

# Elizabeth Wager

## List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: <https://exaly.com/author-pdf/4407994/publications.pdf>

Version: 2024-02-01

103  
papers

5,517  
citations

136885

32  
h-index

85498

71  
g-index

124  
all docs

124  
docs citations

124  
times ranked

5959  
citing authors

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
1	Cooperation & Liaison between Universities & Editors (CLUE): recommendations on best practice. <i>Research Integrity and Peer Review</i> , 2021, 6, 6.	2.2	14
2	Consent for publishing patient photographs. <i>Case Reports in Women's Health</i> , 2020, 26, e00194.	0.2	6
3	Using the STROBE statement: survey findings emphasized the role of journals in enforcing reporting guidelines. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2019, 116, 26-35.	2.4	36
4	Good Practice for Conference Abstracts and Presentations: GPCAP. <i>Research Integrity and Peer Review</i> , 2019, 4, 11.	2.2	25
5	Advancing research integrity: a programme to embed good practice in Africa. <i>Pan African Medical Journal</i> , 2019, 33, 298.	0.3	1
6	A cross-sectional bibliometric study showed suboptimal journal endorsement rates of STROBE and its extensions. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2019, 107, 42-50.	2.4	31
7	UK universities compliance with the Concordat to Support Research Integrity: findings from cross-sectional time-series. <i>PeerJ</i> , 2019, 7, e7292.	0.9	4
8	No difference in knowledge obtained from infographic or plain language summary of a Cochrane systematic review: three randomized controlled trials. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2018, 97, 86-94.	2.4	58
9	Research Integrity and Peer Review's past highlights and future directions. <i>Research Integrity and Peer Review</i> , 2018, 3, 3.	2.2	4
10	Response to letter to the editor by McSween-Cadieux et al. (2017). <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2018, 100, 133-134.	2.4	0
11	Opinions and potential solutions regarding dissemination bias from funding agencies of biomedical research in Europe. <i>Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice</i> , 2018, 24, 72-79.	0.9	1
12	Plagiarism in research: a survey of African medical journals. <i>BMJ Open</i> , 2018, 8, e024777.	0.8	16
13	Why we should worry less about predatory publishers and more about the quality of research and training at our academic institutions. <i>Journal of Epidemiology</i> , 2017, 27, 87-88.	1.1	21
14	Authorship, plagiarism and conflict of interest: views and practices from low/middle-income country health researchers. <i>BMJ Open</i> , 2017, 7, e018467.	0.8	47
15	The STROBE extensions: protocol for a qualitative assessment of content and a survey of endorsement. <i>BMJ Open</i> , 2017, 7, e019043.	0.8	12
16	Interventions to prevent misconduct and promote integrity in research and publication. <i>The Cochrane Library</i> , 2016, 2016, MR000038.	1.5	75
17	Do declarative titles affect readers' perceptions of research findings? A randomized trial. <i>Research Integrity and Peer Review</i> , 2016, 1, 11.	2.2	8
18	A scoping review of competencies for scientific editors of biomedical journals. <i>BMC Medicine</i> , 2016, 14, 16.	2.3	31

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
19	A new forum for research on research integrity and peer review. <i>Research Integrity and Peer Review</i> , 2016, 1, 5.	2.2	3
20	Bias in dissemination of clinical research findings: structured OPEN framework of what, who and why, based on literature review and expert consensus. <i>BMJ Open</i> , 2016, 6, e010024.	0.8	16
21	Professional medical writing support and the quality of randomised controlled trial reporting: a cross-sectional study. <i>BMJ Open</i> , 2016, 6, e010329.	0.8	26
22	Extending the PRISMA statement to equity-focused systematic reviews (PRISMA-E 2012): explanation and elaboration. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2016, 70, 68-89.	2.4	184
23	Good Publication Practice for Communicating Company-Sponsored Medical Research: GPP3. <i>Annals of Internal Medicine</i> , 2015, 163, 461-464.	2.0	291
24	Evidence-informed recommendations to reduce dissemination bias in clinical research: conclusions from the OPEN (Overcome failure to Publish nEgative fiNDings) project based on an international consensus meeting. <i>BMJ Open</i> , 2015, 5, e006666-e006666.	0.8	49
25	Are prolific authors too much of a good thing?. <i>BMJ, The</i> , 2015, 351, h2782.	3.0	7
26	Cooperation between Journals, Research Institutions and Funders over Research and Publication Integrity Cases: Defining the Challenges. , 2015, , 177-190.		4
27	Why are retractions so difficult?. <i>Science Editing</i> , 2015, 2, 32-34.	0.4	8
28	Too much of a good thing? An observational study of prolific authors. <i>PeerJ</i> , 2015, 3, e1154.	0.9	34
29	Why should clinical trials be registered?. <i>European Journal of Anaesthesiology</i> , 2014, 31, 397-400.	0.7	16
30	Awareness and enforcement of guidelines for publishing industry-sponsored medical research among publication professionals: the Global Publication Survey. <i>BMJ Open</i> , 2014, 4, e004780.	0.8	25
31	Reducing waste from incomplete or unusable reports of biomedical research. <i>Lancet, The</i> , 2014, 383, 267-276.	6.3	982
32	Defining and responding to plagiarism. <i>Learned Publishing</i> , 2014, 27, 33-42.	0.8	36
33	Publication Ethics: Whose Problem is It?. <i>Prilozi - Makedonska Akademija Na Naukite I Umetnostite Oddelenie Za Medicinski Nauki</i> , 2014, 35, 23-27.	0.2	6
34	Responsible Research Publication: International Standards for Editors. <i>Prilozi - Makedonska Akademija Na Naukite I Umetnostite Oddelenie Za Medicinski Nauki</i> , 2014, 35, 35-41.	0.2	12
35	How Should Journal Editors Respond to Cases of Suspected Misconduct?. <i>Journal of Microbiology and Biology Education</i> , 2014, 15, 146-150.	0.5	2
36	Uploading garbage files to the DOI system of a journal: a new type of misconduct. <i>Learned Publishing</i> , 2014, 27, 275-280.	0.8	0

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
37	Fate of Articles That Warranted Retraction Due to Ethical Concerns: A Descriptive Cross-Sectional Study. PLoS ONE, 2014, 9, e85846.	1.1	49
38	How Should Journal Editors Respond to Cases of Suspected Misconduct?. Prilozi - Makedonska Akademija Na Naukite I Umetnostite Oddelenie Za Medicinski Nauki, 2014, 35, 95-101.	0.2	3
39	Why publication ethics is relevant to information management : Experience from the Committee on Publication Ethics. Journal of Information Processing and Management, 2014, 57, 443-450.	0.0	0
40	PublicaÃ§Ã£o responsÃ¡vel de pesquisa: padrÃµes internacionais para editores. Cadernos De Pesquisa, 2014, 44, 203-218.	0.3	0
41	PublicaÃ§Ã£o responsÃ¡vel de pesquisa: padrÃµes internacionais para autores. Cadernos De Pesquisa, 2014, 44, 219-226.	0.3	0
42	Responsible Research Publication: International Standards for Authors. Prilozi - Makedonska Akademija Na Naukite I Umetnostite Oddelenie Za Medicinski Nauki, 2014, 35, 29-33.	0.2	3
43	Responsible research publication: international standards for authors. Prilozi - Makedonska Akademija Na Naukite I Umetnostite Oddelenie Za Medicinski Nauki, 2014, 35, 29-33.	0.2	0
44	Defining publication bias: protocol for a systematic review of highly cited articles and proposal for a new framework. Systematic Reviews, 2013, 2, 34.	2.5	19
45	Exploring Why and How Journal Editors Retract Articles: Findings From a Qualitative Study. Science and Engineering Ethics, 2013, 19, 1-11.	1.7	61
46	"Hardly worth the effort"? Medical journals' policies and their editors' and publishers' views on trial registration and publication bias: quantitative and qualitative study. BMJ, The, 2013, 347, f5248-f5248.	3.0	114
47	The UK should lead the way on research integrity. BMJ, The, 2013, 346, f2348-f2348.	3.0	2
48	NEWS. Journal of Global Health, 2013, 3, 020301.	1.2	8
49	Publishing ethics and integrity. , 2012, , 337-354.		2
50	Why has the committee on publication ethics developed guidelines for cooperation between journals and research institutions?. Saudi Journal of Anaesthesia, 2012, 6, 102.	0.2	3
51	Cooperation between research institutions and journals on research integrity cases: Guidance from the committee on publication ethics. Saudi Journal of Anaesthesia, 2012, 6, 155.	0.2	9
52	Research misconduct in the UK. BMJ: British Medical Journal, 2012, 344, d8357-d8357.	2.4	15
53	Editorial code of conduct. Lancet, The, 2012, 379, e31.	6.3	0
54	Cooperation between research institutions and journals on research integrity cases: Guidance from the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). Maturitas, 2012, 72, 165-169.	1.0	28

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
55	The Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE): Objectives and achievements 1997â€“2012. <i>Presse Medicale</i> , 2012, 41, 861-866.	0.8	25
56	Cooperation Between Research Institutions and Journals on Research Integrity Cases: Guidance from the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). <i>Acta Informatica Medica</i> , 2012, 20, 136.	0.5	19
57	Why Has COPE Developed Guidelines for Cooperation Between Journals and Research Institutions?. <i>Materia Socio-medica</i> , 2012, 24, 140.	0.3	0
58	Why Has COPE Developed Guidelines for Cooperation Between Journals and Research Institutions?. <i>Medicinski Arhiv = Medical Archives = Archives De MÃ©decine</i> , 2012, 66, 220.	0.4	2
59	Publication ethics: whose problem is it?. <i>Insights: the UKSG Journal</i> , 2012, 25, 294-299.	0.1	3
60	Why and how do journals retract articles? An analysis of Medline retractions 1988-2008. <i>Journal of Medical Ethics</i> , 2011, 37, 567-570.	1.0	188
61	Ethical issues in preparing and publishing systematic reviews. <i>Journal of Evidence-Based Medicine</i> , 2011, 4, 130-134.	0.7	47
62	Coping with scientific misconduct. <i>BMJ: British Medical Journal</i> , 2011, 343, d6586-d6586.	2.4	35
63	Technical editing of research reports in biomedical journals. <i>The Cochrane Library</i> , 2010, 2010, MR000002.	1.5	38
64	The Committee on Publication Ethics Flowcharts. <i>Chest</i> , 2010, 137, 221-223.	0.4	12
65	JAMA Published Fewer Industry-Funded Studies after Introducing a Requirement for Independent Statistical Analysis. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2010, 5, e13591.	1.1	6
66	Competing interests of professional societies. <i>BMJ: British Medical Journal</i> , 2010, 340, c470-c470.	2.4	1
67	What Should Be Done To Tackle Ghostwriting in the Medical Literature?. <i>PLoS Medicine</i> , 2009, 6, e1000023.	3.9	91
68	Science journal editors' views on publication ethics: results of an international survey. <i>Journal of Medical Ethics</i> , 2009, 35, 348-353.	1.0	121
69	Lessons from a case of overlapping publications. <i>Sexually Transmitted Infections</i> , 2009, 85, 236-238.	0.8	1
70	Medical editors and trial reporting: A betrayal of patient care. <i>Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine</i> , 2009, 102, 4-5.	1.1	2
71	Recognition, reward and responsibility: Why the authorship of scientific papers matters. <i>Maturitas</i> , 2009, 62, 109-112.	1.0	90
72	CONSORT for reporting randomised trials in journal and conference abstracts. <i>Lancet, The</i> , 2008, 371, 281-283.	6.3	432

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
73	CONSORT for Reporting Randomized Controlled Trials in Journal and Conference Abstracts: Explanation and Elaboration. PLoS Medicine, 2008, 5, e20.	3.9	504
74	Ethical publishing: The innocent author's guide to avoiding misconduct. Biochemist, 2008, 30, 23-27.	0.2	0
75	Ethical publishing: the innocent author's guide to avoiding misconduct. Menopause International, 2007, 13, 98-102.	1.6	11
76	Technical editing of research reports in biomedical journals. , 2007, , MR000002.		9
77	Authors, Ghosts, Damned Lies, and Statisticians. PLoS Medicine, 2007, 4, e34.	3.9	35
78	What Medical Writing Means To Me. Mens Sana Monographs, 2007, 5, 169.	0.2	7
79	Do medical journals provide clear and consistent guidelines on authorship?. MedGenMed: Medscape General Medicine, 2007, 9, 16.	0.2	35
80	What do journal editors do when they suspect research misconduct?. Medicine and Law, 2007, 26, 535-44.	0.0	12
81	Bye Bye By-Line, Hello Contributors. Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine, 2006, 99, 542-543.	1.1	2
82	Best Practice Guidelines on Publication Ethics: a Publisher's Perspective. International Journal of Clinical Practice, 2006, 61, 1-26.	0.8	141
83	Are reviewers suggested by authors as good as those chosen by editors? Results of a rater-blinded, retrospective study. BMC Medicine, 2006, 4, 13.	2.3	61
84	Publishing Clinical Trial Results: The Future Beckons. PLOS Clinical Trials, 2006, 1, e31.	3.5	13
85	What is it for? Analysing the purpose of peer review.. Nature, 2006, , .	13.7	3
86	A concern that drug companies cannot ignore. Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine, 2005, 98, 448-450.	1.1	0
87	Response to "The corporate coauthor" Journal of General Internal Medicine, 2005, 20, 672-672.	1.3	1
88	Good practice for publishing the results of clinical trials. The Journal of the British Menopause Society, 2005, 11, 109-111.	1.3	0
89	Pain symptoms in depression: definition and clinical significance. Clinical Medicine, 2005, 5, 390-395.	0.8	105
90	European Medical Writers Association (EMWA) guidelines on the role of medical writers in developing peer-reviewed publications. Current Medical Research and Opinion, 2005, 21, 317-321.	0.9	108

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
91	"Good Publication Practice for Pharmaceutical Companies": where are we now?. MedGenMed: Medscape General Medicine, 2005, 7, 6.	0.2	2
92	The need for trial identifiers. Current Medical Research and Opinion, 2004, 20, 203-206.	0.9	12
93	depressing reasearch. Lancet, The, 2004, 363, 2087-2088.	6.3	0
94	Pressures are growing to publish clinical trials. BMJ: British Medical Journal, 2004, 329, 1044.3.	2.4	0
95	Raising the quality of publications: Now we have GPP!. Quality Assurance Journal, 2003, 7, 166-170.	0.1	0
96	Good publication practice for pharmaceutical companies: why we need another set of guidelines. Current Medical Research and Opinion, 2003, 19, 147-148.	0.9	7
97	Good publication practice for pharmaceutical companies. Current Medical Research and Opinion, 2003, 19, 149-154.	0.9	137
98	How to dance with porcupines: rules and guidelines on doctors' relations with drug companies. BMJ: British Medical Journal, 2003, 326, 1196-1198.	2.4	58
99	Effects of Editorial Peer Review. JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association, 2002, 287, 2784.	3.8	263
100	Measuring the Quality of Editorial Peer Review. JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association, 2002, 287, 2786.	3.8	170
101	Shortcomings of peer review in biomedical journals. Learned Publishing, 2001, 14, 257-263.	0.8	29
102	Cardiac arrhythmias reported during treatment with cisapride. , 1999, 8, 57-58.		14
103	Giving editors and institutions some CLUEs about research integrity cases. European Science Editing, 0, 47, .	0.0	0