

# Steffie K Naber

## List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: <https://exaly.com/author-pdf/1608327/publications.pdf>

Version: 2024-02-01

34  
papers

894  
citations

623734

14  
h-index

477307

29  
g-index

36  
all docs

36  
docs citations

36  
times ranked

1534  
citing authors

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
1	Colorectal Cancer Screening within Colonoscopy Capacity Constraints: Can FIT-Based Programs Save More Lives by Trading off More Sensitive Test Cutoffs against Longer Screening Intervals?. <i>MDM Policy and Practice</i> , 2022, 7, 238146832210970.	0.9	3
2	Calculation of Stop Ages for Colorectal Cancer Screening Based on Comorbidities and Screening History. <i>Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology</i> , 2021, 19, 547-555.	4.4	19
3	Cost-effectiveness of HPV-based cervical screening based on first year results in the Netherlands: a modelling study. <i>BJOG: an International Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology</i> , 2021, 128, 573-582.	2.3	32
4	Cost-effectiveness analysis of colorectal cancer screening in a low incidence country: The case of Saudi Arabia. <i>Saudi Journal of Gastroenterology</i> , 2021, 27, 208.	1.1	9
5	Identifying key factors for the effectiveness of pancreatic cancer screening: A model-based analysis. <i>International Journal of Cancer</i> , 2021, 149, 337-346.	5.1	8
6	Reducing unnecessary referrals for colposcopy in hrHPV-positive women within the Dutch cervical cancer screening programme: A modelling study. <i>Gynecologic Oncology</i> , 2021, 160, 713-720.	1.4	11
7	The Differential Risk of Cervical Cancer in HPV-Vaccinated and -Unvaccinated Women: A Mathematical Modeling Study. <i>Cancer Epidemiology Biomarkers and Prevention</i> , 2021, 30, 912-919.	2.5	1
8	The Optimal Age to Stop Endoscopic Surveillance of Patients With Barrett's Esophagus Based on Sex and Comorbidity: A Comparative Cost-Effectiveness Analysis. <i>Gastroenterology</i> , 2021, 161, 487-494.e4.	1.3	15
9	Cost-Effectiveness of Risk-Stratified Colorectal Cancer Screening Based on Polygenic Risk: Current Status and Future Potential. <i>JNCI Cancer Spectrum</i> , 2020, 4, pkz086.	2.9	39
10	Cost-effectiveness of Active Identification and Subsequent Colonoscopy Surveillance of Lynch Syndrome Cases. <i>Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology</i> , 2020, 18, 2760-2767.e12.	4.4	8
11	Cost-Effectiveness of Personalized Screening for Colorectal Cancer Based on Polygenic Risk and Family History. <i>Cancer Epidemiology Biomarkers and Prevention</i> , 2020, 29, 10-21.	2.5	22
12	Optimizing Management of Patients With Barrett's Esophagus and Low-Grade or No Dysplasia Based on Comparative Modeling. <i>Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology</i> , 2020, 18, 1961-1969.	4.4	15
13	The Impact of Different Screening Model Structures on Cervical Cancer Incidence and Mortality Predictions: The Maximum Clinical Incidence Reduction (MCLIR) Methodology. <i>Medical Decision Making</i> , 2020, 40, 474-482.	2.4	5
14	Cost-effectiveness of inactivated influenza vaccination in children with medical risk conditions in the Netherlands. <i>Vaccine</i> , 2020, 38, 3387-3396.	3.8	1
15	The Impact of the Policy-Practice Gap on Costs and Benefits of Barrett's Esophagus Management. <i>American Journal of Gastroenterology</i> , 2020, 115, 1026-1035.	0.4	1
16	Cost-effectiveness of a multitarget stool DNA test for colorectal cancer screening of Medicare beneficiaries. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2019, 14, e0220234.	2.5	39
17	Costs and outcomes of Lynch syndrome screening in the Australian colorectal cancer population. <i>Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology (Australia)</i> , 2018, 33, 1737-1744.	2.8	11
18	Cost Effectiveness of Age-Specific Screening Intervals for People With Family Histories of Colorectal Cancer. <i>Gastroenterology</i> , 2018, 154, 105-116.e20.	1.3	26

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
19	Modeling in Colorectal Cancer Screening: Assessing External and Predictive Validity of MISCAN-Colon Microsimulation Model Using NORCCAP Trial Results. <i>Medical Decision Making</i> , 2018, 38, 917-929.	2.4	10
20	The health impact of human papillomavirus vaccination in the situation of primary human papillomavirus screening: A mathematical modeling study. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2018, 13, e0202924.	2.5	7
21	Effect of Cervical Cancer Screening Programs on Preterm Birth. <i>Obstetrics and Gynecology</i> , 2017, 130, 1207-1217.	2.4	3
22	Cervical cancer incidence after normal cytological sample in routine screening using SurePath, ThinPrep, and conventional cytology: population based study. <i>BMJ: British Medical Journal</i> , 2017, 356, j504.	2.3	24
23	Cervical Cancer Screening in Partly HPV Vaccinated Cohorts – A Cost-Effectiveness Analysis. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2016, 11, e0145548.	2.5	29
24	The role of pre-invasive disease in overdiagnosis: A microsimulation study comparing mass screening for breast cancer and cervical cancer. <i>Journal of Medical Screening</i> , 2016, 23, 210-216.	2.3	6
25	Public Health Benefits of Routine Human Papillomavirus Vaccination for Adults in the Netherlands: A Mathematical Modeling Study. <i>Journal of Infectious Diseases</i> , 2016, 214, 854-861.	4.0	9
26	Comparing SurePath, ThinPrep, and conventional cytology as primary test method: SurePath is associated with increased CIN II+ detection rates. <i>Cancer Causes and Control</i> , 2016, 27, 15-25.	1.8	44
27	Estimation of Benefits, Burden, and Harms of Colorectal Cancer Screening Strategies. <i>JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association</i> , 2016, 315, 2595.	7.4	388
28	The potential harms of primary human papillomavirus screening in over-screened women: a microsimulation study. <i>Cancer Causes and Control</i> , 2016, 27, 569-581.	1.8	10
29	Beware of Kinked Frontiers: A Systematic Review of the Choice of Comparator Strategies in Cost-Effectiveness Analyses of Human Papillomavirus Testing in Cervical Screening. <i>Value in Health</i> , 2015, 18, 1138-1151.	0.3	17
30	Offering Self-Sampling to Non-Attendees of Organized Primary HPV Screening: When Do Harms Outweigh the Benefits?. <i>Cancer Epidemiology Biomarkers and Prevention</i> , 2015, 24, 773-782.	2.5	42
31	When Is It Effective to Offer Self-Sampling to Non-Attendees? Response. <i>Cancer Epidemiology Biomarkers and Prevention</i> , 2015, 24, 1296-1296.	2.5	1
32	Exploring the trend of increased cervical intraepithelial neoplasia detection rates in the Netherlands. <i>Journal of Medical Screening</i> , 2015, 22, 144-150.	2.3	10
33	Allocating CO2 emission to customers on a distribution route. <i>Omega</i> , 2015, 54, 191-199.	5.9	22
34	The estimated impact of natural immunity on the effectiveness of human papillomavirus vaccination. <i>Vaccine</i> , 2015, 33, 5357-5364.	3.8	7