
Maren Duvendack

List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: https://exaly.com/author-pdf/6283972/publications.pdf Version: 2024-02-01



MADEN DUVENDACK

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
1	Paymentâ€byâ€results for health interventions in low―and middleâ€income countries: A critical review. Development Policy Review, 2021, , .	1.0	1
2	Responding to the Multifaceted COVID-19 Crisis: The Case of Mumbai, India. Progress in Development Studies, 2021, 21, 361-379.	1.0	5
3	IMPACT OF FINANCIAL INCLUSION IN LOW―AND MIDDLEâ€INCOME COUNTRIES: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF REVIEWS. Journal of Economic Surveys, 2020, 34, 594-629.	3.7	44
4	Impact of financial inclusion in Iow―and middleâ€income countries: A systematic review of reviews. Campbell Systematic Reviews, 2019, 15, e1012.	1.2	30
5	Is fin-tech the new panacea for poverty alleviation and local development? Contesting Suri and Jack's M-Pesa findings published in Science. Review of African Political Economy, 2019, 46, .	0.6	75
6	Does Government Spending Affect Income Poverty? A Meta-regression Analysis. World Development, 2018, 103, 60-71.	2.6	66
7	What Is Meant by "Replication―and Why Does It Encounter Resistance in Economics?. American Economic Review, 2017, 107, 46-51.	4.0	71
8	Quasi-experimental study designs series—paper 9: collecting data from quasi-experimental studies. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 2017, 89, 77-83.	2.4	16
9	Quasi-experimental study designs series—paper 10: synthesizing evidence for effects collected from quasi-experimental studies presents surmountable challenges. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 2017, 89, 84-91.	2.4	17
10	Micro-Finance, Women's Empowerment and Fertility Decline in Bangladesh: How Important Was Women's Agency?. Journal of Development Studies, 2017, 53, 664-683.	1.2	28
11	DOES GOVERNMENT SPENDING AFFECT INCOME INEQUALITY? A METAâ€REGRESSION ANALYSIS. Journal of Economic Surveys, 2017, 31, 961-987.	3.7	80
12	(Mis)use of evidence in microfinance programming in the global south: a critique. Contemporary Social Science, 2015, 10, 202-211.	1.0	9
13	The Effects of Microcredit on Women's Control over Household Spending in Developing Countries: A Systematic Review and Metaâ€analysis. Campbell Systematic Reviews, 2014, 10, 1-205.	1.2	39
14	Impact Evaluation – Are We â€~Off the Gold Standard'?. European Journal of Development Research, 2014, 26, 1-11.	1.2	22
15	Meta-analysis of the impact of microcredit on women's control over household decisions: methodological issues and substantive findings. Journal of Development Effectiveness, 2014, 6, 73-96.	0.4	25
16	Things you Wanted to Know about Bias in Evaluations but Never Dared to Think. IDS Bulletin, 2014, 45, 49-64.	0.4	15
17	Replication of quantitative work in development studies: Experiences and suggestions. Progress in Development Studies, 2013, 13, 307-322.	1.0	34
18	Assessing â€~what works' in international development: meta-analysis for sophisticated dummies. Journal of Development Effectiveness, 2012, 4, 456-471.	0.4	40

MAREN DUVENDACK

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
19	Response to Chemin and to Pitt. Journal of Development Studies, 2012, 48, 1892-1897.	1.2	6
20	The benefits and challenges of using systematic reviews in international development research. Journal of Development Effectiveness, 2012, 4, 445-455.	0.4	341
21	High Noon for Microfinance Impact Evaluations: Re-investigating the Evidence from Bangladesh. Journal of Development Studies, 2012, 48, 1864-1880.	1.2	82
22	Much ado about something: response to Haughton's reply to Duvendack and Palmer-Jones. Journal of Development Effectiveness, 2011, 3, 302-303.	0.4	2
23	Comment on: Abou-Ali, H., El-Azony, H., El-Laithy, H., Haughton, J. and Khandker, S., 2010. Evaluating the impact of Egyptian Social Fund for Development programmes. <i>Journal of Development Effectiveness,</i> 2 (4), 521–555. Journal of Development Effectiveness, 2011, 3, 297-299.	0.4	1
24	The impact of government policies on income inequality and the translation of growth into income poverty reduction: protocol for two systematic reviews. Journal of Development Effectiveness, 0, , 1-15.	0.4	0