

Categorical and Geographical Separation in Science

Julian Sienkiewicz^{a,*}, Krzysztof Soja^a, Janusz A. Hołyst^a and Peter M. A. Sloot^{b,c,d}

a Faculty of Physics, Center of Excellence for Complex Systems Research, Warsaw University of Technology, Warsaw, Poland

b Computational Science, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

c National Research University of Information Technologies, Mechanics and Optics (ITMO), Saint Petersburg, Russia

d Nanyang Technological University, Singapore, Singapore

* E-mail: julas@if.pw.edu.pl

Abstract

We perform the analysis of scientific collaboration at the level of universities. The scope of this study is to answer two fundamental questions: (i) can one indicate a category (i.e., a scientific discipline) that has the greatest impact on the rank of the university and (ii) do the best universities collaborate with the best ones only? Using two university ranking lists (ARWU and QS) as well as data from the Science Citation Index we show how the number of publications in certain categories correlates with the university rank. Moreover, using complex networks analysis, we give hints that the scientific collaboration is highly embedded in the physical space and the number of common papers decays with the distance between them. We also show the strength of the ties between universities is proportional to product of their total number of publications.

Introduction

The 20th century is well known for its critical works of Kuhn, Popper, Lakatos and Feyerabend that tried to build models of how the science should work or to show how it does in fact work. In the same, owing to the entrance into era of overwhelming information it was possible to tackle this problem quantitatively [5, 6], pointing out specific phenomena observed in science. Several studies are bound to answer such questions like "How to measure who the best scientist is?" [7–12, 15] or try to simulate the process of paradigms shifts [13, 14]. In this study, we make use of complex networks tools [16, 17] to show how this issue is resolved at the level of scientific institutions (i.e., universities), to be more specific (i) what is the correlation between university rank and the number of papers in a specific discipline and (ii) what are the components of the scientific collaborations.

Results

In order to estimate the correlations between university rankings and scientific productivity we had to identify two different sources of data: (i) first devoted to the university ranking with at least 10 years activity, (ii) second connected to actual bibliographic information, in particular complying with the following rules: (1) allowing to view categories of publications, (2) allowing to view address of the publication, (3) allowing to view year of publication. The lists of top hundred universities were downloaded from two services: Academic Ranking of World Universities¹ - later referred to as ARWU and QS World University Ranking² - later referred to as QS. The rationale behind choosing two rankings that follow different rules was to check the robustness of the performed analysis. After preliminary analysis, we have chosen the service Web of Science as a data source for obtaining the information on citations. For one

¹<http://www.arwu.org>

²<http://www.topuniversities.com>

institution the average number of publications ranges between few to dozens of thousands of publications. As a result each university has two tables containing the following fields: (i) published (date of publication),(ii) ID (reference to the second table),(iii) subject category (category of publications),(iv) language. The key information used in this report is the subject category of the published paper (we will refer to it later as to simply *category*)

We start the analysis with the estimation of correlation reflecting the dependence of the number of papers a university has published on its rank in the list. To be more precise, for each of 180 categories we build a 100 by 2 matrix, where the first row gives ranks r_i of all universities in this category and the second one gathers the number of papers n_i published in this category by the given university. As one of the variables is already given in the form of rank we decided to use Spearman's rank correlation coefficient ρ as the measure of dependence between r and n . The results are gathered in Table 1 together with the total number of papers in the given category and the statistical significance of the test.

It is of use to examine the relation between the size of the category, measured by the number of papers N belonging to it and the above mentioned correlation coefficient ρ . Those results are shown in Fig. 1 giving the evidence that lower correlation (i.e., larger number of papers following higher rank) is in general characteristic for categories with large total number of papers. Moreover, the correlation for such categories are statistically significant.

Categorical separation

Here, we would like to check the hypothesis of categorical separation of Science. It is our belief, that certain categories tend to "glue together" the scientists working in them. In other words, the possibility of interdisciplinary research is not that high as one would expect it to be. In order to test this assumption we performed the Principal Component Analysis (PCA) for 10 most prominent categories (in sense of the total number of papers). As can be seen in Fig. 2a, the first three principal components explain 90% of variability in the data, so the analysis can be restricted just to them. Further, by plotting 2nd component vs 1st (Fig. 2b) and 3rd component vs. 2nd (Fig. 2c) we can identify the main directions of the dataset. In Fig. 2b we have biochemistry, biology, neuroscience, medicine and psychology in the positive part of x-axis while chemistry, physics, materials science, engineering and computer science are in negative part of this axis. It can thus mean that the 1st component divides the categories into technical sciences (negative values) and medicine-related ones (positive values). The 2nd component is much harder to be identified — a rough estimate could link positive axis with *fundamental sciences* as we have physics, chemistry and biology. Finally there is a clear interpretation as to the 3rd component — the only significant positive value is connected to physics.

Network analysis

Apart from the categorical point of view we can also consider university quality by analyzing the direct connections between universities i and j on the basis of the collaboration matrix \mathbf{C}_{ij} where the element \mathbf{C}_{ij} gives the number of common publications of institutions i and j . The principal concept of the network analysis is depicted in Fig. 3.

Using 100 highest ranked universities, for each of them (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{100}) we search for its publications $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{M(u_1)}$. Then, if among the co-authors of p_1 there is any that comes from either of the universities u_2, \dots, u_{100} a link of weight $w = 1$ between those universities (e.g, u_1 and u_2) is established. The weight is increased by one each time u_2 is found among the following publications of u_1 . Finally the weight of the link between nodes u_1 and u_2 is just the number of their common publications (as seen in the database).

Weights probability distribution The first, fundamental quantity to be computed is the probability distribution of weights $p(w)$ giving the idea about the diversity of number of publications between universities. Figure 4 presents $p(w)$ for raw data (black circles) as well as for the logarithmically binned

ones (with the base $b = 2$, red-filled circles). The plot suggests that the majority of weights can be found for w between 1 and 10 - there a plateau can be clearly seen. However, there is still a clear pattern for the remaining part even for weights as large as $w = 10000$ that could be presumably fitted by a power-law function. However it is possible to fit a full-range log-normal function (red curve)

$$p(w) = \frac{1}{w\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{(\ln w - \mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}} \quad (1)$$

with the parameters $\mu = 3.44 \pm 0.02$ and $\sigma = 1.63 \pm 0.01$ (values obtained by a maximum-likelihood fitting). However, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov goodness-of-fit test accepts the hypothesis that the data points come from the distribution described by (1) for relatively low level of significance ($\alpha = 0.01$). The result is similar to this obtained in

Performing this search for consecutive universities from the ranking we obtain a fully connected network of all 100 universities with links denoting the number of common publications.

Dependence of edge width on node strength An interesting point of the further analysis is to test if the strength of the university, measured as the total number of its publications with other universities from the ranking influence the affinity of one university to link to another one. More precisely, we shall test what is dependence of the weight w_{AB} between universities u_A and u_B on the product of their strengths $s_A s_B$. A log-log scatter-plot of this relation for all pairs of universities is shown in Fig. 5a with black circles. It brings clear evidence that the larger is the product of universities' strengths the higher is the number of common publications between them. By performing a logarithmic binning (red-filled circles) it is possible to analyze the specific form of the relation. The outcome is presented in Fig. 5b, where two fits are shown: a linear one (blue line, slope $a = 6.54 \times 10^{-7} \pm 0.15 \times 10^{-7}$ and negligible intercept) and power-law one (red dotted line, exponent 0.97 ± 0.01). The linear fitting has the R^2 value of 0.99 while the power-law one 0.94. Taking into account those value as well as close to 1 exponent of the power-law fitting it is reasonable to assume that the average weight between universities characterized by strengths (number of publications) s_A and s_B is given by the relation

$$\langle w_{AB} \rangle \propto s_A s_B. \quad (2)$$

Equation (2) can serve as a kind of predictor for estimating a possible level of cooperation between two universities. Also, observed deviations from this law could indicate either a presence of outliers in a given dataset or invalid data, thus Eq. (2) might be useful as a first-step verification procedure of the examined data.

Weight threshold Following analysis will use the concept of weight threshold [17] depicted in Fig. 6. Let us take the original network of 5 fully connected universities from Fig. 6a. Let us assume now that we are interested in constructing an unweighted network that would take into account only the connections with weight higher than a certain threshold weight w_T ($w > w_T$). A possible outcome of this procedure is presented in Fig. 6b - all the links with $w < w_T$ are omitted and as a result we obtain a network where links indicate only connections between nodes (i.e., they do not bear any value).

Using weight threshold as a parameter it is possible to obtain several unweighted networks - for each value of w_T in the range $\langle w_{min}; w_{max} \rangle$ we get a different network $NT(w_T)$ whose structure is determined only by w_T . Then, for each of these networks it is possible to compute standard network quantities: (i) number of nodes N that have a at least one link (i.e., nodes with degree $k_i = 0$ are not taken into account), (ii) Number of edges (links) E between the nodes, (iii) clustering coefficient C , (iv) assortativity coefficient r (v) entropy S of node degree probability distribution and (vi) the average shortest path $\langle l \rangle$ (see Materials and Methods for details).

Network observables as function of weight threshold Figure 7 gathers the plots of the above described network parameters as a function of w_T . First, as can be seen in Fig. 7a, the number of nodes N is a linearly decreasing function of the weight threshold w_T . The number edges E decreases even faster - for $w > 200$ it follows an exponential function (Fig. 7b). Similarly to $N(w_T)$ the clustering coefficient also drops down linearly with the weight threshold (Fig. 7c), although several small jumps over the trend can be seen. The most interesting is the behaviour of $r(w_T)$ shown in Figure 5d: the coefficient starts with $r < 0$, while for larger thresholds it crosses $r = 0$ and for w_T in range [200;400] it takes its maximal value. Then it once again drops down below zero reaching $r = -0.4$ for w_T around 1000. Finally it increases toward zero for large w_T . A non-monotonic behaviour is also observed in the case of the normalized entropy S/S_{max} (Fig. 7e) - here a rapid growth occurs at the very beginning (for small w_T), then a linear decrease happens. For large w_T the normalized entropy S/S_{max} again increases. The average shortest path (Fig. 7f) resembles the shape of r except for the lack of growth at the end.

Network visualisation The above described non-trivial behaviour of quantities r , S/S_{max} and $\langle l \rangle$ cannot be the sole cause of the relations presented by Eqs (1) and (2). It seems that there has to be another phenomenon leading to such an effect.

Using Pajek³ program as well as a tool for community detection⁴ it is possible to visualize connections between universities and community structure (denoted by color) for different values of w_T . The results for $w_T = 250, 600, 800$ and 1200 are shown in Figs 8-11, providing an input for further analysis. Up to $w_T = 250$ the network is percolated (it is possible to reach any node from another one); over that value a separation occurs - Chinese, Australian and Singapore, Danish and Swedish as well as Swiss universities all form separate clusters. The giant cluster is built out of American, Canadian, English, Dutch, Swiss, German and Japan universities (Fig. 8). For $w_T = 600$ Dutch, Swiss, German and Japan universities are separated from the giant cluster (Fig. 9) and for $w_T = 800$ also the English ones (Fig. 10). The final separation touches also American universities ($w_T = 1200$, Fig. 11).

It seems that the key aspect governing this kind of phenomenon is the geographical distance between the universities. In fact, Figure 12 confirms this supposition: the number of publications between universities A and B is a decreasing power-law function of the geographical distance between them. The gap around $d_{AB}=5000$ is most probably caused by the presence of continents. Similar results regarding the role of geographical distance in science were obtained in [18, 19].

Discussion

Our preliminary results show that even such fundamental and straightforward analysis as calculation of correlation coefficient between position of the university in the ranking and the number of papers published by its employees may reveal some non-trivial relationships. In particular, one may use it as indicator of the interest a certain scientific area gains over the years. Thus it can be possible to spot an emergence of certain trends in science and, in effect, react for example establishing a new direction of research in the university.

Our final results show that the scientific collaboration is highly embedded in the physical space - it seems that the key aspect that governs the number of common publications is the geographical vicinity of the universities. It is relevant even in the case of links between continents (link between Australia and Singapore). On the other hand the strength of the ties between universities is proportional to product of their total number of publications. These two relations could be used as a starting point for modeling of university collaboration.

³<http://www.pajek.org>

⁴<http://sites.google.com/site/findcommunities>

Materials and Methods

Data verification

Abbreviations. The seemingly straightforward procedure of querying for a specific university name encounters some problems that could have a strong impact on the further results. Web of Science has a set of abbreviations commonly used for searching such as *Univ* for "University" or *Coll* for "College". Moreover it is essential to notice that one has to form a very specific query in order to get rid of severe mistakes. Table 3 shows an exemplary list of the search universities together with the exact search phrase that had to be used.

Ambiguity of queries. The 'Search' field is a search key that we use to associate with the authors of the publications and it can consist of one of the operators: $+$ which stands for *AND* operator in Boolean logic and $|$ which stands for *NOT* operator in Boolean logic. These operators are used to clearly assess the origin of the publication. Table 2 shows that using just the names of universities from the list (first column) would lead in the case of number 98 to obtaining publications of both *Technical University in Munich* and *University of Munich*, instead of just the latter. To omit this problem one has to insert a query *Univ Munich | Tech Univ Munich* that ensures achieving proper results. On the other hand for the case shown as number 78, it was not sufficient to enter it Washington Univ, as there are many universities with such an abbreviation; it was necessary to add *St. Louis* in the query text.

Network analysis *Clustering coefficient* C_i for node i is defined as the number of existing links among its nearest neighbors e_i (i.e., nodes to which it has links) divided by the total number of possible links among them $k_i(k_i - 1)/2$

$$C_i = \frac{2e_i}{k_i(k_i - 1)} \quad (3)$$

The total clustering coefficient for the whole network is calculated as the average over all C_i . *Assortativity coefficient* r defined by

$$r = \frac{\frac{1}{E} \sum_i j_i k_i - \left[\frac{1}{2E} \sum_i (j_i + k_i) \right]^2}{\frac{1}{2E} (\sum_i j_i^2 + k_i^2) - \left[\frac{1}{2E} \sum_i (j_i + k_i) \right]^2} \quad (4)$$

where i goes over all edges in the network. The coefficient is in the range $[-1; 1]$, $r = 1$ means that the highly connected nodes have the affinity to connect to other nodes with high k_i while $r = -1$ happens when highly connected nodes tend to link to nodes with very low k_i .

Entropy of node degree probability distribution. It is calculated by first obtaining the degree probability distribution $p(k)$ (i.e., the probability that a randomly chosen node has exactly k edges) and then evaluating the expression:

$$S = - \sum_{k=k_{min}}^{k=k_{max}} p(k) \ln p(k), \quad (5)$$

where k_{min} and k_{max} are, respectively, the smallest and the largest degree in the network. For the sake of comparison we divide the obtained value of entropy by its maximal value, i.e., $S_{max} = \ln(k_{max} - k_{min})$. *Average shortest path* $\langle l \rangle$. It is calculated as the average value of shortest distance (measured in the number of steps) between all pairs of nodes i, j in the network.

Acknowledgments

We acknowledge support by FP7 FET Open project Dynamically Changing Complex Networks-DynaNets EU Grant Agreement Number 233847. This work has been supported by the European Union in the framework of European Social Fund through the Warsaw University of Technology Development Programme, realized by Center for Advanced Studies.

References

1. Kuhn T. S. (1996). The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. *University of Chicago Press, 3rd Edition*.
2. Popper K. (2002). The Logic of Scientific Discovery. *Routledge, 2nd Edition*.
3. Lakatos I. (1980). The Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes. *Cambridge University Press*.
4. Feyerabend P. (2010). Against method. *Verso, 4th Edition*.
5. Merton, R. K. (1968). The Matthew Effect in Science. *Science 1968, 159, 56-63*.
6. King, D. A. (2004). The scientific impact of nations. *Nature 430, 311*.
7. Hirsh J. E. (2005). An index to quantify an individual's scientific research output. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci USA 102, 16569*.
8. Radicchi F., Fortunato S., Castellano C. (2008). Universality of citation distributions: Toward an objective measure of scientific impact. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA 105, 17268*.
9. Radicchi F., Fortunato S., Markines B., Vespignani A. (2009). *Physical Review E 80, 056103*.
10. Petersen A. M., Wang F., Stanley H. E. (2010). Methods for measuring the citations and productivity of scientists across time and discipline. *Physical Review E 81, 036114*.
11. Radicchi F., Castellano C. (2011). Rescaling citations of publications in physics. *Physical Review E 83, 046116*.
12. Mzaloumian A., Young-Ho E., Helbing D., Lozano S., Fortunato S. (2011). How Citation Boosts Promote Scientific Paradigm Shift and Nobel Prizes. *PLoS ONE 6, e18975*.
13. Bornholdt S., Jensen M. H., Sneppen K. (2011). Emergence and Decline of Scientific Paradigms. *Physical Review Letters 106, 058701*.
14. Kondratiuk P., Siudem G., Hołyst J. A. (2012). Analytical approach to model of scientific revolutions. *Physical Review E 85, 066126*.
15. Fronczak P., Fronczak A., Hołyst J. A. (2007). Analysis of scientific productivity using maximum entropy principle and fluctuation-dissipation theorem. *Physical Review E 75, 026103*.
16. Barabási A.-L., Albert R. (2002). Statistical mechanics of complex networks. *reviews of Modern Physics 74, 47*.
17. Chmiel A., Sienkiewicz J., Suchecki K., Hołyst J. A. (2007) Networks of companies and branches in Poland. *Physica A 383, 134*.
18. Hennemann S., Rybski D., Liefner I. (2012) The myth of global science collaboration collaboration patterns in epistemic communities. *J. Informetr 6, 217225*.
19. Pan R. K., Kaski K., Fortunato S. (2012) World citation and collaboration networks: uncovering the role of geography in science. *Sci. Rep. 2, 902*.

Figure Legends

Tables




Figure 1. Correlation vs. category size.




Figure 2. Principal component analysis (PCA).




Figure 3. Representation of the university collaboration network. Each node is a university and links show the connections between them. The width of each link corresponds to the number of common publications between the nodes in question.




Figure 4. Probability distribution of weights $p(w)$ in the data. Black circles are original data, red-filled circles are binned data (logarithmic binning) and the blue line is a fit to the binned data given by Eq. (1).




Figure 5. Log-log plot of weights w_{AB} versus the product of strengths $s_A s_B$. (a) Original data (black circles) and binned data (red-filled circles). (b) Log-log plot of fittings to the binned data: linear (blue solid line) and power-law (red dotted line).




Figure 6. Illustration of the weight threshold concept: (a) a weighted university network with weights proportional to the number of common publications, (b) an unweighted network constructed from the weighted one seen on panel (a) by imposing a weight threshold — only links with weights $w > w_T$ are kept.




Figure 7. Network observables: (a) number of nodes N (b) number of edges E , (c) clustering coefficient C , (d) assortativity coefficient r , (e) normalized entropy and (f) average shortest path $\langle l \rangle$ as functions of weight threshold w_T .




Figure 8. Network for threshold $w_T = 250$.




Figure 9. Network for threshold $w_T = 600$.




Figure 10. Network for threshold $w_T = 800$.




Figure 11. Network for threshold $w_T = 1200$.




Figure 12. Weight w_{AB} vs geographical distance d_{AB} between universities. Gray circles are row data while red-filled circles are binned data. Blue solid line is a fit (outliers are omitted during the fitting procedure).

Table 1. Correlation coefficient in categories

Category	<i>N</i>	ρ	Category	<i>N</i>	ρ
Acoustics	5182	-0.256*	Agricultural Economics and Policy	440	-0.240*
Agricultural Engineering	746	0.141	Agriculture	6681	0.043
Agronomy	2021	-0.021	Allergy	3534	-0.223*
Anatomy and Morphology	1798	-0.264**	Andrology	448	-0.266**
Anesthesiology	4151	-0.279**	Anthropology	5646	-0.316**
Archaeology	2139	-0.199*	Architecture	12716	-0.285**
Area Studies	3791	-0.386***	Art	39341	-0.516***
Asian Studies	1354	-0.412***	Astronomy and Astrophysics	39504	-0.489***
Automation and Control Systems	10857	-0.234*	Behavioral Sciences	8221	-0.365***
Biochemical Research Methods	13696	-0.419***	Biochemistry and Molecular Biology	59297	-0.456***
Biodiversity Conservation	2514	-0.272**	Biology	138439	-0.464***
Biophysics	13250	-0.365***	Biotechnology and Applied Microbiology	17766	-0.352***
Business	10055	-0.338***	Cardiac and Cardiovascular Systems	28759	-0.324**
Cell and Tissue Engineering	2418	-0.372***	Cell Biology	30993	-0.488***
Chemistry	156631	-0.383***	Classics	1245	-0.182.
Clinical Neurology	37408	-0.357***	Communication	21374	-0.217*
Computer Science	69375	-0.309**	Construction and Building Technology	3531	-0.111
Criminology and Penology	1170	-0.189.	Critical Care Medicine	5857	-0.274**
Crystallography	3898	0.050	Dance	39	-0.123
Demography	963	-0.303**	Dentistry	6004	-0.062
Dermatology	7706	-0.247*	Developmental Biology	7983	-0.487***
Ecology	28411	-0.397***	Economics	19182	-0.481***
Education and Educational Research	6702	-0.182.	Electrochemistry	4368	-0.120
Emergency Medicine	2906	-0.250*	Endocrinology and Metabolism	23900	-0.366***
Energy and Fuels	7356	-0.080	Engineering	141785	-0.227*
Entomology	2120	-0.044	Environmental Sciences	19185	-0.296**
Environmental Studies	4686	-0.300**	Ergonomics	1033	0.010
Ethics	2116	-0.360***	Ethnic Studies	729	-0.191.
Evolutionary Biology	9341	-0.303**	Family Studies	1784	-0.295**
Film	3826	-0.134	Fisheries	1724	0.059
Folklore	143	-0.073	Food Science and Technology	6792	0.000
Forestry	2014	-0.148	Gastroenterology and Hepatology	15405	-0.325***
Genetics and Heredity	27733	-0.440***	Geochemistry and Geophysics	14279	-0.329***
Geography	7055	-0.083	Geology	2912	-0.118
Geosciences	17401	-0.238*	Geriatrics and Gerontology	5761	-0.414***
Gerontology	8154	-0.398***	Health Care Sciences and Services	10164	-0.374***
Health Policy and Services	6895	-0.344***	Hematology	29896	-0.335***
History and Philosophy Of Science	3411	-0.462***	History Of Social Sciences	1460	-0.338***
Horticulture	1157	0.008	Hospitality	1131	0.034
Humanities	5006	-0.328***	Imaging Science and Photographic Technology	5033	-0.311**
Immunology	27363	-0.403***	Industrial Relations and Labor	1039	-0.229*
Infectious Diseases	13355	-0.371***	Information Science and Library Science	3599	-0.240*
Instruments and Instrumentation	8767	-0.205*	Integrative and Complementary Medicine	904	-0.195.
International Relations	2966	-0.360***	Language and Linguistics	3799	-0.230**

Table 2. Correlation coefficient in categories (ctnd)

Category	<i>N</i>	ρ	Category	<i>N</i>	ρ
Law	4049	-0.371***	Limnology	1718	-0.145
Linguistics	6109	-0.249*	Literary Reviews	951	-0.281**
Literary Theory and Criticism	722	-0.267**	Literature	6879	-0.227*
Management	12783	-0.270**	Marine and Freshwater Biology	5079	-0.066
Materials Science	50040	-0.183.	Mathematical and Computational Biology	6544	-0.507***
Mathematics	28228	-0.444***	Mechanics	11252	-0.267**
Medical Ethics	1150	-0.324**	Medical Informatics	2975	-0.435***
Medical Laboratory Technology	2429	-0.269**	Medicine	81833	-0.392***
Medieval and Renaissance Studies	1073	-0.291**	Metallurgy and Metallurgical Engineering	6186	-0.164
Meteorology and Atmospheric Sciences	10451	-0.347***	Microbiology	30534	-0.370***
Microscopy	908	-0.169.	Mineralogy	2064	-0.236*
Mining and Mineral Processing	1150	-0.122	Multidisciplinary Sciences	25490	-0.593***
Music	1456	-0.243*	Mycology	866	-0.122
Nanoscience and Nanotechnology	19773	-0.252*	Neuroimaging	3821	-0.441***
Neurosciences	54583	-0.462***	Nuclear Science and Technology	5157	-0.224*
Nursing	4410	-0.218*	Nutrition and Dietetics	7805	-0.196.
Obstetrics and Gynecology	13415	-0.362***	Oceanography	4667	-0.200*
Oncology	38328	-0.336***	Operations Research and Management Science	6452	-0.267**
Ophthalmology	8838	-0.361***	Optics	21195	-0.304**
Ornithology	660	-0.092	Orthopedics	6515	-0.235*
Otorhinolaryngology	3495	-0.235*	Paleontology	3080	-0.250*
Parasitology	3229	-0.279**	Pathology	12537	-0.355***
Pediatrics	15804	-0.310**	Peripheral Vascular Disease	21836	-0.335***
Pharmacology and Pharmacy	27303	-0.292**	Philosophy	7109	-0.394***
Physics	184647	-0.463***	Physiology	13971	-0.320**
Planning and Development	2427	-0.369***	Plant Sciences	11636	0.003
Poetry	357	-0.250*	Political Science	7026	-0.336***
Polymer Science	7222	-0.201*	Psychiatry	29348	-0.362***
Psychology	44591	-0.324**	Public	29017	-0.347***
Public Administration	1635	-0.208*	Radiology	21722	-0.360***
Rehabilitation	5722	-0.128	Religion	3665	-0.199*
Remote Sensing	2585	-0.196.	Reproductive Biology	6494	-0.257**
Respiratory System	11167	-0.330***	Rheumatology	9382	-0.255*
Robotics	4601	-0.203*	Social Issues	2159	-0.397***
Social Sciences	12472	-0.471***	Social Work	1659	-0.243*
Sociology	5402	-0.327***	Soil Science	1852	-0.015
Spectroscopy	4722	-0.276**	Sport Sciences	5988	-0.141
Statistics and Probability	9024	-0.536***	Substance Abuse	4548	-0.264**
Surgery	31145	-0.304**	Telecommunications	18936	-0.222*
Theater	623	-0.202*	Thermodynamics	3353	-0.197*
Toxicology	5656	-0.219*	Transplantation	8991	-0.314**
Transportation	4395	-0.139	Transportation Science and Technology	3717	-0.125
Tropical Medicine	2965	-0.336***	Urban Studies	1652	-0.218*
Urology and Nephrology	12891	-0.288**	Veterinary Sciences	7279	-0.085
Virology	8370	-0.367***	Water Resources	5735	-0.094
Zoology	9917	-0.206*			

Table 3. University names and search queries

Rank	University	Search query
1	Harvard University	Harvard Univ
2	University of Cambridge	Univ Cambridge
4	UCL University College London	UCL
10	California Institute of Technology	Caltech
73	Washington University in St. Louis	Washington Univ + St Louis
98	Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München	Univ Munich Tech Univ Munich