

# Johanna A A G Damen

## List of Publications by Year in Descending Order

**Source:** <https://exaly.com/author-pdf/1149663/johanna-a-a-g-damen-publications-by-year.pdf>

**Version:** 2024-04-19

This document has been generated based on the publications and citations recorded by exaly.com. For the latest version of this publication list, visit the link given above.

The third column is the impact factor (IF) of the journal, and the fourth column is the number of citations of the article.

20  
papers

2,022  
citations

10  
h-index

25  
g-index

25  
ext. papers

2,933  
ext. citations

7  
avg, IF

4.43  
L-index

#	Paper	IF	Citations
20	Completeness of reporting of clinical prediction models developed using supervised machine learning: a systematic review.. <i>BMC Medical Research Methodology</i> , <b>2022</b> , 22, 12	4.7	5
19	External Validation of Risk Prediction Models to Improve Selection of Patients for Carotid Endarterectomy. <i>Stroke</i> , <b>2021</b> , STROKEAHA120032527	6.7	0
18	The methodological quality of 176,620 randomized controlled trials published between 1966 and 2018 reveals a positive trend but also an urgent need for improvement. <i>PLoS Biology</i> , <b>2021</b> , 19, e3001162	9.7	6
17	Effectiveness of contact tracing apps for SARS-CoV-2: a rapid systematic review. <i>BMJ Open</i> , <b>2021</b> , 11, e050519	3	8
16	Prediction models for diagnosis and prognosis of covid-19: systematic review and critical appraisal. <i>BMJ, The</i> , <b>2020</b> , 369, m1328	5.9	1283
15	Transparent Reporting of Multivariable Prediction Models in Journal and Conference Abstracts: TRIPOD for Abstracts. <i>Annals of Internal Medicine</i> , <b>2020</b> ,	8	12
14	Protocol for a systematic review on the methodological and reporting quality of prediction model studies using machine learning techniques. <i>BMJ Open</i> , <b>2020</b> , 10, e038832	3	21
13	Performance of the Framingham risk models and pooled cohort equations for predicting 10-year risk of cardiovascular disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis. <i>BMC Medicine</i> , <b>2019</b> , 17, 109	11.4	49
12	The increasing need for systematic reviews of prognosis studies: strategies to facilitate review production and improve quality of primary research. <i>Diagnostic and Prognostic Research</i> , <b>2019</b> , 3, 2	5.5	5
11	Uniformity in measuring adherence to reporting guidelines: the example of TRIPOD for assessing completeness of reporting of prediction model studies. <i>BMJ Open</i> , <b>2019</b> , 9, e025611	3	32
10	Empirical evidence of the impact of study characteristics on the performance of prediction models: a meta-epidemiological study. <i>BMJ Open</i> , <b>2019</b> , 9, e026160	3	8
9	Cardiovascular risk prediction models for women in the general population: A systematic review. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , <b>2019</b> , 14, e0210329	3.7	14
8	Contemporary cardiovascular risk prediction. <i>Lancet, The</i> , <b>2018</b> , 391, 1867-1868	40	6
7	Poor reporting of multivariable prediction model studies: towards a targeted implementation strategy of the TRIPOD statement. <i>BMC Medicine</i> , <b>2018</b> , 16, 120	11.4	57
6	Treatment use in prognostic model research: a systematic review of cardiovascular prognostic studies. <i>Diagnostic and Prognostic Research</i> , <b>2017</b> , 1, 15	5.5	10
5	A guide to systematic review and meta-analysis of prediction model performance. <i>BMJ, The</i> , <b>2017</b> , 356, i6460	5.9	170
4	Prediction models for cardiovascular disease risk in the general population: systematic review. <i>BMJ, The</i> , <b>2016</b> , 353, i2416	5.9	326

3	Authors reply to Woodward. <i>BMJ, The</i> , <b>2016</b> , 354, i4485	5.9	4
2	Cost-effectiveness of non-invasive assessment in the Dutch breast cancer screening program versus usual care: a randomized controlled trial. <i>Canadian Journal of Public Health</i> , <b>2014</b> , 105, e342-7	3.2	3
1	Completeness of reporting of clinical prediction models developed using supervised machine learning: A systematic review		1