

Monique J Roobol

List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: <https://exaly.com/author-pdf/941354/publications.pdf>

Version: 2024-02-01

356
papers

25,388
citations

10986

71
h-index

7950

149
g-index

378
all docs

378
docs citations

378
times ranked

16821
citing authors

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
1	Screening and Prostate-Cancer Mortality in a Randomized European Study. <i>New England Journal of Medicine</i> , 2009, 360, 1320-1328.	27.0	3,540
2	MRI-Targeted or Standard Biopsy for Prostate-Cancer Diagnosis. <i>New England Journal of Medicine</i> , 2018, 378, 1767-1777.	27.0	2,036
3	Screening and prostate cancer mortality: results of the European Randomised Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer (ERSPC) at 13 years of follow-up. <i>Lancet, The</i> , 2014, 384, 2027-2035.	13.7	1,261
4	Prostate-Cancer Mortality at 11 Years of Follow-up. <i>New England Journal of Medicine</i> , 2012, 366, 981-990.	27.0	1,105
5	Association analyses of more than 140,000 men identify 63 new prostate cancer susceptibility loci. <i>Nature Genetics</i> , 2018, 50, 928-936.	21.4	652
6	Reporting and Interpreting Decision Curve Analysis: A Guide for Investigators. <i>European Urology</i> , 2018, 74, 796-804.	1.9	590
7	Magnetic Resonance Imaging-targeted Biopsy May Enhance the Diagnostic Accuracy of Significant Prostate Cancer Detection Compared to Standard Transrectal Ultrasound-guided Biopsy: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. <i>European Urology</i> , 2015, 68, 438-450.	1.9	569
8	Active Surveillance for Low-Risk Prostate Cancer Worldwide: The PRIAS Study. <i>European Urology</i> , 2013, 63, 597-603.	1.9	450
9	Quality-of-Life Effects of Prostate-Specific Antigen Screening. <i>New England Journal of Medicine</i> , 2012, 367, 595-605.	27.0	364
10	A 16-yr Follow-up of the European Randomized study of Screening for Prostate Cancer. <i>European Urology</i> , 2019, 76, 43-51.	1.9	359
11	A Decade of Active Surveillance in the PRIAS Study: An Update and Evaluation of the Criteria Used to Recommend a Switch to Active Treatment. <i>European Urology</i> , 2016, 70, 954-960.	1.9	290
12	Prediction of Indolent Prostate Cancer: Validation and Updating of a Prognostic Nomogram. <i>Journal of Urology</i> , 2007, 177, 107-112.	0.4	271
13	Infectious Complications and Hospital Admissions After Prostate Biopsy in a European Randomized Trial. <i>European Urology</i> , 2012, 61, 1110-1114.	1.9	269
14	Trans-ancestry genome-wide association meta-analysis of prostate cancer identifies new susceptibility loci and informs genetic risk prediction. <i>Nature Genetics</i> , 2021, 53, 65-75.	21.4	264
15	A Critical Analysis of the Tumor Volume Threshold for Clinically Insignificant Prostate Cancer Using a Data Set of a Randomized Screening Trial. <i>Journal of Urology</i> , 2011, 185, 121-125.	0.4	248
16	A Risk-Based Strategy Improves Prostate-Specific Antigen-Driven Detection of Prostate Cancer. <i>European Urology</i> , 2010, 57, 79-85.	1.9	245
17	Prostate MRI, with or without MRI-targeted biopsy, and systematic biopsy for detecting prostate cancer. <i>The Cochrane Library</i> , 2019, 2019, CD012663.	2.8	234
18	Prostate Magnetic Resonance Imaging, with or Without Magnetic Resonance Imaging-targeted Biopsy, and Systematic Biopsy for Detecting Prostate Cancer: A Cochrane Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. <i>European Urology</i> , 2020, 77, 78-94.	1.9	224

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
19	Prostate-Specific Antigen (PSA) Isoform p2PSA in Combination with Total PSA and Free PSA Improves Diagnostic Accuracy in Prostate Cancer Detection. <i>European Urology</i> , 2010, 57, 921-927.	1.9	223
20	Screening for Prostate Cancer Decreases the Risk of Developing Metastatic Disease: Findings from the European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer (ERSPC). <i>European Urology</i> , 2012, 62, 745-752.	1.9	216
21	Contemporary Role of Systematic Prostate Biopsies: Indications, Techniques, and Implications for Patient Care. <i>European Urology</i> , 2013, 63, 214-230.	1.9	214
22	Prospective Validation of Active Surveillance in Prostate Cancer: The PRIAS Study. <i>European Urology</i> , 2007, 52, 1560-1563.	1.9	212
23	Reducing Unnecessary Biopsy During Prostate Cancer Screening Using a Four-Kallikrein Panel: An Independent Replication. <i>Journal of Clinical Oncology</i> , 2010, 28, 2493-2498.	1.6	204
24	Prostate Cancer Mortality Reduction by Prostate-Specific Antigen-Based Screening Adjusted for Nonattendance and Contamination in the European Randomised Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer (ERSPC). <i>European Urology</i> , 2009, 56, 584-591.	1.9	180
25	Disease-specific survival of patients with invasive cribriform and intraductal prostate cancer at diagnostic biopsy. <i>Modern Pathology</i> , 2016, 29, 630-636.	5.5	174
26	Prediction of Prostate Cancer Risk: The Role of Prostate Volume and Digital Rectal Examination in the ERSPC Risk Calculators. <i>European Urology</i> , 2012, 61, 577-583.	1.9	170
27	Reconciling the Effects of Screening on Prostate Cancer Mortality in the ERSPC and PLCO Trials. <i>Annals of Internal Medicine</i> , 2017, 167, 449.	3.9	160
28	The effect of the USPSTF PSA screening recommendation on prostate cancer incidence patterns in the USA. <i>Nature Reviews Urology</i> , 2017, 14, 26-37.	3.8	158
29	Short-term outcomes of the prospective multicentre Prostate Cancer Research International: Active Surveillance study. <i>BJU International</i> , 2010, 105, 956-962.	2.5	157
30	Performance of the Prostate Cancer Antigen 3 (PCA3) Gene and Prostate-Specific Antigen in Prescreened Men: Exploring the Value of PCA3 for a First-line Diagnostic Test. <i>European Urology</i> , 2010, 58, 475-481.	1.9	152
31	EAU-EANM-ESTRO-ESUR-SIOG Prostate Cancer Guideline Panel Consensus Statements for Deferred Treatment with Curative Intent for Localised Prostate Cancer from an International Collaborative Study (DETECTIVE Study). <i>European Urology</i> , 2019, 76, 790-813.	1.9	151
32	Early Detection of Prostate Cancer in 2007. <i>European Urology</i> , 2008, 53, 468-477.	1.9	140
33	Active surveillance for prostate cancer: a narrative review of clinical guidelines. <i>Nature Reviews Urology</i> , 2016, 13, 151-167.	3.8	139
34	Prostate cancer: ESMO Consensus Conference Guidelines 2012. <i>Annals of Oncology</i> , 2013, 24, 1141-1162.	1.2	137
35	Overdetection, overtreatment and costs in prostate-specific antigen screening for prostate cancer. <i>British Journal of Cancer</i> , 2009, 101, 1833-1838.	6.4	134
36	Active Surveillance for Prostate Cancer: A Systematic Review of Clinicopathologic Variables and Biomarkers for Risk Stratification. <i>European Urology</i> , 2015, 67, 619-626.	1.9	129

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
37	Prediction of High-grade Prostate Cancer Following Multiparametric Magnetic Resonance Imaging: Improving the Rotterdam European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer Risk Calculators. <i>European Urology</i> , 2019, 75, 310-318.	1.9	129
38	Outcomes of initially expectantly managed patients with low or intermediate risk screen-detected localized prostate cancer. <i>BJU International</i> , 2012, 110, 1672-1677.	2.5	125
39	False-negative Prostate Needle Biopsies: Frequency, Histopathologic Features, and Follow-up. <i>American Journal of Surgical Pathology</i> , 2010, 34, 35-43.	3.7	120
40	Cost-effectiveness of Prostate Cancer Screening: A Simulation Study Based on ERSPC Data. <i>Journal of the National Cancer Institute</i> , 2015, 107, 366.	6.3	120
41	A Meta-analysis of Individual Participant Data Reveals an Association between Circulating Levels of IGF-I and Prostate Cancer Risk. <i>Cancer Research</i> , 2016, 76, 2288-2300.	0.9	117
42	Compliance Rates with the Prostate Cancer Research International Active Surveillance (PRIAS) Protocol and Disease Reclassification in Noncompliers. <i>European Urology</i> , 2015, 68, 814-821.	1.9	116
43	Prostate Cancer Screening: Facts, Statistics, and Interpretation in Response to the US Preventive Services Task Force Review. <i>Journal of Clinical Oncology</i> , 2012, 30, 2581-2584.	1.6	114
44	Metastatic Prostate Cancer Incidence and Prostate-specific Antigen Testing: New Insights from the European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer. <i>European Urology</i> , 2015, 68, 885-890.	1.9	111
45	Features and preliminary results of the Dutch centre of the ERSPC (Rotterdam, the Netherlands). <i>BJU International</i> , 2003, 92, 48-54.	2.5	110
46	ERG immunohistochemistry is not predictive for PSA recurrence, local recurrence or overall survival after radical prostatectomy for prostate cancer. <i>Modern Pathology</i> , 2012, 25, 471-479.	5.5	109
47	Prostate-specific Antigen Testing as Part of a Risk-Adapted Early Detection Strategy for Prostate Cancer: European Association of Urology Position and Recommendations for 2021. <i>European Urology</i> , 2021, 80, 703-711.	1.9	108
48	A Four-Kallikrein Panel Predicts Prostate Cancer in Men with Recent Screening: Data from the European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer, Rotterdam. <i>Clinical Cancer Research</i> , 2010, 16, 3232-3239.	7.0	106
49	Risk-Based Prostate Cancer Screening. <i>European Urology</i> , 2012, 61, 652-661.	1.9	102
50	Importance of prostate volume in the European Randomised Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer (ERSPC) risk calculators: results from the prostate biopsy collaborative group. <i>World Journal of Urology</i> , 2012, 30, 149-155.	2.2	101
51	Screening for Prostate Cancer: Results of the Rotterdam Section of the European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer. <i>European Urology</i> , 2013, 64, 530-539.	1.9	101
52	The Role of the Digital Rectal Examination in Subsequent Screening Visits in the European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer (ERSPC), Rotterdam. <i>European Urology</i> , 2008, 54, 581-588.	1.9	100
53	A four-kallikrein panel for the prediction of repeat prostate biopsy: data from the European Randomized Study of Prostate Cancer Screening in Rotterdam, Netherlands. <i>British Journal of Cancer</i> , 2010, 103, 708-714.	6.4	99
54	Cancer Detection and Cancer Characteristics in the European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer (ERSPC) – Section Rotterdam. <i>European Urology</i> , 2007, 52, 89-97.	1.9	98

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
55	Defining the threshold for significant versus insignificant prostate cancer. <i>Nature Reviews Urology</i> , 2013, 10, 473-482.	3.8	98
56	A multiparametric magnetic resonance imagingâ€based risk model to determine the risk of significant prostate cancer prior to biopsy. <i>BJU International</i> , 2017, 120, 774-781.	2.5	98
57	Is delayed radical prostatectomy in men with lowâ€risk screenâ€detected prostate cancer associated with a higher risk of unfavorable outcomes?. <i>Cancer</i> , 2010, 116, 1281-1290.	4.1	97
58	Risk stratification in prostate cancer screening. <i>Nature Reviews Urology</i> , 2013, 10, 38-48.	3.8	97
59	A graphical device to represent the outcomes of a logistic regression analysis. <i>Prostate</i> , 2008, 68, 1674-1680.	2.3	88
60	Fine-mapping of prostate cancer susceptibility loci in a large meta-analysis identifies candidate causal variants. <i>Nature Communications</i> , 2018, 9, 2256.	12.8	88
61	Shared heritability and functional enrichment across six solid cancers. <i>Nature Communications</i> , 2019, 10, 431.	12.8	88
62	The Relationship between Prostate-Specific Antigen and Prostate Cancer Risk: The Prostate Biopsy Collaborative Group. <i>Clinical Cancer Research</i> , 2010, 16, 4374-4381.	7.0	86
63	Presence of invasive cribriform or intraductal growth at biopsy outperforms percentage grade 4 in predicting outcome of Gleason score 3+4=7 prostate cancer. <i>Modern Pathology</i> , 2017, 30, 1126-1132.	5.5	82
64	Structured Population-based Prostate-specific Antigen Screening for Prostate Cancer: The European Association of Urology Position in 2019. <i>European Urology</i> , 2019, 76, 142-150.	1.9	80
65	Prediction Medicine: Biomarkers, Risk Calculators and Magnetic Resonance Imaging as Risk Stratification Tools in Prostate Cancer Diagnosis. <i>International Journal of Molecular Sciences</i> , 2019, 20, 1637.	4.1	80
66	Use of galliumâ€68 prostateâ€specific membrane antigen positronâ€emission tomography for detecting lymph node metastases in primary and recurrent prostate cancer and location of recurrence after radical prostatectomy: an overview of the current literature. <i>BJU International</i> , 2020, 125, 206-214.	2.5	80
67	Do Anxiety and Distress Increase During Active Surveillance for Low Risk Prostate Cancer?. <i>Journal of Urology</i> , 2010, 183, 1786-1791.	0.4	79
68	Prostate-specific antigen velocity at low prostate-specific antigen levels as screening tool for prostate cancer: results of second screening round of ERSPC (ROTTERDAM). <i>Urology</i> , 2004, 63, 309-313.	1.0	78
69	Predictive Value of Four Kallikrein Markers for Pathologically Insignificant Compared With Aggressive Prostate Cancer in Radical Prostatectomy Specimens: Results From the European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer Section Rotterdam. <i>European Urology</i> , 2013, 64, 693-699.	1.9	78
70	Does PSA Velocity Predict Prostate Cancer in Pre-Screened Populations?. <i>European Urology</i> , 2006, 49, 460-465.	1.9	76
71	The Added Value of Percentage of Free to Total Prostate-specific Antigen, PCA3, and a Kallikrein Panel to the ERSPC Risk Calculator for Prostate Cancer in Prescreened Men. <i>European Urology</i> , 2014, 66, 1109-1115.	1.9	74
72	Is magnetic resonance imagingâ€targeted biopsy a useful addition to systematic confirmatory biopsy in men on active surveillance for lowâ€risk prostate cancer? A systematic review and metaâ€analysis. <i>BJU International</i> , 2018, 122, 946-958.	2.5	73

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
73	Prostate-specific Antigenâ€‘Based Prostate Cancer Screening: Reduction of Prostate Cancer Mortality After Correction for Nonattendance and Contamination in the Rotterdam Section of the European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer. <i>European Urology</i> , 2014, 65, 329-336.	1.9	72
74	Large cribriform growth pattern identifies ISUP grade 2 prostate cancer at high risk for recurrence and metastasis. <i>Modern Pathology</i> , 2019, 32, 139-146.	5.5	71
75	Is additional testing necessary in men with prostate-specific antigen levels of 1.0 ng/mL or less in a population-based screening setting? (ERSPC, section Rotterdam). <i>Urology</i> , 2005, 65, 343-346.	1.0	70
76	COMPARISON OF SCREEN DETECTED AND CLINICALLY DIAGNOSED PROSTATE CANCER IN THE EUROPEAN RANDOMIZED STUDY OF SCREENING FOR PROSTATE CANCER, SECTION ROTTERDAM. <i>Journal of Urology</i> , 2005, 174, 121-125.	0.4	68
77	The effect of study arm on prostate cancer treatment in the large screening trial ERSPC. <i>International Journal of Cancer</i> , 2010, 126, 2387-2393.	5.1	68
78	Tumour markers in prostate cancer III: Biomarkers in urine. <i>Acta OncolÃ³gica</i> , 2011, 50, 85-89.	1.8	68
79	The interobserver variability of digital rectal examination in a large randomized trial for the screening of prostate cancer. <i>Prostate</i> , 2008, 68, 985-993.	2.3	67
80	Riskâ€‘stratification based on magnetic resonance imaging and prostateâ€‘specific antigen density may reduce unnecessary followâ€‘up biopsy procedures in men on active surveillance for lowâ€‘risk prostate cancer. <i>BJU International</i> , 2017, 120, 511-519.	2.5	67
81	Evaluating the PCPT risk calculator in ten international biopsy cohorts: results from the Prostate Biopsy Collaborative Group. <i>World Journal of Urology</i> , 2012, 30, 181-187.	2.2	66
82	A longitudinal study on the impact of active surveillance for prostate cancer on anxiety and distress levels. <i>Psycho-Oncology</i> , 2015, 24, 348-354.	2.3	66
83	Prostate cancer outcomes of men with biopsy Gleason score 6 and 7 without cribriform or intraductal carcinoma. <i>European Journal of Cancer</i> , 2016, 66, 26-33.	2.8	66
84	Nomogram use for the prediction of indolent prostate cancer. <i>Cancer</i> , 2007, 110, 2218-2221.	4.1	65
85	Prostate-Specific Antigen Velocity for Early Detection of Prostate Cancer: Result from a Large, Representative, Population-based Cohort. <i>European Urology</i> , 2009, 56, 753-760.	1.9	65
86	Semantics in active surveillance for men with localized prostate cancer â€‘ results of a modified Delphi consensus procedure. <i>Nature Reviews Urology</i> , 2017, 14, 312-322.	3.8	65
87	Predictors of Unfavourable Repeat Biopsy Results in Men Participating in a Prospective Active Surveillance Program. <i>European Urology</i> , 2012, 61, 370-377.	1.9	64
88	The Melbourne Consensus Statement on the early detection of prostate cancer. <i>BJU International</i> , 2014, 113, 186-188.	2.5	64
89	A Multicentre Evaluation of the Role of the Prostate Health Index (PHI) in Regions with Differing Prevalence of Prostate Cancer: Adjustment of PHI Reference Ranges is Needed for European and Asian Settings. <i>European Urology</i> , 2019, 75, 558-561.	1.9	64
90	Improving the Rotterdam European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer Risk Calculator for Initial Prostate Biopsy by Incorporating the 2014 International Society of Urological Pathology Gleason Grading and Cribriform growth. <i>European Urology</i> , 2017, 72, 45-51.	1.9	63

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
91	Prediction of prostate cancer in unscreened men: External validation of a risk calculator. <i>European Journal of Cancer</i> , 2011, 47, 903-909.	2.8	62
92	Comparison of risk calculators from the Prostate Cancer Prevention Trial and the European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer in a contemporary Canadian cohort. <i>BJU International</i> , 2011, 108, E237-E244.	2.5	62
93	PROSTATE CANCER DETECTION IN THE PROSTATE SPECIFIC ANTIGEN RANGE OF 2.0 TO 3.9 NG/ML: VALUE OF PERCENT FREE PROSTATE SPECIFIC ANTIGEN ON TUMOR DETECTION AND TUMOR AGGRESSIVENESS. <i>Journal of Urology</i> , 2004, 171, 2245-2249.	0.4	61
94	Interval Cancers in Prostate Cancer Screening: Comparing 2- and 4-Year Screening Intervals in the European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer, Gothenburg and Rotterdam. <i>Journal of the National Cancer Institute</i> , 2007, 99, 1296-1303.	6.3	61
95	Clinically significant prostate cancer detection and segmentation in low-risk patients using a convolutional neural network on multi-parametric MRI. <i>European Radiology</i> , 2020, 30, 6582-6592.	4.5	61
96	Prostate-specific antigen-based prostate cancer screening: Past and future. <i>International Journal of Urology</i> , 2015, 22, 524-532.	1.0	59
97	European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer: achievements and presentation. <i>BJU International</i> , 2003, 92, 117-122.	2.5	58
98	Does "Normal" Aging Imply Urinary, Bowel, and Erectile Dysfunction? A General Population Survey. <i>Urology</i> , 2008, 72, 3-9.	1.0	58
99	Improved Prostate Cancer Biopsy Grading by Incorporation of Invasive Cribriform and Intraductal Carcinoma in the 2014 Grade Groups. <i>European Urology</i> , 2020, 77, 191-198.	1.9	57
100	Prostate cancer mortality in screen and clinically detected prostate cancer: Estimating the screening benefit. <i>European Journal of Cancer</i> , 2010, 46, 377-383.	2.8	56
101	The efficacy of prostate-specific antigen screening: Impact of key components in the ERSPC and PLCO trials. <i>Cancer</i> , 2018, 124, 1197-1206.	4.1	56
102	False-positive screening results in the European randomized study of screening for prostate cancer. <i>European Journal of Cancer</i> , 2011, 47, 2698-2705.	2.8	55
103	Risk-based Patient Selection for Magnetic Resonance Imaging-targeted Prostate Biopsy after Negative Transrectal Ultrasound-guided Random Biopsy Avoids Unnecessary Magnetic Resonance Imaging Scans. <i>European Urology</i> , 2016, 69, 1129-1134.	1.9	54
104	Early Detection of Prostate Cancer in 2020 and Beyond: Facts and Recommendations for the European Union and the European Commission. <i>European Urology</i> , 2021, 79, 327-329.	1.9	54
105	Eleven-Year Outcome of Patients with Prostate Cancers Diagnosed During Screening After Initial Negative Sextant Biopsies. <i>European Urology</i> , 2010, 57, 256-266.	1.9	53
106	Complications after prostate biopsies in men on active surveillance and its effects on receiving further biopsies in the Prostate cancer Research International: Active Surveillance (PRIAS) study. <i>BJU International</i> , 2016, 118, 366-371.	2.5	51
107	The Movember Foundation's GAP3 cohort: a profile of the largest global prostate cancer active surveillance database to date. <i>BJU International</i> , 2018, 121, 737-744.	2.5	51
108	A European Model for an Organised Risk-stratified Early Detection Programme for Prostate Cancer. <i>European Urology Oncology</i> , 2021, 4, 731-739.	5.4	51

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
109	Outcomes of a Bladder Cancer Screening Program Using Home Hematuria Testing and Molecular Markers. <i>European Urology</i> , 2013, 64, 41-47.	1.9	49
110	Prostate cancer screening in Europe and Asia. <i>Asian Journal of Urology</i> , 2017, 4, 86-95.	1.2	48
111	4-YEAR PROSTATE SPECIFIC ANTIGEN PROGRESSION AND DIAGNOSIS OF PROSTATE CANCER IN THE EUROPEAN RANDOMIZED STUDY OF SCREENING FOR PROSTATE CANCER, SECTION ROTTERDAM. <i>Journal of Urology</i> , 2005, 174, 489-494.	0.4	47
112	Active surveillance for low-risk prostate cancer. <i>Critical Reviews in Oncology/Hematology</i> , 2013, 85, 295-302.	4.4	46
113	A comparison of first and repeat (four years later) prostate cancer screening in a randomized cohort of a symptomatic men aged 55-75 years using a biopsy indication of 3.0 ng/ml (results of ERSPC). <i>Tj ETQq1 1 0.284314 rgBT /Over</i>	2.3	44
114	Screening for prostate cancer at low PSA range: The impact of digital rectal examination on tumor incidence and tumor characteristics. <i>Prostate</i> , 2007, 67, 154-161.	2.3	44
115	Perspective: Enforce the clinical guidelines. <i>Nature</i> , 2015, 528, S123-S123.	27.8	44
116	Is Prostate-Specific Antigen Velocity Selective for Clinically Significant Prostate Cancer in Screening? European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer (Rotterdam). <i>European Urology</i> , 2009, 55, 385-393.	1.9	43
117	Screening for Prostate Cancer: Early Detection or Overdetection?. <i>Annual Review of Medicine</i> , 2012, 63, 161-170.	12.2	43
118	Sexual function with localized prostate cancer: active surveillance vs radical therapy. <i>BJU International</i> , 2012, 110, 1032-1039.	2.5	43
119	Germline variation at 8q24 and prostate cancer risk in men of European ancestry. <i>Nature Communications</i> , 2018, 9, 4616.	12.8	43
120	Reduction of MRI-targeted biopsies in men with low-risk prostate cancer on active surveillance by stratifying to PI-RADS and PSA-density, with different thresholds for significant disease. <i>Translational Andrology and Urology</i> , 2018, 7, 132-144.	1.4	43
121	Rotterdam Prostate Cancer Risk Calculator: Development and Usability Testing of the Mobile Phone App. <i>JMIR Cancer</i> , 2017, 3, e1.	2.4	43
122	Gleason score 7 screen-detected prostate cancers initially managed expectantly: outcomes in 50 men. <i>BJU International</i> , 2009, 103, 1472-1477.	2.5	42
123	Performance of Prostate Cancer Antigen 3 (PCA3) and Prostate-Specific Antigen in Prescreened Men: Reproducibility and Detection Characteristics for Prostate Cancer Patients with High PCA3 Scores (â‰¥100). <i>European Urology</i> , 2010, 58, 893-899.	1.9	42
124	Polygenic hazard score is associated with prostate cancer in multi-ethnic populations. <i>Nature Communications</i> , 2021, 12, 1236.	12.8	40
125	Tumor characteristics in screening for prostate cancer with and without rectal examination as an initial screening test at low PSA (0.0-3.9 ng/ml). <i>Prostate</i> , 2001, 47, 252-261.	2.3	39
126	mHealth in Urology: A Review of Experts'™ Involvement in App Development. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2015, 10, e0125547.	2.5	39

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
127	The Prostate Cancer Prevention Trial and European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer risk calculators indicating a positive prostate biopsy: a comparison. <i>BJU International</i> , 2008, 102, 1068-1073.	2.5	38
128	Expert Involvement Predicts mHealth App Downloads: Multivariate Regression Analysis of Urology Apps. <i>JMIR MHealth and UHealth</i> , 2016, 4, e86.	3.7	38
129	Prostate cancer diagnosis: The impact on patients' mental health. <i>European Journal of Cancer</i> , 2006, 42, 165-170.	2.8	37
130	The value of an additional hypoechoic lesion-directed biopsy core for detecting prostate cancer. <i>BJU International</i> , 2008, 101, 685-690.	2.5	37
131	Balancing the harms and benefits of early detection of prostate cancer. <i>Cancer</i> , 2010, 116, 4857-4865.	4.1	37
132	Validation of stem cell markers in clinical prostate cancer: α 6-Integrin is predictive for non-aggressive disease. <i>Prostate</i> , 2014, 74, 488-496.	2.3	37
133	Prostate Cancer Risk Assessment in Biopsy-naïve Patients: The Rotterdam Prostate Cancer Risk Calculator in Multiparametric Magnetic Resonance Imaging-Transrectal Ultrasound (TRUS) Fusion Biopsy and Systematic TRUS Biopsy. <i>European Urology Oncology</i> , 2018, 1, 109-117.	5.4	37
134	Positive predictive value of prostate biopsy indicated by prostate-specific antigen-based prostate cancer screening: trends over time in a European randomized trial*. <i>BJU International</i> , 2012, 110, 1654-1660.	2.5	36
135	Prostate Specific Antigen as a Tumor Marker in Prostate Cancer: Biochemical and Clinical Aspects. <i>Advances in Experimental Medicine and Biology</i> , 2015, 867, 93-114.	1.6	36
136	Prediction of Prostate Cancer: External Validation of the ERSPC Risk Calculator in a Contemporary Dutch Clinical Cohort. <i>European Urology Focus</i> , 2018, 4, 228-234.	3.1	36
137	Tumour Features in the Control and Screening Arm of A Randomized Trial of Prostate Cancer. <i>European Urology</i> , 2006, 50, 70-75.	1.9	35
138	Absolute Effect of Prostate Cancer Screening: Balance of Benefits and Harms by Center within the European Randomized Study of Prostate Cancer Screening. <i>Clinical Cancer Research</i> , 2016, 22, 243-249.	7.0	35
139	A Framework for the Identification of Men at Increased Risk for Prostate Cancer. <i>Journal of Urology</i> , 2009, 182, 2112-2122.	0.4	34
140	Prospective validation of a risk calculator which calculates the probability of a positive prostate biopsy in a contemporary clinical cohort. <i>European Journal of Cancer</i> , 2012, 48, 1809-1815.	2.8	34
141	A Calculator for Prostate Cancer Risk 4 Years After an Initially Negative Screen: Findings from ERSPC Rotterdam. <i>European Urology</i> , 2013, 63, 627-633.	1.9	34
142	Multiparametric Ultrasound for Prostate Cancer Detection and Localization: Correlation of B-mode, Shear Wave Elastography and Contrast Enhanced Ultrasound with Radical Prostatectomy Specimens. <i>Journal of Urology</i> , 2019, 202, 1166-1173.	0.4	33
143	Tumor characteristics and prognostic factors in two subsequent screening rounds with four-year interval within prostate cancer screening trial, ERSPC Rotterdam. <i>Urology</i> , 2006, 68, 615-620.	1.0	32
144	Defining Increased Future Risk for Prostate Cancer: Evidence From a Population Based Screening Cohort. <i>Journal of Urology</i> , 2009, 181, 69-74.	0.4	32

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
145	Cribriform architecture in radical prostatectomies predicts oncological outcome in Gleason score 8 prostate cancer patients. <i>Modern Pathology</i> , 2021, 34, 184-193.	5.5	32
146	Is It Necessary to Detect All Prostate Cancers in Men with Serum PSA Levels $\leq 3.0\text{ng/ml}$? A Comparison of Biopsy Results of PCPT and Outcome-Related Information from ERSPC. <i>European Urology</i> , 2008, 53, 901-908.	1.9	31
147	Erectile Dysfunction and Mental Health in a General Population of Older Men. <i>Journal of Sexual Medicine</i> , 2009, 6, 505-512.	0.6	31
148	Feasibility study of screening for bladder cancer with urinary molecular markers (the BLU-P project). <i>Urologic Oncology: Seminars and Original Investigations</i> , 2010, 28, 686-690.	1.6	31
149	Multivariate risk prediction tools including MRI for individualized biopsy decision in prostate cancer diagnosis: current status and future directions. <i>World Journal of Urology</i> , 2020, 38, 517-529.	2.2	31
150	Incidence and follow-up of patients with focal prostate carcinoma in 2 screening rounds after an interval of 4 years. <i>Cancer</i> , 2005, 103, 708-716.	4.1	30
151	Screening for prostate cancer without digital rectal examination and transrectal ultrasound: Results after four years in the European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer (ERSPC), Rotterdam. <i>Prostate</i> , 2006, 66, 625-631.	2.3	30
152	Prostate Cancer Incidence and Disease-Specific Survival of Men with Initial Prostate-Specific Antigen Less Than 3.0ng/ml Who Are Participating in ERSPC Rotterdam. <i>European Urology</i> , 2011, 59, 498-505.	1.9	30
153	Prostate cancer upgrading with serial prostate magnetic resonance imaging and repeat biopsy in men on active surveillance: are confirmatory biopsies still necessary?. <i>BJU International</i> , 2020, 126, 124-132.	2.5	30
154	Summary statement on screening for prostate cancer in Europe. <i>International Journal of Cancer</i> , 2018, 142, 741-746.	5.1	29
155	Reducing unnecessary biopsies while detecting clinically significant prostate cancer including cribriform growth with the ERSPC Rotterdam risk calculator and 4Kscore. <i>Urologic Oncology: Seminars and Original Investigations</i> , 2019, 37, 138-144.	1.6	29
156	Compliance with biopsy recommendations of a prostate cancer risk calculator. <i>BJU International</i> , 2012, 109, 1480-1488.	2.5	28
157	An integrative multi-omics analysis to identify candidate DNA methylation biomarkers related to prostate cancer risk. <i>Nature Communications</i> , 2020, 11, 3905.	12.8	28
158	The value of different screening tests in predicting prostate biopsy outcome in screening for prostate cancer data from a multicenter study (ERSPC). <i>Prostate</i> , 2007, 67, 439-446.	2.3	27
159	Effect of the correction for noncompliance and contamination on the estimated reduction of metastatic prostate cancer within a randomized screening trial (ERSPC section Rotterdam). <i>International Journal of Cancer</i> , 2010, 127, 2639-2644.	5.1	27
160	Change of tumour characteristics and treatment over time in both arms of the European Randomized study of Screening for Prostate Cancer. <i>European Journal of Cancer</i> , 2010, 46, 3082-3089.	2.8	27
161	Towards an Optimal Interval for Prostate Cancer Screening. <i>European Urology</i> , 2012, 61, 171-176.	1.9	27
162	Digital Rectal Examination and the Diagnosis of Prostate Cancer—a Study Based on 8 Years and Three Screenings within the European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer (ERSPC), Rotterdam. <i>European Urology</i> , 2009, 55, 139-147.	1.9	26

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
163	Head-to-head comparison of prostate cancer risk calculators predicting biopsy outcome. <i>Translational Andrology and Urology</i> , 2018, 7, 18-26.	1.4	26
164	Prostate health index (PHI) and prostate-specific antigen (PSA) predictive models for prostate cancer in the Chinese population and the role of digital rectal examination-estimated prostate volume. <i>International Urology and Nephrology</i> , 2016, 48, 1631-1637.	1.4	25
165	Prostate carcinoma detection and increased prostate-specific antigen levels after 4 years in Dutch and Japanese males who had no evidence of disease at initial screening. <i>Cancer</i> , 2005, 103, 242-250.	4.1	24
166	Prostate Specific Antigen Velocity Does Not Aid Prostate Cancer Detection in Men With Prior Negative Biopsy. <i>Journal of Urology</i> , 2010, 184, 907-912.	0.4	24
167	Long-term follow-up after active surveillance or curative treatment: quality-of-life outcomes of men with low-risk prostate cancer. <i>Quality of Life Research</i> , 2017, 26, 1635-1645.	3.1	24
168	Can active surveillance really reduce the harms of overdiagnosing prostate cancer? A reflection of real life clinical practice in the PRIAS study. <i>Translational Andrology and Urology</i> , 2018, 7, 98-105.	1.4	24
169	Comparison of Two Prostate Cancer Risk Calculators that Include the Prostate Health Index. <i>European Urology Focus</i> , 2015, 1, 185-190.	3.1	23
170	Estimating the harms and benefits of prostate cancer screening as used in common practice versus recommended good practice: A microsimulation screening analysis. <i>Cancer</i> , 2016, 122, 3386-3393.	4.1	23
171	Improving the evaluation and diagnosis of clinically significant prostate cancer in 2017. <i>Current Opinion in Urology</i> , 2017, 27, 198-204.	1.8	23
172	Best practice in active surveillance for men with prostate cancer: a Prostate Cancer ^{UK} consensus statement. <i>BJU International</i> , 2019, 124, 47-54.	2.5	23
173	Results of Prostate Cancer Screening in a Unique Cohort at 19 yr of Follow-up. <i>European Urology</i> , 2019, 75, 374-377.	1.9	23
174	Feasibility study of adjustment for contamination and non-compliance in a prostate cancer screening trial. <i>Prostate</i> , 2007, 67, 1053-1060.	2.3	22
175	Concordance of cribriform architecture in matched prostate cancer biopsy and radical prostatectomy specimens. <i>Histopathology</i> , 2019, 75, 338-345.	2.9	22
176	Contemporary role of prostate cancer gene 3 in the management of prostate cancer. <i>Current Opinion in Urology</i> , 2011, 21, 225-229.	1.8	21
177	Improving prediction models with new markers: a comparison of updating strategies. <i>BMC Medical Research Methodology</i> , 2016, 16, 128.	3.1	21
178	Circulating Metabolic Biomarkers of Screen-Detected Prostate Cancer in the ProtecT Study. <i>Cancer Epidemiology Biomarkers and Prevention</i> , 2019, 28, 208-216.	2.5	21
179	Assessment of harms, benefits, and cost-effectiveness of prostate cancer screening: A microsimulation study of 230 scenarios. <i>Cancer Medicine</i> , 2020, 9, 7742-7750.	2.8	21
180	Informed decision making on PSA testing for the detection of prostate cancer: An evaluation of a leaflet with risk indicator. <i>European Journal of Cancer</i> , 2010, 46, 669-677.	2.8	20

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
181	On the use of prostate-specific antigen for screening of prostate cancer in European Randomised Study for Screening of Prostate Cancer. <i>European Journal of Cancer</i> , 2010, 46, 3109-3119.	2.8	20
182	Selecting men diagnosed with prostate cancer for active surveillance using a risk calculator: a prospective impact study. <i>BJU International</i> , 2012, 110, 180-187.	2.5	20
183	External validation of novel magnetic resonance imaging-based models for prostate cancer prediction. <i>BJU International</i> , 2020, 125, 407-416.	2.5	20
184	Adaptation and external validation of the European randomised study of screening for prostate cancer risk calculator for the Chinese population. <i>Prostate Cancer and Prostatic Diseases</i> , 2017, 20, 99-104.	3.9	19
185	Characteristics of Prostate Cancer Found at Fifth Screening in the European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer Rotterdam: Can We Selectively Detect High-grade Prostate Cancer with Upfront Multivariable Risk Stratification and Magnetic Resonance Imaging?. <i>European Urology</i> , 2018, 73, 343-350.	1.9	19
186	Personalized strategies in population screening for prostate cancer. <i>International Journal of Cancer</i> , 2020, 147, 2977-2987.	5.1	19
187	Impact of Early Diagnosis of Prostate Cancer on Survival Outcomes. <i>European Urology Focus</i> , 2015, 1, 137-146.	3.1	18
188	Introducing PIONEER: a project to harness big data in prostate cancer research. <i>Nature Reviews Urology</i> , 2020, 17, 351-362.	3.8	18
189	Clinical outcome comparison of Grade Group 1 and Grade Group 2 prostate cancer with and without cribriform architecture at the time of radical prostatectomy. <i>Histopathology</i> , 2020, 76, 755-762.	2.9	18
190	Can non-malignant biopsy features identify men at increased risk of biopsy-detectable prostate cancer at re-screening after 4 years?. <i>BJU International</i> , 2008, 101, 283-288.	2.5	17
191	Prostate cancer from the horizon of the patient. <i>Acta Oncologica</i> , 2011, 50, 148-154.	1.8	17
192	Predicting biochemical recurrence and prostate cancer-specific mortality after radical prostatectomy: comparison of six prediction models in a cohort of patients with screening- and clinically detected prostate cancer. <i>BJU International</i> , 2019, 124, 635-642.	2.5	17
193	No reason for immediate repeat sextant biopsy after negative initial sextant biopsy in men with PSA level of 4.0 ng/mL or greater (ERSPC, Rotterdam). <i>Urology</i> , 2004, 63, 892-897.	1.0	16
194	The CHEK2 Variant C.349A>G Is Associated with Prostate Cancer Risk and Carriers Share a Common Ancestor. <i>Cancers</i> , 2020, 12, 3254.	3.7	16
195	Intraductal carcinoma has a minimal impact on Grade Group assignment in prostate cancer biopsy and radical prostatectomy specimens. <i>Histopathology</i> , 2020, 77, 742-748.	2.9	16
196	Additional SNPs improve risk stratification of a polygenic hazard score for prostate cancer. <i>Prostate Cancer and Prostatic Diseases</i> , 2021, 24, 532-541.	3.9	16
197	Active surveillance for prostate cancer. <i>Translational Andrology and Urology</i> , 2021, 10, 2809-2819.	1.4	16
198	Circulating insulin-like growth factors and risks of overall, aggressive and early-onset prostate cancer: a collaborative analysis of 20 prospective studies and Mendelian randomization analysis. <i>International Journal of Epidemiology</i> , 2023, 52, 71-86.	1.9	16

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
199	Nonlinear modeling was applied thoughtfully for risk prediction: the Prostate Biopsy Collaborative Group. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i> , 2015, 68, 426-434.	5.0	15
200	Personalised biopsy schedules based on risk of Gleason upgrading for patients with low-risk prostate cancer on active surveillance. <i>BJU International</i> , 2021, 127, 96-107.	2.5	15
201	Blinded and uniform causes of death verification in cancer screening: A major influence on the outcome of a prostate cancer screening trial?. <i>European Journal of Cancer</i> , 2010, 46, 3061-3067.	2.8	14
202	Prostate Cancer Antigen 3: Diagnostic Outcomes in Men Presenting With Urinary Prostate Cancer Antigen 3 Scores ≥ 100 . <i>Urology</i> , 2014, 83, 613-616.	1.0	14
203	A Different Method of Evaluation of the ERSPC Trial Confirms That Prostate-specific Antigen Testing Has a Significant Impact on Prostate Cancer Mortality. <i>European Urology</i> , 2014, 66, 401-403.	1.9	14
204	Differences in Treatment and Outcome After Treatment with Curative Intent in the Screening and Control Arms of the ERSPC Rotterdam. <i>European Urology</i> , 2015, 68, 179-182.	1.9	14
205	Personalized Schedules for Surveillance of Low-Risk Prostate Cancer Patients. <i>Biometrics</i> , 2019, 75, 153-162.	1.4	14
206	Selection of Microsatellite Markers for Bladder Cancer Diagnosis without the Need for Corresponding Blood. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2012, 7, e43345.	2.5	14
207	Consistency of prostate cancer grading results in screened populations across Europe. <i>BJU International</i> , 2003, 92, 88-91.	2.5	13
208	What is an acceptable false negative rate in the detection of prostate cancer?. <i>Translational Andrology and Urology</i> , 2018, 7, 54-60.	1.4	13
209	Reducing Biopsies and Magnetic Resonance Imaging Scans During the Diagnostic Pathway of Prostate Cancer: Applying the Rotterdam Prostate Cancer Risk Calculator to the PRECISION Trial Data. <i>European Urology Open Science</i> , 2022, 36, 1-8.	0.4	13
210	Prostate Cancer Patients Under Active Surveillance with a Suspicious Magnetic Resonance Imaging Finding Are at Increased Risk of Needing Treatment: Results of the Movember Foundation's Global Action Plan Prostate Cancer Active Surveillance (GAP3) Consortium. <i>European Urology Open Science</i> , 2022, 35, 59-67.	0.4	13
211	Updating and Integrating Core Outcome Sets for Localised, Locally Advanced, Metastatic, and Nonmetastatic Castration-resistant Prostate Cancer: An Update from the PIONEER Consortium. <i>European Urology</i> , 2022, 81, 503-514.	1.9	13
212	A Multivariable Approach Using Magnetic Resonance Imaging to Avoid a Protocol-based Prostate Biopsy in Men on Active Surveillance for Prostate Cancer: Data from the International Multicenter Prospective PRIAS Study. <i>European Urology Oncology</i> , 2022, 5, 651-658.	5.4	13
213	Detection rates of high-grade prostate cancer during subsequent screening visits. Results of the European Randomized Screening Study for Prostate Cancer. <i>International Journal of Cancer</i> , 2006, 118, 2538-2542.	5.1	12
214	Long-term radical prostatectomy outcomes among participants from the European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer (ERSPC) Rotterdam. <i>BJU International</i> , 2012, 110, 1678-1683.	2.5	12
215	Additional benefit of using a risk-based selection for prostate biopsy: an analysis of biopsy complications in the Rotterdam section of the European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer. <i>BJU International</i> , 2017, 120, 394-400.	2.5	12
216	Rotterdam Randomized Pilot Studies of Screening for Prostate Cancer: An Overview After 10 Years. <i>Journal of the National Cancer Institute</i> , 2005, 97, 696-696.	6.3	11

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
217	Re: Mortality Results from a Randomized Prostate-Cancer Screening Trial. <i>European Urology</i> , 2009, 55, 1481-1482.	1.9	11
218	Identifying and characterizing "escapes" men who develop metastases or die from prostate cancer despite screening (ERSPC, section Rotterdam). <i>International Journal of Cancer</i> , 2011, 129, 2847-2854.	5.1	11
219	Meta-analysis finds screening for prostate cancer with PSA does not reduce prostate cancer-related or all-cause mortality but results likely due to heterogeneity - the two highest quality studies identified do find prostate cancer-related mortality reductions. <i>Evidence-Based Medicine</i> , 2011, 16, 20-21.	0.6	11
220	Rule-based versus probabilistic selection for active surveillance using three definitions of insignificant prostate cancer. <i>World Journal of Urology</i> , 2016, 34, 253-260.	2.2	11
221	Impact of cause of death adjudication on the results of the European prostate cancer screening trial. <i>British Journal of Cancer</i> , 2017, 116, 141-148.	6.4	11
222	Setting an Agenda for Assessment of Health-related Quality of Life Among Men with Prostate Cancer on Active Surveillance: A Consensus Paper from a European School of Oncology Task Force. <i>European Urology</i> , 2017, 71, 274-280.	1.9	11
223	Screening for prostate cancer: are organized screening programs necessary?. <i>Translational Andrology and Urology</i> , 2018, 7, 4-11.	1.4	11
224	Clinicopathological characteristics of glomeruloid architecture in prostate cancer. <i>Modern Pathology</i> , 2020, 33, 1618-1625.	5.5	11
225	Cribriform architecture outperforms Gleason pattern 4 percentage and tertiary Gleason pattern 5 in predicting the outcome of Grade Group 2 prostate cancer patients. <i>Histopathology</i> , 2022, 80, 558-565.	2.9	11
226	NeuroSAFE in radical prostatectomy increases the rate of nerve-sparing surgery without affecting oncological outcome. <i>BJU International</i> , 2022, 130, 628-636.	2.5	11
227	Disease-Specific Survival of Men With Prostate Cancer Detected During the Screening Interval: Results of the European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer "Rotterdam After 11 Years of Follow-Up. <i>European Urology</i> , 2011, 60, 330-336.	1.9	10
228	Can one blood draw replace transrectal ultrasonography-estimated prostate volume to predict prostate cancer risk?. <i>BJU International</i> , 2013, 112, 602-609.	2.5	10
229	What's new in screening in 2015?. <i>Current Opinion in Urology</i> , 2016, 26, 447-458.	1.8	10
230	Draft USPSTF 2017 recommendation on PSA testing " a sea-change?. <i>Nature Reviews Urology</i> , 2017, 14, 457-458.	3.8	10
231	Active surveillance: a review of risk-based, dynamic monitoring. <i>Translational Andrology and Urology</i> , 2018, 7, 106-115.	1.4	10
232	Differential tissue expression of extracellular vesicle-derived proteins in prostate cancer. <i>Prostate</i> , 2019, 79, 1032-1042.	2.3	10
233	Distribution of prostate cancer recurrences on gallium-68 prostate-specific membrane antigen (⁶⁸ Ga-PSMA) positron-emission/computed tomography after radical prostatectomy with pathological node-positive extended lymph node dissection. <i>BJU International</i> , 2020, 125, 876-883.	2.5	10
234	IMAGINE "Impact Assessment of Guidelines Implementation and Education: The Next Frontier for Harmonising Urological Practice Across Europe by Improving Adherence to Guidelines. <i>European Urology</i> , 2021, 79, 173-176.	1.9	10

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
235	Urine spermine and multivariable Spermine Risk Score predict high-grade prostate cancer. <i>Prostate Cancer and Prostatic Diseases</i> , 2021, 24, 542-548.	3.9	10
236	What is the effect of MRI with targeted biopsies on the rate of patients discontinuing active surveillance? A reflection of the use of MRI in the PRIAS study. <i>Prostate Cancer and Prostatic Diseases</i> , 2021, 24, 1048-1054.	3.9	10
237	Genetic factors associated with prostate cancer conversion from active surveillance to treatment. <i>Human Genetics and Genomics Advances</i> , 2022, 3, 100070.	1.7	10
238	The Rate of Overdiagnosis Inextricably Linked to Prostate-specific Antigen-Based Screening for Prostate Cancer Can Be Quantified in Several Ways, But What Is the Practicable Message?. <i>European Urology</i> , 2014, 65, 1056-1057.	1.9	9
239	Do Treatment Differences between Arms Affect the Main Outcome of ERSPC Rotterdam?. <i>Journal of Urology</i> , 2015, 194, 336-342.	0.4	9
240	Correlation between stage shift and differences in mortality in the European Randomised study of Screening for Prostate Cancer (ERSPC). <i>BJU International</i> , 2016, 118, 677-680.	2.5	9
241	Prospective evaluation on the effect of interobserver variability of digital rectal examination on the performance of the Rotterdam Prostate Cancer Risk Calculator. <i>International Journal of Urology</i> , 2017, 24, 826-832.	1.0	9
242	Multivariable risk-based patient selection for prostate biopsy in a primary health care setting: referral rate and biopsy results from a urology outpatient clinic. <i>Translational Andrology and Urology</i> , 2018, 7, 27-33.	1.4	9
243	Health-related quality of life in Japanese low-risk prostate cancer patients choosing active surveillance: 3-year follow-up from PRIAS-JAPAN. <i>World Journal of Urology</i> , 2021, 39, 2491-2497.	2.2	9
244	The use of nomograms in the detection of prostate cancer. <i>Prostate</i> , 2006, 66, 1266-1267.	2.3	8
245	Cysteine-rich secretory protein 3 and β -microseminoprotein on prostate cancer needle biopsies do not have predictive value for subsequent prostatectomy outcome. <i>BJU International</i> , 2011, 108, 1356-1362.	2.5	8
246	The Impact of Design and Performance in Prostate-Specific Antigen Screening: Differences Between ERSPC Centers. <i>European Urology</i> , 2019, 76, 276-279.	1.9	8
247	Comparing the prediction of prostate biopsy outcome using the Chinese Prostate Cancer Consortium (CPCC) Risk Calculator and the Asian adapted Rotterdam European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer (ERSPC) Risk Calculator in Chinese and European men. <i>World Journal of Urology</i> , 2021, 39, 73-80.	2.2	8
248	Critical assessment of prebiopsy parameters for predicting prostate cancer metastasis and mortality. <i>Canadian Journal of Urology</i> , 2011, 18, 6018-24.	0.0	8
249	Large and small cribriform architecture have similar adverse clinical outcome on prostate cancer biopsies. <i>Histopathology</i> , 2022, 80, 1041-1049.	2.9	8
250	PSA and the Detection of Prostate Cancer After 2005. Part I. <i>EAU-EBU Update Series</i> , 2006, 4, 2-12.	0.6	7
251	Propensity Score Matching, Competing Risk Analysis, and a Competing Risk Nomogram: Some Guidance for Urologists May Be in Place. <i>European Urology</i> , 2011, 60, 931-933.	1.9	7
252	Efficacy versus effectiveness study design within the European screening trial for prostate cancer: consequences for cancer incidence, overall mortality and cancer-specific mortality. <i>Journal of Medical Screening</i> , 2012, 19, 133-140.	2.3	7

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
253	Predictive role of free prostate-specific antigen in a prospective active surveillance program (PRIAS). World Journal of Urology, 2015, 33, 1735-1740.	2.2	7
254	Could Differences in Treatment Between Trial Arms Explain the Reduction in Prostate Cancer Mortality in the European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer?. European Urology, 2019, 75, 1015-1022.	1.9	7
255	Equivocal PI-RADS Three Lesions on Prostate Magnetic Resonance Imaging: Risk Stratification Strategies to Avoid MRI-Targeted Biopsies. Journal of Personalized Medicine, 2020, 10, 270.	2.5	7
256	From PROMIS to PRO-MRI in primary prostate cancer diagnosis. Translational Andrology and Urology, 2017, 6, 604-607.	1.4	7
257	Interval cancers in the Antwerp European randomised study of screening for prostate cancer study, using a 6year screening interval. European Journal of Cancer, 2010, 46, 3090-3094.	2.8	6
258	Is Prostate Cancer Screening Bad or Good? Summary of a Debate at the Innovation in Urology Meeting, September 17-19, 2010, Milan, Italy. European Urology, 2011, 59, 359-362.	1.9	6
259	Prostate Cancer Biomarkers to Improve Risk Stratification: Is Our Knowledge of Prostate Cancer Sufficient to Spare Prostate Biopsies Safely?. European Urology, 2011, 60, 223-225.	1.9	6
260	The prostate-specific antigen test. Expert Opinion on Medical Diagnostics, 2013, 7, 423-426.	1.6	6
261	Rescreening policies and risk calculators. Nature Reviews Urology, 2014, 11, 429-430.	3.8	6
262	Is prostatectomy for Gleason score 6 a treatment failure?. Nature Reviews Urology, 2015, 12, 10-11.	3.8	6
263	Personalized Decision Making for Biopsies in Prostate Cancer Active Surveillance Programs. Medical Decision Making, 2019, 39, 499-508.	2.4	6
264	Comparison of biopsy under-sampling and annual progression using hidden markov models to learn from prostate cancer active surveillance studies. Cancer Medicine, 2020, 9, 9611-9619.	2.8	6
265	Active surveillance for prostate cancer—will the discoveries of the last 5 years change the future?. Translational Andrology and Urology, 2021, 10, 2828-2831.	1.4	6
266	Risk-Based Selection for Active Surveillance: Results of the Movember Foundation's Global Action Plan Prostate Cancer Active Surveillance (GAP3) Initiative. Journal of Urology, 2021, 206, 62-68.	0.4	6
267	The Key Role of Patient Involvement in the Development of Core Outcome Sets in Prostate Cancer. European Urology Focus, 2021, 7, 943-946.	3.1	6
268	Prostate-Specific Antigen Levels in the United States: Implications of Various Definitions for Abnormal. European Urology, 2006, 49, 412-413.	1.9	5
269	(I) Re: Prostate Specific Antigen Velocity in Men with Total Prostate Specific Antigen Less than 4ng/ml. European Urology, 2008, 53, 852-854.	1.9	5
270	Prostate-specific antigen screening can be beneficial to younger and at-risk men. Cmaj, 2013, 185, 47-51.	2.0	5

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
271	The ProtecT trial: what can we expect?. <i>Lancet Oncology</i> , The, 2014, 15, 1046-1047.	10.7	5
272	Ethnicity and prostate cancer: the way to solve the screening problem?. <i>BMC Medicine</i> , 2015, 13, 179.	5.5	5
273	How Often is Biopsy Necessary in Patients with Prostate Cancer on Active Surveillance?. <i>Journal of Urology</i> , 2016, 195, 11-12.	0.4	5
274	Effect of pathologic revision and Ki67 and ERG immunohistochemistry on predicting radical prostatectomy outcome in men initially on active surveillance. <i>Prostate</i> , 2017, 77, 1137-1143.	2.3	5
275	A comparison of prostate cancer prediction models in men undergoing both magnetic resonance imaging and transperineal biopsy: Are the models still relevant?. <i>BJU International</i> , 2021, 128, 36-44.	2.5	5
276	Initial Prostate Health Index (phi) and phi density predicts future risk of clinically significant prostate cancer in men with initial negative prostate biopsy: a 6-year follow-up study. <i>Prostate Cancer and Prostatic Diseases</i> , 2021, , .	3.9	5
277	Interaction of MRI and active surveillance in prostate cancer: Time to re-evaluate the active surveillance inclusion criteria. <i>Urologic Oncology: Seminars and Original Investigations</i> , 2021, , .	1.6	5
278	Improving Guideline Adherence in Urology. <i>European Urology Focus</i> , 2022, 8, 1545-1552.	3.1	5
279	Shared decision making of burdensome surveillance tests using personalized schedules and their burden and benefit. <i>Statistics in Medicine</i> , 2022, 41, 2115-2131.	1.6	5
280	Algorithms, nomograms and the detection of indolent prostate cancer. <i>World Journal of Urology</i> , 2008, 26, 423-429.	2.2	4
281	A COMMENT ON PROSTATE CANCER SCREENING IN THE PROSTATE, LUNG, COLORECTAL AND OVARIAN CANCER SCREENING TRIAL: UPDATE ON FINDINGS FROM THE INITIAL FOUR ROUNDS OF SCREENING IN A RANDOMIZED TRIAL. <i>BJU International</i> , 2009, 103, 143-144.	2.5	4
282	The REDUCE Trial. <i>European Urology</i> , 2010, 58, 253-255.	1.9	4
283	Should prostate-specific antigen screening be offered to asymptomatic men?. <i>Expert Review of Anticancer Therapy</i> , 2010, 10, 1043-1053.	2.4	4
284	Epilogue: Different approaches for prostate cancer screening in the EU?. <i>European Journal of Cancer</i> , 2010, 46, 3120-3125.	2.8	4
285	RE: Prostate-Specific Antigen Screening Trials and Prostate Cancer Deaths: The Androgen Deprivation Connection. <i>Journal of the National Cancer Institute</i> , 2014, 106, .	6.3	4
286	Prostate cancer screening in Europe – Authors' reply. <i>Lancet</i> , The, 2015, 385, 1507-1508.	13.7	4
287	Biopsy undergrading in men with Gleason score ≥ 6 and fatal prostate cancer in the European Randomized study of Screening for Prostate Cancer Rotterdam. <i>International Journal of Urology</i> , 2017, 24, 281-286.	1.0	4
288	Assessing a patient's individual risk of biopsy-detectable prostate cancer: Be aware of case mix heterogeneity and a priori likelihood. <i>European Urology Oncology</i> , 2021, 4, 813-816.	5.4	4

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
289	Restricting False-positive Magnetic Resonance Imaging Scans to Reduce Overdiagnosis of Prostate Cancer. <i>European Urology</i> , 2021, 79, 30-32.	1.9	4
290	Prostate Specific Membrane Antigen Positron Emission Tomography/Computerized Tomography in the Evaluation of Initial Response in Candidates Who Underwent Salvage Radiation Therapy after Radical Prostatectomy for Prostate Cancer. <i>Journal of Urology</i> , 2021, 205, 1100-1109.	0.4	4
291	Using the Movember Foundation's GAP3 cohort to measure the effect of active surveillance on patient-reported urinary and sexual function—a retrospective study in low-risk prostate cancer patients. <i>Translational Andrology and Urology</i> , 2021, 10, 2719-2727.	1.4	4
292	Optimal Timing of Prostate Specific Membrane Antigen Positron Emission Tomography/Computerized Tomography for Biochemical Recurrence after Radical Prostatectomy. <i>Journal of Urology</i> , 2020, 204, 503-510.	0.4	4
293	Diagnostic and prognostic factors in patients with prostate cancer: a systematic review. <i>BMJ Open</i> , 2022, 12, e058267.	1.9	4
294	Reducing prostate biopsies and magnetic resonance imaging with prostate cancer risk stratification. <i>BJUI Compass</i> , 2022, 3, 344-353.	1.3	4
295	Screening for prostate cancer: have we resolved the controversy?. <i>Current Opinion in Supportive and Palliative Care</i> , 2010, 4, 121-126.	1.3	3
296	Reply from Authors re: Michael Baum. Screening for Prostate Cancer: Can We Learn from the Mistakes of the Breast Screening Experience? <i>Eur Urol</i> 2013;64:540-1. <i>European Urology</i> , 2013, 64, 541-543.	1.9	3
297	Re: PSA Density Improves Prediction of Prostate Cancer. <i>European Urology</i> , 2014, 66, 964-965.	1.9	3
298	Unorganized Prostate-specific Antigen-based Screening for Prostate Cancer: More Harm than Benefit. When Will We Finally Start to Implement Guidelines and Risk Assessment Tools in Clinical Practice?. <i>European Urology</i> , 2015, 68, 363-364.	1.9	3
299	What explains the differences between centres in the European screening trial? A simulation study. <i>Cancer Epidemiology</i> , 2017, 46, 14-19.	1.9	3
300	The need for active surveillance for low risk prostate cancer. <i>Expert Review of Anticancer Therapy</i> , 2017, 17, 487-489.	2.4	3
301	Informed decision-making based on a leaflet in the context of prostate cancer screening. <i>Patient Education and Counseling</i> , 2019, 102, 1483-1489.	2.2	3
302	Distribution of Prostate Imaging Reporting and Data System score and diagnostic accuracy of magnetic resonance imaging-targeted biopsy: comparison of an Asian and European cohort. <i>Prostate International</i> , 2019, 7, 96-101.	2.3	3
303	Challenges of urine-based molecular assays for the detection of urothelial cancer. <i>Translational Andrology and Urology</i> , 2019, 8, S493-S496.	1.4	3
304	Improving the prediction of biochemical recurrence after radical prostatectomy with the addition of detailed pathology of the positive surgical margin and cribriform growth. <i>Annals of Diagnostic Pathology</i> , 2022, 56, 151842.	1.3	3
305	PSA and the Detection of Prostate Cancer After 2005. Part II: Ways Out of the PSA Dilemma?. <i>EAU-EBU Update Series</i> , 2006, 4, 71-81.	0.6	2
306	SECONDARY ANALYSIS OF THE EUROPEAN RANDOMIZED STUDY OF SCREENING FOR PROSTATE CANCER (ERSPC) - EFFECT OF PROSTATE CANCER SCREENING ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF METASTASES AFTER ADJUSTMENT FOR NON-COMPLIANCE AND CONTAMINATION. <i>Journal of Urology</i> , 2009, 181, 233-233.	0.4	2

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
307	International Perspectives on Screening. <i>Urologic Clinics of North America</i> , 2014, 41, 237-247.	1.8	2
308	Digital rectal examination can detect early prostate cancer. <i>Evidence-Based Medicine</i> , 2015, 20, 119-119.	0.6	2
309	Predicting Low-Risk Prostate Cancer from Transperineal Saturation Biopsies. <i>Prostate Cancer</i> , 2016, 2016, 1-7.	0.6	2
310	MRI pathway and TRUS-guided biopsy for detecting clinically significant prostate cancer. <i>The Cochrane Library</i> , 2017, , .	2.8	2
311	A Tool for Shared Decision Making on Referral for Prostate Biopsy in the Primary Care Setting: Integrating Risks of Cancer with Life Expectancy. <i>Journal of Personalized Medicine</i> , 2019, 9, 19.	2.5	2
312	Comparison of clinically significant prostate cancer detection by MRI cognitive biopsy and in-bore MRI-targeted biopsy for naïve biopsy patients. <i>Translational Andrology and Urology</i> , 2020, 9, 243-249.	1.4	2
313	External Validation of Two Nomograms Developed for 68Ga-PSMA-11 Applied to the Prostate-specific Membrane Antigen Tracer 18F-DCFPyl: Is Prediction of the Optimal Timing of Salvage Therapy Feasible?. <i>European Urology Open Science</i> , 2021, 28, 47-51.	0.4	2
314	Re: Longitudinal PSA Changes in Men with and without Prostate Cancer: Assessment of Prostate Cancer Risk. <i>European Urology</i> , 2007, 51, 1441-1442.	1.9	1
315	(II) Re: Prostate Specific Antigen Velocity in Men with Total Prostate Specific Antigen Less than 4ng/ml. <i>European Urology</i> , 2008, 53, 854-855.	1.9	1
316	Re: Estimating the Benefits of PSA Screening. <i>European Urology</i> , 2010, 57, 175-176.	1.9	1
317	Reply to David Connolly, Rachel Hutton, Patrick F. Keane's Letter to the Editor re: Monique J. Roobol, Fritz H. Schröder, Pim van Leeuwen, et al. Performance of the Prostate Cancer Antigen 3 (PCA3) Gene and Prostate-Specific Antigen in Prescreened Men: Exploring the Value of PCA3 for a First-line Diagnostic Test. <i>Eur Urol</i> 2010;58:475-81. <i>European Urology</i> , 2011, 59, e10-e11.	1.9	1
318	Re: Re-evaluating PSA Testing Rates in the PLCO Trial. <i>European Urology</i> , 2016, 70, 700-701.	1.9	1
319	Real-time Watchful Surveillance Looks Like Active Waiting. <i>European Urology</i> , 2017, 72, 908-909.	1.9	1
320	Reply by authors: Reducing unnecessary biopsies while detecting clinically significant prostate cancer including cribriform growth with the ERSPC Rotterdam risk calculator and 4Kscore. <i>Urologic Oncology: Seminars and Original Investigations</i> , 2019, 37, 341-342.	1.6	1
321	The ERSPC Study: Quality Takes Time and Perseverance. <i>Clinical Chemistry</i> , 2019, 65, 208-209.	3.2	1
322	Prostate cancer screening and active surveillance in the Western world. <i>Translational Andrology and Urology</i> , 2018, 7, 1-2.	1.4	1
323	Decision Support for Low-Risk Prostate Cancer. , 2016, , 207-213.		1
324	Intervention-related Deaths in the European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer. <i>European Urology Open Science</i> , 2021, 34, 27-32.	0.4	1

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
325	Active surveillance for low-risk prostate cancer " in pursuit of a standardized protocol. Central European Journal of Urology, 2020, 73, 123-126.	0.3	1
326	Updating the Rotterdam Prostate Cancer Risk Calculator with Invasive Cribriform and/or Intraductal Carcinoma for Men with a Prior Negative Biopsy. European Urology Open Science, 2022, 36, 19-22.	0.4	1
327	Predictive Value of Cribriform and Intraductal Carcinoma for the Nomogram-based Selection of Prostate Cancer Patients for Pelvic Lymph Node Dissection. Urology, 2022, 168, 156-164.	1.0	1
328	Can PSA density be used to detect prostate cancer?. Nature Reviews Urology, 2006, 3, 130-131.	1.4	0
329	Re: Prostate-Specific Antigen (PSA) and PSA Velocity for Prostate Cancer Detection in Men Aged <50 Years. European Urology, 2007, 52, 921.	1.9	0
330	Re: Prospective Evaluation of Operating Characteristics of Prostate Cancer Detection Biomarkers. European Urology, 2011, 60, 177-178.	1.9	0
331	Selective detection of aggressive prostate cancer. Cancer, 2012, 118, 2568-2570.	4.1	0
332	Tribute to Stefano Ciatto. European Urology, 2013, 63, e12-e13.	1.9	0
333	Reply from Authors re: Brant A. Inman, Michael R. Abern. Interpreting a Study on Bladder Cancer Screening. Eur Urol 2013;64:48-50. European Urology, 2013, 64, 50-51.	1.9	0
334	Where we are with screening and risk prediction for prostate cancer in 2016. BJU International, 2016, 117, 381-381.	2.5	0
335	Individual and Population-Based Screening. , 2017, , 43-55.		0
336	Editorial Comment to Prognostic factors of prostate cancer mortality in a Finnish randomized screening trial. International Journal of Urology, 2018, 25, 277-277.	1.0	0
337	Is transrectal ultrasonography of the prostate obsolete in the <sc>MRI</sc> era?. BJU International, 2019, 123, 377-378.	2.5	0
338	Active Surveillance for Low-risk Prostate Cancer: Will it Become Obsolete?. European Urology, 2019, 75, 750-751.	1.9	0
339	Impact of cancer screening on metastasis: A prostate cancer case study. Journal of Medical Screening, 2021, 28, 096914132198973.	2.3	0
340	A first step towards a global nomogram to predict disease progression for men on active surveillance. Translational Andrology and Urology, 2021, 10, 1102-1109.	1.4	0
341	Reply by Authors. Journal of Urology, 2021, 205, 1108-1109.	0.4	0
342	Reply to Laura Evangelista and Egesta Lopci's Letter to the Editor re: Hendrik Van Poppel, Ren'e Hogenhout, Peter Albers, et al. Early Detection of Prostate Cancer in 2020 and Beyond: Facts and Recommendations for the European Union and the European Commission. Eur Urol 2021;79:327-9: Early Detection of Prostate Cancer in High-risk Patients with Negative Fusion Biopsy. European Urology, 2021, 80, e28-e29.	1.9	0

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
343	Prostate cancer incidence and disease-specific survival in men participating in the ERSPC with an initial PSA less than 3.0 ng/mL.. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 2011, 29, 7-7.	1.6	0
344	Under- and upgrading of prostate cancer after radical prostatectomy in a screening setting.. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 2011, 29, 105-105.	1.6	0
345	Individual and Mass Screening. , 2012, , 25-37.		0
346	Active Surveillance: The European Experience. , 2012, , 81-94.		0
347	Prostate Cancer Treatment on the Basis of an Individual Risk Profile; Can we Reduce Overtreatment?. Journal of Analytical Oncology, 0, , .	0.1	0
348	Risk-Based Selection for Active Surveillance. Current Clinical Urology, 2018, , 53-64.	0.0	0
349	How Should Patients on Active Surveillance Be Followed?. Current Clinical Urology, 2018, , 71-81.	0.0	0
350	Can We Screen and Still Reduce Overdiagnosis?. Current Clinical Urology, 2018, , 9-20.	0.0	0
351	Reply by Authors. Journal of Urology, 2019, 202, 1172-1173.	0.4	0
352	Reply by Authors. Journal of Urology, 2020, 204, 510-510.	0.4	0
353	Development of a prediction model in female pure or predominant urge urinary incontinence: a retrospective cohort study. Therapeutic Advances in Urology, 2022, 14, 175628722210903.	2.0	0
354	Secondary Treatment for Men with Localized Prostate Cancer: A Pooled Analysis of PRIAS and ERSPC-Rotterdam Data within the PIONEER Data Platform. Journal of Personalized Medicine, 2022, 12, 751.	2.5	0
355	Cross-cultural differences in men on active surveillanceâ€™ anxiety: a longitudinal comparison between Italian and Dutch patients from the Prostate cancer Research International Active Surveillance study. BMC Urology, 2022, 22, .	1.4	0
356	Detailed Evaluation of Androgen Deprivation Overtreatment in Prostate Cancer Patients Compared to the European Association of Urology Guidelines Using Long-term Data from the European Randomised Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer Rotterdam. European Urology Open Science, 2022, 42, 42-49.	0.4	0