Sebastiaan Remmers

List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: https://exaly.com/author-pdf/2169874/publications.pdf

Version: 2024-02-01

41 papers

401 citations

932766 10 h-index 18 g-index

47 all docs

47 docs citations

47 times ranked

658 citing authors

#	Article	IF	Citations
1	Improved Prostate Cancer Biopsy Grading by Incorporation of Invasive Cribriform and Intraductal Carcinoma in the 2014 Grade Groups. European Urology, 2020, 77, 191-198.	0.9	57
2	Reduction of MRI-targeted biopsies in men with low-risk prostate cancer on active surveillance by stratifying to PI-RADS and PSA-density, with different thresholds for significant disease. Translational Andrology and Urology, 2018, 7, 132-144.	0.6	43
3	Multiparametric Ultrasound for Prostate Cancer Detection and Localization: Correlation of B-mode, Shear Wave Elastography and Contrast Enhanced Ultrasound with Radical Prostatectomy Specimens. Journal of Urology, 2019, 202, 1166-1173.	0.2	33
4	Can active surveillance really reduce the harms of overdiagnosing prostate cancer? A reflection of real life clinical practice in the PRIAS study. Translational Andrology and Urology, 2018, 7, 98-105.	0.6	24
5	Results of Prostate Cancer Screening in a Unique Cohort at 19 yr of Follow-up. European Urology, 2019, 75, 374-377.	0.9	23
6	Europa Uomo Patient Reported Outcome Study (EUPROMS): Descriptive Statistics of a Prostate Cancer Survey from Patients for Patients. European Urology Focus, 2021, 7, 987-994.	1.6	23
7	Personalized strategies in population screening for prostate cancer. International Journal of Cancer, 2020, 147, 2977-2987.	2.3	19
8	Introducing PIONEER: a project to harness big data in prostate cancer research. Nature Reviews Urology, 2020, 17, 351-362.	1.9	18
9	Predicting biochemical recurrence and prostate cancerâ€specific mortality after radical prostatectomy: comparison of six prediction models in a cohort of patients with screening†and clinically detected prostate cancer. BJU International, 2019, 124, 635-642.	1.3	17
10	Reducing Biopsies and Magnetic Resonance Imaging Scans During the Diagnostic Pathway of Prostate Cancer: Applying the Rotterdam Prostate Cancer Risk Calculator to the PRECISION Trial Data. European Urology Open Science, 2022, 36, 1-8.	0.2	13
11	A Multivariable Approach Using Magnetic Resonance Imaging to Avoid a Protocol-based Prostate Biopsy in Men on Active Surveillance for Prostate Cancer—Data from the International Multicenter Prospective PRIAS Study. European Urology Oncology, 2022, 5, 651-658.	2.6	13
12	<scp>NeuroSAFE</scp> in radical prostatectomy increases the rate of nerveâ€sparing surgery without affecting oncological outcome. BJU International, 2022, 130, 628-636.	1.3	11
13	Comedonecrosis Gleason pattern 5 is associated with worse clinical outcome in operated prostate cancer patients. Modern Pathology, 2021, 34, 2064-2070.	2.9	10
14	Health-related quality of life in Japanese low-risk prostate cancer patients choosing active surveillance: 3-year follow-up from PRIAS-JAPAN. World Journal of Urology, 2021, 39, 2491-2497.	1.2	9
15	A Prospective Multicenter Comparison Study of Risk-adapted Ultrasound-directed and Magnetic Resonance Imaging–directed Diagnostic Pathways for Suspected Prostate Cancer in Biopsy-naÃ⁻ve Men. European Urology, 2022, 82, 318-326.	0.9	9
16	Large and small cribriform architecture have similar adverse clinical outcome on prostate cancer biopsies. Histopathology, 2022, 80, 1041-1049.	1.6	8
17	Equivocal PI-RADS Three Lesions on Prostate Magnetic Resonance Imaging: Risk Stratification Strategies to Avoid MRI-Targeted Biopsies. Journal of Personalized Medicine, 2020, 10, 270.	1.1	7
18	Rotterdam mobile phone app including MRI data for the prediction of prostate cancer: A multicenter external validation. European Journal of Surgical Oncology, 2021, 47, 2640-2645.	0.5	6

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
19	The Key Role of Patient Involvement in the Development of Core Outcome Sets in Prostate Cancer. European Urology Focus, 2021, 7, 943-946.	1.6	6
20	External validation of two MRI-based risk calculators in prostate cancer diagnosis. World Journal of Urology, 2021, 39, 4109-4116.	1.2	5
21	A comparison of prostate cancer prediction models in men undergoing both magnetic resonance imaging and transperineal biopsy: Are the models still relevant?. BJU International, 2021, 128, 36-44.	1.3	5
22	Initial Prostate Health Index (phi) and phi density predicts future risk of clinically significant prostate cancer in men with initial negative prostate biopsy: a 6-year follow-up study. Prostate Cancer and Prostatic Diseases, 2021, , .	2.0	5
23	Prostate Specific Membrane Antigen Positron Emission Tomography/Computerized Tomography in the Evaluation of Initial Response in Candidates Who Underwent Salvage Radiation Therapy after Radical Prostatectomy for Prostate Cancer. Journal of Urology, 2021, 205, 1100-1109.	0.2	4
24	Using the Movember Foundation's GAP3 cohort to measure the effect of active surveillance on patient-reported urinary and sexual functionâ€"a retrospective study in low-risk prostate cancer patients. Translational Andrology and Urology, 2021, 10, 2719-2727.	0.6	4
25	Optimal Timing of Prostate Specific Membrane Antigen Positron Emission Tomography/Computerized Tomography for Biochemical Recurrence after Radical Prostatectomy. Journal of Urology, 2020, 204, 503-510.	0.2	4
26	Reducing prostate biopsies and magnetic resonance imaging with prostate cancer risk stratification. BJUI Compass, 2022, 3, 344-353.	0.7	4
27	External Validation of the Prostate Biopsy Collaborative Group Risk Calculator and the Rotterdam Prostate Cancer Risk Calculator in a Swedish Population-based Screening Cohort. European Urology Open Science, 2022, 41, 1-7.	0.2	4
28	Improving the prediction of biochemical recurrence after radical prostatectomy with the addition of detailed pathology of the positive surgical margin and cribriform growth. Annals of Diagnostic Pathology, 2022, 56, 151842.	0.6	3
29	External Validation of Two Nomograms Developed for 68Ga-PSMA-11 Applied to the Prostate-specific Membrane Antigen Tracer 18F-DCFPyl: Is Prediction of the Optimal Timing of Salvage Therapy Feasible?. European Urology Open Science, 2021, 28, 47-51.	0.2	2
30	The Influence of Poststudy Action Congruency on Memory Consolidation. Experimental Psychology, 2020, 67, 211-223.	0.3	2
31	Alternative prostate cancer grading systems incorporating percent pattern 4/5 (IQ-Gleason) and cribriform architecture (cGrade) improve prediction of outcome after radical prostatectomy. Virchows Archiv Fur Pathologische Anatomie Und Physiologie Und Fur Klinische Medizin, 2022, 480, 1149-1157.	1.4	2
32	Intervention-related Deaths in the European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer. European Urology Open Science, 2021, 34, 27-32.	0.2	1
33	Updating the Rotterdam Prostate Cancer Risk Calculator with Invasive Cribriform and/or Intraductal Carcinoma for Men with a Prior Negative Biopsy. European Urology Open Science, 2022, 36, 19-22.	0.2	1
34	Predictive Value of Cribriform and Intraductal Carcinoma for the Nomogram-based Selection of Prostate Cancer Patients for Pelvic Lymph Node Dissection. Urology, 2022, 168, 156-164.	0.5	1
35	Impact of cancer screening on metastasis: A prostate cancer case study. Journal of Medical Screening, 2021, 28, 096914132198973.	1.1	0
36	Reply by Authors. Journal of Urology, 2021, 205, 1108-1109.	0.2	0

3

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
37	Reply by Authors. Journal of Urology, 2019, 202, 1172-1173.	0.2	0
38	Reply by Authors. Journal of Urology, 2020, 204, 510-510.	0.2	0
39	Development of a prediction model in female pure or predominant urge urinary incontinence: a retrospective cohort study. Therapeutic Advances in Urology, 2022, 14, 175628722210903.	0.9	0
40	Secondary Treatment for Men with Localized Prostate Cancer: A Pooled Analysis of PRIAS and ERSPC-Rotterdam Data within the PIONEER Data Platform. Journal of Personalized Medicine, 2022, 12, 751.	1.1	0
41	Cross-cultural differences in men on active surveillance' anxiety: a longitudinal comparison between Italian and Dutch patients from the Prostate cancer Research International Active Surveillance study. BMC Urology, 2022, 22, .	0.6	0