

# Sigrid V Carlsson

## List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: <https://exaly.com/author-pdf/8882108/publications.pdf>

Version: 2024-02-01

137  
papers

7,327  
citations

101384

36  
h-index

56606

83  
g-index

143  
all docs

143  
docs citations

143  
times ranked

6931  
citing authors

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
1	Screening and prostate cancer mortality: results of the European Randomised Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer (ERSPC) at 13 years of follow-up. <i>Lancet, The</i> , 2014, 384, 2027-2035.	6.3	1,261
2	Prostate-Cancer Mortality at 11 Years of Follow-up. <i>New England Journal of Medicine</i> , 2012, 366, 981-990.	13.9	1,105
3	Mortality results from the Göteborg randomised population-based prostate-cancer screening trial. <i>Lancet Oncology, The</i> , 2010, 11, 725-732.	5.1	843
4	Quality-of-Life Effects of Prostate-Specific Antigen Screening. <i>New England Journal of Medicine</i> , 2012, 367, 595-605.	13.9	364
5	A 16-yr Follow-up of the European Randomized study of Screening for Prostate Cancer. <i>European Urology</i> , 2019, 76, 43-51.	0.9	359
6	Screening for Prostate Cancer Decreases the Risk of Developing Metastatic Disease: Findings from the European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer (ERSPC). <i>European Urology</i> , 2012, 62, 745-752.	0.9	216
7	The effect of the USPSTF PSA screening recommendation on prostate cancer incidence patterns in the USA. <i>Nature Reviews Urology</i> , 2017, 14, 26-37.	1.9	158
8	Prostate cancer: ESMO Consensus Conference Guidelines 2012. <i>Annals of Oncology</i> , 2013, 24, 1141-1162.	0.6	137
9	Active Surveillance for Prostate Cancer: A Systematic Review of Clinicopathologic Variables and Biomarkers for Risk Stratification. <i>European Urology</i> , 2015, 67, 619-626.	0.9	129
10	Prostate Cancer Screening: Facts, Statistics, and Interpretation in Response to the US Preventive Services Task Force Review. <i>Journal of Clinical Oncology</i> , 2012, 30, 2581-2584.	0.8	114
11	Metastatic Prostate Cancer Incidence and Prostate-specific Antigen Testing: New Insights from the European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer. <i>European Urology</i> , 2015, 68, 885-890.	0.9	111
12	Active surveillance for prostate cancer: a systematic review of contemporary worldwide practices. <i>Translational Andrology and Urology</i> , 2018, 7, 83-97.	0.6	99
13	Risk stratification in prostate cancer screening. <i>Nature Reviews Urology</i> , 2013, 10, 38-48.	1.9	97
14	Factors Influencing Men's Choice of and Adherence to Active Surveillance for Low-risk Prostate Cancer: A Mixed-method Systematic Review. <i>European Urology</i> , 2018, 74, 261-280.	0.9	82
15	Influence of blood prostate specific antigen levels at age 60 on benefits and harms of prostate cancer screening: population based cohort study. <i>BMJ, The</i> , 2014, 348, g2296-g2296.	3.0	79
16	Screening for Prostate Cancer. <i>Medical Clinics of North America</i> , 2020, 104, 1051-1062.	1.1	79
17	Predictive Value of Four Kallikrein Markers for Pathologically Insignificant Compared With Aggressive Prostate Cancer in Radical Prostatectomy Specimens: Results From the European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer Section Rotterdam. <i>European Urology</i> , 2013, 64, 693-699.	0.9	78
18	Baseline Prostate-Specific Antigen Levels in Midlife Predict Lethal Prostate Cancer. <i>Journal of Clinical Oncology</i> , 2016, 34, 2705-2711.	0.8	74

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
19	Role of Magnetic Resonance Imaging in Prostate Cancer Screening: A Pilot Study Within the GÅrteborg Randomised Screening Trial. <i>European Urology</i> , 2016, 70, 566-573.	0.9	65
20	Functional and Oncologic Outcomes Between Open and Robotic Radical Prostatectomy at 24-month Follow-up in the Swedish LAPPRO Trial. <i>European Urology Oncology</i> , 2018, 1, 353-360.	2.6	61
21	Population-based study of long-term functional outcomes after prostate cancer treatment. <i>BJU International</i> , 2016, 117, E36-45.	1.3	58
22	Long-Term Outcomes of Active Surveillance for Prostate Cancer: The Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center Experience. <i>Journal of Urology</i> , 2020, 203, 1122-1127.	0.2	58
23	Risk of suicide in men with low-risk prostate cancer. <i>European Journal of Cancer</i> , 2013, 49, 1588-1599.	1.3	55
24	Anxiety associated with prostate cancer screening with special reference to men with a positive screening test (elevated PSA) – Results from a prospective, population-based, randomised study. <i>European Journal of Cancer</i> , 2007, 43, 2109-2116.	1.3	54
25	Eighteen-year follow-up of the GÅrteborg Randomized Population-based Prostate Cancer Screening Trial: effect of sociodemographic variables on participation, prostate cancer incidence and mortality. <i>Scandinavian Journal of Urology</i> , 2018, 52, 27-37.	0.6	53
26	Validation of the Swedish M. D. Anderson Dysphagia Inventory (MDADI) in Patients with Head and Neck Cancer and Neurologic Swallowing Disturbances. <i>Dysphagia</i> , 2012, 27, 361-369.	1.0	51
27	Routine Use of Magnetic Resonance Imaging for Early Detection of Prostate Cancer Is Not Justified by the Clinical Trial Evidence. <i>European Urology</i> , 2020, 78, 304-306.	0.9	44
28	Prostate-specific kallikrein-related peptidases and their relation to prostate cancer biology and detection. <i>Thrombosis and Haemostasis</i> , 2013, 110, 484-492.	1.8	43
29	Baseline Prostate-specific Antigen Level in Midlife and Aggressive Prostate Cancer in Black Men. <i>European Urology</i> , 2019, 75, 399-407.	0.9	43
30	Screening for Prostate Cancer Starting at Age 50–54 Years. A Population-based Cohort Study. <i>European Urology</i> , 2017, 71, 46-52.	0.9	42
31	Radical retropubic prostatectomy: A review of outcomes and side-effects. <i>Acta Oncologica</i> , 2011, 50, 92-97.	0.8	41
32	Development and validation of the Gothenburg Trismus Questionnaire (GTQ). <i>Oral Oncology</i> , 2012, 48, 730-736.	0.8	41
33	Active surveillance for prostate cancer. <i>International Journal of Urology</i> , 2016, 23, 211-218.	0.5	40
34	Pathological Features of Lymph Node Metastasis for Predicting Biochemical Recurrence After Radical Prostatectomy for Prostate Cancer. <i>Journal of Urology</i> , 2013, 189, 1314-1319.	0.2	39
35	Oncological and functional outcomes 1 year after radical prostatectomy for very-low-risk prostate cancer: results from the prospective <sc>LAPPRO</sc> trial. <i>BJU International</i> , 2016, 118, 205-212.	1.3	38
36	Overdetection in screening for prostate cancer. <i>Current Opinion in Urology</i> , 2014, 24, 256-263.	0.9	36

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
37	Prostate Cancer Mortality in Areas With High and Low Prostate Cancer Incidence. <i>Journal of the National Cancer Institute</i> , 2014, 106, dju007-dju007.	3.0	36
38	A positive family history as a risk factor for prostate cancer in a population-based study with organised prostate-specific antigen screening: results of the Swiss European Randomised Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer (<sc>ERSPC</sc>, Aarau). <i>BJU International</i> , 2016, 117, 576-583.	1.3	36
39	Absolute Effect of Prostate Cancer Screening: Balance of Benefits and Harms by Center within the European Randomized Study of Prostate Cancer Screening. <i>Clinical Cancer Research</i> , 2016, 22, 243-249.	3.2	35
40	The excess burden of side-effects from treatment in men allocated to screening for prostate cancer. The GÅrteborg randomised population-based prostate cancer screening trial. <i>European Journal of Cancer</i> , 2011, 47, 545-553.	1.3	34
41	Association of Baseline Prostate-Specific Antigen Level With Long-term Diagnosis of Clinically Significant Prostate Cancer Among Patients Aged 55 to 60 Years. <i>JAMA Network Open</i> , 2020, 3, e1919284.	2.8	33
42	Performance and inter-observer variability of prostate MRI (PI-RADS version 2) outside high-volume centres. <i>Scandinavian Journal of Urology</i> , 2019, 53, 304-311.	0.6	31
43	No excess mortality after prostate biopsy: results from the European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer. <i>BJU International</i> , 2011, 107, 1912-1917.	1.3	29
44	Preoperative exercise interventions to optimize continence outcomes following radical prostatectomy. <i>Nature Reviews Urology</i> , 2021, 18, 259-281.	1.9	29
45	Increased EZH2 expression in prostate cancer is associated with metastatic recurrence following external beam radiotherapy. <i>Prostate</i> , 2019, 79, 1079-1089.	1.2	28
46	Risk of Metastasis in Men with Grade Group 2 Prostate Cancer Managed with Active Surveillance at a Tertiary Cancer Center. <i>Journal of Urology</i> , 2020, 203, 1117-1121.	0.2	28
47	Towards an Optimal Interval for Prostate Cancer Screening. <i>European Urology</i> , 2012, 61, 171-176.	0.9	27
48	The GÅrTEBORG prostate cancer screening 2 trial: a prospective, randomised, population-based prostate cancer screening trial with prostate-specific antigen testing followed by magnetic resonance imaging of the prostate. <i>Scandinavian Journal of Urology</i> , 2021, 55, 116-124.	0.6	27
49	Prostate-Specific Antigen Screening in Prostate Cancer: Perspectives on the Evidence. <i>Journal of the National Cancer Institute</i> , 2014, 106, dju010-dju010.	3.0	25
50	Surgeon heterogeneity significantly affects functional and oncological outcomes after radical prostatectomy in the Swedish LAPPRO trial. <i>BJU International</i> , 2021, 127, 361-368.	1.3	24
51	Estimating the harms and benefits of prostate cancer screening as used in common practice versus recommended good practice: A microsimulation screening analysis. <i>Cancer</i> , 2016, 122, 3386-3393.	2.0	23
52	Improving the evaluation and diagnosis of clinically significant prostate cancer in 2017. <i>Current Opinion in Urology</i> , 2017, 27, 198-204.	0.9	23
53	Lifetime Benefits and Harms of Prostate-Specific Antigen-Based Risk-Stratified Screening for Prostate Cancer. <i>Journal of the National Cancer Institute</i> , 2020, 112, 1013-1020.	3.0	23
54	Fatherhood status and risk of prostate cancer: Nationwide, population-based case-control study. <i>International Journal of Cancer</i> , 2013, 133, 937-943.	2.3	22

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
55	It Ain't What You Do, It's the Way You Do It: Five Golden Rules for Transforming Prostate-Specific Antigen Screening. <i>European Urology</i> , 2014, 66, 188-190.	0.9	21
56	The STHLM3 prostate cancer diagnostic study: calibration, clarification, and comments. <i>Nature Reviews Clinical Oncology</i> , 2016, 13, 394-394.	12.5	21
57	Effects of surgeon variability on oncologic and functional outcomes in a population-based setting. <i>BMC Urology</i> , 2014, 14, 25.	0.6	20
58	The Effect of Start and Stop Age at Screening on the Risk of Being Diagnosed with Prostate Cancer. <i>Journal of Urology</i> , 2016, 195, 1390-1396.	0.2	20
59	Personalized risk – stratified screening or abandoning it altogether?. <i>Nature Reviews Clinical Oncology</i> , 2016, 13, 140-142.	12.5	20
60	Clinical Findings and Treatment Outcomes in Patients with Extraprostatic Extension Identified on Prostate Biopsy. <i>Journal of Urology</i> , 2016, 196, 703-708.	0.2	17
61	Multicenter analysis of clinical and MRI characteristics associated with detecting clinically significant prostate cancer in PI-RADS (v2.0) category 3 lesions. <i>Urologic Oncology: Seminars and Original Investigations</i> , 2020, 38, 637.e9-637.e15.	0.8	17
62	Nationwide population-based study on 30-day mortality after radical prostatectomy in Sweden. <i>Scandinavian Journal of Urology and Nephrology</i> , 2009, 43, 350-356.	1.4	16
63	Risk of Incisional Hernia after Minimally Invasive and Open Radical Prostatectomy. <i>Journal of Urology</i> , 2013, 190, 1757-1762.	0.2	16
64	Active surveillance for prostate cancer. <i>Translational Andrology and Urology</i> , 2021, 10, 2809-2819.	0.6	16
65	The absence of voiding symptoms in men with a prostate-specific antigen (PSA) concentration of $\leq 3.0$ ng/mL is an independent risk factor for prostate cancer: results from the Gothenburg Randomized Screening Trial. <i>BJU International</i> , 2012, 110, 638-643.	1.3	15
66	A Different Method of Evaluation of the ERSPC Trial Confirms That Prostate-specific Antigen Testing Has a Significant Impact on Prostate Cancer Mortality. <i>European Urology</i> , 2014, 66, 401-403.	0.9	14
67	Prognostic value of lymph node yield during nephroureterectomy for upper tract urothelial carcinoma. <i>Urologic Oncology: Seminars and Original Investigations</i> , 2017, 35, 151.e9-151.e15.	0.8	13
68	Prostate cancer screening – when to start and how to screen?. <i>Translational Andrology and Urology</i> , 2018, 7, 34-45.	0.6	13
69	Grade Migration of Prostate Cancer in the United States During the Last Decade. <i>Journal of the National Cancer Institute</i> , 2022, 114, 1012-1019.	3.0	13
70	Baseline prostate-specific antigen measurements and subsequent prostate cancer risk in the Danish Diet, Cancer and Health cohort. <i>European Journal of Cancer</i> , 2013, 49, 3041-3048.	1.3	12
71	Oncologic Outcomes after Localized Prostate Cancer Treatment: Associations with Pretreatment Prostate Magnetic Resonance Imaging Findings. <i>Journal of Urology</i> , 2021, 205, 1055-1062.	0.2	12
72	Local Extent of Prostate Cancer at MRI versus Prostatectomy Histopathology: Associations with Long-term Oncologic Outcomes. <i>Radiology</i> , 2022, 302, 595-602.	3.6	12

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
73	Meta-analysis finds screening for prostate cancer with PSA does not reduce prostate cancer-related or all-cause mortality but results likely due to heterogeneity - the two highest quality studies identified do find prostate cancer-related mortality reductions. Evidence-Based Medicine, 2011, 16, 20-21.	0.6	11
74	Impact of cause of death adjudication on the results of the European prostate cancer screening trial. British Journal of Cancer, 2017, 116, 141-148.	2.9	11
75	Risk of localized and advanced prostate cancer among immigrants versus native-born Swedish men: a nation-wide population-based study. Cancer Causes and Control, 2013, 24, 383-390.	0.8	10
76	Can one blood draw replace transrectal ultrasonographyâ€estimated prostate volume to predict prostate cancer risk?. BJU International, 2013, 112, 602-609.	1.3	10
77	What's new in screening in 2015?. Current Opinion in Urology, 2016, 26, 447-458.	0.9	10
78	Better Survival After Curative Treatment for Screen-detected Prostate Cancer Compared with Clinical Diagnosis: A Real Effect or Lead-time Bias?. European Urology, 2015, 68, 183-184.	0.9	9
79	Correlation between stage shift and differences in mortality in the European Randomised study of Screening for Prostate Cancer (ERSPC). BJU International, 2016, 118, 677-680.	1.3	9
80	Prostate cancer risk assessment in men with an initial P.S.A. below 3â€ng/mL: results from the GÃrteborg randomized population-based prostate cancer screening trial. Scandinavian Journal of Urology, 2018, 52, 256-262.	0.6	9
81	Prostate cancer mortality and metastasis under different biopsy frequencies in North American active surveillance cohorts. Cancer, 2020, 126, 583-592.	2.0	9
82	A pre-specified model based on four kallikrein markers in blood improves predictions of adverse pathology and biochemical recurrence after radical prostatectomy. British Journal of Cancer, 2020, 123, 604-609.	2.9	9
83	Sexual and Gender Minority Personsâ€™ Perception of the Female Sexual Function Index. Journal of Sexual Medicine, 2021, 18, 2020-2027.	0.3	8
84	Efficacy versus effectiveness study design within the European screening trial for prostate cancer: consequences for cancer incidence, overall mortality and cancer-specific mortality. Journal of Medical Screening, 2012, 19, 133-140.	1.1	7
85	Spotlight on prostate cancer: the latest evidence and current controversies. BMC Medicine, 2015, 13, 60.	2.3	7
86	The USPSTF screening recommendation: a swinging pendulum. Nature Reviews Urology, 2018, 15, 532-534.	1.9	7
87	Could Differences in Treatment Between Trial Arms Explain the Reduction in Prostate Cancer Mortality in the European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer?. European Urology, 2019, 75, 1015-1022.	0.9	7
88	Patient-reported pain, discomfort, and anxiety during magnetic resonance imaging-targeted prostate biopsy. Canadian Urological Association Journal, 2019, 14, E202-E208.	0.3	7
89	Perspective on Prostate Cancer Screening. Clinical Chemistry, 2019, 65, 24-27.	1.5	7
90	Risk of Recurrent Disease 6 Years After Open or Robotic-assisted Radical Prostatectomy in the Prospective Controlled Trial LAPPRO. European Urology Open Science, 2020, 20, 54-61.	0.2	7

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
91	Patient accrual and understanding of informed consent in a two-stage consent design. <i>Clinical Trials</i> , 2021, 18, 377-382.	0.7	7
92	Clinician perspectives on communication and implementation challenges in precision oncology. <i>Personalized Medicine</i> , 2021, 18, 559-572.	0.8	7
93	Oncologic Outcomes of Total Length Gleason Pattern 4 on Biopsy in Men with Grade Group 2 Prostate Cancer. <i>Journal of Urology</i> , 2022, 208, 309-316.	0.2	7
94	Letter to the editor concerning "Do prostate cancer risk models improve the predictive accuracy of PSA screening? A meta-analysis". <i>Annals of Oncology</i> , 2015, 26, 1031.	0.6	5
95	Design-corrected variation by centre in mortality reduction in the ERSPC randomised prostate cancer screening trial. <i>Journal of Medical Screening</i> , 2017, 24, 98-103.	1.1	5
96	Comparison of Physician-Documented Versus Patient-Reported Collection of Comorbidities Among Patients With Prostate Cancer Upon First Visit to the Urology Clinic. <i>JCO Clinical Cancer Informatics</i> , 2018, 2, 1-10.	1.0	5
97	On Risk Estimation versus Risk Stratification in Early Prostate Cancer. <i>PLoS Medicine</i> , 2016, 13, e1002100.	3.9	5
98	The Relationship Between PSA and Total Testosterone Levels in Men with Prostate Cancer. <i>Journal of Sexual Medicine</i> , 2022, 19, 471-478.	0.3	5
99	The dilemmas of prostate cancer screening. <i>Medical Journal of Australia</i> , 2013, 198, 528-529.	0.8	4
100	RE: Prostate-Specific Antigen Screening Trials and Prostate Cancer Deaths: The Androgen Deprivation Connection. <i>Journal of the National Cancer Institute</i> , 2014, 106, .	3.0	4
101	Prostate cancer screening in Europe " Authors' reply. <i>Lancet</i> , The, 2015, 385, 1507-1508.	6.3	4
102	Racial Disparities in Low-Risk Prostate Cancer. <i>JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association</i> , 2019, 321, 1726.	3.8	4
103	What explains the differences between centres in the European screening trial? A simulation study. <i>Cancer Epidemiology</i> , 2017, 46, 14-19.	0.8	3
104	Reply to "Clinical utility of the Prostate Health Index (phi) for biopsy decision management in a large group urology practice setting". <i>Prostate Cancer and Prostatic Diseases</i> , 2018, 21, 446-447.	2.0	3
105	Re: Use of Prostate Systematic and Targeted Biopsy on the Basis of Multiparametric MRI in Biopsy-naive Patients (MRI-FIRST): A Prospective, Multicentre, Paired Diagnostic Study. <i>European Urology</i> , 2019, 76, 534-535.	0.9	3
106	Impact of Prostatic-specific Antigen Threshold and Screening Interval in Prostate Cancer Screening Outcomes: Comparing the Swedish and Finnish European Randomised Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer Centres. <i>European Urology Focus</i> , 2019, 5, 186-191.	1.6	3
107	Towards Wiser Use and Interpretation of $\langle i \rangle P \langle /i \rangle$ Values. <i>Journal of Sexual Medicine</i> , 2020, 17, 1-3.	0.3	3
108	Asian-American Race and Urinary Continence After Radical Prostatectomy. <i>European Urology Open Science</i> , 2020, 22, 51-53.	0.2	3

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
109	Reply to Roderick C.N. van den Bergh, Olivier Rouvière, and Theodorius van der Kwast's Letter to the Editor re: Andrew Vickers, Sigrid V. Carlsson, Matthew Cooperberg. Routine Use of Magnetic Resonance Imaging for Early Detection of Prostate Cancer Is Not Justified by the Clinical Trial Evidence. <i>Eur Urol</i> 2020;78:304-6. Prebiopsy MRI: Through the Looking Glass. <i>European Urology</i> , 2020, 78, 314-315.	0.9	3
110	Estimating patient health in prostate cancer treatment counseling. <i>Prostate Cancer and Prostatic Diseases</i> , 2023, 26, 271-275.	2.0	3
111	Modeling the outcomes of prostate cancer screening. <i>Nature Reviews Urology</i> , 2012, 9, 183-185.	1.9	2
112	Toward Responsible, Informed Decision Making for Prostate Cancer Treatment Decisions. <i>Journal of Clinical Oncology</i> , 2019, 37, 3462-3462.	0.8	2
113	Re: Reconsidering Prostate Cancer Mortality - The Future of PSA Screening. <i>European Urology</i> , 2020, 78, 927-929.	0.9	2
114	PSA Surveillance in the Septuagenarian: A Proposed New Terminology for Clinical Follow-up to Assess Risk of Prostate Cancer in Men Aged 70 Years and Older. <i>European Urology</i> , 2020, 78, 136-137.	0.9	2
115	Problems with Numbers in Decision Aids for Prostate-specific Antigen Screening: A Critical Review. <i>European Urology</i> , 2021, 79, 330-333.	0.9	2
116	On panels and preferences in urology. <i>Nature Reviews Urology</i> , 2021, 18, 639-640.	1.9	2
117	Shared Medical Appointments for Prostate Cancer Active Surveillance Followup Visits. <i>Urology Practice</i> , 2021, 8, 541-545.	0.2	2
118	Long-term predictive value of serum PSA values obtained in clinical practice: Results from the Norwegian Prostate Cancer Consortium (NPCC). <i>Journal of Clinical Oncology</i> , 2022, 40, 5021-5021.	0.8	2
119	PSA: role in screening and monitoring patients with prostate cancer. , 2022, , 131-172.		2
120	Screening for Prostate Cancer. <i>Annals of Internal Medicine</i> , 2012, 156, 539.	2.0	1
121	Four-hundredfold overestimation of biopsy mortality. <i>BJU International</i> , 2013, 111, E16-7.	1.3	1
122	Editorial Comment. <i>Journal of Urology</i> , 2016, 196, 1051-1051.	0.2	1
123	The ERSPC Study: Quality Takes Time and Perseverance. <i>Clinical Chemistry</i> , 2019, 65, 208-209.	1.5	1
124	When to Discuss Prostate Cancer Screening With Average-Risk Men. <i>American Journal of Preventive Medicine</i> , 2021, 61, 294-298.	1.6	1
125	Long-term prediction of prostate cancer diagnosis and death using PSA and obesity related anthropometrics at early middle age: data from the malmö preventive project. <i>Oncotarget</i> , 2018, 9, 5778-5785.	0.8	1
126	Re: Changes in Prostate-specific Antigen Testing Relative to the Revised US Preventive Services Task Force Recommendation on Prostate Cancer Screening. <i>European Urology</i> , 2022, , .	0.9	1



#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
127	Introduction to a seminar on revisiting the value of PSA-based prostate cancer screening. Urologic Oncology: Seminars and Original Investigations, 2023, 41, 76-77.	0.8	1
128	Response. Journal of the National Cancer Institute, 2014, 106, .	3.0	0
129	Clinical Consultation Guide: How to Optimize the Use of Prostate-specific Antigen in the Current Era. European Urology Focus, 2015, 1, 149-151.	1.6	0
130	Editorial Comment. Journal of Urology, 2017, 198, 57-57.	0.2	0
131	Editorial Comment. Journal of Urology, 2018, 200, 87-87.	0.2	0
132	Reply to Yi Sun, Fengxiang Sun, Qiang Wei, Jin Huang, and Ruiqi Duan's Letter to the Editor re: Andrew Vickers, Sigrid V. Carlsson, Matthew Cooperberg. Routine Use of Magnetic Resonance Imaging for Early Detection of Prostate Cancer Is Not Justified by the Clinical Trial Evidence. Eur Urol 2020;78:304-6. European Urology, 2021, 79, e16.	0.9	0
133	What is a good medical choice?. Cancer, 2021, 127, 1933-1934.	2.0	0
134	Impact of cancer screening on metastasis: A prostate cancer case study. Journal of Medical Screening, 2021, 28, 096914132198973.	1.1	0
135	The dilemmas of prostate cancer screening. Medical Journal of Australia, 2013, 199, 583-584.	0.8	0
136	Reply by Authors. Journal of Urology, 2020, 203, 1121-1121.	0.2	0
137	Learning curve for robot-assisted laparoscopic radical prostatectomy in a large prospective multicentre study. Scandinavian Journal of Urology, 2022, 56, 182-190.	0.6	0