Elizabeth S Burnside

List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: https://exaly.com/author-pdf/5554267/publications.pdf

Version: 2024-02-01

144 papers 4,598 citations

33 h-index 62 g-index

146 all docs

146 docs citations

146 times ranked 5640 citing authors

#	Article	IF	Citations
1	A new perspective on breast cancer diagnostic guidelines to reduce overdiagnosis. Production and Operations Management, 2022, 31, 2361-2378.	3.8	5
2	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
3	Enhancing reproducibility using interprofessional team best practices. Journal of Clinical and Translational Science, 2021, 5, e20.	0.6	16
4	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
5	A Population-Based Study of Genes Previously Implicated in Breast Cancer. New England Journal of Medicine, 2021, 384, 440-451.	27.0	414
6	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
7	Risk of Late-Onset Breast Cancer in Genetically Predisposed Women. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 2021, 39, 3430-3440.	1.6	21
8	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
9	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
10	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
11	Image-based screening for men at high risk for breast cancer: Benefits and drawbacks. Clinical Imaging, 2020, 60, 84-89.	1.5	18
12	Framing the Clinical Encounter: Shared Decision-Making, Mammography Screening, and Decision Satisfaction. Journal of Health Communication, 2020, 25, 681-691.	2.4	3
13	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
14	Modeling the natural history of ductal carcinoma in situ based on population data. Breast Cancer Research, 2020, 22, 53.	5.0	22
15	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
16	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
17	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
18	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

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
19	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
20	A Probabilistic Model to Support Radiologists' Classification Decisions in Mammography Practice. Medical Decision Making, 2019, 39, 208-216.	2.4	4
21	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
22	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
23	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
24	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
25	Proposing New RadLex Terms by Analyzing Free-Text Mammography Reports. Journal of Digital Imaging, 2018, 31, 596-603.	2.9	9
26	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
27	Modeling Ductal Carcinoma In Situ (DCIS): An Overview of CISNET Model Approaches. Medical Decision Making, 2018, 38, 126S-139S.	2.4	19
28	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
29	A New Perspective on Breast Cancer Diagnostic Guidelines to Reduce Overdiagnosis. SSRN Electronic Journal, 2018, , .	0.4	1
30	Preferenceâ€Sensitive Management of Postâ€Mammography Decisions in Breast Cancer Diagnosis. Production and Operations Management, 2018, 27, 2313-2338.	3.8	10
31	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
32	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
33	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
34	Quantifying predictive capability of electronic health records for the most harmful breast cancer. , 2018, 10577 , .		5
35	Comparison of screening full-field digital mammography and digital breast tomosynthesis technical recalls. Journal of Medical Imaging, 2018, 6, 1.	1.5	0
36	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

#	Article	IF	Citations
37	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
38	Mammography Screening: Gaps in Patient's and Physician's Needs for Shared Decision-Making. Breast Journal, 2017, 23, 210-214.	1.0	16
39	Association of Patient Age With Outcomes of Current-Era, Large-Scale Screening Mammography. JAMA Oncology, 2017, 3, 1134.	7.1	47
40	Utility of BI-RADS Assessment Category 4 Subdivisions for Screening Breast MRI. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2017, 208, 1392-1399.	2.2	38
41	Screening Breast MRI Outcomes in Routine Clinical Practice. Academic Radiology, 2017, 24, 411-417.	2.5	33
42	Breast Cancer Risk Prediction Using Electronic Health Records. , 2017, , .		10
43	Mammography Performance Benchmarks in an Era of Value-based Care. Radiology, 2017, 284, 605-607.	7.3	1
44	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
45	Breast MRI radiomics: comparison of computer- and human-extracted imaging phenotypes. European Radiology Experimental, 2017, 1, 22.	3.4	29
46	Using automatically extracted information from mammography reports for decision-support. Journal of Biomedical Informatics, 2016, 62, 224-231.	4.3	44
47	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
48	Interpretable models to predict Breast Cancer. , 2016, , .		8
49	A Pragmatic Approach to Determine Components of Optimal Screening Mammography Practice. JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association, 2016, 315, 1951.	7.4	1
50	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
51	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
52	A Speech-to-Text Interface for MammoClass. , 2016, , .		2
53	Discriminatory power of common genetic variants in personalized breast cancer diagnosis. , 2016, 9787, .		2
54	A utility/cost analysis of breast cancer risk prediction algorithms. , 2016, 9787, .		1

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
55	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
56	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
57	The National Mammography Database: Preliminary Data. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2016, 206, 883-890.	2.2	66
58	Structure-Leveraged Methods in Breast Cancer Risk Prediction. Journal of Machine Learning Research, 2016, 17, .	62.4	5
59	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
60	Predicting malignancy from mammography findings and image-guided core biopsies. International Journal of Data Mining and Bioinformatics, 2015, 11, 257.	0.1	9
61	SkILL - A Stochastic Inductive Logic Learner. , 2015, , .		6
62	Developing a clinical utility framework to evaluate prediction models in radiogenomics. , 2015, 9416, .		3
63	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
64	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
65	Developing a utility decision framework to evaluate predictive models in breast cancer risk estimation. Journal of Medical Imaging, 2015, 2, 041005.	1.5	3
66	Leveraging Expert Knowledge to Improve Machine-Learned Decision Support Systems. AMIA Summits on Translational Science Proceedings, 2015, 2015, 87-91.	0.4	2
67	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
68	Addressing the Challenge of Assessing Physician-Level Screening Performance: Mammography as an Example. PLoS ONE, 2014, 9, e89418.	2.5	11
69	Expert Bayes: Automatically Refining Manually Built Bayesian Networks. , 2014, 2014, 362-366.		4
70	Pursuing optimal thresholds to recommend breast biopsy by quantifying the value of tomosynthesis., 2014, 9037, 90370U.		3
71	Online support: Impact on anxiety in women who experience an abnormal screening mammogram. Breast, 2014, 23, 743-748.	2.2	9
72	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

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
73	Predicting invasive breast cancer versus DCIS in different age groups. BMC Cancer, 2014, 14, 584.	2.6	11
74	Healthcare Intelligence: Turning Data into Knowledge. IEEE Intelligent Systems, 2014, 29, 54-68.	4.0	23
75	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
76	Developing a Comprehensive Database Management System for Organization and Evaluation of Mammography Datasets. Cancer Informatics, 2014, 13s3, CIN.S14031.	1.9	10
77	Support Vector Machines for Differential Prediction. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2014, 8725, 50-65.	1.3	19
78	Multiple Testing under Dependence via Semiparametric Graphical Models. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 2014, 32, 955-963.	1.4	1
79	Opportunities for Operations Research in Medical Decision Making. IEEE Intelligent Systems, 2014, 29, 59-62.	4.0	0
80	New genetic variants improve personalized breast cancer diagnosis. AMIA Summits on Translational Science Proceedings, 2014, 2014, 83-9.	0.4	13
81	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
82	A novel method to assess incompleteness of mammography reports. AMIA Annual Symposium proceedings, 2014, 2014, 1758-67.	0.2	0
83	Circulating serum xenoestrogens and mammographic breast density. Breast Cancer Research, 2013, 15, R45.	5.0	86
84	Using machine learning to identify benign cases with non-definitive biopsy., 2013, 2013, 283-285.		6
85	A Comprehensive Methodology for Determining the Most Informative Mammographic Features. Journal of Digital Imaging, 2013, 26, 941-947.	2.9	20
86	Optimal Policies for Reducing Unnecessary Follow-Up Mammography Exams in Breast Cancer Diagnosis. Decision Analysis, 2013, 10, 200-224.	2.1	32
87	Variation in Diagnostic Performance among Radiologists at Screening CT Colonography. Radiology, 2013, 268, 127-134.	7.3	28
88	Artificial Neural Networks in Mammography Interpretation and Diagnostic Decision Making. Computational and Mathematical Methods in Medicine, 2013, 2013, 1-10.	1.3	34
89	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
90	Genetic variants improve breast cancer risk prediction on mammograms. AMIA Annual Symposium proceedings, 2013, 2013, 876-85.	0.2	11

#	Article	lF	Citations
91	A collective ranking method for genome-wide association studies. , 2012, 2012, 313-320.		O
92	Mammographic Breast Density and Serum Phytoestrogen Levels. Nutrition and Cancer, 2012, 64, 783-789.	2.0	6
93	Phenol Xenoestrogens and Mammographic Breast Density. Cancer Epidemiology Biomarkers and Prevention, 2012, 21, 561.2-562.	2.5	1
94	The Effect of Budgetary Restrictions on Breast Cancer Diagnostic Decisions. Manufacturing and Service Operations Management, 2012, 14, 600-617.	3.7	48
95	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
96	Extracting BI-RADS features from Portuguese clinical texts. , 2012, , 1-4.		12
97	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
98	What Is the Optimal Threshold at Which to Recommend Breast Biopsy?. PLoS ONE, 2012, 7, e48820.	2.5	17
99	The vitamin D pathway and mammographic breast density among postmenopausal women. Breast Cancer Research and Treatment, 2012, 131, 255-265.	2.5	21
100	Relational Differential Prediction. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2012, , 617-632.	1.3	4
101	Logical Differential Prediction Bayes Net, improving breast cancer diagnosis for older women. AMIA Annual Symposium proceedings, 2012, 2012, 1330-9.	0.2	4
102	Predicting Malignancy from Mammography Findings and Surgical Biopsies., 2011, 2011,.		2
103	Circulating Sex Hormones and Mammographic Breast Density among Postmenopausal Women. Hormones and Cancer, 2011, 2, 62-72.	4.9	30
104	The Mammographic Density of a Mass Is a Significant Predictor of Breast Cancer. Radiology, 2011, 258, 417-425.	7.3	46
105	Utility of 6-month Follow-up Imaging after a Concordant Benign Breast Biopsy Result. Radiology, 2011, 258, 380-387.	7.3	29
106	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
107	Socioeconomic disparities in the decline in invasive breast cancer incidence. Breast Cancer Research and Treatment, 2010, 122, 873-878.	2.5	14
108	Breast cancer risk estimation with artificial neural networks revisited. Cancer, 2010, 116, 3310-3321.	4.1	103

#	Article	IF	Citations
109	Axial-Shear Strain Imaging for Differentiating Benign and Malignant Breast Masses. Ultrasound in Medicine and Biology, 2010, 36, 1813-1824.	1.5	45
110	Optimal Breast Biopsy Decision-Making Based on Mammographic Features and Demographic Factors. Operations Research, 2010, 58, 1577-1591.	1.9	94
111	Comparison of Logistic Regression and Artificial Neural Network Models in Breast Cancer Risk Estimation. Radiographics, 2010, 30, 13-22.	3.3	136
112	Computer-aided diagnostic models in breast cancer screening. Imaging in Medicine, 2010, 2, 313-323.	0.0	45
113	Uncovering age-specific invasive and DCIS breast cancer rules using inductive logic programming. , 2010, , .		10
114	Boosting First-Order Clauses for Large, Skewed Data Sets. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2010, , 166-177.	1.3	0
115	Axial shear strain imaging for breast mass differentiation. , 2009, , .		0
116	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
117	Probabilistic Computer Model Developed from Clinical Data in National Mammography Database Format to Classify Mammographic Findings. Radiology, 2009, 251, 663-672.	7.3	82
118	Toward Best Practices in Radiology Reporting. Radiology, 2009, 252, 852-856.	7.3	186
119	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
120	Information Extraction for Clinical Data Mining: A Mammography Case Study., 2009,, 37-42.		53
121	The ACR BI-RADS® Experience: Learning From History. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 2009, 6, 851-860.	1.8	257
122	Differentiating Benign from Malignant Solid Breast Masses with US Strain Imaging. Radiology, 2007, 245, 401-410.	7. 3	288
123	Use of Microcalcification Descriptors in BI-RADS 4th Edition to Stratify Risk of Malignancy. Radiology, 2007, 242, 388-395.	7.3	168
124	Feasibility of near-infrared diffuse optical spectroscopy on patients undergoing imageguided core-needle biopsy. Optics Express, 2007, 15, 7335.	3.4	17
125	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
126	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

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
127	A Bayesian Network to Assist Mammography Interpretation. , 2005, , 695-720.		4
128	The Use of Batch Reading to Improve the Performance of Screening Mammography. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2005, 185, 790-796.	2.2	57
129	Bayesian networks. Academic Radiology, 2005, 12, 422-430.	2.5	29
130	An Integrated Approach to Learning Bayesian Networks of Rules. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2005, , 84-95.	1.3	27
131	Knowledge discovery from structured mammography reports using inductive logic programming. AMIA Annual Symposium proceedings, 2005, , 96-100.	0.2	13
132	A Probabilistic Expert System That Provides Automated Mammographic–Histologic Correlation:Initial Experience. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2004, 182, 481-488.	2.2	24
133	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
134	The effects of training parameters on learning a probabilistic expert system for mammography. International Congress Series, 2004, 1268, 1027-1032.	0.2	0
135	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
136	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
137	Differential Value of Comparison with Previous Examinations in Diagnostic Versus Screening Mammography. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2002, 179, 1173-1177.	2.2	82
138	Interpreting Data from Audits When Screening and Diagnostic Mammography Outcomes Are Combined. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2002, 178, 681-686.	2.2	33
139	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
140	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
141	Double-Exposure Artifact Mimicking a Cervical Spine Fracture on Computed Radiography. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2000, 174, 264-264.	2.2	3
142	Merrill C. Sosman Lecture. Surviving managed care American Journal of Roentgenology, 1997, 169, 3-10.	2.2	3
143	Cost benefits of picture archiving and communications systems. Academic Radiology, 1996, 3, S72-S74.	2.5	4
144	Preference-Sensitive Management of Post-Mammography Decisions in Breast Cancer Diagnosis. SSRN Electronic Journal, 0, , .	0.4	2