

Stuart G Baker

List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: <https://exaly.com/author-pdf/841841/publications.pdf>

Version: 2024-02-01

99
papers

2,661
citations

201674

27
h-index

206112

48
g-index

103
all docs

103
docs citations

103
times ranked

2541
citing authors

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
1	Breast cancer overdiagnosis in stop-screen trials: More uncertainty than previously reported. <i>Journal of Medical Screening</i> , 2021, 28, 185-192.	2.3	4
2	The case for a cancer paradox initiative. <i>Carcinogenesis</i> , 2021, 42, 1023-1025.	2.8	7
3	Metrics for Evaluating Polygenic Risk Scores. <i>JNCI Cancer Spectrum</i> , 2021, 5, .	2.9	5
4	Modeling the mean time to interval cancer after negative results of periodic cancer screening. <i>Statistics in Medicine</i> , 2021, 40, 1429-1439.	1.6	0
5	Simple Methods for Evaluating 4 Types of Biomarkers: Surrogate Endpoint, Prognostic, Predictive, and Cancer Screening. <i>Biomarker Insights</i> , 2020, 15, 117727192094671.	2.5	5
6	CACE and meta-analysis (Letter to the Editor). <i>Biometrics</i> , 2020, 76, 1383-1384.	1.4	2
7	Rethinking carcinogenesis: The detached pericyte hypothesis. <i>Medical Hypotheses</i> , 2020, 144, 110056.	1.5	4
8	Maximum likelihood estimation with missing outcomes: From simplicity to complexity. <i>Statistics in Medicine</i> , 2019, 38, 4453-4474.	1.6	6
9	Decision Curves and Relative Utility Curves. <i>Medical Decision Making</i> , 2019, 39, 489-490.	2.4	4
10	Cancer Screening Markers: A Simple Strategy to Substantially Reduce the Sample Size for Validation. <i>Medical Decision Making</i> , 2019, 39, 130-136.	2.4	2
11	Simple Decision-Analytic Functions of the AUC for Ruling Out a Risk Prediction Model and an Added Predictor. <i>Medical Decision Making</i> , 2018, 38, 225-234.	2.4	5
12	Five criteria for using a surrogate endpoint to predict treatment effect based on data from multiple previous trials. <i>Statistics in Medicine</i> , 2018, 37, 507-518.	1.6	9
13	Surrogate Endpoint. , 2018, , 1-5.		0
14	Instrumental variable meta-analysis Comment on: Adjustment for compliance behavior in trials of epidural analgesia in labor using instrumental variable meta-analysis. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2017, 91, 146-147.	5.0	1
15	The summary test tradeoff: a new measure of the value of an additional risk prediction marker. <i>Statistics in Medicine</i> , 2017, 36, 4491-4494.	1.6	8
16	The Latent Class Twin Method. <i>Biometrics</i> , 2016, 72, 827-834.	1.4	2
17	Latent class instrumental variables: a clinical and biostatistical perspective. <i>Statistics in Medicine</i> , 2016, 35, 147-160.	1.6	25
18	Evaluating Markers for Guiding Treatment. <i>Journal of the National Cancer Institute</i> , 2016, 108, djw101.	6.3	7

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
19	Evaluating surrogate endpoints, prognostic markers, and predictive markers: Some simple themes. <i>Clinical Trials</i> , 2015, 12, 299-308.	1.6	14
20	Response. <i>Journal of the National Cancer Institute</i> , 2015, 107, djv061-djv061.	6.3	1
21	RE: Combined Associations of Genetic and Environmental Risk Factors: Implications for Prevention of Breast Cancer. <i>Journal of the National Cancer Institute</i> , 2015, 107, djv127-djv127.	6.3	1
22	Evaluating Prognostic Markers Using Relative Utility Curves and Test Tradeoffs. <i>Journal of Clinical Oncology</i> , 2015, 33, 2578-2580.	1.6	9
23	A Cancer Theory Kerfuffle Can Lead to New Lines of Research. <i>Journal of the National Cancer Institute</i> , 2014, 107, dju405-dju405.	6.3	66
24	The Randomized Registry Trial. <i>New England Journal of Medicine</i> , 2014, 370, 681-682.	27.0	17
25	How to interpret a small increase in AUC with an additional risk prediction marker: decision analysis comes through. <i>Statistics in Medicine</i> , 2014, 33, 3946-3959.	1.6	53
26	Instrumental variable methods for causal inference: early work and recent developments. <i>Statistics in Medicine</i> , 2014, 33, 3058-3059.	1.6	1
27	Lead Time and Overdiagnosis. <i>Journal of the National Cancer Institute</i> , 2014, 106, dju346-dju346.	6.3	23
28	Comparative Analysis of Biologically Relevant Response Curves in Gene Expression Experiments: Heteromorphy, Heterochrony, and Heterometry. <i>Microarrays (Basel, Switzerland)</i> , 2014, 3, 39-51.	1.4	0
29	Biomarker evaluation in randomized trials: addressing different research questions. <i>Statistics in Medicine</i> , 2014, 33, 4139-4140.	1.6	6
30	A latent class method for diagnostic tests: the new, reference, gold standard problem. <i>Statistics in Medicine</i> , 2014, 33, 4320-4320.	1.6	1
31	Erratum to Revisiting a Discrepant Result: A Propensity Score Analysis, the Paired Availability Design for Historical Controls, and a Meta-Analysis of Randomized Trials [J Causal Inference DOI:]. <i>Journal of Causal Inference</i> , 2014, 2, 113.	1.2	0
32	Recognizing Paradigm Instability in Theories of Carcinogenesis. <i>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</i> , 2014, 4, 1149-1163.	0.2	19
33	The Risky Reliance on Small Surrogate End Point Studies When Planning a Large Prevention Trial. <i>Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society</i> , 2013, 176, 603-608.	1.1	8
34	Causal inference, probability theory, and graphical insights. <i>Statistics in Medicine</i> , 2013, 32, 4319-4330.	1.6	15
35	Remarks on "A simple decision analytic solution to the comparison of two binary diagnostic tests" by Vickers et al. <i>Statistics in Medicine</i> , 2013, 32, 718-718.	1.6	0
36	Surrogate Endpoint Analysis: An Exercise in Extrapolation. <i>Journal of the National Cancer Institute</i> , 2013, 105, 316-320.	6.3	28

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
37	Letter to the Editor: "Comment on Hubbard and Miglioretti (2013), Consider Also a Selection Model for the Cumulative Risk of False Positive Screening Tests" Biometrics, 2013, 69, 1084-1084.	1.4	0
38	Additional thoughts on causal inference, probability theory, and graphical insights. Statistics in Medicine, 2013, 32, 4334-4337.	1.6	0
39	Paradox-Driven Cancer Research. Disruptive Science and Technology, 2013, 1, 143-148.	1.0	12
40	Revisiting a Discrepant Result: A Propensity Score Analysis, the Paired Availability Design for Historical Controls, and a Meta-Analysis of Randomized Trials. Journal of Causal Inference, 2013, 1, 51-82.	1.2	13
41	Evaluating a New Marker for Risk Prediction Using the Test Tradeoff: An Update. International Journal of Biostatistics, 2012, 8, 1-37.	0.7	30
42	Comment on Nie et al. (2011), Biometrics, Early View. Biometrics, 2012, 68, 992-992.	1.4	1
43	Paradoxes in Carcinogenesis Should Spur New Avenues of Research: An Historical Perspective. Disruptive Science and Technology, 2012, 1, 100-107.	1.0	24
44	Predicting Treatment Effect from Surrogate Endpoints and Historical Trials: An Extrapolation Involving Probabilities of a Binary Outcome or Survival to a Specific Time. Biometrics, 2012, 68, 248-257.	1.4	14
45	Biomarkers, subgroup evaluation, and clinical trial design. Discovery Medicine, 2012, 13, 187-92.	0.5	24
46	Estimation and Inference for the Causal Effect of Receiving Treatment on a Multinomial Outcome: An Alternative Approach. Biometrics, 2011, 67, 319-323.	1.4	13
47	Systems biology and cancer: Promises and perils. Progress in Biophysics and Molecular Biology, 2011, 106, 410-413.	2.9	18
48	TOFT better explains experimental results in cancer research than SMT (Comment on DOI) Tj ETQq0 0 0 rgBT /Overlock 10 Tf,50 302 Td	2.5	9
49	Simple and flexible classification of gene expression microarrays via Swirls and Ripples. BMC Bioinformatics, 2010, 11, 452.	2.6	16
50	Research on Early-Stage Carcinogenesis: Are We Approaching Paradigm Instability?. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 2010, 28, 3215-3218.	1.6	46
51	Transparency and reproducibility in data analysis: the Prostate Cancer Prevention Trial. Biostatistics, 2010, 11, 413-418.	1.5	6
52	Designing a Randomized Clinical Trial to Evaluate Personalized Medicine: A New Approach Based on Risk Prediction. Journal of the National Cancer Institute, 2010, 102, 1756-1759.	6.3	14
53	Putting Risk Prediction in Perspective: Relative Utility Curves. Journal of the National Cancer Institute, 2009, 101, 1538-1542.	6.3	73
54	Improving the Biomarker Pipeline to Develop and Evaluate Cancer Screening Tests. Journal of the National Cancer Institute, 2009, 101, 1116-1119.	6.3	39

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
55	Plausibility of stromal initiation of epithelial cancers without a mutation in the epithelium: a computer simulation of morphostats. <i>BMC Cancer</i> , 2009, 9, 89.	2.6	34
56	Using Relative Utility Curves to Evaluate Risk Prediction. <i>Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society</i> , 2009, 172, 729-748.	1.1	120
57	Using microarrays to study the microenvironment in tumor biology: The crucial role of statistics. <i>Seminars in Cancer Biology</i> , 2008, 18, 305-310.	9.6	10
58	Randomized trials for the real world: making as few and as reasonable assumptions as possible. <i>Statistical Methods in Medical Research</i> , 2008, 17, 243-252.	1.5	4
59	Estimating the cumulative risk of a false-positive under a regimen involving various types of cancer screening tests. <i>Journal of Medical Screening</i> , 2008, 15, 18-22.	2.3	8
60	Early reporting for cancer screening trials. <i>Journal of Medical Screening</i> , 2008, 15, 122-129.	2.3	11
61	Two simple approaches for validating a binary surrogate endpoint using data from multiple trials. <i>Statistical Methods in Medical Research</i> , 2008, 17, 505-514.	1.5	8
62	Paradoxes in carcinogenesis: New opportunities for research directions. <i>BMC Cancer</i> , 2007, 7, 151.	2.6	71
63	Evaluating markers for the early detection of cancer: overview of study designs and methods. <i>Clinical Trials</i> , 2006, 3, 43-56.	1.6	69
64	Common susceptibility genes for cancer: search for the end of the rainbow. <i>BMJ: British Medical Journal</i> , 2006, 332, 1150-1152.	2.3	15
65	Identifying genes that contribute most to good classification in microarrays. <i>BMC Bioinformatics</i> , 2006, 7, 407.	2.6	51
66	A simple meta-analytic approach for using a binary surrogate endpoint to predict the effect of intervention on true endpoint. <i>Biostatistics</i> , 2006, 7, 58-70.	1.5	27
67	Genetic Susceptibility to Prostate, Breast, and Colorectal Cancer among Nordic Twins. <i>Biometrics</i> , 2005, 61, 55-63.	1.4	40
68	Simple adjustments for randomized trials with nonrandomly missing or censored outcomes arising from informative covariates. <i>Biostatistics</i> , 2005, 7, 29-40.	1.5	17
69	Simple maximum likelihood estimates of efficacy in randomized trials and before-and-after studies, with implications for meta-analysis. <i>Statistical Methods in Medical Research</i> , 2005, 14, 349-367.	1.5	32
70	A Simple Loglinear Model for Haplotype Effects in a Case-Control Study Involving Two Unphased Genotypes. <i>Statistical Applications in Genetics and Molecular Biology</i> , 2005, 4, Article14.	0.6	7
71	Development Tracks for Cancer Prevention Markers. <i>Disease Markers</i> , 2004, 20, 97-102.	1.3	14
72	Comparing breast cancer mortality rates before-and-after a change in availability of screening in different regions: Extension of the paired availability design. <i>BMC Medical Research Methodology</i> , 2004, 4, 12.	3.1	9

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
73	The fallacy of enrolling only high-risk subjects in cancer prevention trials: Is there a "free lunch"?. BMC Medical Research Methodology, 2004, 4, 24.	3.1	5
74	Randomized trials, generalizability, and meta-analysis: Graphical insights for binary outcomes. BMC Medical Research Methodology, 2003, 3, 10.	3.1	12
75	Estimating the cumulative risk of false positive cancer screenings. BMC Medical Research Methodology, 2003, 3, 11.	3.1	23
76	A perfect correlate does not a surrogate make. BMC Medical Research Methodology, 2003, 3, 16.	3.1	133
77	Using observational data to estimate an upper bound on the reduction in cancer mortality due to periodic screening. BMC Medical Research Methodology, 2003, 3, 4.	3.1	9
78	A simple method for analyzing data from a randomized trial with a missing binary outcome. BMC Medical Research Methodology, 2003, 3, 8.	3.1	10
79	A sensitivity analysis for nonrandomly missing categorical data arising from a national health disability survey. Biostatistics, 2003, 4, 41-56.	1.5	16
80	The Central Role of Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) Curves in Evaluating Tests for the Early Detection of Cancer. Journal of the National Cancer Institute, 2003, 95, 511-515.	6.3	149
81	Statistical issues in randomized trials of cancer screening. BMC Medical Research Methodology, 2002, 2, 11.	3.1	42
82	The transitive fallacy for randomized trials: If A bests B and B bests C in separate trials, is A better than C?. BMC Medical Research Methodology, 2002, 2, 13.	3.1	86
83	Markers for early detection of cancer: Statistical guidelines for nested case-control studies. BMC Medical Research Methodology, 2002, 2, 4.	3.1	86
84	Evaluating serial observations of precancerous lesions for further study as a trigger for early intervention. Statistics in Medicine, 2002, 21, 2383-2390.	1.6	9
85	Discussion of Double Sampling for Survival Analysis. Biometrics, 2001, 57, 348-350.	1.4	1
86	The Paired Availability Design for Historical Controls. BMC Medical Research Methodology, 2001, 1, 9.	3.1	24
87	Identifying Combinations of Cancer Markers for Further Study as Triggers of Early Intervention. Biometrics, 2000, 56, 1082-1087.	1.4	89
88	Analyzing a Randomized Cancer Prevention Trial with a Missing Binary Outcome, an Auxiliary Variable, and All-or-None Compliance. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 2000, 95, 43-50.	3.1	33
89	Analysis of Survival Data from a Randomized Trial with All-or-None Compliance: Estimating the Cost-Effectiveness of a Cancer Screening Program. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 1998, 93, 929-934.	3.1	70
90	Marginal Regression for Repeated Binary Data with Outcome Subject to Non-Ignorable Non-Response. Biometrics, 1995, 51, 1042.	1.4	63

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
91	Composite linear models for incomplete multinomial data. <i>Statistics in Medicine</i> , 1994, 13, 609-622.	1.6	28
92	The paired availability design: A proposal for evaluating epidural analgesia during labor. <i>Statistics in Medicine</i> , 1994, 13, 2269-2278.	1.6	119
93	Regression Analysis of Grouped Survival Data with Incomplete Covariates: Nonignorable Missing-Data and Censoring Mechanisms. <i>Biometrics</i> , 1994, 50, 821.	1.4	16
94	The Multinomial-Poisson Transformation. <i>Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series D (the Applied Statistics)</i> , 1990, 39, 50-62.	0.2	90
95	Regression Analysis of Grouped Survival Data: Informative Censoring and Double Sampling. <i>Biometrics</i> , 1993, 49, 379.	1.4	31
96	A Simple Method for Computing the Observed Information Matrix When Using the EM Algorithm with Categorical Data. <i>Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics</i> , 1992, 1, 63-76.	1.7	26
97	Evaluating a new test using a reference test with estimated sensitivity and specificity. <i>Communications in Statistics - Theory and Methods</i> , 1991, 20, 2739-2752.	1.0	21
98	Evaluating Screening for the Early Detection and Treatment of Cancer without Using a Randomized Control Group. <i>Journal of the American Statistical Association</i> , 1990, 85, 321-327.	3.1	24
99	Regression Analysis for Categorical Variables with Outcome Subject to Nonignorable Nonresponse. <i>Journal of the American Statistical Association</i> , 1988, 83, 62-69.	3.1	187