograms. AMIA Annual Symposium proceedings, 2013, 2013, 876-85.	0.2	11
79	Using a Bayesian network to predict the probability and type of breast cancer represented by microcalcifications on mammography. Studies in Health Technology and Informatics, 2004, 107, 13-7.	0.3	11
80	Uncovering age-specific invasive and DCIS breast cancer rules using inductive logic programming. , 2010, , .		10
81	Developing a Comprehensive Database Management System for Organization and Evaluation of Mammography Datasets. Cancer Informatics, 2014, 13s3, CIN.S14031.	1.9	10
82	Breast Cancer Risk Prediction Using Electronic Health Records. , 2017, , .		10
83	Urinary Magnesium and Other Elements in Relation to Mammographic Breast Density, a Measure of Breast Cancer Risk. Nutrition and Cancer, 2018, 70, 441-446.	2.0	10
84	Preference ensitive Management of Postâ€Mammography Decisions in Breast Cancer Diagnosis. Production and Operations Management, 2018, 27, 2313-2338.	3.8	10
85	Breast Cancer Screening in Primary Care: A Call for Development and Validation of Patient-Oriented Shared Decision-Making Tools. Journal of Women's Health, 2019, 28, 114-116.	3.3	10
86	Online support: Impact on anxiety in women who experience an abnormal screening mammogram. Breast, 2014, 23, 743-748.	2.2	9
87	Predicting malignancy from mammography findings and image-guided core biopsies. International Journal of Data Mining and Bioinformatics, 2015, 11, 257.	0.1	9
88	Proposing New RadLex Terms by Analyzing Free-Text Mammography Reports. Journal of Digital Imaging, 2018, 31, 596-603.	2.9	9
89	Core Elements of Shared Decision-making for Women Considering Breast Cancer Screening: Results of a Modified Delphi Survey. Journal of General Internal Medicine, 2020, 35, 1668-1677.	2.6	9

90 Interpretable models to predict Breast Cancer. , 2016, , .

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
91	Using Collaborative Simulation Modeling to Develop a Web-Based Tool to Support Policy-Level Decision Making About Breast Cancer Screening Initiation Age. MDM Policy and Practice, 2017, 2, 238146831771798.	0.9	8
92	A National Study of the Use of Asymptomatic Systemic Imaging for Surveillance Following Breast Cancer Treatment (AFT-01). Annals of Surgical Oncology, 2018, 25, 2587-2595.	1.5	8
93	Quantitative breast density analysis to predict interval and node-positive cancers in pursuit of improved screening protocols: a case–control study. British Journal of Cancer, 2021, 125, 884-892.	6.4	7
94	Score As You Lift (SAYL): A Statistical Relational Learning Approach to Uplift Modeling. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2013, 8190, 595-611.	1.3	7
95	Mammographic Breast Density and Serum Phytoestrogen Levels. Nutrition and Cancer, 2012, 64, 783-789.	2.0	6
96	Using machine learning to identify benign cases with non-definitive biopsy. , 2013, 2013, 283-285.		6
97	External validation of a publicly available computer assisted diagnostic tool for mammographic mass lesions with two high prevalence research datasets. Medical Physics, 2015, 42, 4987-4996.	3.0	6
98	SkILL - A Stochastic Inductive Logic Learner. , 2015, , .		6
99	Utility of Clinical Breast Examinations in Detecting Local–Regional Breast Events After Breast-Conservation in Women with a Personal History of High-Risk Breast Cancer. Annals of Surgical Oncology, 2016, 23, 3385-3391.	1.5	6
100	A history of breast cancer and older age allow risk stratification of mammographic BI-RADS 3 ratings in the diagnostic setting. Clinical Imaging, 2016, 40, 200-204.	1.5	6
101	Linkage of the ACR National Mammography Database to the Network of State Cancer Registries: Proof of Concept Evaluation by the ACR National Mammography Database Committee. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 2019, 16, 8-14.	1.8	5
102	Quantifying predictive capability of electronic health records for the most harmful breast cancer. , 2018, 10577, .		5
103	Structure-Leveraged Methods in Breast Cancer Risk Prediction. Journal of Machine Learning Research, 2016, 17, .	62.4	5
104	A new perspective on breast cancer diagnostic guidelines to reduce overdiagnosis. Production and Operations Management, 2022, 31, 2361-2378.	3.8	5
105	Cost benefits of picture archiving and communications systems. Academic Radiology, 1996, 3, S72-S74.	2.5	4
106	A Bayesian Network to Assist Mammography Interpretation. , 2005, , 695-720.		4
107	Expert Bayes: Automatically Refining Manually Built Bayesian Networks. , 2014, 2014, 362-366.		4
108	Comparative effectiveness of incorporating a hypothetical DCIS prognostic marker into breast cancer screening. Breast Cancer Research and Treatment, 2018, 168, 229-239.	2.5	4

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
109	A Probabilistic Model to Support Radiologists' Classification Decisions in Mammography Practice. Medical Decision Making, 2019, 39, 208-216.	2.4	4
110	Relational Differential Prediction. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2012, , 617-632.	1.3	4
111	Logical Differential Prediction Bayes Net, improving breast cancer diagnosis for older women. AMIA Annual Symposium proceedings, 2012, 2012, 1330-9.	0.2	4
112	Comparing the value of mammographic features and genetic variants in breast cancer risk prediction. AMIA Annual Symposium proceedings, 2014, 2014, 1228-37.	0.2	4
113	Utility of Genetic Testing in Addition to Mammography for Determining Risk of Breast Cancer Depends on Patient Age. AMIA Summits on Translational Science Proceedings, 2018, 2017, 81-90.	0.4	4
114	Merrill C. Sosman Lecture. Surviving managed care American Journal of Roentgenology, 1997, 169, 3-10.	2.2	3
115	Improving a Bayesian network's ability to predict the probability of malignancy of microcalcifications on mammography. International Congress Series, 2004, 1268, 1021-1026.	0.2	3
116	Pursuing optimal thresholds to recommend breast biopsy by quantifying the value of tomosynthesis. , 2014, 9037, 90370U.		3
117	Developing a clinical utility framework to evaluate prediction models in radiogenomics. , 2015, 9416, .		3
118	Developing a utility decision framework to evaluate predictive models in breast cancer risk estimation. Journal of Medical Imaging, 2015, 2, 041005.	1.5	3
119	Framing the Clinical Encounter: Shared Decision-Making, Mammography Screening, and Decision Satisfaction. Journal of Health Communication, 2020, 25, 681-691.	2.4	3
120	Preliminary Evaluation of a Breast Cancer Screening Shared Decision-Making Aid Utilized Within the Primary Care Clinical Encounter. Journal of Patient Experience, 2021, 8, 237437352110340.	0.9	3
121	Double-Exposure Artifact Mimicking a Cervical Spine Fracture on Computed Radiography. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2000, 174, 264-264.	2.2	3
122	Predicting Malignancy from Mammography Findings and Surgical Biopsies. , 2011, 2011, .		2
123	A Speech-to-Text Interface for MammoClass. , 2016, , .		2
124	Discriminatory power of common genetic variants in personalized breast cancer diagnosis. , 2016, 9787, .		2
125	High-dimensional regression analysis links magnetic resonance imaging features and protein expression and signaling pathway alterations in breast invasive carcinoma. Oncoscience, 2018, 5, 39-48.	2.2	2
126	Preference-Sensitive Management of Post-Mammography Decisions in Breast Cancer Diagnosis. SSRN Electronic Journal, 0, , .	0.4	2

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
127	Leveraging Expert Knowledge to Improve Machine-Learned Decision Support Systems. AMIA Summits on Translational Science Proceedings, 2015, 2015, 87-91.	0.4	2
128	Phenol Xenoestrogens and Mammographic Breast Density. Cancer Epidemiology Biomarkers and Prevention, 2012, 21, 561.2-562.	2.5	1
129	A Pragmatic Approach to Determine Components of Optimal Screening Mammography Practice. JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association, 2016, 315, 1951.	7.4	1
130	A utility/cost analysis of breast cancer risk prediction algorithms. , 2016, 9787, .		1
131	Mammography Performance Benchmarks in an Era of Value-based Care. Radiology, 2017, 284, 605-607.	7.3	1
132	A New Perspective on Breast Cancer Diagnostic Guidelines to Reduce Overdiagnosis. SSRN Electronic Journal, 2018, , .	0.4	1
133	Multiple Testing under Dependence via Semiparametric Graphical Models. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 2014, 32, 955-963.	1.4	1
134	Leveraging Interaction between Genetic Variants and Mammographic Findings for Personalized Breast Cancer Diagnosis. AMIA Summits on Translational Science Proceedings, 2015, 2015, 107-11.	0.4	1
135	The effects of training parameters on learning a probabilistic expert system for mammography. International Congress Series, 2004, 1268, 1027-1032.	0.2	0
136	Axial shear strain imaging for breast mass differentiation. , 2009, , .		0
137	A collective ranking method for genome-wide association studies. , 2012, 2012, 313-320.		0
138	Boosting First-Order Clauses for Large, Skewed Data Sets. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2010, , 166-177.	1.3	0
139	Comparison of screening full-field digital mammography and digital breast tomosynthesis technical recalls. Journal of Medical Imaging, 2018, 6, 1.	1.5	Ο
140	BPI19-012: Differences in Stakeholder Perspectives Regarding Key Components of Shared Decision-Making for Mammography in Breast Cancer Screening for Women Ages 40–50. Journal of the National Comprehensive Cancer Network: JNCCN, 2019, 17, BPI19-012.	4.9	0
141	Opportunities for Operations Research in Medical Decision Making. IEEE Intelligent Systems, 2014, 29, 59-62.	4.0	Ο
142	A novel method to assess incompleteness of mammography reports. AMIA Annual Symposium proceedings, 2014, 2014, 1758-67.	0.2	0
143	Improving breast cancer risk prediction by using demographic risk factors, abnormality features on mammograms and genetic variants. AMIA Annual Symposium proceedings, 2018, 2018, 1253-1262.	0.2	0
144	Utilization and Cancer Yield of Probably Benign Assessment Category in the National Mammography Database: 2009 to 2018. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 2022, , .	1.8	0