Natasha A Karp

List of Publications by Year
in descending order

41 papers	**8,184** citations	236925 **25** h-index	265206 **42** g-index
45 all docs	**45** docs citations	**45** times ranked	**11569** citing authors

#	Article	IF	Citations
1	Sex differences and sex bias in human circadian and sleep physiology research. ELife, 2022, 11, .	6.0	14
2	Statistical reproducibility for pairwise <i>t</i>-tests in pharmaceutical research. Statistical Methods in Medical Research, 2022, 31, 673-688.	1.5	5
3	Do multiple experimenters improve the reproducibility of animal studies?. PLoS Biology, 2022, 20, e3001564.	5.6	20
4	Preclinical Comparison of the Blood–brain barrier Permeability of Osimertinib with Other EGFR TKIs. Clinical Cancer Research, 2021, 27, 189-201.	7.0	106
5	What is the optimum design for my animal experiment?. BMJ Open Science, 2021, 5, e100126.	1.7	23
6	High-throughput phenotyping reveals expansive genetic and structural underpinnings of immune variation. Nature Immunology, 2020, 21, 86-100.	14.5	32
7	Improving reproducibility in animal research by splitting the study population into several 'mini-experiments'. Scientific Reports, 2020, 10, 16579.	3.3	49
8	The ARRIVE guidelines 2.0: Updated guidelines for reporting animal research. BMC Veterinary Research, 2020, 16, 242.	1.9	136
9	The ARRIVE guidelines 2.0: Updated guidelines for reporting animal research. PLoS Biology, 2020, 18, e3000410.	5.6	2,209
10	Reporting animal research: Explanation and elaboration for the ARRIVE guidelines 2.0. PLoS Biology, 2020, 18, e3000411.	5.6	1,069
11	The ARRIVE guidelines 2.0: updated guidelines for reporting animal research. Journal of Physiology, 2020, 598, 3793-3801.	2.9	177
12	The ARRIVE guidelines 2.0: Updated guidelines for reporting animal research. Experimental Physiology, 2020, 105, 1459-1466.	2.0	1,300
13	The ARRIVE guidelines 2.0: Updated guidelines for reporting animal research*. Journal of Cerebral Blood Flow and Metabolism, 2020, 40, 1769-1777.	4.3	546
14	The ARRIVE guidelines 2.0: Updated guidelines for reporting animal research. British Journal of Pharmacology, 2020, 177, 3617-3624.	5.4	326
15	Reply to 'It is time for an empirically informed paradigm shift in animal research'. Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 2020, 21, 661-662.	10.2	4
16	Reproducibility of animal research in light of biological variation. Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 2020, 21, 384-393.	10.2	193
17	A multi-batch design to deliver robust estimates of efficacy and reduce animal use – a syngeneic tumour case study. Scientific Reports, 2020, 10, 6178.	3.3	20
18	The ARRIVE guidelines 2.0: updated guidelines for reporting animal researchThe ARRIVE guidelines 2.0: updated guidelines for reporting animal research. BMJ Open Science, 2020, 44, e100115.	1.7	114

#	Article	IF	Citations
19	The functional observational battery and modified Irwin test as global neurobehavioral assessments in the rat: Pharmacological validation data and a comparison of methods. Journal of Pharmacological and Toxicological Methods, 2019, 98, 106591.	0.7	16
20	onlineFDR: an R package to control the false discovery rate for growing data repositories. Bioinformatics, 2019, 35, 4196-4199.	4.1	18
21	Sex bias in preclinical research and an exploration of how to change the status quo. British Journal of Pharmacology, 2019, 176, 4107-4118.	5.4	75
22	Pharmacological validation of individual animal locomotion, temperature and behavioural analysis in group-housed rats using a novel automated home cage analysis system: A comparison with the modified Irwin test. Journal of Pharmacological and Toxicological Methods, 2018, 94, 1-13.	0.7	12
23	Targeting of NAT10 enhances healthspan in a mouse model of human accelerated aging syndrome. Nature Communications, 2018, 9, 1700.	12.8	103
24	Revision of the ARRIVE guidelines: rationale and scope. BMJ Open Science, 2018, 2, e000002.	1.7	36
25	Optimising the design of population-based patient-derived tumor xenograft studies to better predict clinical response. DMM Disease Models and Mechanisms, 2018, 11, .	2.4	3
26	Reproducibility and replicability of rodent phenotyping in preclinical studies. Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews, 2018, 87, 218-232.	6.1	153
27	Reproducible preclinical research—Is embracing variability the answer?. PLoS Biology, 2018, 16, e2005413.	5.6	43
28	Prevalence of sexual dimorphism in mammalian phenotypic traits. Nature Communications, 2017, 8, 15475.	12.8	200
29	Improving the Identification of Phenotypic Abnormalities and Sexual Dimorphism in Mice When Studying Rare Event Categorical Characteristics. Genetics, 2017, 205, 491-501.	2.9	8
30	Automated recording of home cage activity and temperature of individual rats housed in social groups: The Rodent Big Brother project. PLoS ONE, 2017, 12, e0181068.	2.5	64
31	IL-18 associated with lung lymphoid aggregates drives IFNÎ³ production in severe COPD. Respiratory Research, 2017, 18, 159.	3.6	28
32	The Experimental Design Assistant. PLoS Biology, 2017, 15, e2003779.	5.6	69
33	Reporting phenotypes in mouse models when considering body size as a potential confounder. Journal of Biomedical Semantics, 2016, 7, 2.	1.6	9
34	PhenStat: A Tool Kit for Standardized Analysis of High Throughput Phenotypic Data. PLoS ONE, 2015, 10, e0131274.	2.5	51
35	The International Mouse Phenotyping Consortium Web Portal, a unified point of access for knockout mice and related phenotyping data. Nucleic Acids Research, 2014, 42, D802-D809.	14.5	252
36	Impact of Temporal Variation on Design and Analysis of Mouse Knockout Phenotyping Studies. PLoS ONE, 2014, 9, e111239.	2.5	46

#	Article	IF	Citations
37	High-fat feeding rapidly induces obesity and lipid derangements in C57BL/6N mice. Mammalian Genome, 2013, 24, 240-251.	2.2	71
38	Genome-wide Generation and Systematic Phenotyping of Knockout Mice Reveals New Roles for Many Genes. Cell, 2013, 154, 452-464.	28.9	449
39	The fallacy of ratio correction to address confounding factors. Laboratory Animals, 2012, 46, 245-252.	1.0	22
40	Robust and Sensitive Analysis of Mouse Knockout Phenotypes. PLoS ONE, 2012, 7, e52410.	2.5	39
41	Optimising experimental design for high-throughput phenotyping in mice: a case study. Mammalian Genome, 2010, 21, 467-476.	2.2	11