Jennifer Kuzma

List of Publications by Year
in descending order

57	1,692	257429 24	302107 39
papers	citations	h-index	g-index

57	57	57	1637
all docs	docs citations	times ranked	citing authors

#	Article	IF	Citations
1	Governance of Gene-edited Plants: Insights from the History of Biotechnology Oversight and Policy Process Theory. Science Technology and Human Values, 2023, 48, 1260-1291.	3.1	5
2	Narrative policy framework at the macro levelâ€"cultural theory-based beliefs, science-based narrative strategies, and their uptake in the Canadian policy process for genetically modified salmon. Public Policy and Administration, 2022, 37, 480-515.	2.0	4
3	Procedurally Robust Risk Assessment Framework for Novel Genetically Engineered Organisms and Gene Drives. Regulation and Governance, 2021, 15, 1144-1165.	2.9	33
4	Barriers to responsible innovation of nanotechnology applications in food and agriculture: A study of US experts and developers. NanoImpact, 2021, 23, 100326.	4.5	18
5	Responsible innovation of nano-agrifoods: Insights and views from U.S. stakeholders. NanoImpact, 2021, 24, 100365.	4.5	8
6	Community-led governance for gene-edited crops. Science, 2020, 370, 916-918.	12.6	30
7	Responsible innovation in biotechnology: Stakeholder attitudes and implications for research policy. Elementa, 2020, 8, .	3.2	13
8	Synthetic Biology: Perspectives on Risk Analysis, Governance, Communication, and ELSI. Risk, Systems and Decisions, 2020, , 1-18.	0.8	1
9	The Role of Expert Disciplinary Cultures in Assessing Risks and Benefits of Synthetic Biology. Risk, Systems and Decisions, 2020, , 351-370.	0.8	2
10	Best practices from nano-risk analysis relevant for other emerging technologies. Nature Nanotechnology, 2019, 14, 998-1001.	31.5	30
11	Anticipating risks, governance needs, and public perceptions of de-extinction. Journal of Responsible Innovation, 2019, 6, 211-231.	4.9	11
12	â€˜Mapping research and governance needs for gene drivesâ€™. Journal of Responsible Innovation, 2018, 5, S4-S12.	4.9	21
13	Regulating animals with gene drive systems: lessons from the regulatory assessment of a genetically engineered mosquito. Journal of Responsible Innovation, 2018, 5, S203-S222.	4.9	28
14	A roadmap for gene drives: using institutional analysis and development to frame research needs and governance in a systems context. Journal of Responsible Innovation, 2018, 5, S13-S39.	4.9	36
15	A decision analytic model to guide earlyâ€stage government regulatory action: Applications for synthetic biology. Regulation and Governance, 2018, 12, 88-100.	2.9	33
16	Editing nature: Local roots of global governance. Science, 2018, 362, 527-529.	12.6	67
17	Cataloguing the barriers facing RRI in innovation pathways: a response to the dilemma of societal alignment. Journal of Responsible Innovation, 2018, 5, 338-346.	4.9	28
18	Wicked evolution: Can we address the sociobiological dilemma of pesticide resistance?. Science, 2018, 360, 728-732.	12.6	328

#	Article	IF	Citations
19	Comparative, collaborative, and integrative risk governance for emerging technologies. Environment Systems and Decisions, 2018, 38, 170-176.	3.4	81
20	Trails and Trials in Biotechnology Policy. Women in Engineering and Science, 2017, , 85-96.	0.4	0
21	A cooperative governance network for crop genome editing. EMBO Reports, 2017, 18, 1683-1687.	4.5	17
22	Societal Risk Evaluation Scheme (SRES): Scenario-Based Multi-Criteria Evaluation of Synthetic Biology Applications. PLoS ONE, 2017, 12, e0168564.	2.5	32
23	Society and Policy Makerâ€™s Responsibilities. , 2017, , 547-566.		2
24	Policy: Reboot the debate on genetic engineering. Nature, 2016, 531, 165-167.	27.8	64
25	Is adaptation or transformation needed? Active nanomaterials and risk analysis. Journal of Nanoparticle Research, 2016, 18, 1.	1.9	2
26	A missed opportunity for U.S. biotechnology regulation. Science, 2016, 353, 1211-1213.	12.6	21
27	Translational governance research for synthetic biology. Journal of Responsible Innovation, 2015, 2, 109-112.	4.9	5
28	Investigating factors influencing consumer willingness to buy GM food and nano-food. Journal of Nanoparticle Research, 2015, 17, 1.	1.9	39
29	Altruism and skepticism in public attitudes toward food nanotechnologies. Journal of Nanoparticle Research, 2015, 17, 1.	1.9	17
30	Heterogeneous Consumer Preferences for Nanotechnology and Geneticâ€modification Technology in Food Products. Journal of Agricultural Economics, 2015, 66, 308-328.	3.5	40
31	Conflicting Futures. Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society, 2014, 34, 108-120.	2.9	7
32	Mapping the emerging field of genome editing. Technology Analysis and Strategic Management, 2014, 26, 321-352.	3.5	7
33	Governance of genetic biocontrol technologies for invasive fish. Biological Invasions, 2014, 16, 1299-1312.	2.4	10
34	Hungry for Information: Public Attitudes Toward Food Nanotechnology and Labeling. Review of Policy Research, 2013, 30, 512-548.	3.9	46
35	Innovation in emerging energy technologies: A case study analysis to inform the path forward for algal biofuels. Energy Policy, 2013, 61, 1595-1607.	8.8	11
36	Properly paced? Examining the past and present governance of GMOs in the United States. , 2013, , .		3

#	Article	IF	Citations
37	Renegotiating GM crop regulation. EMBO Reports, 2011, 12, 883-888.	4.5	55
38	The â€œRevolving Doorâ€•between Regulatory Agencies and Industry: A Problem That Requires Reconceptualizing Objectivity. Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics, 2011, 24, 575-599.	1.7	56
39	Corporate social responsibility for nanotechnology oversight. Medicine, Health Care and Philosophy, 2011, 14, 407-419.	1.8	14
40	Introduction: designing nanobiotechnology oversight. Journal of Nanoparticle Research, 2011, 13, 1341-1343.	1.9	0
41	Recommendations for oversight of nanobiotechnology: dynamic oversight for complex and convergent technology. Journal of Nanoparticle Research, 2011, 13, 1345-1371.	1.9	32
42	Nanotechnology, voluntary oversight, and corporate social performance: does company size matter?. Journal of Nanoparticle Research, 2011, 13, 1499-1512.	1.9	6
43	Allhoff, Fritz, Patrick Lin, and Daniel Moore. 2010. What is nanotechnology and why does it matter? From science to ethics. Journal of Bioethical Inquiry, 2011, 8, 209-211.	1.5	1
44	Systems Mapping of Consumer Acceptance of Agrifood Nanotechnology. Journal of Consumer Policy, 2010, 33, 299-322.	1.3	29
45	Unpackaging synthetic biology: Identification of oversight policy problems and options. Regulation and Governance, 2010, 4, 92-112.	2.9	36
46	Nanotechnology in animal productionâ€”Upstream assessment of applications. Livestock Science, 2010, 130, 14-24.	1.6	60
47	The public option. EMBO Reports, 2009, 10, 1288-1293.	4.5	6
48	The Challenge of Developing Oversight Approaches to Nanobiotechnology. Journal of Law, Medicine and Ethics, 2009, 37, 543-545.	0.9	7
49	Evaluating Oversight Systems for Emerging Technologies: A Case Study of Genetically Engineered Organisms. Journal of Law, Medicine and Ethics, 2009, 37, 546-586.	0.9	33
50	Developing U.S. Oversight Strategies for Nanobiotechnology: Learning from Past Oversight Experiences. Journal of Law, Medicine and Ethics, 2009, 37, 688-705.	0.9	20
51	Improving oversight of genetically engineered organisms. Policy and Society, 2009, 28, 279-299.	5.6	2
52	Ethics of Risk Analysis and Regulatory Review: From Bio- to Nanotechnology. NanoEthics, 2008, 2, 149-162.	0.8	51
53	Upstream Oversight Assessment for Agrifood Nanotechnology: A Case Studies Approach. Risk Analysis, 2008, 28, 1081-1098.	2.7	53
54	An Integrated Approach to Oversight Assessment for Emerging Technologies. Risk Analysis, 2008, 28, 1197-1220.	2.7	60

#	Article	IF	Citations
55	Evaluating technology oversight through multiple frameworks: a case study of genetically engineered cotton in India. Science and Public Policy, 2008, 35, 121-138.	2.4	7
56	Living with BSE. Risk Analysis, 2006, 26, 585-588.	2.7	5
57	Moving forward responsibly: Oversight for the nanotechnology-biology interface. Journal of Nanoparticle Research, 2006, 9, 165-182.	1.9	59