

Itiel E Dror

List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: <https://exaly.com/author-pdf/9510861/publications.pdf>

Version: 2024-02-01

75
papers

3,564
citations

117625

34
h-index

144013

57
g-index

75
all docs

75
docs citations

75
times ranked

1562
citing authors

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
1	The forensic confirmation bias: Problems, perspectives, and proposed solutions.. Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition, 2013, 2, 42-52.	1.1	419
2	Subjectivity and bias in forensic DNA mixture interpretation. Science and Justice - Journal of the Forensic Science Society, 2011, 51, 204-208.	2.1	244
3	Cognitive and Human Factors in Expert Decision Making: Six Fallacies and the Eight Sources of Bias. Analytical Chemistry, 2020, 92, 7998-8004.	6.5	139
4	Meta-analytically Quantifying the Reliability and Biasability of Forensic Experts. Journal of Forensic Sciences, 2008, 53, 900-903.	1.6	136
5	The vision in "blind" justice: Expert perception, judgment, and visual cognition in forensic pattern recognition. Psychonomic Bulletin and Review, 2010, 17, 161-167.	2.8	116
6	Decision making under time pressure: An independent test of sequential sampling models. Memory and Cognition, 1999, 27, 713-725.	1.6	114
7	Cognitive bias in forensic anthropology: Visual assessment of skeletal remains is susceptible to confirmation bias. Science and Justice - Journal of the Forensic Science Society, 2014, 54, 208-214.	2.1	114
8	Cognitive issues in fingerprint analysis: Inter- and intra-expert consistency and the effect of a "target" comparison. Forensic Science International, 2011, 208, 10-17.	2.2	105
9	Biases in forensic experts. Science, 2018, 360, 243-243.	12.6	99
10	Cognitive bias and blindness: A global survey of forensic science examiners.. Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition, 2017, 6, 452-459.	1.1	95
11	The use of technology in human expert domains: challenges and risks arising from the use of automated fingerprint identification systems in forensic science. Law, Probability and Risk, 2010, 9, 47-67.	2.4	84
12	A hierarchy of expert performance.. Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition, 2016, 5, 121-127.	1.1	84
13	The Impact of Human-Technology Cooperation and Distributed Cognition in Forensic Science: Biasing Effects of AFIS Contextual Information on Human Experts*. Journal of Forensic Sciences, 2012, 57, 343-352.	1.6	69
14	Cognitive bias in forensic pathology decisions. Journal of Forensic Sciences, 2021, 66, 1751-1757.	1.6	67
15	Visual-spatial abilities of pilots.. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1993, 78, 763-773.	5.3	66
16	Making training more cognitively effective: Making videos interactive. British Journal of Educational Technology, 2009, 40, 1124-1134.	6.3	64
17	Understanding and Mitigating Bias in Forensic Evaluation: Lessons from Forensic Science. International Journal of Forensic Mental Health, 2017, 16, 227-238.	1.0	62
18	Age Differences in Decision Making: To Take a Risk or Not?. Gerontology, 1998, 44, 67-71.	2.8	60

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
19	Optimising the use of note-taking as an external cognitive aid for increasing learning. <i>British Journal of Educational Technology</i> , 2009, 40, 619-635.	6.3	60
20	A cognitive perspective on technology enhanced learning in medical training: Great opportunities, pitfalls and challenges. <i>Medical Teacher</i> , 2011, 33, 291-296.	1.8	58
21	Practical Solutions to Cognitive and Human Factor Challenges in Forensic Science. <i>Forensic Science Policy and Management</i> , 2013, 4, 105-113.	0.5	57
22	Human expert performance in forensic decision making: Seven different sources of bias. <i>Australian Journal of Forensic Sciences</i> , 2017, 49, 541-547.	1.2	53
23	Cognitive and human factors in digital forensics: Problems, challenges, and the way forward. <i>Digital Investigation</i> , 2019, 29, 101-108.	3.2	53
24	Cognitive bias in forensic mental health assessment: Evaluator beliefs about its nature and scope.. <i>Psychology, Public Policy, and Law</i> , 2018, 24, 1-10.	1.2	52
25	Implementing context information management in forensic casework: Minimizing contextual bias in firearms examination. <i>Science and Justice - Journal of the Forensic Science Society</i> , 2016, 56, 113-122.	2.1	48
26	A novel approach to minimize error in the medical domain: Cognitive neuroscientific insights into training. <i>Medical Teacher</i> , 2011, 33, 34-38.	1.8	47
27	Human Factors Effecting Forensic Decision Making: Workplace Stress and Well-being. <i>Journal of Forensic Sciences</i> , 2018, 63, 258-261.	1.6	47
28	Emotional Experiences and Motivating Factors Associated with Fingerprint Analysis. <i>Journal of Forensic Sciences</i> , 2010, 55, 385-393.	1.6	45
29	Letter to the Editor "The Bias Snowball and the Bias Cascade Effects: Two Distinct Biases that May Impact Forensic Decision Making. <i>Journal of Forensic Sciences</i> , 2017, 62, 832-833.	1.6	45
30	"Cannot Decide" The Fine Line Between Appropriate Inconclusive Determinations Versus Unjustifiably Deciding Not To Decide. <i>Journal of Forensic Sciences</i> , 2019, 64, 10-15.	1.6	45
31	A hierarchy of expert performance applied to forensic psychological assessments.. <i>Psychology, Public Policy, and Law</i> , 2018, 24, 11-23.	1.2	45
32	Older Adults Use Mental Representations That Reduce Cognitive Load: Mental Rotation Utilizes Holistic Representations and Processing. <i>Experimental Aging Research</i> , 2005, 31, 409-420.	1.2	43
33	Cognitive neuroscience in forensic science: understanding and utilizing the human element. <i>Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences</i> , 2015, 370, 20140255.	4.0	40
34	Contextual bias and cross-contamination in the forensic sciences: the corrosive implications for investigations, plea bargains, trials and appeals. <i>Law, Probability and Risk</i> , 2015, 14, 1-25.	2.4	39
35	The ambition to be scientific: Human expert performance and objectivity. <i>Science and Justice - Journal of the Forensic Science Society</i> , 2013, 53, 81-82.	2.1	38
36	Computational analyses in cognitive neuroscience: In defense of biological implausibility. <i>Psychonomic Bulletin and Review</i> , 1999, 6, 173-182.	2.8	36

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
37	Cognitive and contextual influences in determination of latent fingerprint suitability for identification judgments. <i>Science and Justice - Journal of the Forensic Science Society</i> , 2013, 53, 144-153.	2.1	36
38	New application of psychology to law: Improving forensic evidence and expert witness contributions.. <i>Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition</i> , 2013, 2, 78-81.	1.1	35
39	Strengthening forensic DNA decision making through a better understanding of the influence of cognitive bias. <i>Science and Justice - Journal of the Forensic Science Society</i> , 2017, 57, 415-420.	2.1	35
40	Aging and the Scope of Visual Attention. <i>Gerontology</i> , 1999, 45, 102-109.	2.8	34
41	Forensic Comparison and Matching of Fingerprints: Using Quantitative Image Measures for Estimating Error Rates through Understanding and Predicting Difficulty. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2014, 9, e94617.	2.5	32
42	Perception of Risk and the Decision to Use Force. <i>Policing (Oxford)</i> , 2007, 1, 265-272.	1.4	31
43	Bias among forensic document examiners: Still a need for procedural changes. <i>Australian Journal of Forensic Sciences</i> , 2014, 46, 91-97.	1.2	31
44	ISO Standards Addressing Issues of Bias and Impartiality in Forensic Work. <i>Journal of Forensic Sciences</i> , 2020, 65, 800-808.	1.6	29
45	Linear Sequential Unmaskingâ€œExpanded (LSU-E): A general approach for improving decision making as well as minimizing noise and bias. <i>Forensic Science International (Online)</i> , 2021, 3, 100161.	1.3	28
46	What do forensic analysts consider relevant to their decision making?. <i>Science and Justice - Journal of the Forensic Science Society</i> , 2019, 59, 516-523.	2.1	26
47	Cascading Bias of Initial Exposure to Information at the Crime Scene to the Subsequent Evaluation of Skeletal Remains,. <i>Journal of Forensic Sciences</i> , 2018, 63, 403-411.	1.6	23
48	The forensic disclosure model: What should be disclosed to, and by, forensic experts?. <i>International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice</i> , 2019, 59, 100330.	0.8	23
49	The Error in â€œError Rateâ€œ: Why Error Rates Are So Needed, Yet So Elusive. <i>Journal of Forensic Sciences</i> , 2020, 65, 1034-1039.	1.6	23
50	Helping the cognitive system learn: exaggerating distinctiveness and uniqueness. <i>Applied Cognitive Psychology</i> , 2008, 22, 573-584.	1.6	22
51	Aging and Scanning of Imagined and Perceived Visual Images. <i>Experimental Aging Research</i> , 1998, 24, 181-194.	1.2	19
52	The role of meaning and familiarity in mental transformations. <i>Psychonomic Bulletin and Review</i> , 2001, 8, 732-741.	2.8	19
53	Training Induces Cognitive Bias. <i>Simulation in Healthcare</i> , 2014, 9, 85-93.	1.2	18
54	Organizational and Human Factors Affecting Forensic Decisionâ€œMaking: Workplace Stress and Feedback. <i>Journal of Forensic Sciences</i> , 2020, 65, 1968-1977.	1.6	18

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
55	Visual mental rotation of possible and impossible objects. <i>Psychonomic Bulletin and Review</i> , 1997, 4, 242-247.	2.8	17
56	Time for DNA Disclosure. <i>Science</i> , 2009, 326, 1631-1632.	12.6	15
57	The Collapsing Choice Theory: Dissociating Choice and Judgment in Decision Making. <i>Theory and Decision</i> , 2009, 66, 149-179.	1.0	12
58	Complexity as a guide to understanding decision bias: A contribution to the favorite-longshot bias debate. <i>Journal of Behavioral Decision Making</i> , 2009, 22, 318-337.	1.7	11
59	Biasability and reliability of expert forensic document examiners. <i>Forensic Science International</i> , 2021, 318, 110610.	2.2	11
60	A hierarchy of expert performance (HEP) applied to digital forensics: Reliability and biasability in digital forensics decision making. <i>Forensic Science International: Digital Investigation</i> , 2021, 37, 301175.	1.7	11
61	Metric forensic anthropology decisions: Reliability and biasability of sectioning-point-based sex estimates. <i>Journal of Forensic Sciences</i> , 2022, 67, 68-79.	1.6	7
62	The effect of contextual information on professional judgment: Reliability and biasability of expert workplace safety inspectors. <i>Journal of Safety Research</i> , 2021, 77, 13-22.	3.6	6
63	Reply to Comment on "Cognitive and Human Factors in Expert Decision Making: Six Fallacies and the Eight Sources of Bias". <i>Analytical Chemistry</i> , 2020, 92, 12727-12728.	6.5	3
64	Using artificial bat sonar neural networks for complex pattern recognition: Recognizing faces and the speed of a moving target. <i>Biological Cybernetics</i> , 1996, 74, 331-338.	1.3	1
65	Authors'™ Response to Tse et al Commentary on. <i>Journal of Forensic Sciences</i> , 2021, 66, 2569-2570.	1.6	0
66	Authors'™ Response to Dufluo Commentary on. <i>Journal of Forensic Sciences</i> , 2021, 66, 2562-2562.	1.6	0
67	Authors'™ Response to Peterson et al Commentary on. <i>Journal of Forensic Sciences</i> , 2021, 66, 2545-2548.	1.6	0
68	Authors'™ Response to Obenson Commentary on. <i>Journal of Forensic Sciences</i> , 2021, 66, 2585-2586.	1.6	0
69	Authors'™ Response to Gill et al Commentary on. <i>Journal of Forensic Sciences</i> , 2021, 66, 2555-2556.	1.6	0
70	Authors'™ Response to Oliver Commentary on. <i>Journal of Forensic Sciences</i> , 2021, 66, 2565-2566.	1.6	0
71	Authors'™ Response to Gill et al Response. <i>Journal of Forensic Sciences</i> , 2021, 66, 2559-2560.	1.6	0
72	Authors'™ Response to Young Commentary on. <i>Journal of Forensic Sciences</i> , 2021, 66, 2572-2573.	1.6	0

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
73	Authors'™ Response to Graber Commentary on. Journal of Forensic Sciences, 2021, 66, 2575-2576.	1.6	0
74	Authors'™ Response to Speth et al Commentary on. Journal of Forensic Sciences, 2021, 66, 2580-2581.	1.6	0
75	Authors'™ Response to Peterson et al Response. Journal of Forensic Sciences, 2021, 66, 2553-2553.	1.6	0