

Inge de Kok

List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: <https://exaly.com/author-pdf/6902231/publications.pdf>

Version: 2024-02-01

63
papers

1,475
citations

304743

22
h-index

345221

36
g-index

64
all docs

64
docs citations

64
times ranked

1716
citing authors

| # | ARTICLE | IF | CITATIONS |
|----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|-----------|
| 1 | Shift in harms and benefits of cervical cancer screening in the era of <scp>HPV</scp> screening and vaccination: A modelling study. BJOG: an International Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, 2022, , . | 2.3 | 1 |
| 2 | Projected prevalence and incidence of dementia accounting for secular trends and birth cohort effects: a population-based microsimulation study. European Journal of Epidemiology, 2022, 37, 807-814. | 5.7 | 6 |
| 3 | Costâ€effectiveness of HPVâ€based cervical screening based on first year results in the Netherlands: a modelling study. BJOG: an International Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, 2021, 128, 573-582. | 2.3 | 32 |
| 4 | Mapping the multicausality of Alzheimerâ€™s disease through group model building. GeroScience, 2021, 43, 829-843. | 4.6 | 26 |
| 5 | The potential of breast cancer screening in Europe. International Journal of Cancer, 2021, 148, 406-418. | 5.1 | 55 |
| 6 | The optimal HPV-screening protocol in Eastern-Europe: The example of Slovenia. Gynecologic Oncology, 2021, 160, 118-127. | 1.4 | 5 |
| 7 | Culture and perceptions on cancer risk and prevention, information access, and source credibility: a qualitative interview study in Chinese adults. Health, Risk and Society, 2021, 23, 1-16. | 1.7 | 1 |
| 8 | Risk of Gynecologic Cancer after Atypical Glandular Cells Found on Cervical Cytology: A Population-Based Cohort Study. Cancer Epidemiology Biomarkers and Prevention, 2021, 30, 743-750. | 2.5 | 0 |
| 9 | Effects of cancer screening restart strategies after COVID-19 disruption. British Journal of Cancer, 2021, 124, 1516-1523. | 6.4 | 55 |
| 10 | Identifying key factors for the effectiveness of pancreatic cancer screening: A modelâ€based analysis. International Journal of Cancer, 2021, 149, 337-346. | 5.1 | 8 |
| 11 | Impact of COVID-19-related care disruptions on cervical cancer screening in the United States. Journal of Medical Screening, 2021, 28, 213-216. | 2.3 | 34 |
| 12 | Reducing unnecessary referrals for colposcopy in hrHPV-positive women within the Dutch cervical cancer screening programme: A modelling study. Gynecologic Oncology, 2021, 160, 713-720. | 1.4 | 11 |
| 13 | The Differential Risk of Cervical Cancer in HPV-Vaccinated and -Unvaccinated Women: A Mathematical Modeling Study. Cancer Epidemiology Biomarkers and Prevention, 2021, 30, 912-919. | 2.5 | 1 |
| 14 | Cervical screening during the COVID-19 pandemic: optimising recovery strategies. Lancet Public Health, The, 2021, 6, e522-e527. | 10.0 | 37 |
| 15 | Investigating the decrease in participation in the Dutch cervical cancer screening programme: The role of personal and organisational characteristics. Preventive Medicine Reports, 2021, 22, 101328. | 1.8 | 5 |
| 16 | Modeling Strategies to Optimize Cancer Screening in USPSTF Guidelineâ€™Noncompliant Women. JAMA Oncology, 2021, 7, 885. | 7.1 | 5 |
| 17 | Molecular markers for cervical cancer screening. Expert Review of Proteomics, 2021, 18, 675-691. | 3.0 | 21 |
| 18 | Impact of disruptions and recovery for established cervical screening programs across a range of high-income country program designs, using COVID-19 as an example: A modelled analysis. Preventive Medicine, 2021, 151, 106623. | 3.4 | 34 |

| # | ARTICLE | IF | CITATIONS |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-----------|
| 19 | Clinical performance of high-risk HPV testing on self-samples versus clinician samples in routine primary HPV screening in the Netherlands: An observational study. <i>Lancet Regional Health - Europe</i> , The, 2021, 11, 100235. | 5.6 | 36 |
| 20 | How do dementia risk differences between birth cohorts affect future incidence predictions: A microsimulation study. <i>Alzheimer's and Dementia</i> , 2021, 17, . | 0.8 | 0 |
| 21 | Estimating the Natural History of Cervical Carcinogenesis Using Simulation Models: A CISNET Comparative Analysis. <i>Journal of the National Cancer Institute</i> , 2020, 112, 955-963. | 6.3 | 37 |
| 22 | The Impact of Different Screening Model Structures on Cervical Cancer Incidence and Mortality Predictions: The Maximum Clinical Incidence Reduction (MCLIR) Methodology. <i>Medical Decision Making</i> , 2020, 40, 474-482. | 2.4 | 5 |
| 23 | Historical and projected hysterectomy rates in the USA: Implications for future observed cervical cancer rates and evaluating prevention interventions. <i>Gynecologic Oncology</i> , 2020, 158, 710-718. | 1.4 | 16 |
| 24 | The development of a microsimulation model to predict the future burden of dementia and effects of public health interventions. <i>Alzheimer's and Dementia</i> , 2020, 16, e040855. | 0.8 | 0 |
| 25 | The impact of knowledge of HPV positivity on cytology triage in primary high-risk HPV screening. <i>Journal of Medical Screening</i> , 2019, 26, 221-224. | 2.3 | 6 |
| 26 | Pancreatic cyst surveillance imposes low psychological burden. <i>Pancreatology</i> , 2019, 19, 1061-1066. | 1.1 | 8 |
| 27 | Management and treatment of cervical intraepithelial neoplasia in the Netherlands after referral for colposcopy. <i>Acta Obstetrica Et Gynecologica Scandinavica</i> , 2019, 98, 737-746. | 2.8 | 10 |
| 28 | Introduction of primary screening using high-risk HPV DNA detection in the Dutch cervical cancer screening programme: a population-based cohort study. <i>BMC Medicine</i> , 2019, 17, 228. | 5.5 | 83 |
| 29 | Key indicators of organized cancer screening programs: Results from a Delphi study. <i>Journal of Medical Screening</i> , 2019, 26, 120-126. | 2.3 | 10 |
| 30 | Quality of life assumptions determine which cervical cancer screening strategies are cost-effective. <i>International Journal of Cancer</i> , 2018, 142, 2383-2393. | 5.1 | 13 |
| 31 | The health impact of human papillomavirus vaccination in the situation of primary human papillomavirus screening: A mathematical modeling study. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2018, 13, e0202924. | 2.5 | 7 |
| 32 | Identifying the barriers to effective breast, cervical and colorectal cancer screening in thirty one European countries using the Barriers to Effective Screening Tool (BEST). <i>Health Policy</i> , 2018, 122, 1190-1197. | 3.0 | 57 |
| 33 | Results of a health systems approach to identify barriers to population-based cervical and colorectal cancer screening programmes in six European countries. <i>Health Policy</i> , 2018, 122, 1206-1211. | 3.0 | 11 |
| 34 | Increasing incidence of invasive and in situ cervical adenocarcinoma in the Netherlands during 2004-2013. <i>Cancer Medicine</i> , 2017, 6, 416-423. | 2.8 | 60 |
| 35 | Risk of cervical intra-epithelial neoplasia and invasive cancer of the cervix in DES daughters. <i>Gynecologic Oncology</i> , 2017, 144, 305-311. | 1.4 | 7 |
| 36 | HPV-vaccinatie. <i>Bijblijven (Amsterdam, Netherlands)</i> , 2017, 33, 29-40. | 0.0 | 0 |

| # | ARTICLE | IF | CITATIONS |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-----------|
| 37 | Harms of cervical cancer screening in the United States and the Netherlands. <i>International Journal of Cancer</i> , 2017, 140, 1215-1222. | 5.1 | 46 |
| 38 | Cervical cancer incidence after normal cytological sample in routine screening using SurePath, ThinPrep, and conventional cytology: population based study. <i>BMJ: British Medical Journal</i> , 2017, 356, j504. | 2.3 | 24 |
| 39 | Cervical Cancer Screening in Partly HPV Vaccinated Cohorts – A Cost-Effectiveness Analysis. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2016, 11, e0145548. | 2.5 | 29 |
| 40 | Authors' reply re: Cost-effectiveness of cervical cancer screening: cytology versus human papillomavirus DNA testing. <i>BJOG: an International Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology</i> , 2016, 123, 1401-1402. | 2.3 | 1 |
| 41 | Public Health Benefits of Routine Human Papillomavirus Vaccination for Adults in the Netherlands: A Mathematical Modeling Study. <i>Journal of Infectious Diseases</i> , 2016, 214, 854-861. | 4.0 | 9 |
| 42 | Comparing SurePath, ThinPrep, and conventional cytology as primary test method: SurePath is associated with increased CIN II+ detection rates. <i>Cancer Causes and Control</i> , 2016, 27, 15-25. | 1.8 | 44 |
| 43 | The potential harms of primary human papillomavirus screening in over-screened women: a microsimulation study. <i>Cancer Causes and Control</i> , 2016, 27, 569-581. | 1.8 | 10 |
| 44 | Beware of Kinked Frontiers: A Systematic Review of the Choice of Comparator Strategies in Cost-Effectiveness Analyses of Human Papillomavirus Testing in Cervical Screening. <i>Value in Health</i> , 2015, 18, 1138-1151. | 0.3 | 17 |
| 45 | The Role of Acquired Immunity in the Spread of Human Papillomavirus (HPV): Explorations with a Microsimulation Model. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2015, 10, e0116618. | 2.5 | 17 |
| 46 | Offering Self-Sampling to Non-Attendees of Organized Primary HPV Screening: When Do Harms Outweigh the Benefits?. <i>Cancer Epidemiology Biomarkers and Prevention</i> , 2015, 24, 773-782. | 2.5 | 42 |
| 47 | When Is It Effective to Offer Self-Sampling to Non-Attendees? Response. <i>Cancer Epidemiology Biomarkers and Prevention</i> , 2015, 24, 1296-1296. | 2.5 | 1 |
| 48 | Exploring the trend of increased cervical intraepithelial neoplasia detection rates in the Netherlands. <i>Journal of Medical Screening</i> , 2015, 22, 144-150. | 2.3 | 10 |
| 49 | The estimated impact of natural immunity on the effectiveness of human papillomavirus vaccination. <i>Vaccine</i> , 2015, 33, 5357-5364. | 3.8 | 7 |
| 50 | How many cervical cancer cases can potentially be prevented using a more sensitive screening test at young age?. <i>International Journal of Cancer</i> , 2014, 134, 460-466. | 5.1 | 5 |
| 51 | Primary screening for human papillomavirus compared with cytology screening for cervical cancer in European settings: cost effectiveness analysis based on a Dutch microsimulation model. <i>BMJ: British Medical Journal</i> , 2012, 344, e670-e670. | 2.3 | 79 |
| 52 | Liquid-based cervical cytology using ThinPrep technology: weighing the pros and cons in a cost-effectiveness analysis. <i>Cancer Causes and Control</i> , 2012, 23, 1323-1331. | 1.8 | 21 |
| 53 | Cost-effectiveness of cervical cancer screening: cytology versus human papillomavirus DNA testing. <i>BJOG: an International Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology</i> , 2012, 119, 699-709. | 2.3 | 57 |
| 54 | Cervical Cancer Screening in the United States and the Netherlands: A Tale of Two Countries. <i>Milbank Quarterly</i> , 2012, 90, 5-37. | 4.4 | 71 |

| # | ARTICLE | IF | CITATIONS |
|----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-----------|
| 55 | Practical Implications of Differential Discounting in Cost-Effectiveness Analyses with Varying Numbers of Cohorts. <i>Value in Health</i> , 2011, 14, 438-442. | 0.3 | 21 |
| 56 | Practical Implications of Differential Discounting of Costs and Health Effects in Cost-Effectiveness Analysis. <i>Value in Health</i> , 2011, 14, 1174-1175. | 0.3 | 3 |
| 57 | Would the effect of HPV vaccination on non-cervical HPV-positive cancers make the difference for its cost-effectiveness?. <i>European Journal of Cancer</i> , 2011, 47, 428-435. | 2.8 | 23 |
| 58 | Trends in cervical cancer in the Netherlands until 2007: Has the bottom been reached?. <i>International Journal of Cancer</i> , 2011, 128, 2174-2181. | 5.1 | 46 |
| 59 | Cost-Effectiveness Analysis of Human Papillomavirus Vaccination in the Netherlands. <i>Journal of the National Cancer Institute</i> , 2009, 101, 1083-1092. | 6.3 | 67 |
| 60 | The impact of healthcare costs in the last year of life and in all life years gained on the cost-effectiveness of cancer screening. <i>British Journal of Cancer</i> , 2009, 100, 1240-1244. | 6.4 | 19 |
| 61 | Gender differences in the trend of colorectal cancer incidence in Singapore, 1968-2002. <i>International Journal of Colorectal Disease</i> , 2008, 23, 461-467. | 2.2 | 35 |
| 62 | Does lowering the screening age for cervical cancer in The Netherlands make sense?. <i>International Journal of Cancer</i> , 2008, 123, 1403-1406. | 5.1 | 7 |
| 63 | Childhood social class and cancer incidence: Results of the globe study. <i>Social Science and Medicine</i> , 2008, 66, 1131-1139. | 3.8 | 60 |