K Lance Gould

List of Publications by Year
in descending order

Source: https://exaly.com/author-pdf/9105523/publications.pdf

Version: 2024-02-01

111	7,044	94381	56687
papers	citations	37 h-index	83 g-index

113	113	113	4004
all docs	docs citations	times ranked	citing authors

#	Article	IF	Citations
1	Prognostic Value of FractionalÂFlowÂReserve. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 2014, 64, 1641-1654.	1.2	513
2	Anatomic Versus Physiologic Assessment of Coronary Artery Disease. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 2013, 62, 1639-1653.	1.2	495
3	Coronary flow reserve as a physiologic measure of stenosis severity. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 1990, 15, 459-474.	1.2	494
4	Abnormal Epicardial Coronary Resistance in Patients With Diffuse Atherosclerosis but â€œNormalâ€• Coronary Angiography. Circulation, 2001, 104, 2401-2406.	1.6	427
5	Assessment of coronary stenoses by myocardial perfusion imaging during pharmacologic coronary vasodilation. VII. Validation of coronary flow reserve as a single integrated functional measure of stenosis severity reflecting all its geometric dimensions. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 1986, 7, 103-113.	1.2	318
6	Multicenter Core Laboratory Comparison of the Instantaneous Wave-Free Ratio and Resting P /P With Fractional Flow Reserve. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 2014, 63, 1253-1261.	1.2	301
7	Noninvasive assessment of coronary stenoses by myocardial perfusion imaging during pharmacologic coronary vasodilation. VIII. Clinical feasibility of positron cardiac imaging without a cyclotron using generator-produced Rubidium-82. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 1986, 7, 775-789.	1.2	269
8	Is Discordance of Coronary Flow Reserve and Fractional Flow Reserve Due to Methodology or Clinically Relevant Coronary Pathophysiology?. JACC: Cardiovascular Imaging, 2012, 5, 193-202.	2.3	265
9	Frequent Diagnostic Errors in Cardiac PET/CT Due to Misregistration of CT Attenuation and Emission PET Images: A Definitive Analysis of Causes, Consequences, and Corrections. Journal of Nuclear Medicine, 2007, 48, 1112-1121.	2.8	257
10	Pressure-Derived Fractional Flow Reserve to Assess Serial Epicardial Stenoses. Circulation, 2000, 101, 1840-1847.	1.6	241
11	Changes in Myocardial Perfusion Abnormalities by Positron Emission Tomography After Long-term, Intense Risk Factor Modification. JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association, 1995, 274, 894.	3.8	229
12	Integrating Noninvasive Absolute Flow, Coronary Flow Reserve, and Ischemic Thresholds Into a Comprehensive Map of Physiological Severity. JACC: Cardiovascular Imaging, 2012, 5, 430-440.	2.3	197
13	Noninvasive assessment of coronary stenoses with myocardial perfusion imaging during pharmacologic coronary vasodilatation. American Journal of Cardiology, 1979, 43, 200-208.	0.7	194
14	Does Coronary Flow Trump Coronary Anatomy?. JACC: Cardiovascular Imaging, 2009, 2, 1009-1023.	2.3	180
15	Frequency and Clinical Implications of Fluid Dynamically Significant Diffuse Coronary Artery Disease Manifest as Graded, Longitudinal, Base-to-Apex Myocardial Perfusion Abnormalities by Noninvasive Positron Emission Tomography. Circulation, 2000, 101, 1931-1939.	1.6	172
16	Physiologic Severity of Diffuse Coronary Artery Disease. Circulation, 2015, 131, 4-6.	1.6	132
17	Continuum of Vasodilator Stress FromÂRest to Contrast Medium toÂAdenosine Hyperemia for FractionalÂFlow Reserve Assessment. JACC: Cardiovascular Interventions, 2016, 9, 757-767.	1.1	129
18	Combined intense lifestyle and pharmacologic lipid treatment further reduce coronary events and myocardial perfusion abnormalities compared with usual-care cholesterol-lowering drugs in coronary artery disease. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 2003, 41, 263-272.	1.2	117

#	Article	IF	Citations
19	Physiological Basis for Angina and ST-Segment Change. JACC: Cardiovascular Imaging, 2011, 4, 990-998.	2.3	117
20	Impact of Unexpected Factors on Quantitative Myocardial Perfusion and Coronary Flow Reserve in Young, Asymptomatic Volunteers. JACC: Cardiovascular Imaging, 2011, 4, 402-412.	2.3	112
21	Coronary Physiology Beyond CoronaryÂFlowÂReserve in MicrovascularÂAngina. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 2018, 72, 2642-2662.	1.2	101
22	Why Angina in Aortic Stenosis With Normal Coronary Arteriograms?. Circulation, 2003, 107, 3121-3123.	1.6	96
23	Does the Instantaneous Wave-Free Ratio Approximate the Fractional Flow Reserve?. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 2013, 61, 1428-1435.	1.2	94
24	Routine Clinical Quantitative Rest Stress Myocardial Perfusion for Managing Coronary Artery Disease. JACC: Cardiovascular Imaging, 2017, 10, 565-577.	2.3	85
25	Repeatability of Fractional Flow Reserve Despite Variations in Systemic andÂCoronaryÂHemodynamics. JACC: Cardiovascular Interventions, 2015, 8, 1018-1027.	1.1	83
26	Regional, Artery-Specific Thresholds of Quantitative Myocardial Perfusion by PET Associated with Reduced Myocardial Infarction and Death After Revascularization in Stable Coronary Artery Disease. Journal of Nuclear Medicine, 2019, 60, 410-417.	2.8	83
27	Coronary Anatomy to Predict Physiology. Circulation: Cardiovascular Imaging, 2013, 6, 817-832.	1.3	79
28	Invasive FFR and Noninvasive CFR inÂtheÂEvaluation of Ischemia. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 2016, 67, 2772-2788.	1.2	77
29	Common artifacts in PET myocardial perfusion images due to attenuation-emission misregistration: clinical significance, causes, and solutions. Journal of Nuclear Medicine, 2004, 45, 1029-39.	2.8	77
30	Regadenoson Versus Dipyridamole Hyperemia for Cardiac PET Imaging. JACC: Cardiovascular Imaging, 2015, 8, 438-447.	2.3	73
31	Imaging Microvascular Dysfunction and Mechanisms for Female-Male DifferencesÂin CAD. JACC: Cardiovascular Imaging, 2016, 9, 465-482.	2.3	68
32	High Prevalence of Myocardial Perfusion Abnormalities on Positron Emission Tomography in Asymptomatic Persons With a Parent or Sibling With Coronary Artery Disease. Circulation, 2001, 103, 496-501.	1.6	60
33	Variation in Quantitative Myocardial Perfusion Due to Arterial Input Selection. JACC: Cardiovascular Imaging, 2013, 6, 559-568.	2.3	46
34	Clinical evaluation of a new concept: resting myocardial perfusion heterogeneity quantified by markovian analysis of PET identifies coronary microvascular dysfunction and early atherosclerosis in 1,034 subjects. Journal of Nuclear Medicine, 2005, 46, 1427-37.	2.8	42
35	Mechanisms of progression and regression of coronary artery disease by PET related to treatment intensity and clinical events at long-term follow-up. Journal of Nuclear Medicine, 2006, 47, 59-67.	2.8	42
36	Mortality Prediction by Quantitative PET Perfusion Expressed as Coronary Flow Capacity With and Without Revascularization. JACC: Cardiovascular Imaging, 2021, 14, 1020-1034.	2.3	41

#	Article	IF	Citations
37	Coronary Branch Steal. Circulation: Cardiovascular Imaging, 2010, 3, 701-709.	1.3	39
38	Patient Selection for Elective Revascularization to Reduce Myocardial Infarction and Mortality. Circulation: Cardiovascular Imaging, 2015, 8, .	1.3	37
39	Myocardial Bridges: Lessons in ClinicalÂCoronary Pathophysiology. JACC: Cardiovascular Imaging, 2015, 8, 705-709.	2.3	37
40	Reducing Radiation Dose in Restâ€“Stress Cardiac PET/CT by Single Poststress Cine CT for Attenuation Correction: Quantitative Validation. Journal of Nuclear Medicine, 2008, 49, 738-745.	2.8	32
41	Clinical cardiac PET using generator-produced Rb-82: A review. CardioVascular and Interventional Radiology, 1989, 12, 245-251.	0.9	28
42	Assessing progression or regression of CAD: The role of perfusion imaging. Journal of Nuclear Cardiology, 2005, 12, 625-638.	1.4	27
43	Coronary Flow Reserve and Pharmacologic Stress Perfusion Imaging. JACC: Cardiovascular Imaging, 2009, 2, 664-669.	2.3	25
44	Partial volume correction incorporating Rb-82 positron range for quantitative myocardial perfusion PET based on systolic-diastolic activity ratios and phantom measurements. Journal of Nuclear Cardiology, 2011, 18, 247-258.	1.4	25
45	A precise, three-dimensional atlas of myocardial perfusion correlated with coronary arteriographic anatomy. Journal of Nuclear Cardiology, 2001, 8, 580-590.	1.4	24
46	Why Angina Pectoris in Aortic Stenosis. Circulation, 1997, 95, 790-792.	1.6	24
47	A 6 month randomized, double blind, placebo controlled, multi-center trial of high dose atorvastatin on myocardial perfusion abnormalities by positron emission tomography in coronary artery disease. American Heart Journal, 2008, 155, 245-253.	1.2	22
48	Combined Pressure and Flow Measurements to Guide Treatment of Coronary Stenoses. JACC: Cardiovascular Interventions, 2021, 14, 1904-1913.	1.1	22
49	Autoregulation of Coronary Blood Supply in Response to Demand. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 2021, 77, 2335-2345.	1.2	19
50	Fulminant Vascular and Cardiac Toxicity Associated with Tyrosine Kinase Inhibitor Sorafenib. Cardiovascular Toxicology, 2019, 19, 382-387.	1.1	17
51	What can intracoronary pressure measurements tell us about flow reserve? Pressureâ€Bounded coronary flow reserve and example application to the randomized DEFER trial. Catheterization and Cardiovascular Interventions, 2017, 90, 917-925.	0.7	16
52	Fractional Flow Reserve Returns to Its Origins. Circulation: Cardiovascular Imaging, 2016, 9, .	1.3	15
53	Quantitative myocardial perfusion positron emission tomography and caffeine revisited with new insights on major adverse cardiovascular events and coronary flow capacity. European Heart Journal Cardiovascular Imaging, 2019, 20, 751-762.	0.5	15
54	Distal Evaluation of Functional performance with Intravascular sensors to assess the Narrowing Effectâ€”combined pressure and Doppler FLOW velocity measurements (DEFINE-FLOW) trial: Rationale and trial design. American Heart Journal, 2020, 222, 139-146.	1.2	15

#	Article	IF	Citations
55	Imaging Coronary Blood Flow in AS. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 2016, 67, 1423-1426.	1.2	14
56	Physiology of endothelin in producing myocardial perfusion heterogeneity: A mechanistic study using darusentan and positron emission tomography. Journal of Nuclear Cardiology, 2013, 20, 835-844.	1.4	13
57	Optimal Adenosine Stress for Maximum Stress Perfusion, Coronary Flow Reserve, and Pixel Distribution of Coronary Flow Capacity by Kolmogorovâ€“Smirnov Analysis. Circulation: Cardiovascular Imaging, 2017, 10, .	1.3	13
58	Pitfalls in quantitative myocardial PET perfusion II: Arterial input function. Journal of Nuclear Cardiology, 2020, 27, 397-409.	1.4	13
59	Positron emission tomography in coronary artery disease. Current Opinion in Cardiology, 2007, 22, 422-428.	0.8	12
60	Standardized Hyperemic Stress for Fractional Flow Reserve. Circulation: Cardiovascular Interventions, 2013, 6, 602-603.	1.4	12
61	Does coronary vasodilation after adenosine override endothelin-1-induced coronary vasoconstriction?. American Journal of Physiology - Heart and Circulatory Physiology, 2007, 292, H496-H502.	1.5	11
62	Preliminary Results with TOFPET. IEEE Transactions on Nuclear Science, 1983, 30, 739-743.	1.2	10
63	Percent stenosis in CADâ€”a flaw in current practice. Nature Reviews Cardiology, 2010, 7, 482-484.	6.1	10
64	A Black and White Response to the â€œGray Zoneâ€•for Fractional Flow Reserve Measurements. JACC: Cardiovascular Interventions, 2014, 7, 227-228.	1.1	10
65	Ischemia in Aortic Stenosis. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 2016, 68, 698-701.	1.2	9
66	Pitfalls in quantitative myocardial PET perfusion I: Myocardial partial volume correction. Journal of Nuclear Cardiology, 2020, 27, 386-396.	1.4	9
67	How Do PET Myocardial Blood Flow Reserve and FFR Differ?. Current Cardiology Reports, 2020, 22, 20.	1.3	9
68	Quantitative Coronary Physiology for Clinical Management: the Imaging Standard. Current Cardiology Reports, 2016, 18, 9.	1.3	8
69	Coronary Flow Capacity to Identify Stenosis Associated With Coronary Flow Improvement After Revascularization: A Combined Analysis From DEFINE FLOW and IDEAL. Journal of the American Heart Association, 2020, 9, e016130.	1.6	8
70	Not All Randomized Trials Are EqualâžâžEditorials published in the Journal of American College of Cardiologyreflect the views of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of JACCor the American College of Cardiology.. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 2007, 50, 2013-2015.	1.2	7
71	Dipyridamole reversal using theophylline during aminophylline shortage. Journal of Nuclear Cardiology, 2011, 18, 1115.	1.4	7
72	Physiologic Stenosis Severity, Binary Thinking, Revascularization, and â€œHidden Realityâ€• Circulation: Cardiovascular Imaging, 2015, 8, .	1.3	7

#	Article	IF	Citations
73	History and Development of Coronary Flow Reserve and Fractional Flow Reserve for Clinical Applications. Interventional Cardiology Clinics, 2015, 4, 397-410.	0.2	7
74	Approximate Truth. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 2017, 70, 3097-3101.	1.2	7
75	Integrating Coronary Physiology, Longitudinal Pressure, and Perfusion Gradients in CAD. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 2019, 74, 1785-1788.	1.2	7
76	Nitroglycerine and Angina. Circulation, 2017, 136, 35-38.	1.6	6
77	Same Lesion, Different Artery, DifferentÂFFR!?. JACC: Cardiovascular Imaging, 2019, 12, 718-721.	2.3	6
78	Coronary Steal: Mechanisms of a Misnomer. Journal of the American Heart Association, 2021, 10, e021000.	1.6	6
79	Shifted Helical Computed Tomography to Optimize Cardiac Positron Emission Tomographyâ€“Computed Tomography Coregistration: Quantitative Improvement and Limitations. Molecular Imaging, 2010, 9, 7290.2010.00015.	0.7	5
80	Intense Exercise and Native Collateral Function in Stable Moderate Coronary Artery Disease. Circulation, 2016, 133, 1431-1434.	1.6	5
81	A Slanting Light-Guide Analog Decoding High Resolution Detector for Positron Emission Tomography Camera. IEEE Transactions on Nuclear Science, 1987, 34, 280-284.	1.2	4
82	Reply. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 2013, 62, 566-567.	1.2	4
83	Hydrostatic Forces. JACC: Cardiovascular Interventions, 2017, 10, 1596-1597.	1.1	4
84	Experimental to Clinical Coronary Physiology. Circulation Research, 2018, 123, 1124-1126.	2.0	4
85	Reliability and Reproducibility of Absolute Myocardial Blood Flow: Does It Depend on the PET/CT Technology, the Vasodilator, and/or the Software?. Current Cardiology Reports, 2021, 23, 12.	1.3	4
86	Can Percutaneous Transluminal Coronary Angioplasty be Considered Successful for Managing Coronary Artery Disease?. Journal of Interventional Cardiology, 1991, 4, 257-260.	0.5	3
87	Imaging in Aortic Stenosisâ€”Let the Data Talk. JACC: Cardiovascular Imaging, 2012, 5, 190-192.	2.3	3
88	An Analysis of 3 Common CardioGen-82 82Rb Infusion System Injection Methods and Their Impact on Clinical Volume and Image Counts. Journal of Nuclear Medicine Technology, 2015, 43, 113-116.	0.4	3
89	TAG, Youâ€™re Out. JACC: Cardiovascular Imaging, 2019, 12, 334-337.	2.3	3
90	Coronary Physiology and Quantitative Myocardial Perfusion. , 2021, , 161-259.		3

#	Article	IF	Citations
91	Letter to the Editor regarding â€œPET: Is myocardial flow quantification a clinical reality?â€• Journal of Nuclear Cardiology, 2012, 19, 1243-1244.	1.4	2
92	Economic Methods in the Century Trialâ€”a Comprehensive Lifestyle Modification Study for Managing Coronary Artery Disease. Journal of Cardiovascular Translational Research, 2012, 5, 333-336.	1.1	2
93	Clinical Utility of Enhanced Relative Activity Recovery on Systolic Myocardial Perfusion SPECT: Lessons from PET. Journal of Nuclear Medicine, 2015, 56, 1882-1888.	2.8	2
94	Coronary Blood Flow After Acute MI. JACC: Cardiovascular Interventions, 2016, 9, 614-617.	1.1	2
95	Apples, oranges, or pears: unexpected insights in coronary pathophysiology. European Heart Journal Cardiovascular Imaging, 2019, 20, 14-17.	0.5	2
96	Coronary Physiology. JACC: Cardiovascular Imaging, 2020, 13, 1986-1988.	2.3	2
97	Coronary flow capacity: where to next?. EuroIntervention, 2021, 17, e269-e270.	1.4	2
98	Shifted helical computed tomography to optimize cardiac positron emission tomography-computed tomography coregistration: quantitative improvement and limitations. Molecular Imaging, 2010, 9, 256-67.	0.7	2
99	Prognostic value of microvascular resistance and its association to fractional flow reserve: a DEFINE-FLOW substudy. Open Heart, 2022, 9, e001981.	0.9	2
100	Exercise PET: More insight or more complex?. Journal of Nuclear Cardiology, 2015, 22, 1281-1284.	1.4	1
101	Optimizing quantitative myocardial perfusion by positron emission tomography for guiding CAD management. Journal of Nuclear Cardiology, 2017, 24, 1950-1954.	1.4	1
102	A fundamental principle of coronary pathophysiology for risk stratifying coronary artery disease. European Heart Journal Cardiovascular Imaging, 2021, 22, 647-649.	0.5	1
103	How shall we judge a PET flow model?. Journal of Nuclear Cardiology, 2022, 29, 2551-2554.	1.4	1
104	Effective Dose of PET/CT in Informed Consent Forms. JACC: Cardiovascular Imaging, 2012, 5, 1184-1185.	2.3	0
105	Myocardial perfusion models: A means or an end?. Journal of Nuclear Cardiology, 2013, 20, 20-22.	1.4	0
106	Clinical Cardiac Positron Emission Tomography. Cardiovascular Medicine, 2015, , 263-281.	0.0	0
107	Coronary CT Angiography With PETÂPerfusion Imaging. JACC: Cardiovascular Imaging, 2017, 10, 1371-1373.	2.3	0
108	FFR at high heart rate â€“ Unexpected physiologic insights. International Journal of Cardiology, 2020, 317, 44-46.	0.8	0

#	Article	IF	Citations
109	A simulation study of a class of nonparametric test statistics: a close look of empirical distribution function-based tests. Communications in Statistics Part B: Simulation and Computation, 2023, 52, 1132-1148.	0.6	0
110	Retention models: â€˜tis the gift to be simple. Journal of Nuclear Cardiology, 2022, 29, 2595-2598.	1.4	0
111	Nuclear Cardiology: SPECT and PET. , 2010, , 219-250.		0