## Jesse Barber

## List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: https://exaly.com/author-pdf/8657427/publications.pdf

Version: 2024-02-01

159358 143772 4,243 61 30 57 citations h-index g-index papers 64 64 64 3359 docs citations times ranked citing authors all docs

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
1	Hidden Phylogenomic Signal Helps Elucidate Arsenurine Silkmoth Phylogeny and the Evolution of Body Size and Wing Shape Trade-Offs. Systematic Biology, 2022, 71, 859-874.	2.7	5
2	Natural and anthropogenic noise increase vigilance and decrease foraging behaviors in song sparrows. Behavioral Ecology, 2022, 33, 288-297.	1.0	6
3	A stochastic simulation model for assessing the masking effects of road noise for wildlife, outdoor recreation, and bioacoustic monitoring. Oecologia, 2022, 199, 217-228.	0.9	2
4	Anti-bat ultrasound production in moths is globally and phylogenetically widespread. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 2022, 119, .	3.3	13
5	Phantom river noise alters orbâ€weaving spider abundance, web size and prey capture. Functional Ecology, 2021, 35, 717-726.	1.7	10
6	Ecosystem services enhanced through soundscape management link people and wildlife. People and Nature, 2021, 3, 176-189.	1.7	27
7	Artificial nightlight alters the predator–prey dynamics of an apex carnivore. Ecography, 2021, 44, 149-161.	2.1	42
8	Eight simple actions that individuals can take to save insects from global declines. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 2021, 118, .	3.3	40
9	Does experimentally quieting traffic noise benefit people and birds?. Ecology and Society, 2021, 26, .	1.0	2
10	Noise distracts foraging bats. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 2021, 288, 20202689.	1.2	25
11	Phantom rivers filter birds and bats by acoustic niche. Nature Communications, 2021, 12, 3029.	5.8	14
12	Artificial night light and anthropogenic noise interact to influence bird abundance over a continental scale. Global Change Biology, 2021, 27, 3987-4004.	4.2	34
13	Assessing the Vulnerabilities of Vertebrate Species to Light and Noise Pollution: Expert Surveys Illuminate the Impacts on Specialist Species. Integrative and Comparative Biology, 2021, 61, 1202-1215.	0.9	5
14	Natural noise affects conspecific signal detection and territorial defense behaviors in songbirds. Behavioral Ecology, 2021, 32, 993-1003.	1.0	11
15	Adaptive shifts underlie the divergence in wing morphology in bombycoid moths. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 2021, 288, 20210677.	1.2	5
16	Experimental river noise alters arthropod abundance. Oikos, 2021, 130, 2001-2014.	1.2	5
17	Using the Past to Understand the Present: Coping with Natural and Anthropogenic Noise. BioScience, 2021, 71, 223-234.	2.2	23
18	Bio-acoustic tracking and localization using heterogeneous, scalable microphone arrays. Communications Biology, 2021, 4, 1275.	2.0	13

#	Article	IF	Citations
19	Sensory pollutants alter bird phenology and fitness across a continent. Nature, 2020, 587, 605-609.	13.7	94
20	The phantom chorus: birdsong boosts human well-being in protected areas. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 2020, 287, 20201811.	1.2	40
21	Why conservation biology can benefit from sensory ecology. Nature Ecology and Evolution, 2020, 4, 502-511.	3.4	131
22	Time of night and moonlight structure vertical space use by insectivorous bats in a Neotropical rainforest: an acoustic monitoring study. PeerJ, 2020, 8, e10591.	0.9	20
23	Phylogenomics reveals the evolutionary timing and pattern of butterflies and moths. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 2019, 116, 22657-22663.	3.3	291
24	Natural sounds alter California ground squirrel, Otospermophilus beecheyi, foraging, vigilance and movement behaviours. Animal Behaviour, 2019, 157, 51-60.	0.8	17
25	Phylogenomics resolves major relationships and reveals significant diversification rate shifts in the evolution of silk moths and relatives. BMC Evolutionary Biology, 2019, 19, 182.	3.2	49
26	Largeâ€scale manipulation of the acoustic environment can alter the abundance of breeding birds: Evidence from a phantom natural gas field. Journal of Applied Ecology, 2019, 56, 2091-2101.	1.9	19
27	Experimental exclusion of insectivorous predators results in no responses across multiple trophic levels in a water-limited, sagebrush-steppe ecosystem. Journal of Arid Environments, 2019, 160, 74-81.	1.2	0
28	An improved method for utilizing highâ€throughput amplicon sequencing to determine the diets of insectivorous animals. Molecular Ecology Resources, 2019, 19, 176-190.	2.2	109
29	Diel behavior in moths and butterflies: a synthesis of data illuminates the evolution of temporal activity. Organisms Diversity and Evolution, 2018, 18, 13-27.	0.7	37
30	Modeling anthropogenic noise impacts on animals in natural areas. Landscape and Urban Planning, 2018, 180, 76-84.	3.4	6
31	The evolution of anti-bat sensory illusions in moths. Science Advances, 2018, 4, eaar7428.	4.7	35
32	Fireflies thwart bat attack with multisensory warnings. Science Advances, 2018, 4, eaat6601.	4.7	32
33	Natural and anthropogenic sounds reduce song performance: insights from two emberizid species. Behavioral Ecology, 2017, 28, 974-982.	1.0	26
34	Anthropogenic noise changes arthropod abundances. Ecology and Evolution, 2017, 7, 2977-2985.	0.8	52
35	Acoustic environments matter: Synergistic benefits to humans and ecological communities. Journal of Environmental Management, 2017, 203, 245-254.	3.8	57
36	Noise from a phantom road experiment alters the age structure of a community of migrating birds. Animal Conservation, 2017, 20, 164-172.	1.5	44

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
37	Anthropogenic noise impairs owl hunting behavior. Biological Conservation, 2016, 199, 29-32.	1.9	78
38	The ecological implications of visitor transportation in parks and protected areas: Examples from research in US National Parks. Journal of Transport Geography, 2016, 51, 27-35.	2.3	39
39	Anthropogenic noise alters bat activity levels and echolocation calls. Global Ecology and Conservation, 2015, 3, 62-71.	1.0	71
40	A molecular phylogeny of <i>Eumorpha</i> ( <scp>L</scp> epidoptera: <scp>S</scp> phingidae) and the evolution of antiâ€predator larval eyespots. Systematic Entomology, 2015, 40, 401-408.	1.7	8
41	Moth tails divert bat attack: Evolution of acoustic deflection. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 2015, 112, 2812-2816.	3.3	66
42	Pavement and riparian forest shape the bird community along an urban river corridor. Global Ecology and Conservation, 2015, 4, 291-310.	1.0	19
43	A framework to assess evolutionary responses to anthropogenic light and sound. Trends in Ecology and Evolution, 2015, 30, 550-560.	4.2	248
44	Tempo and mode of antibat ultrasound production and sonar jamming in the diverse hawkmoth radiation. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 2015, 112, 6407-6412.	3.3	55
45	A phantom road experiment reveals traffic noise is an invisible source of habitat degradation. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 2015, 112, 12105-12109.	3.3	202
46	A framework for understanding noise impacts on wildlife: an urgent conservation priority. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment, 2013, 11, 305-313.	1.9	395
47	An experimental investigation into the effects of traffic noise on distributions of birds: avoiding the phantom road. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 2013, 280, 20132290.	1.2	210
48	Hawkmoths produce anti-bat ultrasound. Biology Letters, 2013, 9, 20130161.	1.0	36
49	The Effect of Human Activities and Their Associated Noise on Ungulate Behavior. PLoS ONE, 2012, 7, e40505.	1.1	60
50	Anthropogenic noise exposure in protected natural areas: estimating the scale of ecological consequences. Landscape Ecology, 2011, 26, 1281-1295.	1.9	173
51	How do tiger moths jam bat sonar?. Journal of Experimental Biology, 2011, 214, 2416-2425.	0.8	40
52	Anti-bat tiger moth sounds: Form and function. Environmental Epigenetics, 2010, 56, 358-369.	0.9	40
53	The costs of chronic noise exposure for terrestrial organisms. Trends in Ecology and Evolution, 2010, 25, 180-189.	4.2	748
54	Nail ve bats discriminate arctiid moth warning sounds but generalize their aposematic meaning. Journal of Experimental Biology, 2009, 212, 2141-2148.	0.8	28

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
55	Tiger Moth Jams Bat Sonar. Science, 2009, 325, 325-327.	6.0	136
56	Acoustic mimicry in a predator prey interaction. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 2007, 104, 9331-9334.	3.3	109
57	Tiger moth responses to a simulated bat attack: timing and duty cycle. Journal of Experimental Biology, 2006, 209, 2637-2650.	0.8	41
58	Can two streams of auditory information be processed simultaneously? Evidence from the gleaning bat Antrozous pallidus. Journal of Comparative Physiology A: Neuroethology, Sensory, Neural, and Behavioral Physiology, 2003, 189, 843-855.	0.7	73
59	First to Flush: The Effects of Ambient Noise on Songbird Flight Initiation Distances and Implications for Human Experiences with Nature. Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution, 0, 5, .	1.1	21
60	A phantom ultrasonic insect chorus repels lowâ€flying bats, but most are undeterred. Functional Ecology, 0, , .	1.7	1
61	Experimentally broadcast ocean surf and river noise alters birdsong. PeerJ, 0, 10, e13297.	0.9	1