Martin J Yaffe

List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: https://exaly.com/author-pdf/5854720/publications.pdf

Version: 2024-02-01

134610 39744 9,992 124 34 98 citations g-index h-index papers 124 124 124 7784 docs citations times ranked citing authors all docs

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
1	The randomized trial of mammography screening that was notâ€"A cautionary tale. Journal of Medical Screening, 2022, 29, 7-11.	1.1	13
2	Breast Cancer Screening Strategies for Women With <i>ATM, CHEK2</i> , and <i>PALB2</i> Pathogenic Variants. JAMA Oncology, 2022, 8, 587.	3.4	36
3	The OncoSim-Breast Cancer Microsimulation Model. Current Oncology, 2022, 29, 1619-1633.	0.9	4
4	The Fundamental Flaws of the CNBSS Trials: A Scientific Review. Journal of Breast Imaging, 2022, 4, 108-119.	0.5	11
5	Errors in Conduct of the CNBSS Trials of Breast Cancer Screening Observed by Research Personnel. Journal of Breast Imaging, 2022, 4, 135-143.	0.5	11
6	Overdetection of Breast Cancer. Current Oncology, 2022, 29, 3894-3910.	0.9	7
7	Adjusting the TMIST study design to accommodate slower than expected accrual: ECOG-ACRIN EA1151 Journal of Clinical Oncology, 2022, 40, TPS10614-TPS10614.	0.8	1
8	The impact of episodic screening interruption: COVID-19 and population-based cancer screening in Canada. Journal of Medical Screening, 2021, 28, 100-107.	1.1	134
9	RE: Advanced Breast Cancer Definitions by Staging System Examined in the Breast Cancer Surveillance Consortium. Journal of the National Cancer Institute, 2021, 113, 938-939.	3.0	1
10	Breast Cancer Screening and Anxiety. Journal of Breast Imaging, 2021, 3, 273-275.	0.5	2
11	Technical Note: Volumetric coverage in breast tomosynthesis images — Phantom QC results from the TMIST study. Medical Physics, 2021, 48, 3623-3629.	1.6	4
12	Engaging the radiology community in the National Clinical Trials Network: The ECOG-ACRIN TMIST experience Journal of Clinical Oncology, 2021, 39, TPS10609-TPS10609.	0.8	0
13	Breast cancer screening for carriers of ATM, CHEK2, and PALB2 pathogenic variants: A comparative modeling analysis Journal of Clinical Oncology, 2021, 39, 10500-10500.	0.8	0
14	Looking at breast cancer through the ethnic and racial lensâ€"One size definitely does not fit all. Cancer, 2021, 127, 4356-4358.	2.0	3
15	Breast Density and Tomosynthesis. Radiology, 2021, 301, 211788.	3.6	0
16	Heterogeneity of Circulating Tumor Cell–Associated Genomic Gains in Breast Cancer and Its Association with the Host Immune Response. Cancer Research, 2021, 81, 6196-6206.	0.4	5
17	Quantitative single-cell analysis of immunofluorescence protein multiplex images illustrates biomarker spatial heterogeneity within breast cancer subtypes. Breast Cancer Research, 2021, 23, 114.	2.2	3
18	Long-Term Outcomes and Cost-Effectiveness of Breast Cancer Screening With Digital Breast Tomosynthesis in the United States. Journal of the National Cancer Institute, 2020, 112, 582-589.	3.0	48

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
19	Revamp governance of Canadian Task Force on Preventive Health Care. Cmaj, 2020, 192, E145-E145.	0.9	1
20	Breast Cancer Mortality among Women with a BRCA1 or BRCA2 Mutation in a Magnetic Resonance Imaging Plus Mammography Screening Program. Cancers, 2020, 12, 3479.	1.7	13
21	Identification of 31 loci for mammographic density phenotypes and their associations with breast cancer risk. Nature Communications, 2020, 11, 5116.	5.8	29
22	Recommendations for breast cancer screening. Lancet Oncology, The, 2020, 21, e512.	5.1	0
23	Alcohol and Tobacco Use in Relation to Mammographic Density in 23,456 Women. Cancer Epidemiology Biomarkers and Prevention, 2020, 29, 1039-1048.	1.1	11
24	The Value of All-Cause Mortality as a Metric for Assessing Breast Cancer Screening. Journal of the National Cancer Institute, 2020, 112, 989-993.	3.0	6
25	ECOG-ACRIN tomosynthesis mammographic imaging screening trial (EA1151) Journal of Clinical Oncology, 2020, 38, TPS1597-TPS1597.	0.8	0
26	External validation of a mammographic texture marker for breast cancer risk in a case–control study. Journal of Medical Imaging, 2020, 7, 1.	0.8	3
27	Prediction of Cancer Masking in Screening Mammography Using Density and Textural Features. Academic Radiology, 2019, 26, 608-619.	1.3	16
28	Investigating the feasibility of stratified breast cancer screening using a masking risk predictor. Breast Cancer Research, 2019, 21, 91.	2.2	10
29	Predictors of mammographic density among women with a strong family history of breast cancer. BMC Cancer, 2019, 19, 631.	1.1	5
30	Breast Cancer Screening: Beyond Mortality. Journal of Breast Imaging, 2019, 1, 161-165.	0.5	7
31	A Case-Control Study to Add Volumetric or Clinical Mammographic Density into the Tyrer-Cuzick Breast Cancer Risk Model. Journal of Breast Imaging, 2019, 1, 99-106.	0.5	39
32	Reproductive Factors and Mammographic Density: Associations Among 24,840 Women and Comparison of Studies Using Digitized Film-Screen Mammography and Full-Field Digital Mammography. American Journal of Epidemiology, 2019, 188, 1144-1154.	1.6	14
33	RE: A Methodological Issue in Prediction of Cancer Masking in Screening Mammography Using Density and Textural Features - Authors' Response. Academic Radiology, 2019, 26, e78.	1.3	1
34	Three-dimensional tumor visualization of invasive breast carcinomas using whole-mount serial section histopathology: implications for tumor size assessment. Breast Cancer Research and Treatment, 2019, 174, 669-677.	1.1	7
35	Emergence of "Big Data―and Its Potential and Current Limitations in Medical Imaging. Seminars in Nuclear Medicine, 2019, 49, 94-104.	2.5	17
36	Cost-effectiveness of mammography from a publicly funded health care system perspective. CMAJ Open, 2018, 6, E77-E86.	1.1	12

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
37	Serum osteoprotegerin levels and mammographic density among high-risk women. Cancer Causes and Control, 2018, 29, 507-517.	0.8	6
38	Towards improving accuracy, effectiveness, and efficiency in breast cancer screening. Lancet Oncology, The, 2018, 19, 1426-1427.	5.1	2
39	[18F]-Fluorodeoxyglucose PET/CT imaging as a marker of carotid plaque inflammation: Comparison to immunohistology and relationship to acuity of events. International Journal of Cardiology, 2018, 271, 378-386.	0.8	41
40	The effect of mammography screening regimen on incidence-based breast cancer mortality. Journal of Medical Screening, 2018, 25, 197-204.	1,1	7
41	The origins of breast cancer associated with mammographic density: a testable biological hypothesis. Breast Cancer Research, 2018, 20, 17.	2.2	32
42	"What if I keep my breasts?" Extended follow-up of unaffected <i>BRCA</i> mutation carriers diagnosed with breast cancer (BC) in the Toronto magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) screening study Journal of Clinical Oncology, 2018, 36, 1523-1523.	0.8	1
43	Predicting breast cancer response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy using pretreatment diffuse optical spectroscopic texture analysis. British Journal of Cancer, 2017, 116, 1329-1339.	2.9	35
44	A Randomized Double-Blind Placebo-Controlled Trial of the Effect of Vitamin D3 Supplementation on Breast Density in Premenopausal Women. Cancer Epidemiology Biomarkers and Prevention, 2017, 26, 1233-1241.	1.1	13
45	Age at Menarche and Late Adolescent Adiposity Associated with Mammographic Density on Processed Digital Mammograms in 24,840 Women. Cancer Epidemiology Biomarkers and Prevention, 2017, 26, 1450-1458.	1.1	12
46	What Do Women Know About Breast Density? Results From a Population SurveyÂof Virginia Women. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 2017, 14, 34-44.	0.9	23
47	Response to: "[Miller's] Response to: â€~Beyond the Mammography Debate: A Moderate Perspective'â Current Oncology, 2016, 23, 324-326.	쀕 0.9	3
48	Wholeâ€mount pathology of breast lumpectomy specimens improves detection of tumour margins and focality. Histopathology, 2016, 69, 35-44.	1.6	8
49	Case-control study of mammographic density and breast cancer risk using processed digital mammograms. Breast Cancer Research, 2016, 18, 53.	2.2	18
50	Quantifying masking in clinical mammograms via local detectability of simulated lesions. Medical Physics, 2016, 43, 1249-1258.	1.6	22
51	Technical Note: Robust measurement of the slice-sensitivity profile in breast tomosynthesis. Medical Physics, 2016, 43, 4803-4807.	1.6	7
52	Mammographic density assessed on paired raw and processed digital images and on paired screen-film and digital images across three mammography systems. Breast Cancer Research, 2016, 18, 130.	2.2	17
53	Reducing radiation doses for breast tomosynthesis?. Lancet Oncology, The, 2016, 17, 1027-1029.	5.1	7
54	Digital Compared with Screen-Film Mammography: Measures of Diagnostic Accuracy among Women Screened in the Ontario Breast Screening Program. Radiology, 2016, 278, 365-373.	3.6	24

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
55	International Consortium on Mammographic Density: Methodology and population diversity captured across 22 countries. Cancer Epidemiology, 2016, 40, 141-151.	0.8	19
56	Adjunctive ultrasonography in breast cancer screening. Lancet, The, 2016, 387, 313-314.	6.3	16
57	Early detection of chemotherapyâ€refractory patients by monitoring textural alterations in diffuse optical spectroscopic images. Medical Physics, 2015, 42, 6130-6146.	1.6	20
58	Response to: "Beyond the Mammography Debate: A Moderate Perspective― Current Oncology, 2015, 22, 401-403.	0.9	4
59	Point: Mammography Screeningâ€"Sticking to the Science. Current Oncology, 2015, 22, 174-176.	0.9	8
60	Response to: "Counterpoint Re: â€~Mammography Screening—Sticking to the Science'― Current Oncology, 2015, 22, 400-400.	0.9	0
61	Quantitative Ultrasound Spectroscopic Imaging for Characterization of Disease Extent in Prostate Cancer Patients. Translational Oncology, 2015, 8, 25-34.	1.7	13
62	Tumor shrinkage associated with whole-mount histopathologic techniques in oral tongue carcinoma. Pathology Research and Practice, 2015, 211, 398-403.	1.0	8
63	Digital versus screen-film mammography: impact of mammographic density and hormone therapy on breast cancer detection. Breast Cancer Research and Treatment, 2015, 154, 377-387.	1.1	11
64	Clinical outcomes of modelling mammography screening strategies. Health Reports, 2015, 26, 9-15.	0.6	3
65	Modelling mammography screening for breast cancer in the Canadian context: Modification and testing of a microsimulation model. Health Reports, 2015, 26, 3-8.	0.6	4
66	Total cost-effectiveness of mammography screening strategies. Health Reports, 2015, 26, 16-25.	0.6	20
67	Evidence That Breast Tissue Stiffness Is Associated with Risk of Breast Cancer. PLoS ONE, 2014, 9, e100937.	1.1	127
68	Segmenting pectoralis muscle on digital mammograms by a Markov random field-maximuma posteriorimodel. Journal of Medical Imaging, 2014, 1, 034503.	0.8	6
69	Overdiagnosing Overdiagnosis. Oncologist, 2014, 19, 103-106.	1.9	17
70	A novel, automated technology for multiplex biomarker imaging and application to breast cancer. Histopathology, 2014, 64, 242-255.	1.6	27
71	Method of measuring NEQ as a quality control metric for digital mammography. Medical Physics, 2014, 41, 031905.	1.6	6
72	Research in digital mammography and tomosynthesis at the University of Toronto. Radiological Physics and Technology, 2014, 7, 191-202.	1.0	2

#	Article	IF	Citations
73	Digital Tomosynthesis. Radiologic Clinics of North America, 2014, 52, 489-497.	0.9	23
74	Comparative performance of modern digital mammography systems in a large breast screening program. Medical Physics, 2013, 40, 121915.	1.6	31
75	MRI volumetric analysis of fibroglandular tissue to assess risk of the spared nipple in <i>BRCA 1/2</i> patients who are considering prophylactic nipple-sparing mastectomy Journal of Clinical Oncology, 2013, 31, 1507-1507.	0.8	0
76	Long-term results of screening with magnetic resonance imaging in women with BRCA mutations. British Journal of Cancer, 2012, 107, 24-30.	2.9	167
77	3D Pathology Volumetric Technique: A Method for Calculating Breast Tumour Volume from Whole-Mount Serial Section Images. International Journal of Breast Cancer, 2012, 2012, 1-9.	0.6	18
78	Three-dimensional ultrasound-based spectroscopic imaging for the detection of prostate cancer Journal of Clinical Oncology, 2012, 30, 234-234.	0.8	0
79	Increasing specimen coverage using digital whole-mount breast pathology: Implementation, clinical feasibility and application in research. Computerized Medical Imaging and Graphics, 2011, 35, 531-541.	3.5	18
80	Risk of Radiation-induced Breast Cancer from Mammographic Screening. Radiology, 2011, 258, 98-105.	3.6	230
81	The myth of the 50â€50 breast. Medical Physics, 2009, 36, 5437-5443.	1.6	209
82	An Improved Processing Method for Breast Whole-Mount Serial Sections for Three-Dimensional Histopathology Imaging. American Journal of Clinical Pathology, 2009, 131, 383-392.	0.4	25
83	Measurement of compressed breast thickness by optical stereoscopic photogrammetry. Medical Physics, 2009, 36, 569-576.	1.6	42
84	Accurate estimation of compressed breast thickness in mammography. Medical Physics, 2009, 36, 577-586.	1.6	48
85	Mammographic density. Measurement of mammographic density. Breast Cancer Research, 2008, 10, 209.	2.2	196
86	TECHNICAL DEVELOPMENTS IN MAMMOGRAPHY. Health Physics, 2008, 95, 599-611.	0.3	21
87	Spatial resolution requirements for acquisition of the virtual screening slide for digital whole-specimen breast histopathology. Human Pathology, 2007, 38, 1764-1771.	1.1	12
88	Mammographic Density and the Risk and Detection of Breast Cancer. New England Journal of Medicine, 2007, 356, 227-236.	13.9	2,027
89	Whole-specimen histopathology: a method to produce whole-mount breast serial sections for 3-D digital histopathology imaging. Histopathology, 2007, 50, 232-242.	1.6	61
90	American Cancer Society Guidelines for Breast Screening with MRI as an Adjunct to Mammography. Ca-A Cancer Journal for Clinicians, 2007, 57, 75-89.	157.7	2,234

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
91	Quality control for digital mammography: Part II recommendations from the ACRIN DMIST trial. Medical Physics, 2006, 33, 719.	1.6	43
92	Film mammography for breast cancer screening in younger women is no longer appropriate because of the demonstrated superiority of digital mammography for this age group. Medical Physics, 2006, 33, 3979-3982.	1.6	11
93	Mammographic breast density as an intermediate phenotype for breast cancer. Lancet Oncology, The, 2005, 6, 798-808.	5.1	548
94	Is mammographic density, as currently measured, a robust surrogate marker for breast cancer?. Gynecological Endocrinology, 2005, 21, 17-21.	0.7	19
95	Mammographic breast density and cancer risk: The radiological view. Gynecological Endocrinology, 2005, 21, 6-11.	0.7	34
96	Detectors for Digital Mammography. Technology in Cancer Research and Treatment, 2004, 3, 309-324.	0.8	23
97	Surveillance of <emph type="ITAL">BRCA1</emph> and <emph type="ITAL">BRCA2</emph> Mutation Carriers With Magnetic Resonance Imaging, Ultrasound, Mammography, and Clinical Breast Examination. JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association, 2004, 292, 1317.	3.8	1,033
98	What should the burden of proof be for acceptance of a new breast-cancer screening technique?. Lancet, The, 2004, 364, 1111-1112.	6.3	11
99	A longitudinal study of the effects of menopause on mammographic features. Cancer Epidemiology Biomarkers and Prevention, 2002, 11, 1048-53.	1.1	99
100	Field nonuniformity correction for quantitative analysis of digitized mammograms. Medical Physics, 2001, 28, 438-444.	1.6	15
101	The effect of phosphor persistence on image quality in digital x-ray scanning systems. Medical Physics, 1998, 25, 2440-2454.	1.6	19
102	Digital Mammography. Breast Disease, 1998, 10, 127-135.	0.4	14
103	Breast cancer risk and measured mammographic density. European Journal of Cancer Prevention, 1998, 7, S47-S56.	0.6	64
104	Automated analysis of mammographic densities and breast carcinoma risk. Cancer, 1997, 80, 66-74.	2.0	103
105	Variations in measured vessel diameters using Coronary Measurement System. , 1996, 39, 131-136.		5
106	X-ray imaging with amorphous selenium: Optimal spectra for digital mammography. Medical Physics, 1996, 23, 557-567.	1.6	31
107	X-ray imaging with amorphous selenium: Detective quantum efficiency of photoconductive receptors for digital mammography. Medical Physics, 1995, 22, 153-160.	1.6	46
108	Optimization of spectral shape in digital mammography: Dependence on anode material, breast thickness, and lesion type. Medical Physics, 1994, 21, 1473-1481.	1.6	78

#	Article	lF	CITATIONS
109	Binary vascular reconstruction from a limited number of cone beam projections. Medical Physics, 1994, 21, 1839-1851.	1.6	24
110	Analysis of the spatial-frequency-dependent DQE of optically coupled digital mammography detectors. Medical Physics, 1994, 21, 721-729.	1.6	60
111	The quantitative analysis of mammographic densities. Physics in Medicine and Biology, 1994, 39, 1629-1638.	1.6	569
112	Performance of glass fiber antiscatter devices at mammographic energies. Medical Physics, 1994, 21, 1277-1282.	1.6	27
113	A model for optimization of spectral shape in digital mammography. Medical Physics, 1994, 21, 1463-1471.	1.6	45
114	Dynamic range requirements in digital mammography. Medical Physics, 1993, 20, 1621-1633.	1.6	40
115	A critical appraisal of the Canadian National Breast Cancer Screening Study Radiology, 1993, 189, 661-663.	3.6	68
116	Digital breast techniques excel at image display. Diagnostic Imaging, 1993, 15, 79-85, 105.	0.0	0
117	AAPM tutorial. Physics of mammography: image recording process Radiographics, 1990, 10, 341-363.	1.4	21
118	Model of the spatial-frequency-dependent detective quantum efficiency of phosphor screens. Medical Physics, 1990, 17, 894-904.	1.6	91
119	Effect of various noise sources on the detective quantum efficiency of phosphor screens. Medical Physics, 1990, 17, 887-893.	1.6	28
120	Effect of finite phosphor thickness on detective quantum efficiency. Medical Physics, 1989, 16, 773-780.	1.6	43
121	Scanned-projection digital mammography. Medical Physics, 1987, 14, 717-727.	1.6	84
122	Signal-to-noise properties of mammographic film-screen systems. Medical Physics, 1985, 12, 32-39.	1.6	67
123	Theoretical optimization of dual-energy x-ray imaging with application to mammography. Medical Physics, 1985, 12, 289-296.	1.6	122
124	Dual-energy mammography: Initial experimental results. Medical Physics, 1985, 12, 297-304.	1.6	82