## Antonio C Westphalen

List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: https://exaly.com/author-pdf/365094/publications.pdf Version: 2024-02-01



#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
1	Interobserver Reproducibility of the PI-RADS Version 2 Lexicon: A Multicenter Study of Six Experienced Prostate Radiologists. Radiology, 2016, 280, 793-804.	7.3	398
2	Variability of the Positive Predictive Value of PI-RADS for Prostate MRI across 26 Centers: Experience of the Society of Abdominal Radiology Prostate Cancer Disease-focused Panel. Radiology, 2020, 296, 76-84.	7.3	207
3	Radiological Imaging of Patients With Suspected Urinary Tract Stones: National Trends, Diagnoses, and Predictors. Academic Emergency Medicine, 2011, 18, 699-707.	1.8	147
4	Diagnostic Accuracy of <sup>68</sup> Ga-PSMA-11 PET/MRI Compared with Multiparametric MRI in the Detection of Prostate Cancer. Radiology, 2018, 289, 730-737.	7.3	114
5	Prostate Imaging Reporting and Data System (PI-RADS), Version 2: A Critical Look. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2016, 206, 1179-1183.	2.2	92
6	Magnetic Resonance Imaging–Ultrasound Fusion Biopsy During Prostate Cancer Active Surveillance. European Urology, 2017, 72, 275-281.	1.9	88
7	Locally Recurrent Prostate Cancer after External Beam Radiation Therapy: Diagnostic Performance of 1.5-T Endorectal MR Imaging and MR Spectroscopic Imaging for Detection. Radiology, 2010, 256, 485-492.	7.3	83
8	Peripheral Zone Prostate Cancer: Accuracy of Different Interpretative Approaches with MR and MR Spectroscopic Imaging. Radiology, 2008, 246, 177-184.	7.3	76
9	A Systematic Review of the Existing Prostate Imaging Reporting and Data System Version 2 (PI-RADSv2) Literature and Subset Meta-Analysis of PI-RADSv2 Categories Stratified by Gleason Scores. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2019, 212, 847-854.	2.2	68
10	Can computer-aided diagnosis assist in the identification of prostate cancer on prostate MRI? a multi-center, multi-reader investigation. Oncotarget, 2018, 9, 33804-33817.	1.8	65
11	Prostate Cancer: Is Inapparent Tumor at Endorectal MR and MR Spectroscopic Imaging a Favorable Prognostic Finding in Patients Who Select Active Surveillance?. Radiology, 2008, 247, 444-450.	7.3	50
12	Multiparametric 3T endorectal mri after external beam radiation therapy for prostate cancer. Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging, 2012, 36, 430-437.	3.4	43
13	Beyond Prostate Adenocarcinoma: Expanding the Differential Diagnosis in Prostate Pathologic Conditions. Radiographics, 2016, 36, 1055-1075.	3.3	42
14	Role of endorectal MR imaging and MR spectroscopic imaging in defining treatable intraprostatic tumor foci in prostate cancer: Quantitative analysis of imaging contour compared to whole-mount histopathology. Radiotherapy and Oncology, 2014, 110, 303-308.	0.6	39
15	CT and MRI of small renal masses. British Journal of Radiology, 2018, 91, 20180131.	2.2	39
16	Role of Magnetic Resonance Imaging and Magnetic Resonance Spectroscopic Imaging Before and After Radiotherapy for Prostate Cancer. Journal of Endourology, 2008, 22, 789-794.	2.1	37
17	Genomic Prostate Score, PI-RADSâ,,¢ version 2 and Progression in Men with Prostate Cancer on Active Surveillance. Journal of Urology, 2019, 201, 300-307.	0.4	36
18	Prostate Imaging Reporting and Data System (PI-RADS): Reflections on Early Experience With a Standardized Interpretation Scheme for Multiparametric Prostate MRI. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2014, 202, 121-123.	2.2	35

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
19	Optimal MRI sequences for 68Ga-PSMA-11 PET/MRI in evaluation of biochemically recurrent prostate cancer. EJNMMI Research, 2017, 7, 77.	2.5	33
20	Mucinous Adenocarcinoma of the Prostate: MRI and MR Spectroscopy Features. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2009, 193, W238-W243.	2.2	32
21	T2-weighted endorectal magnetic resonance imaging of prostate cancer after external beam radiation therapy. International Braz J Urol: Official Journal of the Brazilian Society of Urology, 2009, 35, 171-182.	1.5	30
22	Imaging Manifestations of Hematologic Diseases with Renal and Perinephric Involvement. Radiographics, 2016, 36, 1038-1054.	3.3	30
23	Prostate Cancer: Prediction of Biochemical Failure after External-Beam Radiation Therapy—Kattan Nomogram and Endorectal MR Imaging Estimation of Tumor Volume. Radiology, 2011, 261, 477-486.	7.3	28
24	Differential Diagnosis of Perinephric Masses on CT and MRI. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2004, 183, 1697-1702.	2.2	26
25	High-Resolution 3-T Endorectal Prostate MRI: A Multireader Study of Radiologist Preference and Perceived Interpretive Quality of 2D and 3D T2-Weighted Fast Spin-Echo MR Images. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2016, 206, 86-91.	2.2	25
26	Multiparametric MRI of the prostate: diagnostic performance and interreader agreement of two scoring systems. British Journal of Radiology, 2016, 89, 20151056.	2.2	24
27	Association between a 17-gene genomic prostate score and multi-parametric prostate MRI in men with low and intermediate risk prostate cancer (PCa). PLoS ONE, 2017, 12, e0185535.	2.5	22
28	PI-RADS v2 and ADC values: is there room for improvement?. Abdominal Radiology, 2018, 43, 3109-3116.	2.1	21
29	Prognostic Value of Pretreatment MRI in Patients With Prostate Cancer Treated With Radiation Therapy: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2020, 214, 597-604.	2.2	21
30	3D T2-weighted and Gd-EOB-DTPA-enhanced 3D T1-weighted MR cholangiography for evaluation of biliary anatomy in living liver donors. Abdominal Radiology, 2017, 42, 842-850.	2.1	20
31	Impact of Staging 68Ga-PSMA-11 PET Scans on Radiation Treatment Plansin Patients With Prostate Cancer. Urology, 2019, 125, 154-162.	1.0	20
32	Evaluating the performance of PI-RADS v2 in the non-academic setting. Abdominal Radiology, 2017, 42, 2725-2731.	2.1	19
33	Impact of Lesion Visibility on Transrectal Ultrasound on the Prediction of Clinically Significant Prostate Cancer (Gleason Score 3 + 4 or Greater) with Transrectal Ultrasound-Magnetic Resonance Imaging Fusion Biopsy. Journal of Urology, 2018, 199, 699-705.	0.4	16
34	Detection of clinically significant prostate cancer with PI-RADS v2 scores, PSA density, and ADC values in regions with and without mpMRI visible lesions. International Braz J Urol: Official Journal of the Brazilian Society of Urology, 2019, 45, 713-723.	1.5	16
35	Imaging Prostate Cancer. Radiologic Clinics of North America, 2012, 50, 1043-1059.	1.8	15
36	MRI-Based Prostate-Specific Antigen Density Predicts Gleason Score Upgrade in an Active Surveillance Cohort. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2020, 214, 574-578.	2.2	15

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
37	Adrenal hemorrhage and hemorrhagic masses; diagnostic workup and imaging findings. British Journal of Radiology, 2021, 94, 20210753.	2.2	15
38	Diagnostic Accuracy and Prognostic Value of Serial Prostate Multiparametric Magnetic Resonance Imaging in Men on Active Surveillance for Prostate Cancer. European Urology Oncology, 2022, 5, 537-543.	5.4	13
39	Abnormal findings on multiparametric prostate magnetic resonance imaging predict subsequent biopsy upgrade in patients with low risk prostate cancer managed with active surveillance. Abdominal Imaging, 2014, 39, 1027-1035.	2.0	12
40	Practical aspects of prostate MRI: hardware and software considerations, protocols, and patient preparation. Abdominal Radiology, 2016, 41, 817-830.	2.1	12
41	Comparison of Positive Oral Contrast Agents for Abdominopelvic CT. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2019, 212, 1037-1043.	2.2	12
42	Multiparametric Magnetic Resonance Imaging Alone is Insufficient to Detect Grade Reclassification in Active Surveillance for Prostate Cancer. European Urology, 2020, 78, 515-517.	1.9	12
43	Impact of the integration of proton magnetic resonance imaging spectroscopy to PI-RADS 2 for prediction of high grade and high stage prostate cancer. Radiologia Brasileira, 2017, 50, 299-307.	0.7	11
44	Multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging of the prostate—a basic tutorial. Translational Andrology and Urology, 2017, 6, 376-386.	1.4	9
45	An Image Quality–informed Framework for CT Characterization. Radiology, 2022, 302, 380-389.	7.3	9
46	Prevalence of abdominal aortic calcifications in older living renal donors and its effect on graft function and histology. Transplant International, 2015, 28, 1172-1178.	1.6	8
47	Multiparametric MR imaging of the Prostate. Radiologic Clinics of North America, 2018, 56, 223-238.	1.8	8
48	Prostate MRI: staging and decision-making. Abdominal Radiology, 2020, 45, 2143-2153.	2.1	8
49	Is it time for prostate MRI certification?. Abdominal Radiology, 2016, 41, 799-800.	2.1	7
50	How Often Does Magnetic Resonance Imaging Detect Prostate Cancer Missed by Transrectal Ultrasound?. European Urology Focus, 2021, 7, 1268-1273.	3.1	6
51	The impact and collateral damage of COVID-19 on prostate MRI and guided biopsy operations: Society of Abdominal Radiology Prostate Cancer Disease-Focused Panel survey analysis. Abdominal Radiology, 2021, 46, 4362-4369.	2.1	6
52	Prostate cancer with a pseudocapsule at MR imaging: a marker of high grade and stage disease?. Clinical Imaging, 2016, 40, 365-369.	1.5	5
53	Gastrointestinal Stromal Tumor Incidentally Detected on 18F-Fluciclovine PET/CT. Clinical Nuclear Medicine, 2021, 46, 345-347.	1.3	5
54	Serial Anatomical Prostate Ultrasound during Prostate Cancer Active Surveillance. Journal of Urology, 2016, 196, 727-733.	0.4	4

ANTONIO C WESTPHALEN

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
55	Complications of Retrievable Inferior Vena Cava Filters: A Retrospective Comparison of Denali and Option-ELITE Filters. Journal of Clinical Interventional Radiology ISVIR, 2018, 02, 149-154.	0.2	4
56	Uncommon malignant renal tumors and atypical presentation of common ones: a guide for radiologists. Abdominal Radiology, 2019, 44, 1430-1452.	2.1	4
57	PET-detected asymptomatic recurrence is associated with improved survival in recurrent cervical cancer. Abdominal Radiology, 2021, 46, 341-350.	2.1	4
58	Targeted PET imaging for prostate-specific membrane antigen in prostate cancer. Future Oncology, 2016, 12, 2393-2396.	2.4	3
59	The Director of Prostate Imaging: advancing care for prostate cancer patients. Abdominal Radiology, 2017, 42, 2358-2362.	2.1	3
60	Multiparametric MR imaging of the Prostate. Urologic Clinics of North America, 2018, 45, 439-454.	1.8	3
61	Lost in translation: lessons learned from the "demise―of MRSI of the prostate. Abdominal Radiology, 2019, 44, 3185-3187.	2.1	3
62	Differences in negative predictive value of prostate MRI based in men with suspected or known cancer. Radiologia Brasileira, 2019, 52, 281-286.	0.7	3
63	Prostate magnetic resonance imaging technique. Abdominal Radiology, 2020, 45, 2109-2119.	2.1	2
64	Renal Mass Biopsy in the Era of Surgical Alternatives. Current Radiology Reports, 2015, 3, 1.	1.4	1
65	Association between misty mesentery with baseline or new diagnosis of cancer: a matched cohort study. Clinical Imaging, 2018, 50, 57-61.	1.5	1
66	Case series of collapsed simple renal cysts potentially simulating cystic malignancy at CT. Clinical Imaging, 2018, 50, 297-301.	1.5	1
67	Introduction to the special issue: Prostate Cancer Update. Abdominal Radiology, 2020, 45, 3947-3947.	2.1	1
68	Radiological Reasoning: 88-Year-Old Man With Abdominal Pain and Dilated Biliary Tree and Pancreatic Duct. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2010, 194, S46-S50.	2.2	0
69	More Doctors: Thoughts about a Controversial Health Care Policy. Value in Health Regional Issues, 2014, 5, 75-77.	1.2	0
70	Why we need a vendor neutral specification for delineating prostate cancer with mpMRI. Abdominal Radiology, 2016, 41, 801-802.	2.1	0
71	The use of prostate MR for targeting prostate biopsies. BJR   Open, 2019, 1, 20180044.	0.6	Ο
72	SAR Prostate Cancer Disease-Focused Panel report. Abdominal Radiology, 2020, 45, 3948-3950.	2.1	0

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
73	The role of magnetic resonance imaging in active surveillance of prostate cancer. Radiologia Brasileira, 2021, 54, 246-253.	0.7	0
74	Overcoming the challenges of imaging patients with metabolic syndrome. Radiologia Brasileira, 2019, 52, V-VI.	0.7	0
75	Interpretation of Multiparametric MRI Using PI-RADS (Prostate Imaging-Reporting and Data System). , 2020, , 89-104.		0
76	US lesion visibility predicts clinically significant upgrade of prostate cancer by systematic biopsy. Abdominal Radiology, 2022, 47, 1133.	2.1	0