

Brenda J Wilson

List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: <https://exaly.com/author-pdf/8208050/publications.pdf>

Version: 2024-02-01

37
papers

609
citations

623188

14
h-index

642321

23
g-index

38
all docs

38
docs citations

38
times ranked

1076
citing authors

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
1	Systematic review: family history in risk assessment for common diseases. <i>Annals of Internal Medicine</i> , 2009, 151, 878-85.	2.0	67
2	Analyzing communication in genetic consultationsâ€”A systematic review. <i>Patient Education and Counseling</i> , 2015, 98, 15-33.	1.0	42
3	Public views on participating in newborn screening using genome sequencing. <i>European Journal of Human Genetics</i> , 2014, 22, 1248-1254.	1.4	39
4	Experiences of caregivers of children with inherited metabolic diseases: a qualitative study. <i>Orphanet Journal of Rare Diseases</i> , 2016, 11, 168.	1.2	38
5	The health system impact of false positive newborn screening results for medium-chain acyl-CoA dehydrogenase deficiency: a cohort study. <i>Orphanet Journal of Rare Diseases</i> , 2016, 11, 12.	1.2	38
6	Decision aids that support decisions about prenatal testing for Down syndrome: an environmental scan. <i>BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making</i> , 2015, 15, 76.	1.5	29
7	Consent for newborn screening: parentsâ€™ and health-care professionalsâ€™ experiences of consent in practice. <i>European Journal of Human Genetics</i> , 2016, 24, 1530-1534.	1.4	29
8	Health literacy in pregnant women facing prenatal screening may explain their intention to use a patient decision aid: a short report. <i>BMC Research Notes</i> , 2016, 9, 339.	0.6	26
9	Child and family experiences with inborn errors of metabolism: a qualitative interview study with representatives of patient groups. <i>Journal of Inherited Metabolic Disease</i> , 2016, 39, 139-147.	1.7	26
10	Use of a patient decision aid for prenatal screening for Down syndrome: what do pregnant women say?. <i>BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth</i> , 2017, 17, 90.	0.9	24
11	Role of Psychosocial Factors and Health Literacy in Pregnant Womenâ€™s Intention to Use a Decision Aid for Down Syndrome Screening: A Theory-Based Web Survey. <i>Journal of Medical Internet Research</i> , 2016, 18, e283.	2.1	21
12	Benefits and burdens of newborn screening: public understanding and decision-making. <i>Personalized Medicine</i> , 2014, 11, 593-607.	0.8	17
13	Australiansâ€™ perspectives on support around use of personal genomic testing: Findings from the Genioz study. <i>European Journal of Medical Genetics</i> , 2019, 62, 290-299.	0.7	17
14	Controversy and debate on clinical genomics sequencingâ€”paper 1: genomics is not exceptional: rigorous evaluations are necessary for clinical applications of genomic sequencing. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2017, 92, 4-6.	2.4	16
15	Australiansâ€™ views on personal genomic testing: focus group findings from the Genioz study. <i>European Journal of Human Genetics</i> , 2018, 26, 1101-1112.	1.4	14
16	Australiansâ€™ views and experience of personal genomic testing: survey findings from the Genioz study. <i>European Journal of Human Genetics</i> , 2019, 27, 711-720.	1.4	14
17	Attitudes to incorporating genomic risk assessments into population screening programs: the importance of purpose, context and deliberation. <i>BMC Medical Genomics</i> , 2016, 9, 25.	0.7	12
18	What factors influence health professionals to use decision aids for Down syndrome prenatal screening?. <i>BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth</i> , 2016, 16, 262.	0.9	12

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
19	Using Newborn Screening Bloodspots for Research: Public Preferences for Policy Options. <i>Pediatrics</i> , 2016, 137, .	1.0	11
20	Multigene panels in prostate cancer risk assessment: a systematic review. <i>Genetics in Medicine</i> , 2016, 18, 535-544.	1.1	11
21	Psychosocial Factors of Health Professionals' Intention to Use a Decision Aid for Down Syndrome Screening: Cross-Sectional Quantitative Study. <i>Journal of Medical Internet Research</i> , 2018, 20, e114.	2.1	11
22	Screening for impaired vision in community-dwelling adults aged 65 years and older in primary care settings. <i>Cmaj</i> , 2018, 190, E588-E594.	0.9	10
23	Fall prevention interventions for older community-dwelling adults: systematic reviews on benefits, harms, and patient values and preferences. <i>Systematic Reviews</i> , 2021, 10, 18.	2.5	10
24	Cultural differences in family communication about inherited cancer: implications for cancer genetics research. <i>Journal of Cultural Diversity</i> , 2013, 20, 195-201.	0.6	10
25	Supporting genetics in primary care: investigating how theory can inform professional education. <i>European Journal of Human Genetics</i> , 2016, 24, 1541-1546.	1.4	9
26	Pregnant women's views on how to promote the use of a decision aid for Down syndrome prenatal screening: a theory-informed qualitative study. <i>BMC Health Services Research</i> , 2018, 18, 434.	0.9	9
27	Implementation science as a leadership capability to improve patient outcomes and value in healthcare. <i>Healthcare Management Forum</i> , 2019, 32, 307-312.	0.6	9
28	Bringing personalized medicine to the community through public engagement. <i>Personalized Medicine</i> , 2013, 10, 647-659.	0.8	7
29	Screening for chlamydia and/or gonorrhea in primary health care: protocol for systematic review. <i>Systematic Reviews</i> , 2018, 7, 248.	2.5	7
30	The Challenge of Developing Evidence-Based Genetics Health Care in Practice. <i>Familial Cancer</i> , 2006, 5, 55-59.	0.9	5
31	A blueprint for the next generation of ELSI research, training, and outreach in regenerative medicine. <i>Npj Regenerative Medicine</i> , 2017, 2, 21.	2.5	5
32	Does breast cancer genetic counselling meet women's expectations? A qualitative study. <i>Critical Public Health</i> , 2006, 16, 281-293.	1.4	4
33	Anticipating the primary care role in genomic medicine: expectations of genetics health professionals. <i>Journal of Community Genetics</i> , 2021, 12, 559-568.	0.5	4
34	Is genetic makeup a perceived health risk: analysis of a national survey of Canadians. <i>Journal of Risk Research</i> , 2009, 12, 223-237.	1.4	3
35	What is in a Name? Parent, Professional and Policy-Maker Conceptions of Consent-Related Language in the Context of Newborn Screening. <i>Public Health Ethics</i> , 2019, 12, 158-175.	0.4	2
36	Implementation of an ED surge management platform: a study protocol. <i>Implementation Science Communications</i> , 2022, 3, 21.	0.8	1

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
37	Controversy and debate on clinical genomics sequencingâ€”paper 3: response to â€œclinical genome-wide sequencing: do not throw out the baby with the bathwaterâ€. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 2017, 92, 11-12.	2.4	0