Lidewij Henneman

List of Publications by Year
in descending order

127	4,298	117619	133244
papers	citations	34 h-index	59 g-index

136	136	136	3804
all docs	docs citations	times ranked	citing authors

#	Article	IF	Citations
1	Non-invasive prenatal testing for aneuploidy and beyond: challenges of responsible innovation in prenatal screening. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2015, 23, 1438-1450.	2.8	260
2	Responsible implementation of expanded carrier screening. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2016, 24, e1-e12.	2.8	240
3	TRIDENT-2: National Implementation of Genome-wide Non-invasive Prenatal Testing as a First-Tier Screening Test in the Netherlands. American Journal of Human Genetics, 2019, 105, 1091-1101.	6.2	222
4	Deficiency of knowledge of genetics and genetic tests among general practitioners, gynecologists, and pediatricians: A global problem. Genetics in Medicine, 2005, 7, 605-610.	2.4	196
5	Preconceptional genetic carrier testing and the commercial offer directly-to-consumers. Human Reproduction, 2011, 26, 972-977.	0.9	124
6	Trial by Dutch laboratories for evaluation of nonâ€invasive prenatal testing. Part Iâ€”clinical impact. Prenatal Diagnosis, 2016, 36, 1083-1090.	2.3	122
7	Public Experiences, Knowledge and Expectations about Medical Genetics and the Use of Genetic Information. Public Health Genomics, 2004, 7, 33-43.	1.0	113
8	Genetic educational needs and the role of genetics in primary care: a focus group study with multiple perspectives. BMC Family Practice, 2011, 12, 5.	2.9	106
9	Public attitudes towards genetic testing revisited: comparing opinions between 2002 and 2010. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2013, 21, 793-799.	2.8	103
10	Attitudes of pregnant women and male partners towards non-invasive prenatal testing and widening the scope of prenatal screening. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2014, 22, 1345-1350.	2.8	93
11	Using family history information to promote healthy lifestyles and prevent diseases; a discussion of the evidence. BMC Public Health, 2010, 10, 248.	2.9	89
12	Origin and clinical relevance of chromosomal aberrations other than the common trisomies detected by genome-wide NIPS: results of the TRIDENT study. Genetics in Medicine, 2018, 20, 480-485.	2.4	85
13	Presenting health risk information in different formats: The effect on participantsâ€™ cognitive and emotional evaluation and decisions. Patient Education and Counseling, 2008, 73, 443-447.	2.2	81
14	Public Attitudes Toward Genetic Testing: Perceived Benefits and Objections. Genetic Testing and Molecular Biomarkers, 2006, 10, 139-145.	1.7	71
15	Impact of Communicating Familial Risk of Diabetes on Illness Perceptions and Self-Reported Behavioral Outcomes. Diabetes Care, 2009, 32, 597-599.	8.6	65
16	Trial by Dutch laboratories for evaluation of nonâ€invasive prenatal testing. Part IIâ€”women's perspectives. Prenatal Diagnosis, 2016, 36, 1091-1098.	2.3	62
17	International perspectives on the implementation of reproductive carrier screening. Prenatal Diagnosis, 2020, 40, 301-310.	2.3	60
18	Deficient knowledge of genetics relevant for daily practice among medical students nearing graduation. Genetics in Medicine, 2005, 7, 295-301.	2.4	58

#	Article	IF	Citations
19	NIPT-based screening for Down syndrome and beyond: what do pregnant women think?. Prenatal Diagnosis, 2015, 35, 598-604.	2.3	58
20	Preferences for prenatal tests for Down syndrome: an international comparison of the views of pregnant women and health professionals. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2016, 24, 968-975.	2.8	56
21	Implementing non-invasive prenatal testing for aneuploidy in a national healthcare system: global challenges and national solutions. BMC Health Services Research, 2017, 17, 670.	2.2	55
22	The Emergence and Global Spread of Noninvasive Prenatal Testing. Annual Review of Genomics and Human Genetics, 2021, 22, 309-338.	6.2	53
23	Public attitudes towards preventive genomics and personal interest in genetic testing to prevent disease: a survey study. European Journal of Public Health, 2014, 24, 768-775.	0.3	51
24	Prioritization of future genetics education for general practitioners: a Delphi study. Genetics in Medicine, 2012, 14, 323-329.	2.4	49
25	â€˜A Low Risk Is Still a Riskâ€™: Exploring Womenâ€™s Attitudes towards Genetic Testing for Breast Cancer Susceptibility in Order to Target Disease Prevention. Public Health Genomics, 2011, 14, 238-247.	1.0	47
26	Three-month follow-up of Western and non-Western participants in a study on preconceptional ancestry-based carrier couple screening for cystic fibrosis and hemoglobinopathies in the Netherlands. Genetics in Medicine, 2008, 10, 820-830.	2.4	45
27	Reflecting on Earlier Experiences with Unsolicited Findings: Points to Consider for Nextâ€Generation Sequencing and Informed Consent in Diagnostics. Human Mutation, 2013, 34, 1322-1328.	2.5	45
28	What Do Parents of Children with Down Syndrome Think about Nonâ€Invasive Prenatal Testing (NIPT)?. Journal of Genetic Counseling, 2017, 26, 522-531.	1.6	43
29	Preconceptional ancestry-based carrier couple screening for cystic fibrosis and haemoglobinopathies: what determines the intention to participate or not and actual participation?. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2009, 17, 999-1009.	2.8	42
30	Women's Experience with Nonâ€Invasive Prenatal Testing and Emotional Wellâ€being and Satisfaction after Testâ€Results. Journal of Genetic Counseling, 2017, 26, 1348-1356.	1.6	42
31	Advantages of expanded universal carrier screening: what is at stake?. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2017, 25, 17-21.	2.8	41
32	Sustained effects of online genetics education: a randomized controlled trial on oncogenetics. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2014, 22, 310-316.	2.8	40
33	Clinical impact of additional findings detected by genome-wide non-invasive prenatal testing: Follow-up results of the TRIDENT-2 study. American Journal of Human Genetics, 2022, 109, 1140-1152.	6.2	39
34	Opinions of maternity care professionals and other stakeholders about integration of maternity care: a qualitative study in the Netherlands. BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth, 2016, 16, 188.	2.4	38
35	Offering Preconceptional Cystic Fibrosis Carrier Couple Screening in the Absence of Established Preconceptional Care Services. Public Health Genomics, 2003, 6, 5-13.	1.0	36
36	Stakeholder perspectives on the implementation of genetic carrier screening in a changing landscape. BMC Health Services Research, 2017, 17, 146.	2.2	36

#	Article	IF	Citations
37	Informed consent for exome sequencing in diagnostics: exploring first experiences and views of professionals and patients. Clinical Genetics, 2014, 85, 417-422.	2.0	35
38	Preconceptional Cystic Fibrosis Carrier Screening: Attitudes and Intentions of the Target Population. Genetic Testing and Molecular Biomarkers, 2004, 8, 80-89.	1.7	34
39	Consanguineous marriage and reproductive risk: attitudes and understanding of ethnic groups practising consanguinity in Western society. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2014, 22, 452-457.	2.8	34
40	Developing a framework for implementation of genetic services: learning from examples of testing for monogenic forms of common diseases. Journal of Community Genetics, 2014, 5, 337-347.	1.2	33
41	Evaluation of cystic fibrosis carrier screening programs according to genetic screening criteria. Genetics in Medicine, 2002, 4, 241-249.	2.4	32
42	Effectiveness of oncogenetics training on general practitionersâ€™ consultation skills: a randomized controlled trial. Genetics in Medicine, 2014, 16, 45-52.	2.4	32
43	Clinical geneticistsâ€™ and genetic counselorsâ€™ views on the communication of genetic risks: A qualitative study. Patient Education and Counseling, 2008, 73, 42-49.	2.2	31
44	Targeted carrier screening for four recessive disorders: High detection rate within a founder population. European Journal of Medical Genetics, 2015, 58, 123-128.	1.3	31
45	Factors for successful implementation of population-based expanded carrier screening: learning from existing initiatives: Table 1. European Journal of Public Health, 2016, 27, ckw110.	0.3	31
46	Attitudes of Potential Providers Towards Preconceptional Cystic Fibrosis Carrier Screening. Journal of Genetic Counseling, 2004, 13, 31-44.	1.6	30
47	Neonatal and carrier screening for rare diseases: how innovation challenges screening criteria worldwide. Journal of Community Genetics, 2021, 12, 257-265.	1.2	30
48	Effect of Comprehensive Oncogenetics Training Interventions for General Practitioners, Evaluated at Multiple Performance Levels. PLoS ONE, 2015, 10, e0122648.	2.5	29
49	Changing to NIPT as a first-tier screening test and future perspectives: opinions of health professionals. Prenatal Diagnosis, 2015, 35, 1316-1323.	2.3	28
50	Attitudes of the general population towards preconception expanded carrier screening for autosomal recessive disorders including inborn errors of metabolism. Molecular Genetics and Metabolism, 2019, 126, 14-22.	1.1	28
51	Maternal Plasma DNA and RNA Sequencing for Prenatal Testing. Advances in Clinical Chemistry, 2016, 74, 63-102.	3.7	25
52	Attitudes of cystic fibrosis patients and parents toward carrier screening and related reproductive issues. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2016, 24, 506-512.	2.8	25
53	Parentsâ€™ Perspectives and Societal Acceptance of Implementation of Newborn Screening for SCID in the Netherlands. Journal of Clinical Immunology, 2021, 41, 99-108.	3.8	25
54	Uptake of fetal aneuploidy screening after the introduction of the nonâ€invasive prenatal test: A national populationâ€based register study. Acta Obstetricia Et Gynecologica Scandinavica, 2021, 100, 1265-1272.	2.8	25

#	Article	IF	Citations
55	Noninvasive Prenatal Test Results Indicative of Maternal Malignancies: A Nationwide Genetic and Clinical Follow-Up Study. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 2022, 40, 2426-2435.	1.6	23
56	Psychological factors associated with the intention to choose for risk-reducing mastectomy in family cancer clinic attendees. Breast, 2016, 30, 66-72.	2.2	22
57	Do people from the Jewish community prefer ancestry-based or pan-ethnic expanded carrier screening?. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2016, 24, 171-177.	2.8	21
58	Introduction of non-invasive prenatal testing as a first-tier aneuploidy screening test: A survey among Dutch midwives about their role as counsellors. Midwifery, 2018, 56, 1-8.	2.3	20
59	Family history of diabetes: exploring perceptions of people at risk in the Netherlands. Preventing Chronic Disease, 2009, 6, A54.	3.4	20
60	A decade of molecular genetic testing for MODY: a retrospective study of utilization in The Netherlands. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2015, 23, 29-33.	2.8	19
61	Dilemma of Reporting Incidental Findings in Newborn Screening Programs for SCID: Parentsâ€™ Perspective on Ataxia Telangiectasia. Frontiers in Immunology, 2019, 10, 2438.	4.8	19
62	Do Health Professionals Need Additional Competencies for Stratified Cancer Prevention Based on Genetic Risk Profiling?. Journal of Personalized Medicine, 2015, 5, 191-212.	2.5	18
63	Preconception carrier screening for multiple disorders: evaluation of a screening offer in a Dutch founder population. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2018, 26, 166-175.	2.8	18
64	Routinization of prenatal screening with theÂnon-invasive prenatal test: pregnant womenâ€™s perspectives. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2022, 30, 661-668.	2.8	18
65	Developing and optimizing a decisional instrument using self-reported ancestry for carrier screening in a multi-ethnic society. Genetics in Medicine, 2006, 8, 502-509.	2.4	17
66	Design of the BRISC study: a multicentre controlled clinical trial to optimize the communication of breast cancer risks in genetic counselling. BMC Cancer, 2008, 8, 283.	2.6	17
67	The Gen-Equip Project: evaluation and impact of genetics e-learning resources for primary care in six European languages. Genetics in Medicine, 2019, 21, 718-726.	2.4	17
68	How Should Preconceptional Cystic Fibrosis Carrier Screening Be Provided? Opinions of Potential Providers and the Target Population. Public Health Genomics, 2003, 6, 157-165.	1.0	16
69	Autosomal recessive disease in children of consanguineous parents: inferences from the proportion of compound heterozygotes. Journal of Community Genetics, 2010, 1, 37-40.	1.2	16
70	Lay perceptions of predictive testing for diabetes based on DNA test results versus family history assessment: a focus group study. BMC Public Health, 2011, 11, 535.	2.9	16
71	Current and Best Practices of Genetic Testing for Maturity Onset Diabetes of the Young: Views of Professional Experts. Public Health Genomics, 2015, 18, 52-59.	1.0	16
72	Uptake of prenatal diagnostic testing for retinoblastoma compared to other hereditary cancer syndromes in the Netherlands. Familial Cancer, 2017, 16, 271-277.	1.9	16

#	Article	IF	Citations
73	Association between low fetal fraction in cellâ€free DNA testing and adverse pregnancy outcome: A systematic review. Prenatal Diagnosis, 2021, 41, 1287-1295.	2.3	16
74	Do consanguineous parents of a child affected by an autosomal recessive disease have more DNA identical-by-descent than similarly-related parents with healthy offspring? Design of a case-control study. BMC Medical Genetics, 2010, 11, 113.	2.1	15
75	Nonâ€invasive prenatal test uptake in socioeconomically disadvantaged neighborhoods. Prenatal Diagnosis, 2021, 41, 1395-1400.	2.3	15
76	Present to future: what the reasons for declining firstâ€trimester combined testing tell us about accepting or declining cellâ€free DNA testing. Prenatal Diagnosis, 2016, 36, 587-590.	2.3	14
77	Recontacting in light of new genetic diagnostic techniques for patients with intellectual disability: Feasibility and parental perspectives. European Journal of Medical Genetics, 2018, 61, 213-218.	1.3	14
78	Non-invasive prenatal testing for aneuploidy and beyond: challenges of responsible innovation in prenatal screening. Summary and recommendations. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2015, , .	2.8	13
79	A genetic diagnosis of maturityâ€onset diabetes of the young (<scp>MODY</scp>): experiences of patients and family members. Diabetic Medicine, 2015, 32, 1385-1392.	2.3	13
80	Couplesâ€™ experiences with expanded carrier screening: evaluation of a university hospital screening offer. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2021, 29, 1252-1258.	2.8	13
81	Low fetal fraction in cellâ€free DNA testing is associated with adverse pregnancy outcome: Analysis of a subcohort of the TRIDENTâ€2 study. Prenatal Diagnosis, 2021, 41, 1296-1304.	2.3	13
82	Expanding Neonatal Bloodspot Screening: A Multi-Stakeholder Perspective. Frontiers in Pediatrics, 2021, 9, 706394.	1.9	13
83	'A morass of considerations': exploring attitudes towards ethnicity-based haemoglobinopathy-carrier screening in primary care. Family Practice, 2013, 30, 604-610.	1.9	12
84	Screening for Familial Hypercholesterolemia in Children: What Can We Learn From Adult Screening Programs?. Healthcare (Switzerland), 2015, 3, 1018-1030.	2.0	12
85	First steps in exploring prospective exome sequencing of consanguineous couples. European Journal of Medical Genetics, 2014, 57, 613-616.	1.3	11
86	Preconception expanded carrier screening: Impact of information presented by text or video on genetic knowledge and attitudes. Journal of Genetic Counseling, 2021, 30, 457-469.	1.6	11
87	Informing Parents about Newborn Screening: A European Comparison Study. International Journal of Neonatal Screening, 2021, 7, 13.	3.2	11
88	Challenges in the care for consanguineous couples: an exploratory interview study among general practitioners and midwives. BMC Family Practice, 2012, 13, 105.	2.9	10
89	The effectiveness of a graphical presentation in addition to a frequency format in the context of familial breast cancer risk communication: a multicenter controlled trial. BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making, 2013, 13, 55.	3.0	10
90	Consanguinity and Endogamy in the Netherlands: Demographic and Medical Genetic Aspects. Human Heredity, 2014, 77, 161-166.	0.8	10

#	Article	IF	Citations
91	Women's decision making regarding prenatal screening for fetal aneuploidy: A qualitative comparison between 2003 and 2016. Midwifery, 2018, 64, 93-100.	2.3	10
92	Informing relatives at risk of inherited cardiac conditions: experiences and attitudes of healthcare professionals and counselees. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2019, 27, 1341-1350.	2.8	10
93	Who ever heard of 16p11.2 deletion syndrome? Parentsâ€™ perspectives on a susceptibility copy number variation syndrome. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2020, 28, 1196-1204.	2.8	10
94	Attitudes of general practitioners and midwives towards ethnicity-based haemoglobinopathy-carrier screening. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2012, 20, 1112-1117.	2.8	9
95	What do people want to know about NIPT? Content analysis of questions emailed to national NIPT information websites. Prenatal Diagnosis, 2017, 37, 412-415.	2.3	8
96	Non-invasive prenatal testing (NIPT) and pregnant womenâ€™s views on good motherhood: a qualitative study. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2021, , .	2.8	7
97	Nationwide implementation of the non-invasive prenatal test: Evaluation of a blended learning program for counselors. PLoS ONE, 2022, 17, e0267865.	2.5	7
98	Views of patients and parents of children with genetic disorders on populationâ€based expanded carrier screening. Prenatal Diagnosis, 0, , .	2.3	7
99	Attitudes of cystic fibrosis patients and their parents towards direct-to-consumer genetic testing for carrier status. Personalized Medicine, 2015, 12, 99-107.	1.5	6
100	Mothers' Views on Longer Storage of Neonatal Dried Blood Spots for Specific Secondary Uses. Public Health Genomics, 2016, 19, 25-33.	1.0	6
101	With expanded carrier screening, founder populations run the risk of being overlooked. Journal of Community Genetics, 2017, 8, 327-333.	1.2	6
102	Experiences of a Highâ€Risk Population with Prenatal Hemoglobinopathy Carrier Screening in a Primary Care Setting: a Qualitative Study. Journal of Genetic Counseling, 2018, 27, 635-646.	1.6	6
103	Attitudes of relatives of mucopolysaccharidosis type III patients toward preconception expanded carrier screening. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2020, 28, 1331-1340.	2.8	6
104	Benefit vs potential harm of genomeâ€wide prenatal <scp>cfDNA</scp> testing requires further investigation and should not be dismissed based on current data. Ultrasound in Obstetrics and Gynecology, 2020, 55, 695-696.	1.7	6
105	Preconception expanded carrier screening: a focus group study with relatives of mucopolysaccharidosis type III patients and the general population. Journal of Community Genetics, 2021, 12, 311-323.	1.2	6
106	Direct-to-consumer carrier screening for cystic fibrosis via a hospital website: a 6-year evaluation. Journal of Community Genetics, 2019, 10, 249-257.	1.2	5
107	Should germline genome editing be allowed? The effect of treatment characteristics on public acceptability. Human Reproduction, 2021, 36, 465-478.	0.9	5
108	Ethnicity, educational level and attitudes contribute to parental intentions about genetic testing for child obesity. Journal of Community Genetics, 2013, 4, 243-250.	1.2	4

#	Article	IF	Citations
109	Genetic testing and implications for personalized medicine: changes in public and healthcare professional perspectives. Personalized Medicine, 2013, 10, 217-219.	1.5	4
110	Do Preferred Risk Formats Lead to Better Understanding? A Multicenter Controlled Trial on Communicating Familial Breast Cancer Risks Using Different Risk Formats . Patient Preference and Adherence, 2020, Volume 14, 333-342.	1.8	4
111	How will new genetic technologies, such as gene editing, change reproductive decision-making? Views of high-risk couples. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2021, 29, 39-50.	2.8	4
112	Preconception risk assessment for thalassaemia, sickle cell disease, cystic fibrosis and Tay-Sachs disease. The Cochrane Library, 2021, 2021, CD010849.	2.8	4
113	Genetic diagnosis for rare diseases in the Dutch Caribbean: a qualitative study on the experiences and associated needs of parents. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2022, , .	2.8	4
114	Effect of education and attitude on health professionalsâ€™ knowledge on prenatal screening. European Journal of Midwifery, 2020, 4, 1-7.	1.1	3
115	Medical costs of children admitted to the neonatal intensive care unit: The role and possible economic impact of WES in early diagnosis. European Journal of Medical Genetics, 2022, 65, 104467.	1.3	3
116	Cell-Free DNA-Based Noninvasive Prenatal Testing and Society. , 2018, , 235-249.		2
117	Womenâ€™s experiences of monitoring the small-for-gestational age fetus by ultrasound: A qualitative study. PLoS ONE, 2019, 14, e0216052.	2.5	2
118	Comment on Gialluisi et al. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2014, 22, 157-157.	2.8	1
119	Determining the genome-wide kinship coefficient seems unhelpful in distinguishing consanguineous couples with a high versus low risk for adverse reproductive outcome. BMC Medical Genetics, 2015, 16, 50.	2.1	1
120	Users evaluate a detailed familial risk questionnaire as valuable and no more time consuming than a simple enquiry in a web-based diabetes risk assessment tool. Public Health, 2016, 130, 87-90.	2.9	1
121	In memoriam Prof. Dr. Leo P. ten Kate. Journal of Community Genetics, 2021, 12, 1-3.	1.2	1
122	Clinical and community genetics services in the Dutch Caribbean. Journal of Community Genetics, 2021, 12, 497-501.	1.2	1
123	Genetic Health Care Before Conception. , 2020, , 35-52.		1
124	Economic evaluations of exome and genome sequencing in pediatric genetics: considerations towards a consensus strategy. Journal of Medical Economics, 2021, 24, 60-70.	2.1	1
125	Dynamics of reproductive genetic technologies: Perspectives of professional stakeholders. PLoS ONE, 2022, 17, e0269719.	2.5	1
126	PS6 - 5. Towards best practice guidelines for genetic testing for Maturity-Onset Diabetes of the Young. Nederlands Tijdschrift Voor Diabetologie, 2013, 11, 151-152.	0.0	0

#	Article	IF	Citations
127	Genetic Screening for Disease. , 2015, , 926-931.		0