Wendie A Berg

List of Publications by Year
in descending order

73 papers	8,345 citations	100601 38 h-index	107981 68 g-index
74 all docs	74 docs citations	74 times ranked	5707 citing authors

#	Article	IF	Citations
1	Breast Density and Risk of Interval Cancers: The Effect of Annual Versus Biennial Screening Mammography Policies in Canada. Canadian Association of Radiologists Journal, 2022, 73, 90-100.	1.1	18
2	Corrections: Breast cancer screening guidelines for young women of color. Cancer, 2022, 128, 849-850.	2.0	0
3	Enhancing Cherry Hemangioma: A Mimic for Breast Cancer on Contrast-Enhanced Mammography. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2022, , .	1.0	0
4	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, , .	0.9	0
5	Breast MRI for â€œthe Massesâ€• European Radiology, 2022, 32, 4034-4035.	2.3	2
6	Nipple Adenoma: Correlation of Imaging Findings and Histopathology. Journal of Breast Imaging, 2022, 4, 408-412.	0.5	4
7	Screening Algorithms in Dense Breasts: AJR Expert Panel Narrative Review. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2021, 216, 275-294.	1.0	38
8	Training Radiologists to Interpret Contrast-enhanced Mammography: Toward a Standardized Lexicon. Journal of Breast Imaging, 2021, 3, 176-189.	0.5	7
9	Effect of an educational intervention on women's healthcare provider knowledge gaps about breast density, breast cancer risk, and screening. Menopause, 2021, 28, 909-917.	0.8	4
10	Impact of Original and Artificially Improved Artificial Intelligenceâ€“based Computer-aided Diagnosis on Breast US Interpretation. Journal of Breast Imaging, 2021, 3, 301-311.	0.5	17
11	Cancer Yield Exceeds 2% for BI-RADS 3 Probably Benign Findings in Women Older Than 60 Years in the National Mammography Database. Radiology, 2021, 299, 550-558.	3.6	11
12	Granular Cell Tumor of the Breast: Radiologicâ€“Pathologic Correlation. Journal of Breast Imaging, 2021, 3, 473-481.	0.5	1
13	Is It Really Time to Close the Chapter on Screening Breast US?. Radiology, 2021, 301, E414-E414.	3.6	1
14	BI-RADS 3 on Screening Breast Ultrasound: What Is It and What Is the Appropriate Management?. Journal of Breast Imaging, 2021, 3, 527-538.	0.5	12
15	Deep learning modeling using normal mammograms for predicting breast cancer risk. Medical Physics, 2020, 47, 110-118.	1.6	71
16	Radiologic Technologist and Radiologist Knowledge Gaps about Breast Density Revealed by an Online Continuing Education Course. Journal of Breast Imaging, 2020, 2, 315-329.	0.5	2
17	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.	3.6	38
18	A Prospective Study of Automated Breast Ultrasound Screening of Women with Dense Breasts in a Digital Breast Tomosynthesis-based Practice. Journal of Breast Imaging, 2020, 2, 125-133.	0.5	4

#	Article	IF	Citations
19	Reducing Unnecessary Biopsy and Follow-up of Benign Cystic Breast Lesions. Radiology, 2020, 295, 52-53.	3.6	16
20	Encapsulated Papillary Carcinoma of the Breast: Imaging Features with Histopathologic Correlation. Journal of Breast Imaging, 2020, 2, 590-597.	0.5	4
21	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.	0.9	5
22	Benefits of Supplemental Ultrasonography With Mammography. JAMA Internal Medicine, 2019, 179, 1150.	2.6	2
23	Diagnostic Performance of MRI, Molecular Breast Imaging, and Contrast-enhanced Mammography in Women with Newly Diagnosed Breast Cancer. Radiology, 2019, 293, 531-540.	3.6	64
24	Comment on Aminololama-Shakeri et al, â€œScreening Guidelines and Supplemental Screening Tools: Assessment of the Adequacy of Patientâ€“Provider Discussion.â€•Journal of Breast Imaging 2019;1(2). Journal of Breast Imaging, 2019, 1, 276-276.	0.5	0
25	Screening Breast Ultrasound Using Handheld or Automated Technique in Women with Dense Breasts. Journal of Breast Imaging, 2019, 1, 283-296.	0.5	51
26	Breast density implications and supplemental screening. European Radiology, 2019, 29, 1762-1777.	2.3	115
27	Can Optoacoustic Imaging Safely Reduce Benign Breast Biopsies?. Radiology, 2018, 287, 413-415.	3.6	5
28	Use of Breast-Specific PET Scanners and Comparison with MR Imaging. Magnetic Resonance Imaging Clinics of North America, 2018, 26, 265-272.	0.6	12
29	A deep learning method for classifying mammographic breast density categories. Medical Physics, 2018, 45, 314-321.	1.6	188
30	Palpable Breast Lump Triage by Minimally Trained Operators in Mexico Using Computer-Assisted Diagnosis and Low-Cost Ultrasound. Journal of Global Oncology, 2018, 4, 1-9.	0.5	17
31	Deep Learning to Distinguish Recalled but Benign Mammography Images in Breast Cancer Screening. Clinical Cancer Research, 2018, 24, 5902-5909.	3.2	86
32	Dedicated Breast Gamma Camera Imaging and Breast PET. PET Clinics, 2018, 13, 363-381.	1.5	35
33	Comment on Thigpen D. et al. The Role of Ultrasound in Screening Dense Breastsâ€”A Review of the Literature and Practical Solutions for Implementation. Diagnostics 2018, 8, 20. Diagnostics, 2018, 8, 37.	1.3	0
34	Grouped Amorphous Calcifications at Mammography: Frequently Atypical but Rarely Associated with Aggressive Malignancy. Radiology, 2018, 288, 671-679.	3.6	20
35	DCE-MRI Background Parenchymal Enhancement Quantified from an Early versus Delayed Post-contrast Sequence: Association with Breast Cancer Presence. Scientific Reports, 2017, 7, 2115.	1.6	20
36	Breast MRI contrast enhancement kinetics of normal parenchyma correlate with presence of breast cancer. Breast Cancer Research, 2016, 18, 76.	2.2	25

#	Article	IF	Citations
37	Current Status of Supplemental Screening in Dense Breasts. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 2016, 34, 1840-1843.	0.8	59
38	Nuclear Breast Imaging: Clinical Results and Future Directions. Journal of Nuclear Medicine, 2016, 57, 46S-52S.	2.8	28
39	Ultrasound as the Primary Screening Test for Breast Cancer: Analysis From ACRIN 6666. Journal of the National Cancer Institute, 2016, 108, djv367.	3.0	201
40	Quantitative Maximum Shear-Wave Stiffness of Breast Masses as a Predictor of Histopathologic Severity. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2015, 205, 448-455.	1.0	59
41	How Well Does Supplemental Screening Magnetic Resonance Imaging Work in High-Risk Women?. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 2014, 32, 2193-2196.	0.8	15
42	How Should Screening Breast US Be Audited? The Patient Perspective. Radiology, 2014, 272, 309-315.	3.6	5
43	Technologist-performed Handheld Screening Breast US Imaging: How Is It Performed and What Are the Outcomes to Date?. Radiology, 2014, 272, 12-27.	3.6	43
44	Probably Benign Lesions at Screening Breast US in a Population with Elevated Risk: Prevalence and Rate of Malignancy in the ACRIN 6666 Trial. Radiology, 2013, 269, 701-712.	3.6	86
45	Multiple Bilateral Circumscribed Masses at Screening Breast US: Consider Annual Follow-up. Radiology, 2013, 268, 673-683.	3.6	56
46	Detection of Breast Cancer With Addition of Annual Screening Ultrasound or a Single Screening MRI to Mammography in Women With Elevated Breast Cancer Risk. JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association, 2012, 307, 1394.	3.8	897
47	Training the ACRIN 6666 Investigators and Effects of Feedback on Breast Ultrasound Interpretive Performance and Agreement in BI-RADS Ultrasound Feature Analysis. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2012, 199, 224-235.	1.0	53
48	Comparative Effectiveness of Positron Emission Mammography and MRI in the Contralateral Breast of Women With Newly Diagnosed Breast Cancer. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2012, 198, 219-232.	1.0	62
49	Gamma Camera Breast Imaging Lexicon. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2012, 199, W767-W774.	1.0	44
50	Shear-wave Elastography Improves the Specificity of Breast US: The BE1 Multinational Study of 939 Masses. Radiology, 2012, 262, 435-449.	3.6	714
51	Lexicon for standardized interpretation of gamma camera molecular breast imaging: observer agreement and diagnostic accuracy. European Journal of Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Imaging, 2012, 39, 971-982.	3.3	60
52	Interpretation of Positron Emission Mammography and MRI by Experienced Breast Imaging Radiologists: Performance and Observer Reproducibility. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2011, 196, 971-981.	1.0	51
53	Breast Cancer: Comparative Effectiveness of Positron Emission Mammography and MR Imaging in Presurgical Planning for the Ipsilateral Breast. Radiology, 2011, 258, 59-72.	3.6	172
54	Benefits of Screening Mammography. JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association, 2010, 303, 168.	3.8	45

#	Article	IF	Citations
55	Reasons Women at Elevated Risk of Breast Cancer Refuse Breast MR Imaging Screening: ACRIN 6666. Radiology, 2010, 254, 79-87.	3.6	163
56	Cystic Breast Masses and the ACRIN 6666 Experience. Radiologic Clinics of North America, 2010, 48, 931-987.	0.9	138
57	Tailored Supplemental Screening for Breast Cancer: What Now and What Next?. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2009, 192, 390-399.	1.0	158
58	Combined Screening With Ultrasound and Mammography vs Mammography Alone in Women at Elevated Risk of Breast Cancer. JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association, 2008, 299, 2151.	3.8	1,222
59	Beyond Standard Mammographic Screening: Mammography at Age Extremes, Ultrasound, and MR Imaging. Radiologic Clinics of North America, 2007, 45, 895-906.	0.9	29
60	High-Resolution Fluorodeoxyglucose Positron Emission Tomography with Compression ("Positron) Tj ETQq0 0 0 rgBT /Overlock 10 Tf 50 12, 309-323.	0.4	218
61	Operator Dependence of Physician-performed Whole-Breast US: Lesion Detection and Characterization. Radiology, 2006, 241, 355-365.	3.6	171
62	Lesion Detection and Characterization in a Breast US Phantom: Results of the ACRIN 6666 Investigators. Radiology, 2006, 239, 693-702.	3.6	51
63	Sonographically Depicted Breast Clustered Microcysts: Is Follow-Up Appropriate?. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2005, 185, 952-959.	1.0	49
64	Diagnostic Accuracy of Mammography, Clinical Examination, US, and MR Imaging in Preoperative Assessment of Breast Cancer. Radiology, 2004, 233, 830-849.	3.6	1,268
65	Cystic Lesions of the Breast: Sonographic-Pathologic Correlation. Radiology, 2003, 227, 183-191.	3.6	185
66	Does Training in the Breast Imaging Reporting and Data System (BI-RADS) Improve Biopsy Recommendations or Feature Analysis Agreement with Experienced Breast Imagers at Mammography?. Radiology, 2002, 224, 871-880.	3.6	155
67	MR Imaging of Extracapsular Silicone from Breast Implants. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2002, 178, 465-472.	1.0	64
68	Toward a standardized breast ultrasound lexicon, BI-RADS: Ultrasound. Seminars in Roentgenology, 2001, 36, 217-225.	0.2	131
69	Biopsy of Amorphous Breast Calcifications: Pathologic Outcome and Yield at Stereotactic Biopsy. Radiology, 2001, 221, 495-503.	3.6	128
70	Breast Imaging Reporting and Data System. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2000, 174, 1769-1777.	1.0	496
71	Core Needle Breast Biopsy in Patients Undergoing Anticoagulation Therapy. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2000, 174, 245-249.	1.0	83
72	Preliminary results for positron emission mammography: real-time functional breast imaging in a conventional mammography gantry. European Journal of Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Imaging, 1996, 23, 804-806.	2.2	87

#	Article	IF	Citations
73	Optimizing the Breast Imaging Report for Today and Tomorrow. Journal of Breast Imaging, 0, , .	0.5	2