

# Christian Von Wagner

## List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: <https://exaly.com/author-pdf/6210009/publications.pdf>

Version: 2024-02-01

69  
papers

2,717  
citations

279487

23  
h-index

189595

50  
g-index

73  
all docs

73  
docs citations

73  
times ranked

3541  
citing authors

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
1	Outcomes of the Bowel Cancer Screening Programme (BCSP) in England after the first 1 million tests. <i>Gut</i> , 2012, 61, 1439-1446.	6.1	457
2	Health Literacy and Health Actions: A Review and a Framework From Health Psychology. <i>Health Education and Behavior</i> , 2009, 36, 860-877.	1.3	319
3	Inequalities in participation in an organized national colorectal cancer screening programme: results from the first 2.6 million invitations in England. <i>International Journal of Epidemiology</i> , 2011, 40, 712-718.	0.9	262
4	What do people fear about cancer? A systematic review and meta-analysis of cancer fears in the general population. <i>Psycho-Oncology</i> , 2017, 26, 1070-1079.	1.0	121
5	Effects of evidence-based strategies to reduce the socioeconomic gradient of uptake in the English NHS Bowel Cancer Screening Programme (ASCEND): four cluster-randomised controlled trials. <i>Lancet</i> , The, 2016, 387, 751-759.	6.3	120
6	Uptake of colorectal cancer screening: system, provider and individual factors and strategies to improve participation. <i>Future Oncology</i> , 2009, 5, 1371-1388.	1.1	118
7	Colorectal cancer screening uptake over three biennial invitation rounds in the English bowel cancer screening programme. <i>Gut</i> , 2015, 64, 282-291.	6.1	111
8	Socioeconomic inequalities in colorectal cancer screening uptake: Does time perspective play a role?. <i>Health Psychology</i> , 2011, 30, 702-709.	1.3	101
9	Faecal immunochemical tests versus colonoscopy for post-polypectomy surveillance: an accuracy, acceptability and economic study. <i>Health Technology Assessment</i> , 2019, 23, 1-84.	1.3	91
10	Cancer Fatalism: Deterring Early Presentation and Increasing Social Inequalities?. <i>Cancer Epidemiology Biomarkers and Prevention</i> , 2011, 20, 2127-2131.	1.1	86
11	Faecal immunochemical tests (FIT) versus colonoscopy for surveillance after screening and polypectomy: a diagnostic accuracy and cost-effectiveness study. <i>Gut</i> , 2019, 68, 1642-1652.	6.1	53
12	Men's information-seeking behavior regarding cancer risk and screening: A meta-narrative systematic review. <i>Psycho-Oncology</i> , 2018, 27, 410-419.	1.0	51
13	Uptake of the English Bowel (Colorectal) Cancer Screening Programme: an update 5 years after the full roll-out. <i>European Journal of Cancer</i> , 2018, 103, 267-273.	1.3	49
14	Uptake of Bowel Scope (Flexible Sigmoidoscopy) Screening in the English National Programme: the first 14 months. <i>Journal of Medical Screening</i> , 2016, 23, 77-82.	1.1	46
15	Use of Social Media to Promote Cancer Screening and Early Diagnosis: Scoping Review. <i>Journal of Medical Internet Research</i> , 2020, 22, e21582.	2.1	46
16	Patient factors associated with non-attendance at colonoscopy after a positive screening faecal occult blood test. <i>Journal of Medical Screening</i> , 2017, 24, 12-19.	1.1	42
17	The impact of supplementary narrative-based information on colorectal cancer screening beliefs and intention. <i>BMC Cancer</i> , 2015, 15, 162.	1.1	36
18	Impact of general practice endorsement on the social gradient in uptake in bowel cancer screening. <i>British Journal of Cancer</i> , 2016, 114, 321-326.	2.9	35

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
19	Attitudes towards risk-stratified breast cancer screening among women in England: A cross-sectional survey. <i>Journal of Medical Screening</i> , 2020, 27, 138-145.	1.1	35
20	Public preferences for colorectal cancer screening tests: a review of conjoint analysis studies. <i>Expert Review of Medical Devices</i> , 2013, 10, 489-499.	1.4	33
21	Social Cognitive Mediators of Sociodemographic Differences in Colorectal Cancer Screening Uptake. <i>BioMed Research International</i> , 2015, 2015, 1-9.	0.9	32
22	Preformulated implementation intentions to promote colorectal cancer screening: A cluster-randomized trial. <i>Health Psychology</i> , 2014, 33, 998-1002.	1.3	30
23	How do people interpret information about colorectal cancer screening: observations from a think-aloud study. <i>Health Expectations</i> , 2015, 18, 703-714.	1.1	28
24	Patient experience of gastrointestinal endoscopy: informing the development of the Newcastle ENDOPREMA. <i>Frontline Gastroenterology</i> , 2020, 11, 209-217.	0.9	25
25	Testing the decoy effect to increase interest in colorectal cancer screening. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2019, 14, e0213668.	1.1	24
26	The impact of descriptive norms on motivation to participate in cancer screening – Evidence from online experiments. <i>Patient Education and Counseling</i> , 2019, 102, 1621-1628.	1.0	22
27	Associations between diagnostic pathways and care experience in colorectal cancer: evidence from patient-reported data. <i>Frontline Gastroenterology</i> , 2018, 9, 241-248.	0.9	21
28	Patient attitudes towards faecal immunochemical testing for haemoglobin as an alternative to colonoscopic surveillance of groups at increased risk of colorectal cancer. <i>Journal of Medical Screening</i> , 2013, 20, 149-156.	1.1	20
29	Improving uptake of flexible sigmoidoscopy screening: a randomized trial of nonparticipant reminders in the English Screening Programme. <i>Endoscopy</i> , 2017, 49, 35-43.	1.0	20
30	Use of a 12 months self-referral reminder to facilitate uptake of bowel scope (flexible sigmoidoscopy) screening in previous non-responders: a London-based feasibility study. <i>British Journal of Cancer</i> , 2016, 114, 751-758.	2.9	19
31	Testing active choice for screening practitioner's gender in endoscopy among disinclined women: An online experiment. <i>Journal of Medical Screening</i> , 2019, 26, 98-103.	1.1	17
32	Quantifying public preferences for different bowel preparation options prior to screening CT colonography: a discrete choice experiment. <i>BMJ Open</i> , 2014, 4, e004327.	0.8	16
33	Testing verbal quantifiers for social norms messages in cancer screening: evidence from an online experiment. <i>BMC Public Health</i> , 2019, 19, 658.	1.2	16
34	Attitudes towards faecal immunochemical testing in patients at increased risk of colorectal cancer: an online survey of GPs in England. <i>British Journal of General Practice</i> , 2018, 68, e757-e764.	0.7	13
35	Gender differences in self-reported family history of cancer: A review and secondary data analysis. <i>Cancer Medicine</i> , 2020, 9, 7772-7780.	1.3	13
36	British Society of Gastroenterology position statement on patient experience of GI endoscopy. <i>Gut</i> , 2020, 69, 1718.1-1719.	6.1	13

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
37	The Newcastle ENDOPREMA, a validated patient reported experience measure for gastrointestinal endoscopy. <i>BMJ Open Gastroenterology</i> , 2021, 8, e000653.	1.1	13
38	Non- or full-laxative CT colonography vs. endoscopic tests for colorectal cancer screening: A randomised survey comparing public perceptions and intentions to undergo testing. <i>European Radiology</i> , 2014, 24, 1477-1486.	2.3	11
39	A national cluster-randomised controlled trial to examine the effect of enhanced reminders on the socioeconomic gradient in uptake in bowel cancer screening. <i>British Journal of Cancer</i> , 2016, 115, 1479-1486.	2.9	10
40	Cancer worries and uptake of breast, cervical, and colorectal cancer screening: A population-based survey in England. <i>Journal of Medical Screening</i> , 2019, 26, 3-10.	1.1	10
41	Acceptability of risk-stratified breast screening: Effect of the order of presenting risk and benefit information. <i>Journal of Medical Screening</i> , 2020, 27, 52-56.	1.1	10
42	Type 2 diabetes and colorectal cancer screening: Findings from the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing. <i>Journal of Medical Screening</i> , 2020, 27, 25-30.	1.1	9
43	Public preferences for using quantitative faecal immunochemical test versus colonoscopy as diagnostic test for colorectal cancer: evidence from an online survey. <i>BJGP Open</i> , 2020, 4, bjgpopen20X101007.	0.9	9
44	Using a hypothetical scenario to assess public preferences for colorectal surveillance following screening-detected, intermediate-risk adenomas: annual home-based stool test vs. triennial colonoscopy. <i>BMC Gastroenterology</i> , 2016, 16, 113.	0.8	8
45	Testing whether barriers to a hypothetical screening test affect unrelated perceived benefits and vice versa: A randomised, experimental study. <i>Patient Education and Counseling</i> , 2017, 100, e1-e24.	1.0	8
46	Reducing the socioeconomic gradient in uptake of the NHS bowel cancer screening Programme using a simplified supplementary information leaflet: a cluster-randomised trial. <i>BMC Cancer</i> , 2017, 17, 543.	1.1	8
47	Feasibility and acceptability of breath research in primary care: a prospective, cross-sectional, observational study. <i>BMJ Open</i> , 2021, 11, e044691.	0.8	8
48	Medication use and risk of proximal colon cancer: a systematic review of prospective studies with narrative synthesis and meta-analysis. <i>Cancer Causes and Control</i> , 2021, 32, 1047-1061.	0.8	8
49	Testing messages from behavioral economics to improve participation in a population-based colorectal cancer screening program in Cyprus: Results from two randomized controlled trials. <i>Preventive Medicine Reports</i> , 2021, 24, 101499.	0.8	7
50	Use of social media for cancer prevention and early diagnosis: scoping review protocol. <i>BMJ Open</i> , 2020, 10, e033592.	0.8	6
51	The role of chronic conditions in influencing symptom attribution and anticipated help-seeking for potential lung cancer symptoms: a vignette-based study. <i>BJGP Open</i> , 2020, 4, bjgpopen20X101086.	0.9	6
52	Barriers to bowel scope (flexible sigmoidoscopy) screening: a comparison of non-responders, active decliners and non-attenders. <i>BMC Public Health</i> , 2018, 18, 1161.	1.2	5
53	The WASH Trial: water-assisted sigmoidoscopy in the English Bowel Scope Screening Programme: study protocol for a randomized multicenter trial. <i>Endoscopy International Open</i> , 2019, 07, E1574-E1582.	0.9	5
54	WASH multicentre randomised controlled trial: water-assisted sigmoidoscopy in English NHS bowel scope screening. <i>Gut</i> , 2021, 70, 845-852.	6.1	5

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
55	Micro actions in colorectal cancer screening participation: a population-based survey study. <i>BMC Cancer</i> , 2015, 15, 438.	1.1	4
56	Promoting men's knowledge of cancer risk reduction: A systematic review of interventions. <i>Patient Education and Counseling</i> , 2018, 101, 1322-1336.	1.0	4
57	Rapid review of factors associated with flexible sigmoidoscopy screening use. <i>Preventive Medicine</i> , 2019, 120, 8-18.	1.6	2
58	Preferences for different diagnostic modalities to follow up abnormal colorectal cancer screening results: a hypothetical vignette study. <i>BMJ Open</i> , 2020, 10, e035264.	0.8	2
59	Testing Enhanced Active Choice to Optimize Acceptance and Participation in a Population-Based Colorectal Cancer Screening Program in Malta. <i>Behavioral Medicine</i> , 2021, , 1-6.	1.0	2
60	Behavioural Challenges Associated With Risk-Adapted Cancer Screening. <i>Cancer Control</i> , 2022, 29, 107327482110602.	0.7	2
61	Evaluation of the Call for a Kit intervention to increase bowel cancer screening uptake in Lancashire, England. <i>Journal of Medical Screening</i> , 2022, 29, 166-171.	1.1	2
62	Why are most colorectal cancers diagnosed outside of screening? A retrospective analysis of data from the English bowel screening programme. <i>Journal of Medical Screening</i> , 2022, 29, 224-230.	1.1	2
63	Testing temporal frames of colorectal cancer risks: evidence from randomized online experiments. <i>Psychology, Health and Medicine</i> , 2023, 28, 375-389.	1.3	2
64	Using specialist screening practitioners (SSPs) to increase uptake of bowel scope (flexible) Tj ETQq0 0 0 rgBT /Overlock 10 Tf 50 387 Td 9, e023801.	0.8	1
65	Offering disinclined people the choice between different screening appointments: a randomised online survey. <i>Psychology and Health</i> , 2020, 36, 1-12.	1.2	1
66	Use of a GP-endorsed non-participant reminder letter to promote uptake of bowel scope screening: A randomised controlled trial in a hard-to-reach population. <i>Preventive Medicine</i> , 2020, 141, 106268.	1.6	1
67	Testing innovative strategies to reduce the social gradient in the uptake of bowel cancer screening: a programme of four qualitatively enhanced randomised controlled trials. <i>Programme Grants for Applied Research</i> , 2017, 5, 1-302.	0.4	1
68	Developing Reporting Guidelines for Social Media Research (RESOME) by Using a Modified Delphi Method: Protocol for Guideline Development. <i>JMIR Research Protocols</i> , 2022, 11, e31739.	0.5	1
69	Including a general practice endorsement letter with the testing kit in the Bowel Cancer Screening Programme: Results of a cluster randomised trial. <i>Journal of Medical Screening</i> , 2021, 28, 096914132199748.	1.1	0