

## **Metrics and Mechanisms: Measuring the Unmeasurable in the Science of Science**

Lingfei Wu<sup>1\*</sup> Aniket Kittur<sup>2</sup> Hyejin Youn<sup>3,4</sup> Staša Milojević<sup>5</sup> Erin Leahey<sup>6</sup> Stephen M. Fiore<sup>7</sup> Yong Yeol Ahn<sup>5\*</sup>

---

### **Abstract**

What science does, what science could do, and how to make science work? If we want to know the answers to these questions, we need to be able to uncover the social mechanisms of science, going beyond metrics that are easily collectable and quantifiable. In this perspective piece, we link *metrics to mechanisms*—by demonstrating how emerging metrics of science not only offer complementaries to existing ones, but also shed light on the underlying social organization and function of science. Based on fundamental properties of science emerging across the units of analysis, we classify existing theories and findings into: *hot and cold* science referring to attention to scientific fields, *fast and slow* science reflecting productivity of scientists and teams, *soft and hard* science revealing reproducibility of research papers. We suggest that curiosity about social mechanisms of science since Derek J. de Solla Price, Robert K. Merton, Eugene Garfield and many others complement the zeitgeist in pursuing new, complex metrics without understanding the underlying social processes.

*Keywords:* Science of Science, Measure, Citation, Novelty  
2021 MSC: 68U35, 91D30, 68T50

---

<sup>1</sup> School of Computing and Information, The University of Pittsburgh, 135 N Bellefield Ave, Pittsburgh, PA 15213

<sup>2</sup> Human-Computer Interaction Institute, Carnegie Mellon University, 5000 Forbes Ave Pittsburgh, PA 15213

<sup>3</sup> Kellogg School of Management, Northwestern University, 2211 Campus Dr, Evanston, IL 60208

<sup>4</sup> Santa Fe Institute, 1399 Hyde Park Rd, Santa Fe, NM 87501

<sup>5</sup> Luddy School of Informatics, Computing and Engineering, Indiana University Bloomington, 919 E 10th St. Bloomington, IN 47408

<sup>6</sup> School of Sociology, University of Arizona, 1145 E. South Campus Drive, Tucson, AZ 85721

<sup>7</sup> Department of Philosophy and Institute for Simulation and Training, University of Central Florida, 3100 Technology Parkway, Orlando, FL 32826

\* Corresponding authors: Lingfei Wu (liw105@pitt.edu) and Yong Yeol Ahn (yyahn@iu.edu)

## 1. Introduction

### Linking Metrics and Mechanisms

What science does, what science could do, and how to make science work? If we want to know the answers to these questions, we need to be able to uncover the underlying social mechanisms of science, and not just focus on creating the metrics that are easy to collect and quantify. Metrics are sometimes deceiving. For example, the decline of citations to a scholarly work may not be because it is no longer relevant or important, but because the once-novel idea is now common knowledge and does not need any explicit reference—we don't cite Galileo Galilei to argue that the earth orbits around the Sun instead of the reverse (Merton 1968; McCain 2014). The observation that the most cited work of a scholar is more likely to appear earlier rather than later in their career leads to the enduring myth of young, creative scientists. Sinatra et al. (2016) have shown that this myth of young, creative scientists is an illusion created by the uneven distribution of research resources over a career—young scholars have more time to produce and old scholars have the social and intellectual capital to disseminate. Controlling for productivity, the most influential work may happen at any stage of a scientist's career (Sinatra et al. 2016). The exponential increase of scholarly literature has been used to celebrate the growth of total knowledge, but we often forget that this exponential pace depends on our choice of the unit of analysis to measure the knowledge stock. If we look at new concepts rather than new articles, the cognitive content of science expands slowly, following a linear form (Milojević 2015). These are just a few cases among many more in which metrics can be misleading or come to be misused when there is a lack of understanding of the social mechanisms that produced them (C. Chen 2016).

In this perspective piece, we link *metrics to mechanisms* by demonstrating how emerging metrics not only offer complementaries to the existing ones, but are also inspired from, and shed light on, the social mechanisms of science. Based on fundamental properties of science, we classify existing theories and findings into: *hot and cold* science referring to attention to scientific fields, *fast and slow* science reflecting productivity of scientists and teams, *soft and hard* science revealing reproducibility of research papers. In extracting these properties we follow the practice pioneered by Derek J. de Solla Price in viewing science as a complex system via an analogy to thermodynamics, conceptualizing science like gas with individual molecules (scientists) possessing individual velocities and interactions, a total volume, and general properties or laws (D. J. de S. Price 1963). Bringing back the emphasis on the properties and dynamics of science shared by Derek J. de Solla Price, Robert K. Merton, Eugene Garfield, and many others, may complement the zeitgeist in pursuing new, complex metrics without understanding the underlying social processes.

We are not suggesting the abandonment of metrics. Rather, we join a growing number of scholars who argue for the careful study and cautious use of metrics (Hicks et al. 2015). This is critical because each metric comes with a hidden “worldview” of science, and how we measure

science affects how science works—as Goodhart's law states, “when a measure becomes a target, it ceases to be a good measure” (Goodhart 1984). In particular, by linking metrics to mechanisms, we hope to motivate broad research interest in analyzing dynamic processes by scholars in the Science of Science, Scientometrics and Informetrics, Science and Technology Studies, and beyond. Our objective is to motivate a more conscientious use of metrics by research institutions, funding agencies, and policymakers conditional on the understanding of what society can expect and get from science (Bernal 1939). In this way, we propose contextualized and theory-derived quantitative metrics designed to expose the currently unmeasurable structure and mechanisms of science.

### Why now?

Metrics and mechanisms of science were connected from the beginning. When Derek J. de Solla Price envisioned and founded scientometrics, he called it “Science of Science” to emphasize the vision of this new field as turning scientific curiosity and research methods onto ourselves to understand the properties, laws, and mechanisms of science (Price 1963). Price wasn't doing this alone but worked together with allies from other disciplines, including Robert K. Merton who founded the sociology of science (Merton 1973) and Eugene Garfield who created the Science Citation Index, the current Web of Science (Garfield 1964). Over time, significant focus on evaluative metrics, especially ones based on citation, have left some of the early questions on social mechanisms understudied. Since then, with increasingly available data and computation, the time has ripened for this vision to be fully realized.




Figure 1. In an age of big data and smart machines, the Science of Science research once dreamed by Price and others has now become the reality—we can explore the “deep space” of knowledge initiatives and measure the previously unmeasurable structure and dynamics of science. ILLUSTRATION: ANDREW RAE

As scientific enterprises continuously drive the 21-century knowledge economy, it has become apparent that the ambitious inquiries raised by Price and his extraordinary colleagues can not be solved by any discipline alone. The recent Science of Science revival (Fortunato et al. 2018; Wang and Barabási 2021) has provided a new array of whys, wherefores, and know-hows to expand the scope and depth of scientometrics by integrating theories and methods from sociology, economics, management science, psychology and beyond. These include the social mechanism of knowledge production (Merton 1968; Foster, Rzhetsky, and Evans 2015), the

economics of scientific idea production (Ahmadpoor and Jones 2017; Azoulay, Fons-Rosen, and Zivin 2019), the science of organization and teams in collective innovation (Fiore 2008; Woolley et al. 2010; Boudreau, Lacetera, and Lakhani 2011; Lorenz et al. 2011; Mason and Watts 2012; Cummings and Kiesler 2014), the psychological structure of the talent and creativity of individual scientists ([Simonton 1979](#); [Liu et al. 2018](#)), just to name a few.

In an age of big data and smart machines, the potential of these interdisciplinary research initiatives is multiplied by large-scale datasets and computational methods, including complex network analysis, machine learning, and data visualization. The research once dreamed by Price and others has now become the reality (Figure 1). The new landmarks include uncovering “invisible colleges” using community detection algorithms (Price and Beaver 1966; Crane 1972; Newman 2001), retrieval of “undiscovered public knowledge” using machine learning models (Swanson 1986; Tshitoyan et al. 2019a; Kittur et al. 2019; Peng et al. 2020), confirmation of the proposition that “science progresses one funeral at a time” by applying causality analysis to career and obituaries data (Planck 1950; Azoulay, Fons-Rosen, and Zivin 2019), identification of “multiple discoveries” using online repository of standardized research discoverie (Merton 1961; Dean Keith Simonton 1978; Hill and Stein 2019; Painter et al. 2020), quantifying “paradigm shift” by unfolding the temporal evolution of citation networks (Kuhn 1962; C. Chen 2004; Wu, Wang, and Evans 2019), and accessing the formation of scientific consensus using computational linguistic models (Bruno Latour 1987; Shwed and Bearman 2010; Jurgens et al. 2018). These are merely a representative sample of studies that we use to argue for a more systematic and broad consideration of metrics and how they relate to science. In the following sections we discuss how a meta-level perspective allows us to demonstrate the complementarity of these metrics to produce a more integrative, and, sometimes, holistic, understanding of the scientific ecosystem.

## 2. The Properties of Science

In 1963, Price made the beautiful analogy between science of science and thermodynamics, conceptualizing science like gas with individual molecules (scientists) possessing individual velocities and interactions, a total volume, and general properties or laws (D. J. de S. Price 1963). We extend Price’s analogy to find out more properties that can be analyzed using the paradigms of physics, such as *temperature, velocity, and density*. Based on these properties, we classify existing theories and findings into: *hot and cold* science referring to attention to scientific fields, *fast and slow* science reflecting productivity of scientists and teams, *soft and hard* science revealing reproducibility of research papers. For a representative list of research topics in the Science of Science, we show how emerging metrics offer complementarity to existing ones and reveal underlying social mechanisms. (Table 1).

Table 1. The emerging, complementary metrics as the products of theories on the mechanisms of science.

<b>2. The Properties of Science</b>
-------------------------------------

Topics	Metrics		Social Mechanisms
	Existing	Emerging	
<b>2.1 Hot &amp; Cold Science</b>			
<i>2.1.1 Discovery Significance</i>	Citation number	Disruption Score (Funk and Owen-Smith 2017; Wu, Wang, and Evans 2019)	<i>Theory Creation and Destruction</i>  Scientific revolution (T. S. Kuhn 1962) The creative destruction of science (Schumpeter 1942; McMahan and McFarland 2021) The burden of knowledge (Jones 2009)
<i>2.1.2 Concept Establishment</i>	Keyword popularity	ForeCite score (King, Downey, and Weld 2020) Meme score (Kuhn, Perc, and Helbing 2014) Ambiguity score (McMahan and Evans 2018) Citation function (Jurgens et al. 2018)	<i>Concept Explicitness and Ambiguity</i>  The black box of science (Bruno Latour 1987) Scholarly consensus (Shwed and Bearman 2010) and debate (McMahan and Evans 2018)
<i>2.1.3 Discipline Formation</i>	Keyword age	Paradigmaticness (Evans, Gomez, and McFarland 2016) Intellectual turning points (C. Chen 2004) Competing paradigms (C. Chen 2013) Discipline Cohesion (Moody 2004) and Rao-Stirling index (Leahey, Beckman, and Stanko 2017)	<i>Discipline Independence and Integration</i>  Two faces of science (Bruno Latour 1987) The republic of science (Polanyi 1962) Rapid discoveries (Collins 1994) Individual concept maps (Novak and Cañas 2006; Gowin and Novak 1984; Dai and Boos 2019) Boundary-spanning (C. Chen 2012; Sebastian and Chen 2021)
<i>2.1.4 Research Impact</i>	Citation number	Eponymy (McCain 2011) Forgotten Index (McGail 2021) Sleeping Beauty Index (Ke et al. 2015)	<i>Knowledge Forgetting and Remembering</i>

			Obliteration by Incorporation (Merton 1968; McCain 2014) Delayed Recognition (Garfield 1980) Sleeping Beauty (van Raan 2004)
<b>2.2 Fast &amp; Slow Science</b>			
<i>2.2.1 Scholar Performance</i>	H-index (Hirsch 2005)	Q parameter (Sinatra et al. 2016) Credit allocation algorithm (Shen and Barabási 2014)	<i>Scholarly Creativity and Recognition</i>  The Matthew's effect (R. K. Merton 1968) Invisible college (D. J. de S. Price and Beaver 1966; Crane 1972)
<i>2.2.2 Knowledge Cumulativeness</i>	Number of papers	Atypicality (Uzzi et al. 2013) Pivot size (Hill et al. 2021) Cognitive extent (Milojević 2015) Price Index (D. J. de S. Price 1969; Milojević 2012)	<i>Adjacent Possible and Realization</i>  Adjacent possible (Kauffman 2000; Johnson 2011; Youn et al. 2015; Loreto et al. 2016) Rapid discoveries (D. J. de S. Price 1969; Collins 1994) Upper bound of science (D. J. de S. Price 1963)
<i>2.2.3 Concept Relevance</i>	Bibliographic coupling	Knowledge graph (Bordes et al. 2013) Analogy modeling (Tshitoyan et al. 2019b; Kittur et al. 2019)	<i>Shallow and Deep Association between Knowledge</i>  Undiscovered public knowledge (D. R. Swanson 1986) Analogy as the fuel and fire of thinking (Hofstadter and Sander 2013)
<b>2.3 Soft &amp; Hard Science</b>			
<i>2.3.1 Finding Replicability</i>	Number of figures	Embedding dimensions of soft vs hard science (Peng et al. 2021)	<i>Soft and Hard Science</i>  Hierarchy of the sciences (D. J. de S. Price 1969; Cole 1983) Drawing things together (B. Latour 2011)

2.3.2 <i>Discovery Originality</i>	Anecdotes	Priority race identification (Hill and Stein 2019; Painter et al. 2020)	<i>Singletons and Multiples in Scientific Discoveries</i>  Multiple discoveries (Merton 1961; Dean Keith Simonton 1978; Brannigan and Wanner 1983) Creativity in science: genius vs zeitgeist (Dean Keith Simonton 2004)
2.3.3 <i>Knowledge Spreadness</i>	Citation number	Effective, travel distance (Brockmann and Helbing 2013; Coscia, Neffke, and Hausmann 2020; Catalini, Fons-Rosen, and Gaulé 2020)	<i>Tacit and Codified Knowledge</i>  Tacit knowledge (Polanyi 1966) Sticky, locus information (von Hippel 1994) Know-how space (Hidalgo et al. 2007)

## 2.1 Hot and Cold Science

Heat is a property of molecular kinetic energy, and, analogously, emerging fields, where science is still “in the making” through debates, are hotter and of higher vitality than established fields. In the latter, where science is considered to be “made”, that is, scholarly consensus has formed, there is less activity, and is considered to be “cold” science. Latour referred to the “black box” of scientific concepts to capture the idea of a cold science’s codified knowledge that has been created, sealed, and passed down (Latour 1987). The “black box” may be opened again in the scientific revolution (Kuhn 1962), when the cold, normal science becomes hot and vital again.

Here, we can continue with our physics metaphor with the notion of heat as thermal energy transfer when systems come in contact. Energy is transferred from a hotter system to a cooler system when they collide, and this can occur in science for any number of reasons. In some instances, scholars from different disciplines, that are actively engaged in new theory or methods (hot science), can explore their ideas in older or established areas (cold science). Or, novel paradigms can be created by “newcomers,” the new generation of scholars or scholars from other fields, who are more innovative because they know less, or are less inclined to accept the ‘black box’ of passed down knowledge, that is, they do not have the “burden of knowledge” (Jones 2009). Of course, in many cases, “premature” ideas may appear ahead of their time and are therefore forgotten. Some of them are lucky to be remembered again and enjoy delayed recognition (Garfield 1980; Ke et al. 2015), and that contact may then transform a cold science to a hot science. Through the dynamics of hot and cold seasons of science, paradigms are created and destroyed, claims are established and challenged, disciplines that were celebrating

independence are melded with other disciplines, and scholars creating similar work are amalgamated. We next discuss the quantities of interest we see as important for better understanding the dynamics of, and between, hot and cold science. We do this through analyses of existing and emerging metrics and describe the mechanisms through which these can alter science.

### 2.1.1 Discovery Significance: Creation and Destruction

It is a human tendency to separate decisive moments from trivial moments and to remember major, historical events instead of daily routines. We tend to ask, “what are the most significant scientific discoveries?” But we often forget that science is perpetually in flux. As Latour (Bruno Latour 1987) so eloquently described, science can be viewed as the ever-changing river of Heraclitus where one can not step twice into in the same circumstance, the ship of Theseus which has all of its components replaced every several years, and Janus the god of myth and duality with *two faces*: one facing the past for the codification of consolidated knowledge, and one facing the future for the search for new knowledge. The *creative destruction of science* (Schumpeter 1942; McMahan and McFarland 2021), in which new ideas substitute the old, has been discussed under different names but shared sentiments (Polanyi 1962; Bourdieu 1975; March 1991; Whitley 2000) among which the “*normal science*” and “*revolutionary science*” proposed by Kuhn are perhaps the most widely used (Kuhn 1962).

The fact that ideas are created and destroyed repeatedly reminds us that research consolidating existing scientific paradigms needs to be examined in the context of work that challenges those paradigms with a purpose to create new paths. The latter is typically led by “newcomers,” the new generation of scholars or scholars from other fields. These scholars are less familiar with existing theories, and thus have no *burden of knowledge* (Jones 2009), or they may be aware, but disagree with the established way of thinking (Kuhn, 1962). To illustrate how these metrics can similarly guide science, they could be incorporated more systematically into graduate education. For example, scientists typically only receive exposure to perspectives on knowledge creation or discussion if they take a course on the history and philosophy of science. By more clearly linking these to quantifiable metrics, these ideas could be incorporated into traditional discipline-based courses to more illustrate the progression of knowledge. This, in turn, may motivate each generation of scholars to be less accepting of prevailing perspectives and to open the “black box”.

Recent research distinguished between two distinct scientific activities, “developing vs. disruption” using a “*disruption*” measure or *D-score* (Funk and Owen-Smith 2017; Wu, Wang, and Evans 2019). Developing refers to the verification and refinement of existing theories and is associated with incremental scientific advances. Disruption captures the influence of a paper in challenging existing theories and bringing radical changes to science and technology. Two works



may have the same level of citation counts, but very different  $D$ -scores. For example, the BTW-model paper (Bak, Tang, and Wiesenfeld, n.d.) that discovered the “self-organized criticality” property of dynamical systems, one of the most prominent patterns in complexity science, is among the most disruptive papers ( $D = 0.86$ , top 1%). In contrast, the article by Davis et al. (Davis et al. 1996) on first observing the Bose-Einstein condensation in the lab is among the most developing ( $D = -0.58$ , bottom 3%). Our point, though, is that both were published in the same prominent journal, Physical Review Letters, and both have over 8,000 citations according to Google Scholar. But it is their  $D$ -scores that highlight the distinct nature of the knowledge created by these two papers. The  $D$ -score is just an example of many possible measures that can be defined from the citation network to quantify scientific advances in steps or leaps and it has its own limitations.

$D$ -score compresses two dimensions, i.e., “developing” and “disrupting,” into one variable so that the discriminant power of that single variable is maximized. Recent work discussed the “dual characteristics” of technology by reviewing the complicated cases where a work might be both developing and disruptive, and suggested separating  $D$ -score into two components to address this complexity at the cost of efficiency (J. Chen, Shao, and Fan 2021). Emerging studies also engaged in evaluating and developing  $D$ -score by linking it to paper content novelty measured through keywords (Leahey et al. 2021) or references (Lin, Evans, and Wu 2021) or measures of “interdisciplinarity” and “synergy” in scientific collaborations (Leydesdorff and Ivanova 2021). Future research can also test whether  $D$ -score is associated with transformative science (Staudt et al. 2018) or *intellectual turning points* (C. Chen 2004). Indeed, the  $D$ -score can also help the process of science itself by aiding one’s literature review. For example, it may be that  $D$ -scores can guide a scientist’s reading of the literature to seek out under-explored areas that may be less reviewed.

### **2.1.2 Claim Establishment: Consensus and Debate**

The “*black box*” (Bruno Latour 1987) metaphor helps us better understand the turn-taking between “normal science” and “revolutionary science” from the perspective of scientific products. Normal science is conducted in a way that existing claims are taken for granted in order to develop further assumptions, and scientific revolution happens when the new generation of scholars try to open the “black box” of sealed claims and challenge it with new ideas and/or conflicting evidence. In this way, the creation and destruction of scientific claims are achieved through social arrangements. Indeed, scientific claims such as “smoking causes cancer” are built on *scholarly consensus* formed through a long, complicated process (Shwed and Bearman 2010).

This does not deny the possibility that we can approach truth but reminds us that we always rely on certain social mechanisms to approach it. For example, most scientific concepts can be traced back to a single article that is “voted” by the scientists community as its source, or conversely, if

the citations between papers containing a focal keyword are highly uneven and concentrated to a single paper, the keyword is likely to be a scientific concept. The *ForeCite* algorithm (King, Downey, and Weld 2020) developed from this rationale has been shown to be highly effective in distinguishing scientific concepts (e.g., “fast gradient sign method”) from common words (e.g., “effective method”).

To better position evaluation of metrics on claim establishment, though, we need to look at the temporality of change. Each scholarly consensus is typically preceded by substantive debate about a concept or established finding. We suggest that research needs to more carefully attend to the nature of the concept and the context of its use. For example, concept *ambiguity* (Chen, Song, and Heo 2018; Chen 2019) may make an inviting, open “black box” that leads to a higher level of engagement (McMahan and Evans 2018) than concept clarity. In the latter, there is convergence of meaning that facilitates the propagation of ideas as *scientific memes* (Kuhn, Perc, and Helbing 2014), and may make it less attractive to innovators. More importantly, to consider context, detailed study of scientific debates based on analysis of the wordings surrounding citations (Catalini, Lacetera, and Oettl 2015) can be achieved by inferring the different intentions behind the citations. This is also called *citation functions*, and can include acknowledging an intellectual debt or criticizing previous work in order to create new directions. What is critical for understanding citations in context is that, contrary to the common belief that people mostly cite to agree, nearly 17% of citations are created for the purpose of “comparison or contrast.” Further, more relevant to understanding conception establishment, citations to provoke or disagree are not always rewarded by attention, as positive citations predict future impact better than negative citations (Jurgens et al. 2018; Lamers et al. 2021). Here we have noted simply another example of how to more carefully analyze the literature space while also guiding the creation of this space. For example, scholars can be taught to more regularly include citations that conflict so the breadth of some literature space is continually conveyed. Although this might forestall consensus, it may increase the robustness of any concept that does get established (C. Chen 2020).

### **2.1.3 Discipline Formation: Independence and Integration**

Polanyi (Polanyi 1962) created the concept of the “republic of science” to argue that the practicing community of science implicitly organized itself in ways similar to political and economic systems, which is contradictory to Bernal’s “planned economy” vision on the social function of science (Bernal 1939). By making this explicit, though, scientists can better manage their actions and interactions in ways more planful and productive. For example, the republic of science expands its territory and grows new disciplines through interactions between the new and the old, including methodological fields that export broadly. With this we find emerging topical fields that borrow heavily and expand, and old topical fields that grow insular and retract (Ramage, Manning, and McFarland 2020).

In this process, science presents two faces: *science in the making* and *science made* (Latour 1987). Science in the making is chaotic, dynamic, with heated, “fluid” knowledge spilling over from one discipline to another, whereas science made is relatively more organized and stabilized, with cooled, “crystalized” pieces of claims hanging in the hall of frames, worshiped by “disciplined” scholars (Sugimoto and Weingart 2015).

So what are the key factors that lead to the growth or creation of disciplines within *the republic of science* (Polanyi 1962) Investigating 16th-17th century Europe, under the Scientific Revolution, may help address this question. It was at this period when several branches of natural science shifted into a fast track of independent development characterized by *rapid discovery and high consensus*. For example, chemistry became independent from alchemy after the work of Robert Boyle, and astronomy gained autonomy from astrology after the work of Galileo Galilei. In contrast, metaphysics, promoted by Francis Bacon, or social physics, advocated by Thomas Hobbes, failed to become independent from philosophy.

Why was this so? On the one hand, it could have been because of Bacon and Hobbes’ lack of talent, passion, or connection in comparison to Boyle and Galileo. On the other hand, there could have been external factors driving the developments. That is, setting aside differences due to training from scientific epistemology, or complexity of research topics, Collins proposed that research technology was the key to make science “take off” (Collins 1994). One could argue that we can better understand the development of scholarly consensus by the genealogy of research technologies (e.g., telescopes in 16th-17th century astronomy). These research tools lower the bar of training new scientists, inexpensively produce new facts, and help scientists within the field to rapidly form a consensus on old topics so they can adapt to the moving research front. By developing metrics to track such changes, we may be better positioned to identify where science funding needs to be focused (e.g., on infrastructure) to accelerate developments.

In the “science in the making” stage, there could be *competing paradigms*, trackable through the density curves of citations (Chen 2013). After science is made and *discipline cohesion* is achieved (Moody 2004), high consensus measured in entropy of keywords, and rapid discovery measured in the number of emerging papers, can be used to quantify the formation and stabilization of paradigms, or *paradigmaticness* of a discipline (Evans, Gomez, and McFarland 2016).

As the gap between disciplines increases, it takes a Renaissance person or an interdisciplinary team to bridge it. However, the cognitive cost to go across the boundaries is high. *Individual concept maps* are typically very different and only overlap marginally between scholars trained from different traditions (Gowin and Novak 1984; Novak and Cañas 2006; Dai and Boos 2019). This makes collaboration between such scientists challenging given the interaction dynamics and

knowledge diversity (Hall et al. 2018). Further, they face a challenge of concept integration to bridge these gaps to produce new knowledge (Salazar et al. 2012). To understand these challenges, *Rao-Stirling index* (Leahey, Beckman, and Stanko 2017) is a good way to measure the cost as it considers not only the spanning of categories but also the evenness and cognitive distance between disciplines.

Effective discipline integration comes with a price, making the author(s) more prominent, but less productive (Leahey, Beckman, and Stanko 2017). For this reason, nominal interdisciplinary collaborations in which scholars strategically team up for grant opportunities (Dai 2020), or shallow interdisciplinary collaboration driven by labor division of hierarchical teams (Walsh and Lee 2015; Haeussler and Sauermann 2020) may happen. This metric, then, can also identify areas of research in which deeper expertise is needed and help graduate education, and professional development, target scholars in these areas to ensure genuine interdisciplinarity can emerge.

#### **2.1.4 Research Impact: Forgetting and Remembering**

As already discussed, the science citation index allows us to track the genealogy of ideas (Schoenbach and Garfield 1956; Garfield 1964). However, citations only capture the explicit, author-specified dependencies between papers, but not the implicit influence between them. An additional issue is that citations only, and obviously, tell us what has been cited. Related citations may have been left out due to space constraints, author ignorance, or although relevant, no longer seen as needed. With regard to the latter, one mechanism challenging the conventional analysis of citations is “*obliteration by incorporation*” (OBI): when ideas, methods, or findings are incorporated into currently accepted knowledge and treated as “common sense,” their source is obliterated (Merton 1968). No contemporary physicists would cite Newton’s *Principia* to refer to the law of universal gravitation. As a result, as more papers make use of original work, the number of explicit references ironically declines. In the successive transmission of ideas across generations, different versions of science are integrated into the legitimated, centralized one, creating a palimpsestic replacement (McCain 2014) in which all but the immediately antecedent versions are faded and citations hardly point to the true origins of ideas precisely. Furthermore, this mechanism is moderated by information and communication technologies such as Google Scholar. Searching online is more efficient and following hyperlinks quickly puts researchers in touch with prevailing opinion, but this may accelerate consensus and narrow the range of findings and ideas built upon (Evans 2008).

The *delayed recognition* of papers has been known for decades. It was called “premature” discoveries in the 1960s (Barber 1963; Stent 1972; Wyatt 1975; Hook 2002), “delayed recognition” after the 1970s (Cole 1970; Garfield 1989, 1990), and “revived classics” or “sleeping beauties” after 2000 (Krapivsky and Redner 2001; van Raan 2004; Ke et al. 2015). For

the origins of delayed recognition, Barber (1963) suggested that resistance to new discoveries partially stems from the “tendency of scientists to think in terms of established models” and “repulsion to potentially change.” This bias against novelty is observed across disciplines (Wang, Veugelers, and Stephan 2016). For the frequency of delayed recognition, Glänzel and Garfield observed that most papers are well cited within the first three to five years of publication, except for a small fraction of outliers—0.01% according to their study—experiencing a burst of attention after ten years (Glänzel and Garfield 2004).

Recent studies with large-scale data suggest that these “outliers” may be more common than expected (van Raan 2004; Yin and Wang 2017; He, Lei, and Wang 2018). Based on the analysis of the “*sleeping beauty index* (SBI),” a non-parametric measure, papers among the top 0.1% SBI still demonstrate a clear pattern of delayed recognition, ten times larger than what Glänzel and Garfield found (Ke et al. 2015). One possibility is that Glänzel and Garfield only analyzed papers published before 1980, and so missed the opportunity to discover a majority of papers “awakened” in recent decades. Nonetheless, this finding identifies a critical issue that Glänzel and Garfield ignored—papers of belated recognition may be rare, but this does not mean that they are not important. On the contrary, it is very likely that these papers are too novel to be recognized immediately and their importance unfolds over time (Lin, Evans, and Wu 2021). As for the function, half of “sleeping beauties” are research technologies, therefore, they are indeed “sleeping innovations” (van Raan 2017). Furthermore, the use of these technologies outside science, measured in patent citations, may come after their “awakening” within science (van Raan 2017).

There have been several attempts to measure the OBI mechanism, including the cases of Nash Equilibrium (McCain 2011) as summarized together with other attempts (McCain 2014). For now, the most established measure is *eponymy*: comparing the degree to which implicit citations are or are not included when including the named concept without the author (McCain, 2011). The recently developed *Forgotten Index* (McGail 2021) can also be used to infer the existence of the OBI effect indirectly. Finally, because such metrics can help us understand how citations diminish or disappear, they may also help identify the drivers of innovation. In particular, new findings in a given area may benefit from seeking out lost citations as these earlier papers may have additional data or concepts to increase the impact of the newly discovered knowledge - essentially seeing something old with a fresh perspective.

## 2.2 Fast & Slow Science

Different branches of science move at different paces. In general, hard science moves faster than soft science. Research technology plays a key role in the formation of hard science characterized by high consensus and rapid discoveries (Collins 1994, 2009). When science moves forward, it carries the existing knowledge in a way that the common knowledge is used without citations

(Merton 1968; McCain 2014). Therefore, the pace at which science moves can be measured by the “Price index,” the fraction of recent references against all references.

In theory, science should move at an accelerating pace, as the emerging ideas, concepts, and methods will exponentially expand the space of “adjacent possible” including all possible ideas as the combination of existing elements (Kauffman 2000; Johnson 2011; Youn et al. 2015; Loreto et al. 2016). But analyzing the growth of total knowledge must account for the fact that many, if not the majority, individual scientists and teams are working on evaluating rather than searching for new ideas. Thus the total number of papers is a deceiving measure in comparison to the total number of unique concepts (Milojević 2015). Will science hit its upper bound before long, as Price conceived back in 1963? Or, will science move towards the “endless frontier” (Bush 1945) with an increasing rate of realizing possible ideas with the help of AI? These are pressing questions in our time that are calling for answers. We next describe how to conceptualize quantities of interest and their associated metrics to address this question.

### **2.2.1 Scholar Performance: Creativity and Recognition**

The performance of scholars is perhaps the quantity that generated the most interest among scientists, but also among the broadest range of indicators. The complexity of this issue originates from the decoupling between the quality and recognition of artifacts due to social influence (Salganik, Dodds, and Watts 2006). In particular, the “*Matthew effect*” in science, in which the initial, random differences between scientists in status are amplified over time, results in the increasing cumulative advantage of successful scholars (Price 1965; Merton 1968; Wang, Song, and Barabási 2013). The positive feedback mechanism transforms even a normal distribution of inherent aptitude among scientists into the long-tail distribution of recognition.

The *Q parameter* was developed to overcome biases intrinsic in science citations because of these kinds of effects. For example, the *H-index* (Hirsch 2005) is a biased product of social influence and does not reflect the “intrinsic” creativity of a scientist. The *Q parameter* allows creativity to be inferred after productivity and social influence are controlled (Sinatra et al. 2016). Furthermore, the control of citations between fields in comparing scholars is particularly important. A social scientist receiving 158 citations is among the top 10% of scholars in the field during the period 1996–2017, comparable to a biomedical scholar with over 1,769 citations, more than eleven times higher (Ioannidis et al. 2019). A related problem is that the impact factor of journals is also sensitive to journal size and outlier effects due to the Central Limit Theorem (Antonoyiannakis 2018, 2020). Other metrics probe deeper to consider the role of individuals in multi-authored papers. The *credit allocation algorithm* (Shen and Barabási 2014) is developed to track the recognition of author contribution within each paper. This algorithm is designed to consider the effect of scholar visibility within the *invisible college* (D. J. de S. Price and Beaver 1966; Crane 1972) and how that changes over time. Specifically, one needs to stay in the

discipline long enough to collect credit, as socially perceived credit dynamically evolves over time, increasing with the future publications and visibility. This creates another layer of the Mathew effect that favors scholars who survive longer against those who leave the field prematurely (Petersen et al. 2011).

This is where the social context becomes critical. Although these new measures can indeed add new dimensions to the measurement of scientific creativity and productivity, we should be keenly aware of the issue that the metrics—on which these new measures are built—themselves are not certainly free from systematic biases against underrepresented populations and therefore they cannot automatically address deeply rooted systematic inequality.

### **2.2.2 Knowledge Cumulativeness: Adjacent Possible and Realization**

Science grows by accumulating knowledge based on scholarly consensus and moving forward to include new ideas and evidence. This brings the question of how fast does a research front move and what are the factors determining it? There are two theories on how science advances. The more optimistic one is based on the observation of the exponential growth of scientific literature, which doubles every 15-20 years (Price 1963). As described earlier, an explanation for this growth is the theory of *adjacent possible*. This assumes new ideas are the combinations of existing ideas, therefore, the space of all possible new ideas as the combination of existing elements should increase exponentially with the pool of available elements (Kauffman 2000; Johnson 2011). The observation is aligned with two periods of *rapid discoveries* (Price 1969; Collins 1994), including the scientific revolution in the 16th-17th century of Europe and after World War II in the U.S. (Bush 1945), when it was believed that science would move toward the “endless frontier”.

In contrast to the more optimistic view, the *upper bound of science* is proposed to predict that science may hit a wall and the exponential growth will collapse into a logistics curve at some point (Price 1963). Recent studies echoed this concern on stagnant science (Collison and Nielsen 2018) and the diminishing returns of science (Bloom et al. 2020). Measuring the pace at which the research front moves by the *Price Index*, which is the fraction of references within five years over total references (Price 1969; Milojević 2012), and disruption (Park, Leahey, and Funk 2021), suggests that science is slowing down. A critical issue with the use of these measures is to identify how the rate of growth relates to science funding. When declines align with funding decreases, the scientific community needs to determine if the decrease is warranted (e.g., consensus on lack of potential for growth), or if other factors contributed to the decline. In this way, improved metrics, linked to more substantive quantities, can more productively inform how science should develop.

This slow increase of science is supported by the slower, linear growth of new concepts in

contrast to the exponential growth of papers (Milojević 2015). The direct comparison between adjacent possible and realization in patent inventions (Youn et al. 2015) and scientific discoveries (Loreto et al. 2016) confirmed that only a small fraction of all possible ideas are created—science seems to move slowly and conservatively.

This determines the best strategy to write a hit paper in normal science: starting from highly conventional knowledge and trying to add novel ingredients. Based on this assumption, (Uzzi et al. 2013) developed a score for reference *typicality* (Z-score) to identify whether co-cited journals appear more or less likely than random in the literature, as a proxy for content novelty.

For example, the transformative “DNA” paper by Watson and Crick (Watson and Crick 1953) is more novel than the “RNA” paper by David Baltimore (Baltimore 1970), despite the fact that both papers won a Nobel prize for their author(s) (Lin, Evans, and Wu 2021). Large-scale analysis based on typicality shows that new ideas need to be introduced into the literature in appropriate proportion to old ideas, as an effective strategy of proposing something new is to make it a “familiar surprise,” by anchoring it to the well-accepted ideas (Kim et al. 2016).

Creative leaps to link distant ideas, such as how Lilian Bruch connected “HIV” with “monkeys” to introduce HIV’s origins in nonhuman primates (Sarngadharan et al. 1984), or how Londa Schiebinger (1991) linked “masculinity” to “justify” and pioneered the academic studies on gender bias, is a long shot for career success as it trades immediate citations for long-term impact (Lin 2021). These innovations are disproportionately made by minority groups (Hofstra et al. 2020), small teams (Wu, Wang, and Evans 2019), and young scientists (Packalen and Bhattacharya 2015). To improve the likelihood of accelerating innovation, and offsetting the slow pace of science, research can be done to better understand why these demographics are more likely to be innovative.

### **2.2.3 Concept Relevance: Shallow and Deep Association**

The optimistic theory of adjacent possible naively assumes that all existing ideas are independent and of the same potential to complement each other in the formation of new ideas. But what if most of the realized ideas are actually highly redundant? There is evidence that 2,000 discourse atoms in English are enough to represent over 100,000 words that capture different meanings across contexts of modern life (Arora et al. 2018). To this end, quantifying the deep association between scientific concepts rather than shallow overlapping, is the premise of understanding the potential of science. Science could advance in a way by realizing this potential through linking knowns to reveal unknowns: “... independently created pieces of knowledge can harbor an unseen, unknown, and unintended pattern. And so it is that the world of recorded knowledge can yield genuinely new discoveries” (Swanson 1986). A major way to achieve this is to model *analogy as the fuel and fire of thinking*, which answers the question such as “a is to b as c is to



\_\_?” (Hofstadter and Sander 2013).

The most famous example of discovered hidden association based on word co-occurrence is that Raynaud’s disease and fish oil were both related to blood viscosity, which predicts that dietary fish oil could be used to cure patients with Raynaud’s disease, as confirmed by subsequent clinical trials (Swanson 1986). Cognitive science has studied how analogy is used in research laboratories and found that labs finding disparate connections are more likely to do so via analogic reasoning (Dunbar 1997), and that within-domain, versus cross-domain analogies, will differentially drive innovation (Paletz, Schunn, and Kim 2013).

The emergence of *knowledge graphs* and Translational embedding (Bordes et al. 2013) model the “a is to b as c is to \_\_?” question and enable *embedding entities and relations* into low-dimensional spaces for scientific reasoning tasks. Examples include predicting new thermoelectric materials (Tshitoyan et al. 2019a) or early singles for impactful research (Weis and Jacobson 2021). Others use machine learning to determine the kinds of questions that need to be asked and answered based upon suggestions, identified gaps, and speculation (Malhotra et al. 2013). Machine learning models also effectively extract and represent “problems” and “solutions” in research articles and facilitate productive analogies for discovering new solutions to existing problems (Chan et al. 2018; Kittur et al. 2019). These metrics, and the subsequent tools based upon them, represent important developments for helping to automate or accelerate scientific innovation (Kittur et al. 2019). It may be that developments in AI can overcome limitations in slow or soft science by accelerating either discovery or consensus (see the “rapid discovery” theory of (Collins 1994). This is comparable to how network science and complexity theory, when combined with a soft science, created computational social science (Lazer et al. 2009) to greatly accelerate research in the complicated study of human behavior. Regardless, metrics based upon novel interpretations of extant knowledge, whether through analogy or integration, can help science policy and practice, better understand how to address problematic areas where science is slowing.

### 2.3 Soft and Hard Science

Science of different “hardness” or “density” of knowledge may behave in a very different way, and this shapes the activities of scientists. A naive classification is to consider natural sciences such as physics as “hard” and social sciences such as sociology as “soft” (Frost 2009). Hard science is conventionally believed to be easier to form scholarly consensus based on reproducible facts and so achieve a higher level of cumulativeness (Smith et al. 2000). Papers in hard science tend to use more graphs than those in soft science (Cleveland 1984). This happens for a reason, as figures are designed to “draw things together” and thus facilitate the production of scientific facts rather than merely reflecting them (B. Latour 2011). Soft science deals with much more complex subjects such as people and society, is closer to personal, tacit knowledge (Polanyi 1966), on which scholarly consensus is harder to achieve. In soft science, people tend to

diverge in thinking, which may be associated with less competitive priority races or fewer “multiple discoveries,” in which two or more scientists claim the same discovery independently (Robert K. Merton 1961; Painter et al. 2020). As personal, tacit, and soft knowledge is more challenging to move over time and space (Polanyi 1966), it diffuses more slowly and relies on social networks to evaluate the quality, therefore, creating a higher level of stratification in the recognition and status across scholars and institutions.

### **2.3.1 Finding Replicability: Soft and Hard Science**

The pursuit and evaluation of replication and reproducibility have become part of the most important agendas of science (Munafò et al. 2017). Not only is this critical for ensuring the validity of scientific findings, but it is also foundational to meta-analysis which has been greatly advanced by the continuous effort in converging the protocol and workflow of systematic review to improve the quality of meta-data in medicine, biology, and beyond (Moher et al. 2009). Meanwhile, the unequal evolution of meta-analysis across scientific fields reminds us that meaningful discussions on this topic should be conditional on being aware of the distinct nature of knowledge across various domains. Auguste Comte proposed the *hierarchy of the sciences* to classify science by the complexity of its objects (Price 1969; Cole 1983). A modern interpretation is that in some fields papers are “harder” than in other fields in terms of packing denser knowledge or data using intensive human labor and therefore introduce a higher level of reproducibility. This explains why “multiple discoveries” are more apparent in science than in technology, and in hard science than in soft science (Simonton 1978).

How do we quantify the “hardness” of sciences? The *number of figures* could be a good starting point to represent “hardness”(Cleveland 1984; Smith et al. 2000), because researchers tend to use figures to communicate empirical results, so the frequency of figures reveals the higher dependence on empirical evidence rather than on theories within a discipline”. More importantly, figures not just passively reflect “hardness” but also actively enhance the “hardness” of science by *drawing things together*, as figures converge the thinking and understanding of the world ( Latour 2011). It is important to identify metrics that are agnostic to discipline because these are more likely to identify differences not due to biases. Other metrics could be on keywords that similarly suggest knowledge integration (e.g., model, framework). The emergence of large data and machine learning methods allow us to construct knowledge spaces from the association of journals and discover the *hidden dimensions of soft vs hard science* (Peng et al. 2021) from how journals align and link with each other (Boyack, Klavans, and Börner 2005). Based upon these metrics, it might be feasible to target science policy in areas of science needing more attention on knowledge integration, that is, drawing concepts together, as well as on methods to improve replication.

### **2.3.2 Discovery Originality: Singletons and Multiples**

Is creativity in science originated from *genius or zeitgeist* (Simonton 2004)? Or, put it in a poetic way, are great ideas products of great minds or great times? A pattern that points to the latter as the answer is “*multiple discoveries*” or “simultaneous innovations,” in which two or more scholars invent similar if not the same ideas independently (Merton 1961; Simonton 1978; Brannigan and Wanner 1983; Painter et al. 2020). The most famous examples include the debate on the priority over integrals between Newton and Leibniz, or the theory of evolution of species, independently advanced in the 19th century by Charles Darwin and Alfred Russel Wallace. This phenomenon overshadows the pursuit for “originality” of scientific ideas and complicates the precise reference of the origins of scientific ideas.

Due to the challenge of identifying multiple discoveries, previous research relied on anecdotes or hand-crafted lists of multiples. Despite the limited size of the datasets, the inevitability of science—at least some parts of it, seems to be supported. Thirty percent of discoveries will see their multiples within a year, 70% of multiples happen within a decade (Merton 1961). A majority of discoveries have multiples, according to the Poisson distribution of multiple magnitudes with a mean value greater than unity (Simonton 1978). Over the past four decades, multiple discoveries involved fewer scientists each time. This runs counter to other studies showing an increasing prevalence of teams in science (Wuchty, Jones, and Uzzi 2007). Furthermore, when it does occur, the time interval separating independent reports is diminishing (Brannigan and Wanner 1983). This may be due to the rapid development of scholarly communication systems including journals, conferences, and workshops, and the wide use of information and communication technologies, which make it easier for scientists to learn each other’s work but also more likely to step on each other's toes if they embrace competition. But reassuringly, scientific recognition is not always a “winner takes all” game, the “scooped” research receives less but substantial (45%) share of total citations, based on a recent work analyzing *priority races* in submissions to Protein Data Bank, a repository of standardized research discoveries in structural biology (Hill and Stein 2019).

### **2.3.3 Knowledge Spreadness: Tacit and Codified**

If science is built upon scholarly consensus, an important question is the theoretical limit to how much scientists can agree with one another and how fast this agreement diffuses across time and space. Setting aside that which is yet to be known, one possibility is that common knowledge is only the tip of the iceberg, akin to the stars in a universe full of “dark matter” for which we can not agree or even describe; that is, a vast amount of personal, tacit, and unspoken knowledge of scientists. The unsuccessful attempts of many great scientists to *codify tacit* knowledge reveal the big gap between these two kinds and the fundamental challenge in transferring one another (Polanyi 1966).

The slow diffusion of tacit knowledge has constrained the economic opportunities of countries as they move very slowly in the *know-how space* (Hidalgo et al. 2007): one country cannot primarily grow crops one day and send people to the moon the next. The “*sticky*” knowledge also shapes the development of companies and spill-over of knowledge (von Hippel 1994). Know-how is the bottleneck of technology spreading and economic growth—tools can be shipped, codes and blueprints can be mailed, but tacit knowledge, or know-how, can only be transferred by moving persons: studying abroad, immigration, business travel, etc. In this sense the *travel distance* (Brockmann and Helbing 2013; Coscia, Neffke, and Hausmann 2020; Catalini, Fons-Rosen, and Gaulé 2020) between research hubs conditions the spreadness of knowledge, in contrast to the common belief that knowledge can be accessed instantly due to the development of information and communication technologies. Identifying metrics that differentiate between tacit and codified knowledge within and across disciplines provides important targets for science policy and education. On one hand, if disciplines are too low in codified knowledge proportionate to tacit knowledge, science policy can identify areas of research for knowledge development. On the other hand, graduate education, within disciplines too high on tacit knowledge, would need to focus research education on ways to improve codification of knowledge.

### **3. Discussions: Science and Society**

Science is a complex system of enterprises driven by the efforts of scientists who aim to expand human knowledge by making more things measurable and reasonable. However, with the expansion of science, scientific undertakings at the interface between the natural world and knowledge representations are increasingly complicated, nuanced, and hidden. The manifested features of scientific research are produced by underlying structures and mechanisms. This presents the urgent challenge to develop, test, and implement new science metrics in combination with theories and models that will better capture the properties and dynamics of science. We suggest that the understanding of the processes of science conditions the effective design, interpretation, and application of the metrics as the outcomes of these processes. Our understanding of the underlying structure (such as how citations distribute), and dynamics (such as how citations grow) of science, scaffolds effective evaluation of outcomes (such as paper citations, journal impact factor, and scholar h-index) and productive science policy for societal benefits.

To this end, scientometrics is an underdeveloped rather than overexploited field. Perhaps because convenience is often where we start, whereas measuring the unmeasurable is a valuable but difficult endeavor. For example, despite numerous metrics on productivity of individual scientists and their impact within academia, we know relatively less on how to access the efficiency of labor division and coordination within research teams (Larivière et al. 2016; Milojević, Radicchi, and Walsh 2018; Haeussler and Sauermann 2020; Xu, Wu, and Evans

2022) or evaluating downstream impact of science in supporting patent invention (Ahmadpoor and Jones 2017) and policy development (Yin, Gao, et al. 2021; Yin, Dong, et al. 2021), which are becoming the new research front. Furthermore, the scope and depth of scientometrics, which mainly focus on papers and references as the unit of analysis, can be greatly expanded by integrating theories and findings on individuals, teams, and communities from psychology (Simonton, 1987; Salas and Fiore 2004), economics (Jones 2009; Azoulay, Fons-Rosen, and Zivin 2019; Bloom et al. 2020), sociology (Moody 2004; Uzzi and Spiro 2005; Leahey 2007; Foster, Rzhetsky, and Evans 2015; McMahan and McFarland 2021), and beyond.

In this paper, rather than merely discussing the limitations of widely-used evaluative metrics, we presented a number of possible metrics focused on processes and the resulting structures and built off of theoretical work. We review multiple theories on the mechanisms of science where research creativity is channeled to capture the latent—not immediately explicit—features of science. From this, we argue that using a richer set of metrics, inspired from mechanism exploration, may improve the operation of the scientific enterprise as a whole. This can be realized by encouraging more and different kinds of research—from small to large teams, from developing to disruptive, and from safe to audacious—to be conducted, funded, and rewarded.

At the same time, we acknowledge the drawbacks of quantitative metrics. Such endeavors must always be cognizant of the fact that there will always be systemic biases, side effects, and/or unintended consequences from whatever metrics developed. The wide-spread systematic inequalities and barriers in science disproportionately promote or punish certain intersections of the population, posing a critical challenge to contextualize whatever metrics that we employ. Even the most sophisticated metrics with tight connections to the mechanisms cannot easily overcome the fact that the most basic measurements and the system itself are biased. As numerous scientists have argued (Hicks et al. 2015; Sugimoto 2021), without properly contextualizing the metrics and without recognizing the tilted system itself, wielding a metric can do a great harm of exacerbating structural inequality in science.

We argue, however, this is not an argument for ceasing the development of new metrics. Although metrics do provide shortcuts to understanding, an absence of contextualized metrics would simply lead to heavier reliance on simpler, more problematic metrics. The science of science will, and should, keep moving towards more rigorous yet nuanced measurements and theories that reveal the fundamental dynamics of science while striving to incorporate the rich, complex social contexts that bias everything we measure—in order to *measure the unmeasurable*.

## **Acknowledgments**

We acknowledge the following scholars in commenting on this article: Dean Keith Simonton, Julia Lane, Manolis Antonoyiannakis, Ludo Waltman, Cassandra Amato, Stephen Fitzmier,

Richard Van Noorden, Kevin Boyack, Richard Klavans, Jiang Li, Lianghao Dai, Chaomei Chen, Dashun Wang and James A. Evans. S.M and Y.Y.A acknowledge the support by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research under award number FA9550-19-1-0391. S.M.F acknowledges the support of National Science Foundation grant 2033970. L. W. acknowledges the support of Pitt Cyber Institute and Richard King Mellon Foundation.

## References

- Ahmadpoor, Mohammad, and Benjamin F. Jones. 2017. "The Dual Frontier: Patented Inventions and Prior Scientific Advance." *Science* 357 (6351): 583–87.
- Antonoyiannakis, Manolis. 2018. "Impact Factors and the Central Limit Theorem: Why Citation Averages Are Scale Dependent." *Journal of Informetrics* 12 (4): 1072–88.
- . 2020. "Impact Factor Volatility due to a Single Paper: A Comprehensive Analysis." *Quantitative Science Studies*, March, 1–24.
- Arora, Sanjeev, Yuanzhi Li, Yingyu Liang, Tengyu Ma, and Andrej Risteski. 2018. "Linear Algebraic Structure of Word Senses, with Applications to Polysemy." *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 6 (December): 483–95.
- Azoulay, Pierre, Christian Fons-Rosen, and Joshua S. Graff Zivin. 2019. "Does Science Advance One Funeral at a Time?" *The American Economic Review* 109 (8): 2889–2920.
- Azoulay, Pierre, Joshua S. Graff Zivin, and Jialan Wang. 2010. "Superstar Extinction." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 125 (2): 549–89.
- Bak, P., C. Tang, and K. Wiesenfeld. n.d. "Self-Organized Criticality: An Explanation of 1/f Noise, 1987." *Physical Review Letters* 59: 381.
- Baltimore, David. 1970. "Viral RNA-Dependent DNA Polymerase: RNA-Dependent DNA Polymerase in Virions of RNA Tumour Viruses." *Nature* 226 (5252): 1209–11.
- Barber, Bernard. 1963. "Resistance by Scientists to Scientific Discovery." *American Journal of Clinical Hypnosis*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00029157.1963.10402309>.
- Bernal, John Desmond, and Others. 1939. "The Social Function of Science." *The Social Function of Science*. <https://www.cabdirect.org/cabdirect/abstract/19402201466>.
- Bloom, Nicholas, Charles I. Jones, John Van Reenen, and Michael Webb. 2020. "Are Ideas Getting Harder to Find?" *The American Economic Review* 110 (4): 1104–44.
- Bordes, Antoine, Nicolas Usunier, Alberto Garcia-Duran, Jason Weston, and Oksana Yakhnenko. 2013. "Translating Embeddings for Modeling Multi-Relational Data." In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 26*, edited by C. J. C. Burges, L. Bottou, M. Welling, Z. Ghahramani, and K. Q. Weinberger, 2787–95. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Boudreau, Kevin J., Nicola Lacetera, and Karim R. Lakhani. 2011. "Incentives and Problem Uncertainty in Innovation Contests: An Empirical Analysis." *Management Science* 57 (5): 843–63.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1975. "The Specificity of the Scientific Field and the Social Conditions of the Progress of Reason." *Social Sciences Information. Information Sur Les Sciences Sociales* 14 (6): 19–47.
- Boyack, Kevin W., Richard Klavans, and Katy Börner. 2005. "Mapping the Backbone of Science." *Scientometrics* 64 (3): 351–74.
- Brannigan, Augustine, and Richard A. Wanner. 1983. "Multiple Discoveries in Science: A Test of the Communication Theory." *Canadian Journal of Sociology = Cahiers Canadiens de*

- Sociologie* 8 (2): 135–51.
- Brockmann, Dirk, and Dirk Helbing. 2013. “The Hidden Geometry of Complex, Network-Driven Contagion Phenomena.” *Science* 342 (6164): 1337–42.
- Bush, Vannevar. 1945. “The Endless Frontier.” *National Science Foundation--EUA. Washington*. [https://toplumsalbakis.net/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/ScienceEndlessFrontier\\_Vannevar-Bush-july-1945-Opt.pdf](https://toplumsalbakis.net/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/ScienceEndlessFrontier_Vannevar-Bush-july-1945-Opt.pdf).
- Catalini, Christian, Christian Fons-Rosen, and Patrick Gaulé. 2020. “How Do Travel Costs Shape Collaboration?” *Management Science* 66 (8): 3340–60.
- Catalini, Christian, Nicola Lacetera, and Alexander Oetl. 2015. “The Incidence and Role of Negative Citations in Science.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1502280112>.
- Chan, Joel, Joseph Chee Chang, Tom Hope, Dafna Shahaf, and Aniket Kittur. 2018. “SOLVENT: A Mixed Initiative System for Finding Analogies between Research Papers.” *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.*, 31, 2 (CSCW): 1–21.
- Chen, Chaomei. 2004. “Searching for Intellectual Turning Points: Progressive Knowledge Domain Visualization.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 101 Suppl 1 (April): 5303–10.
- . 2012. “Predictive Effects of Structural Variation on Citation Counts.” *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 63 (3): 431–49.
- . 2013. *Mapping Scientific Frontiers: The Quest for Knowledge Visualization*. Springer, London.
- . 2016. “Grand Challenges in Measuring and Characterizing Scholarly Impact.” *Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics* 1. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frma.2016.00004>.
- . 2019. *REPRESENTING SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE: The Role of Uncertainty*. SPRINGER.
- . 2020. “A Glimpse of the First Eight Months of the COVID-19 Literature on Microsoft Academic Graph: Themes, Citation Contexts, and Uncertainties.” *Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frma.2020.607286>.
- Chen, Chaomei, Min Song, and Go Eun Heo. 2018. “A Scalable and Adaptive Method for Finding Semantically Equivalent Cue Words of Uncertainty.” *Journal of Informetrics* 12 (1): 158–80.
- Chen, Jiyao, Diana Shao, and Shaokun Fan. 2021. “Destabilization and Consolidation: Conceptualizing, Measuring, and Validating the Dual Characteristics of Technology.” *Research Policy* 50 (1): 104115.
- Cleveland, William S. 1984. “Graphs in Scientific Publications.” *The American Statistician* 38 (4): 261–69.
- Cole, Stephen. 1970. “Professional Standing and the Reception of Scientific Discoveries.” *The American Journal of Sociology* 76 (2): 286–306.
- . 1983. “The Hierarchy of the Sciences?” *The American Journal of Sociology* 89 (1): 111–39.
- Collins, Randall. 1994. “Why the Social Sciences Won’t Become High-Consensus, Rapid-Discovery Science.” *Sociological Forum*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf01476360>.
- . 2009. *THE SOCIOLOGY OF PHILOSOPHIES*. Harvard University Press.
- Collison, Patrick, and Michael Nielsen. 2018. “Science Is Getting Less Bang for Its Buck.” *Atlantic*.
- Coscia, Michele, Frank M. H. Neffke, and Ricardo Hausmann. 2020. “Knowledge Diffusion in

- the Network of International Business Travel.” *Nature Human Behaviour* 4 (10): 1011–20.
- Crane, Diana. 1972. *Invisible Colleges; Diffusion of Knowledge in Scientific Communities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cummings, Jonathon N., and Sara Kiesler. 2014. “Organization Theory and the Changing Nature of Science.” <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=2549609>.
- Dai, Lianghao. 2020. “What Are Fake Interdisciplinary Collaborations and Why Do They Occur?”
- Dai, Lianghao, and Margarete Boos. 2019. “Mapping the Right Fit for Knowledge Sharing.” *Nature*, November. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-019-03558-5>.
- Davis, K. B., M-O Mewes, M. R. Andrews, N. J. van Druten, D. S. Durfee, D. M. Kurn, and W. Ketterle. 1996. “Bose-Einstein Condensation in a Gas of Sodium Atoms.” *EQEC 96 1996 European Quantum Electronic Conference EQEC-96*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/eqec.1996.561567>.
- Dunbar, Kevin. 1997. “How Scientists Think: On-Line Creativity and Conceptual Change in Science.” In *Creative Thought: An Investigation of Conceptual Structures and Processes*, (pp, edited by Thomas B. Ward, 567:461–93. Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association, xv.
- Evans, Eliza D., Charles J. Gomez, and Daniel A. McFarland. 2016. “Measuring Paradigmaticness of Disciplines Using Text.” *Sociological Science* 3: 757–78.
- Evans, James A. 2008. “Electronic Publication and the Narrowing of Science and Scholarship.” *Science* 321 (5887): 395–99.
- Fiore, Stephen M. 2008. “Interdisciplinarity as Teamwork: How the Science of Teams Can Inform Team Science.” *Small Group Research* 39 (3): 251–77.
- Fortunato, Santo, Carl T. Bergstrom, Katy Börner, James A. Evans, Dirk Helbing, Staša Milojević, Alexander M. Petersen, et al. 2018. “Science of Science.” *Science* 359 (6379). <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aao0185>.
- Foster, Jacob G., Andrey Rzhetsky, and James A. Evans. 2015. “Tradition and Innovation in Scientists’ Research Strategies.” *American Sociological Review* 80 (5): 875–908.
- Frost, Pamela. 2009. “Soft Science and Hard News.” *21st C. Research at Columbia*.
- Funk, Russell J., and Jason Owen-Smith. 2017. “A Dynamic Network Measure of Technological Change.” *Management Science* 63 (3): 791–817.
- Garfield, Eugene. 1964. “‘Science Citation Index’-A New Dimension in Indexing.” *Science* 144 (3619): 649–54.
- . 1980. “Premature Discovery or Delayed Recognition-Why.” *Current Contents. Clinical Medicine*, no. 21: 5–10.
- . 1989. “More Delayed Recognition. 1. Examples from the Genetics of Color-Blindness, the Entropy of Short-Term-Memory, Phosphoinositides, and Polymer Rheology.” *Current Contents. Clinical Medicine* 38: 3–8.
- . 1990. “More Delayed Recognition. 2. From Inhibin to Scanning Electron-Microscopy.” *Current Contents. Clinical Medicine* 9: 3–9.
- Glanzel, Wolfgang, and Eugene Garfield. 2004. “The Myth of Delayed Recognition: Citation Analysis Demonstrates That Premature Discovery, While Rare, Does Occur: Nearly All Significant Research Is Normally Cited Soon after Publication,” June 7, 2004.
- Goodhart, C. A. E. 1984. “Problems of Monetary Management: The UK Experience.” In *Monetary Theory and Practice: The UK Experience*, edited by C. A. E. Goodhart, 91–121. London: Macmillan Education UK.



- Gowin, D. Bob, and Joseph D. Novak. 1984. "Learning How to Learn." *USA: Cambridge University*.  
[http://www.dubberly.com/courses/design\\_theory/01.\\_Learning\\_How\\_To\\_Learn.pdf](http://www.dubberly.com/courses/design_theory/01._Learning_How_To_Learn.pdf).
- Haeussler, Carolin, and Henry Sauermann. 2020. "Division of Labor in Collaborative Knowledge Production: The Role of Team Size and Interdisciplinarity." *Research Policy* 49 (6): 103987.
- Hall, Kara L., Amanda L. Vogel, Grace C. Huang, Katrina J. Serrano, Elise L. Rice, Sophia P. Tsakraklides, and Stephen M. Fiore. 2018. "The Science of Team Science: A Review of the Empirical Evidence and Research Gaps on Collaboration in Science." *The American Psychologist* 73 (4): 532–48.
- He, Zhongyang, Zhen Lei, and Dashun Wang. 2018. "Modeling Citation Dynamics of 'atypical' Articles." *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology* 69 (9): 1148–60.
- Hicks, Diana, Paul Wouters, Ludo Waltman, Sarah de Rijcke, and Ismael Rafols. 2015. "Bibliometrics: The Leiden Manifesto for Research Metrics." *Nature* 520 (7548): 429–31.
- Hidalgo, C. A., B. Klinger, A-L Barabási, and R. Hausmann. 2007. "The Product Space Conditions the Development of Nations." *Science* 317 (5837): 482–87.
- Hill, Ryan, and Carolyn Stein. 2019. "Scooped! Estimating Rewards for Priority in Science." Working Paper, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Hill, Ryan, Yian Yin, Carolyn Stein, Dashun Wang, and Benjamin F. Jones. 2021. "Adaptability and the Pivot Penalty in Science." <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3886142>.
- Hippel, Eric von. 1994. "'Sticky Information' and the Locus of Problem Solving: Implications for Innovation." *Management Science* 40 (4): 429–39.
- Hirsch, J. E. 2005. "An Index to Quantify an Individual's Scientific Research Output." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 102 (46): 16569–72.
- Hofstadter, Douglas R., and Emmanuel Sander. 2013. *Surfaces and Essences: Analogy as the Fuel and Fire of Thinking*. Basic Books.
- Hofstra, Bas, Vivek V. Kulkarni, Sebastian Munoz-Najar Galvez, Bryan He, Dan Jurafsky, and Daniel A. McFarland. 2020. "The Diversity–Innovation Paradox in Science." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 117 (17): 9284–91.
- Hook, Ernest B. 2002. *Prematurity in Scientific Discovery: On Resistance and Neglect*. University of California Press.
- Ioannidis, John P. A., Jeroen Baas, Richard Klavans, and Kevin W. Boyack. 2019. "A Standardized Citation Metrics Author Database Annotated for Scientific Field." *PLoS Biology* 17 (8): e3000384.
- Johnson, Steven. 2011. *Where Good Ideas Come from: The Natural History of Innovation*. Penguin.
- Jones, Benjamin F. 2009. "The Burden of Knowledge and the 'Death of the Renaissance Man': Is Innovation Getting Harder?" *The Review of Economic Studies* 76 (1): 283–317.
- Jurgens, David, Srijan Kumar, Raine Hoover, Dan McFarland, and Dan Jurafsky. 2018. "Measuring the Evolution of a Scientific Field through Citation Frames." *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 6 (December): 391–406.
- Kauffman, Stuart A. 2000. *Investigations*. Oxford University Press.
- Ke, Qing, Emilio Ferrara, Filippo Radicchi, and Alessandro Flammini. 2015. "Defining and Identifying Sleeping Beauties in Science." *Proceedings of the National Academy of*

- Sciences of the United States of America* 112 (24): 7426–31.
- King, Daniel, Doug Downey, and Daniel S. Weld. 2020. “High-Precision Extraction of Emerging Concepts from Scientific Literature.” In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, 1549–52. SIGIR '20. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery.
- Kittur, Aniket, Lixiu Yu, Tom Hope, Joel Chan, Hila Lifshitz-Assaf, Karni Gilon, Felicia Ng, Robert E. Kraut, and Dafna Shahaf. 2019. “Scaling up Analogical Innovation with Crowds and AI.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 116 (6): 1870–77.
- Krapivsky, P. L., and S. Redner. 2001. “Organization of Growing Random Networks.” *Physical Review E, Statistical, Nonlinear, and Soft Matter Physics* 63 (6 Pt 2): 066123.
- Kuhn, Thomas S. 1962. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions: 50th Anniversary Edition*. University of Chicago Press.
- Kuhn, Tobias, Matjaž Perc, and Dirk Helbing. 2014. “Inheritance Patterns in Citation Networks Reveal Scientific Memes.” *Physical Review X* 4 (4): 041036.
- Lamers, Wout S., Kevin Boyack, Vincent Larivière, Cassidy R. Sugimoto, Nees Jan van Eck, Ludo Waltman, and Dakota Murray. 2021. “Meta-Research: Investigating Disagreement in the Scientific Literature.” *eLife* 10: e72737.
- Larivière, Vincent, Nadine Desrochers, Benoît Macaluso, Philippe Mongeon, Adèle Paul-Hus, and Cassidy R. Sugimoto. 2016. “Contributorship and Division of Labor in Knowledge Production.” *Social Studies of Science* 46 (3): 417–35.
- Latour, B. 2011. “Drawing Things Together.” *The Map Reader: Theories of Mapping Practice and*. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/9780470979587.ch9>.
- Latour, Bruno. 1987. *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers Through Society*. Harvard University Press.
- Lazer, David, Alex Pentland, Lada Adamic, Sinan Aral, Albert-Laszlo Barabasi, Devon Brewer, Nicholas Christakis, et al. 2009. “Social Science. Computational Social Science.” *Science* 323 (5915): 721–23.
- Leahey, Erin. 2007. “Not by Productivity Alone: How Visibility and Specialization Contribute to Academic Earnings.” *American Sociological Review* 72 (4): 533–61.
- Leahey, Erin, Christine M. Beckman, and Taryn L. Stanko. 2017. “Prominent but Less Productive: The Impact of Interdisciplinarity on Scientists’ Research.” *Administrative Science Quarterly* 62 (1): 105–39.
- Leydesdorff, Loet, and Inga Ivanova. 2021. “The Measurement of ‘interdisciplinarity’ and ‘synergy’ in Scientific and Extra-scientific Collaborations.” *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology* 72 (4): 387–402.
- Lin, Yiling. 2021. “Where Do New Ideas Come from: New Directions in Science Emerge from Disconnection and Discord.” University of Chicago. <https://knowledge.uchicago.edu/record/3114>.
- Lin, Yiling, James Allen Evans, and Lingfei Wu. 2021. “The Delayed Recognition of Scientific Novelty.” *arXiv [cs.DL]*. arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2103.03398>.
- Linzhuo, Li, Wu Lingfei, and Evans James. 2020. “Social Centralization and Semantic Collapse: Hyperbolic Embeddings of Networks and Text.” *Poetics*, February, 101428.
- Liu, Lu, Yang Wang, Roberta Sinatra, C. Lee Giles, Chaoming Song, and Dashun Wang. 2018. “Hot Streaks in Artistic, Cultural, and Scientific Careers.” *Nature* 559 (7714): 396–99.
- Lorenz, Jan, Heiko Rauhut, Frank Schweitzer, and Dirk Helbing. 2011. “How Social Influence

- Can Undermine the Wisdom of Crowd Effect.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 108 (22): 9020–25.
- Loreto, Vittorio, Vito D. P. Servedio, Steven H. Strogatz, and Francesca Tria. 2016. “Dynamics on Expanding Spaces: Modeling the Emergence of Novelties.” In *Creativity and Universality in Language*, edited by Mirko Degli Esposti, Eduardo G. Altmann, and François Pacht, 59–83. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Malhotra, Ashutosh, Erfan Younesi, Harsha Gurulingappa, and Martin Hofmann-Apitius. 2013. “‘HypothesisFinder’: A Strategy for the Detection of Speculative Statements in Scientific Text.” *PLoS Computational Biology* 9 (7): e1003117.
- March, James G. 1991. “Exploration and Exploitation in Organizational Learning.” *Organization Science* 2 (1): 71–87.
- Mason, Winter, and Duncan J. Watts. 2012. “Collaborative Learning in Networks.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 109 (3): 764–69.
- McCain, Katherine W. 2011. “Eponymy and Obliteration by Incorporation: The Case of the ‘Nash Equilibrium.’” *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 62 (7): 1412–24.
- . 2014. “Obliteration by Incorporation.” *Beyond Bibliometrics: Harnessing Multidimensional Indicators of Scholarly Impact*, 129–49.
- McGail, Alec. 2021. “Lost & Forgotten: An Index of the Famous Works Which Sociology Has Left behind.” *The American Sociologist* 52 (2): 304–40.
- McMahan, Peter, and James Evans. 2018. “Ambiguity and Engagement.” *The American Journal of Sociology* 124 (3): 860–912.
- McMahan, Peter, and Daniel A. McFarland. 2021. “Creative Destruction: The Structural Consequences of Scientific Curation.” *American Sociological Review* 86 (2): 341–76.
- Merton. 1961. “Singletons and Multiples in Scientific Discovery: A Chapter in the Sociology of Science.” *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 105 (5): 470–86.
- . 1968. *Social Theory and Social Structure*. Simon and Schuster.
- Merton, R. K. 1968. “The Matthew Effect in Science. The Reward and Communication Systems of Science Are Considered.” *Science* 159 (3810): 56–63.
- Merton, Robert K. 1961. “Singletons and Multiples in Scientific Discovery: A Chapter in the Sociology of Science.” *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 105 (5): 470–86.
- Merton, Robert King. 1973. *The Sociology of Science: Theoretical and Empirical Investigations*. University of Chicago Press.
- Milojević, Staša. 2012. “How Are Academic Age, Productivity and Collaboration Related to Citing Behavior of Researchers?” *PloS One* 7 (11): e49176.
- . 2015. “Quantifying the Cognitive Extent of Science.” *Journal of Informetrics* 9 (4): 962–73.
- Milojević, Staša, Filippo Radicchi, and John P. Walsh. 2018. “Changing Demographics of Scientific Careers: The Rise of the Temporary Workforce.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 115 (50): 12616–23.
- Moher, David, Alessandro Liberati, Jennifer Tetzlaff, Douglas G. Altman, and PRISMA Group. 2009. “Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement.” *PLoS Medicine* 6 (7): e1000097.
- Moody, James. 2004. “The Structure of a Social Science Collaboration Network: Disciplinary Cohesion from 1963 to 1999.” *American Sociological Review* 69 (2): 213–38.
- Munafò, Marcus R., Brian A. Nosek, Dorothy V. M. Bishop, Katherine S. Button, Christopher

- D. Chambers, Nathalie Percie du Sert, Uri Simonsohn, Eric-Jan Wagenmakers, Jennifer J. Ware, and John P. A. Ioannidis. 2017. "A Manifesto for Reproducible Science." *Nature Human Behaviour* 1 (January): 0021.
- Newman, M. E. 2001. "The Structure of Scientific Collaboration Networks." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 98 (2): 404–9.
- Novak, Joseph D., and Alberto J. Cañas. 2006. "The Theory Underlying Concept Maps and How to Construct Them." *Florida Institute for Human and Machine Cognition* 1 (1): 1–31.
- Packalen, Mikko, and Jay Bhattacharya. 2015. "Age and the Trying Out of New Ideas." w20920. National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w20920>.
- Painter, Deryc T., Frank van der Wouden, Manfred D. Laubichler, and Hyejin Youn. 2020. "Quantifying Simultaneous Innovations in Evolutionary Medicine." *Theory in Biosciences = Theorie in Den Biowissenschaften* 139 (4): 319–35.
- Paletz, Susannah B. F., Christian D. Schunn, and Kevin H. Kim. 2013. "The Interplay of Conflict and Analogy in Multidisciplinary Teams." *Cognition* 126 (1): 1–19.
- Park, Michael, Erin Leahey, and Russell Funk. 2021. "Dynamics of Disruption in Science and Technology." *arXiv [cs.SI]*. arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2106.11184>.
- Peng, Hao, Qing Ke, Ceren Budak, Daniel M. Romero, and Yong-Yeol Ahn. 2020. "Neural Embeddings of Scholarly Periodicals Reveal Complex Disciplinary Organizations." *arXiv [cs.DL]*. arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2001.08199>.
- . 2021. "Neural Embeddings of Scholarly Periodicals Reveal Complex Disciplinary Organizations." *Science Advances* 7 (17). <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abb9004>.
- Petersen, Alexander M., Woo-Sung Jung, Jae-Suk Yang, and H. Eugene Stanley. 2011. "Quantitative and Empirical Demonstration of the Matthew Effect in a Study of Career Longevity." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 108 (1): 18–23.
- Planck, Max. (1950) 1950. "Scientific Autobiography and Other Papers." *Philosophy of Science* 17 (4): 361–361.
- Polanyi, Michael. 1962. "The Republic of Science." *Minerva* 1 (1): 54–73.
- . 1966. *The Tacit Dimension*. University of Chicago Press.
- Price, Derek John de Solla. 1963. *Little Science, Big Science*. Vol. 5. Columbia University Press New York.
- . 1969. *Citation Measures of Hard Science, Soft Science, Technology and Non-Science: Paper Presented at a Conference on Communication Among Scientists and Technologists. The Johns Hopkins University, October 28-30, 1969*.
- Price, Derek John de Solla, and Donald Beaver. 1966. "Collaboration in an Invisible College." *The American Psychologist* 21 (11): 1011–18.
- Price, D. J. 1965. "NETWORKS OF SCIENTIFIC PAPERS." *Science* 149 (3683): 510–15.
- Raan, Anthony F. J. van. 2004. "Sleeping Beauties in Science." *Scientometrics* 59 (3): 467–72.
- . 2017. "Sleeping Beauties Cited in Patents: Is There Also a Dormitory of Inventions?" *Scientometrics* 110 (3): 1123–56.
- Ramage, Daniel, Christopher D. Manning, and Daniel A. McFarland. 2020. "Mapping Three Decades of Intellectual Change in Academia." *arXiv [cs.DL]*. arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2004.01291>.
- Salas, Eduardo Ed, and Stephen M. Fiore. 2004. *Team Cognition: Understanding the Factors That Drive Process and Performance*. American Psychological Association.
- Salazar, Maritza R., Theresa K. Lant, Stephen M. Fiore, and Eduardo Salas. 2012. "Facilitating

- Innovation in Diverse Science Teams Through Integrative Capacity.” *Small Group Research* 43 (5): 527–58.
- Salganik, Matthew J., Peter Sheridan Dodds, and Duncan J. Watts. 2006. “Experimental Study of Inequality and Unpredictability in an Artificial Cultural Market.” *Science* 311 (5762): 854–56.
- Sarnagadharan, M. G., M. Popovic, L. Bruch, J. Schüpbach, and R. C. Gallo. 1984. “Antibodies Reactive with Human T-Lymphotropic Retroviruses (HTLV-III) in the Serum of Patients with AIDS.” *Science* 224 (4648): 506–8.
- Schoenbach, U. H., and E. Garfield. 1956. “Citation Indexes for Science.” *Science* 123 (3185): 61–62.
- Schumpeter, Joseph. 1942. “Creative Destruction.” *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy* 825: 82–85.
- Sebastian, Yakub, and Chaomei Chen. 2021. “The Boundary-Spanning Mechanisms of Nobel Prize Winning Papers.” *PloS One* 16 (8): e0254744.
- Shen, H. W., and A. L. Barabási. 2014. “Collective Credit Allocation in Science.” *The National Academy of Sciences*. <https://www.pnas.org/content/111/34/12325.short>.
- Shwed, Uri, and Peter S. Bearman. 2010. “The Temporal Structure of Scientific Consensus Formation.” *American Sociological Review* 75 (6): 817–40.
- Simonton. n.d. “Creative Productivity: A Predictive and Explanatory Model of Career Trajectories and Landmarks.” *Psychological Review* 104 (1): 66–89.
- Simonton, Dean K. 1979. “Multiple Discovery and Invention: Zeitgeist, Genius, or Chance?” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 37 (9): 1603–16.
- Simonton, Dean Keith. 1978. “Independent Discovery in Science and Technology: A Closer Look at the Poisson Distribution.” *Social Studies of Science* 8 (4): 521–32.
- . 2004. *Creativity in Science: Chance, Logic, Genius, and Zeitgeist*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sinatra, Roberta, Dashun Wang, Pierre Deville, Chaoming Song, and Albert-László Barabási. 2016. “Quantifying the Evolution of Individual Scientific Impact.” *Science* 354 (6312). <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaf5239>.
- Smith, Laurence D., Lisa A. Best, D. Alan Stubbs, John Johnston, and Andrea Bastiani Archibald. 2000. “Scientific Graphs and the Hierarchy of the Sciences: A Latourian Survey of Inscription Practices.” *Social Studies of Science* 30 (1): 73–94.
- Staudt, Joseph, Huifeng Yu, Robert P. Light, Gerald Marschke, Katy Börner, and Bruce A. Weinberg. 2018. “High-Impact and Transformative Science (HITS) Metrics: Definition, Exemplification, and Comparison.” *PloS One* 13 (7): e0200597.
- Stent, G. S. 1972. “Prematurity and Uniqueness in Scientific Discovery.” *Scientific American* 227 (6): 84–93.
- Sugimoto, Cassidy R. 2021. “Scientific Success by Numbers.” *Nature* 593 (May): 30.
- Sugimoto, Cassidy R., and Scott Weingart. 2015. “The Kaleidoscope of Disciplinarity.” *Journal of Documentation* 71 (4): 775–94.
- Swanson, Don R. 1986. “Fish Oil, Raynaud’s Syndrome, and Undiscovered Public Knowledge.” *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine*. <https://doi.org/10.1353/pbm.1986.0087>.
- Swanson, D. R. 1986. “Fish Oil, Raynaud’s Syndrome, and Undiscovered Public Knowledge.” *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine* 30 (1): 7–18.
- Tshitoyan, Vahe, John Dagdelen, Leigh Weston, Alexander Dunn, Ziqin Rong, Olga Kononova, Kristin A. Persson, Gerbrand Ceder, and Anubhav Jain. 2019a. “Unsupervised Word

- Embeddings Capture Latent Knowledge from Materials Science Literature.” *Nature* 571 (7763): 95–98.
- . 2019b. “Unsupervised Word Embeddings Capture Latent Knowledge from Materials Science Literature.” *Nature* 571 (7763): 95–98.
- Uzzi, Brian, Satyam Mukherjee, Michael Stringer, and Ben Jones. 2013. “Atypical Combinations and Scientific Impact.” *Science* 342 (6157): 468–72.
- Uzzi, Brian, and Jarrett Spiro. 2005. “Collaboration and Creativity: The Small World Problem.” *The American Journal of Sociology* 111 (2): 447–504.
- Walsh, John P., and You-Na Lee. 2015. “The Bureaucratization of Science.” *Research Policy* 44 (8): 1584–1600.
- Wang, Dashun, and Albert-László Barabási. 2021. *The Science of Science*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wang, Song, and Barabási. 2013. “Quantifying Long-Term Scientific Impact.” *Science* 342 (6154): 127–32.
- Wang, Veugelers, and Stephan. 2016. “Bias against Novelty in Science: A Cautionary Tale for Users of Bibliometric Indicators.” <https://doi.org/10.3386/w22180>.
- Watson, J. D., and F. H. Crick. 1953. “Molecular Structure of Nucleic Acids; a Structure for Deoxyribose Nucleic Acid.” *Nature* 171 (4356): 737–38.
- Weis, James W., and Joseph M. Jacobson. 2021. “Learning on Knowledge Graph Dynamics Provides an Early Warning of Impactful Research.” *Nature Biotechnology*, May. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41587-021-00907-6>.
- Whitley, Richard. 2000. *The Intellectual and Social Organization of the Sciences*. Oxford University Press.
- Woolley, Anita Williams, Christopher F. Chabris, Alex Pentland, Nada Hashmi, and Thomas W. Malone. 2010. “Evidence for a Collective Intelligence Factor in the Performance of Human Groups.” *Science* 330 (6004): 686–88.
- Wuchty, Stefan, Benjamin F. Jones, and Brian Uzzi. 2007. “The Increasing Dominance of Teams in Production of Knowledge.” *Science* 316 (5827): 1036–39.
- Wu, Lingfei, Dashun Wang, and James A. Evans. 2019. “Large Teams Develop and Small Teams Disrupt Science and Technology.” *Nature* 566 (7744): 378–82.
- Wyatt, H. V. 1975. “Knowledge and Prematurity: The Journey from Transformation to DNA.” *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine* 18 (2): 149–56.
- Xu, Fengli, Lingfei Wu, and James Evans. 2022. “Flat Teams Drive Scientific Innovation.” *arXiv [cs.DL]*. arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2201.06726>.
- Yin, Yian, Yuxiao Dong, Kuansan Wang, Dashun Wang, and Benjamin Jones. 2021. “Science as a Public Good: Public Use and Funding of Science.” Working Paper Series. National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w28748>.
- Yin, Yian, Jian Gao, Benjamin F. Jones, and Dashun Wang. 2021. “Coevolution of Policy and Science during the Pandemic.” *Science* 371 (6525): 128–30.
- Yin, Yian, and Dashun Wang. 2017. “The Time Dimension of Science: Connecting the Past to the Future.” *Journal of Informetrics* 11 (2): 608–21.
- Youn, Hyejin, Deborah Strumsky, Luis M. A. Bettencourt, and José Lobo. 2015. “Invention as a Combinatorial Process: Evidence from US Patents.” *Journal of the Royal Society, Interface / the Royal Society* 12 (106). <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsif.2015.0272>.
- Cronin, Blaise, and Cassidy R. Sugimoto, eds. *Beyond bibliometrics: Harnessing multidimensional indicators of scholarly impact*. MIT Press, 2014.

- Goodhart, Charles AE. "Problems of monetary management: the UK experience." *In Monetary theory and practice*, pp. 91-121. Palgrave, London, 1984.
- Hicks, Diana, Paul Wouters, Ludo Waltman, Sarah De Rijcke, and Ismael Rafols. "Bibliometrics: the Leiden Manifesto for research metrics." *Nature News* 520, no. 7548 (2015): 429.
- Lamers, Wout S., Kevin Boyack, Vincent Larivière, Cassidy R. Sugimoto, Nees Jan van Eck, Ludo Waltman, and Dakota Murray. "Meta-Research: Investigating disagreement in the scientific literature." *Elife* 10 (2021): e72737.
- Lin, Yiling, James A. Evans, and Lingfei Wu. "New directions in science emerge from disconnection and discord." *Journal of Informetrics* 16, no. 1 (2022): 101234.
- Novak, Joseph D., D. Bob Gowin, and Gowin D. Bob. *Learning how to learn*. Cambridge University press, 1984.
- Sugimoto, Cassidy R. "Scientific success by numbers." *Nature* 593, no. 7857 (2021): 30-31.
- Sugimoto, Cassidy R., and Scott Weingart. "The kaleidoscope of disciplinarity." *Journal of Documentation* (2015).
- Wang, D., & Barabási, A. L. (2021). *The science of science*. Cambridge University Press.
- Yin, Yian, Jian Gao, Benjamin F. Jones, and Dashun Wang. "Coevolution of policy and science during the pandemic." *Science* 371, no. 6525 (2021): 128-130.
- Yin, Yian, Yuxiao Dong, Kuansan Wang, Dashun Wang, and Benjamin Jones. *Science as a Public Good: Public Use and Funding of Science*. No. w28748. National Bureau of Economic Research, 2021.