

## The disruption index in the multiverse:

The calculation of scores comes with numerous (hidden) degrees of freedom

Christian Leibel<sup>1,2</sup>; Lutz Bornmann<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Science Policy and Strategy Department

Administrative Headquarters of the Max Planck Society

Hofgartenstr. 8,

80539 Munich, Germany.

Email: christian.leibel.extern@gv.mpg.de, bornmann@gv.mpg.de

<sup>2</sup> Department of Sociology

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München

Konradstr. 6,

80801 Munich, Germany.

Conceptualization: Christian Leibel, Lutz Bornmann; Supervision: Lutz Bornmann; Writing – original draft: Christian Leibel; Writing – review & editing: Lutz Bornmann, Christian Leibel

## **Abstract**

Following Funk and Owen-Smith (2017), Wu et al. (2019) proposed the disruption index ( $DI_1$ ) as a bibliometric indicator that measures disruptive and consolidating research. When we summarized the literature on the disruption index for our recently published review article (Leibel & Bornmann, 2024), we noticed that the calculation of disruption scores comes with numerous (hidden) degrees of freedom. In this Letter to the Editor, we explain why this analytical flexibility endangers the credibility of bibliometric research based on the  $DI_1$  (and its variants) and advertise the application of multiverse-style methods to increase the transparency of the research.

## **Key words**

bibliometrics, disruption index, CD index, robustness, multiverse-style methods

Shortly after Funk and Owen-Smith (2017) introduced the disruption index ( $DI_1$ ) as a measure of technological change<sup>1</sup>, Wu et al. (2019) recognized its potential for the bibliometric study of transformative science. The  $DI_1$  has started a new stream of research and plays a central role in no less than three *Nature* articles (Lin et al., 2023; Park et al., 2023; Wu et al., 2019) and numerous other publications. When we summarized the literature on the  $DI_1$  for our recently published review article (Leibel & Bornmann, 2024), we noticed that the calculation of disruption scores comes with numerous (hidden) degrees of freedom. In this Letter to the Editor, we explain why this analytical flexibility endangers the credibility of research based on the  $DI_1$  and advertise the application of multiverse-style methods to increase the transparency of the research.

The  $DI_1$  is closely related to measures of betweenness centrality (Freeman, 1977; Gebhart & Funk, 2023) and uses bibliographic coupling links to quantify historical discontinuities in the citation network of a focal paper (FP) (Leydesdorff & Bornmann, 2021). Bibliographic coupling links connect publications that cite the same references. The  $DI_1$  ranges from -1 to 1 and is equivalent to the following ratio:

$$DI_1 = \frac{N_F - N_B}{N_F + N_B + N_R}$$

$N_B$  is the number of citing papers that contain at least one bibliographic coupling link with the FP. These papers represent historical continuity because they connect the more recent literature with literature that predates the FP. Conversely,  $N_F$  quantifies historical discontinuities by counting the number of papers that cite the FP without citing any of the FP's cited references. A large  $N_F$  signals that the ideas that inspired the FP are no longer relevant for future research. Because  $N_B$  is subtracted from  $N_F$  in the numerator of the  $DI_1$ , positive disruption scores indicate that the FP “overshadows” (Liu et al., 2023) previous research. Negative disruption scores indicate that previous research still remains relevant after the publication of the FP.  $N_R$  is the number of papers that cite the FP's cited references without citing the FP itself. Compared to  $N_B$  and  $N_F$ , it is less clear what  $N_R$  is supposed to represent. The purpose of  $N_R$  may be to compare the citation impact of the FP to the citation impact of its cited references.  $N_R$  reduces the disruption score of a FP considerably if the sum of the citations received by the cited references exceeds the citation count of the FP.

---

<sup>1</sup> Funk and Owen-Smith (2017) use the name CD index, but we use disruption index ( $DI_1$ ) in this Letter and in our review article (Leibel & Bornmann, 2024)

The calculation of the  $DI_1$  hints at degrees of freedom that are often neglected in the literature. On the one hand, these degrees of freedom concern the index formula. For example, Bornmann et al. (2020) point out that the  $DI_1$  contains an implicit threshold  $X$ , such that a citing paper only counts towards  $N_B$  if it cites at least  $X$  of the FP's cited references. For the  $DI_1$ ,  $X = 1$ , but one could just as well choose  $X > 1$  with the argument that stronger bibliographic coupling links are a better indicator of historical continuity. For want of strong theoretical or statistical justifications,  $X$  has to be chosen arbitrarily because any choice of  $X$  is no more or less defensible than alternative choices. Since the justifiable modifications of the  $DI_1$  are too numerous to discuss them all in this letter (there is an increasing multiverse of modifications), we refer the interested reader to our literature review (Leibel & Bornmann, 2024) where we provide an overview of the various alternatives to the  $DI_1$  researchers have suggested so far.

On the other hand, we observed degrees of freedom in the many small, yet often significant, decisions researchers make when collecting and processing data. Examples include the choice of the database (e.g., Web of Science, Clarivate, or Scopus, Elsevier), the exclusion of data (e.g., citing papers from certain years), and the transformation of variables (e.g., logarithm transformation). When calculating disruption scores it is common practice to use citation windows of  $X$  years or to exclude FPs with less than  $X$  cited references (and/or citations). As is explained in Table 1, these practices are justifiable, but, once again, the choice of  $X$  is arbitrary (and other choices as well). It becomes clear that, for each set of raw data there are multiple justifiable processed datasets. Generally speaking, “raw data do not uniquely give rise to a single data set for analysis but rather to multiple alternatively processed data sets, depending on the specific combination of choices – a *many worlds* or *multiverse* of data sets” (Steegeen et al., 2016, p. 702).

We now turn to the methodological consequences of our observations. Following Steegeen et al. (2016), we think of the various studies on the  $DI_1$  and its variants as the products of all decisions researchers make during the entire research process. We can define a multiverse as a set that contains all specifications (index formula and data processing) that may be considered as *equally valid*.<sup>2</sup> The multiverse of valid specifications “directly implies a multiverse of statistical results” (Steegeen et al., 2016, p. 702). Recent literature draws attention to the problematic fact that, in standard research practice, large parts of the multiverse remain unexplored or at least unreported because “researchers typically report a single analysis or, at most, a few analyses and results”, which “may or may not be representative of the multiverse

---

<sup>2</sup> Del Giudice and Gangestad (2021) provide a list of criteria that help to decide whether specifications can be considered as equally valid.

of possible valid specifications” (Del Giudice & Gangestad, 2021). The decision not to report alternative justifiable analyses may be arbitrary or motivated by the desire to present certain results (Simmons et al., 2011; Simonsohn et al., 2020). In the case of the  $DI_1$  and its variants, there is concrete evidence in the research literature that disruption scores can vary significantly depending on the variant of the index (Bittmann et al., 2022; Bornmann et al., 2020; Bornmann & Tekles, 2021; Deng & Zeng, 2023; Wang et al., 2023) as well as choices made during data processing such as the selection of the citation window (Bornmann & Tekles, 2019a; Liang et al., 2022) or the treatment of data artefacts (Holst et al., 2024; Liang et al., 2022; Ruan et al., 2021). Thus, there is the risk that bibliometric analyses based on the  $DI_1$  turn into a “garden of forking paths” (Gelman & Loken, 2014, p. 463) in which empirical results and their policy implications hinge on arbitrarily chosen specifications.

Conventional robustness checks may fail to address the ambiguity that is pervasive in the bibliometric research based on the  $DI_1$  and its variants for the simple reason that they themselves are selective. Robustness checks typically only present a few alternative specifications and do not systematically investigate how much outcomes vary across all combinations of defensible analytical decisions. To overcome the limitations of robustness checks and combat the pitfalls of selective reporting, researchers have developed multiverse-style methods like *multiverse analysis* (Stegen et al., 2016), *multi-model analysis* (Muñoz & Young, 2018; Young & Holsteen, 2017), *specification-curve analysis* (Simonsohn et al., 2020), and *vibration of effects analysis* (Palpacuer et al., 2019; Patel et al., 2015; Tierney et al., 2021). The decisive advantage of multiverse-style methods is that they are *exhaustive* and report the outcomes of all valid specifications. They not only improve the robustness of research outcomes, but also increase the transparency of the research process by specifying “the decision nodes required to prepare a data set for analysis” (Del Giudice & Gangestad, 2021).

We are currently working on a multiverse-style analysis to investigate the robustness of disruption scores. Since we believe that the arguments presented in this Letter to the Editor are also applicable to other bibliometric indicators we encourage the use of multiverse-style methods.

Table 1: Examples of degrees of freedom in the calculation of the  $DI_1$

Type of data processing	Examples in the literature	Explanation
Performing analyses only on FPs with at least $X$ cited references (and/or citations)	<p>No minimum: Park et al. (2023)</p> <p><math>X = 5</math>: Deng and Zeng (2023)</p> <p><math>X = 10</math>: Bornmann et al. (2020); Bornmann and Tekles (2019b); Sheng et al. (2023)</p>	<p>A FP with no cited references has <math>N_B = N_R = 0</math> and is thus guaranteed to receive the maximum <math>DI_1</math> score of 1 as long as it has at least one citation – a clear case of a data artefact. Such cases of <math>DI_1 = 1</math> are highly misleading, particularly if the FP does actually cite references, which are not covered by the respective literature database and are thus missing in the reconstructed citation network of the FP (Holst et al., 2024; Liang et al., 2022; Ruan et al., 2021).</p>
Using citation windows of length $X$ (in years)	<p><u>Only subsequent publications</u></p> <p>No citation window: Wei et al. (2023)</p> <p><math>X = 3</math> years: Liu et al. (2023)</p> <p><math>X = 5</math> years: Li and Chen (2022); Park et al. (2023)</p> <p><u>All publications:</u></p> <p>No citation window: Bittmann et al. (2022); Bornmann and Tekles (2019b, 2021)</p>	<p>Citation windows address the fact that disruption scores depend on the time of measurement by taking a snapshot of every FP’s citation network at a fixed point in time. It is a special feature of the <math>DI_1</math> (and some of its variants) that citation windows may include publications that predate the FP because publications that only cite the FP’s references were published prior to the FP. Thus, there are two versions of every citation window of length <math>X</math>: One version that includes publications published after the FP and another version that includes all publications (even those published prior to the FP). Funk and Owen-Smith (2017) only include subsequent publications.</p>

## References

- Bittmann, F., Tekles, A., & Bornmann, L. (2022). Applied usage and performance of statistical matching in bibliometrics: The comparison of milestone and regular papers with multiple measurements of disruptiveness as an empirical example. *Quantitative Science Studies*, 2(4), 1246-1270. [https://doi.org/10.1162/qss\\_a\\_00158](https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00158)
- Bornmann, L., Devarakonda, S., Tekles, A., & Chacko, G. (2020). Are disruption index indicators convergently valid? The comparison of several indicator variants with assessments by peers. *Quantitative Science Studies*, 1(3), 1242-1259. [https://doi.org/10.1162/qss\\_a\\_00068](https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00068)
- Bornmann, L., & Tekles, A. (2019a). Disruption index depends on length of citation window. *Profesional De La Informacion*, 28(2), Article e280207. <https://doi.org/10.3145/epi.2019.mar.07>
- Bornmann, L., & Tekles, A. (2019b). Disruptive papers published in *Scientometrics*. *Scientometrics*, 120(1), 331-336. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-019-03113-z>
- Bornmann, L., & Tekles, A. (2021). Convergent validity of several indicators measuring disruptiveness with milestone assignments to physics papers by experts. *Journal of Informetrics*, 15(3), Article 101159. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2021.101159>
- Del Giudice, M., & Gangestad, S. W. (2021). A traveler's guide to the multiverse: Promises, pitfalls, and a framework for the evaluation of analytic decisions. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, 4(1), Article 2515245920954925. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2515245920954925>
- Deng, N., & Zeng, A. (2023). Enhancing the robustness of the disruption metric against noise. *Scientometrics*, 128(4), 2419–2428. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-023-04644-2>
- Freeman, L. C. (1977). A set of measures of centrality based on betweenness. *Sociometry*, 40(1), 35-41. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3033543>
- Funk, R. J., & Owen-Smith, J. (2017). A dynamic network measure of technological change. *Management Science*, 63(3), 791-817. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2015.2366>
- Gebhart, T., & Funk, R. (2023). *A mathematical framework for citation disruption*. Retrieved September 11, 2023 from <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2308.16363>
- Gelman, A., & Loken, E. (2014). The statistical crisis in science. *American Scientist*, 102(6), 460-465. <https://doi.org/10.1511/2014.111.460>
- Holst, V., Algaba, A., Tori, F., Wenmackers, S., & Ginis, V. (2024). *Dataset artefacts are the hidden drivers of the declining disruptiveness in science*. Retrieved February 26, 2024 from <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2402.14583>
- Leibel, C., & Bornmann, L. (2024). What do we know about the disruption index in scientometrics? An overview of the literature. *Scientometrics*, 129(1), 601-639. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-023-04873-5>
- Leydesdorff, L., & Bornmann, L. (2021). Disruption indices and their calculation using web-of-science data: Indicators of historical developments or evolutionary dynamics? *Journal of Informetrics*, 15(4), Article 101219. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2021.101219>
- Li, J., & Chen, J. (2022). Measuring destabilization and consolidation in scientific knowledge evolution. *Scientometrics*, 127(10), 5819-5839. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-022-04479-3>
- Liang, G., Lou, Y., & Hou, H. (2022). Revisiting the disruptive index: Evidence from the Nobel Prize-winning articles. *Scientometrics*, 127(10), 5721-5730. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-022-04499-z>
- Lin, Y., Frey, C. B., & Wu, L. (2023). Remote collaboration fuses fewer breakthrough ideas. *Nature*, 623(7989), 987-991. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-06767-1>

- Liu, X., Zhang, C., & Li, J. (2023). Conceptual and technical work: Who will disrupt science? *Journal of Informetrics*, 17(3), Article 101432. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2023.101432>
- Muñoz, J., & Young, C. (2018). We ran 9 billion regressions: Eliminating false positives through computational model robustness. *Sociological Methodology*, 48(1), 1-33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0081175018777988>
- Palpacuer, C., Hammas, K., Duprez, R., Laviolle, B., Ioannidis, J. P. A., & Naudet, F. (2019). Vibration of effects from diverse inclusion/exclusion criteria and analytical choices: 9216 different ways to perform an indirect comparison meta-analysis. *Bmc Medicine*, 17(1), Article 174. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-019-1409-3>
- Park, M., Leahey, E., & Funk, R. J. (2023). Papers and patents are becoming less disruptive over time. *Nature*, 613(7942), 138-144. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-022-05543-x>
- Patel, C. J., Burford, B., & Ioannidis, J. P. A. (2015). Assessment of vibration of effects due to model specification can demonstrate the instability of observational associations. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 68(9), 1046-1058. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2015.05.029>
- Ruan, X., Lyu, D., Gong, K., Cheng, Y., & Li, J. (2021). Rethinking the disruption index as a measure of scientific and technological advances. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 172, Article 121071. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2021.121071>
- Sheng, L., Lyu, D., Ruan, X., Shen, H., & Cheng, Y. (2023). The association between prior knowledge and the disruption of an article. *Scientometrics*, 128(8), 4731-4751. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-023-04751-0>
- Simmons, J. P., Nelson, L. D., & Simonsohn, U. (2011). False-positive psychology: Undisclosed flexibility in data collection and analysis allows presenting anything as significant. *Psychological Science*, 22(11), 1359-1366. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797611417632>
- Simonsohn, U., Simmons, J. P., & Nelson, L. D. (2020). Specification curve analysis. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 4(11), 1208-1214. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-0912-z>
- Steege, S., Tuerlinckx, F., Gelman, A., & Vanpaemel, W. (2016). Increasing transparency through a multiverse analysis. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 11(5), 702-712. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691616658637>
- Tierney, B. T., Anderson, E., Tan, Y. X., Claypool, K., Tangirala, S., Kostic, A. D., Manrai, A. K., & Patel, C. J. (2021). Leveraging vibration of effects analysis for robust discovery in observational biomedical data science. *Plos Biology*, 19(9), Article e3001398. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3001398>
- Wang, S., Ma, Y., Mao, J., Bai, Y., Liang, Z., & Li, G. (2023). Quantifying scientific breakthroughs by a novel disruption indicator based on knowledge entities. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 74(2), 150-167. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24719>
- Wei, C., Li, J., & Shi, D. (2023). Quantifying revolutionary discoveries: Evidence from Nobel prize-winning papers. *Information Processing & Management*, 60(3), Article 103252. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipm.2022.103252>
- Wu, L., Wang, D., & Evans, J. A. (2019). Large teams develop and small teams disrupt science and technology. *Nature*, 566(7744), 378-382. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-0941-9>
- Young, C., & Holsteen, K. (2017). Model uncertainty and robustness: A computational framework for multimodel analysis. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 46(1), 3-40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124115610347>