Ralf K W Schulze

List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: https://exaly.com/author-pdf/6166408/publications.pdf Version: 2024-02-01



PALEK W SCHULZE

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
1	Artefacts in CBCT: a review. Dentomaxillofacial Radiology, 2011, 40, 265-273.	1.3	711
2	On coneâ€beam computed tomography artifacts induced by titanium implants. Clinical Oral Implants Research, 2010, 21, 100-107.	1.9	240
3	Spatial resolution in CBCT machines for dental/maxillofacial applications—what do we know today?. Dentomaxillofacial Radiology, 2015, 44, 20140204.	1.3	139
4	Basic training requirements for the use of dental CBCT by dentists: a position paper prepared by the European Academy of DentoMaxilloFacial Radiology. Dentomaxillofacial Radiology, 2014, 43, 20130291.	1.3	90
5	The Image Gently in Dentistry campaign: promotion of responsible use of maxillofacial radiology in dentistry for children. Oral Surgery, Oral Medicine, Oral Pathology and Oral Radiology, 2014, 118, 257-261.	0.2	67
6	Precision and accuracy of measurements in digital panoramic radiography. Dentomaxillofacial Radiology, 0, 29, 52-56.	1.3	63
7	Correlation of cone beam computed tomography (CBCT) findings in the maxillary sinus with dental diagnoses: a retrospective cross-sectional study. Clinical Oral Investigations, 2012, 16, 1023-1029.	1.4	62
8	Cytotoxicity of Root Canal Filling Materials to Three Different Human Cell Lines. Journal of Endodontics, 2000, 26, 703-707.	1.4	50
9	A method for automatic forensic facial reconstruction based on dense statistics of soft tissue thickness. PLoS ONE, 2019, 14, e0210257.	1.1	41
10	Dental CBCT equipment and performance issues. Radiation Protection Dosimetry, 2013, 153, 212-218.	0.4	38
11	Necessity of 3D visualization for the removal of lower wisdom teeth: required sample size to prove non-inferiority of panoramic radiography compared to CBCT. Clinical Oral Investigations, 2012, 16, 699-706.	1.4	34
12	Mathematical analysis of projection errors in "paralleling technique―with respect to implant geometry. Clinical Oral Implants Research, 2001, 12, 364-371.	1.9	32
13	B-mode versus A-mode ultrasonographic measurements of mucosal thickness in vivo. Oral Surgery Oral Medicine Oral Pathology Oral Radiology and Endodontics, 2002, 93, 110-117.	1.6	27
14	Landmark identification on direct digital versus film-based cephalometric radiographs: A human skull study. American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics, 2002, 122, 635-642.	0.8	26
15	Surgical evaluation of panoramic radiography and cone beam computed tomography for therapy planning of bisphosphonate-related osteonecrosis of the jaws. Oral Surgery, Oral Medicine, Oral Pathology and Oral Radiology, 2016, 121, 419-424.	0.2	24
16	Cone-beam computed tomography and its applications in dental and maxillofacial radiology. Clinical Radiology, 2020, 75, 647-657.	0.5	24
17	Automated detection of patient movement during a CBCT scan based on the projection data. Oral Surgery, Oral Medicine, Oral Pathology and Oral Radiology, 2015, 119, 468-472.	0.2	23
18	Presurgical evaluation of bony implant sites using panoramic radiography and cone beam computed tomography—influence of medical education. Dentomaxillofacial Radiology, 2017, 46, 20160081.	1.3	19

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
19	The Treatment of Anterior Dental Trauma. Deutsches Ärzteblatt International, 2010, 108, 565-70.	0.6	19
20	Auto calibration of a coneâ€beam T. Medical Physics, 2012, 39, 5959-5970.	1.6	18
21	Future prospects for dental cone beam CT imaging. Imaging in Medicine, 2012, 4, 551-563.	0.0	18
22	In vitro perception of low-contrast features in digital, film, and digitized dental radiographs: A receiver operating characteristic analysis. Oral Surgery Oral Medicine Oral Pathology Oral Radiology and Endodontics, 2007, 103, 694-701.	1.6	17
23	Determination of projection geometry from quantitative assessment of the distortion of spherical references in single-view projection radiography. Medical Physics, 2004, 31, 2849-2854.	1.6	16
24	Contrast perception in digitized panoramic radiographs compared with their film-based origin. Oral Surgery Oral Medicine Oral Pathology Oral Radiology and Endodontics, 2002, 94, 388-394.	1.6	14
25	In vitro carious lesion detection on D-, E-, and F-speed radiographic films. Oral Surgery Oral Medicine Oral Pathology Oral Radiology and Endodontics, 2004, 97, 529-534.	1.6	14
26	Implant treatment planning regarding augmentation procedures: panoramic radiographs vs. cone beam computed tomography images. Clinical Oral Implants Research, 2016, 27, 1010-1016.	1.9	14
27	Projectionâ€based improvement of 3D reconstructions from motionâ€impaired dental cone beam CT data. Medical Physics, 2019, 46, 4470-4480.	1.6	13
28	Epulis granulomatosa as an oral manifestation of Klippel-Trénaunay syndrome. Journal of Oral Pathology and Medicine, 2006, 35, 576-578.	1.4	11
29	Influence of a Commercial Lead Apron on Patient Skin Dose Delivered During Oral and Maxillofacial Examinations under Cone Beam Computed Tomography (CBCT). Health Physics, 2017, 113, 129-134.	0.3	11
30	The Effect of Wavelet and Discrete Cosine Transform Compression of Digital Radiographs on the Detection of Subtle Proximal Caries. Caries Research, 2008, 42, 334-339.	0.9	10
31	GPU-Based Volume Reconstruction from Very Few Arbitrarily Aligned X-Ray Images. SIAM Journal of Scientific Computing, 2010, 31, 4204-4221.	1.3	10
32	The influence of ambient lighting on the detection of small contrast elements in digital dental radiographs. Clinical Oral Investigations, 2013, 17, 1727-1731.	1.4	10
33	Length of endodontic files measured in digital radiographs with and without noise-suppression filters: an <i>ex-vivo</i> study. Dentomaxillofacial Radiology, 2011, 40, 170-176.	1.3	9
34	Skin entrance dose with and without lead apron in digital panoramic radiography for selected sensitive body regions. Clinical Oral Investigations, 2017, 21, 1327-1333.	1.4	8
35	Accuracy in Detecting Artificial Root Resorption in Panoramic Radiography versus Tomosynthetic Panoramic Radiographs. Journal of Endodontics, 2019, 45, 634-639.e2.	1.4	8
36	Detection accuracy of maxillary sinus floor septa in panoramic radiographs using CBCT as gold standard: a multi-observer receiver operating characteristic (ROC) study. Clinical Oral Investigations, 2019, 23, 99-105.	1.4	8

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
37	A new method for the radiological investigation of residual ridge resorption in the maxilla. Dentomaxillofacial Radiology, 0, 29, 368-375.	1.3	8
38	A method to calculate angular disparities between object and receptor in `paralleling technique'. Dentomaxillofacial Radiology, 0, 31, 32-38.	1.3	8
39	Accurate registration of random radiographic projections based on three spherical references for the purpose of few-view 3D reconstruction. Medical Physics, 2008, 35, 546-555.	1.6	7
40	Contrast curves of five different intraoral X-ray sensors: a technical note. Oral Surgery, Oral Medicine, Oral Pathology and Oral Radiology, 2013, 115, e55-e61.	0.2	7
41	Quality of individually calibrated customary printers for assessment of typical dental diagnoses on glossy paper prints: a multicenter pilot study. Oral Surgery Oral Medicine Oral Pathology Oral Radiology and Endodontics, 2008, 106, 578-586.	1.6	6
42	Ex vivo radiographic tooth length measurements with the reference sphere method (RSM). Clinical Oral Investigations, 2010, 14, 645-651.	1.4	6
43	Pose determination of a cylindrical (dental) implant in three-dimensions from a single two-dimensional radiograph. Dentomaxillofacial Radiology, 2010, 39, 33-41.	1.3	6
44	Spatial relation between a rigid (digital) intraoral X-ray receptor and longitudinal axes of maxillary teeth. Clinical Oral Investigations, 2011, 15, 715-719.	1.4	6
45	Metal artifact reduction in x-ray computed tomography: Inpainting versus missing value. , 2011, , .		6
46	Editorial: CBCT special issue. Dentomaxillofacial Radiology, 2015, 44, 20140380.	1.3	6
47	Influence of Three-dimensional Imaging on Implant Treatment Planning: Implant Diameter and Length. Journal of Contemporary Dental Practice, 2018, 19, 704-711.	0.2	6
48	Software for automated application of a reference-based method fora posterioridetermination of the effective radiographic imaging geometry. Dentomaxillofacial Radiology, 2005, 34, 205-211.	1.3	5
49	A contact-free volumetric measurement of facial volume after third molar osteotomy: proof of concept. Oral Surgery, Oral Medicine, Oral Pathology and Oral Radiology, 2014, 117, e51-e56.	0.2	5
50	Correlation of objective image quality and working length measurements in different CBCT machines: An ex vivo study. Scientific Reports, 2020, 10, 19414.	1.6	5
51	Three-Dimensional Classification of Lower Third Molars and Their Relationship to the Mandibular Canal. Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, 2021, 79, 1611-1620.	0.5	5
52	Alignment of cone beam computed tomography data using intra-oral fiducial markers. Computerized Medical Imaging and Graphics, 2010, 34, 543-552.	3.5	4
53	The ethics of scientific publishing. Dentomaxillofacial Radiology, 2012, 41, 355-355.	1.3	4
54	Editorial. Dentomaxillofacial Radiology, 2012, 41, 443-443.	1.3	4

4

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
55	Effects of minute misregistrations of prefabricated markers for imageâ€guided dental implant surgery: an analytical evaluation. Clinical Oral Implants Research, 2013, 24, 1339-1346.	1.9	4
56	Simple computation of the approximated modulation transfer function (MTF) using spreadsheet-software: method and evaluation in five maxillofacial CBCT-devices. Dentomaxillofacial Radiology, 2019, 48, 20180350.	1.3	4
57	Fractal dimension in CBCT images as predictor for MRONJ: a retrospective cohort study. Clinical Oral Investigations, 2021, 25, 2113-2118.	1.4	4
58	Diagnostic yield of ink-jet prints from digital radiographs for the assessment of approximal carious lesions: ROC-analysis. European Journal of Radiology, 2011, 79, 277-282.	1.2	3
59	Role of ambient light in the detection of contrast elements in digital dental radiography. Oral Surgery, Oral Medicine, Oral Pathology and Oral Radiology, 2018, 126, 439-443.	0.2	3
60	Ink-jet printout of radiographs on transparent film and glossy paper versus monitor display: an ROC analysis. Clinical Oral Investigations, 2011, 15, 351-356.	1.4	2
61	Editorial. Dentomaxillofacial Radiology, 2012, 41, 1-2.	1.3	2
62	Editorial: guidelines for oral and maxillofacial radiology. Dentomaxillofacial Radiology, 2016, 45, 20160034.	1.3	2
63	Radiation protection <i>vs</i> research interests. Dentomaxillofacial Radiology, 2013, 42, 20120348.	1.3	1
64	Editorial 1/2018. Dentomaxillofacial Radiology, 2018, 47, 20170359.	1.3	1
65	The effects of examiner fatigue on the diagnostic accuracy of dental radiographs. Clinical Oral Investigations, 2021, 25, 6193-6199.	1.4	1
66	Letter to the Editor / Reply. Caries Research, 2009, 43, 81-82.	0.9	0
67	Total Variation Regularization in Digital Breast Tomosynthesis. Informatik Aktuell, 2013, , 356-361.	0.4	0
68	Continuous publication. Dentomaxillofacial Radiology, 2013, 42, 20130124.	1.3	0
69	Why so few case reports—why (systematic) reviews instead?. Dentomaxillofacial Radiology, 2013, 42, 20130272.	1.3	0
70	EDITORIAL. Dentomaxillofacial Radiology, 2013, 42, 20120344-20120344.	1.3	0
71	Challenges for a new year. Dentomaxillofacial Radiology, 2014, 43, 20130411.	1.3	0
72	The success of cone beam CT. Dentomaxillofacial Radiology, 2014, 43, 20140109.	1.3	0

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
73	Construction of a low-cost surface scanner for medical studies: a feasibility study. Oral Radiology, 2016, 32, 211-216.	0.9	0
74	Editorial 1/2016. Dentomaxillofacial Radiology, 2016, 45, 20150242.	1.3	0
75	Image Quality. , 2018, , 95-112.		0
76	<i>>Dentomaxillofacial Radiology</i> in 2020—Exciting developments ahead. Dentomaxillofacial Radiology, 2020, 49, 20209001.	1.3	0