Khara D Grieger

List of Publications by Year
in descending order

44 papers	2,190 citations	361413 20 h-index	276875 41 g-index
48 all docs	48 docs citations	48 times ranked	3135 citing authors

#	Article	IF	Citations
1	Environmental Risk Assessment of Emerging Contaminantsâ€"The Case of Nanomaterials. , 2022, , 349-371.		1
2	Fostering Responsible Innovation through Stakeholder Engagement: Case Study of North Carolina Sweetpotato Stakeholders. Sustainability, 2022, 14, 2274.	3.2	4
3	Formulating best practices for responsible innovation of nano-agrifoods through stakeholder insights and reflection. Journal of Responsible Technology, 2022, 10, 100030.	1.8	4
4	Bioaccumulation and Translocation of 6:2 Fluorotelomer Sulfonate, GenX, and Perfluoroalkyl Acids by Urban Spontaneous Plants. ACS ES&T Engineering, 2022, 2, 1169-1178.	7.6	20
5	Assessing the impacts of urbanization on stream ecosystem functioning through investigating litter decomposition and nutrient uptake in a forest and a hyper-eutrophic urban stream. Ecological Indicators, 2022, 138, 108859.	6.3	4
6	Informing environmental health and risk priorities through local outreach and extension. Environment Systems and Decisions, 2022, 42, 388-401.	3.4	3
7	Effect of microplastics on ecosystem functioning: Microbial nitrogen removal mediated by benthic invertebrates. Science of the Total Environment, 2021, 754, 142133.	8.0	68
8	(Broken) Promises of Sustainable Food and Agriculture through New Biotechnologies: The CRISPR Case. CRISPR Journal, 2021, 4, 25-31.	2.9	12
9	Barriers to responsible innovation of nanotechnology applications in food and agriculture: A study of US experts and developers. NanoImpact, 2021, 23, 100326.	4.5	18
10	Influence of natural organic matter and pH on phosphate removal by and filterable lanthanum release from lanthanum-modified bentonite. Water Research, 2021, 202, 117399.	11.3	32
11	Responsible innovation of nano-agrifoods: Insights and views from U.S. stakeholders. NanoImpact, 2021, 24, 100365.	4.5	8
12	Responsible Innovation Definitions, Practices, and Motivations from Nanotechnology Researchers in Food and Agriculture. NanoEthics, 2021, 15, 229-243.	0.8	11
13	Emerging lanthanum (III)-containing materials for phosphate removal from water: A review towards future developments. Environment International, 2020, 145, 106115.	10.0	62
14	Community-led governance for gene-edited crops. Science, 2020, 370, 916-918.	12.6	30
15	Accessing Legacy Phosphorus in Soils. Soil Systems, 2020, 4, 74.	2.6	35
16	Best practices from nano-risk analysis relevant for other emerging technologies. Nature Nanotechnology, 2019, 14, 998-1001.	31.5	30
17	Biological interactions between nanomaterials and placental development and function following oral exposure. Reproductive Toxicology, 2019, 90, 150-165.	2.9	13
18	Sustainable Environmental Remediation Using NZVI by Managing Benefit-Risk Trade-Offs. , 2019, , 511-562.		3

#	Article	IF	Citations
19	Risk Governance of Nanomaterials: Review of Criteria and Tools for Risk Communication, Evaluation, and Mitigation. Nanomaterials, 2019, 9, 696.	4.1	31
20	Emerging risk governance for stratospheric aerosol injection as a climate management technology. Environment Systems and Decisions, 2019, 39, 371-382.	3.4	12
21	From risk perception to risk governance in nanotechnology: a multi-stakeholder study. Journal of Nanoparticle Research, 2019, 21, 1.	1.9	22
22	Application and testing of risk screening tools for nanomaterial risk analysis. Environmental Science: Nano, 2018, 5, 1844-1858.	4.3	7
23	The role of alternative testing strategies in environmental risk assessment of engineered nanomaterials. Environmental Science: Nano, 2017, 4, 292-301.	4.3	23
24	A framework for One Health research. One Health, 2017, 3, 44-50.	3.4	137
25	International Implications of Labeling Foods Containing Engineered Nanomaterials. Journal of Food Protection, 2016, 79, 830-842.	1.7	12
26	Prioritizing research needs for analytical techniques suited for engineered nanomaterials in food. Trends in Food Science and Technology, 2016, 50, 219-229.	15.1	23
27	Emerging Technologies for Environmental Remediation: Integrating Data and Judgment. Environmental Science & Technology, 2016, 50, 349-358.	10.0	50
28	A relative ranking approach for nano-enabled applications to improve risk-based decision making: a case study of Army materiel. Environment Systems and Decisions, 2015, 35, 42-53.	3.4	19
29	Data dialogues: critical connections for designing and implementing future nanomaterial research. Environment Systems and Decisions, 2015, 35, 76-87.	3.4	4
30	Risk Assessment, Life Cycle Assessment, and Decision Methods for Nanomaterials. , 2015, , 383-419.		4
31	A web-based tool to engage stakeholders in informing research planning for future decisions on emerging materials. Science of the Total Environment, 2014, 470-471, 660-668.	8.0	12
32	Operationalization and application of â€œearly warning signsâ€•to screen nanomaterials for harmful properties. Environmental Sciences: Processes and Impacts, 2013, 15, 190-203.	3.5	19
33	Modeling Approaches for Characterizing and Evaluating Environmental Exposure to Engineered Nanomaterials in Support of Risk-Based Decision Making. Environmental Science & Technology, 2013, 47, 1190-1205.	10.0	72
34	Benefit-risk trade-offs in retrospect: how major stakeholders perceive the decision-making process in the Barents Sea oil field development. Journal of Risk Research, 2013, 16, 1163-1185.	2.6	7
35	Environmental risk analysis for nanomaterials: Review and evaluation of frameworks. Nanotoxicology, 2012, 6, 196-212.	3.0	96
36	Analysis of current research addressing complementary use of life-cycle assessment and risk assessment for engineered nanomaterials: have lessons been learned from previous experience with chemicals?. Journal of Nanoparticle Research, 2012, 14, 1.	1.9	58

#	Article	IF	Citations
37	Conceptual modeling for identification of worst case conditions in environmental risk assessment of nanomaterials using nZVI and C60 as case studies. Science of the Total Environment, 2011, 409, 4109-4124.	8.0	15
38	Redefining risk research priorities for nanomaterials. Journal of Nanoparticle Research, 2010, 12, 383-392.	1.9	57
39	Environmental benefits and risks of zero-valent iron nanoparticles (nZVI) for in situ remediation: Risk mitigation or trade-off?. Journal of Contaminant Hydrology, 2010, 118, 165-183.	3.3	333
40	Conscious worst case definition for risk assessment, part I. Science of the Total Environment, 2010, 408, 3852-3859.	8.0	12
41	The known unknowns of nanomaterials: Describing and characterizing uncertainty within environmental, health and safety risks. Nanotoxicology, 2009, 3, 222-233.	3.0	78
42	Setting the limits for engineered nanoparticles in European surface waters â€“ are current approaches appropriate?. Journal of Environmental Monitoring, 2009, 11, 1774.	2.1	67
43	Ecotoxicity of engineered nanoparticles to aquatic invertebrates: a brief review and recommendations for future toxicity testing. Ecotoxicology, 2008, 17, 387-395.	2.4	655
44	What Role Does Regulation Play in Responsible Innovation of Nanotechnology in Food and Agriculture? Insights and Framings from U.S. Stakeholders. Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society, 0, , 027046762211020.	2.9	2