

Nicolien T Van Ravesteyn

List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: <https://exaly.com/author-pdf/8871429/publications.pdf>

Version: 2024-02-01

54
papers

3,172
citations

236612

25
h-index

174990

52
g-index

55
all docs

55
docs citations

55
times ranked

3572
citing authors

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
1	Effects of Mammography Screening Under Different Screening Schedules: Model Estimates of Potential Benefits and Harms. <i>Annals of Internal Medicine</i> , 2009, 151, 738.	2.0	509
2	Risk Factors for Breast Cancer for Women Aged 40 to 49 Years. <i>Annals of Internal Medicine</i> , 2012, 156, 635.	2.0	316
3	Collaborative Modeling of the Benefits and Harms Associated With Different U.S. Breast Cancer Screening Strategies. <i>Annals of Internal Medicine</i> , 2016, 164, 215.	2.0	209
4	Association of Screening and Treatment With Breast Cancer Mortality by Molecular Subtype in US Women, 2000-2012. <i>JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association</i> , 2018, 319, 154.	3.8	209
5	Benefits, Harms, and Cost-Effectiveness of Supplemental Ultrasonography Screening for Women With Dense Breasts. <i>Annals of Internal Medicine</i> , 2015, 162, 157-166.	2.0	175
6	Interpreting Overdiagnosis Estimates in Population-based Mammography Screening. <i>Epidemiologic Reviews</i> , 2011, 33, 111-121.	1.3	174
7	Personalizing Age of Cancer Screening Cessation Based on Comorbid Conditions: Model Estimates of Harms and Benefits. <i>Annals of Internal Medicine</i> , 2014, 161, 104.	2.0	123
8	Radiation-Induced Breast Cancer Incidence and Mortality From Digital Mammography Screening. <i>Annals of Internal Medicine</i> , 2016, 164, 205.	2.0	121
9	Effects of Screening and Systemic Adjuvant Therapy on ER-Specific US Breast Cancer Mortality. <i>Journal of the National Cancer Institute</i> , 2014, 106, .	3.0	120
10	Benefits, Harms, and Costs for Breast Cancer Screening After US Implementation of Digital Mammography. <i>Journal of the National Cancer Institute</i> , 2014, 106, dju092.	3.0	120
11	Tipping the Balance of Benefits and Harms to Favor Screening Mammography Starting at Age 40 Years. <i>Annals of Internal Medicine</i> , 2012, 156, 609.	2.0	110
12	Tailoring Breast Cancer Screening Intervals by Breast Density and Risk for Women Aged 50 Years or Older: Collaborative Modeling of Screening Outcomes. <i>Annals of Internal Medicine</i> , 2016, 165, 700.	2.0	90
13	Evidence for reducing cancer-specific mortality due to screening for breast cancer in Europe: A systematic review. <i>European Journal of Cancer</i> , 2020, 127, 191-206.	1.3	76
14	Race-Specific Impact of Natural History, Mammography Screening, and Adjuvant Treatment on Breast Cancer Mortality Rates in the United States. <i>Cancer Epidemiology Biomarkers and Prevention</i> , 2011, 20, 112-122.	1.1	65
15	Benefits and Harms of Mammography Screening After Age 74 Years: Model Estimates of Overdiagnosis. <i>Journal of the National Cancer Institute</i> , 2015, 107, djv103-djv103.	3.0	56
16	The potential of breast cancer screening in Europe. <i>International Journal of Cancer</i> , 2021, 148, 406-418.	2.3	55
17	Effects of cancer screening restart strategies after COVID-19 disruption. <i>British Journal of Cancer</i> , 2021, 124, 1516-1523.	2.9	55
18	The effect of population-based mammography screening in Dutch municipalities on breast cancer mortality: 20 years of follow-up. <i>International Journal of Cancer</i> , 2017, 141, 671-677.	2.3	52

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
19	Cost-Effectiveness of Magnetic Resonance Imaging Screening for Women With Extremely Dense Breast Tissue. <i>Journal of the National Cancer Institute</i> , 2021, 113, 1476-1483.	3.0	39
20	Breast Cancer Screening Strategies for Women With <i>ATM</i> , <i>CHEK2</i> , and <i>PALB2</i> Pathogenic Variants. <i>JAMA Oncology</i> , 2022, 8, 587.	3.4	36
21	Which strategies reduce breast cancer mortality most?. <i>Cancer</i> , 2013, 119, 2541-2548.	2.0	35
22	Cost-effectiveness of digital mammography screening before the age of 50 in the Netherlands. <i>International Journal of Cancer</i> , 2015, 137, 1990-1999.	2.3	35
23	Quantifying Overdiagnosis in Cancer Screening: A Systematic Review to Evaluate the Methodology. <i>Journal of the National Cancer Institute</i> , 2017, 109, .	3.0	34
24	Personalizing Breast Cancer Screening Based on Polygenic Risk and Family History. <i>Journal of the National Cancer Institute</i> , 2021, 113, 434-442.	3.0	34
25	Collaborative modeling of the impact of obesity on race-specific breast cancer incidence and mortality. <i>Breast Cancer Research and Treatment</i> , 2012, 136, 823-835.	1.1	25
26	Simulating the Impact of Risk-Based Screening and Treatment on Breast Cancer Outcomes with MISCAN-Fadia. <i>Medical Decision Making</i> , 2018, 38, 54S-65S.	1.2	25
27	Modeling the natural history of ductal carcinoma in situ based on population data. <i>Breast Cancer Research</i> , 2020, 22, 53.	2.2	22
28	Modeling the impact of population screening on breast cancer mortality in the United States. <i>Breast</i> , 2011, 20, S75-S81.	0.9	20
29	Detection and interval cancer rates during the transition from screen-film to digital mammography in population-based screening. <i>BMC Cancer</i> , 2018, 18, 256.	1.1	20
30	Modeling Ductal Carcinoma In Situ (DCIS): An Overview of CISNET Model Approaches. <i>Medical Decision Making</i> , 2018, 38, 126S-139S.	1.2	19
31	Transition From Film to Digital Mammography. <i>American Journal of Preventive Medicine</i> , 2015, 48, 535-542.	1.6	17
32	Evaluation of health benefits and harms of the breast cancer screening programme in the Basque Country using discrete event simulation. <i>BMC Cancer</i> , 2015, 15, 671.	1.1	15
33	Cost-effectiveness of Digital Breast Tomosynthesis in Population-based Breast Cancer Screening: A Probabilistic Sensitivity Analysis. <i>Radiology</i> , 2020, 297, 40-48.	3.6	15
34	Risk stratification in breast cancer screening: Cost-effectiveness and harm-benefit ratios for low-risk and high-risk women. <i>International Journal of Cancer</i> , 2020, 147, 3059-3067.	2.3	15
35	Comparing CISNET Breast Cancer Incidence and Mortality Predictions to Observed Clinical Trial Results of Mammography Screening from Ages 40 to 49. <i>Medical Decision Making</i> , 2018, 38, 140S-150S.	1.2	13
36	Comparing CISNET Breast Cancer Models Using the Maximum Clinical Incidence Reduction Methodology. <i>Medical Decision Making</i> , 2018, 38, 112S-125S.	1.2	11

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
37	Finding the optimal mammography screening strategy: A cost-effectiveness analysis of 920 modelled strategies. <i>International Journal of Cancer</i> , 2022, 151, 287-296.	2.3	11
38	A health systems approach to identifying barriers to breast cancer screening programmes. Methodology and application in six European countries. <i>Health Policy</i> , 2018, 122, 1198-1205.	1.4	9
39	Cost-effectiveness Analysis of Breast Cancer Screening Using Mammography in Singapore: A Modeling Study. <i>Cancer Epidemiology Biomarkers and Prevention</i> , 2021, 30, 653-660.	1.1	9
40	Reflecting on 20 years of breast cancer modeling in CISNET: Recommendations for future cancer systems modeling efforts. <i>PLoS Computational Biology</i> , 2021, 17, e1009020.	1.5	9
41	Trade-Offs Between Harms and Benefits of Different Breast Cancer Screening Intervals Among Low-Risk Women. <i>Journal of the National Cancer Institute</i> , 2021, 113, 1017-1026.	3.0	9
42	Using Collaborative Simulation Modeling to Develop a Web-Based Tool to Support Policy-Level Decision Making About Breast Cancer Screening Initiation Age. <i>MDM Policy and Practice</i> , 2017, 2, 238146831771798.	0.5	8
43	The Early Detection of Breast Cancer Using Liquid Biopsies: Model Estimates of the Benefits, Harms, and Costs. <i>Cancers</i> , 2022, 14, 2951.	1.7	8
44	Effects of a leaflet on breast cancer screening knowledge, explicit attitudes, and implicit associations. <i>Patient Education and Counseling</i> , 2020, 103, 2499-2507.	1.0	7
45	The EU-TOPIA evaluation tool: An online modelling-based tool for informing breast, cervical, and colorectal cancer screening decisions in Europe. <i>Preventive Medicine Reports</i> , 2021, 22, 101392.	0.8	7
46	Benefits and Harms of Mammography Screening for Women With Down Syndrome: a Collaborative Modeling Study. <i>Journal of General Internal Medicine</i> , 2019, 34, 2374-2381.	1.3	6
47	Extending Age Ranges in Breast Cancer Screening in Four European Countries: Model Estimations of Harm-to-Benefit Ratios. <i>Cancers</i> , 2021, 13, 3360.	1.7	6
48	Breast cancer incidence trends in Norway and estimates of overdiagnosis. <i>Journal of Medical Screening</i> , 2017, 24, 83-91.	1.1	5
49	Modeling Strategies to Optimize Cancer Screening in USPSTF Guideline "Noncompliant Women. <i>JAMA Oncology</i> , 2021, 7, 885.	3.4	5
50	Implementation Barriers to Value of Information Analysis in Health Technology Decision Making: Results From a Process Evaluation. <i>Value in Health</i> , 2021, 24, 1126-1136.	0.1	4
51	Costs, Evidence, and Value in the Medicare Program. <i>JAMA Internal Medicine</i> , 2013, 173, 227.	2.6	3
52	Breast cancer screening for carriers of ATM, CHEK2, and PALB2 pathogenic variants: A comparative modeling analysis. <i>Journal of Clinical Oncology</i> , 2021, 39, 10500-10500.	0.8	0
53	The Role of Microsimulation Modeling in Evaluating the Outcomes and Effect of Screening. , 2016, , 103-132.		0
54	Reply to: Comments on "Finding the optimal mammography screening strategy: A cost-effectiveness analysis of 920 modeled strategies". <i>International Journal of Cancer</i> , 2022, 151, 651-652.	2.3	0