

Establishing Efficient Partner Notification Periods for P

Sexually Transmitted Diseases

26, 49-54

DOI: 10.1097/00007435-199901000-00008

Citation Report

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
1	No Difference between 1- and 2-Year Recall Periods in Locatability of Sexual and Drug Injection Partners. SSRN Electronic Journal, 1999, , .	0.4	0
2	Chlamydia Transmission: Concurrency, Reproduction Number, and the Epidemic Trajectory. American Journal of Epidemiology, 1999, 150, 1331-1339.	3.4	182
3	To Notify or Not To Notify. Sexually Transmitted Diseases, 2000, 27, 193-200.	1.7	63
4	Epidemiology and Control of Curable Sexually Transmitted Diseases. Sexually Transmitted Diseases, 2000, 27, 588-599.	1.7	43
5	Sexual Networks and Sexually Transmitted Infections: A Tale of Two Cities. Journal of Urban Health, 2001, 78, 433-445.	3.6	69
6	The Transformation of Partner Notification. Clinical Infectious Diseases, 2002, 35, S138-S145.	5.8	27
7	Sexual network structure as an indicator of epidemic phase. Sexually Transmitted Infections, 2002, 78, i152-i158.	1.9	71
8	The Clinical and Economic Consequences of Screening Young Men for Genital Chlamydial Infection. Sexually Transmitted Diseases, 2003, 30, 99-106.	1.7	36
9	Cost-Effectiveness Analysis of Screening Adolescent Males for Chlamydia On Admission to Detention. Sexually Transmitted Diseases, 2004, 31, 85-95.	1.7	52
10	Case-Finding Effectiveness of Partner Notification and Cluster Investigation for Sexually Transmitted Diseases/HIV. Sexually Transmitted Diseases, 2005, 32, 78-83.	1.7	80
11	Agreement in Reported Sexual Partnership Dates and Implications for Measuring Concurrency. Sexually Transmitted Diseases, 2006, 33, 277-283.	1.7	37
12	Prevalence of Chlamydia in Young Men in the United States From Newly Implemented Universal Screening in a National Job Training Program. Sexually Transmitted Diseases, 2006, 33, 636-639.	1.7	20
13	Cost and Effectiveness of Chlamydia Screening Among Male Military Recruits: Markov Modeling of Complications Averted Through Notification of Prior Female Partners. Sexually Transmitted Diseases, 2008, 35, 705-713.	1.7	12
14	Should Asymptomatic Men Be Included in Chlamydia Screening Programs? Cost-Effectiveness of Chlamydia Screening Among Male and Female Entrants to a National Job Training Program. Sexually Transmitted Diseases, 2008, 35, 91-101.	1.7	19
15	Improved contact tracing for Chlamydia trachomatis with experienced tracers, tracing for one year back in time and interviewing by phone in remote areas. Sexually Transmitted Infections, 2008, 84, 239-242.	1.9	23
16	2010 European guideline for <i>Chlamydia trachomatis</i> infections: recommending partner notification look-back periods. International Journal of STD and AIDS, 2011, 22, 615-615.	1.1	2
17	Disclosure of Genital Human Papillomavirus Infection to Female Sex Partners by Young Men. Sexually Transmitted Diseases, 2012, 39, 583-587.	1.7	5
18	Individual and Population Level Effects of Partner Notification for Chlamydia trachomatis. PLoS ONE, 2012, 7, e51438.	2.5	32

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
19	2012 BASHH statement on partner notification for sexually transmissible infections. International Journal of STD and AIDS, 2013, 24, 253-261.	1.1	31
20	Power of Knowledge. Clinical Pediatrics, 2016, 55, 717-723.	0.8	3
21	Sexual Networks and Sexually Transmitted Infections; "The Strength of Weak (Long Distance) Ties", 2013, , 77-109.		6
22	Effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of traditional and new partner notification technologies for curable sexually transmitted infections: observational study, systematic reviews and mathematical modelling. Health Technology Assessment, 2014, 18, 1-100, vii-viii.	2.8	73
23	Interviewing Practices in Partner Notification for STD and HIV. SSRN Electronic Journal, 0, , .	0.4	0
24	Partner Notification and Management Interventions. , 2007, , 170-189.		1