Melissa Hill

List of Publications by Year
in descending order

63 papers	1,898 citations	218381 26 h-index	276539 41 g-index
67 all docs	67 docs citations	67 times ranked	1514 citing authors

#	Article	IF	Citations
1	The clinical implementation of nonâ€invasive prenatal diagnosis for singleâ€gene disorders: challenges and progress made. Prenatal Diagnosis, 2013, 33, 555-562.	1.1	121
2	Uptake, outcomes, and costs of implementing non-invasive prenatal testing for Downâ€™s syndrome into NHS maternity care: prospective cohort study in eight diverse maternity units. BMJ, The, 2016, 354, i3426.	3.0	115
3	Womenâ€™s and health professionalsâ€™ preferences for prenatal tests for Down syndrome: a discrete choice experiment to contrast noninvasive prenatal diagnosis with current invasive tests. Genetics in Medicine, 2012, 14, 905-913.	1.1	111
4	Model-Based Analysis of Costs and Outcomes of Non-Invasive Prenatal Testing for Downâ€™s Syndrome Using Cell Free Fetal DNA in the UK National Health Service. PLoS ONE, 2014, 9, e93559.	1.1	95
5	Nonâ€invasive prenatal diagnosis for cystic fibrosis: detection of paternal mutations, exploration of patient preferences and cost analysis. Prenatal Diagnosis, 2015, 35, 950-958.	1.1	76
6	Diagnostic yield of exome sequencing for prenatal diagnosis of fetal structural anomalies: A systematic review and metaâ€analysis. Prenatal Diagnosis, 2022, 42, 662-685.	1.1	75
7	Non-invasive prenatal diagnosis for fetal sex determination: benefits and disadvantages from the service usersâ€™ perspective. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2012, 20, 1127-1133.	1.4	74
8	Evaluation of non-invasive prenatal testing (NIPT) for aneuploidy in an NHS setting: a reliable accurate prenatal non-invasive diagnosis (RAPID) protocol. BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth, 2014, 14, 229.	0.9	72
9	Womenâ€™s Experiences and Preferences for Service Delivery of Non-Invasive Prenatal Testing for Aneuploidy in a Public Health Setting: A Mixed Methods Study. PLoS ONE, 2016, 11, e0153147.	1.1	63
10	Development and validation of a measure of informed choice for women undergoing non-invasive prenatal testing for aneuploidy. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2016, 24, 809-816.	1.4	60
11	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.	1.4	56
12	Fetal sex determination using cellâ€free fetal DNA: service users' experiences of and preferences for service delivery. Prenatal Diagnosis, 2012, 32, 735-741.	1.1	53
13	Has noninvasive prenatal testing impacted termination of pregnancy and live birth rates of infants with <scp>Down</scp> syndrome?. Prenatal Diagnosis, 2017, 37, 1281-1290.	1.1	51
14	Uses of cell free fetal DNA in maternal circulation. Best Practice and Research in Clinical Obstetrics and Gynaecology, 2012, 26, 639-654.	1.4	48
15	Nonâ€invasive prenatal diagnosis (NIPD) for single gene disorders: cost analysis of NIPD and invasive testing pathways. Prenatal Diagnosis, 2016, 36, 636-642.	1.1	48
16	Views and preferences for the implementation of nonâ€invasive prenatal diagnosis for single gene disorders from health professionals in the united kingdom. American Journal of Medical Genetics, Part A, 2013, 161, 1612-1618.	0.7	47
17	Client Views and Attitudes to Nonâ€Invasive Prenatal Diagnosis for Sickle Cell Disease, Thalassaemia and Cystic Fibrosis. Journal of Genetic Counseling, 2014, 23, 1012-1021.	0.9	44
18	Non-invasive prenatal testing for single gene disorders: exploring the ethics. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2013, 21, 713-718.	1.4	43

#	Article	IF	Citations
19	Implementing noninvasive prenatal fetal sex determination using cell-free fetal DNA in the United Kingdom. Expert Opinion on Biological Therapy, 2012, 12, S119-S126.	1.4	41
20	Offering nonâ€invasive prenatal testing as part of routine clinical service. Can high levels of informed choice be maintained?. Prenatal Diagnosis, 2017, 37, 1130-1137.	1.1	40
21	â€œWe might get a lot more families who will agreeâ€: Muslim and Jewish perspectives on less invasive perinatal and paediatric autopsy. PLoS ONE, 2018, 13, e0202023.	1.1	38
22	Incremental cost of nonâ€invasive prenatal diagnosis versus invasive prenatal diagnosis of fetal sex in England. Prenatal Diagnosis, 2011, 31, 267-273.	1.1	36
23	A qualitative study looking at informed choice in the context of nonâ€invasive prenatal testing for aneuploidy. Prenatal Diagnosis, 2016, 36, 875-881.	1.1	33
24	Health professionalsâ€™ and coronersâ€™ views on less invasive perinatal and paediatric autopsy: a qualitative study. Archives of Disease in Childhood, 2018, 103, 572-578.	1.0	32
25	Will the introduction of nonâ€invasive prenatal testing for <scp>D</scp>own's syndrome undermine informed choice?. Health Expectations, 2015, 18, 1658-1671.	1.1	31
26	Delivering genome sequencing in clinical practice: an interview study with healthcare professionals involved in the 100 000 Genomes Project. BMJ Open, 2019, 9, e029699.	0.8	30
27	Parentsâ€™ motivations, concerns and understanding of genome sequencing: a qualitative interview study. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2020, 28, 874-884.	1.4	30
28	Delivering genome sequencing for rapid genetic diagnosis in critically ill children: parent and professional views, experiences and challenges. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2020, 28, 1529-1540.	1.4	29
29	Noninvasive Prenatal Diagnosis for Cystic Fibrosis: Implementation, Uptake, Outcome, and Implications. Clinical Chemistry, 2020, 66, 207-216.	1.5	27
30	Couples experiences of receiving uncertain results following prenatal microarray or exome sequencing: A mixedâ€methods systematic review. Prenatal Diagnosis, 2020, 40, 1028-1039.	1.1	25
31	Development and evaluation of training resources to prepare health professionals for counselling pregnant women about non-invasive prenatal testing for Down syndrome: a mixed methods study. BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth, 2017, 17, 132.	0.9	20
32	Parental experiences of uncertainty following an abnormal fetal anomaly scan: Insights using Hanâ€™s taxonomy of uncertainty. Journal of Genetic Counseling, 2021, 30, 198-210.	0.9	20
33	Preferences for Prenatal Tests for Cystic Fibrosis: A Discrete Choice Experiment to Compare the Views of Adult Patients, Carriers of Cystic Fibrosis and Health Professionals. Journal of Clinical Medicine, 2014, 3, 176-190.	1.0	19
34	Minimally invasive autopsy for fetuses and children based on a combination of post-mortem MRI and endoscopic examination: a feasibility study. Health Technology Assessment, 2019, 23, 1-104.	1.3	16
35	Stakeholder views and attitudes towards prenatal and postnatal transplantation of fetal mesenchymal stem cells to treat Osteogenesis Imperfecta. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2019, 27, 1244-1253.	1.4	15
36	Opening the ‘black box’ of informed consent appointments for genome sequencing: a multisite observational study. Genetics in Medicine, 2019, 21, 1083-1091.	1.1	15

#	Article	IF	Citations
37	How to deal with uncertainty in prenatal genomics: A systematic review of guidelines and policies. Clinical Genetics, 2021, 100, 647-658.	1.0	15
38	Young people's understanding, attitudes and involvement in decision-making about genome sequencing for rare diseases: A qualitative study with participants in the UK 100, 000 Genomes Project. European Journal of Medical Genetics, 2020, 63, 104043.	0.7	13
39	Dealing with uncertain results from chromosomal microarray and exome sequencing in the prenatal setting: An international crossâ€sectional study with healthcare professionals. Prenatal Diagnosis, 2021, 41, 720-732.	1.1	13
40	Stakeholder attitudes and needs regarding cell-free fetal DNA testing. Current Opinion in Obstetrics and Gynecology, 2016, 28, 125-131.	0.9	12
41	Preferences for prenatal diagnosis of sickleâ€cell disorder: AÂdiscrete choice experiment comparing potential service usersÂand healthâ€care providers. Health Expectations, 2017, 20, 1289-1295.	1.1	11
42	Exploring the impact of Osteogenesis Imperfecta on families: A mixed-methods systematic review. Disability and Health Journal, 2019, 12, 340-349.	1.6	10
43	Development and mixed-methods evaluation of an online animation for young people about genome sequencing. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2020, 28, 896-906.	1.4	10
44	Participant experiences of genome sequencing for rare diseases in the 100,000 Genomes Project: a mixed methods study. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2022, 30, 604-610.	1.4	10
45	Decision-making, attitudes, and understanding among patients and relatives invited to undergo genome sequencing in the 100,000 Genomes Project: A multisite survey study. Genetics in Medicine, 2022, 24, 61-74.	1.1	7
46	Living with osteogenesis imperfecta: A qualitative study exploring experiences and psychosocial impact from the perspective of patients, parents and professionals. Disability and Health Journal, 2022, 15, 101168.	1.6	6
47	â€œThe communication and support from the health professional is incredibly importantâ€: A qualitative study exploring the processes and practices that support parental decisionâ€making about postmortem examination. Prenatal Diagnosis, 2019, 39, 1242-1253.	1.1	5
48	Implementing a rapid fetal exome sequencing service: What do parents and health professionals think?. Prenatal Diagnosis, 2022, 42, 783-795.	1.1	5
49	Factors that impact on women's decisionâ€making around prenatal genomic tests: An international discrete choice survey. Prenatal Diagnosis, 2022, 42, 934-946.	1.1	5
50	RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN NON-INVASIVE PRENATAL DIAGNOSIS AND TESTING. Fetal and Maternal Medicine Review, 2014, 25, 295-317.	0.3	4
51	Assessing womenâ€™s preferences towards tests that may reveal uncertain results from prenatal genomic testing: Development of attributes for a discrete choice experiment, using a mixed-methods design. PLoS ONE, 2022, 17, e0261898.	1.1	4
52	The Special Measures for Quality and Challenged Provider Regimes in the English NHS: A Rapid Evaluation of a National Improvement Initiative for Failing Healthcare Organisations. International Journal of Health Policy and Management, 2022, , .	0.5	4
53	Evaluation of patient information leaflets for non-invasive prenatal testing for Down's syndrome. British Journal of Midwifery, 2017, 25, 585-592.	0.1	2
54	Animation or leaflet: Does it make a difference when educating young people about genome sequencing?. Patient Education and Counseling, 2021, 104, 2522-2530.	1.0	2

#	Article	IF	Citations
55	Special Measures for Quality and Challenged Providers: Study Protocol for Evaluating the Impact of Improvement Interventions in NHS Trusts. International Journal of Health Policy and Management, 2020, 9, 143-151.	0.5	2
56	What's out there for parents? A systematic review of online information about prenatal microarray and exome sequencing. Prenatal Diagnosis, 2022, 42, 97-108.	1.1	2
57	Cell-free fetal DNA: emerging applications and future obstacles. Expert Review of Obstetrics and Gynecology, 2012, 7, 513-515.	0.4	1
58	Optimising Exome Prenatal Sequencing Services (EXPRESS): a study protocol to evaluate rapid prenatal exome sequencing in the NHS Genomic Medicine Service. NIHR Open Research, 0, 2, 10.	0.0	1
59	Mixed-methods evaluation of the NHS Genomic Medicine Service for paediatric rare diseases: study protocol. NIHR Open Research, 0, 1, 23.	0.0	1
60	Optimising Exome Prenatal Sequencing Services (EXPRESS): a study protocol to evaluate rapid prenatal exome sequencing in the NHS Genomic Medicine Service. NIHR Open Research, 0, 2, 10.	0.0	1
61	56â€…Parent and health professional experiences and views of genome sequencing for rapid diagnosis in critically ill children. , 2019, , .		0
62	Noninvasive Prenatal Diagnosis for Single-Gene Disorders. , 2020, , 214-224.e2.		0
63	97â€…Exploring health professional attitudes towards rapid fetal exome sequencing for prenatal diagnosis: What do we need to do to ensure safe implementation?. , 2019, , .		0