

# Past, Present, and Future of Citation Practices in HCI

JONAS OPPENLAENDER, University of Oulu, Finland




Fig. 1. Number of references per article in the Proceedings of the ACM CHI Conference from 1981 to 2024.

Science is a complex system comprised of many scientists who individually make collective decisions that, due to the size and nature of the academic system, largely do not affect the system as a whole. However, certain decisions at the meso-level of research communities, such as the Human-Computer Interaction (HCI) community, may result in deep and long-lasting behavioral changes in scientists. In this article, we provide quantitative evidence on how a change in editorial policies introduced at the ACM CHI Conference in 2016 launched the CHI community on an expansive path, denoted by a year-by-year increase in the mean number of references included in CHI articles. If this near-linear trend continues undisrupted, an article at CHI 2030 will include *on average* almost 130 references. The trend towards more citations reflects a citation culture where quantity is prioritized over quality, contributing to both author and peer reviewer fatigue. This article underscores the profound impact that meso-level policy adjustments have on the evolution of scientific fields and disciplines, urging stakeholders to carefully consider the broader implications of such changes.

CCS Concepts: • **General and reference** → General conference proceedings; General literature; • **Applied computing** → Digital libraries and archives; • **Human-centered computing** → Human computer interaction (HCI).

Additional Key Words and Phrases: quantitative analysis, citations, references, bibliometric analysis, CHI, meta-science, meta-HCI.

## 1 Introduction

Citation serves as the backbone of academic rigor, enabling researchers to build upon previous work, acknowledge contributions, and weave a rich tapestry of interdisciplinary knowledge. Editorial policies shape the landscape of academic publishing, influencing not only the structure and content of the research published but also the citation practices of researchers. Citation practices, as a tangible expression of scholarly discourse, provide valuable insights into the evolving norms and values of the CHI community. Understanding the impact of policy decisions on citation practices is crucial for ensuring that scholarly communication serves both the authors and the broader field effectively.

In this work, we examine how the citation practices of researchers in the Human-Computer Interaction (HCI) community have changed after a significant editorial policy decision introduced in 2016. In this year, the page restrictions at the HCI field's top conference, the ACM Conference

on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI), were lifted. This policy decision had a profound impact on the citation practices of the CHI community. Our analysis of 11,542 articles published at the CHI Conference between 1981 and 2024 provides evidence of a year-by-year increase in the mean number of references included in CHI articles. This change signifies a departure from previous patterns and suggests the community's entry into a novel trajectory (cf. Figure 1). If this trend continues undisrupted, an article in CHI 2030 will include *on average* about 130 references. Such a scenario poses practical challenges for authors and peer reviewers alike, straining the authors' capacity to meaningfully engage with the literature and the peer reviewers' capacity to thoroughly vet the cited literature during the peer review process.

The excessive and escalating number of references in CHI articles raises important questions about the nature of academic discourse, the balance between comprehensiveness and focus in scholarly communication, and the sustainability of current citation practices. The challenges brought by the citation practices within the HCI community are multifaceted, encompassing the expansion of the conference itself and the elevation of standards for what constitutes a publication-worthy contribution. Such developments, while indicative of progress, also contribute to the increasing complexity of the academic ecosystem, negatively impacting both authors and peer reviewers. With the volume of references expanding, the feasibility of conducting thorough and effective peer reviews is called into question. We argue it is high time for the CHI community to pause, reflect, and reevaluate how the HCI field approaches the practice of citation. In light of our findings, this paper aims to spark a conversation within the CHI community and beyond about the future of scholarly communication and academic publishing. By examining the contextual factors and ramifications of changing citation practices, we invite scholars, practitioners, and policymakers to reflect on past decisions and identify sustainable pathways forward.

## 2 Related Work

### 2.1 The Field of Human-Computer Interaction

Human-Computer Interaction is both a field and a discipline [6, 24]. As a field, HCI encompasses diverse disciplines, such as computer science, cognitive science, psychology, design, sociology, anthropology, and more [6, 16, 24, 27]. HCI draws from these diverse areas to understand how humans interact with computers and how to design user-friendly systems. As an academic discipline, HCI is taught in structured curricula at many universities in dedicated degree programs, educating students in the principles and practices of HCI. Human-Computer Interaction is also recognized as a professional discipline with specific roles, such as UX researchers and interaction designers. Other researchers have aimed to look past the dichotomy of field versus discipline by framing HCI as problem-solving [28]. In the remainder of this paper, we refer to HCI as a field.

Each year, a growing number of articles are being published in the field of HCI. The international top conference in the field of HCI is the ACM CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI), which has been held each year since 1981 (with exception of 1984). CHI is the most prestigious conference venue for researchers in HCI, with many HCI labs submitting their articles exclusively to this conference venue. As such, the CHI conference can serve as a reference standard for the entire field and discipline of HCI field.

From its humble beginnings in the early 1980s, the CHI conference has been expanding since 2005 in terms of articles accepted at the conference. Except for the COVID-19 pandemic years 2021 and 2022, the CHI proceedings have exhibited near linear growth since 2005. In 2024, the CHI proceedings exceeded 1000 articles. While this expansion is plan-driven and directed by CHI's Steering Committee, it also reflects the expansion of the wider HCI field.

In this expansive and evolving research landscape, the practice of citing relevant works is important for HCI researchers. Citations serve as a vital link, connecting current research efforts with the rich history of past works. Citations acknowledge the contributions of other researchers and weave a rich tapestry of knowledge that informs and enriches new inquiries. For a field as interdisciplinary as HCI, where the integration of diverse perspectives and methodologies is crucial, citations provide a structured way to navigate and summarize the vast array of existing knowledge for readers without deep subject-matter knowledge and expertise. Further, citations enhance the credibility and rigor of academic discourse, enabling scholars to build upon a verified body of work. Proper citation practices contribute to the integrity of the HCI field, fostering an environment of collaboration and continuous learning. As such, citations are not merely a scholarly obligation but a critical element that underpins the academic and intellectual growth of the HCI community.

## 2.2 Meta-Research on the CHI Community and the Field of HCI

While the majority of HCI researchers conduct research within their field, some researchers have also examined aspects about the field of HCI. This is commonly referred to as meta-research [13]. Meta-research is valuable, as it enables the research community to reflect on its research practices [29]. The CHI proceedings, in particular, are a fruitful study subject for meta-scientific and bibliometric inquiries in the field of HCI. Bartneck and Hu, for instance, presented a scientometric analysis of the CHI proceedings, focusing on organizations and countries that contribute to CHI [3]. Their work highlighted the difficulty of judging quality in the context of best paper awards, finding a mismatch between awarded papers and citations received. Our paper also includes an analysis of awards, however we focus on analyzing whether there is a systematic bias in awarded papers.

Lee et al. presented a bibliometric analysis of the CHI proceedings (from 1981 to 2018), using a citation network analysis to identify emerging topics in CHI [21]. Liu et al. also conducted a bibliometric analysis of CHI publications [24]. Their keyword co-word analysis quantified and described the thematic evolution of the HCI field based on 3152 CHI articles published between 1994 and 2013. Like our work, their work includes a comparison between two time periods (1994–2003, 2004–2013), highlighting the underlying trends in the HCI community.

Pohl and Mottelson presented a quantitative meta-research study on paper writing at CHI, including an investigation on citations received [30]. Their analysis of 6578 CHI papers found that readability, title length, and novelty influence citation counts. Our work differs in that we do not investigate writing, and only focus on citations given, not received.

Another area of meta-research is the use of literature reviews in HCI. Stefanidi et al. conducted an analysis of CHI proceedings and ACM Transactions on Computer–Human Interaction (TOCHI) articles included 189 articles [33]. Like in our work, the authors note an “insufficient consensus of what to expect of literature reviews in HCI.” The diverse types and methodologies of literature reviews in HCI prompt us to split our analysis of literature reviews into a broad and narrow part.

Kaye presented a quantitative analysis of CHI, examining author counts, gender, and repeat authorship [15]. Among other findings, the work identified a trend toward an increasing number of authors per paper. We identify the same trend in our work, and similar to Kaye, we aim to encourage a discussion about what the preferred state of CHI should be.

## 3 Dataset

The ACM CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems is the HCI field’s largest and most important annual conference. Therefore, the CHI conference proceedings may act as a proxy for investigations into the wider field of HCI. In particular, the digital CHI Proceedings are a fertile ground for investigating the citation practices of HCI authors. The CHI proceedings are stored in ACM’s Digital Library (ACM-DL), which is the main data source in our research.

We collected data on the number of references for each article published in the CHI proceedings from 1981 to 2024<sup>1</sup> by scraping the ACM-DL. We excluded session details, panel sessions, keynotes, and abstract-only entries using regular expressions. For articles with more than 150 references, we manually collected the number of references due to the ACM-DL’s display limit. Additionally, we identified and corrected six instances where the number of references was incorrectly reported as zero. This process resulted in a dataset of DOI identifiers with their respective reference counts. We then downloaded the PDF documents for each DOI from the ACM-DL, resulting in a comprehensive dataset of 11,542 CHI articles.

## 4 Findings

Over the course of 34 years (from 1981 to 2024, with exception of 1984), authors at the CHI conference cited a total of 558,080 articles. The mean number of references per CHI article over the entirety of the CHI proceedings is 48.35 references ( $SD = 35.09$ ,  $Min = 0$ ,  $Max = 496$ ). However, the field of HCI has evolved from its humble beginnings, and a more in-depth look at these statistics is warranted. In particular, we focus on the increase in the mean number of references per article in the following section.

### 4.1 The Rising Number of References in CHI Articles

We first provide an historical overview of citation trends in the CHI proceedings, from the conference’s beginning to the current trend. We then extrapolate this trend into the future to provide an outlook for the year 2030. This year is not too distant (only six years from the time of writing), and we believe focusing on the year 2030 in our prediction of future trends will – if the current trend is not broken – provide an accurate and realistic estimation of the future of citations at CHI.

*4.1.1 Historical development.* In the early years of the CHI conference, it was not uncommon for authors to submit an article without a single citation to other works. The trend of zero-reference articles continued with only few exceptions until the year 1997 (see Figure 1 and Figure 2). From 1998 to 2017, the minimum number of references per article has been positive and in the one-digit range. Since 2017, the minimum number of references has increased into the double-digits.




Fig. 2. Number of references per article in the CHI conference proceedings from 1981 to 2024.

Between 1981 and 2015, the mean number of references per CHI article showed only modest linear growth (cf. Figure 1). After 2015, a clear and sudden quantitative change in the CHI community’s

<sup>1</sup>With exception of the year 1984 in which the CHI conference was not scheduled.

citation practices took place (see Figure 1 and Figure 2). Clearly, the CHI community entered a novel trajectory at this point in time, characterized by a year-by-year increase in the mean number of references per article.<sup>2</sup> While there were on average 28.8 references per article in the 2015 proceedings, the number of references per article more than tripled to an average of 88.6 references per article in 2024.

For about two decades since its inception, the maximum number of references per CHI article hovered at around 40. After 2015, the maximum number of references skyrocketed to up to 496 references in one article in 2022. The box plots in Figure 2 demonstrate that the maximum number of references per article has become more volatile in recent years. During the years of the COVID-19 pandemic (2020 and 2021), one can observe a slump in the maximum number and upper quartile of the number of references per CHI article. However, there is overall a clear tendency for CHI authors to include more references in their articles than before the year 2015, and this number is monotonously growing each year. The number of references per article between 2006 and 2015 can be approximated with linear regression to a function  $y_{t+1} = m_1 y_t + b_1$ , with  $m_1 = 0.79$ ,  $b_1 = -1555.92$ , and  $y_t \in [2006, 2015]$ , with mean absolute error  $MAE = 0.50$  and mean squared error  $MSE = 0.38$ . The trend after 2015 is approximated by the function  $y_{t+1} = m_2 y_t + b_2$ , with  $m_2 = 6.68$ ,  $b_2 = -13435.27$ , and  $y_t > 2015$  (with  $MAE = 1.88$  and  $MSE = 6.16$ ).

To examine the differences between the linear regression models fitted to the two distinct periods, we employed a Chow Test, a test to determine whether there is a significant difference in the coefficients between two the linear regressions. The Chow Test indicates a substantial divergence in the regression parameters across the two periods under consideration ( $F = 145.47$ ,  $p = 4.30e^{-10}$ ). This extremely low p-value strongly refutes the null hypothesis, suggesting that the regression parameters (slope and intercept) for the two periods are significantly distinct. This statistical evidence underscores the presence of a notable change in the trend between the two periods, corroborated by a clear shift in the slope. We assert that the observed variations in the dataset characteristics are not merely coincidental but indicative of a fundamental shift in the underlying dynamics across the two periods examined.

*4.1.2 Extrapolation of the observed trend.* We extrapolate the observed trend with the linear regression model and predict the mean number of references per article in future instances of the CHI conference proceedings (see Figure 3). We estimate that if the current observed trend is not broken, an article published at CHI 2030 will contain on average 129.5 references. The minimum number of references per article in 2030 is predicted to reach 33.7 references, which is higher than the mean number of references from the year 2015 (28.9 references).

## 4.2 Root Cause: A Change in Editorial Policies at the CHI Conference

A diverse and complex community consisting of thousands of members, such as the CHI community, is not likely to change its course suddenly, unless change is mandated from top down. In this section, we discuss the editorial change that can be considered the root cause for the observed trend.

*4.2.1 Lifting the page restrictions in 2016 launched the CHI community on its expansive path.* The CHI conference organizing committee Program Chairs) in consultation with the Executive Committee of the ACM SIGCHI (Special Interest Group on Computer-Human Interaction) introduced a decisive change in the year 2016. In this year, the conference's Call for Papers (CFP) moved away from counting references towards the page count limit, as highlighted in the excerpts reproduced in Figure 4. Articles published at CHI '16 were allowed to include an unlimited number of references,

<sup>2</sup>Throughout this article, we refer to the mean number of references. As depicted in Figure 1, the median number of references follows a very similar trend.




Fig. 3. Extrapolation of the trend in the mean and minimum number of references per CHI article. CHI articles are predicted to include, on average, almost 130 references in the year 2030. The minimum number of references per CHI article is estimated to reach 33.7 references per article, which is more than the 2015 average level of references.

#### 2015 CfP (excerpt)

A Paper is no more than 10 pages long, while a Note is no more than 4 pages long. **This includes** figures, **references**, appendices and an abstract of less than 150 words long. Over length submissions will be rejected.

#### 2016 CfP (excerpt)

A Paper is no more than 10 pages long, while a Note is no more than 4 pages long. **References do not count toward these lengths.** The lengths do include figures, appendices, and an abstract of less than 150 words. Submissions that exceed these limits will be rejected.

Fig. 4. Side-by-side comparison of excerpts from the CHI conference Call for Papers (CfPs) in 2015 and 2016 (own highlighting).

as long as the article's content fit the 10-page limit, with references no longer counting towards this page limit. While sub-committees were introduced as another significant change in the year 2016, allowing an unlimited number of references clearly is one of the main contributors to the increase in the mean number of references identified in our work. Further, the 2016 "Guide to a Successful Paper or Note Submission" stressed the importance of citing relevant previous work, explicitly asking "*is prior work adequately reviewed?*" The 2016 Guide highlighted the importance of reproducibility of authors work, with "*letting others build on your work*" being regarded as "*the entire purpose of a CHI Paper.*" These direct quotes from the 2016 Guide were stark reminders and may have contributed to making the community pay special attention to their references in the year 2016. These policy changes nudged the community towards its expansive path. Awards presented to articles may have also played a role, as demonstrated in the following section.

**4.2.2 Are high-citation articles rewarded in the CHI community?** Each year, awards are given to a select number of accepted articles at the CHI conference. Typically, between 14.6% and 24.6% of articles are given an award at the CHI conference.<sup>3</sup> These awards are a signal for the community on which articles are to be considered high quality. As a quality signal, awards can motivate authors to change their behavior. If articles with a high number of references were to systematically be presented with awards, this could potentially incentivize CHI authors to include more references

<sup>3</sup>Based on awards presented from 2015–2024.

in their articles. In this section, we examine whether there is such a systematic bias in awarded papers. We analyze the difference in the mean number of references in articles that received an award at the CHI conference compared to the mean number of references in articles that did not receive an award. As award, we consider both “best paper” awards and “honorable mentions.”

Table 1. Comparison of mean number of references in articles awarded a best paper award or honorable mention ( $M_{\text{awarded}}$ ) with the mean number of references in unawarded articles ( $M_{\text{regular}}$ ) in the CHI Proceedings from 2015 to 2024.

	$M_{\text{awarded}}$	$M_{\text{regular}}$	t	p	
2015	31.2185	28.1534	2.2984	0.0220	*
2016	43.4696	40.7047	1.6156	0.1068	
2017	49.8843	44.4969	2.7794	0.0056	**
2018	57.8651	49.8795	3.6289	0.0003	***
2019	61.1419	54.9910	2.6155	0.0091	**
2020	66.0513	60.1246	2.6780	0.0076	**
2021	72.9648	70.9868	0.6910	0.4898	
2022	87.9219	81.9332	1.5201	0.1290	
2023	88.9688	84.7736	1.2218	0.2221	
2024	92.9579	87.6505	1.7950	0.0729	

Table 1 shows no evidence of a systematic bias towards awarding high-reference articles in recent proceedings. For instance, in the 2024 CHI Proceedings, the mean number of references for awarded articles was 92.96 versus 87.65 for articles without award. This means a high number of references is not considered a signal of high quality in the CHI community in recent years. However, between 2015 and 2020 (with exception of 2016), awarded articles had significantly more references than unawarded articles. The systematic award of articles with above-average references may have sent a quality signal to authors, thus potentially contributing to launching the CHI community on its current trajectory.

### 4.3 Additional Contextual Factors influencing HCI Citation Practices

The CHI community is vast and highly diverse, and there are many more factors that potentially shape and make up the citation practices of the members of the CHI community. While the editorial change introduced in 2016 is the primary reason for the change in the citation practices of HCI scholars, in this section, we take a step back and shed light on a number of broader contextual factors affecting the citation practices at the CHI conference. We do not claim that this list of factors is exhaustive. Beside the investigated changes, other latent factors could contribute to the observed trend, as is the case with any complex system under change. The investigated factors are an increase in the average number of authors (Section 4.3.1), an increase in the number of literature reviews (Section 4.3.2), an increasing number of citations to arXiv pre-print articles (Section 4.3.3), and an increase in citations to data and code repositories (Section 4.3.4).

**4.3.1 Collaborative research is increasing.** There has been an increase in collaborative research efforts in the field of HCI, leading to articles with a greater number of co-authors. Figure 5 depicts the number of authors per CHI article for each CHI proceeding. The mean number of authors per article has increased over time, from an average of 1.85 authors per CHI article in 1981 to an average of 5.17 authors per article in 2024.

Figure 6 plots the mean number of references per author in CHI articles since the inception of the CHI Conference. In 1981, a CHI article would include on average 5.6 references per author.




Fig. 5. Violin plot illustrating the distribution and central tendencies (mean and median) of the number of authors per CHI article from 1981 to 2024, highlighting the trend toward an increase in collaboration over time.




Fig. 6. Mean number of references per author in CHI articles from 1981 to 2024.

In 2024, this number has increased to 21.4 references per author. We note that while the mean number of references per author has seen a slow increase over time, there is a significant change in trajectory in the mean number of references per author after 2015.

**4.3.2 Literature reviews are becoming more common.** Literature reviews aim to capture the current state of a research area or field. Given that the production of scholarly articles is growing, we expect CHI authors are increasingly conducting literature reviews to address this expansion. We identified literature reviews by searching each CHI article’s full text (excluding the references section) for the keywords “literature review,” “literature survey,” and “systematic literature review.” We manually verified these occurrences, ensuring that only articles explicitly stating they conducted a literature review were included. Note that CHI authors, particularly in earlier proceedings, often refer to the related work section as a literature review. Additionally, some authors claim to have conducted an “extensive” or “exhaustive” literature review without detailing the process. Our data encompasses “literature review” in a broad sense, while “systematic literature reviews” are represented more narrowly, typically indicating articles that adhere to a more rigorous academic process.

In total, we identified 615 literature reviews and 60 systematic literature reviews. The time series in Figure 7 demonstrates that it is increasingly more common for CHI authors to conduct literature






Fig. 7. Absolute (top) and relative (bottom) number of articles in the CHI proceedings reporting having conducted a “literature review” (including “literature surveys” and “systematic literature reviews”; in red) and a “systematic literature review” (in teal color) from 1981 to 2024. Systematic literature reviews in CHI articles are a new phenomenon starting in 2016.

reviews. The amount of articles which mention having conducted a literature review was about 10% in the years 2021, 2022, and 2023. Figure 7 also demonstrates that systematic literature reviews in CHI are a recent phenomenon. Before 2016, there was no instance of authors calling their work a systematic literature review, but it has become increasingly more common for CHI authors to conduct systematic literature reviews. In 2024, the CHI proceedings included 17 systematic reviews (1.6% of the articles published in that year).

**4.3.3 Pre-print articles are increasingly being cited by CHI authors.** The landscape of academic publishing is changing. In this section, we examine how CHI authors cite pre-print articles. Pre-print articles are versions of scholarly articles that precede publication in peer-reviewed journals and conference venues. While traditionally shunned upon due to not being formally reviewed, it has become common place in some research fields, such as Machine Learning, to upload and also cite pre-print articles. Pre-print archives offer a convenient way for authors to claim priority capital, establishing the authors’ precedence in scientific discoveries or novel ideas [26]. One of the most popular pre-print archives is arXiv, launched by Cornell University in 1991. In recent years, an exponentially growing number of articles are being submitted to this pre-print archive. The high number of available pre-prints and the success of pre-prints in certain fields, such as Machine Learning, may incentivize CHI authors to include more citations to pre-prints in their CHI

articles. To investigate this in more depth, we scraped the references from the ACM–DL for each article in the CHI proceedings. We then identified the number of citations to arXiv by counting the number of times “arxiv” is mentioned in the articles’ reference section. For counting the number of occurrences of arXiv in the references section, we used a case-insensitive regular expression that accounts for hyphenation within the word arXiv due to line breaks.




Fig. 8. Citations to pre-print arXiv papers (a) and percentage of CHI articles citing arXiv pre-prints  $n$  times (b) in the CHI Proceedings.

Even though arXiv was made available to the World Wide Web in 1993, we find that none of the CHI articles before the year 2006 include citations to arXiv pre-print articles. Figure 8a depicts the number of citations to arXiv pre-prints in CHI articles since 2006. We note there is a change in this time series after 2015. While the mean number of citations to arXiv pre-print articles has only slightly increased since 2016 (from 0.03 references in 2015 to 4.24 references in 2024), citations to pre-print articles have become overall more accepted among some CHI authors (Figure 8a). One article in CHI ’24 included 89 references to arXiv. Figure 8b depicts the number of times  $n$  that an article cites arXiv articles. From this figure, one can note an increase in the number of articles that cite a high amount of arXiv pre-prints. In recent proceedings, over a third of the CHI papers include more than one citation to arXiv. Given that this change coincides with the year 2016, citations to arXiv articles are one contributing factor to the increase in references per CHI article.

**4.3.4 Data-driven research is on the rise.** With the rise of big data and data-driven research methodologies, CHI papers may have started referencing more data sources, scientific software and tools, code repositories, and prior data-heavy studies. We investigate this trend by counting the number of references to five common open data and source code repositories:

- *osf.io*, a cloud-based management solution for open access science, often used to share datasets and other data related to HCI studies,
- *zenodo.org*, an open repository for datasets and other research related digital artefacts,
- *github.com*, a source code repository that, with git LFS, can also store big datasets,
- *kaggle.com*, a web-based platform for sharing datasets for machine learning, and
- *huggingface.com*, a repository for storing and sharing machine learning related files.

As above, we limit our investigation to the articles’ reference sections which we scraped from the ACM–DL.<sup>4</sup>

Figure 9a plots the mean number of references to code and data repositories in CHI articles. While the average number of citations to such repositories per CHI article is still low, we identify a

<sup>4</sup>We ignore citations in footnotes within the article’s full text to make the results comparable to the other findings in this article.




Fig. 9. Mean number of citations to code and data repositories (a) and relative number of CHI articles citing at least one repository (b) in the CHI proceedings from 2008 to 2024.

clear increase in the number of citations to code and data repositories occurring after the year 2015. Before 2015, almost no authors formally cited these repositories, whereas today, such citations have become more common. In the proceedings of CHI 2024, 147 articles (13.9%) cite at least one data and code repository (see Figure 9b). GitHub was cited most often with 115 articles (10.8%) in the CHI 2024 proceedings including at least one reference to this repository. This empirical trend in the citation practices reflects the broader trend towards applying data-driven methodologies and machine learning in HCI research.




Fig. 10. Citations to potential predatory journals and publishers from CHI articles. Left: a) absolute and d) relative number of citations to potential predatory journals and publishers in Beall’s List; Middle: b) absolute and e) relative citations to potential predatory journals and publishers other than Frontiers journals; Right: c) absolute and f) relative citations to Frontiers journals.

4.3.5 *CHI authors increasingly cite questionable publishers.* Predatory journals are questionable publications that accept articles with minimal peer review. These journals are generally regarded as having a lower quality compared to more rigorously peer-reviewed journals [5]. Without trade-off cost between references in CHI articles, CHI authors may cite articles from potential predatory journals and publishers more often. To investigate this, we compare the references included in CHI articles with entries in Beall’s List of Potential Predatory Journals and Publishers [5].<sup>5</sup> We

<sup>5</sup><https://bealllist.net>

first download Beall's List and merge the lists of journals and publishers into one list. We remove any additional notes and entries that are generic, such as "Qualitative Research" and "American Journal," since these entries would produce many false positive matches. We then check for exact matches between the entries in Beall's List and the references included in CHI articles, using basic string normalization techniques (e.g., lower-casing, removal of line breaks and special characters, and expansion of ampersand characters into the word 'and'). This comparison yields 5126 potential matches between entries in Beall's List and CHI references. Because the names of predatory journals are often designed to partially match with reputable journals [5], each of the potential matches was manually reviewed to sort out false positives.

Note that this approach is limited in several ways, pertaining to the limitations of Beall's List and the matching approach. First, Beall's List is subjective and it should not be the only source of quality appraisal. Second, the list contains entries with notes that the journal or publisher may not, in fact, be predatory. Beall's List also mentions several instances where a previously reputable journal has been taken over by a predatory publisher. Third, while an archived version is available, Beall's List is no longer maintained. Finally, exact matching is imperfect, although we address false positives with manual review. The presented figures can be considered a lower boundary, as there may be more matches that are not identified with the exact matching approach.

With the above method, we identified 3298 citations from CHI articles to potential predatory journals and publishers in the CHI proceedings (1981 – 2024). There is a marked increase in citations to potential predatory journals and publishers since 2016, both in absolute and relative numbers (see Figure 10a and Figure 10d, respectively).

Citations to Frontiers Media – the publisher who successfully pressured Beall to shut down his list – account for the vast majority of citations. Splitting Frontiers from the rest of potential predatory publications, we can see that citations to journals published by Frontiers Media are monotonously increasing, both in absolute and relative terms (see Figure 10c and Figure 10c). The top-cited journals from this publisher are Frontiers in Psychology ( $n = 873$ , 39.72%), Frontiers in Human Neuroscience ( $n = 248$ , 11.28%), Frontiers in Robotics and AI ( $n = 213$ , 9.69%), Frontiers in Virtual Reality ( $n = 130$ , 5.91%), Frontiers in Neuroscience ( $n = 86$ , 3.91%), Frontiers in Psychiatry ( $n = 68$ , 3.09%), Frontiers in Public Health ( $n = 67$ , 3.05%), Frontiers in Computer Science ( $n = 55$ , 2.5%), Frontiers in ICT ( $n = 37$ , 1.68%), Frontiers in Neurology ( $n = 32$ , 1.46%), Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence ( $n = 31$ , 1.41%), and Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience ( $n = 26$ , 1.18%). In 2024, every CHI paper includes on average about one reference to a Frontiers journal. This is a testament that the CHI community has embraced Frontiers Media as a legitimate publisher.

The remaining matches are mostly one-off citations to potential predatory journals and publishers. While there is an increase in the absolute number of citations to potential predatory journals (other than Frontiers; see Figure 10b), the relative number of citations remained limited in the recent decade (Figure 10e). Among these citations, IOS Press ( $n = 418$ ) and IGI Global ( $n = 195$ ) are occurring most often, followed by IntechOpen ( $n = 36$ ), International Journal of Computer Applications ( $n = 28$ ), Scientific World ( $n = 15$ ), Journal of Physical Therapy Science ( $n = 13$ ), Cambridge Scholars Publishing ( $n = 9$ ), Global Media Journal ( $n = 8$ ), and Research and Reviews ( $n = 8$ ).

## 5 Discussion

This article presented meta-research in the field of HCI, providing clear descriptive evidence of quantitative and qualitative changes in the citation practices of the CHI community co-occurring since the year 2016. Specifically, we have described six co-occurring changes in citation practices:

- (1) *An increase in the mean number of references included in CHI articles* (Section 4.1):

In the 2016 Call for Papers, references were no longer included in the page limit of CHI

articles. This editorial decision launched the CHI community on an expansive path, characterized by a year-by-year expansion of the mean number of references included in CHI articles. One could argue that the observed trend in Figure 1 is simply an effect of the overall growth of publications in the HCI field. However, while growth may certainly be a contributing factor, the growth of the CHI conference proceedings precedes the observed trend by 10 years, as presented in Section 2.1. Therefore, the increase in the mean number of references per CHI article is likely not a mere side-effect of CHI proceedings growth. Rather, it is the top-down policy change that took place in the year 2016 that opened the floodgates, allowing authors to cite more and more works in their articles.

(2) *An increase in collaboration and the number of references per author* (Section 4.3.1):

It is becoming more common for authors in HCI to collaborate and the mean number of authors per CHI article is expanding. An increase in the number of co-authors means that the set of authors may potentially contain authors from different disciplines. This implies that authors potentially draw from a broader range of interdisciplinary sources, hence leading to more citations to other articles. However, our analysis found that the increase in the mean number of authors is not proportionate to the increase in the mean number of references, as evident in Figure 6. The growth in the mean number of references exceeds the growth in authors.

(3) *An increase in the number of literature reviews* (Section 4.3.2):

The literature is growing at a rapid rate, and we found that CHI authors increasingly conduct systematic literature reviews of the expanding corpus of scholarly literature. The COVID-19 pandemic years saw an acceleration of this trend, denoted by an increase in the relative number of CHI articles conducting literature reviews. This can be explained by authors not being able to conduct user studies, a common method in HCI, during the pandemic. However, as depicted at the top in Figure 7, the growing trend toward literature reviews already started earlier. The editorial decision to lift the page restrictions greatly contributed to the growing popularity of literature reviews at CHI. Literature reviews typically contain an above average number of references, which contributes to the increase of the mean number of references included in CHI articles.

(4) *An increase in the number of citations to arXiv pre-print articles* (Section 4.3.3):

Entire fields of science rely on arXiv as a means for article dissemination. The field of HCI is not immune to this trend, and it is becoming increasingly more common for CHI authors to cite unrefereed pre-print articles. Before 2015, citations to arXiv were shunned upon by CHI authors. From 2016 onward, citations to arXiv were no longer competing for space with citations to peer-reviewed articles. The editorial decision of lifting page restrictions in CHI articles contributes to this shift in citation behavior. Today, many CHI authors cite arXiv pre-print articles. This can lead to adverse problems, such as the pre-print being cited instead of the published article.

(5) *An increase in the number of citations to open data and code repositories* (Section 4.3.4):

Before 2015, there were virtually no formal citations to code or data repositories to be found in the references sections of CHI articles. From our analysis, it can be concluded that lifting the page restrictions animated authors to include more citations to such repositories in their CHI articles. From an economic lens, there no longer is a marginal cost to including another citation to arXiv or code and data repositories and there is no trade-off cost between citations.

(6) *An increase in the number of citations to questionable publishers* (Section 4.3.5):

Without a trade-off cost between citations, authors are increasingly including citations to potential predatory journals and publishers in their CHI articles. However, the long-tailed

distribution of citations to publications on Beall's List highlights that the CHI community, overall, has not lost its sense for quality. The relative number of citations to minor potential predatory publishers is negligible compared to the overall number of citations in each proceedings year. However, the picture is different with the larger questionable publishers (Frontiers, IOS Press, IntechOpen) who are increasingly being cited by CHI authors. Perhaps this is yet another expression of the CHI community's obsession with quantity.

Together, these co-occurring trends shape the citation practices of the CHI community in the shifting landscape of HCI. The trends reflect an interesting gradual change of pace in academic working in the CHI community starting with CHI '16. The trends are also a reflection of broader changes that affect not only the field of HCI, but academia in general.

Like a frog in slowly boiling water, the CHI community is heating up under the relentless growth of references, risking a culture where quantity overshadows meaningful discourse and genuine innovation. A common proverb states: "Things need to get a lot worse before they get better". One has to wonder: At what point will the number of references per CHI article become unbearable for authors and peer reviewers – at 80 references, 130 references, 200 references? The pre-2016 limit on the number of pages in CHI articles constituted a "Schelling fence" [2] – a hard limit on the number of pages that could be included in CHI articles. Authors could not cross this limit without risking a desk-reject of their paper. Thus, the space for references and content had to be weighed against each other, and each additional reference reduced the space available for the article's content. Without these clear boundaries, the CHI community is on a slippery slope [2], a gradual erosion – or evolution, if one prefers to look at it this way – of norms and principles. The expansive path incentivizes authors to, year-by-year, value quantity over quality and include more references in their articles.

What is striking about the observed trend in Figure 1 is that it follows a relatively stable linear growth pattern. This near-linear growth takes place in the presence of exponential growth in academia, such as the exponentially growing number of scholarly articles. Future work could investigate why the observed year-by-year growth in references is linear. Perhaps it could be explained with a simple psychology model of herd mentality. Each year, members of the CHI community observe – whether consciously or sub-consciously – an increase in the mean number of references per CHI article. In other fields of science, evidence has been found that longer articles are cited more [18]. A simple strategy of "the more, the better" could be motivating authors in CHI to include more references in their articles to satisfy the seemingly growing expectations of peer reviewers. In the following section, we discuss why the growing number of references is a critical concern that demands attention.

### 5.1 Implications for Authors, Reviewers, and the Broader Academic Community

An article with many references can help novices to learn and become familiar with the research area. However, we argue the observed trend (i.e., excessive citations as evident in the rising number of references in CHI articles) is a negative development for authors, peer reviewers, and the entire field of HCI, for a number of different reasons.

First, we argue that 130 references per article is too many to thoroughly screen during the peer review process. A high number of references increases the cognitive load on peer reviewers, contributing to reviewer fatigue. This only adds to the already high amount of peer review fatigue, with conferences struggling to recruit high-quality reviewers. Peer review is the backbone of academic rigor, and if reviewers only give a cursory glance at the reference section, the integrity of the peer review process is compromised.

Second, the number of references included in CHI articles serves as a signal to the CHI community. Peer pressure and herd mentality suggest that if the average number of references is high, authors feel compelled to include a similar number of references in their articles. Deviations from this norm are likely to be viewed negatively by peer reviewers, creating a spiraling pattern of year-by-year increasing academic pressure and competition. This spiraling pattern contributes to author dissatisfaction and fatigue.

Third, despite the shift away from awarding best paper awards and honorable mentions to high-reference articles, the overall rise in the number of references still sends the wrong message to junior members of the CHI community. Today, PhD students in HCI are faced with a seemingly insurmountable and overwhelming amount of literature work, which distracts them from developing their own research skills and expertise.

Fourth, the excessive citation inflates the value of each citation. Citation value is subject to inflation, since a citation today does not carry the same weight it did in the past. This is similar to how early search engine optimization efforts devalued the significance of web links. The increasing number of citations reduces their impact and can lead to an overload of less meaningful references.

Last, the high number of references makes it easier for bad actors to commit fraud. In an environment of hypercompetition and “perverse” incentives [8], academic fraud is surprisingly common [35]. With no clear trade-off cost between citations in an article, the reference section can be expanded arbitrarily, facilitating citation manipulation. This can include self-citation [4, 20], author collusion in citation cartels [14, 17], and even the purchasing of citations [12]. The high number of references that, likely, undergo only cursory peer review, makes it harder to detect such unethical and fraudulent research practices.

## 5.2 Reflective Considerations for Future Research Practices

Many of the developments in the CHI community are plan-driven. For instance, the number of articles accepted at the CHI conference is deliberately expanded each year. However, one should not forget that top-down policy changes lead to behavioral changes in members of the research community. Notably, while the CHI Steering Committee initially started the CHI community on its expansive path, it is the collective decision of authors at CHI to, year-by-year, cite more and more articles. In this section, we urge the community to pause and reflect on its citation practices.

The work is meant as a zealous vehicle for the CHI research community to open their eyes to its growing problems. We presented trends in citation practices to foster dialogue – not to prescribe mandates, but to encourage diverse interpretations and applications of these findings. We invite readers to engage with the data, reflecting on its implications for the future of HCI research. Our data serves not as a directive, but as a mirror reflecting the current state of CHI’s scholarly practices. By offering this comprehensive overview, we aim to help scholars and practitioners navigate the complexities of the modern research landscape.

However, a critical question arises: How much responsibility does each author in the CHI community bear for the observed changes in citation practices? While scientific knowledge advances rapidly, the academic system remains relatively conservative and resistant to change. This system, dominated by powerful publishers like ACM Press, often feels too vast for any one individual to influence significantly. Therefore, we call for reflective consideration. We urge CHI authors to be more deliberate with their citations, viewing them as quality signals and endorsements. Readers should consider how these trends impact their research practices and the broader HCI community. Through introspection, the community can shape future research in ways that are thoughtful and aligned with shared values. This approach emphasizes the agency of the scholarly community to enact change. It respects the diversity of perspectives within our field and acknowledges each researcher’s autonomy to interpret and integrate these insights according to their goals.

### 5.3 Potential Solutions

In this section, we provide our opinions on potential solutions. One potential response to the observed trend is to simply ignore it, though this approach risks future challenges. Proactively addressing the issue of excessive citations is a more constructive approach. This section discusses three solutions for addressing the growing number of references.

*5.3.1 Solution 1.* A first solution would be to revert to the 2015 editorial policy (or an updated version thereof). This could involve setting a limit on the number of references or the overall number of pages per article, as was the case in 2015. At that time, citing a paper was an endorsement, and any citation had to be weighed against the space it would take away from the article’s content or other references. This trade-off has since been lost. While modern practice tends to allow an unrestricted number of pages and references, recent iterations of the CHI Conference have seen inconsistently enforced page limits. For instance, the quality signaling by the Chairs during the CHI ’23 submission process clearly indicated that unrestricted growth in article length is not welcomed by the Conference Chairs and the Steering Committee. Limiting the number of references for most articles (with the exception of literature reviews) would be a viable solution to address the growing and excessive number of references included in CHI articles.

*5.3.2 Solution 2.* A second solution is to develop language models for supporting paper writing. In particular, specialized language models could be trained to automatically cite prior work, given the text of a paper manuscript. From the perspective of the author, this would alleviate much of the literature work, and it would help authors concentrate on ideation and conducting high-quality work. However, as the failed release of Meta’s Galactica model demonstrated in 2022 [11], language models are still prone to hallucinate non-factual and biased information which makes these models, in their present form, not suitable for literature work. This solution also would not alleviate peer reviewer fatigue, which we discuss in the next section.

*5.3.3 Solution 3.* A third potential solution pertains to the nature of the peer review process in academia. Peer review is the cornerstone of scholarly rigor, serving as a crucial filter that ensures the quality, relevance, and integrity of academic publications. From the perspective of creativity theory [31] and Csikszentmihalyi’s systems model of creativity [7], the peer review process is a gatekeeping process that validates two critical components of an article: novelty and importance (also referred to as “usefulness” or “appropriateness”) [31]. As gatekeepers, it is the peer reviewer’s task to assess these two components and, hence, the creativity of a submitted article. In some cases, an extensive related work section may support the evaluation of an article’s novelty, especially in cases where the peer reviewer may not have sufficient knowledge for conducting the review. In an ideal world, a peer reviewer lacking sufficient knowledge of the field would not review an article in the first place. However, in practice, a mismatch between reviewer expertise and with a paper is, unfortunately, rather common [32], especially in large and highly diverse conferences, such as CHI. However, in the role of a gatekeeper, it is the peer reviewer’s duty to be knowledgeable about works in the field. However, in a field as vast and diverse as HCI, this can be challenging.

A potential solution is to split peer review into two parts, one conducted by the human peer reviewer, the other one performed by a machine. Language models, as knowledge compressors, can assess whether a contribution is original – and whether the references are comprehensive – more effectively than human reviewers. This would allow human reviewers to focus on assessing the second component, the importance of the methodologies, findings, and contributions.

Evidence suggests we are moving towards this direction. In the United States, automated essay scoring systems are already grading student essays [9, 36], and a growing number of peer reviewers use language models to write their reviews. A study by Liang et al. found that up to 17% of peer



reviews at top machine learning conferences are substantially authored by language models [22]. Liang et al.'s study found an overlap of between 30.9% and 39.2% between the points raised by GPT-4 and human reviewers, and their user study with 308 researchers from 110 institutions in the US highlighted that researchers find AI-generated feedback useful. Similarly, Sun et al. found automated peer review significantly expedited the review process and improved review coverage, although raising concerns around trust, bias, and agency [34].

Automating aspects of peer review could offer significant benefits [19]. The cost of peer review is estimated to be billions of dollars annually [1]. In a system strained by an overwhelming volume of literature [10], partial automation can alleviate the burden on reviewers. Further, automating peer review could increase trust in the scientific process by reducing biases, such as the Matthew effect, which has been a concern in academia since 1968 [25]. In the future, language models could assist in evaluating novelty, leaving other aspects to human reviewers, thereby enhancing the efficiency and reliability of the peer review process.

## 6 Conclusion

This article presented meta-research on citation practices at the ACM CHI Conference, the top conference in the field of Human-Computer Interaction. A segmented regression analysis provided clear evidence of a change of pace in academic working in the CHI community, indicative of broader trends in HCI. We provided empirical evidence of a year-by-year increase in the number of references included in CHI articles. The excessive citation practices were enabled by a policy decision that lifted page restrictions on the reference section of CHI articles. The implications of this meso-level policy decisions are profound, underlining the value of meta-research for the CHI community and HCI. More meta-research is needed to carefully consider the broader impact of policy decisions and to provide clear recommendations for stakeholders. It is time for the HCI community to pause and reflect on its citation practices, and constructively discuss solutions. A different pathway forward is urgently needed.

## References

- [1] Balazs Aczel, Barnabas Szasz, and Alex O. Holcombe. 2021. A Billion-dollar Donation: Estimating The Cost Of Researchers' Time Spent On Peer Review. *Research Integrity and Peer Review* 6, 1 (2021), 8 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-021-00118-2>
- [2] Scott Alexander. 2012. Schelling fences on slippery slopes. <https://www.lesswrong.com/posts/Kbm6QnJv9dgWsPHQP/schelling-fences-on-slippery-slopes>
- [3] Christoph Bartneck and Jun Hu. 2009. Scientometric Analysis of the CHI Proceedings. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '09)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 699–708. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1518701.1518810>
- [4] Christoph Bartneck and Servaas Kokkermans. 2011. Detecting H-index Manipulation Through Self-citation Analysis. *Scientometrics* 87, 1 (April 2011), 85–98. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-010-0306-5>
- [5] Jeffrey Beall. 2012. Predatory publishers are corrupting open access. *Nature* 489, 179 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1038/489179a>
- [6] Alan F. Blackwell. 2015. HCI as an Inter-Discipline. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI EA '15)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 503–516. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2702613.2732505>
- [7] Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi. 2014. *The Systems Model of Creativity*. Springer, Dordrecht, Netherlands. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9085-7>
- [8] Marc A. Edwards and Siddhartha Roy. 2017. Academic Research in the 21st Century: Maintaining Scientific Integrity in a Climate of Perverse Incentives and Hypercompetition. *Environmental Engineering Science* 34, 1 (2017), 51–61. <https://doi.org/10.1089/ees.2016.0223>
- [9] Todd Feathers. 2019. Flawed Algorithms Are Grading Millions of Students' Essays. <https://www.vice.com/en/article/pa7dj9/flawed-algorithms-are-grading-millions-of-students-essays>
- [10] Mark A. Hanson, Pablo Gómez Barreiro, Paolo Crosetto, and Dan Brockington. 2023. The Strain on Scientific Publishing. arXiv:2309.15884

- [11] Will Douglas Heaven. 2022. Why Meta’s latest large language model survived only three days online. *MIT Technology Review* (18 Nov 2022). <https://www.technologyreview.com/2022/11/18/1063487/meta-large-language-model-ai-only-survived-three-days-gpt-3-science/>
- [12] Hazem Ibrahim, Fengyuan Liu, Yasir Zaki, and Talal Rahwan. 2024. Google Scholar is Manipulatable. arXiv:2402.04607
- [13] John PA Ioannidis, Daniele Fanelli, Debbie Drake Dunne, and Steven N Goodman. 2015. Meta-research: Evaluation and Improvement of Research Methods and Practices. *PLoS Biology* 13, 10 (2015), e1002264.
- [14] Baani Leen Kaur Jolly, Lavina Jain, Debajyoti Bera, and Tanmoy Chakraborty. 2020. Unsupervised Anomaly Detection in Journal-Level Citation Networks. In *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE Joint Conference on Digital Libraries in 2020 (JCDL '20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 27–36. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3383583.3398531>
- [15] Joseph Kaye. 2009. Some Statistical Analyses of CHI. In *CHI '09 Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI EA '09)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2585–2594. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1520340.1520364>
- [16] Scott Kim. 1995. Interdisciplinary Cooperation. In *Readings in Human–Computer Interaction*, Ronald M. Baecker, Jonathan Grudin, William A.S. Buxton, and Saul Greenberg (Eds.). Morgan Kaufmann, 304–311. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-051574-8.50033-9>
- [17] Sadamori Kojaku, Giacomo Livan, and Naoki Masuda. 2021. Detecting anomalous citation groups in journal networks. *Scientific Reports* 11, 1 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-93572-3>
- [18] Kayvan Kousha and Mike Thelwall. 2022. Artificial Intelligence Technologies to Support Research Assessment: A Review. arXiv:2212.06574
- [19] Iliia Kuznetsov, Osama Mohammed Afzal, Koen Dercksen, Nils Dycke, Alexander Goldberg, Tom Hope, Dirk Hovy, Jonathan K. Kummerfeld, Anne Lauscher, Kevin Leyton-Brown, Sheng Lu, Mausam, Margot Mieskes, Aurélie Névél, Danish Pruthi, Lizhen Qu, Roy Schwartz, Noah A. Smith, Thamar Solorio, Jingyan Wang, Xiaodan Zhu, Anna Rogers, Nihar B. Shah, and Iryna Gurevych. 2024. What Can Natural Language Processing Do for Peer Review? arXiv:2405.06563
- [20] Cyril Labbé. 2010. Ike Antkare one of the great stars in the scientific firmament. *International Society for Scientometrics and Informetrics Newsletter* 6, 2 (June 2010), 48–52. <https://hal.science/hal-00713564>
- [21] Clement Lee, Andrew Garbett, Junyan Wang, Bingzhang Hu, and Dan Jackson. 2019. Weaving the Topics of CHI: Using Citation Network Analysis to Explore Emerging Trends. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI EA '19)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3290607.3312776>
- [22] Weixin Liang, Zachary Izzo, Yaohui Zhang, Haley Lepp, Hancheng Cao, Xuandong Zhao, Lingjiao Chen, Haotian Ye, Sheng Liu, Zhi Huang, Daniel A. McFarland, and James Y. Zou. 2024. Monitoring AI-Modified Content at Scale: A Case Study on the Impact of ChatGPT on AI Conference Peer Reviews. arXiv:2403.07183
- [23] Weixin Liang, Yuhui Zhang, Hancheng Cao, Binglu Wang, Daisy Ding, Xinyu Yang, Kailas Vodrahalli, Siyu He, Daniel Smith, Yian Yin, Daniel McFarland, and James Zou. 2023. Can Large Language Models Provide Useful Feedback On Research Papers? A Large-scale Empirical Analysis. arXiv:2310.01783
- [24] Yong Liu, Jorge Goncalves, Deniz Ferreira, Bei Xiao, Simo Hosio, and Vassilis Kostakos. 2014. CHI 1994-2013: Mapping Two Decades of Intellectual Progress through Co-Word Analysis. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '14)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 3553–3562. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2556288.2556969>
- [25] Robert K. Merton. 1968. The Matthew Effect in Science. *Science* 159, 3810 (1968), 56–63. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.159.3810.56>
- [26] M. E. J. Newman. 2009. The First-mover Advantage in Scientific Publication. *Europhysics Letters* 86, 6 (jun 2009), 68001. <https://doi.org/10.1209/0295-5075/86/68001>
- [27] Jonas Oppenlaender and Joonas Hämäläinen. 2023. Mapping the Challenges of HCI: An Application and Evaluation of ChatGPT and GPT-4 for Mining Insights at Scale. arXiv:2306.05036
- [28] Antti Oulasvirta and Kasper Hornbæk. 2016. HCI Research as Problem-Solving. In *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '16)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 4956–4967. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2858036.2858283>
- [29] Victor Le Pochat. 2024. Reflecting on Research Practices. *Commun. ACM* 67, 5 (may 2024), 37–39. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3651965>
- [30] Henning Pohl and Aske Mottelson. 2019. How We Guide, Write, and Cite at CHI. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI EA '19)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3290607.3310429>
- [31] Mark A. Runco and Garrett J. Jaeger. 2012. The Standard Definition of Creativity. *Creativity Research Journal* 24, 1 (2012), 92–96. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2012.650092>
- [32] Nihar B. Shah. 2022. Challenges, Experiments, and Computational Solutions in Peer Review. *Commun. ACM* 65, 6 (may 2022), 76–87. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3528086>

- [33] Evropi Stefanidi, Marit Bentvelzen, Paweł W. Woźniak, Thomas Kosch, Mikołaj P. Woźniak, Thomas Mildner, Stefan Schneegass, Heiko Müller, and Jasmin Niess. 2023. Literature Reviews in HCI: A Review of Reviews. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 509, 24 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3544548.3581332>
- [34] Lu Sun, Stone Tao, Junjie Hu, and Steven P. Dow. 2024. MetaWriter: Exploring the Potential and Perils of AI Writing Support in Scientific Peer Review. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.* 8, CSCW1, Article 94 (apr 2024), 32 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3637371>
- [35] Joeri K. Tjeldink, Reinout Verbeke, and Yvo M. Smulders. 2014. Publication Pressure and Scientific Misconduct in Medical Scientists. *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics* 9, 5 (2014), 64–71. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1556264614552421>
- [36] Jess Weatherbed. 2024. Texas is Replacing Thousands of Human Exam Graders with AI. <https://www.theverge.com/2024/4/10/24126206/texas-staar-exam-graders-ai-automated-scoring-engine>