Brenda J Wilson

List of Publications by Year
in descending order

37 papers	609 citations	623734 14 h-index	642732 23 g-index
38 all docs	38 docs citations	38 times ranked	1076 citing authors

#	Article	IF	Citations
1	Systematic review: family history in risk assessment for common diseases. Annals of Internal Medicine, 2009, 151, 878-85.	3.9	67
2	Analyzing communication in genetic consultationsâ€"A systematic review. Patient Education and Counseling, 2015, 98, 15-33.	2.2	42
3	Public views on participating in newborn screening using genome sequencing. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2014, 22, 1248-1254.	2.8	39
4	Experiences of caregivers of children with inherited metabolic diseases: a qualitative study. Orphanet Journal of Rare Diseases, 2016, 11, 168.	2.7	38
5	The health system impact of false positive newborn screening results for medium-chain acyl-CoA dehydrogenase deficiency: a cohort study. Orphanet Journal of Rare Diseases, 2016, 11, 12.	2.7	38
6	Decision aids that support decisions about prenatal testing for Down syndrome: an environmental scan. BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making, 2015, 15, 76.	3.0	29
7	Consent for newborn screening: parentsâ€™ and health-care professionalsâ€™ experiences of consent in practice. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2016, 24, 1530-1534.	2.8	29
8	Health literacy in pregnant women facing prenatal screening may explain their intention to use a patient decision aid: a short report. BMC Research Notes, 2016, 9, 339.	1.4	26
9	Child and family experiences with inborn errors of metabolism: a qualitative interview study with representatives of patient groups. Journal of Inherited Metabolic Disease, 2016, 39, 139-147.	3.6	26
10	Use of a patient decision aid for prenatal screening for Down syndrome: what do pregnant women say?. BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth, 2017, 17, 90.	2.4	24
11	Role of Psychosocial Factors and Health Literacy in Pregnant Womenâ€™s Intention to Use a Decision Aid for Down Syndrome Screening: A Theory-Based Web Survey. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 2016, 18, e283.	4.3	21
12	Benefits and burdens of newborn screening: public understanding and decision-making. Personalized Medicine, 2014, 11, 593-607.	1.5	17
13	Australiansâ€™ perspectives on support around use of personal genomic testing: Findings from the Genioz study. European Journal of Medical Genetics, 2019, 62, 290-299.	1.3	17
14	Controversy and debate on clinical genomics sequencingâ€"paper 1: genomics is not exceptional: rigorous evaluations are necessary for clinical applications of genomic sequencing. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 2017, 92, 4-6.	5.0	16
15	Australiansâ€™ views on personal genomic testing: focus group findings from the Genioz study. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2018, 26, 1101-1112.	2.8	14
16	Australiansâ€™ views and experience of personal genomic testing: survey findings from the Genioz study. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2019, 27, 711-720.	2.8	14
17	Attitudes to incorporating genomic risk assessments into population screening programs: the importance of purpose, context and deliberation. BMC Medical Genomics, 2016, 9, 25.	1.5	12
18	What factors influence health professionals to use decision aids for Down syndrome prenatal screening?. BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth, 2016, 16, 262.	2.4	12

#	Article	IF	Citations
19	Using Newborn Screening Bloodspots for Research: Public Preferences for Policy Options. Pediatrics, 2016, 137, .	2.1	11
20	Multigene panels in prostate cancer risk assessment: a systematic review. Genetics in Medicine, 2016, 18, 535-544.	2.4	11
21	Psychosocial Factors of Health Professionalsâ€™ Intention to Use a Decision Aid for Down Syndrome Screening: Cross-Sectional Quantitative Study. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 2018, 20, e114.	4.3	11
22	Screening for impaired vision in community-dwelling adults aged 65 years and older in primary care settings. Cmaj, 2018, 190, E588-E594.	2.0	10
23	Fall prevention interventions for older community-dwelling adults: systematic reviews on benefits, harms, and patient values and preferences. Systematic Reviews, 2021, 10, 18.	5.3	10
24	Cultural differences in family communication about inherited cancer: implications for cancer genetics research. Journal of Cultural Diversity, 2013, 20, 195-201.	0.6	10
25	Supporting genetics in primary care: investigating how theory can inform professional education. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2016, 24, 1541-1546.	2.8	9
26	Pregnant womenâ€™s views on how to promote the use of a decision aid for Down syndrome prenatal screening: a theory-informed qualitative study. BMC Health Services Research, 2018, 18, 434.	2.2	9
27	Implementation science as a leadership capability to improve patient outcomes and value in healthcare. Healthcare Management Forum, 2019, 32, 307-312.	1.4	9
28	Bringing personalized medicine to the community through public engagement. Personalized Medicine, 2013, 10, 647-659.	1.5	7
29	Screening for chlamydia and/or gonorrhea in primary health care: protocol for systematic review. Systematic Reviews, 2018, 7, 248.	5.3	7
30	The Challenge of Developing Evidence-Based Genetics Health Care in Practice. Familial Cancer, 2006, 5, 55-59.	1.9	5
31	A blueprint for the next generation of ELSI research, training, and outreach in regenerative medicine. Npj Regenerative Medicine, 2017, 2, 21.	5.2	5
32	Does breast cancer genetic counselling meet women's expectations? A qualitative study. Critical Public Health, 2006, 16, 281-293.	2.4	4
33	Anticipating the primary care role in genomic medicine: expectations of genetics health professionals. Journal of Community Genetics, 2021, 12, 559-568.	1.2	4
34	Is genetic makeup a perceived health risk: analysis of a national survey of Canadians. Journal of Risk Research, 2009, 12, 223-237.	2.6	3
35	What is in a Name? Parent, Professional and Policy-Maker Conceptions of Consent-Related Language in the Context of Newborn Screening. Public Health Ethics, 2019, 12, 158-175.	1.0	2
36	Implementation of an ED surge management platform: a study protocol. Implementation Science Communications, 2022, 3, 21.	2.2	1

#	Article	IF	Citations
37	Controversy and debate on clinical genomics sequencingâ€"paper 3: response to â€œclinical genome-wide sequencing: do not throw out the baby with the bathwaterâ€. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 2017, 92, 11-12.	5.0	0