## Rachel M Baker

List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: https://exaly.com/author-pdf/4048089/publications.pdf

Version: 2024-02-01

279798 276875 1,769 51 23 41 citations h-index g-index papers 52 52 52 1856 docs citations times ranked citing authors all docs

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
1	Microcredit as a public health initiative? Exploring mechanisms and pathways to health and wellbeing. Social Science and Medicine, 2021, 270, 113633.	3.8	7
2	Public values and plurality in health priority setting: What to do when people disagree and why we should care about reasons as well as choices. Social Science and Medicine, 2021, 277, 113892.	3.8	17
3	Self reliant groups from India to Scotland: lessons from south to north. Community Development Journal, 2020, 55, 277-294.	1.1	1
4	Exploring the relative value of end of life QALYs: Are the comparators important?. Social Science and Medicine, 2020, 245, 112660.	3.8	7
5	Walking a Tightrope: Using Financial Diaries to Investigate Day-to-Day Financial Decisions and the Social Safety Net of the Financially Excluded. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 2020, 689, 46-64.	1.6	8
6	Who knows best? A Q methodology study to explore perspectives of professional stakeholders and community participants on health in low-income communities. BMC Health Services Research, 2019, 19, 35.	2.2	16
7	Filling a void? The role of social enterprise in addressing social isolation and loneliness in rural communities. Journal of Rural Studies, 2019, 70, 225-236.	4.7	58
8	Microcredit for enterprise in the UK as an â€~alternative' economic space. Geoforum, 2019, 100, 80-88.	2.5	8
9	Innovating on Methods to Understand the Relationship Between Finances and Wellbeing. Social Indicators Research Series, 2019, , 129-144.	0.3	1
10	Is "end of life―a special case? Connecting Q with survey methods to measure societal support for views on the value of lifeâ€extending treatments. Health Economics (United Kingdom), 2018, 27, 819-831.	1.7	12
11	Are life-extending treatments for terminal illnesses a special case? Exploring choices and societal viewpoints. Social Science and Medicine, 2018, 198, 61-69.	3.8	16
12	Two false positives do not make a right: Setting the bar of social enterprise research even higher through avoiding the straw man fallacy. Social Science and Medicine, 2018, 217, 42-44.	3.8	8
13	Priority to End of Life Treatments? Views of the Public in the Netherlands. Value in Health, 2017, 20, 107-117.	0.3	22
14	Marketing Authorization Procedures for Advanced Cancer Drugs: Exploring the Views of Patients, Oncologists, Healthcare Decision Makers, and Citizens in France. Medical Decision Making, 2017, 37, 555-566.	2.4	5
15	Working with and for social enterprises: the role of the volunteer ethnographer. Social Enterprise Journal, 2017, 13, 180-193.	1.8	10
16	Universal health coverage, priority setting, and the human right to health. Lancet, The, 2017, 390, 712-714.	13.7	56
17	Health and Brexit. Health Economics (United Kingdom), 2017, 26, 959-961.	1.7	1
18	Conceptualising the public health role of actors operating outside of formal health systems: The case of social enterprise. Social Science and Medicine, 2017, 172, 144-152.	3.8	42

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
19	â€~Hidden Habitus': A Qualitative Study of Socio-Ecological Influences on Drinking Practices and Social Identity in Mid-Adolescence. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 2017, 14, 611.	2.6	14
20	From representing views to representativeness of views: Illustrating a new (Q2S) approach in the context of health care priority setting in nine European countries. Social Science and Medicine, 2016, 166, 205-213.	3.8	19
21	Eliciting Societal Views on the Value of Life-Extending Treatments Using Q Methodology. , 2016, , 141-152.		0
22	Extending life for people with a terminal illness: a moral right and an expensive death? Exploring societal perspectives. BMC Medical Ethics, 2015, 16, 14.	2.4	31
23	Comparing WTP Values of Different Types of QALY Gain Elicited from the General Public. Health Economics (United Kingdom), 2015, 24, 280-293.	1.7	64
24	Public views on principles for health care priority setting: Findings of a European cross-country study using Q methodology. Social Science and Medicine, 2015, 126, 128-137.	3.8	108
25	Qâ€ING FOR HEALTHâ€"A NEW APPROACH TO ELICITING THE PUBLIC'S VIEWS ON HEALTH CARE RESOURCE ALLOCATION. Health Economics (United Kingdom), 2014, 23, 283-297.	1.7	37
26	The potential of social enterprise to enhance health and well-being: A model and systematic review. Social Science and Medicine, 2014, 123, 182-193.	3.8	147
27	Autonomy, special offers and routines: a <scp>Q</scp> methodological study of industryâ€driven marketing influences on young people's drinking behaviour. Addiction, 2014, 109, 1833-1844.	3.3	15
28	Valuing QALYs at the end of life. Social Science and Medicine, 2014, 113, 5-14.	3.8	55
29	Did people "buy―what was "sold� A qualitative evaluation of a contingent valuation survey information set for gains in life expectancy. Journal of Environmental Management, 2014, 133, 94-103.	7.8	4
30	Estimating a WTP-based value of a QALY: The â€~chained' approach. Social Science and Medicine, 2013, 92, 92-104.	3.8	71
31	A Person Trade-Off Study to Estimate Age-Related Weights for Health Gains in Economic Evaluation. Pharmacoeconomics, 2013, 31, 893-907.	3.3	20
32	Social enterprise: New pathways to health and well-being?. Journal of Public Health Policy, 2013, 34, 55-68.	2.0	62
33	Deriving distributional weights for QALYs through discrete choice experiments. Journal of Health Economics, 2011, 30, 466-478.	2.7	91
34	Social business, health and well-being. Social Business, 2011, 1, 17-35.	0.3	17
35	The social value of a QALY: raising the bar or barring the raise?. BMC Health Services Research, 2011, 11, 8.	2.2	68
36	Understanding public preferences for prioritizing health care interventions in England: Does the type of health gain matter?. Journal of Health Services Research and Policy, 2011, 16, 81-89.	1.7	14

#	Article	IF	Citations
37	Searchers vs surveyors in estimating the monetary value of a QALY: resolving a nasty dilemma for NICE. Health Economics, Policy and Law, 2011, 6, 435-447.	1.8	30
38	What needs to be done in contingent valuation: have Smith and Sach missed the boat?. Health Economics, Policy and Law, 2010, 5, 113-121.	1.8	5
39	â€~l've just taken you to see the man with the CD on his head': the experience and management of recurrent sore throat in children. Journal of Child Health Care, 2010, 14, 95-110.	1.4	7
40	Weighting and valuing quality-adjusted life-years using stated preference methods: preliminary results from the Social Value of a QALY Project. Health Technology Assessment, 2010, 14, 1-162.	2.8	117
41	Valuing lives equally in a benefit-coast analysis of safety projects: A method to reconcile theory and practice. Safety Science, 2009, 47, 813-816.	4.9	2
42	Valuing lives equally: Defensible premise or unwarranted compromise?. Journal of Risk and Uncertainty, 2008, 36, 125-138.	1.5	23
43	How do respondents explain WTP responses? A review of the qualitative evidence. Journal of Socio-Economics, 2008, 37, 1427-1442.	1.0	15
44	The New Myth. Pharmacoeconomics, 2008, 26, 1-4.	3.3	34
45	Willingness to pay for a QALY: past, present and future. Expert Review of Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research, 2008, 8, 575-582.	1.4	35
46	Explaining variation in GP referral rates for x-rays for back pain. Implementation Science, 2006, 1, 15.	6.9	34
47	Economic rationality and health and lifestyle choices for people with diabetes. Social Science and Medicine, 2006, 63, 2341-2353.	3.8	67
48	Q methodology in health economics. Journal of Health Services Research and Policy, 2006, 11, 38-45.	1.7	94
49	Guiding the design and selection of interventions to influence the implementation of evidence-based practice: an experimental simulation of a complex intervention trial. Social Science and Medicine, 2005, 60, 2135-2147.	3.8	89
50	Issues arising from the use of qualitative methods in health economics. Journal of Health Services Research and Policy, 2004, 9, 171-176.	1.7	47
51	Responses to standard gambles: are preferencesâ€~well constructed'?. Health Economics (United) Tj ETQq1	1 0.784314 1.7	l   rgBT  Over