

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

430442

18
h-index

580395

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.	0.8	57
2	Thinking forensics: Cognitive science for forensic practitioners. <i>Science and Justice - Journal of the Forensic Science Society</i> , 2017, 57, 144-154.	1.3	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.	1.2	39
4	Model forensic science. <i>Australian Journal of Forensic Sciences</i> , 2016, 48, 496-537.	0.7	32
5	Scientific literacy and the jury: reconsidering jury 'competence'. <i>Public Understanding of Science</i> , 1997, 6, 329-357.	1.6	30
6	Litigation Life. <i>Social Studies of Science</i> , 2000, 30, 265-316.	1.5	30
7	The Law-Set: The Legal-Scientific Production of Medical Propriety. <i>Science Technology and Human Values</i> , 2001, 26, 191-226.	1.7	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.	0.2	29
9	Legal Engineering. <i>Social Studies of Science</i> , 2002, 32, 371-412.	1.5	28
10	Judicial Representations of Scientific Evidence. <i>Modern Law Review</i> , 2000, 63, 216-251.	0.1	27
11	Peer review in forensic science. <i>Forensic Science International</i> , 2017, 277, 66-76.	1.3	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.	0.3	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.	0.8	24
14	Thick Decisions: Expertise, Advocacy and Reasonableness in the Federal Court of Australia. <i>Oceania</i> , 2004, 74, 190-230.	0.6	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.	0.2	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.	1.3	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.	1.1	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.	0.7	17

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
19	Expressing evaluative forensic science opinions in a court of law. <i>Law, Probability and Risk</i> , 2012, 11, 289-302.	1.2	16
20	On the likelihood of "encapsulating all uncertainty". <i>Science and Justice - Journal of the Forensic Science Society</i> , 2017, 57, 76-79.	1.3	16
21	Review essay: The building blocks of forensic science and law: Recent work on DNA profiling (and Tj ETQq1 1 0.784314 rgBT /Overlo	1.5	15
22	Reporting on the comparison and interpretation of pattern evidence: recommendations for forensic specialists. <i>Australian Journal of Forensic Sciences</i> , 2012, 44, 193-196.	0.7	15
23	Legal versus non-legal approaches to forensic science evidence. <i>International Journal of Evidence and Proof</i> , 2016, 20, 3-28.	0.2	13
24	Creating (public) science in the Noah's Ark case. <i>Public Understanding of Science</i> , 1999, 8, 317-343.	1.6	12
25	Science Friction: Streamlined Forensic Reporting, Reliability and Justice. <i>Oxford Journal of Legal Studies</i> , 2018, 38, 764-792.	0.5	12
26	Impartiality, efficiency or reliability? A critical response to expert evidence law and procedure in Australia. <i>Australian Journal of Forensic Sciences</i> , 2010, 42, 83-99.	0.7	11
27	Public attitudes towards the use of automatic facial recognition technology in criminal justice systems around the world. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2021, 16, e0258241.	1.1	11
28	Representing the Sociology of Scientific Knowledge and Law. <i>Science Communication</i> , 1998, 19, 307-327.	1.8	10
29	Anti-social Epistemologies. <i>Social Studies of Science</i> , 2006, 36, 843-853.	1.5	10
30	Expert evidence in reports and courts. <i>Australian Journal of Forensic Sciences</i> , 2013, 45, 248-262.	0.7	10
31	Advice for the Courts? <i>Sufficiently Reliable</i> Assistance with Forensic Science and Medicine (Part 2). <i>International Journal of Evidence and Proof</i> , 2012, 16, 263-297.	0.2	9
32	Justicia's Gaze: Surveillance, Evidence and the Criminal Trial. <i>Surveillance & Society</i> , 2013, 11, 252-271.	0.4	9
33	Forensic science evidence: Naive estimates of false positive error rates and reliability. <i>Forensic Science International</i> , 2019, 302, 109877.	1.3	9
34	Survey review. <i>Metascience</i> , 1996, 5, 40-58.	0.1	8
35	Just truth? Carefully applying history, philosophy and sociology of science to the forensic use of CCTV images. <i>Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part C: Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences</i> , 2013, 44, 80-91.	0.8	7
36	A little ignorance is a dangerous thing: engaging with exogenous knowledge not adduced by the parties. <i>Griffith Law Review</i> , 2016, 25, 383-413.	0.6	7

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
37	Judicial notice: beyond adversarialism and into the exogenous zone. Griffith Law Review, 2016, 25, 291-318.	0.6	7
38	Juggling science: From polemic to pastiche. Social Epistemology, 1999, 13, 215-233.	0.7	6
39	Just Cognition: Scientific Research on Bias and Some Implications for Legal Procedure and Decision-Making. Modern Law Review, 2019, 82, 633-664.	0.1	6
40	An expert's novice comparison of feature choice. Applied Cognitive Psychology, 2020, 34, 984-995.	0.9	6
41	Antipodean forensics: a comment on ANZFSS's response to PCAST. Australian Journal of Forensic Sciences, 2018, 50, 140-151.	0.7	5
42	Forensic science and the myth of adversarial testing. Current Issues in Criminal Justice, 2020, 32, 146-179.	0.8	5
43	Exploring juror evaluations of expert opinions using the Expert Persuasion Expectancy framework. Legal and Criminological Psychology, 2020, 25, 90-110.	1.5	4
44	Title is missing!. Public Understanding of Science, 1998, 7, 83-111.	1.6	4
45	Fingerprint Comparison and Adversarialism: The Scientific and Historical Evidence. Modern Law Review, 2020, 83, 1287-1327.	0.1	3
46	Forensic science needs registered reports. Forensic Science International (Online), 2020, 2, 41-45.	0.6	2
47	Reply to Response to Vacuous standards "Subversion of the OSAC standards-development process. Forensic Science International (Online), 2021, 3, 100149.	0.6	2
48	Judging Surveys: Experts, Empirical Evidence and Law Reform. Federal Law Review, 2005, 33, 95-139.	0.2	2
49	Judging Surveys: Experts, Empirical Evidence and Law Reform. Federal Law Review, 2005, 33, 95-139.	0.2	2
50	Lay comprehension of statistical evidence: A novel measurement approach.. Law and Human Behavior, 2021, 45, 370-390.	0.6	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.	1.3	1
52	Simply Unconvincing: The High Court on Probative Value and Reliability in the Uniform Evidence Law. Federal Law Review, 2022, 50, 104-127.	0.2	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.	0.5	1
54	Law and the uncooked "a reply. Oceania, 2004, 75, 60-67.	0.6	0

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