

# BÃ©nÃ©dicte Michel

## List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: <https://exaly.com/author-pdf/3929386/publications.pdf>

Version: 2024-02-01

33  
papers

2,873  
citations

257450

24  
h-index

395702

33  
g-index

33  
all docs

33  
docs citations

33  
times ranked

1910  
citing authors

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
1	RuvAB Acts at Arrested Replication Forks. <i>Cell</i> , 1998, 95, 419-430.	28.9	523
2	Multiple pathways process stalled replication forks. <i>Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America</i> , 2004, 101, 12783-12788.	7.1	305
3	After 30 Years of Study, the Bacterial SOS Response Still Surprises Us. <i>PLoS Biology</i> , 2005, 3, e255.	5.6	251
4	The helicases DinG, Rep and UvrD cooperate to promote replication across transcription units in vivo. <i>EMBO Journal</i> , 2010, 29, 145-157.	7.8	230
5	Recombination proteins and rescue of arrested replication forks. <i>DNA Repair</i> , 2007, 6, 967-980.	2.8	177
6	A fork-clearing role for UvrD. <i>Molecular Microbiology</i> , 2005, 57, 1664-1675.	2.5	125
7	RuvABC-dependent double-strand breaks in dnaBts mutants require RecA. <i>Molecular Microbiology</i> , 2000, 38, 565-574.	2.5	110
8	Replication Fork Reversal after Replication-Transcription Collision. <i>PLoS Genetics</i> , 2012, 8, e1002622.	3.5	102
9	Replication fork collapse at replication terminator sequences. <i>EMBO Journal</i> , 2002, 21, 3898-3907.	7.8	98
10	Replication Fork Breakage and Restart in <i>Escherichia coli</i> . <i>Microbiology and Molecular Biology Reviews</i> , 2018, 82, .	6.6	89
11	UvrD controls the access of recombination proteins to blocked replication forks. <i>EMBO Journal</i> , 2007, 26, 3804-3814.	7.8	87
12	Transcription-induced deletions in <i>Escherichia coli</i> plasmids. <i>Molecular Microbiology</i> , 1995, 17, 493-504.	2.5	66
13	Replication fork reversal in DNA polymerase III mutants of <i>Escherichia coli</i> : a role for the $\beta^2$ clamp. <i>Molecular Microbiology</i> , 2002, 44, 1331-1339.	2.5	61
14	RuvAB is essential for replication forks reversal in certain replication mutants. <i>EMBO Journal</i> , 2006, 25, 596-604.	7.8	60
15	The <i>Escherichia coli</i> UvrD helicase is essential for Tus removal during recombination-dependent replication restart from Tersites. <i>Molecular Microbiology</i> , 2006, 62, 382-396.	2.5	57
16	RNA polymerase mutations that facilitate replication progression in the <i>rep uvrD recF</i> mutant lacking two accessory replicative helicases. <i>Molecular Microbiology</i> , 2010, 77, 324-336.	2.5	54
17	Replication Restart in Bacteria. <i>Journal of Bacteriology</i> , 2017, 199, .	2.2	53
18	Replication restart in <i>gyrB</i> <i>Escherichia coli</i> mutants. <i>Molecular Microbiology</i> , 2003, 48, 845-854.	2.5	51

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
19	Homologous Recombination Enzymes and Pathways. <i>EcoSal Plus</i> , 2012, 5, .	5.4	48
20	Primosome assembly requirement for replication restart in the <i>Escherichia coli</i> holDG10 replication mutant. <i>Molecular Microbiology</i> , 2002, 44, 783-792.	2.5	43
21	sbkB sbkC null mutations allow RecF-mediated repair of arrested replication forks in rep recBC mutants. <i>Molecular Microbiology</i> , 1999, 33, 846-857.	2.5	40
22	Broken replication forks trigger heritable DNA breaks in the terminus of a circular chromosome. <i>PLoS Genetics</i> , 2018, 14, e1007256.	3.5	36
23	Lethality of bypass polymerases in <i>Escherichia coli</i> cells with a defective clamp loader complex of DNA polymerase III. <i>Molecular Microbiology</i> , 2003, 50, 193-204.	2.5	31
24	Cells defective for replication restart undergo replication fork reversal. <i>EMBO Reports</i> , 2004, 5, 607-612.	4.5	29
25	ruvA Mutants That Resolve Holliday Junctions but Do Not Reverse Replication Forks. <i>PLoS Genetics</i> , 2008, 4, e1000012.	3.5	25
26	Division-induced DNA double strand breaks in the chromosome terminus region of <i>Escherichia coli</i> lacking RecBCD DNA repair enzyme. <i>PLoS Genetics</i> , 2017, 13, e1006895.	3.5	23
27	<i>ruvA</i> and <i>ruvB</i> mutants specifically impaired for replication fork reversal. <i>Molecular Microbiology</i> , 2008, 70, 537-548.	2.5	20
28	PriA Is Essential for Viability of the <i>Escherichia coli</i> Topoisomerase IV parE10 (Ts) Mutant. <i>Journal of Bacteriology</i> , 2004, 186, 1197-1199.	2.2	16
29	Formation of a Stable RuvA Protein Double Tetramer Is Required for Efficient Branch Migration in Vitro and for Replication Fork Reversal in Vivo. <i>Journal of Biological Chemistry</i> , 2011, 286, 22372-22383.	3.4	16
30	Are the SSB-Interacting Proteins RecO, RecG, PriA and the DnaB-Interacting Protein Rep Bound to Progressing Replication Forks in <i>Escherichia coli</i> ?. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2015, 10, e0134892.	2.5	15
31	Mutations Affecting Potassium Import Restore the Viability of the <i>Escherichia coli</i> DNA Polymerase III holD Mutant. <i>PLoS Genetics</i> , 2016, 12, e1006114.	3.5	13
32	ssb Gene Duplication Restores the Viability of $\Delta$ holC and $\Delta$ holD <i>Escherichia coli</i> Mutants. <i>PLoS Genetics</i> , 2014, 10, e1004719.	3.5	10
33	The inactivation of <i>rfaP</i> , <i>rarA</i> or <i>sspA</i> gene improves the viability of the <i>Escherichia coli</i> DNA polymerase III holD mutant. <i>Molecular Microbiology</i> , 2017, 104, 1008-1026.	2.5	9