Constance D Lehman

List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: https://exaly.com/author-pdf/401810/publications.pdf

Version: 2024-02-01

255 papers 18,567 citations

14655 66 h-index 13771

257 all docs

257 docs citations

times ranked

257

12000 citing authors

g-index

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
1	American Cancer Society Guidelines for Breast Screening with MRI as an Adjunct to Mammography. Ca-A Cancer Journal for Clinicians, 2007, 57, 75-89.	329.8	2,234
2	MRI Evaluation of the Contralateral Breast in Women with Recently Diagnosed Breast Cancer. New England Journal of Medicine, 2007, 356, 1295-1303.	27.0	842
3	Screening for Breast Cancer. JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association, 2005, 293, 1245.	7.4	718
4	Diagnostic Architectural and Dynamic Features at Breast MR Imaging: Multicenter Study. Radiology, 2006, 238, 42-53.	7.3	469
5	Diagnostic Accuracy of Digital Screening Mammography With and Without Computer-Aided Detection. JAMA Internal Medicine, 2015, 175, 1828.	5.1	452
6	Magnetic Resonance Imaging of the Breast Prior to Biopsy. JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association, 2004, 292, 2735.	7.4	443
7	National Performance Benchmarks for Modern Screening Digital Mammography: Update from the Breast Cancer Surveillance Consortium. Radiology, 2017, 283, 49-58.	7.3	418
8	A Deep Learning Mammography-based Model for Improved Breast Cancer Risk Prediction. Radiology, 2019, 292, 60-66.	7.3	401
9	Locally Advanced Breast Cancer: MR Imaging for Prediction of Response to Neoadjuvant Chemotherapyâ€"Results from ACRIN 6657/I-SPY TRIAL. Radiology, 2012, 263, 663-672.	7.3	391
10	Pathologic Complete Response Predicts Recurrence-Free Survival More Effectively by Cancer Subset: Results From the I-SPY 1 TRIALâ€"CALGB 150007/150012, ACRIN 6657. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 2012, 30, 3242-3249.	1.6	379
11	Cancer Yield of Mammography, MR, and US in High-Risk Women: Prospective Multi-Institution Breast Cancer Screening Study. Radiology, 2007, 244, 381-388.	7.3	361
12	Screening women at high risk for breast cancer with mammography and magnetic resonance imaging. Cancer, 2005, 103, 1898-1905.	4.1	355
13	Performance Benchmarks for Screening Mammography. Radiology, 2006, 241, 55-66.	7.3	317
14	Chemotherapy response and recurrence-free survival in neoadjuvant breast cancer depends on biomarker profiles: results from the I-SPY 1 TRIAL (CALGB 150007/150012; ACRIN 6657). Breast Cancer Research and Treatment, 2012, 132, 1049-1062.	2.5	286
15	Factors Contributing to Mammography Failure in Women Aged 40-49 Years. Journal of the National Cancer Institute, 2004, 96, 1432-1440.	6.3	274
16	Quantitative Diffusion-Weighted Imaging as an Adjunct to Conventional Breast MRI for Improved Positive Predictive Value. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2009, 193, 1716-1722.	2.2	246
17	ACR Appropriateness Criteria Breast Cancer Screening. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 2013, 10, 11-14.	1.8	241
18	Comparative Effectiveness of Digital Versus Film-Screen Mammography in Community Practice in the United States. Annals of Internal Medicine, 2011, 155, 493.	3.9	232

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
19	Identifying Women With Dense Breasts at High Risk for Interval Cancer. Annals of Internal Medicine, 2015, 162, 673-681.	3.9	215
20	Statement of the Science Concerning Locoregional Treatments After Preoperative Chemotherapy for Breast Cancer: A National Cancer Institute Conference. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 2008, 26, 791-797.	1.6	206
21	Mammographic Breast Density Assessment Using Deep Learning: Clinical Implementation. Radiology, 2019, 290, 52-58.	7.3	187
22	Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy for Breast Cancer: Functional Tumor Volume by MR Imaging Predicts Recurrence-free Survival—Results from the ACRIN 6657/CALGB 150007 I-SPY 1 TRIAL. Radiology, 2016, 279, 44-55.	7.3	186
23	Benefits, Harms, and Cost-Effectiveness of Supplemental Ultrasonography Screening for Women With Dense Breasts. Annals of Internal Medicine, 2015, 162, 157-166.	3.9	175
24	Are Qualitative Assessments of Background Parenchymal Enhancement, Amount of Fibroglandular Tissue on MR Images, and Mammographic Density Associated with Breast Cancer Risk?. Radiology, 2015, 276, 371-380.	7.3	163
25	Background Parenchymal Enhancement on Breast MRI: Impact on Diagnostic Performance. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2012, 198, W373-W380.	2.2	155
26	Positive Predictive Value of BI-RADS MR Imaging. Radiology, 2012, 264, 51-58.	7.3	151
27	BI-RADS Lesion Characteristics Predict Likelihood of Malignancy in Breast MRI for Masses But Not for Nonmasslike Enhancement. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2009, 193, 994-1000.	2.2	150
28	Variation in Mammographic Breast Density Assessments Among Radiologists in Clinical Practice. Annals of Internal Medicine, 2016, 165, 457.	3.9	148
29	Diffusionâ€weighted imaging outside the brain: Consensus statement from an ISMRMâ€sponsored workshop. Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging, 2016, 44, 521-540.	3.4	146
30	Apparent Diffusion Coefficient Values for Discriminating Benign and Malignant Breast MRI Lesions: Effects of Lesion Type and Size. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2010, 194, 1664-1673.	2.2	145
31	Performance of Diagnostic Mammography for Women With Signs or Symptoms of Breast Cancer. Journal of the National Cancer Institute, 2002, 94, 1151-1159.	6.3	127
32	Patterns of Breast Magnetic Resonance Imaging Use in Community Practice. JAMA Internal Medicine, 2014, 174, 125.	5.1	126
33	A Deep Learning Model to Triage Screening Mammograms: A Simulation Study. Radiology, 2019, 293, 38-46.	7.3	125
34	High-Risk Breast Lesions: A Machine Learning Model to Predict Pathologic Upgrade and Reduce Unnecessary Surgical Excision. Radiology, 2018, 286, 810-818.	7.3	123
35	Screening ultrasound as an adjunct to mammography in women with mammographically dense breasts. American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology, 2015, 212, 9-17.	1.3	119
36	Clinical Experience with MRI-Guided Vacuum-Assisted Breast Biopsy. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2005, 184, 1782-1787.	2,2	118

#	Article	IF	Citations
37	Screening MRI in Women With a Personal History of Breast Cancer. Journal of the National Cancer Institute, 2016, 108, djv349.	6.3	118
38	Added cancer yield of MRI in screening the contralateral breast of women recently diagnosed with breast cancer: Results from the International Breast Magnetic Resonance Consortium (IBMC) trial. Journal of Surgical Oncology, 2005, 92, 9-15.	1.7	117
39	Utility of Targeted Sonography for Breast Lesions That Were Suspicious on MRI. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2009, 192, 1128-1134.	2.2	114
40	Lobular In-Situ Neoplasia on Breast Core Needle Biopsy: Imaging Indication and Pathologic Extent Can Identify Which Patients Require Excisional Biopsy. Annals of Surgical Oncology, 2012, 19, 914-921.	1.5	114
41	BI-RADS MRI Enhancement Characteristics of Ductal Carcinoma In Situ. Breast Journal, 2007, 13, 545-550.	1.0	113
42	Breast MRI for Cancer Detection and Characterization. Academic Radiology, 2008, 15, 408-416.	2.5	112
43	Risk of Upgrade of Atypical Ductal Hyperplasia after Stereotactic Breast Biopsy: Effects of Number of Foci and Complete Removal of Calcifications. Radiology, 2010, 255, 723-730.	7.3	112
44	Breast MR Imaging: Computer-aided Evaluation Program for Discriminating Benign from Malignant Lesions. Radiology, 2007, 244, 94-103.	7.3	107
45	National Performance Benchmarks for Modern Diagnostic Digital Mammography: Update from the Breast Cancer Surveillance Consortium. Radiology, 2017, 283, 59-69.	7.3	102
46	Utility of Diffusion-weighted Imaging to Decrease Unnecessary Biopsies Prompted by Breast MRI: A Trial of the ECOG-ACRIN Cancer Research Group (A6702). Clinical Cancer Research, 2019, 25, 1756-1765.	7.0	100
47	Toward robust mammography-based models for breast cancer risk. Science Translational Medicine, 2021, 13, .	12.4	100
48	Frequency and Upgrade Rates of Atypical Ductal Hyperplasia Diagnosed at Stereotactic Vacuum-Assisted Breast Biopsy: 9-Versus 11-Gauge. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2009, 192, 229-234.	2.2	99
49	Comparative Effectiveness of Combined Digital Mammography and Tomosynthesis Screening for Women with Dense Breasts. Radiology, 2015, 274, 772-780.	7.3	98
50	Indications for Breast MRI in the Patient with Newly Diagnosed Breast Cancer. Journal of the National Comprehensive Cancer Network: JNCCN, 2009, 7, 193-201.	4.9	92
51	MRI, Clinical Examination, and Mammography for Preoperative Assessment of Residual Disease and Pathologic Complete Response After Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy for Breast Cancer: ACRIN 6657 Trial. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2018, 210, 1376-1385.	2.2	90
52	A Review of Current Evidence-Based Clinical Applications for Breast Magnetic Resonance Imaging. Topics in Magnetic Resonance Imaging, 2008, 19, 143-150.	1.2	89
53	Characteristics of Probably Benign Breast MRI Lesions. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2009, 193, 861-867.	2.2	88
54	Accuracy and Value of Breast Ultrasound for Primary Imaging Evaluation of Symptomatic Women 30-39 Years of Age. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2012, 199, 1169-1177.	2.2	88

#	Article	IF	Citations
55	Using machine learning to parse breast pathology reports. Breast Cancer Research and Treatment, 2017, 161, 203-211.	2.5	87
56	Magnetic Resonance Imaging in the Evaluation of Ductal Carcinoma In Situ. Journal of the National Cancer Institute Monographs, 2010, 2010, 150-151.	2.1	85
57	ACR Appropriateness Criteria Breast Cancer Screening. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 2016, 13, R45-R49.	1.8	80
58	Unilateral Lymphadenopathy After COVID-19 Vaccination: A Practical Management Plan for Radiologists Across Specialties. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 2021, 18, 843-852.	1.8	78
59	Role of MRI in screening women at high risk for breast cancer. Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging, 2006, 24, 964-970.	3.4	77
60	A New Automated Software System to Evaluate Breast MR Examinations: Improved Specificity Without Decreased Sensitivity. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2006, 187, 51-56.	2.2	75
61	Pathologic Outcomes of Architectural Distortion on Digital 2D Versus Tomosynthesis Mammography. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2017, 209, 1162-1167.	2.2	75
62	Performance of DWI as a Rapid Unenhanced Technique for Detecting Mammographically Occult Breast Cancer in Elevated-Risk Women With Dense Breasts. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2016, 207, 205-216.	2.2	74
63	MRI-Detected Suspicious Breast Lesions: Predictive Values of Kinetic Features Measured by Computer-Aided Evaluation. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2009, 193, 826-831.	2.2	72
64	Nonmalignant Breast Lesions: ADCs of Benign and High-Risk Subtypes Assessed as False-Positive at Dynamic Enhanced MR Imaging. Radiology, 2012, 265, 696-706.	7.3	72
65	In Vivo Assessment of Ductal Carcinoma in Situ Grade: A Model Incorporating Dynamic Contrast-enhanced and Diffusion-weighted Breast MR Imaging Parameters. Radiology, 2012, 263, 374-382.	7.3	72
66	Imaging in breast cancer: Magnetic resonance imaging. Breast Cancer Research, 2005, 7, 215-9.	5.0	71
67	Multi-Institutional Validation of a Mammography-Based Breast Cancer Risk Model. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 2022, 40, 1732-1740.	1.6	71
68	Breast Cancer Characteristics Associated with 2D Digital Mammography versus Digital Breast Tomosynthesis for Screening-detected and Interval Cancers. Radiology, 2018, 287, 49-57.	7.3	70
69	Combined use of MRI and PET to monitor response and assess residual disease for locally advanced breast cancer treated with neoadjuvant chemotherapy1. Academic Radiology, 2004, 11, 1115-1124.	2.5	69
70	Frequency, Upgrade Rates, and Characteristics of High-Risk Lesions Initially Identified With Breast MRI. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2010, 195, 792-798.	2.2	68
71	Diffusion tensor magnetic resonance imaging of the normal breast. Magnetic Resonance Imaging, 2010, 28, 320-328.	1.8	67
72	Performance Benchmarks for Screening Breast MR Imaging in Community Practice. Radiology, 2017, 285, 44-52.	7.3	66

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
73	Performance of Screening Ultrasonography as an Adjunct to Screening Mammography in Women Across the Spectrum of Breast Cancer Risk. JAMA Internal Medicine, 2019, 179, 658.	5.1	66
74	The Incremental Contribution of Clinical Breast Examination to Invasive Cancer Detection in a Mammography Screening Program. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2005, 184, 428-432.	2.2	65
75	Population-Based Assessment of the Association Between Magnetic Resonance Imaging Background Parenchymal Enhancement and Future Primary Breast Cancer Risk. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 2019, 37, 954-963.	1.6	65
76	Breast Density Legislation and Opportunities for Patient-centered Outcomes Research. Radiology, 2012, 264, 632-636.	7.3	64
77	Frequency of Malignancy Seen in Probably Benign Lesions at Contrast-enhanced Breast MR Imaging: Findings from ACRIN 6667. Radiology, 2010, 255, 731-737.	7.3	63
78	Use of the American College of Radiology BI-RADS Guidelines by Community Radiologists: Concordance of Assessments and Recommendations Assigned to Screening Mammograms. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2002, 179, 15-20.	2.2	62
79	Breast Cancer Yield for Screening Mammographic Examinations with Recommendation for Short-Interval Follow-up. Radiology, 2005, 234, 684-692.	7.3	60
80	Diffusion-weighted MRI: influence of intravoxel fat signal and breast density on breast tumor conspicuity and apparent diffusion coefficient measurements. Magnetic Resonance Imaging, 2011, 29, 1215-1221.	1.8	60
81	Implications of Overdiagnosis: Impact on Screening Mammography Practices. Population Health Management, 2015, 18, S-3-S-11.	1.7	55
82	Predictors of Sensitivity of Clinical Breast Examination (CBE). Breast Cancer Research and Treatment, 2002, 76, 73-81.	2.5	53
83	MRI-Guided Breast Biopsy:Clinical Experience with 14-Gauge Stainless Steel Core Biopsy Needle. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2004, 182, 1075-1080.	2.2	52
84	PET/MR in invasive ductal breast cancer: correlation between imaging markers and histological phenotype. British Journal of Cancer, 2017, 116, 893-902.	6.4	52
85	Targeted Ultrasound in Women Younger Than 30 Years With Focal Breast Signs or Symptoms: Outcomes Analyses and Management Implications. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2010, 195, 1472-1477.	2.2	51
86	Imaging Axillary Lymph Nodes in Patients with Newly Diagnosed Breast Cancer. Current Problems in Diagnostic Radiology, 2012, 41, 149-158.	1.4	51
87	Imaging Management of Palpable Breast Abnormalities. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2014, 203, 1142-1153.	2.2	51
88	Mitigating the Impact of Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Vaccinations on Patients Undergoing Breast Imaging Examinations: A Pragmatic Approach. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2021, 217, 584-586.	2.2	50
89	MR spectroscopy of breast cancer for assessing early treatment response: Results from the ACRIN 6657 MRS trial. Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging, 2017, 46, 290-302.	3.4	49
90	Performance of Screening Breast MRI across Women with Different Elevated Breast Cancer Risk Indications. Radiology, 2019, 292, 51-59.	7.3	49

#	Article	IF	Citations
91	Computer-Aided Detection Applied to Breast MRI: Assessment of CAD-Generated Enhancement and Tumor Sizes in Breast Cancers Before and After Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy1. Academic Radiology, 2005, 12, 806-814.	2.5	48
92	The Utility of Breast MRI as a Problem-Solving Tool. Breast Journal, 2011, 17, 273-280.	1.0	47
93	Clinical and technical considerations for high quality breast MRI at 3 tesla. Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging, 2013, 37, 778-790.	3.4	47
94	Testing the Effect of Computer-Assisted Detection on Interpretive Performance in Screening Mammography. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2006, 187, 1475-1482.	2.2	46
95	Surveillance Breast MRI and Mammography: Comparison in Women with a Personal History of Breast Cancer. Radiology, 2019, 292, 311-318.	7.3	46
96	High Cancer Yield and Positive Predictive Value: Outcomes at a Center Routinely Using Preoperative Breast MRI for Staging. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2011, 196, W93-W99.	2.2	45
97	Relationship of established risk factors with breast cancer subtypes. Cancer Medicine, 2021, 10, 6456-6467.	2.8	45
98	The Role of MRI in Breast Cancer Screening. Journal of the National Comprehensive Cancer Network: JNCCN, 2009, 7, 1109-1115.	4.9	42
99	Underutilization of Supplemental Magnetic Resonance Imaging Screening Among Patients at High Breast Cancer Risk. Journal of Women's Health, 2018, 27, 748-754.	3.3	42
100	Association between serial dynamic contrastâ€enhanced MRI and dynamic ¹⁸ Fâ€FDG PET measures in patients undergoing neoadjuvant chemotherapy for locally advanced breast cancer. Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging, 2010, 32, 1124-1131.	3.4	41
101	Comparison of Upright Digital Breast Tomosynthesis–guided versus Prone Stereotactic Vacuum-assisted Breast Biopsy. Radiology, 2019, 290, 298-304.	7.3	39
102	Improved B1 homogeneity of 3 tesla breast MRI using dual-source parallel radiofrequency excitation. Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging, 2012, 35, 1222-1226.	3.4	38
103	Is Surgical Excision Necessary for Focal Atypical Ductal Hyperplasia Found at Stereotactic Vacuum-Assisted Breast Biopsy?. Annals of Surgical Oncology, 2008, 15, 3232-3238.	1.5	37
104	Breast DCE-MRI. Academic Radiology, 2014, 21, 1195-1203.	2.5	36
105	Impact of a Same-Day Breast Biopsy Program on Disparities in Time to Biopsy. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 2019, 16, 1554-1560.	1.8	36
106	Metabolic and Vascular Features of Dynamic Contrast-enhanced Breast Magnetic Resonance Imaging and 150-Water Positron Emission Tomography Blood Flow in Breast Cancer. Academic Radiology, 2008, 15, 1246-1254.	2.5	34
107	Evaluation of a Nonradioactive Magnetic Marker Wireless Localization Program. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2018, 211, 940-945.	2.2	34
108	Optimizing risk-based breast cancer screening policies with reinforcement learning. Nature Medicine, 2022, 28, 136-143.	30.7	34

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
109	Magnetic Resonance Imaging-Guided Breast Interventions. Topics in Magnetic Resonance Imaging, 2008, 19, 151-162.	1.2	32
110	Diffusion-Weighted MRI: Association Between Patient Characteristics and Apparent Diffusion Coefficients of Normal Breast Fibroglandular Tissue at 3 T. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2014, 202, W496-W502.	2.2	32
111	Five-Year Risk for Interval-Invasive Second Breast Cancer. Journal of the National Cancer Institute, 2015, 107, .	6.3	31
112	Disclosing Harmful Mammography Errors to Patients. Radiology, 2009, 253, 443-452.	7.3	30
113	Breast Cancer Characteristics Associated With Digital Versus Film-Screen Mammography for Screen-Detected and Interval Cancers. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2015, 205, 676-684.	2.2	30
114	Flat Epithelial Atypia: Upgrade Rates and Risk-Stratification Approach to Support Informed Decision Making. Journal of the American College of Surgeons, 2017, 225, 696-701.	0.5	28
115	Breast Biopsy Intensity and Findings Following Breast Cancer Screening in Women With and Without a Personal History of Breast Cancer. JAMA Internal Medicine, 2018, 178, 458.	5.1	28
116	Disparities in Same-Day Diagnostic Imaging in Breast Cancer Screening: Impact of an Immediate-Read Screening Mammography Program Implemented During the COVID-19 Pandemic. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2022, 218, 270-278.	2.2	28
117	MR-guided Vacuum-assisted Breast Biopsy: Accuracy of Targeting and Success in Sampling in a Phantom Model. Radiology, 2004, 232, 911-914.	7.3	27
118	Lesion and Patient Characteristics Associated with Malignancy After a Probably Benign Finding on Community Practice Mammography. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2008, 190, 511-515.	2.2	27
119	Suspicious Axillary Lymph Nodes Identified on Clinical Breast MRI inÂPatients Newly Diagnosed withÂBreast Cancer. Academic Radiology, 2015, 22, 430-438.	2.5	27
120	Ductal Carcinoma in Situ: Quantitative Preoperative Breast MR Imaging Features Associated with Recurrence after Treatment. Radiology, 2017, 285, 788-797.	7.3	27
121	MR Imagingâ€"Guided Breast Biopsy Using a Coaxial Technique with a 14-Gauge Stainless Steel Core Biopsy Needle and a Titanium Sheath. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2003, 181, 183-185.	2.2	26
122	Probability of malignancy for lesions detected on breast MRI: a predictive model incorporating BI-RADS imaging features and patient characteristics. European Radiology, 2011, 21, 1609-1617.	4.5	26
123	Locally advanced breast cancers are more likely to present as Interval Cancers: results from the I-SPY 1 TRIAL (CALGB 150007/150012, ACRIN 6657, InterSPORE Trial). Breast Cancer Research and Treatment, 2012, 132, 871-879.	2.5	26
124	Accuracy and Interpretation Time of Computer-Aided Detection Among Novice and Experienced Breast MRI Readers. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2013, 200, W683-W689.	2.2	26
125	Accuracy of 3T versus 1.5T breast MRI for pre-operative assessment of extent of disease in newly diagnosed DCIS. European Journal of Radiology, 2015, 84, 611-616.	2.6	26
126	Patient-Reported Breast Density Awareness and Knowledge after Breast Density Legislation Passage. Academic Radiology, 2019, 26, 726-731.	2.5	26

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
127	Influence of Menstrual Cycle Timing on Screening Breast MRI Background Parenchymal Enhancement and Diagnostic Performance in Premenopausal Women. Journal of Breast Imaging, 2019, 1, 205-211.	1.3	26
128	Stereotactic Biopsy of the Breast Using an Upright Unit, a Vacuum-Suction Needle, and a Lateral Arm-Support System. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2002, 178, 1017-1024.	2.2	25
129	Breast Cancer Screening with Digital Breast Tomosynthesis: Are Initial Benefits Sustained?. Radiology, 2020, 295, 529-539.	7.3	24
130	Morphologic Blooming in Breast MRI as a Characterization of Margin for Discriminating Benign from Malignant Lesions. Academic Radiology, 2006, 13, 1344-1354.	2.5	23
131	Diffusionâ€weighted imaging: Effects of intravascular contrast agents on apparent diffusion coefficient measures of breast malignancies at 3 tesla. Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging, 2015, 42, 788-800.	3.4	23
132	Comparison of performance metrics with digital 2D versus tomosynthesis mammography in the diagnostic setting. European Radiology, 2019, 29, 477-484.	4.5	23
133	Association of Magnetic Resonance Imaging and a 12-Gene Expression Assay With Breast Ductal Carcinoma In Situ Treatment. JAMA Oncology, 2019, 5, 1036.	7.1	23
134	Preoperative and Intraoperative Sonographic Visibility of Collagen-Based Breast Biopsy Marker Clips. Academic Radiology, 2010, 17, 340-347.	2.5	22
135	Imaging Surveillance of Breast Cancer Survivors with Digital Mammography versus Digital Breast Tomosynthesis. Radiology, 2021, 298, 308-316.	7.3	22
136	The importance of survivors and partners in improving breast cancer outcomes in Uganda. Breast, 2013, 22, 138-141.	2.2	21
137	JOURNAL CLUB: Diagnostic Utility of MRI After Negative or Inconclusive Mammography for the Evaluation of Pathologic Nipple Discharge. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2017, 209, 1404-1410.	2.2	21
138	Deep Learning Model to Assess Cancer Risk on the Basis of a Breast MR Image Alone. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2019, 213, 227-233.	2.2	21
139	The Impact of Preoperative Breast MRI on Surgical Management of Women with Newly Diagnosed Ductal Carcinoma In Situ. Academic Radiology, 2020, 27, 478-486.	2.5	21
140	Do Eligibility Criteria for Ductal Carcinoma In Situ (DCIS) Active Surveillance Trials Identify Patients at Low Risk for Upgrade to Invasive Carcinoma?. Annals of Surgical Oncology, 2020, 27, 4459-4465.	1.5	21
141	Artificial Intelligence (AI) for Screening Mammography, From the <i>AJR</i> Special Series on AI Applications. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2022, 219, 369-380.	2.2	21
142	Pathologic Upgrade Rates of High-Risk Breast Lesions on Digital Two-Dimensional vs Tomosynthesis Mammography. Journal of the American College of Surgeons, 2018, 226, 858-867.	0.5	20
143	Dynamic Breast MRI: Does Lower Temporal Resolution Negatively Affect Clinical Kinetic Analysis?. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2012, 199, 703-708.	2.2	19
144	Improving Breast Ultrasound Interpretation in Uganda Using a Condensed Breast Imaging Reporting and Data System. Academic Radiology, 2016, 23, 1271-1277.	2.5	19

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
145	External Validation of a Deep Learning Model for Predicting Mammographic Breast Density in Routine Clinical Practice. Academic Radiology, 2021, 28, 475-480.	2.5	19
146	Double reading of automated breast ultrasound with digital mammography or digital breast tomosynthesis for breast cancer screening. Clinical Imaging, 2019, 55, 119-125.	1.5	18
147	Preoperative MRI Improves Prediction of Extensive Occult Axillary Lymph Node Metastases in Breast Cancer Patients with a Positive Sentinel Lymph Node Biopsy. Academic Radiology, 2014, 21, 92-98.	2.5	17
148	Epidemiology, Biology, Treatment, and Prevention of Ductal Carcinoma In Situ (DCIS). JNCI Cancer Spectrum, 2018, 2, pky063.	2.9	17
149	Digital 2D versus Tomosynthesis Screening Mammography among Women Aged 65 and Older in the United States. Radiology, 2019, 291, 582-590.	7.3	17
150	Ductal Carcinoma In Situ (DCIS) at Breast MRI: Predictors of Upgrade to Invasive Carcinoma. Academic Radiology, 2020, 27, 1394-1399.	2.5	17
151	Frequency and Cancer Yield of BI-RADS Category 3 Lesions Detected at High-Risk Screening Breast MRI. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2020, 214, 240-248.	2.2	17
152	Screening for Breast Cancer. Medical Clinics of North America, 2020, 104, 1007-1021.	2.5	17
153	Breast MRI during Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy: Lack of Background Parenchymal Enhancement Suppression and Inferior Treatment Response. Radiology, 2021, 301, 295-308.	7. 3	17
154	Preoperative Breast MRI for Newly Diagnosed Ductal Carcinoma in Situ: Imaging Features and Performance in a Multicenter Setting (ECOG-ACRIN E4112 Trial). Radiology, 2021, 301, 66-77.	7.3	17
155	Effect of Training with the American College of Radiology Breast Imaging Reporting and Data System Lexicon on Mammographic Interpretation Skills in Developing Countries1. Academic Radiology, 2001, 8, 647-650.	2.5	16
156	Daidzein-metabolizing phenotypes in relation to mammographic breast density among premenopausal women in the United States. Breast Cancer Research and Treatment, 2009, 116, 587-594.	2.5	16
157	Imaging-Based Screening: Understanding the Controversies. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2014, 203, 952-956.	2.2	16
158	Diffusion-Weighted Breast Magnetic Resonance Imaging. Journal of Computer Assisted Tomography, 2016, 40, 428-435.	0.9	16
159	National Cancer Institute Workshop on Artificial Intelligence in Radiation Oncology: Training the Next Generation. Practical Radiation Oncology, 2021, 11, 74-83.	2.1	16
160	Implementation and Utilization of a "Pink Card―Walk-In Screening Mammography Program Integrated With Physician Visits. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 2020, 17, 1602-1608.	1.8	16
161	Breast MRI BI-RADS Assessments and Abnormal Interpretation Rates by Clinical Indication in US Community Practices. Academic Radiology, 2014, 21, 1370-1376.	2.5	15
162	Latinas' Mammography Intention Following a Home-Based Promotores-Led Intervention. Journal of Community Health, 2015, 40, 1185-1192.	3.8	15

#	Article	IF	Citations
163	Effect of Background Parenchymal Enhancement on Cancer Risk Across Different High-Risk Patient Populations Undergoing Screening Breast MRI. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2019, 212, 1412-1418.	2.2	15
164	Impact of Primary Care Physician Interaction on Longitudinal Adherence to Screening Mammography Across Different Racial/Ethnic Groups. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 2019, 16, 908-914.	1.8	15
165	Through-transmission US applied to breast imaging. Academic Radiology, 2000, 7, 100-107.	2.5	14
166	Breast Cancer Downstaging Practices and Breast Health Messaging Preferences Among a Community Sample of Urban and Rural Ugandan Women. Journal of Global Oncology, 2017, 3, 105-113.	0.5	14
167	Assessing Eligibility for Lung Cancer Screening Among Women Undergoing Screening Mammography: Cross-Sectional Survey Results From the National Health Interview Survey. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 2019, 16, 1433-1439.	1.8	14
168	Pre-operative MRI in patients with ductal carcinoma in situ: Is MRI useful for identifying additional disease?. European Journal of Radiology, 2020, 129, 109130.	2.6	14
169	Digital Breast Tomosynthesis and the Challenges of Implementing an Emerging Breast Cancer Screening Technology Into Clinical Practice. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 2016, 13, R61-R66.	1.8	13
170	Availability of Advanced Breast Imaging at Screening Facilities Serving Vulnerable Populations. Journal of Medical Screening, 2016, 23, 24-30.	2.3	13
171	Can MRI biomarkers at 3 T identify low-risk ductal carcinoma in situ?. Clinical Imaging, 2016, 40, 125-129.	1.5	13
172	ACR BI-RADS Use in Low-Income Countries: An Analysis of Diagnostic Breast Ultrasound Practice in Uganda. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 2016, 13, 163-169.	1.8	13
173	Implementation of an Intimate Partner Violence Screening Assessment and Referral System in an Academic Women's Imaging Department. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 2019, 16, 631-634.	1.8	13
174	Performance of Screening Breast MRI After Negative Full-Field Digital Mammography Versus After Negative Digital Breast Tomosynthesis in Women at Higher Than Average Risk for Breast Cancer. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2019, 212, 271-279.	2.2	13
175	Imaging in Locoregional Management of Breast Cancer. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 2020, 38, 2351-2361.	1.6	13
176	Screening Mammography Recovery After COVID-19 Pandemic Facility Closures: Associations of Facility Access and Racial and Ethnic Screening Disparities. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2022, 218, 988-996.	2.2	13
177	Lateral Approach Biopsy Adapter. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2001, 177, 897-899.	2.2	12
178	Clinical Indication and Patient Age Predict Likelihood of Malignancy in Suspicious Breast MRI Lesions. Academic Radiology, 2009, 16, 1281-1285.	2.5	12
179	Retrospective Review of Preoperative Radiofrequency Tag Localization of Breast Lesions in 848 Patients. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2021, 217, 605-612.	2.2	12
180	Magnetic Seeds: An Alternative to Wire Localization for Nonpalpable Breast Lesions. Clinical Breast Cancer, 2022, 22, e700-e707.	2.4	12

#	Article	IF	Citations
181	MRI-Guided Breast Interventions. Seminars in Ultrasound, CT and MRI, 2006, 27, 339-350.	1.5	11
182	Stepping Out Further from the Shadows: Disclosure of Harmful Radiologic Errors to Patients. Radiology, 2012, 262, 381-386.	7.3	11
183	Kinetic Analysis of Lesions Identified on a Rapid Abridged Multiphase (RAMP) Breast MRI Protocol. Academic Radiology, 2020, 27, 672-681.	2.5	11
184	Impact of Background Parenchymal Enhancement on Diagnostic Performance in Screening Breast MRI. Academic Radiology, 2020, 27, 663-671.	2.5	11
185	Rethinking Preoperative Breast Magnetic Resonance Imaging. JAMA Oncology, 2015, 1, 1226.	7.1	10
186	Breast Cancer Beliefs as Potential Targets for Breast Cancer Awareness Efforts to Decrease Late-Stage Presentation in Uganda. Journal of Global Oncology, 2018, 4, 1-9.	0.5	10
187	Population-Based Health Engagement Opportunities Through Breast Imaging: A Population-Based Cross-Sectional Survey. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 2018, 15, 1401-1407.	1.8	10
188	Multilevel Predictors of Continued Adherence to Breast Cancer Screening Among Women Ages 50–74 Years in a Screening Population. Journal of Women's Health, 2019, 28, 1051-1059.	3.3	10
189	Will the Effect of New Federal Breast Density Legislation Be Diminished by Currently Available Online Patient Educational Materials?. Academic Radiology, 2020, 27, 1400-1405.	2.5	10
190	Screening Mammography Visits as Opportunities to Engage Smokers With Tobacco Cessation Services and Lung Cancer Screening. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 2020, 17, 606-612.	1.8	10
191	Breast MRI in Community Practice: Equipment and Imaging Techniques at Facilities in the Breast Cancer Surveillance Consortium. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 2010, 7, 878-884.	1.8	9
192	Dynamic contrastâ€enhanced magnetic resonance imaging and invasive breast cancer: Primary lesion kinetics correlated with axillary lymph node extracapsular extension. Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging, 2011, 33, 96-101.	3.4	9
193	Contralateral Prophylactic Mastectomy in the American College of Radiology Imaging Network 6667 Trial: Effect of Breast MR Imaging Assessments and Patient Characteristics. Radiology, 2014, 273, 53-60.	7. 3	9
194	Factors Associated with Preoperative Magnetic Resonance Imaging Use among Medicare Beneficiaries with Nonmetastatic Breast Cancer. Breast Journal, 2016, 22, 24-34.	1.0	9
195	Risk factors for an advanced breast cancer diagnosis within 2 years of a negative mammogram. Cancer, 2021, 127, 3334-3342.	4.1	9
196	Position of Clip Placement After Vacuum-Assisted Breast Biopsy: Is a Unilateral Two-View Postbiopsy Mammogram Necessary?. Breast Journal, 2003, 9, 272-276.	1.0	8
197	Report of the Working Groups on Breast MRI: Report of the High-Risk Screening Group. Breast Journal, 2004, 10, S9-S12.	1.0	8
198	Benign Breast Cyst without Associated Gynecomastia in a Male Patient: A Case Report. Journal of Radiology Case Reports, 2011, 5, 35-40.	0.4	8

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
199	Data Engineering for Machine Learning in Women's Imaging and Beyond. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2019, 213, 216-226.	2.2	8
200	Readiness for mammography and artificial intelligence. Lancet, The, 2021, 398, 1867.	13.7	8
201	Stargazing through the lens of AI in clinical oncology. Nature Cancer, 2021, 2, 1265-1267.	13.2	8
202	Screening MRI for Women at High Risk for Breast Cancer. Seminars in Ultrasound, CT and MRI, 2006, 27, 333-338.	1.5	7
203	Advanced Breast Imaging Availability by Screening Facility Characteristics. Academic Radiology, 2015, 22, 846-852.	2.5	7
204	The Effect of Digital Breast Tomosynthesis Adoption on Facility-Level Breast Cancer Screening Volume. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2018, 211, 957-963.	2.2	7
205	Obesity and breast cancer screening: Crossâ€sectional survey results from the behavioral risk factor surveillance system. Cancer, 2019, 125, 4158-4163.	4.1	7
206	Are English-language online patient education materials related to breast cancer risk assessment understandable, readable, and actionable?. Breast, 2022, 61, 29-34.	2.2	7
207	Evaluation of Tissue Sampling Methods Used for MRI-Detected Contralateral Breast Lesions in the American College of Radiology Imaging Network 6667 Trial. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2012, 199, W386-W391.	2.2	6
208	Performance Goals for an Adjunct DiagnosticÂTestÂto Reduce Unnecessary BiopsiesÂAfter Screening Mammography: AnalysisÂof Costs, Benefits, and Consequences. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 2016, 13, R81-R88.	1.8	6
209	Chronic Medical Illness as a Risk Factor for Poor Mammography Screening Adherence. Journal of Women's Health, 2019, 28, 1378-1383.	3.3	6
210	MRI Evaluation of the Contralateral Breast in Women with Recently Diagnosed Breast Cancer: 2-Year Follow-up. Journal of Breast Imaging, 2020, 2, 50-55.	1.3	6
211	Opportunities for Radiology Trainee Education Amid the COVID-19 Pandemic: Lessons From an Academic Breast Imaging Program. Academic Radiology, 2021, 28, 136-141.	2.5	6
212	Shear-Wave Elastography of the Breast: Impact of Technical Image Quality Parameters on Diagnostic Accuracy. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2021, 216, 1205-1215.	2.2	6
213	AUR-RRA Review: Logistics of Academic-Industry Partnerships in Artificial Intelligence. Academic Radiology, 2021, , .	2.5	6
214	Patient-Reported Testing Burden of Breast Magnetic Resonance Imaging Among Women With Ductal Carcinoma In Situ. JAMA Network Open, 2021, 4, e2129697.	5.9	6
215	Computer-Assisted Mammography Feedback Program (CAMFP). Academic Radiology, 2007, 14, 1036-1042.	2.5	5
216	Concordance of BI-RADS Assessments and Management Recommendations for Breast MRI in Community Practice. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2016, 206, 211-216.	2,2	5

#	Article	IF	Citations
217	Healthcare Factors for Obtaining a Mammogram in Latinas With a Variable Mammography History. Oncology Nursing Forum, 2017, 44, 66-76.	1.2	5
218	Gallstone Susceptibility to In Vitro Fragmentation by a 480-nm Pulsed Dye Laser. Investigative Radiology, 1991, 26, 799-803.	6.2	4
219	ACR Appropriateness Criteria \hat{A}^{\otimes} Stage I Breast Carcinoma. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 2012, 9, 463-467.	1.8	4
220	Value of Mammography for Women 30–39 Years Old Presenting With Breast Symptoms. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2018, 211, 1416-1424.	2.2	4
221	Quantifying performance thresholds for recommending screening mammography: a revealed preference analysis of USPSTF guidelines. Breast Cancer Research and Treatment, 2018, 172, 463-468.	2.5	4
222	The Adoption and Impact on Performance of an Automated OutcomesÂFeedback Application for Tomosynthesis Screening Mammography. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 2020, 17, 1626-1635.	1.8	4
223	Artificial Intelligence for Image Interpretation: Pointâ€"The Radiologist's Potential Friend. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2021, 217, 556-557.	2.2	4
224	Patient Sociodemographic Characteristics Associated With Saturday Breast Imaging Clinic Utilization. Journal of Breast Imaging, 2022, 4, 378-383.	1.3	4
225	Evaluation of a Nonradioactive Magnetic Marker Wireless Localization Program. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2018, 211, W202-W202.	2.2	3
226	Predictors of surveillance mammography outcomes in women with a personal history of breast cancer. Breast Cancer Research and Treatment, 2018, 171, 209-215.	2.5	3
227	Breast Cancer Screening Using Digital Breast Tomosynthesis. JAMA Oncology, 2019, 5, 642.	7.1	3
228	Patient-Assisted Compression in Screening Mammography: Patient Experience and Image Quality. Journal of Breast Imaging, 2019, 1, 192-198.	1.3	3
229	The Effect of Prior Comparison MRI on Interpretive Performance of Screening Breast MRI. Journal of Breast Imaging, 2020, 2, 36-42.	1.3	3
230	Leveraging Emergency Department Encounters to Improve Cancer Screening Adherence. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 2021, 18, 834-840.	1.8	3
231	Multilevel follow-up of cancer screening (mFOCUS): Protocol for a multilevel intervention to improve the follow-up of abnormal cancer screening test results. Contemporary Clinical Trials, 2021, 109, 106533.	1.8	3
232	Association Between Surgery Preference and Receipt in Ductal Carcinoma In Situ After Breast Magnetic Resonance Imaging. JAMA Network Open, 2022, 5, e2210331.	5.9	3
233	Effects of Lesion Positioning on Digital Magnification Mammography Performance. Academic Radiology, 2010, 17, 791-794.	2.5	2
234	Radiologists' Performance in the ACR Breast MR With Guided Biopsy Course. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 2013, 10, 854-858.	1.8	2

#	Article	IF	Citations
235	Breast Cancer Screening in Puerto Rico and Other US Territories: Findings from the 2016 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System Survey. Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved, 2020, 31, 340-352.	0.8	2
236	Mammography Screening Guideline Controversies: Opportunities to Improve Patient Engagement in Screening. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 2020, 17, 633-636.	1.8	2
237	Potential of using mammography screening appointments to identify high-risk women: cross sectional survey results from the national health interview survey. Breast Cancer Research and Treatment, 2021, 186, 229-235.	2.5	2
238	A Multimetric Evaluation of Online Patient Educational Materials for Breast Implant–associated Anaplastic Large Cell Lymphoma. Journal of Breast Imaging, 2021, 3, 564-571.	1.3	2
239	Impact of a Deep Learning Model for Predicting Mammographic Breast Density in Routine Clinical Practice. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 2022, 19, 1021-1030.	1.8	2
240	Potential Benefits of Computer-Aided Detection for Cancer Identification and Treatmentâ€"Reply. JAMA Internal Medicine, 2016, 176, 411.	5.1	1
241	Mammography Performance Benchmarks in an Era of Value-based Care. Radiology, 2017, 284, 605-607.	7.3	1
242	Case 7-2020: A 52-Year-Old Man with a Mass in the Left Breast. New England Journal of Medicine, 2020, 382, 856-864.	27.0	1
243	Rare case of invasive lobular carcinoma in a male. Radiology Case Reports, 2020, 15, 727-729.	0.6	1
244	Abstract IA-21: Al in an imaging center: Challenges and opportunities., 2021,,.		1
245	Power Spectrum Analysis of Breast Parenchyma with Digital Breast Tomosynthesis Images in a Longitudinal Screening Cohort from Two Vendors. Academic Radiology, 2022, 29, 841-850.	2.5	1
246	Systematic tissue collection during clinical breast biopsy is feasible, safe and enables high-content translational analyses. Npj Precision Oncology, 2021, 5, 85.	5.4	1
247	Prospective study of magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) and multiparameter gene expression assay in ductal carcinoma in situ (DCIS): A trial of the ECOG-ACRIN Cancer Research Group (E4112) Journal of Clinical Oncology, 2017, 35, 534-534.	1.6	1
248	Impact of a Same-Day Breast Biopsy Program on Disparities in Time to Biopsy for Patients With Serious Mental Illness. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 2022, 19, 146-154.	1.8	1
249	Reply to "Strategies Used to Reduce the Time of Diagnosis in Screening Mammography― American Journal of Roentgenology, 2022, 218, 389-390.	2.2	1
250	Reply to "Get the Mammogram First: Screening Is the Reason for Imaging the Breast― American Journal of Roentgenology, 2019, 212, W117-W117.	2.2	0
251	Abstract PS7-02: The relationship of established breast cancer risk factors with breast cancer subtypes., 2021,,.		0
252	Imaging Evaluation of the Axilla—A National Survey of Clinical Practice Among Radiologists. Journal of Breast Imaging, 0, , .	1.3	0

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
253	Response. Radiology, 2013, 266, 999-1000.	7.3	O
254	Abstract P3-13-01: Association of polygenic risk score with 2 year risk of poor prognosis breast cancer. Cancer Research, 2022, 82, P3-13-01-P3-13-01.	0.9	0
255	Reply to "The Matrix Is Not Ready for Screening Mammography― American Journal of Roentgenology, 0, , 2-3.	2.2	0