Stuart J Smyth

List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: https://exaly.com/author-pdf/7582128/publications.pdf

Version: 2024-02-01

87 papers	1,609 citations	331259 21 h-index	360668 35 g-index
90 all docs	90 docs citations	90 times ranked	1164 citing authors

#	Article	IF	Citations
1	A comparison of the EU regulatory approach to directed mutagenesis with that of other jurisdictions, consequences for international trade and potential steps forward. New Phytologist, 2019, 222, 1673-1684.	3.5	90
2	Liabilities and economics of transgenic crops. Nature Biotechnology, 2002, 20, 537-541.	9.4	85
3	US regulatory system for genetically modified [genetically modified organism (GMO), rDNA or transgenic] crop cultivars. Plant Biotechnology Journal, 2008, 6, 2-12.	4.1	84
4	Canadian regulatory perspectives on genome engineered crops. GM Crops and Food, 2017, 8, 35-43.	2.0	78
5	Regulatory approaches for genome edited agricultural plants in select countries and jurisdictions around the world. Transgenic Research, 2021, 30, 551-584.	1.3	74
6	Benefits of genome-edited crops: expert opinion. Transgenic Research, 2019, 28, 247-256.	1.3	68
7	Environmental impacts from herbicide tolerant canola production in Western Canada. Agricultural Systems, 2011, 104, 403-410.	3.2	53
8	Genetically modified crops, regulatory delays, and international trade. Food and Energy Security, 2017, 6, 78-86.	2.0	51
9	CRISPR/Cas9 gene editing in legume crops: Opportunities and challenges. , 2021, 3, e96.		49
10	Regulating innovative crop technologies in Canada: the case of regulating genetically modified crops. Plant Biotechnology Journal, 2008, 6, 213-225.	4.1	43
11	Global economic, environmental and health benefits from GM crop adoption. Global Food Security, 2015, 7, 24-29.	4.0	43
12	Investment, regulation, and uncertainty. GM Crops and Food, 2014, 5, 44-57.	2.0	42
13	Regulatory Uncertainty Around New Breeding Techniques. Frontiers in Plant Science, 2018, 9, 1291.	1.7	41
14	Risk and safety considerations of genome edited crops: Expert opinion. Current Research in Biotechnology, 2019, 1, 11-21.	1.9	40
15	Estimating the cost of regulating genome edited crops: expert judgment and overconfidence. GM Crops and Food, 2019, 10, 44-62.	2.0	40
16	The adoption of automated phenotyping by plant breeders. Euphytica, 2018, 214, 1.	0.6	38
17	Expert opinions on the regulation of plant genome editing. Plant Biotechnology Journal, 2021, 19, 1104-1109.	4.1	38
18	Food security and the evaluation of risk. Global Food Security, 2015, 4, 16-23.	4.0	35

#	Article	IF	Citations
19	The human health benefits from <scp>GM</scp> crops. Plant Biotechnology Journal, 2020, 18, 887-888.	4.1	33
20	Competitors co-operating: establishing a supply chain to manage genetically modified canola. International Food and Agribusiness Management Review, 2001, 4, 51-66.	0.8	30
21	Risk, regulation and biotechnology: The case of GM crops. GM Crops and Food, 2014, 5, 170-177.	2.0	30
22	The economic and environmental cost of delayed GM crop adoption: The case of Australia's GM canola moratorium. GM Crops and Food, 2018, 9, 13-20.	2.0	24
23	Perceptions of Genetically Engineered Technology in Developed Areas. Trends in Biotechnology, 2019, 37, 447-451.	4.9	21
24	How should we regulate products of new breeding techniques? Opinion of surveyed experts in plant biotechnology. Biotechnology Reports (Amsterdam, Netherlands), 2020, 26, e00460.	2.1	21
25	The role of public-private partnerships in improving global food security. Global Food Security, 2021, 31, 100588.	4.0	21
26	Agriculture R&D Implications of the CJEUâ€™s Gene-Specific Mutagenesis Ruling. Trends in Biotechnology, 2019, 37, 337-340.	4.9	20
27	Implications of biological information digitization: Access and benefit sharing of plant genetic resources. Journal of World Intellectual Property, 2020, 23, 267-287.	0.2	19
28	CRISPR-Cas9 Application in Canadian Public and Private Plant Breeding. CRISPR Journal, 2020, 3, 44-51.	1.4	19
29	Correlating Genetically Modified Crops, Glyphosate Use and Increased Carbon Sequestration. Sustainability, 2021, 13, 11679.	1.6	19
30	Regulatory barriers to improving global food security. Global Food Security, 2020, 26, 100440.	4.0	17
31	Managing the value of newâ€trait varieties in the canola supply chain in Canada. Supply Chain Management, 2004, 9, 313-322.	3.7	16
32	Accelerating adoption of genetically modified crops in <scp>A</scp>frica through a trade liability regime. Plant Biotechnology Journal, 2013, 11, 527-534.	4.1	16
33	Closing markets to biotechnology: does it pose an economic risk if markets are globalised?. International Journal of Technology and Globalisation, 2006, 2, 377.	0.1	15
34	Canadian Consumer Insights on Agriculture: Addressing the Knowledge-Gap. Journal of Agricultural and Food Information, 2020, 21, 50-72.	1.1	15
35	EU Failing FAO Challenge to Improve Global Food Security. Trends in Biotechnology, 2016, 34, 521-523.	4.9	14
36	Reasonable Foreseeability and Liability in Relation to Genetically Modified Organisms. Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society, 2007, 27, 215-232.	1.1	13

#	Article	IF	Citations
37	Intellectual property sharing agreements in gene technology: implications for research and commercialisation. International Journal of Intellectual Property Management, 2011, 4, 179.	0.2	13
38	The current status of the debate on socio-economic regulatory assessments: positions and policies in Canada, the USA, the EU and developing countries. World Review of Science, Technology and Sustainable Development, 2013, 10, 203.	0.3	13
39	The state of genetically modified crop regulation in Canada. GM Crops and Food, 2014, 5, 195-203.	2.0	13
40	Consumer insights on Canada's food safety and food risk assessment system. Journal of Agriculture and Food Research, 2020, 2, 100038.	1.2	13
41	Removing politics from innovations that improve food security. Transgenic Research, 2021, 30, 601-612.	1.3	13
42	Contributions of Genome Editing Technologies Towards Improved Nutrition, Environmental Sustainability and Poverty Reduction. Frontiers in Genome Editing, 2022, 4, 863193.	2.7	13
43	Labeling to manage marketing of GM foods. Trends in Biotechnology, 2003, 21, 389-393.	4.9	12
44	Expert Insights on the Impacts of, and Potential for, Agricultural Big Data. Sustainability, 2021, 13, 2521.	1.6	12
45	Canadian consumer opinions regarding food purchase decisions. Journal of Agriculture and Food Research, 2021, 3, 100098.	1.2	11
46	Canadian Consumer Preferences Regarding Gene-Edited Food Products. Frontiers in Genome Editing, 2022, 4, 854334.	2.7	10
47	The perils of zero tolerance: technology management, supply chains and thwarted globalisation. International Journal of Technology and Globalisation, 2014, 7, 203.	0.1	8
48	Managing Opportunism in Value-Added Supply Chains: Lessons From Organics. Journal of International Food and Agribusiness Marketing, 2012, 24, 22-46.	1.0	7
49	Evidence-based policy making: determining what is evidence. Heliyon, 2020, 6, e04519.	1.4	7
50	Regulation of Genome Editing in Plant Biotechnology: Canada. , 2019, , 111-135.		7
51	The Unintended Consequences of Technological Change: Winners and Losers from GM Technologies and the Policy Response in the Organic Food Market. Sustainability, 2015, 7, 7667-7683.	1.6	6
52	The future of genome editing innovations in the EU. Trends in Biotechnology, 2022, 40, 1-3.	4.9	6
53	Regulatory Barriers to Innovative Plant Breeding in Canada. Frontiers in Genome Editing, 2020, 2, 591592.	2.7	6
54	Grounding the Management of Liabilities in the Risk Analysis Framework. Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society, 2007, 27, 274-285.	1.1	4

#	Article	IF	Citations
55	Expert and Lay Public Risk Preferences Regarding Plants with Novel Traits. Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics, 2016, 64, 717-738.	1.2	4
56	Ex-post assessment of genetically modified, low level presence in Canadian flax. Transgenic Research, 2017, 26, 399-409.	1.3	4
57	Scientific underpinnings of biotechnology regulatory frameworks. New Biotechnology, 2018, 42, 26-32.	2.4	4
58	Top plant breeding techniques for improving food security: an expert Delphi survey of the opportunities and challenges. International Journal of Agricultural Resources, Governance and Ecology, 2018, 14, 321.	0.1	4
59	Regulatory Lags for Genetically Modified Crops: Legal and Political Perspectives. , 2016, , 197-206.		3
60	Ex-ante impact assessment of GM maize adoption in El Salvador. GM Crops and Food, 2020, 11, 70-78.	2.0	3
61	Canadian perspectives on food security and plant breeding. CABI Agriculture and Bioscience, 2021, 2, .	1.1	3
62	Data challenges for future plant gene editing: expert opinion. Transgenic Research, 2021, 30, 765-780.	1.3	3
63	Canadian Consumer Risk Perceptions of Food Production. Journal of Agricultural and Food Information, 0, , 1-18.	1.1	3
64	Developing a patent landscape methodology. Queen Mary Journal of Intellectual Property, 2013, 3, 251-266.	0.3	2
65	Technology transfer in transitional economies: the case of Mexico. International Journal of Technology, Policy and Management, 2014, 14, 111.	0.1	2
66	An assessment of Canadian university technology transfer offices. International Journal of Intellectual Property Management, 2016, 9, 32.	0.2	2
67	Regulatory barriers to international scientific innovation: approving new biotechnology in North America. Canadian Foreign Policy Journal, 2017, 23, 134-145.	0.3	2
68	Genetically modified maize impacts in Honduras: production and social issues. Transgenic Research, 2020, 29, 575-586.	1.3	2
69	(Mis)information and the politicization of food security. Animal Frontiers, 2017, 7, 33-38.	0.8	2
70	Forensics at the Port: Can Diagnostic Testing Benefit Trade?. Sustainability, 2021, 13, 106.	1.6	2
71	Economic surplus implications of Mexicoâ€™s decision to phaseout genetically modified maize imports. GM Crops and Food, 2022, 13, 388-401.	2.0	2
72	Labeling Demands, Coexistence and the Challenges for Trade. Journal of Agricultural and Food Industrial Organization, 2017, 15, .	0.9	1

#	Article	IF	Citations
73	Agricultural Biotechnology and Food Security: Can CETA, TPP, and TTIP Become Venues to Facilitate Trade in GM Products?. Frontiers of Economics and Globalization, 2017, , 191-206.	0.3	1
74	Approaches to Set Rules for Trade in the Products of Agricultural Biotechnology. Is Harmonization under Trans-Pacific Partnership Possible?. Journal of Agricultural and Food Industrial Organization, 2017, 15, .	0.9	1
75	EU Got To Be Kidding?. CRISPR Journal, 2018, 1, 267-269.	1.4	1
76	Labeling and Preferential Trade Deals. Natural Resource Management and Policy, 2017, , 235-250.	0.1	1
77	Consumer attitudes and preferences for GM products. , 2014, , .		1
78	Incomplete coexistence systems and international food trade impacts. Transgenic Research, 2015, 24, 1003-1016.	1.3	0
79	Effects of information presentation on regulatory decisions for products of biotechnology. EURO Journal on Decision Processes, 2020, 8, 151-175.	1.8	0
80	Impacts on International Research Collaborations from DSI/ABS Uncertainty. Trends in Biotechnology, 2021, 39, 430-433.	4.9	0
81	The Quandary of Agricultural Biotechnology, Pure Economic Loss, and Non-Adopters: Comparing Australia, Canada, and the United States. SSRN Electronic Journal, 0, , .	0.4	0
82	Ensuring Functional Biosafety Systems. , 2014, , 277-293.		0
83	The Impact of Barriers to Trade on Investment. Natural Resource Management and Policy, 2017, , 125-146.	0.1	0
84	Refining the Risk Analysis Framework. Natural Resource Management and Policy, 2017, , 171-186.	0.1	0
85	GM Crop Development: Solution or Another Problem?. Natural Resource Management and Policy, 2017, , 3-15.	0.1	0
86	International Treaty Precedence. Natural Resource Management and Policy, 2017, , 147-168.	0.1	0
87	Transgenic Flax and the Triffid Affair. Plant Genetics and Genomics: Crops and Models, 2019, , 249-260.	0.3	0