Uwe Baumann

List of Publications by Year
in descending order

Source: https://exaly.com/author-pdf/3015430/publications.pdf

Version: 2024-02-01

86	2,179	236912	265191
papers	citations	25 h-index	42 g-index

101	101	101	1217
all docs	docs citations	times ranked	citing authors

#	Article	IF	Citations
1	Electric-Acoustic Stimulation of the Auditory System: A Review of the First Decade. Audiology and Neuro-Otology, 2011, 16, 1-30.	1.3	166
2	Localization ability with bimodal hearing aids and bilateral cochlear implants. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 2004, 116, 1698-1709.	1.1	130
3	A new electrode for residual hearing preservation in cochlear implantation: first clinical results. Acta Oto-Laryngologica, 2009, 129, 372-379.	0.9	123
4	Towards a Unified Testing Framework for Single-Sided Deafness Studies: A Consensus Paper. Audiology and Neuro-Otology, 2016, 21, 391-398.	1.3	110
5	Evaluation of Performance with the COMBI 40 Cochlear Implant in Adults: A Multicentric Clinical Study. Orl, 1997, 59, 23-35.	1.1	102
6	Combined electric acoustic stimulation with the PULSARCI¹⁰⁰implant system using the FLEX^{EAS}electrode array. Acta Oto-Laryngologica, 2011, 131, 585-595.	0.9	83
7	Speech Perception With Combined Electric-Acoustic Stimulation and Bilateral Cochlear Implants in a Multisource Noise Field. Ear and Hearing, 2013, 34, 324-332.	2.1	80
8	Long-term Hearing Preservation Outcomes After Cochlear Implantation for Electric-Acoustic Stimulation. Otology and Neurotology, 2016, 37, e353-e359.	1.3	66
9	The cochlear implant electrodeâ€“pitch function. Hearing Research, 2006, 213, 34-42.	2.0	63
10	Hearing Preservation After Complete Cochlear Coverage in Cochlear Implantation With the Free-Fitting FLEXSOFT Electrode Carrier. Otology and Neurotology, 2011, 32, 973-979.	1.3	59
11	Pulse rate discrimination with deeply inserted electrode arrays. Hearing Research, 2004, 196, 49-57.	2.0	45
12	Place dependent stimulation rates improve pitch perception in cochlear implantees with single-sided deafness. Hearing Research, 2016, 339, 94-103.	2.0	43
13	High prevalence of hearing disorders at the Special Olympics indicate need to screen persons with intellectual disability. Journal of Intellectual Disability Research, 2008, 52, 520-528.	2.0	42
14	Recording and analysis of electrically evoked compound action potentials (ECAPs) with MED-EL cochlear implants and different artifact reduction strategies in Matlab. Journal of Neuroscience Methods, 2010, 191, 66-74.	2.5	38
15	Single-Sided Deafness: Impact of Cochlear Implantation on Speech Perception in Complex Noise and on Auditory Localization Accuracy. Otology and Neurotology, 2017, 38, e563-e569.	1.3	38
16	Comparison of the TEMPO+ Ear-Level Speech Processor and the CIS PRO+ Body-Worn Processor in Adult MED-EL Cochlear Implant Users. Orl, 2001, 63, 31-40.	1.1	37
17	Improvement of speech perception in quiet and in noise without decreasing localization abilities with the bone conduction device Bonebridge. European Archives of Oto-Rhino-Laryngology, 2017, 274, 2107-2115.	1.6	37
18	Labyrinth Dysfunction 8 Months After Cochlear Implantation: A Case Report. Otology and Neurotology, 2004, 25, 727-729.	1.3	32

#	Article	IF	Citations
19	Preventing Facial Nerve Stimulation by Triphasic Pulse Stimulation in Cochlear Implant Users: Intraoperative Recordings. Otology and Neurotology, 2017, 38, e438-e444.	1.3	31
20	A New Combined Speech Processor for Electric and Acoustic Stimulation – Eight Months Experience. Orl, 2008, 70, 359-365.	1.1	30
21	Management of Cochlear Implant Electrode Migration. Otology and Neurotology, 2016, 37, e341-e348.	1.3	30
22	Evaluation of an Electrode Prototype for Atraumatic Cochlear Implantation in Hearing Preservation Candidates. Otology and Neurotology, 2011, 32, 419-423.	1.3	29
23	Recording of electrically evoked auditory brainstem responses (E-ABR) with an integrated stimulus generator in Matlab. Journal of Neuroscience Methods, 2008, 173, 306-314.	2.5	27
24	Recording of electrically evoked auditory brainstem responses after electrical stimulation with biphasic, triphasic and precision triphasic pulses. Hearing Research, 2010, 259, 75-85.	2.0	26
25	The Underlying Mechanism of Preventing Facial Nerve Stimulation by Triphasic Pulse Stimulation in Cochlear Implant Users Assessed With Objective Measure. Otology and Neurotology, 2016, 37, 1231-1237.	1.3	26
26	Incidence for Tip Foldover During Cochlear Implantation. Otology and Neurotology, 2018, 39, 1115-1121.	1.3	25
27	Pitch Ranking with Deeply Inserted Electrode Arrays. Ear and Hearing, 2004, 25, 275-283.	2.1	23
28	Speech audiometry in quiet with the Oldenburg Sentence Test for Children. International Journal of Audiology, 2012, 51, 157-163.	1.7	23
29	A method for determining precise electrical hearing thresholds in cochlear implant users. International Journal of Audiology, 2018, 57, 502-509.	1.7	23
30	Minimal Reporting Standards for Active Middle Ear Hearing Implants. Audiology and Neuro-Otology, 2018, 23, 105-115.	1.3	23
31	Hearing Preservation Outcomes After Cochlear Implantation Depending on the Angle of Insertion: Indication for Electric or Electric-Acoustic Stimulation. Otology and Neurotology, 2018, 39, 834-841.	1.3	22
32	Consensus Statement on Bone Conduction Devices and Active Middle Ear Implants in Conductive and Mixed Hearing Loss. Otology and Neurotology, 2022, 43, 513-529.	1.3	22
33	Hearing Preservation and Improved Speech Perception With a Flexible 28-mm Electrode. Otology and Neurotology, 2015, 36, 34-42.	1.3	21
34	Analysis of Ceiling Effects Occurring with Speech Recognition Tests in Adult Cochlear-Implanted Patients. Orl, 2004, 66, 130-135.	1.1	20
35	Comparison of Musical Activities of Cochlear Implant Users with Different Speech-Coding Strategies. Ear and Hearing, 2007, 28, 49S-51S.	2.1	20
36	Effectiveness of Directional Microphones in Bilateral/Bimodal Cochlear Implant Usersâ€"Impact of Spatial and Temporal Noise Characteristics. Otology and Neurotology, 2017, 38, e551-e557.	1.3	20

#	Article	IF	Citations
37	Early Fitting in Cochlear Implantation: Benefits and Limits. Otology and Neurotology, 2018, 39, e250-e256.	1.3	19
38	Acceptance and Fitting of the DUET Device â€“ A Combined Speech Processor for Electric Acoustic Stimulation. Advances in Oto-Rhino-Laryngology, 2009, 67, 81-87.	1.6	18
39	Pitch Matching Psychometrics in Electric Acoustic Stimulation. Ear and Hearing, 2011, 32, 656-662.	2.1	18
40	Cochlear Implant Therapy Improves the Quality of Life in Older Patientsâ€”A Prospective Evaluation Study. Otology and Neurotology, 2020, 41, 1214-1221.	1.3	18
41	Impact of Hearing Rehabilitation Using Cochlear Implants on Cognitive Function in Older Patients. Otology and Neurotology, 2021, 42, 1136-1141.	1.3	18
42	Effects of electrical pulse polarity shape on intra cochlear neural responses in humans: Triphasic pulses with cathodic second phase. Hearing Research, 2013, 306, 123-130.	2.0	17
43	Speech Perception With Combined Electric-Acoustic Stimulation. Ear and Hearing, 2015, 36, e314-e325.	2.1	16
44	German Oldenburg Sentence Test for Children: A Useful Speech Audiometry Tool for Hearing-Impaired Children at Kindergarten and School Age. Folia Phoniatrica Et Logopaedica, 2012, 64, 227-233.	1.1	15
45	A case of bilateral cochlear implantation in single-sided untreated acoustic neurinoma. Acta Oto-Laryngologica, 2009, 129, 694-696.	0.9	14
46	Application of triphasic pulses with adjustable phase amplitude ratio (PAR) for cochlear ECAP recording: I. Amplitude growth functions. Journal of Neuroscience Methods, 2012, 205, 202-211.	2.5	13
47	New parallel stimulation strategies revisited: Effect of synchronous multi electrode stimulation on rate discrimination in cochlear implant users. Cochlear Implants International, 2013, 14, 142-149.	1.2	13
48	Pitch Matching in Cochlear Implant Users With Single-Sided Deafness: Effects of Electrode Position and Acoustic Stimulus Type. Frontiers in Neuroscience, 2019, 13, 1119.	2.8	13
49	Outcomes for a clinically representative cohort of hearing-impaired adults using the NucleusÂ® CI532 cochlear implant. European Archives of Oto-Rhino-Laryngology, 2020, 277, 1625-1635.	1.6	12
50	Impact of a Moving Noise Masker on Speech Perception in Cochlear Implant Users. PLoS ONE, 2015, 10, e0126133.	2.5	12
51	Impedance audiometry in infants with a cleft palate: The standard 226-Hz probe tone has no predictive value for the middle ear condition. International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology, 2010, 74, 586-590.	1.0	11
52	Long-Term Follow-Up of Early Cochlear Implant Device Activation. Audiology and Neuro-Otology, 2021, 26, 327-337.	1.3	11
53	Cochlear Reimplantation after Surgery for Electric-Acoustic Stimulation. Orl, 2009, 71, 172-178.	1.1	10
54	Age Differences in Speech Perception in Noise and Sound Localization in Individuals With Subjective Normal Hearing. Frontiers in Psychology, 2022, 13, 845285.	2.1	10

#	Article	IF	Citations
55	Application of triphasic pulses with adjustable phase amplitude ratio (PAR) for cochlear ECAP recording: II. Recovery functions. Journal of Neuroscience Methods, 2012, 205, 212-220.	2.5	9
56	Evaluation of a Transimpedance Matrix Algorithm to Detect Anomalous Cochlear Implant Electrode Position. Audiology and Neuro-Otology, 2022, 27, 347-355.	1.3	9
57	Long-term effects on the quality of life following cochlear implant treatment in older patients. European Archives of Oto-Rhino-Laryngology, 2022, 279, 5135-5144.	1.6	8
58	Assessment of the Subjective Benefit of Electric Acoustic Stimulation with the Abbreviated Profile of Hearing Aid Benefit. Orl, 2011, 73, 321-329.	1.1	7
59	Evaluation of an artifact reduction strategy for electrically evoked auditory steady-state responses: Simulations and measurements. Journal of Neuroscience Methods, 2018, 296, 57-68.	2.5	7
60	Speech perception in noise: Impact of directional microphones in users of combined electric-acoustic stimulation. PLoS ONE, 2019, 14, e0213251.	2.5	6
61	Recording and online analysis of auditory steady state responses (ASSR) in Matlab. Journal of Neuroscience Methods, 2010, 187, 105-113.	2.5	5
62	Sensitivity to interaural time differences and localization accuracy in cochlear implant users with combined electric-acoustic stimulation. PLoS ONE, 2020, 15, e0241015.	2.5	5
63	Device profile of the MED-EL cochlear implant system for hearing loss: overview of its safety and efficacy. Expert Review of Medical Devices, 2020, 17, 599-614.	2.8	4
64	Band-Limited Chirp-Evoked Compound Action Potential in Guinea Pig: Comprehensive Neural Measure for Cochlear Implantation Monitoring. Ear and Hearing, 2021, 42, 142-162.	2.1	4
65	Psychometric function of jittered rate pitch discrimination. Hearing Research, 2014, 313, 47-54.	2.0	3
66	Noise Exposure of Teachers in Nursery Schoolsâ€"Evaluation of Measures for Noise Reduction When Dropping DUPLO Toy Bricks into Storage Cases by Sound Analyses. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 2016, 13, 677.	2.6	3
67	Impact of Reverberation on Speech Perception and Sound Localization Accuracy in Cochlear Implant Users With Single-Sided Deafness. Otology and Neurotology, 2022, 43, e30-e37.	1.3	3
68	Interleaved Acoustic Environments: Impact of an Auditory Scene Classification Procedure on Speech Perception in Cochlear Implant Users. Trends in Hearing, 2021, 25, 233121652110141.	1.3	2
69	Vertigo Associated With Cochlear Implant Surgery: Correlation With Vertigo Diagnostic Result, Electrode Carrier, and Insertion Angle. Frontiers in Neurology, 2021, 12, 663386.	2.4	2
70	A setup for simultaneous measurement of electrophysiological and psychometric temporal encoding in the auditory system. Journal of Neuroscience Methods, 2015, 249, 50-58.	2.5	1
71	Impact of Microphone Configuration on Speech Perception of Cochlear Implant Users in Traffic Noise. Otology and Neurotology, 2019, 40, e198-e205.	1.3	1
72	4.3 Andere HÃ¶rimplantate. , 2018, , .		1

#	Article	IF	Citations
73	3.4 Andere HÃ¶rimplantate. , 2018, , .		1
74	3.3 Elektrisch-akustische Stimulation am gleichen Ohr. , 2018, , .		0
75	1.6 HÃ¶rstÃ¶rungen. , 2018, , .		0
76	1.5 Grundlagen der Sprachwahrnehmung. , 2018, , .		0
77	4.1 Konventionelle HÃ¶rsysteme. , 2018, , .		0
78	2.6 Verifikation und Validierung von HÃ¶rsystemversorgungen. , 2018, , .		0
79	3.5 Aspekte der Rehabilitation mit HÃ¶rimplantaten. , 2018, , .		0
80	3.2 Bimodale Versorgung. , 2018, , .		0
81	4.2 Cochlea-Implantat und elektrisch-akustische Stimulationssysteme. , 2018, , .		0
82	4.4 Indikationskriterien und technischer Fortschritt. , 2018, , .		0
83	2.4 MÃ¶gliche zukÃ¼nftige LÃ¶sungen. , 2018, , .		0
84	2.1 Konventionelle HÃ¶rsysteme: HÃ¶rgerÃte. , 2018, , .		0
85	3.1 Cochlea-Implantate. , 2018, , .		0
86	2.3 Aktuelle AnsÃtze zur Weiterentwicklung der HÃ¶rgerÃtefunktionalitÃt. , 2018, , .		0