

# Elizabeth Chloe Romanis

## List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: <https://exaly.com/author-pdf/6594314/publications.pdf>

Version: 2024-02-01

29  
papers

370  
citations

933264

10  
h-index

887953

17  
g-index

29  
all docs

29  
docs citations

29  
times ranked

174  
citing authors

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
1	Twin pregnancy reduction is not an "all or nothing" problem: a response to RÃnen. <i>Journal of Medical Ethics</i> , 2022, 48, 139-141.	1.0	3
2	The Excessive Regulation of Early Abortion Medication in the UK: The Case for Reform. <i>Medical Law Review</i> , 2022, 30, 4-32.	0.2	3
3	The Case for Telemedical Early Medical Abortion in England: Dispelling Adult Safeguarding Concerns. <i>Health Care Analysis</i> , 2022, 30, 73-96.	1.4	4
4	Appropriately framing maternal request caesarean section. <i>Journal of Medical Ethics</i> , 2022, 48, 554-556.	1.0	3
5	Artificial womb technology, pregnancy, and EU employment rights. <i>Journal of Law and the Biosciences</i> , 2022, 9, Isac009.	0.8	9
6	Assisted gestative technologies. <i>Journal of Medical Ethics</i> , 2022, 48, 439-446.	1.0	12
7	Directed and conditional uterus donation. <i>Journal of Medical Ethics</i> , 2022, 48, 810-815.	1.0	1
8	Reviewing the womb. <i>Journal of Medical Ethics</i> , 2021, 47, 820-829.	1.0	21
9	Sally Sheldon and Kaye Wellings (eds), <i>Decriminalising Abortion in the UK: What Would It Mean?</i> . <i>Medical Law Review</i> , 2021, 29, 185-192.	0.2	1
10	2020 developments in the provision of early medical abortion by telemedicine in the UK. <i>Health Policy</i> , 2021, 125, 17-21.	1.4	12
11	The Medicalisation of Childbirth and Access to homebirth in the UK: Covid-19 and Beyond. <i>Medical Law Review</i> , 2021, 29, 661-687.	0.2	4
12	Abortion & "artificial wombs": would "artificial womb" technology legally empower non-gestating genetic progenitors to participate in decisions about <i>how</i> to terminate pregnancy in England and Wales?. <i>Journal of Law and the Biosciences</i> , 2021, 8, Isab011.	0.8	4
13	Surrogacy and uterus transplantation using live donors: Examining the options from the perspective of "womb-givers". <i>Bioethics</i> , 2021, 35, 820-828.	0.7	4
14	Safeguarding and teleconsultation for abortion. <i>Lancet</i> , The, 2021, 398, 555-558.	6.3	7
15	Challenging the "Born Alive" Threshold: Fetal Surgery, Artificial Wombs, and the English Approach to Legal Personhood. <i>Medical Law Review</i> , 2020, 28, 93-123.	0.2	15
16	COVID-19 and reproductive justice in Great Britain and the United States: ensuring access to abortion care during a global pandemic. <i>Journal of Law and the Biosciences</i> , 2020, 7, Isaa027.	0.8	19
17	Is "viability" viable? Abortion, conceptual confusion and the law in England and Wales and the United States. <i>Journal of Law and the Biosciences</i> , 2020, 7, Isaa059.	0.8	13
18	Artificial Wombs and the Ectogenesis Conversation: A Misplaced Focus? Technology, Abortion, and Reproductive Freedom. <i>International Journal of Feminist Approaches To Bioethics</i> , 2020, 13, 174-194.	0.1	9

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
19	Maternal request caesareans and COVID-19: the virus does not diminish the importance of choice in childbirth. <i>Journal of Medical Ethics</i> , 2020, 46, 726-731.	1.0	11
20	Partial ectogenesis: freedom, equality and political perspective. <i>Journal of Medical Ethics</i> , 2020, 46, 89-90.	1.0	9
21	Artificial Womb Technology and the Choice to Gestate Ex Utero: Is Partial Ectogenesis the Business of the Criminal Law?. <i>Medical Law Review</i> , 2020, 28, 342-374.	0.2	13
22	Artificial womb technology and clinical translation: Innovative treatment or medical research?. <i>Bioethics</i> , 2020, 34, 392-402.	0.7	18
23	Legal and policy responses to the delivery of abortion care during COVID-19. <i>International Journal of Gynecology and Obstetrics</i> , 2020, 151, 479-486.	1.0	24
24	Establishing Boundaries for Speculation About Artificial Wombs, Ectogenesis, Gender, and the Gestating Body. , 2020, , 227-254.		9
25	Homebirthing in the United Kingdom during COVID-19. <i>Medical Law International</i> , 2020, 20, 183-200.	0.4	14
26	Addressing Rising Cesarean Rates: Maternal Request Cesareans, Defensive Practice, and the Power of Choice in Childbirth. <i>International Journal of Feminist Approaches To Bioethics</i> , 2020, 13, 1-26.	0.1	5
27	Why the Elective Caesarean Lottery is Ethically Impermissible. <i>Health Care Analysis</i> , 2019, 27, 249-268.	1.4	13
28	Artificial womb technology and the significance of birth: why gestatelings are not newborns (or) Tj ETQq0 0 0 rgBT /Overlock 10 Tf 50 3	1.0	25
29	Artificial womb technology and the frontiers of human reproduction: conceptual differences and potential implications. <i>Journal of Medical Ethics</i> , 2018, 44, 751-755.	1.0	85