1

Cultural Differences and Perverse Incentives in Science Create a Bad Mix: Exploring Country-Level Publication Bias in Select ACM Conferences

Aksheytha Chelikavada^{1*}, Casey C. Bennett¹

¹Department of Computing & Digital Media, DePaul University, Chicago, IL USA

*Corresponding Author: Aksheytha Chelikavada, achelika@depaul.edu

Abstract

In the era of big science, many national governments are helping to build well-funded teams of scientists to serve nationalistic ambitions, providing financial incentives for certain outcomes for purposes other than advancing science. That in turn can impact the behavior of scientists and create distortions in publication rates, frequency, and publication venues targeted. To that end, we provide evidence that indicates significant inequality using standard Gini Index metrics in the publication rates of individual scientists across various groupings (e.g. country, institution type, ranking-level) based on an intensive analysis of thousands of papers published in several well-known ACM conferences (HRI, IUI, KDD, CHI, SIGGRAPH, UIST, and UBICOMP) over 15 years between 2010 to 2024. Furthermore, scientists who were affiliated with the top-5 countries (in terms of research expenditure) were found to be contributing significantly more to the inequality in publication rates than others, which raises a number of questions for the scientific community. We discuss some of those questions later in the paper. We also detected several examples in the dataset of potential serious ethical problems in publications likely caused by such incentive systems. Finally, a topic modeling analysis revealed that some countries are pursuing a much narrower range of scientific topics relative to others, indicating those incentives may also be limiting genuine scientific curiosity. In summary, our findings raise awareness of systems put in place by certain national governments that may be eroding the pursuit of truth through science and gradually undermining the integrity of the global scientific community.

Keywords Perverse Incentives • Scientific Inequality • Publication Bias • Latent Semantics • Bibliometrics • Nationalistic Ambitions

1. Introduction

1.1 Overview

Science, very broadly, is based off of curiosity and the pursuit of truth. Scientists are usually driven to understand how things work and find solutions to real-world problems (Holladay, 1953). Their inquisitiveness is often paired with meticulous and rigorous methodologies that prioritize evidence and logic, making sure that their findings are as accurate and reliable as possible (Popper, 2005; Voit, 2019). Yet at the same time, scientific behavior is also oftentimes driven by cultural values and more practical motivations, at least in the modern era of "big science" (Han, 2019). In other words, what was once a small "cottage industry" of scientists working alone with limited resources has, in the current day and age, transformed into well-funded scientific teams pursuing ideas that potentially may have broad economic impact and/or serve nationalistic ambitions (Adams, 2013). Those factors can make a strong impact upon the publishing patterns of scientists, given that funding typically comes from national governments who *incentivize* certain things (Franzoni et al., 2011). Research priorities are thus influenced by the goals of a nation and their political class, which arguably may lead to distorted variations in publication rates, frequency, and the kinds of publication venues targeted.

Moreover, there are some national governments, e.g. China and South Korea, that are specifically trying to achieve enhanced global recognition through technological and scientific innovation for various political reasons (Reshetnikova et al., 2021). For example, both of those aforementioned countries are aggressively pushing their scientists to publish at top international journals and conferences (based on metrics such as impact factor) to build their political reputation internationally, providing direct incentives to scientists and universities that do so (Kim & Jeong, 2023). Though there have been efforts to reform things in both those countries (Zhang & Sivertsen, 2020),

the behaviors still persist as of 2024, as evidenced by our results here. Due to that kind of environment, scientists in those places face intense demands to publish frequently in particular international venues for **reasons other than purely scientific ones, creating "perverse incentives" for individual scientist behavior**.

There are of course sometimes "good incentives" for research, where high-quality research is recognized across a broad array of topics, interdisciplinary collaborations are encouraged without concern for ethnic or political affiliation, scientific ethical lapses are heavily penalized, all types of scientific results (whether it is positive or negative) are considered valuable and important, and the primary goal is advancement of human knowledge (Gärtner, Leising, & Schönbrodt, 2024). However, incentives can become harmful when they create a climate that could more broadly be thought of as a complex high-stakes "publish or perish" culture, leading scientists into compromising ethical situations where they have to produce significant results quickly (or what at least appears "significant"), often times at the expense of thoroughness and scientific validity, to meet certain productivity quotas for funding and promotions with the primary goal of benefiting one human group over another (Shin, 2019; Tian et al., 2016). It is in situations like these that the pursuit of truth can become perversely incentivized, even if an individual scientist may wish otherwise. We emphasize here that this is not intended as a criticism of individual scientists from particular countries, but rather a criticism of the "systems" put in place (e.g. by national governments) that encourage certain scientific behaviors.

We would be remiss not to note that the authors of this paper have lived and worked for years at universities in both East Asia (South Korea) and the West (United States), and have experienced/seen many of the things discussed in this paper personally.

1.2 Background Research on Scientific Publication Bias

The phenomenon of bias is well-studied because it can cause unfair treatment, reduce diversity in those who participate, and damage public trust in the institution in question. Scientific publications are no exception to instances of bias. Previous literature has documented several factors that lead to potential bias in a wide range of academic environments from the field of scientific bibliometrics. Many of those bias-causing factors are discussed at length later in the analysis section of this paper, which we provide examples of here in this section.

The preference for close personal relations over merit is one common issue that can be identified in many forms across the business and scientific worlds. In Italian academia, for instance, there was a well-known case that had been raised regarding nepotistic practices of hiring close relatives for academic positions, based on a retrospective analysis of last names at Italian institutions of higher education (Allesina, 2011). Additionally, in top economic journals, it was found that there is a strong possibility that in-group members, i.e. authors who share a journal's institutional affiliation, receive fewer citation counts compared to out-group members, suggesting that in-group members papers get preferential treatment (e.g. higher chance of acceptance) regardless the quality of the research (Lutmar & Reingewertz, 2021). There have also been studies on "status bias", since it is a common issue in scientific publishing. For instance, upon analysis most of the Chinese-language academic journals were found to reject the work of junior researchers and students at a higher rate than average beyond what might be expected by random chance, i.e. without considering the quality of the research itself (Tang et al., 2022). Issues like that stem from editorial department resources, editorial department culture, the scientific research peer evaluation system, and the wider academic environment. Moreover, race, ethnicity, age, religion, sex, or sexual orientation have been identified as potential factors for bias in some specialties (e.g. medical research) (Rouan et al., 2021).

On a broader scale, there have been previous comparisons of academic productivity across nations. One such comparison in particular showed how differences in language, institutional practices, and national priorities shape the publishing patterns of scientists (Bentley, 2014). Oftentimes, a country's position in human resources (e.g. researchers and their skill levels) as well as physical resources (e.g. finances) contribute to academic performance, which is often overlooked. We should also take into consideration the goal of institutions, the way they are managed, and the national government overseeing them, since they play a role in the policies towards research & development (R&D) at both national and local levels.

Of course, there is the factor of "chance" as well when it comes to publication patterns that may stem from unforeseen consequences (Harzing & Giroud, 2014). Reportedly, China leads the USA in the volume of AI-related research papers. The reason for that has been argued to be because of China's lax data protection policies and its broad diaspora allowing for research that would not be permitted in most countries due to safety concerns (Min et al., 2023). To take another example, it has been found that, ironically, private institutions and departments that grow at a moderate rate tend to have a higher publication activity than those with lower or higher rates (Jordan et al., 1989). More often than not, resources used to conduct cutting-edge research, especially in fields like AI, are only available to a few institutions that can handle the cost and manpower, which subsequently requires the gradual

acquisition of both. This means there is a growing disparity when it comes to conducting influential AI research that requires sustained investment over time (Togelius & Yannakakis, 2023). This also leads to narrowing AI research as private sector researchers specialize in more computationally intensive work that offer more immediate financial rewards, averse to tackling harder theoretical problems that may not engender immediate gain (Klinger et al., 2020).

Although there is existing literature on scientific publication bias, prior research focusing on status bias, country-level bias, and the influence of well-funded research groups *specifically* in reputed scientific conferences is limited. However, conferences serve as a major publication venue for computer science fields, rather than the traditional journal format. That suggests more research in the area is needed, thus motivating our work here.

1.3 Research Aims

When scientists align their work to cultural norms and nationalistic motivations, there is a chance that it may lead to publication bias and inequality which should theoretically show up as certain scientists or certain nations publishing more scientific papers at a rate higher than expected based on chance alone. We take the previous sentence as our central hypothesis to test in this paper, which we investigate via several standard metrics of inequality used widely in the scientific literature (described in Section 2). We discuss some potential reasons for such inequality and why we might consider those reasons good or bad in the Discussion (Section 4).

In short, our goal here was to identify and quantify whether such inequality occurs within several well-regarded Association for Computing Machinery (ACM) conferences: Human-Robot Interaction (HRI), Intelligent User Interfaces (IUI), Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (KDD), Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI), Computer Graphics and Interactive Techniques (SIGGRAPH), User Interface Software and Technology (UIST), and Ubiquitous Computing (UBICOMP). Within these specific conferences, we first sought to evaluate publication patterns among individual scientists. After that, we compared the scientists by several groupings. That included comparing by institution type (top research organizations, university ranking, etc.), as well as comparing scientists from the current top-5 countries in terms of research & development expenditures relative to GDP (e.g. United States, China, Japan, Germany, and South Korea) versus scientists from several non-top-5 countries (e.g. Australia, Canada, France, Taiwan, and Turkey) based on country comparisons used in analysis by the National Science Foundation (NSF) in the US (National Science Board, 2022). Those top-5 countries are at the forefront of scientific technological advancements and show consistent, long-term growth in research output, thus serving as a useful standard to what we might consider "high" scientific productivity.

2. Methodology

2.1 Dataset Collection

To begin our study, we scraped data about authors who have published in the seven conferences: HRI, IUI, KDD, CHI, SIGGRAPH, UIST, and UBICOMP from the ACM digital library (https://dl.acm.org/conferences). To do so, we utilized Selenium, which is a Python library for web scraping. The web scraper code was written as an automated data collection tool, and functions as follows. In the ACM digital library, we first accessed the proceedings page for each conference. Then, we drilled down into each conference proceeding for each year between 2010 and 2024 by clicking on "View all proceedings". Upon arriving at the resulting webpage, each year can be accessed sequentially where one can find "containers" of each article published that year (typically organized under various sessions at the conference). Lastly, we then navigated to the webpage of the article in order to extract the first name, last name, and the most recently associated affiliation of each author at the time of publication, which was compiled into an Excel file automatically by our web scraping Python code to comprise our "dataset" for that conference. The affiliation data point included the name of the institution and the country location.

Some further post-processing of the data was necessary before analysis, so that we would have 1 row per author and a series of columns with the number of publications in that single conference (e.g. CHI) for each year. For the first and last names, we noticed that there were inconsistencies with diacritic and middle name initials. So, we made sure to remove the diacritics and only extracted the first name and last name out of their full names and placed those in their respective columns labeled "first name" and "last name" for each Excel conference file. In order to differentiate each author, we decided to utilize unique keys. Initially, we used their first name, last name, and affiliation as a unique key, but we had to do some manual cleanup of the list when there were duplicate scientist names with different affiliated institutions, which may be due to different people with the same name or the same scientist moving from one affiliation to another. So, to streamline the process and to avoid human error, we decided to use their first and last names as a unique key. Using such a unique key is effective because each conference relates to a specific scientific field and the scientific community is generally small within each specific field.

Surprisingly, the number of duplicates was much lower than we initially feared, which came to around 21%, likely due to the relatively small size of the scientific community in each field publishing at that specific conference and the (unfortunately) limited job mobility in academia.

In order to generate the single row for each scientist, we wanted to keep a yearly count of the total number of publications for each author from 2010 to 2024 for that given conference, so we programmed the Python code to count every unique article a scientist published at each conference for each year. At the end of those processing steps, each conference had an excel file with individual columns for first name, last name, affiliation, and 15 separate columns for counts of publication for each year between 2010-2024. That dataset was then used for our analysis.

2.2 Possible Breach of Scientific Ethics

We found a few publications with suspiciously similar titles and the same authors (in different orders) at the ACM HRI conference between 2021-2024, which resulted in us looking into the papers more closely and discovering several potential instances of duplication publication. In other words, what appeared to be a breach of scientific ethics. Those articles were reported to the ACM digital library for further investigation. We discuss that issue more in the Results and Discussion sections below, including potential causes (e.g. perverse incentives).

2.3 Analysis Methods

2.3.1 Methodology for Individual Scientist Comparison

To compare individual scientists, we first wanted to create a weighted publication rate that would evaluate how much an author has published and how they distributed their work over time, based on the assumption that if a conference has an acceptance rate around 20-25% (which is claimed by several of the ACM conferences analyzed here) then if an author submitted 1 paper every year for 4 years that would by random chance result in 1 publication over any 4-year period. Of course, other factors would affect that, such as the quality of submitted work, highoutput labs that submit multiple papers per year, or potentially instances of publication bias. Using the above assumption, the measure we utilized is as follows:

$$R = \begin{cases} \frac{T}{P + 2(n-1)} & \text{if } n \ge 1, \text{else } R = 0 \end{cases}$$
 (1)

To create a temporal version of the R metric over time, we defined four-year time windows starting from 2010 (2010-2013, 2011-2014, etc.). Then, we summed the total number of publications for each window, represented as T in Equation 1 and divided it by the denominator. The denominator used P for the number of years in the period (in this case, 4), which could be increased or decreased if one wanted to analyze a larger or smaller time period than we did. A "denominator adjustment" was added to P so that for each consecutive year, n, an author publishes a paper the denominator will increase by 50%. The idea is that scientists who publish every year at the same conference have a greater chance of publishing in future years (e.g. perhaps they are thought leaders in the field), so we accounted for that by down-weighting the resulting value (via the denominator adjustment) to ensure that those few high-output labs/scientists would not be penalized nor overshadow the rest of the dataset. The goal here after all was not to pick out specific scientists for criticism, but look for general patterns across scientists. The final output of the formula, R, is the publication rate for an individual scientist for each specific window at that specific ACM conference. If an author does not publish in the window (n=0), the publication rate is hard set to 0. All else being equal, all authors would have an R value within each time window that matches the published acceptance rate of that conference (i.e. 0.2-0.25 in this case).

Using the above approach, we wanted to see if there were any similarities or differences in the consistency and frequency of publications based on the R values over time. To do so, we calculated the Gini index value from the R values for each author in each selected conference as a measure of publication "inequality" for that conference (Nishioka et al., 2022). The Gini index is a widely used measure of inequality across many fields from economics to statistical science that can be applied to any underlying numerical value (e.g. money, healthcare access, voting power). In this case, it was used to quantitatively identify instances of long-term publication inequality in the R values over the 4-year time windows (Ceriani & Verme, 2011). We calculated a Gini index score for each individual author in that way, and we also calculated it *across* authors to create a Gini score for each conference between 2010 and 2024. Furthermore, the Gini index can be used to calculate inequality at both the individual level or group level, which can include grouping scientists by institution type, country, etc. (see Section

2.3.2 below). Such inequality may be a sign of publication bias, though other factors could contribute of course (e.g. good incentives, see Section 1).

The interpretation of Gini values varies at the individual and conference levels here, however. At the individual author level, we can theorize that the authors who have lower Gini index values, i.e. those who are publishing consistently and frequently through all the time windows, likely belong to the "in-crowd" social clique of that conference. Conversely, those with higher Gini index values would perhaps be those who publish infrequently at that conference and thus represent the out-crowd or out-group. At the conference level though, higher Gini index values signal greater inequality at that conference. Or to put it simply, at the conference level, higher Gini index values could be considered "bad" if the goal is to increase participation and interest in science.

To further validate our findings, we also utilized Lotka's Law as a secondary inequality measure. It is a commonly used scientific bibliometric measure to evaluate the distribution of the productivity of authors (Lotka, 1926). Though Lotka's Law is subject to a number of criticisms (Pao, 1986), it provides some further evidence here alongside the Gini index scores to support our findings.

2.3.2 Methodology for Grouping Comparisons

To dig deeper into the issue of publication bias and inequality, we decided to group authors in various ways, to find possible factors leading to differences across authors. For instances, such differences could be associated with their institution type (top research organizations), university ranking level, or their country location.

To do so, we used the same Gini index values we calculated in the previous section for each conference. First, we did an **institution-type analysis**, where we grouped those scientists who are affiliated with top research organizations versus those who are not, based on a previously published categorization system of the institutions in our dataset (National Science Board, 2022). Those categories were comprised of academic institutions, government organizations, healthcare organizations, NGOs, and corporate organizations. We then aggregated the Gini scores for each institutional category.

After that, we performed a **rankings-based analysis** grouping scientists who are affiliated with the world's top 10 universities in computer science versus those who are not, based on published rankings in 2024 (U.S. News & World Report, 2024). Similarly, we did a separate **country-level analysis** grouping of authors who are affiliated with the top-5 countries based on research expenditure relative to GDP (e.g. United States, China, Japan, Germany, and South Korea) versus scientists who come from non-top-5 countries (e.g. Australia, Canada, France, Taiwan, and Turkey) reported by in published NSF analyses (National Science Board, 2022). We used a subset of 5 of the 12 non-top-5 countries used in (National Science Board, 2022), so that each of our groups would have the same number of countries, choosing ones that were geographically diverse amongst the 12.

2.3.3 Topic Analysis by Country Group

To explore the country groups further, we conducted topic modeling using Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) to find common topics within the top-5 countries mentioned in the previous section in the conferences (Klinger et al., 2020). By training on the abstracts of articles, an LDA approach can discover topics or common themes among the countries (or, vice versa, different themes) while estimating the amount of topic diversity being researched. The aim was to see if there were differences in the kinds of scientific topics scientists in those countries were researching, which perhaps might relate to any differences in publication patterns among the countries.

To do so, we first pulled out authors from our dataset who are affiliated with the top-5 countries and then extracted the abstracts of all the published articles for each country for each conference. Then, we pre-processed the abstracts in preparation for the LDA, which included text cleaning, tokenization, removal of stopwords, and lemmatization. After that, LDA was applied to the data to create a heatmap of topics for each country. For each resulting model, we visually tuned the hyperparameters with the heatmaps to optimize performance.




Fig. 1 Country-level embedding – flow chart. An example of computing a country-level embedding. We are assuming there are 4 articles associated with this country and that each abstract has 4 sentences. By treating the abstract of the article as a paragraph, we performed sentence tokenization and fed the sentences to the pre-trained SBERT model to generate sentence-level embeddings. Then, we averaged the features of the sentence-level embeddings to obtain a paragraph-level embedding. Lastly, we averaged the features of the paragraph-level embeddings to obtain a single country-level embedding.

We also decided to use a more quantitative method than LDA heatmaps to identify topic preference for each country. As such, we used semantic similarity to calculate "topic similarity" among the top-5 countries for each conference (Hurtado Martín et al., 2013). That measure provides insight to how similar or different topics are across groups as a numerical score, with the groups here being the countries. Our approach to using topic similarity is as follows: if there is high similarity, then there is no topic preference that distinguishes one country from others; Adversely, if there is low similarity, then it is evidence that topic preference exists within a given country. Likewise, low similarity may also indicate reduced topic diversity compared to other countries.

To calculate semantic similarity, we used a pre-trained Sentence-BERT (SBERT) model - more specifically, all-MiniLM-L6-v2 - to process the abstracts to obtain sentence embeddings (Reimers & Gurevych, 2019). This model is hosted by the Hugging Face hub, but can be accessed through the sentence-transformers library in Python. Using the abstracts of all the published articles for each country, and treating the abstract as a paragraph, we performed sentence tokenization to get individual sentences. Then, we fed the sentences into the pre-trained Sentence-BERT (SBERT) model, which gave us associated sentence-level embedding vectors, with each of them having 384 features. Our next step was to average the features of the sentence-level embedding vectors to get a paragraph-level embedding vector. We should mention that we decided to do paragraph-level embeddings rather than sentence-level to calculate the country-level values because sentences in paragraphs are connected contextually,

and we wanted to capture those relationships. Once we obtained all of our paragraph-level embedding vectors, we averaged their features to get a country-level embedding vector, which portrays the overall content of abstracts for a country (see Fig. 1). With country-level embedding vectors, we can calculate the cosine similarity among pairs of countries, which produced seven similarity matrices, each one representing one of the ACM conferences.

3. Results

3.1 Results for Individual Scientists Comparison

With our 7 datasets, each representing a specified ACM conference, we first wanted to investigate any patterns or anomalies that might point to publication bias at the individual scientist level, which would then warrant further investigation. To do so, we obtained the weighted publication rates (the "R" value from Equation 1) for all time period windows of each author between 2010 and 2024 at each conference, then calculated the mean and standard deviations of those values across authors for each conference (Table 1).

Table 1 Mean and Standard Deviation Table

Conference	HRI	IUI	KDD	CHI	SIGGRAPH	UIST	UBICOMP
Mean	0.1548	0.1603	0.1692	0.2009	0.1296	0.1787	0.2029
Standard Deviation	0.2304	0.1914	0.2260	0.2428	0.2349	0.2126	0.2533

As can be seen in Table 1, the mean values are generally low and close in range with one another (between 0.15 and 0.20), which aligns with the low published acceptance rates of around 20-25% for those ACM conferences and matches the "all else being equal" statement we made in Section 2.3.1 above. However, we found that the standard deviation values were much larger than the mean values. This would suggest that although the *average* values match the published acceptance rates, there is a high variability (e.g. large spread) in publication rates among authors. In other words, some authors are publishing much more frequently than other ones beyond what would be expected based on chance alone.

To further analyze the spread in publication rates, we utilized the Gini index as described in Section 2 to measure publication "inequality" across authors. The overall Gini index value for each conference usually varied between 0.60 and 0.78 (Table 2). Gini index values for individual authors are provided in the online Appendix.

Table 2 Conference-level Gini Index Value Table

Conference	HRI	IUI	KDD	CHI	SIGGRAPH	UIST	UBICOMP
Gini Index Value	0.7007	0.6116	0.6390	0.6033	0.7716	0.6038	0.6189

The values in Table 2 are considered relatively "high" for Gini index (Abramo et al., 2016) and further reinforces that there seems to be a significant inequality in the productivity among authors. In other words, there are a small number of authors who are publishing consistently across multiple years at the same conference, but there are also many authors who are publishing more sporadically or perhaps only once. While such publication inequality may be justifiable (e.g. smarter scientists, "good" incentives"), there are also many potential reasons why it may not be justifiable (e.g. researchers from the Global South who lack resources for research, personal biases of scientists, or other "perverse" incentives"). The justification of such publication inequality is, of course, a matter of debate. However, if the goal of science is to push humanity forward, then it could be argued those latter "unjustified" reasons may in fact be holding us back. That is something that warrants further research investigation and discussion amongst the scientific community.

To provide further evidence of the above point from a different angle, we utilized Lotka's Law to analyze the publication rates (Lotka, 1926). The resulting tables were very large and extensive, so we have included an example of the results for the ACM HRI conference in the online Appendix D. In those results, the observed values for the number of authors were smaller as the number of papers published increased. That is consistent with the general "power law" hypothesis basis that underlies Lotka's Law, which essentially says that the hotter the scientific field then the more unequal the distribution of scientific resources/publications will become. In other words, the bigger something gets, the narrower the opportunity to get involved becomes (e.g. professional sports is a good example of that). The growth of "big science" over the past century certainly fits such a description. All that said, the Lotka values from the conference publications appear to reinforce our findings that there is indeed a small group of authors publishing quite frequently for whatever reason, beyond what might be expected by chance.

Additionally, we calculated the Gini index value for each author, which produced lengthy lists containing the names of every single author who published at that conference over the past 15 years. Those lists are too long to include in this paper, but an example from the ACM HRI conference is shown in the online Appendix A (Table A1). The ACM HRI conference is an area that the authors of this paper are pretty familiar with, having published there ourselves in the past. Of course, analyzing such individual scientist data is difficult, but we could hypothesize that authors who have lower Gini index values in such lists of publications belong to the "in-crowd" social clique of a given conference. Data such as in Table A1 could potentially be analyzed using "social network" analysis to confirm that theory, though that remains for future research to untangle.

3.2 Results for Grouping Comparisons

To evaluate whether groups of authors are possibly contributing to the inequality of publication patterns found in the individual level data in the previous section, we calculated the Gini index value of various groupings of scientists: institution-type, rankings-based, country-level (see Section 2.3.2). Theoretically, if a grouping was the source of individual-level inequality shown in Section 3.1 above, then the Gini index values would differ across groups in each grouping, e.g. some countries would have higher values than others. Conversely, if the Gini index values were the same across groups, then we could theorize that the source of inequality was at the individual level. To evaluate the Gini index values against one another we used Relative Percentage Difference (RPD) (Cole & Altman, 2017; Mahinpei, 2020). We decided to use this metric as it allows us to compare the differences between values in a rigorous, standardized manner. A high RPD value would indicate a potential source of inequality for the underlying Gini index values. The results can be succinctly summarized as follows.

3.2.1 Institution-Type and Rankings-Based Results

With the **institution-type analysis**, the RPD values were low (generally <30%) and relatively close to one another within a limited range (shown in Table 4). This implies that institution type does not seem to contribute much to the observed publication inequality. Likewise, when we conducted **ranking-based analysis**, the RPD values were again low (<15%) and relatively close to each other within a limited range (Table 4). In short, neither the institution type nor university ranking level seem to explain much of the observed publication inequality across scientists shown in Section 3.1.

Conference	Category	RPD
HRI	NTRL	29.29%
IIII	USCS	23.18%
IUI	NTRL	31.15%
101	USCS	11.29%
KDD	NTRL	7.88%
KDD	USCS	7.42%
CHI	NTRL	15.55%
	USCS	3.85%
SIGGRAPH	NTRL	30.94%
SIGGRAFII	USCS	24.63%
UIST	NTRL	9.04%
0151	USCS	5.08%
UBICOMP	NTRL	0.09%
ODICOMP	USCS	3.84%

Table 4 RPD Table for Institution-level Analysis (NTRL) and Ranking-based Analysis (USCS)

3.2.2 Country-Level Results

However, when we conducted **country-level analysis** and compared the Gini index using RPD for the top-5 countries versus non-top-5, we found significant differences. For both the top-5 and non-top-5 countries, there was a lack of consistency in the values across conferences and countries with a less predictable pattern (see Table 5 and 6). More specifically, in the RPD values for the top-5 countries, we noticed spikes in certain countries (China and

4.99%

13.38%

South Korea) that consistently had the highest RPD values well above other countries (sometimes by 2 or 3 times the average of all others) across all conferences, which we have highlighted in blue (see Table 5). This implies consistent, high inequality in publishing scientific papers with these two countries. Meanwhile for the non-top-5 countries, there were similar spikes but it was not consistent for the same country across all conferences (see Table 6). For the non-top-5 countries, we do note that there were a few instances where some cells had "NaN" values due to a lack of data for such country in that specific conference,

Moreover, the RPD for some of the top-5 countries in some conferences (e.g. HRI), were vastly larger than any of the non-top-5, in some cases even exceeding 100% RPD. The range of RPD scores was also larger for the top-5 countries for all conferences, except for SIGGRAPH. In short, there seems to be observable inequality at the country-level. Our interpretation of these results is that, for the top-5 countries, country-level grouping could be contributing to the inequality in publication rates among individual authors seen in Section 3.1. The fact that this phenomenon only occurred in the top-5 countries (not the non-top-5) reinforces the notion that perverse incentives at the national level may be driving this pattern among scientists.

Country	HRI	IUI	KDD	CHI	SIGGRAPH	UIST	UBICOMP
China	122.99%	26.39%	11.47%	39.33%	39.52%	37.58%	3.87%
USA	24.55%	4.02%	4.54%	1.08%	6.45%	10.72%	18.14%
Japan	13.07%	6.49%	17.99%	11.16%	19.55%	7.72%	6.29%
South Korea	100.86%	66.49%	29.11%	9.99%	13.39%	4.82%	35.68%

2.93%

12.48%

12.03%

Table 5 RPD Table of Top-5 Countries for Select ACM Conferences

41.33%

Germany

Table 6 RPD Table of Non-Top	o-5 Countries for	Select ACM	Conferences
-------------------------------------	-------------------	------------	-------------

11.84%

Country	HRI	IUI	KDD	CHI	SIGGRAPH	UIST	UBICOMP
Australia	25.02%	.0024%	5.57%	6.98%	97.43%	4.36%	11.97%
Canada	9.01%	27.79%	7.99%	10.75%	4.23%	21.56%	2.42%
France	2.19%	27.03%	21.04%	20.54%	17.73%	13.67%	0.46%
Taiwan	4.52%	NaN	3.21%	14.00%	32.63%	18.42%	10.15%
Turkey	39.37%	NaN	NaN	55.47%	NaN	NaN	NaN

Here, population size should not be a concern because it does not affect the measure of inequality we used, which evaluates the *frequency distribution* of publications rather than the raw amount. Regardless, these findings should not come as a complete surprise since China and South Korea have been pushing at a national level to become global powerhouses in science through publishing scientific papers in acclaimed international journals. Currently, China outspends the United States and the European Union in research and publishes the most papers, especially in top-ranked journals, compared to the rest of the world (Hyland, 2023). Published data also suggests that South Korea has been making similar national efforts to rise in worldwide rankings through deliberate international publishing strategies (Lee & Lee, 2013).

This phenomenon could be attributed to nationalistic hyper-competitiveness that goes beyond the traditional scientific endeavor, blurring political and cultural concerns into the mix resulting in the mindset that the goal of science is primarily to outperform other countries, rather than scientific progress in and of itself (Chiang, 1990). Indeed, it has been argued previously that such a view is deeply rooted in academic communities of countries where Confucianism is a prevalent system of thought (e.g. East Asia) (Cheng, 1990). Academic success in such environments is not only seen as a personal achievement but also as a way to elevate status of one's group in society. More specifically, the pressure to excel comes from the Confucian concept of filial piety to uphold family honor and fulfill societal expectations, i.e. the group's success is the individual's success, whatever the means (Kim, 2009). As such, we could interpret these above results as the interplay of Confucianist power hierarchies upon traditional Western scientific systems, leading to those countries to create group-level systems that encourage certain individual level behaviors (aggressive publishing practices aimed at particular international journals and conferences) to serve national interests, rather than scientific ones.

To encourage such publishing behaviors, it is well-known that some governments and institutions are establishing what we might consider "perverse incentives". For instance, a key factor in China's rise as a publishing

powerhouse is its government implementing policies and targeted funding for research with a focus on quantity over quality, including direct financial "rewards" to scientists for publishing in certain scientific venues (Hyland, 2023), despite efforts to reform the system in recent years (Zhang & Sivertsen, 2020). In South Korea, its government too has been implementing various policies and financial incentives such as income tax reductions for successful scientists (Jung & Mah, 2014), with a similar focus on quantity over quality (Kim & Bak, 2016). For publishing in leading journals such as Nature and Science, a South Korean researcher could in the past earn up to \$17,000 USD for a single publication (Lee & Lee, 2013). Moreover, to compete for government research funding and university-level incentives (e.g. promotions), scientists at institutions in both those countries are placed under great pressure to publish in certain top-ranked venues with high frequency, using a government-curated list of internationally renowned journals & conferences, while at the same time absconding other traditional scientific activities such as peer reviewing other scientists' papers (Tian et al., 2016). That of course has had the unfortunate side-effect of a number of scientific publishing scandals in China and South Korea over the past couple decades, including a number of paper retractions and instances of plagiarism (Do, 2021). In the new era of AI (e.g. large-language models, or LLMs) being used to write scientific papers, there is renewed concern over those issues in recent years (e.g. paper mills), which we return to discussing more later in this paper.

Table 7 Topic Semantic Similarity Matrices (via SBERT model)

		China	Germany	Japan	South Korea	USA
	China	1.000	0.844	0.887	0.872	0.860
110136	Germany	0.844	1.000	0.975	0.930	0.987
HRI Matrix	Japan	0.887	0.975	1.000	0.945	0.976
	South Korea	0.872	0.930	0.945	1.000	0.936
	USA	0.860	0.987	0.976	0.936	1.000
		China	Germany	Japan	South Korea	USA
	China	1.000	0.858	0.873	0.791	0.881
IUI Matrix	Germany	0.858	1.000	0.878	0.798	0.924
101 Matrix	Japan	0.873	0.878	1.000	0.872	0.919
	South Korea	0.791	0.798	0.872	1.000	0.889
	USA	0.881	0.924	0.919	0.889	1.000
		China	Germany	Japan	South Korea	USA
	China	1.000	0.940	0.961	0.946	0.993
KDD Matrix	Germany	0.940	1.000	0.951	0.935	0.960
KDD Matrix	Japan	0.961	0.951	1.000	0.955	0.970
	South Korea	0.946	0.935	0.955	1.000	0.952
	USA	0.993	0.960	0.970	0.952	1.000
		China	Germany	Japan	South Korea	USA
	China	1.000	0.966	0.958	0.984	0.965
CHI Matrix	Germany	0.966	1.000	0.972	0.978	0.940
CIII Matrix	Japan	0.958	0.972	1.000	0.964	0.900
	South Korea	0.984	0.978	0.964	1.000	0.961
	USA	0.965	0.940	0.900	0.961	1.000
		China	Germany	Japan	South Korea	USA
	China	1.000	0.952	0.733	0.882	0.973
SIGGRAPH Matrix	Germany	0.952	1.000	0.799	0.908	0.970
SIGGILAI II MALIIX	Japan	0.733	0.799	1.000	0.887	0.804
	South Korea	0.882	0.908	0.887	1.000	0.914
	USA	0.973	0.970	0.804	0.914	1.000
		China	Germany	Japan	South Korea	USA
	China	1.000	0.954	0.942	0.938	0.960
UIST Matrix	Germany	0.954	1.000	0.958	0.947	0.937
OIDI MAHIX	Japan	0.942	0.958	1.000	0.919	0.914
	South Korea	0.938	0.947	0.919	1.000	0.923
	USA	0.960	0.937	0.914	0.923	1.000
		China	Germany	Japan	South Korea	USA
	China	1.000	0.904	0.939	0.902	0.956
UBICOMP Matrix	Germany	0.904	1.000	0.948	0.971	0.966
ODICOMI Matrix	Japan	0.939	0.948	1.000	0.923	0.956
	South Korea	0.902	0.971	0.923	1.000	0.972
	USA	0.956	0.966	0.956	0.972	1.000

3.3 Results for Topic Analysis by Country Group

We conducted topic modeling using LDA for the conferences, which identified the most common published topics by conference and by country. However, that was not as informative as first hoped because no clear topic preferences emerged from the analysis at the country-level using the heatmaps from LDA, either by individual country or by country group. As such, there was no clear "theme" for any particular country based on LDA. For brevity, those results can be found in the online Appendix B (Table B1).

As a more quantitative alternative to LDA, we attempted to use semantic similarity to calculate "topic similarity" among the countries for each conference to gain further insight (see Section 2.3.3). Via that method, we could obtain a quantified degree of similarity which would help us better understand the relationship between topics of the countries. We calculated the similarity scores and formatted it into a matrix for easier analysis. At the end, we had a total of 7 matrices, each one representing a conference (Table 7). For all the conferences, we found that the topics of the top-5 countries were very similar to one another, with the similarity scores approaching 1.0 in most cases and rarely dipping below 0.9. That is not entirely surprising, since most of these conferences have a defined set of topics in their call for papers (CFPs). Nevertheless, the results tell us that the topics being studied/published in these countries are quite identical to one another semantically-speaking and that there are not any notable differences in topic diversity. This leads us to infer that observed publication inequality across countries (see Section 3.2) as well as across individuals (see Section 3.1) is not being driven by topic diversity, based on these results.

3.4 Evidence of Ethical Problems due to Perverse Incentives

In this section, we provide some further evidence of potential ethical concerns that we accidentally discovered during our analysis related to the country-level grouping analysis of publication analysis in Section 3.2.2. Those concerns relate to two countries (China and South Korea) and likely can be tied the "perverse incentives" we mention in Section 3.2.2. We emphasize here again that this is not intended as a criticism of individual scientists from particular countries, but rather a criticism of the "systems" put in place (e.g. by national governments) that encourage certain scientific behaviors.

3.4.1 China

In China, there have been growing number of reports of researchers utilizing paper mills to quickly produce papers for publication, sometimes multiple versions with slightly altered content for duplicate publication. Paper mills deliberately mass produce and sell papers to scientists, who can then publish them in journals and conferences (Candal-Pedreira, 2022). Those papers can sometimes make it through peer review even when using fabricated data and results, which is extremely concerning as it can lead to misleading theories and results (Christopher, 2021). Moreover, in recent years, there is growing alarm over the use of AI and LLMs, such as ChatGPT, to further fuel paper mills and potentially jeopardize the entire scientific ecosystem with a flood of spurious papers that the peer review system cannot appropriately handle (Gray 2024; Kendall & da Silva, 2024).

Within our results, we noticed that the RPD value for the HRI conference seemed unusually high for the top-5 countries (see Table 5 in Section 3.2.2), so we investigated that abnormality further. Keeping in mind the main characteristics of papers produced by paper mills (e.g. duplicate content, AI-generated content), we manually reviewed each paper from the HRI conference between 2010 and 2024 by scanning paper titles and abstracts for semantic similarity (Parker et al., 2024; Patel, 2022). Via that process, we discovered 19 total articles (all from institutions in China), within which we identified 8 pairs of published papers (16 total papers) that were exceedingly similar in terms of content and appeared to be duplicate publications. Screenshots of those papers in the ACM digital library can be seen in the online Appendix C. Upon closer review, the other three papers did not seem to breach scientific publishing ethics.

Those 8 pairs had similar titles and abstracts and the same exact authors, except the author order was shuffled and slight alterations were made to the titles/abstracts. Within the body of the papers themselves, the sections were sometimes reorganized and split differently, but they had nearly identical content with many of the images being reused. Obviously, those papers appear to violate ethical scientific publishing guidelines, so the issue was reported to the ACM Digital Library. However, we do stress that this is indicative of a system-level problem, which in these cases create incentives that individual scientists are simply responding to. That is human nature, and if the same systems existed in another country, the outcomes would likely be similar, unfortunately.

3.4.2 South Korea

In South Korea, there has been a higher-than-average global average of influx of academics from abroad, whether they are relocating from elsewhere or Korean nationals returning back home after studying/working overseas. For instance, nearly 5% of scientists taking new positions in academia had moved from abroad to South Korea between 2017-2019. This is higher than the global average of 3.7% (Woolston, 2020). These researchers come with access to resources (such as fluency in English) to publish in international journals, which is advantageous to institutions and the country as a whole because of the visibility that is gained (Lee & Lee, 2013). As mentioned in Section 3.2.2, the South Korean government and individual institutions provide further financial incentives for publishing in such venues.

Interestingly, this phenomenon can be found in the ACM conferences analyzed in our dataset too. For instance, we identified that for HRI, around 72% of articles had been written by at least one author who is affiliated with a South Korean institution that had either overseas training or overseas research work experience. That is higher than the total percentage of academics in South Korea who had such overseas training/experience (roughly 50%) as per published estimates (Kim, 2010). In the IUI conference, the percentage is even higher, with all of the articles in our dataset (100%) having been written by at least one Korean institution affiliated author who has such overseas training/experience. One possible explanation for those results is the interplay of those researchers' English language and international research skills with the incentives from the Korean government, resulting in such outcomes. However, it begs an ethical question about whether a local scientist who studied and trained within South Korea (perhaps due to financial limitations) and as a result has limited English fluency would be penalized in such a system averse to their peers. Ideally, science should reward scientists for doing great science regardless of their backgrounds.

4 Discussion

4.1 Summary

In summary, we analyzed publications from several prestigious ACM conferences (HRI, IUI, KDD, CHI, SIGGRAPH, UIST, and UBICOMP) over 15 years between 2010 to 2024, and we discovered indications of potential publication bias and inquality at those conferences, where some individual scientists appear to be publishing scientific papers at a higher rate than chance alone given the published acceptance rates at those conferences, even after taking into account factors such as high output labs/scientists. In other words, there appears to be behavior amongst some scientists that is intended to "game" the publication system. To support our claim, we present a range of evidence that stems from the scraped data about authors who have published their work in the chosen conferences during that time period.

Such evidence includes the significant inequality among the publication rates of the individual authors, that may indicate in-group "social cliques" within some ACM conferences (Section 3.1). We also evaluated whether such publishing inequality at the individual-level was influenced by group-level factors based on author affiliation, including institution-type, rankings-based, and country-level. We found that institution-type and rankings-based grouping were not able to explain the publication inequality, but country-level did appear to have a significant contribution to the publication inequality at the individual-level (Section 3.2). In short, scientists who were affiliated with the top-5 countries based on research expenditure (United States, China, Japan, Germany, and South Korea) seem to be behaving in ways that are contributing more to publication frequency patterns that diverge from what we might expect from chance alone, i.e. what one might call "publication bias". RPD values (which account for population differences) were much higher than expected, particularly at some individual conferences.

We further investigated ethical problems that we discovered in two particular countries (China, South Korea) that both showed up in our country-level analysis results above and where governments are thought to be providing "perverse incentives" to scientists for reasons other than advancing science itself. There is notable previously published evidence indicating that China and South Korea at the national-level are consistently pushing for their scientists to publish aggressively at certain venues (even at the expense of ethical considerations), which we argue here can be attributed to nationalistic hyper-competitiveness intertwined with cultural factors all intending to serve national goals. We present several examples within our publication dataset of potential recent ethical issues (Section 3.4). To further back our claims, we conducted topic modeling using LDA as well as semantic similarity to find "topic similarity" and found that publication inequality is not being driven by scientists from some countries covering more diverse scientific topics, so that can be ruled out as a factor (Section 3.3).

These results suggest a closer investigation of the practices of some national governments on science in general may be warranted, as the systems those governments are putting in place may be incentivizing individual behaviors that are ultimately damaging to the scientific community. We discuss some broader implications of these results below.

4.2 Implications

We hope that our findings will raise awareness in various issues related to the influence of national governments' policies on modern science, while possibly even challenging pre-existing standards in academia and scientific publishing.

First and foremost, we want to bring attention to the mental health and well-being of researchers, especially early-career researchers who are affiliated with institutions in some of the countries discussed in this paper (e.g. China and South Korea) where national governments are known to be providing perverse incentives to scientists.

This specific group of people are most at-risk in such environments and pressured to have a certain number of publications within a very small time-frame, which causes many to have substantial "work-related anxiety" as their tenure and promotions are on the table (Tian et al., 2016; Zhong & Liu, 2022). Oftentimes, those who exhibit such anxiety will also have depressive symptoms, possible substance-use issues, sleeping difficulties, and severe fatigue. Unfortunately, these symptoms can end up being a precursor to suicide in some cases (Doering et al., 2024). Getting help for such conditions is seen with much dismay because in many Asian countries there is severe shame and social ostracism associated with mental illnesses (Yoo, 2018). This stigma makes it even harder for them to access support and leaves them in a very vulnerable state with their livelihood on the line.

Another issue is that, with paper mills becoming increasingly more popular, many fake articles are appearing in different journals across various disciplines (Brundy & Thornton, 2024). These fake articles often include fabricated data, which compromises the integrity of scientific theories and creates concerning foundations for future work that may be based on them (Christopher, 2021). Moreover, if such fraud is discovered, it can also unfairly damage the credibility of all scientists from that particular country associated with such shoddy work (Horta & Li, 2023; Mckie, 2024). When such articles are used as foundations for future work, many resources such as research funding and the valuable time of other researchers are wasted. This causes many, even those within the scientific community, to have a difficult time in trusting scientific literature (Chambers, 2024). Our paper reveals more potential evidence for such activity at ACM conferences, which goes to show that it is prevalent and common, unfortunately, and something that we as a global scientific community must more seriously address together in a concerted effort rather than piecemeal (Else & Van Noorden, 2021).

National hyper-competitiveness urges countries to compete with one another to become leaders in science and innovation. However, we must not neglect global scientific interests that are geared toward advancing human knowledge for all mankind, not just any one affiliation (ethnic, racial, tribal, national, etc.), but for all of us. Although competition is important, collaboration is the driving factor for new questions and ideas (Van den Besselaar et al., 2012). It is important to foster international collaborations and to build such networks as global science is often driven by those relationships, which rely on mutual trust (Gui et al., 2019). A common standard to compare researchers is through their h-index and the impact factor of the journals they publish in (Boell & Wilson, 2010), but it is debatable whether such metrics help foster a collaborative spirit. In this paper, we have seen the distress and pressure this creates for researchers often forcing them down the path of quantity over quality, as well as the consequences of "perverse incentives" on the practice of science. Instead, a better approach may be to perhaps focus on the overall impact an individual scientist's work has in the specific field and the rigor of their studies using new measures. For example, this might mean that we would look into how a researcher's work helped advance the field based on the size of their collaborative network or how they helped solve real-world issues based on social development indexes or other non-academic metrics (Ravenscroft et al., 2017). Those are just a couple potential ideas, but there is a plethora of ways the scientific community could attempt to address this issue.

4.3 Scientific "Economy" and the Breakdown of Peer Review

There has been a rapid growth in the overall number of scientific publications in recent years (Bornmann & Mutz, 2015; Drodz & Ladomery, 2024; McCook, 2006; Park et al., 2023), which may be partially due to the "perverse incentives" for scientists discussed in this paper. At the same time, there is growing awareness of an overall "crisis" in the peer review process for scientific publications, with a lack of available qualified peer reviewers. To put it bluntly, if we assume that any random scientific paper has a 25% chance of getting accepted, and all publications need at least 2 reviewers, then any scientist should technically be reviewing at least 2 papers for each paper they publish every year, though some published estimates have stated as high as 3-4 (Raoult, 2020). So, if college professor X published 5 papers last year, then they should have peer reviewed 10-20 papers. However, there is no current incentive for scientists to do so, outside of some personal honor code. Universities typically do not factor peer reviewing into decisions on promotion or tenure, for that matter (Day, 2022; Malcolm, 2018). Combined with the aforementioned "perverse incentives" for aggressive publication, this lack of incentives for peer reviewing is a very plausible part of the peer review crisis.

Technically speaking, scientific publication has always operated as an *informal economy*, where scientists submit papers to be peer-reviewed by other scientists, with the general understanding that they return the favor-in-kind and careers on-the-line (Ioannidis, 2005; Partha & David, 1994; Stephen, 1996; Van Dalen, 2021). **However, perhaps the time has come to** *formalize* **that scientific economy for publications**, to counter the peer review crisis and perverse incentives of national governments. We propose that could be created rather simply by instituting "tokens" (e.g. via blockchain), which scientists would receive after conducting a peer review. This is similar to other suggestions in recent years (Mohan, 2019; Spearpoint, 2017). Those tokens could then be used as

credits when they submit their own papers for publication, with each submission requiring some number of credits. To make it fairer, early-stage researchers could receive a pool of tokens to start with, and perhaps tokens could be partially refunded if a paper was rejected after peer review. Furthermore, peer reviewers could be rated on the quality of their peer review by the editors of the journal/conference, which might affect how many tokens they receive and thus ensure they make a reasonable effort. In essence, this would create a more formal scientific economy that is less likely to be gamed and more resistant to behaviors engendered through perverse incentives.

The difficult part of the above would be the administration of such a system. In real economies, that is of course handled by governing bodies at a national level. However, science is an international effort at this stage, with many different actors. Thus, the challenge is to ensure the integrity of such a formal science economy, and whether the token system would be managed by one large journal publisher, or some group of publishers, or perhaps a non-profit organization on behalf of scientists. Also, there is an open question of whether all publishers (journals and/or conferences) would be included, or whether a publication venue's participation in the token system would be restricted somehow. The problem is if it is not restricted, that may lead to abuse whereas small groups of scientists could setup "sham" conferences or journals to inappropriately obtain tokens. All that said, there is already some precedent for what we are suggesting, in the form of international bodies like Science Citation Index (SCI) or Webof-Science (WOS) or ORC-ID that could perhaps be used to restrict access to the token system based on some sort of quality-control, in order to prevent any abuse.

Regardless, we think the above concept is something that needs to be seriously discussed across the scientific community, as this paper and other recent papers on the topic have shown we are likely reaching a critical point in the history of science, and that scientific practices we have traditionally used in the past are no longer suitable for current conditions (Park et al., 2023).

4.4 Limitations

This study has several potential limitations. For example, the size of the datasets we scraped varied from conference to conference. There were some conferences where the datasets were very large (CHI had 17,279 rows) and some that had much smaller datasets (HRI had 3,787 rows). Variations in sample size could potentially impact any analysis results, or produce bias in the form of under-representation. The same issue occurred with the countries as well, since some countries had a larger dataset of authors and publications averse to others. We attempted to deal with that issue by using metrics that focused on ratios (Gini Index, RPD) rather than raw absolute counts.

In terms of the data within the datasets, we attempted to scrape all the available papers on the ACM digital library for a defined set of well-known ACM conferences, but there could be other conferences or papers of interest for analysis of publication bias that were not included. That might include conferences outside the ACM realm, e.g. IEEE conferences, as well as potentially journals. However, for our purposes here, the ACM Digital Library provided a high-quality source of data. Overall, though we have looked through a small subset of ACM conferences, we could get a more comprehensive analysis of publication bias by adding additional conferences to any future analysis.

Finally, another limitation is regarding the author affiliations, as we did not take into consideration of the author's earlier affiliations but only their affiliation at time of publication in the ACM conference. This has the possibility of skewing our results when evaluating various groupings of scientists. With the authors, we also deliberately overlooked varying levels of contribution such as 1st author, 2nd author, 3rd author, and so on. The results may be different if only the 1st author or corresponding author was considered, for instance. Regardless, author affiliations may have affected some parts of our analysis, such as the ranking-based groupings. Though we can also not ignore the reality that there is the possibility of the ranking system used for university ranking-level to be flawed. Oftentimes, there are minute differences in the scoring and ranking of universities, but ranking agencies will capitalize on the first decimal value differences and sensationalize rankings (Soh, 2015).

4.5 Future Work

Our work has the potential to open up future exploration to find the prevalence and influence of publication bias and inequality in the scientific world, potentially creating a better "scientific ecosystem" for all scientists to produce better science for the **ultimate benefit of all humanity** rather than one group over another. However, there is still much research to be done in this area, and many unanswered questions.

At the moment, we are in the new era of AI where many are utilizing LLMs to write scientific papers. This has caused a sudden increase in scientific publications from around 2019, which raises concerns in the originality of such work but also adds pressure to peer-reviewers (as mentioned in Section 4.3). We ourselves too have noticed such increase in publications at around the same time in this study, given the number of reviews invites we receive

every week in recent years. This raises the question of whether there is any correlation between the prevalence of AI and the rise in publications. That topic is one that needs quantitative scientific investigation to verify, similar to the work presented in this paper.

On a broader scale, there are of course both "unjustified" and "justified" reasons for publication inequality, like the inequality evidenced in this paper. Yet, this raises the deeper philosophical question of what makes a reason unjustified or justified. That question takes us back to the work of Latour and Popper and others in asking what "science" really is (Dunbar, 2000; Latour, 1987; Popper, 2005). As such, further investigations would be necessary to consider the global scientific interests and whether the "unjustified" reasons are advancing science (e.g. through competition) or instead holding us back from reaching higher heights in science. Likewise, there could be further analysis in the "social network" of scientists using bibliometric techniques to identify those who belong to the so called scientific "in-crowd" clique of the ACM conferences. That could be followed by an analysis of their publication citation patterns to evaluate whether such in-group/out-group behavior in science is related to the pace of scientific advancement. For instance, it would be a relatively simple matter to look at whether a smaller, more-defined in-crowd in a field leads to a quicker pace of discovery in that field based on some evaluation metric derived from scraped Google Scholar results. The harder part would be deciding what would make for a good evaluation metric (e.g. growth in impact factor), taking into account differences across fields (Coccia, 2022).

There are a few other issues that still need to be considered in future research, such as automated tools to detect plagiarism. In order to maintain integrity of publication ethics, ACM has introduced a software named Crossref iThenticate, which can be used to check for similarity to other literature and web content (Association for Computing Machinery, n.d.). Although this is a very important tool, we must take into consideration that there is a possibility for flagged papers to create a "first impression", and this would incline the reviewers to possibly reject them unfairly. Research could investigate more sophisticated ways of looking for plagiarism or unethical publication practices. Along the same lines, for semantic similarity across publications we used SBERT in our analysis here. However, to catch the even subtler differences among the topics across various conferences/journals, a fine-tuned model could be used, especially if those conferences/journals have defined set of topics for their CFPs. For instance, one can fine-tune a base model, such as SciBERT, on the datasets first to make the model more sensitive (Beltagy & Cohan, 2019). That, however, will require significant resources such as GPUs and large storage spaces, so future research could explore the tradeoff between sensitivity and computational resources for that use case.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank our many research collaborators for their thoughtful discussions on this topic prior to this publication, as well as some of our colleagues in South Korea who contributed to the initial idea behind this research.

References

- [1] Abramo, G., D'Angelo, C. A., & Soldatenkova, A. (2016). The dispersion of the citation distribution of top scientists' publications. *Scientometrics*, 109(3), 1711–1724. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-016-2143-7
- [2] Adams, J. (2013). The fourth age of research. *Nature*, 497(7451), 557–560.
 https://doi.org/10.1038/497557a
- [3] Allesina, S. (2011). Measuring Nepotism through Shared Last Names: The Case of Italian Academia. *PLoS ONE*, 6(8), e21160. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0021160
- [4] Association for Computing Machinery. (n.d.). *Proceedings*. ACM Special Interest Groups. Retrieved January 16, 2025, from https://www.acm.org/special-interest-groups/volunteer-resources/conference-planning/proceedings
- [5] Beltagy, I., Lo, K., & Cohan, A. (2019). SciBERT: A Pretrained Language Model for Scientific Text. *ArXiv*. https://arxiv.org/abs/1903.10676

- [6] Bentley, P. J. (2014). Cross-country differences in publishing productivity of academics in research universities. *Scientometrics*, 102(1), 865–883. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-014-1430-4
- [7] Boell, S. K., & Wilson, C. S. (2010). Journal Impact Factors for evaluating scientific performance: use of h-like indicators. *Scientometrics*, 82(3), 613–626. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-010-0175-y
- [8] Bornmann, L., & Mutz, R. (2015). Growth rates of modern science: A bibliometric analysis based on the number of publications and cited references. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 66(11), 2215-2222.
- [9] Brundy, C., & Thornton, J. B. (2024). The paper mill crisis is a five-alarm fire for science: what can librarians do about it? *Insights the UKSG Journal*, *37*. https://doi.org/10.1629/uksg.659
- [10] Candal-Pedreira, C., Ross, J. S., Ruano-Ravina, A., Egilman, D. S., Fernández, E., & Pérez-Ríos, M. (2022). Retracted papers originating from paper mills: cross sectional study. *BMJ*, e071517. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj-2022-071517
- [11] Chambers, H. (2024). Unmasking the fraud: How paper mills are undermining scientific publishing. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology*. https://doi.org/10.1111/dmcn.15997
- [12] Cheng, S. K. (1990). Understanding the culture and behaviour of East Asians--a Confucian perspective. *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 24(4), 510–515. https://doi.org/10.3109/00048679009062907
- [13] Chiang, J.-T. (1990). Producing "national champions" in technology through deliberate strategic decisions. *Technology in Society*, 12(3), 235–254. https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-791x(90)90018-8
- [14] Christopher, J. (2021). The raw truth about paper mills. FEBS Letters, 595(13), 1751–1757. https://doi.org/10.1002/1873-3468.14143
- [15] Coccia, M. (2022). Probability of discoveries between research fields to explain scientific and technological change. *Technology in Society*, 68, 101874.
- [16] Cole, T. J., & Altman, D. G. (2017). Statistics Notes: What is a percentage difference? *BMJ*, *j3663*. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.j3663
- [17] Day, A. (2022). Exploratory analysis of text duplication in peer-review reveals peer-review fraud and paper mills. *Scientometrics*, *127*(10), 5965-5987.
- [18] Do, C. H. (2021). Progress of Ethical Issues in Science and Technology in South Korea. *In International Ethics in Chemistry: Developing Common Values across Cultures* (pp. 215-226). American Chemical Society.
- [19] Doering, S., Probert-Lindström, S., Ehnvall, A., Wiktorsson, S., Nina Palmqvist Öberg, Bergqvist, E., Stefenson, A., Jesper Fransson, Åsa Westrin, & Margda Waern. (2024). Anxiety symptoms preceding suicide: A Swedish nationwide record review. *Journal of Affective Disorders (Print)*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2024.03.118
- [20] Drozdz, J. A., & Ladomery, M. R. (2024). The peer review process: past, present, and future. *British Journal of Biomedical Science*, 81, 12054.

- [21] Dunbar, K. (2000). How scientists think in the real world: Implications for science education. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 21(1), 49-58.
- [22] Else, H., & Van Noorden, R. (2021). The fight against fake-paper factories that churn out sham science. *Nature*, *591*(7851), 516-520.
- [23] Franzoni, C., Scellato, G., & Stephan, P. (2011). Changing incentives to publish. *Science*, 333(6043), 702–703. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1197286
- [24] Gray, A. (2024). ChatGPT "contamination": estimating the prevalence of LLMs in the scholarly literature. ArXiv.org. https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.16887
- [25] Gui, Q., Liu, C., & Du, D. (2019). Globalization of science and international scientific collaboration: A network perspective. *Geoforum*, 105, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2019.06.017
- [26] Han, Q. (2019). Scientific Culture: Its Western Origin and its Context in Modern China. *Cultures of Science*, 2(1), 5-8. https://doi.org/10.1177/209660831900200101
- [27] Harzing, A.-W., & Giroud, A. (2014). The competitive advantage of nations: An application to academia. *Journal of Informetrics*, 8(1), 29–42. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2013.10.007
- [28] Holladay, A. M. (1953). Some secrets to science's success. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *31*(2), 79–85. https://doi.org/10.1080/01619565309536462
- [29] Horta, H., & Li, H. (2023). Nothing but publishing: The overriding goal of PhD students in mainland China, Hong Kong, and Macau. *Studies in Higher Education*, 48(2), 263-282.
- [30] Hurtado Martín, G., Schockaert, S., Cornelis, C., & Naessens, H. (2013). Using semi-structured data for assessing research paper similarity. *Information Sciences*, 221, 245–261. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ins.2012.09.044
- [31] Hyland, K. (2023). Enter the dragon: China and global academic publishing. *Learned Publishing*, *36*(3), 394–403. https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1545
- [32] Ioannidis, J. P. (2005). Why most published research findings are false. PLoS medicine, 2(8), e124.
- [33] Jordan, J. M., Meador, M., & Walters, S. J. (1989). Academic research productivity, department size and organization: Further results. *Journal of Higher Education* 8(4), 345–352. https://doi.org/10.1016/0272-7757(89)90020-4
- [34] Jung, H., & Mah, J. S. (2014). The Role of the Government in Science and Technology Education of Korea. Science, Technology and Society, 19(2), 199–227. https://doi.org/10.1177/0971721814529877
- [35] Kendall, G., & da Silva, J. A. T. (2024). Risks of abuse of large language models, like ChatGPT, in scientific publishing: Authorship, predatory publishing, and paper mills. *Learned Publishing*, 37(1), 55-62.
- [36] Kim, D. H., & Bak, H. J. (2016). How do scientists respond to performance-based incentives? Evidence from South Korea. *International Public Management Journal*, 19(1), 31-52.
- [37] Kim, E., Jeong, D. Y. (2023). Comparison of the open access status and metrics of Scopus journals published in East Asian countries: a descriptive study. *Science Editing*, *10*(1), 57–63.

- [38] Kim, S. (2010). From brain drain to brain competition: Changing opportunities and the career patterns of US-trained Korean academics. In C. T. Clotfelter (Ed.), *American universities in a global market* (pp. 335–369). University of Chicago Press.
- [39] Kim, T. (2009). Confucianism, Modernities and Knowledge: China, South Korea and Japan. *International Handpaper of Comparative Education* 857–872. https://doi.org/107362073/s200_terri
- [40] King, D. A. (2004). The scientific impact of nations. *Nature*, 430(6997), 311–316. https://doi.org/10.1038/430311a
- [41] Klinger, J., Mateos-Garcia, J., & Stathoulopoulos, K. (2020). A narrowing of AI research? SSRN Electronic Journal. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3698698
- [42] Latour, B. (1987). Science in action: How to follow scientists and engineers through society. Harvard University Press.
- [43] Lee, H., & Lee, K. (2013). Publish (in international indexed journals) or perish: Neoliberal ideology in a Korean university. *Language Policy*, 12(3), 215–230. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-012-9267-2
- [44] Lotka, A. J. (1926). "The frequency distribution of scientific productivity". *Journal of the Washington Academy of Sciences*. *16* (12): 317–324.
- [45] Lutmar, C., & Reingewertz, Y. (2021). Academic in-group bias in the top five economics journals. *Scientometrics*, 126(12), 9543–9556. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-021-04174-9
- [46] Mahinpei, R. (2020). A Comparative Analysis of the Gini Index. *STEM Fellowship Journal*, 6(1), 34–52. https://doi.org/10.17975/sfj-2020-010
- [47] Malcom, D. (2018). It's time we fix the peer review system. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 82(5).
- [48] McCook, A. (2006). Is peer review broken? Submissions are up, reviewers are overtaxed, and authors are lodging complaint after complaint about the process at top-tier journals. What's wrong with peer review? *The Scientist*, 20(2), 26-35.
- [49] Mckie, R. (2024). 'The situation has become appalling': fake scientific papers push research credibility to crisis point. *Sat*, *3*, 11-00.
- [50] Min, C., Zhao, Y., Bu, Y., Ding, Y., & Wagner, C. S. (2023). Has China caught up to the US in AI research? An exploration of mimetic isomorphism as a model for late industrializers. ArXiv.org. https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.10198
- [51] Mohan, V. (2019). On the use of blockchain-based mechanisms to tackle academic misconduct. *Research Policy*, 48(9), 103805.
- [52] National Science Board. (2022). *Science and engineering indicators 2022*. National Science Foundation. https://ncses.nsf.gov/pubs/nsb20225/
- [53] Nature Publishing Group. (2024). 2024 research leaders: Leading institutions. *Nature News*. Retrieved from https://www.nature.com/nature-index/research-leaders/2024/institution/all/all/global
- [54] Nishioka, C., Färber, M., & Tarek Saier. (2022). How does author affiliation affect preprint citation count? *ArXiv*. https://doi.org/10.1145/3529372.3530953

- [55] Pao, M. L. (1986). An empirical examination of Lotka's law. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 37(1), 26–33. https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.4630370105
- [56] Park, M., Leahey, E., & Funk, R. J. (2023). Papers and patents are becoming less disruptive over time. *Nature*, 613(7942), 138-144.
- [57] Parker, L., Boughton, S., Bero, L., & Byrne, J. A. (2024). Paper Mill challenges: past, present and future. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 111549–111549. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2024.111549
- [58] Partha, D., & David, P. A. (1994). Toward a new economics of science. Research policy, 23(5), 487-521.
- [59] Patel, J. (2022). Practical tips on managing paper mills. Committee on Publication Ethics.
- [60] Popper, K. (2005). The Logic of Scientific Discovery. Routledge.
- [61] Quan, W., Chen, B., & Shu, F. (2017). Publish or impoverish: An investigation of the monetary reward system of science in China (1999-2016). *arXiv Preprint*.
- [62] Raoult, V. (2020). How many papers should scientists be reviewing? An analysis using verified peer review reports. *Publications*, 8(1), 4.
- [63] Ravenscroft, J., Liakata, M., Clare, A., & Duma, D. (2017). Measuring scientific impact beyond academia: An assessment of existing impact metrics and proposed improvements. *PloS one*, *12*(3), e0173152.
- [64] Reimers, N., & Gurevych, I. (2019). Sentence-BERT: Sentence Embeddings using Siamese BERT-Networks. arXiv Preprint. https://arxiv.org/pdf/1908.10084
- [65] Reshetnikova, M., Pugacheva, I., & Evseevicheva, A. (2021). China or South Korea: a comparative analysis of innovative development. E3S Web of Conferences, 295, 01060. https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202129501060
- [66] Rouan, J., Velazquez, G., Freischlag, J., & Kibbe, M. R. (2021). Publication bias is the consequence of a lack of diversity, equity, and inclusion. *Journal of Vascular Surgery*, 74(2), 111S117S. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvs.2021.03.049
- [67] Shin, E.-J. (2019). Journal publishing and authorship in library and information science by early career researchers in South Korea. *Journal of Information Science Theory and Practice*, 7(1). https://doi.org/10.1633/JISTaP.2019.7.1.1
- [68] Soh, K. (2015). What the Overall doesn't tell about world university rankings: examples from ARWU, QSWUR, and THEWUR in 2013. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *37*(3), 295–307. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080x.2015.1035523
- [69] Spearpoint, M. (2017). A proposed currency system for academic peer review payments using the blockchain technology. *Publications*, *5*(3), 19.
- [70] Stephan, P. E. (1996). The economics of science. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 34(3), 1199-1235.
- [71] Tang, G., Cai, H., & Jia, J. (2022). Status bias in Chinese scholarly publishing: an exploratory study based on mixed methods. *Accountability in Research*, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2022.2117621
- [72] Tian, M., Su, Y., & Ru, X. (2016). Perish or Publish in China: Pressures on Young Chinese Scholars to Publish in Internationally Indexed Journals. *Publications*, 4(2), 9. https://doi.org/10.3390/publications4020009

- [73] Togelius, J., & Yannakakis, Georgios N. (2023). Choose Your Weapon: Survival Strategies for Depressed AI Academics. *ArXiv.org*. https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.06035
- [74] U.S. News & World Report. (2024). The best universities in the world for computer science. *Best Global Universities for Computer Science*. Retrieved from https://www.usnews.com/education/best-global-universities/computer-science
- [75] Van Dalen, H. P. (2021). How the publish-or-perish principle divides a science: The case of economists. *Scientometrics*, *126*(2), 1675-1694.
- [76] Van den Besselaar, P., Hemlin, S., & Van der Weijden, I. (2012). Collaboration and Competition in Research. *Higher Education Policy*, 25(3), 263–266. https://doi.org/10.1057/hep.2012.16
- [77] Voit, E. O. (2019). Perspective: Dimensions of the scientific method. *PLOS Computational Biology, 15*(9), e1007279. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1007279
- [78] Woolston, C. (2020). South Korean institutions lure global talent. *Nature*, *581*(7809), S66–S67. https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-020-01467-6
- [79] Yoo, T. (2018). It's Madness: The Politics of Mental Health in Colonial Korea [Review of *It's Madness: The Politics of Mental Health in Colonial Korea*]. Yonsei University.

 health-in-colonial-korea
- [80] Zhang, L. & Sivertsen, G. (2020). The new research assessment reform in China and its implementation. Scholarly Assessment Reports, 2(1). https://doi.org/10.29024/sar.15
- [81] Zhong, B., & Liu, X. (2022). Preserving credibility of open access journals. Science, 378(6617), 257-257.

Appendix A.

Table A1

Author First Name	Author Last Name	Affiliation	Gini Index
Andi	Peng	MIT, Cambridge, MA, USA	0.9167
Cloe	Emnett	Colorado School of Mines, Golden, CO, USA	0.9167
Philip	Stafford	Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA	0.9167
Mark	Higger	Colorado School of Mines, Golden, CO, USA	0.9167
		Collaborative Robotics and Intelligent Systems Institute, Oregon	
Theing	Oo	State University, Corvallis, OR, USA	0.9167
Gregory	LeMasurier Gorostiaga	University of Massachusetts Lowell, Lowell, MA, USA	0.9167
Geronimo	Zubizarreta	Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA	0.9167
Lisa	Scherf	Technische Universität Darmstadt, Darmstadt, Germany	0.9167
Dorothea	Koert	Technische Universität Darmstadt, Darmstadt, Germany	0.9167
Eileen	Roesler	George Mason University, Fairfax, VA, USA	0.9167
Arsha	Ali	University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA	0.9167
Fares	Abawi	University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany	0.9167
Philipp	Allgeuer	University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany	0.9167
Di	Fu	University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany	0.9167
Stefan	Wermter	University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany	0.9167
Alex	Chow	University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, USA	0.9167
		Department of Sciences and Methods for Engineering, University of	
Valeria	Villani	Modena and Reggio Emilia, Reggio Emilia, Italy	0.9167
	6.1	Department of Sciences and Methods for Engineering, University of	0.04.67
Lorenzo	Sabattini	Modena and Reggio Emilia, Reggio Emilia, Italy	0.9167
Raphaelle	Roy	Fédération ENAC ISAE-SUPAERO ONERA, Université de Toulouse, Toulouse, France	0.9167
Napriaerie	КОУ	Fédération ENAC ISAE-SUPAERO ONERA, Université de Toulouse,	0.9107
Anke	Brock	Toulouse, France	0.9167
Liubove	Orlov Savko	Rice University, Houston, TX, USA	0.9167
Zhiqin	Qian	Rice University, Houston, TX, USA	0.9167
Gregory	Gremillion	Army Research Laboratory, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, USA	0.9167
Catherine	Neubauer	Army Research Laboratory, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, USA	0.9167
Andres	Ramirez Duque	University of Glasgow, Glasgow, United Kingdom	0.9167
Josh	Bhagat Smith	Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR, USA	0.9167
Prakash	Baskaran	Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR, USA	0.9167
Kota	Nieda	Nara Institute of Science and Technology, Ikoma, Japan	0.9167
Dawn	Tilbury	University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA	0.9167
		Faculty of Science and Engineering, Pontificia Universidad Catolica	
Dante	Arroyo	del Peru, Lima, Peru	0.9167
	_	Institut de Robòtica i Informàtica Industrial, CSIC-UPC, Barcelona,	.
Cristian	Barrue	Spain	0.9167

		Institut de Robòtica i Informàtica Industrial, CSIC-UPC, Barcelona,	
Guillem	Alenya	Spain	0.9167
Adel	Baselizadeh	Department of Informatics, University of Oslo, OSLO, Norway	0.9167
Diana	Lindblom	Department of Informatics, University of Oslo, OSLO, Norway	0.9167
		Department of Informatics, University of Oslo & RITMO Centrer for	
		Interdisciplinary Studies in Rhythm, Time and Motion, University of	
Jim	Torresen	Oslo, OSLO, Norway	0.9167
		Skolkovo Institute of Science and Technology, Moscow, Russian	
Artem	Bazhenov	Federation	0.9167
		Skolkovo Institute of Science and Technology, Moscow, Russian	
Vladimir	Berman	Federation	0.9167
		Skolkovo Institute of Science and Technology, Moscow, Russian	
Artem	Lykov	Federation	0.9167
		Skolkovo Institute of Science and Technology, Moscow, Russian	
Dzmitry	Tsetserukou	Federation	0.9167
Director	Van Dauman	Expertise Centre for Digital Media, UHasselt - Flanders Make,	0.0167
Bram	Van Deurzen	Diepenbeek, Belgium Evperties Contro for Digital Media, LIHasselt Elanders Make	0.9167
Kris	Luyten	Expertise Centre for Digital Media, UHasselt - Flanders Make, Diepenbeek, Belgium	0.9167
KHS	Luyten	Université de Sherbrooke, Research Center of Aging & Université de	0.9107
		Sherbrooke, Interdisciplinary Institute for Technological Innovation,	
Adina	Panchea	Sherbrooke, QC, Canada	0.9167
, tama	Tanenca	School of Information, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas,	0.5107
Yao-Cheng	Chan	USA	0.9167
Cristina	Gena	Department of Computer Science, University of Turin, Torino, Italy	0.9167
Arthi	Haripriyan	University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, USA	0.9167
Vignesh	Prasad	Technische Universität Darmstadt, Darmstadt, Germany	0.9167
V.B.16311	114544	Technische Universität Darmstadt & German Research Center for Al,	0.5107
Jan	Peters	Darmstadt, Germany	0.9167
		Technische Universität Darmstadt & Hessian Center for AI,	
Georgia	Chalvatzaki	Darmstadt, Germany	0.9167
· ·		Autonomous Systems and Robotics Lab, U2IS, ENSTA Paris, Institut	
Xiaoxuan	Hei	Polytechnique de Paris, Palaiseau, France	0.9167
		Autonomous Systems and Robotics Lab, U2IS, ENSTA Paris, Institut	
Heng	Zhang	Polytechnique de Paris, Palaiseau, France	0.9167
Eric	Nichols	Honda Research Institute Japan, Wako, Saitama, Japan	0.9167
Ayse	Dogan	Sabanci University, Istanbul, Turkey	0.9167
Shogo	Okada	Japan Advanced Institute of Science and Technology, Nomi, Japan	0.9167
Marieke	Van Otterdijk	ROBIN, RITMO, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway	0.9167
Xuezhu	Wang	Tsinghua University, Beijing, China	0.9167
Ruilin	Xiong	Tsinghua University, Beijing, China	0.9167
Xun	Cui	Tsinghua University, Beijing, China	0.9167
Bernardo	Marques	IEETA, DETI, LASI, University of Aveiro, Aveiro, Portugal	0.9167
Eurico	Pedrosa	•	0.9167
		IEETA, DETI, LASI, University of Aveiro, Aveiro, Portugal	
Tsvetomila	Mihaylova	Aalto University, Espoo, Finland	0.9167
Max	Pascher	TU Dortmund University, Dortmund, Germany	0.9167

Jens	Gerken	TU Dortmund University, Dortmund, Germany Lund University & Zittau/Görlitz University of Applied Sciences,	0.9167
Stefan	Reitmann	Lund, Sweden	0.9167
Anna	Kim	Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, USA	0.9167
Changdan	Cao	Tsinghua University, Beijing, China	0.9167
Xiangyu	Sun	Harbin Institute of Technology, Harbin, China	0.9167
Yilin	Wang	Tsinghua University, Beijing, Beijing, China	0.9167
Qingwei	Wang	Tsinghua University, Beijing, China	0.9167
Ruisi	Sun	Tsinghua University, Beijing, China	0.9167
Qi	Xin	Tsinghua University, Beijing, China	0.9167
Xinyu	Wang	Tsinghua University, Beijing, China	0.9167
Angela	Pan Ding	Tsinghua University, Beijing, China	0.9167
Zipeng	Zhang	Tsinghua University, Beijing, China	0.9167
Zihui	Chen	Tsinghua University, Beijing, China	0.9167
Aakash	Yadav	University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI, USA	0.9167
Ranjana	Mehta	University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI, USA	0.9167
Ningning	Zhang	Tsinghua University, Beijing, China	0.9167
Ziwei	Chi	Tsinghua University, Beijing, China	0.9167
Zhiling	Xu	Tsinghua University, Beijing, China	0.9167
Qi	Chen	Tsinghua University & Wuhan Textile University, Beijing, China	0.9167
Valentina	Campo	Tsinghua University, Beijing, China	0.9167
Sarah	Kriz	University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA	0.9167
Dilip	Limbu	Institute for Infocomm Research, Singapore, Singapore	0.9167
Lawrence	Por	Institute for Infocomm Research, Singapore, Singapore	0.9167
Takafumi	Matsumaru	Shizuoka University, Hamamatsu, Japan	0.9167
Yuichi	Ito	Shizuoka University, Hamamatsu, Japan	0.9167
Wataru	Saitou	Shizuoka University, Hamamatsu, Japan	0.9167
Weslie	Khoo	Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA	0.8712
Manasi	Swaminathan	Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA	0.8712
David	Crandall	Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA	0.8712
Mark-Robin	Giolando	Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR, USA	0.8712
Nathaniel	Dennler	University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA	0.8712
Lynne	Baillie	Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, United Kingdom	0.8712
Kyrie	Amon	Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA	0.8611
Reiden	Webber	Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA	0.8611
Alan	Lindsay	Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, United Kingdom	0.8611
Ronald	Petrick	Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, United Kingdom	0.8611
		Faculty of Science and Engineering, Pontificia Universidad Catolica	
Carlos	Granados	del Peru, Lima, Peru	0.8611
Jouh	Chew	Honda Research Institute Japan, Saitama, Japan	0.8611
Melissa	Donnermann	Julius-Maximilians-University Würzburg, Würzburg, Germany	0.8611
Yao	Lu	Tsinghua University, Beijing, China	0.8611
Haipeng	Mi	Tsinghua University, Beijing, China	0.8611

Mary	Foster	University of Glasgow, Glasgow, United Kingdom	0.8514
Cong	Shi	University of Miami, Miami, FL, USA	0.8452
Yanheng	Li	City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, Hong Kong	0.8452
Sawyer	Collins	Indiana University Bloomington, Bloomington, IN, USA	0.8452
Kenna	Baugus Henkel	Mississippi State University, Mississippi State, MS, USA	0.8452
		ITI, LARSYS, Instituto Superior Técnico, Universidade de Lisboa,	
Patricia	Piedade	Lisbon, Portugal	0.8452
Alyssa	Hanson	Colorado School of Mines, Golden, CO, USA	0.8452
Hiroki	Sato	Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA	0.8452
Ulas	Karli	Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA	0.8452
Victor	Antony	Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA	0.8452
		Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences, Amsterdam,	
Marianne	Bossema	Netherlands	0.8452
		Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences, Amsterdam,	
Lamia	Elloumi	Netherlands	0.8452
Matthijs	Smakman Mohammed	HU University of Applied Sciences Utrecht, Utrecht, Netherlands	0.8452
Muhammad	Zaffir	Nara Institute of Science and Technology, Ikoma, Nara, Japan	0.8452
Takahiro	Wada	Nara Institute of Science and Technology, Ikoma, Nara, Japan	0.8452
		LASIGE, Faculdade de Ciências, Universidade de Lisboa, Lisboa,	
Filipa	Rocha	Portugal	0.8452
		Mixed Reality Lab, School of Computer Science, University of	
Stuart	Reeves	Nottingham, Nottingham, Nottinghamshire, United Kingdom	0.8452
Zulfiqar	Zaidi	Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA	0.8452
Arjun	Krishna	Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA	0.8452
Samia	Bhatti	University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA	0.8452
Yifei	Zhu	Colorado School of Mines, Golden, CO, USA	0.8452
Helen	Zhou	Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA	0.8452
Qiping	Zhang	Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA	0.8452
		Department of Information Technology, Uppsala University,	
Lux	Miranda	Uppsala, Sweden	0.8452
lool	Fischor	School of Computer Science, University of Nottingham, Nottingham,	0.0453
Joel	Fischer	United Kingdom	0.8452
Takuto	Akiyoshi	Nara Institute of Science and Technology, Ikoma, Japan	0.8452
Adrian	Anhuaman	Faculty of Science and Engineering, Pontificia Universidad Catolica del Peru, Lima, Peru	0.8452
Adrian	Allitualitati	Faculty of Science and Engineering, Pontificia Universidad Catolica	0.0432
Itala	Latorre	del Peru, Lima, Peru	0.8452
		Faculty of Science and Engineering, Pontificia Universidad Catolica	
Sebastian	Chion	del Peru, Lima, Peru	0.8452
		Faculty of Science and Engineering, Pontificia Universidad Catolica	
William	Meza	del Peru, Lima, Peru	0.8452
		U2IS, ENSTA Paris, IP Paris & IMT Atlantique, Lab-STICC, UMR CNRS	
Sao	Nguyen	6285, Palaiseau, 91120, France	0.8452
Jane	Stuart-Smith	University of Glasgow, Glasgow, United Kingdom	0.8452

		Institute of Visual Computing and Human-Centered Technology, HCI	
Katharina	Brunnmayr	Group, Technische Universität Wien, Vienna, Austria	0.8452
Andres	Ramirez-Duque	University of Glasgow, Glasgow, United Kingdom	0.8452
Daniel	Sidobre	CNRS, UPS, LAAS-CNRS, Université de Toulouse, Toulouse, France	0.8452
Pratyusha	Ghosh	University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, USA	0.8452
Rabeya	Jamshad	University of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA, USA	0.8452
Carl	Bettosi	Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, United Kingdom	0.8452
	Paetzel-		
Maike	Prusmann	Disney Research, Zurich, Switzerland	0.8452
		Mobility Research Division, Japan Automobile Research Institute,	
Toshihiro	Hiraoka	Tokyo, Japan	0.8452
Niko	Kleer	DFKI, Saarland Informatics Campus, Saarbrücken, Germany	0.8452
Michael	Feld	DFKI, Saarland Informatics Campus, Saarbrücken, Germany	0.8452
Kurina a	Cakai	Advanced Telecommunications Research Institute International,	0.0453
Kurima	Sakai	Keihanna Science City, Kyoto, Japan	0.8452
Rosalind	Picard	MIT Media Laboratory, Cambridge, MA, USA	0.8452
Zachary	Kaufman	Indiana University Bloomington, Bloomington, Indiana, USA	0.8452
Arinah	Karim	Indiana University Bloomington, Bloomington, Indiana, USA	0.8452
Yijie	Guo	The Future Laboratory, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China	0.8452
Sehoon	На	School of Interactive Computing, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA	0.8452
Selloon	IId	Department of Cognitive Science, Graduate School of Informatics,	0.0432
Tugce	Pekcetin	Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey	0.8452
. 0		Department of Cognitive Science, Jagiellonian University, Krakow,	
Cengiz	Acarturk	Poland	0.8452
Linda	Onnasch	Technische Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany	0.8452
Barbara	Bruno	Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Karlsruhe, Germany	0.8452
		Institute Digital Engineering, Technical University of Applied	
Fabian	Schirmer	Sciences, Würzburg-Schweinfurt, Germany	0.8452
··		DIBRIS, University of Genoa & RBCS, Italian Institute of Technology,	
Giulia	Scorza Azzara	Genoa, Italy	0.8452
loo Hyun	Cong	Cognitive, Linguistic, and Psychological Sciences, Brown University,	0.8452
Joo-Hyun Shenando	Song Stals	Providence, RI, USA Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, United Kingdom	0.8452
Isobel		•	0.8452
	Voysey Vrins	University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, United Kingdom	0.8452
Anita Ethel		Tilburg University, Tilburg, Netherlands	0.8452
Caterina	Pruss	Tilburg University, Tilburg, Netherlands	
	Ceccato	Tilburg University, Tilburg, Netherlands	0.8452
Jos	Prinsen	Tilburg University, Tilburg, Netherlands	0.8452
Leimin	Tian	Faculty of Engineering, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia Art and Design Department, Pontifical Catholic University of Peru,	0.8452
Jose	Cortazar	Lima, Peru	0.8452
3030	Contazai	King's Mongkut University of Technology Thonburi, Bangkok,	0.0402
Chacharin	Lertyosbordin	Thailand	0.8452
Teeratas	Asavareongchai	Shrewsbury International School Bangkok, Bangkok, Thailand	0.8452
		2 2 2 2 2 7	

Nichaput	Khurukitwanit	Shrewsbury International School Bangkok, Bangkok, Thailand	0.8452
Sirin	Liukasemsarn	Darunsikkhalai School, bangkok, Bangkok, Thailand	0.8452
Frederic	Delaunay	University of Plymouth, Plymouth, United Kingdom	0.8452
Joachim	de Greeff	University of Plymouth, Plymouth, United Kingdom	0.8452
P.	De Silva	Toyohashi University of Technology, Toyohashi, Japan	0.8452
Yuta	Yoshiike	Toyohashi University of Technology, Toyohashi, Japan	0.8452
Christian	Kroos	University of Western Sydney, Sydney, Australia	0.8452
Greg	Mori	Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, BC, Canada	0.8452
Richard	Vaughan	Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, BC, Canada	0.8452
Kate	Candon	Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA	0.8377
Minja	Axelsson	University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom	0.8333
Mirjam	De Haas	HU University of Applied Sciences, Utrecht, Netherlands	0.8333
Joshua	Zonca	CONTACT Unit, Italian Institute of Technology, Genoa, Italy	0.8333
Nialah	Wilson-Small	New York University, Brooklyn, NY, USA	0.8333
Kirstin	Petersen	Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA	0.8333
Qiaoqiao	Ren	Ghent University - imec, Ghent, Belgium	0.8333
Natasha	Randall	Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA	0.8333
Patric	Jensfelt	KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden	0.8333
Sjoerd	Hendriks	Chalmers University of Technology, Gothenburg, Sweden	0.8333
Wei-Chu	Chen	Indiana University Bloomington, Bloomington, IN, USA	0.8333
Nguyen	Tuyen	King's College London, London, United Kingdom	0.8333
Tibor	Bosse	Radboud University, Nijmegen, Netherlands	0.8333
Hanyang	Hu	Tsinghua University, Beijing, China	0.8333
Mengyu	Chen	Tsinghua University, Beijing, China	0.8333
Ruhan	Wang	Tsinghua University, Beijing, China	0.8333
Zhilong	Zhao	Tsinghua University, Beijing, China	0.8333
Yanran	Chen	Tsinghua University, Beijing, China	0.8333
Qingyu	Hu	Tsinghua University, Beijing, China	0.8333
Siran	Ma	Tsinghua University, Beijing, China	0.8333
Houze	Li	Tsinghua University, Beijing, China	0.8333
Aryaman	Pandya	Motional, Boston, MA, USA	0.8333
Paul	Schmitt	MassRobotics, Boston, MA, USA	0.8333
Dian	Lv	Tsinghua University, Beijing, China	0.8333
Jirui	Liu	Tsinghua University, Beijing, China	0.8333
Jiancheng	Zhong	Tsinghua University, Beijing, China	0.8333
Zhiyao	Ma	Tsinghua University, Beijing, China	0.8333
Seong	Lee	Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA	0.8333
Nicholas	Britten	Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA, USA	0.8333
Aksel	Holmgren	Linköping University, Linköping, Sweden	0.8333
Max	Pettersson	Linköping University, Linköping, Sweden	0.8333
Arna	Aimysheva	Nazarbayev University, Astana, Kazakhstan	0.8333
Maria	Insuasty	Universidad del Rosario, Bogota, Colombia	0.8333
Yahan	Xie	Tsinghua University, Beijing, China	0.8333
Tanan	AIC	Tombrida Ornversity, Deljing, Crima	0.0333

Hanhui	Yang	Tsinghua University, Beijing, China	0.8333
Jing	Huang	Tsinghua University, Beijing, China	0.8333
Jing	Wang	Tsinghua University, Beijing, China	0.8333
Hanxuan	Li	Tsinghua University, Beijing, China	0.8333
Sebastian	Caballa	Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, Lima, Peru	0.8333
Eleanor	Avrunin	Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA	0.8333
		Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Lausanne, Lausanne,	
Eric	Sauser	Switzerland	0.8333
		Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Lausanne, Lausanne,	
Aude	Billard	Switzerland	0.8333
Antonio	Andriella	Pal Robotics, Barcelona, Spain	0.8141
Leigh	Levinson	Indiana University Bloomington, Bloomington, IN, USA	0.8095
Long-Jing	Hsu	Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA	0.8081
laabal	Note	INESC-ID, Instituto Superior Técnico, Universidade de Lisboa, Lisbon,	0.0017
Isabel	Neto	Portugal	0.8017
Aida	Amirova	Nazarbayev University, Astana, Kazakhstan Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya - BarcelonaTech (UPC) &	0.8007
		Institut de Robòtica i Informàtica Industrial (CSIC-UPC), Barcelona,	
Alberto	Sanfeliu	Spain	0.7955
		UCL Interaction Centre, Computer Science Department, University	
Chuang	Yu	College London, London, United Kingdom	0.7955
Nurziya	Oralbayeva	Nazarbayev University, Astana, Kazakhstan	0.7939
		National Institute of Advanced Industrial Science and Technology,	
Ayaka	Fujii	Tokyo, Japan	0.7917
Laura	Kunold	Ruhr University Bochum, Bochum, Germany	0.7917
Selen	Akay	Sabanci University, Istanbul, Turkey	0.7917
Paul	Schermerhorn	Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA	0.7917
		ITI, LARSYS, Instituto Superior Técnico, Universidade de Lisboa,	
Hugo	Nicolau	Lisbon, Portugal	0.7885
Andrew	Schoen	University of Wisconsin - Madison, Madison, WI, USA	0.7885
Ruben	Janssens	IDLab - AIRO, Ghent University - imec, Ghent, Belgium	0.7885
Connor	Esterwood	University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA	0.7833
Lionel	Robert	University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA	0.7833
Fainan	71	Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim,	0.7022
Feiran	Zhang	Norway	0.7833
Oriana	Ferrari	Eindhoven University of Technology, Eindhoven, Netherlands	0.7833
Hidenobu	Sumioka	ATR, Kyoto, Japan	0.7833
Kim	Baraka	Free University Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands	0.7803
Frank	Broz	Intelligent Systems, Delft University of Technology, Delft, Netherlands	0.7767
Hank	DIOZ	Computer Sciences Department, University of Wisconsin - Madison,	0.7707
Bengisu	Cagiltay	Madison, WI, USA	0.7717
Dakota	Sullivan	University of Wisconsin - Madison, Madison, WI, USA	0.7717
	-	School of Computing and Augmented Intelligence, Arizona State	
Mudit	Verma	University, Tempe, AZ, USA	0.7717

		Department of Management Information Systems, National	
Yu-Wen	Chang	Chengchi University, Taipei, Taiwan	0.7717
Ching-Chih	Tsao	Cornell Tech, New York, New York, USA	0.7717
		Institut de Robòtica i Informàtica Industrial (CSIC-UPC), Barcelona,	
J.	Dominguez-Vidal	Spain	0.7717
Takashi	Minato	RIKEN, Seika-cho, Japan	0.7717
Hirokazu	Kato	Nara Institute of Science and Technology, Ikoma, Japan	0.7717
Saurav	Singh	Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, New York, USA	0.7717
Jamison	Heard	Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, New York, USA	0.7717
Kumar	Akash	Honda Research Institute USA, Inc., San Jose, CA, USA	0.7717
Teruhisa	Misu	Honda Research Institute USA, Inc., San Jose, CA, USA	0.7717
Keiichi	Yamazaki	Saitama University, Saitama, Japan	0.7717
		University of California, San Diego & VA San Diego Healthcare	
Elizabeth	Twamley	System, San Diego, CA, USA	0.7667
Elior	Carsenti	milab, Reichman University, Herzliya, Israel	0.7667
Nathan	White	University of Wisconsin - Madison, Madison, WI, USA	0.7667
Angelique	Taylor	Cornell University, New York City, NY, USA	0.7667
Hannen	Wolfe	Colby College, Waterville, ME, USA	0.7667
Chao	Zhang	Eindhoven University of Technology, Eindhoven, Netherlands	0.7667
Mohammad	Yasar	University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA, USA	0.7667
Md	Islam	AWS Generative Al Innovation Center, Seattle, WA, USA	0.7667
		New England Robotics Validation and Experimentation (NERVE)	
Adam	Norton	Center, University of Massachusetts Lowell, Lowell, MA, USA	0.7667
Lorenzo	Ferrini	PAL Robotics & Technische Universität Wien, Barcelona, Spain	0.7667
		Technical Faculty of IT and Design, Aalborg University, Aalborg,	
Matthias	Rehm	Denmark	0.7667
Sara	Cooper	Honda Research Institute Japan, Wako, Japan	0.7667
Ruth	Stock-Homburg	Technische Universität Darmstadt, Darmstadt, Germany	0.7667
		Al Research Center, National Institute of Advanced Industrial	0.7667
Kristiina	Jokinen	Science and Technology, Tokyo, Japan	0.7667
Graham	Wilcock	CDM Interact & University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland	0.7667
Nadine	Reissner	KUKA Deutschland GmbH, Augsburg, Germany	0.7667
N 4 a + + h : a a	Van de	Chair for Human-Centered Artificial Intelligence, University of	0.7667
Matthias	Kraus	Augsburg, Augsburg, Germany	0.7667
Sabahat	Bagci	Sabanci University, Istanbul, Türkiye	0.7667
Eleonore	Lumer	Digital Linguistics Lab, Bielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany	0.7667
Hendrik	Buschmeier	Digital Linguistics Lab, Bielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany	0.7667
Yi	Zhao	Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning, The University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia	0.7667
Akihiro		Shizuoka University, Shizuoka, Japan	0.7667
ANIIIIU	Maehigashi	Adaptive Systems Group, Humboldt-Universitaet zu Berlin, Berlin,	0.7007
Verena	Hafner	Germany	0.7667
		Grado Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, Virginia	0.7007
Jiayuan	Dong	Tech, Blacksburg, VA, USA	0.7667
-	-		

		Department of Human Development and Family Science, Virginia	
Shuqi	Yu	Tech, Blacksburg, VA, USA	0.7667
		Department of Human Development and Family Science, Virginia	
Koeun	Choi	Tech, Blacksburg, VA, USA	0.7667
Federica	Nenna	University of Padova, Padova, Italy	0.7667
Luciano	Gamberini	University of Padova, Padova, Italy	0.7667
Yuichiro	Fujimoto	Nara Institute of Science and Technology, Ikoma, Japan	0.7667
Marc-	Mahauw	Interdisciplinary Institute for Technological Innovation, Université	0.7667
Antoine	Maheux	de Sherbrooke, Sherbrooke, QC, Canada Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Psycholinguistics, Paderborn	0.7667
Nils	Tolksdorf	University, Paderborn, Germany	0.7667
	romodori	Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Psycholinguistics, Paderborn	0.7007
Katharina	Rohlfing	University, Paderborn, Germany	0.7667
Elliott	Hauser	School of Information, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, USA	0.7667
Thomas	Demeester	IDLab, Ghent University - imec, Ghent, Belgium	0.7667
Christopher	Peters	KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden	0.7667
Benjamin	Dossett	University of Denver, Denver, CO, USA	0.7667
Paul	Rybski	Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA	0.7667
Bryan	Morse	Brigham Young University, Provo, UT, USA	0.7667
Rehj	Cantrell	Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA	0.7667
Yuichiro	Yoshikawa	Osaka University, Toyonaka, Osaka, Japan	0.7661
Micol	Spitale	Politecnico di Milano, Milan, Italy	0.7655
Soyon	Kim	University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, USA	0.7652
Danilo	Gallo	Naver Labs Europe, Grenoble, France	0.7652
Tommaso	Colombino	Naver Labs Europe, Grenoble, France	0.7652
	Gonzalez-	•	
Shreepriya	Jimenez	Naver Labs Europe, Meylan, France	0.7652
Cecile	Boulard	Naver Labs Europe, Grenoble, France	0.7652
Marius	Hoggenmuller	The University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia	0.7652
Erin	Hedlund-Botti	Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA	0.7652
Kaisa	Vaananen	Tampere University, Tampere, Finland	0.7652
Stefano	Guidi	University of Siena, Siena, Italy	0.7652
Christian	Pek	KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden	0.7652
Daniel	Weber	University of Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany	0.7652
Andreas	Zell	University of Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany	0.7652
Jin	Ryu	Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA	0.7652
Rachel	Au	New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, NM, USA	0.7652
Raida	Karim	The University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA	0.7652
Hanna	Lee	The University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA	0.7652
Sara	Mongile	Italian Institute of Technology & University of Genoa, Genoa, Italy	0.7652
Ana	Tanevska	Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden	0.7652
James	Berzuk	University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Canada	0.7652
Seonghee	Lee	Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA	0.7652
Leon	Bodenhagen	University of Southern Denmark, Odense, Denmark	0.7652

Javier	Laplaza	Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, Barcelona, Spain	0.7652
Tobiaz	Paulsson	Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden	0.7652
Mengyu	Zhong	Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden	0.7652
Daniella	DiPaola	Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA	0.7652
		Institut de Robòtica i Informàtica industrial (CSIC-UPC), Barcelona,	
Nicolas	Rodriguez	Spain	0.7652
Jonas	Jorgensen	University of Southern Denmark, Odense, Denmark	0.7652
Ali	Ayub	University of Waterloo, Waterloo, ON, Canada	0.7652
Cheng-Yi	Tang	National Chengchi University, Taipei, Taiwan Roc	0.7652
Shamil	Sarmonov	Nazarbayev University, Astana, Kazakhstan	0.7652
Aidar	Shakerimov	Nazarbayev University, Astana, Kazakhstan	0.7652
Jules	van Gurp	Eindhoven University of Technology, Eindhoven, Netherlands	0.7652
Johan	Michalove	Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA	0.7652
Roberto	Raez	Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, Lima, Peru	0.7652
Andreas	Kolling	University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, USA	0.7652
Yoshinori	Kobayashi	Saitama University & JST, PRESTO, Saitama, Japan	0.7652
Yoshinori	Kuno	Saitama University, Saitama, Japan	0.7652
Michael	Gielniak	Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA	0.7652
Maria	Parreira	KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden	0.7567
Alexandra	Bejarano	Colorado School of Mines, Golden, CO, USA	0.7564
Vivienne	Chi	Brown University, Providence, RI, USA	0.7500
Bryce	Ikeda	University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA	0.7500
Tariq	Iqbal	University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA, USA	0.7500
		Dalle Molle Institute for Artificial Intelligence (IDSIA) USI-SUPSI,	
Antonio	Paolillo	Lugano, Switzerland	0.7500
		School of Computer Science, University of Nottingham, Nottingham,	
Eike	Schneiders	United Kingdom	0.7500
		Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya - BarcelonaTech (UPC) & Institut de Robòtica i Informàtica Industrial (CSIC-UPC), Barcelona,	
Anais	Garrell	Spain	0.7500
Robin	Murphy	Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, USA	0.7500
Eva	Wiese	Technische Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany	0.7500
Nazerke	Rakhymbayeva	Nazarbayev University, Astana, Kazakhstan	0.7500
Kolja	Kuhnlenz	Coburg University of Applied Sciences and Arts, Coburg, Germany	0.7500
Kolju	Sarmiento	cobarg offiversity of Applica sciences and Arts, cobarg, definiting	0.7500
Lucia	Calderon	Pontifical Catholic University of Peru, Lima, Peru	0.7500
Leonardo	Gomez Hormaza	Pontifical Catholic University of Peru, Lima, Peru	0.7500
Ornnalin	Phaijit	University of New South Wales, Sydney, NSW, Australia	0.7500
Claude	Sammut	University of New South Wales, Sydney, NSW, Australia	0.7500
Katrina	Ling	New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, NM, USA	0.7500
Katie	Seaborn	Tokyo Institute of Technology, Tokyo, Japan	0.7500
Peter	Pennefather	gDial, Inc., Toronto, ON, Canada	0.7500
		U.S. National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg,	
Vinh	Nguyen	MD, USA	0.7500

Yuga	Adachi	University of Tsukuba, Tsukuba, Japan	0.7500
Carmen	Espinoza	Pontifical Catholic University of Peru, Lima, Peru	0.7500
Andres	Alamo	Pontifical Catholic University of Peru, Lima, Peru	0.7500
Daniel	Bambusek	Brno University of Technology, Brno, Czech Rep	0.7500
Zdenek	Materna	Brno University of Technology, Brno, Czech Rep	0.7500
Michal	Kapinus	Brno University of Technology, Brno, Czech Rep	0.7500
Vitezslav	Beran	Brno University of Technology, Brno, Czech Rep	0.7500
Pavel	Smrz	Brno University of Technology, Brno, Czech Rep	0.7500
Phani	Singamaneni	LAAS-CNRS, Toulouse, France	0.7500
	J	University of Glasgow & Macquarie University, Glasgow, United	
Emily	Cross	Kingdom	0.7500
Ayumu	Kawahara	University of Tsukuba, Tsukuba, Japan	0.7500
Wing-ting	Law	Hong Kong Productivity Council, Hong Kong, Hong Kong	0.7500
Ki-sing	Li	Hong Kong Productivity Council, Hong Kong, Hong Kong	0.7500
Kam-wah	Fan	Hong Kong Productivity Council, Hong Kong, Hong Kong	0.7500
Tiande	Mo	Hong Kong Productivity Council, Hong Kong, Hong Kong	0.7500
Chi-kin	Poon	Hong Kong Productivity Council, Hong Kong, Hong Kong	0.7500
Meriam	Moujahid	Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, United Kingdom	0.7500
Oliver	Lemon	Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, United Kingdom	0.7500
Jose	Aguas Lopes	Semasio, Edinburgh, United Kingdom	0.7500
Guy	Laban	University of Glasgow, Glasgow, United Kingdom	0.7500
Roberto	Raez Pereyra	Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, Lima, Peru	0.7500
		Delft University of Technology & Leiden University, Delft & Leiden,	
Catholijn	Jonker	Netherlands	0.7500
Bruce	Wilson	Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, United Kingdom	0.7500
Antonia	Krummheuer	Aalborg University, Aalborg, Denmark	0.7500
Nina	Riether	Bielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany	0.7500
Britta	Wrede	Bielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany	0.7500
Waki	Kamino	Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA	0.7422
Sam	Thellman	IDA, Linköping University, Linköping, Sweden	0.7422
Terran	Mott	Colorado School of Mines, Golden, CO, USA	0.7418
Yuyi	Liu	Kyoto University & ATR, Kyoto, Japan	0.7402
Norihiro	Hagita	ATR, Kyoto, Japan	0.7271
Hadas	Erel	miLab, Reichman University, Herzliya, Israel	0.7250
Franziska	Babel	Dept.of Computer Science, Linköping University, Linköping, Sweden	0.7226
Sharifa	Alghowinem	MIT Media Lab, Cambridge, MA, USA	0.7188
Kantwon	Rogers	Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA	0.7188
Mohammad	Obaid	Chalmers University of Technology, Gothenburg, Sweden	0.7188
o !:	C :	Institute of Computer Science, University of Applied Sciences Ruhr	0.7467
Carolin	Strassmann	West, Bottrop, Germany	0.7167
Sabrina	Eimler	Institute of Computer Science, University of Applied Sciences Ruhr West, Bottrop, Germany	0.7167
Maryam	Alimardani	Tilburg University, Tilburg, Netherlands	0.7107
Johannes	Kraus	Ulm University, Ulm, Germany	0.7149
JOHAIHIES	Maus	onn oniversity, onn, derinally	0.7147

Anastasia	Ostrowski	Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA	0.7130
Martin	Baumann	Ulm University, Ulm, Germany	0.7130
Tom	Ziemke	Dept. of Computer Science, Linköping University, Linköping, Sweden	0.7115
Taishi	Sawabe	Nara Institute of Science and Technology, Ikoma, Japan	0.7108
Philipp	Hock	Dept.of Computer Science, Linköping University, Linköping, Sweden	0.7024
Maria	Lupetti	Human Centred Design, TU Delft, Delft, Netherlands	0.7024
Saad	Elbeleidy	Colorado School of Mines & Peerbots, Golden, CO, USA	0.7024
Silvia	Rossi	University of Naples Federico II, Naples, Italy	0.7024
Elin	Bjorling	The University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA	0.7024
Alessandra	Rossi	University of Naples Federico II, Naples, Italy	0.7024
Eric	Rosen	Brown University, Providence, RI, USA	0.7024
		Department of Psychology, Department of Neuroscience, Bilkent	
Burcu	Urgen	University, UMRAM, Ankara, Turkey	0.6983
		Institute Digital Engineering, Technical University of Applied	
Philipp	Kranz	Sciences, Würzburg-Schweinfurt, Germany	0.6983
		Institute Digital Engineering, Technical University of Applied	
Jan	Schmitt	Sciences, Würzburg-Schweinfurt, Germany	0.6983
Tabias		Institute Digital Engineering, Technical University of Applied	0.0002
Tobias	Kaupp	Sciences, Würzburg-Schweinfurt, Germany	0.6983
Tiffany	Chen	Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA	0.6968
Charles	Kemp 	Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA	0.6968
Birgit	Lugrin	University of Würzburg, Würzburg, Germany	0.6930
Sarah	Gillet	KTH Royal Inst. of Tech., Stockholm, Sweden	0.6927
Nina	Moorman	Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA	0.6927
Ray	LC	City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, Hong Kong	0.6927
Tal	Oron-Gilad	Ben Gurion University of the Negev, Be'er Sheva, Israel University of Applied Sciences and Arts Northwestern Switzerland,	0.6927
Theresa	Schmiedel	Basel, Switzerland	0.6927
		University of Applied Sciences and Arts Northwestern Switzerland,	
Vivienne	Zhong	Basel, Switzerland	0.6927
Chrystopher	Nehaniv	University of Waterloo, Waterloo, ON, Canada	0.6927
Munjal	Desai	University of Massachusetts Lowell, Lowell, USA	0.6927
Sara	Kiesler	Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA	0.6927
Jenay	Beer	Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA Human-Centered Design, Delft University of Technology, Delft,	0.6927
Nazli	Cila	Netherlands	0.6909
Masayuki	Kanbara	Nara Institute of Science and Technology, Ikoma, Japan	0.6909
Donald	McMillan	Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden	0.6905
Sooyeon	Jeong	Northwestern University, Chicago, IL, USA	0.6905
Debasmita	Ghose	Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA	0.6905
Thomas	Beelen	University of Twente, Enschede, Netherlands	0.6905
Khiet	Truong	University of Twente, Enschede, Netherlands	0.6905
Anna-Lisa	Vollmer	Bielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany	0.6905
Kuanhao	Zheng	ATR, Kyoto, Japan	0.6905

Oskar	Palinko	University of Southern Denmark, Odense, Denmark	0.6861
Alisha	Bevins	University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, NE, USA	0.6859
Pia	Dautzenberg	RWTH Aachen University, Aachen, Germany	0.6859
Stefan	Ladwig	RWTH Aachen University, Aachen, NRW, Germany	0.6859
Adam	Stogsdill	RAISonance, Greenwood Village, CO, USA	0.6859
Grace	Clark	Colorado School of Mines, Golden, CO, USA	0.6859
Jindan	Huang	Tufts University, Medford, MA, USA	0.6859
Isaac	Sheidlower	Tufts University, Medford, MA, USA	0.6859
Minjung	Park	Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA	0.6859
Olov	Engwall	KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden	0.6859
Mariacarla	Staffa	University of Naples Parthenope, Naples, Italy	0.6859
Kei	Okada	The University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan	0.6859
Takanori	Komatsu	Meiji University, Tokyo, Japan	0.6859
Alexander	Arntz	University of Applied Sciences Ruhr West, Oberhausen, Germany	0.6859
Alexander	AIIIC	Bristol Robotics Laboratory, University of the West of England,	0.0055
Nicola	Webb	Bristol, United Kingdom	0.6859
Rahatul	Ananto	McGill University, Montreal, QC, Canada	0.6859
Rebecca	Ramnauth	Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA	0.6833
Emmanuel	Adeniran	Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA	0.6833
Michal	Lewkowicz	Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA	0.6833
Zhao	Zhao	University of Toronto Mississauga, Mississauga, ON, Canada	0.6833
Rhonda	McEwen	University of Toronto Mississauga, Mississauga, ON, Canada	0.6833
Gaspar	Melsion	KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden	0.6833
Kaitlynn	Pineda	Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA	0.6833
Jana	Tumova	KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden	0.6833
Kazuo	Hiraki	The University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan	0.6833
Victoria	Chen	Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR, USA	0.6833
Kleio	Baxevani	University of Delaware, Newark, DE, USA	0.6833
Herbert	Tanner	University of Delaware, Newark, DE, USA	0.6833
Elena	Kokkoni	University of California, Riverside, Riverside, CA, USA	0.6833
Ela	Liberman-Pincu	Ben Gurion University of the Negev, Beer Sheva, Israel	0.6833
Birthe	Nesset	Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, United Kingdom	0.6833
		Korea Institute of Robotics and Technology Convergence, Pohang,	
Juhyun	Kim	Republic of Korea	0.6833
		Korea Institute of Robotics and Technology Convergence, Pohang,	
Min-Gyu	Kim	Republic of Korea	0.6833
Heejin	Jeong	University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL, USA	0.6833
Jimin	Rhim	McGill University, Montreal, Canada	0.6833
Eduard	Fosch-Villaronga	Leiden University, Leiden, Netherlands	0.6833
Nicholas	Rabb	Tufts University, Medford, MA, USA	0.6833
Theresa	Law	Tufts University, Medford, MA, USA	0.6833
Carlos	Martinho	INESC-ID and IST, Technical University of Lisbon, Lisbon, Portugal	0.6833
Mikhail	Medvedev	University of Massachusetts Lowell, Lowell, USA	0.6833

Cory-Ann Smarr Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA 0.6833 Tracy Mitzner Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA 0.6833 Wendy Rogers Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA 0.6833 Wendy Rogers Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA 0.6836 Wense Jo University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA 0.6786 Lionel Robert Jr. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA 0.6786 Aida Zhanatkyry Nazarbayev University, Astana, Kazakhstan 0.6781 Zhansaule Telisheva Nazarbayev University, Astana, Kazakhstan 0.6781 Sophia Steinhaeusser University of Wichzburg, Würzburg, Germany 0.6781 Giulia Perugia Eindhoven University of Technology, Eindhoven, Netherlands 0.6667 Matous Jelinek University of Virechnology, Stockholm, Sweden 0.6667 Anouk Neerincx Utrecht University, Utrecht, Netherlands 0.6667 Angelica Lim Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, Canada 0.6667 Voussef Mohamed KTH The Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden 0.6667 Angelica Lim Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, Canada 0.6667 Cyrthia Matuszek University of Maryland, Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD, USA 0.6667 Joakim Gustafson KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden 0.6667 Muyleng Ghuy Georgia Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden 0.6667 Muyleng Ghuy Georgia Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden 0.6667 Michelle Park Stanford University, Euraby, Canada 0.6667 Michelle Park Stanford University, Euraby, Canada 0.6667 Aaquib Tabrez University of Maryland, Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD, USA 0.6667 Alaquib Tabrez University of Maryland, Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD, USA 0.6667 Alaquib Tabrez University of Maryland, Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD, USA 0.6667 Alaquib Tabrez University of Maryland, Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD, USA 0.6667 Alaquib Tabrez University, Utrecht, Metherlands 0.6667 Alaquib Tabrez University of Maryland, Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD, USA 0.6667 Alaquib Tabrez University, Utrecht, Metherlands 0.6667 Alaquib Tabrez University, Utrecht, Metherlands 0.6667 Alaquib Garcia Unive	Akanksha	Prakash	Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA	0.6833
Tracy Mitzner Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA 0.6833 Wendy Rogers Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA 0.6833 Reuben Aronson Tufts University, Medford, MA, USA 0.6786 Wonse Jo University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA 0.6786 Lionel Robert Jr. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA 0.6786 Alda Zhanatkyzy Nazarbayev University, Astana, Kazakhstan 0.6781 Zhansaule Telisheva Nazarbayev University, Astana, Kazakhstan 0.6781 Sophia Steinhaeusser University of Technology, Eindhoven, Netherlands 0.6779 Giulia Perugia Eindhoven University of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden 0.6667 Matous Jelinek University of Southern Denmark, Sønderborg, Denmark 0.6667 Matous Jelinek University of Southern Denmark, Sønderborg, Denmark 0.6667 Anouk Neerincx Utrecht University, Utrecht, Netherlands 0.6667 Angelica Lim Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, Canada 0.6667 Angelica Lim Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, Canada 0.6667 Thao Phung Colorado School of Mines, Golden, CO, USA 0.6667 Joakim Gustafson KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden 0.6667 Rebecca Currano Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA 0.6667 Michelle Park Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA 0.6667 Michelle Park Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA 0.6667 Diljot Garcha University of Manitoba 0.6667 Makulen Park Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA 0.6667 Makulen Park Stanford University of Manitoba 0.6667 Makulen Park Stanford University of Manitoba 0.6667 Makulen Park Stanford University of Manitoba 0.6667 Makulen Park Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA 0.6667 Michelle Park Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA 0.6667 Michelle Park Stanford University of Manitoba 0.6667 Michelle Park Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA 0.6667 Michelle Park Stanford University, Utrecht, Hentherlands 0.6667 Michelle Park Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA 0.6667 Michael Wontanier SoftBank Robotics Europe, Paris, France 0.6667 Michael Hoffman Bielefeld University, Utrecht, the Netherlands 0.6667 Michael Garcia University of Ply				
WendyRogersGeorgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA0.6833ReubenAronsonTufts University, Medford, MA, USA0.6786WonseJoUniversity of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA0.6786LionelRobert Jr.University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA0.6786AidaZhanatkyzyNazarbayev University, Astana, Kazakhstan0.6781ZhansauleTelishevaNazarbayev University, Astana, Kazakhstan0.6781SophiaSteinhaeusserUniversity of Würzburg, Würzburg, Germany0.6779GiuliaPerugiaEindhoven University of Technology, Eindhoven, Netherlands0.6681RonaldCumbalKTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667MatousJelinekUniversity of Southern Denmark, Sønderborg, Denmark0.6667AnoukNeerincxUtrecht University, Utrecht, Netherlands0.6667YoussefMohamedKTH The Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667CynthiaMatuszekUniversity of Maryland, Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD, USA0.6667CynthiaMatuszekUniversity of Maryland, Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD, USA0.6667RebeccaCurranoStanford University, Stanford, CA, USA0.6667RebeccaCurranoStanford University, Stanford, CA, USA0.6667MichelleParkStanford University of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA0.6667MichelleParkStanford University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands0.6667MaidLiu	•			
ReubenAronsonTufts University, Medford, MA, USA0.6786WonseJoUniversity of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA0.6786LionelRobert Ir.University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA0.6786AidaZhanatkyzyNazarbayev University, Astana, Kazakhstan0.6781ZhansauleTelishevaNazarbayev University, Astana, Kazakhstan0.6781SophiaSteinhaeuserUniversity of Würzburg, Würzburg, Germany0.6779GiuliaPerugiaEindhoven University of Technology, Eindhoven, Netherlands0.6681RonaldCumbalKTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667MatousJelinekUniversity of Southern Denmark, Sønderborg, Denmark0.6667AnoukNeerincxUtrecht University, Utrecht, Netherlands0.6667YoussefMohamedKTH The Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667YoussefMohamedKTH The Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667CynthiaMatuszekUniversity of Maryland, Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD, USA0.6667ThaoPhungColorado School of Mines, Golden, CO, USA0.6667JoakimGustafsonKTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667RebeccaCurranoStanford University, Stanford, CA, USA0.6667MuylengGhuyGeorgia Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667JaquibTabrezUniversity of Manitoba0.6667JaquibTabrezUniversity of Colorado B	•			
WonseJoUniversity of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA0.6786LionelRobert Jr.University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA0.6786AidaZhanatkyzyNazarbayev University, Astana, Kazakhstan0.6781SophiaSteinhaeusserUniversity of Würzburg, Würzburg, Germany0.6779GiuliaPerugiaEindhoven University, Of Technology, Eindhoven, Netherlands0.6687RonaldCumbalKTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667MatousJelinekUniversity of Southern Denmark, Sønderborg, Denmark0.6667AnoukNeerincxUtrecht University, Utrecht, Netherlands0.6667YoussefMohamedKTH The Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667AngelicaLimSimon Fraser University, Burnaby, Canada0.6667CynthiaMatuszekUniversity of Maryland, Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD, USA0.6667CynthiaMatuszekUniversity of Maryland, Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD, USA0.6667ThaoPhungColorado School of Mines, Golden, CO, USA0.6667RebeccaCurranoStanford University, Stanford, CA, USA0.6667MuylengGhuyGeorgia Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667MichelleParkStanford University0.6667AaquibTabrezUniversity of Manitoba0.6667AiralChakrabortiIBM Research Al0.6667ElieSaadDelft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands0.6667 <t< td=""><td>•</td><td>_</td><td></td><td></td></t<>	•	_		
LionelRobert Jr.University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA0.6786AidaZhanatkyzyNazarbayev University, Astana, Kazakhstan0.6781ZhansauleTelishevaNazarbayev University, Astana, Kazakhstan0.6781SophiaSteinhaeusserUniversity of Würzburg, Würzburg, Germany0.6779GiuliaPerugiaEindhoven University of Technology, Eindhoven, Netherlands0.6681RonaldCumbalKTH Royal Institute of Technology, Eindhoven, Neden0.6667MatousJelinekUniversity of Southern Denmark, Sønderborg, Denmark0.6667AnoukNeerincxUtrecht University, Utrecht, Netherlands0.6667YoussefMohamedKTH The Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667AngelicaLimSimon Fraser University, Burnaby, Canada0.6667CynthiaMatuszekUniversity of Maryland, Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD, USA0.6667ThaoPhungColorado School of Mines, Golden, CO, USA0.6667JoakimGustafsonKTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667MuylengGhuyGeorgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA0.6667MichelleParkStanford University, Stanford, CA, USA0.6667AaquibTabrezUniversity of Colorado Boulder0.6667TathagataChakrabortiIBM Research Al0.6667IaluraPandeySoftBank Robotics Europe, Paris, France0.6667NakChongJAIST, Kanazawa, Japan0.6667<			•	
AidaZhanatkyzyNazarbayev University, Astana, Kazakhstan0.6781ZhansauleTelishevaNazarbayev University, Astana, Kazakhstan0.6781SophiaSteinhaeusserUniversity of Würzburg, Würzburg, Germany0.6779GiuliaPerugiaEindhoven University of Technology, Eindhoven, Netherlands0.6681RonaldCumbalKTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667MatousJelinekUniversity of Southern Denmark, Sønderborg, Denmark0.6667AnoukNeerincxUtrecht University, Utrecht, Netherlands0.6667YoussefMohamedKTH The Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667AngelicaLimSimon Fraser University, Burnaby, Canada0.6667CynthiaMatuszekUniversity of Maryland, Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD, USA0.6667ThaoPhungColorado School of Mines, Golden, CO, USA0.6667RebeccaCurranoStanford University, Stanford, CA, USA0.6667MuylengGhuyGeorgia Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667MichelleParkStanford University0.6667AaquibTabrezUniversity of Manitoba0.6667MichelleParkStanford University0.6667AaquibTabrezUniversity of Colorado Boulder0.6667TathagataChakrabortiIBM Research Al0.6667ElieSaadDelft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands0.6667NakChongJAIST, Kanazawa			•	
ZhansauleTelishevaNazarbayev University, Astana, Kazakhstan0.6781SophiaSteinhaeusserUniversity of Würzburg, Würzburg, Germany0.6779GiuliaPerugiaEindhoven University of Technology, Eindhoven, Netherlands0.6681RonaldCumbalKTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667MatousJelinekUniversity of Southern Denmark, Sønderborg, Denmark0.6667AnoukNeerincxUtrecht University, Utrecht, Netherlands0.6667YoussefMohamedKTH The Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667AngelicaLimSimon Fraser University, Burnaby, Canada0.6667CynthiaMatuszekUniversity of Maryland, Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD, USA0.6667JoakimGustafsonKTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667RebeccaCurranoStanford University, Stanford, CA, USA0.6667MuylengGhuyGeorgia Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667MichelleParkStanford University, Stanford, CA, USA0.6667AaquibTabrezUniversity of Manitoba0.6667TathagataChakrabortiIBM Research Al0.6667LiuHeriot-Watt University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands0.6667AmitPandeySoftBank Robotics Europe, Paris, France0.6667NakChongJAIST, Kanazawa, Japan0.6667LauraHoffmanBielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany0.6667Laura			•	
SophiaSteinhaeusserUniversity of Würzburg, Würzburg, Germany0.6779GiuliaPerugiaEindhoven University of Technology, Eindhoven, Netherlands0.6861RonaldCumbalKTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667MatousJelinekUniversity of Southern Denmark, Sønderborg, Denmark0.6667AnoukNeerincxUtrecht University, Utrecht, Netherlands0.6667YoussefMohamedKTH The Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667AngelicaLimSimon Fraser University, Burnaby, Canada0.6667CynthiaMatuszekUniversity of Maryland, Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD, USA0.6667ThaoPhungColorado School of Mines, Golden, CO, USA0.6667JoakimGustafsonKTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667RebeccaCurranoStanford University, Stanford, CA, USA0.6667MuylengGhuyGeorgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA0.6667MichelleParkStanford University0.6667AaquibTabrezUniversity of Manitoba0.6667AaquibTabrezUniversity of Colorado Boulder0.6667AintPandeySoftBank Robotics Europe, Paris, France0.6667NakChongJAIST, Kanazawa, Japan0.6667NakChongJAIST, Kanazawa, Japan0.6667LauraHoffmanBielefeld University, Eidnburgh, UK0.6667LauraHoffmanBielefeld University, Eitnbul,		• •	•	
GiuliaPerugiaEindhoven University of Technology, Eindhoven, Netherlands0.6681RonaldCumbalKTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667MatousJelinekUniversity of Southern Denmark, Sønderborg, Denmark0.6667AnoukNeerincxUtrecht University, Utrecht, Netherlands0.6667YoussefMohamedKTH The Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667AngelicaLimSimon Fraser University, Burnaby, Canada0.6667CynthiaMatuszekUniversity of Maryland, Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD, USA0.6667ThaoPhungColorado School of Mines, Golden, CO, USA0.6667JoakimGustafsonKTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667RebeccaCurranoStanford University, Stanford, CA, USA0.6667MuylengGhuyGeorgia Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667MichelleParkStanford University0.6667AaquibTabrezUniversity of Manitoba0.6667AinthagataChakrabortiIBM Research AI0.6667ElieSaadDelft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands0.6667NakChongJAIST, Kanazawa, Japan0.6667NakChongJAIST, Kanazawa, Japan0.6667XingkunLiuHeriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, UK0.6667LauraHoffmanBielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany0.6667LauraHoffmanBielefeld University, Istanbul,				
RonaldCumbalKTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667MatousJelinekUniversity of Southern Denmark, Sønderborg, Denmark0.6667AnoukNeerincxUtrecht University, Utrecht, Netherlands0.6667YoussefMohamedKTH The Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667AngelicaLimSimon Fraser University, Burnaby, Canada0.6667CynthiaMatuszekUniversity of Maryland, Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD, USA0.6667ThaoPhungColorado School of Mines, Golden, CO, USA0.6667JoakimGustafsonKTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667MuylengGhuyGeorgia Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667MuylengGhuyGeorgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA0.6667DiljotGarchaUniversity of Manitoba0.6667MichelleParkStanford University0.6667AaquibTabrezUniversity of Colorado Boulder0.6667TathagataChakrabortiIBM Research Al0.6667ElieSaadDelft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands0.6667AmitPandeySoftBank Robotics Europe, Paris, France0.6667NakChongJAIST, Kanazawa, Japan0.6667XingkunLiuHerfot-Watt University, Edinburgh, UK0.6667LauraHoffmanBielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany0.6667EzgiMamusKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey	-			
MatousJelinekUniversity of Southern Denmark, Sønderborg, Denmark0.6667AnoukNeerincxUtrecht University, Utrecht, Netherlands0.6667YoussefMohamedKTH The Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667AngelicaLimSimon Fraser University, Burnaby, Canada0.6667CynthiaMatuszekUniversity of Maryland, Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD, USA0.6667ThaoPhungColorado School of Mines, Golden, CO, USA0.6667JoakimGustafsonKTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667RebeccaCurranoStanford University, Stanford, CA, USA0.6667MuylengGhuyGeorgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA0.6667DiljotGarchaUniversity of Manitoba0.6667MichelleParkStanford University0.6667AaquibTabrezUniversity of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands0.6667TathagataChakrabortiIBM Research Al0.6667ElieSaadDelft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands0.6667AmitPandeySoftBank Robotics Europe, Paris, France0.6667NakChongJAIST, Kanazawa, Japan0.6667XingkunLiuHeriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, UK0.6667LauraHoffmanBielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany0.6667EzgiMamusKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667CansuOrancKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667 <td></td> <td>_</td> <td></td> <td></td>		_		
AnoukNeerincxUtrecht University, Utrecht, Netherlands0.6667YoussefMohamedKTH The Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667AngelicaLimSimon Fraser University, Burnaby, Canada0.6667CynthiaMatuszekUniversity of Maryland, Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD, USA0.6667ThaoPhungColorado School of Mines, Golden, CO, USA0.6667JoakimGustafsonKTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667RebeccaCurranoStanford University, Stanford, CA, USA0.6667MuylengGhuyGeorgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA0.6667MilchelleParkStanford University of Manitoba0.6667AaquibTabrezUniversity of Colorado Boulder0.6667TathagataChakrabortiIBM Research Al0.6667ElieSaadDelft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands0.6667AmitPandeySoftBank Robotics Europe, Paris, France0.6667NakChongJAIST, Kanazawa, Japan0.6667KingkunLiuHeriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, UK0.6667LauraHoffmanBielefeld University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667Jean-MarcMontanierSoftBank Robotics, Paris, France0.6667CansuOrancKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667OrancOudgenoeg-PazUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667OrancOudgenoeg-PazUtrecht University, Utrecht, the N				
YoussefMohamedKTH The Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667AngelicaLimSimon Fraser University, Burnaby, Canada0.6667CynthiaMatuszekUniversity of Maryland, Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD, USA0.6667ThaoPhungColorado School of Mines, Golden, CO, USA0.6667JoakimGustafsonKTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667RebeccaCurranoStanford University, Stanford, CA, USA0.6667MuylengGhuyGeorgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA0.6667DiljotGarchaUniversity of Manitoba0.6667MichelleParkStanford University0.6667AaquibTabrezUniversity of Colorado Boulder0.6667TathagataChakrabortiIBM Research Al0.6667ElieSaadDelft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands0.6667AmitPandeySoftBank Robotics Europe, Paris, France0.6667NakChongJAIST, Kanazawa, Japan0.6667XingkunLiuHeriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, UK0.6667LauraHoffmanBielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany0.6667EzgiMamusKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667Jean-MarcMontanierSoftBank Robotics, Paris, France0.6667CansuOracKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667OracOudgenoeg-PazUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667Daniel <td></td> <td></td> <td>•</td> <td></td>			•	
AngelicaLimSimon Fraser University, Burnaby, Canada0.6667CynthiaMatuszekUniversity of Maryland, Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD, USA0.6667ThaoPhungColorado School of Mines, Golden, CO, USA0.6667JoakimGustafsonKTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667RebeccaCurranoStanford University, Stanford, CA, USA0.6667MuylengGhuyGeorgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA0.6667DiljotGarchaUniversity of Manitoba0.6667MichelleParkStanford University0.6667AaquibTabrezUniversity of Colorado Boulder0.6667TathagataChakrabortiIBM Research Al0.6667ElieSaadDelft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands0.6667AmitPandeySoftBank Robotics Europe, Paris, France0.6667NakChongJAIST, Kanazawa, Japan0.6667XingkunLiuHeriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, UK0.6667LauraHoffmanBielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany0.6667ZegiMamusKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667Jean-MarcMontanierSoftBank Robotics, Paris, France0.6667CansuOrancKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667OraOudgenoeg-PazUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667JosjeVerhagenUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667OrilbeGoksun </td <td></td> <td></td> <td>•</td> <td></td>			•	
CynthiaMatuszekUniversity of Maryland, Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD, USA0.6667ThaoPhungColorado School of Mines, Golden, CO, USA0.6667JoakimGustafsonKTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667RebeccaCurranoStanford University, Stanford, CA, USA0.6667MuylengGhuyGeorgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA0.6667DiljotGarchaUniversity of Manitoba0.6667MichelleParkStanford University0.6667AaquibTabrezUniversity of Colorado Boulder0.6667TathagataChakrabortiIBM Research Al0.6667ElieSaadDelft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands0.6667AmitPandeySoftBank Robotics Europe, Paris, France0.6667NakChongJAIST, Kanazawa, Japan0.6667XingkunLiuHeriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, UK0.6667LauraHoffmanBielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany0.6667LauraHoffmanBielefeld University, Bianbul, Turkey0.6667Jean-MarcMontanierSoftBank Robotics, Paris, France0.6667CansuOrancKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667OraOudgenoeg-PazUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667DanielGarciaUniversity of Plymouth, Plymouth, United Kingdom0.6667OrijeVerhagenUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667Orije<				
ThaoPhungColorado School of Mines, Golden, CO, USA0.6667JoakimGustafsonKTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667RebeccaCurranoStanford University, Stanford, CA, USA0.6667MuylengGhuyGeorgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA0.6667DiljotGarchaUniversity of Manitoba0.6667MichelleParkStanford University0.6667AaquibTabrezUniversity of Colorado Boulder0.6667TathagataChakrabortiIBM Research AI0.6667ElieSaadDelft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands0.6667AmitPandeySoftBank Robotics Europe, Paris, France0.6667NakChongJAIST, Kanazawa, Japan0.6667XingkunLiuHeriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, UK0.6667LauraHoffmanBielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany0.6667LauraHoffmanBielefeld University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667Jean-MarcMontanierSoftBank Robotics, Paris, France0.6667CansuOrancKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667OraOudgenoeg-PazUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667DanielGarciaUniversity of Plymouth, Plymouth, United Kingdom0.6667JosjeVerhagenUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667ChristopherWallbridgeUniversity, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667ChristopherWallbridge<	-		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
JoakimGustafsonKTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden0.6667RebeccaCurranoStanford University, Stanford, CA, USA0.6667MuylengGhuyGeorgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA0.6667DiljotGarchaUniversity of Manitoba0.6667MichelleParkStanford University0.6667AaquibTabrezUniversity of Colorado Boulder0.6667TathagataChakrabortiIBM Research AI0.6667ElieSaadDelft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands0.6667AmitPandeySoftBank Robotics Europe, Paris, France0.6667NakChongJAIST, Kanazawa, Japan0.6667XingkunLiuHeriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, UK0.6667LauraHoffmanBielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany0.6667EzgiMamusKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667Jean-MarcMontanierSoftBank Robotics, Paris, France0.6667CansuOrancKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667OraOudgenoeg-PazUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667JosjeVerhagenUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667JosjeVerhagenUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667JosjeVerhagenUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667JosieWallbridgeUniversity, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667PaulLesemanUtrecht Unive	•			
RebeccaCurranoStanford University, Stanford, CA, USA0.6667MuylengGhuyGeorgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA0.6667DiljotGarchaUniversity of Manitoba0.6667MichelleParkStanford University0.6667AaquibTabrezUniversity of Colorado Boulder0.6667TathagataChakrabortiIBM Research AI0.6667ElieSaadDelft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands0.6667AmitPandeySoftBank Robotics Europe, Paris, France0.6667NakChongJAIST, Kanazawa, Japan0.6667XingkunLiuHeriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, UK0.6667LauraHoffmanBielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany0.6667EzgiMamusKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667Jean-MarcMontanierSoftBank Robotics, Paris, France0.6667CansuOrancKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667OraOudgenoeg-PazUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667DanielGarciaUniversity of Plymouth, Plymouth, United Kingdom0.6667JosjeVerhagenUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667ChristopherWallbridgeUniversity, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667TilbeGoksunKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667AylinKuntayKoç University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667MichaelNovitzkyMassachusetts Institute of Tec		•		
MuylengGhuyGeorgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA0.6667DiljotGarchaUniversity of Manitoba0.6667MichelleParkStanford University0.6667AaquibTabrezUniversity of Colorado Boulder0.6667TathagataChakrabortiIBM Research AI0.6667ElieSaadDelft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands0.6667AmitPandeySoftBank Robotics Europe, Paris, France0.6667NakChongJAIST, Kanazawa, Japan0.6667XingkunLiuHeriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, UK0.6667LauraHoffmanBielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany0.6667EzgiMamusKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667Jean-MarcMontanierSoftBank Robotics, Paris, France0.6667CansuOrancKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667OraOudgenoeg-PazUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667DanielGarciaUniversity of Plymouth, Plymouth, United Kingdom0.6667JosjeVerhagenUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667ChristopherWallbridgeUniversity, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667TilbeGoksunKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667AylinKuntayKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667PaulLesemanUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667MichaelNovitzkyMassachusetts Institute of Technolo				
DiljotGarchaUniversity of Manitoba0.6667MichelleParkStanford University0.6667AaquibTabrezUniversity of Colorado Boulder0.6667TathagataChakrabortiIBM Research AI0.6667ElieSaadDelft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands0.6667AmitPandeySoftBank Robotics Europe, Paris, France0.6667NakChongJAIST, Kanazawa, Japan0.6667XingkunLiuHeriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, UK0.6667LauraHoffmanBielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany0.6667EzgiMamusKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667Jean-MarcMontanierSoftBank Robotics, Paris, France0.6667CansuOrancKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667OraOudgenoeg-PazUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667JosjeVerhagenUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667JosjeVerhagenUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667ChristopherWallbridgeUniversity of Plymouth, Plymouth, United Kingdom0.6667TilbeGoksunKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667AylinKuntayKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667PaulLesemanUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667MichaelNovitzkyMassachusetts Institute of Technology0.6667MichaelBenjaminMassachusetts Institute of			•	
MichelleParkStanford University0.6667AaquibTabrezUniversity of Colorado Boulder0.6667TathagataChakrabortiIBM Research AI0.6667ElieSaadDelft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands0.6667AmitPandeySoftBank Robotics Europe, Paris, France0.6667NakChongJAIST, Kanazawa, Japan0.6667XingkunLiuHeriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, UK0.6667LauraHoffmanBielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany0.6667EzgiMamusKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667Jean-MarcMontanierSoftBank Robotics, Paris, France0.6667CansuOrancKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667OraOudgenoeg-PazUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667DanielGarciaUniversity of Plymouth, Plymouth, United Kingdom0.6667JosjeVerhagenUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667ChristopherWallbridgeUniversity of Plymouth, Plymouth, United Kingdom0.6667TilbeGoksunKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667AylinKuntayKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667PaulLesemanUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667MichaelNovitzkyMassachusetts Institute of Technology0.6667MichaelBenjaminMassachusetts Institute of Technology0.6667		•		
AaquibTabrezUniversity of Colorado Boulder0.6667TathagataChakrabortiIBM Research Al0.6667ElieSaadDelft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands0.6667AmitPandeySoftBank Robotics Europe, Paris, France0.6667NakChongJAIST, Kanazawa, Japan0.6667XingkunLiuHeriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, UK0.6667LauraHoffmanBielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany0.6667EzgiMamusKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667Jean-MarcMontanierSoftBank Robotics, Paris, France0.6667CansuOrancKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667OraOudgenoeg-PazUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667DanielGarciaUniversity of Plymouth, Plymouth, United Kingdom0.6667JosjeVerhagenUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667ChristopherWallbridgeUniversity, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667TilbeGoksunKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667AylinKuntayKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667PaulLesemanUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667MichaelNovitzkyMassachusetts Institute of Technology0.6667MichaelBenjaminMassachusetts Institute of Technology0.6667	•		•	
TathagataChakrabortiIBM Research Al0.6667ElieSaadDelft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands0.6667AmitPandeySoftBank Robotics Europe, Paris, France0.6667NakChongJAIST, Kanazawa, Japan0.6667XingkunLiuHeriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, UK0.6667LauraHoffmanBielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany0.6667EzgiMamusKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667Jean-MarcMontanierSoftBank Robotics, Paris, France0.6667CansuOrancKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667OraOudgenoeg-PazUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667DanielGarciaUniversity of Plymouth, Plymouth, United Kingdom0.6667JosjeVerhagenUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667ChristopherWallbridgeUniversity of Plymouth, Plymouth, United Kingdom0.6667TilbeGoksunKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667AylinKuntayKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667PaulLesemanUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667MichaelNovitzkyMassachusetts Institute of Technology0.6667MichaelBenjaminMassachusetts Institute of Technology0.6667	Aaquib	Tabrez	•	
ElieSaadDelft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands0.6667AmitPandeySoftBank Robotics Europe, Paris, France0.6667NakChongJAIST, Kanazawa, Japan0.6667XingkunLiuHeriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, UK0.6667LauraHoffmanBielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany0.6667EzgiMamusKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667Jean-MarcMontanierSoftBank Robotics, Paris, France0.6667CansuOrancKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667OraOudgenoeg-PazUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667DanielGarciaUniversity of Plymouth, Plymouth, United Kingdom0.6667JosjeVerhagenUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667ChristopherWallbridgeUniversity, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667TilbeGoksunKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667AylinKuntayKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667PaulLesemanUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667MichaelNovitzkyMassachusetts Institute of Technology0.6667MichaelBenjaminMassachusetts Institute of Technology0.6667	•	Chakraborti	•	0.6667
AmitPandeySoftBank Robotics Europe, Paris, France0.6667NakChongJAIST, Kanazawa, Japan0.6667XingkunLiuHeriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, UK0.6667LauraHoffmanBielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany0.6667EzgiMamusKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667Jean-MarcMontanierSoftBank Robotics, Paris, France0.6667CansuOrancKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667OraOudgenoeg-PazUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667DanielGarciaUniversity of Plymouth, Plymouth, United Kingdom0.6667JosjeVerhagenUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667ChristopherWallbridgeUniversity of Plymouth, Plymouth, United Kingdom0.6667TilbeGoksunKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667AylinKuntayKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667PaulLesemanUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667MichaelNovitzkyMassachusetts Institute of Technology0.6667MichaelBenjaminMassachusetts Institute of Technology0.6667	_		Delft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands	0.6667
XingkunLiuHeriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, UK0.6667LauraHoffmanBielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany0.6667EzgiMamusKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667Jean-MarcMontanierSoftBank Robotics, Paris, France0.6667CansuOrancKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667OraOudgenoeg-PazUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667DanielGarciaUniversity of Plymouth, Plymouth, United Kingdom0.6667JosjeVerhagenUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667ChristopherWallbridgeUniversity of Plymouth, Plymouth, United Kingdom0.6667TilbeGoksunKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667AylinKuntayKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667PaulLesemanUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667MichaelNovitzkyMassachusetts Institute of Technology0.6667MichaelBenjaminMassachusetts Institute of Technology0.6667	Amit	Pandey	SoftBank Robotics Europe, Paris, France	0.6667
LauraHoffmanBielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany0.6667EzgiMamusKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667Jean-MarcMontanierSoftBank Robotics, Paris, France0.6667CansuOrancKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667OraOudgenoeg-PazUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667DanielGarciaUniversity of Plymouth, Plymouth, United Kingdom0.6667JosjeVerhagenUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667ChristopherWallbridgeUniversity of Plymouth, Plymouth, United Kingdom0.6667TilbeGoksunKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667AylinKuntayKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667PaulLesemanUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667MichaelNovitzkyMassachusetts Institute of Technology0.6667MichaelBenjaminMassachusetts Institute of Technology0.6667	Nak	Chong	JAIST, Kanazawa, Japan	0.6667
EzgiMamusKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667Jean-MarcMontanierSoftBank Robotics, Paris, France0.6667CansuOrancKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667OraOudgenoeg-PazUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667DanielGarciaUniversity of Plymouth, Plymouth, United Kingdom0.6667JosjeVerhagenUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667ChristopherWallbridgeUniversity of Plymouth, Plymouth, United Kingdom0.6667TilbeGoksunKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667AylinKuntayKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667PaulLesemanUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667MichaelNovitzkyMassachusetts Institute of Technology0.6667MichaelBenjaminMassachusetts Institute of Technology0.6667	Xingkun	Liu	Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, UK	0.6667
Jean-MarcMontanierSoftBank Robotics, Paris, France0.6667CansuOrancKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667OraOudgenoeg-PazUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667DanielGarciaUniversity of Plymouth, Plymouth, United Kingdom0.6667JosjeVerhagenUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667ChristopherWallbridgeUniversity of Plymouth, Plymouth, United Kingdom0.6667TilbeGoksunKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667AylinKuntayKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667PaulLesemanUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667MichaelNovitzkyMassachusetts Institute of Technology0.6667MichaelBenjaminMassachusetts Institute of Technology0.6667	Laura	Hoffman	Bielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany	0.6667
CansuOrancKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667OraOudgenoeg-PazUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667DanielGarciaUniversity of Plymouth, Plymouth, United Kingdom0.6667JosjeVerhagenUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667ChristopherWallbridgeUniversity of Plymouth, Plymouth, United Kingdom0.6667TilbeGoksunKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667AylinKuntayKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667PaulLesemanUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667MichaelNovitzkyMassachusetts Institute of Technology0.6667MichaelBenjaminMassachusetts Institute of Technology0.6667	Ezgi	Mamus	Koç University, Istanbul, Turkey	0.6667
OraOudgenoeg-PazUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667DanielGarciaUniversity of Plymouth, Plymouth, United Kingdom0.6667JosjeVerhagenUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667ChristopherWallbridgeUniversity of Plymouth, Plymouth, United Kingdom0.6667TilbeGoksunKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667AylinKuntayKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667PaulLesemanUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667MichaelNovitzkyMassachusetts Institute of Technology0.6667MichaelBenjaminMassachusetts Institute of Technology0.6667	Jean-Marc	Montanier	SoftBank Robotics, Paris, France	0.6667
DanielGarciaUniversity of Plymouth, Plymouth, United Kingdom0.6667JosjeVerhagenUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667ChristopherWallbridgeUniversity of Plymouth, Plymouth, United Kingdom0.6667TilbeGoksunKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667AylinKuntayKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667PaulLesemanUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667MichaelNovitzkyMassachusetts Institute of Technology0.6667MichaelBenjaminMassachusetts Institute of Technology0.6667	Cansu	Oranc	Koç University, Istanbul, Turkey	0.6667
JosjeVerhagenUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667ChristopherWallbridgeUniversity of Plymouth, Plymouth, United Kingdom0.6667TilbeGoksunKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667AylinKuntayKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667PaulLesemanUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667MichaelNovitzkyMassachusetts Institute of Technology0.6667MichaelBenjaminMassachusetts Institute of Technology0.6667	Ora	Oudgenoeg-Paz	Utrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands	0.6667
ChristopherWallbridgeUniversity of Plymouth, Plymouth, United Kingdom0.6667TilbeGoksunKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667AylinKuntayKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667PaulLesemanUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667MichaelNovitzkyMassachusetts Institute of Technology0.6667MichaelBenjaminMassachusetts Institute of Technology0.6667	Daniel	Garcia	University of Plymouth, Plymouth, United Kingdom	0.6667
TilbeGoksunKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667AylinKuntayKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667PaulLesemanUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667MichaelNovitzkyMassachusetts Institute of Technology0.6667MichaelBenjaminMassachusetts Institute of Technology0.6667	Josje	Verhagen	Utrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands	0.6667
AylinKuntayKoç University, Istanbul, Turkey0.6667PaulLesemanUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667MichaelNovitzkyMassachusetts Institute of Technology0.6667MichaelBenjaminMassachusetts Institute of Technology0.6667	Christopher	Wallbridge	University of Plymouth, Plymouth, United Kingdom	0.6667
PaulLesemanUtrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands0.6667MichaelNovitzkyMassachusetts Institute of Technology0.6667MichaelBenjaminMassachusetts Institute of Technology0.6667	Tilbe	Goksun	Koç University, Istanbul, Turkey	0.6667
MichaelNovitzkyMassachusetts Institute of Technology0.6667MichaelBenjaminMassachusetts Institute of Technology0.6667	Aylin	Kuntay	Koç University, Istanbul, Turkey	0.6667
Michael Benjamin Massachusetts Institute of Technology 0.6667	Paul	Leseman	Utrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands	0.6667
,	Michael	Novitzky	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	0.6667
Caileigh Fitzgerald Massachusetts Institute of Technology 0.6667	Michael	Benjamin	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	0.6667
	Caileigh	Fitzgerald	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	0.6667

Henrik	Schmidt	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	0.6667
Patric	Spence	University of Central Florida	0.6667
Tatsuya	Nomura	Ryukoku University, Otsu, Japan	0.6667
Alessandro	Di Nuovo	Sheffield Hallam University, Sheffield, United Kingdom	0.6667
Daniela	Conti	Sheffield Hallam University, Sheffield, United Kingdom	0.6667
Shirley	Elprama	imec-SMIT-Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussels, Belgium	0.6667
An	Jacobs	imec-SMIT-Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussels, Belgium	0.6667
Pablo	Esteban	Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussels, Belgium	0.6667
Kheng	Koay	University of Hertfordshire, Hatfield, England	0.6667
Kneng Keunwook	Kim	Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea	0.6667
Minkyung	Kim	KAIST, Daejeon, Korea	0.6667
Hotae	Lee	Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea	0.6667
Jaehoon	Kim	Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea	0.6667
Jungwook	Moon	Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea	0.6667
Scott	Niekum	University of Texas at Austin	0.6667
	Tonkin	•	0.6667
Meg		University of Technology Sydney, Sydney, Australia	
Xun William	Wang	Commonwealth Bank of Australia, Sydney, Australia	0.6667
	Judge	Commonwealth Bank of Australia, Sydney, Australia	0.6667
Siddharta	Srinivasa	Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, USA École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), Lausanne,	0.6667
Fernando	Garcia	Switzerland	0.6667
remando	Carola	École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), Lausanne,	0.0007
Alexis	Jacq	Switzerland	0.6667
S.	Sundar	Penn State University, University Park, PA, USA	0.6667
Marissa	McCoy	Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA	0.6667
Rosemarijn	Looije	TNO Human Factors, Soesterberg, Netherlands	0.6667
Sofia	Thunberg	Linköping University, Linköping, Sweden	0.6667
Takamasa	lio	University of Tsukuba, Tsukuba, Japan	0.6667
Yu	Zhang	Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ, USA	0.6667
Philipp	Schaper	University of Wuerzburg, Wuerzburg, Germany	0.6667
Santosh	Banisetty	Colorado School of Mines, Golden, CO, USA	0.6667
Zhao	Han	University of South Florida, Tampa, FL, USA	0.6657
Junya	Nakanishi	Osaka University, Osaka, Japan	0.6613
Hadas	Kress-Gazit	Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA	0.6548
Katherine	Tsui	Toyota Research Institute, Cambridge, MA, USA	0.6528
Francesco	Rea	CONTACT Unit, Italian Institute of Technology, Genoa, Italy	0.6525
Jun	Baba	CyberAgent, Inc., Tokyo, Japan	0.6523
Alessandra	Sciutti	CONTACT Unit, Italian Institute of Technology, Genoa, Italy	0.6510
Dorsa	Sadigh	Google Deepmind, Mountain View, CA, USA	0.6458
Erdem	Biyik	Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA	0.6458
Anna	Dobrosovestnova	Human-Computer Interaction Group, TU Wien, Vienna, Austria	0.6447
		Curiosity Lab, Department of Industrial Engineering, Tel-Aviv	
Omer	Gvirsman	University, Tel Aviv, Israel, Israel	0.6389

Manuel	Giuliani	Kempten University of Applied Sciences, Kempten, Germany	0.6389
Bram	Willemsen	Tilburg University, Tilburg, the Netherlands	0.6389
Justin	Hart	The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, USA	0.6367
Alyssa	Kubota	San Francisco State University, San Francisco, CA, USA	0.6342
Ruchen	Wen	Univ. of Maryland Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD, USA	0.6342
Andreea	Bobu	University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, USA	0.6337
Avram	Block	Motional, Boston, MA, USA	0.6333
Nathan	Tsoi	Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA	0.6204
Timothy	Adamson	Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA	0.6204
Michael	Johnson	Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA	0.6204
Joe	Connolly	Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA	0.6204
Sachie	Yamada	Tokai University & ATR, Kanagawa & Kyoto, Japan	0.6204
		Instituto Universitário de Lisboa (ISCTE-IUL), CIS-IUL, Portugal and	
Raquel	Oliveira	INESC-ID, Portugal	0.6204
Rui	Prada	Universidade de Lisboa	0.6204
Ayberk	Ozgur	École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland	0.6204
Paul	Baxter	Plymouth University, Plymouth, United Kingdom	0.6204
Amal	Nanavati	University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA	0.6194
Manisha	Natarajan	Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA	0.6194
Angelo	Cangelosi	University of Manchester, Manchester, United Kingdom	0.6194
		Advanced Telecommunications Research Institute International,	0.6404
Luis	Morales Saiki	Kyoto, Japan	0.6194
Dagoberto	Cruz-Sandoval	University of California, San Diego, San Diego, CA, USA	0.6181
Mirjam	de Haas	HU University of Applied Sciences Utrecht, Utrecht, Netherlands	0.6146
Letian	Chen	Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA	0.6127
Rebecca	Stower	KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden	0.6127
Stephanie	Rosenthal	Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA	0.6127
Yeping	Wang	University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI, USA	0.6127
Yunus	Terzioglu	Northeastern University, Boston, MA, USA	0.6127
Aditi	Talati	Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA	0.6127
Thomas	Groechel	University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA	0.6127
Anouk	van Maris	University of the West of England, Bristol, United Kingdom Department of Culture and Society, Linköping University, Linköping,	0.6127
Hannah	Pelikan	Östergötland, Sweden	0.6125
Glenda	Hannibal	TU Wien, Vienna, Austria	0.6125
Nick	Walker	University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA	0.6111
Houston	Claure	Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA	0.6111
		Adaptive Systems Group, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Berlin,	
Dimosthenis	Kontogiorgos	Germany	0.6111
Chad	Edwards	Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI, USA	0.6111
Autumn	Edwards	Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI, USA	0.6111
Ella	Velner	University of Twente, Enschede, Netherlands	0.6111
Nicolas	Spatola	Istituto Italiano di Tecnologia, Genova, Italy	0.6111
De'Aira	Bryant	Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA	0.6111

Muneeb	Ahmad	Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, United Kingdom	0.6111
Eric	Pairet	Heriot-Watt University & University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, United Kingdom	0.6111
	Ham	Eindhoven University of Technology, Eindhoven, Netherlands	0.6111
Jaap Panos	-	Eindhoven University of Technology, Eindhoven, Netherlands	0.6111
	Markopoulos		0.6111
Yaacov	Koren	Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel	
Michael	Suguitan	Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA	0.6111
Andrew	Murtagh	Akara Robotics, Dublin, Ireland Korea Institute of Science and Technology (KIST), Seoul, Republic of	0.6111
JongSuk	Choi	Korea	0.6111
Sonja	Stange	Bielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany	0.6111
Samuel	Mascarenhas	Universidade de Lisboa	0.6111
Anthony	Harrison	U.S. Naval Research Laboratory	0.6111
Hae-Sung	Lee	Yonsei University, Seoul, Korea	0.6111
JeeHang	Lee	KAIST, Daejeon, Korea	0.6111
Jinwoo	Kim	Yonsei University, Seoul, Korea	0.6111
		NIPPON TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE CORPORATION, Kanagawa,	
Mitsuhiro	Goto	Japan	0.6111
Laurie	Santos	Yale University	0.6111
Kirsten	Bergmann	Bielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany	0.6111
Chandrayee	Basu	University of California Merced, Merced, CA, USA	0.6111
Mukesh	Singhal	University of California Merced, Merced, CA, USA	0.6111
Tomohiro	Yamada	NTT Service Evolution Laboratories, Yokosuka-shi, Japan	0.6111
Nikolai	Bock	University of Duisburg-Essen, Duisburg, Germany	0.6111
Jurgen	Brandstetter	University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand	0.6111
Denise	Hebesberger	Akademie für Altersforschung, Vienna, Austria	0.6111
John	Voiklis	Brown University, Providence, RI, USA	0.6111
Alexandru	Litoiu	Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA	0.6111
Corey	Cusimano	University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA	0.6111
Maha	Salem	University of Hertfordshire, Hatfield, United Kingdom	0.6111
Rui	Fang	Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, USA	0.6111
Joyce	Chai	Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, USA	0.6111
Keinan	Vanunu	IDC Herzliya, Herzliya, Israel	0.6111
Jakub	Zlotowski	University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand	0.6111
Brian	Gleeson	University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada	0.6111
Elizabeth	Jochum	Aalborg University, Aalborg, Denmark	0.6111
Janie	Grant	University of Canberra, Canberra, ACT, Australia	0.6111
David	Goedicke	Cornell Tech, New York, NY, USA	0.6090
Karon	MacLean	University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada	0.6090
Gabriel	Skantze	KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden	0.6090
Ethan	Gordon	University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA	0.6042
Xiajie	Zhang	Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA	0.6042
Felix	Lindner	Ulm University, Ulm, Germany	0.6042
		,,,	J. J. J. I

		Center of Excellence in Cognitive Interaction Technology (CITEC),	
Dieta	Kuchenbrandt	Bielefeld, Germany	0.6042
Qin	Zhu	Department of Engineering Education, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA, USA	0.6009
Luca	Gambardella	USI-SUPSI, Lugano, Switzerland	0.5996
Julie	Adams	Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR, USA	0.5967
Jan	de Wit	Tilburg University, Tilburg, Noord-Brabant, Netherlands	0.5946
Emiel	Krahmer		0.5940
		Tilburg University, Tilburg, Noord-Brabant, Netherlands	
Matthew	Gombolay	Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA School of Interactive Computing, Georgia Institute of Technology &	0.5858
Mariah	Schrum	Robotics, University of California, Berkeley, Atlanta, GA, USA	0.5839
Huili	Chen	MIT Media Lab, Cambridge, MA, USA	0.5833
Yoyo	Hou	Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA	0.5833
Jacob	Crandall	Brigham Young University, Provo, UT, USA	0.5833
Jacob	Cranuan	U.S. Naval Research Laboratory, NRC Postdoctoral Research	0.3633
David	Porfirio	Associate, Washington, DC, USA	0.5833
Oya	Celiktutan	King's College London, London, United Kingdom	0.5833
Oyu	Centuali	Dalle Molle Institute for Artificial Intelligence (IDSIA) USI-SUPSI,	0.5055
Gabriele	Abbate	Lugano, Switzerland	0.5833
		Université de Sherbrooke, Interdisciplinary Institute for	
		Technological Innovation & Université de Sherbrooke, Research	
Francois	Ferland	Center of Aging, Sherbrooke, QC, Canada	0.5833
Deborah	Szapiro	University of Technology Sydney, Sydney, Australia	0.5833
		Psychological Medicine, University of Auckland, Auckland, New	
Elizabeth	Broadbent	Zealand	0.5833
		Electrical, Computer and Software Engineering, The University of	0.5000
Но	Ahn	Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand	0.5833
Elisabeth	Andre	Chair for Human-Centered Artificial Intelligence, University of Augsburg, Augsburg, Germany	0.5833
Liisabetii	Allule	Lincoln Laboratory, Massachusetts Institute of Technology,	0.3633
Но	Siu	Lexington, MA, USA	0.5833
Kotaro	Funakoshi	Tokyo Institute of Technology, Tokyo, Japan	0.5833
Cindy	Grimm	Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR, USA	0.5833
Jason	Borenstein	Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA	0.5833
Sayanti	Roy	Purdue University Northwest, Hammond, Indiana, USA	0.5833
Heqiu	Song	RWTH Aachen University, Aachen, Germany	0.5833
AJung	Moon	McGill University, Montreal, QC, Canada	0.5833
Patrick	Holthaus	University of Hertfordshire, Hatfield, United Kingdom	0.5833
Shiri	Azenkot	Jacobs Technion-Cornell Institute, Cornell Tech, New York, NY, USA	0.5833
Aws	Albarghouthi	University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI, USA	0.5833
, 1445	, and a Bridger	National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD,	0.5055
Shelly	Bagchi	USA	0.5833
Yoonseob	Lim	Korea Institute of Science and Technology, Seoul, Republic of Korea	0.5833
		U.S. National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg,	
Megan	Zimmerman	MD, USA	0.5833

		U.S. National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg,	
Jeremy	Marvel	MD, USA	0.5833
Franca	Garzotto	Politecnico di Milano, Milan, Italy	0.5833
Paul	Vogt	Tilburg University, Tilburg, Noord-Brabant, Netherlands	0.5833
Matthew	Walter	Toyota Technological Institute at Chicago, Chicago, IL, USA	0.5833
Michio	Okada	Toyohashi University of Technology, Toyohashi, Japan	0.5833
Pamela	Hinds	Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA	0.5833
Charles	Rich	Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester, MA, USA	0.5833
Candace	Sidner	Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester, MA, USA	0.5833
Stefanie	Tellex	Massachusettes Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA	0.5833
Tom	Williams	Colorado School of Mines, Golden, CO, USA	0.5781
		Computer Science and Engineering, Chalmers University of	
Ilaria	Torre	Technology, Gothenburg, Sweden	0.5774
Cristina	Zaga	University of Twente, Enschede, Netherlands	0.5774
5	AA. 16 .	Donders Institute for Brain, Cognition and Behaviour, Radboud	0.5770
Pieter	Wolfert	University, Nijmegen, Netherlands	0.5770
Sarah	Sebo	The University of Chicago, Chicago, USA	0.5682
Alap	Kshirsagar	Technische Universität Darmstadt, Darmstadt, Germany	0.5682
Min	Lee	University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, USA	0.5682
Conor	McGinn	Trinity College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland	0.5680
Vanassa	Fuers	University of Twente & Nanyang Technological University,	0.5667
Vanessa	Evers	Enschede, Netherlands	
Raquel	Thiessen	University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MAN, Canada	0.5667
Boris	Gromov	USI-SUPSI, Lugano, Switzerland	0.5667
Michael	Koller	Technische Universität Wien, Vienna, Austria	0.5667
Sebastian Nhan	Schneider	University of Applied Sciences Cologne, Cologne, Germany	0.5667
-	Tran	Colorado School of Mines, Golden, CO, USA	0.5667
Sarah	Strohkorb Sebo	Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA	0.5667
Dylan	Hadfield-Menell	UC Berkeley	0.5667
Andrew	Williams	University of Kansas Center for Intelligent and Interactive Robotics, Korea Institute of	0.5667
Dahyun	Kang	Science and Technology, Seoul, Korea, Republic of	0.5661
Sanne	van Waveren	Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA	0.5661
Hatice	Gunes	University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom	0.5643
Mike	Ligthart	Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands	0.5627
Emilia	Barakova	Eindhoven University of Technology, Eindhoven, Netherlands	0.5627
Tapomayukh	Bhattacharjee	Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA	0.5625
Helen	Hastie	Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, United Kingdom	0.5604
X.	Yang	University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA	0.5595
Brittany	Duncan	University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, NE, USA	0.5565
Directarry	Dancan	Grado Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, Virginia	0.5505
Myounghoon	Jeon	Tech, Blacksburg, VA, USA	0.5565
Serge	Thill	Radboud University, Nijmegen, Netherlands	0.5565
Ryan	Jackson	Colorado School of Mines, Golden, CO, USA	0.5565
•		· · · · · ·	_

Fotios	Papadopoulos	University of Plymouth, Plymouth, United Kingdom	0.5565
Thorsten	Schodde	Bielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany	0.5565
Irvin	Cardenas	Kent State University, Kent	0.5565
Jong-Hoon	Kim	Kent State University, Kent	0.5565
		Dalle Molle Institute for Artificial Intelligence (IDSIA) USI-SUPSI,	
Alessandro	Giusti	Lugano, Switzerland	0.5493
Jerome	Guzzi	USI-SUPSI, Lugano, Switzerland	0.5493
Elizabeth	Phillips	Psychology, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA, USA	0.5449
Hiroyuki	Umemuro	Tokyo Institute of Technology, Tokyo, Japan	0.5443
Katherine	Kuchenbecker	MPI for Intelligent Systems, Stuttgart, Germany	0.5435
Mattia	Racca	Aalto University, Espoo, Finland	0.5435
Ross	Knepper	Cornell University	0.5435
Brian	Mok	Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA	0.5435
Justin	Huang	University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA	0.5435
Micheline	Ziadee	American University of Science and Technology, Beirut, Lebanon	0.5435
Majd	Sakr	Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA	0.5435
Sarath	Sreedharan	Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO, USA	0.5417
Rianne	van den Berghe	Windesheim University of Applied Sciences, Almere, Netherlands	0.5417
Marcela	Munera	University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom	0.5417
Carlos	Cifuentes	Bristol Robotics Laboratory, UWE, Bristol, United Kingdom	0.5417
Meia	Chita-Tegmark	Tufts University, Medford, MA, USA	0.5389
Pragathi	Praveena	University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI, USA	0.5389
Ross	Mead	Semio AI, Inc., Los Angeles, CA, USA	0.5389
Junko	Kanero	Sabanci University, Istanbul, Turkey	0.5379
David	Robb	Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, United Kingdom	0.5370
		Collaborative Robotics and Intelligent Systems Institute, Oregon	
Heather	Knight	State University, Corvallis, OR, USA	0.5362
Agnieszka	Wykowska	Istituto Italiano di Tecnologia, Genova, Italy	0.5357
		Department of Computer Science, The University of Alabama,	
Chris	Crawford	Tuscaloosa, AL, USA	0.5357
William	Smart	Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR, USA	0.5357
Ewart	de Visser	U.S. Air Force Academy, Air Force Academy, CO, USA	0.5357
Zahra	Zahedi	Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ, USA	0.5357
Yuki	Okafuji	CyberAgent, Inc., Tokyo, Japan	0.5357
Bob	Schadenberg	University of Twente, Enschede, Netherlands	0.5357
Michael	Lewis	University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, USA	0.5357
Mayumi	Mohan	MPI for Intelligent Systems, Stuttgart, Germany	0.5333
Kerstin	Haring	University of Denver, DENVER, CO, USA	0.5333
Akiko	Yamazaki	Tokyo University of Technology, Hachioji, Japan	0.5333
Jose	Lopes	Heriot Watt University, Edinburgh, United Kingdom	0.5333
Minae	Kwon	Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA	0.5333
Dylan	Losey	Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA	0.5333
Diana	Loffler	University of Siegen, Siegen, Germany	0.5333

Swapna	Joshi	Indiana University	0.5333
Jacob	Nielsen	University of Southern Denmark	0.5333
Ronald	Moore	University of Kansas	0.5333
Mirko	Gelsomini	Politecnico di Milano, Milan, Italy	0.5333
Andre	Cleaver	Tufts University	0.5333
Jivko	Sinapov	Tufts University	0.5333
Abhijeet	Agnihotri	Oregon State University	0.5333
Joseph	Daly	UWE, Frenchay Campus, Bristol, UK	0.5333
Xuan	Zhao	Brown University, Providence, RI, USA	0.5333
		Instituto Universitário de Lisboa (ISCTE-IUL), CIS-IUL & INESC-ID,	
Sofia	Petisca	Lisbon, Portugal	0.5333
Norman	Su	Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA	0.5333
Jean-Claude	Martin	Université Paris-Saclay, Orsay, France	0.5333
Wan-Ling	Chang	Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA	0.5333
Gurit	Birnbaum	IDC Herzliya, Herzliya, Israel	0.5333
Harry	Reis	University of Rochester, Rochester, NY, USA	0.5333
Omri	Sass	Cornell Tech, New York, NY, USA	0.5333
Hiroyuki	Kidokoro	ATR & Osaka University, Kyoto, Japan	0.5333
Rohan	Paleja	Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA	0.5323
Koen	Hindriks	Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands	0.5307
Meiying	Qin	Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA	0.5303
Vicky	Charisi	Joint Research Centre, Seville, Spain	0.5303
Hooman	Hedayati	University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA	0.5238
		ITI, LARSYS, Instituto Superior Técnico, Universidade de Lisboa,	
Filipa	Correia	Lisbon, Portugal	0.5230
Casey	Bennett	Depaul University, Chicago, IL, USA	0.5219
Jennifer	Piatt	Indiana University Bloomington, Bloomington, IN, USA	0.5219
Somaya	Ben Allouch	Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences, Amsterdam, Netherlands	0.5219
Yuhan			0.5219
Daniel	Hu Brown	Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT, USA	0.5219
Alessandro	Roncone	University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, CO, USA	0.5219
Alessaliulu	Koncone	The Maersk M. Moller Institute, University of Southern Denmark,	0.3219
Anders	Sorensen	Odense, Denmark	0.5219
		College of Comprehensive Psychology, Ritsumeikan University,	0.0 = = 0
Yugo	Hayashi	Ibaraki, Osaka, Japan	0.5219
Brenna	Argall	Northwestern University, Shirley Ryan Ability Lab, Chicago, IL, USA	0.5219
Timothy	Bickmore	Northeastern University, Boston, MA, USA	0.5219
Markus	Vincze	Technische Universität Wien, Vienna, Austria	0.5219
Yasuto	Nakanishi	Keio University, Fujisawa, Japan	0.5219
Kate	Loveys	The University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand	0.5219
Kazuki	Mizumaru	Hokkaido University, Sapporo, Hokkaido, Japan	0.5219
Tetsuo	Ono	Hokkaido University, Sapporo, Hokkaido, Japan	0.5219

		U.S. National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg,	0.5040
Murat	Aksu	MD, USA	0.5219
Brian	Antonishek	U.S. National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg,	0.5219
Yue		MD, USA	0.5219
	Wang	Clemson University, Clemson, SC, USA	
Jeonghye	Han	Cheongju National University of Education, Republic of Korea	0.5219
John	Antanitis	Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA	0.5219
Chaoran	Liu	ATR, Keihanna, Kyoto, Japan	0.5219
Naomi	Fitter	Collaborative Robotics and Intelligent Systems (CoRIS) Institute, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR, USA	0.5192
Katie	Winkle	Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden	0.5109
Anara	Sandygulova	Nazarbayev University, Astana, Kazakhstan	0.5109
Sarita	Herse		0.5109
Jonathan	Vitale	University of Technology Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia	
		University of Technology Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia	0.5076
Mary-Anne	Williams	University of New South Wales, Sydney, NSW, Australia	0.5076
Lars	Jensen	University of Southern Denmark Kolding, Denmark	0.5076
Sanya	Kwak	Center for Intelligent and Interactive Robotics, Korea Institute of	0.5052
Sonya Samantha		Science and Technology, Seoul, Korea, Republic of Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA	0.5032
	Reig	,, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
Trenton	Schulz	Norwegian Computing Center, Oslo, Norway	0.5000
Gabriella	Lakatos	University of Hertfordshire, Hatfield, United Kingdom	0.5000
Andrea	Bajcsy	University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, USA	0.5000
Jesse	de Pagter	TU Wien, Vienna, Austria	0.5000
Minsu	Jang	Electronics and Telecommunications Research Institute, Daejeon, Republic of Korea	0.5000
Roel	Boumans		0.5000
Kosuke		Radboud University, Nijmegen, Netherlands	0.5000
	Wakabayashi	Ritsumeikan University, Ibaraki, Japan	
Karolina	Zawieska	Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark	0.5000
Marta	Romeo	University of Manchester, Manchester, United Kingdom	0.5000
Claire	Liang	Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA	0.5000
Tatsuya	Kawahara	Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan	0.5000
Patricia -	Arriaga	Iscte-iul, Lisboa, Portugal	0.5000
Francisco	Melo	Universidade de Lisboa	0.5000
Hirotaka	Osawa	Univeristy of Tsukuba, Tsukuba, Japan	0.5000
Nathan	Kirchner	University of Technology, Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia	0.5000
Katia	Sycara	Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA	0.5000
Peter	McOwan	Queen Mary University of London, London, United Kingdom	0.5000
David	St-Onge	Laval University, Québec, PQ, Canada	0.5000
Nicolas	Reeves	University of Québec in Montreal, Montreal, PQ, Canada	0.5000
Fumihide	Tanaka	University of Tsukuba, Tsukuba, Japan	0.4890
Michael	Walker	University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA	0.4881
Masahiro	Shiomi	ATR, Kyoto, Japan	0.4833
Elaine	Short	Tufts University, Medford, MA, USA	0.4801
Paul	Robinette	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	0.4781

David	Hsu	National University of Singapore, Singapore	0.4700
Thomas	Arnold	Tufts University, Medford, MA, USA	0.4700
Ailie	Turton	Bristol Robotics Laboratory, Bristol, United Kingdom	0.4657
Hamish	Tennent	Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA	0.4657
Jin	Lee	MIT Media Lab	0.4657
Maartje	de Graaf	Utrecht University, Utrecht, Netherlands	0.4634
Peter	Kahn	University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA	0.4567
Brian	Gill	Seattle Pacific University, Seattle, WA, USA	0.4567
Jolina	Ruckert	University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA	0.4567
Heather	Gary	University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA	0.4567
Damith	Herath	University of Western Sydney, Sydney, Australia	0.4567
Masayuki	Inaba	The University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan	0.4529
Enkelejda	Kasneci	Technical University of Munich, Munich, Germany	0.4529
Daniel	Rea	University of New Brunswick, Fredericton, NB, Canada	0.4516
Harold	Soh	National University of Singapore, Singapore, Singapore	0.4494
Alan	Wagner	The Pennsylvania State University, State College, PA, USA	0.4444
	-	Heriot-Watt University & NTB University of Applied Sciences in	
Katrin	Lohan	Technology, Buchs, CH, Edinburgh, United Kingdom	0.4444
Francesco	Mondada	École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland	0.4444
Laura	Hiatt	U.S. Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, DC, USA	0.4394
		Interdisciplinary Institute for Technological Innovation, Université	
Dominic	Letourneau	de Sherbrooke, Sherbrooke, QC, Canada	0.4394
François	Michaud	Interdisciplinary Institute for Technological Innovation, Université	0.4394
Francois	Michaud Hanheide	de Sherbrooke, Sherbrooke, QC, Canada	0.4394
Marc		University of Lincoln, Lincoln, United Kingdom	0.4394
Dylan James	Moore Landay	Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA Stanford University	0.4394
	•	University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH, USA	0.4394
Momotaz Scott	Begum Hudson	,	0.4394
Kazuhiro	Sasabuchi	Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA Microsoft, Tokyo, Japan	0.4394
		, , ,	
Katsushi	Ikeuchi Rakita	Microsoft, Redmond, WA, USA	0.4394 0.4386
Daniel		Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA	
Malte	Jung	Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA	0.4366
Elizabeth	Carter	Robotics Institute, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA Department of Biomedical Engineering, School of Engineering and	0.4349
		Applied Science, George Washington University, Washington,	
Chung	Park	District of Columbia, USA	0.4312
Sichao	Song	CyberAgent, Inc., Tokyo, Japan	0.4306
David	Feil-Seifer	Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA	0.4298
Wafa	Johal	University of Melbourne, Melbourne, VIC, Australia	0.4202
Serena	Booth	Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA	0.4167
Sanja	Dogramadzi	University of Sheffield, Sheffield, United Kingdom	0.4167
Pauline	Chevalier	Italian Institute of Technology, Genoa, Italy	0.4167
Mai	Chang	University of Texas Austin, Austin, TX, USA	0.4167
	-		

Hiroko	Kamide	Nagoya University, Nagoya, Japan	0.4167
Takahiro	Matsumoto	Keio University, Yokohama-shi, Japan	0.4167
		INESC-ID and Instituto Superior Técnico, Universidade de Lisboa,	
Tiago	Ribeiro	Lisboa, Portugal	0.4167
Christoforos	Mavrogiannis	University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA	0.4145
Stefan	Корр	CITEC, Bielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany	0.4056
Michael	Goodrich	Brigham Young University, Provo, UT, USA	0.4000
Zachary	Henkel	Mississippi State University, Mississippi State, MS, USA	0.3981
Eduardo	Sandoval	University of New South Wales, Sydney, NSW, Australia	0.3958
Kerstin	Dautenhahn	University of Waterloo, Waterloo, ON, Canada	0.3958
		Evinoks Service Equipment Industry and Commerce Inc., Bursa,	
Bahar	Irfan	Turkey	0.3917
Patricia	Alves-Oliveira	University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA	0.3854
Randy	Gomez	Honda Research Institute Japan, Wako, Japan	0.3821
Eliot	Smith	Indiana University	0.3810
Stela	Seo	University of Manitoba, Canada	0.3810
		National Institute of Informatics & The Graduate University for	
Seiji	Yamada	Advanced Studies (SOKENDAI), Tokyo, Japan	0.3796
Elin	Торр	Lund University, Lund, Sweden	0.3796
Oren	Zuckerman	Interdisciplinary Center (IDC), Herzliya, Israel	0.3796
Rinat	Rosenberg-Kima	Technion - Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa, Israel	0.3796
Reid	Simmons	Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA	0.3796
Michal	Luria	Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA	0.3782
		Magic Lab, Industrial Engineering and Management, Ben Gurion	
		University of the Negev & CNRS, UPS, LAAS-CNRS, Université de	
Jessica	Cauchard	Toulouse, Be'er Sheva, Israel	0.3750
James	Kennedy	Disney Research, Glendale, CA, USA	0.3679
Culphana		School of Computing and Augmented Intelligence, Arizona State	0.2624
Subbarao	Kambhampati	University, Tempe, AZ, USA	0.3624
Hae	Park	MIT Media Lab, Cambridge, MA, USA	0.3571
Astrid	Rosenthal-von der Putten	RWTH Aachen University, Aachen, Germany	0.3567
Daniel	Szafir	University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA	
			0.3454 0.3444
Pierre	Dillenbourg	École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland Institute of Visual Computing and Human-Centered Technology, HCI	0.3444
Astrid	Weiss	Group, Technische Universität Wien, Vienna, Austria	0.3417
Kerstin	Fischer	University of Southern Denmark, Sonderborg, Denmark	0.3410
Christopher	Crick	Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK, USA	0.3333
Christian	Dondrup	Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, United Kingdom	0.3333
Cilistian	Бопагар	Univ Rennes, INSA Rennes, Inria, CNRS & Irisa-UMR6074, Rennes,	0.5555
Yoren	Gaffary	France	0.3333
Steven	Sherrin	Indiana University	0.3333
Monika	Lohani	University of Utah	0.3333
Greg	Trafton	U.S. Naval Research Laboratory	0.3333
Oreg	Haiton	O.S. INAVALINESCAICH LABOLATOLY	0.3333

Susan	Fussell	Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA	0.3333
Matthew	Pan	University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada	0.3333
James	Tompkin	Brown University, Providence, RI, USA	0.3333
		Department of Management Information Systems, National	
Shih-Yi	Chien	Chengchi University, Taipei, Taiwan	0.3306
	_	Department of Psychology, New Mexico State University, Las	
Marlena	Fraune	Cruces, NM, USA	0.3234
Aditi	Ramachandran	Vän Robotics, Columbia, SC, USA	0.3204
Malcolm	Doering	Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan	0.3167
J.	Trafton	Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, DC, USA	0.3167
Cindy	Bethel	Mississsippi State University, Mississippi State, MS, USA	0.3114
Iolanda	Leite	KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden	0.3103
Ute	Leonards	University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom	0.3095
Dylan	Glas	Futurewei Technologies	0.3081
Andrea	Thomaz	University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, USA	0.3078
EunJeong	Cheon	Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY, USA	0.3047
Hee	Lee	Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, USA	0.3039
Jamy	Li	University of Twente, Enschede, Netherlands	0.3000
Elizabeth	Cha	University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA	0.3000
Nikolas	Martelaro	Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA	0.3000
Selma	Sabanovic	Indiana University Bloomington, Bloomington, IN, USA	0.2939
Carlos	Ishi	RIKEN, Sorakugun, Seika-cho, Kyoto, Japan	0.2902
Myrthe	Tielman	Delft University of Technology, Delft, Netherlands	0.2902
James	Young	University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Canada	0.2874
		Bielefeld University, Center for Cognitive Interaction Technology	
Friederike	Eyssel	(CITEC), Bielefeld, Germany	0.2870
Emmanuel	Senft	Idiap Research Institute, Martigny, Switzerland	0.2869
A -1 -2	T	Autonomous Systems and Robotics Lab, U2IS, ENSTA Paris, Institut	0.2027
Adriana	Tapus	Polytechnique de Paris, Palaiseau, France	0.2827
Nicole	Salomons	Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA	0.2826
Sean	Andrist	Microsoft Research, Redmond	0.2801
Leila	Takayama	Hoku Labs, Santa Cruz, CA, USA	0.2791
Allison	Sauppe	University of Wisconsin-La Crosse, La Crosse, WI, USA	0.2778
Bertram	Malle	Brown University, Providence, RI, USA	0.2717
Rachid	Alami	LAAS-CNRS, Toulouse, France	0.2696
Laurel	Riek	University of California, San Diego, San Diego, CA, USA	0.2526
Marynel	Vazquez	Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA	0.2509
Goren	Gordon	Curiosity Lab, Department of Industrial Engineering, Tel Aviv Univeristy & Curiosity Robotics, Tel Aviv, Israel	0.2500
Michael	Gleicher	University of Wisconsin - Madison, Madison, WI, USA	0.2458
IVIICITACI	Gleichei	University of Wisconsin - Madison, Madison, Wi, USA University of Victoria & Monash University, Victoria, British	0.2436
Elizabeth	Croft	Columbia, Canada	0.2429
Megan	Strait	University of Texas Rio Grande Valley, Edinburg, TX, USA	0.2429
Mark	Neerincx	Delft University of Technology, Delft, Netherlands	0.2372
HIGH		Sent Sintersity of Teermology, Sent, Netherlands	0.2372

Samuel	Spaulding	Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA	0.2358
Vaibhav	Unhelkar	Rice University, Houston, TX, USA	0.2337
Daniel	Ullman	Brown University, Providence, RI, USA	0.2337
		Department of Information Technology, Uppsala University,	
Ginevra	Castellano	Uppsala, Sweden	0.2332
Solace	Shen	Cornell University	0.2303
Andre	Pereira	KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden Dept. of Computing and Software, McMaster University, Hamilton,	0.2294
Denise	Geiskkovitch	ON, Canada	0.2262
Keisuke	Nakamura	Honda Research Institute Japan, Saitama, Japan	0.2197
Hiroshi	Ishiguro	Osaka University, Osaka, Japan	0.2188
Severin	Lemaignan	PAL Robotics, Barcelona, Spain	0.2164
Christoph	Bartneck	University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand	0.2125
Cynthia	Breazeal	MIT Media Lab, Cambridge, MA, USA	0.2092
Paul	Bremner	University of the West of England, Bristol, United Kingdom	0.2051
Ville	Kyrki	Aalto University, Espoo, Finland	0.1990
Amir	Aly	University of Plymouth, Plymouth, United Kingdom	0.1909
		U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Moffett Field,	
Terry	Fong	CA, USA	0.1909
Stefanos	Nikolaidis	University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA	0.1791
Xiang	Tan	Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA	0.1776
Wendy	Ju	Cornell Tech, New York, NY, USA	0.1766
Drazen	Brscic	Kyoto University & ATR, Kyoto, Japan	0.1765
Praminda	Caleb-Solly	University of Nottingham, Nottingham, United Kingdom	0.1728
		INESC-ID, Instituto Superior Técnico, Universidade de Lisboa &	
Ana	Paiva	Örebro University & Umeå University, Lisbon, Portugal	0.1699
Maja	Mataric	University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA	0.1687
Ayanna	Howard	The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, USA	0.1667
Farshid	Amirabdollahian	University of Hertfordshire, Hatfield, United Kingdom	0.1667
Sonia	Chernova	Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA	0.1667
D:1		Computer Sciences Department, University of Wisconsin - Madison,	0.4600
Bilge	Mutlu	Madison, WI, USA	0.1600
Maya	Cakmak	University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA	0.1596
Bradley	Hayes -	University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, CO, USA	0.1538
Terrence	Fong	NASA Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, CA, USA	0.1464
David	Sirkin	Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA	0.1431
Guy	Hoffman	Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA	0.1425
Anca	Dragan	University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, USA	0.1393
Aaron	Steinfeld	Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA	0.1375
Siddhartha	Srinivasa	University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA	0.1316
Chien-Ming	Huang	Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA	0.1305
Tony	Belpaeme	IDLab - AIRO, Ghent University - imec, Ghent, Belgium	0.1299
Takayuki	Kanda	Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan	0.1235
Matthias	Scheutz	Tufts University, Medford, MA, USA	0.1225

Brian	Scassellati	Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA	0.1202
Holly	Yanco	University of Massachusetts Lowell, Lowell, MA, USA	0.1146
Satoru	Satake	ATR, Kyoto, Japan	0.1136
Jodi	Forlizzi	Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA	0.1017
Julie	e Shah MIT, Cambridge, MA, USA		0.1013
Henny	Admoni	Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, USA	0.0588
Michita	Imai	Keio University, Kouhoku-ku, Yokohama-shi, Japan	0.0227

Appendix B.

Table B1

Conference	Country	Keywords
		[robot, interaction, behavior, orbo]
		[child, interaction, robot, design]
	China	[robot, navigation, people, human]
		[robot, interaction, study, people]
		[child, participant, toy, interaction]
		[robot, human, learning, interaction]
		[robot, human, interaction, child]
	USA	[robot, user, task, hri]
		[robot, human, user, task]
		[robot, human, participant, interaction]
		[robot, human, interaction, social]
		[robot, human, agent, participant]
HRI	Japan	[robot, people, interaction, human]
		[robot, touch, hand, behavior]
		[robot, human, interaction, people]
	South Korea	[service, robot, restaurant, touch]
		[robot, medical, staff, label]
		[robot, design, user, communication]
		[robot, human, interaction, social]
		[robot, social, human, tactility]
		[robot, human, social, research]
		[human, robot, uncertainty, task]
	Germany	[robot, study, social, perception]
		[robot, human, interaction, user]
		[robot, human, social, risk]

Conference	Country	Keywords
	China	[user, gesture, touch, multi]
		[user, system, item, based]
		[system, user, interaction, language]
		[system, manual, marker, interaction]
		[user, context, explanation, style]
	USA	[user, task, system, interface]
		[user, paper, data, screen]
		[user, model, system, explanation]
		[user, model, system, tool]
		[user, system, model, based]
		[data, query, user, transformation]
	Japan	[user, system, model, text]
IUI		[user, viewpoint, system, object]
		[object, user, animation, hand]
		[user, system, sensor, interface]
	South Korea	[tool, model, tag, error]
		[user, video, dissatisfaction, label]
		[e, ltgms, visual, work]
		[user, step, interaction, video]
		[description, group, image, text]
	Germany	[user, device, based, result]
		[user, model, interaction, driving]
		[user, system, interaction, intelligent]
		[user, display, gesture, warning]
		[user, image, human, password]

Conference	Country	Keywords
	China	[data, method, model, real]
		[learning, model, data, task]
		[model, data, graph, method]
		[user, graph, network, node]
		[model, data, learning, feature]
		[user, social, network, algorithm]
		[system, data, result, time]
	USA	[data, model, method, prediction]
		[model, data, method, algorithm]
		[graph, algorithm, clustering, network]
		[model, data, recommendation, method]
	Japan	[method, data, learning, model]
KDD		[method, data, time, pattern]
		[data, method, model, performance]
		[method, data, graph, time]
	South Korea	[data, model, method, feature]
		[data, based, algorithm, two]
		[graph, time, data, network]
		[aspect, node, change, network]
		[data, graph, tensor, real]
	Germany	[model, data, pattern, algorithm]
		[time, data, model, learning]
		[data, clustering, graph, cluster]
		[graph, data, model, method]
		[data, user, model, graph]


Conference	Country	Keywords
	China	[ai, user, study, human]
		[user, design, study, based]
		[design, user, study, based]
		[user, study, based, system]
		[user, design, data, visualization]
	USA	[user, design, study, system]
	Japan	[user, design, study, speech]
		[user, system, study, feedback]
		[study, design, user, tool]
CHI		[user, system, design, device]
		[paper, user, system, magnetic]
	South Korea	[user, study, design, virtual]
		[user, touch, study, design]
		[user, study, design, interaction]
		[user, design, study, based]
		[user, study, based, video]
	Germany	[user, touch, input, interaction]
		[user, study, data, design]
		[user, task, time, display]
		[user, study, virtual, experience]
		[user, design, vr, study]


Conference	Country	Keywords
	China	[motion, method, model, expression]
		[image, view, method, representation]
		[method, network, model, structure]
		[image, model, motion, method]
		[method, model, point, based]
	USA	[method, based, model, image]
		[time, real, approach, surface]
		[material, light, display, field]
		[motion, image, method, model]
SIGGRAPH		[model, image, method, based]
bidditAi ii	Japan	[method, using, display, user]
		[motion, object, user, used]
	South Korea	[motion, based, model, method]
		[image, supervised, lens, object]
	Germany	[image, field, model, method]
		[model, based, approach, image]
		[shape, algorithm, based, surface]
		[object, light, image, based]
		[surface, approach, neural, method]


Conference	Country	Keywords
		[user, based, image, hand]
		[user, design, device, paper]
	China	[user, e, interaction, video]
		[user, target, ring, based]
		[design, user, color, based]
		[user, technique, system, design]
		[user, design, tool, model]
	USA	[user, system, hand, model]
		[user, system, design, video]
		[user, device, object, data]
		[user, system, design, method]
		[ring, virtual, taste, garment]
UIST	Japan	[user, system, device, haptic]
		[user, method, system, object]
		[user, gesture, design, technique]
		[touch, finger, gesture, user]
		[table, palmrest, push, reader]
	South Korea	[user, feedback, interaction, design]
		[user, using, study, device]
		[touch, user, surface, object]
		[display, user, gaze, position]
	Germany	[user, system, adaptation, object]
		[user, object, device, present]
		[user, system, physical, present]


Conference	Country	Keywords
	China	[user, based, system, device]
		[signal, system, based, gesture]
		[user, data, based, model]
		[system, sensing, signal, device]
		[system, time, sensing, data]
		[user, device, system, based]
		[data, sensor, system, feature]
	USA	[data, system, user, model]
		[sensing, system, based, signal]
		[user, system, based, device]
		[method, sensor, using, data]
	Japan	[user, system, method, data]
UBICOMP		[user, data, using, device]
		[data, using, sensor, method]
		[data, activity, recognition, method]
	South Korea	[user, system, stress, activity]
		[user, phone, data, based]
		[user, data, system, study]
		[study, user, system, based]
		[user, device, system, study]
	Germany	[user, device, interaction, human]
		[system, activity, based, sensor]
		[user, data, system, model]
		[data, user, based, eye]
		[system, recognition, based, using]


Appendix C.



































Appendix D.




Expected Value of authors for 2010 for publishing 1 paper/s: 111.0 Observed Value of authors for 2010 for publishing 1 paper/s: 111 Expected Value of authors for 2010 for publishing 2 paper/s: 27.75 Observed Value of authors for 2010 for publishing 2 paper/s: 13 Expected Value of authors for 2010 for publishing 3 paper/s: 12.333 Observed Value of authors for 2010 for publishing 3 paper/s: 1




Expected Value of authors for 2011 for publishing 1 paper/s: 155.0 Observed Value of authors for 2011 for publishing 1 paper/s: 155 Expected Value of authors for 2011 for publishing 2 paper/s: 38.75 Observed Value of authors for 2011 for publishing 2 paper/s: 7 Expected Value of authors for 2011 for publishing 3 paper/s: 17.222 Observed Value of authors for 2011 for publishing 3 paper/s: 2 Expected Value of authors for 2011 for publishing 4 paper/s: 9.688 Observed Value of authors for 2011 for publishing 4 paper/s: 1 Expected Value of authors for 2011 for publishing 5 paper/s: 6.2 Observed Value of authors for 2011 for publishing 5 paper/s: 1




Expected Value of authors for 2012 for publishing 1 paper/s: 108.0 Observed Value of authors for 2012 for publishing 1 paper/s: 108 Expected Value of authors for 2012 for publishing 2 paper/s: 27.0 Observed Value of authors for 2012 for publishing 2 paper/s: 9 Expected Value of authors for 2012 for publishing 3 paper/s: 12.0 Observed Value of authors for 2012 for publishing 3 paper/s: 2 Expected Value of authors for 2012 for publishing 4 paper/s: 6.75 Observed Value of authors for 2012 for publishing 4 paper/s: 1




Expected Value of authors for 2013 for publishing 1 paper/s: 83.0 Observed Value of authors for 2013 for publishing 1 paper/s: 83 Expected Value of authors for 2013 for publishing 2 paper/s: 20.75 Observed Value of authors for 2013 for publishing 2 paper/s: 5 Expected Value of authors for 2013 for publishing 4 paper/s: 5.188 Observed Value of authors for 2013 for publishing 4 paper/s: 1




Expected Value of authors for 2014 for publishing 1 paper/s: 103.0 Observed Value of authors for 2014 for publishing 1 paper/s: 103 Expected Value of authors for 2014 for publishing 2 paper/s: 25.75 Observed Value of authors for 2014 for publishing 2 paper/s: 6 Expected Value of authors for 2014 for publishing 3 paper/s: 11.444 Observed Value of authors for 2014 for publishing 3 paper/s: 1 Expected Value of authors for 2014 for publishing 4 paper/s: 6.438 Observed Value of authors for 2014 for publishing 4 paper/s: 1




Expected Value of authors for 2015 for publishing 1 paper/s: 131.0 Observed Value of authors for 2015 for publishing 1 paper/s: 131 Expected Value of authors for 2015 for publishing 2 paper/s: 32.75 Observed Value of authors for 2015 for publishing 2 paper/s: 11 Expected Value of authors for 2015 for publishing 3 paper/s: 14.556 Observed Value of authors for 2015 for publishing 3 paper/s: 4 Expected Value of authors for 2015 for publishing 4 paper/s: 8.188 Observed Value of authors for 2015 for publishing 4 paper/s: 1




Expected Value of authors for 2016 for publishing 1 paper/s: 148.0 Observed Value of authors for 2016 for publishing 1 paper/s: 148 Expected Value of authors for 2016 for publishing 2 paper/s: 37.0 Observed Value of authors for 2016 for publishing 2 paper/s: 16 Expected Value of authors for 2016 for publishing 3 paper/s: 16.444 Observed Value of authors for 2016 for publishing 3 paper/s: 5




Expected Value of authors for 2017 for publishing 1 paper/s: 169.0 Observed Value of authors for 2017 for publishing 1 paper/s: 169 Expected Value of authors for 2017 for publishing 2 paper/s: 42.25 Observed Value of authors for 2017 for publishing 2 paper/s: 18




Expected Value of authors for 2018 for publishing 1 paper/s: 180.0 Observed Value of authors for 2018 for publishing 1 paper/s: 180 Expected Value of authors for 2018 for publishing 2 paper/s: 45.0 Observed Value of authors for 2018 for publishing 2 paper/s: 18 Expected Value of authors for 2018 for publishing 3 paper/s: 20.0 Observed Value of authors for 2018 for publishing 3 paper/s: 5




Expected Value of authors for 2019 for publishing 1 paper/s: 453.0 Observed Value of authors for 2019 for publishing 1 paper/s: 453
Expected Value of authors for 2019 for publishing 2 paper/s: 113.25
Observed Value of authors for 2019 for publishing 2 paper/s: 81
Expected Value of authors for 2019 for publishing 3 paper/s: 50.333
Observed Value of authors for 2019 for publishing 3 paper/s: 26
Expected Value of authors for 2019 for publishing 4 paper/s: 28.312
Observed Value of authors for 2019 for publishing 4 paper/s: 11
Expected Value of authors for 2019 for publishing 5 paper/s: 18.12
Observed Value of authors for 2019 for publishing 5 paper/s: 2
Expected Value of authors for 2019 for publishing 6 paper/s: 12.583
Observed Value of authors for 2019 for publishing 6 paper/s: 1




Expected Value of authors for 2020 for publishing 1 paper/s: 264.0 Observed Value of authors for 2020 for publishing 1 paper/s: 264 Expected Value of authors for 2020 for publishing 2 paper/s: 66.0 Observed Value of authors for 2020 for publishing 2 paper/s: 19 Expected Value of authors for 2020 for publishing 3 paper/s: 29.333 Observed Value of authors for 2020 for publishing 3 paper/s: 4 Expected Value of authors for 2020 for publishing 4 paper/s: 16.5 Observed Value of authors for 2020 for publishing 4 paper/s: 1




Expected Value of authors for 2021 for publishing 1 paper/s: 467.0 Observed Value of authors for 2021 for publishing 1 paper/s: 467 Expected Value of authors for 2021 for publishing 2 paper/s: 116.75 Observed Value of authors for 2021 for publishing 2 paper/s: 39 Expected Value of authors for 2021 for publishing 3 paper/s: 51.889 Observed Value of authors for 2021 for publishing 3 paper/s: 7 Expected Value of authors for 2021 for publishing 4 paper/s: 29.188 Observed Value of authors for 2021 for publishing 4 paper/s: 5 Expected Value of authors for 2021 for publishing 8 paper/s: 7.297 Observed Value of authors for 2021 for publishing 8 paper/s: 1



Expected Value of authors for 2022 for publishing 1 paper/s: 610.0 Observed Value of authors for 2022 for publishing 1 paper/s: 610 Expected Value of authors for 2022 for publishing 2 paper/s: 152.5 Observed Value of authors for 2022 for publishing 2 paper/s: 95 Expected Value of authors for 2022 for publishing 3 paper/s: 67.778 Observed Value of authors for 2022 for publishing 3 paper/s: 21 Expected Value of authors for 2022 for publishing 4 paper/s: 38.125 Observed Value of authors for 2022 for publishing 4 paper/s: 6 Expected Value of authors for 2022 for publishing 5 paper/s: 24.4 Observed Value of authors for 2022 for publishing 5 paper/s: 2 Expected Value of authors for 2022 for publishing 6 paper/s: 1 Expected Value of authors for 2022 for publishing 6 paper/s: 1 Expected Value of authors for 2022 for publishing 10 paper/s: 6.1 Observed Value of authors for 2022 for publishing 10 paper/s: 1



Expected Value of authors for 2023 for publishing 1 paper/s: 641.0 Observed Value of authors for 2023 for publishing 1 paper/s: 641 Expected Value of authors for 2023 for publishing 2 paper/s: 160.25 Observed Value of authors for 2023 for publishing 2 paper/s: 81 Expected Value of authors for 2023 for publishing 3 paper/s: 71.222 Observed Value of authors for 2023 for publishing 3 paper/s: 24 Expected Value of authors for 2023 for publishing 4 paper/s: 40.062 Observed Value of authors for 2023 for publishing 4 paper/s: 6 Expected Value of authors for 2023 for publishing 5 paper/s: 25.64 Observed Value of authors for 2023 for publishing 5 paper/s: 1 Expected Value of authors for 2023 for publishing 6 paper/s: 17.806 Observed Value of authors for 2023 for publishing 6 paper/s: 1 Expected Value of authors for 2023 for publishing 7 paper/s: 1 Sometime Value of authors for 2023 for publishing 7 paper/s: 1 Observed Value of authors for 2023 for publishing 7 paper/s: 1



Expected Value of authors for 2024 for publishing 1 paper/s: 991.0 Observed Value of authors for 2024 for publishing 1 paper/s: 991 Expected Value of authors for 2024 for publishing 2 paper/s: 247.75 Observed Value of authors for 2024 for publishing 2 paper/s: 134 Expected Value of authors for 2024 for publishing 3 paper/s: 110.111 Observed Value of authors for 2024 for publishing 3 paper/s: 35 Expected Value of authors for 2024 for publishing 4 paper/s: 61.938 Observed Value of authors for 2024 for publishing 4 paper/s: 9 Expected Value of authors for 2024 for publishing 5 paper/s: 39.64 Observed Value of authors for 2024 for publishing 5 paper/s: 2 Expected Value of authors for 2024 for publishing 6 paper/s: 27.528 Observed Value of authors for 2024 for publishing 6 paper/s: 3

Expected Value of authors for 2024 for publishing 8 paper/s: 15.484 Observed Value of authors for 2024 for publishing 8 paper/s: 1 Expected Value of authors for 2024 for publishing 14 paper/s: 5.056 Observed Value of authors for 2024 for publishing 14 paper/s: 1