Mandy Ryan

List of Publications by Year
in descending order

119 papers	7,990 citations	76326 40 h-index	56724 83 g-index
125 all docs	125 docs citations	125 times ranked	6674 citing authors

#	Article	IF	Citations
1	Continuing the sequence? Towards an economic evaluation of whole genome sequencing for the diagnosis of rare diseases in Scotland. Journal of Community Genetics, 2022, 13, 487-501.	1.2	5
2	Won't you stay just a little bit longer? A discrete choice experiment of UK doctorsâ€™ preferences for delaying retirement. Health Policy, 2022, 126, 60-68.	3.0	2
3	Will the Public Engage with New Pharmacy Roles? Assessing Future Uptake of a Community Pharmacy Health Check Using a Discrete Choice Experiment. Patient, 2022, 15, 473-483.	2.7	4
4	Public acceptability of non-pharmaceutical interventions to control a pandemic in the UK: a discrete choice experiment. BMJ Open, 2022, 12, e054155.	1.9	4
5	Weighting or aggregating? Investigating information processing in multiâ€attribute choices. Health Economics (United Kingdom), 2021, 30, 1291-1305.	1.7	2
6	To pay or not to pay? Cost information processing in the valuation of publicly funded healthcare. Social Science and Medicine, 2021, 276, 113822.	3.8	3
7	Paid work, household work, or leisure? Time allocation pathways among women following a cancer diagnosis. Social Science and Medicine, 2020, 246, 112776.	3.8	3
8	Survey modes comparison in contingent valuation: Internet panels and mail surveys. Health Economics (United Kingdom), 2020, 29, 234-242.	1.7	7
9	Understanding public preferences and trade-offs for government responses during a pandemic: a protocol for a discrete choice experiment in the UK. BMJ Open, 2020, 10, e043477.	1.9	14
10	Mode and Frame Matter: Assessing the Impact of Survey Mode and Sample Frame in Choice Experiments. Medical Decision Making, 2019, 39, 827-841.	2.4	8
11	Testing the Expert Based Weights Used in the UKâ€™s Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) Against Three Preference-Based Methods. Social Indicators Research, 2019, 144, 1055-1074.	2.7	9
12	For more than money: willingness of health professionals to stay in remote Senegal. Human Resources for Health, 2019, 17, 28.	3.1	11
13	For better or worse? Investigating the validity of bestâ€“worst discrete choice experiments in health. Health Economics (United Kingdom), 2019, 28, 572-586.	1.7	12
14	U.K. Intensivistsâ€™ Preferences for Patient Admission to ICU: Evidence From a Choice Experiment. Critical Care Medicine, 2019, 47, 1522-1530.	0.9	23
15	Developing an intervention around referral and admissions to intensive care: a mixed-methods study. Health Services and Delivery Research, 2019, 7, 1-284.	1.4	12
16	The eyes have it: Using eye tracking to inform information processing strategies in multiâ€attributes choices. Health Economics (United Kingdom), 2018, 27, 709-721.	1.7	41
17	Decision heuristic or preference? Attribute non-attendance in discrete choice problems. Health Economics (United Kingdom), 2018, 27, 157-171.	1.7	34
18	The Best of Both Worlds: An Example Mixed Methods Approach to Understand Menâ€™s Preferences for the Treatment of Lower Urinary Tract Symptoms. Patient, 2018, 11, 55-67.	2.7	16

#	Article	IF	Citations
19	Contemporary Guidance for Stated Preference Studies. Journal of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists, 2017, 4, 319-405.	1.5	718
20	Visual attention in multi-attributes choices: What can eye-tracking tell us?. Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization, 2017, 135, 251-267.	2.0	50
21	Is Bestâ€“Worst Scaling Suitable for Health State Valuation? A Comparison with Discrete Choice Experiments. Health Economics (United Kingdom), 2017, 26, e1-e16.	1.7	33
22	The value of different aspects of person-centred care: a series of discrete choice experiments in people with long-term conditions. BMJ Open, 2017, 7, e015689.	1.9	36
23	External Validity of Contingent Valuation: Comparing Hypothetical and Actual Payments. Health Economics (United Kingdom), 2017, 26, 1467-1473.	1.7	10
24	Discrete Choice Experiments. , 2017, , 121-133.		9
25	Men’s preferences for the treatment of lower urinary tract symptoms associated with benign prostatic hyperplasia: a discrete choice experiment. Patient Preference and Adherence, 2016, Volume 10, 2407-2417.	1.8	9
26	What, who and when? Incorporating a discrete choice experiment into an economic evaluation. Health Economics Review, 2016, 6, 31.	2.0	24
27	Eliciting preferences for social health insurance in Ethiopia: a discrete choice experiment. Health Policy and Planning, 2016, 31, 1423-1432.	2.7	32
28	Determining cancer survivors' preferences to inform new models of follow-up care. British Journal of Cancer, 2016, 115, 1495-1503.	6.4	39
29	Managing Minor Ailments; The Publicâ€™s Preferences for Attributes of Community Pharmacies. A Discrete Choice Experiment. PLoS ONE, 2016, 11, e0152257.	2.5	40
30	Exploring preferences for symptom management in primary care: a discrete choice experiment using a questionnaire survey. British Journal of General Practice, 2015, 65, e478-e488.	1.4	8
31	Gaining pounds by losing pounds: preferences for lifestyle interventions to reduce obesity. Health Economics, Policy and Law, 2015, 10, 161-182.	1.8	18
32	Improving the public health sector in South Africa: eliciting public preferences using a discrete choice experiment. Health Policy and Planning, 2015, 30, 600-611.	2.7	36
33	Specification of the Utility Function in Discrete Choice Experiments. Value in Health, 2014, 17, 297-301.	0.3	33
34	Modelling Heterogeneity and Uncertainty in Contingent Valuation: an Application to the Valuation of Informal Care. Scottish Journal of Political Economy, 2014, 61, 1-25.	1.6	5
35	Valuing patients' experiences of healthcare processes: Towards broader applications of existing methods. Social Science and Medicine, 2014, 106, 194-203.	3.8	35
36	Inclusiveness in the health economic evaluation space. Social Science and Medicine, 2014, 108, 248-251.	3.8	7

#	Article	IF	Citations
37	Valuing Benefits to Inform a Clinical Trial in Pharmacy. Pharmacoeconomics, 2013, 31, 163-171.	3.3	8
38	Rural Clinician Scarcity and Job Preferences of Doctors and Nurses in India: A Discrete Choice Experiment. PLoS ONE, 2013, 8, e82984.	2.5	39
39	Involving the public in priority setting: a case study using discrete choice experiments. Journal of Public Health, 2012, 34, 253-260.	1.8	29
40	Which Experiences of Health Care Delivery Matter to Service Users and Why? A Critical Interpretive Synthesis and Conceptual Map. Journal of Health Services Research and Policy, 2012, 17, 70-78.	1.7	112
41	Discrete choice experiments in health economics: a review of the literature. Health Economics (United) Tj ETQq1 1 0.784314 rgBT /Over	1.7	924
42	Preferences for Managing Symptoms of Differing Severity: A Discrete Choice Experiment. Value in Health, 2012, 15, 1069-1076.	0.3	16
43	Managing poorly performing clinicians: Health care providersâ€™ willingness to pay for independent help. Health Policy, 2012, 104, 260-271.	3.0	3
44	Valuing Informal Care Experience: Does Choice of Measure Matter?. Social Indicators Research, 2012, 108, 169-184.	2.7	12
45	Deriving distributional weights for QALYs through discrete choice experiments. Journal of Health Economics, 2011, 30, 466-478.	2.7	91
46	Using discrete choice experiments to evaluate alternative electronic prescribing systems. International Journal of Pharmacy Practice, 2011, 10, 191-200.	0.6	9
47	Using discrete choice experiments to value informal care tasks: exploring preference heterogeneity. Health Economics (United Kingdom), 2011, 20, 930-944.	1.7	54
48	Using discrete choice experiments to inform randomised controlled trials: an application to chronic low back pain management in primary care. European Journal of Pain, 2011, 15, 531.e1-10.	2.8	18
49	Patients' preferences for an increased pharmacist role in the management of drug therapy. International Journal of Pharmacy Practice, 2010, 17, 275-282.	0.6	40
50	Does One Size Fit All? Investigating Heterogeneity in Menâ€™s Preferences for Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia Treatment Using Mixed Logit Analysis. Medical Decision Making, 2009, 29, 707-715.	2.4	27
51	Comparing welfare estimates from payment card contingent valuation and discrete choice experiments. Health Economics (United Kingdom), 2009, 18, 389-401.	1.7	121
52	Rationalising the â€˜irrationalâ€™: a think aloud study of discrete choice experiment responses. Health Economics (United Kingdom), 2009, 18, 321-336.	1.7	163
53	Who cares and how much: exploring the determinants of co-residential informal care. Review of Economics of the Household, 2009, 7, 283-303.	4.2	59
54	Bayesian and classical estimation of mixed logit: An application to genetic testing. Journal of Health Economics, 2009, 28, 598-610.	2.7	61

#	Article	IF	Citations
55	Discrete Choice Experiments in a Nutshell. The Economics of Non-market Goods and Resources, 2008, , 13-46.	1.2	53
56	Practical Issues in Conducting a Discrete Choice Experiment. The Economics of Non-market Goods and Resources, 2008, , 73-97.	1.2	25
57	â€œIrrationalâ€•Stated Preferences: A quantitative and qualitative investigation. The Economics of Non-market Goods and Resources, 2008, , 195-215.	1.2	0
58	Developing a Preference-Based Glaucoma Utility Index Using a Discrete Choice Experiment. Optometry and Vision Science, 2007, 84, E797-E809.	1.2	102
59	Exploring preference anomalies in double bounded contingent valuation. Journal of Health Economics, 2007, 26, 463-482.	2.7	51
60	Treatment of minor illness in primary care: a national survey of patient satisfaction, attitudes and preferences regarding a wider nursing role. Health Expectations, 2007, 10, 30-45.	2.6	51
61	Using discrete choice experiments to estimate a preference-based measure of outcomeâ€”An application to social care for older people. Journal of Health Economics, 2006, 25, 927-944.	2.7	138
62	Women's preferences for cervical cancer screening: A study using a discrete choice experiment. International Journal of Technology Assessment in Health Care, 2006, 22, 344-350.	0.5	35
63	Counting the cost of fast access: using discrete choice experiments to elicit preferences in general practice. British Journal of General Practice, 2006, 56, 4-5.	1.4	5
64	Preferences for self-care or professional advice for minor illness: a discrete choice experiment. British Journal of General Practice, 2006, 56, 911-7.	1.4	57
65	Using discrete choice experiments to go beyond clinical outcomes when evaluating clinical practice. Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice, 2005, 11, 328-338.	1.8	40
66	?Irrational? stated preferences: a quantitative and qualitative investigation. Health Economics (United) Tj ETQq0 0 0 rgBT /Overlock 10 T	1.7	92
67	â€˜Threatsâ€™ to and hopes for estimating benefits. Health Economics (United Kingdom), 2005, 14, 609-619.	1.7	22
68	Economic valuation of policies for managing acidity in remote mountain lakes: Examining validity through scope sensitivity testing. Aquatic Sciences, 2005, 67, 274-291.	1.5	50
69	Rapid prenatal diagnostic testing for Down syndrome only or longer wait for full karyotype: the views of pregnant women. Prenatal Diagnosis, 2005, 25, 1206-1211.	2.3	43
70	Economic valuation of policies for managing acidity in remote mountain lakes: Examining validity through scope sensitivity testing. Aquatic Sciences, 2005, 67, 274-291.	1.5	6
71	Discrete choice experiments in health care. BMJ: British Medical Journal, 2004, 328, 360-361.	2.3	315
72	Are women's expectations and preferences for intrapartum care affected by the model of care on offer?. BJOG: an International Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, 2004, 111, 550-560.	2.3	44

#	Article	IF	Citations
73	Valuing the Benefits of Weight Loss Programs: An Application of the Discrete Choice Experiment. Obesity, 2004, 12, 1342-1351.	4.0	42
74	A comparison of stated preference methods for estimating monetary values. Health Economics (United) Tj ETQq0 0 0 rgBT /Overlock 10	1.7	53
75	Modelling non-demanders in choice experiments. Health Economics (United Kingdom), 2004, 13, 397-402.	1.7	96
76	Deriving welfare measures in discrete choice experiments: a comment to Lancsar and Savage(1). Health Economics (United Kingdom), 2004, 13, 909-912.	1.7	40
77	Valuing health care using willingness to pay: a comparison of the payment card and dichotomous choice methods. Journal of Health Economics, 2004, 23, 237-258.	2.7	142
78	Revisiting the axiom of completeness in health care. Health Economics (United Kingdom), 2003, 12, 295-307.	1.7	36
79	Estimating the monetary value of health care: lessons from environmental economics. Health Economics (United Kingdom), 2003, 12, 3-16.	1.7	123
80	Evidenceâ€based consumer choice: a case study in colorectal cancer screening. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health, 2003, 27, 449-455.	1.8	46
81	Testing for an experience endowment effect in health care. Applied Economics Letters, 2003, 10, 407-410.	1.8	24
82	Methodological issues in the monetary valuation of benefits in healthcare. Expert Review of Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research, 2003, 3, 717-727.	1.4	27
83	Using discrete choice experiments to value health care programmes: current practice and future research reflections. Applied Health Economics and Health Policy, 2003, 2, 55-64.	2.1	411
84	Establishing patient preferences for gastroenterology clinic reorganization using conjoint analysis. European Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, 2002, 14, 429-433.	1.6	27
85	Are preferences stable? The case of health care. Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization, 2002, 48, 1-14.	2.0	50
86	Testing the assumptions of rationality, continuity and symmetry when applying discrete choice experiments in health care. Applied Economics Letters, 2001, 8, 59-63.	1.8	50
87	Do obstetric complications explain high caesarean section rates among women over 30? A retrospective analysis. BMJ: British Medical Journal, 2001, 322, 894-895.	2.3	61
88	Costs and benefits of cervical screening IV: valuation by women of the cervical screening programme. Cytopathology, 2001, 12, 367-376.	0.7	16
89	Assessing Women's Preferences for Intrapartum Care. Birth, 2001, 28, 254-263.	2.2	87
90	Testing for consistency in willingness to pay experiments. Journal of Economic Psychology, 2000, 21, 305-317.	2.2	34

#	Article	IF	Citations
91	Sensitivity of Willingness to Pay Estimates to the Level of Attributes in Discrete Choice Experiments. Scottish Journal of Political Economy, 2000, 47, 504-524.	1.6	77
92	The use of conjoint analysis to elicit community preferences in public health research: a case study of hospital services in South Australia. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health, 2000, 24, 64-70.	1.8	56
93	Using discrete choice modelling in priority setting: an application to clinical service developments. Social Science and Medicine, 2000, 50, 63-75.	3.8	102
94	Using conjoint analysis to elicit preferences for health care. BMJ: British Medical Journal, 2000, 320, 1530-1533.	2.3	748
95	Applying conjoint analysis in economic evaluations: an application to menorrhagia. Applied Economics, 2000, 32, 823-833.	2.2	52
96	A ROLE FOR CONJOINT ANALYSIS IN TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT IN HEALTH CARE?. International Journal of Technology Assessment in Health Care, 1999, 15, 443-457.	0.5	69
97	Using conjoint analysis to take account of patient preferences and go beyond health outcomes: an application to in vitro fertilisation. Social Science and Medicine, 1999, 48, 535-546.	3.8	297
98	Response-ordering effects: a methodological issue in conjoint analysis. , 1999, 8, 75-79.		44
99	Recent Advances in the Methods of Cost-Benefit Analysis in Healthcare. Pharmacoeconomics, 1999, 15, 357-367.	3.3	79
100	New Labour, New Charges? Will Charges Curb Costs and Raise more Revenue for the NHS?. Public Policy Research, 1998, 5, 196-201.	0.2	0
101	Methodological issues in the application of conjoint analysis in health care. , 1998, 7, 373-378.		118
102	Using conjoint analysis to elicit the views of health service users: an application to the patient health card. Health Expectations, 1998, 1, 117-129.	2.6	48
103	Valuing psychological factors in the provision of assisted reproductive techniques using the economic instrument of willingness to pay. Journal of Economic Psychology, 1998, 19, 179-204.	2.2	29
104	Should government fund assisted reproductive techniques? A study using willingness to pay. Applied Economics, 1997, 29, 841-849.	2.2	29
105	The Cost of Medicines in the United Kingdom. Pharmacoeconomics, 1997, 11, 56-63.	3.3	12
106	Using willingness to pay to value alternative models of antenatal care. Social Science and Medicine, 1997, 44, 371-380.	3.8	73
107	Using Conjoint Analysis to Assess Women's Preferences for Miscarriage Management. , 1997, 6, 261-273.		263
108	Using Conjoint Analysis to Assess Women's Preferences for Miscarriage Management. Health Economics (United Kingdom), 1997, 6, 261-273.	1.7	5

#	Article	IF	Citations
109	Do Physicians?? Perceptions of Drug Costs Influence Their Prescribing?. Pharmacoeconomics, 1996, 9, 321-331.	3.3	24
110	Using willingness to pay to assess the benefits of assisted reproductive techniques. , 1996, 5, 543-558.		50
111	Assessing the costs of assisted reproductive techniques. BJOG: an International Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, 1996, 103, 198-201.	2.3	12
112	Using conjoint analysis to establish consumer preferences for fruit and vegetables. British Food Journal, 1996, 98, 5-12.	2.9	75
113	Divided views among health professionals on place of birth. British Journal of Midwifery, 1995, 3, 583-586.	0.4	2
114	A preliminary analysis of variations in hospital discharge rates in Scotland. Public Money and Management, 1994, 14, 45-49.	2.1	21
115	Dispensing Physicians and Prescribing Pharmacists. Pharmacoeconomics, 1994, 5, 8-17.	3.3	19
116	Agency in Health Care: Lessons for Economists from Sociologists. American Journal of Economics and Sociology, 1994, 53, 207-217.	0.8	33
117	The way to economic prescribing. Public Money and Management, 1990, 10, 55-59.	2.1	0
118	Using Discrete Choice Experiments in Health Economics: Moving Forward. , 0, , 25-40.		7
119	Managing Poorly Performing Clinicians: The Value of Independent Help. SSRN Electronic Journal, 0, , .	0.4	0