Leonard Pieter Bokhorst

List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: https://exaly.com/author-pdf/7733618/publications.pdf Version: 2024-02-01



#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
1	A Decade of Active Surveillance in the PRIAS Study: An Update and Evaluation of the Criteria Used to Recommend a Switch to Active Treatment. European Urology, 2016, 70, 954-960.	1.9	290
2	Magnetic Resonance Imaging in Active Surveillance of Prostate Cancer: A Systematic Review. European Urology, 2015, 67, 627-636.	1.9	284
3	Active surveillance for prostate cancer: a narrative review of clinical guidelines. Nature Reviews Urology, 2016, 13, 151-167.	3.8	139
4	Compliance Rates with the Prostate Cancer Research International Active Surveillance (PRIAS) Protocol and Disease Reclassification in Noncompliers. European Urology, 2015, 68, 814-821.	1.9	116
5	Prostate-specific Antigen–Based Prostate Cancer Screening: Reduction of Prostate Cancer Mortality After Correction for Nonattendance and Contamination in the Rotterdam Section of the European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer. European Urology, 2014, 65, 329-336.	1.9	72
6	Riskâ€stratification based on magnetic resonance imaging and prostateâ€specific antigen density may reduce unnecessary followâ€up biopsy procedures in men on active surveillance for lowâ€risk prostate cancer. BJU International, 2017, 120, 511-519.	2.5	67
7	Risk-based Patient Selection for Magnetic Resonance Imaging-targeted Prostate Biopsy after Negative Transrectal Ultrasound-guided Random Biopsy Avoids Unnecessary Magnetic Resonance Imaging Scans. European Urology, 2016, 69, 1129-1134.	1.9	54
8	Complications after prostate biopsies in men on active surveillance and its effects on receiving further biopsies in the Prostate cancer Research International: Active Surveillance (PRIAS) study. BJU International, 2016, 118, 366-371.	2.5	51
9	Positive predictive value of prostate biopsy indicated by prostateâ€specificâ€antigenâ€based prostate cancer screening: trends over time in a European randomized trial*. BJU International, 2012, 110, 1654-1660.	2.5	36
10	Long-term follow-up after active surveillance or curative treatment: quality-of-life outcomes of men with low-risk prostate cancer. Quality of Life Research, 2017, 26, 1635-1645.	3.1	24
11	Characteristics of Prostate Cancer Found at Fifth Screening in the European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer Rotterdam: Can We Selectively Detect High-grade Prostate Cancer with Upfront Multivariable Risk Stratification and Magnetic Resonance Imaging?. European Urology, 2018, 73, 343-350.	1.9	19
12	Differences in Treatment and Outcome After Treatment with Curative Intent in the Screening and Control Arms of the ERSPC Rotterdam. European Urology, 2015, 68, 179-182.	1.9	14
13	Rule-based versus probabilistic selection for active surveillance using three definitions of insignificant prostate cancer. World Journal of Urology, 2016, 34, 253-260.	2.2	11
14	Correlation between stage shift and differences in mortality in the European Randomised study of Screening for Prostate Cancer (ERSPC). BJU International, 2016, 118, 677-680.	2.5	9
15	The ProtecT trial: what can we expect?. Lancet Oncology, The, 2014, 15, 1046-1047.	10.7	5
16	Ethnicity and prostate cancer: the way to solve the screening problem?. BMC Medicine, 2015, 13, 179.	5.5	5
17	Effect of pathologic revision and Ki67 and ERG immunohistochemistry on predicting radical prostatectomy outcome in men initially on active surveillance. Prostate, 2017, 77, 1137-1143.	2.3	5
18	Biopsy undergrading in men with Gleason scoreÂ6 and fatal prostate cancer in the European Randomized study of Screening for Prostate Cancer Rotterdam. International Journal of Urology, 2017, 24, 281-286.	1.0	4

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
19	Reply from Authors re: Michael Baum. Screening for Prostate Cancer: Can We Learn from the Mistakes of the Breast Screening Experience? Eur Urol 2013;64:540–1. European Urology, 2013, 64, 541-543.	1.9	3