

Gary Edmond

List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: <https://exaly.com/author-pdf/8430593/publications.pdf>

Version: 2024-02-01

55
papers

813
citations

430874

18
h-index

580821

25
g-index

58
all docs

58
docs citations

58
times ranked

337
citing authors

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
1	Law's Looking Glass: Expert Identification Evidence Derived from Photographic and Video Images. <i>Current Issues in Criminal Justice</i> , 2009, 20, 337-377.	1.4	57
2	Thinking forensics: Cognitive science for forensic practitioners. <i>Science and Justice - Journal of the Forensic Science Society</i> , 2017, 57, 144-154.	2.1	51
3	Contextual bias and cross-contamination in the forensic sciences: the corrosive implications for investigations, plea bargains, trials and appeals. <i>Law, Probability and Risk</i> , 2015, 14, 1-25.	2.4	39
4	Model forensic science. <i>Australian Journal of Forensic Sciences</i> , 2016, 48, 496-537.	1.2	32
5	Scientific literacy and the jury: reconsidering jury 'competence'. <i>Public Understanding of Science</i> , 1997, 6, 329-357.	2.8	30
6	Litigation Life. <i>Social Studies of Science</i> , 2000, 30, 265-316.	2.5	30
7	The Law-Set: The Legal-Scientific Production of Medical Propriety. <i>Science Technology and Human Values</i> , 2001, 26, 191-226.	3.1	29
8	Conjectures and Exhumations: Citations of History, Philosophy and Sociology of Science in US Federal Courts. <i>Law and Literature</i> , 2002, 14, 309-366.	0.3	29
9	Legal Engineering. <i>Social Studies of Science</i> , 2002, 32, 371-412.	2.5	28
10	Judicial Representations of Scientific Evidence. <i>Modern Law Review</i> , 2000, 63, 216-251.	0.2	27
11	Peer review in forensic science. <i>Forensic Science International</i> , 2017, 277, 66-76.	2.2	27
12	Daubert and the Exclusionary Ethos: The Convergence of Corporate and Judicial Attitudes towards the Admissibility of Expert Evidence in Tort Litigation*. <i>Law and Policy</i> , 2004, 26, 231-257.	0.7	24
13	The Cool Crucible: Forensic Science and the Frailty of the Criminal Trial. <i>Current Issues in Criminal Justice</i> , 2012, 24, 51-68.	1.4	24
14	Thick Decisions: Expertise, Advocacy and Reasonableness in the Federal Court of Australia. <i>Oceania</i> , 2004, 74, 190-230.	0.3	22
15	Is Reliability Sufficient? The Law Commission and Expert Evidence in International and Interdisciplinary Perspective (Part 1). <i>International Journal of Evidence and Proof</i> , 2012, 16, 30-65.	0.4	22
16	Communicating forensic science opinion: An examination of expert reporting practices. <i>Science and Justice - Journal of the Forensic Science Society</i> , 2020, 60, 216-224.	2.1	21
17	A CONTEXTUAL APPROACH TO THE ADMISSIBILITY OF THE STATE'S FORENSIC SCIENCE AND MEDICAL EVIDENCE. <i>University of Toronto Law Journal</i> , 2011, 61, 343-409.	0.2	20
18	Actual innocents? Legal limitations and their implications for forensic science and medicine. <i>Australian Journal of Forensic Sciences</i> , 2011, 43, 177-212.	1.2	17

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
19	Expressing evaluative forensic science opinions in a court of law. Law, Probability and Risk, 2012, 11, 289-302.	2.4	16
20	On the likelihood of “encapsulating all uncertainty”. Science and Justice - Journal of the Forensic Science Society, 2017, 57, 76-79.	2.1	16
21	Review essay: The building blocks of forensic science and law: Recent work on DNA profiling (and) Tj ETQq1 1 0.784314 rgBT /Overl	2.5	15
22	Reporting on the comparison and interpretation of pattern evidence: recommendations for forensic specialists. Australian Journal of Forensic Sciences, 2012, 44, 193-196.	1.2	15
23	Legal versus non-legal approaches to forensic science evidence. International Journal of Evidence and Proof, 2016, 20, 3-28.	0.4	13
24	Creating (public) science in the Noah's Ark case. Public Understanding of Science, 1999, 8, 317-343.	2.8	12
25	Science Friction: Streamlined Forensic Reporting, Reliability and Justice. Oxford Journal of Legal Studies, 2018, 38, 764-792.	0.7	12
26	Impartiality, efficiency or reliability? A critical response to expert evidence law and procedure in Australia. Australian Journal of Forensic Sciences, 2010, 42, 83-99.	1.2	11
27	Public attitudes towards the use of automatic facial recognition technology in criminal justice systems around the world. PLoS ONE, 2021, 16, e0258241.	2.5	11
28	Representing the Sociology of Scientific Knowledge and Law. Science Communication, 1998, 19, 307-327.	3.3	10
29	Anti-social Epistemologies. Social Studies of Science, 2006, 36, 843-853.	2.5	10
30	Expert evidence in reports and courts. Australian Journal of Forensic Sciences, 2013, 45, 248-262.	1.2	10
31	Advice for the Courts? <i>Sufficiently Reliable</i> Assistance with Forensic Science and Medicine (Part 2). International Journal of Evidence and Proof, 2012, 16, 263-297.	0.4	9
32	Justicia’s Gaze: Surveillance, Evidence and the Criminal Trial. Surveillance & Society, 2013, 11, 252-271.	0.6	9
33	Forensic science evidence: Naive estimates of false positive error rates and reliability. Forensic Science International, 2019, 302, 109877.	2.2	9
34	Survey review. Metascience, 1996, 5, 40-58.	0.3	8
35	Just truth? Carefully applying history, philosophy and sociology of science to the forensic use of CCTV images. Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part C:Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences, 2013, 44, 80-91.	1.3	7
36	A little ignorance is a dangerous thing: engaging with exogenous knowledge not adduced by the parties. Griffith Law Review, 2016, 25, 383-413.	0.8	7

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
37	Judicial notice: beyond adversarialism and into the exogenous zone. Griffith Law Review, 2016, 25, 291-318.	0.8	7
38	Juggling science: From polemic to pastiche. Social Epistemology, 1999, 13, 215-233.	1.2	6
39	Just Cognition: Scientific Research on Bias and Some Implications for Legal Procedure and Decision-Making. Modern Law Review, 2019, 82, 633-664.	0.2	6
40	An expert's novice comparison of feature choice. Applied Cognitive Psychology, 2020, 34, 984-995.	1.6	6
41	Antipodean forensics: a comment on ANZFSS's response to PCAST. Australian Journal of Forensic Sciences, 2018, 50, 140-151.	1.2	5
42	Forensic science and the myth of adversarial testing. Current Issues in Criminal Justice, 2020, 32, 146-179.	1.4	5
43	Exploring juror evaluations of expert opinions using the Expert Persuasion Expectancy framework. Legal and Criminological Psychology, 2020, 25, 90-110.	2.0	4
44	Title is missing!. Public Understanding of Science, 1998, 7, 83-111.	2.8	4
45	Fingerprint Comparison and Adversarialism: The Scientific and Historical Evidence. Modern Law Review, 2020, 83, 1287-1327.	0.2	3
46	Forensic science needs registered reports. Forensic Science International (Online), 2020, 2, 41-45.	1.3	2
47	Reply to Response to Vacuous standards "Subversion of the OSAC standards-development process. Forensic Science International (Online), 2021, 3, 100149.	1.3	2
48	Judging Surveys: Experts, Empirical Evidence and Law Reform. Federal Law Review, 2005, 33, 95-139.	0.4	2
49	Judging Surveys: Experts, Empirical Evidence and Law Reform. Federal Law Review, 2005, 33, 95-139.	0.4	2
50	Lay comprehension of statistical evidence: A novel measurement approach.. Law and Human Behavior, 2021, 45, 370-390.	0.7	1
51	Latent justice? A review of adversarial challenges to fingerprint evidence. Science and Justice - Journal of the Forensic Science Society, 2022, 62, 21-29.	2.1	1
52	Simply Unconvincing: The High Court on Probative Value and Reliability in the Uniform Evidence Law. Federal Law Review, 2022, 50, 104-127.	0.4	1
53	Reliability and validity of a quality tool for assessing clinical forensic medicine legal reports. Journal of Clinical Forensic and Legal Medicine, 2022, 89, 102359.	1.0	1
54	Law and the uncooked "a reply. Oceania, 2004, 75, 60-67.	0.3	0

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
55	Latent Justice. , 2022, , 248-295.		0