The churns and turns of HCI: Which CHI papers make the most impact in an ever-growing sea of HCI publications?

Annika Kaltenhauser
annika.kaltenhauser@unisg.ch
University of St. Gallen
St. Gallen, Switzerland

Johannes Schöning
johannes.schoening@unisg.ch
University of St. Gallen
St. Gallen, Switzerland

Elizabeth F. Churchill
Mohamed bin Zayed University of Artificial Intelligence
Abu Dhabi, UAE

Hiroshi Ishii
MIT Media Lab
Cambridge, USA

Elisa Mekler
IT University of Copenhagen
Copenhagen, Denmark

Ben Shneiderman
University of Maryland
College Park, USA

ABSTRACT

The ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI) is the premier venue for research in Human-Computer Interaction (HCI). 11,290 full papers have been published and collectively cited almost one million times. Highly cited papers undoubtedly represent influential work, affecting the creation of review standards and conference submission and acceptance practices within and beyond CHI. However, the factors contributing to high citation counts and what constitutes a highly cited CHI paper remain largely unclear. In this panel discussion, we will engage the CHI community in exploring the relationship between paper characteristics, citation numbers, and effective impact on HCI as a discipline, and on HCI as an influential endeavour in technology design and development. To ground this discussion, we present findings from a literature review of the 100 most cited CHI full papers, looking at past and present fields and subfields of influence. We will also share insights from HCI experts. Our goals are to shed light on the meaning of impactful work at CHI and in HCI more broadly, to reflect on key trends in HCI over the years, and to discuss themes that have driven pivotal shifts in HCI research. We will lead the conversation toward a deeper understanding of citation practices, the role of citations in focusing and driving HCI research, and the implications of citation when it comes to shaping what is considered impactful HCI.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Human-centered computing → HCI theory, concepts and models**.

KEYWORDS

literature review, literature survey, meta review, meta-analysis, citations, citation counts, expert interviews, CHI conference, history, meta-HCI, HCI impact

CHI EA '25, April 26-May 1, 2025, Yokohama, Japan

ACM ISBN 979-8-4007-1395-8/25/04
https://doi.org/10.1145/3706599.3716285

ACM Reference Format:
Annika Kaltenhauser, Johannes Schöning, Elizabeth F. Churchill, Hiroshi Ishii, Elisa Mekler, and Ben Shneiderman. 2025. The churns and turns of HCI: Which CHI papers make the most impact in an ever-growing sea of HCI publications?. In *Extended Abstracts of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI EA '25), April 26-May 1, 2025, Yokohama, Japan.* ACM, New York, NY, USA, 5 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3706599.3716285

1 SCOPE OF PANEL DISCUSSION

Over the years, the field of Human-Computer Interaction (HCI) has grown and expanded its scope to influence many diverse domains. As the premier venue for HCI research, the ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI) has played a pivotal role with over 11,000 full papers published and nearly one million citations collectively accrued and regularly accessed by all computing science disciplines who have access to the ACM digital library. Throughout HCI's evolution, specific areas—such as usability, interaction design, accessibility, and user-centred design methodologies have had a demonstrable and sustained impact, succeeding in the overall goal of improving human experiences with technology.

This panel will engage the CHI community in critically reflecting on the evolving meaning of impact in HCI in the face of new technological landscapes. The focus of the panel is on citation practices as a mechanism for reflecting interest and driving impact. We will share insights gained from an analysis of full paper citations and interviews with experts, and will create a space for open dialogue with audience members around citation practices. We aim to explore the implications of citation practices, publication culture, and evolving research priorities in what shapes and constitutes impactful work in HCI. Our intent is to forge a clearer understanding of how the field can navigate its growth while maintaining a commitment to meaningful and transformative contributions. This panel will not be focused on the review process. It will focus on post-publication citations and full paper citations as key components of what makes research impactful in HCI.

The panel plan is as follows: The first 3 minutes will be dedicated to a brief introduction by the moderator, Johannes Schöning,

Author's Note: This is a corrected version of the article published in CHI EA '25: Proceedings of the Extended Abstracts of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. Minor typographical and spelling errors have been corrected in this version in section 2.2 and 2.3. The content is otherwise identical to the published version.

who will outline the panel's topic, goals, and logistics for audience engagement. Following the introduction, we will feature video statements from researchers in the CHI community reflecting on the concepts of research impact and citation count. Video interviewees include, but are not limited to founders of the field, such as Ben Shneiderman and Jakob Nielsen. In the next 7 minutes, each panellist will introduce themselves, share their academic background, and offer a concise statement on the key factors they believe contribute to impactful research in HCI. The moderator will then spend 10 minutes providing an overview of insights from a literature review of CHI's top-cited papers and from expert interviews, further setting the stage for the discussion topics.

The next phase consists of a 35-minute guided panel discussion, with each topic allocated approximately 8 minutes. The topics will cover the following:

- Which CHI or HCI publications have significantly influenced the panellists' work or thinking?
- How do the panellists define "impact" in the context of HCI research?
- What metrics or indicators do they consider important when assessing the impact of a research paper or body of work?
- What is the relationship between citation numbers and a research's impact, and how can we move beyond citations to evaluate impact?

Towards the end of each topic, there will be time for brief audience comments before moving on to the next topic.

Following the guided discussion, a 30-minute open Q&A session will be held.

The panel will conclude with a 10-minute reflection: 5 minutes of the moderator recapping the key themes and suggestions identified during the panel, followed by 1-minute closing statements from each panellist.

On hybridity: We aim to keep the panel hybrid if possible, and each of our sections is designed for inclusion of all participants whether local or remote. We will work with the conference organizers to ensure a positive experience for all attendees.

Post-panel, we will continue engaging with active audience members through a shared document where they can document, update, and discuss insights on impactful HCI research. This will serve as an evolving knowledge base and discussion space where contributors can share new findings, thoughts, and discuss under-represented work that has had, should have had, or could have long-term impact.

We will also publish our findings from the literature review before ACM CHI as well as plan to publish the collaborative document synthesising the panel discussion after ACM CHI 2025.

2 GROUNDWORK FOR PANEL DISCUSSION

In 2025, CHI will celebrate its 43th edition in Japan, Yokohama. Covering a broad spectrum of topics. As a result, CHI attracts a diverse and interdisciplinary group of scholars and practitioners, including those from computer science, psychology, design, engineering, and social sciences. According to Google Scholar (GS), it is ranked as one of the top Computer Science conferences with an h5-index of 129 and an h5-median of 183[1] and collectively cited 996'352 times[2]. The impact of HCI research extends far beyond the academic world and citations, shaping how millions interact with new technologies and influencing the design of everyday digital experiences. The research has transformed user interfaces, making technology more accessible and intuitive for a global audience. Beginning with the CHI conference, ACM SIGCHI now oversees 26 sponsored and co-sponsored conferences [8]. Against this backdrop, CHI and its community have produced much HCI research in the last four decades.

To better understand this extensive body of research, CHI publications and their knowledge production have been the focus of several meta-analyses and literature reviews [e.g., 1–3, 7, 9–13]. These works reflect on the field of HCI by, e.g., understanding our research and reporting practices [1, 3, 7, 12], authorship and collaboration patterns [2], or shed light on the demographic and cultural diversity of empirical findings within the CHI community [9]. Many outlets outside scientific publications also provide insight into how CHI publishes research (e.g., through data and statistics such as https://whatthehci.com or lists of awards such as https://jeffhuang.com/best_paper_awards/).

Considering this rich history and reflective nature of CHI's scholarly output, we want to discuss the following questions in our panel: "What are the key topics that contribute to this impactful body of research, and how can we comprehend them?". To start and ground the discussion, we conducted a qualitative literature review, using citations as a quantitative metric to filter and identify relevant papers. By examining CHI's 100 top-cited papers over the last 43 years, we assessed characteristics such as types of contributions, methods, and topics. This analysis provided the foundation for further discussion and initial answers to our questions. To add an additional dimension to our analysis, we conducted seven in-depth interviews with HCI experts, all of whom are SIGCHI Academy members and have been closely involved with the conference series – in some cases since its inception. These experts provided valuable context and insights to interpret our initial findings. These insights will serve as a basis of this panel. We hope that our findings help to find further reference points for identifying key trends and recurring themes and to understand the pivotal shifts that have defined and reshaped HCI research evolution within the CHI conference. Furthermore, we seek to discuss further the characteristics that contribute to the high citation counts of these papers and critically assess citations as a metric for impact.

In particular, we hope our work and this panel can help researchers get a comprehensive overview and introduction to various subfields, methods, and key innovations within HCI. We want to stimulate discussions on how our community can produce impactful knowledge within HCI and beyond, addressing real-world problems and contributing to advancements in both academic and practical applications within the broader technology landscape.

2.1 Literature Review Findings

Our literature review provides a comprehensive overview of the developments that have shaped the CHI community over the last 43 years. We created a dataset of the 100 most-cited CHI full papers and qualitatively analysed them in a systematic literature review.

[1]Retrieved 07/29/2024 on Google Scholar: Computer-Human Interaction (CHI).

[2]Data collected in August 2024.

In a recent article for ACM Interactions magazine [6], we outlined our process in more detail. We also aim to publish an article about the panel, as well as the full details of our literature review, after ACM CHI 2025.

By synthesising contribution types, topics, methods and technology types and identifying other characteristics, the analysis revealed, among other things, that the majority of the 100 most cited CHI papers made empirical contributions, with two-thirds presenting empirical results often complemented with artefacts or theoretical insights. Key themes include the dominance of implementation as a research method, a balanced use of qualitative and quantitative approaches, and the introduction of influential theories and frameworks that have opened new research directions, such as Feminist HCI.

We believe citations provide a valuable perspective on the reach of research within and beyond the CHI community, serving as one measure of the impact of a paper [14]. However, it is important to acknowledge the limitations of using citations to indicate a paper's recognition in the scientific community (CHI and beyond). Some papers are cited as negative examples, and citation practices differ between HCI's subfields and adjacent fields of research (e.g., artificial intelligence, communication science, psychology, and social sciences) that cite CHI publications. We complemented this analysis with insights from expert interviews to better contextualize the ambiguities surrounding citation counts.

2.2 Expert Interviews

In the course of our dataset analysis, following the coding and initial analysis identifying clusters and temporal trends within 35 publications, we invited senior HCI experts who have been deeply involved with the CHI community for one-on-one remote interviews. These interviews aimed to gain insight into the general evolution of CHI, start a discussion about the concept of impact within the CHI community, and discuss and contextualise the initial findings of our literature review. We recruited several experts through convenience sampling, targeting members of the SIGCHI Academy via mail. The choice to interview members of the SIGCHI Academy was due to their expertise and involvement in the CHI community. The seven HCI experts (2 female, 5 male) we interviewed have 29-48 years of experience (median: 40 years) in practising and/or researching HCI and work in research institutions in the UK (2), a Northern European country (1), Germany (1), Canada (1), and the US (2). All interviewees are members of the SIGCHI Academy. [3] Some of the HCI experts granted optional consent for their identities to be revealed.

The in-depth, semi-structured interviews with each expert lasted between 26 and 80 minutes (mean: 57.4 SD: 19.36) and were divided into two parts. The first part involved open questions about their experiences with CHI conferences and the community, their perspectives on their own impactful work in the community and the work that had inspired them, and their observations on the evolution of trends, topics, pivotal shifts and metrics of impact. In part two of the interview, we presented initial findings from our literature review. We prompted the participants to express surprises, met and unmet expectations, and memories that align with the patterns that were shown in the data. We transcribed the audio recordings of the interviews, totalling 402 minutes of audio data. Following each interview, we summarised our notes and later added quotes and insights from the transcripts. We jointly analysed the transcripts using affinity diagramming to identify common themes and patterns.

[3]Our study was granted ethics approval by the ethics committee at our research institution, and all participants provided informed consent before taking part, with written consent obtained from each participant.

2.3 Interview Findings

Reflections on CHI's Evolution. Insights from our expert interviews highlight the dynamic evolution of the CHI conference. In its early days, CHI was a groundbreaking forum where "computer scientists and psychologists collaborated to explore the symbiosis between humans and technology", as Saul Greenberg noted. This era was characterised by a "warm, community-driven atmosphere", contrasting with the more "competitive and often male-dominated environment" of traditional computer science, as Ben Shneiderman observed. He also mentioned CHI's early struggles with tenure acceptance and integrating newer, qualitative approaches. Yet, CHI became essential for building community among isolated researchers. Over time, the conference adapted, creating subcommittees to diversify paper evaluations and address the shift in research domains. Yvonne Rogers linked this "hopping from domain to domain" to less sustainability in terms of citations in our community, contributing to a perception that HCI has "spiralled out of control" and become a "huge, unwieldy monster" that is increasingly difficult to define.

Several experts discussed the challenges of publishing innovative work at CHI. Yvonne Rogers mentioned that pioneering new areas often made it difficult to get papers accepted: *"So I think if you're pioneering or pushing a new area, it's not so easy to get your paper accepted in something like CHI at the time."* Two other experts reflected on past debates, highlighting that while criticisms of usability evaluations (see [5]) once fueled a push for more innovative methods, the field has returned to favouring empirical studies with statistical significance, which can make it hard for novel ideas to gain acceptance, as reflected in HCI Expert B's comment: *"So again, the tricky thing is you want a paper, and you want a paper in CHI. CHI will not let you in unless it's numerical and has all this garbage."* Ben Shneiderman added that CHI's focus on empirical research still makes it difficult for qualitative approaches to succeed.

Reflections on the Meaning of Impact. Impact, as discussed in the interviews, is a complex and sometimes elusive measure. Yvonne Rogers defined it as the inspiration one's work provides, either by sparking new ideas or guiding product development. HCI Expert B viewed impact as a catalyst for changing thought and behaviour, often in ways not immediately apparent. Hiroshi Ishii described research impact as a "side effect" of meaningful work and cautioned that pursuing impact can be challenging, particularly when ideas are ahead of their time. He stressed that impact is about advancing vision rather than seeking recognition or citations. These reflections highlight that impact is more about lasting influence on thought and innovation than immediate recognition. In her article in ACM's Interactions magazine, Impact!, Elizabeth Churchill stated clearly "the word impact often disguises more than it illuminates"–we need

to interrogate what the measures are, citation counts being a central one [4].

The interviewees also provided insights into the real-world impact of research. HCI Expert B outlined the process as a multi-stage journey: publication, citation accumulation, and translation into practical products. Ben Shneiderman noted that addressing real-world problems enhances research quality and impact, citing his work on visual information, which contributed to the creation of Spotfire. This example illustrates how research can extend beyond academia to influence industry and create tangible value.

Reflections on What Makes Research Impactful. Interviews revealed that impactful research often stems from the ability to inspire and provoke new ways of thinking. Yvonne Rogers noted that her work is impactful because it challenges boundaries and explores innovative designs, speculating that this ability to *"push the envelope"* leads to higher citation counts. Similarly, HCI Expert B noted that impactful papers often tackle compelling questions or present new methodologies, inspiring others to explore these ideas further. This perspective suggests that the depth of a paper's influence is often linked to its capacity to stimulate thought and provide a new lens through which to view the field. For example, they highlighted Saul Greenberg's "Usability evaluation considered harmful (some of the time)" [5], a paper not included in our corpus, as a paper offering a transformative perspective on the field. Personal engagement with the work, as observed in the experience of HCI Expert A repeatedly revisiting influential papers for their stimulating insights, reflects the depth of impact. This suggests that the true measure of impact is not only in how widely a paper is cited but also in how deeply it resonates with and influences the research community. And that this may take time; impact is not something that is easily measured in a short time frame.

Reflections on Citation Counts. The HCI experts reflected on the nuanced role citation counts play in evaluating research. Yvonne Rogers highlighted that citation counts can sometimes be part of a "scratch my back" culture and "becom[ing] a bit of a game in that regards" where researchers boost each other's citations. Despite this, she acknowledged citation counts as a generally useful measure, especially with the rise of tools like Google Scholar that have made them more reliable and accessible. Another expert likened the pursuit of citations to earning martial arts belts, suggesting some researchers prioritise accumulating citations for status over meaningful contributions, treating them more as markers of achievement than scholarly value.

The interviewees also highlighted the varying *"depths of citation"* in academic work, where deeper citations form the intellectual foundation of a new study. In contrast, other citations might serve a more superficial role, such as acknowledging a field without engaging deeply with its core concepts. This distinction underscores that not all citations hold the same scholarly significance, exemplified by this statement of Saul Greenberg: *"For example, […] if I had a paper that was cited by five people. Those five people pioneered this area. That, to me, is more impactful than, let's say, a paper with, you know, 500 citations where they're just being used to say, here's a pointer to an area."*

The HCI experts highlighted the varying temporal impact of citations in the field. They noted that certain research areas may experience a decline in significance as the field evolves and focuses shift. As HCI Expert A mentioned during the interviews: *"Human-Computation is a funny example of a survey that completely lost its importance now. It happened and everybody moved on."* Citation patterns can also differ considerably, with some papers seeing short-lived spikes in attention while others sustain a steady rate of citations over time. Additionally, while specific methods may become obsolete as new approaches emerge, foundational concepts and overarching visions often retain their influence much longer, as reflected in this comment by Hiroshi Ishii: *"Methods [are] also nice, but have a lifespan, [it is] like a revolution happened [and] it replaced an old method, but vision lasts much longer."*

However, the HCI experts' emphasised that the true measure of impact often goes beyond formal metrics like citation counts. Saul Greenberg highlighted the importance of engaging in meaningful discussions with peers at conferences as a key indicator of impact: *"The real metric […] is when I go to a conference. I meet people who are doing work similar to mine and we engage in a lively discussion. That to me is kind of the best"*. Similarly, Ben Shneiderman valued recognition from respected colleagues as a significant form of professional validation.

Building on these experts emphasis on community, we want to create precisely these types of exchanges with this panel. With the organizing committee's support we hope to bring together in-person and virtual participants, and thus to create an inclusive space for meaningful discussion and debate, and to further all of our understanding of factors that drive impact within and beyond HCI.

3 PANELISTS

Below, find the list of panellists confirmed for the panel.

Hiroshi Ishii is a Media Arts and Sciences Professor at the MIT Media Lab, where he leads the Tangible Media Group. His research focuses on designing tangible user interfaces, blending the physical and digital worlds to create innovative ways of interacting with technology. Ishii's work has been recognised globally and has influenced both academic research and industry practices.

Elizabeth F. Churchill is the Department Chair of Human-Computer Interaction and Professor of Human-Computer Interaction at the Mohamed bin Zayed University of Artificial Intelligence. She is renowned for her interdisciplinary research bridging computer science, design, and social sciences, with significant contributions to user experience design, social computing, and human-centred technologies and she has worked in industry and academia throughout her career.

Elisa Mekler is an associate professor at the IT University of Copenhagen, Center for Digital Play. Much of her current work concerns the emergence and evolution of HCI research practices, such as CHI writing conventions, and the import and adoption of theory into HCI.

Ben Shneiderman is a computer scientist and professor at the University of Maryland's Department of Computer Science. He is widely recognised for his groundbreaking work in HCI, user interface design, and information visualisation.

His research has significantly influenced the development of interactive systems and data representation techniques. He will provide a video statement to kick-off the panel discussion.

Open Panel Position This panel slot is reserved for an individual whose expertise and insights will significantly enhance the discussion. It provides the flexibility to invite e.g. the keynote speaker of CHI 2025 or a notable attendee at the conference to join the panel. The goal is to ensure a dynamic and inclusive dialogue on the panel's core topics.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Gian-Luca Savino and Nick von Felten for contributing to this panel as well as their contribution to the summary article in the ACM Interactions magazine [6]. Their efforts in preparing the panel, doing the groundwork in collecting data on the top 100 cited CHI papers, and performing data cleaning and processing have been essential to proposing this panel discussion. We would also like to thank Yvonne Rogers for her input, discussion, and for suggesting the title of the panel. Additionally, we extend our gratitude in advance to all participants of the panel at CHI 2025. We hope to continue and deepen the conversation within the community.

REFERENCES

[1] Louise Barkhuus and Jennifer A. Rode. 2007. From Mice to Men - 24 Years of Evaluation in CHI. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (San Jose, California, USA) *(CHI '07)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA. https://doi.org/10.1145/1240624.2180963

[2] Christoph Bartneck and Jun Hu. 2009. Scientometric analysis of the CHI proceedings. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Boston, MA, USA) *(CHI '09)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 699–708. https://doi.org/10.1145/1518701.1518810

[3] Kelly Caine. 2016. Local Standards for Sample Size at CHI. In *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (San Jose, California, USA) *(CHI '16)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 981–992. https://doi.org/10.1145/2858036.2858498

[4] Elizabeth F. Churchill. 2012. Impact! *Interactions* 19, 3 (May 2012), 12–15. https://doi.org/10.1145/2168931.2168936

[5] Saul Greenberg and Bill Buxton. 2008. Usability evaluation considered harmful (some of the time). In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Florence, Italy) *(CHI '08)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 111–120. https://doi.org/10.1145/1357054.1357074

[6] Annika Kaltenhauser, Gian-Luca Savino, Nick von Felten, and Johannes Schöning. 2025. CHI's Greatest Hits: Analyzing the 100 Most-Cited Papers in 43 Years of Research at ACM CHI. *Interactions* 32, 1 (Jan. 2025), 28–33. https://doi.org/10.1145/3704804

[7] Yubo Kou, Colin M. Gray, Austin Toombs, and Bonnie Nardi. 2018. The Politics of Titling: The Representation of Countries in CHI Papers. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Montreal QC, Canada) *(CHI EA '18)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1145/3170427.3188409

[8] Neha Kumar, Julie A. Adams, Bill Buxton, Linda Candy, Pablo Cesar, Leigh Clark, Benjamin R. Cowan, Anind Dey, Phoebe O. Toups Dugas, Ernest Edmonds, Michael A. Goodrich, Mark Green, Jonathan Grudin, Yoshifumi Kitamura, Joe Konstan, Celine Latulipe, Minha Lee, Tom Malone, Regan Mandryk, Panos Markopoulos, Michael Muller, Lennart Nacke, Yukiko Nakano, Marianna Obrist, Martin Porcheron, Aleksandra Sarcevic, Johannes Schöning, Stacey Scott, Bonita Sharif, Frank Steinicke, Simone Stumpf, Edward Tse, and Vinoba Vinayagamoorthy. 2022. A chronology of SIGCHI conferences: 1983 to 2022. *Interactions* 29, 6 (nov 2022), 34–41. https://doi.org/10.1145/3568732

[9] Sebastian Linxen, Christian Sturm, Florian Brühlmann, Vincent Cassau, Klaus Opwis, and Katharina Reinecke. 2021. How WEIRD is CHI?. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Yokohama, Japan) *(CHI '21)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 143, 14 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3411764.3445488

[10] Yong Liu, Jorge Goncalves, Denzil 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* (Toronto, Ontario, Canada) *(CHI '14)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 3553–3562. https://doi.org/10.1145/2556288.2556969

[11] Jonas Oppenlaender. 2024. Past, Present, and Future of Citation Practices in HCI. arXiv:2405.16526 [cs.HC] https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.16526

[12] Sebastian A. C. Perrig, Lena Fanya Aeschbach, Nicolas Scharowski, Nick von Felten, Klaus Opwis, and Florian Brühlmann. 2024. Measurement practices in user experience (UX) research: a systematic quantitative literature review. *Frontiers in Computer Science* 6 (2024). https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomp.2024.1368860

[13] 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* (Glasgow, Scotland Uk) *(CHI EA '19)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1145/3290607.3310429

[14] Richard Van Noorden, Brendan Maher, and Regina Nuzzo. 2014. The top 100 papers. *Nature* 514 (10 2014), 550–3. https://doi.org/10.1038/514550a