## Paolo Belli

List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: https://exaly.com/author-pdf/1427140/publications.pdf Version: 2024-02-01



#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
1	Multicenter Surveillance of Women at High Genetic Breast Cancer Risk Using Mammography, Ultrasonography, and Contrast-Enhanced Magnetic Resonance Imaging (the High Breast Cancer Risk) Tj ETQq1	1 06784314	r <b>ള8</b> 9 /Over
2	Characterization of Solid Breast Masses. Journal of Ultrasound in Medicine, 2006, 25, 649-659.	1.7	135
3	Automated Breast Ultrasonography (ABUS) in the Screening and Diagnostic Setting. Academic Radiology, 2018, 25, 1457-1470.	2.5	70
4	Magnetic Resonance Imaging Features in Triple-Negative Breast Cancer: Comparison With Luminal and HER2-Overexpressing Tumors. Clinical Breast Cancer, 2012, 12, 331-339.	2.4	65
5	Diffusion-weighted Imaging in Evaluating the Response to Neoadjuvant Breast Cancer Treatment. Breast Journal, 2011, 17, 610-619.	1.0	58
6	Multicenter, Double-Blind, Randomized, Intraindividual Crossover Comparison of Gadobenate Dimeglumine and Gadopentetate Dimeglumine for Breast MR Imaging (DETECT Trial). Radiology, 2011, 258, 396-408.	7.3	55
7	Role of the Apparent Diffusion Coefficient in theÂPrediction of Response to Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy in Patients With Locally Advanced Breast Cancer. Clinical Breast Cancer, 2015, 15, 370-380.	2.4	47
8	Cystic Breast Lesions. Journal of Ultrasound in Medicine, 2010, 29, 1617-1626.	1.7	41
9	Effect of breast cancer phenotype on diagnostic performance of MRI in the prediction to response to neoadjuvant treatment. European Journal of Radiology, 2014, 83, 1631-1638.	2.6	38
10	Breast imaging and cancer diagnosis during the COVID-19 pandemic: recommendations from the Italian College of Breast Radiologists by SIRM. Radiologia Medica, 2020, 125, 926-930.	7.7	38
11	Diffusion magnetic resonance imaging in breast cancer characterisation: correlations between the apparent diffusion coefficient and major prognostic factors. Radiologia Medica, 2015, 120, 268-276.	7.7	37
12	DWI in breast MRI: Role of ADC value to determine diagnosis between recurrent tumor and surgical scar in operated patients. European Journal of Radiology, 2010, 75, e114-e123.	2.6	30
13	Association between sonographic appearances of breast cancers and their histopathologic features and biomarkers. Journal of Clinical Ultrasound, 2016, 44, 26-33.	0.8	30
14	Synchronous Bilateral Paget's Disease of the Nipple Associated with Bilateral Breast Carcinoma. Breast Journal, 2005, 11, 355-356.	1.0	28
15	Automated breast volume scanner (ABVS) compared to handheld ultrasound (HHUS) and contrast-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging (CE-MRI) in the early assessment of breast cancer during neoadjuvant chemotherapy: an emerging role to monitoring tumor response?. Radiologia Medica. 2021, 126, 517-526.	7.7	24
16	Recommendations for breast imaging follow-up of women with a previous history of breast cancer: position paper from the Italian Group for Mammography Screening (GISMa) and the Italian College of Breast Radiologists (ICBR) by SIRM. Radiologia Medica, 2016, 121, 891-896.	7.7	22
17	Radial Scar: a management dilemma. Radiologia Medica, 2021, 126, 774-785.	7.7	21
18	Structured reporting of x-ray mammography in the first diagnosis of breast cancer: a Delphi consensus proposal. Radiologia Medica, 2022, 127, 471-483.	7.7	21

Paolo Belli

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
19	A Feasibility Study of Neo-Adjuvant Low-Dose Fractionated Radiotherapy with Two Different Concurrent Anthracycline-Docetaxel Schedules in Stage IIA/B-IIIA Breast Cancer. Tumori, 2012, 98, 79-85.	1.1	20
20	Mammography and MRI for screening women who underwent chest radiation therapy (lymphoma) Tj ETQqO 0 SIRM. Radiologia Medica, 2016, 121, 834-837.	0 rgBT /Ov 7.7	erlock 10 Tf 50 20
21	Digital breast tomosynthesis (DBT): recommendations from the Italian College of Breast Radiologists (ICBR) by the Italian Society of Medical Radiology (SIRM) and the Italian Group for Mammography Screening (GISMa). Radiologia Medica, 2017, 122, 723-730.	7.7	18
22	Diabetic muscle infarction. American Journal of Medicine, 2001, 111, 671-672.	1.5	15
23	Image-Guided Localization Techniques for Surgical Excision of Non-Palpable Breast Lesions: An Overview of Current Literature and Our Experience with Preoperative Skin Tattoo. Journal of Personalized Medicine, 2021, 11, 99.	2.5	15
24	Early onset lactating adenoma and the role of breast MRI: a case report. Journal of Medical Case Reports, 2009, 3, 43.	0.8	14
25	Ultrasound-guided preoperative localization of breast lesions: a good choice. Journal of Ultrasound, 2019, 22, 85-94.	1.3	14
26	Lesions of uncertain malignant potential of the breast (B3) on vacuum-assisted biopsy for microcalcifications: Predictors of malignancy. European Journal of Radiology, 2020, 130, 109194.	2.6	13
27	A feasibility study of neo-adjuvant low-dose fractionated radiotherapy with two different concurrent anthracycline-docetaxel schedules in stage IIA/B-IIIA breast cancer. Tumori, 2012, 98, 79-85.	1.1	13
28	A new risk stratification score for the management of ultrasound-detected B3 breast lesions. Breast Journal, 2018, 24, 965-970.	1.0	12
29	Mammographic and Ultrasonographic Findings of Oxidized Regenerated Cellulose in Breast Cancer Surgery: A 5-Year Experience. Clinical Breast Cancer, 2015, 15, e249-e256.	2.4	11
30	Effect of Needle Size in Ultrasound-guided Core Needle Breast Biopsy: Comparison of 14-, 16-, and 18-Gauge Needles. Clinical Breast Cancer, 2017, 17, 536-543.	2.4	10
31	Primary systemic treatment and concomitant low dose radiotherapy for breast cancer: Final results of a prospective phase II study. Breast, 2014, 23, 597-602.	2.2	9
32	Comparison of gadobenate dimeglumine-enhanced breast MRI and gadopentetate dimeglumine-enhanced breast MRI with mammography and ultrasound for the detection of breast cancer. Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging, 2014, 39, 1272-1286.	3.4	7
33	Synchronous Bilateral Breast Carcinoma in a 50-Year-Old Man with 45,X/46,XY Mosaic Karyotype: Report of a Case. Surgery Today, 2005, 36, 71-75.	1.5	6
34	Background parenchymal enhancement and breast cancer: a review of the emerging evidences about its potential use as imaging biomarker. British Journal of Radiology, 2021, 94, 20200630.	2.2	5
35	Phyllodes Tumor of the Breast: Magnetic Resonance Imaging Findings and Surgical Treatment. Breast Journal, 2005, 11, 144-145.	1.0	4
36	Can Breast Cancer Biopsy Influence Sentinel Lymph Node Status?. Clinical Breast Cancer, 2016, 16, e153-e157.	2.4	4

Paolo Belli

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
37	Hypervascularity Predicts Complete Pathologic Response to Chemotherapy and Late Outcomes in Breast Cancer. Clinical Breast Cancer, 2016, 16, e193-e201.	2.4	4
38	Magnetic resonance imaging appearance of oxidized regenerated cellulose in breast cancer surgery. Radiologia Medica, 2016, 121, 688-695.	7.7	4
39	Breast MRI in a Case of "Early Onset―Lactating Adenoma. Breast Journal, 2009, 15, 105-106.	1.0	3
40	Sensitivity of breast MRI for ductal carcinoma in situ appearing as microcalcifications only on mammography. Clinical Imaging, 2016, 40, 1207-1212.	1.5	3
41	The P.I.N.K. Study Approach for Supporting Personalized Risk Assessment and Early Diagnosis of Breast Cancer. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 2021, 18, 2456.	2.6	3
42	Conventional CT versus Dedicated CT Angiography in DIEP Flap Planning: A Feasibility Study. Journal of Personalized Medicine, 2021, 11, 277.	2.5	3
43	MRI versus Mammography plus Ultrasound in Women at Intermediate Breast Cancer Risk: Study Design and Protocol of the MRIB Multicenter, Randomized, Controlled Trial. Diagnostics, 2021, 11, 1635.	2.6	3
44	Screening women at intermediate risk: harm or charm?. European Journal of Radiology, 2012, 81, S116-S117.	2.6	2
45	The Assisi Think Tank Meeting Breast Large Database for Standardized Data Collection in Breast Cancer—ATTM.BLADE. Journal of Personalized Medicine, 2021, 11, 143.	2.5	2
46	Taking one step backward to take two steps forward: the importance of breast tumor phenotype in MRI-based prediction of response. Translational Cancer Research, 2018, 7, S424-S432.	1.0	1
47	A case of intracystic breast cancer. Rays, 2005, 30, 245-50.	0.2	1