Camiel Rosman

List of Publications by Year
in descending order

Source: https://exaly.com/author-pdf/6775211/publications.pdf

Version: 2024-02-01

192 papers	13,422 citations	41258 49 h-index	22764 112 g-index
196 all docs	196 docs citations	196 times ranked	9065 citing authors

#	Article	IF	Citations
1	Minimally invasive versus open oesophagectomy for patients with oesophageal cancer: a multicentre, open-label, randomised controlled trial. Lancet, The, 2012, 379, 1887-1892.	6.3	1,429
2	A Step-up Approach or Open Necrosectomy for Necrotizing Pancreatitis. New England Journal of Medicine, 2010, 362, 1491-1502.	13.9	1,358
3	Probiotic prophylaxis in predicted severe acute pancreatitis: a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. Lancet, The, 2008, 371, 651-659.	6.3	1,239
4	A Conservative and Minimally Invasive Approach to Necrotizing Pancreatitis Improves Outcome. Gastroenterology, 2011, 141, 1254-1263.	0.6	584
5	Endoscopic or surgical step-up approach for infected necrotising pancreatitis: a multicentre randomised trial. Lancet, The, 2018, 391, 51-58.	6.3	504
6	Minimally Invasive Versus Open Esophageal Resection. Annals of Surgery, 2017, 266, 232-236.	2.1	415
7	Chronic pain after mesh repair of inguinal hernia: a systematic review. American Journal of Surgery, 2007, 194, 394-400.	0.9	330
8	Timing and impact of infections in acute pancreatitis. British Journal of Surgery, 2009, 96, 267-273.	0.1	300
9	Colonoscopic perforations: a review of 30,366 patients. Surgical Endoscopy and Other Interventional Techniques, 2007, 21, 994-997.	1.3	283
10	Early closure of a multicenter randomized clinical trial of endoscopic stenting versus surgery for stage IV left-sided colorectal cancer. Endoscopy, 2008, 40, 184-191.	1.0	280
11	Same-admission versus interval cholecystectomy for mild gallstone pancreatitis (PONCHO): a multicentre randomised controlled trial. Lancet, The, 2015, 386, 1261-1268.	6.3	276
12	â€œComponents separation techniqueâ€•for the repair of large abdominal wall hernias. Journal of the American College of Surgeons, 2003, 196, 32-37.	0.2	275
13	Repair of Giant Midline Abdominal Wall Hernias: â€œComponents Separation Techniqueâ€•versus Prosthetic Repair. World Journal of Surgery, 2007, 31, 756-763.	0.8	254
14	Multicenter, Prospective, Longitudinal Study of the Recurrence, Surgical Site Infection, and Quality of Life After Contaminated Ventral Hernia Repair Using Biosynthetic Absorbable Mesh. Annals of Surgery, 2017, 265, 205-211.	2.1	213
15	Detection of residual disease after neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy for oesophageal cancer (preSANO): a prospective multicentre, diagnostic cohort study. Lancet Oncology, The, 2018, 19, 965-974.	5.1	211
16	Learning Curve and Associated Morbidity of Minimally Invasive Esophagectomy. Annals of Surgery, 2019, 269, 88-94.	2.1	207
17	Textbook outcome as a composite measure in oesophagogastric cancer surgery. British Journal of Surgery, 2017, 104, 742-750.	0.1	174
18	Quality of Life and Late Complications After Minimally Invasive Compared to Open Esophagectomy: Results of a Randomized Trial. World Journal of Surgery, 2015, 39, 1986-1993.	0.8	169

#	Article	IF	Citations
19	Neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy plus surgery versus active surveillance for oesophageal cancer: a stepped-wedge cluster randomised trial. BMC Cancer, 2018, 18, 142.	1.1	166
20	Systematic review and meta-analysis for laparoscopic versus open colon surgery with or without an ERAS programme. Surgical Endoscopy and Other Interventional Techniques, 2015, 29, 3443-3453.	1.3	165
21	Minimally invasive 'step-up approach' versus maximal necrosectomy in patients with acute necrotising pancreatitis (PANTER trial): design and rationale of a randomised controlled multicenter trial [ISRCTN13975868]. BMC Surgery, 2006, 6, 6.	0.6	158
22	Superiority of Step-up Approach vs Open Necrosectomy in Long-term Follow-up of Patients With Necrotizing Pancreatitis. Gastroenterology, 2019, 156, 1016-1026.	0.6	145
23	Intestinal Barrier Dysfunction in a Randomized Trial of a Specific Probiotic Composition in Acute Pancreatitis. Annals of Surgery, 2009, 250, 712-719.	2.1	138
24	The Dutch multicenter experience of the Endo-Sponge treatment for anastomotic leakage after colorectal surgery. Surgical Endoscopy and Other Interventional Techniques, 2009, 23, 1379-1383.	1.3	136
25	T raditional i nvasive vs. m inimally invasive e sophagectomy: a multi-center, randomized trial (TIME-trial). BMC Surgery, 2011, 11, 2.	0.6	126
26	Early outcomes from the Dutch Upper Gastrointestinal Cancer Audit. British Journal of Surgery, 2016, 103, 1855-1863.	0.1	121
27	Transluminal endoscopic step-up approach versus minimally invasive surgical step-up approach in patients with infected necrotising pancreatitis (TENSION trial): design and rationale of a randomised controlled multicenter trial [ISRCTN09186711]. BMC Gastroenterology, 2013, 13, 161.	0.8	116
28	Early Endoscopic Retrograde Cholangiopancreatography in Predicted Severe Acute Biliary Pancreatitis. Annals of Surgery, 2009, 250, 68-75.	2.1	107
29	The role of routine fine-needle aspiration in the diagnosis of infected necrotizing pancreatitis. Surgery, 2014, 155, 442-448.	1.0	101
30	Randomized trial comparing the ProleneÂ® Hernia System, mesh plug repair and Lichtenstein method for open inguinal hernia repair. British Journal of Surgery, 2004, 92, 33-38.	0.1	89
31	Detecting Pathological Complete Response in Esophageal Cancer after Neoadjuvant Therapy Based on Imaging Techniques: A Diagnostic Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Journal of Thoracic Oncology, 2019, 14, 1156-1171.	0.5	85
32	Preoperative exercise therapy for elective major abdominal surgery: A systematic review. International Journal of Surgery, 2014, 12, 134-140.	1.1	83
33	Improved Functional Results After Minimally Invasive Esophagectomy: Intrathoracic Versus Cervical Anastomosis. Annals of Thoracic Surgery, 2017, 103, 267-273.	0.7	82
34	Immediate Postoperative Oral Nutrition Following Esophagectomy: A Multicenter Clinical Trial. Annals of Thoracic Surgery, 2016, 102, 1141-1148.	0.7	81
35	Prospective nationwide outcome audit of surgery for suspected acute appendicitis. British Journal of Surgery, 2015, 103, 144-151.	0.1	80
36	Clinical Outcome in Relation to Timing of Surgery in Chronic Pancreatitis. Archives of Surgery, 2012, 147, 925-32.	2.3	79

#	Article	IF	Citations
37	Prophylactic Mesh Placement During Formation of an End-colostomy Reduces the Rate of Parastomal Hernia. Annals of Surgery, 2017, 265, 663-669.	2.1	72
38	Timing of cholecystectomy after mild biliary pancreatitis. British Journal of Surgery, 2011, 98, 1446-1454.	0.1	71
39	McKeown or Ivor Lewis totally minimally invasive esophagectomy for cancer of the esophagus and gastroesophageal junction: systematic review and meta-analysis. Journal of Thoracic Disease, 2017, 9, S826-S833.	0.6	71
40	Multicentre randomized clinical trial of inspiratory muscle training versus usual care before surgery for oesophageal cancer. British Journal of Surgery, 2018, 105, 502-511.	0.1	71
41	Antibiotic Duration After Laparoscopic Appendectomy for Acute Complicated Appendicitis. JAMA Surgery, 2016, 151, 323.	2.2	69
42	Intrathoracic vs Cervical Anastomosis After Totally or Hybrid Minimally Invasive Esophagectomy for Esophageal Cancer. JAMA Surgery, 2021, 156, 601.	2.2	65
43	Translocation of Bacteria and Endotoxin in Organ Donors. Archives of Surgery, 1994, 129, 1063.	2.3	64
44	Costs of complications after colorectal cancer surgery in the Netherlands: Building the business case for hospitals. European Journal of Surgical Oncology, 2015, 41, 1059-1067.	0.5	63
45	Propensity Scoreâ€“Matched Analysis Comparing Minimally Invasive Ivor Lewis Versus Minimally Invasive Mckeown Esophagectomy. Annals of Surgery, 2020, 271, 128-133.	2.1	63
46	Distribution of lymph node metastases in esophageal carcinoma [TIGER study]: study protocol of a multinational observational study. BMC Cancer, 2019, 19, 662.	1.1	62
47	Prospective validation of classification of intraoperative adverse events (ClassIntra): international, multicentre cohort study. BMJ, The, 2020, 370, m2917.	3.0	62
48	Pain after Open Preperitoneal Repair versus Lichtenstein Repair: A Randomized Trial. World Journal of Surgery, 2007, 31, 1751-1757.	0.8	60
49	Prophylactic mesh placement to prevent parastomal hernia, early results of a prospective multicentre randomized trial. Hernia: the Journal of Hernias and Abdominal Wall Surgery, 2016, 20, 535-541.	0.9	56
50	Long-term survival improvement in oesophageal cancer in the Netherlands. European Journal of Cancer, 2018, 94, 138-147.	1.3	56
51	Techniques and short-term outcomes for total minimally invasive Ivor Lewis esophageal resection in distal esophageal and gastroesophageal junction cancers: pooled data from six European centers. Surgical Endoscopy and Other Interventional Techniques, 2017, 31, 119-126.	1.3	55
52	Learning curve and postoperative outcomes of minimally invasive esophagectomy. Journal of Thoracic Disease, 2019, 11, S777-S785.	0.6	54
53	Management of intrathoracic and cervical anastomotic leakage after esophagectomy for esophageal cancer: a systematic review. World Journal of Emergency Surgery, 2019, 14, 17.	2.1	54
54	Updated protocol of the SANO trial: a stepped-wedge cluster randomised trial comparing surgery with active surveillance after neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy for oesophageal cancer. Trials, 2021, 22, 345.	0.7	54

#	Article	IF	Citations
55	Failure-to-rescue in patients undergoing surgery for esophageal or gastric cancer. European Journal of Surgical Oncology, 2017, 43, 1962-1969.	0.5	53
56	An overview of the features influencing pain after inguinal hernia repair. International Journal of Surgery, 2008, 6, 351-356.	1.1	47
57	Cardiorespiratory Comorbidity and Postoperative Complications following Esophagectomy: a European Multicenter Cohort Study. Annals of Surgical Oncology, 2019, 26, 2864-2873.	0.7	46
58	Preoperative inspiratory muscle training to prevent postoperative pulmonary complications in patients undergoing esophageal resection (PREPARE study): study protocol for a randomized controlled trial. Trials, 2014, 15, 144.	0.7	43
59	Time interval between neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy and surgery for oesophageal or junctional cancer: A nationwide study. European Journal of Cancer, 2018, 91, 76-85.	1.3	39
60	A Population-based Study on Lymph Node Retrieval in Patients with Esophageal Cancer: Results from the Dutch Upper Gastrointestinal Cancer Audit. Annals of Surgical Oncology, 2018, 25, 1211-1220.	0.7	39
61	The oncological and surgical safety of robot-assisted surgery in colorectal cancer: outcomes of a longitudinal prospective cohort study. Surgical Endoscopy and Other Interventional Techniques, 2019, 33, 3644-3655.	1.3	39
62	Robot assisted versus laparoscopic suturing learning curve in a simulated setting. Surgical Endoscopy and Other Interventional Techniques, 2020, 34, 3679-3689.	1.3	39
63	Pancreatitis of biliary origin, optimal timing of cholecystectomy (PONCHO trial): study protocol for a randomized controlled trial. Trials, 2012, 13, 225.	0.7	38
64	Intrathoracic versus Cervical ANastomosis after minimally invasive esophagectomy for esophageal cancer: study protocol of the ICAN randomized controlled trial. Trials, 2016, 17, 505.	0.7	37
65	The feeding route after esophagectomy: a review of literature. Journal of Thoracic Disease, 2017, 9, S785-S791.	0.6	37
66	The impact of pain on daily activities following open mesh inguinal hernia repair. Hernia: the Journal of Hernias and Abdominal Wall Surgery, 2008, 12, 153-157.	0.9	36
67	Metastatic pattern in esophageal and gastric cancer: Influenced by site and histology. World Journal of Gastroenterology, 2020, 26, 6037-6046.	1.4	36
68	Hernia repair in elderly patients under unmonitored local anaesthesia is feasible. Hernia: the Journal of Hernias and Abdominal Wall Surgery, 2005, 9, 218-222.	0.9	35
69	Isosorbide dinitrate ointment vs botulinum toxin <scp>A</scp> (<scp>D</scp>ysport^{Â®}) as the primary treatment for chronic anal fissure: a randomized multicentre study. Colorectal Disease, 2014, 16, O360-6.	0.7	34
70	Long-term outcome after randomizing prolene hernia system, mesh plug repair and lichtenstein for inguinal hernia repair. Hernia: the Journal of Hernias and Abdominal Wall Surgery, 2015, 19, 77-81.	0.9	34
71	Randomized clinical trial of biodegradeable intraluminal sheath to prevent anastomotic leak after stapled colorectal anastomosis. British Journal of Surgery, 2017, 104, 1010-1019.	0.1	33
72	Clinical response after laparoscopic fenestration of symptomatic hepatic cysts: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Surgical Endoscopy and Other Interventional Techniques, 2019, 33, 691-704.	1.3	33

#	Article	IF	Citations
73	To eat or not to eat: Facilitating early oral intake after elective colonic surgery in the Netherlands. Clinical Nutrition, 2009, 28, 29-33.	2.3	31
74	The long-term effects of early oral feeding following minimal invasive esophagectomy. Ecological Management and Restoration, 2018, 31, 1-8.	0.2	30
75	Management of resectable esophageal and gastric (mixed adeno)neuroendocrine carcinoma: A nationwide cohort study. European Journal of Surgical Oncology, 2018, 44, 1955-1962.	0.5	29
76	Early Angiopoietin-2 Levels after Onset Predict the Advent of Severe Pancreatitis, Multiple Organ Failure, and Infectious Complications in Patients with Acute Pancreatitis. Journal of the American College of Surgeons, 2014, 218, 26-32.	0.2	28
77	Diagnostic criteria and symptom grading for delayed gastric conduit emptying after esophagectomy for cancer: international expert consensus based on a modified Delphi process. Ecological Management and Restoration, 2020, 33, .	0.2	28
78	Totally minimally invasive esophagectomy versus hybrid minimally invasive esophagectomy: systematic review and meta-analysis. Ecological Management and Restoration, 2020, 33, .	0.2	28
79	Learning curves in minimally invasive esophagectomy. World Journal of Gastroenterology, 2018, 24, 4974-4978.	1.4	28
80	International Variation in Surgical Practices in Units Performing Oesophagectomy for Oesophageal Cancer: A Unit Survey from the Oesophagoâ€Gastric Anastomosis Audit (OGAA). World Journal of Surgery, 2019, 43, 2874-2884.	0.8	27
81	Novel imaging techniques for intraoperative margin assessment in surgical oncology: A systematic review. International Journal of Cancer, 2021, 149, 635-645.	2.3	27
82	Selective decontamination of the digestive tract prevents secondary infection of the abdominal cavity, and endotoxemia and mortality in sterile peritonitis in laboratory rats. Critical Care Medicine, 1992, 20, 1699-1704.	0.4	26
83	PREVENTion of a parastomal hernia with a prosthetic mesh in patients undergoing permanent end-colostomy; the PREVENT-trial: study protocol for a multicenter randomized controlled trial. Trials, 2012, 13, 226.	0.7	26
84	Impact of pathological tumor response after CROSS neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy followed by surgery on long-term outcome of esophageal cancer: a population-based study. Acta OncolÃ³gica, 2021, 60, 497-504.	0.8	23
85	Effect of Intraperitoneal Antimicrobials on the Concentration of Bacteria, Endotoxin, and Tumor Necrosis Factor in Abdominal Fluid and Plasma in Rats. European Surgical Research, 1996, 28, 351-360.	0.6	22
86	Predictive factors for post-operative respiratory infections after esophagectomy for esophageal cancer: outcome of randomized trial. Journal of Thoracic Disease, 2017, 9, S861-S867.	0.6	22
87	Preferred Mesh-Based Inguinal Hernia Repair in a Teaching Setting. Archives of Surgery, 2004, 139, 1097.	2.3	21
88	A prospective cohort study to investigate cost-minimisation, of Traditional open, open fAst track recovery and laParoscopic fASt track multimodal management, for surgical patients with colon carcinomas (TAPAS study). BMC Surgery, 2010, 10, 18.	0.6	21
89	Minimally Invasive Oesophagectomy: Preliminary Results after Introduction of an Intrathoracic Anastomosis. Digestive Surgery, 2014, 31, 95-103.	0.6	20
90	Synoptic reporting increases quality of upper gastrointestinal cancer pathology reports. Virchows Archiv Fur Pathologische Anatomie Und Physiologie Und Fur Klinische Medizin, 2019, 475, 255-259.	1.4	20

#	Article	IF	Citations
91	Surgeon Volume and Surgeon Age in Relation to Proficiency Gain Curves for Prognosis Following Surgery for Esophageal Cancer. Annals of Surgical Oncology, 2019, 26, 497-505.	0.7	20
92	Early diagnosis is associated with improved clinical outcomes in benign esophageal perforation: an individual patient data meta-analysis. Surgical Endoscopy and Other Interventional Techniques, 2021, 35, 3492-3505.	1.3	20
93	Local Treatment of Generalised Peritonitis in Rats; Effects on Bacteria, Endotoxin and Mortality. The European Journal of Surgery, 1999, 165, 1072-1079.	1.0	19
94	Physical ExeRcise Following Esophageal Cancer Treatment (PERFECT) study: design of a randomized controlled trial. BMC Cancer, 2017, 17, 552.	1.1	18
95	The Influence of Age on Complications and Overall Survival After Ivor Lewis Totally Minimally Invasive Esophagectomy. Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery, 2019, 23, 1293-1300.	0.9	18
96	Postoperative Complications and Long-Term Quality of Life After Multimodality Treatment for Esophageal Cancer: An Analysis of the Prospective Observational Cohort Study of Esophageal-Gastric Cancer Patients (POCOP). Annals of Surgical Oncology, 2021, 28, 7259-7276.	0.7	18
97	Mortality from esophagectomy for esophageal cancer across low, middle, and high-income countries: An international cohort study. European Journal of Surgical Oncology, 2021, 47, 1481-1488.	0.5	18
98	Can topical negative pressure be used to control complex enterocutaneous fistulae?. Journal of Wound Care, 2003, 12, 343-345.	0.5	17
99	Life and death of the nasogastric tube in elective colonic surgery in the Netherlands. Clinical Nutrition, 2009, 28, 26-28.	2.3	17
100	Electromagnetic-Guided Bedside Placement of Nasoenteral Feeding Tubes by Nurses Is Non-Inferior to Endoscopic Placement by Gastroenterologists: A Multicenter Randomized Controlled Trial. American Journal of Gastroenterology, 2016, 111, 1123-1132.	0.2	16
101	Treatment of anastomotic leakage after rectal cancer resection: The TENTACLEâ€“Rectum study. Colorectal Disease, 2021, 23, 982-988.	0.7	16
102	Construct Validity of a Serious Game for Laparoscopic Skills Training: Validation Study. JMIR Serious Games, 2020, 8, e17222.	1.7	16
103	Improved quality of care for patients undergoing an abdominoperineal excision for rectal cancer. European Journal of Surgical Oncology, 2015, 41, 201-207.	0.5	15
104	Association Analysis of Genetic Variants in the Myosin IXB Gene in Acute Pancreatitis. PLoS ONE, 2013, 8, e85870.	1.1	14
105	Study protocol for the nutritional route in oesophageal resection trial: a single-arm feasibility trial (NUTRIENT trial). BMJ Open, 2014, 4, e004557-e004557.	0.8	14
106	Outcomes of Patients with Anastomotic Leakage After Transhiatal, McKeown or Ivor Lewis Esophagectomy: A Nationwide Cohort Study. World Journal of Surgery, 2021, 45, 3341-3349.	0.8	14
107	Resection of hepatic and pulmonary metastasis from metastatic esophageal and gastric cancer: a nationwide study. Ecological Management and Restoration, 2019, 32, .	0.2	13
108	Learning Curves of Ivor Lewis Totally Minimally Invasive Esophagectomy by Hospital and Surgeon Characteristics. Annals of Surgery, 2022, 275, 911-918.	2.1	13

#	Article	IF	Citations
109	Diagnosis and Treatment of Acute Appendicitis in Children: A Survey Among Dutch Surgeons and Comparison with Evidence-based Practice. World Journal of Surgery, 2006, 30, 512-518.	0.8	12
110	Supervised exercise after oesophageal cancer surgery: the PERFECT multicentre randomized clinical trial. British Journal of Surgery, 2021, 108, 786-796.	0.1	12
111	Textbook outcome following oesophagectomy for cancer: international cohort study. British Journal of Surgery, 2022, 109, 439-449.	0.1	12
112	Determinants of improved survival after oesophagectomy for cancer. British Journal of Surgery, 2015, 102, 668-675.	0.1	11
113	Added value of 3D-vision during robotic pancreatoduodenectomy anastomoses in biotissue (LAEBOT) Tj ETQq1 1 0.784314 rgBT /Ove Techniques, 2021, 35, 2928-2935.	1.3	11
114	Transanal Endoscopic Microsurgery with or without Completion Total Mesorectal Excision for T2 and T3 Rectal Carcinoma. Digestive Surgery, 2019, 36, 76-82.	0.6	10
115	Evolution of the surgical technique of minimally invasive Ivor-Lewis esophagectomy: description according to the IDEAL framework. Ecological Management and Restoration, 2019, 32, .	0.2	10
116	Assessment of validity evidence for the RobotiX robot assisted surgery simulator on advanced suturing tasks. BMC Surgery, 2020, 20, 183.	0.6	10
117	Outcomes of curative esophageal cancer surgery in elderly: A meta-analysis. World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology, 2021, 13, 131-146.	0.8	10
118	Performance with robotic surgery versus 3D- and 2DÂłaparoscopy during pancreatic and biliary anastomoses in a biotissue model: pooled analysis of two randomized trials. Surgical Endoscopy and Other Interventional Techniques, 2022, 36, 4518-4528.	1.3	10
119	Controlled mechanical ventilation to detect regional lymph node metastases in esophageal cancer using USPIO-enhanced MRI; comparison of image quality. Magnetic Resonance Imaging, 2020, 74, 258-265.	1.0	9
120	Prognostic value of patient-reported quality of life for survival in oesophagogastric cancer: analysis from the population-based POCOP study. Gastric Cancer, 2021, 24, 1203-1212.	2.7	9
121	Postoperative intensive care unit stay after minimally invasive esophagectomy shows large hospital variation. Results from the Dutch Upper Gastrointestinal Cancer Audit. European Journal of Surgical Oncology, 2021, 47, 1961-1968.	0.5	9
122	Severity of oEsophageal Anastomotic Leak in patients after oesophagectomy: the SEAL score. British Journal of Surgery, 2022, 109, 864-871.	0.1	9
123	Identifying Biomarkers in Lymph Node Metastases of Esophageal Adenocarcinoma for Tumor-Targeted Imaging. Molecular Diagnosis and Therapy, 2020, 24, 191-200.	1.6	8
124	Technique of open and minimally invasive intrathoracic reconstruction following esophagectomyâ€"an expert consensus based on a modified Delphi process. Ecological Management and Restoration, 2021, 34, .	0.2	8
125	European consensus on essential steps of Minimally Invasive Ivor Lewis and McKeown Esophagectomy through Delphi methodology. Surgical Endoscopy and Other Interventional Techniques, 2022, 36, 446-460.	1.3	8
126	Impact of nationwide centralization of oesophageal, gastric, and pancreatic surgery on travel distance and experienced burden in the Netherlands. European Journal of Surgical Oncology, 2022, 48, 348-355.	0.5	8

#	Article	IF	Citations
127	Electromagnetic guided bedside or endoscopic placement of nasoenteral feeding tubes in surgical patients (CORE trial): study protocol for a randomized controlled trial. Trials, 2015, 16, 119.	0.7	7
128	Predicting lymph node metastases with endoscopic resection in cT2N0M0 oesophageal cancer: A systematic review and metaâ€analysis. United European Gastroenterology Journal, 2020, 8, 35-43.	1.6	7
129	Age-specific incidence, treatment, and survival trends in esophageal cancer: a Dutch population-based cohort study. Acta OncolÃ³gica, 2022, 61, 545-552.	0.8	7
130	The Fun Factor: Does Serious Gaming Affect the Volume of Voluntary Laparoscopic Skills Training?. World Journal of Surgery, 2021, 45, 66-71.	0.8	6
131	Management of complex ventral hernias: results of an international survey. BJS Open, 2021, 5, .	0.7	6
132	How can robot-assisted surgery provide value for money?. BMJ Surgery, Interventions, and Health Technologies, 2021, 3, e000042.	0.6	6
133	Anastomotic leak following oesophagectomy: research priorities from an international Delphi consensus study. British Journal of Surgery, 2021, 108, 66-73.	0.1	6
134	Shrinkage versus fragmentation response in neoadjuvantly treated oesophageal adenocarcinoma: significant prognostic relevance. Histopathology, 2022, , .	1.6	6
135	Selective Decontamination of the Digestive Tract in Hepatobiliary Surgery: A Concept. HPB Surgery, 1990, 2, 1-5.	2.2	5
136	Fit-for-Discharge Criteria after Esophagectomy: An International Expert Delphi Consensus. Ecological Management and Restoration, 2020, 34, .	0.2	5
137	Changes in hospital variation in the probability of receiving treatment with curative intent for esophageal and gastric cancer. Cancer Epidemiology, 2021, 71, 101897.	0.8	5
138	Treatment of anastomotic leak after esophagectomy: insights of an international case vignette survey and expert discussions. Ecological Management and Restoration, 2022, , .	0.2	5
139	The PROPATRIA trial: best practices at the time were followed. Lancet, The, 2010, 375, 1249-1250.	6.3	4
140	Altered Cortical Responsiveness to Pain Stimuli after High Frequency Electrical Stimulation of the Skin in Patients with Persistent Pain after Inguinal Hernia Repair. PLoS ONE, 2013, 8, e82701.	1.1	4
141	Comparison of short-term outcomes from the International Oesophago-Gastric Anastomosis Audit (OGAA), the Esophagectomy Complications Consensus Group (ECCG), and the Dutch Upper Gastrointestinal Cancer Audit (DUCA). BJS Open, 2021, 5, .	0.7	4
142	Selective Decontamination of the Digestive Tract to Prevent Postoperative Pneumonia and Anastomotic Leakage after Esophagectomy: A Retrospective Cohort Study. Antibiotics, 2021, 10, 43.	1.5	4
143	Factors contributing to variation in the use of multimodality treatment in patients with gastric cancer: A Dutch population based study. European Journal of Surgical Oncology, 2018, 44, 260-267.	0.5	3
144	Extent and consequences of lymphadenectomy in oesophageal cancer surgery: case vignette survey. BMJ Surgery, Interventions, and Health Technologies, 2020, 2, e000026.	0.6	3

#	Article	IF	Citations
145	Response to the Comment on â€œLearning Curves of Ivor Lewis Totally Minimally Invasive Esophagectomy by Hospital and Surgeon Characteristics a Retrospective Multi-national Cohort Studyâ€• Annals of Surgery, 2021, 274, e930.	2.1	3
146	A young female with severe upper abdominal pain and profuse vomiting. European Respiratory Journal, 2005, 26, 1188-1190.	3.1	2
147	Colicky pain and related complications after cholecystectomy for mild gallstone pancreatitis. Hpb, 2018, 20, 745-751.	0.1	2
148	EARLY DIAGNOSIS IS ASSOCIATED WITH IMPROVED CLINICAL OUTCOME IN BENIGN ESOPHAGEAL PERFORATIONS: AN INDIVIDUAL PATIENT DATA META-ANALYSIS. , 2019, 51, .		2
149	Age and Charlson Comorbidity Index score are not independent risk factors for severe complications after curative esophagectomy for esophageal cancer: a Dutch population-based cohort study. Surgical Oncology, 2022, 43, 101789.	0.8	2
150	Reply. Journal of the American College of Surgeons, 2014, 218, 1075.	0.2	1
151	PS01.202: MANAGEMENT OF RESECTABLE ESOPHAGEAL AND GASTRIC (MIXED ADENO)NEUROENDOCRINE CARCINOMA: A NATIONWIDE COHORT STUDY. Ecological Management and Restoration, 2018, 31, 107-107.	0.2	1
152	FA04.06: RESECTION OF HEPATIC AND PULMONARY METASTASIS FROM ESOPHAGEAL AND GASTRIC CANCER: A NATIONWIDE STUDY. Ecological Management and Restoration, 2018, 31, 9-9.	0.2	1
153	Sa1247 EARLY DIAGNOSIS IS ASSOCIATED WITH IMPROVED CLINICAL OUTCOME IN BENIGN ESOPHAGEAL PERFORATIONS: AN INDIVIDUAL PATIENT DATA META-ANALYSIS. Gastrointestinal Endoscopy, 2019, 89, AB186-AB187.	0.5	1
154	Training benchmarks based on validated composite scores for the RobotiX robot-assisted surgery simulator on basic tasks. Journal of Robotic Surgery, 2021, 15, 69-79.	1.0	1
155	Randomized clinical trial on the effect of a supervised exercise program on quality of life, fatigue, and fitness following esophageal cancer treatment (PERFECT study).. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 2020, 38, 12055-12055.	0.8	1
156	Postoperative outcomes in oesophagectomy with trainee involvement. BJS Open, 2021, 5, .	0.7	1
157	Treatment decisionâ€making during outpatient clinic visit of patients with esophagogastric cancer. The perspectives of clinicians and patients, a mixed method, multiple case study. Cancer Medicine, 2022, , .	1.3	1
158	Clinical variation in the organization of clinical pathways in esophagogastric cancer, a mixed method multiple case study. BMC Health Services Research, 2022, 22, 527.	0.9	1
159	Coping with increasing numbers of medical students in rural clinical schools: options and opportunities. Medical Journal of Australia, 2009, 190, 101-101.	0.8	0
160	Incisional Hernia: Difficult Cases 2. Hernia: the Journal of Hernias and Abdominal Wall Surgery, 2015, 19, S105-S111.	0.9	0
161	PS01.173: MANAGEMENT OF INTRATHORACIC AND CERVICAL ANASTOMOTIC LEAKAGE AFTER ESOPHAGECTOMY FOR ESOPHAGEAL CANCER: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW. Ecological Management and Restoration, 2018, 31, 99-99.	0.2	0
162	Prospective observational cohort study of oesophagogastric cancer patients (POCOP): A Dutch nationwide cohort. Annals of Oncology, 2018, 29, viii234.	0.6	0

#	Article	IF	Citations
163	RA05.09: THE INFLUENCE OF AGE ON OVERALL SURVIVAL AND COMPLICATIONS AFTER IVOR LEWIS TOTALLY MINIMALLY INVASIVE ESOPHAGEAL SURGERY. Ecological Management and Restoration, 2018, 31, 29-29.	0.2	0
164	RA07.02: IDENTIFYING TUMOR MARKERS IN ESOPHAGEAL ADENOCARCINOMA AND LYMPH NODE METASTASES FOR TARGETED FLUORESCENCE IMAGING. Ecological Management and Restoration, 2018, 31, 34-34.	0.2	0
165	PS02.078: FEASIBILITY OF PREOPERATIVE STAGING WITH USPIO ENHANCED MRI IN PATIENTS WITH RESECTABLE ESOPHAGEAL CARCINOMA (PRECIES STUDY). Ecological Management and Restoration, 2018, 31, 142-142.	0.2	0
166	PS01.246: ESOPHAGECTOMY-SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE STRUCTURED ASSESSMENT OF TECHNICAL SKILL (E-OSATS): CONSENSUS ON ESSENTIAL STEPS THROUGH DELPHI METHODOLOGY. Ecological Management and Restoration, 2018, 31, 119-119.	0.2	0
167	Clinical response after laparoscopic fenestration of large simple hepatic cysts: a systematic review. Journal of Hepatology, 2018, 68, S629.	1.8	0
168	Author's response regarding manuscript â€˜Evolution of the surgical technique of minimally invasive Ivor-Lewis esophagectomy: description according to the IDEAL frameworkâ€™. Ecological Management and Restoration, 2019, 32, .	0.2	0
169	P42 EFFICACY OF ENDOSCOPIC TREATMENT FOR CONTAINED LEAKAGE AFTER IVOR LEWIS ESOPHAGECTOMY. Ecological Management and Restoration, 2019, 32, .	0.2	0
170	O102 FINDING FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH SAFE IMPLEMENTATION OF IVOR LEWIS TOTALLY MINIMALLY INVASIVE ESOPHAGECTOMY. Ecological Management and Restoration, 2019, 32, .	0.2	0
171	P113 ESOPHAGECTOMY-SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE STRUCTURED ASSESSMENT OF TECHNICAL SKILL (E-OSATS): CONSENSUS ON ESSENTIAL IVOR-LEWIS AND MCKEOWN STEPS TROUGH DELPHI METHODOLOGY. Ecological Management and Restoration, 2019, 32, .	0.2	0
172	P63 REQUIREMENTS FOR A NEW DIAGNOSTIC TEST TO DETECT LYMPH NODE METASTASES IN ESOPHAGEAL CANCER: A HEALTH-ECONOMIC MODELLING STUDY. Ecological Management and Restoration, 2019, 32, .	0.2	0
173	P65 USPIO-MRI FOR PRE-OPERATIVE LYMPH NODE STAGING AFTER NEOADJUVANT CHEMORADIOTHERAPY: FEASIBILITY AND VALIDATION FRAMEWORK. Ecological Management and Restoration, 2019, 32, .	0.2	0
174	P121 ESOPHAGECTOMY-SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE STRUCTURED ASSESSMENT OF TECHNICAL SKILL (E-OSATS): VALIDATION PROTOCOL. Ecological Management and Restoration, 2019, 32, .	0.2	0
175	O19 OUTCOMES OF IVOR LEWIS VERSUS MCKEOWN OESOPHAGECTOMY FOR CANCER: A PROPENSITY SCORE MATCHED ANALYSIS OF THE NETHERLANDS CANCER REGISTRY. Ecological Management and Restoration, 2019, 32, .	0.2	0
176	P204 DETECTING PATHOLOGICAL COMPLETE RESPONSE IN ESOPHAGEAL CANCER AFTER NEOADJUVANT THERAPY BASED ON IMAGING TECHNIQUES: A DIAGNOSTIC SYSTEMATIC REVIEW AND META-ANALYSIS. Ecological Management and Restoration, 2019, 32, .	0.2	0
177	442 HAS HOSPITAL VARIATION IN THE PROBABILITY OF RECEIVING TREATMENT WITH CURATIVE INTENT FOR ESOPHAGEAL AND GASTRIC CANCER DECREASED OVER TIME?. Ecological Management and Restoration, 2020, 33, .	0.2	0
178	388 TREATMENT OF ANASTOMOTIC LEAKAGE AFTER ESOPHAGECTOMY (TENTACLEâ€”ESOPHAGUS) STUDY: FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH ANASTOMOTIC LEAKAGE SEVERITY. Ecological Management and Restoration, 2020, 33, .	0.2	0
179	Commentary: endoscopic vacuum therapy for anastomotic leakage after esophagectomy and total gastrectomy: obstacles to finding true evidence. Ecological Management and Restoration, 2021, 34, .	0.2	0
180	551 INCREASED POSTOPERATIVE MORBIDITY AFTER TOTALLY MINIMALLY INVASIVE ESOPHAGECTOMY FOR CANCER IN ELDERLY PATIENTS. Ecological Management and Restoration, 2021, 34, .	0.2	0

#	Article	IF	Citations
181	734 PL11.06 PROGNOSTIC FACTORS FOR MORTALITY IN PATIENTS WITH ANASTOMOTIC LEAKAGE AFTER ESOPHAGECTOMY FOR CANCER (TENTACLEâ€"ESOPHAGUS STUDY). Ecological Management and Restoration, 2021, 34, .	0.2	0
182	388 TREATMENT OF ANASTOMOTIC LEAKAGE AFTER ESOPHAGECTOMY (TENTACLEâ€"ESOPHAGUS) STUDY: FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH ANASTOMOTIC LEAKAGE SEVERITY. Ecological Management and Restoration, 2021, 34, .	0.2	0
183	382 INTRATHORACIC VERSUS CERVICAL ANASTOMOSIS AFTER MINIMALLY INVASIVE ESOPHAGECTOMY FOR OESOPHAGEAL CANCER: A RANDOMIZED CONTROLLED TRIAL (ICAN TRIAL). Ecological Management and Restoration, 2021, 34, .	0.2	0
184	771 IMPACT OF NATIONWIDE CENTRALIZATION OF ESOPHAGEAL, GASTRIC, AND PANCREATIC SURGERY ON TRAVEL DISTANCE AND EXPERIENCED BURDEN IN THE NETHERLANDS. Ecological Management and Restoration, 2021, 34, .	0.2	0
185	679 TREATMENT OF ANASTOMOTIC LEAKAGE AFTER ESOPHAGECTOMY (TENTACLEâ€"ESOPHAGUS) STUDY: EFFICACY OF DIFFERENT INITIAL TREATMENT STRATEGIES FOR ANASTOMOTIC LEAKAGE. Ecological Management and Restoration, 2021, 34, .	0.2	0
186	130 SEVERITY OF ANASTOMOTIC LEAKAGE AFTER DIFFERENT TYPES OF ESOPHAGECTOMY: A NATIONWIDE COHORT STUDY. Ecological Management and Restoration, 2021, 34, .	0.2	0
187	Generalizability of the Results and Concerns About Leakage Rates of the ICAN Trialâ€"Reply. JAMA Surgery, 2021, , .	2.2	0
188	Intrathoracic versus cervical anastomosis after minimally invasive esophagectomy for esophageal cancer: A randomized controlled trial.. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 2020, 38, 4509-4509.	0.8	0
189	Treatment of anastomotic leakage after esophagectomy (TENTACLE study). European Journal of Surgical Oncology, 2020, 46, e25-e26.	0.5	0
190	O01â€ƒPROPHYLACTIC MESH PLACEMENT DURING FORMATION OF AN END-COLOSTOMY LONG TERM RCT ON EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY. British Journal of Surgery, 2021, 108, .	0.1	0
191	124: DETERMINING SEVERITY OF ESOPHAGEAL ANASTOMOTIC LEAK IN PATIENTS AFTER ESOPHAGECTOMY: DEVELOPMENT OF THE SEAL SCORE. Ecological Management and Restoration, 2022, 35, .	0.2	0
192	39: TREATMENT OF ANASTOMOTIC LEAKAGE AFTER ESOPHAGECTOMY (TENTACLEâ€"ESOPHAGUS) STUDY: EFFICACY OF DIFFERENT INITIAL TREATMENT STRATEGIES FOR ANASTOMOTIC LEAKAGE. Ecological Management and Restoration, 2022, 35, .	0.2	0