Mark Emberton

List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: https://exaly.com/author-pdf/9206647/publications.pdf

Version: 2024-02-01

271 papers

17,494 citations

34076 52 h-index 126 g-index

276 all docs

276 docs citations

276 times ranked

10781 citing authors

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
1	Diagnostic accuracy of multi-parametric MRI and TRUS biopsy in prostate cancer (PROMIS): a paired validating confirmatory study. Lancet, The, 2017, 389, 815-822.	6.3	2,267
2	MRI-Targeted or Standard Biopsy for Prostate-Cancer Diagnosis. New England Journal of Medicine, 2018, 378, 1767-1777.	13.9	2,036
3	Systematic Review of Complications of Prostate Biopsy. European Urology, 2013, 64, 876-892.	0.9	779
4	Can Clinically Significant Prostate Cancer Be Detected with Multiparametric Magnetic Resonance Imaging? A Systematic Review of the Literature. European Urology, 2015, 68, 1045-1053.	0.9	657
5	Magnetic Resonance Imaging for the Detection, Localisation, and Characterisation of Prostate Cancer: Recommendations from a European Consensus Meeting. European Urology, 2011, 59, 477-494.	0.9	642
6	Image-Guided Prostate Biopsy Using Magnetic Resonance Imaging–Derived Targets: A Systematic Review. European Urology, 2013, 63, 125-140.	0.9	479
7	Standards of Reporting for MRI-targeted Biopsy Studies (START) of the Prostate: Recommendations from an International Working Group. European Urology, 2013, 64, 544-552.	0.9	383
8	Detection of Clinically Significant Prostate Cancer Using Magnetic Resonance Imaging–Ultrasound Fusion Targeted Biopsy: A Systematic Review. European Urology, 2015, 68, 8-19.	0.9	381
9	Focal therapy for localised unifocal and multifocal prostate cancer: a prospective development study. Lancet Oncology, The, 2012, 13, 622-632.	5.1	359
10	How Good is MRI at Detecting and Characterising Cancer within the Prostate?. European Urology, 2006, 50, 1163-1175.	0.9	319
11	The Role of Focal Therapy in the Management of Localised Prostate Cancer: A Systematic Review. European Urology, 2014, 66, 732-751.	0.9	298
12	Early detection of cancer. Science, 2022, 375, eaay9040.	6.0	291
13	Is it time to consider a role for MRI before prostate biopsy?. Nature Reviews Clinical Oncology, 2009, 6, 197-206.	12.5	288
14	Weakly-supervised convolutional neural networks for multimodal image registration. Medical Image Analysis, 2018, 49, 1-13.	7.0	280
15	Padeliporfin vascular-targeted photodynamic therapy versus active surveillance in men with low-risk prostate cancer (CLIN1001 PCM301): an open-label, phase 3, randomised controlled trial. Lancet Oncology, The, 2017, 18, 181-191.	5.1	263
16	Characterizing Clinically Significant Prostate Cancer Using Template Prostate Mapping Biopsy. Journal of Urology, 2011, 186, 458-464.	0.2	253
17	New and Established Technology in Focal Ablation of the Prostate: A Systematic Review. European Urology, 2017, 71, 17-34.	0.9	232
18	A Multicentre Study of 5-year Outcomes Following Focal Therapy in Treating Clinically Significant Nonmetastatic Prostate Cancer. European Urology, 2018, 74, 422-429.	0.9	220

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
19	Contemporary Role of Systematic Prostate Biopsies: Indications, Techniques, and Implications for Patient Care. European Urology, 2013, 63, 214-230.	0.9	214
20	Multiparametric MRI for prostate cancer diagnosis: current status and future directions. Nature Reviews Urology, 2020, 17, 41-61.	1.9	207
21	Focal Therapy: Patients, Interventions, and Outcomesâ€"A Report from a Consensus Meeting. European Urology, 2015, 67, 771-777.	0.9	206
22	Management of prostate cancer in older patients: updated recommendations of a working group of the International Society of Geriatric Oncology. Lancet Oncology, The, 2014, 15, e404-e414.	5.1	196
23	Photodynamic Therapy for Prostate Cancer Recurrence After Radiotherapy: A Phase I Study. Journal of Urology, 2002, 168, 1427-1432.	0.2	183
24	Transperineal Magnetic Resonance Image Targeted Prostate Biopsy Versus Transperineal Template Prostate Biopsy in the Detection of Clinically Significant Prostate Cancer. Journal of Urology, 2013, 189, 860-866.	0.2	181
25	Focal Ablation Targeted to the Index Lesion in Multifocal Localised Prostate Cancer: a Prospective Development Study. European Urology, 2015, 68, 927-936.	0.9	163
26	Prostate Imaging Quality (PI-QUAL): A New Quality Control Scoring System for Multiparametric Magnetic Resonance Imaging of the Prostate from the PRECISION trial. European Urology Oncology, 2020, 3, 615-619.	2.6	155
27	Magnetic Resonance Imaging-targeted Biopsy Versus Systematic Biopsy in the Detection of Prostate Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. European Urology, 2019, 76, 284-303.	0.9	153
28	MR to ultrasound registration for image-guided prostate interventions. Medical Image Analysis, 2012, 16, 687-703.	7.0	148
29	<scp>TOOKAD</scp> [®] <scp>S</scp> oluble vascularâ€targeted photodynamic (<scp>VTP</scp>) therapy: determination of optimal treatment conditions and assessment of effects in patients with localised prostate cancer. BJU International, 2013, 112, 766-774.	1.3	135
30	Optimising the Diagnosis of Prostate Cancer in the Era of Multiparametric Magnetic Resonance Imaging: A Cost-effectiveness Analysis Based on the Prostate MR Imaging Study (PROMIS). European Urology, 2018, 73, 23-30.	0.9	133
31	Scoring systems used for the interpretation and reporting of multiparametric MRI for prostate cancer detection, localization, and characterization: could standardization lead to improved utilization of imaging within the diagnostic pathway?. Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging, 2013, 37, 48-58.	1.9	119
32	The accuracy of multiparametric MRI in men with negative biopsy and elevated PSA levelâ€"Can it rule out clinically significant prostate cancer?. Urologic Oncology: Seminars and Original Investigations, 2014, 32, 45.e17-45.e22.	0.8	110
33	Transatlantic Consensus Group on active surveillance and focal therapy for prostate cancer. BJU International, 2012, 109, 1636-1647.	1.3	103
34	Five-year Outcomes of Magnetic Resonance Imaging–based Active Surveillance for Prostate Cancer: A Large Cohort Study. European Urology, 2020, 78, 443-451.	0.9	94
35	Mediumâ€term oncological outcomes in a large cohort of men treated with either focal or hemiâ€ablation using highâ€intensity focused ultrasonography for primary localized prostate cancer. BJU International, 2019, 124, 431-440.	1.3	93
36	The PICTURE study: diagnostic accuracy of multiparametric MRI in men requiring a repeat prostate biopsy. British Journal of Cancer, 2017, 116, 1159-1165.	2.9	90

#	Article	IF	Citations
37	Identifying Candidates for Active Surveillance: An Evaluation of the Repeat Biopsy Strategy for Men with Favorable Risk Prostate Cancer. Journal of Urology, 2012, 188, 762-768.	0.2	86
38	Focal salvage therapy for localized prostate cancer recurrence after external beam radiotherapy. Cancer, 2012, 118, 4148-4155.	2.0	83
39	Determination of optimal drug dose and light doseÂindex to achieve minimally invasive focal ablation of localised prostate cancer using ⟨scp⟩WST⟨/scp⟩11â€vascularâ€targeted photodynamic (⟨scp⟩VTP⟨/scp⟩) therapy. BJU International, 2015, 116, 888-896.	1.3	81
40	"Textural analysis of multiparametric MRI detects transition zone prostate cancer― European Radiology, 2017, 27, 2348-2358.	2.3	74
41	Multiparametric MRI to improve detection of prostate cancer compared with transrectal ultrasound-guided prostate biopsy alone: the PROMIS study. Health Technology Assessment, 2018, 22, 1-176.	1.3	70
42	"TREXIT 2020― why the time to abandon transrectal prostate biopsy starts now. Prostate Cancer and Prostatic Diseases, 2020, 23, 62-65.	2.0	68
43	Label-driven weakly-supervised learning for multimodal deformarle image registration. , 2018, , .		67
44	The SmartTarget Biopsy Trial: A Prospective, Within-person Randomised, Blinded Trial Comparing the Accuracy of Visual-registration and Magnetic Resonance Imaging/Ultrasound Image-fusion Targeted Biopsies for Prostate Cancer Risk Stratification. European Urology, 2019, 75, 733-740.	0.9	67
45	Nanoknife Electroporation Ablation Trial: A Prospective Development Study Investigating Focal Irreversible Electroporation for Localized Prostate Cancer. Journal of Urology, 2017, 197, 647-654.	0.2	66
46	Prostate-specific antigen vs. magnetic resonance imaging parameters for assessing oncological outcomes after high intensity–focused ultrasound focal therapy for localized prostate cancer. Urologic Oncology: Seminars and Original Investigations, 2017, 35, 30.e9-30.e15.	0.8	65
47	Randomized Trial of Partial Gland Ablation with Vascular Targeted Phototherapy versus Active Surveillance for Low Risk Prostate Cancer: Extended Followup and Analyses of Effectiveness. Journal of Urology, 2018, 200, 786-793.	0.2	65
48	Management of low risk prostate cancerâ€"active surveillance and focal therapy. Nature Reviews Clinical Oncology, 2014, 11, 324-334.	12.5	61
49	Can we deliver randomized trials of focal therapy in prostate cancer?. Nature Reviews Clinical Oncology, 2014, 11, 482-491.	12.5	60
50	What Type of Prostate Cancer Is Systematically Overlooked by Multiparametric Magnetic Resonance Imaging? An Analysis from the PROMIS Cohort. European Urology, 2020, 78, 163-170.	0.9	60
51	MRI-Targeted Biopsy for Prostate-Cancer Diagnosis. New England Journal of Medicine, 2018, 379, 589-590.	13.9	59
52	3D Cancer Models: The Need for a Complex Stroma, Compartmentalization and Stiffness. Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology, 2021, 9, 660502.	2.0	58
53	Medium-term Outcomes after Whole-gland High-intensity Focused Ultrasound for the Treatment of Nonmetastatic Prostate Cancer from a Multicentre Registry Cohort. European Urology, 2016, 70, 668-674.	0.9	56
54	Polygenic risk-tailored screening for prostate cancer: A benefit–harm and cost-effectiveness modelling study. PLoS Medicine, 2019, 16, e1002998.	3.9	56

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
55	Prostate Cancer Risk Inflation as a Consequence of Image-targeted Biopsy of the Prostate: A Computer Simulation Study. European Urology, 2014, 65, 628-634.	0.9	55
56	Patient Reported Outcome Measures for Transperineal Template Prostate Mapping Biopsies in the PICTURE Study. Journal of Urology, 2018, 200, 1235-1240.	0.2	55
57	A prospective development study investigating focal irreversible electroporation in men with localised prostate cancer: Nanoknife Electroporation Ablation Trial (NEAT). Contemporary Clinical Trials, 2014, 39, 57-65.	0.8	53
58	Robot-assisted Radical Prostatectomy After Focal Therapy: Oncological, Functional Outcomes and Predictors of Recurrence. European Urology, 2019, 76, 27-30.	0.9	53
59	VERDICT MRI for Prostate Cancer: Intracellular Volume Fraction versus Apparent Diffusion Coefficient. Radiology, 2019, 291, 391-397.	3.6	52
60	Final Results of a Phase I/II Multicenter Trial of WST11 Vascular Targeted Photodynamic Therapy for Hemi-Ablation of the Prostate in Men with Unilateral Low Risk Prostate Cancer Performed in the United States. Journal of Urology, 2016, 196, 1096-1104.	0.2	51
61	Cancer-associated fibroblasts mediate cancer progression and remodel the tumouroid stroma. British Journal of Cancer, 2020, 123, 1178-1190.	2.9	51
62	The PICTURE study â€" Prostate Imaging (multi-parametric MRI and Prostate HistoScanningâ,,¢) Compared to Transperineal Ultrasound guided biopsy for significant prostate cancer Risk Evaluation. Contemporary Clinical Trials, 2014, 37, 69-83.	0.8	50
63	The Effects of Focal Therapy for Prostate Cancer on Sexual Function: A Combined Analysis of Three Prospective Trials. European Urology, 2016, 69, 844-851.	0.9	47
64	Modelling Prostate Motion for Data Fusion During Image-Guided Interventions. IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging, 2011, 30, 1887-1900.	5.4	46
65	Stiffness memory of indirectly 3D-printed elastomer nanohybrid regulates chondrogenesis and osteogenesis of human mesenchymal stem cells. Biomaterials, 2018, 186, 64-79.	5.7	46
66	Automatic segmentation of prostate MRI using convolutional neural networks: Investigating the impact of network architecture on the accuracy of volume measurement and MRI-ultrasound registration. Medical Image Analysis, 2019, 58, 101558.	7.0	45
67	Visually directed vs. software-based targeted biopsy compared to transperineal template mapping biopsy in the detection of clinically significant prostate cancer. Urologic Oncology: Seminars and Original Investigations, 2015, 33, 424.e9-424.e16.	0.8	44
68	A Modified Newcastle-Ottawa Scale for Assessment of Study Quality in Genetic Urological Research. European Urology, 2021, 79, 325-326.	0.9	44
69	Comparison of Magnetic Resonance Imaging and Transrectal Ultrasound Informed Prostate Biopsy for Prostate Cancer Diagnosis in Biopsy NaĀ ve Men: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Journal of Urology, 2020, 203, 1085-1093.	0.2	44
70	Progression of benign prostatic hyperplasia: systematic review of the placebo arms of clinical trials. BJU International, 2008, 102, 981-986.	1.3	43
71	Understanding PI-QUAL for prostate MRI quality: a practical primer for radiologists. Insights Into Imaging, 2021, 12, 59.	1.6	43
72	MRI in prostate cancer diagnosis: do we need to add standard sampling? A review of the last 5 years. Prostate Cancer and Prostatic Diseases, 2018, 21, 473-487.	2.0	42

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
73	Cancer Control Outcomes Following Focal Therapy Using High-intensity Focused Ultrasound in 1379 Men with Nonmetastatic Prostate Cancer: A Multi-institute 15-year Experience. European Urology, 2022, 81, 407-413.	0.9	41
74	Logistic regression model for diagnosis of transition zone prostate cancer on multi-parametric MRI. European Radiology, 2015, 25, 523-532.	2.3	40
75	Focal salvage highâ€intensity focused ultrasound in radiorecurrent prostate cancer. BJU International, 2017, 120, 246-256.	1.3	39
76	The Evolution of MRI of the Prostate: The Past, the Present, and the Future. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2019, 213, 384-396.	1.0	39
77	Accuracy of Transperineal Targeted Prostate Biopsies, Visual Estimation and Image Fusion in Men Needing Repeat Biopsy in the PICTURE Trial. Journal of Urology, 2018, 200, 1227-1234.	0.2	38
78	Magnetic resonance imaging-transrectal ultrasound fusion focal cryotherapy of the prostate: A prospective development study. Urologic Oncology: Seminars and Original Investigations, 2017, 35, 150.e1-150.e7.	0.8	37
79	Natural history of prostate cancer on active surveillance: stratification by MRI using the PRECISE recommendations in a UK cohort. European Radiology, 2021, 31, 1644-1655.	2.3	37
80	MRI in active surveillance: a critical review. Prostate Cancer and Prostatic Diseases, 2019, 22, 5-15.	2.0	36
81	Prostate Cancer Tumour Features on Template Prostate-mapping Biopsies: Implications for Focal Therapy. European Urology, 2014, 66, 12-19.	0.9	35
82	Benefit, Harm, and Cost-effectiveness Associated With Magnetic Resonance Imaging Before Biopsy in Age-based and Risk-stratified Screening for Prostate Cancer. JAMA Network Open, 2021, 4, e2037657.	2.8	34
83	Symptom deterioration during treatment and history of AUR are the strongest predictors for AUR and BPH-related surgery in men with LUTS treated with alfuzosin 10 mg once daily. Urology, 2005, 66, 316-322.	0.5	33
84	Population-based prediction of subject-specific prostate deformation for MR-to-ultrasound image registration. Medical Image Analysis, 2015, 26, 332-344.	7.0	33
85	Investigating the performance of a novel pH and cathepsin B sensitive, stimulus-responsive nanoparticle for optimised sonodynamic therapy in prostate cancer. Journal of Controlled Release, 2021, 329, 76-86.	4.8	33
86	Prostate Specific Antigen Criteria to Diagnose Failure of Cancer Control following Focal Therapy of Nonmetastatic Prostate Cancer Using High Intensity Focused Ultrasound. Journal of Urology, 2020, 203, 734-742.	0.2	33
87	Inter-reader agreement of the PI-QUAL score for prostate MRI quality in the NeuroSAFE PROOF trial. European Radiology, 2022, 32, 879-889.	2.3	32
88	Salvage Local Treatments After Focal Therapy for Prostate Cancer. European Urology Oncology, 2019, 2, 526-538.	2.6	31
89	Managing the progression of lower urinary tract symptoms/benign prostatic hyperplasia: therapeutic options for the man at risk. BJU International, 2007, 100, 249-253.	1.3	30
90	Histological outcomes after focal high-intensity focused ultrasound and cryotherapy. World Journal of Urology, 2015, 33, 955-964.	1.2	30

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
91	Dosimetry Modeling for Focal Low-Dose-Rate Prostate Brachytherapy. International Journal of Radiation Oncology Biology Physics, 2015, 92, 787-793.	0.4	30
92	Cancer invasion regulates vascular complexity in a three-dimensional biomimetic model. European Journal of Cancer, 2019, 119, 179-193.	1.3	29
93	Evaluating the Trade-Offs Men with Localized Prostate Cancer Make between the Risks and Benefits of Treatments: The COMPARE Study. Journal of Urology, 2020, 204, 273-280.	0.2	29
94	The influence of family history on prostate cancer risk: implications for clinical management. BJU International, 2011, 107, 716-721.	1.3	28
95	The role of MRI in active surveillance of prostate cancer. Current Opinion in Urology, 2013, 23, 261-267.	0.9	28
96	Focal therapy compared to radical prostatectomy for non-metastatic prostate cancer: a propensity score-matched study. Prostate Cancer and Prostatic Diseases, 2021, 24, 567-574.	2.0	28
97	Risk stratification for benign prostatic hyperplasia (BPH) treatment. BJU International, 2011, 107, 876-880.	1.3	27
98	Salvage High-intensity Focused Ultrasound for Patients With Recurrent Prostate Cancer After Brachytherapy. Urology, 2014, 84, 1157-1162.	0.5	27
99	results at more definitive histology?11Mohamed Abd-Alazeez receives funding from the Egyptian government. Mark Emberton and Hashim U. Ahmed receive funding from USHIFU and Advanced Medical Diagnostics for clinical trials. Mark Emberton is a paid consultant for Steba Biotech, USHIFU and Sanofi-Aventis. Mark Emberton has received research support by GSK for a study evaluating the role of	0.8	27
100	MRI in men with prostate. Urologic Oncology: Seminars and Original Investigations. 2014. 32, 741-747. Prostate Indeterminate Lesions on Magnetic Resonance Imaging—Biopsy Versus Surveillance: A Literature Review. European Urology Focus, 2019, 5, 799-806.	1.6	27
101	Genetic Landscape of Prostate Cancer Conspicuity on Multiparametric Magnetic Resonance Imaging: A Systematic Review and Bioinformatic Analysis. European Urology Open Science, 2020, 20, 37-47.	0.2	27
102	Additional Value of Dynamic Contrast-enhanced Sequences in Multiparametric Prostate Magnetic Resonance Imaging: Data from the PROMIS Study. European Urology, 2020, 78, 503-511.	0.9	27
103	Role of MRI in planning radical prostatectomy: what is the added value?. World Journal of Urology, 2019, 37, 1289-1292.	1.2	26
104	The next level of 3D tumour models: immunocompetence. Drug Discovery Today, 2016, 21, 1421-1428.	3.2	25
105	Multiparametric ultrasound versus multiparametric MRI to diagnose prostate cancer (CADMUS): a prospective, multicentre, paired-cohort, confirmatory study. Lancet Oncology, The, 2022, 23, 428-438.	5.1	25
106	Management of low risk prostate cancer. Current Opinion in Urology, 2014, 24, 270-279.	0.9	24
107	MRI findings in men on active surveillance for prostate cancer: does dutasteride make MRI visible lesions less conspicuous? Results from a placebo-controlled, randomised clinical trial. European Radiology, 2017, 27, 4767-4774.	2.3	24
108	Optimization of prostate biopsy - Micro-Ultrasound versus MRI (OPTIMUM): A 3-arm randomized controlled trial evaluating the role of 29‬MHz micro-ultrasound in guiding prostate biopsy in men with clinical suspicion of prostate cancer. Contemporary Clinical Trials, 2022, 112, 106618.	0.8	24

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
109	Multiparametric MRI followed by targeted prostate biopsy for men with suspected prostate cancer: a clinical decision analysis. BMJ Open, 2014, 4, e004895-e004895.	0.8	23
110	Evaluation of functional outcomes after a second focal highâ€intensity focused ultrasonography (HIFU) procedure in men with primary localized, nonâ€metastatic prostate cancer: results from the HIFU Evaluation and Assessment of Treatment (HEAT) registry. BJU International, 2020, 125, 853-860.	1.3	23
111	Focal HIFU therapy for anterior compared to posterior prostate cancer lesions. World Journal of Urology, 2021, 39, 1115-1119.	1.2	23
112	Stiffness memory nanohybrid scaffolds generated by indirect 3D printing for biologically responsive soft implants. Acta Biomaterialia, 2018, 80, 188-202.	4.1	22
113	Prostate MRI quality: a critical review of the last 5 years and the role of the PI-QUAL score. British Journal of Radiology, 2022, 95, 20210415.	1.0	22
114	Multiparametric prostate MRI: technical conduct, standardized report and clinical use. Minerva Urology and Nephrology, 2018, 70, 9-21.	1.3	20
115	Cellular responses to thermoresponsive stiffness memory elastomer nanohybrid scaffolds by 3D-TIPS. Acta Biomaterialia, 2019, 85, 157-171.	4.1	20
116	Interobserver reproducibility of the PRECISE scoring system for prostate MRI on active surveillance: results from a two-centre pilot study. European Radiology, 2020, 30, 2082-2090.	2.3	20
117	Comparative Healthcare Research Outcomes of Novel Surgery in prostate cancer (IP4-CHRONOS): A prospective, multi-centre therapeutic phase II parallel Randomised Control Trial. Contemporary Clinical Trials, 2020, 93, 105999.	0.8	20
118	The Effect of Dutasteride on Magnetic Resonance Imaging Defined Prostate Cancer: MAPPED—A Randomized, Placebo Controlled, Double-Blind Clinical Trial. Journal of Urology, 2017, 197, 1006-1013.	0.2	19
119	A comparison of time taken to return to baseline erectile function following focal and whole gland ablative therapies for localized prostate cancer: A systematic review. Urologic Oncology: Seminars and Original Investigations, 2018, 36, 67-76.	0.8	19
120	Cellular senescence as a possible link between prostate diseases of the ageing male. Nature Reviews Urology, 2021, 18, 597-610.	1.9	19
121	Computer-aided diagnosis of prostate cancer using multiparametric MRI and clinical features: A patient-level classification framework. Medical Image Analysis, 2021, 73, 102153.	7.0	19
122	Radical Prostatectomy after Vascular Targeted Photodynamic Therapy with Padeliporfin: Feasibility, and Early and Intermediate Results. Journal of Urology, 2019, 201, 315-321.	0.2	19
123	A comparison of Bayesian and non-linear regression methods for robust estimation of pharmacokinetics in DCE-MRI and how it affects cancer diagnosis. Computerized Medical Imaging and Graphics, 2017, 56, 1-10.	3.5	18
124	Prostate cancer heterogeneity: texture analysis score based on multiple magnetic resonance imaging sequences for detection, stratification and selection of lesions at time of biopsy. BJU International, 2019, 124, 76-86.	1.3	18
125	The Role of Percentage of Prostate-specific Antigen Reduction After Focal Therapy Using High-intensity Focused Ultrasound for Primary Localised Prostate Cancer. Results from a Large Multi-institutional Series. European Urology, 2020, 78, 155-160.	0.9	18
126	Update on Multiparametric Prostate MRI During Active Surveillance: Current and Future Trends and Role of the PRECISE Recommendations. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2021, 216, 943-951.	1.0	18

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
127	Overcoming difficulties with equipoise to enable recruitment to a randomised controlled trial of partial ablation vs radical prostatectomy for unilateral localised prostate cancer. BJU International, 2018, 122, 970-977.	1.3	17
128	Protocol for a feasibility study of a cohort embedded randomised controlled trial comparing NE phron S paring T reatment (NEST) for small renal masses. BMJ Open, 2019, 9, e030965.	0.8	17
129	Multiparametric prostate MRI quality assessment using a semi-automated PI-QUAL software program. European Radiology Experimental, 2021, 5, 48.	1.7	17
130	Identifying the Index Lesion with Template Prostate Mapping Biopsies. Journal of Urology, 2015, 193, 1185-1190.	0.2	16
131	A Dedicated Prostate MRI Teaching Course Improves the Ability of the Urologist to Interpret Clinically Significant Prostate Cancer on Multiparametric MRI. European Urology, 2019, 75, 203-204.	0.9	16
132	A review of economic evaluations of diagnostic strategies using imaging in men at risk of prostate cancer. Current Opinion in Urology, 2015, 25, 483-489.	0.9	15
133	The role of the multiparametric MRI in the diagnosis of prostate cancer in biopsy-naÃ-ve men. Current Opinion in Urology, 2017, 27, 488-494.	0.9	15
134	Human airway-like multilayered tissue on 3D-TIPS printed thermoresponsive elastomer/collagen hybrid scaffolds. Acta Biomaterialia, 2020, 113, 177-195.	4.1	15
135	Has Magnetic Resonance–Guided Biopsy of the Prostate Become the Standard of Care?. European Urology, 2013, 64, 720-721.	0.9	14
136	Development and Phantom Validation of a 3-D-Ultrasound-Guided System for Targeting MRI-Visible Lesions During Transrectal Prostate Biopsy. IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering, 2017, 64, 946-958.	2.5	14
137	A multicentre randomised controlled trial assessing whether MRI-targeted biopsy is non-inferior to standard transrectal ultrasound guided biopsy for the diagnosis of clinically significant prostate cancer in men without prior biopsy: a study protocol. BMJ Open, 2017, 7, e017863.	0.8	14
138	Prostate cancer diagnostic pathway: Is a one-stop cognitive MRI targeted biopsy service a realistic goal in everyday practice? A pilot cohort in a tertiary referral centre in the UK. BMJ Open, 2018, 8, e024941.	0.8	14
139	DWI and PRECISE criteria in men on active surveillance for prostate cancer: A multicentre preliminary experience of different ADC calculations. Magnetic Resonance Imaging, 2020, 67, 50-58.	1.0	14
140	Response to Daily 10 Mg Alfuzosin Predicts Acute Urinary Retention and Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia Related Surgery in Men With Lower Urinary Tract Symptoms. Journal of Urology, 2006, 176, 1051-1056.	0.2	13
141	Focal Therapy of Prostate Cancer Using Irreversible Electroporation. Techniques in Vascular and Interventional Radiology, 2015, 18, 147-152.	0.4	13
142	The British Urology Researchers in Surgical Training (<scp>BURST</scp>) Research Collaborative: an alternative research model for carrying out large scale multiâ€centre urological studies. BJU International, 2018, 121, 6-9.	1.3	13
143	The natural history of prostate cancer on MRI: lessons from an active surveillance cohort. Prostate Cancer and Prostatic Diseases, 2018, 21, 556-563.	2.0	13
144	Prediction of significant prostate cancer in biopsy-naÃ-ve men: Validation of a novel risk model combining MRI and clinical parameters and comparison to an ERSPC risk calculator and PI-RADS. PLoS ONE, 2019, 14, e0221350.	1.1	13

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
145	Targeted biopsy of the prostate: does this result in improvement in detection of highâ€grade cancer or the occurrence of the Will Rogers phenomenon?. BJU International, 2019, 124, 643-648.	1.3	13
146	Prostate cancer treated with irreversible electroporation: MRI-based volumetric analysis and oncological outcome. Magnetic Resonance Imaging, 2019, 58, 143-147.	1.0	13
147	Sequential prostate MRI reporting in men on active surveillance: initial experience of a dedicated PRECISE software program. Magnetic Resonance Imaging, 2019, 57, 34-39.	1.0	13
148	False Positive Multiparametric Magnetic Resonance Imaging Phenotypes in the Biopsy-naÃ-ve Prostate: Are They Distinct from Significant Cancer-associated Lesions? Lessons from PROMIS. European Urology, 2021, 79, 20-29.	0.9	13
149	Promoting the use of the PI-QUAL score for prostate MRI quality: results from the ESOR Nicholas Gourtsoyiannis teaching fellowship. European Radiology, 2023, 33, 461-471.	2.3	13
150	Repeat Prostate Biopsy: Rationale, Indications, and Strategies. European Urology Focus, 2015, 1, 127-136.	1.6	12
151	Prostate cancer detection using quantitative T ₂ and T ₂ â€weighted imaging: The effects of 5â€alphaâ€reductase inhibitors in men on active surveillance. Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging, 2018, 47, 1646-1653.	1.9	12
152	Thermoresponsive Stiffness Softening of Hierarchically Porous Nanohybrid Membranes Promotes Niches for Mesenchymal Stem Cell Differentiation. Advanced Healthcare Materials, 2019, 8, e1801556.	3.9	12
153	Prostate Radiofrequency Focal Ablation (ProRAFT) Trial: A Prospective Development Study Evaluating a Bipolar Radiofrequency Device to Treat Prostate Cancer. Journal of Urology, 2021, 205, 1090-1099.	0.2	12
154	Development and internal validation of prediction models for biochemical failure and composite failure after focal salvage high intensity focused ultrasound for local radiorecurrent prostate cancer: Presentation of risk scores for individual patient prognoses. Urologic Oncology: Seminars and Original Investigations, 2018, 36, 13.e1-13.e10.	0.8	11
155	Prostate cancer measurements on serial MRI during active surveillance: it's time to be PRECISE. British Journal of Radiology, 2020, 93, 20200819.	1.0	11
156	Multivariable model development and internal validation for prostate cancer specific survival and overall survival after whole-gland salvage lodine-125 prostate brachytherapy. Radiotherapy and Oncology, 2016, 119, 104-110.	0.3	10
157	Padeliporfin vascular-targeted photodynamic therapy versus active surveillance in men with low-risk prostate cancer – Authors' reply. Lancet Oncology, The, 2017, 18, e188.	5.1	10
158	Magnetic Resonance Imaging Should Be Used in the Active Surveillance of Patients with Localised Prostate Cancer. European Urology, 2020, 77, 318-319.	0.9	10
159	Utilization of focal therapy for patients discontinuing active surveillance of prostate cancer: Recommendations of an international Delphi consensus. Urologic Oncology: Seminars and Original Investigations, 2021, 39, 781.e17-781.e24.	0.8	10
160	Evaluation of PSA and PSA Density in a Multiparametric Magnetic Resonance Imaging-Directed Diagnostic Pathway for Suspected Prostate Cancer: The INNOVATE Trial. Cancers, 2021, 13, 1985.	1.7	10
161	Conventional radical versus focal treatment for localised prostate cancer: a propensity score weighted comparison of 6-year tumour control. Prostate Cancer and Prostatic Diseases, 2021, 24, 1120-1128.	2.0	10
162	Mapping PSA density to outcome of MRI-based active surveillance for prostate cancer through joint longitudinal-survival models. Prostate Cancer and Prostatic Diseases, 2021, 24, 1028-1031.	2.0	10

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
163	Association Between Multiparametric Magnetic Resonance Imaging of the Prostate and Oncological Outcomes after Primary Treatment for Prostate Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. European Urology Oncology, 2021, 4, 519-528.	2.6	10
164	AutoProstate: Towards Automated Reporting of Prostate MRI for Prostate Cancer Assessment Using Deep Learning. Cancers, 2021, 13, 6138.	1.7	10
165	The CADMUS trial – Multi-parametric ultrasound targeted biopsies compared to multi-parametric MRI targeted biopsies in the diagnosis of clinically significant prostate cancer. Contemporary Clinical Trials, 2018, 66, 86-92.	0.8	9
166	Immunohistochemical biomarker validation in highly selective needle biopsy microarrays derived from mpMRlâ€characterized prostates. Prostate, 2018, 78, 1229-1237.	1.2	9
167	Prostate Imaging Compared to Transperineal Ultrasound-guided biopsy for significant prostate cancer Risk Evaluation (PICTURE): a prospective cohort validating study assessing Prostate HistoScanning. Prostate Cancer and Prostatic Diseases, 2019, 22, 261-267.	2.0	9
168	Management of Radiologically Indeterminate Magnetic Resonance Imaging Signals in Men at Risk of Prostate Cancer. European Urology Focus, 2019, 5, 62-68.	1.6	9
169	Comparison of Transrectal Ultrasound Biopsy to Transperineal Template Mapping Biopsies Stratified by Multiparametric Magnetic Resonance Imaging Score in the PROMIS Trial. Journal of Urology, 2020, 203, 100-107.	0.2	9
170	Magnetic Resonance Imaging and Targeted Biopsies Compared to Transperineal Mapping Biopsies Before Focal Ablation in Localised and Metastatic Recurrent Prostate Cancer After Radiotherapy. European Urology, 2022, 81, 598-605.	0.9	9
171	Systematic identification of functionally relevant risk alleles to stratify aggressive versus indolent prostate cancer. Oncotarget, 2018, 9, 12812-12824.	0.8	8
172	Added value of diffusionâ€weighted images and dynamic contrast enhancement in multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging for the detection of clinically significant prostate cancer in the PICTURE trial. BJU International, 2020, 125, 391-398.	1.3	8
173	Outcomes of the RAFT trial: robotic surgery after focal therapy. BJU International, 2021, 128, 504-510.	1.3	8
174	Detailing Sexual Outcomes After Focal Therapy for Localised Prostate Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. European Urology Focus, 2022, 8, 926-941.	1.6	8
175	The Role of Prostate-specific Membrane Antigen Positron Emission Tomography/Magnetic Resonance Imaging in Primary and Recurrent Prostate Cancer: A Systematic Review of the Literature. European Urology Focus, 2021, , .	1.6	8
176	Conditional Segmentation in Lieu of Image Registration. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2019, , 401-409.	1.0	8
177	Imageâ€Guided Magnetic Thermoseed Navigation and Tumor Ablation Using a Magnetic Resonance Imaging System. Advanced Science, 2022, , 2105333.	5.6	8
178	There Is No Longer a Role for Systematic Biopsies in Prostate Cancer Diagnosis. European Urology Open Science, 2022, 38, 12-13.	0.2	8
179	Defining the level of evidence for technology adoption in the localized prostate cancer pathway. Urologic Oncology: Seminars and Original Investigations, 2014, 32, 924-930.	0.8	7
180	From computer-assisted intervention research to clinical impact: The need for a holistic approach. Medical Image Analysis, 2016, 33, 72-78.	7.0	7

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
181	Is a negative prostate biopsy a risk factor for a prostate cancer related death?. Lancet Oncology, The, 2017, 18, 162-163.	5.1	7
182	Technical Note: Error metrics for estimating the accuracy of needle/instrument placement during transperineal magnetic resonance/ultrasoundâ€guided prostate interventions. Medical Physics, 2018, 45, 1408-1414.	1.6	7
183	Genetic correlates of prostate cancer visibility (and invisibility) on multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging: it's time to take stock. BJU International, 2020, 125, 340-342.	1.3	7
184	Conspicuity of prostate cancer on multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging: A crossâ€disciplinary translational hypothesis. FASEB Journal, 2020, 34, 14150-14159.	0.2	7
185	Genetic landscape of prostate cancer conspicuity on multiparametric MRI: a protocol for a systematic review and bioinformatic analysis. BMJ Open, 2020, 10, e034611.	0.8	7
186	An Exploratory Study of Dose Escalation <i>>vs</i> > Standard Focal High-Intensity Focused Ultrasound for Treating Nonmetastatic Prostate Cancer. Journal of Endourology, 2020, 34, 641-646.	1.1	7
187	Tissue-Engineering the Fibrous Pancreatic Tumour Stroma Capsule in 3D Tumouroids to Demonstrate Paclitaxel Response. International Journal of Molecular Sciences, 2021, 22, 4289.	1.8	7
188	Is Prostate Magnetic Resonance Imaging Going to Break the Bank?. European Urology, 2014, 66, 437-438.	0.9	6
189	The anti-angiogenic tyrosine kinase inhibitor Pazopanib kills cancer cells and disrupts endothelial networks in biomimetic three-dimensional renal tumouroids. Journal of Tissue Engineering, 2020, 11, 204173142092059.	2.3	6
190	Role of MRI for the detection of prostate cancer. World Journal of Urology, 2021, 39, 637-649.	1.2	6
191	Prostate cancer and the human papilloma virus: causative association, role of vaccines, and the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Prostate Cancer and Prostatic Diseases, 2022, 25, 55-57.	2.0	6
192	Geographic Variability, Time Trends and Association of Preoperative Magnetic Resonance Imaging with Surgical Outcomes for Elderly United States Men with Prostate Cancer: A Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results-Medicare Analysis. Journal of Urology, 2022, 208, 609-617.	0.2	6
193	SCREENING FOR PROSTATE CANCER APPEARS TO WORK, BUT AT WHAT COST?. BJU International, 2009, 104, 290-292.	1.3	5
194	Why Focal Therapy is a Legitimate and Necessary Response to a Changing World. Journal of Urology, 2015, 194, 875-876.	0.2	5
195	The challenging landscape of medical device approval in localized prostate cancer. Nature Reviews Urology, 2016, 13, 91-98.	1.9	5
196	Diagnostic accuracy of the PROMIS study – Authors' reply. Lancet, The, 2017, 390, 362.	6.3	5
197	Exploring the risk-reward balance in focal therapy for prostate cancer—a contribution to the debate. Prostate Cancer and Prostatic Diseases, 2019, 22, 382-384.	2.0	5
198	Detailing sexual outcomes after treatment of localised prostate cancer with focal therapy using various energy sources: protocol for a mixed-methods study. BMJ Open, 2020, 10, e045500.	0.8	5

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
199	Prostate cancer visibility on multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging: high Gleason grade and increased tumour volume are not the only important histopathological features. BJU International, 2020, 126, 237-239.	1.3	5
200	Conspicuity of cribriform prostate cancer on multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging: the jury is still out. BJU International, 2021, 127, 169-170.	1.3	5
201	Can quantitative analysis of multi-parametric MRI independently predict failure of focal salvage HIFU therapy in men with radio-recurrent prostate cancer?. Urologic Oncology: Seminars and Original Investigations, 2021, 39, 830.e1-830.e8.	0.8	5
202	Update from the ReIMAGINE Prostate Cancer Screening Study NCT04063566: Inviting Men for Prostate Cancer Screening Using Magnetic Resonance Imaging. European Urology Focus, 2021, 7, 503-505.	1.6	5
203	Tumour growth rates of prostate cancer during active surveillance: is there a difference between MRI-visible low and intermediate-risk disease?. British Journal of Radiology, 2022, 95, 20210321.	1.0	5
204	Diagnostic Accuracy of Abbreviated Bi-Parametric MRI (a-bpMRI) for Prostate Cancer Detection and Screening: A Multi-Reader Study. Diagnostics, 2022, 12, 231.	1.3	5
205	Renal tumouroids: challenges of manufacturing 3D cultures from patient derived primary cells. Journal of Cell Communication and Signaling, 2022, 16, 637-648.	1.8	5
206	A novel randomised controlled trial design in prostate cancer. BJU International, 2015, 116, 6-8.	1.3	4
207	Incidental prostate cancer diagnosed following a transurethral resection of the prostate: A national database analysis in England. Journal of Clinical Urology, 2016, 9, 170-176.	0.1	4
208	MP33-20 THE SMARTTARGET BIOPSY TRIAL: A PROSPECTIVE PAIRED BLINDED TRIAL WITH RANDOMISATION TO COMPARE VISUAL-ESTIMATION AND IMAGE-FUSION TARGETED PROSTATE BIOPSIES. Journal of Urology, 2017, 197, .	0.2	4
209	Acceptability and feasibility study of patient-specific †tumouroids†as personalised treatment screening tools: Protocol for prospective tissue and data collection of participants with confirmed or suspected renal cell carcinoma. International Journal of Surgery Protocols, 2019, 14, 24-29.	0.5	4
210	A critical evaluation of visual proportion of Gleason 4 and maximum cancer core length quantified by histopathologists. Scientific Reports, 2020, 10, 17177.	1.6	4
211	Exploring Patient Views and Acceptance of Multiparametric Magnetic Resonance Imaging for the Investigation of Suspected Prostate Cancer (the PACT Study): A Mixed-Methods Study Protocol. Methods and Protocols, 2020, 3, 26.	0.9	4
212	Which Prostate Cancers are Undetected by Multiparametric Magnetic Resonance Imaging in Men with Previous Prostate Biopsy? An Analysis from the PICTURE Study. European Urology Open Science, 2021, 30, 16-24.	0.2	4
213	Deep Learning-Based Long Term Mortality Prediction in the National Lung Screening Trial. IEEE Access, 2022, 10, 34369-34378.	2.6	4
214	Re: Jarow et al.: Drug and Device Development for Localized Prostate Cancer: Report of a Food and Drug Administration/American Urological Association Public Workshop (Urology 2014;83:975-979). Urology, 2014, 84, 732-733.	0.5	3
215	Are men who are biopsied without prior prostate magnetic resonance imaging getting substandard care?. BJU International, 2015, 116, 837-839.	1.3	3
216	Evaluating variation in use of definitive therapy and risk-adjusted prostate cancer mortality in England and the USA. BMJ Open, 2015, 5, e006805-e006805.	0.8	3

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
217	Development data associated with effects of stiffness softening of 3D-TIPS elastomer nanohybrid scaffolds on tissue ingrowth, vascularization and inflammation in vivo. Data in Brief, 2019, 22, 885-902.	0.5	3
218	Mapping Contemporary Biopsy Zones to Traditional Prostatic Anatomy: The Key to Understanding Relationships Between Prostate Cancer Topography, Magnetic Resonance Imaging Conspicuity, and Clinical Risk. European Urology, 2021, 80, 263-265.	0.9	3
219	What Burden of Prostate Cancer Can Radiologists Rule Out on Multiparametric Magnetic Resonance Imaging? A Sensitivity Analysis Based on Varying the Target Condition in Template Prostate Mapping Biopsies. Urology, 2015, 86, 544-551.	0.5	2
220	Reply from Authors re: Giorgio Gandaglia, Alberto Briganti, Andrea Salonia, Francesco Montorsi. Excellent Erectile Function Recovery after Focal Therapy: Is This Enough? Eur Urol 2016;69:852–3. European Urology, 2016, 69, 853-854.	0.9	2
221	An end to the phenomenon of â€~upgrading' in early prostate cancer?. BJU International, 2017, 119, 506-507.	1.3	2
222	Phenotypic appearances of prostate utilizing PET-MRI and PET-CT with 68Ga-PSMA, radiolabelled choline and 68Ga-DOTATATE. Nuclear Medicine Communications, 2018, 39, 196-204.	0.5	2
223	Performance characteristics of multiparametric-MRI at a non-academic hospital using transperineal template mapping biopsy as a reference standard. International Journal of Surgery Open, 2018, 10, 66-71.	0.2	2
224	Dropping the <scp>GAD</scp> – just a fad? The case for a simpler, quicker, safer and cheaper prostate <scp>magnetic resonance imaging</scp> . BJU International, 2019, 124, 183-184.	1.3	2
225	Re: Henk G. van der Poel, Roderick C.N. van den Bergh, Erik Briers, et al. Focal Therapy in Primary Localised Prostate Cancer: The European Association of Urology Position in 2018. Eur Urol 2018;74:84–91. European Urology, 2019, 75, e21-e22.	0.9	2
226	Relationship of prostate cancer topography and tumour conspicuity on multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging: a protocol for a systematic review and meta-analysis. BMJ Open, 2022, 12, e050376.	0.8	2
227	A protocol for the VISION study: An indiVidual patient data meta-analysis of randomised trials comparing MRI-targeted biopsy to standard transrectal ultraSound guided blopsy in the detection of prOstate cancer. PLoS ONE, 2022, 17, e0263345.	1.1	2
228	Prostate Cancer Staging Tablesâ€"A Predictive Model for the UK. British Journal of Medical and Surgical Urology, 2008, 1, 107-119.	0.2	1
229	Are we ready for the new wave of focal therapy interventions for men with early prostate cancer?. BJU International, 2013, 112, 423-424.	1.3	1
230	¹⁸ F-FECH PET/CT to Assess Clinically Significant Disease in Prostate Cancer: Correlation With Maximum and Total Cancer Core Length Obtained via MRI-Guided Template Mapping Biopsies. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2016, 207, 1297-1306.	1.0	1
231	Doubling our precision of risk stratification in early prostate cancer: too good to be true?. BJU International, 2016, 117, 8-9.	1.3	1
232	Re: Magnetic Resonance Imaging Underestimation of Prostate Cancer Geometry: Use of Patient Specific Molds toÂCorrelate Images with Whole Mount Pathology. Journal of Urology, 2017, 198, 1436-1437.	0.2	1
233	Has tailored, tissueâ€selective tumour ablation in men with prostate cancer come of age?. BJU International, 2018, 121, 676-677.	1.3	1
234	Translating costâ€utility modelling into the real world – the case of focal highâ€intensity focussed ultrasound and active surveillance. BJU International, 2019, 124, 900-901.	1.3	1

#	Article	IF	Citations
235	Prostate Cancer Undetected by mpMRI: Tumor Conspicuity is Reliant Upon Optimal Scan Timing and Quality. Urology, 2021, 148, 316-317.	0.5	1
236	Re: Simpa S. Salami, Jeffrey J. Tosoian, Srinivas Nallandhighal, et al. Serial Molecular Profiling of Low-grade Prostate Cancer to Assess Tumor Upgrading: A Longitudinal Cohort Study. Eur Urol. In press. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2020.06.041. European Urology, 2021, 79, e98-e99.	0.9	1
237	Clinical outcomes associated with prostate cancer conspicuity on biparametric and multiparametric MRI: a protocol for a systematic review and meta-analysis of biochemical recurrence following radical prostatectomy. BMJ Open, 2021, 11, e047664.	0.8	1
238	An update from the ReIMAGINE Prostate Cancer Risk Study (NCT04060589): A prospective cohort study in men with a suspicion of prostate cancer who are referred onto a magnetic resonance imaging–based diagnostic pathway with donation of tissue, blood, and urine for biomarker analyses. European Urology, 2021, 80, 398-399.	0.9	1
239	Multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging in the diagnosis and characterisation of prostate cancer: The PROMIS study Journal of Clinical Oncology, 2012, 30, 62-62.	0.8	1
240	Is perfect the enemy of good? Weighing the evidence for biparametric MRI in prostate cancer. British Journal of Radiology, 2022, 95, 20210840.	1.0	1
241	Prostate-specific membrane antigen positron emission tomography compared to multiparametric MRI for prostate cancer diagnosis: a protocol for a systematic review and meta-analysis. BMJ Open, 2021, 11, e052277.	0.8	1
242	Diagnostic potential of radiological apical tumor involvement. Journal of Robotic Surgery, 2022, , 1.	1.0	1
243	Treating coexistent benign prostatic hyperplasia/lower urinary tract symptoms and erectile dysfunction in the aging male. Aging Health, 2007, 3, 191-200.	0.3	0
244	Combination therapy—a strategy for BPH-related progression. Nature Reviews Urology, 2010, 7, 239-240.	1.9	0
245	Foreword. BJU International, 2012, 109, v-v.	1.3	0
246	The University College London/Medical Research Council/National Institute of Health Research-Health Technology Assessment PROMIS Trial: An Update. European Urology Focus, 2015, 1, 212-214.	1.6	0
247	A randomized controlled trial to investigate magnetic resonance imaging–targeted biopsy as an alternative diagnostic strategy to transrectal ultrasound–guided prostate biopsy in the diagnosis of prostate cancer. Urologic Oncology: Seminars and Original Investigations, 2015, 33, 156-157.	0.8	0
248	Editorial Comment. Journal of Urology, 2016, 196, 559-559.	0.2	0
249	Evidence based management of male lower urinary tract symptoms: A contemporary update. International Journal of Surgery, 2016, 25, 162-163.	1.1	0
250	The changing prostate cancer pathway – new challenges, new pitfalls. Medico-Legal Journal, 2017, 85, 70-80.	0.2	0
251	Re: Jochen Walz. The "PROMIS―of Magnetic Resonance Imaging Cost Effectiveness in Prostate Cancer Diagnosis? Eur Urol 2018;73:31–2. European Urology, 2018, 73, e151-e152.	0.9	0
252	Data of a stiffness softening mechanism effect on proliferation and differentiation of a human bone marrow derived mesenchymal stem cell line towards the chondrogenic and osteogenic lineages. Data in Brief, 2018, 21, 133-142.	0.5	0

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
253	Reply to Francesco Montorsi, Giorgio Gandaglia, Alberto Briganti's Letter to the Editor, re: Veeru Kasivisvanathan, Armando Stabile, Joana B. Neves, et al. Magnetic Resonance Imaging-targeted Biopsy Versus Systematic Biopsy in the Detection of Prostate Cancer: A Systematic Review, Meta-analysis. Eur Urol 2019;76:284–303. European Urology, 2019, 76, e133-e134.	0.9	0
254	Stiffness Softening: Thermoresponsive Stiffness Softening of Hierarchically Porous Nanohybrid Membranes Promotes Niches for Mesenchymal Stem Cell Differentiation (Adv. Healthcare Mater.) Tj ETQq0 0 0	rgB 3. ØVve	rloata 10 Tf 50
255	To see or not to see â€" what renders prostate cancer visible?. Nature Reviews Urology, 2019, 16, 274-275.	1.9	0
256	Re: Quantitation of hypoechoic lesions for the prediction and Gleason grading of prostate cancer: a prospective study. World Journal of Urology, 2020, 38, 803-804.	1.2	0
257	Reply to Carissa E. Chu, Peter E. Lonergan, and Peter R. Carroll's Letter to the Editor re: Vasilis Stavrinides, Francesco Giganti, Bruce Trock, et al. Five-year Outcomes of Magnetic Resonance Imaging-based Active Surveillance for Prostate Cancer: A Large Cohort Study. Eur Urol 2020;78:443–51. European Urology, 2020, 78, e112-e113.	0.9	0
258	Reply to Francesco Montorsi, Giorgio Gandaglia, Nicola Fossati, Andrea Salonia, and Alberto Briganti's Letter to the Editor re: Vasilis Stavrinides, Francesco Giganti, Bruce Trock, et al. Five-year Outcomes of Magnetic Resonance Imaging–based Active Surveillance for Prostate Cancer: A Large Cohort Study. Eur Urol 2020;78:443–51. European Urology, 2020, 78, e166.	0.9	0
259	Histopathological features of prostate cancer conspicuity on multiparametric MRI: protocol for a systematic review and meta-analysis. BMJ Open, 2020, 10, e039735.	0.8	0
260	Re: Giorgio Gandaglia, Guillaume Ploussard, Massimo Valerio, et al. Prognostic Implications of Multiparametric Magnetic Resonance Imaging and Concomitant Systematic Biopsy in Predicting Biochemical Recurrence After Radical Prostatectomy in Prostate Cancer Patients Diagnosed with Magnetic Resonance Imaging–targeted Biopsy. Eur Urol Oncol 2020;7:739–47. European Urology	2.6	0
261	Oncology, 2021, 4, 127-128. Chronic Baseline Prostate Inflammation is Associated with Lower Tumor Grade in Men with Prostate Cancer on Repeat Biopsy: Results from the REDUCE Study. Letter Journal of Urology, 2021, 205, 1233-1234.	0.2	0
262	Followup of Men with PI-RADS TM 4 or 5 Abnormality on Prostate Magnetic Resonance Imaging and Nonmalignant Pathological Findings on Initial Targeted Prostate Biopsy. Letter Journal of Urology, 2021, 205, 1526-1528.	0.2	0
263	Patient Perspectives and Understanding of MRI-directed Prostate Cancer Diagnosis. Urology, 2021, 153, 6-7.	0.5	0
264	Micro-ultrasound vs. MRI for prostate cancer diagnosis: Considerations to address. Canadian Urological Association Journal, 2021, 15, E522-E523.	0.3	0
265	Reply by Authors. Journal of Urology, 2020, 203, 1093-1093.	0.2	O
266	High-Intensity-Focused Ultrasound for Prostate Cancer. , 2021, , 197-213.		0
267	Re: Does the Visibility of Grade Group 1 Prostate Cancer on Baseline Multiparametric Magnetic Resonance Imaging Impact Clinical Outcomes?. Journal of Urology, 2020, 204, 1065-1066.	0.2	O
268	Title is missing!. , 2019, 16, e1002998.		0
269	Title is missing!. , 2019, 16, e1002998.		0
270	Title is missing!. , 2019, 16, e1002998.		O

ARTICLE IF CITATIONS
271 Title is missing!., 2019, 16, e1002998. 0