

# Solveig Hofvind

## List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: <https://exaly.com/author-pdf/7266291/publications.pdf>

Version: 2024-02-01

116  
papers

4,684  
citations

159585

30  
h-index

106344

65  
g-index

119  
all docs

119  
docs citations

119  
times ranked

3407  
citing authors

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
1	Patterns of aggressiveness: risk of progression to invasive breast cancer by mammographic features of calcifications in screen-detected ductal carcinoma in situ. <i>Acta Radiologica</i> , 2022, 63, 586-595.	1.1	1
2	True and Missed Interval Cancer in Organized Mammographic Screening: A Retrospective Review Study of Diagnostic and Prior Screening Mammograms. <i>Academic Radiology</i> , 2022, 29, S180-S191.	2.5	19
3	The relation of number of childbirths with age at natural menopause: a population study of 310 147 women in Norway. <i>Human Reproduction</i> , 2022, 37, 333-340.	0.9	5
4	Quality of life among women with symptomatic, screen-detected, and interval breast cancer, and for women without breast cancer: a retrospective cross-sectional study from Norway. <i>Quality of Life Research</i> , 2022, 31, 1057-1068.	3.1	10
5	A Warning about Warning Signals for Interpreting Mammograms. <i>Radiology</i> , 2022, 302, 284-285.	7.3	2
6	An individual participant data meta-analysis of breast cancer detection and recall rates for digital breast tomosynthesis versus digital mammography population screening. <i>Clinical Breast Cancer</i> , 2022, 22, e647-e654.	2.4	10
7	Early screening outcomes among non-immigrants and immigrants targeted by BreastScreen Norway, 2010–2019. <i>Scandinavian Journal of Public Health</i> , 2022, , 140349482210787.	2.3	1
8	Artificial Intelligence Evaluation of 122 969 Mammography Examinations from a Population-based Screening Program. <i>Radiology</i> , 2022, 303, 502-511.	7.3	44
9	Standardised or individualised X-ray tube angle for mediolateral oblique projection in digital mammography?. <i>Radiography</i> , 2022, , .	2.1	3
10	Screen-detected and interval breast cancer after concordant and discordant interpretations in a population based screening program using independent double reading. <i>European Radiology</i> , 2022, 32, 5974-5985.	4.5	5
11	Cumulative risk of a false positive screening result: A retrospective cohort study using empirical data from 10 biennial screening rounds in BreastScreen Norway. <i>Cancer</i> , 2022, 128, 1373-1380.	4.1	5
12	Participation and cancer detection after reminders versus ordinary invitations in BreastScreen Norway. <i>Journal of Medical Screening</i> , 2022, 29, 178-184.	2.3	1
13	Possible strategies for use of artificial intelligence in screen-reading of mammograms, based on retrospective data from 122,969 screening examinations. <i>European Radiology</i> , 2022, 32, 8238-8246.	4.5	21
14	Costs and Effects of Implementing Digital Tomosynthesis in a Population-Based Breast Cancer Screening Program: Predictions Using Results from the To-Be Trial in Norway. <i>Pharmacoeconomics - Open</i> , 2022, 6, 495-507.	1.8	2
15	Time of day and mammographic reader performance in a population-based breast cancer screening programme. <i>Journal of Medical Screening</i> , 2021, 28, 295-301.	2.3	2
16	Factors associated with attendance and attendance patterns in a population-based mammographic screening program. <i>Journal of Medical Screening</i> , 2021, 28, 169-176.	2.3	8
17	Radiological review of prior screening mammograms of screen-detected breast cancer. <i>European Radiology</i> , 2021, 31, 2568-2579.	4.5	18
18	Survival among women diagnosed with screen-detected or interval breast cancer classified as true, minimal signs, or missed through an informed radiological review. <i>European Radiology</i> , 2021, 31, 2677-2686.	4.5	4

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
19	Assessment of breast positioning criteria in mammographic screening: Agreement between artificial intelligence software and radiographers. <i>Journal of Medical Screening</i> , 2021, 28, 448-455.	2.3	16
20	Interval breast cancer rates for digital breast tomosynthesis versus digital mammography population screening: An individual participant data meta-analysis. <i>EClinicalMedicine</i> , 2021, 34, 100804.	7.1	17
21	Mammographic features and screening outcome in a randomized controlled trial comparing digital breast tomosynthesis and digital mammography. <i>European Journal of Radiology</i> , 2021, 141, 109753.	2.6	7
22	Can breast cancer be stopped? Modifiable risk factors of breast cancer among women with a prior benign or premalignant lesion. <i>International Journal of Cancer</i> , 2021, 149, 1247-1256.	5.1	5
23	Meta-analysis of prospective studies evaluating breast cancer detection and interval cancer rates for digital breast tomosynthesis versus mammography population screening. <i>European Journal of Cancer</i> , 2021, 148, 14-23.	2.8	32
24	Detection and significance of small and low proliferation breast cancer. <i>Journal of Medical Screening</i> , 2021, , 096914132110239.	2.3	0
25	Does it matter for the radiologists' performance whether they read short or long batches in organized mammographic screening?. <i>European Radiology</i> , 2021, 31, 9548-9555.	4.5	10
26	Digital breast tomosynthesis in a population based mammographic screening program: Breast compression and early performance measures. <i>European Journal of Radiology</i> , 2021, 139, 109665.	2.6	7
27	Interval and Subsequent Round Breast Cancer in a Randomized Controlled Trial Comparing Digital Breast Tomosynthesis and Digital Mammography Screening. <i>Radiology</i> , 2021, 300, 66-76.	7.3	21
28	Visualization of the Nipple in Profile: Does It Really Affect Selected Outcomes in Organized Mammographic Screening?. <i>Journal of Breast Imaging</i> , 2021, 3, 427-437.	1.3	4
29	Impact of Artificial Intelligence Decision Support Using Deep Learning on Breast Cancer Screening Interpretation with Single-View Wide-Angle Digital Breast Tomosynthesis. <i>Radiology</i> , 2021, 300, 529-536.	7.3	27
30	Can artificial intelligence reduce the interval cancer rate in mammography screening?. <i>European Radiology</i> , 2021, 31, 5940-5947.	4.5	44
31	Self-reported Pain Associated With Screening With Digital Breast Tomosynthesis. <i>Journal of Breast Imaging</i> , 2021, 3, 25-33.	1.3	1
32	Women's conceptual knowledge about breast cancer screening and overdiagnosis in Norway: a cross-sectional study. <i>BMJ Open</i> , 2021, 11, e052121.	1.9	1
33	Terminal digit preference: a source of measurement error in breast cancer diameter reporting. <i>Acta Oncologica</i> , 2020, 59, 260-267.	1.8	5
34	Breast compression parameters among women screened with standard digital mammography and digital breast tomosynthesis in a randomized controlled trial. <i>Acta Radiologica</i> , 2020, 61, 321-330.	1.1	7
35	Interval and Consecutive Round Breast Cancer after Digital Breast Tomosynthesis and Synthetic 2D Mammography versus Standard 2D Digital Mammography in BreastScreen Norway. <i>Radiology</i> , 2020, 294, 256-264.	7.3	55
36	Screening at stationary versus mobile units in BreastScreen Norway. <i>Journal of Medical Screening</i> , 2020, 27, 31-39.	2.3	1

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
37	Breast Cancer Mortality After Implementation of Organized Population-Based Breast Cancer Screening in Norway. <i>Journal of the National Cancer Institute</i> , 2020, 112, 839-846.	6.3	15
38	Response to Zahl. <i>Journal of the National Cancer Institute</i> , 2020, 112, 1175-1175.	6.3	0
39	Self-reported symptoms among participants in a population-based screening program. <i>Breast</i> , 2020, 54, 56-61.	2.2	3
40	Breast Cancer Screening and Diagnosis: A Synopsis of the European Breast Guidelines. <i>Annals of Internal Medicine</i> , 2020, 172, 46.	3.9	157
41	Comparing Screening Outcomes for Digital Breast Tomosynthesis and Digital Mammography by Automated Breast Density in a Randomized Controlled Trial: Results from the To-Be Trial. <i>Radiology</i> , 2020, 297, 522-531.	7.3	19
42	Number of prior negative screening outcomes does not influence future risk of breast cancer. <i>European Journal of Epidemiology</i> , 2020, 35, 549-556.	5.7	0
43	Consensus Reads: The More Sets of Eyes Interpreting a Mammogram, the Better for Women. <i>Radiology</i> , 2020, 295, 42-43.	7.3	6
44	Lower attendance rates in BreastScreen Norway among immigrants across all levels of socio-demographic factors: a population-based study. <i>Zeitschrift Fur Gesundheitswissenschaften</i> , 2019, 27, 229-240.	1.6	13
45	Menopausal hormone therapy and breast cancer risk: effect modification by body mass through life. <i>European Journal of Epidemiology</i> , 2019, 34, 267-278.	5.7	4
46	Cost differences between digital tomosynthesis and standard digital mammography in a breast cancer screening programme: results from the To-Be trial in Norway. <i>European Journal of Health Economics</i> , 2019, 20, 1261-1269.	2.8	8
47	Risk of breast cancer by prior screening results among women participating in BreastScreen Norway. <i>Cancer</i> , 2019, 125, 3330-3337.	4.1	6
48	Influence of Mammography Volume on Radiologists'™ Performance: Results from BreastScreen Norway. <i>Radiology</i> , 2019, 292, 289-296.	7.3	24
49	Screening outcome for consecutive examinations with digital breast tomosynthesis versus standard digital mammography in a population-based screening program. <i>European Radiology</i> , 2019, 29, 6991-6999.	4.5	19
50	Two-view digital breast tomosynthesis versus digital mammography in a population-based breast cancer screening programme (To-Be): a randomised, controlled trial. <i>Lancet Oncology</i> , The, 2019, 20, 795-805.	10.7	75
51	Breast compression and experienced pain during mammography by use of three different compression paddles. <i>European Journal of Radiology</i> , 2019, 115, 59-65.	2.6	11
52	Performance measures among non-immigrants and immigrants attending BreastScreen Norway: a population-based screening programme. <i>European Radiology</i> , 2019, 29, 4833-4842.	4.5	4
53	Digital Mammography versus Digital Mammography Plus Tomosynthesis in Breast Cancer Screening: The Oslo Tomosynthesis Screening Trial. <i>Radiology</i> , 2019, 291, 23-30.	7.3	115
54	Gender, letters, relatives, and God: mediating actors in mammographic screening among Pakistani women in Norway. <i>Acta Radiologica Open</i> , 2019, 8, 205846011987501.	0.6	6

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
55	A randomized controlled trial of digital breast tomosynthesis versus digital mammography in population-based screening in Bergen: interim analysis of performance indicators from the To-Be trial. <i>European Radiology</i> , 2019, 29, 1175-1186.	4.5	29
56	Digital Breast Tomosynthesis and Synthetic 2D Mammography versus Digital Mammography: Evaluation in a Population-based Screening Program. <i>Radiology</i> , 2018, 287, 787-794.	7.3	105
57	Mammographic screening attendance among immigrant and minority women: a systematic review and meta-analysis. <i>Acta Radiologica</i> , 2018, 59, 1285-1291.	1.1	32
58	The impact of compression force and pressure at prevalent screening on subsequent re-attendance in a national screening program. <i>Preventive Medicine</i> , 2018, 108, 129-136.	3.4	11
59	Validity and reliability of self-reported health indicators among women attending organized mammographic screening. <i>Scandinavian Journal of Public Health</i> , 2018, 46, 744-751.	2.3	17
60	Optimizing performance of BreastScreen Norway using value of information in graphical models. <i>Statistics in Medicine</i> , 2018, 37, 1531-1549.	1.6	1
61	Performance of breast cancer screening using digital breast tomosynthesis: results from the prospective population-based Oslo Tomosynthesis Screening Trial. <i>Breast Cancer Research and Treatment</i> , 2018, 169, 489-496.	2.5	101
62	Stage-specific incidence and survival of breast cancer in Norway: The implications of changes in coding and classification practice. <i>Breast</i> , 2018, 38, 107-113.	2.2	19
63	Lower attendance rates in immigrant versus non-immigrant women in the Norwegian Breast Cancer Screening Programme. <i>Journal of Medical Screening</i> , 2018, 25, 155-161.	2.3	31
64	Interval Breast Cancer Rates and Histopathologic Tumor Characteristics after False-Positive Findings at Mammography in a Population-based Screening Program. <i>Radiology</i> , 2018, 287, 58-67.	7.3	30
65	Breast compression parameters and mammographic density in the Norwegian Breast Cancer Screening Programme. <i>European Radiology</i> , 2018, 28, 1662-1672.	4.5	16
66	Number of Risky Lifestyle Behaviors and Breast Cancer Risk. <i>JNCI Cancer Spectrum</i> , 2018, 2, pky030.	2.9	10
67	Breast compression across consecutive examinations among females participating in BreastScreen Norway. <i>British Journal of Radiology</i> , 2018, 91, 20180209.	2.2	6
68	Automated Volumetric Analysis of Mammographic Density in a Screening Setting: Worse Outcomes for Women with Dense Breasts. <i>Radiology</i> , 2018, 288, 343-352.	7.3	35
69	Volumetric Mammographic Density, Age-Related Decline, and Breast Cancer Risk Factors in a National Breast Cancer Screening Program. <i>Cancer Epidemiology Biomarkers and Prevention</i> , 2018, 27, 1065-1074.	2.5	19
70	Comparison of subjective and fully automated methods for measuring mammographic density. <i>Acta Radiologica</i> , 2018, 59, 154-160.	1.1	9
71	Compression force and radiation dose in the Norwegian Breast Cancer Screening Program. <i>European Journal of Radiology</i> , 2017, 88, 41-46.	2.6	15
72	Parity, hormones and breast cancer subtypes - results from a large nested case-control study in a national screening program. <i>Breast Cancer Research</i> , 2017, 19, 10.	5.0	77

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
73	Compression forces used in the Norwegian Breast Cancer Screening Program. <i>British Journal of Radiology</i> , 2017, 90, 20160770.	2.2	22
74	Radiographers' opinions on radiography research in Norway – A national survey. <i>Radiography</i> , 2017, 23, 135-140.	2.1	17
75	Is breast compression associated with breast cancer detection and other early performance measures in a population-based breast cancer screening program?. <i>Breast Cancer Research and Treatment</i> , 2017, 163, 605-613.	2.5	21
76	Alcohol, Physical Activity, Smoking, and Breast Cancer Subtypes in a Large, Nested Case–Control Study from the Norwegian Breast Cancer Screening Program. <i>Cancer Epidemiology Biomarkers and Prevention</i> , 2017, 26, 1736-1744.	2.5	37
77	Menopausal hormone therapy and risk of melanoma: Do estrogens and progestins have a different role?. <i>International Journal of Cancer</i> , 2017, 141, 1763-1770.	5.1	39
78	Menopausal hormone therapy and colorectal cancer: a linkage between nationwide registries in Norway. <i>BMJ Open</i> , 2017, 7, e017639.	1.9	33
79	Overdiagnosis in Mammographic Screening because of Competing Risk of Death. <i>Cancer Epidemiology Biomarkers and Prevention</i> , 2016, 25, 759-765.	2.5	6
80	Postmenopausal hormone therapy and the risk of breast cancer in Norway. <i>International Journal of Cancer</i> , 2016, 138, 584-593.	5.1	22
81	Impact of errors in recorded compressed breast thickness measurements on volumetric density classification using <i>volpara</i> v1.5.0 software. <i>Medical Physics</i> , 2016, 43, 2870-2876.	3.0	6
82	Mode of detection: an independent prognostic factor for women with breast cancer. <i>Journal of Medical Screening</i> , 2016, 23, 89-97.	2.3	31
83	Balancing the benefits and detriments among women targeted by the Norwegian Breast Cancer Screening Program. <i>Journal of Medical Screening</i> , 2016, 23, 203-209.	2.3	7
84	Positive predictive values by mammographic density and screening mode in the Norwegian Breast Cancer Screening Program. <i>European Journal of Radiology</i> , 2016, 85, 248-254.	2.6	8
85	Cross-national comparison of screening mammography accuracy measures in U.S., Norway, and Spain. <i>European Radiology</i> , 2016, 26, 2520-2528.	4.5	47
86	Mammographic density and histopathologic characteristics of screen-detected tumors in the Norwegian Breast Cancer Screening Program. <i>Acta Radiologica Open</i> , 2015, 4, 205846011560434.	0.6	8
87	Two-View Digital Breast Tomosynthesis Screening with Synthetically Reconstructed Projection Images: Comparison with Digital Breast Tomosynthesis with Full-Field Digital Mammographic Images. <i>Radiology</i> , 2014, 271, 655-663.	7.3	286
88	Trends in aggregate cancer incidence rates in relation to screening and possible overdiagnosis: A word of caution. <i>Journal of Medical Screening</i> , 2014, 21, 24-29.	2.3	13
89	Mammographic Performance in a Population-based Screening Program: Before, during, and after the Transition from Screen-Film to Full-Field Digital Mammography. <i>Radiology</i> , 2014, 272, 52-62.	7.3	49
90	The risk of radiation-induced breast cancers due to biennial mammographic screening in women aged 50–69 years is minimal. <i>Acta Radiologica</i> , 2014, 55, 1174-1179.	1.1	29

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
91	Variation in detection of ductal carcinoma in situ during screening mammography: A survey within the International Cancer Screening Network. <i>European Journal of Cancer</i> , 2014, 50, 185-192.	2.8	58
92	Prospective trial comparing full-field digital mammography (FFDM) versus combined FFDM and tomosynthesis in a population-based screening programme using independent double reading with arbitration. <i>European Radiology</i> , 2013, 23, 2061-2071.	4.5	196
93	The cumulative risk of false-positive results in the Norwegian Breast Cancer Screening Program: Updated results. <i>Cancer</i> , 2013, 119, 3952-3958.	4.1	13
94	Comparison of Digital Mammography Alone and Digital Mammography Plus Tomosynthesis in a Population-based Screening Program. <i>Radiology</i> , 2013, 267, 47-56.	7.3	857
95	Breast cancer mortality in participants of the Norwegian Breast Cancer Screening Program. <i>Cancer</i> , 2013, 119, 3106-3112.	4.1	98
96	Organisert mammografiscreening - flere fordeler enn ulemper. <i>Tidsskrift for Den Norske Lægeforening</i> , 2013, 133, 619-620.	0.2	3
97	Breast Cancer: Missed Interval and Screening-detected Cancer at Full-Field Digital Mammography and Screen-Film Mammography—Results from a Retrospective Review. <i>Radiology</i> , 2012, 264, 378-386.	7.3	91
98	False-Positive Results in Mammographic Screening for Breast Cancer in Europe: A Literature Review and Survey of Service Screening Programmes. <i>Journal of Medical Screening</i> , 2012, 19, 57-66.	2.3	104
99	Stage-specific breast cancer incidence rates among participants and non-participants of a population-based mammographic screening program. <i>Breast Cancer Research and Treatment</i> , 2012, 135, 291-299.	2.5	46
100	Mammographic Screening Programmes in Europe: Organization, Coverage and Participation. <i>Journal of Medical Screening</i> , 2012, 19, 72-82.	2.3	142
101	Breast cancer incidence trends in Norway—explained by hormone therapy or mammographic screening?. <i>International Journal of Cancer</i> , 2012, 130, 2930-2938.	5.1	28
102	Missed and True Interval and Screen-detected Breast Cancers in a Population Based Screening Program. <i>Academic Radiology</i> , 2011, 18, 454-460.	2.5	32
103	Comparing Interval Breast Cancer Rates in Norway and North Carolina: Results and Challenges. <i>Journal of Medical Screening</i> , 2009, 16, 131-139.	2.3	26
104	Screening-detected Breast Cancers: Discordant Independent Double Reading in a Population-based Screening Program. <i>Radiology</i> , 2009, 253, 652-660.	7.3	49
105	Quality assurance of mammograms in the Norwegian Breast Cancer Screening Program. <i>European Journal of Radiography</i> , 2009, 1, 22-29.	0.2	8
106	Full-field digital mammography compared to screen film mammography in the prevalent round of a population-based screening programme: the Vestfold County Study. <i>European Radiology</i> , 2008, 18, 183-191.	4.5	92
107	Comparing Screening Mammography for Early Breast Cancer Detection in Vermont and Norway. <i>Journal of the National Cancer Institute</i> , 2008, 100, 1082-1091.	6.3	82
108	Incidence and tumor characteristics of breast cancer diagnosed before and after implementation of a population-based screening-program. <i>Acta Oncologica</i> , 2008, 47, 225-231.	1.8	42

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
109	Breast cancer screening – prevalence of disease in women who only respond after an invitation reminder. <i>Journal of Medical Screening</i> , 2007, 14, 21-22.	2.3	8
110	Randomized Trial of Screen-Film versus Full-Field Digital Mammography with Soft-Copy Reading in Population-based Screening Program: Follow-up and Final Results of Oslo II Study. <i>Radiology</i> , 2007, 244, 708-717.	7.3	205
111	Using the European guidelines to evaluate the Norwegian Breast Cancer Screening Program. <i>European Journal of Epidemiology</i> , 2007, 22, 447-455.	5.7	105
112	Number and characteristics of breast cancer cases diagnosed in four periods in the screening interval of a biennial population-based screening programme. <i>Journal of Medical Screening</i> , 2006, 13, 192-196.	2.3	17
113	Use of hormone therapy and risk of breast cancer detected at screening and between mammographic screens. <i>International Journal of Cancer</i> , 2006, 118, 3112-3117.	5.1	30
114	Influence of Review Design on Percentages of Missed Interval Breast Cancers: Retrospective Study of Interval Cancers in a Population-based Screening Program. <i>Radiology</i> , 2005, 237, 437-443.	7.3	55
115	The cumulative risk of a false-positive recall in the Norwegian Breast Cancer Screening Program. <i>Cancer</i> , 2004, 101, 1501-1507.	4.1	92
116	Do the results of the process indicators in the Norwegian breast cancer screening program predict future mortality reduction from breast cancer?. <i>Acta OncolÅ³gica</i> , 2004, 43, 467-473.	1.8	24