

Esther W De Bekker-Grob

List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: <https://exaly.com/author-pdf/1266650/publications.pdf>

Version: 2024-02-01

92
papers

5,730
citations

126708

33
h-index

88477

70
g-index

94
all docs

94
docs citations

94
times ranked

5325
citing authors

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
1	Surgeons preference for lumbar disk surgery: a discrete choice experiment. <i>European Spine Journal</i> , 2022, 31, 380-388.	1.0	2
2	Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards 2022 (CHEERS 2022) Statement: Updated Reporting Guidance for Health Economic Evaluations. <i>Journal of Medical Economics</i> , 2022, 25, 1-7.	1.0	9
3	Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards 2022 (CHEERS 2022) statement: updated reporting guidance for health economic evaluations. <i>BMJ, The</i> , 2022, 376, e067975.	3.0	141
4	Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards 2022 (CHEERS 2022) Statement: Updated Reporting Guidance for Health Economic Evaluations. <i>Pharmacoeconomics</i> , 2022, 40, 601-609.	1.7	39
5	Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards (CHEERS) 2022 Explanation and Elaboration: A Report of the ISPOR CHEERS II Good Practices Task Force. <i>Value in Health</i> , 2022, 25, 10-31.	0.1	251
6	Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards 2022 (CHEERS 2022) statement: updated reporting guidance for health economic evaluations. <i>BMC Public Health</i> , 2022, 22, 179.	1.2	7
7	Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards 2022 (CHEERS 2022) statement: updated reporting guidance for health economic evaluations. <i>Journal of Managed Care & Specialty Pharmacy</i> , 2022, , 1-10.	0.5	0
8	Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards 2022 (CHEERS 2022) statement: updated reporting guidance for health economic evaluations. <i>BMC Health Services Research</i> , 2022, 22, 114.	0.9	5
9	Consolidated health economic evaluation reporting standards 2022 (CHEERS 2022) statement: updated reporting guidance for health economic evaluations. <i>International Journal of Technology Assessment in Health Care</i> , 2022, 38, e13.	0.2	78
10	Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards 2022 (CHEERS 2022) Statement: Updated Reporting Guidance for Health Economic Evaluations. <i>Value in Health</i> , 2022, 25, 3-9.	0.1	254
11	Efficacy, cost-minimization, and budget impact of a personalized discharge letter for basal cell carcinoma patients to reduce low-value follow-up care. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2022, 17, e0260978.	1.1	4
12	Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards 2022 (CHEERS 2022) statement: updated reporting guidance for health economic evaluations. <i>BMC Medicine</i> , 2022, 20, 23.	2.3	73
13	Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards 2022 (CHEERS 2022) Statement: Updated Reporting Guidance for Health Economic Evaluations. <i>Applied Health Economics and Health Policy</i> , 2022, 20, 213.	1.0	12
14	Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards 2022 (CHEERS 2022) statement: updated reporting guidance for health economic evaluations. <i>European Journal of Health Economics</i> , 2022, 23, 1309-1317.	1.4	9
15	Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards 2022 (CHEERS 2022) statement: updated reporting guidance for health economic evaluations. <i>Journal of Managed Care & Specialty Pharmacy</i> , 2022, 28, 146-155.	0.5	3
16	Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards 2022 (CHEERS 2022) Statement: Updated Reporting Guidance for Health Economic Evaluations. <i>Clinical Therapeutics</i> , 2022, 44, 158-168.	1.1	22
17	Patient preferences for treatment of lumbar disc herniation: a discrete choice experiment. <i>Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine</i> , 2022, 36, 704-712.	0.9	7
18	Preference Variation: Where Does Health Risk Attitude Come Into the Equation?. <i>Value in Health</i> , 2022, 25, 2044-2052.	0.1	2

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
19	What Factors Influence Non-Participation Most in Colorectal Cancer Screening? A Discrete Choice Experiment. <i>Patient</i> , 2021, 14, 269-281.	1.1	16
20	Persons with dementia and informal caregivers prioritizing care: A mixed-methods study. <i>Alzheimer's and Dementia: Translational Research and Clinical Interventions</i> , 2021, 7, e12193.	1.8	8
21	How to integrate evidence from patient preference studies into health technology assessment: a critical review and recommendations. <i>International Journal of Technology Assessment in Health Care</i> , 2021, 37, .	0.2	7
22	Patient Preferences in Rare Diseases: A Qualitative Study in Neuromuscular Disorders to Inform a Quantitative Preference Study. <i>Patient</i> , 2021, 14, 601-612.	1.1	8
23	What do patients and dermatologists prefer regarding low-risk basal cell carcinoma follow-up care? A discrete choice experiment. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2021, 16, e0249298.	1.1	1
24	Methodological Priorities for Patient Preferences Research: Stakeholder Input to the PREFER Public-Private Project. <i>Patient</i> , 2021, 14, 449-453.	1.1	8
25	Preferences of patients and clinicians for treatment of Graves' disease: a discrete choice experiment. <i>European Journal of Endocrinology</i> , 2021, 184, 803-812.	1.9	20
26	An implantable device to treat multiple sclerosis: A discrete choice experiment on patient preferences in three European countries. <i>Journal of the Neurological Sciences</i> , 2021, 428, 117587.	0.3	4
27	Case 2 best-worst scaling: For good or for bad but not for both. <i>Journal of Choice Modelling</i> , 2021, 41, 100325.	1.2	6
28	A Guide to Observable Differences in Stated Preference Evidence. <i>Patient</i> , 2021, , 1.	1.1	2
29	Can healthcare choice be predicted using stated preference data?. <i>Social Science and Medicine</i> , 2020, 246, 112736.	1.8	60
30	Patient Preferences in the Medical Product Lifecycle. <i>Patient</i> , 2020, 13, 7-10.	1.1	8
31	Patients', healthcare providers', and insurance company employees' preferences for knee and hip osteoarthritis care: a discrete choice experiment. <i>Osteoarthritis and Cartilage</i> , 2020, 28, 1316-1324.	0.6	9
32	Important components for Dutch in-home care based on qualitative interviews with persons with dementia and informal caregivers. <i>Health Expectations</i> , 2020, 23, 1412-1419.	1.1	5
33	Mimicking Real-Life Decision Making in Health: Allowing Respondents Time to Think in a Discrete Choice Experiment. <i>Value in Health</i> , 2020, 23, 945-952.	0.1	7
34	An overview of critical decision-points in the medical product lifecycle: Where to include patient preference information in the decision-making process?. <i>Health Policy</i> , 2020, 124, 1325-1332.	1.4	28
35	Appraising patient preference methods for decision-making in the medical product lifecycle: an empirical comparison. <i>BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making</i> , 2020, 20, 114.	1.5	26
36	Summarizing Patient Preferences for the Competitive Landscape of Multiple Sclerosis Treatment Options. <i>Medical Decision Making</i> , 2020, 40, 198-211.	1.2	27

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
37	COVID-19 Contact Tracing Apps: Predicted Uptake in the Netherlands Based on a Discrete Choice Experiment. <i>JMIR MHealth and UHealth</i> , 2020, 8, e20741.	1.8	99
38	A study protocol for quantifying patient preferences in neuromuscular disorders: a case study of the IMI PREFER Project. <i>Wellcome Open Research</i> , 2020, 5, 253.	0.9	4
39	Public preferences for health care facilities in rural China: A discrete choice experiment. <i>Social Science and Medicine</i> , 2019, 237, 112396.	1.8	40
40	Designing Unforced Choice Experiments to Inform Health Care Decision Making: Implications of Using Opt-Out, Neither, or Status Quo Alternatives in Discrete Choice Experiments. <i>Medical Decision Making</i> , 2019, 39, 681-692.	1.2	20
41	Factors and Situations Affecting the Value of Patient Preference Studies: Semi-Structured Interviews in Europe and the US. <i>Frontiers in Pharmacology</i> , 2019, 10, 1009.	1.6	16
42	Opportunities and challenges for the inclusion of patient preferences in the medical product life cycle: a systematic review. <i>BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making</i> , 2019, 19, 189.	1.5	36
43	What Is Next for Patient Preferences in Health Technology Assessment? A Systematic Review of the Challenges. <i>Value in Health</i> , 2019, 22, 1318-1328.	0.1	26
44	Patient Preferences in the Medical Product Life Cycle: What do Stakeholders Think? Semi-Structured Qualitative Interviews in Europe and the USA. <i>Patient</i> , 2019, 12, 513-526.	1.1	24
45	Are Healthcare Choices Predictable? The Impact of Discrete Choice Experiment Designs and Models. <i>Value in Health</i> , 2019, 22, 1050-1062.	0.1	69
46	Methods for exploring and eliciting patient preferences in the medical product lifecycle: a literature review. <i>Drug Discovery Today</i> , 2019, 24, 1324-1331.	3.2	90
47	Understanding Patients' Preferences: A Systematic Review of Psychological Instruments Used in Patients' Preference and Decision Studies. <i>Value in Health</i> , 2019, 22, 491-501.	0.1	51
48	Attributes influencing parental decision-making to receive the Tdap vaccine to reduce the risk of pertussis transmission to their newborn – outcome of a cross-sectional conjoint experiment in Spain and Italy. <i>Human Vaccines and Immunotherapeutics</i> , 2019, 15, 1080-1091.	1.4	14
49	Design, Conduct, and Use of Patient Preference Studies in the Medical Product Life Cycle: A Multi-Method Study. <i>Frontiers in Pharmacology</i> , 2019, 10, 1395.	1.6	48
50	Attribute level overlap (and color coding) can reduce task complexity, improve choice consistency, and decrease the dropout rate in discrete choice experiments. <i>Health Economics (United Kingdom)</i> , 2019, 28, 350-363.	0.8	50
51	Discrete Choice Experiments in Health Economics: Past, Present and Future. <i>Pharmacoeconomics</i> , 2019, 37, 201-226.	1.7	420
52	Factors and situations influencing the value of patient preference studies along the medical product lifecycle: a literature review. <i>Drug Discovery Today</i> , 2019, 24, 57-68.	3.2	69
53	The impact of vaccination and patient characteristics on influenza vaccination uptake of elderly people: A discrete choice experiment. <i>Vaccine</i> , 2018, 36, 1467-1476.	1.7	53
54	Effect of Level Overlap and Color Coding on Attribute Non-Attendance in Discrete Choice Experiments. <i>Value in Health</i> , 2018, 21, 767-771.	0.1	48

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
55	Advocating a Paradigm Shift in Health-State Valuations: The Estimation of Time-Preference Corrected QALY Tariffs. <i>Value in Health</i> , 2018, 21, 993-1001.	0.1	31
56	Women's preferences for alternative financial incentive schemes for breastfeeding: A discrete choice experiment. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2018, 13, e0194231.	1.1	12
57	Discrete Choice Experiment Response Rates: A Meta-analysis. <i>Health Economics (United Kingdom)</i> , 2017, 26, 810-817.	0.8	61
58	Preferences for Health Interventions: Improving Uptake, Adherence, and Efficiency. <i>Patient</i> , 2017, 10, 511-514.	1.1	34
59	Impact of Survey Administration Mode on the Results of a Health-Related Discrete Choice Experiment: Online and Paper Comparison. <i>Value in Health</i> , 2017, 20, 953-960.	0.1	55
60	Personal health records in the Netherlands: potential user preferences quantified by a discrete choice experiment. <i>Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association: JAMIA</i> , 2017, 24, 529-536.	2.2	14
61	Giving Patients' Preferences a Voice in Medical Treatment Life Cycle: The PREFER Public-Private Project. <i>Patient</i> , 2017, 10, 263-266.	1.1	96
62	Patients' Preferences for Treatment for Dupuytren's Disease. <i>Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery</i> , 2016, 137, 165-173.	0.7	36
63	What health plans do people prefer? The trade-off between premium and provider choice. <i>Social Science and Medicine</i> , 2016, 165, 10-18.	1.8	22
64	Cost-effectiveness of routine screening for Lynch syndrome in endometrial cancer patients up to 70 years of age. <i>Gynecologic Oncology</i> , 2016, 143, 453-459.	0.6	43
65	Exploring how individuals complete the choice tasks in a discrete choice experiment: an interview study. <i>BMC Medical Research Methodology</i> , 2016, 16, 45.	1.4	23
66	Clinicians' overestimation of febrile child risk assessment. <i>European Journal of Pediatrics</i> , 2016, 175, 563-572.	1.3	2
67	Cost-effectiveness of routine screening for Lynch syndrome in colorectal cancer patients up to 70 years of age. <i>Genetics in Medicine</i> , 2016, 18, 966-973.	1.1	42
68	Future pandemics and vaccination: Public opinion and attitudes across three European countries. <i>Vaccine</i> , 2016, 34, 803-808.	1.7	33
69	The Relative Importance of the Domains of Work Functioning. <i>Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine</i> , 2015, 57, 361-366.	0.9	6
70	Patients' Preferences for Surgical Management of Esophageal Cancer: A Discrete Choice Experiment. <i>World Journal of Surgery</i> , 2015, 39, 2492-2499.	0.8	20
71	Sample Size Requirements for Discrete-Choice Experiments in Healthcare: a Practical Guide. <i>Patient</i> , 2015, 8, 373-384.	1.1	497
72	Factors affecting food choices of older adults from high and low socioeconomic groups: a discrete choice experiment. <i>American Journal of Clinical Nutrition</i> , 2015, 101, 768-774.	2.2	92

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
73	Calculating Preference Weights for the Labor and Delivery Index: A Discrete Choice Experiment on Women's Birth Experiences. <i>Value in Health</i> , 2015, 18, 856-864.	0.1	6
74	Protective Behaviour of Citizens to Transport Accidents Involving Hazardous Materials: A Discrete Choice Experiment Applied to Populated Areas nearby Waterways. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2015, 10, e0142507.	1.1	6
75	Risk Prediction Scores for Recurrence and Progression of Non-Muscle Invasive Bladder Cancer: An International Validation in Primary Tumours. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2014, 9, e96849.	1.1	46
76	The Added Value of Percentage of Free to Total Prostate-specific Antigen, PCA3, and a Kallikrein Panel to the ERSPC Risk Calculator for Prostate Cancer in Prescreened Men. <i>European Urology</i> , 2014, 66, 1109-1115.	0.9	74
77	Discrete Choice Experiments in Health Economics: A Review of the Literature. <i>Pharmacoeconomics</i> , 2014, 32, 883-902.	1.7	560
78	Acceptance of Vaccinations in Pandemic Outbreaks: A Discrete Choice Experiment. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2014, 9, e102505.	1.1	88
79	Have Preferences of Girls Changed Almost 3 Years after the Much Debated Start of the HPV Vaccination Program in the Netherlands? A Discrete Choice Experiment. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2014, 9, e104772.	1.1	19
80	The Effect of Including an Opt-Out Option in Discrete Choice Experiments. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2014, 9, e111805.	1.1	126
81	Towards Successful Implementation of Pharmacokinetic-Guided Prophylactic Dosing of Clotting Factor Concentrate in Hemophilia; The Do's and Don'ts after Discrete Choice Experiment Analysis. <i>Blood</i> , 2014, 124, 5038-5038.	0.6	0
82	A Closer Look at Decision and Analyst Error by Including Nonlinearities in Discrete Choice Models: Implications on Willingness-to-Pay Estimates Derived from Discrete Choice Data in Healthcare. <i>Pharmacoeconomics</i> , 2013, 31, 1169-1183.	1.7	14
83	Random Regret-Based Discrete-Choice Modelling: An Application to Healthcare. <i>Pharmacoeconomics</i> , 2013, 31, 623-634.	1.7	32
84	Discrete choice experiments in health economics: a review of the literature. <i>Health Economics (United Kingdom)</i> 2014, 28, 924-944.	0.8	924
85	Liquid-based cervical cytology using ThinPrep technology: weighing the pros and cons in a cost-effectiveness analysis. <i>Cancer Causes and Control</i> , 2012, 23, 1323-1331.	0.8	21
86	Patients' Preferences for Scoliosis Brace Treatment. <i>Spine</i> , 2010, 35, 57-63.	1.0	33
87	Labeled versus Unlabeled Discrete Choice Experiments in Health Economics: An Application to Colorectal Cancer Screening. <i>Value in Health</i> , 2010, 13, 315-323.	0.1	156
88	What determines individuals' preferences for colorectal cancer screening programmes? A discrete choice experiment. <i>European Journal of Cancer</i> , 2010, 46, 150-159.	1.3	65
89	Salpingotomy or salpingectomy in tubal ectopic pregnancy: What do women prefer?. <i>Reproductive BioMedicine Online</i> , 2010, 21, 687-693.	1.1	34
90	Non-muscle-invasive bladder cancer surveillance for which cystoscopy is partly replaced by microsatellite analysis of urine: a cost-effective alternative?. <i>BJU International</i> , 2009, 104, 41-47.	1.3	40

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
91	Surveillance in a Prospectively Followed Cohort of Patients with Barrett Esophagus in the Netherlands: A Cost-Effectiveness Analysis. <i>Gastrointestinal Endoscopy</i> , 2009, 69, AB109-AB110.	0.5	0
92	Towards a comprehensive estimate of national spending on prevention. <i>BMC Public Health</i> , 2007, 7, 252.	1.2	12