Manisha Bahl

List of Publications by Year
in descending order

Source: https://exaly.com/author-pdf/6094180/publications.pdf

Version: 2024-02-01

60 papers	1,595 citations	331670 21 h-index	330143 37 g-index
60 all docs	60 docs citations	60 times ranked	1866 citing authors

#	Article	IF	Citations
1	Contralateral breast cancer after curative-intent treatment for ductal carcinoma in situ: Rate and associated clinicopathological and imaging risk factors. Clinical Imaging, 2022, 82, 179-192.	1.5	4
2	Contrast-enhanced Mammography: An Emerging Modality in Breast Imaging. Radiology, 2022, 302, 582-583.	7.3	2
3	Artificial Intelligence (AI) for Screening Mammography, From the AJR Special Series on AI Applications. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2022, 219, 369-380.	2.2	21
4	Management of Architectural Distortion on Digital Breast Tomosynthesis With Nonmalignant Pathology at Biopsy. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2022, 219, 46-54.	2.2	9
5	Breast Imaging in Older Patients: Pointâ€"Revisiting Age Cutoffs with New Evidence. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2022, , .	2.2	0
6	Screening MRI in Women at Intermediate Breast Cancer Risk: An Update of the Recent Literature. Journal of Breast Imaging, 2022, 4, 231-240.	1.3	7
7	Noncalcified Ductal Carcinoma In Situ (DCIS): Rate and Predictors of Upgrade to Invasive Carcinoma. Academic Radiology, 2021, 28, e71-e76.	2.5	15
8	Impact of digital breast tomosynthesis (DBT) on finding types leading to true-positive and false-positive examinations. Clinical Imaging, 2021, 71, 155-159.	1.5	3
9	Management of High-Risk Breast Lesions. Radiologic Clinics of North America, 2021, 59, 29-40.	1.8	18
10	Imaging Surveillance of Breast Cancer Survivors with Digital Mammography versus Digital Breast Tomosynthesis. Radiology, 2021, 298, 308-316.	7.3	22
11	ASO Author Reflections: Re-Excision for Ductal Carcinoma In Situ: Who Is at Risk?. Annals of Surgical Oncology, 2021, 28, 1398-1399.	1.5	0
12	Predictors of Reexcision following Breast-Conserving Surgery for Ductal Carcinoma In Situ. Annals of Surgical Oncology, 2021, 28, 1390-1397.	1.5	11
13	Assessing Risk of Breast Cancer: A Review of Risk Prediction Models. Journal of Breast Imaging, 2021, 3, 144-155.	1.3	47
14	Artificial Intelligence for Breast Ultrasound: Will It Impact Radiologistsâ€™ Accuracy?. Journal of Breast Imaging, 2021, 3, 312-314.	1.3	7
15	Symptomatic ductal carcinoma in situ (DCIS): Upstaging risk and predictors. Clinical Imaging, 2021, 73, 101-107.	1.5	8
16	Risk factors for an advanced breast cancer diagnosis within 2 years of a negative mammogram. Cancer, 2021, 127, 3334-3342.	4.1	9
17	Evidence-Based Pragmatic Approach to the Management of Borderline or High-Risk Breast Lesions. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2021, , 1-2.	2.2	0
18	Probably Benign on Screening Ultrasound: New Data Call for New Rules. Journal of Breast Imaging, 2021, 3, 539-541.	1.3	1

#	Article	IF	Citations
19	Updates in Artificial Intelligence for Breast Imaging. Seminars in Roentgenology, 2021, 57, 160-167.	0.6	7
20	Ductal Carcinoma In Situ (DCIS) at Breast MRI: Predictors of Upgrade to Invasive Carcinoma. Academic Radiology, 2020, 27, 1394-1399.	2.5	17
21	Harnessing the Power of Deep Learning to Assess Breast Cancer Risk. Radiology, 2020, 294, 273-274.	7.3	7
22	The Adoption and Impact on Performance of an Automated OutcomesÂFeedback Application for Tomosynthesis Screening Mammography. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 2020, 17, 1626-1635.	1.8	4
23	Artificial Intelligence: A Primer for Breast Imaging Radiologists. Journal of Breast Imaging, 2020, 2, 304-314.	1.3	26
24	Do Eligibility Criteria for Ductal Carcinoma In Situ (DCIS) Active Surveillance Trials Identify Patients at Low Risk for Upgrade to Invasive Carcinoma?. Annals of Surgical Oncology, 2020, 27, 4459-4465.	1.5	21
25	ASO Author Reflections: Active Surveillance for Ductal Carcinoma In Situ (DCIS). Annals of Surgical Oncology, 2020, 27, 4466-4467.	1.5	0
26	Pre-operative MRI in patients with ductal carcinoma in situ: Is MRI useful for identifying additional disease?. European Journal of Radiology, 2020, 129, 109130.	2.6	14
27	Ductal carcinoma in situ on digital mammography versus digital breast tomosynthesis: rates and predictors of pathologic upgrade. European Radiology, 2020, 30, 6089-6098.	4.5	7
28	Breast Cancer Screening with Digital Breast Tomosynthesis: Are Initial Benefits Sustained?. Radiology, 2020, 295, 529-539.	7.3	24
29	Comparison of performance metrics with digital 2D versus tomosynthesis mammography in the diagnostic setting. European Radiology, 2019, 29, 477-484.	4.5	23
30	MRI predictors of tumor-positive margins after breast-conserving surgery. Clinical Imaging, 2019, 57, 45-49.	1.5	10
31	Digital 2D versus Tomosynthesis Screening Mammography among Women Aged 65 and Older in the United States. Radiology, 2019, 291, 582-590.	7.3	17
32	Breast Cancer Screening Using Digital Breast Tomosynthesis. JAMA Oncology, 2019, 5, 642.	7.1	3
33	Preoperative Parathyroid Imaging: Trends in Utilization and Comparative Accuracy of Sonography, Scintigraphy, and 4-Dimensional Computed Tomography. Journal of Computer Assisted Tomography, 2019, 43, 264-268.	0.9	15
34	Detecting Breast Cancers with Mammography: Will AI Succeed Where Traditional CAD Failed?. Radiology, 2019, 290, 315-316.	7.3	21
35	Mammographic Breast Density Assessment Using Deep Learning: Clinical Implementation. Radiology, 2019, 290, 52-58.	7.3	187
36	Comparison of Upright Digital Breast Tomosynthesisâ€“guided versus Prone Stereotactic Vacuum-assisted Breast Biopsy. Radiology, 2019, 290, 298-304.	7.3	39

#	Article	IF	Citations
37	Incidental Thyroid Nodules in the National Lung Screening Trial. Academic Radiology, 2018, 25, 1152-1155.	2.5	10
38	Pathologic Upgrade Rates of High-Risk Breast Lesions on Digital Two-Dimensional vs Tomosynthesis Mammography. Journal of the American College of Surgeons, 2018, 226, 858-867.	0.5	20
39	Breast Cancer Characteristics Associated with 2D Digital Mammography versus Digital Breast Tomosynthesis for Screening-detected and Interval Cancers. Radiology, 2018, 287, 49-57.	7.3	70
40	High-Risk Breast Lesions: A Machine Learning Model to Predict Pathologic Upgrade and Reduce Unnecessary Surgical Excision. Radiology, 2018, 286, 810-818.	7.3	123
41	Evaluation of a Nonradioactive Magnetic Marker Wireless Localization Program. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2018, 211, 940-945.	2.2	34
42	American Joint Committee on Cancerâ€™s Staging System for Breast Cancer, Eighth Edition: What the Radiologist Needs to Know. Radiographics, 2018, 38, 1921-1933.	3.3	81
43	Evaluation of a Nonradioactive Magnetic Marker Wireless Localization Program. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2018, 211, W202-W202.	2.2	3
44	Applying Criteria of Active Surveillance to Low-Risk Papillary Thyroid Cancer Over a Decade: How Many Surgeries and Complications Can Be Avoided?. Thyroid, 2017, 27, 518-523.	4.5	40
45	Pathologic Outcomes of Architectural Distortion on Digital 2D Versus Tomosynthesis Mammography. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2017, 209, 1162-1167.	2.2	75
46	JOURNAL CLUB: Diagnostic Utility of MRI After Negative or Inconclusive Mammography for the Evaluation of Pathologic Nipple Discharge. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2017, 209, 1404-1410.	2.2	21
47	Flat Epithelial Atypia: Upgrade Rates and Risk-Stratification Approach to Support Informed Decision Making. Journal of the American College of Surgeons, 2017, 225, 696-701.	0.5	28
48	Impact of Breast Density Notification Legislation on Radiologistsâ€™ Practices of Reporting Breast Density: A Multi-State Study. Radiology, 2016, 280, 701-706.	7.3	20
49	Can Vascular Patterns on Preoperative Magnetic Resonance Imaging Help Predict Skin Necrosis after Nipple-Sparing Mastectomy?. Journal of the American College of Surgeons, 2016, 223, 279-285.	0.5	14
50	Parathyroid 4D CT and Scintigraphy. Otolaryngology - Head and Neck Surgery, 2016, 154, 847-853.	1.9	49
51	Reply to â€œConventional Ductography Combined With Digital Breast Tomosynthesis for Imaging of Pathologic Nipple Dischargeâ€• American Journal of Roentgenology, 2016, 206, W45-W45.	2.2	0
52	Diagnostic Value of Ultrasound in Female Patients With Nipple Discharge. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2015, 205, 203-208.	2.2	50
53	Parathyroid Adenomas and Hyperplasia on Four-dimensional CT Scans: Three Patterns of Enhancement Relative to the Thyroid Gland Justify a Three-Phase Protocol. Radiology, 2015, 277, 454-462.	7.3	88
54	Architectural Distortion on Mammography: Correlation With Pathologic Outcomes and Predictors of Malignancy. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2015, 205, 1339-1345.	2.2	81

#	Article	IF	Citations
55	Evaluation of Pathologic Nipple Discharge: What is the Added Diagnostic Value of MRI?. Annals of Surgical Oncology, 2015, 22, 435-441.	1.5	34
56	Thyroid Cancers Incidentally Detected at Imaging in a 10-year Period: How Many Cancers Would Be Missed with Use of the Recommendations from the Society of Radiologists in Ultrasound?. Radiology, 2014, 271, 888-894.	7.3	21
57	Trends in Incidentally Identified Thyroid Cancers Over a Decade: A Retrospective Analysis of 2,090 Surgical Patients. World Journal of Surgery, 2014, 38, 1312-1317.	1.6	41
58	JOURNAL CLUB: Incidental Thyroid Nodules Detected at Imaging: Can Diagnostic Workup Be Reduced by Use of the Society of Radiologists in Ultrasound Recommendations and the Three-Tiered System?. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2014, 202, 18-24.	2.2	42
59	Using the 3-Tiered System for Categorizing Workup of Incidental Thyroid Nodules Detected on CT, MRI, or PET/CT: How Many Cancers Would Be Missed?. Thyroid, 2014, 24, 1772-1778.	4.5	24
60	Reply to â€œThe Matrix Is Not Ready for Screening Mammographyâ€. American Journal of Roentgenology, 0, , 2-3.	2.2	0