

Per Skaane

List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: <https://exaly.com/author-pdf/4533018/publications.pdf>

Version: 2024-02-01

41
papers

3,631
citations

304368

22
h-index

329751

37
g-index

42
all docs

42
docs citations

42
times ranked

2215
citing authors

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
1	Comparison of Digital Mammography Alone and Digital Mammography Plus Tomosynthesis in a Population-based Screening Program. <i>Radiology</i> , 2013, 267, 47-56.	3.6	857
2	Breast MRI: EUSOBI recommendations for women's information. <i>European Radiology</i> , 2015, 25, 3669-3678.	2.3	330
3	Two-View Digital Breast Tomosynthesis Screening with Synthetically Reconstructed Projection Images: Comparison with Digital Breast Tomosynthesis with Full-Field Digital Mammographic Images. <i>Radiology</i> , 2014, 271, 655-663.	3.6	286
4	Screen-Film Mammography versus Full-Field Digital Mammography with Soft-Copy Reading: Randomized Trial in a Population-based Screening Program—The Oslo II Study. <i>Radiology</i> , 2004, 232, 197-204.	3.6	224
5	Population-based Mammography Screening: Comparison of Screen-Film and Full-Field Digital Mammography with Soft-Copy Reading—Oslo I Study. <i>Radiology</i> , 2003, 229, 877-884.	3.6	213
6	Randomized Trial of Screen-Film versus Full-Field Digital Mammography with Soft-Copy Reading in Population-based Screening Program: Follow-up and Final Results of Oslo II Study. <i>Radiology</i> , 2007, 244, 708-717.	3.6	205
7	Prospective trial comparing full-field digital mammography (FFDM) versus combined FFDM and tomosynthesis in a population-based screening programme using independent double reading with arbitration. <i>European Radiology</i> , 2013, 23, 2061-2071.	2.3	196
8	Overview of the evidence on digital breast tomosynthesis in breast cancer detection. <i>Breast</i> , 2013, 22, 101-108.	0.9	163
9	Digital breast tomosynthesis (DBT): initial experience in a clinical setting. <i>Acta Radiologica</i> , 2012, 53, 524-529.	0.5	120
10	Digital Mammography versus Digital Mammography Plus Tomosynthesis in Breast Cancer Screening: The Oslo Tomosynthesis Screening Trial. <i>Radiology</i> , 2019, 291, 23-30.	3.6	115
11	Digital Breast Tomosynthesis and Synthetic 2D Mammography versus Digital Mammography: Evaluation in a Population-based Screening Program. <i>Radiology</i> , 2018, 287, 787-794.	3.6	105
12	Performance of breast cancer screening using digital breast tomosynthesis: results from the prospective population-based Oslo Tomosynthesis Screening Trial. <i>Breast Cancer Research and Treatment</i> , 2018, 169, 489-496.	1.1	101
13	Breast Lesion Detection and Classification: Comparison of Screen-Film Mammography and Full-Field Digital Mammography with Soft-copy Reading—Observer Performance Study. <i>Radiology</i> , 2005, 237, 37-44.	3.6	64
14	Breast cancer screening with digital breast tomosynthesis. <i>Breast Cancer</i> , 2017, 24, 32-41.	1.3	64
15	Interpretation of automated breast ultrasound (ABUS) with and without knowledge of mammography: a reader performance study. <i>Acta Radiologica</i> , 2015, 56, 404-412.	0.5	60
16	Interval cancers in the Norwegian breast cancer screening program: Frequency, characteristics and use of HRT. <i>International Journal of Cancer</i> , 2001, 94, 594-598.	2.3	56
17	Effect of Computer-Aided Detection on Independent Double Reading of Paired Screen-Film and Full-Field Digital Screening Mammograms. <i>American Journal of Roentgenology</i> , 2007, 188, 377-384.	1.0	56
18	Influence of Review Design on Percentages of Missed Interval Breast Cancers: Retrospective Study of Interval Cancers in a Population-based Screening Program. <i>Radiology</i> , 2005, 237, 437-443.	3.6	55

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
19	Interval and Consecutive Round Breast Cancer after Digital Breast Tomosynthesis and Synthetic 2D Mammography versus Standard 2D Digital Mammography in BreastScreen Norway. <i>Radiology</i> , 2020, 294, 256-264.	3.6	55
20	Digital Mammography versus Breast Tomosynthesis: Impact of Breast Density on Diagnostic Performance in Population-based Screening. <i>Radiology</i> , 2019, 293, 60-68.	3.6	51
21	Screening-detected Breast Cancers: Discordant Independent Double Reading in a Population-based Screening Program. <i>Radiology</i> , 2009, 253, 652-660.	3.6	49
22	Mammographic Performance in a Population-based Screening Program: Before, during, and after the Transition from Screen-Film to Full-Field Digital Mammography. <i>Radiology</i> , 2014, 272, 52-62.	3.6	49
23	Digital breast tomosynthesis (3D-mammography) screening: A pictorial review of screen-detected cancers and false recalls attributed to tomosynthesis in prospective screening trials. <i>Breast</i> , 2016, 26, 119-134.	0.9	21
24	Observer variability in screen-film mammography versus full-field digital mammography with soft-copy reading. <i>European Radiology</i> , 2008, 18, 1134-1143.	2.3	20
25	Average glandular dose in paired digital mammography and digital breast tomosynthesis acquisitions in a population based screening program: effects of measuring breast density, air kerma and beam quality. <i>Physics in Medicine and Biology</i> , 2018, 63, 035006.	1.6	20
26	Classification of fatty and dense breast parenchyma: comparison of automatic volumetric density measurement and radiologists'™ classification and their inter-observer variation. <i>Acta Radiologica</i> , 2016, 57, 1178-1185.	0.5	19
27	Screening outcome for consecutive examinations with digital breast tomosynthesis versus standard digital mammography in a population-based screening program. <i>European Radiology</i> , 2019, 29, 6991-6999.	2.3	19
28	Diagnostic Value of Ultrasonography in Patients with Palpable Mammographically Noncalcified Breast Tumors. <i>Acta Radiologica</i> , 1999, 40, 163-168.	0.5	14
29	Ultrasonic features of ileocecal intussusception. <i>Journal of Clinical Ultrasound</i> , 1989, 17, 590-593.	0.4	10
30	Consensus Meeting of Breast Imaging: BI-RADS® and Beyond. <i>Breast Care</i> , 2019, 14, 308-314.	0.8	9
31	BI-RADS Density Classification From Areometric and Volumetric Automatic Breast Density Measurements. <i>Academic Radiology</i> , 2016, 23, 468-478.	1.3	7
32	Mammography screening using independent double reading with consensus: Is there a potential benefit for computer-aided detection?. <i>Acta Radiologica</i> , 2012, 53, 241-248.	0.5	4
33	Malignant Mammographic Asymmetric Densities without US Correlate Remain Challenging. <i>Radiology</i> , 2022, 302, 533-534.	3.6	4
34	How Can We Reduce Unnecessary Procedures after Screening Mammography?. <i>Radiology</i> , 2019, 291, 318-319.	3.6	3
35	Tomosynthesis in X-ray: proven additional value?. <i>European Journal of Radiology</i> , 2012, 81, S156-S157.	1.2	2
36	Dose hysteria and concern about radiation exposure should not prevent women from undergoing life-saving mammography screening. <i>Acta Radiologica</i> , 2014, 55, 1155-1156.	0.5	2

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
37	Screening-detected desmoid tumor of the breast: findings at conventional imaging and digital breast tomosynthesis. Acta Radiologica Open, 2018, 7, 205846011775203.	0.3	1
38	Tomosynthesis: Should it Be Integrated into Screening and Clinical Routine Imaging?. , 2014, , 332-336.		1
39	An Extraperitoneal Ischiorectogluteal Lipoma Treated By Liposuction. Scandinavian Journal of Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery and Hand Surgery, 1993, 27, 323-325.	0.6	0
40	Response to: "Mammographic density as a risk factor: to go out of a 30-year fog" Acta Radiologica, 2017, 58, NP2-NP3.	0.5	0
41	Reflection on the Oslo Tomosynthesis Screening Trial. , 2015, , 247-250.		0