## Kai-Ming Fu

List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: https://exaly.com/author-pdf/11926611/publications.pdf Version: 2024-02-01



KAL-MING FU

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
1	Association of ≥ 12 months of delayed surgical treatment for cervical myelopathy with worsened postoperative outcomes: a multicenter analysis of the Quality Outcomes Database. Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine, 2022, 36, 568-574.	0.9	3
2	Differences in Patient-Reported Outcomes Between Anterior and Posterior Approaches for Treatment of Cervical Spondylotic Myelopathy: A Quality Outcomes Database Analysis. World Neurosurgery, 2022, 160, e436-e441.	0.7	6
3	Social risk factors predicting outcomes of cervical myelopathy surgery. Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine, 2022, 37, 41-48.	0.9	8
4	Role of obesity in less radiographic correction and worse health-related quality-of-life outcomes following minimally invasive deformity surgery. Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine, 2022, 37, 222-231.	0.9	0
5	Differences in postoperative quality of life in young, early elderly, and late elderly patients undergoing surgical treatment for degenerative cervical myelopathy. Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine, 2022, , 1-11.	0.9	4
6	Two- and three-year outcomes of minimally invasive and hybrid correction of adult spinal deformity. Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine, 2022, 36, 595-608.	0.9	10
7	Inferior Clinical Outcomes for Patients with Medicaid Insurance After Surgery for Degenerative Lumbar Spondylolisthesis: A Prospective Registry Analysis of 608 Patients. World Neurosurgery, 2022, 164, e1024-e1033.	0.7	4
8	Determining the time frame of maximum clinical improvement in surgical decompression for cervical spondylotic myelopathy when stratified by preoperative myelopathy severity: a cervical Quality Outcomes Database study. Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine, 2022, , 1-9.	0.9	2
9	Revision Surgery Rates After Minimally Invasive Adult Spinal Deformity Surgery: Correlation with Roussouly Spine Type at 2-Year Follow-Up?. World Neurosurgery, 2021, 148, e482-e487.	0.7	1
10	The minimally invasive interbody selection algorithm for spinal deformity. Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine, 2021, 34, 741-748.	0.9	13
11	Impact of surgeon and hospital factors on surgical decision-making for grade 1 degenerative lumbar spondylolisthesis: a Quality Outcomes Database analysis. Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine, 2021, 34, 768-778.	0.9	5
12	Identifying patients at risk for nonroutine discharge after surgery for cervical myelopathy: an analysis from the Quality Outcomes Database. Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine, 2021, 35, 25-33.	0.9	4
13	Patient-reported outcome improvements at 24-month follow-up after fusion added to decompression for grade I degenerative lumbar spondylolisthesis: a multicenter study using the Quality Outcomes Database. Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine, 2021, 35, 42-51.	0.9	11
14	Patient selection for minimally invasive spine surgery. Seminars in Spine Surgery, 2021, 33, 100887.	0.1	1
15	Does reduction of the Meyerding grade correlate with outcomes in patients undergoing decompression and fusion for grade I degenerative lumbar spondylolisthesis?. Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine, 2021, , 1-8.	0.9	5
16	OUP accepted manuscript. Neurosurgery, 2021, 89, 1033-1041.	0.6	4
17	Patient outcomes after circumferential minimally invasive surgery compared with those of open correction for adult spinal deformity: initial analysis of prospectively collected data. Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine, 2021, , 1-12.	0.9	6
18	Utility of the MISDEF2 Algorithm and Extent of Fusion in Open Adult Spinal Deformity Surgery With Minimum 2-Year Follow-up. Neurospine, 2021, 18, 824-832.	1.1	4

Kai-Ming Fu

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
19	Obese Patients Benefit, but do not Fare as Well as Nonobese Patients, Following Lumbar Spondylolisthesis Surgery: An Analysis of the Quality Outcomes Database. Neurosurgery, 2020, 86, 80-87.	0.6	36
20	Scoliosis Correction with One Ventricle: A Multispecialty Approach. World Neurosurgery, 2020, 134, 302-307.	0.7	0
21	The MISDEF2 algorithm: an updated algorithm for patient selection in minimally invasive deformity surgery. Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine, 2020, 32, 221-228.	0.9	49
22	Sexual Dysfunction: Prevalence and Prognosis in Patients Operated for Degenerative Lumbar Spondylolisthesis. Neurosurgery, 2020, 87, 200-210.	0.6	8
23	Outcomes and Complications With Age in Spondylolisthesis. Spine, 2020, 45, 1000-1008.	1.0	12
24	State of the art advances in minimally invasive surgery for adult spinal deformity. Spine Deformity, 2020, 8, 1143-1158.	0.7	10
25	A Comparison of Minimally Invasive and Open Transforaminal Lumbar Interbody Fusion for Grade 1 Degenerative Lumbar Spondylolisthesis: An Analysis of the Prospective Quality Outcomes Database. Neurosurgery, 2020, 87, 555-562.	0.6	20
26	Patients with a depressive and/or anxiety disorder can achieve optimum Long term outcomes after surgery for grade 1 spondylolisthesis: Analysis from the quality outcomes database (QOD). Clinical Neurology and Neurosurgery, 2020, 197, 106098.	0.6	9
27	Predictors of the Best Outcomes Following Minimally Invasive Surgery for Grade 1 Degenerative Lumbar Spondylolisthesis. Neurosurgery, 2020, 87, 1130-1138.	0.6	3
28	Regional Variance in Disability and Quality-of-Life Outcomes After Surgery for Grade I Degenerative Lumbar Spondylolisthesis: A Quality Outcomes Database Analysis. World Neurosurgery, 2020, 138, e336-e344.	0.7	4
29	Minimally Invasive Spinal Deformity Surgery: Analysis of Patients Who Fail to Reach Minimal Clinically Important Difference. World Neurosurgery, 2020, 137, e499-e505.	0.7	4
30	Correlation of return to work with patient satisfaction after surgery for lumbar spondylolisthesis: an analysis of the Quality Outcomes Database. Neurosurgical Focus, 2020, 48, E5.	1.0	8
31	Quality Outcomes Database Spine Care Project 2012–2020: milestones achieved in a collaborative North American outcomes registry to advance value-based spine care and evolution to the American Spine Registry. Neurosurgical Focus, 2020, 48, E2.	1.0	34
32	Open versus minimally invasive decompression for low-grade spondylolisthesis: analysis from the Quality Outcomes Database. Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine, 2020, 33, 349-359.	0.9	11
33	"July Effect―Revisited. Spine, 2020, Publish Ahead of Print, 836-843.	1.0	3
34	Predictors of nonroutine discharge among patients undergoing surgery for grade I spondylolisthesis: insights from the Quality Outcomes Database. Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine, 2020, 32, 523-532.	0.9	12
35	Assessing the differences in characteristics of patients lost to follow-up at 2 years: results from the Quality Outcomes Database study on outcomes of surgery for grade I spondylolisthesis. Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine, 2020, 33, 643-651.	0.9	9
36	Minimally Invasive Surgery for Mild-to-Moderate Adult Spinal Deformities: Impact on Intensive Care Unit and Hospital Stay. World Neurosurgery, 2019, 127, e649-e655.	0.7	16

Kai-Ming Fu

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
37	Analysis of Complications with Staged Surgery for Less Invasive Treatment of Adult Spinal Deformity. World Neurosurgery, 2019, 126, e1337-e1342.	0.7	14
38	Is achieving optimal spinopelvic parameters necessary to obtain substantial clinical benefit? An analysis of patients who underwent circumferential minimally invasive surgery or hybrid surgery with open posterior instrumentation. Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine, 2019, 30, 833-838.	0.9	5
39	Laminectomy alone versus fusion for grade 1 lumbar spondylolisthesis in 426 patients from the prospective Quality Outcomes Database. Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine, 2019, 30, 234-241.	0.9	49
40	A comparison of minimally invasive transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion and decompression alone for degenerative lumbar spondylolisthesis. Neurosurgical Focus, 2019, 46, E13.	1.0	33
41	Predictive model for long-term patient satisfaction after surgery for grade I degenerative lumbar spondylolisthesis: insights from the Quality Outcomes Database. Neurosurgical Focus, 2019, 46, E12.	1.0	36
42	Women fare best following surgery for degenerative lumbar spondylolisthesis: a comparison of the most and least satisfied patients utilizing data from the Quality Outcomes Database. Neurosurgical Focus, 2018, 44, E3.	1.0	30
43	Defining the minimum clinically important difference for grade I degenerative lumbar spondylolisthesis: insights from the Quality Outcomes Database. Neurosurgical Focus, 2018, 44, E2.	1.0	93
44	Editorial. The relevance of sagittal radiographic parameters. Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine, 2018, 28, 571-572.	0.9	0
45	Evolution of the Minimally Invasive Spinal Deformity Surgery Algorithm. Neurosurgery Clinics of North America, 2018, 29, 399-406.	0.8	26
46	Treatment of the Fractional Curve of Adult Scoliosis With Circumferential Minimally Invasive Surgery Versus Traditional, Open Surgery: An Analysis of Surgical Outcomes. Global Spine Journal, 2018, 8, 827-833.	1.2	21
47	The impact of age on surgical goals for spinopelvic alignment in minimally invasive surgery for adult spinal deformity. Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine, 2018, 29, 560-564.	0.9	20
48	Minimally invasive versus open fusion for Grade I degenerative lumbar spondylolisthesis: analysis of the Quality Outcomes Database. Neurosurgical Focus, 2017, 43, E11.	1.0	73
49	The Health Impact of Symptomatic Adult Spinal Deformity. Spine, 2016, 41, 224-233.	1.0	208
50	Results of the Scoliosis Research Society Morbidity and Mortality Database 2009–2012: A Report From the Morbidity and Mortality Committee. Spine Deformity, 2016, 4, 338-343.	0.7	32
51	Can a Minimal Clinically Important Difference Be Achieved in Elderly Patients with Adult Spinal Deformity Who Undergo Minimally Invasive Spinal Surgery?. World Neurosurgery, 2016, 86, 168-172.	0.7	28
52	Clinical and radiographic parameters associated with best versus worst clinical outcomes in minimally invasive spinal deformity surgery. Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine, 2016, 25, 21-25.	0.9	48
53	IMPROVEMENT OF BACK PAIN WITH OPERATIVE AND NONOPERATIVE TREATMENT IN ADULTS WITH SCOLIOSIS. Neurosurgery, 2009, 65, 86-94.	0.6	232
54	Neurological symptoms and deficits in adults with scoliosis who present to a surgical clinic: incidence and association with the choice of operative versus nonoperative management. Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine, 2008, 9, 326-331.	0.9	81