

# Cautious explorers generate more future academic impact.

## Authors and affiliations

**Authors:** Xingsheng Yang<sup>1†</sup>, Zhaoru Ke<sup>1†</sup>, Qing Ke<sup>2</sup>, Haipeng Zhang<sup>1\*</sup>, and Fengnan Gao<sup>3\*</sup>

**Affiliations:**

<sup>1</sup>School of Information Science and Technology, ShanghaiTech University, Shanghai, China.

<sup>2</sup>School of Data Science, City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China.

<sup>3</sup>School of Data Science, Shanghai Centre for Mathematical Sciences, Fudan University, Shanghai, China.

†These authors contributed equally to this work.

\*Corresponding authors, equal contribution. Email: zhanghp@shanghaitech.edu.cn (H.Z.), fngao@fudan.edu.cn (F.G.).

## Abstract

Some scientists are more likely to explore unfamiliar research topics while others tend to exploit existing ones. In previous work, correlations have been found between scientists' topic choices and their career performances. However, literature has yet to untangle the intricate interplay between scientific impact and research topic choices, where scientific exploration and exploitation intertwine. Here we study two metrics that gauge how frequently scientists switch topic areas and how large those jumps are, and discover that 'cautious explorers' who switch topics frequently but do so to 'close' domains have notably better future performance and can be identified at a remarkably early career stage. Cautious explorers who balance exploration and exploitation in their first four career years have up to 19% more citations per future paper. Our results suggest that the proposed metrics depict the scholarly traits of scientists throughout their careers and provide fresh insight, especially for nurturing junior scientists.

## Introduction

While advancing their academic pursuits, scientists choose their research topics, and these choices shape their individual careers<sup>1-3</sup> as well as the evolution of science<sup>4-6</sup>. Like phenomena seen in various human activities and the broader natural world<sup>7-9</sup>, some scientists choose to exploit their current domains, following a conservative strategy, while the more risk-taking ones prefer to explore domains that are less familiar to them<sup>10,11</sup>. To maximize prospective academic output while reducing uncertainty, it is arguably an optimal strategy to keep sensible balances between prudent production and risky innovation<sup>9</sup>—a hypothesis that we will test empirically through the subtle interplay of two quantitative metrics.


Studies in sociology of science and philosophy of science have long investigated research topic choices<sup>10,12</sup>, and more recently and relevantly, data-driven approaches assigned probabilities to such choices and yielded realistic simulations on large-scale real-world datasets<sup>3,13,14</sup>. Besides the work on generating mechanisms, there has been plenty of attention paid to the association between switching and academic performance<sup>3,15-19</sup>, and interestingly, contradictory accounts exist, at both the paper level<sup>11,19</sup> and the individual level<sup>3,15-18</sup>. Some studies on individual behaviours reported negative correlations between switch tendencies and scholarly performances<sup>3,15</sup>, while others found positive

connections<sup>16–18</sup>. This contradiction may be resolved if confounding factors around both the switching patterns and academic performance are taken into account, and we elaborate the point in the example below.

Considering versatile ways of interpreting switching, we assume the convention that *areas* and *topics* are specific levels of academic categories with areas being broader (An area may contain many topics, see Methods). We define the *exploration propensity* (EP) of a scientist to measure her likelihood of switching to an unfamiliar area, estimated by the proportion of papers that explore unfamiliar areas among all her papers (Fig. 1a, Methods, and section S2.1). We further define a paper’s 5 (or 10)-year log-citations, denoted by log-c5 (or log-c10), by the logarithm of the number of citations it receives within five (or ten) years after publication (Methods and sections S1.1.3 and S7.4.1), and we typically measure a scientist’s performance by averaging her papers’ log-c5. Figure 2a presents an apparent negative correlation between the EP and overall career performance, which seemingly implies that someone who stays focused will have better performance. However, this implication can be easily challenged. For instance, the negative correlation can be explained the other way around—scientists who enjoy past successes are more likely to stick with their existing areas (Fig. 2b). When we look at a specific group of scientists with similar past performance (and thus the past performance is controlled for), the correlation between their past EP and future performance is almost non-existent (Fig. 2c).


Furthermore, the complex switching behaviour has more stories to tell than the one-dimensional metrics that only consider the binary choices of whether to switch to new areas can capture. Under these metrics, a drastic switch from acoustics to lasers appears identical to the one from statistics to machine learning.

The complexities of the switching behaviour and unaccounted-for confounding factors call for an in-depth study, which we present here. To this end, we examine a PubMed dataset formulated in the Microsoft Academic Graph<sup>20</sup> including 29,776,639 papers in biomedicine, the American Physical Society (APS) dataset that covers 678,961 physics papers, and the American Chemical Society (ACS) dataset with 1,325,257 chemistry papers (Methods). The main text focuses on the APS dataset, while all the reported results also hold for the PubMed dataset (section S4.6) and the ACS dataset (section S4.7).



**Figure 1. Computing exploration propensity (EP) and exploration distance (ED).** Suppose a scientist has a set of papers, denoted by  $S$ . (a) EP is calculated as the proportion of exploratory papers in  $S$ . A paper  $Paper_t$  is exploratory if it covers at least one research area that has not been studied by the scientist in a past period, i.e., if it has at least one area not covered by  $LB(Paper_t)$ —the papers by the scientist in a look-back period (the past five

papers in this example). **(b)** ED measures how different (in terms of topic similarities) each paper of the scientist is from his or her previous paper, on average. Specifically, Paper<sub>*t*</sub>'s distance is the distance between its topic set and that of  $LB(\text{Paper}_t)$ , where we average the pairwise distances of all possible topic pairs between these two topic sets. Details on how to compute the EP and ED are in Methods.




**Figure 2. Interplay between switching and career performance.** **(a)** EPs and career performance. We calculate the EP and log-c5 per paper for each scientist’s entire career and divide the scientists into groups by aligning their EPs to the nearest integer multiples of 0.1. Each blue point marks the mean of the log-c5 per paper of the scientists in that group, with 95% confidence bands. The career performance shows a decreasing trend as the EP increases. **(b)** Scientists with higher past performance (log-c5 per past paper) have lower probability of changing research areas for their next paper. Each time a scientist publishes a new paper, we compute her past mean log-c5 to put the publication into a group of publications with similar past performance among all authors. For each publication in a particular group, we decide whether it is exploratory and calculate the portion of exploratory papers in the group as the group’s probability of changing research area for the next paper (section S3.2 and fig. S8(a)). **(c)** Past EPs and future performance of a group of scientists whose past performance is controlled for. We regard the first ten years of each scientist’s career as ‘past’, select the scientists whose past performance is in the small range of [1.74,1.90], and plot future performance against past EP, in a fashion like (a). The disappeared correlation suggests that past performance can be one confounding factor not to be ignored.

## Results

### Cautious explorers

We are interested in explaining the differences in scientists’ future performance by the variations in their past research area switching behaviours measured by EP. To this end, we conduct regression analysis correlating scientists’ ‘past’ EP up to a *split point* with their ‘future’ performance (Methods), where we control for ‘past’ performance (log-citations), ‘past’ number of papers, and the area and year of the first paper. The regression results (table S2, column (S3) on the left) confirm the highly-intuitive relationship between future performance and past performance<sup>21–23</sup>, and indicate that EP has a statistically significant positive effect on scientists’ future performance ( $P = 2.2 \times 10^{-13}$ ). For those more likely to explore new areas (i.e., with higher EPs), their future papers have significantly higher average log-citations, as shown in the marginal effect plot in Fig. 3a, where future performance increases with respect to increasing EP after all other variables are fixed at their respective averages. This finding resolves the inconsistency in reported correlations between switching and academic performance, either seemingly negative<sup>3,15</sup> or positive<sup>16–18</sup>. It moderates the stronger claims about extreme exploration at paper-level<sup>19</sup> and reveals that the established understanding in the literature has drawn, at best, an incomplete picture.



**Figure 3. Marginal effect of the exploration metrics.** (a) We regress the future performance against the EP as the only metric while controlling for the usual variables. The marginal effect of the EP on the future performance is graphed. (b) Similar to (a), we run the regression with the EP and ED as the metrics and plot the marginal effect of the EP on the future performance. (c) The same as (b), except that the marginal effect of the ED on the future performance is shown.

Further analyses under varying temporal split points suggest a robust relationship between switching and performance (table S3). Strikingly, the results are valid at even very early career stages of two years or having published just two papers. We may surmise that those junior scientists who, in as early as their starting years of PhD study, adventure into domains other than their primary ones are probably different from their peers in qualities such as open-mindedness and breadth of knowledge that are not easily reflected in conventional scholarly performance indicators.


Switching between research topics can be bold or cautious: a scientist may switch between similar topics, such as from statistics to machine learning, or to something very different, such as from acoustics to lasers<sup>1,18,19</sup>. Thus, we also propose a complementary measure called the *exploration distance* (ED), the average distance of a scientist’s papers to her previous papers (Fig. 1b, Methods, and section S2.2).

Adding ED to our regression setup as one more independent variable, we find that it has statistically significant negative effects on the future performance ( $P = 3.7 \times 10^{-9}$ ), while the positive effects of the EP remain statistically significant (table S2, column (S4) on the left). The results are still true across comprehensive choices of split points with respect to both career length (2-15 years) and the number of papers (2-15) (table S4). These indicate that for someone with high EP but low ED, whom we categorize as a ‘cautious explorer,’ her future papers have higher average citations (Figs. 3b and 3c). Since it is generally expected that those with higher EP have higher ED and vice versa (Pearson correlation between EP and ED: 0.6039), individuals with high EP and yet low ED deviate from the norm and achieve a balance between exploration and exploitation.

Both the EP and ED give E-values<sup>24</sup> (table S5) much larger than ones that scientists commonly consider safe to report their findings (larger E-values suggest more reliable findings, see Methods). Besides, the regression results are consistent when we perturb the EP and ED with Gaussian noises (section S7.8). Note that similar conclusions hold consistently if we change the measurement of *academic performance* to the log-c10 per future paper or the log-citations of a scientist’s most impactful future paper<sup>25</sup> (section

S7.4). We also control for possible confounding factors, e.g., topic contribution from co-authors<sup>26</sup>, and high-EP-low-ED scientists preferring hot areas<sup>27</sup>, combining novelty and conventionality in papers<sup>28</sup>, seeking advantageous collaborations<sup>29–31</sup>, or utilizing institutional resources<sup>32</sup> that may yield more academic impact (Methods and section S6). To further consolidate the discovery, we convert the original data into dynamic panel data and perform author and time fixed-effect regressions (Methods and section S4.3). This approach allows us to account for the unobserved differences between individual scientists in the regression model. Passing the above robustness checks, our findings on EP and ED in the regression analyses remain (statistically) striking.

To better understand these high-EP-low-ED scientists, as well as other behavioural patterns quantified by EP and ED, we divide the scientists into four groups along two dimensions, one dividing EP into upper or lower halves of all EPs, and the other dividing ED into upper and lower halves. As anticipated, the high-EP-low-ED group is relatively small, consisting of only 14% of the population. Figure 4 visualizes one scientist for each group (chosen such that the four scientists started their careers in the same area for illustration purposes, see section S5). Here each node represents a topic, and any two topics that have co-occurred in at least one paper are connected by an edge, the length of which is the topic distance between the two. Nodes sharing the same colour are in the same area defined by the APS and if a scientist has multiple papers with a particular topic, the corresponding node is proportionally larger. In Fig. 4, the high-ED representatives (right column) have visibly more spread topics and those in the high-EP groups (top row) have more colours, which indicates that they explore more areas. For the high-EP-low-ED group of cautious explorers, the representative scientist has colourful nodes of moderate sizes that are clustered together, which implies that this scientist makes steady moves when choosing topics, yet these topics span a variety of areas.




**Figure 4. Sample scientist from each of the four high/low EP/ED groups.** Each node, coloured or grey, represents a topic, and each edge linking two nodes indicates that the corresponding topics have occurred together in at least one paper, with its length showing the distance between the topics (Methods and section S2.2.2). In each subplot, only the topics covered by the corresponding scientist’s papers are coloured and expanded, where the colours correspond to the area containing the topic/node. Any topics/nodes of the same colour (excluding grey in the background) are under the same area. The node size reflects how many of the scientist’s papers are on that topic. Among the four groups, the high-EP-low-ED (cautious explorers) and low-EP-high-ED ones are relatively rare combinations, each taking up about 14% of the entire population, while the other two combinations each represent roughly 36%.

### Quantifying the effects via propensity score weighting

The above analysis revealed a clear relationship between future performance and EP/ED, but we are further interested in precisely quantifying the difference between the four groups defined above. We first compute the citations per paper for each scientist’s future career and obtain the group averages. In Fig. 5a, we see that ‘cautious explorers’ have the highest future performance across split points from 2 to 15 career years; when the split point is only two career years, for example, the advantage over the second place is almost 20%. However, this line of thinking does not take the inter-group differences in other dependent variables into account. To remedy this, we borrow the standard method of *propensity score weighting* from causal inference that handles multiple treatments<sup>33</sup>, which in our scenario correspond to the four high/low EP/ED groups. The method weights each scientist according to her estimated likelihood to be in her own group to make the groups comparable and calculates the pairwise average treatment effect (ATE) between groups (Methods and section S4.2.3).

We carry out our study in diverse split points consistent with those in the previous regression analyses.

Figure 5b illustrates the pairwise ATEs across different split points on career years, against the baseline high-EP-high-ED groups. We see that the high-EP-low-ED groups (cautious explorers) are always significantly better than the others, even when only considering the EP and ED metrics from the first two years of the scientists' careers. This implies that combining both serves as a powerful indicator of more successful scientific careers ahead. We also observe that the low-EP-high-ED groups have negative ATEs compared with the baseline and the high-EP-high-ED 'bold explorers' do not have a clear advantage/disadvantage over the baseline, with the ATEs being around zero. We further compare the cautious explorers with the apparently opposite low-EP-high-ED groups by changing the baseline (Fig. 5c). The 'cautious explorers' have statistically significant positive ATEs against the new baseline since the corresponding confidence intervals only contain positive elements. If the split point is set to four career years, the ATE of being in the high-EP-low-ED group is as much as 19% more citations per future paper (percentage translated from 0.1738 in the logarithmic scale, 95% CI = [0.1252, 0.2225], table S7). In a simplified setup where cautious explorers are compared against the rest three groups combined, the ATE of being cautious explorers is about 10% more citations per future paper (Fig. 5c). These findings pass through robustness checks and are consistent on the PubMed dataset (section S4.6) and the ACS dataset (section S4.7).



**Figure 5. Better future performance of cautious explorers.** (a) We compute the average future citations for each of the four high/low EP/ED groups with varying career years as split point. The cautious explorer (high-EP-low-ED) groups have consistently the highest future performance, while the opposite (low-EP-high-ED) groups have the lowest. (b) We select the high-EP-high-ED groups as the baseline and calculate the ATEs between the baseline and other three groups. The y-axis marks the ATEs of the three groups over the baseline with 95% confidence intervals, corresponding to the future citations per paper in the logarithmic scale with translated percentages in parentheses.



The ‘cautious explorers’ have the largest ATEs across all groups. **(c)** We compare the ‘cautious explorers’ against the low-EP-high-ED baseline; the ATEs reported in orange are significantly larger than zero, with the largest ATE being 0.1738 (19%) at the split point of four career years. The violet line shows the (statistically significant) ATEs with cautious explorers as the treatment group and everyone else as the control. When the split point is four years, cautious explorers compared to everyone else have an ATE of about 0.094, which translates to 10% more future citations per paper. **(d)** We try different thresholds on EPs and EDs to form the four groups with the split point of 10 years. There is an increasing trend in ATEs when larger EPs and smaller EDs are required to form the cautious explorer group.

As the regressions suggest that a higher EP and lower ED are associated with better future performance, we next study how the inter-group differences change, if we adjust the thresholds to obtain more disparate group divisions. Instead of using the previous ‘upper and lower halves’ threshold, we vary it to ‘upper and lower  $Q\%$ ’ to obtain the high/low groups, with  $Q$  being 40, 30, and 25, respectively. We see in Fig. 5d that when we form the groups with more extreme EPs and EDs, the ‘cautious explorer’ group displays increasing advantage over other groups. We conduct further analyses almost parallel to the above via propensity score matching<sup>34</sup>—a common (and less refined) causal inference technique, and they give consistent findings (sections S4.2 and S7.6).

## Discussion


It is natural to ask how the EP and ED evolve through scientists’ careers and how scientists of different generations behave under these two metrics. Figure 6a displays the average EP and ED of scientists in their careers. The EP shows a decreasing trend while the ED grows over time, despite the early-stage sharp drop of the EP that may be partially associated with the way it is calculated (when there are relatively fewer past papers in the early stage, the EP can be high). Curiously, this suggests that junior scientists are more cautious explorers than the future senior scientists that they become.

In Fig. 6b, we compare the EPs and EDs of three groups of scientists who started their careers in different periods of time (i.e., 1985-1989, 1990-1994, and 1995-1999). Kolmogorov–Smirnov (K–S) tests on the distributions of the EP and ED, respectively, suggest that scientists from these three periods have similar distributions of EPs, while scientists of newer generations become more cautious as indicated by having smaller EDs, which is consistent with existing findings<sup>13</sup>. This effect may be related to the growing trend of training junior scientists to become experts in ever more specified fields, which is possibly a direct consequence of the increasingly expanding knowledge in almost every field<sup>35</sup>.

How do memberships of the four high/low EP/ED groups change over time? In Fig. 6c, we track the scientists who started their careers before 2000 and remained active beyond 2009. We compute the group memberships at four time points—the ends of 2000, 2003, 2006 and 2009—using all data prior to the respective time point and observe how the memberships evolved. We see that over 60% of the ‘cautious explorers’ in 2000 had remained in the same group in 2003 and the ratio was more than 72%, when we look at the transition from 2006 to 2009. The two groups in the middle are relatively stable across the years, with the ratios of staying being over 83%. Meanwhile, members seldom flow between



completely opposite groups.



**Figure 6. Temporal perspectives of EP and ED.** (a) The average EP and ED of scientists in each year of their careers with 95% confidence bands. We select scientists with careers of at least 15 years (58% of the population) and examine their first 15 years. For each year, we calculate each scientist’s career EP and ED until the end of that year and compute the average. Notably, junior scientists have higher EPs and lower EDs than they do in later career stages. (b) The EP and ED distributions of scientists who are selected from those specified in (a) and whose careers began in 1985-1989, 1990-1994, and 1995-1999, respectively. The EP and ED are calculated within their first 15 career years. The three distributions of EP are similar ( $K-S$  tests,  $P > 0.48$ ), while the distributions of ED are different ( $P < 10^{-5}$ ). This suggests that scientists tend to become more cautious in choosing research topics in the past decades. (c) Member exchanges among the four groups in the 2000s. We select the 11,791 scientists who have at least two papers before 2000 and at least one paper after 2009, and divide them into groups in 2000, 2003, 2006, and 2009, respectively, where we set the threshold for having a high EP (ED) at the 50th percentile. For the ‘cautious explorers’ in 2000, 37.21% of them were still ‘cautious explorers’ by 2009, and 29.48% of them are in this group in all four snapshots.

Are ‘cautious explorers’ a certain kind of people, or is ‘cautious exploration’ a ‘strategy’ that can be adopted for better performance? The individual fixed-effect regressions mentioned earlier lean to the latter hypothesis. One way to study this is by interpreting one’s future EP and ED as a proxy to future ‘strategy’, as opposed to using past EP and ED as predictors, and we further examine how one’s future

performance correlates with the strategy selected. The regression results are consistent with the fixed-effect analysis (Methods, section S4.3).

We seek more analyses in the absence of large-scale real-world experiments. Fig. 6c suggests that most scientists intentionally or unintentionally maintain consistent research agendas. However, as noticed earlier, a very small portion of scientists exhibit drastic behavioural changes, such as transitioning from low-EP-high-ED to the completely opposite high-EP low-ED group of cautious explorers and vice versa. We speculate that these ‘drastic changers’ alter their research strategies on purpose. Like in Fig. 6c, we divide the scientists into the four high/low EP/ED groups, before and after a split point of 10 career years, respectively. Interestingly, 8.6% of the low-EP-high-ED scientists drastically turn into cautious explorers after the split point, and their citations per paper increase by 4.8%. On the other hand, 6.9% of cautious explorers became ‘drastic changers’, and their performance drop by 19.0%. Beyond this simple calculation, we also conduct the PSW analysis to estimate their performance change against their counterparts who remained in the same groups after the split point. Scientists who drastically changed to cautious explorers saw a 34.1% increase in citations per paper, while the opposite group experienced a 26.2% drop. These analyses, which are detailed in the Methods and section S4.5, further shed light on the possibility that cautious exploration could be a strategy connected to greater research impact, yet not adopted by many.

EP and ED help us take a first step towards disentangling the complex relations between switching and performance. We have discovered that cautious explorers have better future performance, and this is valid even when we look at early scientists who have just published two papers. The conclusion is consistent whether we look from split points defined by years into the career or number of publications. By dividing scientists into four groups (high/low EP/ED) after quantifying their switching behaviours, we look into the balance between exploration and exploitation<sup>7-9</sup>, specifically in scientific research and its connection to academic achievements. Previous studies investigated the behaviours from the risk-taking aspect for impact and the risk-averse aspect for production<sup>10,11</sup>, which we measure collectively with the EP and ED metrics. Our study predicts that a junior scientist with higher exploration propensity will be more impactful in the future, but someone who balances risk-taking with shorter topic moves would enjoy an even larger advantage. In contrast to existing studies on correlations between switching behaviour and performance, we rule out extensive possible confounding factors and discover quantifiable predictive power. As such, we suggest that these two metrics could help track the behavioural change of the participants in the evolution of science and shed light on individuals’ upcoming careers, especially those of junior scientists.

Although the EP and ED metrics may be informative gauges of scientists, evidences from a purely data analytic viewpoint are not enough to decide whether they are indicators of certain inherent traits of scientists or strategies that lead to different academic impacts. Answering these questions can potentially assist research-related activities such as self-assessment and planning, research resource allocation, and training curricula design. Further research may look in a more fundamental direction from possibly neurocognitive and brain science perspectives<sup>9,36,37</sup>. Moreover, an open question is whether other creative activities, such as filmmaking, invention, and entrepreneurship, also have these uniquely

successful ‘cautious explorers.’

## References

1. Jia, T., Wang, D. & Szymanski, B. K. Quantifying patterns of research-interest evolution. *Nat. Hum. Behav.* **1**, 0078 (2017).
2. Kleinberg, J. & Oren, S. Mechanisms for (mis)allocating scientific credit. *Algorithmica* **84**, 344–378 (2022).
3. Zeng, A. *et al.* Increasing trend of scientists to switch between topics. *Nat. Commun.* **10**, 3439 (2019).
4. Sinatra, R., Deville, P., Szell, M., Wang, D. & Barabási, A.-L. A century of physics. *Nat. Phys.* **11**, 791–796 (2015).
5. Shi, F., Foster, J. G. & Evans, J. A. Weaving the fabric of science: Dynamic network models of science’s unfolding structure. *Soc. Netw.* **43**, 73–85 (2015).
6. Gates, A. J., Ke, Q., Varol, O. & Barabási, A.-L. Nature’s reach: narrow work has broad impact. *Nature* **575**, 32–34 (2019).
7. March, J. G. Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organ. Sci.* **2**, 71–87 (1991).
8. Mehlhorn, K. *et al.* Unpacking the exploration–exploitation tradeoff: a synthesis of human and animal literatures. *Decision* **2**, 191–215 (2015).
9. Cohen, J. D., McClure, S. M. & Yu, A. J. Should I stay or should I go? how the human brain manages the trade-off between exploitation and exploration. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **362**, 933 (2007).
10. Kuhn T. S. *The Essential Tension: Selected Studies in Scientific Tradition and Change*. (Univ. Chicago Press, 1979).
11. Foster, J. G., Rzhetsky, A. & Evans, J. A. Tradition and innovation in scientists’ research strategies. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* **80**, 875–908 (2015).
12. Zuckerman, H. Theory choice and problem choice in science. *Sociol. Inq.* **48**, 65–95 (1978).
13. Rzhetsky, A., Foster, J. G., Foster, I. T. & Evans, J. A. Choosing experiments to accelerate collective discovery. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **112**, 14569–14574 (2015).
14. Yin, Y., Wang, Y., Evans, J. A. & Wang, D. Quantifying the dynamics of failure across science, startups and security. *Nature* **575**, 190–194 (2019).
15. Amjad, T., Daud, A. & Song, M. Measuring the impact of topic drift in scholarly networks. in *Companion of the The Web Conference 2018 on The Web Conference 2018 - WWW ’18* 373–378 (2018).
16. Yu, X., Szymanski, B. K. & Jia, T. Become a better you: correlation between the change of research direction and the change of scientific performance. *J. Informetr.* **15**, 101193 (2021).
17. Pramanik, S., Gora, S. T., Sundaram, R., Ganguly, N. & Mitra, B. On the migration of researchers across scientific domains. *Proc. Int. AAAI Conf. Web Soc. Media* **13**, 381–392 (2019).
18. Huang, S., Lu, W., Bu, Y. & Huang, Y. Revisiting the exploration-exploitation behavior of scholars’ research topic selection: evidence from a large-scale bibliographic database. *Inf. Process. Manag.* **59**, 103110 (2022).
19. Hill, R., Yin, Y., Stein, C., Wang, D. & Jones, B. F. Adaptability and the Pivot Penalty in Science. Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2107.06476> (2021).
20. Sinha, A. *et al.* An overview of Microsoft Academic Service (MAS) and applications. *Proc. 24th Int. Conf. World Wide Web* (2015).
21. Merton, R. K. The Matthew effect in science. *Science* (1968).
22. Clauset, A., Larremore, D. B. & Sinatra, R. Data-driven predictions in the science of science. *Science*

(2017).

23. Kong, X. *et al.* The gene of scientific success. *ACM Trans. Knowl. Discov. Data TKDD* (2020).
24. VanderWeele, T. J. & Ding, P. Sensitivity analysis in observational research: introducing the E-Value. *Ann. Intern. Med.* **167**, 268 (2017).
25. Sinatra, R., Wang, D., Deville, P., Song, C. & Barabási, A.-L. Quantifying the evolution of individual scientific impact. *Science* **354**, aaf5239 (2016).
26. Xu, F., Wu, L. & Evans, J. Flat teams drive scientific innovation. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **119**, e2200927119 (2022).
27. Wei, T. *et al.* Do scientists trace hot topics? *Sci. Rep.* **3**, 1–5 (2013).
28. Uzzi, B., Mukherjee, S., Stringer, M. & Jones, B. Atypical combinations and scientific impact. *Science* **342**, 468–472 (2013).
29. Wuchty, S., Jones, B. F. & Uzzi, B. The increasing dominance of teams in production of knowledge. *Science* (2007).
30. Zhang, C.-T. A proposal for calculating weighted citations based on author rank. *EMBO Rep.* **10**, 416–417 (2009).
31. Larivière, V., Gingras, Y., Sugimoto, C. R. & Tsou, A. Team size matters: collaboration and scientific impact since 1900. *J. Assoc. Inf. Sci. Technol.* **66**, 1323–1332 (2015).
32. Allison, P. D. & Long, J. S. Departmental effects on scientific productivity. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* **55**, 469–478 (1990).
33. Lee, B. K., Lessler, J. & Stuart, E. A. Improving propensity score weighting using machine learning. *Stat. Med.* **29**, 337–346 (2010).
34. Ho, D. E., Imai, K., King, G. & Stuart, E. A. Matching as nonparametric preprocessing for reducing model dependence in parametric causal inference. *Polit. Anal.* **15**, 199–236 (2007).
35. Jones, B. F. The burden of knowledge and the “death of the renaissance man”: is innovation getting harder? *Rev. Econ. Stud.* **76**, 283–317 (2009).
36. Tt, H., Pm, T., D, L., Ad, R. & Id, C. Exploration versus exploitation in space, mind, and society. *Trends Cogn. Sci.* **19**, (2015).
37. Daw, N. D., O’Doherty, J. P., Dayan, P., Seymour, B. & Dolan, R. J. Cortical substrates for exploratory decisions in humans. *Nature* **441**, 876–879 (2006).
38. Martin, T., Ball, B., Karrer, B. & Newman, M. E. J. Coauthorship and citation patterns in the Physical Review. *Phys. Rev. E* **88**, 012814 (2013).
39. Pan, R. K., Sinha, S., Kaski, K. & Saramäki, J. The evolution of interdisciplinarity in physics research. *Sci. Rep.* **2**, 551 (2012).
40. Grover, A. & Leskovec, J. node2vec: Scalable Feature Learning for Networks. in *ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining* 855–864 (ACM, 2016).
41. Radicchi, F., Fortunato, S. & Castellano, C. Universality of citation distributions: toward an objective measure of scientific impact. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **105**, 17268–17272 (2008).
42. Brzezinski, M. Power laws in citation distributions: evidence from Scopus. *Scientometrics* **103**, 213–228 (2015).
43. Blundell, R. & Bond, S. Initial conditions and moment restrictions in dynamic panel data models. *J. Econom.* **87**, 115–143 (1998).
44. Friedman, J. H. Greedy function approximation: a gradient boosting machine. *Ann. Stat.* **29**, 1189–1232 (2001).

## Methods

### Datasets

We have studied three large-scale datasets, covering disciplines of physics, chemistry, and biomedicine, respectively. In the main text, we present analysis on the APS (American Physical Society) dataset and in the Supplementary Information, the comparable chemistry and biomedicine datasets are analysed, respectively. The APS dataset contains all papers from the journals in the APS from 1893 to 2020. Each paper is associated with up to five 6-digit PACS codes, and the PACS codes have a hierarchical structure, where the first digit represents the top level of classifications. The chemistry dataset includes papers published in the ACS (American Chemical Society) journals and collected by the Microsoft Academic Graph (MAG), which assigns each paper several field codes under a hierarchical classification scheme. The biomedicine dataset is constructed from the PubMed data collected by MAG. Besides the MAG codes, papers in this PubMed dataset can be mapped to the hierarchically organized Medical Subject Headings (MeSH), as an alternative source of classification codes. For the APS dataset, we perform author name disambiguation using the approaches of other studies of the APS data<sup>25,38</sup> and obtain 395,678 unique authors. The authorships in the ACS and PubMed datasets have already been disambiguated by MAG. In all three datasets, we keep authors with at least 10 papers. These steps result in 25,245 authors with 281,958 papers in the APS dataset, 62,316 authors with 747,061 papers in the ACS dataset, and 1,218,355 authors with 13,072,174 papers in the PubMed dataset (1,260,125 authors with 13,649,286 papers, if MeSH is used for PubMed.). Details on the datasets and processing procedures are presented in the Supplementary Information (section S1).

### The metrics: EP and ED

EP is the frequency that a scientist switches to unfamiliar areas. These switches are represented by the number of exploratory papers published by the scientist. Specifically, ‘areas’ of a paper are represented by the first two digits of the paper’s PACS codes in the APS dataset (section S1.1) and an exploratory paper covers at least one area that is different from these of the scientist’s past papers in the *look-back* period, which can either be defined as her past  $J$  papers or the papers in the last  $K$  years. The EP is then calculated as the fraction of the exploratory papers among all the scientist’s papers. In the study presented in the main text, we compare each paper to the five papers before it to decide whether it is exploratory and study the outcomes. In the Supplementary Information (section S7.5), we test 1 to 15 papers and 1 to 15 years as alternative look-back periods for the calculation of EP, and we also test infinity as the look-back period, which means we include all past papers in comparisons.

ED is the average distance of a scientist’s papers to her previous papers, measured by research topic similarities, in the same look-back period as in the definition of the EP. For each paper, we calculate its distance to the scientist’s last  $J$  papers or papers within the last  $K$  years (consistent with the choices in EP) and take the average over all papers. Like the calculation of EP, we calculate the distance of each paper to the five papers before and vary the look-back periods in the Supplementary Information (section S7.5). Specifically, to compute the distance between a paper and the set of past papers, we measure the distance between two sets of topics, one from the focal paper and the other from the past papers in the look-back period, and the paper distance is the average distance of all possible topic pairs between these two topic sets. To calculate the distance between any given pair of topics, we construct a network where

nodes represent said topics, and weighted edges indicate the frequency with which the two topics occur together in papers. There are two primary methods for determining this distance. The first involves analysing the degree to which the neighbours of the nodes overlap after appropriate normalizations<sup>39</sup>. The second forms low-dimensional vector representations of the nodes in the network through a graph embedding technique known as node2vec<sup>40</sup>, and calculates the cosine distance between the two nodes in question. Recall that each unique six-digit PACS code is a topic in the APS dataset. More details about the calculations and alternative definitions of EP and ED are in the Supplementary Information (sections S2 and S7.3).

## Regression Analyses

We design regressions to study the relationship between the proposed metrics and the future performance. The data of any scientist is split into two parts, where the first part before the split point corresponds to her ‘past’ for computing independent variables, and the second consists of the ‘future’ for an assessment of her performance in the rest of her career as the dependent variable. The independent variables include the EP, the number of papers, and the scientist’s past performance represented by the log-c5 per paper, and the future performance is evaluated by the average log-c5 of her future papers. We also control for the year and area of the scientist’s first paper, since papers of different research areas and times often display distinct citation patterns<sup>41</sup>. All data points used in the same regression share a *split point*, which is either the first  $N$  career years (years that any individual has spent in her scientific career), or the first  $M$  papers. Throughout the main text, the results are presented under the split point of ten career years, unless specified otherwise. The following regression (eq. (S3)) studies the relation between the scientists’ past EP and the future performances:

$$\text{LogCit}_{\text{future}} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{LogCit}_{\text{past}} + \beta_2 P_{\text{past}} + \beta_3 \text{year}_{\text{first}} + \beta_4 \text{area}_{\text{first}} + \beta_5 \text{EP}_{\text{past}} + \text{Noise}.$$

For each choice of  $N$  or  $M$  for the split point, we process the data of any scientist with proper splitting and run a regression. Citations of scientific publications are known to follow heavy-tailed distributions<sup>42</sup> and taking logarithms on said citations drastically reduces the undesirable variability in their numeric values (section S1.1.3). Particularly,  $\text{LogCit}_{\text{past}}$  is the average logarithm of the citations that the scientist’s past papers receive,  $P_{\text{past}}$  is the number of her published papers in the past,  $\text{year}_{\text{first}}$  is the year of her first paper understood as a category variable, and  $\text{area}_{\text{first}}$  is the area of her first paper, again understood as a category variable. The dependent variable,  $\text{LogCit}_{\text{future}}$  is computed using the data dated after the split point by averaging the logarithms of the number of citations per paper in the scientist’s future career.

Furthermore, we construct another regression (eq. (S4)) to study the effect of including the ED as an independent variable:

$$\text{LogCit}_{\text{future}} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{LogCit}_{\text{past}} + \beta_2 P_{\text{past}} + \beta_3 \text{year}_{\text{first}} + \beta_4 \text{area}_{\text{first}} + \beta_5 \text{EP}_{\text{past}} + \beta_6 \text{ED}_{\text{past}} + \text{Noise},$$

where the newly added  $\text{ED}_{\text{past}}$  is computed from the scientist’s past papers. Similarly, we run one regression for each choice of split point. All the regression results are reported in the Supplementary Information (section S4.1). Note that the alternative ways of measuring future performance as robustness checks are investigated in the Supplementary Information (section S7.4).

Beyond the usual regression analysis and in part to study the question whether cautious exploration is a strategy, we borrow the idea from econometrics and perform the individual fixed-effect analysis. The additional individual fixed effect parameter is introduced to account for the effect of possible

unobservable variables at the individual level. To form dynamic panel data for this analysis, we divide the timeline into several evenly spaced time periods and based on each scientist's publication record in each period alone, we calculate the scientist's average log-citations, the EP and ED, and other covariates. The setup here compartmentalizes each period to alleviate the complex time dependencies among all quantities involved and is different from the usual regression analysis above. We proceed to solve the following regression equation using the classic Arellano-Bond estimator—one of the most popular system GMM<sup>43</sup>:

$$\text{LogCit}_{i,t} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{LogCit}_{i,t-1} + \beta_2 \text{EP}_{i,t-1} + \beta_3 \text{ED}_{i,t-1} + \beta_4 P_{i,t-1} + \beta_5 \text{Career\_year}_{i,t-1} + u_i + \eta_t + \text{Noise},$$

where  $\text{LogCit}_{i,t}$  is the average logarithm of the citations of scientist  $i$  in period  $t$ ,  $\text{EP}_{i,t-1}$  and  $\text{ED}_{i,t-1}$  measure scientist  $i$ 's EP and ED in period  $t - 1$ ,  $P_{i,t-1}$  and  $\text{Career\_year}_{i,t-1}$  are the number of paper and last career year of scientist  $i$  in period  $t - 1$ ,  $u_i$  and  $\eta_t$  denote the individual fixed effects and time fixed effects, respectively. Statistical tests are conducted to validate the model choice. The regression results and further details are documented in table S10 and in section S4.3, respectively.

We further examine the possibility of 'cautious exploration' being a strategy, from a different perspective. We quantify a scientist's (future) switching strategy with future EP and ED and replace past EP and ED in the original regression (eq. S4) to analyse how one's future performance is correlated with the research strategy chosen. The results, presented in Table S11, show that future EP and ED contribute to future impact in a similar manner as past EP and ED. This finding suggests that 'cautious exploration' could potentially be a strategy worth considering for achieving higher academic impact.

### Propensity score weighting

Our study has four groups differentiated by whether the EP/ED of each scientist lies in the top or bottom half of the metrics, respectively, as opposed to the usual two-group setting in causal inference. We wish to systematically quantify the differences of scientific careers of those in the high/low EP/ED groups by exploiting techniques in causal inference that controls for the inter-group discrepancies. For the multiple 'treatment' scenario considered, each group corresponds to a treatment, and we pick one of the treatments as the baseline group, the choice of which makes little difference and often depends on what we are looking at. In practice, whether a scientist is in a certain treatment group is intertwined with her other features, which results in systematic inter-group differences. The *propensity score weighting* scheme assigns scientists weights based on their estimated odds of being in their groups, respectively, and the groups should have become similar after reweighting. We apply the highly versatile nonparametric generalized boosted model (GBM)<sup>44</sup> from machine learning to estimate the propensity score weights. We then conduct a weighted regression where the weights on each data point (scientist) equal the reciprocal of her estimated propensity score to be in her group. Taking one of the groups as the baseline, the regression uses membership indicators of the rest of the groups as dependent variables (covariates) and the average log-c5 of the future papers as independent variable (response). The obtained regression coefficient of each group membership indicator, together with the corresponding confidence intervals, equivalently measures the *average treatment effect (ATE)* of being in that group relative to the baseline. The ATE measures the (average) difference in outcomes between the *hypothetical* cases that all scientists in question, regardless of which group they are in, were in the treatment group and that all were in the baseline group.



### Ruling out other factors

We have calculated the E-values<sup>24</sup> to evaluate the sensitivity of the statistical significances of EP and ED in the regression against possible unknown confounding factors, where large E-values indicate that more unaccounted-for confounding would be needed to explain away an effect estimate, or roughly speaking, the findings are more reliable against unmeasured confounding. While we have controlled for many easily conceivable factors and a quick calculation in the above regression analysis on the E-values (table S5) indicates that our results have taken enough confounding factors into account, it is still conceptually possible that other less visible factors may have more than negligible roles. For instance, after the split point, (A) perhaps the cautious explorers are more likely to switch to hot areas, which often results in more citations<sup>27</sup>? Or (B) are they more likely to publish papers with high novelty and high conventionality, which were shown to be superior<sup>28</sup>? We have formulated more such hypotheses to propose factors that may explain away the discovered phenomenon as follows: (C) Do cautious explorers work with larger teams such that more citations follow<sup>29,31</sup>, or do their scholarly impacts mainly come from research in which they take secondary roles<sup>30</sup>? (D) Do they change institutions more frequently<sup>32</sup> or do they work in Ivy League schools such that they enjoy more resources and opportunities to produce high-impact work? (E) Is cautious exploration the behaviour of the focal scientist, or is it contributed by co-authors who bring in their preferences of research topics<sup>26</sup>? To clarify such questions, we conduct several regression analyses where the independent variables further include the variables indicating the above listed factors of concern along with the usual ones studied in the main text. When such additional variables are considered or even if we include all the variables of these hypotheses in one of the regression studies, our results (section S6) are robust as the regression coefficients of EP and ED have the same signs and are always statistically significant, despite that the explanatory power of EP and ED combined may be weakened slightly. This implies that although more factors may be at play, the differences of scientists indicated quantitatively by EP and ED metrics are sound.

### Code availability

The code for this study is accessible at <https://cautious-explorers.github.io/cautious-explorers/>.

### Data availability

The processed data for analysis and plotting, as well as the pointers to the original data, are available at <https://cautious-explorers.github.io/cautious-explorers/>.

# Supplementary Information for *Cautious explorers generate more future academic impact*

30th June 2023

## Contents

<b>S1 Data Description</b>	<b>7</b>
S1.1 The APS Dataset . . . . .	7
S1.1.1 Author Name Disambiguation . . . . .	8
S1.1.2 Data Selection . . . . .	9
S1.1.3 Log-Citations . . . . .	9
S1.1.4 Gender Assignment . . . . .	10
S1.1.5 Limitations of the APS dataset . . . . .	10
S1.2 The PubMed Dataset . . . . .	11
S1.3 The ACS Dataset . . . . .	13
<b>S2 Exploration Metrics</b>	<b>13</b>
S2.1 Exploration Propensity . . . . .	13
S2.2 Exploration Distance . . . . .	15
S2.2.1 Topic Co-occurrence Graph . . . . .	15
S2.2.2 Topic Distance . . . . .	16
S2.2.3 Paper Distance and Exploration Distance . . . . .	18

S2.3	Exploration Metrics in Relation to Other Factors . . . . .	18
S2.3.1	Gender . . . . .	18
S2.3.2	Team Size . . . . .	19
S2.3.3	Ivy League Experience . . . . .	19
<b>S3</b>	<b>Preliminary Analysis of the EP and ED</b>	<b>20</b>
S3.1	Correlational Analysis . . . . .	21
S3.2	Relations Between Past Performance and Future Explorations . . . . .	22
<b>S4</b>	<b>Experiments</b>	<b>24</b>
S4.1	Regression . . . . .	24
S4.2	Propensity Score Matching and Weighting . . . . .	26
S4.2.1	The EP . . . . .	27
S4.2.2	The ED . . . . .	28
S4.2.3	The EP and ED combined and PSW . . . . .	28
S4.3	Fixed Effect Analysis . . . . .	34
S4.4	Future EP/ED and Future Performance . . . . .	34
S4.5	Performance of “Drastic Changers” . . . . .	35
S4.6	Results on the PubMed Dataset . . . . .	36
S4.7	Results on the ACS Dataset . . . . .	41
<b>S5</b>	<b>Case Study</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>S6</b>	<b>Analysing Other Possible Latent Factors</b>	<b>44</b>
S6.1	Hypothesis A: Research Area . . . . .	44
S6.2	Hypothesis B: Paper Novelty . . . . .	45
S6.3	Hypothesis C: Advantageous Collaborations . . . . .	46
S6.4	Hypothesis D: Changing Institutions . . . . .	48
S6.5	Combining Hypotheses A–D . . . . .	48
S6.6	Mediation Analysis . . . . .	48
<b>S7</b>	<b>Robustness Checks</b>	<b>50</b>
S7.1	Different Subsets of Scientists . . . . .	50
S7.1.1	The Minimum Number of Publications Requirement . . . . .	50
S7.1.2	Removing Scientists with Asian Last Names . . . . .	51

S7.2	Controlling for the Genders of Scientists . . . . .	51
S7.3	Alternative Definitions of the EP and ED . . . . .	51
S7.3.1	Different PACS code digits . . . . .	52
S7.3.2	Different Topic Graphs . . . . .	53
S7.3.3	Different Node Distance Metrics . . . . .	54
S7.3.4	Different Paper Distance . . . . .	55
S7.4	Citation Measurements . . . . .	55
S7.4.1	10-Year Citations . . . . .	56
S7.4.2	Normalized Citations . . . . .	56
S7.4.3	Percentiles among Peers . . . . .	57
S7.4.4	Maximum Future Citations . . . . .	57
S7.5	Different Look-back Windows . . . . .	58
S7.6	Propensity Score Matching . . . . .	58
S7.6.1	Varying Grouping Quantiles . . . . .	58
S7.6.2	Shuffling after Matching—The Null Model . . . . .	58
S7.7	Propensity Score Weighting . . . . .	59
S7.7.1	Shuffling after Weighting—The Null Model . . . . .	59
S7.8	Perturbing Independent Variables . . . . .	59

## List of Figures

S1	An illustrative sample of the classification scheme of the MAG dataset.	11
S2	Relationship between the co-occurrence weight and the neighbourhood overlapping similarity. . . . .	17
S3	Distributions of EPs and EDs for male and female scientists. . . . .	19
S4	The average EPs and EDs for scientists with different team sizes. . . . .	20
S5	Distributions of EPs and EDs for Ivy versus non-Ivy scientists. . . . .	20
S6	The distributions of EPs and EDs for scientists with at least 10 papers.	21
S7	Association between scientists' ED and academic performance. . . . .	22
S8	Relationships between the prior performance and the next explorations.	23
S9	Average treatment effects with different baseline groups and varying numbers of papers as split point. . . . .	30
S10	Average treatment effects with different baseline groups and varying career years as split point. . . . .	31

S11	Average treatment effects for different treated groups and varying numbers of papers as split point. . . . .	32
S12	Average treatment effects for different treated groups and varying career years as split point. . . . .	33
S13	Average treatment effects for varying split points in a simplified setup.	33
S14	Average treatment effects with varying numbers of papers as split point in the PubMed <sub>1</sub> dataset. . . . .	37
S15	Average treatment effects with varying career years as split point in the PubMed <sub>1</sub> dataset. . . . .	38
S16	Average treatment effects with varying quantiles in the PubMed <sub>1</sub> dataset. . . . .	38
S17	Average treatment effects with varying numbers of papers as split point in the PubMed <sub>2</sub> dataset. . . . .	39
S18	Average treatment effects with varying career years as split point in the PubMed <sub>2</sub> dataset. . . . .	40
S19	Average treatment effects with varying quantiles in the PubMed <sub>2</sub> dataset. . . . .	40
S20	Average treatment effects with varying numbers of papers as split point in the ACS dataset. . . . .	42
S21	Average treatment effects with varying career years as split point in the ACS dataset. . . . .	42
S22	Average treatment effects with varying quantiles in the ACS dataset.	43
S23	Possible mechanisms to explain why cautious explorers have more impact in the future. . . . .	49
S24	Distributions of the ED calculated with 2, 4, and 6 digits of PACS codes. . . . .	52

## List of Tables

S1	Pearson correlation coefficients between code distance matrices calculated using papers from different time periods . . . . .	64
S2	Regression results with varying regression equations . . . . .	65
S3	Regression results of Model (S3) with varying split points . . . . .	66
S4	Regression results of Model (S4) with varying split points . . . . .	67

S5	E-values for the regression analyses with varying split points . . . . .	68
S6	PSM results with varying career years as split point . . . . .	69
S7	Average treatment effect in different groups with varying career years as split point . . . . .	70
S8	PSM results with varying numbers of papers as split point . . . . .	71
S9	Average treatment effect with varying numbers of papers as split point	72
S10	Regression results of the system GMM . . . . .	73
S11	Regression results of Model (S8) with varying split points . . . . .	74
S12	Regression results on the PubMed <sub>1</sub> dataset . . . . .	75
S13	Regression results on the PubMed <sub>1</sub> dataset with an alternative performance measurement . . . . .	76
S14	Regression results on the PubMed <sub>2</sub> dataset . . . . .	77
S15	Regression results on the ACS dataset . . . . .	78
S16	Regression results on the ACS dataset with an alternative perform- ance measurement . . . . .	79
S17	Normalized regression coefficients of the EP and ED with different factors as the dependent variable. . . . .	80
S18	Coefficients of the EP and ED when controlling for different factors	81
S19	Pearson correlation coefficients between confounding factors and other independent variables. . . . .	82
S20	Pearson correlation coefficients between confounding factors and other independent variables with 10 papers as split point. . . . .	82
S21	Mediation effects of different factors on the future impact . . . . .	83
S22	Mediation effects of different factors on the future impact with 10 papers as split point. . . . .	84
S23	Regression coefficients of the EP and ED on different subsets of scientists, with at least 5 or 20 publications . . . . .	84
S24	Regression coefficients of the EP and ED on the subset excluding scientists with common Asian last names . . . . .	85
S25	Regression coefficients of the EP and ED when controlling for sci- entists' genders . . . . .	85
S26	Regression coefficients of the EP and ED with varying definitions of EP and ED . . . . .	86

S27	Regression coefficients of EP and ED under alternative topic graphs for measuring topic distances . . . . .	86
S28	Regression coefficients of EP and ED under different node distance metric . . . . .	87
S29	Regression coefficients of EP and ED when using Hausdorff distance for paper distance . . . . .	87
S30	Regression coefficients of the EP and ED under varying definitions of academic impact . . . . .	88
S31	Regression coefficients of the EP and ED under varying numbers of papers as the look-back period . . . . .	89
S32	Regression coefficients of the EP and ED under different look-back years . . . . .	90
S33	PSM results with varying grouping quantiles and 10 papers as split points . . . . .	91
S34	PSM results with varying grouping quantiles and 10 career years as split points . . . . .	92
S35	Results of the null model in PSM . . . . .	93
S36	Results of the null model in PSW . . . . .	93
S37	Regression coefficients of the EP and ED after adding Gaussian noise to the independent variables. . . . .	94



# S1 Data Description

## S1.1 The APS Dataset

We perform our analyses primarily on the APS dataset<sup>1</sup>, which is provided by the American Physical Society (APS) and includes information of all papers published in the Physical Review series of journals between 1893 and 2020, totalling more than 670,000 publications. For each paper, the dataset contains information such as the paper’s digital object identifier (DOI), the date of publication, the name of the journal of publication, and the name and affiliation(s) of every author. In addition, the citations between publications in the Physical Review journals and the PACS codes of each paper are provided.

The Physics and Astronomy Classification Scheme<sup>2</sup> (PACS) is the classification criterion of papers used by the APS journals, which we apply in the definitions of the exploration propensity (EP) and the exploration distance (ED) in our study. The PACS codes in each paper are submitted by the authors and reviewed by the editors. The scheme first came in use in the early 1970s and was discontinued in around 2015. More than 90% of the publications were assigned PACS codes between 1976 and 2015, and one publication can have up to five PACS codes. A PACS code takes the form of six digits with a hierarchical structure. The highest level in a PACS code is marked by the first digit, ranging from 0 (general) to 9 (geophysics, astronomy and astrophysics). The second level is marked by the first two digits, such as 04 (general relativity and gravitation) and 32 (atomic properties and interactions with photons). The third level is recorded by the first four digits, e.g., 91.25 (geomagnetism and paleomagnetism; geoelectricity). Overall, there are 10 categories in the top level, 73 in the second, and 948 in the third. The fourth and fifth levels are designed to be represented by the first five digits and the entire six digits, respectively (e.g., 91.25.F for ‘rock and mineral magnetism’ and 91.25.fd for ‘environmental magnetism’). All the 5,971 unique PACS codes cover the third level, 80% of them the fourth, and 10% the fifth. These unique 6-digit PACS codes can be seen as a mixture of the finest possible levels—20% of it being third levels, 70% fourth levels, and 10% fifth levels. We call each 6-digit PACS code a research

---

<sup>1</sup><https://publish.aps.org/datasets>

<sup>2</sup><https://journals.aps.org/PACS>

*topic* and use the first two digits to represent a broader research *area*.

### **S1.1.1 Author Name Disambiguation**

Since the APS does not maintain a list of unique author identifiers, a name disambiguation is required to associate scientists with their publications. The name disambiguation procedure of scientific publications usually starts with assigning a unique identifier to each author of any publication, then proceeds to merge the identifiers that appear to correspond to the same person. We infer the authorship from the author names and metadata available in each publication, which is similar with the name disambiguation methods in prior works [14, 21]. First, we compile a list of 2,333,999 authors by treating each author from any publication as if each were unique; then, we merge the records of the supposedly identical authors into one entry in the following steps.

- (1) We first combine the author records with the same last names and compatible first names into one group. By “compatible”, we mean either the first names are exactly matched when the complete first names are available, or the first names have same initials, when deciding for these only have initials.
- (2) In each group, we measure the degree of similarity of authors from the following perspectives: whether they worked in similar and/or related institutions, whether they cited each other, had the same co-authors, and published in journals of similar research areas. Records with similarities above a certain threshold are merged.

With the above merging process, we obtain 395,678 authors. To evaluate the accuracy of our disambiguation procedure, we randomly sample some author pairs from all the author pairs which have the same last names and compatible first names. In detail, we sample 200 pairs of author identifiers that our procedure classifies as identical and 200 pairs of author identifiers that our procedure considers different. Out of these 400 pairs, we evaluate the outcomes of our procedure by manually looking up names on ResearchGate<sup>3</sup> and Google Scholar<sup>4</sup> to recover the ground truth. As such, we obtain estimates of the false positive rate—the fraction

---

<sup>3</sup><https://www.researchgate.net/>

<sup>4</sup><https://scholar.google.com/>

of pairs that are merged wrongly—to be about 5% and the false negative rate—the fraction of pairs that are supposed to merge while they are not—to be around 10%. Compared to other related works [14, 21], our error rates are low. Besides, we note that the errors produced by disambiguation are not evenly distributed among authors. Previous studies have pointed out that name disambiguation is more difficult for authors with Asian names [21]. In fact, in the evaluation just above, 90% of the errors are related to authors with Asian names. We have repeated our main analysis in the subset excluding the authors with Asian names, and have found that our experimental results remain essentially the same (see Section S7.1.2).

### S1.1.2 Data Selection

After disambiguating the author names, we obtained the publication records of all authors. We only consider the authors and their publications that meet the following criteria: (1) the publications were published during 1976-2015, when it was required to submit the PACS codes along with each publication; (2) we exclude the authors with any publication that has an incomplete record in the dataset, in the sense that not all fields (publish date, PACS codes) related to the paper were included; (3) the authors should be associated with at least ten papers that were published between 1976 and 2015. Criteria (1) and (2) ensure the accuracy of the author’s EP and ED calculations and allow us to trace the author’s initial performance; criterion (3) ensures that the author had a substantial scientific career rather than, say, only participated in some projects as short gigs. Note that enforcing (2) removes about 6% of all the authors, and 281,916 papers published by 25,237 scientists are left in the dataset after this step of screening.

### S1.1.3 Log-Citations

The most prominent problems with citation-based performance measures are that the number of citations for papers grows naturally as time elapses, and the heavy-tailed distribution of citations leads to erratic performance measurements in [4]. As such, for any paper, we use the logarithm of the cumulative citations it received within five years after its publication to measure its scientific impact. In the following sections, we call it “5-year log-citations”, denoted by  $\log c_5$ . Taking

logarithms on the citation numbers makes them much less problematic as the effect of sometimes extraordinarily large citation numbers in averaging is mitigated, and since the logarithm transformation is strictly monotone increasing on  $(0, \infty)$ , the ordering of the papers' importance (as measured by 5-year citations) is preserved.

#### **S1.1.4 Gender Assignment**

In our study, we infer a scientist's gender from the name. Specifically, we use a commercial service [genderize.io](https://genderize.io/)<sup>5</sup> widely used in scientific studies [11], which has built a database of names mapping first names to binary gender labels by integrating information from publicly available census datasets. For each first name, [genderize.io](https://genderize.io/) gives a gender prediction and provides both an estimated probability of its labelling being correct and the count of samples in its database. We only accept its gender labelling of the first names with at least 10 samples and probabilities of at least 60% to be correct in its database, such that relatively precise gender assignments are carried out. After this process, we obtain 17,140 male and 1,904 female scientists in the APS dataset.

#### **S1.1.5 Limitations of the APS dataset**

Although the APS dataset has been widely investigated in scientific studies, there are several limitations that should be kept in mind.

First, scientists may have published their manuscripts in any journals, but we only study their publications in the APS journals. Similarly, papers may receive citations from journals not in the APS journal list, but we only count the citations between pairs of the APS journals.

Second, the PACS codes were submitted by scientists and might later be reviewed and modified by editors, so they might not have been objectively written down in accordance with the classification scheme. Besides, the PACS codes and their exact meanings were subject to revisions by the APS from time to time. Nevertheless, the PACS had been an enduring and the recommended classification standard for the APS journals for a long time.

Third, some papers had incomplete records—some miss the PACS codes or the scientists' name. For the record, we note that over 95% of all the publication

---

<sup>5</sup><https://genderize.io/>

records of the scientists with at least 10 papers during 1976–2015 have the PACS codes on the records. More than 99% of the publications have complete records of all the other information (paper DOI, publish date, number of citations, authors’ names and affiliations, and journal of publications). Our analyses are performed only on those papers which have both records of PACS codes and authors’ names.

## S1.2 The PubMed Dataset

We also examine the PubMed dataset, which covers biomedicine publications. This dataset is constructed from the Microsoft Academic Graph (MAG) [22], by requiring the URLs of the papers to be from PubMed. It originally contains 29,776,639 papers.




Figure S1: **An illustrative sample of the classification scheme of the MAG dataset.**

For the PubMed dataset, there are two distinct coding systems that can be used to identify the areas and topics of papers. The first is a classification scheme provided by MAG. It is inferred based on paper content and other publicly available information [22] and applies to all papers in MAG. The second is the hierarchically-organized Medical Subject Headings (MeSH)<sup>6</sup> specific to the PubMed dataset and provided by the National Library of Medicine (NLM). In this study, we not only use

<sup>6</sup><https://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/meshhome.html>

the MAG coding systems to infer the areas and topics of papers within PubMed, but also utilize the MeSH system to build a separate dataset for robustness check purposes.

Specifically, MAG’s classification scheme consists of 6 levels (Figure S1). For papers in PubMed, there are 45 categories in the first level, 39,666 in the second level, 65,949 in the third, 91,552 in the fourth, and 17,643 in the fifth. We use the first-level fields as *areas* for computation for the EP and the second-level fields as *topics* for the ED. As a sizeable portion of the publications (about 17.1%) has no records of the second-level fields, we fill these missing values with the fields of other levels in the following steps.

1. If the publication have records of its third-level fields, we find the corresponding second-level fields of each of its third-level fields, and consider the corresponding second-level fields as the “true” second-level fields of the publication.
2. If a publication does not have records of its third-level fields, we use the fourth-level fields to obtain the corresponding third-level fields and then the third to the second.
3. Those with only higher-level fields in their records than the third-level ones can be dealt with similarly in a recursive fashion.

We also utilize the MeSH for inferring PubMed papers’ areas and topics. This involves mapping a MeSH code to the MeSH tree<sup>7</sup> and obtaining the corresponding area and topic, from its ancestor and descendant, respectively. Given a MeSH code, we use its ancestor at the first level (the MeSH tree starts at the zeroth level) as the area it represents, and the descendant(s) at the tenth level as the topic(s). If all leaf nodes of a code are at levels less than ten, we just use these leaf nodes as the code’s topics. Note that the NLM modifies the structure of the MeSH tree annually, and we decide to use the most recent (2016) MeSH tree. By doing this, 99.94% of the papers have at least one MeSH code. In total, we have 14 areas and 39,660 topics using MeSH, and they are of comparable order of magnitude as the results from using MAG’s classification scheme.

---

<sup>7</sup><https://meshb-prev.nlm.nih.gov/treeView>

The MAG provides citations between publications, similar to the APS dataset. Recalling  $\log c_5$ , we count only a paper’s citations in the five-year period after its publication, and take its logarithm to measure the paper’s impact. Note that here we are able to count a paper’s citation from all papers that cite it, instead of from only those published in the APS journals in the APS dataset (see Section S1.1.5).

All the publication entries in the PubMed dataset have field IDs and publication dates, and more than 99% of them contain author IDs. Similarly to the APS dataset, we consider only papers published before the end of 2016 to make sure that the 5-year log-citations (after their publications) are calculable, and only authors with at least 10 publications are studied. (In the later case of using 10-year log-citations, we only consider papers published before the end of 2011 for similar reasons.)

Finally, using the MAG and MeSH coding systems respectively, we arrive at the PubMed<sub>1</sub> dataset comprising 1,218,355 scientists and 13,072,174 papers, and the PubMed<sub>2</sub> dataset with 1,260,125 scientists and 13,649,286 papers. The divergence in the number of papers between the two datasets is attributable to differences in code coverage rates for the papers.

### S1.3 The ACS Dataset

We also construct a dataset of chemistry papers published in the 86 American Chemical Society (ACS) journals, from 1879 to 2021, by filtering the MAG dataset. Originally, it contains 1,325,257 papers. It is then processed in the same way as the PubMed dataset and the papers’ areas and topics are decided by the MAG classification scheme (the MeSH system is only available for PubMed.). In total, the processed dataset has 21 areas and 16,257 topics, covering 62,316 scientists and 747,061 papers.

## S2 Exploration Metrics

### S2.1 Exploration Propensity

The exploration propensity (EP) measures a scientist’s likelihood of switching to an unfamiliar area. It is calculated as the proportion of her exploratory papers that



explore unfamiliar research areas among all her papers. An exploratory paper is a paper that covers at least one area that is different from the areas of the papers in the *look-back* period, which can either consist of her past  $J$  papers before this paper or the papers in the  $K$  years before the publication year. When  $J$  is set to be 1, the EP is the probability that a scientist explores different areas between any two consecutive publications. When  $J$  is  $\infty$ , we consider all papers before it when deciding whether a paper is exploratory or not, even if the previously explored area might have seen so much progress that it is quite different from the area a few years ago. One example would be “machine learning”, which nowadays mainly consists of deep learning and is drastically different from what machine learning used to be several years ago. By default, we use  $J = 5$  and in the robustness check, we vary  $J$  from 1 to 15 and  $K$  from 1 to 15 as well. Besides, we also set them to  $\infty$  to consider all the past papers for the robustness checks.

Formally, assuming that a scientist has published  $L$  papers, we need to decide how many of them are exploratory. We denote her  $i$ -th paper as  $p_i$  and when  $p_i$  is not the first paper ( $i \in \{2, \dots, L\}$ ), we compare its set of areas  $A_i$  with  $A_{i,m}$ , which is the set of past areas from her  $m$  papers published in the *look-back* period. If  $A_i \not\subset A_{i,m}$ ,  $p_i$  is an exploratory paper since it contains areas unseen in the *look-back* period. The first paper,  $p_1$ , does not have previous papers, and thus we do not determine whether it is exploratory. Therefore,  $(L - 1)$  out of  $L$  papers can be determined, and we calculate the EP as the fraction of exploratory papers among these  $(L - 1)$  papers. Specifically, for the APS dataset, we use the first two digits of the PACS codes as the area identifiers, of which there are 73 unique ones, while for the PubMed dataset, we use the first-level tags of 45 different areas.

If we use the entire six digits of PACS codes (research “topics”, as described in Section S1.1) when determining exploratory papers, most papers will be exploratory, and a large portion of scientists will appear to explore all the time with high EPs. The other extreme is to use the first digit that represents one of the 10 top level classifications as a PACS code’s area, and the coarse-grained classifications would result in very few switches and many scientists with EPs being zero. We therefore use the first two digits, and we try four digits in Section S7.3.1.

## S2.2 Exploration Distance

To complement the EP, we calculate the exploration distance (ED) of a scientist by an average distance of her papers to their corresponding previous papers. A paper’s distance to another is determined by the average distance between the two papers’ topics. And to compute the distance between two topics, the straightforward approach based on counting topic co-occurrences in the same papers [26] is not applicable in our scenario, since 98.31% of the six-digit PACS code pairs in the APS dataset do not co-occur, despite that they may be indirectly related. If the two-digit PACS area codes are used instead of the six-digit topic codes for the co-occurrences, only the crude area-level distances can be captured, and finer details in topics are omitted. Therefore, it would be more appropriate to use six-digit PACS codes to include subtle (dis)similarity at the topic-level. As such, we adopt the construction of a co-occurrence based code similarity graph using the entire dataset and measure the pairwise code distances according to how the pair’s neighbours overlap [16, 18, 34]. After such a graph is constructed, the distance between any pair of papers can be determined, based on which we calculate the EDs of the scientists. We elaborate on these operations in the following subsections.

### S2.2.1 Topic Co-occurrence Graph

Following [18], we consider all papers in the focal dataset and construct a weighted graph, in which each node represents a unique topic and an edge connects two topics that have appeared in the same papers. The edge weight between topic  $i$  and  $j$  is  $w_{ij} = \sum_{p \in H} (n_p - 1)^{-1}$ , where  $H$  denotes the set of all papers containing  $i$  and  $j$ , and  $n_p$  is the number of topics in paper  $p$ .  $(n_p - 1)$  is the number of co-occurring topics that each topic has in paper  $p$  and each co-occurrence has  $1/(n_p - 1)$  as the weight from this paper. Therefore,  $w_{ij}$  depicts the co-occurrences of  $i$  and  $j$ , with each co-occurrence weighted by the number of all topic co-occurrences of  $i$  or  $j$  on the corresponding paper. The strength of each topic,  $s_i = \sum_j w_{ij}$ , is equal to the number of papers containing that topic, excluding these with single topics. With this graph, the similarity between topic  $i$  and  $j$  can be calculated using the *weighted overlap* indicator that considers their overlapping neighbours.

### S2.2.2 Topic Distance

In an unweighted graph, the similarity between two nodes can be measured by the number of their overlapped neighbours divided by the number of nodes in the union set of their neighbours [17]. Pan et al. [18] extends this to a weighted graph, and defines the *weighted overlap* similarity between  $i$  and  $j$  as:

$$O_{ij} = \frac{W_{ij}}{s_i + s_j - 2w_{ij} - W_{ij}} \quad (\text{S1})$$

where  $w_{ij}$  is the weight of the edge between nodes  $i$  and  $j$ ,  $s_i$  is the sum of weights from all  $i$ 's edges, and  $W_{ij}$ , defined by  $\sum_{k \in \Lambda_i \cap \Lambda_j} \frac{w_{ik} + w_{kj}}{2}$ , represents the weight from overlapped neighbours of  $i$  and  $j$ , and  $\Lambda_i$  is  $i$ 's neighbouring nodes. The subtraction of  $2w_{ij}$  in the denominator is to exclude the effect of direct links between  $i$  and  $j$ , if there is any. By definition,  $O_{ij} = 0$  if  $i$  and  $j$  do not have any overlapping neighbours, while  $O_{ij} = 1$  if  $i$  and  $j$  have the same set of neighbours. We then define the topic distance between  $i$  and  $j$  as:  $\text{TD}_{ij} = 1 - O_{ij}$ , and  $\text{TD}_{ij} \in [0, 1]$  by definition.

We choose to compute neighbourhood overlap for ED instead of measuring how nodes are directly connected (i.e., the weighted co-occurrence for the graph edges), mainly because that very few (1.69%) pairs of nodes are directly connected. For these pairs of connected codes, the similarities measured from the neighbourhood overlap correlate positively with the weighted co-occurrence (Fig. S2), indicating that the neighbourhood overlap measurement is a reasonable replacement.

Some APS codes may disappear in certain years [18] and if the code graph is constructed from papers in a short period of time, it may miss some codes such that the distances for these missing codes from other years cannot be computed. To avoid this, we use papers of all years to build the graph, and all the codes that have ever appeared are in this graph. Here we show that the code distances are relatively stable, regardless of whether we construct the graph with all papers or just the papers from a certain period of time, by adopting the analysis from Hidalgo et al. [9]. First, we construct node graphs using papers from different time periods. For each period, we compute the distances for all possible node pairs and form a distance matrix only for the nodes that appear across all periods. We then calculate pairwise correlations for all the matrices, including the one built with all papers as used in our method. The correlations in Table S1 are fairly high, indicating

the stability of node distances over time. The first row of Table S1 shows that our distance matrix that uses all papers aligns well with distance matrices built from papers of various time periods, and the correlations are mostly above 0.75. The only exception is 1981-1985 (0.544), during which the published papers only account for 1.21% of all the papers.




Figure S2: **The relationship between the co-occurrence weight and the neighbourhood overlapping similarity used in the paper.** We divide the connected code pairs (98.67% of all connected code pairs) with co-occurrence weight ranging from 0 and 20 into 20 groups by aligning their weights to the nearest integer and calculate the average similarity and corresponding 95% confidence bands for the code pairs within each group. We see a clear monotone increasing relation between the two metrics.

When computing any code distance, we use papers of all years to construct the graph and all the codes that have ever appeared are in this graph, to avoid the issue of code missing. Furthermore, to prove the validity of this approach, we verify that the distances between nodes are stable whether we use papers from the entire time period or from a partial time period to construct the topic graph, following an analysis adopted from Hidalgo et al. [9]. First, we construct node graphs using papers from different time periods. For each period, we compute the distances for all possible node pairs and form a distance matrix only for the nodes that appear across all periods. We then calculate pairwise correlations for all the matrices,

including the one built with all papers as used in our method. The correlations in Table S1 are fairly high, indicating the stability of node distances over time. The first column of Table S1 shows that our distance matrix that uses all papers aligns well with distance matrices built from papers of various time periods, and the correlations are mostly above 0.75. The only exception is 1981-1985 (0.544), during which the published papers only account for 1.21% of all the papers.

### S2.2.3 Paper Distance and Exploration Distance

Before diving into the ED, we need to compute paper distances on papers in consideration. Similar to Section S2.1 where we decide whether a paper  $p_i$  is exploratory by comparing its set of areas ( $A_i$ ) with that of the  $m$  papers before it ( $A_{i,m}$ ), the paper distance is the average of pairwise topic distances between  $p_i$ 's topics and these of the  $m$  papers:

$$\text{PD}_{p_i} = \frac{1}{|T_i| \times |T_{i,m}|} \sum_{t_j \in T_i} \sum_{t_k \in T_{i,m}} \text{TD}_{t_j t_k}, \quad (\text{S2})$$

where  $t_j$  is a topic in  $p_i$ 's topic set  $T_i$ , and  $t_k$  is a topic in the  $m$  past papers' topic set  $T_{i,m}$ . The ED of a scientist is computed as the average paper distances of all her published papers in a certain period, which often corresponds to the part before the split point.

## S2.3 Exploration Metrics in Relation to Other Factors

We examine the relationships between the two exploration metrics and the factors that are often associated with systematic differences in human behaviours connected to academic career performances. Some factors, such as years into careers and different periods of time as starting points of careers, have been discussed in the main text.

### S2.3.1 Gender

Using the gender inferring tool in Section S1.1.4, we obtain 17,140 male and 1,904 female scientists in the APS dataset and plot the distributions of EP and ED for the two genders in Figure S3. Applications of the Kruskal–Wallis (KW) tests suggest that there are no statistically distinguishable differences between the EP

distributions of both genders ( $P = 0.3886$ ), while they seem to differ (statistically) in their ED distributions ( $P = 0.0045$ ). The average ED of men and women are 0.570 and 0.561, respectively. In light of this, we will include gender as an independent variable in the robustness check Section S7 to see the role it plays in scientists' future performance.




Figure S3: **Distributions of EPs and EDs for male and female scientists.**

We have calculated and aggregated the career-long EPs and EDs of every male and female scientist, respectively.

### S2.3.2 Team Size

Team sizes affect the extent to which scientists explore [29]. For each scientist, we calculate her average team size across all her papers, where the team size of a paper refers to its number of authors. We then plot the EP and ED distributions over different team sizes in Figure S4 and find that the two metrics peak when the team size is around 5 and 6.

### S2.3.3 Ivy League Experience

We identify scientists who have worked for or studied at Ivy League universities according to their affiliated institutions in their publications. Figure S5 shows the distributions of EPs and EDs for Ivy versus non-Ivy scientists, and the KW tests as expected suggest that these two groups of scientists have different exploration




Figure S4: **The average EPs and EDs for scientists with different team sizes and the distribution of average team sizes of scientists.**

patterns—the ones from the Ivy group have larger EPs ( $P = 1.40 \times 10^{-12}$ ) and EDs ( $P = 3.60 \times 10^{-13}$ ).




Figure S5: **Distributions of EPs and EDs for Ivy versus non-Ivy scientists.** We calculate the career-long EPs and EDs for every scientist with and without Ivy League affiliations, respectively.

### S3 Preliminary Analysis of the EP and ED

Existing literature have reported the correlation between scientists' academic performance and their tendencies to switch to new topics, among which Zeng et al.



[33] found a weak negative correlation between the scientists’ 5-year citations per paper and their degrees of concentration on certain topics measured (reversely) by the switching probabilities. In what follows, we study the EP and ED and explore the relationships between them and their relations with confounding factors.

We start the section by plotting the histograms of career-long EPs and EDs of all scientists in Fig. S6.




Figure S6: **The distributions of EPs and EDs for scientists with at least 10 papers.** Both the EP and ED are calculated in each scientist’s entire career.

### S3.1 Correlational Analysis

As pointed out in Fig. 2 in the main text, we observed a negative correlation between the exploration propensity and the scientists’ academic performance (Pearson correlation coefficient:  $-0.1072$ )—as a scientist’s overall exploration propensity increased, her academic performance became worse. As our study unveils in the main text and in the sections below, having higher EP should be in fact associated with better academic performance in the future, and we remark that this is an exemplifying example of the failure of correlational analysis that statisticians have always warned us about.

Furthermore, there is a more substantial negative correlation between the scientists’ exploration distances and their overall performance (Pearson correlation

coefficient:  $-0.2852$ ) (Fig. S7).




Figure S7: **Association between scientists' ED and academic performance.**

The figure is otherwise similar to Fig. 2a in the main text, except that the horizontal axis corresponds to the current object of interest—the (career-long) ED, instead of the EP.

### S3.2 Relations Between Past Performance and Future Explorations

When conceiving new projects, a scientist may determine the direction of the next paper(s) based on her experience in areas and topics that she has worked on. Two hypotheses arise. By some psychological accounts, engaging in mastery experience builds a person's self-efficacy [13], i.e., a scientist becomes more confident in tackling new challenges after achieving successes in the past, so she is more willing to explore new topics; or alternatively, it may prompt the scientist to commit to the areas of her existing expertise and enter a scientific comfort zone, thus she would focus on topics that she is already experienced in and more comfortable with. Either seems plausible.

We call the later one of a scientist's any two consecutive papers a *new publication*, and this is the opportunity where she could choose to switch topics and decide how far away the next topic would be from previous ones. We observe the connection between the scientist's performance measured by the 5-year log-citations per paper prior to her each new publication, and the outcomes of the publications measured




Figure S8: **Relationships between the prior performance and the next explorations.** For each publication of any scientist (except the first one), we calculate the prior research performance by averaging the 5-year log-citations of all her publications prior to this publication, then we determine whether she explores in this publication, and calculate how far she explores. For all publications of similar prior research performance that are grouped together by having the same nearest integer multiple of 0.1, we calculate the probability of exploration by counting how many times explorations take place and calculate the average distance of the next paper from the past (five) papers during all these publications. (a) Scientists' past performance versus the probability of changing research area in the next paper. Each red point marks the mean of the log  $c_5$  per paper of the scientists in that group, with 95% confidence bands. The light grey bars in the figure indicate the distribution of scientists' past performance at every (new) publication. Note that part of (a) has appeared in the main text. (b) Scientist's past performance versus the next paper distance. Scientists are less likely to be bold in their explorations as the prior performance improves.

by (the average of) whether an area switch takes place and (the average of) how far away the next paper’s topics are from the last one. We find that scientists with better past performance are more likely to continue exploiting areas of familiarity by either not exploring or exploring closer topics, and vice versa, see Fig. S8.

## S4 Experiments

Given the negative correlation between a scientist’s academic performance and her exploration propensity throughout their academic career (Section S3.1) and our observation of the relation between the prior performance and the future explorations (Section S3.2), we would hypothesize that the prior exploratory metrics can be used to explain and predict future successes. To test the validity of this idea, we design two types of tasks: choosing each (i) scientist’s  $i$ -th ( $i = 2, \dots, 15$ ) career year or (ii)  $i$ -th ( $i = 2, \dots, 15$ ) article as split point, and using the exploration metrics prior to the point to predict their academic performance after the split point. For each type of task, we first apply regression analyses to quantitatively verify the idea and then study the relations further via propensity score matching and weighting.

### S4.1 Regression

Keeping in mind the systematic differences among the scientists, we introduce the following regression analyses to study the explanatory and predictive powers of the aforementioned exploratory metrics on future performance while controlling for other features.

We construct the regression equation to study the relation between the future academic performance and the variable  $EP_{\text{past}}$ —the EP before the split point—while controlling for the other independent variables:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LogCit}_{\text{future}} = & \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{LogCit}_{\text{past}} + \beta_2 P_{\text{past}} \\ & + \beta_3 \text{year}_{\text{first}} + \beta_4 \text{area}_{\text{first}} + \beta_5 EP_{\text{past}} + \text{Noise}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S3})$$

where  $\text{LogCit}_{\text{future}}$  represents scientists’ average academic performance after the split point, and  $\text{LogCit}_{\text{past}}$ ,  $P_{\text{past}}$ ,  $\text{year}_{\text{first}}$ , and  $\text{area}_{\text{first}}$  record the average performance and the number of papers before the split point, and the publishing year and areas

of the first paper, respectively. Note that  $\text{year}_{\text{first}}$  and  $\text{area}_{\text{first}}$  are both categorical variables and handled as such. The above regression output is reported in the column of Model (S3) in Table S2, where the past EP has a statistically significant positive impact on the future performance. The result is consistent with the (later) propensity score weighting/matching results in Section S4.2.

We then add the scientists' average ED before the split point into the mix of independent variables on top of (S3):

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LogCit}_{\text{future}} = & \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{LogCit}_{\text{past}} + \beta_2 P_{\text{past}} + \beta_3 \text{year}_{\text{first}} \\ & + \beta_4 \text{area}_{\text{first}} + \beta_5 \text{EP}_{\text{past}} + \beta_6 \text{ED}_{\text{past}} + \text{Noise}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S4})$$

The corresponding column in Table S2 indicates that after controlling for the performance and EP in the past (before the split point), the effect of the ED on the future performance is statistically significantly negative. This is later confirmed again by the propensity score weighting results: scientists who explore new topics at shorter distances enjoy certain advantages in the future.

We also propose the rudimentary regression model

$$\text{LogCit}_{\text{future}} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{EP}_{\text{past}} + \beta_2 \text{ED}_{\text{past}} + \text{Noise}, \quad (\text{S5})$$

to investigate the basic relations between the future performance and  $\text{EP}_{\text{past}}$  and  $\text{ED}_{\text{past}}$  jointly. The output in Table S2 is consistent with what we have known, albeit in a crude fashion.

As illuminated in the above, scientists with higher EPs and lower EDs have better academic performances as measured by 5-year log-citations per paper. Similar to the main text, we go a step further and partitioned the scientists into four groups with four different kinds of patterns in exploratory metrics and put the group membership in the following regression study. Following the same framework as above and after calculating the EP and ED for every scientist, we label each scientist either high/low EP/ED, depending on whether her EP/ED metric lie in the top half or the bottom half of all. Then high-EP-low-ED scientists go to group A, low-EP-low-ED ones B, high-EP-high-ED ones C and the rest (low-EP-high-ED ones) D. Then we propose the next regression formula by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LogCit}_{\text{future}} = & \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{LogCit}_{\text{past}} + \beta_2 P_{\text{past}} \\ & + \beta_3 \text{year}_{\text{first}} + \beta_4 \text{area}_{\text{first}} + \beta_5 \text{group} + \text{Noise}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S6})$$

where the variable group is the categorical variable indicating to which of the four groups a scientist belongs with group D as the baseline. The regression result is shown in Table S2. We find that group A have the best future performance, followed by C and B, and finally D. This again supports our analyses in the main text via propensity score weighting about differences among the four groups.

To verify the robustness of our results, we run regressions of Model (S3) and Model (S4) with different split points, from 2 to 15 in number of papers and from 2 to 15 in career years, although some care is necessary to handle the EP that only have values of 0 and 1 when the split point is set to be two papers. The regression results of Model (S3) are shown in Table S3, where all the coefficients of the EP are (statistically) significantly positive. The more refined regression analyses with Model (S4) are shown in Table S4, and again all the coefficients of the EP are (statistically) significantly positive and all the coefficients of the ED are (statistically) significantly negative. The consistency of results under exhaustive choices of split points suggests the robustness of our results.

For the potentially unobserved confounding factors, we use E-values of the sensitivity analysis [24] to measure their potential impact on the above regression results. Specifically, we use the “EValue” package<sup>8</sup> in R to obtain the E-values of  $EP_{\text{past}}$  and  $ED_{\text{past}}$ , respectively. See the package documentation for detailed references and Table S5 for exact numbers. It suffices to conclude that in the experiments with split points set in terms of career years, both  $EP_{\text{past}}$  and  $ED_{\text{past}}$  have large E-values, which provides further evidence of the soundness of our discoveries on top of Section S6.

## S4.2 Propensity Score Matching and Weighting

To further solidify the reported relations between the proposed exploration metrics and future performance, we conduct more analyses via propensity score matching (PSM) [10] and propensity score weighting (PSW) [12]. We design tasks similar to our regression analyses, where the data are pre-processed similarly with the length of career years and the number of papers serving as split points. However, when applying the PSM, we have to study the EP and ED separately due to the limitation of the methodology itself.

---

<sup>8</sup><https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/EValue/index.html>

### S4.2.1 The EP

Specifically, for each split point, the analysis on the EP via PSM is conducted in the following steps:

1. First, we divide the scientists into a treatment group with their EPs lying in the top half of all EPs and a control group with their EPs in the bottom half, where the EPs are calculated (as usual) with each scientist's data before the split point.
2. Then PSM is used to match scientists in the treatment and control groups, where the covariates (to be matched) are the individual's performance, the number of papers before the split point, the PACS code and the year of the first paper. After playing around with the `caliper` hyper-parameter, we obtain the matched groups, both being subsets of the original treatment and control groups, respectively. The choice of `caliper` relies on human interventions such that the obtained groups after matching are statistically indistinguishable from each other in terms of their past performance and other covariates, and thus are *balanced*.
3. Finally, we compare the differences of the future performance of scientists between the matched treatment and control groups.

In particular, we use the implementation of the `MatchIt`<sup>9</sup> package from `R` to carry out the matching process in the above second step. We mostly follow the default settings recommended by the package for tuning parameters, except for `caliper`.

The results of the above analyses are detailed in the EP columns in Tables [S6](#) and [S8](#). The future performance of the scientists in the treatment group are statistically significantly ( $P < 0.01$ ) higher than those in the control group, regardless of the choice of the split point. For example, we take the choice of the default split point of ten career years, and have 14,159 individuals in both the treatment and control groups in total, and after the matching 4,983 pairs of scientists remain. We have ensured that the covariates such as the past performance are statistically indistinguishable between the groups after the matching. On average, the future performance of the scientists in the treatment (high-EP) group is higher than those in the control (low-EP) group by 4.71%.

<sup>9</sup><https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/MatchIt/>

### S4.2.2 The ED

We do similar analyses for the ED. The methodology is virtually the same, except in two parts. The first is that the variable of interest is no longer the EP, and the second is that we added the EP to the covariates to be matched via PSM. The latter is to ensure that the obtained subsets of both groups have similar (and thus comparable) distributions in the EP.

As expected, the future performance of scientists in the high-ED treatment group is (statistically) significantly lower than those in the low-ED control group, regardless of which split point is chosen. See the ED columns in Tables S6 and S8 for more details on the results. We point out that under the default split point of 10 career years, the future performance of the scientists in the treatment group is lower than those in the control group by 6.40%, on average.

### S4.2.3 The EP and ED combined and PSW

The above results suggest that those with high EP (low ED) will have an edge in future academic performance, over their otherwise similar counterparts with low EP (high ED). But do the scientists with both high ES and low ED perform better than others? And if so, by how much?

Recall that in the main text and Section S4.1, we have divided the scientists into four groups A, B, C and D, each with different exploration habits quantified by both the EP and ED. We first conduct an elementary analysis via PSM by finding a one-to-one matching between group A and D, similar to what is done in Sections S4.2.1 and S4.2.2. The matching results show that the treatment group A performs statistically significantly better than the control group D, as expected. Again, we refer to the corresponding columns in Tables S6 and S8.

However, the PSM is in itself no longer sufficient to deal with the multiple-group scenario, and as a result, we introduce the propensity score weighting [15].

For simplicity of exposition, we start by observing two groups of data, one ‘treatment’ group and the other ‘control’. In practice, whether a scientist is in the treatment group is intertwined with her other features, resulting in systematic difference between the two groups. The PSW scheme assigns scientists weights with the generalized boosted model (GBM), which depends on the estimated probability of each scientist being in either the treatment or the control group given



her measured features. The GBM algorithm is an iterative scheme to combine the predictive power of a large collection of simple regression trees with proper weighting. At each iteration, the algorithm seeks to add to the model a small refinement in the form of a simple regression tree to improve the fitness of the current model to the data measured by the Bernoulli log-likelihood, where the simple regression tree is a recursive algorithm to find a partitioning of the covariate space to estimate the relation between the covariate space and the treatment assignment. At each recursion step, the simple regression tree algorithm finds a further level of partitioning of the current model such that the prediction error is minimized. The GBM keeps iterating to find a maximum-likelihood fit, if a proper stopping criterion is specified. Then we calculate the average treatment effect (ATE) of being in different groups, by performing a weighted linear regression on just the dummy variable indicating the group membership, with one of the groups as baseline. Alternatively, we can also compute the average treatment effect on the treated (ATT) by virtually the same procedure as above, except for minor differences in obtaining the weights via GBM. The ATE and ATT are both quantities in causal inference to measure such causal effects with subtle differences. Roughly speaking, the ATE measures the population (i.e. all scientists) difference in outcomes between the treatment and control, while the ATT measures the difference in outcomes if the scientists in the treatment group were in the control group.

Specifically, in our case, the covariates for calculating the propensity scores are the same as the independent variables in Section S4.2.1. The obtained ATEs for varying definitions of split points are reported in Tables S7 and S9 and Figs. S9 and S10, and they consistently suggest that group A outperforms any other groups and particularly by a significant margin group D, while groups B and C have similarly better performance than group D. Similarly, we compute the ATTs as a robustness check, and the results are presented in Figs. S11 and S12. Note that the results on the ATTs are virtually the same as those on the ATE.

We also compare group A (as the treatment) against all other three groups combined (as the control) with the same methodology, and the ATEs of being group A under varying split points are shown in Fig. S13.




Figure S9: **Average treatment effects with different baseline groups and varying numbers of papers as split point.** For completeness, each plot has a different group as the baseline group: (a) has group D as the baseline, (b) group C, (c) group B, and (d) group A.




Figure S10: **Average treatment effects with different baseline groups and varying career years as split point.** (a) has group D as the baseline, (b) group C, (c) group B, and (d) group A. Note that (b) has appeared in the main text.




Figure S11: **Average treatment effects for different treated groups and varying numbers of papers as split point.** Note that (a) has group D as the baseline, (b) group C, (c) group B, and (d) group A.




Figure S12: Average treatment effects for different treated groups and varying career years as split point. Note that (a) has group D as the baseline, (b) group C, (c) group B, and (d) group A.




Figure S13: Average treatment effects for varying split points in a simplified setup. Group A functions as the treatment group, and the other three groups make up the control. Note that (a) has appeared in the main text as part of Fig. 4c.

### S4.3 Fixed Effect Analysis

In this section, we control for individual fixed effects by constructing panel data, to explore from another perspective the connection between past EP and ED and future performance.

Specifically, following the Methods section in the main text, we divide the 21 calendar years (1995 – 2015) into 7 three-year periods (or 30 calendar years (1986 – 2015) into five 5-year periods) and perform the calculations of all relevant variables. Then, we solve the following regression equation using the Arellano–Bond estimator [2]:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LogCit}_{i,t} = & \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{LogCit}_{i,t-1} + \beta_2 \text{EP}_{i,t-1} + \beta_3 \text{ED}_{i,t-1} + \beta_4 P_{i,t-1} \\ & + \beta_5 \text{Careeryear}_{i,t-1} + \mu_i + \eta_t + \text{Noise}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S7})$$

Note that the above Eq. (S7) is the same as the fixed-effect regression equation in the Methods section in the main text. Here, we treat Careeryear as an endogenous variable, i.e., a variable correlating with the observational noise in each time period.

The results in the Table S10 show that after controlling for individual fixed effects and a range of other covariates, the coefficients on EP and ED remain statistically significant, which is consistent with the findings in Table S2. Note that we also conduct the Hansen test and the AR tests [2], respectively, to justify our model in Eq. (S7). The Hansen test tells us that our model does not suffer from the over-identifying problem, which indicates our choice of the independent variables and endogenous variables is sound; the AR tests show the first-order autoregressive structure is valid, which permits us to employ system GMM in solving Eq. (S7).

### S4.4 Future EP/ED and Future Performance

Following the Methods section in the main text, we define the following regression:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LogCit}_{\text{future}} = & \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{LogCit}_{\text{past}} + \beta_2 P_{\text{past}} + \beta_3 \text{year}_{\text{first}} \\ & + \beta_4 \text{area}_{\text{first}} + \beta_5 \text{EP}_{\text{future}} + \beta_6 \text{ED}_{\text{future}} + \text{Noise}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S8})$$

The results are shown in Table S11, and hint at a certain extent of inference in the relationship between the future performance and the adopted strategy.

## S4.5 Performance of “Drastic Changers”

As mentioned in the main text, most scientists intentionally or unintentionally maintain consistent research agendas, while a very small portion of scientists exhibit drastic behavioural changes, such as transitioning from low-EP-high-ED to the completely opposite high-EP low-ED (cautious explorers) and vice versa. We may guess that these ‘drastic changers’ alter their research strategies on purpose. Here we examine how their performance correlates with these drastic changes.

To be more specific, for the default split point of 10 career years, we focus on group A and group D and observe the performance changes of these scientists who adopt the opposite strategies after the split point, i.e., scientist who were in the high-EP-low-ED (low-EP-high-ED) group before the split point and joined the low-EP-high-ED (high-EP-low-ED) group after the split point. We compare their performance after the split point to 1) their own performance before the split point and 2) the after-split performance of their counterparts, who were in the same group as the scientists before the split point and remain in the original group after the split point.

In the comparison of within-personal performance, scientists in group D (group A) who employ the opposite strategy after the split point, i.e., turning into group A (group D), comprises only 8.6% (6.9%) of the group. This dramatic change results in an increase of 4.77% (a decrease of 18.97%) on average in the individuals’ performance after the split point, as compared to their performance before the split.

We also conduct a comparative analysis of the future performance between scientists who change their research strategy and their counterparts who do not. Specifically, we focus on scientists in group D (group A) prior to the split point. Scientists who remain in the same group after the split point are assigned to the control group, while those who adopt the opposite strategies are allocated to the treatment group. We employ the PSW technique to measure the difference in after-split performance between the control and treatment groups while controlling for the usual covariates. The results indicate that the average treatment effect between the control group and the treatment group is 0.293 (-0.304) with a  $P$  value of  $4.55 \times 10^{-8}$  ( $1.33 \times 10^{-6}$ ), which translated to a percentage is 34.14% (-26.23%).

## S4.6 Results on the PubMed Dataset

To figure out how the past EPs and EDs of scientists are connected with future scientific impact in biomedicine, we conduct similar analyses using regression and propensity score weighting on the PubMed dataset. Recall the difference between PubMed<sub>1</sub> and PubMed<sub>2</sub>. In this section, we perform the same regression and PSW analyses on both PubMed datasets, and the results are consistent. We therefore do not distinguish the two in the descriptions below.

First, we run the regression (S4) on the dataset with varying split points, from 2 to 15 in number of papers and in career years, respectively. As is shown in Tables S12 and S14, the regression coefficients of the EP and ED with all split points are (statistically) significant and have the right signs, which is consistent with our findings in the APS dataset (Table S4). The result suggests that cautious explorers have higher future impact in biomedicine as well. When measuring scientists' future impact, we also employ another method—the maximum 5-year log-citations after the split point as an alternative, and the results are robust (Table S13).

Furthermore, we utilize propensity score weighting to verify the advantage of being in group A, where the groups A, B, C and D are defined similarly. The experiments are similar to the above regression process, and the calculated ATEs for varying split points consistently show that group A performs better than any other group (see Figs. S14, S15, S17 and S18).

In the studies on the APS dataset in the main text, we see that group A has an expanding advantage as the thresholds on constructing high/low EP/ED groups (A, B, C and D) become extreme. As such, we test different thresholds in the PubMed dataset, and the results in Figs. S16 and S19 verify that the conclusions are similar to those before.






Figure S14: **Average treatment effects with different baseline groups and varying numbers of papers as split point in the PubMed<sub>1</sub> dataset.** Note that (a) has group D as the baseline, (b) group C, (c) group B, and (d) group A.




Figure S15: **Average treatment effects with different baseline groups and varying career years as split point in the PubMed<sub>1</sub> dataset.** Note that (a) has group D as the baseline, (b) group C, (c) group B, and (d) group A.




Figure S16: **Average treatment effects in the PubMed<sub>1</sub> dataset with varying quantiles.** The split point is 10 career year and group C is the baseline.




Figure S17: Average treatment effects with different baseline groups and varying numbers of papers as split point in the PubMed<sub>2</sub> dataset. Note that (a) has group D as the baseline, (b) group C, (c) group B, and (d) group A.




Figure S18: **Average treatment effects with different baseline groups and varying career years as split point in the PubMed<sub>2</sub> dataset.** Note that (a) has group D as the baseline, (b) group C, (c) group B, and (d) group A.




Figure S19: **Average treatment effects in the PubMed<sub>2</sub> dataset with varying quantiles.** The split point is 10 career year and group C is the baseline.

## S4.7 Results on the ACS Dataset

In this section, we investigate the relationship between the past EPs and EDs of scientists and their subsequent scientific impact in the field of chemistry. To this end, we also employ regression and propensity score weighting techniques to analyse the ACS dataset.

First, we conduct a regression (S4) on the ACS dataset, utilizing a range of split points varying from 2 to 15 in the number of papers and career years. The results, as presented in Table S15, indicate that the regression coefficients of EP and ED are (statistically) significant and have the correct signs. The results are in agreement with those obtained from the APS dataset (Table S4) and PubMed dataset (Table S12). Our findings indicate that cautious explorers have a higher future impact in chemistry. The results are robust when we employ “maximum 5-year log-citations” as an alternative method for measuring scientists’ future impact (Table S16).

In addition, we employ propensity score weighting to investigate the advantage of being in group A. The experimental procedures are similar to those of the aforementioned regression analysis, and the ATEs for different split points consistently demonstrate that group A outperforms all other groups (Figs. S20 and S21).

Furthermore, we also demonstrate that group A exhibits a widening advantage as the thresholds used to construct high- and low-EP/ED groups become increasingly extreme in the ACS dataset (Fig. S22).




Figure S20: **Average treatment effects with different baseline groups and varying numbers of papers as split point in the ACS dataset.** Note that (a) has group D as the baseline, (b) group C, (c) group B, and (d) group A.




Figure S21: **Average treatment effects with different baseline groups and varying career years as split point in the ACS dataset.** Note that (a) has group D as the baseline, (b) group C, (c) group B, and (d) group A.




Figure S22: **Average treatment effects in the ACS dataset with varying quantiles.** The split point is 10 career year and group C is the baseline.

## S5 Case Study

We select a representative case for each of the four groups in the main text. The representatives start their careers in similar topics and have comparable numbers of publications. Specifically, the areas of their first publications in the APS journals are the same, which all correspond to the PACS codes with their first two digits being “74”; the differences between their numbers of publications in the first ten years of their careers are no more than one. For clear illustrations, we select those specific cases so that individuals with high (low) EDs work on topics that have longer (shorter) average distance between their PACS codes in their own respective groups (cf. Section S2.2.2) and those with high (low) EPs have more (fewer) explored two-digit areas, comparing with other individuals within the same groups. Besides, the number of explored areas (marked by the first two digits of PACS codes) and explored topics (marked by the first six digits of PACS codes) should be comparable both between the two high-EP (low-EP) individuals with different EDs, and the average distances between PACS codes of their papers should be comparable both between the two high-ED (low-ED) individuals with different EPs.

## S6 Analysing Other Possible Latent Factors

As we mentioned in the main text and the Methods section, several conceivable mechanisms may provide alternative explanations to why cautious explorers have greater future impact. Here, we study some possible hypotheses, from the viewpoints of (A) hot research areas, (B) paper novelty, (C) advantageous collaborations and (D) changing institutions, and demonstrate how we may exclude these hypotheses. The related results in the entire section are summarized in Fig. S23 and Tables S17 and S18. As usual, the *past* in this section corresponds to all the information of any scientist before the split point, while the *future* to that after the split point, the split point in all the experiments in this section is 10 career years or 10 papers. The independent variables (covariates) are inherited from Section S4.1.

### S6.1 Hypothesis A: Research Area

As cautious explorers explored new areas more frequently, they could be chasing hot areas or just have greater exposure to hot areas, thus they garner higher future impact. The question is in fact two-fold:

1. Are cautious explorers more likely to publish on hot areas in the future?
2. Will working on hot areas in the future explain why cautious explorers have higher future impact?

To answer the first question, we examine the effect of having different past exploration patterns, measured by the EP and ED, on the popularity of the areas of their future publications. Recall that a research *area* correspond to the first two-digit of PACS codes. For a specific year, we gauge the popularity of an area— $\text{Popularity}_{\text{area}}$ , by the proportion of papers that are associated with the area among all the papers published in the same year. Since a paper may have several (unique) areas as identified by the first two digits in its PACS code(s), we define the area popularity of a paper— $\text{Popularity}_{\text{paper}}$ , either by (1) the average area popularity of all the associated PACS codes, or (2) the maximal area popularity of those codes. With either definition, we run a regression analysis where the dependent variable is the average area popularity of a scientist’ future papers— $\text{Popularity}_{\text{future}}$ , against the usual independent variables as in Section S4.1. The regression equation is as



follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Popularity}_{\text{future}} = & \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{LogCit}_{\text{past}} + \beta_2 P_{\text{past}} \\ & + \beta_3 \text{year}_{\text{first}} + \beta_4 \text{area}_{\text{first}} + \beta_5 \text{EP}_{\text{past}} + \beta_6 \text{ED}_{\text{past}} + \text{error}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S9})$$

where the future area popularity is the average area popularity of a scientist’s future papers. We find that cautious explorers are more likely to publish high area-popularity papers in the future ( $P < 0.001$ , see Table S17 and Fig. S23), since the above regression reports that both the EP and ED have statistically significant coefficients and the coefficient of the EP (ED) is positive (negative). The results hold regardless of which definition of the  $\text{Popularity}_{\text{paper}}$  is used.

Finally, we carry out a regression analysis of the future scientific impact when controlling for the  $\text{Popularity}_{\text{future}}$ , and find that the EP and ED remain statistically significant ( $P < 0.001$ , see Table S18), though area popularity may explain some of the difference. The regression equation is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LogCit}_{\text{future}} = & \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{LogCit}_{\text{past}} + \beta_2 P_{\text{past}} \\ & + \beta_3 \text{year}_{\text{first}} + \beta_4 \text{area}_{\text{first}} + \beta_5 \text{EP}_{\text{past}} + \beta_6 \text{ED}_{\text{past}} \\ & + \text{Popularity}_{\text{future}} + \text{error}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S10})$$

## S6.2 Hypothesis B: Paper Novelty

Uzzi et al. [23] suggested that the highest-impact publications have a combination of high novelty and high conventionality. Cautious explorers may be more creative as they explored more frequently, so they may publish papers with higher novelty. At the same time, as they tended to explore closer areas, their publications may be somewhat more conventional in a sense. As such, publishing this type of paper may explain why cautious explorers have greater future impact. To test the hypothesis, we evaluate the following two questions:

1. Do cautious explorers tend to publish papers with both high novelty and high conventionality in the future?
2. Will publishing paper with both high novelty and high conventionality in the future explain why cautious explorers have more future scientific impact?

We estimate the effect of the past exploration behaviour (exploration propensity and exploration distance) on the probability of publishing papers with both high

novelty and high conventionality by a regression analysis, similar to those in the above Section S6.1. We calculate the novelty and conventionality of each paper and label the papers of high novelty and high conventionality in the same way as [23]. Then we run regressions where the dependent variable is the probability of a scientist publishing papers of both high novelty and conventionality. Similarly to the discovery in Section S6.1, we find that cautious explorers are more likely to publish papers of both high novelty and conventionality in the future ( $P < 0.001$ , see Table S17 and Fig. S23).

Finally, we perform a regression analysis on the future impact while controlling for the probability of publishing papers with both high novelty and conventionality in the future. The results are again similar to those in Section S6.1 and suggest that the coefficients of EP and ED remain statistically significant ( $P < 0.001$ , see Table S18) with the correct signs, though publishing papers of both high novelty and conventionality may explain some of the difference in the future impact.

### S6.3 Hypothesis C: Advantageous Collaborations

Are cautious explorers prone to seek more advantageous collaborations? Some studies showed that teams often produced works of higher impact [30] than individuals, and having more distinguished co-authors may be partially responsible for greater future scientific impact. Besides, we measure scientists' EP and ED based the codes of papers, and these codes may be "brought in" by their co-authors. Through measuring EP and ED, are we quantifying the scientists' behaviour or their co-authors' behaviour? We need to further quantify the co-authors' contribution to the paper topics. Here, we study whether 1) cautious explorers having distinguished co-authors who contribute more to the papers, 2) co-authors bringing in their PACS codes or 3) cautious explorers working with larger teams is the reason for higher future impact.

To begin with, we assess the author's contribution by whether she takes an important role in leading the research or managing correspondence. Similar to Wang et al. [27], we consider a scientist to be a *lead author* if she is the first or last author of the publication. Then we study whether the probability of having lead-author publications is different between cautious explorers and other scientists. We find that having higher ED in the past predicts having higher proportions of

lead-author publications in the future ( $P < 0.001$ , see Table S17 and Fig. S23). Finally, we measure the future impact of a scientist by only considering papers of which she was the lead author and thus has contributed the most to the publication. Our conclusions on the EP and ED are the same under this setting ( $P < 0.001$ , see Table S18).

For the second question, we measure the co-author’s “contribution to topics” as a function of the co-author’s likely importation of codes from her prior work to a focal paper [31]. Following this idea, we first compute the number of unique codes that the focal author brings to the focal paper from her past 5 papers, denoted as  $I_{focal}$ . We then compute this code importation metric for all other authors combined except the focal author, denoted as  $I_{other}$ . Other co-authors’ contribution is computed as  $\frac{I_{other}}{I_{focal}+I_{other}}$ . Note that here we try both 2 digits and 6 digits of PACS codes, to represent “area” contribution and “topic” contribution respectively, in the context of our main text.

We next perform the usual regression routine similar to Eq. (S9) and Eq. (S10), only on the newly constructed factor—co-authors’ area/topic contribution in the future, and find that scientists with low EP and low ED are more likely to have co-authors with higher contribution in the future. When we set the future impact as dependent variable, and control for the co-authors’ area/topic contribution in the future on top of the usual independent variables, the coefficients of EP and ED remain statistically significant ( $P < 0.001$ , see Table S18).

We also study whether the future team sizes have much to do with the EP and ED. We define the team size of each paper by the number of its authors. Then we run regressions where the dependent variable is the average team size of the scientist’s future publications. We find that a lower ED is a statistically significant predictor of a larger average future team size ( $P < 0.001$ , see Table S17 and Fig. S23). Then we conduct one more regression analysis on the future scientific impact controlling further for the average future team size, and the obtained coefficients of the EP and ED remain statistically significant ( $P < 0.001$ , see Table S18) and have the correct signs.

## S6.4 Hypothesis D: Changing Institutions

Cautious explorers may work in different institutions in the future, where they may have higher impact because of being in institutions of higher reputation [1], and this may lead to greater future scientific impacts. Besides, they often have better opportunities in institutions of great reputation, e.g. Ivy League schools.

We measure a scientist’ tendency of switching institutions, by dividing the number of institutions by the number of publications. By adding the tendency of changing institutions and whether working in the Ivy League in the future to the mix of dependent variables separately, we find that being cautious explorers is a statistically significant predictor of working with more institutions in the future ( $P < 0.001$ , see Table S17 and Fig. S23), and having higher ED predicts well whether a scientist would work in the Ivy League in the future ( $P < 0.001$ , see Table S17 and Fig. S23). A further regression analysis, where these two factors are controlled for on top of the usual independent variables, finds that the coefficients of EP and ED remain statistically significant ( $P < 0.001$ , see Table S18).

## S6.5 Combining Hypotheses A–D

To see if combining all the above hypotheses would explain away our main findings, we take all the corresponding variables in question mentioned above and perform a regression analysis with the following equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LogCit}_{\text{future}} = & \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{LogCit}_{\text{past}} + \beta_2 P_{\text{past}} \\ & + \beta_3 \text{year}_{\text{first}} + \beta_4 \text{area}_{\text{first}} + \beta_5 \text{EP}_{\text{past}} \\ & + \beta_6 \mathbf{X}_{i,\text{attribute}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S11})$$

where  $\mathbf{X}_{i,\text{attribute}}$  is a vector collecting all the attributes we studied in Section S6. We see in Table S18 that the coefficients of the EP and ED are always statistically significant, i.e., the established positive relation between having higher future research impacts and being cautious explorers, cannot be explained away by the above hypotheses, separately or jointly.

## S6.6 Mediation Analysis

We examine the correlation between the above confounding factors and past EP/ED and find that several confounding factors we study in this section are correlated with




Figure S23: **Possible mechanisms to explain why cautious explorers have more impact in the future.** We present the regression analyses to investigate if scientists with different EPs and EDs behave differently in these dimensions in the future: area popularity of future publications, probability of publishing both novel and conventional papers, team size, probability of publishing lead-author papers, co-author's area and topic contribution, tendency of changing institutions and whether she would work in an Ivy League university. (a-b) are results with 10 career years as split points, (c-d) are results with 10 papers as split points. The normalized coefficients are calculated by the equation mentioned in the caption of Table S17. ( $*P < 0.1$ ;  $**P < 0.05$ ;  $***P < 0.01$ . Error bars are based on standard errors.)

the exploration metrics (see Table S19 and Table S20). To accurately assess the direct and mediating effects between the EP/ED and the future impact, we employ mediation analysis for hypothesis A–E, which enables us to assess both the direct path coefficients linking the treatment variables (the EP or ED) to outcome variables (the future impact) and the indirect path coefficients mediated by intermediate variables (the confounding factors). By doing so, we can examine the presence of the mediating effect by the confounding factors, as well as quantify the respective magnitudes of the direct effect of exploratory metrics and the mediating effect of confounding factors on future impact.

In detail, we include  $\text{LogCit}_{\text{past}}$ ,  $P_{\text{past}}$ ,  $\text{year}_{\text{first}}$ , and  $\text{area}_{\text{first}}$  as control variables, following the approach in the vanilla regression model (Eq. (S4)). We separately set one of the EP and ED as the treatment variable (while controlling for the other), and different confounding factors as the mediating variable, aiming to determine the magnitude of the direct and mediating effects. To calculate these effects, we utilize the “Mediation” package<sup>10</sup> in Python. The results of the mediation analysis are presented in Table S21 and Table S22. Notably, the average casual mediation effects (ACME) consistently exhibit small magnitudes, indicating a minor role of mediation in the overall effect. In contrast, the average direct effect (ADE) consistently shows statistical significance ( $P < 0.01$ ) and accounts for a substantial portion of the total effect, affirming the existence of a direct relationship between EP/ED and future impact. Hence, the correlation between the exploratory metrics and future impact cannot be explained away by these mediating factors.

## S7 Robustness Checks

### S7.1 Different Subsets of Scientists

#### S7.1.1 The Minimum Number of Publications Requirement

In the main text, we select scientists with at least 10 publications to make sure they are not short-term researchers, and this selection inevitably (wrongfully) screens out some scientists. Here, we repeat our analysis under different selection rules

---

<sup>10</sup><https://www.statsmodels.org/stable/generated/statsmodels.stats.mediation.Mediation.html>

(of authors with at least 5 publications and at least 20 publications) with other settings being default (10 career years or 10 papers being the split point), and find that the results remain statistically significant in the regressions (see Table S23).

### S7.1.2 Removing Scientists with Asian Last Names

As mentioned in Section S1.1.1, the disambiguation process may bring identification errors to scientists, especially to those with Asian names. Therefore, we follow the approach suggested by other studies [21] and exclude scientists with the top 200 most common Asian last names, in a list collected from Wikipedia. After such a removal, we obtain a smaller dataset with 21,963 scientists and perform the same regression analysis (see Equation (S4)). We find that the coefficients of the EP and ED are still statistically significant (see Table S24), and this suggests that our conclusions are robust against possible inaccuracies in name disambiguation.

## S7.2 Controlling for the Genders of Scientists

In Section S2.3.1, we find that men tend to have higher EDs. Here, we check whether the difference in future impact between scientists with different EPs and EDs is influenced by the confounding factor gender.

We add the gender of each scientist as a control variable to the regression Equation (S4). Through the gender assignment process mentioned in Section S1.1.4, we obtain a smaller set of scientists, each of whom is assigned a (predicted) gender. We run regressions on the dataset of 19,044 scientists—a subset of the original dataset, and find that even if we control for genders, the regression coefficients of the EP and ED exhibit phenomena consistent with our main findings (see Table S25).

## S7.3 Alternative Definitions of the EP and ED

In this section, we change the definitions of EP and ED to test the robustness of the findings on the exploration metrics. First, we utilize different PACS code digits (2/4/6) for the calculation of EP and ED. Then, we replace the major components of computing the ED with other possibilities by constructing alternative topic graphs, trying a classic graph node distance measurement, and computing paper distance differently.

### S7.3.1 Different PACS code digits

We have always used *areas*—the first two digits of PACS codes in the APS dataset to calculate the EP, and *topics*—the entire six digits for the ED, which we call the 2-6 combination of PACS code digits for calculating the EP and ED. For the ED, we choose the intuitively more informative six digits since we want to capture finer-grained distances, and we prefer the ED to be discriminative. As a comparison, we plot the distributions of the ED calculated with the first 2, 4, and 6 digits in Figure S24, and they seem agreeable to our presumption that the distributions of the ED resulted from using 2 and 4 digits are more skewed and concentrated, i.e., many more scientists have similar EDs, and the EDs—as a metric—would be therefore carry less information.

Besides the 2-6 combination used in the paper, we try the 2-2, 2-4, 4-4 and 4-6 combinations. In Table S26, we see that the EPs always (statistically) significantly contribute to the future performance when calculated with the first 2 or 4 PACS digits. The table also shows that choosing the first 2 or 4 digits to calculate the ED is less than ideal, if we compare it with choosing the entire 6 digits. As such, we choose the way the ED is computed in our study to make the metric more informative.




Figure S24: Distributions of the ED calculated with 2, 4, and 6 digits of PACS codes, respectively.



### 57.3.2 Different Topic Graphs

In the main text, we use the co-occurrences of PACS codes in the same papers to construct the topic graph for measuring topic distances. Here, we try other popular alternatives, including the citation graph [7, 20] and the co-citing graph [28, 33].

- Citation graph: Unlike the co-occurrence based topic graph in the main text, the citation graph is directed. The edge from topic  $i$  to  $j$  indicates that at least one paper  $p_i$  of topic  $i$  cites a paper  $p_j$  of topic  $j$ . Specifically, each of such citations contributes  $w'_{i \rightarrow j}$  to the total edge weight from topic  $i$  to  $j$  by

$$w'_{i \rightarrow j} = \frac{1}{n_{p_i} \times r_{p_i} \times n_{p_j}}, \quad (\text{S12})$$

where  $n_{p_i}$  and  $r_{p_i}$  denote the number of topics and the number of references in  $p_i$ , respectively. Then, the total weight from topic  $i$  to topic  $j$  equals to the sum of  $w'_{i \rightarrow j}$  over all such citations by  $w_{i \rightarrow j} = \sum w'_{i \rightarrow j}$ .

To calculate the distance between topic  $i$  and  $j$ , we adopt the *weighted overlap* metric in the main text in the obtained *directed* citation graph, by considering the incoming and outgoing links of the node pair separately and taking the average of the two. This approach is similar to that in [5], with the difference being that we take the average to scale the similarity to  $[0, 1]$ , making it consistent with our other similarity metrics. Specifically, the *weighted overlap* of topic  $i$  and  $j$  based on their outgoing links is denoted as  $O_{ij}^{\text{out}}$  and that based on incoming links as  $O_{ij}^{\text{in}}$ , and both are calculated by

$$O_{ij}^{\text{out}} = \frac{W_{ij}^{\text{out}}}{s_i^{\text{out}} + s_j^{\text{out}} - w_{i \rightarrow j} - w_{j \rightarrow i} - W_{ij}^{\text{out}}}, \quad (\text{S13})$$

$$O_{ij}^{\text{in}} = \frac{W_{ij}^{\text{in}}}{s_i^{\text{in}} + s_j^{\text{in}} - w_{i \rightarrow j} - w_{j \rightarrow i} - W_{ij}^{\text{in}}}, \quad (\text{S14})$$

where  $s_i^{\text{out}}$  denote the sum of weights from all  $i$ 's outgoing edges and  $W_{ij}^{\text{out}}$  is the weight of  $i$  and  $j$ 's overlapped outgoing neighbours. The *weighted overlap* between topic  $i$  to topic  $j$  in a directed graph is then calculated by

$$O'_{ij} = \frac{O_{ij}^{\text{out}} + O_{ij}^{\text{in}}}{2}. \quad (\text{S15})$$

- Co-citing graph: An edge between topic  $i$  and  $j$  indicates that papers of topic  $i$  and papers of topic  $j$  cite the same paper(s). Each time a paper of topic  $i$  and a paper of topic  $j$  cite the same paper(s), it contributes  $w'_{ij}$  to total edge weight between topic  $i$  and topic  $j$ , which is calculated by

$$w'_{ij} = \frac{1}{n_{p_i} \times n_{p_j}}, \quad (\text{S16})$$

where  $n_{p_i}$  ( $n_{p_j}$ ) is the number of topics in  $p_i$  ( $p_j$ ). The total weight between topic  $i$  and topic  $j$  is  $w_{ij} = \sum w'_{ij}$ .

The results in Table S27 tell us that these different constructions of topic graphs do not affect our conclusions.

### S7.3.3 Different Node Distance Metrics

We try two alternative node distance metrics, one basically an unweighted version of the metric used in the main text and the other is based on graph embedding through neural networks.

In the main text, we have computed the *weighted overlap* of two nodes' neighbours as the two nodes' distance on the graph, as described in Section S2.2.2. It can be seen as a weighted graph version of the classic unweighted Jaccard similarity [19], and the similarity between node  $i$  and  $j$  can be defined by

$$\text{Jac}_{ij} = \frac{|\Lambda_i \cap \Lambda_j|}{|\Lambda_i \cup \Lambda_j|}, \quad (\text{S17})$$

where  $\Lambda_i$  and  $\Lambda_j$  are their sets of neighbouring nodes, respectively. Here we adopt the unweighted version and take  $(1 - \text{Jac}_{ij})$  to convert it to a distance metric. Using this alternative distance metric, the regression results in Table S28 suggest the same conclusions.

The other node distance metric is based on continuous lower-dimensional feature representations for the nodes learnt by node2vec [6], which takes into account higher-order connections between nodes. The distance between two nodes can then be calculated as the cosine distance for the corresponding feature vectors. As detailed in [6], we select various hyperparameters for node2vec, such as dimension  $d = 128$ , walks per node  $r = 10$ , walk length  $l = 80$ , context size  $k = 20$ , return parameter

$p = 4$ , and in-out parameter  $q = 0.25$ , based on link prediction experiments. We then run node2vec on our topic co-occurrence graph to acquire node representations. Topic similarity is computed using the following equation:

$$\text{Node2VecSim}_{ij} := \text{MinMax}(\cos(f(i), f(j))), \quad (\text{S18})$$

where MinMax and cos refer to the min-max scaling and cosine similarity operations, respectively, and  $f(i)$  corresponds to the representation vector of node  $i$  acquired above. We then obtain the distance metric by subtracting  $\text{Node2VecSim}_{ij}$  from 1. We observe that when utilizing the EP calculated through node2vec for regression, we have robust results consistent with our main findings; see Table S28.

### S7.3.4 Different Paper Distance

When computing the ED of a scientist, we have calculated a paper  $p_i$ 's distance from the  $m$  papers before it. The method used in the main text (see Section S2.2.3) first constructs two sets, among which  $T_i$  contains the topics of  $p_i$  and  $T_{i,m}$  consists of all topics from the  $m$  papers before  $p_i$ . The task then becomes calculating the distance between these two sets. For a topic  $t_j$  in  $T_i$ , the method calculates its distance to all possible topics in  $T_{i,m}$  and takes the average to obtain  $t_j$ 's distance to the set  $T_{i,m}$ . This is repeated over all topics in  $T_i$  and their distances to  $T_{i,m}$  are averaged to obtain the paper distance between  $p_i$  and the  $m$  papers before  $p_i$ . As an alternative, we use the classic Hausdorff distance [8] to calculate the distance between two sets, which takes the minimum distance from  $t_j$  to all topics in set  $T_{i,m}$  as  $t_j$ 's distance to  $T_{i,m}$ , and finds the maximum among all the node-to-set distances to be  $p_i$ 's paper distance from the  $m$  papers before it. It is calculated by

$$\text{PD}_{p_i} = \max_{t_j \in T_i} \min_{t_k \in T_{i,m}} \text{TD}_{t_j t_k}. \quad (\text{S19})$$

Table S29 shows consistent regression results using the Hausdorff distance, compared with these in the main text.

## S7.4 Citation Measurements

In the main text and the above, we measure a paper's impact by taking the logarithm of the number of citations it receives within five years after it is published

(5-year log-citations,  $\log c_5$ ), and here we try 10-year log-citations as an alternative. Furthermore, considering the fact that papers published in different periods of time [21] and in different research areas [32] may have different trends of popularity, we take into account possible factors that may affect the outcomes of interest. Finally, adopting a different angle of measuring academic achievements as suggested in [21], we could pay attention to a scientist’s highest impact work in the future, which is the one with the highest  $\log c_5$  or  $\log c_{10}$ .

#### S7.4.1 10-Year Citations

We try the 10-year log-citations ( $\log c_{10}$ ) to measure the impact of papers over a longer period, as in [21]. Note that when using 10-year citations as citation measurement, only papers published before the end of 2010 are used in the regression. Table S30 shows that our conclusions remain the same.

#### S7.4.2 Normalized Citations

We normalize the citations with two existing methods to measure a paper’s impact relatively to its peers, to offset the influence of papers being published in different years and having different areas. Specifically, the first method [32] divides a paper’s number of citations by the estimated number of citations that a paper published in the same year with the same research areas would receive. Since the focal paper  $p$  may have several research areas (that may have duplicates), we compute  $e_i$  as the 5-year log-citations averaged over all papers published in the same year that are associated with area  $i$ , and compute the arithmetic mean of all the  $e_i$  of  $p$  for the estimated log-citations  $e$  that an average peer paper of  $p$  would receive

$$\begin{aligned} e_i &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_j^m c_{i,j}, \\ e &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_i^n e_i, \end{aligned} \tag{S20}$$

where  $c_{i,j}$  is the 5-year log-citations received by paper  $j$  in area  $i$ ,  $m$  is the number of papers in  $i$  in the same year and of the same area as the paper  $p$ , and  $n$  is the number of areas paper  $p$  covers. Paper  $p$ ’s normalized 5-year log-citations  $c_{\text{norm}}$  is then calculated by  $c_{\text{norm}} = c_{\text{raw}}/e$ , where  $c_{\text{raw}}$  is the (raw) log-citations of  $p$ .

To accommodate the fact that papers are often associated with more than one area, the second method [25] proposes that  $c_{i,j}$  should be weighted by  $f_{i,j}$ , which is the fraction that area  $i$  takes up among all areas of paper  $j$ . The normalizing factor  $e$  admits the harmonic mean of  $e_i$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
 e_i &= \frac{\sum_j^m c_{i,j} f_{i,j}}{\sum_j^m f_{i,j}}, \\
 e &= \left( \frac{\sum_i^n e_i^{-1}}{n} \right)^{-1}, \\
 c_{\text{norm}} &= c_{\text{raw}}/e.
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{S21}$$

Table S30 shows that under these two methods of normalizing citations, the main findings remain true.

### S7.4.3 Percentiles among Peers

One way to take care of the influences on the paper citations from both research areas and time periods is comparing a paper’s citations with other papers in the same area and published in the same year, and using its relative percentile as the impact measurement [21]. Here we calculate the percentiles under  $\log c_5$  and if a paper’s 5-year log-citations is at the  $k$ -th percentile, it indicates that  $k\%$  of the papers from the same area and year have fewer  $\log c_5$  citations than the paper in question. Since papers are usually assigned with more than one area, we calculate the maximal and mean percentile in all its areas. Analyses show that under these two percentile measurements, our conclusions still hold (Table S30).

### S7.4.4 Maximum Future Citations

In this section, we use the maximum 5-year log-citations or the maximum 10-year log-citations among all the scientist’s publications after the split point to measure her future impact. This measurement [21] is meant to capture a scientist’s highest impact—another measurement of academic success—in the future. Table S30 shows that we observe similar findings that are consistent with those reported above, if we adopt this alternate way of measuring a scientist’s future accomplishments.

## S7.5 Different Look-back Windows

When calculating the EPs and EDs, we backtrack the focal paper’s past  $J$  papers or past  $K$  years, which is called the *look-back* period, to decide whether it is an exploratory paper or to compute its paper distance. In the main text, we have used  $J = 5$  papers, and here we repeat the experiments by varying the look-back period to be the past  $J$  papers and the last  $K$  years from 1 to 15 as well as setting it to  $\infty$ . The results in Tables S31 and S32 are consistent with these in the main text.

## S7.6 Propensity Score Matching

### S7.6.1 Varying Grouping Quantiles

In Sections S4.2.1 and S4.2.2, we select the scientists with either of their exploration metrics (EP and ED) in the top 50% of all relevant values to be the *high* group, and those with their metrics in the bottom 50% the *low* group. Here we change the definition of being *high* (*low*) in either metric to being in the top (bottom) 40%, 30%, 25%, 20% and 15%, respectively, and repeat the experiments. The results are consistent with those in the main text (see Tables S33 and S34).

### S7.6.2 Shuffling after Matching—The Null Model

In order to verify that the differences between the matched groups are not due to the random nature of quantities involved, we create synthetic datasets by shuffling scientists and their papers after the groups are matched, so that the resulting future performance are randomized. This will be referred to as the null model. We calculate the gap between the randomized future performance of the treatment group (with “high” metric) and that of the control group (with “low” metric) to see whether the synthetic datasets give a gap more extreme (larger in absolute values in this case) than the actually observed one (cf.  $P$ values in permutation tests). This can be repeated many times, and if more extreme gaps occur a lot, our finding are not robust enough. Specifically, we uniformly at random reassign scientists to papers and make sure that each scientist is assigned the same number of papers as she actually had (in a certain year) and each paper has the same number of authors as it actually had. We repeat the experiment 1,000 times, and observe

none of such ‘extreme random cases’ (see the paper-level rows in Table S35), which suggests the robustness of our findings.

Alternatively, instead of randomly shuffling the author-paper relations, it is possible to shuffle future performances of scientists uniformly at random. Such results are reported in the author-level rows of Table S35, and at the worst 4 out of 1,000 times reported more extreme intergroup gaps than what is actually observed. Again, this is a strong indicator that our results are robust against what any randomness allows for.

## S7.7 Propensity Score Weighting

### S7.7.1 Shuffling after Weighting—The Null Model

Similarly to what was done in S7.6.2, we may create synthetic datasets as the null model by reshuffling uniformly at random the author-paper relations—the paper-level reshuffling, or the future performances of scientists—the author-level reshuffling. With both types of reshuffling, we repeat the propensity score weighting methodology of Section S4.2.3 on the synthetic datasets. The results are summarized in Table S36. Simply put, the high/low EP/ED groups are indistinguishable in future performances under the null model, and this is again in accordance with the conviction that our findings are more than reliable.

## S7.8 Perturbing Independent Variables

To further ensure the robustness of our regression results against potential variations in the independent variables, we introduce artificial Gaussian noise  $\epsilon \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$  and incorporate it into each scientist’s independent variables of EP, ED, and  $\text{LogCit}_{\text{past}}$  separately. Through a series of experiments, we systematically adjust the value of  $\sigma$  to determine the maximum level of perturbation that can be introduced while still maintaining consistent regression results. The detailed regression outcomes are presented in Table S37, where we see the regression results are robust when adding different levels of perturbation to the independent variables.

## References

- [1] Paul D. Allison and J. Scott Long. Departmental effects on scientific productivity. *American Sociological Review*, 55:469, 1990.
- [2] Richard Blundell and Stephen Bond. Initial conditions and moment restrictions in dynamic panel data models. *Journal of econometrics*, 87(1):115–143, 1998.
- [3] Johan Bring. How to standardize regression coefficients. *The American Statistician*, 48(3):209–213, 1994.
- [4] Michal Brzezinski. Power laws in citation distributions: evidence from scopus. *Scientometrics*, 103(1):213–228, 2015.
- [5] Hossien Ghorbanzadeh, Amir Sheikahmadi, Mahdi Jalili, and Sadegh Sulaimany. A hybrid method of link prediction in directed graphs. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 165:113896, 2021.
- [6] Aditya Grover and Jure Leskovec. node2vec: Scalable feature learning for networks. *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, 2016.
- [7] Stanislao Gualdi, Chi Ho Yeung, and Y-C Zhang. Tracing the evolution of physics on the backbone of citation networks. *Physical Review E*, 84(4):046104, 2011.
- [8] Felix Hausdorff. Dimension und äußeres maß. *Mathematische Annalen*, 79(1):157–179, 1918.
- [9] César A. Hidalgo, Bailey Klinger, A L Barabasi, and Ricardo Hausmann. The product space conditions the development of nations. *Science*, 317:482 – 487, 2007.
- [10] Daniel Ho, Kosuke Imai, Gary King, and Elizabeth A. Stuart. Matchit: nonparametric preprocessing for parametric causal inference. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 42(8):1–28, 2011.
- [11] Junming Huang, Alexander J. Gates, Roberta Sinatra, and Albert-László Barabási. Historical comparison of gender inequality in scientific careers across



- countries and disciplines. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(9):4609–4616, 2020.
- [12] Brian K. Lee, Justin Lessler, and Elizabeth A. Stuart. Improving propensity score weighting using machine learning. *Statistics in Medicine*, 29(3):337–346, 2010.
- [13] Edwin A. Locke. Self-efficacy: the exercise of control. *Personnel Psychology*, 50(3):801, 1997.
- [14] Travis Martin, Brian Ball, Brian Karrer, and MEJ Newman. Coauthorship and citation patterns in the physical review. *Physical Review E*, 88(1):012814, 2013.
- [15] Daniel F. McCaffrey, Beth Ann Griffin, Daniel Almirall, Mary Ellen Slaughter, Rajeev Ramchand, and Lane F. Burgette. A tutorial on propensity score estimation for multiple treatments using generalized boosted models. *Statistics in medicine*, 32(19):3388–3414, 2013.
- [16] Tsuyoshi Murata and Sakiko Moriyasu. Link prediction of social networks based on weighted proximity measures. *IEEE/WIC/ACM International Conference on Web Intelligence (WI’07)*, pages 85–88, 2007.
- [17] Jukka-Pekka Onnela, Jari Saramäki, Jörkki Hyvönen, Gábor Szabó, David Lazer, Kimmo K. Kaski, János Kertész, and Albert-László Barabasi. Structure and tie strengths in mobile communication networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104:7332 – 7336, 2007.
- [18] Raj Kumar Pan, Sitabhra Sinha, Kimmo Kaski, and Jari Saramäki. The evolution of interdisciplinarity in physics research. *Scientific Reports*, 2(1):1–8, 2012.
- [19] Gerard Salton and Michael J. McGill. *Introduction to Modern Information Retrieval*. McGraw-Hill, Inc., USA, 1986.
- [20] Zhesi Shen, Liying Yang, Jiansuo Pei, Menghui Li, Chensheng Wu, Jianzhang Bao, Tian Wei, Zengru Di, Ronald Rousseau, and Jinshan Wu. Interrelations among scientific fields and their relative influences revealed by an input–output analysis. *Journal of Informetrics*, 10(1):82–97, 2016.

- [21] Roberta Sinatra, Dashun Wang, Pierre Deville, Chaoming Song, and Albert-László Barabási. Quantifying the evolution of individual scientific impact. *Science*, 354(6312):aaf5239, 2016.
- [22] Arnab Sinha, Zhihong Shen, Yang Song, Hao Ma, Darrin Eide, Bo-June Hsu, and Kuansan Wang. An overview of microsoft academic service (mas) and applications. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on World Wide Web*, pages 243–246, 2015.
- [23] Brian Uzzi, Satyam Mukherjee, Michael Stringer, and Ben Jones. Atypical combinations and scientific impact. *Science*, 342(6157):468–472, 2013.
- [24] Tyler J. VanderWeele and Peng Ding. Sensitivity analysis in observational research: introducing the e-value. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 167:268–274, 2017.
- [25] Ludo Waltman, Nees Jan van Eck, Thed N. van Leeuwen, Martijn S. Visser, and Anthony F.J. van Raan. Towards a new crown indicator: some theoretical considerations. *Journal of Informetrics*, 5(1):37–47, 2011.
- [26] Xiaomeng Wang, Yijun Ran, and Tao Jia. Measuring similarity in co-occurrence data using ego-networks. *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 30(1):013101, 2020.
- [27] Yang Wang, Benjamin F. Jones, and Dashun Wang. Early-career setback and future career impact. *Nature Communications*, 10(1):1–10, 2019.
- [28] Howard D. White and Katherine W. McCain. Visualizing a discipline: an author co-citation analysis of information science, 1972–1995. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 49:327–355, 1998.
- [29] Lingfei Wu, Dashun Wang, and James A. Evans. Large teams develop and small teams disrupt science and technology. *Nature*, 566(7744):378–382, 2019.
- [30] Stefan Wuchty, Benjamin F. Jones, and Brian Uzzi. The increasing dominance of teams in production of knowledge. *Science*, 316(5827):1036–1039, 2007.
- [31] Fengli Xu, Lingfei Wu, and James Evans. Flat teams drive scientific innovation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 119(23):e2200927119, 2022.

- [32] Xiaoyao Yu, Boleslaw K. Szymanski, and Tao Jia. Become a better you: correlation between the change of research direction and the change of scientific performance. *Journal of Informetrics*, 15(3):101193, 2021.
- [33] An Zeng, Zhesi Shen, Jianlin Zhou, Ying Fan, Zengru Di, Yougui Wang, H. Eugene Stanley, and Shlomo Havlin. Increasing trend of scientists to switch between topics. *Nature Communications*, 10(1):3439, 2019.
- [34] Wenbin Zhao, Tongrang Fan, Zhixian Yin, Zijian Fu, and Feng Wu. An evaluation method of scientific research team influence based on heterogeneity and node similarity of content and structure. *Journal of Ambient Intelligence and Humanized Computing*, 11(9):3617–3626, 2020.

Table S1: **Pearson correlation coefficient between code distance matrices calculated using papers from different time periods**

Time periods	1981-2015	1981-1985	1986-1990	1991-1995	1996-2000	2001-2005	2006-2010	2011-2015
1981-2015	—	0.544	0.751	0.793	0.849	0.883	0.892	0.886
1981-1985	—	—	0.706	0.661	0.646	0.652	0.65	0.649
1986-1990	—	—	—	0.808	0.778	0.758	0.748	0.734
1991-1995	—	—	—	—	0.805	0.76	0.75	0.728
1996-2000	—	—	—	—	—	0.823	0.806	0.783
2001-2005	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.869	0.832
2006-2010	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.851
2011-2015	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

We divide the entire dataset of papers into seven 5-year periods: 1981-1985, 1986-1990, 1991-1995, 1996-2000, 2001-2005, 2006-2010, and 2011-2015, respectively, and the proportions of papers in each period are 1.21%, 6.02%, 11.62%, 15.51%, 19.45%, 22.77%, and 23.34%, respectively. We then calculate the code distance matrices for each period and subsequently compute the correlation coefficients between the different code distance matrices.

Table S2: **Regression results with varying regression equations**

Regression Eq.	10 career years as split point				10 papers as split point			
	(S3)	(S4)	(S5)	(S6)	(S3)	(S4)	(S5)	(S6)
past EP	0.17*** (0.02)	0.27*** (0.03)	0.29*** (0.03)		0.19*** (0.02)	0.30*** (0.03)	0.43*** (0.03)	
past ED		-0.25*** (0.04)	-0.92*** (0.04)			-0.25*** (0.04)	-1.03*** (0.03)	
group A				0.09*** (0.02)				0.10*** (0.01)
group B				0.06*** (0.01)				0.03** (0.01)
group C				0.07*** (0.01)				0.06*** (0.01)
past average log $c_5$	0.47*** (0.01)	0.47*** (0.01)		0.47*** (0.01)	0.53*** (0.01)	0.52*** (0.01)		0.53*** (0.01)
past no. of papers	0.00*** (0.00)	0.00*** (0.00)		0.00*** (0.00)				
first year	YES	YES		YES	YES	YES		YES
first area	YES	YES		YES	YES	YES		YES
const	0.59*** (0.11)	0.71*** (0.11)	1.97*** (0.02)	0.60*** (0.11)	0.63*** (0.08)	0.73*** (0.08)	2.04*** (0.02)	0.67*** (0.08)
Sample Size	14,526	14,526	14,526	14,526	18,154	18,154	18,154	18,154
$R^2$	0.28	0.29	0.04	0.28	0.34	0.34	0.05	0.34

Standard errors in parentheses. (\* $P < 0.1$ ; \*\* $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*\* $P < 0.01$ .)

Regression shows how the past EP and ED correlate with future scientific impact when we control for the past average log  $c_5$ , the past publication numbers, the first year of career and the area of the first paper.

“Yes” means the corresponding variable is controlled for in the regression study.

Note that, in order to reduce the noise of  $EP_{\text{past}}$ ,  $ED_{\text{past}}$  and  $\text{LogCit}_{\text{future}}$ , we select the scientists who had at least 5 publications before the split point and 3 publications after the split point if the split point is defined in terms of career years. If the split point is defined in terms of papers, we select the samples who had at least 3 publications after the split point.

Table S3: Regression results of Model (S3) with varying split points

Split point	Career years as split point		Number of papers as split point	
	EP coeff	Sample Size	EP coeff	Sample Size
2	0.10***	3,944	0.06***	25,237
3	0.11***	8,197	0.09***	25,237
4	0.14***	11,823	0.12***	25,237
5	0.16***	14,197	0.15***	25,237
6	0.15***	15,373	0.17***	25,237
7	0.16***	15,879	0.18***	25,237
8	0.18***	15,844	0.18***	22,440
9	0.16***	15,312	0.20***	20,107
10	0.17***	14,526	0.19***	18,154
11	0.18***	13,628	0.17***	16,448
12	0.17***	12,693	0.17***	15,035
13	0.17***	11,624	0.18***	13,679
14	0.17***	10,616	0.17***	12,502
15	0.17***	9,518	0.17***	11,467

Regression results under different split points show how the past EP correlate with future scientific impact when we control for the past average  $\log c_5$ , the past publication numbers, the first year of career and the area of the first paper. The regression equation is always Eq. (S3), unless stated otherwise. We list here only the coefficients of the EP in each regression. (\* $P < 0.1$ ; \*\* $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*\* $P < 0.01$ .)

Table S4: Regression results of Model (S4) with varying split points

Split point	Career years as split point			Number of papers as split point		
	EP coeff	ED coeff	Sample Size	EP coeff	ED coeff	Sample Size
2	0.18***	-0.21***	3,944	0.07***	-0.05***	25,237
3	0.21***	-0.27***	8,197	0.11***	-0.08***	25,237
4	0.24***	-0.26***	11,823	0.16***	-0.12***	25,237
5	0.26***	-0.27***	14,197	0.20***	-0.16***	25,237
6	0.24***	-0.22***	15,373	0.23***	-0.19***	25,237
7	0.25***	-0.23***	15,879	0.26***	-0.21***	25,237
8	0.28***	-0.24***	15,844	0.27***	-0.22***	22,440
9	0.24***	-0.22***	15,312	0.29***	-0.22***	20,107
10	0.27***	-0.25***	14,526	0.30***	-0.25***	18,154
11	0.29***	-0.25***	13,628	0.28***	-0.24***	16,448
12	0.27***	-0.25***	12,693	0.29***	-0.24***	15,035
13	0.28***	-0.26***	11,624	0.31***	-0.27***	13,679
14	0.29***	-0.26***	10,616	0.31***	-0.27***	12,502
15	0.30***	-0.28***	9,518	0.30***	-0.26***	11,467

Regression results under different split points show how the past EP and ED correlate with future scientific impact when we control for the past average  $\log c_5$ , the past publication numbers, the first year of career and the area of the first paper. The regression equation is always Eq. (S4), unless stated otherwise. We list here only the coefficients of the EP and ED in each regression. (\* $P < 0.1$ ; \*\* $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*\* $P < 0.01$ .)

Table S5: **E-values for the regression analyses with varying split points**

Split point	Career years as split point		Number of papers as split point	
	EP	ED	EP	ED
2	1.95	2.12	1.49	1.37
3	2.13	2.44	1.71	1.54
4	2.25	2.33	1.91	1.73
5	2.33	2.39	2.11	1.91
6	2.24	2.14	2.24	2.01
7	2.29	2.18	2.32	2.08
8	2.44	2.28	2.39	2.12
9	2.27	2.13	2.50	2.12
10	2.41	2.28	2.53	2.27
11	2.49	2.31	2.45	2.22
12	2.42	2.29	2.49	2.24
13	2.45	2.35	2.61	2.41
14	2.49	2.34	2.59	2.40
15	2.53	2.43	2.57	2.39



Table S6: PSM results with varying career years as split point

Career year	EP			ED			Combining the EP and ED					
	Pairs	Treat	Control	P	Pairs	Treat	Control	P	Pairs	Treat	Control	P
2	1,313	1.772 (0.017)	1.725 (0.016)	** (*)	809	1.751 (0.021)	1.762 (0.021)	NS (NS)	192	1.896 (0.043)	1.725 (0.043)	*** (***)
3	2,793	1.753 (0.011)	1.689 (0.011)	*** (***)	1,772	1.692 (0.014)	1.734 (0.014)	** (**)	314	1.822 (0.031)	1.691 (0.033)	*** (***)
4	4,108	1.725 (0.009)	1.668 (0.009)	*** (***)	2,634	1.666 (0.011)	1.722 (0.012)	*** (***)	761	1.746 (0.021)	1.618 (0.021)	*** (***)
5	4,870	1.702 (0.009)	1.637 (0.009)	*** (***)	3,163	1.631 (0.010)	1.681 (0.011)	*** (***)	826	1.745 (0.020)	1.618 (0.020)	*** (***)
6	5,281	1.665 (0.008)	1.611 (0.008)	*** (***)	3,451	1.608 (0.010)	1.662 (0.010)	*** (***)	926	1.705 (0.019)	1.598 (0.019)	*** (***)
7	5,438	1.643 (0.008)	1.588 (0.008)	*** (***)	3,630	1.587 (0.009)	1.635 (0.010)	*** (***)	1,003	1.666 (0.018)	1.562 (0.018)	*** (***)
8	5,420	1.629 (0.008)	1.568 (0.008)	*** (***)	3,588	1.560 (0.010)	1.608 (0.010)	*** (***)	949	1.641 (0.018)	1.530 (0.019)	*** (***)
9	5,253	1.601 (0.008)	1.550 (0.008)	*** (***)	3,413	1.534 (0.010)	1.586 (0.010)	*** (***)	992	1.594 (0.018)	1.510 (0.018)	*** (***)
10	4,983	1.586 (0.008)	1.540 (0.008)	*** (***)	3,250	1.518 (0.010)	1.580 (0.010)	*** (***)	994	1.570 (0.018)	1.506 (0.018)	** (***)
11	4,679	1.576 (0.008)	1.543 (0.009)	*** (***)	3,005	1.519 (0.010)	1.562 (0.011)	*** (***)	989	1.572 (0.018)	1.484 (0.017)	*** (***)
12	4,308	1.569 (0.009)	1.528 (0.009)	*** (***)	2,783	1.516 (0.011)	1.561 (0.011)	*** (***)	848	1.584 (0.020)	1.460 (0.019)	*** (***)
13	3,967	1.552 (0.009)	1.518 (0.009)	*** (**)	2,572	1.505 (0.011)	1.553 (0.012)	*** (***)	829	1.574 (0.020)	1.476 (0.019)	*** (***)
14	3,608	1.561 (0.010)	1.522 (0.010)	*** (***)	2,332	1.500 (0.012)	1.551 (0.012)	*** (***)	755	1.533 (0.022)	1.450 (0.020)	*** (***)
15	3,252	1.553 (0.010)	1.514 (0.010)	*** (***)	2,041	1.494 (0.013)	1.555 (0.013)	*** (***)	689	1.577 (0.024)	1.451 (0.021)	*** (***)

For each choice of split point, we present the number of matched pairs, the mean and standard error (in brackets) of the future performance in the treatment and control groups, and the  $P$  values of paired  $t$ -tests and Kruskal–Wallis tests (in brackets). (NS, not significant; \*  $P < 0.1$ ; \*\*  $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*\*  $P < 0.01$ .)

Table S7: Average treatment effect in different groups with varying career years as split point

Career year	E(C-D)	E(B-D)	E(A-D)
2	0.06332* (-0.00869, 0.13533)	0.06536* (-0.00585, 0.13657)	0.15219*** (0.0696, 0.23478)
3	0.085*** (0.03016, 0.13984)	0.09007*** (0.03521, 0.14493)	0.15051*** (0.08971, 0.21131)
4	0.08509*** (0.0433, 0.12689)	0.09807*** (0.05709, 0.13904)	0.17384*** (0.12515, 0.22252)
5	0.08764*** (0.04873, 0.12655)	0.07329*** (0.03553, 0.11106)	0.15863*** (0.11507, 0.2022)
6	0.07294*** (0.03656, 0.10932)	0.07119*** (0.0353, 0.10708)	0.14727*** (0.10562, 0.18891)
7	0.08042*** (0.04449, 0.11636)	0.08949*** (0.05446, 0.12453)	0.1543*** (0.114, 0.1946)
8	0.07867*** (0.04095, 0.11639)	0.08535*** (0.04811, 0.12259)	0.15456*** (0.11193, 0.19718)
9	0.07304*** (0.03698, 0.1091)	0.08347*** (0.04783, 0.11911)	0.1487*** (0.1078, 0.18959)
10	0.07626*** (0.03923, 0.11329)	0.09318*** (0.05642, 0.12994)	0.13332*** (0.09108, 0.17556)
11	0.07475*** (0.03823, 0.11127)	0.09819*** (0.06186, 0.13451)	0.13987*** (0.09774, 0.182)
12	0.07302*** (0.03358, 0.11247)	0.09136*** (0.05288, 0.12983)	0.13803*** (0.09292, 0.18313)
13	0.08556*** (0.04421, 0.12691)	0.10618*** (0.06589, 0.14647)	0.14461*** (0.09712, 0.19209)
14	0.07323*** (0.03001, 0.11645)	0.10154*** (0.0599, 0.14318)	0.13927*** (0.08851, 0.19003)
15	0.09245*** (0.04454, 0.14036)	0.1172*** (0.07025, 0.16414)	0.14741*** (0.09123, 0.20359)

PSW results with varying career years as split point. (\* $P < 0.1$ ; \*\* $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*\* $P < 0.01$ .) The groups A, B, C and D are defined in Section S4.1.

Table S8: PSM results with varying numbers of papers as split point

Number of papers	EP			ED			Combining the EP and ED					
	Pairs	Treat	Control	P	Pairs	Treat	Control	P	Pairs	Treat	Control	P
2	9,814	1.719 (0.005)	1.663 (0.005)	*** (***)	6,023	1.668 (0.007)	1.689 (0.007)	** (**)	165	1.903 (0.041)	1.636 (0.039)	*** (***)
3	4,744	1.722 (0.008)	1.625 (0.008)	*** (***)	6,016	1.643 (0.007)	1.676 (0.007)	*** (***)	1,376	1.794 (0.015)	1.714 (0.015)	*** (***)
4	3,610	1.744 (0.009)	1.646 (0.009)	*** (***)	5,953	1.634 (0.007)	1.659 (0.007)	** (***)	1,904	1.696 (0.013)	1.610 (0.012)	*** (***)
5	2,849	1.798 (0.011)	1.707 (0.011)	*** (***)	5,862	1.622 (0.007)	1.649 (0.007)	*** (***)	1,253	1.777 (0.016)	1.707 (0.017)	*** (***)
6	5,992	1.692 (0.008)	1.603 (0.008)	*** (***)	5,740	1.601 (0.008)	1.639 (0.008)	*** (***)	1,696	1.736 (0.014)	1.634 (0.014)	*** (***)
7	5,277	1.714 (0.008)	1.613 (0.008)	*** (***)	5,584	1.591 (0.008)	1.630 (0.008)	*** (***)	1,847	1.668 (0.014)	1.573 (0.014)	*** (***)
8	3,166	1.772 (0.011)	1.693 (0.011)	*** (***)	4,927	1.598 (0.008)	1.633 (0.008)	*** (***)	427	1.883 (0.029)	1.673 (0.029)	*** (***)
9	5,262	1.687 (0.008)	1.609 (0.008)	*** (***)	4,291	1.602 (0.009)	1.649 (0.009)	*** (***)	1,369	1.727 (0.016)	1.610 (0.016)	*** (***)
10	4,403	1.717 (0.009)	1.641 (0.009)	*** (***)	3,831	1.615 (0.010)	1.658 (0.009)	*** (***)	1,270	1.701 (0.016)	1.606 (0.016)	*** (***)
11	2,526	1.790 (0.012)	1.736 (0.012)	*** (***)	3,411	1.623 (0.010)	1.660 (0.010)	*** (***)	506	1.818 (0.026)	1.700 (0.027)	*** (***)
12	4,157	1.699 (0.009)	1.642 (0.009)	*** (***)	3,091	1.639 (0.010)	1.682 (0.011)	*** (***)	637	1.695 (0.023)	1.588 (0.022)	*** (***)
13	3,599	1.742 (0.010)	1.683 (0.010)	*** (***)	2,814	1.640 (0.011)	1.699 (0.011)	*** (***)	947	1.715 (0.019)	1.613 (0.018)	*** (***)
14	2,060	1.813 (0.013)	1.738 (0.012)	*** (***)	2,556	1.652 (0.011)	1.722 (0.012)	*** (***)	533	1.790 (0.024)	1.631 (0.024)	*** (***)
15	3,019	1.743 (0.011)	1.688 (0.010)	*** (***)	2,325	1.656 (0.012)	1.735 (0.012)	*** (***)	521	1.760 (0.025)	1.610 (0.024)	*** (***)

PSM results for EP, ED, combining EP and ED in different numbers of papers as split points. For each choice of split point, we present the number of matched pairs, the mean and standard error (in brackets) of the future performance in the treatment and control groups, and the  $P$  values of paired-sample  $t$ -tests and Kruskal–Wallis tests (in brackets). (\* $P < 0.1$ ; \*\* $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*\* $P < 0.01$ .)

Table S9: Average treatment effect with varying numbers of papers as split point

Number of papers	E(C-D)	E(B-D)	E(A-D)
2	0.0975*** (0.06941, 0.12559)	0.06725*** (0.03888, 0.09562)	0.14483*** (0.11441, 0.17524)
3	0.15646*** (0.10877, 0.20414)	0.10633*** (0.05856, 0.1541)	0.24904*** (0.19562, 0.30247)
4	0.18537*** (0.12063, 0.25011)	0.12084*** (0.05371, 0.18796)	0.2378*** (0.17128, 0.30431)
5	0.11941*** (0.08514, 0.15368)	0.07209*** (0.04065, 0.10352)	0.17634*** (0.13324, 0.21943)
6	0.16588*** (0.12624, 0.20552)	0.1204*** (0.08099, 0.15981)	0.22243*** (0.17748, 0.26738)
7	0.17998*** (0.13266, 0.2273)	0.13927*** (0.09054, 0.188)	0.24218*** (0.19218, 0.29218)
8	0.11549*** (0.07871, 0.15226)	0.08618*** (0.05226, 0.12011)	0.17371*** (0.12854, 0.21888)
9	0.13348*** (0.08824, 0.17872)	0.10238*** (0.05805, 0.14671)	0.1863*** (0.13546, 0.23713)
10	0.09276*** (0.04149, 0.14402)	0.0745*** (0.02287, 0.12612)	0.16935*** (0.11443, 0.22427)
11	0.08301*** (0.04279, 0.12324)	0.08783*** (0.05039, 0.12527)	0.17041*** (0.11877, 0.22205)
12	0.08535*** (0.03935, 0.13135)	0.08783*** (0.04314, 0.13253)	0.15778*** (0.10521, 0.21034)
13	0.09062*** (0.03817, 0.14307)	0.10515*** (0.05226, 0.15804)	0.17269*** (0.11517, 0.23022)
14	0.11532*** (0.07031, 0.16034)	0.12231*** (0.0812, 0.16341)	0.21708*** (0.16231, 0.27184)
15	0.10024*** (0.04964, 0.15083)	0.11123*** (0.06124, 0.16122)	0.18833*** (0.12892, 0.24774)

PSW results with varying numbers of papers as split points. (\* $P < 0.1$ ; \*\* $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*\* $P < 0.01$ .) The groups A, B, C and D are defined in Section S4.1.

Table S10: **Regression results of the system GMM**

Different period	5-year period	3-year period
L.LogCit	0.198*** (0.0184)	0.166*** (0.0121)
L.EP	1.091*** (0.295)	0.881*** (0.205)
L.ED	-2.207*** (0.807)	-2.773*** (0.74)
L.P	0.0528*** (0.00629)	0.0702*** (0.00722)
L.Careeryear	-0.0205*** (0.00353)	-0.0349*** (0.00373)
Constant	1.946*** (0.362)	2.623*** (0.343)
Time Fixed Effect	Yes	Yes
Author Fixed Effect	Yes	Yes
Observations	36,297	53,484
Number of authors	18,766	21,031
Hansen	14.02 (0.372)	13.79 (0.245)
AR(1)	-21.29 (0)	-33.47 (0)
AR(2)	-0.824 (0.41)	1.37 (0.171)

Standard errors are reported below the estimated coefficients of the system GMM. (\*P < 0.1; \*\*P < 0.05; \*\*\*P < 0.01.) “L” in variable names stands for lag or lagged. Regression shows how the lagged EP and ED correlate with future scientific impact when we control for scientific impact, publication number, career year, time fixed effect, and author fixed effect in the lagged period.

“Yes” means the corresponding variable is controlled for in the regression study.

In the below part of the table, the Hansen statistic tests if the proposed model suffers from over-identification, and the AR(1) and AR(2) are tests for autocorrelation in differences. The corresponding p-values for these tests are shown in parentheses. In our case, the Hansen test shows no signs of over identifying issues, and the AR tests show that there is first-order residual autocorrelation but no second-order autocorrelation. Combining the tests shows that our setup (choices of lagged response, independent, dependent and endogenous variables) in the model satisfies the conditions for applying system GMM.

Table S11: **Regression results of Model (S8) with varying split points**

Split point	Career years as split point			Number of papers as split point		
	EP coeff	ED coeff	Sample Size	EP coeff	ED coeff	Sample Size
2	0.19***	-0.61***	3,944	0.32***	-0.89***	25,237
3	0.21***	-0.69***	8,197	0.31***	-0.85***	25,237
4	0.14***	-0.66***	11,823	0.28***	-0.79***	25,237
5	0.18***	-0.73***	14,197	0.23***	-0.74***	25,237
6	0.16***	-0.70***	15,373	0.21***	-0.72***	25,237
7	0.15***	-0.70***	15,879	0.16***	-0.66***	25,237
8	0.14***	-0.66***	15,844	0.16***	-0.66***	22,440
9	0.16***	-0.68***	15,312	0.15***	-0.67***	20,107
10	0.14***	-0.66***	14,526	0.16***	-0.68***	18,154
11	0.15***	-0.66***	13,628	0.17***	-0.66***	16,448
12	0.16***	-0.68***	12,693	0.18***	-0.65***	15,035
13	0.14***	-0.67***	11,624	0.23***	-0.71***	13,679
14	0.13***	-0.64***	10,616	0.21***	-0.67***	12,502
15	0.12***	-0.65***	9,518	0.16***	-0.63***	11,467

Regression results under different split points show how the future EP and ED correlate with future scientific impact when we control for the past average  $\log c_5$ , the past publication numbers, the first year of career and the area of the first paper. The regression equation is always Eq. (S8), unless stated otherwise. We list here only the coefficients of the EP and ED in each regression. (\* $P < 0.1$ ; \*\* $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*\* $P < 0.01$ .)

Table S12: **Regression results on the PubMed<sub>1</sub> dataset**

Split point	Career years as split points			Number of papers as split points		
	EP coeff	ED coeff	Sample Size	EP coeff	ED coeff	Sample Size
2	0.03***	-0.23***	267,703	0.02***	-0.17***	1,218,355
3	0.04***	-0.22***	449,043	0.03***	-0.19***	1,218,355
4	0.05***	-0.21***	572,547	0.04***	-0.19***	1,218,355
5	0.06***	-0.19***	644,001	0.05***	-0.18***	1,218,355
6	0.06***	-0.20***	678,146	0.06***	-0.17***	1,218,355
7	0.07***	-0.18***	685,769	0.07***	-0.16***	1,218,355
8	0.07***	-0.18***	676,301	0.08***	-0.16***	1,108,314
9	0.08***	-0.17***	654,789	0.09***	-0.16***	1,016,137
10	0.09***	-0.17***	626,712	0.09***	-0.17***	937,477
11	0.10***	-0.16***	593,621	0.09***	-0.17***	869,808
12	0.10***	-0.16***	558,425	0.10***	-0.17***	811,250
13	0.10***	-0.15***	522,716	0.10***	-0.18***	759,211
14	0.11***	-0.15***	487,054	0.10***	-0.18***	712,870
15	0.12***	-0.15***	451,955	0.10***	-0.19***	671,552

Regression results under different setting of split points show how the past EP and ED correlate with future scientific impact when controlling for the past average  $\log c_5$ , the past publication numbers, the first year of career and area of the first paper. Note that, in order to reduce the noise brought by the scientist's past EP and ED and future performance in the regression, we select the scientists who had at least 5 publications before the split point and 3 publications after the split point. (\* $P < 0.1$ ; \*\* $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*\* $P < 0.01$ .)

Table S13: **Regression results on the PubMed<sub>1</sub> dataset with an alternative performance measurement**

Split point	Career years as split points			Number of papers as split points		
	EP coeff	ED coeff	Sample Size	EP coeff	ED coeff	Sample Size
2	0.23***	-0.17***	267,703	0.06***	-0.13***	1,218,355
3	0.31***	-0.16***	449,043	0.12***	-0.15***	1,218,355
4	0.34***	-0.17***	572,547	0.16***	-0.15***	1,218,355
5	0.37***	-0.12***	644,001	0.20***	-0.14***	1,218,355
6	0.39***	-0.12***	678,146	0.24***	-0.12***	1,218,355
7	0.41***	-0.10***	685,769	0.28***	-0.11***	1,218,355
8	0.42***	-0.09***	676,301	0.31***	-0.11***	1,108,314
9	0.43***	-0.08***	654,789	0.33***	-0.12***	1,016,137
10	0.45***	-0.07***	626,712	0.35***	-0.14***	937,477
11	0.46***	-0.06***	593,621	0.36***	-0.15***	869,808
12	0.48***	-0.05***	558,425	0.38***	-0.15***	811,250
13	0.49***	-0.03***	522,716	0.40***	-0.17***	759,211
14	0.51***	-0.03***	487,054	0.41***	-0.18***	712,870
15	0.52***	-0.02*	451,955	0.42***	-0.20***	671,552

The regression equation is always (S4).

Regression results under different settings of split points show how the past EP and ED correlate with future scientific impact measured by the maximum 5-year log-citations after split points, when we control for the past average log  $c_5$ , the past publication numbers, the first year of career and area of the first paper. (\* $P < 0.1$ ; \*\* $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*\* $P < 0.01$ .)



Table S14: **Regression results on the PubMed<sub>2</sub> dataset**

Split point	Career years as split points			Number of papers as split points		
	EP coeff	ED coeff	Sample Size	EP coeff	ED coeff	Sample Size
2	0.08***	-0.37***	272,841	0.03***	-0.22***	1,260,125
3	0.08***	-0.37***	469,409	0.05***	-0.26***	1,260,125
4	0.08***	-0.36***	606,146	0.07***	-0.27***	1,260,125
5	0.09***	-0.35***	685,944	0.09***	-0.28***	1,260,125
6	0.10***	-0.34***	724,003	0.11***	-0.27***	1,260,125
7	0.11***	-0.33***	731,949	0.12***	-0.26***	1,260,125
8	0.12***	-0.32***	720,138	0.13***	-0.27***	1,145,845
9	0.12***	-0.30***	694,829	0.13***	-0.27***	1,050,425
10	0.13***	-0.29***	661,940	0.14***	-0.28***	969,054
11	0.14***	-0.28***	623,877	0.15***	-0.27***	899,121
12	0.16***	-0.27***	583,888	0.16***	-0.27***	837,921
13	0.17***	-0.25***	544,020	0.16***	-0.27***	783,907
14	0.17***	-0.24***	504,690	0.16***	-0.27***	736,002
15	0.17***	-0.23***	466,476	0.17***	-0.26***	692,976

Regression results under different setting of split points show how the past EP and ED correlate with future scientific impact when controlling for the past average  $\log c_5$ , the past publication numbers, the first year of career and area of the first paper. Note that, in order to reduce the noise brought by the scientist's past EP and ED and future performance in the regression, we select the scientists who had at least 5 publications before the split point and 3 publications after the split point. (\* $P < 0.1$ ; \*\* $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*\* $P < 0.01$ .)

Table S15: **Regression results on the ACS dataset**

Split point	Career years as split points			Number of papers as split points		
	EP coeff	ED coeff	Sample Size	EP coeff	ED coeff	Sample Size
2	0.11***	-0.24***	17,319	0.04***	-0.12***	62,486
3	0.11***	-0.26***	24,162	0.06***	-0.15***	62,486
4	0.12***	-0.27***	29,042	0.08***	-0.16***	62,486
5	0.13***	-0.27***	32,270	0.11***	-0.17***	62,486
6	0.14***	-0.25***	33,920	0.13***	-0.17***	62,486
7	0.14***	-0.24***	34,345	0.15***	-0.19***	62,486
8	0.14***	-0.22***	34,188	0.16***	-0.21***	54,756
9	0.15***	-0.22***	33,281	0.17***	-0.23***	48,689
10	0.15***	-0.21***	31,826	0.18***	-0.25***	43,680
11	0.16***	-0.21***	30,278	0.18***	-0.28***	39,479
12	0.16***	-0.19***	28,524	0.19***	-0.28***	35,770
13	0.17***	-0.18***	26,769	0.18***	-0.30***	32,641
14	0.17***	-0.18***	25,085	0.18***	-0.32***	29,927
15	0.18***	-0.17***	23,426	0.20***	-0.34***	27,533

Regression results under different setting of split points show how the past EP and ED correlate with future scientific impact when controlling for the past average  $\log c_5$ , the past publication numbers, the first year of career and area of the first paper. Note that, in order to reduce the noise brought by the scientist's past EP and ED and future performance in the regression, we select the scientists who had at least 5 publications before the split point and 3 publications after the split point. (\* $P < 0.1$ ; \*\* $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*\* $P < 0.01$ .)

Table S16: **Regression results on the ACS dataset with an alternative performance measurement**

Split point	Career years as split points			Number of papers as split points		
	EP coeff	ED coeff	Sample Size	EP coeff	ED coeff	Sample Size
2	0.34***	-0.48***	17,319	0.09***	-0.31***	62,486
3	0.35***	-0.51***	24,162	0.14***	-0.38***	62,486
4	0.35***	-0.56***	29,042	0.20***	-0.41***	62,486
5	0.37***	-0.55***	32,270	0.27***	-0.43***	62,486
6	0.39***	-0.56***	33,920	0.30***	-0.44***	62,486
7	0.40***	-0.54***	34,345	0.35***	-0.47***	62,486
8	0.41***	-0.50***	34,188	0.39***	-0.51***	54,756
9	0.41***	-0.49***	33,281	0.40***	-0.57***	48,689
10	0.42***	-0.46***	31,826	0.43***	-0.62***	43,680
11	0.43***	-0.44***	30,278	0.44***	-0.65***	39,479
12	0.42***	-0.42***	28,524	0.46***	-0.66***	35,770
13	0.43***	-0.42***	26,769	0.44***	-0.70***	32,641
14	0.43***	-0.43***	25,085	0.45***	-0.74***	29,927
15	0.42***	-0.43***	23,426	0.47***	-0.77***	27,533

The regression equation is always (S4).

Regression results under different settings of split points show how the past EP and ED correlate with future scientific impact measured by the maximum 5-year log-citations after split points, when we control for the past average log  $c_5$ , the past publication numbers, the first year of career and area of the first paper. (\* $P < 0.1$ ; \*\* $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*\* $P < 0.01$ .)

Table S17: **Normalized regression coefficients of the EP and ED with different factors as the dependent variable**

Different factors	10 career years as split point		10 papers as split point	
	EP	ED	EP	ED
A: hot areas (max)	0.09***	-0.10***	0.11***	-0.11***
A: hot areas (mean)	0.05***	-0.14***	0.06***	-0.15***
B: novelty and conventionality	0.03***	-0.12***	0.06***	-0.11***
C: lead-author publications	-0.01	0.043***	-0.01	0.03***
C: team size	0.00	-0.06***	0.01	-0.06***
C: co-authors's area contribution	0.01	0.02**	0.04***	0.03***
C: co-authors's topic contribution	0.04***	-0.03***	0.06***	-0.02*
D: changing institutions	0.02**	0.05***	0.03***	0.08***
D: Ivy League	0.01	0.05***	0.01	0.03***

We run several regressions to determine if scientists with different EPs and EDs behave differently in these dimensions in the future: area popularity of future publications, probability of publishing both novel and conventional papers, team size, probability of publishing lead-author papers, co-author's area and topic contribution, tendency of changing institutions, whether working in the Ivy League and co-authors' area/topic contribution. In the table, we list the normalized coefficients of the EP and ED in each regression. (\* $P < 0.1$ ; \*\* $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*\* $P < 0.01$ .)

We compute the normalized coefficients of the independent variable  $i$  with the following equation [3]

$$\text{coef}_{i,\text{norm}} = \text{coef}_{i,\text{raw}} \times \frac{\text{SD}_i}{\text{SD}_{\text{dependent}}},$$

where  $\text{coef}_{i,\text{raw}}$  is the raw regression coefficient of the variable  $i$ ,  $\text{SD}_i$  is the standard deviation of  $i$ ,  $\text{SD}_{\text{dependent}}$  is the standard deviation of the dependent variable, and  $\text{coef}_{\text{norm}}$  is the normalized coefficient of  $i$ .

Table S18: **Coefficients of the EP and ED when controlling for different factors**

Different factors	10 career years as split point		10 papers as split point	
	EP	ED	EP	ED
vanilla regression	0.27***	-0.25***	0.30***	-0.25***
A: hot areas (max)	0.24***	-0.21***	0.27***	-0.21***
A: hot areas (mean)	0.25***	-0.19***	0.28***	-0.18***
B: novelty and conventionality	0.26***	-0.18***	0.28***	-0.20***
C: team size	0.27***	-0.22***	0.30***	-0.24***
C: lead-author publications	0.27***	-0.28***	0.29***	-0.26***
C: co-authors's area contribution	0.27***	-0.26***	0.29***	-0.26***
C: co-authors's topic contribution	0.25***	-0.23***	0.28***	-0.24***
D: changing institutions	0.28***	-0.22***	0.31***	-0.21***
D: Ivy League	0.27***	-0.25***	0.30***	-0.25***
combining all the above	0.28***	-0.11**	0.28***	-0.11**

We run several regressions to test if the hypotheses explain the observation that cautious explorers gain more impact in the future. Specifically, we firstly control for each of the factors separately on top of our vanilla regression (see Eq. (S4)), and then we control for all of them in one regression study. We list here only the coefficients of the EP and ED in each regression. (\* $P < 0.1$ ; \*\* $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*\* $P < 0.01$ .)

Vanilla regression refers to the (original) regression analysis with Eq. (S4) without any of the variables below.

Table S19: **Pearson correlation coefficients between confounding factors and other independent variables**

	$EP_{\text{past}}$	$ED_{\text{past}}$	$P_{\text{past}}$	$\text{LogCit}_{\text{past}}$
hot areas (mean)	-0.03	-0.16	0.09	0.10
hot areas (max)	0.02	-0.12	0.09	0.07
Ivy League	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.05
changing institutions	0.09	0.08	-0.19	-0.09
novelty and conventionality	-0.13	-0.27	0.11	0.13
team size	-0.07	-0.12	0.05	-0.01
co-authors' area contribution	0.03	0.02	0.05	0.07
co-authors' topic contribution	0.00	-0.06	0.10	0.09

The correlation coefficients of the independent variables in each regression in Hypothesis A–E. The split point is 10 career years.

Table S20: **Pearson correlation coefficients between confounding factors and other independent variables with 10 papers as split point**

	$EP_{\text{past}}$	$ED_{\text{past}}$	$\text{LogCit}_{\text{past}}$
hot areas (mean)	-0.02	-0.15	0.09
hot areas (max)	0.04	-0.10	0.06
Ivy League	0.01	0.00	0.09
changing institutions	0.07	0.08	-0.07
novelty and conventionality	-0.11	-0.25	0.12
team size	-0.07	-0.13	0.00
co-authors' area contribution	0.07	0.03	0.05
co-authors' topic contribution	0.03	-0.04	0.07

The correlation coefficients of the independent variables in each regression in Hypothesis A–E. Here, the split point is 10 papers.

Table S21: Mediation effects of different factors on the future impact

Mediators	EP as treatment variable			ED as treatment variable		
	ACME	ADE	Total Effect	ACME	ADE	Total Effect
hot areas (max)	0.03***	0.24***	0.27***	-0.04***	-0.21***	-0.25***
hot areas (mean)	0.02***	0.25***	0.27***	-0.06***	-0.19***	-0.25***
Ivy League	0.00	0.27***	0.27***	0.01***	-0.25***	-0.25***
changing institutions	-0.01	0.28***	0.27***	-0.02***	-0.22***	-0.25***
novelty and conventionality	0.01***	0.26***	0.27***	-0.06***	-0.18***	-0.25***
team size	0.00	0.27***	0.27***	-0.02***	-0.23***	-0.25***
co-authors' area contribution	0.01	0.27***	0.27***	0.01***	-0.26***	-0.25***
co-authors' topic contribution	0.02***	0.25***	0.27***	-0.02***	-0.23**	-0.25***

We perform mediation analysis of the past exploratory metrics on the future impact with several confounding factors as mediators and 10 career years as split point. The EP and ED are separately set as the treatment variable. ACME stands for average causal mediation effects, and ADE stands for average direct effects. (\* $P < 0.1$ ; \*\* $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*\* $P < 0.01$ .)

Table S22: **Mediation effects of different factors on the future impact with 10 papers as split point**

Mediators	EP as treatment variable			ED as treatment variable		
	ACME	ADE	Total Effect	ACME	ADE	Total Effect
hot areas (max)	0.03***	0.26***	0.30***	-0.04***	-0.20***	-0.24***
hot areas (mean)	0.02***	0.28***	0.30***	-0.06***	-0.18***	-0.25***
Ivy League	0.00	0.30***	0.30***	0.01**	-0.25***	-0.25***
changing institutions	-0.01***	0.31***	0.30***	-0.03***	-0.21***	-0.24***
novelty and conventionality	0.02***	0.28***	0.30***	-0.05***	-0.20***	-0.25***
team size	0.00	0.30***	0.30***	-0.01***	-0.23***	-0.24***
co-authors' area contribution	0.01***	0.28***	0.30***	0.01***	-0.25***	-0.24***
co-authors' topic contribution	0.02***	0.27***	0.30***	-0.01***	-0.24***	-0.24***

We perform mediation analysis of the past exploratory metrics on the future impact with several confounding factors as mediators and 10 papers as split point. The EP and ED are separately set as the treatment variable. ACME stands for average causal mediation effects, and ADE stands for average direct effects. (\* $P < 0.1$ ; \*\* $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*\* $P < 0.01$ .)

Table S23: **Regression coefficients of the EP and ED on different subsets of scientists, with at least 5 or 20 publications**

Different subsets	10 career years as split point		10 papers as split point	
	EP	ED	EP	ED
	at least 5 publications	0.229***	-0.179***	0.298***
at least 20 publications	0.288***	-0.265***	0.247***	-0.168***

We study scientists with at least 5 or 20 publications with regression equation (S4), respectively, as opposed to the usual 10 papers considered in the main text and for the rest of the supplement. We list here only the coefficients of the EP and ED in each regression. (\* $P < 0.1$ ; \*\* $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*\* $P < 0.01$ .)



Table S24: **Regression coefficients of the EP and ED on the subset excluding scientists with common Asian last names**

Different subsets	10 career years as split point		10 papers as split point	
	EP	ED	EP	ED
Without scientists having Asian last names	0.299***	-0.247***	0.269***	-0.268***

We exclude scientists who have common Asian last names for regression (S4), with the same regression setup as in the main text. We list here only the coefficients of the EP and ED in each regression. (\* $P < 0.1$ ; \*\* $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*\* $P < 0.01$ .)

Table S25: **Regression coefficients of the EP and ED when controlling for scientists' genders**

Control factor	10 career years as split point		10 papers as split point	
	EP	ED	EP	ED
gender	0.240***	-0.323***	0.250***	-0.301***

We add the gender of each scientist as a control variable in the regression equation (S4), with the same regression setup as in the main text. We list here only the coefficients of the EP and ED in each regression. (\* $P < 0.1$ ; \*\* $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*\* $P < 0.01$ .)

Table S26: **Regression coefficients of the EP and ED with varying definitions of EP and ED**

Different definitions of EP and ED	10 career years as split point		10 papers as split point	
	EP	ED	EP	ED
2-digit EP and 2-digit ED	0.173***	-0.035	0.196***	-0.063
2-digit EP and 4-digit ED	0.196***	-0.100*	0.195***	-0.025
4-digit EP and 4-digit ED	0.153***	-0.045	0.173***	0.011
4-digit EP and 6-digit ED	0.220***	-0.209***	0.261***	-0.224***
2-digit EP and 6-digit ED	0.270***	-0.245***	0.298***	-0.245***

We vary the numbers of PACS code digits for computing EP and ED. The regression equation is (S4), with the same setup as in the main text. We list here only the coefficients of the EP and ED in each regression. (\* $P < 0.1$ ; \*\* $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*\* $P < 0.01$ .)

It shows that using 2 or 4 digits for the EP does not affect the significance of the results, while the ED needs to be calculated with 6 digits. See the discussion in Section S7.3.1.

Table S27: **Regression coefficients of EP and ED under alternative topic graphs for measuring topic distances**

Topic Graph	10 career years as split point		10 papers as split point	
	EP	ED	EP	ED
citation	0.255***	-0.267***	0.277***	-0.258***
co-citing	0.180***	-0.317**	0.199***	-0.313***

We test the citation graph and co-citing graph as described in Section S7.3.2. The regression equation is (S4), with the same setup as in the main text. We list here only the coefficients of the EP and ED in each regression. (\* $P < 0.1$ ; \*\* $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*\* $P < 0.01$ .)

Table S28: **Regression coefficients of EP and ED under different node distance metrics**

Distance Metric	10 career years as split point		10 papers as split point	
	EP	ED	EP	ED
Jaccard	0.233***	-0.204***	0.222***	-0.119***
node2vec	0.272***	-0.502***	0.258***	-0.412***

Instead of using the weighted overlap of two nodes' neighbours as their distance on the graph, we explore the distance metric using unweighted Jaccard and node2vec algorithms, as described in Section [S7.3.3](#). The regression equation is (S4), with the same setup as in the main text. We list here only the coefficients of the EP and ED in each regression. (\* $P < 0.1$ ; \*\* $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*\* $P < 0.01$ .)

Table S29: **Regression coefficients of EP and ED when using Hausdorff distance for paper distance**

paper distance	10 career years as split point		10 papers as split point	
	EP	ED	EP	ED
Hausdorff (max-min)	0.323***	-0.274***	0.336***	-0.278***

Different from taking pairwise average in the main text, we try Hausdorff distance (max-min distance) when measuring paper distance, as described in Section [S7.3.4](#). The regression equation is (S4), with the same setup as in the main text. We list here only the coefficients of the EP and ED in each regression. (\* $P < 0.1$ ; \*\* $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*\* $P < 0.01$ .)

Table S30: **Regression coefficients of the EP and ED under varying definitions of academic impact**

Varying definitions of future performance	10 career years as split point		10 papers as split point	
	EP	ED	EP	ED
$\log c_{10}$	0.229***	-0.184***	0.291***	-0.271***
normalization: method 1 [32]	0.134***	-0.057**	0.135***	-0.086***
normalization: method 2 [25]	0.134***	-0.068***	0.135***	-0.082***
percentile: max	0.034***	-0.014**	0.044***	-0.025***
percentile: mean	0.029***	-0.018***	0.036***	-0.025***
maximum $\log c_5$	0.495***	-0.242***	0.476***	-0.408***
maximum $\log c_{10}$	0.239***	-0.223***	0.460***	-0.403***

As discussed in Section S7.4, we test different measurements of future academic impact, as alternatives to  $\log c_5$  used in the main text. The regression equation is (S4), with the same setup as in the main text. We list here only the coefficients of the EP and ED in each regression. (\* $P < 0.1$ ; \*\* $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*\* $P < 0.01$ .)

Table S31: **Regression coefficients of the EP and ED under varying numbers of papers as the look-back period**

look-back papers	10 career years as split point		10 papers as split point	
	EP	ED	EP	ED
1	0.218***	-0.295***	0.250***	-0.324***
2	0.255***	-0.305***	0.272***	-0.312***
3	0.266***	-0.280***	0.290***	-0.289***
4	0.275***	-0.263***	0.293***	-0.261***
5	0.270***	-0.245***	0.298***	-0.245***
6	0.272***	-0.236***	0.302***	-0.234***
7	0.265***	-0.222***	0.300***	-0.221***
8	0.262***	-0.213***	0.305***	-0.217***
9	0.260***	-0.207***	0.307***	-0.214***
10	0.256***	-0.200***	—————	—————
11	0.254***	-0.196***	—————	—————
12	0.250***	-0.191***	—————	—————
13	0.251***	-0.190***	—————	—————
14	0.252***	-0.188***	—————	—————
15	0.252***	-0.187***	—————	—————
$\infty$	0.251***	-0.182***	—————	—————

Note that in the case of using 10 papers as split point, the EP and ED are always the same when the number of papers in the look-back period is greater than or equal to 9 (there are not enough papers before the split point to allow for more papers in the look-back window), and hence the coefficients are the same as well. We list here only the coefficients of the EP and ED in each regression. (\* $P < 0.1$ ; \*\* $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*\* $P < 0.01$ .)

Table S32: **Regression coefficients of the EP and ED under different look-back years**

look-back years	10 career years as split point		10 papers as split point	
	EP	ED	EP	ED
1	0.149***	-0.163***	0.198***	-0.211***
2	0.160***	-0.202***	0.219***	-0.244***
3	0.211***	-0.243***	0.252***	-0.260***
4	0.209***	-0.224***	0.256***	-0.248***
5	0.221***	-0.223***	0.266***	-0.245***
6	0.247***	-0.230***	0.283***	-0.247***
7	0.253***	-0.224***	0.289***	-0.243***
8	0.262***	-0.215***	0.290***	-0.239***
9	0.255***	-0.194***	0.297***	-0.239***
10	0.251***	-0.182***	0.301***	-0.239***
11	—————	—————	0.304***	-0.239***
12	—————	—————	0.306***	-0.235***
13	—————	—————	0.306***	-0.232***
14	—————	—————	0.309***	-0.231***
15	—————	—————	0.309***	-0.228***
$\infty$	—————	—————	0.307***	-0.214***

Note that in the case of using 10 career years as split point, the EP and ED are always the same when the number of the look-back years is greater than or equal to 9 (there are not enough years before the split point to allow for more years in the look-back window), and hence the coefficients are the same as well. We list here only the coefficients of the EP and ED in each regression. (\* $P < 0.1$ ; \*\* $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*\* $P < 0.01$ .)

Table S33: PSM results with varying grouping quantiles and 10 papers as split points

Qtl	EP			ED			Combining EP and ED					
	Pairs	Treat	Control	P	Pairs	Treat	Control	P	Pairs	Treat	Control	P
40	5838	1.718 (0.008)	1.657 (0.008)	*** (***)	2238	1.595 (0.012)	1.659 (0.012)	*** (***)	680	1.700 (0.023)	1.567 (0.022)	*** (***)
30	4403	1.717 (0.009)	1.641 (0.009)	*** (***)	1162	1.558 (0.017)	1.659 (0.017)	*** (***)	11	2.026 (0.135)	1.413 (0.139)	*** (*)
25	2630	1.746 (0.012)	1.662 (0.011)	*** (***)	716	1.526 (0.022)	1.623 (0.021)	*** (***)	16	1.603 (0.109)	1.266 (0.119)	** (**)
20	2630	1.746 (0.012)	1.662 (0.011)	*** (***)	409	1.506 (0.027)	1.658 (0.028)	*** (***)	—	—	—	—
15	2630	1.746 (0.012)	1.662 (0.011)	*** (***)	189	1.444 (0.034)	1.642 (0.040)	*** (***)	—	—	—	—

The column of pairs reports how many pairs are left in the groups after matchings. The Qtl column marks the quantile used in the grouping. The ED, EP and combining EP and ED columns correspond to the experiments where the ED, EP and combining both are the variable in question in PSMs, respectively. The Treat columns record the mean of the log-citations per paper of the treatment group, while the Control columns report those of the control group, where the exact meanings of treatment and control depend on the corresponding context. The P columns report whether the matched groups are statistically significantly different under  $t$ -tests—reported in rows without parentheses, and the Kruskal–Wallis tests—reported in rows with parentheses. (NS, not significant; \* $P < 0.1$ ; \*\* $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*\* $P < 0.01$ .)

Table S34: PSM results with varying grouping quantiles and 10 career years as split points

Qtl	EP			ED			Combining EP and ED					
	Pairs	Treat	Control	P	Pairs	Treat	Control	P	Pairs	Treat	Control	P
40	3549	1.611 (0.010)	1.557 (0.010)	*** (***)	1941	1.498 (0.013)	1.572 (0.013)	*** (***)	417	1.569 (0.027)	1.440 (0.027)	*** (***)
30	2601	1.557 (0.011)	1.497 (0.011)	*** (***)	1040	1.466 (0.017)	1.567 (0.018)	*** (***)	72	1.550 (0.072)	1.380 (0.065)	* (*)
25	2507	1.562 (0.012)	1.505 (0.012)	*** (***)	678	1.484 (0.021)	1.573 (0.024)	*** (***)	32	1.531 (0.101)	1.229 (0.081)	** (**)
20	1347	1.572 (0.016)	1.497 (0.016)	*** (***)	414	1.421 (0.027)	1.553 (0.030)	*** (***)	—	—	—	—
15	949	1.573 (0.019)	1.441 (0.019)	*** (***)	187	1.399 (0.036)	1.515 (0.040)	** (*)	—	—	—	—

The table has the same notation as Table S33.



Table S35: **Results of the null model in PSM**

Shuffling Level	Split Point	EP	ED	Combining EP and ED
Paper-level	10 career year	0	0	0
	10 paper	0	0	0
Author-level	10 career year	4	4	4
	10 paper	0	1	0

The numbers in the table reports in how many times out of 1,000 repeated experiments the average differences within groups after matching in synthetic datasets are larger than the actually observed difference from the real data. The smaller the number, the better it is in supporting the robustness of our findings.

Table S36: **Results of the null model in PSW**

Shuffling Level	Split Point	E(C-D)	E(B-D)	E(A-D)
Paper-level	10th career year	0	0	0
	10th paper	0	0	0
Author-level	10th career year	0	0	0
	10th paper	0	7	0

The numbers in the table reports in how many times out of 1,000 repeated experiments ATEs in synthetic datasets are larger than the actually observed ATEs from the real data. The smaller the number, the better it is to support the robustness of our findings. The groups A, B, C and D are defined in Section [S4.1](#).

Table S37: **Regression coefficients of the EP and ED after adding Gaussian noise to the independent variables**

Added noise and variable	10 career years as split point		10 papers as split point	
	EP	ED	EP	ED
$\epsilon \sim N(0, 0.1^2)$ to EP	0.17***	-0.16***	0.21***	-0.17***
$\epsilon \sim N(0, 0.3^2)$ to ED	0.19***	-0.04***	0.20***	-0.17***
$\epsilon \sim N(0, 10^2)$ to LogCit <sub>past</sub>	0.34***	-0.58***	0.37***	-0.66***

We introduce Gaussian noise with different  $\sigma$  to the independent variables EP, ED and LogCit<sub>past</sub> separately, and run the regression Eq. (S4). We increment the value of  $\sigma$  starting from 0.1 until the regression results become statistically insignificant. We record the maximum  $\sigma$  at which the results remain significant, as well as the coefficients of EP and ED at this perturbation level. Our experiments find that the maximum  $\sigma$  of perturbation that can be added to EP while still maintaining significant results is 0.1. Similarly, for ED, the maximum  $\sigma$  is 0.3. For LogCit<sub>past</sub>, we observe that a perturbation level of more than 10 is unnecessary. Both EP and ED have a range of  $[0, 1]$ , so adding Gaussian noise with a standard deviation of 0.1 or 0.3 is considered a significant perturbation to either variable. The same applies to LogCit<sub>past</sub>, which has a range of  $[0, 4.3]$ . (\* $P < 0.1$ ; \*\* $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*\* $P < 0.01$ .)