

# Anna Middleton

## List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: <https://exaly.com/author-pdf/8666863/publications.pdf>

Version: 2024-02-01

69  
papers

2,974  
citations

236925

25  
h-index

189892

50  
g-index

71  
all docs

71  
docs citations

71  
times ranked

4584  
citing authors

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
1	Return of genomic results does not motivate intent to participate in research for all: Perspectives across 22 countries. <i>Genetics in Medicine</i> , 2022, 24, 1120-1129.	2.4	8
2	Towards equitable and trustworthy genomics research. <i>EBioMedicine</i> , 2022, 76, 103879.	6.1	34
3	A public backlash towards genomics is a risk all of us working in genomics must share. <i>Lancet Regional Health - Europe</i> , 2022, 15, 100347.	5.6	1
4	The expectations and realities of nutrigenomic testing in australia: A qualitative study. <i>Health Expectations</i> , 2021, 24, 670-686.	2.6	3
5	Attitudes of Costa Rican individuals towards donation of personal genetic data for research. <i>Personalized Medicine</i> , 2021, 18, 141-152.	1.5	4
6	Public trust and genomic medicine in Canada and the UK. <i>Wellcome Open Research</i> , 2021, 6, 124.	1.8	1
7	Demonstrating trustworthiness when collecting and sharing genomic data: public views across 22 countries. <i>Genome Medicine</i> , 2021, 13, 92.	8.2	39
8	Public trust and genomic medicine in Canada and the UK. <i>Wellcome Open Research</i> , 2021, 6, 124.	1.8	2
9	GA4GH: International policies and standards for data sharing across genomic research and healthcare. <i>Cell Genomics</i> , 2021, 1, 100029.	6.5	94
10	Engaged genomic science produces better and fairer outcomes: an engagement framework for engaging and involving participants, patients and publics in genomics research and healthcare implementation. <i>Wellcome Open Research</i> , 2021, 6, 311.	1.8	6
11	From Expectations to Experiences: Consumer Autonomy and Choice in Personal Genomic Testing. <i>AJOB Empirical Bioethics</i> , 2020, 11, 63-76.	1.6	9
12	Members of the public in the USA, UK, Canada and Australia expressing genetic exceptionalism say they are more willing to donate genomic data. <i>European Journal of Human Genetics</i> , 2020, 28, 424-434.	2.8	29
13	Global Public Perceptions of Genomic Data Sharing: What Shapes the Willingness to Donate DNA and Health Data?. <i>American Journal of Human Genetics</i> , 2020, 107, 743-752.	6.2	76
14	Professional duties are now considered legal duties of care within genomic medicine. <i>European Journal of Human Genetics</i> , 2020, 28, 1301-1304.	2.8	5
15	A Maturity Matrix for Nurse Leaders to Facilitate and Benchmark Progress in Genomic Healthcare Policy, Infrastructure, Education, and Delivery. <i>Journal of Nursing Scholarship</i> , 2020, 52, 583-592.	2.4	14
16	A Roadmap for Global Acceleration of Genomics Integration Across Nursing. <i>Journal of Nursing Scholarship</i> , 2020, 52, 329-338.	2.4	24
17	Willingness to donate genomic and other medical data: results from Germany. <i>European Journal of Human Genetics</i> , 2020, 28, 1000-1009.	2.8	28
18	Trust in genomic data sharing among members of the general public in the UK, USA, Canada and Australia. <i>Human Genetics</i> , 2019, 138, 1237-1246.	3.8	69

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
19	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.	2.8	14
20	World congress on genetic counselling. <i>European Journal of Medical Genetics</i> , 2019, 62, 287.	1.3	1
21	Point of View: An evolution from genetic counselling to genomic counselling. <i>European Journal of Medical Genetics</i> , 2019, 62, 288-289.	1.3	12
22	The preferences of potential stakeholders in psychiatric genomic research regarding consent procedures and information delivery. <i>European Psychiatry</i> , 2019, 55, 29-35.	0.2	10
23	Should doctors have a legal duty to warn relatives of their genetic risks?. <i>Lancet, The</i> , 2019, 394, 2133-2135.	13.7	9
24	Popular culture and genetics; friend, foe or something more complex?. <i>European Journal of Medical Genetics</i> , 2019, 62, 368-375.	1.3	12
25	Attitudes of publics who are unwilling to donate DNA data for research. <i>European Journal of Medical Genetics</i> , 2019, 62, 316-323.	1.3	53
26	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.	1.3	17
27	The Global State of the Genetic Counseling Profession. <i>European Journal of Human Genetics</i> , 2019, 27, 183-197.	2.8	215
28	Genomic variant sharing: a position statement. <i>Wellcome Open Research</i> , 2019, 4, 22.	1.8	31
29	Society and personal genome data. <i>Human Molecular Genetics</i> , 2018, 27, R8-R13.	2.9	29
30	The Global Landscape of Nursing and Genomics. <i>Journal of Nursing Scholarship</i> , 2018, 50, 249-256.	2.4	59
31	Genetic counseling globally: Where are we now?. <i>American Journal of Medical Genetics, Part C: Seminars in Medical Genetics</i> , 2018, 178, 98-107.	1.6	109
32	Genetic counselling in the era of genomic medicine. <i>British Medical Bulletin</i> , 2018, 126, 27-36.	6.9	85
33	A roadmap for restoring trust in Big Data. <i>Lancet Oncology, The</i> , 2018, 19, 1014-1015.	10.7	13
34	Increasing nursing capacity in genomics: Overview of existing global genomics resources. <i>Nurse Education Today</i> , 2018, 69, 53-59.	3.3	32
35	Australiansâ€™ views on personal genomic testing: focus group findings from the Genioz study. <i>European Journal of Human Genetics</i> , 2018, 26, 1101-1112.	2.8	14
36	APPLaUD: access for patients and participants to individual level uninterpreted genomic data. <i>Human Genomics</i> , 2018, 12, 7.	2.9	45

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
37	“Your DNA, Your Say”™: global survey gathering attitudes toward genomics: design, delivery and methods. <i>Personalized Medicine</i> , 2018, 15, 311-318.	1.5	26
38	Socialising the genome. <i>Lancet, The</i> , 2017, 389, 1603-1604.	13.7	10
39	The role of genetic counsellors in genomic healthcare in the United Kingdom: a statement by the Association of Genetic Nurses and Counsellors. <i>European Journal of Human Genetics</i> , 2017, 25, 659-661.	2.8	32
40	Stakeholders in psychiatry and their attitudes toward receiving pertinent and incident findings in genomic research. <i>American Journal of Medical Genetics, Part A</i> , 2017, 173, 2649-2658.	1.2	20
41	Direct-to-consumer genetic testing: where and how does genetic counseling fit?. <i>Personalized Medicine</i> , 2017, 14, 249-257.	1.5	44
42	Human Germline Genome Editing. <i>American Journal of Human Genetics</i> , 2017, 101, 167-176.	6.2	168
43	Your DNA, Your Say. <i>New Bioethics</i> , 2017, 23, 74-80.	1.1	11
44	Genetics in the 21st Century: Implications for patients, consumers and citizens. <i>F1000Research</i> , 2017, 6, 2020.	1.6	15
45	Genetics in the 21st Century: Implications for patients, consumers and citizens. <i>F1000Research</i> , 2017, 6, 2020.	1.6	13
46	Returning genome sequences to research participants: Policy and practice. <i>Wellcome Open Research</i> , 2017, 2, 15.	1.8	24
47	Attitudes of nearly 7000 health professionals, genomic researchers and publics toward the return of incidental results from sequencing research. <i>European Journal of Human Genetics</i> , 2016, 24, 21-29.	2.8	161
48	Genetic diagnosis of developmental disorders in the DDD study: a scalable analysis of genome-wide research data. <i>Lancet, The</i> , 2015, 385, 1305-1314.	13.7	651
49	Potential research participants support the return of raw sequence data. <i>Journal of Medical Genetics</i> , 2015, 52, 571-574.	3.2	38
50	A pilot study of inhaled dry-powder mannitol during cystic fibrosis-related pulmonary exacerbation. <i>European Respiratory Journal</i> , 2015, 45, 541-544.	6.7	11
51	Genetic counselors and Genomic Counseling in the United Kingdom. <i>Molecular Genetics &amp; Genomic Medicine</i> , 2015, 3, 79-83.	1.2	28
52	No expectation to share incidental findings in genomic research. <i>Lancet, The</i> , 2015, 385, 1289-1290.	13.7	19
53	Position statement on opportunistic genomic screening from the Association of Genetic Nurses and Counsellors (UK and Ireland). <i>European Journal of Human Genetics</i> , 2014, 22, 955-956.	2.8	25
54	Policy challenges of clinical genome sequencing. <i>BMJ, The</i> , 2013, 347, f6845-f6845.	6.0	50

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
55	Empirical research on the ethics of genomic research. American Journal of Medical Genetics, Part A, 2013, 161, 2099-2101.	1.2	17
56	Communication about DTC Testing: Commentary on a "Family Experience of Personal Genomics". Journal of Genetic Counseling, 2012, 21, 392-398.	1.6	9
57	Preferences for communication in clinic from deaf people: a cross-sectional study. Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice, 2010, 16, 811-817.	1.8	41
58	Whose Deaf Genes Are They Anyway?: The Deaf Community's Challenge to Legislation on Embryo Selection. Sign Language Studies, 2010, 10, 155-169.	0.3	18
59	Communicating in a healthcare setting with people who have hearing loss. BMJ: British Medical Journal, 2010, 341, c4672-c4672.	2.3	26
60	Views, Knowledge, and Beliefs about Genetics and Genetic Counseling among Deaf People. Sign Language Studies, 2010, 10, 170-196.	0.3	14
61	Clause 14(4)(9) of embryo bill should be amended or deleted. BMJ: British Medical Journal, 2008, 336, 976.1-976.	2.3	5
62	Editorial on Supervision. Journal of Genetic Counseling, 2007, 16, 123-125.	1.6	2
63	Report from the UK and Eire Association of Genetic Nurses and Counsellors (AGNC) Supervision Working Group on Genetic Counselling Supervision. Journal of Genetic Counseling, 2007, 16, 127-142.	1.6	17
64	Reflections on the Experience of Counseling Supervision by a Team of Genetic Counselors from the UK. Journal of Genetic Counseling, 2007, 16, 143-155.	1.6	17
65	Providing a Transcultural Genetic Counseling Service in the UK. Journal of Genetic Counseling, 2007, 16, 567-582.	1.6	7
66	Tailoring genetic information and services to clients' culture, knowledge and language level. Nursing Standard (Royal College of Nursing (Great Britain): 1987), 2005, 20, 52-56.	0.1	6
67	Prenatal Diagnosis for Inherited Deafness "What is the Potential Demand?. Journal of Genetic Counseling, 2001, 10, 121-131.	1.6	82
68	Attitudes of Deaf Adults toward Genetic Testing for Hereditary Deafness. American Journal of Human Genetics, 1998, 63, 1175-1180.	6.2	153
69	Genomic variant sharing: a position statement. Wellcome Open Research, 0, 4, 22.	1.8	7