

# 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	The future of genome editing innovations in the EU. Trends in Biotechnology, 2022, 40, 1-3.	4.9	6
2	Economic surplus implications of Mexico's decision to phaseout genetically modified maize imports. GM Crops and Food, 2022, 13, 388-401.	2.0	2
3	Contributions of Genome Editing Technologies Towards Improved Nutrition, Environmental Sustainability and Poverty Reduction. Frontiers in Genome Editing, 2022, 4, 863193.	2.7	13
4	Canadian Consumer Preferences Regarding Gene-Edited Food Products. Frontiers in Genome Editing, 2022, 4, 854334.	2.7	10
5	Impacts on International Research Collaborations from DSI/ABS Uncertainty. Trends in Biotechnology, 2021, 39, 430-433.	4.9	0
6	Expert Insights on the Impacts of, and Potential for, Agricultural Big Data. Sustainability, 2021, 13, 2521.	1.6	12
7	Canadian consumer opinions regarding food purchase decisions. Journal of Agriculture and Food Research, 2021, 3, 100098.	1.2	11
8	Canadian perspectives on food security and plant breeding. CABI Agriculture and Bioscience, 2021, 2, .	1.1	3
9	Expert opinions on the regulation of plant genome editing. Plant Biotechnology Journal, 2021, 19, 1104-1109.	4.1	38
10	Removing politics from innovations that improve food security. Transgenic Research, 2021, 30, 601-612.	1.3	13
11	Regulatory approaches for genome edited agricultural plants in select countries and jurisdictions around the world. Transgenic Research, 2021, 30, 551-584.	1.3	74
12	CRISPR/Cas9 gene editing in legume crops: Opportunities and challenges. , 2021, 3, e96.		49
13	Data challenges for future plant gene editing: expert opinion. Transgenic Research, 2021, 30, 765-780.	1.3	3
14	Correlating Genetically Modified Crops, Glyphosate Use and Increased Carbon Sequestration. Sustainability, 2021, 13, 11679.	1.6	19
15	The role of public-private partnerships in improving global food security. Global Food Security, 2021, 31, 100588.	4.0	21
16	Forensics at the Port: Can Diagnostic Testing Benefit Trade?. Sustainability, 2021, 13, 106.	1.6	2
17	The human health benefits from <sc>GM</sc> crops. Plant Biotechnology Journal, 2020, 18, 887-888.	4.1	33
18	Ex-ante impact assessment of GM maize adoption in El Salvador. GM Crops and Food, 2020, 11, 70-78.	2.0	3

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
19	Evidence-based policy making: determining what is evidence. <i>Heliyon</i> , 2020, 6, e04519.	1.4	7
20	Regulatory barriers to improving global food security. <i>Global Food Security</i> , 2020, 26, 100440.	4.0	17
21	Genetically modified maize impacts in Honduras: production and social issues. <i>Transgenic Research</i> , 2020, 29, 575-586.	1.3	2
22	Effects of information presentation on regulatory decisions for products of biotechnology. <i>EURO Journal on Decision Processes</i> , 2020, 8, 151-175.	1.8	0
23	How should we regulate products of new breeding techniques? Opinion of surveyed experts in plant biotechnology. <i>Biotechnology Reports (Amsterdam, Netherlands)</i> , 2020, 26, e00460.	2.1	21
24	Implications of biological information digitization: Access and benefit sharing of plant genetic resources. <i>Journal of World Intellectual Property</i> , 2020, 23, 267-287.	0.2	19
25	CRISPR-Cas9 Application in Canadian Public and Private Plant Breeding. <i>CRISPR Journal</i> , 2020, 3, 44-51.	1.4	19
26	Canadian Consumer Insights on Agriculture: Addressing the Knowledge-Gap. <i>Journal of Agricultural and Food Information</i> , 2020, 21, 50-72.	1.1	15
27	Consumer insights on Canada's food safety and food risk assessment system. <i>Journal of Agriculture and Food Research</i> , 2020, 2, 100038.	1.2	13
28	Regulatory Barriers to Innovative Plant Breeding in Canada. <i>Frontiers in Genome Editing</i> , 2020, 2, 591592.	2.7	6
29	Risk and safety considerations of genome edited crops: Expert opinion. <i>Current Research in Biotechnology</i> , 2019, 1, 11-21.	1.9	40
30	Estimating the cost of regulating genome edited crops: expert judgment and overconfidence. <i>GM Crops and Food</i> , 2019, 10, 44-62.	2.0	40
31	Benefits of genome-edited crops: expert opinion. <i>Transgenic Research</i> , 2019, 28, 247-256.	1.3	68
32	A comparison of the EU regulatory approach to directed mutagenesis with that of other jurisdictions, consequences for international trade and potential steps forward. <i>New Phytologist</i> , 2019, 222, 1673-1684.	3.5	90
33	Perceptions of Genetically Engineered Technology in Developed Areas. <i>Trends in Biotechnology</i> , 2019, 37, 447-451.	4.9	21
34	Agriculture R&D Implications of the CJEU's Gene-Specific Mutagenesis Ruling. <i>Trends in Biotechnology</i> , 2019, 37, 337-340.	4.9	20
35	Regulation of Genome Editing in Plant Biotechnology: Canada. , 2019, , 111-135.		7
36	Transgenic Flax and the Triffid Affair. <i>Plant Genetics and Genomics: Crops and Models</i> , 2019, , 249-260.	0.3	0

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
37	Scientific underpinnings of biotechnology regulatory frameworks. <i>New Biotechnology</i> , 2018, 42, 26-32.	2.4	4
38	The economic and environmental cost of delayed GM crop adoption: The case of Australia's GM canola moratorium. <i>GM Crops and Food</i> , 2018, 9, 13-20.	2.0	24
39	Top plant breeding techniques for improving food security: an expert Delphi survey of the opportunities and challenges. <i>International Journal of Agricultural Resources, Governance and Ecology</i> , 2018, 14, 321.	0.1	4
40	Regulatory Uncertainty Around New Breeding Techniques. <i>Frontiers in Plant Science</i> , 2018, 9, 1291.	1.7	41
41	EU Got To Be Kidding?. <i>CRISPR Journal</i> , 2018, 1, 267-269.	1.4	1
42	The adoption of automated phenotyping by plant breeders. <i>Euphytica</i> , 2018, 214, 1.	0.6	38
43	Regulatory barriers to international scientific innovation: approving new biotechnology in North America. <i>Canadian Foreign Policy Journal</i> , 2017, 23, 134-145.	0.3	2
44	Genetically modified crops, regulatory delays, and international trade. <i>Food and Energy Security</i> , 2017, 6, 78-86.	2.0	51
45	Ex-post assessment of genetically modified, low level presence in Canadian flax. <i>Transgenic Research</i> , 2017, 26, 399-409.	1.3	4
46	Labeling Demands, Coexistence and the Challenges for Trade. <i>Journal of Agricultural and Food Industrial Organization</i> , 2017, 15, .	0.9	1
47	Agricultural Biotechnology and Food Security: Can CETA, TPP, and TTIP Become Venues to Facilitate Trade in GM Products?. <i>Frontiers of Economics and Globalization</i> , 2017, , 191-206.	0.3	1
48	Approaches to Set Rules for Trade in the Products of Agricultural Biotechnology. Is Harmonization under Trans-Pacific Partnership Possible?. <i>Journal of Agricultural and Food Industrial Organization</i> , 2017, 15, .	0.9	1
49	Canadian regulatory perspectives on genome engineered crops. <i>GM Crops and Food</i> , 2017, 8, 35-43.	2.0	78
50	Labeling and Preferential Trade Deals. <i>Natural Resource Management and Policy</i> , 2017, , 235-250.	0.1	1
51	The Impact of Barriers to Trade on Investment. <i>Natural Resource Management and Policy</i> , 2017, , 125-146.	0.1	0
52	Refining the Risk Analysis Framework. <i>Natural Resource Management and Policy</i> , 2017, , 171-186.	0.1	0
53	GM Crop Development: Solution or Another Problem?. <i>Natural Resource Management and Policy</i> , 2017, , 3-15.	0.1	0
54	International Treaty Precedence. <i>Natural Resource Management and Policy</i> , 2017, , 147-168.	0.1	0

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
55	(Mis)information and the politicization of food security. <i>Animal Frontiers</i> , 2017, 7, 33-38.	0.8	2
56	Expert and Lay Public Risk Preferences Regarding Plants with Novel Traits. <i>Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics</i> , 2016, 64, 717-738.	1.2	4
57	An assessment of Canadian university technology transfer offices. <i>International Journal of Intellectual Property Management</i> , 2016, 9, 32.	0.2	2
58	Regulatory Lags for Genetically Modified Crops: Legal and Political Perspectives. , 2016, , 197-206.		3
59	EU Failing FAO Challenge to Improve Global Food Security. <i>Trends in Biotechnology</i> , 2016, 34, 521-523.	4.9	14
60	The Unintended Consequences of Technological Change: Winners and Losers from GM Technologies and the Policy Response in the Organic Food Market. <i>Sustainability</i> , 2015, 7, 7667-7683.	1.6	6
61	Global economic, environmental and health benefits from GM crop adoption. <i>Global Food Security</i> , 2015, 7, 24-29.	4.0	43
62	Incomplete coexistence systems and international food trade impacts. <i>Transgenic Research</i> , 2015, 24, 1003-1016.	1.3	0
63	Food security and the evaluation of risk. <i>Global Food Security</i> , 2015, 4, 16-23.	4.0	35
64	Risk, regulation and biotechnology: The case of GM crops. <i>GM Crops and Food</i> , 2014, 5, 170-177.	2.0	30
65	Investment, regulation, and uncertainty. <i>GM Crops and Food</i> , 2014, 5, 44-57.	2.0	42
66	The state of genetically modified crop regulation in Canada. <i>GM Crops and Food</i> , 2014, 5, 195-203.	2.0	13
67	The perils of zero tolerance: technology management, supply chains and thwarted globalisation. <i>International Journal of Technology and Globalisation</i> , 2014, 7, 203.	0.1	8
68	Technology transfer in transitional economies: the case of Mexico. <i>International Journal of Technology, Policy and Management</i> , 2014, 14, 111.	0.1	2
69	Consumer attitudes and preferences for GM products. , 2014, , .		1
70	Ensuring Functional Biosafety Systems. , 2014, , 277-293.		0
71	Accelerating adoption of genetically modified crops in <sc>A</sc>frica through a trade liability regime. <i>Plant Biotechnology Journal</i> , 2013, 11, 527-534.	4.1	16
72	The current status of the debate on socio-economic regulatory assessments: positions and policies in Canada, the USA, the EU and developing countries. <i>World Review of Science, Technology and Sustainable Development</i> , 2013, 10, 203.	0.3	13

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
73	Developing a patent landscape methodology. Queen Mary Journal of Intellectual Property, 2013, 3, 251-266.	0.3	2
74	Managing Opportunism in Value-Added Supply Chains: Lessons From Organics. Journal of International Food and Agribusiness Marketing, 2012, 24, 22-46.	1.0	7
75	Environmental impacts from herbicide tolerant canola production in Western Canada. Agricultural Systems, 2011, 104, 403-410.	3.2	53
76	Intellectual property sharing agreements in gene technology: implications for research and commercialisation. International Journal of Intellectual Property Management, 2011, 4, 179.	0.2	13
77	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
78	Regulating innovative crop technologies in Canada: the case of regulating genetically modified crops. Plant Biotechnology Journal, 2008, 6, 213-225.	4.1	43
79	Grounding the Management of Liabilities in the Risk Analysis Framework. Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society, 2007, 27, 274-285.	1.1	4
80	Reasonable Foreseeability and Liability in Relation to Genetically Modified Organisms. Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society, 2007, 27, 215-232.	1.1	13
81	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
82	Managing the value of new trait varieties in the canola supply chain in Canada. Supply Chain Management, 2004, 9, 313-322.	3.7	16
83	Labeling to manage marketing of GM foods. Trends in Biotechnology, 2003, 21, 389-393.	4.9	12
84	Liabilities and economics of transgenic crops. Nature Biotechnology, 2002, 20, 537-541.	9.4	85
85	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
86	Canadian Consumer Risk Perceptions of Food Production. Journal of Agricultural and Food Information, 0, , 1-18.	1.1	3
87	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