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	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
2	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
3	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
4	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
5	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
6	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
7	Implementing a rapid fetal exome sequencing service: What do parents and health professionals think?. Prenatal Diagnosis, 2022, 42, 783-795.	1.1	5
8	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
9	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
10	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
11	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
12	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
13	How to deal with uncertainty in prenatal genomics: A systematic review of guidelines and policies. Clinical Genetics, 2021, 100, 647-658.	1.0	15
14	Noninvasive Prenatal Diagnosis for Cystic Fibrosis: Implementation, Uptake, Outcome, and Implications. Clinical Chemistry, 2020, 66, 207-216.	1.5	27
15	Noninvasive Prenatal Diagnosis for Single-Gene Disorders. , 2020, , 214-224.e2.		0
16	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
17	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
18	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

#	Article	IF	Citations
19	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
20	Parentsâ€™ motivations, concerns and understanding of genome sequencing: a qualitative interview study. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2020, 28, 874-884.	1.4	30
21	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
22	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
23	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
24	56â€…Parent and health professional experiences and views of genome sequencing for rapid diagnosis in critically ill children. , 2019, , .		0
25	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
26	Exploring the impact of Osteogenesis Imperfecta on families: A mixed-methods systematic review. Disability and Health Journal, 2019, 12, 340-349.	1.6	10
27	Opening the ìblack boxì‹ of informed consent appointments for genome sequencing: a multisite observational study. Genetics in Medicine, 2019, 21, 1083-1091.	1.1	15
28	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
29	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
30	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
31	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
32	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
33	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
34	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
35	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
36	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

#	Article	IF	Citations
37	Stakeholder attitudes and needs regarding cell-free fetal DNA testing. Current Opinion in Obstetrics and Gynecology, 2016, 28, 125-131.	0.9	12
38	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
39	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
40	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
41	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
42	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
43	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
44	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
45	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
46	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
47	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
48	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
49	RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN NON-INVASIVE PRENATAL DIAGNOSIS AND TESTING. Fetal and Maternal Medicine Review, 2014, 25, 295-317.	0.3	4
50	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
51	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
52	Non-invasive prenatal testing for single gene disorders: exploring the ethics. European Journal of Human Genetics, 2013, 21, 713-718.	1.4	43
53	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
54	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

#	Article	IF	Citations
55	Cell-free fetal DNA: emerging applications and future obstacles. Expert Review of Obstetrics and Gynecology, 2012, 7, 513-515.	0.4	1
56	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
57	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
58	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
59	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
60	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
61	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
62	Mixed-methods evaluation of the NHS Genomic Medicine Service for paediatric rare diseases: study protocol. NIHR Open Research, 0, 1, 23.	0.0	1
63	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