John Brandt Brodersen

List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: https://exaly.com/author-pdf/2092865/publications.pdf

Version: 2024-02-01

147 papers 4,303 citations

147566 31 h-index 59 g-index

151 all docs

151 docs citations

151 times ranked

4331 citing authors

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
1	CT screening for lung cancer brings forward early disease. The randomised Danish Lung Cancer Screening Trial: status after five annual screening rounds with low-dose CT. Thorax, 2012, 67, 296-301.	2.7	374
2	The Danish Randomized Lung Cancer CT Screening Trialâ€"Overall Design and Results of the Prevalence Round. Journal of Thoracic Oncology, 2009, 4, 608-614.	0.5	373
3	Results of the Randomized Danish Lung Cancer Screening Trial with Focus on High-Risk Profiling. American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine, 2016, 193, 542-551.	2.5	279
4	Long-Term Psychosocial Consequences of False-Positive Screening Mammography. Annals of Family Medicine, 2013, 11, 106-115.	0.9	270
5	Overdiagnosis: what it is and what it isn't. BMJ Evidence-Based Medicine, 2018, 23, 1-3.	1.7	191
6	Breast screening: the facts-or maybe not. BMJ: British Medical Journal, 2009, 338, b86-b86.	2.4	128
7	Quantification of harms in cancer screening trials: literature review. BMJ, The, 2013, 347, f5334-f5334.	3.0	101
8	Quaternary prevention: reviewing the concept. European Journal of General Practice, 2018, 24, 106-111.	0.9	91
9	Participation bias in a randomised trial of screening for lung cancer. Lung Cancer, 2011, 73, 325-331.	0.9	78
10	Rasch analysis of the Knee injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score (KOOS): a statistical reâ€evaluation. Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports, 2008, 18, 336-345.	1.3	70
11	Walking the tightrope: communicating overdiagnosis in modern healthcare. BMJ, The, 2016, 352, i348.	3.0	69
12	To nudge or not to nudge: cancer screening programmes and the limits of libertarian paternalism. Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 2012, 66, 1193-1196.	2.0	65
13	Estimation of Overdiagnosis of Lung Cancer in Low-Dose Computed Tomography Screening. JAMA Internal Medicine, 2018, 178, 1420.	2.6	64
14	The Adequacy of Measurement of Short and Long-Term Consequences of False-Positive Screening Mammography. Journal of Medical Screening, 2004, 11, 39-44.	1.1	59
15	Methodological aspects of differential item functioning in the Rasch model. Journal of Medical Economics, 2007, 10, 309-324.	1.0	58
16	Overdiagnosis: How cancer screening can turn indolent pathology into illness. Apmis, 2014, 122, 683-689.	0.9	57
17	Benefits and harms of screening men for abdominal aortic aneurysm in Sweden: a registry-based cohort study. Lancet, The, 2018, 391, 2441-2447.	6.3	57
18	Consequences of Screening in Lung Cancer: Development and Dimensionality of a Questionnaire. Value in Health, 2010, 13, 601-612.	0.1	52

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
19	Consequences of Screening in Breast Cancer (COS-BC): development of a questionnaire. Scandinavian Journal of Primary Health Care, 2008, 26, 251-256.	0.6	48
20	Validation of a Condition-Specific Measure for Women Having an Abnormal Screening Mammography. Value in Health, 2007, 10, 294-304.	0.1	47
21	Overdiagnosis of lung cancer with low-dose computed tomography screening: meta-analysis of the randomised clinical trials. Breathe, 2020, 16, 200013.	0.6	46
22	Informed choice requires information about both benefits and harms. Journal of Medical Ethics, 2009, 35, 268-269.	1.0	45
23	Psychosocial consequences of allocation to lung cancer screening: a randomised controlled trial. BMJ Open, 2012, 2, e000663.	0.8	44
24	Measuring the psychosocial consequences of screening. Health and Quality of Life Outcomes, 2007, 5, 3.	1.0	43
25	Z-Inspection (sup) \hat{A}^{\otimes} (sup): A Process to Assess Trustworthy Al. IEEE Transactions on Technology and Society, 2021, 2, 83-97.	2.4	42
26	Lolland-Falster Health Study: Study protocol for a household-based prospective cohort study. Scandinavian Journal of Public Health, 2020, 48, 382-390.	1.2	41
27	No evidence of a clinically important effect of adding local infusion analgesia administrated through a catheter in pain treatment after total hip arthroplasty. Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society: Letters, 2011, 82, 315-320.	1.2	40
28	Relationship between chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and subclinical coronary artery disease in long-term smokers. European Heart Journal Cardiovascular Imaging, 2013, 14, 1159-1166.	0.5	38
29	Estimating overdiagnosis in screening for abdominal aortic aneurysm: could a change in smoking habits and lowered aortic diameter tip the balance of screening towards harm?. BMJ, The, 2015, 350, h825-h825.	3.0	38
30	Screening for reducing morbidity and mortality in malignant melanoma. The Cochrane Library, 2019, 2019, CD012352.	1.5	37
31	Reforming disease definitions: a new primary care led, people-centred approach. BMJ Evidence-Based Medicine, 2019, 24, 170-173.	1.7	36
32	Healthcare costs in the Danish randomised controlled lung cancer CT-screening trial: A registry study. Lung Cancer, 2014, 83, 347-355.	0.9	34
33	Overview of guidelines on breast screening: Why recommendations differ and what to do about it. Breast, 2017, 31, 261-269.	0.9	32
34	How precision medicine and screening with big data could increase overdiagnosis. BMJ: British Medical Journal, 2019, 366, l5270.	2.4	32
35	Preconceptions influence women's perceptions of information on breast cancer screening: a qualitative study. BMC Research Notes, 2015, 8, 404.	0.6	31
36	Opening Pandora's box: The experiences of having an asymptomatic aortic aneurysm under surveillance. Health, Risk and Society, 2012, 14, 341-359.	0.9	30

#	Article	IF	Citations
37	Harms of screening for abdominal aortic aneurysm: is there more to life than a 0Â-46% disease-specific mortality reduction?. Lancet, The, 2016, 387, 308-310.	6.3	30
38	Psychosocial consequences of receiving false-positive colorectal cancer screening results: a qualitative study. Scandinavian Journal of Primary Health Care, 2019, 37, 145-154.	0.6	28
39	The benefits and harms of screening for cancer with a focus on breast screening. Polish Archives of Internal Medicine, 2010, 120, 89-94.	0.3	28
40	Informed choice in screening needs more than information. Lancet, The, 2015, 385, 1597-1599.	6.3	27
41	Patients' experiences of the use of point-of-care ultrasound in general practice – a cross-sectional study. BMC Family Practice, 2021, 22, 116.	2.9	27
42	The adequacy of measurement of short and long-term consequences of false-positive screening mammography. Journal of Medical Screening, 2004, 11, 39-44.	1.1	26
43	Focusing on overdiagnosis as a driver of too much medicine. BMJ: British Medical Journal, 2018, 362, k3494.	2.4	25
44	A catalogue of PROMs in sports science: Quality assessment of PROM development and validation. Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports, 2021, 31, 991-998.	1.3	25
45	Use and impact of point-of-care ultrasonography in general practice: a prospective observational study. BMJ Open, 2020, 10, e037664.	0.8	24
46	How to translate and locally adapt a PROM. Assessment of cross ultural differential item functioning. Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports, 2021, 31, 999-1008.	1.3	24
47	What is a PROM and why do we need it?. Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports, 2021, 31, 967-971.	1.3	24
48	Psychometric validation of PROM instruments. Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports, 2021, 31, 1225-1238.	1.3	24
49	Co-Design of a Trustworthy Al System in Healthcare: Deep Learning Based Skin Lesion Classifier. Frontiers in Human Dynamics, 2021, 3, .	1.0	24
50	Psychosocial consequences of false positives in the Danish Lung Cancer CT Screening Trial: a nested matched cohort study. BMJ Open, 2020, 10, e034682.	0.8	22
51	How to develop a conditionâ€specific PROM. Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports, 2021, 31, 1216-1224.	1.3	21
52	The benefits and harms of screening for cancer with a focus on breast screening., 2010, 120, 89-94.		20
53	Development of the Knee Numericâ€Entity Evaluation Score (<scp>KNEES</scp> – <scp>ACL</scp>): A conditionâ€specific questionnaire. Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports, 2013, 23, e293-301.	1.3	19
54	Measuring bothersome menopausal symptoms: development and validation of the MenoScores questionnaire. Health and Quality of Life Outcomes, 2018, 16, 97.	1.0	19

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
55	Efficacy of a standardised acupuncture approach for women with bothersome menopausal symptoms: a pragmatic randomised study in primary care (the ACOM study). BMJ Open, 2019, 9, e023637.	0.8	18
56	Four of five frequently used orthopedic PROMs possess inadequate content validity: a COSMIN evaluation of the mHHS, HAGOS, IKDC-SKF, KOOS and KNEES-ACL. Knee Surgery, Sports Traumatology, Arthroscopy, 2022, 30, 3602-3615.	2.3	18
57	Contamination during 4 years of annual CT screening in the Danish Lung Cancer Screening Trial (DLCST). Lung Cancer, 2011, 71, 323-327.	0.9	17
58	Danish general practitioners have found their own way of using point-of-care ultrasonography in primary care: a qualitative study. BMC Family Practice, 2019, 20, 89.	2.9	17
59	The perception gap: how the benefits and harms of cervical cancer screening are understood in information material focusing on informed choice. Health, Risk and Society, 2020, 22, 177-196.	0.9	17
60	Better safe than sorry: a long-term perspective on experiences with a false-positive screening mammography in Denmark. Health, Risk and Society, 2013, 15, 699-716.	0.9	16
61	Do invitations for cervical screening provide sufficient information to enable informed choice? A cross-sectional study of invitations for publicly funded cervical screening. Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine, 2016, 109, 274-281.	1.1	16
62	Why do some participants in colorectal cancer screening choose not to undergo colonoscopy following a positive test result? A qualitative study. Scandinavian Journal of Primary Health Care, 2018, 36, 262-271.	0.6	16
63	New hypertension guidance risks overdiagnosis and overtreatment. BMJ: British Medical Journal, 2019, 365, l1657.	2.4	16
64	Clinical and pathophysiological aspects of bicuspid aortic valve disease. Cardiology in the Young, 2019, 29, 1-10.	0.4	16
65	Are adequate PROMs used as outcomes in randomized controlled trials? an analysis of 54 trials. Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports, 2021, 31, 972-981.	1.3	16
66	Breast cancer screening: â€~â€~reassuring'' the worried well?. Scandinavian Journal of Public Health, 2011, 39, 326-332.	1.2	15
67	The impact of HPV vaccination on future cervical screening: a simulation study of two birth cohorts in Denmark. BMJ Open, 2015, 5, e007921.	0.8	15
68	Do men with lower urinary tract symptoms have an increased risk of advanced prostate cancer?. BMJ: British Medical Journal, 2018, 361, k 1202.	2.4	15
69	Precision medicine in the clouds. Nature Biotechnology, 2018, 36, 678-680.	9.4	15
70	<p>Specific Measures of Quality of Life in Patients with Multimorbidity in Primary Healthcare: A Systematic Review on Patient-Reported Outcome Measures' Adequacy of Measurement</p> . Patient Related Outcome Measures, 2020, Volume 11, 1-10.	0.7	15
71	Ensuring face validity in patient-related outcome scores — A matter of content. Knee, 2013, 20, 72-78.	0.8	14
72	The Development and Validation of a Multidimensional Sum-Scaling Questionnaire to Measure Patient-Reported Outcomes in Acute Respiratory Tract Infections in Primary Care: The Acute Respiratory Tract Infection Questionnaire. Value in Health, 2013, 16, 987-992.	0.1	14

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
7 3	Dimensionality of the Knee Numericâ€Entity Evaluation Score (<scp>KNEES</scp> â€ <scp>ACL</scp>): A conditionâ€specific questionnaire. Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports, 2013, 23, e302-12.	1.3	14
74	User experiences on implementation of patient reported outcome measures (PROMs) in a Haematological outpatient clinic. Journal of Patient-Reported Outcomes, 2020, 4, 87.	0.9	14
75	Consequences of screening in abdominal aortic aneurysm: development and dimensionality of a questionnaire. Journal of Patient-Reported Outcomes, 2018, 2, 37.	0.9	13
76	Diagnostic Invasiveness and Psychosocial Consequences of False-Positive Mammography. Annals of Family Medicine, 2015, 13, 242-249.	0.9	12
77	Informed or misinformed choice? Framing effects in a national information pamphlet on colorectal cancer screening. Health, Risk and Society, 2018, 20, 241-258.	0.9	12
78	†You should see a doctor', said the robot: Reflections on a digital diagnostic device in a pandemic age. Scandinavian Journal of Public Health, 2021, 49, 33-36.	1.2	12
79	Marginal public health gain of screening for colorectal cancer: modelling study, based on WHO and national databases in the Nordic countries. Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice, 2013, 19, 400-407.	0.9	11
80	Breast cancer screening implementation and reassurance. European Journal of Public Health, 2014, 24, 258-263.	0.1	11
81	Development and validation of a condition-specific diary to measure severity, bothersomeness and impact on daily activities for patients with acute urinary tract infection in primary care. Health and Quality of Life Outcomes, 2017, 15, 57.	1.0	11
82	Quaternary prevention: an evidence-based concept aiming to protect patients from medical harm. British Journal of General Practice, 2019, 69, 614-615.	0.7	11
83	Haematologists' experiences implementing patient reported outcome measures (PROMs) in an outpatient clinic: a qualitative study for applied practice. Journal of Patient-Reported Outcomes, 2019, 3, 74.	0.9	11
84	Sarcopenia: early prevention or overdiagnosis?. BMJ, The, 2022, 376, e052592.	3.0	11
85	How to conduct research on overdiagnosis. A keynote paper from the EGPRN May 2016, Tel Aviv. European Journal of General Practice, 2017, 23, 78-82.	0.9	10
86	Direct and indirect healthcare costs of lung cancer CT screening in Denmark: a registry study. BMJ Open, 2020, 10, e031768.	0.8	10
87	Non-specific symptoms and signs of cancer: different organisations of a cancer patient pathway in Denmark. Scandinavian Journal of Primary Health Care, 2021, 39, 23-30.	0.6	10
88	Potential problems in the use of patient reported outcome measures (PROMs) and reporting of PROM data in sports science. Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports, 2021, 31, 1249-1258.	1.3	10
89	Reading screening mammograms – Attitudes among radiologists and radiographers about skill mix. European Journal of Radiology, 2011, 80, e325-e330.	1.2	9
90	The structure of medical decisions: uncertainty, probability and risk in five common choice situations. Health, Risk and Society, 2013, 15, 27-50.	0.9	9

#	Article	IF	Citations
91	Effects of numerical information on intention to participate in cervical screening among women offered HPV vaccination: a randomised study. Scandinavian Journal of Primary Health Care, 2016, 34, 401-419.	0.6	9
92	Informed participation in cancer screening: The facts are changing, and GPs are going to feel it. Scandinavian Journal of Primary Health Care, 2010, 28, 1-3.	0.6	8
93	Adaptation to Swedish and further development of the â€ [~] Consequences of Screening – Breast Cancerâ€ [™] questionnaire: a multimethod study. Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences, 2013, 27, 475-486.	1.0	8
94	Experiences of the screening process and the diagnosis abdominal aortic aneurysm among 65-year-old men from invitation to a 1-year surveillance. Journal of Vascular Nursing, 2017, 35, 70-77.	0.2	8
95	Consequences of screening in cervical cancer: development and dimensionality of a questionnaire. BMC Psychology, 2018, 6, 39.	0.9	8
96	Psychosocial consequences of potential overdiagnosis in prostate cancer a qualitative interview study. Scandinavian Journal of Primary Health Care, 2020, 38, 439-446.	0.6	8
97	Responsiveness, minimal important difference, minimal relevant difference, and optimal number of patients for a study. Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports, 2021, 31, 1239-1248.	1.3	8
98	Scientific second-order 'nudging' or lobbying by interest groups: the battle over Abdominal Aortic Aneurysm Screening Programmes. Medicine, Health Care and Philosophy, 2014, 17, 641-650.	0.9	7
99	A Study of Anti-Fat Bias among Danish General Practitioners and Whether This Bias and General Practitioners' Lifestyle Can Affect Treatment of Tension Headache in Patients with Obesity. Obesity Facts, 2018, 11, 501-513.	1.6	7
100	Why do Danish junior doctors choose general practice as their future specialty? Results of a mixed-methods survey. European Journal of General Practice, 2019, 25, 149-156.	0.9	7
101	Are PROMs used adequately in sports research? An analysis of 54 randomized controlled trials with PROMs as endpoint. Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports, 2021, 31, 982-990.	1.3	7
102	Addressing the future role of general practice at the 16th Nordic Congress in Copenhagen 2009: How can we ensure sustainable care in a complex world of evidence, context, organization, and personal care?. Scandinavian Journal of Primary Health Care, 2008, 26, 193-195.	0.6	6
103	The effectiveness of structured personal care of type 2 diabetes on recurrent outcomes: a 19Âyear follow-up of the study Diabetes Care in General Practice (DCGP). Diabetologia, 2014, 57, 1119-23.	2.9	6
104	Waiting time and the psychosocial consequences of false-positive mammography: cohort study. Journal of Negative Results in BioMedicine, 2015, 14, 8.	1.4	6
105	Psychometric Validation of the Danish Version of the Oswestry Disability Index in Patients With Chronic Low Back Pain. Spine, 2020, 45, 1143-1150.	1.0	6
106	Adaptation of the Activity Measure Post-Acute Care (AM-PAC) from English to Mandarin using the dual-panel translation approach. Disability and Rehabilitation, 2018, 40, 2571-2576.	0.9	5
107	Choosing the most appropriate PROM for clinical studies in sports medicine. Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports, 2021, 31, 1209-1215.	1.3	5
108	Categories of systematic influences applied to increase cancer screening participation: a literature review and analysis. European Journal of Public Health, 2021, 31, 200-206.	0.1	5

#	Article	lF	Citations
109	Use and diagnostic outcomes of cancer patient pathways in Denmark – is the place of initial diagnostic work-up an important factor?. BMC Health Services Research, 2022, 22, 130.	0.9	5
110	Validity of Short-Term Consequences of Cancer Prevention and Screening Activities?. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 2005, 23, 244-244.	0.8	4
111	Potential biases in colorectal cancer screening using faecal occult blood test. Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice, 2013, 19, 311-316.	0.9	4
112	The benefits of screening–and its harms. Lancet, The, 2016, 388, 563-564.	6.3	4
113	How does HPV vaccination status relate to risk perceptions and intention to participate in cervical screening? a survey study. BMC Public Health, 2016, 16, 708.	1.2	4
114	Overdiagnosis: An unrecognised and growing worldwide problem in healthcare. Zdravstveno Varstvo, 2017, 56, 147-149.	0.6	4
115	Psychosocial consequences among women with false-positive results after mammography screening in Norway. Scandinavian Journal of Primary Health Care, 2018, 36, 380-389.	0.6	4
116	Did psychosocial status, sociodemographics and smoking status affect non-attendance in control participants in the Danish Lung Cancer Screening Trial? A nested observational study. BMJ Open, 2020, 10, e030871.	0.8	4
117	Consequences of screening in colorectal cancer (COS-CRC): development and dimensionality of a questionnaire. BMC Psychology, 2021, 9, 7.	0.9	4
118	Psychosocial consequences of invitation to colorectal cancer screening: a matched cohort study. Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 2021, 75, 867-873.	2.0	4
119	Validity of Current Assessment Tools Aiming to Measure the Affective Component of Pain: A Systematic Review. Patient Related Outcome Measures, 2021, Volume 12, 213-226.	0.7	4
120	Psychosocial consequences of screening-detected abdominal aortic aneurisms: a cross-sectional study. Scandinavian Journal of Primary Health Care, 2021, 39, 459-465.	0.6	4
121	Validation of a health screening questionnaire for primary care using Rasch models. Journal of Patient-Reported Outcomes, 2019, 3, 12.	0.9	3
122	Psychosocial consequences of a three-month follow-up after receiving an abnormal lung cancer CT-screening result: A longitudinal survey. Lung Cancer, 2021, 155, 46-52.	0.9	3
123	Short and long-term psychosocial consequences of participating in a colorectal cancer screening programme: a matched longitudinal study. BMJ Evidence-Based Medicine, 2022, 27, 87-96.	1.7	3
124	Development of an item pool for a questionnaire on the psychosocial consequences of hypertension labelling. Journal of Patient-Reported Outcomes, 2020, 4, 2.	0.9	3
125	The efficacy of acupuncture on menopausal symptoms (ACOM study): protocol for a randomised study. Danish Medical Journal, 2017, 64, .	0.5	3
126	Luckilyâ€"I am not the worrying kind: Experiences of patients in the Danish cancer patient pathway for non-specific symptoms and signs of cancer. Health (United Kingdom), 2023, 27, 1059-1075.	0.9	3

#	Article	IF	Citations
127	Psychometric properties of a Swedish version of the Consequences of Screening – Breast Cancer questionnaire. Journal of Advanced Nursing, 2014, 70, 2373-2388.	1.5	2
128	Screening for reducing morbidity and mortality in malignant melanoma. The Cochrane Library, 2016, , .	1.5	2
129	High incidence of cervical cancer in women over 60 is likely due to less intensive cervical screening in this generation of women. BMJ Evidence-Based Medicine, 2018, 23, 37-37.	1.7	2
130	Sustained effects of a brief and standardised acupuncture approach on menopausal symptoms: post hoc analysis of the ACOM randomised controlled trial. Acupuncture in Medicine, 2020, 38, 396-406.	0.4	2
131	Breaking potentially bad news of cancer workup to wellâ€informed patients by telephone <i>versus</i> inâ€person: A randomised controlled trial on psychosocial consequences. European Journal of Cancer Care, 2021, 30, e13435.	0.7	2
132	Using a Deliberative Poll on breast cancer screening to assess and improve the decision quality of laypeople. PLoS ONE, 2021, 16, e0258869.	1.1	2
133	Learning strategies of general practitioners striving to achieve point-of-care ultrasound competence: a qualitative study. Scandinavian Journal of Primary Health Care, 2022, 40, 67-77.	0.6	2
134	Screening for Lung Cancer With Low-Dose Computed Tomography. Annals of Internal Medicine, 2014, 160, 211.	2.0	1
135	Screening for abdominal aortic aneurysm – Authors' reply. Lancet, The, 2019, 393, 28.	6.3	1
136	Cognitive screening instruments: How much overdiagnosis do they create?. International Journal of Clinical Practice, 2019, 73, e13291.	0.8	1
137	Factors associated with a clinically relevant reduction in menopausal symptoms of a standardized acupuncture approach for women with bothersome menopausal symptoms. BMC Complementary Medicine and Therapies, 2021, 21, 29.	1.2	1
138	Re: Hofmann et al. Overdiagnosis, one concept, three perspectives, and a model. European Journal of Epidemiology, 2021, 36, 655-656.	2.5	1
139	Screening for Lung Cancer With Low-Dose Computed Tomography. Annals of Internal Medicine, 2014, 160, 211-212.	2.0	O
140	How does information reduce psychological impact?. Maturitas, 2015, 80, 441.	1.0	O
141	18â€Use of CT in asymptomatic people for individual health assessment (IHA): a framework to improve clinical governance and regulatory compliance. , 2019, , .		O
142	8â€The lack of ontological awareness in evidence-based medicine allows overdiagnosis. , 2019, , .		0
143	Letter to the editor. Medicine, Health Care and Philosophy, 2020, 23, 541-542.	0.9	O
144	Psychometric properties of a condition-specific PROM for the psychosocial consequences of Labelling hypertension by using Rasch analysis. Journal of Patient-Reported Outcomes, 2021, 5, 19.	0.9	0

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
145	$1\hat{a}$ \in Quaternary prevention as a tool to prevent overdiagnosis in the clinical practice. , 2019, , .		O
146	â€~People say it is dangerous'. Revista Brasileira De Medicina De FamÃlia E Comunidade, 2022, 17, 3052.	0.1	0
147	The Tyranny of Numbers: How e-Health Record Transparency Affects Patients' Health Perceptions and Conversations with Physicians. Medicine Anthropology Theory, 2022, 9, 1-25.	0.6	0