

# Shelley Potter

## List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: <https://exaly.com/author-pdf/5734918/publications.pdf>

Version: 2024-02-01

112  
papers

1,734  
citations

304368

22  
h-index

329751

37  
g-index

116  
all docs

116  
docs citations

116  
times ranked

1901  
citing authors

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
1	A Core Outcome Set for Seamless, Standardized Evaluation of Innovative Surgical Procedures and Devices (COHESIVE). <i>Annals of Surgery</i> , 2023, 277, 238-245.	2.1	16
2	Implant-Based Reconstruction following Mastectomy in Patients Who Have Had a Previous Breast Augmentation: Lessons from the National Multicenter Implant Breast Reconstruction Evaluation Study. <i>Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery</i> , 2022, 149, 324-337.	0.7	1
3	Wire- and magnetic-seed-guided localization of impalpable breast lesions: iBRA-NET localisation study. <i>British Journal of Surgery</i> , 2022, 109, 274-282.	0.1	17
4	Global variations in the definition and management of multifocal and multicentric breast cancer: the MINIM international survey. <i>British Journal of Surgery</i> , 2022, 109, 656-659.	0.1	2
5	Short-term safety outcomes of mastectomy and immediate prepectoral implant-based breast reconstruction: Pre-BRA prospective multicentre cohort study. <i>British Journal of Surgery</i> , 2022, 109, 530-538.	0.1	4
6	The MARECA (national study of management of breast cancer locoregional recurrence and) decision making. <i>European Journal of Surgical Oncology</i> , 2022, 48, 1510-1519.	0.5	5
7	Oncoplastic breast consortium recommendations for mastectomy and whole breast reconstruction in the setting of post-mastectomy radiation therapy. <i>Breast</i> , 2022, 63, 123-139.	0.9	22
8	Current practice and surgical outcomes of neoadjuvant chemotherapy for early breast cancer: UK NeST study. <i>British Journal of Surgery</i> , 2022, 109, 800-803.	0.1	5
9	Identification of outcomes to inform the development of a core outcome set for surgical innovation: a targeted review of case studies of novel surgical devices. <i>BMJ Open</i> , 2022, 12, e056003.	0.8	1
10	Patient-reported outcomes of prepectoral implant-based breast reconstruction: Early results from the pre-bra prospective multi-centre cohort study. <i>European Journal of Surgical Oncology</i> , 2022, 48, e189-e190.	0.5	1
11	Patient-Reported Outcome Measures for Post-mastectomy Breast Reconstruction: A Systematic Review of Development and Measurement Properties. <i>Annals of Surgical Oncology</i> , 2021, 28, 386-404.	0.7	28
12	Impalpable breast lesion localisation, a logistical challenge: results of the UK iBRA-NET national practice questionnaire. <i>Breast Cancer Research and Treatment</i> , 2021, 185, 13-20.	1.1	11
13	A Novel Mixed-Methods Platform Study Protocol for Investigating New Surgical Devices, with Embedded Shared Learning: Ibra-net Breast Lesion Localisation Study. <i>International Journal of Surgery Protocols</i> , 2021, 25, 26-33.	0.5	5
14	The NeST (Neoadjuvant systemic therapy in breast cancer) study: National Practice Questionnaire of United Kingdom multi-disciplinary decision making. <i>BMC Cancer</i> , 2021, 21, 90.	1.1	11
15	Patient-reported outcomes of immediate implant-based breast reconstruction with and without biological or synthetic mesh. <i>BJs Open</i> , 2021, 5, .	0.7	18
16	Breast Angiosarcoma Surveillance Study: UK national audit of management and outcomes of angiosarcoma of the breast and chest wall. <i>British Journal of Surgery</i> , 2021, 108, 388-394.	0.1	11
17	O77: DOES MESH IMPROVE PATIENT SATISFACTION AND HEALTH-RELATED QUALITY OF LIFE AFTER IMPLANT-BASED BREAST RECONSTRUCTION? A MULTICENTRE PROSPECTIVE COHORT STUDY. <i>British Journal of Surgery</i> , 2021, 108, .	0.1	0
18	O58: THE IMPACT OF RADIOTHERAPY ON PATIENT-REPORTED OUTCOMES OF IMMEDIATE IMPLANT-BASED BREAST RECONSTRUCTION: RESULTS OF A PROSPECTIVE MULTICENTRE COHORT STUDY. <i>British Journal of Surgery</i> , 2021, 108, .	0.1	0

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
19	Breast cancer management pathways during the COVID-19 pandemic: outcomes from the UK "Alert Level 4" phase of the B-MaP-C study. <i>British Journal of Cancer</i> , 2021, 124, 1785-1794.	2.9	21
20	Protocol for a mixed-method study to inform the feasibility of undertaking a large-scale multicentre study comparing the clinical and patient-reported outcomes of oncoplastic breast conservation as an alternative to mastectomy with or without immediate breast reconstruction in women unsuitable for standard breast-conserving surgery (the ANTHEM Feasibility Study). <i>BMJ Open</i> , 2021, 11, e046622.	0.8	6
21	Biological and synthetic mesh assisted breast reconstruction procedures: Joint guidelines from the Association of Breast Surgery and the British Association of Plastic, Reconstructive and Aesthetic Surgeons. <i>European Journal of Surgical Oncology</i> , 2021, 47, 2807-2813.	0.5	7
22	P060. Exploring best peri-operative practice for implant-based breast reconstruction: Further analysis from the iBRA prospective multicentre cohort study. <i>European Journal of Surgical Oncology</i> , 2021, 47, e311-e312.	0.5	1
23	Innovations for the future of breast surgery. <i>British Journal of Surgery</i> , 2021, 108, 908-916.	0.1	10
24	P133. Current practice and provision of oncoplastic breast surgery in the UK: Preliminary results of the Anthem National practice survey. <i>European Journal of Surgical Oncology</i> , 2021, 47, e331.	0.5	0
25	P114. The clinical impact and resource implication of her-2 testing in breast cancer patients 80 and over: A multi-centre retrospective study. <i>European Journal of Surgical Oncology</i> , 2021, 47, e326.	0.5	0
26	Protocol for a national cohort study to explore the "long-term" clinical and patient-reported outcomes and cost-effectiveness of implant-based and autologous breast reconstruction after mastectomy for breast cancer: the brighter study. <i>BMJ Open</i> , 2021, 11, e054055.	0.8	6
27	Prepectoral versus subpectoral implant-based breast reconstruction after skin-sparing mastectomy or nipple-sparing mastectomy (OPBC-02/ PREPEC): a pragmatic, multicentre, randomised, superiority trial. <i>BMJ Open</i> , 2021, 11, e045239.	0.8	1
28	Reporting Modifications in Surgical Innovation: A Systematic Scoping Review Protocol. <i>International Journal of Surgery Protocols</i> , 2021, 25, 250-256.	0.5	4
29	Best-BRA (Is subpectoral or prepectoral implant placement best in immediate breast reconstruction?): a protocol for a pilot randomised controlled trial of subpectoral versus prepectoral immediate implant-based breast reconstruction in women following mastectomy. <i>BMJ Open</i> , 2021, 11, e050886.	0.8	2
30	Mapping the Landscape of Surgical Registries in the United Kingdom: A Review According to the SWiM Methodology. <i>International Journal of Surgery Protocols</i> , 2021, 25, 257-261.	0.5	0
31	Prepectoral versus subpectoral implant-based breast reconstruction after skin-sparing mastectomy or nipple-sparing mastectomy (OPBC-02/ PREPEC): a pragmatic, multicentre, randomised, superiority trial. <i>BMJ Open</i> , 2021, 11, e045239.	0.8	12
32	Using qualitative research methods to understand how surgical procedures and devices are introduced into NHS hospitals: the Lotus study protocol. <i>BMJ Open</i> , 2021, 11, e049234.	0.8	2
33	The B-MaP-C study: Breast cancer management pathways during the COVID-19 pandemic. Study protocol. <i>International Journal of Surgery Protocols</i> , 2020, 24, 1-5.	0.5	9
34	Outcome selection, measurement and reporting for new surgical procedures and devices: a systematic review of IDEAL/IDEAL-D studies to inform development of a core outcome set. <i>BJS Open</i> , 2020, 4, 1072-1083.	0.7	12
35	Knowledge gaps in oncoplastic breast surgery. <i>Lancet Oncology</i> , The, 2020, 21, e375-e385.	5.1	34
36	International development and implementation of a core measurement set for research and audit studies in implant-based breast reconstruction: a study protocol. <i>BMJ Open</i> , 2020, 10, e035505.	0.8	9

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
37	A systematic review and in-depth analysis of outcome reporting in early phase studies of colorectal cancer surgical innovation. <i>Colorectal Disease</i> , 2020, 22, 1862-1873.	0.7	6
38	The impact of radiotherapy on patient-reported outcomes of immediate implant-based breast reconstruction: Results of a prospective multicentre cohort study. <i>European Journal of Cancer</i> , 2020, 138, S35.	1.3	0
39	Experiences of implant loss after immediate implant-based breast reconstruction: qualitative study. <i>BJS Open</i> , 2020, 4, 380-390.	0.7	9
40	The Breast Angiosarcoma Surveillance Study. <i>European Journal of Surgical Oncology</i> , 2020, 46, e47.	0.5	0
41	Methods for assessment of patient adherence to removable orthoses used after surgery or trauma to the appendicular skeleton: a systematic review. <i>Trials</i> , 2020, 21, 507.	0.7	7
42	P115: International development of a core measurement set for research and audit studies in implant-based breast reconstruction. <i>European Journal of Surgical Oncology</i> , 2020, 46, e41.	0.5	0
43	The use of micro-costing in economic analyses of surgical interventions: a systematic review. <i>Health Economics Review</i> , 2020, 10, 3.	0.8	25
44	Therapeutic mammoplasty is a safe and effective alternative to mastectomy with or without immediate breast reconstruction. <i>British Journal of Surgery</i> , 2020, 107, 832-844.	0.1	26
45	The Pre-BRA (pre-pectoral Breast Reconstruction EvAluation) feasibility study: protocol for a mixed-methods IDEAL 2a/2b prospective cohort study to determine the safety and effectiveness of prepectoral implant-based breast reconstruction. <i>BMJ Open</i> , 2020, 10, e033641.	0.8	7
46	Perceived barriers to randomised controlled trials in breast reconstruction: obstacle to trial initiation or opportunity to resolve? A qualitative study. <i>Trials</i> , 2020, 21, 316.	0.7	5
47	The Impact of Radiotherapy on Patient-reported Outcomes of Immediate Implant-based Breast Reconstruction With and Without Mesh. <i>Annals of Surgery</i> , 2020, Publish Ahead of Print, .	2.1	5
48	07. DOES MESH IMPROVE PATIENT SATISFACTION AND HEALTH-RELATED QUALITY OF LIFE AFTER IMPLANT-BASED BREAST RECONSTRUCTION? A MULTICENTRE PROSPECTIVE COHORT STUDY. <i>European Journal of Surgical Oncology</i> , 2020, 46, e3.	0.5	0
49	P154: "Do the best you can until you know better": Why, how and when Pilot and Feasibility Studies (PFS) should be utilised to optimise surgical trials. <i>European Journal of Surgical Oncology</i> , 2020, 46, e51.	0.5	0
50	Abstract P2-16-04: National utilisation of neoadjuvant systemic therapy and impact on surgical treatment - A prospective multi-centre cohort study. , 2020, , .		0
51	Barriers to clinical trial recruitment and recommendations for supporting breast surgeons in the workplace. <i>Bulletin of the Royal College of Surgeons of England</i> , 2020, 102, 320-323.	0.1	1
52	The SMALL Trial: A Big Change for Small Breast Cancers. <i>Clinical Oncology</i> , 2019, 31, 659-663.	0.6	13
53	Value of surgical pilot and feasibility study protocols. <i>British Journal of Surgery</i> , 2019, 106, 968-978.	0.1	13
54	The impact of immediate breast reconstruction on the time to delivery of adjuvant therapy: the iBRA-2 study. <i>British Journal of Cancer</i> , 2019, 120, 883-895.	2.9	45

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
55	Development of reporting guidance and core outcome sets for seamless, standardised evaluation of innovative surgical procedures and devices: a study protocol for content generation and a Delphi consensus process (COHESIVE study). <i>BMJ Open</i> , 2019, 9, e029574.	0.8	15
56	The NeST (neoadjuvant systemic therapy in breast cancer) study - Protocol for a prospective multi-centre cohort study to assess the current utilization and short-term outcomes of neoadjuvant systemic therapies in breast cancer. <i>International Journal of Surgery Protocols</i> , 2019, 18, 5-11.	0.5	6
57	Short-term safety outcomes of mastectomy and immediate implant-based breast reconstruction with and without mesh (iBRA): a multicentre, prospective cohort study. <i>Lancet Oncology</i> , The, 2019, 20, 254-266.	5.1	141
58	Is the current training pathway for oncoplastic breast surgeons fit for purpose?. <i>Bulletin of the Royal College of Surgeons of England</i> , 2019, 101, 69-75.	0.1	5
59	Adherence to best practice consensus guidelines for implant-based breast reconstruction: Results from the iBRA national practice questionnaire survey. <i>European Journal of Surgical Oncology</i> , 2018, 44, 708-716.	0.5	16
60	Quality of life after breast reconstruction – the BRIOS study. <i>Lancet Oncology</i> , The, 2018, 19, e577.	5.1	0
61	2062. Patterns of Post-Mastectomy Radiotherapy In Patients With Immediate Breast Reconstruction – Results From The Ibra-2 (Immediate Breast Reconstruction And Adjuvant Therapy) Prospective Cohort Study. <i>European Journal of Surgical Oncology</i> , 2018, 44, 1844.	0.5	0
62	#11 The Pre-Bra Study (oral presentation). <i>International Journal of Surgery</i> , 2018, 59, S3-S4.	1.1	0
63	Opportunities and priorities for breast surgical research. <i>Lancet Oncology</i> , The, 2018, 19, e521-e533.	5.1	36
64	Does the addition of mesh improve outcomes in implant based breast reconstruction after mastectomy for breast cancer?. <i>BMJ: British Medical Journal</i> , 2018, 362, k2607.	2.4	12
65	Current practice and short-term outcomes of therapeutic mammoplasty in the international TeaM multicentre prospective cohort study. <i>British Journal of Surgery</i> , 2018, 105, 1778-1792.	0.1	33
66	Multicentre observational study of adherence to Sepsis Six guidelines in emergency general surgery. <i>British Journal of Surgery</i> , 2017, 104, e165-e171.	0.1	16
67	Results from the BRIOS randomised trial. <i>Lancet Oncology</i> , The, 2017, 18, e189.	5.1	13
68	Conservative management of mallet injuries: A national survey of current practice in the UK. <i>Journal of Plastic, Reconstructive and Aesthetic Surgery</i> , 2017, 70, 901-907.	0.5	9
69	The BRASS (BR east Angiosarcoma Surveillance Study): Protocol for a retrospective multicentre cohort study to evaluate the management and outcomes of angiosarcoma of the breast and chest wall. <i>International Journal of Surgery Protocols</i> , 2017, 5, 5-10.	0.5	4
70	Variation in the provision and practice of implant-based breast reconstruction in the UK: Results from the iBRA national practice questionnaire. <i>Breast</i> , 2017, 35, 182-190.	0.9	26
71	Adverse event reporting in surgical trials and early phase studies: the need for new and joint perspectives. <i>BMJ: British Medical Journal</i> , 2017, 357, j1693.	2.4	2
72	Three nested randomized controlled trials of peer-only or multiple stakeholder group feedback within Delphi surveys during core outcome and information set development. <i>Trials</i> , 2016, 17, 409.	0.7	74

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
73	The iBRA-2 (immediate breast reconstruction and adjuvant therapy audit) study: protocol for a prospective national multicentre cohort study to evaluate the impact of immediate breast reconstruction on the delivery of adjuvant therapy. <i>BMJ Open</i> , 2016, 6, e012678.	0.8	16
74	The TeaM (Therapeutic Mammoplasty) study: Protocol for a prospective multi-centre cohort study to evaluate the practice and outcomes of therapeutic mammoplasty. <i>International Journal of Surgery Protocols</i> , 2016, 1, 3-10.	0.5	15
75	Variation in the management of ductal carcinoma in situ: Results of the Mammary Fold National Practice Survey. <i>European Journal of Surgical Oncology</i> , 2016, 42, S32.	0.5	1
76	Response to: Gschwantler-Kaulich et al (2016) Mesh versus acellular dermal matrix in immediate implant-based breast reconstruction – A prospective randomized trial doi:10.1016/j.ejso.2016.02.007. <i>European Journal of Surgical Oncology</i> , 2016, 42, 1767-1768.	0.5	5
77	Exploring methods for selection and integration of stakeholder views in the development of core outcome sets: a case study in reconstructive breast surgery. <i>Trials</i> , 2016, 17, 463.	0.7	8
78	The iBRA (implant breast reconstruction evaluation) study: protocol for a prospective multi-centre cohort study to inform the feasibility, design and conduct of a pragmatic randomised clinical trial comparing new techniques of implant-based breast reconstruction. <i>Pilot and Feasibility Studies</i> , 2016, 2, 41.	0.5	24
79	Variation in the management of ductal carcinoma in situ in the UK: Results of the Mammary Fold National Practice Survey. <i>European Journal of Surgical Oncology</i> , 2016, 42, 1153-1161.	0.5	15
80	Systematic review and critical appraisal of the impact of acellular dermal matrix use on the outcomes of implant-based breast reconstruction. <i>British Journal of Surgery</i> , 2015, 102, 1010-1025.	0.1	64
81	The iBRA (implant breast reconstruction evaluation) study: a prospective multicentre cohort study to inform the feasibility, design and conduct of a pragmatic randomised clinical trial comparing new approaches to implant-based breast reconstruction. <i>Trials</i> , 2015, 16, .	0.7	1
82	Three nested RCTs of dual or single stakeholder feedback within Delphi surveys during core outcome and information set development. <i>Trials</i> , 2015, 16, .	0.7	1
83	Development of a core outcome set for research and audit studies in reconstructive breast surgery. <i>British Journal of Surgery</i> , 2015, 102, 1360-1371.	0.1	118
84	Systematic review of surgical innovation reporting in laparoendoscopic colonic polyp resection. <i>British Journal of Surgery</i> , 2015, 102, e108-e116.	0.1	25
85	Exploring information provision in reconstructive breast surgery: A qualitative study. <i>Breast</i> , 2015, 24, 732-738.	0.9	16
86	Early complications and implant loss in implant-based breast reconstruction with and without acellular dermal matrix (Tecnoss Protexa®): A comparative study. <i>European Journal of Surgical Oncology</i> , 2015, 41, 113-119.	0.5	27
87	A single centre experience of adrenalectomy for adrenal metastases. <i>European Journal of Surgical Oncology</i> , 2014, 40, S5.	0.5	0
88	The iBRA study: A national multicentre audit of the outcomes of implant-based breast reconstruction with and without lower pole support. <i>Journal of Plastic, Reconstructive and Aesthetic Surgery</i> , 2014, 67, 1467-1468.	0.5	2
89	442. The iBRA Study: A national multicentre audit of the practice and outcomes of implant-based breast reconstruction. <i>European Journal of Surgical Oncology</i> , 2014, 40, S168-S169.	0.5	3
90	Time to be BRAVE: is educating surgeons the key to unlocking the potential of randomised clinical trials in surgery? A qualitative study. <i>Trials</i> , 2014, 15, 80.	0.7	43

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
91	Investigation of the feasibility of clinical trials in breast reconstruction. <i>Lancet, The</i> , 2013, 381, S88.	6.3	4
92	Short-term complications of prosthetic breast reconstruction with and without acellular dermal matrix: A comparative study. <i>European Journal of Surgical Oncology</i> , 2013, 39, 467-468.	0.5	0
93	Is innovation in surgery less than ideal? A case study of acellular dermal matrix assisted prosthetic breast reconstruction. <i>Trials</i> , 2013, 14, P1.	0.7	1
94	Exploring inequalities in access to care and the provision of choice to women seeking breast reconstruction surgery: a qualitative study. <i>British Journal of Cancer</i> , 2013, 109, 1181-1191.	2.9	31
95	The BREAST-Q. <i>Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery</i> , 2012, 130, 616e-618e.	0.7	5
96	Outcome reporting for reconstructive breast surgery: The need for consensus, consistency and core outcome sets. <i>European Journal of Surgical Oncology</i> , 2012, 38, 1020-1021.	0.5	11
97	Understanding decision-making for reconstructive breast surgery: A qualitative study. <i>European Journal of Surgical Oncology</i> , 2012, 38, 458.	0.5	2
98	Improving the patient journey in breast reconstruction: A qualitative study. <i>European Journal of Surgical Oncology</i> , 2012, 38, 426.	0.5	1
99	Assessment of Cosmesis After Breast Reconstruction Surgery: a Systematic Review. <i>Annals of Surgical Oncology</i> , 2011, 18, 813-823.	0.7	35
100	Reporting Clinical Outcomes of Breast Reconstruction: A Systematic Review. <i>Journal of the National Cancer Institute</i> , 2011, 103, 31-46.	3.0	87
101	Psychosocial Outcomes of Screening for Cancer and Pre-invasive Disease. , 2011, , 245-268.		2
102	Health-related quality of life assessment after breast reconstruction. <i>British Journal of Surgery</i> , 2009, 96, 613-620.	0.1	46
103	A Prospective Longitudinal Study of Cosmetic Outcome in Immediate Latissimus Dorsi Breast Reconstruction and the Influence of Radiotherapy. <i>Annals of Surgical Oncology</i> , 2008, 15, 1081-1091.	0.7	58
104	Measuring quality of life following breast reconstruction -A comparison of four instruments. <i>European Journal of Cancer, Supplement</i> , 2008, 6, 90.	2.2	0
105	'The sooner the better' or 'too much too soon'? A pilot prospective longitudinal study to evaluate quality of life and body image following immediate latissimus dorsi breast reconstruction. <i>Breast Cancer Research</i> , 2008, 10, .	2.2	0
106	The QUEST study: a multicentre randomised trial to assess the impact of the type and timing of breast reconstruction on quality of life following mastectomy. <i>Breast Cancer Research</i> , 2008, 10, .	2.2	0
107	A comparison of patients' and health-care professionals' views of the cosmetic outcome of breast reconstruction and its influence on patient satisfaction and quality of life: Whose opinion really matters?. <i>European Journal of Surgical Oncology</i> , 2008, 34, 1182-1183.	0.5	0
108	Does Limiting Long-Term Follow-Up for Breast Cancer Allow All Referrals to be Seen in 2 Weeks?. <i>Annals of the Royal College of Surgeons of England</i> , 2008, 90, 381-385.	0.3	4

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
109	Referral patterns, cancer diagnoses, and waiting times after introduction of two week wait rule for breast cancer: prospective cohort study. <i>BMJ: British Medical Journal</i> , 2007, 335, 288.	2.4	97
110	Patient satisfaction and time-saving implications of a nurse-led nipple and areola reconstitution service following breast reconstruction. <i>Breast</i> , 2007, 16, 293-296.	0.9	16
111	Accuracy of sonographic localisation and specimen ultrasound performed by surgeons in impalpable screen-detected breast lesions. <i>Breast</i> , 2007, 16, 425-428.	0.9	15
112	A quantitative approach to the distress caused by symptoms in patients treated with radical radiotherapy. <i>British Journal of Cancer</i> , 1996, 74, 640-647.	2.9	63