

# Thomas Koelewijn

## List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: <https://exaly.com/author-pdf/5032518/publications.pdf>

Version: 2024-02-01

24  
papers

1,625  
citations

471509

17  
h-index

610901

24  
g-index

24  
all docs

24  
docs citations

24  
times ranked

1469  
citing authors

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
1	Attention and the multiple stages of multisensory integration: A review of audiovisual studies. <i>Acta Psychologica</i> , 2010, 134, 372-384.	1.5	240
2	Pupil Dilation Uncovers Extra Listening Effort in the Presence of a Single-Talker Masker. <i>Ear and Hearing</i> , 2012, 33, 291-300.	2.1	173
3	The Pupil Dilation Response to Auditory Stimuli: Current State of Knowledge. <i>Trends in Hearing</i> , 2018, 22, 233121651877717.	1.3	160
4	Motor-cortical beta oscillations are modulated by correctness of observed action. <i>NeuroImage</i> , 2008, 40, 767-775.	4.2	154
5	Best Practices and Advice for Using Pupillometry to Measure Listening Effort: An Introduction for Those Who Want to Get Started. <i>Trends in Hearing</i> , 2018, 22, 233121651880086.	1.3	145
6	How Linguistic Closure and Verbal Working Memory Relate to Speech Recognition in Noise—A Review. <i>Trends in Amplification</i> , 2013, 17, 75-93.	2.4	119
7	Processing Load Induced by Informational Masking Is Related to Linguistic Abilities. <i>International Journal of Otolaryngology</i> , 2012, 2012, 1-11.	0.9	93
8	The pupil response reveals increased listening effort when it is difficult to focus attention. <i>Hearing Research</i> , 2015, 323, 81-90.	2.0	79
9	The pupil response is sensitive to divided attention during speech processing. <i>Hearing Research</i> , 2014, 312, 114-120.	2.0	69
10	Toward a more comprehensive understanding of the impact of masker type and signal-to-noise ratio on the pupillary response while performing a speech-in-noise test. <i>Hearing Research</i> , 2018, 369, 67-78.	2.0	66
11	The effect of reward on listening effort as reflected by the pupil dilation response. <i>Hearing Research</i> , 2018, 367, 106-112.	2.0	54
12	The influence of informational masking on speech perception and pupil response in adults with hearing impairment. <i>Journal of the Acoustical Society of America</i> , 2014, 135, 1596-1606.	1.1	48
13	Evidence for fast, low-level motor resonance to action observation: An MEG study. <i>Social Neuroscience</i> , 2008, 3, 213-228.	1.3	39
14	Auditory and visual capture during focused visual attention.. <i>Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance</i> , 2009, 35, 1303-1315.	0.9	33
15	A stimulus set of words and pictures matched for visual and semantic similarity. <i>Journal of Cognitive Psychology</i> , 2016, 28, 1-15.	0.9	29
16	Competition between auditory and visual spatial cues during visual task performance. <i>Experimental Brain Research</i> , 2009, 195, 593-602.	1.5	19
17	The absence of an auditory-visual attentional blink is not due to echoic memory. <i>Perception &amp; Psychophysics</i> , 2007, 69, 1230-1241.	2.3	18
18	Effects of attention on the speech reception threshold and pupil response of people with impaired and normal hearing. <i>Hearing Research</i> , 2017, 354, 56-63.	2.0	18

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
19	The effect of monetary reward on listening effort and sentence recognition. <i>Hearing Research</i> , 2021, 406, 108255.	2.0	15
20	Priming T2 in a visual and auditory attentional blink task. <i>Perception &amp; Psychophysics</i> , 2008, 70, 658-666.	2.3	14
21	The Application of Pupillometry in Hearing Science to Assess Listening Effort. <i>Trends in Hearing</i> , 2018, 22, 233121651879943.	1.3	13
22	FORUM: Remote testing for psychological and physiological acoustics. <i>Journal of the Acoustical Society of America</i> , 2022, 151, 3116-3128.	1.1	12
23	The effects of lexical content, acoustic and linguistic variability, and vocoding on voice cue perception. <i>Journal of the Acoustical Society of America</i> , 2021, 150, 1620-1634.	1.1	11
24	Pupil Responses of Adults With Traumatic Brain Injury During Processing of Speech in Noise. <i>Trends in Hearing</i> , 2018, 22, 233121651881144.	1.3	4