Eveline A M Heijnsdijk

List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: https://exaly.com/author-pdf/4736959/publications.pdf

Version: 2024-02-01

69 papers 2,826 citations

28 h-index 52 g-index

70 all docs

70 docs citations

times ranked

70

3632 citing authors

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
1	Quality-of-Life Effects of Prostate-Specific Antigen Screening. New England Journal of Medicine, 2012, 367, 595-605.	27.0	364
2	Interpreting Overdiagnosis Estimates in Population-based Mammography Screening. Epidemiologic Reviews, 2011, 33, 111-121.	3.5	174
3	Reconciling the Effects of Screening on Prostate Cancer Mortality in the ERSPC and PLCO Trials. Annals of Internal Medicine, 2017, 167, 449.	3.9	160
4	The prostate cancer conundrum revisited. Cancer, 2012, 118, 5955-5963.	4.1	125
5	Personalizing Age of Cancer Screening Cessation Based on Comorbid Conditions: Model Estimates of Harms and Benefits. Annals of Internal Medicine, 2014, 161, 104.	3.9	123
6	Effects of Screening and Systemic Adjuvant Therapy on ER-Specific US Breast Cancer Mortality. Journal of the National Cancer Institute, 2014, 106, .	6.3	120
7	MRI versus mammography for breast cancer screening in women with familial risk (FaMRIsc): a multicentre, randomised, controlled trial. Lancet Oncology, The, 2019, 20, 1136-1147.	10.7	112
8	Tipping the Balance of Benefits and Harms to Favor Screening Mammography Starting at Age 40 Years. Annals of Internal Medicine, 2012, 156, 609.	3.9	110
9	Is prostate cancer different in black men? Answers from 3 natural history models. Cancer, 2017, 123, 2312-2319.	4.1	100
10	Empirical estimates of prostate cancer overdiagnosis by age and prostate-specific antigen. BMC Medicine, 2014, 12, 26.	5.5	88
11	Differences in Natural History between Breast Cancers in <i>BRCA1</i> and <i>BRCA2</i> Mutation Carriers and Effects of MRI Screening-MRISC, MARIBS, and Canadian Studies Combined. Cancer Epidemiology Biomarkers and Prevention, 2012, 21, 1458-1468.	2.5	79
12	Nation-wide data on screening performance during the transition to digital mammography: Observations in 6 million screens. European Journal of Cancer, 2013, 49, 3517-3525.	2.8	66
13	Race-Specific Impact of Natural History, Mammography Screening, and Adjuvant Treatment on Breast Cancer Mortality Rates in the United States. Cancer Epidemiology Biomarkers and Prevention, 2011, 20, 112-122.	2.5	65
14	The impact of PLCO control arm contamination on perceived PSA screening efficacy. Cancer Causes and Control, 2012, 23, 827-835.	1.8	61
15	Cost-Effectiveness of Screening Women With Familial Risk for Breast Cancer With Magnetic Resonance Imaging. Journal of the National Cancer Institute, 2013, 105, 1314-1321.	6.3	57
16	Benefits and Harms of Mammography Screening After Age 74 Years: Model Estimates of Overdiagnosis. Journal of the National Cancer Institute, 2015, 107, djv103-djv103.	6.3	56
17	The efficacy of prostateâ€specific antigen screening: Impact of key components in the ERSPC and PLCO trials. Cancer, 2018, 124, 1197-1206.	4.1	56
18	The potential of breast cancer screening in Europe. International Journal of Cancer, 2021, 148, 406-418.	5.1	55

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
19	Effects of cancer screening restart strategies after COVID-19 disruption. British Journal of Cancer, 2021, 124, 1516-1523.	6.4	55
20	The effect of populationâ€based mammography screening in Dutch municipalities on breast cancer mortality: 20 years of followâ€up. International Journal of Cancer, 2017, 141, 671-677.	5.1	52
21	Prostate-Specific Antigen Screening in the United States vs in the European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer–Rotterdam. Journal of the National Cancer Institute, 2010, 102, 352-355.	6.3	51
22	Digital mammography screening: Weighing reduced mortality against increased overdiagnosis. Preventive Medicine, 2011, 53, 134-140.	3.4	45
23	The Cost-Effectiveness of Prostate Cancer Detection with the Use of Prostate Health Index. Value in Health, 2016, 19, 153-157.	0.3	43
24	Cost-Effectiveness of Magnetic Resonance Imaging Screening for Women With Extremely Dense Breast Tissue. Journal of the National Cancer Institute, 2021, 113, 1476-1483.	6.3	39
25	The effects of populationâ€based mammography screening starting between age 40 and 50 in the presence of adjuvant systemic therapy. International Journal of Cancer, 2015, 137, 165-172.	5.1	37
26	How Does Early Detection by Screening Affect Disease Progression?. Medical Decision Making, 2011, 31, 550-558.	2.4	35
27	Costâ€effectiveness of digital mammography screening before the age of 50 in <scp>T</scp> he <scp>N</scp> etherlands. International Journal of Cancer, 2015, 137, 1990-1999.	5.1	35
28	Cost-effectiveness of Breast Cancer Screening With Magnetic Resonance Imaging for Women at Familial Risk. JAMA Oncology, 2020, 6, 1381.	7.1	31
29	Summary statement on screening for prostate cancer in Europe. International Journal of Cancer, 2018, 142, 741-746.	5.1	29
30	Allâ€cause mortality versus cancerâ€specific mortality as outcome in cancer screening trials: A review and modeling study. Cancer Medicine, 2019, 8, 6127-6138.	2.8	27
31	Estimating the harms and benefits of prostate cancer screening as used in common practice versus recommended good practice: A microsimulation screening analysis. Cancer, 2016, 122, 3386-3393.	4.1	23
32	Lifetime Benefits and Harms of Prostate-Specific Antigen–BasedÂRisk-Stratified Screening for Prostate Cancer. Journal of the National Cancer Institute, 2020, 112, 1013-1020.	6.3	23
33	Screening for prostate cancer in the US? Reduce the harms and keep the benefit. International Journal of Cancer, 2015, 136, 1600-1607.	5.1	22
34	The Impact of Intensifying Prostate Cancer Screening in Black Men: A Model-Based Analysis. Journal of the National Cancer Institute, 2021, 113, 1336-1342.	6.3	22
35	Assessment of harms, benefits, and costâ€effectiveness of prostate cancer screening: A microâ€simulation study of 230 scenarios. Cancer Medicine, 2020, 9, 7742-7750.	2.8	21
36	Detection and interval cancer rates during the transition from screen-film to digital mammography in population-based screening. BMC Cancer, 2018, 18, 256.	2.6	20

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
37	Breast density as indicator for the use of mammography or MRI to screen women with familial risk for breast cancer (FaMRIsc): a multicentre randomized controlled trial. BMC Cancer, 2012, 12, 440.	2.6	19
38	Socio-economic inequality of utilization of cancer testing in Europe: A cross-sectional study. Preventive Medicine Reports, 2022, 26, 101733.	1.8	19
39	Mammographic screening in BRCA1 mutation carriers postponed until age 40: Evaluation of benefits, costs and radiation risks using models. European Journal of Cancer, 2016, 63, 135-142.	2.8	17
40	The influence of health systems on breast, cervical and colorectal cancer screening: an overview of systematic reviews using health systems and implementation research frameworks. Journal of Health Services Research and Policy, 2020, 25, 49-58.	1.7	16
41	Risk stratification in breast cancer screening: Costâ€effectiveness and harmâ€benefit ratios for lowâ€risk and highâ€risk women. International Journal of Cancer, 2020, 147, 3059-3067.	5.1	15
42	Estimating the risks and benefits of active surveillance protocols for prostate cancer: a microsimulation study. BJU International, 2017, 119, 560-566.	2.5	13
43	Costâ€effectiveness of surveillance schedules in older adults with nonâ€muscleâ€invasive bladder cancer. BJU International, 2019, 123, 307-312.	2.5	13
44	When should active surveillance for prostate cancer stop if no progression is detected?. Prostate, 2017, 77, 962-969.	2.3	11
45	Costâ€effectiveness of the Norwegian breast cancer screening program. International Journal of Cancer, 2017, 140, 833-840.	5.1	11
46	Finding the optimal mammography screening strategy: A costâ€effectiveness analysis of 920 modelled strategies. International Journal of Cancer, 2022, 151, 287-296.	5.1	11
47	Evaluating Parameter Uncertainty in a Simulation Model of Cancer Using Emulators. Medical Decision Making, 2019, 39, 405-413.	2.4	9
48	The Impact of Design and Performance in Prostate-Specific Antigen Screening: Differences Between ERSPC Centers. European Urology, 2019, 76, 276-279.	1.9	8
49	Experiences, expectations and preferences regarding MRI and mammography as breast cancer screening tools in women at familial risk. Breast, 2021, 56, 1-6.	2.2	8
50	Estimating the individual benefit of immediate treatment or active surveillance for prostate cancer after screenâ€detection in older (65+) men. International Journal of Cancer, 2016, 138, 2522-2528.	5.1	6
51	The role of pre-invasive disease in overdiagnosis: A microsimulation study comparing mass screening for breast cancer and cervical cancer. Journal of Medical Screening, 2016, 23, 210-216.	2.3	6
52	Comparative effectiveness of prostate cancer screening between the ages of 55 and 69 years followed by active surveillance. Cancer, 2018, 124, 507-513.	4.1	6
53	Screening for cancers with a good prognosis: The case of testicular germ cell cancer. Cancer Medicine, 2021, 10, 2897-2903.	2.8	6
54	Extending Age Ranges in Breast Cancer Screening in Four European Countries: Model Estimations of Harm-to-Benefit Ratios. Cancers, 2021, 13, 3360.	3.7	6

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
55	Predicting the stage shift as a result of breast cancer screening in low- and middle-income countries: a proof of concept. Journal of Medical Screening, 2015, 22, 8-19.	2.3	5
56	Swiss Medical Board Mammography screening predictions for Switzerland: Importance of time-periods. Journal of Medical Screening, 2015, 22, 201-206.	2.3	5
57	Breast cancer incidence trends in Norway and estimates of overdiagnosis. Journal of Medical Screening, 2017, 24, 83-91.	2.3	5
58	Disability-Adjusted Life Years Averted Versus Quality-Adjusted Life Years Gained: A Model Analysis for Breast Cancer Screening. Value in Health, 2021, 24, 353-360.	0.3	5
59	The comparative effectiveness of mpMRI and MRI-guided biopsy vs regular biopsy in a population-based PSA testing: a modeling study. Scientific Reports, 2021, 11, 1801.	3.3	4
60	Costâ€effectiveness of multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging and MRIâ€guided biopsy in a populationâ€based prostate cancer screening setting using a microâ€simulation model. Cancer Medicine, 2021, 10, 4046-4053.	2.8	4
61	The role of modelling in the policy decision making process for cancer screening: example of prostate specific antigen screening. Public Health Research and Practice, 2019, 29, .	1.5	4
62	Response. Journal of the National Cancer Institute, 2015, 107, djv111-djv111.	6.3	3
63	Informed decision-making based on a leaflet in the context of prostate cancer screening. Patient Education and Counseling, 2019, 102, 1483-1489.	2.2	3
64	Evaluation of Prostate Cancer Screening Strategies in a Low-Resource, High-risk Population in the Bahamas. JAMA Health Forum, 2022, 3, e221116.	2.2	3
65	The cost-effectiveness of different visual acuity screening strategies in three European countries: A microsimulation study. Preventive Medicine Reports, 2022, 28, 101868.	1.8	2
66	The effect of omitting an early population-based vision screen in the Netherlands: A micro-simulation model approach. Journal of Medical Screening, 2017, 24, 120-126.	2.3	1
67	Authors' reply to: "Questionable method for estimating the influence of mammography screening on breast cancer mortality in the Netherlandsâ€. International Journal of Cancer, 2017, 141, 1709-1710.	5.1	0
68	Improved Harm/Benefit Ratio and Cost-effectiveness of Prostate Cancer Screening Using New Technologies. European Urology, 2022, , .	1.9	0
69	Reply to: Comments on "Finding the optimal mammography screening strategy: A costâ€effectiveness analysis of 920 modeled strategies― International Journal of Cancer, 2022, 151, 651-652.	5.1	0