

# Penny F Whiting

## List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: <https://exaly.com/author-pdf/7726015/publications.pdf>

Version: 2024-02-01

110  
papers

86,332  
citations

36691

53  
h-index

34195

103  
g-index

124  
all docs

124  
docs citations

124  
times ranked

70459  
citing authors

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
1	The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. <i>BMJ, The</i> , 2021, 372, n71.	3.0	26,066
2	RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. <i>BMJ: British Medical Journal</i> , 2019, 366, i4898.	2.4	10,984
3	QUADAS-2: A Revised Tool for the Quality Assessment of Diagnostic Accuracy Studies. <i>Annals of Internal Medicine</i> , 2011, 155, 529.	2.0	9,012
4	ROBINS-I: a tool for assessing risk of bias in non-randomised studies of interventions. <i>BMJ, The</i> , 2016, 355, i4919.	3.0	8,654
5	The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. <i>Systematic Reviews</i> , 2021, 10, 89.	2.5	3,624
6	The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. <i>International Journal of Surgery</i> , 2021, 88, 105906.	1.1	3,487
7	PRISMA 2020 explanation and elaboration: updated guidance and exemplars for reporting systematic reviews. <i>BMJ, The</i> , 2021, 372, n160.	3.0	3,413
8	The development of QUADAS: a tool for the quality assessment of studies of diagnostic accuracy included in systematic reviews. <i>BMC Medical Research Methodology</i> , 2003, 3, 25.	1.4	3,036
9	Preferred Reporting Items for a Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Diagnostic Test Accuracy Studies. <i>JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association</i> , 2018, 319, 388.	3.8	1,783
10	Cannabinoids for Medical Use. <i>JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association</i> , 2015, 313, 2456.	3.8	1,629
11	The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. <i>PLoS Medicine</i> , 2021, 18, e1003583.	3.9	1,340
12	ROBIS: A new tool to assess risk of bias in systematic reviews was developed. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2016, 69, 225-234.	2.4	1,204
13	PROBAST: A Tool to Assess the Risk of Bias and Applicability of Prediction Model Studies. <i>Annals of Internal Medicine</i> , 2019, 170, 51.	2.0	1,066
14	The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2021, 134, 178-189.	2.4	995
15	Protection by BCG Vaccine Against Tuberculosis: A Systematic Review of Randomized Controlled Trials. <i>Clinical Infectious Diseases</i> , 2014, 58, 470-480.	2.9	749
16	PROBAST: A Tool to Assess Risk of Bias and Applicability of Prediction Model Studies: Explanation and Elaboration. <i>Annals of Internal Medicine</i> , 2019, 170, W1.	2.0	696
17	Sources of Variation and Bias in Studies of Diagnostic Accuracy. <i>Annals of Internal Medicine</i> , 2004, 140, 189.	2.0	679
18	Evaluation of QUADAS, a tool for the quality assessment of diagnostic accuracy studies. <i>BMC Medical Research Methodology</i> , 2006, 6, 9.	1.4	655

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
19	A unification of models for meta-analysis of diagnostic accuracy studies. <i>Biostatistics</i> , 2007, 8, 239-251.	0.9	593
20	Interpreting a covid-19 test result. <i>BMJ, The</i> , 2020, 369, m1808.	3.0	556
21	Declaraci3n PRISMA 2020: una gu3a actualizada para la publicaci3n de revisiones sistem3ticas. <i>Revista Espanola De Cardiologia</i> , 2021, 74, 790-799.	0.6	473
22	Systematic review of water fluoridation. <i>BMJ: British Medical Journal</i> , 2000, 321, 855-859.	2.4	434
23	Interventions for the Treatment and Management of Chronic Fatigue Syndrome. <i>JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association</i> , 2001, 286, 1360.	3.8	433
24	Metandi: Meta-analysis of Diagnostic Accuracy Using Hierarchical Logistic Regression. <i>The Stata Journal</i> , 2009, 9, 211-229.	0.9	341
25	Declaraci3n PRISMA 2020: una gu3a actualizada para la publicaci3n de revisiones sistem3ticas. <i>Revista Espanola De Cardiologia (English Ed )</i> , 2021, 74, 790-799.	0.4	333
26	No role for quality scores in systematic reviews of diagnostic accuracy studies. <i>BMC Medical Research Methodology</i> , 2005, 5, 19.	1.4	275
27	Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis of diagnostic test accuracy studies (PRISMA-DTA): explanation, elaboration, and checklist. <i>BMJ, The</i> , 2020, 370, m2632.	3.0	262
28	Viscoelastic point-of-care testing to assist with the diagnosis, management and monitoring of haemostasis: a systematic review and cost-effectiveness analysis. <i>Health Technology Assessment</i> , 2015, 19, 1-228.	1.3	230
29	A systematic review classifies sources of bias and variation in diagnostic test accuracy studies. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2013, 66, 1093-1104.	2.4	224
30	An empirical comparison of methods for meta-analysis of diagnostic accuracy showed hierarchical models are necessary. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2008, 61, 1095-1103.	2.4	173
31	Systematic Review: Accuracy of Anti3Citrullinated Peptide Antibodies for Diagnosing Rheumatoid Arthritis. <i>Annals of Internal Medicine</i> , 2010, 152, 456.	2.0	160
32	At what times during infection is SARS-CoV-2 detectable and no longer detectable using RT-PCR-based tests? A systematic review of individual participant data. <i>BMC Medicine</i> , 2020, 18, 346.	2.3	144
33	Procalcitonin testing to guide antibiotic therapy for the treatment of sepsis in intensive care settings and for suspected bacterial infection in emergency department settings: a systematic review and cost-effectiveness analysis. <i>Health Technology Assessment</i> , 2015, 19, 1-236.	1.3	114
34	Rapid tests and urine sampling techniques for the diagnosis of urinary tract infection (UTI) in children under five years: a systematic review. <i>BMC Pediatrics</i> , 2005, 5, 4.	0.7	109
35	Digital Education in Health Professions: The Need for Overarching Evidence Synthesis. <i>Journal of Medical Internet Research</i> , 2019, 21, e12913.	2.1	108
36	Developing a reporting guideline for artificial intelligence-centred diagnostic test accuracy studies: the STARD-AI protocol. <i>BMJ Open</i> , 2021, 11, e047709.	0.8	102

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
37	Inclusion of methodological filters in searches for diagnostic test accuracy studies misses relevant studies. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2011, 64, 602-607.	2.4	96
38	QUADAS-C: A Tool for Assessing Risk of Bias in Comparative Diagnostic Accuracy Studies. <i>Annals of Internal Medicine</i> , 2021, 174, 1592-1599.	2.0	88
39	Systematic reviews of test accuracy should search a range of databases to identify primary studies. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2008, 61, 357.e1-357.e10.	2.4	84
40	Speech and Language Therapy Interventions for Children with Cleft Palate: A Systematic Review. <i>Cleft Palate-Craniofacial Journal</i> , 2013, 50, 1-17.	0.5	82
41	How well do health professionals interpret diagnostic information? A systematic review. <i>BMJ Open</i> , 2015, 5, e008155.	0.8	78
42	Can early warning scores identify deteriorating patients in pre-hospital settings? A systematic review. <i>Resuscitation</i> , 2018, 132, 101-111.	1.3	77
43	A quality assessment tool for artificial intelligence-centered diagnostic test accuracy studies: QUADAS-AI. <i>Nature Medicine</i> , 2021, 27, 1663-1665.	15.2	76
44	Search strategies to identify diagnostic accuracy studies in MEDLINE and EMBASE. <i>The Cochrane Library</i> , 2013, 2013, MR000022.	1.5	75
45	Ivacaftor for the treatment of patients with cystic fibrosis and the G551D mutation: a systematic review and cost-effectiveness analysis. <i>Health Technology Assessment</i> , 2014, 18, 1-106.	1.3	74
46	What are the risks and benefits of temporarily discontinuing medications to prevent acute kidney injury? A systematic review and meta-analysis. <i>BMJ Open</i> , 2017, 7, e012674.	0.8	73
47	How does study quality affect the results of a diagnostic meta-analysis?. <i>BMC Medical Research Methodology</i> , 2005, 5, 20.	1.4	72
48	A systematic review finds that diagnostic reviews fail to incorporate quality despite available tools. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2005, 58, 1-12.	2.4	70
49	KRAS mutation testing of tumours in adults with metastatic colorectal cancer: a systematic review and cost-effectiveness analysis. <i>Health Technology Assessment</i> , 2014, 18, 1-132.	1.3	66
50	A review identifies and classifies reasons for ordering diagnostic tests. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2007, 60, 981-989.	2.4	65
51	Symptomatic and quality of life outcomes after treatment for clinically localised prostate cancer: a systematic review. <i>BJU International</i> , 2016, 118, 193-204.	1.3	63
52	Accuracy of magnetic resonance imaging for the diagnosis of multiple sclerosis: systematic review. <i>BMJ: British Medical Journal</i> , 2006, 332, 875-884.	2.4	58
53	The Diagnosis of Urinary Tract infection in Young children (DUTY): a diagnostic prospective observational study to derive and validate a clinical algorithm for the diagnosis of urinary tract infection in children presenting to primary care with an acute illness. <i>Health Technology Assessment</i> , 2016, 20, 1-294.	1.3	56
54	Predictive value of inflammatory markers for cancer diagnosis in primary care: a prospective cohort study using electronic health records. <i>British Journal of Cancer</i> , 2019, 120, 1045-1051.	2.9	55

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
55	A proposed framework for developing quality assessment tools. <i>Systematic Reviews</i> , 2017, 6, 204.	2.5	54
56	Further investigation of confirmed urinary tract infection (UTI) in children under five years: a systematic review. <i>BMC Pediatrics</i> , 2005, 5, 2.	0.7	50
57	Pravila PRISMA 2020.. <i>Medicina Fluminensis</i> , 2021, 57, 444-465.	0.1	50
58	Graphical presentation of diagnostic information. <i>BMC Medical Research Methodology</i> , 2008, 8, 20.	1.4	42
59	Epidermal growth factor receptor tyrosine kinase (EGFR-TK) mutation testing in adults with locally advanced or metastatic non-small cell lung cancer: a systematic review and cost-effectiveness analysis. <i>Health Technology Assessment</i> , 2014, 18, 1-166.	1.3	42
60	Meta-epidemiologic analysis indicates that MEDLINE searches are sufficient for diagnostic test accuracy systematic reviews. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2014, 67, 1192-1199.	2.4	40
61	High-sensitivity troponin assays for the early rule-out or diagnosis of acute myocardial infarction in people with acute chest pain: a systematic review and cost-effectiveness analysis. <i>Health Technology Assessment</i> , 2015, 19, 1-234.	1.3	39
62	Digital Education for Health Professions on Smoking Cessation Management: Systematic Review by the Digital Health Education Collaboration. <i>Journal of Medical Internet Research</i> , 2019, 21, e13000.	2.1	34
63	Digital Health Professions Education in the Field of Pediatrics: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis by the Digital Health Education Collaboration. <i>Journal of Medical Internet Research</i> , 2019, 21, e14231.	2.1	34
64	Distributions of the National Early Warning Score (NEWS) across a healthcare system following a large-scale roll-out. <i>Emergency Medicine Journal</i> , 2019, 36, 287-292.	0.4	30
65	Preferred reporting items for journal and conference abstracts of systematic reviews and meta-analyses of diagnostic test accuracy studies (PRISMA-DTA for Abstracts): checklist, explanation, and elaboration. <i>BMJ, The</i> , 2021, 372, n265.	3.0	30
66	Improving the Diagnosis and Treatment of Urinary Tract Infection in Young Children in Primary Care: Results from the DUTY Prospective Diagnostic Cohort Study. <i>Annals of Family Medicine</i> , 2016, 14, 325-336.	0.9	29
67	Is MRI better than CT for detecting a vascular component to dementia? A systematic review and meta-analysis. <i>BMC Neurology</i> , 2012, 12, 33.	0.8	27
68	Quality of family relationships and outcomes of dementia: a systematic review. <i>BMJ Open</i> , 2018, 8, e015538.	0.8	24
69	Evidence-based diagnosis. <i>Journal of Health Services Research and Policy</i> , 2008, 13, 57-63.	0.8	23
70	Added value and cascade effects of inflammatory marker tests in UK primary care: a cohort study from the Clinical Practice Research Datalink. <i>British Journal of General Practice</i> , 2019, 69, e470-e478.	0.7	23
71	Use of multiple inflammatory marker tests in primary care: using Clinical Practice Research Datalink to evaluate accuracy. <i>British Journal of General Practice</i> , 2019, 69, e462-e469.	0.7	19
72	Association of Down's syndrome and water fluoride level: a systematic review of the evidence. <i>BMC Public Health</i> , 2001, 1, 6.	1.2	16

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
73	How best to diagnose urinary tract infection in preschool children in primary care?. <i>BMJ: British Medical Journal</i> , 2011, 343, d6316-d6316.	2.4	16
74	Systematic review with meta-analysis: the accuracy of serological tests to support the diagnosis of coeliac disease. <i>Alimentary Pharmacology and Therapeutics</i> , 2022, 55, 514-527.	1.9	16
75	Exposure to domestic violence and abuse and consultations for emergency contraception: nested case-control study in a UK primary care dataset. <i>British Journal of General Practice</i> , 2019, 69, e199-e207.	0.7	15
76	QUAPAS: An Adaptation of the QUADAS-2 Tool to Assess Prognostic Accuracy Studies. <i>Annals of Internal Medicine</i> , 2022, 175, 1010-1018.	2.0	15
77	The utility of diagnostic selective nerve root blocks in the management of patients with lumbar radiculopathy: a systematic review. <i>BMJ Open</i> , 2019, 9, e025790.	0.8	14
78	Models to predict relapse in psychosis: A systematic review. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2017, 12, e0183998.	1.1	14
79	How to apply the results of a research paper on diagnosis to your patient. <i>JRSM Short Reports</i> , 2013, 4, 1-9.	0.6	13
80	Guidance was developed on how to write a plain language summary for diagnostic test accuracy reviews. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2018, 103, 112-119.	2.4	13
81	Understanding test accuracy research: a test consequence graphic. <i>Diagnostic and Prognostic Research</i> , 2018, 2, 2.	0.8	11
82	The accuracy of diagnostic indicators for coeliac disease: A systematic review and meta-analysis. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2021, 16, e0258501.	1.1	10
83	The Revised QUADAS-2 Tool. <i>Annals of Internal Medicine</i> , 2012, 156, 323.	2.0	9
84	The risks and benefits of patients temporarily discontinuing medications in the event of an intercurrent illness: a systematic review protocol. <i>Systematic Reviews</i> , 2015, 4, 139.	2.5	9
85	Use of emergency contraception among women with experience of domestic violence and abuse: a systematic review. <i>BMC Women's Health</i> , 2018, 18, 156.	0.8	9
86	Methodological review to develop a list of bias items used to assess reviews incorporating network meta-analysis: protocol and rationale. <i>BMJ Open</i> , 2021, 11, e045987.	0.8	9
87	Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Diagnostic Test Accuracy Studies Evaluating Point-of-Care Tests of Coagulopathy in Cardiac Surgery. <i>Transfusion Medicine Reviews</i> , 2021, 35, 7-15.	0.9	8
88	Interpreting a lateral flow SARS-CoV-2 antigen test. <i>BMJ</i> , The, 2021, 373, n1411.	3.0	8
89	Accuracy of cystatin C for the detection of abnormal renal function in children undergoing chemotherapy for malignancy: a systematic review using individual patient data. <i>Supportive Care in Cancer</i> , 2017, 26, 1635-1644.	1.0	7
90	Can non-pharmacological interventions reduce hospital admissions in people with dementia? A systematic review. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2019, 14, e0223717.	1.1	7

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
91	Presentation of Diagnostic Information to Doctors May Change Their Interpretation and Clinical Management: A Web-Based Randomised Controlled Trial. PLoS ONE, 2015, 10, e0128637.	1.1	7
92	Nappy pad urine samples for investigation and treatment of UTI in young children: the "DUTY"™ prospective diagnostic cohort study. British Journal of General Practice, 2016, 66, e516-e524.	0.7	6
93	Predictive values of referrals for transient ischaemic attack from first-contact health care: a systematic review. British Journal of General Practice, 2017, 67, e871-e880.	0.7	6
94	Comparison of microbiological diagnosis of urinary tract infection in young children by routine health service laboratories and a research laboratory: Diagnostic cohort study. PLoS ONE, 2017, 12, e0171113.	1.1	6
95	Risk of bias assessment of test comparisons was uncommon in comparative accuracy systematic reviews: an overview of reviews. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 2020, 127, 167-174.	2.4	6
96	Accuracy of potential diagnostic indicators for coeliac disease: a systematic review protocol. BMJ Open, 2020, 10, e038994.	0.8	5
97	Using qualitative research to inform development of a diagnostic algorithm for UTI in children. Family Practice, 2013, 30, 325-331.	0.8	4
98	Development and external validation of a clinical prediction model to aid coeliac disease diagnosis in primary care: An observational study. EClinicalMedicine, 2022, 46, 101376.	3.2	4
99	The rationale for rating risk of bias should be fully reported: response. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 2016, 76, 239.	2.4	3
100	Applicability of diagnostic studies " statistics, bias and estimates of diagnostic accuracy. Zeitschrift Fur Evidenz, Fortbildung Und Qualitat Im Gesundheitswesen, 2011, 105, 498-503.	0.7	2
101	Quality of relationships as predictors of outcomes in people with dementia: a systematic review protocol. BMJ Open, 2016, 6, e010835.	0.8	2
102	Medical Use of Cannabinoids"Reply. JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association, 2015, 314, 1751.	3.8	1
103	Response to commentary: dealing with heterogeneity in meta-analyses of diagnostic test accuracy. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 2008, 61, 1083-1084.	2.4	0
104	Evidence-Based Assessment of PET in Germany. Journal of Nuclear Medicine, 2012, 53, 1166.2-1167.	2.8	0
105	Inclusion of methodological filters in searches for diagnostic test accuracy studies misses relevant studies - Reply. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 2012, 65, 117-118.	2.4	0
106	Agreement was moderate between data-based and opinion-based assessments of biases affecting randomized trials within meta-analyses. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 2020, 125, 16-25.	2.4	0
107	Title is missing!. , 2019, 14, e0223717.		0
108	Title is missing!. , 2019, 14, e0223717.		0

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
109	Title is missing!. , 2019, 14, e0223717.		0
110	Title is missing!. , 2019, 14, e0223717.		0