

Alessio Ippolito

List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: <https://exaly.com/author-pdf/9538377/publications.pdf>

Version: 2024-02-01

80
papers

1,020
citations

687363

13
h-index

454955

30
g-index

81
all docs

81
docs citations

81
times ranked

1501
citing authors

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
1	Statement on the active substance flupyradifurone. EFSA Journal, 2022, 20, e07030.	1.8	6
2	Statement on the active substance acetamiprid. EFSA Journal, 2022, 20, e07031.	1.8	9
3	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment for the active substance thiabendazole in light of confirmatory data submitted. EFSA Journal, 2022, 20, e07212.	1.8	3
4	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance Trichoderma atroviride strain AGR2. EFSA Journal, 2022, 20, e07199.	1.8	1
5	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance Aspergillus flavus strain MUCL54911. EFSA Journal, 2022, 20, e07202.	1.8	4
6	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance heptamaloxylglucan. EFSA Journal, 2022, 20, e07210.	1.8	1
7	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance Trichoderma atroviride strain AT10. EFSA Journal, 2022, 20, e07200.	1.8	1
8	Evaluation of the risks for animal health related to the presence of hydroxymethylfurfural (HMF) in feed for honey bees. EFSA Journal, 2022, 20, e07227.	1.8	3
9	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance aluminium ammonium sulfate. EFSA Journal, 2022, 20, e07319.	1.8	1
10	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance Purpureocillium lilacinum strain PL11. EFSA Journal, 2022, 20, e06393.	1.8	1
11	Application of General Unified Threshold Models of Survival Models for Regulatory Aquatic Pesticide Risk Assessment Illustrated with an Example for the Insecticide Chlorpyrifos. Integrated Environmental Assessment and Management, 2021, 17, 243-258.	2.9	9
12	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment for the active substance spiroxamine in light of confirmatory data submitted. EFSA Journal, 2021, 19, e06385.	1.8	3
13	Analysis of background variability of honey bee colony size. EFSA Supporting Publications, 2021, 18, 6518E.	0.7	6
14	Outcome of the Public Consultation on the draft statement of the PPR Panel on a framework for conducting the environmental exposure and risk assessment for transition metals when used as active substances in plant protection products (PPP). EFSA Supporting Publications, 2021, 18, 6501E.	0.7	0
15	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance potassium hydrogen carbonate. EFSA Journal, 2021, 19, e06593.	1.8	2
16	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance Bacillus amyloliquefaciens strain ITâ€45. EFSA Journal, 2021, 19, e06594.	1.8	6
17	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment for the active substance acibenzolarâ€5â€methyl in light of confirmatory data submitted. EFSA Journal, 2021, 19, e06687.	1.8	0
18	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance pelargonic acid (nonanoic acid). EFSA Journal, 2021, 19, e06813.	1.8	7

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
19	Updated peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance bifenazate. EFSA Journal, 2021, 19, e06818.	1.8	1
20	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance clofentezine. EFSA Journal, 2021, 19, e06817.	1.8	0
21	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance benthiaivalicarb (variant assessed) Tj ETQq1 1 0,784314 rgBT /Overlock 10	1.8	2
22	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substances Pepino Mosaic Virus,EU strain, mild isolate Abp1 and Pepino Mosaic Virus,CH2 strain, mild isolate Abp2. EFSA Journal, 2021, 19, e06388.	1.8	1
23	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance Bacillus amyloliquefaciens strain QST 713 (formerly Bacillus subtilis strain QST 713). EFSA Journal, 2021, 19, e06381.	1.8	9
24	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance Spodoptera exigua multicapsid nucleopolyhedrovirus (SeMNPV). EFSA Journal, 2021, 19, e06848.	1.8	0
25	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance Bacillus thuringiensis subsp. kurstaki strain ABTS 351. EFSA Journal, 2021, 19, e06879.	1.8	2
26	Updated peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance asulam (variant evaluated) Tj ETQq0 0 0 rgBT /Overlock 10	1.8	3
27	Updated peer review of the pesticide risk assessment for the active substance dithianon in light of confirmatory data submitted. EFSA Journal, 2020, 18, e06189.	1.8	0
28	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance Metarhizium brunneum BIPESCO 5/F52. EFSA Journal, 2020, 18, e06274.	1.8	5
29	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance 24-epibrassinolide. EFSA Journal, 2020, 18, e06132.	1.8	4
30	Review of the evidence on bee background mortality. EFSA Supporting Publications, 2020, 17, 1880E.	0.7	12
31	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance Bacillus amyloliquefaciens strain AH2. EFSA Journal, 2020, 18, e06156.	1.8	7
32	Updated peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance cyazofamid. EFSA Journal, 2020, 18, e06232.	1.8	1
33	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance Pythium oligandrum strain M1. EFSA Journal, 2020, 18, e06296.	1.8	1
34	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment for the active substance sulfoxaflor in light of confirmatory data submitted. EFSA Journal, 2020, 18, e06056.	1.8	4
35	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance ferric pyrophosphate. EFSA Journal, 2020, 18, e05986.	1.8	0
36	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance garlic extract. EFSA Journal, 2020, 18, e06116.	1.8	0

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
37	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance <i>Akanthomyces muscarius</i> strain Ve6, formerly <i>Lecanicillium muscarium</i> strain Ve6. EFSA Journal, 2020, 18, e06121.	1.8	2
38	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance lavandulylsenecioate. EFSA Journal, 2020, 18, e05588.	1.8	0
39	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance mancozeb. EFSA Journal, 2020, 18, e05755.	1.8	12
40	Outcome of the Pesticides Peer Review Meeting on general recurring issues in ecotoxicology. EFSA Supporting Publications, 2019, 16, 1673E.	0.7	14
41	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance pyriproxyfen. EFSA Journal, 2019, 17, e05732.	1.8	9
42	Using problem formulation for fit-for-purpose pre-market environmental risk assessments of regulated stressors. EFSA Journal, 2019, 17, e170708.	1.8	15
43	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance <i>Phlebiopsis gigantea</i> strains VRA 1835, VRA 1984 and FOC PG 410.3. EFSA Journal, 2019, 17, e05820.	1.8	0
44	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance pydiflumetofen. EFSA Journal, 2019, 17, e05821.	1.8	4
45	Updated peer review of the pesticide risk assessment for the active substance terbuthylazine in light of confirmatory data submitted. EFSA Journal, 2019, 17, e05817.	1.8	8
46	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance thiacloprid. EFSA Journal, 2019, 17, e05595.	1.8	27
47	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance <i>Verticillium albo-atrum</i> strain WCS850. EFSA Journal, 2019, 17, e05575.	1.8	0
48	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance dimethyl disulfide. EFSA Journal, 2019, 17, e05905.	1.8	3
49	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance benfluralin. EFSA Journal, 2019, 17, e05842.	1.8	6
50	Pesticides in surface waters: from edge-of-field to global modelling. Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, 2019, 36, 78-84.	6.3	33
51	Agricultural water pollution: key knowledge gaps and research needs. Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, 2019, 36, 20-27.	6.3	200
52	Disentangling the effects of low pH and metal mixture toxicity on macroinvertebrate diversity. Environmental Pollution, 2018, 235, 889-898.	7.5	15
53	Predicting pesticide fate in small cultivated mountain watersheds using the DynAPlus model: Toward improved assessment of peak exposure. Science of the Total Environment, 2018, 615, 307-318.	8.0	39
54	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance rimsulfuron. EFSA Journal, 2018, 16, e05258.	1.8	4

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
55	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance (EZ) 1,3-dichloropropene. EFSA Journal, 2018, 16, e05464.	1.8	1
56	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance trinexapac (variant evaluated) Tj ETQq0 0 0 rgBT/Overlock 10 Tf 50	1.8	1
57	Scientific Opinion on the state of the art of Toxicokinetic/Toxicodynamic (TKTD) effect models for regulatory risk assessment of pesticides for aquatic organisms. EFSA Journal, 2018, 16, e05377.	1.8	69
58	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance sodium hydrogen carbonate. EFSA Journal, 2018, 16, e05407.	1.8	1
59	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance asulam (variant evaluated) Tj ETQq1 1 0.784314 rgBT/Overlock 10	1.8	5
60	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment for the active substance bromoxynil in light of negligible exposure data submitted. EFSA Journal, 2018, 16, e05490.	1.8	1
61	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance azadirachtin (Margosa extract). EFSA Journal, 2018, 16, e05234.	1.8	4
62	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance Bacillus subtilis strain IAB/BS03. EFSA Journal, 2018, 16, e05261.	1.8	0
63	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance dichlorprop 2-ethylhexyl. EFSA Journal, 2018, 16, e05288.	1.8	1
64	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance 1-methylcyclopropene. EFSA Journal, 2018, 16, e05308.	1.8	1
65	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance thiophanate-methyl. EFSA Journal, 2018, 16, e05133.	1.8	5
66	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance spinosad. EFSA Journal, 2018, 16, e05252.	1.8	13
67	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance Beauveria bassiana strain PPRI 5339. EFSA Journal, 2018, 16, e05230.	1.8	2
68	Updated peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance flurtamone. EFSA Journal, 2017, 15, e04976.	1.8	9
69	Natural variability of enzymatic biomarkers in freshwater invertebrates. Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 2017, 24, 732-742.	5.3	7
70	Neonicotinoids and bees: The case of the European regulatory risk assessment. Science of the Total Environment, 2017, 579, 966-971.	8.0	35
71	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance mepanipyrim. EFSA Journal, 2017, 15, e04852.	1.8	2
72	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance propiconazole. EFSA Journal, 2017, 15, e04887.	1.8	11

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
73	Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance Metschnikowia fructicola NRRL Yâ€27328. EFSA Journal, 2017, 15, e05084.	1.8	5
74	Modeling global distribution of agricultural insecticides in surface waters. Environmental Pollution, 2015, 198, 54-60.	7.5	100
75	Analysing chemical-induced changes in macroinvertebrate communities in aquatic mesocosm experiments: a comparison of methods. Ecotoxicology, 2015, 24, 760-769.	2.4	22
76	Evaluating pesticide effects on freshwater invertebrate communities in alpine environment: a model ecosystem experiment. Ecotoxicology, 2012, 21, 2051-2067.	2.4	12
77	Exposure of pollinators to plant protection products. Ecotoxicology, 2012, 21, 2177-2185.	2.4	7
78	First evidences of the occurrence of polycyclic synthetic musk fragrances in surface water systems in Italy: Spatial and temporal trends in the Molgora River (Lombardia Region, Northern Italy). Science of the Total Environment, 2012, 416, 137-141.	8.0	65
79	Sensitivity assessment of freshwater macroinvertebrates to pesticides using biological traits. Ecotoxicology, 2012, 21, 336-352.	2.4	37
80	Ecological vulnerability analysis: A river basin case study. Science of the Total Environment, 2010, 408, 3880-3890.	8.0	85