

# Alison J Haughton

## List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: <https://exaly.com/author-pdf/3761353/publications.pdf>

Version: 2024-02-01

37  
papers

2,167  
citations

218677

26  
h-index

377865

34  
g-index

37  
all docs

37  
docs citations

37  
times ranked

1871  
citing authors

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
1	Reviewers for Weed Research 2020~21. Weed Research, 2021, 61, 532-533.	1.7	0
2	Reviewers for Weed Research 2019~20. Weed Research, 2020, 60, 475-476.	1.7	0
3	Reviewers for Weed Research. Weed Research, 2019, 59, 501-502.	1.7	0
4	Oilseed rape ( <i>Brassica napus</i> ) as a resource for farmland insect pollinators: quantifying floral traits in conventional varieties and breeding systems. GCB Bioenergy, 2017, 9, 1370-1379.	5.6	42
5	Flight performance of actively foraging honey bees is reduced by a common pathogen. Environmental Microbiology Reports, 2016, 8, 728-737.	2.4	44
6	Networking Our Way to Better Ecosystem Service Provision. Trends in Ecology and Evolution, 2016, 31, 105-115.	8.7	72
7	Dedicated biomass crops can enhance biodiversity in the arable landscape. GCB Bioenergy, 2016, 8, 1071-1081.	5.6	45
8	10 Years Later. Advances in Ecological Research, 2015, 53, 1-53.	2.7	43
9	Using functional traits to quantify the value of plant communities to invertebrate ecosystem service providers in arable landscapes. Journal of Ecology, 2013, 101, 38-46.	4.0	55
10	Effects of local landscape richness on in-field weed metrics across the Great Britain scale. Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment, 2012, 158, 208-215.	5.3	11
11	Learning How to Deal with Values, Frames and Governance in Sustainability Appraisal. Regional Studies, 2011, 45, 1157-1170.	4.4	45
12	Modelling rotations: can crop sequences explain arable weed seedbank abundance?. Weed Research, 2011, 51, 422-432.	1.7	55
13	The environmental impacts of biomass crops: use by birds of miscanthus in summer and winter in southwestern England. Ibis, 2010, 152, 487-499.	1.9	35
14	How might we model an ecosystem?. Ecological Modelling, 2009, 220, 1935-1949.	2.5	32
15	Functional approaches for assessing plant and invertebrate abundance patterns in arable systems. Basic and Applied Ecology, 2009, 10, 34-42.	2.7	54
16	A novel, integrated approach to assessing social, economic and environmental implications of changing rural land use: a case study of perennial biomass crops. Journal of Applied Ecology, 2009, 46, 315-322.	4.0	117
17	Weed and invertebrate community compositions in arable farmland. Arthropod-Plant Interactions, 2008, 2, 21-30.	1.1	27
18	Providing the evidence base for environmental risk assessments of novel farm management practices. Environmental Science and Policy, 2008, 11, 579-587.	4.9	19

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
19	Statistical models to evaluate invertebrateâ€™ plant trophic interactions in arable systems. <i>Bulletin of Entomological Research</i> , 2007, 97, 265-280.	1.0	20
20	Effects of genetically modified herbicide-tolerant cropping systems on weed seedbanks in two years of following crops. <i>Biology Letters</i> , 2006, 2, 140-143.	2.3	26
21	Effects of successive seasons of genetically modified herbicide-tolerant maize cropping on weeds and invertebrates. <i>Annals of Applied Biology</i> , 2006, 149, 249-254.	2.5	21
22	Weed seed resources for birds in fields with contrasting conventional and genetically modified herbicide-tolerant crops. <i>Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences</i> , 2006, 273, 1921-1928.	2.6	61
23	Effects on weed and invertebrate abundance and diversity of herbicide management in genetically modified herbicide-tolerant winter-sown oilseed rape. <i>Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences</i> , 2005, 272, 463-474.	2.6	82
24	Invertebrate biodiversity in maize following withdrawal of triazine herbicides. <i>Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences</i> , 2005, 272, 1497-1502.	2.6	12
25	An introduction to the Farm-Scale Evaluations of genetically modified herbicide-tolerant crops. <i>Journal of Applied Ecology</i> , 2003, 40, 2-16.	4.0	166
26	Invertebrate responses to the management of genetically modified herbicideâ€™ tolerant and conventional spring crops. I. Soil-surface-active invertebrates. <i>Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences</i> , 2003, 358, 1847-1862.	4.0	114
27	Invertebrate responses to the management of genetically modified herbicideâ€™ tolerant and conventional spring crops. II. Within-field epigeal and aerial arthropods. <i>Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences</i> , 2003, 358, 1863-1877.	4.0	127
28	Responses of plants and invertebrate trophic groups to contrasting herbicide regimes in the Farm Scale Evaluations of genetically modified herbicideâ€™ tolerant crops. <i>Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences</i> , 2003, 358, 1899-1913.	4.0	185
29	Weeds in fields with contrasting conventional and genetically modified herbicideâ€™ tolerant crops. I. Effects on abundance and diversity. <i>Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences</i> , 2003, 358, 1819-1832.	4.0	150
30	Invertebrates and vegetation of field margins adjacent to crops subject to contrasting herbicide regimes in the Farm Scale Evaluations of genetically modified herbicideâ€™ tolerant crops. <i>Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences</i> , 2003, 358, 1879-1898.	4.0	101
31	Crop management and agronomic context of the Farm Scale Evaluations of genetically modified herbicideâ€™ tolerant crops. <i>Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences</i> , 2003, 358, 1801-1818.	4.0	98
32	Weeds in fields with contrasting conventional and genetically modified herbicideâ€™ tolerant crops. II. Effects on individual species. <i>Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences</i> , 2003, 358, 1833-1846.	4.0	79
33	On the rationale and interpretation of the Farm Scale Evaluations of genetically modified herbicide-tolerant crops. <i>Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences</i> , 2003, 358, 1779-1799.	4.0	102
34	DO INCREMENTAL INCREASES OF THE HERBICIDE GLYPHOSATE HAVE INDIRECT CONSEQUENCES FOR SPIDER COMMUNITIES?. <i>Journal of Arachnology</i> , 2002, 30, 288-297.	0.5	19
35	Manipulating the abundance of <i>Lepthyphantes tenuis</i> (Araneae: Linyphiidae) by field margin management. <i>Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment</i> , 2002, 93, 295-304.	5.3	20
36	The effect of the herbicide glyphosate on non-target spiders: Part I. Direct effects on <i>Lepthyphantes tenuis</i> under laboratory conditions. <i>Pest Management Science</i> , 2001, 57, 1033-1036.	3.4	48

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
37	The effect of the herbicide glyphosate on non-target spiders: Part II. Indirect effects on <i>Lepthyphantes tenuis</i> in field margins. <i>Pest Management Science</i> , 2001, 57, 1037-1042.	3.4	40