## Alfonso Mauro Marrelli

List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: https://exaly.com/author-pdf/8943367/publications.pdf

Version: 2024-02-01

23 papers 515 citations

840776 11 h-index 713466 21 g-index

24 all docs

24 docs citations

times ranked

24

676 citing authors

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
1	Reliability of transcranial magnetic stimulation-related measurements of tibialis anterior muscle in healthy subjects. Clinical Neurophysiology, 2009, 120, 414-419.	1.5	80
2	Neurophysiology and neuroimaging accurately predict poor neurological outcome within 24 hours after cardiac arrest: The ProNeCA prospective multicentre prognostication study. Resuscitation, 2019, 143, 115-123.	3.0	70
3	Reliability of TMS-related measures of tibialis anterior muscle in patients with chronic stroke and healthy subjects. Journal of the Neurological Sciences, 2011, 303, 90-94.	0.6	61
4	Neurophysiology for predicting good and poor neurological outcome at 12 and 72 h after cardiac arrest: The ProNeCA multicentre prospective study. Resuscitation, 2020, 147, 95-103.	3.0	60
5	Visual Evoked Potentials and Serum Magnesium Levels in Juvenile Migraine Patients. Headache, 1997, 37, 383-385.	3.9	39
6	SSEP amplitude accurately predicts both good and poor neurological outcome early after cardiac arrest; a post-hoc analysis of the ProNeCA multicentre study. Resuscitation, 2021, 163, 162-171.	3.0	26
7	Adjunctive Perampanel in Older Patients With Epilepsy: A Multicenter Study of Clinical Practice. Drugs and Aging, 2021, 38, 603-610.	2.7	25
8	Geomagnetic Activity, Humidity, Temperature and Headache: Is, There Any Correlation?. Headache, 1994, 34, 41-43.	3.9	23
9	Neurophysiological and neuroradiological test for early poor outcome (Cerebral Performance) Tj ETQq1 1 0.78431 Brief, 2019, 27, 104755.	14 rgBT /O\ 1.0	verlock 10 T 22
10	Does a combination of ≥2 abnormal tests vs. the ERC-ESICM stepwise algorithm improve prediction of poor neurological outcome after cardiac arrest? A post-hoc analysis of the ProNeCA multicentre study. Resuscitation, 2021, 160, 158-167.	3.0	20
11	Spectral Analysis of Visual Potentials Evoked by Pattern-Reversal Checkerboard in Juvenile Patients With Headache. Headache, 2001, 41, 792-797.	3.9	15
12	Seasonal and Meteorological Factors in Primary Headaches. Headache, 1988, 28, 111-113.	3.9	12
13	Cognitive, adaptive, and behavioral effects of adjunctive rufinamide in Lennox–Gastaut syndrome: A prospective observational clinical study. Epilepsy and Behavior, 2020, 112, 107445.	1.7	12
14	Brivaracetam as addâ€on treatment in focal epilepsy: A realâ€world timeâ€based analysis. Epilepsia, 2021, 62, e1-e6.	5.1	11
15	Diversified social cognition in temporal lobe epilepsy. Acta Neurologica Scandinavica, 2021, 143, 396-406.	2.1	9
16	Electroencephalogram and somatosensory evoked potential evaluation for good and poor neurological prognosis after cardiac arrest: a prospective multicenter cohort trial (ProNeCA). Future Neurology, 2019, 14, FNL16.	0.5	7
17	Neurological complications of schoenlein-henoch syndrome: contribution of MR to the diagnosis. Case report. Italian Journal of Neurological Sciences, 1989, 10, 351-355.	0.1	6
18	Emotional reactivity in mesial temporal lobe epilepsy: A pilot study. Epilepsy and Behavior, 2018, 82, 87-90.	1.7	5

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
19	Multimodal Neurophysiological Monitoring Reduces Shunt Incidence during Carotid Endarterectomy. Annals of Vascular Surgery, 2019, 61, 178-184.	0.9	5
20	Is there inter-observer variation in the interpretation of SSEPs in comatose cardiac arrest survivors? Further considerations following the Italian multicenter ProNeCa study. Resuscitation, 2020, 155, 207-210.	3.0	4
21	Hopelessness in persons with epilepsy: Relationship with demographic, clinical, and social variables. Epilepsy and Behavior, 2019, 100, 106383.	1.7	1
22	Facial emotion recognition in schizophrenia: an event-related potentials study. Rivista Di Psichiatria, 2014, 49, 183-6.	0.6	1
23	Emotional reactivity and neuropsychological assessment in ten cases of ablated temporal lobe tumors. Neurology Psychiatry and Brain Research, 2019, 34, 22-27.	2.0	0