

# Socio-cognitive Networks between Researchers

Alejandro Espinosa-Rada<sup>1</sup>, Jürgen Lerner<sup>2</sup>, Cornelius Fritz<sup>3</sup>,

<sup>1</sup>Social Networks Lab, ETH Zurich

<sup>2</sup> University of Konstanz, Germany

<sup>3</sup>Department of Statistics, Pennsylvania State University

August 1, 2024


## Abstract

Understanding why researchers cite each other has been a longstanding conjecture in studying scientific networks. Prior research suggests relevance, group cohesion, or honest source crediting as possible factors. However, the dual nature of cognitive and social dimensions underlying citation is often overlooked by not considering the intermediary steps leading up to a citation. For one work to be cited by another, it must first be published by a set of authors. Therefore, we investigate the reasons behind researchers' citations, explicitly examining the interplay of socio-cognitive ties through the interdependence of coauthorship and citation networks. We assess our claims in an empirical analysis by employing the Author-Oriented Relational HyperEvent Model (AuthRHEM) to study Chilean astronomers' citation and collaboration behavior between 2013 and 2015 in a joint framework. We find evidence that when deciding which work to cite, authors prefer other work with novelty and cognitive ties, such as work-to-work relations. At the same time, coherent groups are relevant because coauthors are cocited more frequently in subsequent publications.

*Keywords:* Duality, Scientific Networks, Science of Science, Relational Event Model, Hyperevents.

## 1 Introduction

Why do researchers cite each other? Citation is one of the most relevant indicators to measure the impact and recognition of researchers, which, as a consequence, reinforces some level of hierarchy in science (de Solla Price, 1965; Crane, 1972; Cole and Cole, 1973; Merton, 1988; Bellotti and Espinosa-Rada, 2024). Still, understanding why researchers cite each other is a longstanding conjecture in studying scientific networks. Existing theories suggest relevance, group cohesion, or honest source crediting as possible factors (Nicolaisen, 2007). White et al. (2004) also emphasize interpersonal networks, such as



**Figure 1** Illustrative example of indirect and direct interactions between actors and publications.

coauthorship networks. However, prior research often overlooked the dual nature of cognitive and social dimensions (Mützel and Breiger, 2020). While different interpretations exist in the literature, there is no agreed-upon theory on how social or cognitive ties are interrelated and which are the main mechanisms driving accumulation processes. Are citations accumulated because of intellectual merits or because individuals know each other? To unravel this puzzle, we investigate the tendency of researchers' citations by examining the concurrent interplay of socio-cognitive ties through coauthorship and citation networks.

Understanding citation patterns is challenging, although they have been extensively criticized as a simplistic measure (Edge, 1979) that is often under-theorized (Leydesdorff, 1998; Nicolaisen, 2007). However, to disentangle their structural properties, recent research has analyzed how they are embedded in a social context to identify the main mechanisms underlying why authors cite each other and how different networks are interrelated to explain citation tendencies (White et al., 2004; Espinosa-Rada et al., 2024; Lerner et al., 2024). This literature followed the tradition of the network researchers working on the sociology of science and knowledge that investigates social circles (Bellotti and Espinosa-Rada, 2024). These social circles or invisible colleges are investigated using bibliographic data through the lens of the duality of socio-cognitive ties (Kadushin, 1966; Crane, 1969; Breiger, 1974).

The literature on author citation networks often relies on aggregate data and has not

yet explored the intermediary role of works without aggregating the information (e.g., Small, 1973 and Zhao and Strotmann, 2008). This gap arises due to difficulties considering the complex and interdependent latent mechanisms in citation data. As illustrated in Fig. 1, for actor  $a_1$  to cite actor  $a_2$ ,  $a_1$  must first publish work<sup>1</sup>  $w_1$  referencing another work  $w_2$  (co-)authored by actor  $a_2$ . The numerous ways of representing the citation process underscore the socio-cognitive dimension of scientific networks and give rise to multiple interdependent “*dualities*”. Authors become indirectly related by coauthoring the same work, citing the same works or authors, and being cited by the same works or authors. The authors become indirectly related via common authors – but also by citing, or being cited by, the same works or authors. Considering multiple paths reveals various “*dualities*” that depend on one another. For instance, the citation relationship between two works may depend on the coauthorship relations between the authors. Disregarding this dependence results in information loss and biased results.

In this paper, we explore the dual relationship between academic citations and coauthorship to shed light on this complex phenomenon. We start by laying out the available theory on the concept of “*duality*” and bibliographic patterns in Section 2. In Section 3, we theorize about academic authors’ interdependencies between citation and collaboration behavior to identify whether the collaboration begets citations and more collaborations. As a case study, we analyze the collaboration and citation data among Chilean astronomers from 2013 to 2015, introduced in Section 4. We then construct a joint model in Section 5 that unifies previous research findings on citation and coauthor behavior (e.g., Matthew effect and group effect) and our novel theoretical insights about the interplay between coauthorship and citation in the statistical framework of relational hyperevents. We hypothesize that effects drawing on dualities in socio-cognitive networks among scientific works and researchers provide additional explanations for “*who coauthors with whom*” and “*who cites whom*”. This model allows us to simultaneously consider different “*dualities*” in scientific networks by studying citations and collaboration ties in a joint framework. Thus, we advance the duality approach by using all available information in bibliometric data. Against this background, we assess our claims by employing an author-oriented variant of the relational hyperevent model (Lerner and Lomi, 2023; Lerner et al., 2024) in Section 6. Finally, Section 7 provides a discussion of the main findings.

---

<sup>1</sup>Note that we use the terms publication and work interchangeably.

## 2 Theory

“*Duality*”, as a concept, was initially associated with the intersection of social circles following the tradition of Georg Simmel. This concept was related to relationships among actors of different levels through membership relations (Breiger, 1974). The main reasons for the intersections are individuals’ shared interests, personal affinities, or ascribed status of members who regularly participate in collective activities. Breiger (1974) also demonstrated that the representation of a two-mode network can act as a proxy to create two different networks, where a set of actors can be connected due to a shared affiliation just like groups to which the actors belong are connected via overlapping memberships. By projecting the matrix, a rectangular matrix resulted in two square matrices. New extensions of the concept of “*duality*” aimed to go beyond structural representations and consider cultural forms such as shared objects, symbols, or expressions of taste (Mützel and Breiger, 2020).

To capture science’s cultural or cognitive dimension, network researchers working on the sociology of science and knowledge often associate social circles – the sociological phenomenon behind the analytical concept of “*duality*” – with invisible colleges when analyzing researchers. In this literature, researchers are grouped together because they interact, have a common interest in shared topics, and do not need to know each other to be influenced by other members (Kadushin, 1966; Crane, 1969). This type of social circle requires both a social (the social circle) and cognitive (the scientific specialty) dimension. These invisible colleges should not separate the specialty they come from from the social aspect of science (Mullins, 1972), making the socio-cognitive dimension of science explicit. In the postscript of Kuhn (2012), he mentioned that paradigms are better understood when the community structure of science is taken into account, as was investigated by researchers of the time using the social network perspective (e.g., Hagstrom, 1965, de Solla Price and Beaver, 1966, and Crane, 1969).

Duality can leverage science’s socio-cognitive dimension by explicitly explaining how individuals create social ties by considering these two dimensions together. Regarding scientific networks, there is a longstanding tradition emphasizing that researchers should consider social and cognitive ties to analyze scientific networks (Crane, 1972; Merton, 2000; White et al., 2004; White, 2011; Bellotti and Espinosa-Rada, 2024). The main reason therein is that each type of tie measures something different, and separating them

can lead to distorted representations of the underlying network (Holland and Leinhardt, 1974; Chubin, 1976). Still, when emergent morphological structures are considered, such as scientific groups, clusters, specialties (Mullins and Mullins, 1973) or invisible colleges (Crane, 1972; Zuccala, 2006), researchers often analyze social or cognitive ties separate from one another. For example, for Moody (2004), citation networks are not social networks because the social ties do not capture the informational interaction structure of the latter. Schrum and Mullins (1988) distinguished between “*interactions*” and “*interest*”. The former mechanism implies communication, information flow, or general contact (such as coauthorship and “*in-house*” citation). In contrast, the latter is represented by citing the same papers (i.e., co-occurrence of citations in bibliographies). Leydesdorff and Vaughan (2006) argues that co-occurrences in bibliometric research represent variables attributed to texts, which is different from social networks that often refer to concrete relations (such as “*affiliations*”).

**Collaboration and Citation.** Citations are a manifestation of formal but asymmetric communication between two scientists: if researcher  $a_1$  refers to a work authored by another researcher  $a_2$ , it is presumed that the cited work was helpful in  $a_1$ ’s research (Chubin, 1976). For Small (1978), citations are symbols of concepts and ideas expressed in language, as cited works embody ideas that authors discuss in their work. On the other hand, to characterize the structure of a scientific field, researchers often use coauthorship networks (Newman, 2001; Moody and Light, 2006) as a proxy of interpersonal relationships to identify scientists’ communication as a social dimension of science. These researchers distinguished between cognitive and social ties.

Separating citation and collaboration as cognitive and social dimensions added another layer of distortion by assuming the citation is cognitive without any social component interweaving with cognitive ties. The overlapping nature of these two types of relations is referred to as a socio-cognitive network (Merton, 2000; White et al., 2004), and has been recently studied as a co-evolving process that allowed disentangling whether the two networks influence each other (Espinosa-Rada et al., 2024; Lerner et al., 2024) specifically by considering a delimited context. Researchers relied on intercitation, defined as “*the record of who has cited whom within a fixed set of authors*” (White, 2011, p. 275) to explore in bounded contexts, and assuming awareness, the dual nature of socio-cognitive networks such as “*in-house*” (i.e., same institution) relationships (Chubin and Studer,

1979; Schrum and Mullins, 1988). By delimiting the context, researchers can investigate in more detail how the social dimension of scientific networks unfolds by identifying whether citations also have a social component. The resulting socio-cognitive process is inherently part of bibliometric data, leading to many possible linked networks (Batagelj and Cerinšek, 2013) manifesting the duality (Breiger, 1974; Mützel and Breiger, 2020) of scientific networks. From the same scientific work, different networks can be derived, such as coauthorships, in which two authors are linked if they produce a joint work (e.g., paper, book, presentation), or a citation network, in which authors can cite many other different works, which in both cases represents a two-mode network. Bibliographic data, as a product of science, allow for the tracing of many formal communication channels in science.

**Author Cocitation.** In the study of author-to-author citation networks, researchers often use aggregated network representations to investigate social and cognitive ties without explicitly considering the intermediate role of works. For instance, author cocitation, where *“authors whose works are generally seen to be related, and are repeatedly cited as such in later documents, tend to cluster together on the map, while authors who are rarely or never cited together are relatively far apart”* (White and Griffith, 1981, p. 164). While a single work is implicitly considered a building block of the representation, an author cocitation approximates how the same works cite two authors through a two-mode network.

**Bibliographic Coupling.** Another strategy that uses citation-based representations is author bibliographic coupling (Zhao and Strotmann, 2008). Contrasting cocitation, two individuals are assumed to be closer if they cite the same references. In this case, the focus lies on the research front, i.e., who they cite, rather than the knowledge agreement, which relates to how other publications cite them.

**Author Intercitation.** Finally, author intercitation (also referred to as author direct citation or cross-citation) is a third representation based on direct relationships between authors through citations without including a third-party work (White, 2011). By considering authors and works in a chain, it is apparent that for  $a_1$  to cite actor  $a_2$ ,  $a_1$  must first publish work  $w_1$  referencing another work  $w_2$  (co-)authored by actor  $a_2$  (see Fig. 1). As in

cocitation and bibliographic coupling, the intercitation is often treated as an aggregated matrix, assuming that the frequency of citation among  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  measures direct relation strength between them (Wang et al., 2012).

In all these representations, the available timestamped interaction events are boiled down to the frequency of shared works to indicate the strength of a dyadic tie. However, treating the data as weighted ties raises new problems because works with more authors or references can overestimate their prevalence, requiring new techniques to normalize the credit given to authors (e.g., Batagelj, 2020). At the same time, it is impossible to explicitly address the contribution of the chain of the entire set of authors and the whole sets of works in these network representations. A representation that can explore the duality of persons and groups as pushed forward by Breiger (1974) can capture higher-order dependencies typically present in networks with these characteristics. For example, if work  $w_1$  cites another work  $w_2$ , it may depend on the coauthorship relations between the authors of both papers.

The aggregated representation of the ties assumes that the frequency of links between entities reflects the durability of the underlying structure of scientific networks. Nonetheless, analyses of the precise order and repeated interactions via authorship or citations in science have received little attention (some exceptions are Lerner and Hâncean (2023); Lerner et al. (2024)). For instance, works are events or instances in science that are scientific productions generated by an author or a team of researchers that refer to previous works by citing the references that justify the stands of the work. For example, the history of science depends on the sequence of events on which each discovery depends (Garfield, 1964, p. iii). Compared with aggregated measures, events in scientific networks allow the study of links between researchers and other entities (Hummon and Doreian, 1989).

### 3 Socio-cognitive Mechanisms

Researchers investigating mechanisms underlying scientific networks consider different network mechanisms (Rivera et al., 2010; Espinosa-Rada et al., 2024). These relational mechanisms are based on dyadic similarity (e.g., homophily), relationships (e.g., Matthew effect or group structures), and proximity-based mechanisms (e.g., focuses of activity). Some mechanisms represent general patterns, while others can be dissected into con-

crete network representations that explicitly show entities' internal structure and relations (Stadtfeld and Amati, 2021).

Socio-cognitive networks are complex structures that can be understood through the lens of mechanisms involving a mixture of different entities (e.g., authors and works) and ties (e.g., citations and collaborations). One can explore these structures in fine-grained data as micro-temporal patterns (Butts et al., 2023), considering the temporal order of relational events over specific time scales. We present four general mechanisms involving socio-cognitive structures and then suggest more concrete micro-temporal mechanisms to explore these patterns.

**Matthew Effect.** We investigate the Matthew effect (Merton, 1968), one of the primary explanations for why researchers receive more recognition over time. Originally, Robert K. Merton was interested in how the allocation of credit in cases of collaboration affects the flow of ideas through the communication network of science. The Matthew effect highlighted the bias of allocating more recognition to renowned researchers while reducing the visibility of contributions of less well-known authors (Merton, 1968; Cole and Cole, 1973; Merton, 1988). One instance of this mechanism is the accumulation of work citations (de Solla Price, 1965) and collaborators (Newman, 2001; Barabási et al., 2002). By analyzing collaboration and citations separately, the pattern becomes a self-fulfilled prophecy in which collaborations lead to more collaborators, citations of some work lead to more citations, and authors accumulate more recognition. Nonetheless, it is unclear how authors, collaboration, and citations lead to accumulative processes when they are analyzed together. Authors can gain more recognition by receiving more citations; this accumulation might occur because a single work becomes highly visible, the author's portfolio of documents accumulates more citations, or both. These accumulation processes can also result from a group of researchers reinforcing the recognition or a consensus among the broader scientific community. In other words, is it the work or the author that gets repeatedly cited? And do they get cited repeatedly by the same or different authors? Due to the dual accumulation process by individual papers or the author's entire portfolio, an assortativity degree process underlies the mechanism. This is reasonable in scientific networks, as it represents the reinforcement of active actors according to the Matthew effect and their more visible positions within groups (Brieger, 1976; Mullins et al., 1977).

**Hypothesis 1 (H1):** *Actors tend to send more ties to other actors that have received*



*more ties before.*

**Intercitation.** Intercitation or author-to-author citation occurs when members of a bounded group cite each other. White et al. (2004) investigate whether intercitation varies according to acquaintanceship and communication between members of these groups, intellectual affinities that are paramount regardless of the social dimension, or a combination of both. Intercitation allows focusing on asymmetric relationships since one author citing another author does not imply that the latter cites the former. For intercitations, we can distinguish if an author cites another author because they are collaborators or if, because they cite each other, they will collaborate. We further dissect this mechanism by considering the hyperevent taking into consideration author  $a_1$  publishing a work  $w_1$  that cites another work  $w_2$  to a different author  $a_2$ .

**Hypothesis 2a (H2a):** *Authors tend to cite other authors they had cited before.*

**Hypothesis 2b (H2b):** *Authors tend to collaborate with other authors they had cited before.*

**Hypothesis 2c (H2c):** *Authors tend to cite coauthors' works.*

**Author Cocitation.** White (2011) criticized the intercitation because he believes that the “*true glue*” binding scientists and scholars together is what members can competently write about rather than whom they know. To him, social and affective ties are secondary to intellectual relevance. To achieve this conclusion, he explored the author cocitation mechanism as a measure that controls for the propensity of any work by an author that also appears in any work of another author to appear in the references of a later work (White and Griffith, 1981). White et al. (2004) write that “[b]ecause scholars are cited together for many reasons, cocitation data can be noisy, but in the aggregate, they are a robust measure of how citers view the intellectual linkages in a research domain” (p. 115). This approach considers the global community, and as long as two researchers are cocited from anyone else, they would appear together in a network representation (as a symmetric weighted tie). White et al. (2004) considered that cocitation and intercitation could be conflated in bounded settings because if author  $a_1$  cites himself and another author  $a_2$  in the same network, it will increment the author  $a_1$  to author  $a_2$  intercitation and the author  $a_1$  to author  $a_2$  cocitation. Nonetheless, this conflation appears when self-citations are considered.

**Hypothesis 3 (H3):** *Authors that are frequently cocited will tend to be cocited together more often in future publications.*

**Group Effect.** The last mechanism we are interested in is related to the relevance of group effects of invisible colleges. Mullins (1972, 1973) and Griffith and Mullins (1972) proposed that “*coherent groups*” – which are considered small and intensely interacting research groups – are the primary drivers of scientific change and seed larger invisible colleges that develop around them. Dyadic and triadic structures of multiple ties represent these groups, allowing the emergence of more complex morphological structures, such as clusters, invisible colleges, or whole scientific specialties (Mullins and Mullins, 1973). Recently, researchers have used similar structures by considering one layer in collaboration networks (Kronegger et al., 2011; Ferligoj et al., 2015; Stark et al., 2020; Wittek et al., 2023).

However, Espinosa-Rada et al. (2024) proposed a cross-network closure that involves citation and collaboration network mechanisms. They operationalized it as “*the tendency to cite an author if two researchers share a joint coauthor and the tendency of two actors collaborating to be cited by the same authors*”(pp. 98-99). A further possible distinction of cross-network closure is between influence and selection processes. The coherent group can influence other members by promoting the authors to adopt the past citations of their past coauthors or to cite the papers of their coauthors. They might also expand the group by being cocited by third authors. In both cases, the group expands by indirectly agreeing with the accumulated knowledge shared by a paradigmatic group or by directly being cocited with those with whom they agree.

**Hypothesis 4a (H4a):** *Coauthors tend to cite similar references in their publications.*

**Hypothesis 4b (H4b):** *Coauthors tend to be cocited in subsequent publications.*

## 4 Data

For the exploration of the socio-cognitive mechanisms, we make use of data involving Chilean astronomers (for details, see Espinosa-Rada, 2021 and Espinosa-Rada et al., 2024). The studied time frame corresponds to the local group formation period of astronomers and astrophysics a few years after the Atacama Large Millimeter/submillimeter Array became fully operative in 2013. The bibliographic data were initially gathered


Year	2013	2014	2015
Number of authors	87	87	87
Number of citing papers	322	345	367
Average number of coauthors	2.39	2.18	2.25
Average number of references	59.27	56.74	56.33

**Table 1** Descriptive statistics on the number of authors and works per year in the Chileans Citation Network

from the Web of Science, and additional information, such as the researcher’s nationality, was collected from the academics’ CVs. We use the Web of Science ID as a proxy of the time order, representing the date the paper was indexed into the database.

**Network Boundary.** We restrict the data to researchers affiliated with organizations settled in Chile and, thereby, have access to all the telescopes in the country. For the analysis, we consider the authors and publications in which at least one researcher is affiliated with an organization settled in Chile participating in 2013 – 2015. All authors that are not settled in Chile are excluded from the analysis. Note, however, that foreigners can be settled in Chile. The cited papers are the works of this cohort published between 1947 and 2015.

**Descriptive statistics.** For each year, additional information on the number of authors and citing papers is given in Table 1. The aggregated network data can be considered dual because it involves different types of nodes (works and authors) and its multiplex nature (connections based on coauthorship and citation). The two networks that distinguish between coauthor and citation relations are visualized in Fig. 2a and Fig. 2b, respectively. While this visualization can be helpful for the exploration of the network, recent trends in network modeling for scientific networks aim to go beyond projections to analyze the two-mode structure of the network (for examples and further discussion, see Espinosa-Rada and Ortiz, 2022, Fritz et al., 2023, and Gallagher et al., 2023).



**Figure 2** Intercitation network of Chilean astronomers (2013-2015). The size of the nodes is the log-transformed number of accumulated citations, the edges are the weighted ties (number of works), and the colors represent if the nodes are Foreigners (pink) or Chileans (blue).

## 5 Methods

### 5.1 Author-Oriented Hyperevent Model

Denote the set of all  $N$  astronomers by  $\mathcal{A} = \{1, \dots, N\}$  and the set of documents published up until but not including time point  $t \in \mathcal{T}$  by  $\mathcal{W}(t)$ , with  $\mathcal{T}$  being the set including all possible timestamps between 2013 and 2015 for which the bibliographic data is available. To shorten the notation, we assume that the static information on whether a particular astronomer in the data is Chilean is also encompassed in  $\mathcal{W}(t)$ . In this context, the observed coauthorship and citation data are set-to-set relational events, i.e., where the sender is a group of actors and the receiver a group of works. A publication  $w = (A(w), C(w), t(w))$  encompasses an author set  $A(w) \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ , citation set  $C(w) \subseteq \mathcal{W}(t(w))$ , and timestamp  $t(w) \in \mathcal{T}$ . As described in Section 4, only the order, not the exact timing of each work, is available in the publication records. Therefore, we assume that each work  $w$  corresponds to an arbitrary timestamp  $t(w)$  such that the order of the times corresponds to the observed order. Since one may regard  $A(w)$  as the sender and  $C(w)$  as the receiver of the event, and both entities are set-valued, we term this type of data set-to-set relational events. We can consider these sets a two-mode structure of authors and works (Breiger, 1974) or a three-mode structure (Fararo and Doreian, 1984) if we include time, as they also involve authors, citing, and cited work. The set of citable works at time point  $t$  is then defined by  $\mathcal{W}(t) = \{w; t(w) < t\}$ , and the number of authors and references in  $A(w)$  and  $C(w)$  is denoted by  $|A(w)|$  and  $|C(w)|$ , respectively. Finally, the set of sets of all possible citation

lists of length  $k \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$  with information available up until but not including time point  $t \in \mathcal{T}$  is given by  $\mathcal{H}(t, k)$ .

**REM for Set-to-Set Events.** Lerner et al. (2021) extended the REM to events involving multiple actors. The available data from Section 4 can, however, best be comprehended as events between sets of authors and sets of cited works, a data type for which we coin the name *set-to-set events*. Lerner et al. (2024) proposed an extension of undirected hyperevents (Lerner et al., 2021) and directed one-to-many hyperevents (Lerner and Lomi, 2023) in a one-mode network to set-to-set events in a two-mode network, which we next amend to our setting. Instead of specifying the intensity of a dyadic interaction, such as author  $a_1$  to cite some work by author  $a_2$  at time  $t$ , we state a joint intensity to write a work with coauthors  $A$  and citations to works  $C$  at time  $t$ . This intensity characterizes a multivariate counting process that counts how often each possible work (encompassing any number of coauthors and cited works) was written until arbitrary time point  $t$ . A similar model – analyzing the interrelation between collaboration networks and references to previous work in cultural production – has been applied by (Burgdorf et al., 2024), who analyze collaboration of filmmakers jointly producing films that may make stylistic references to previous work of the same or other filmmakers. See Appendix A, for a discussion of alternative models.

**Author-Oriented Formulation.** For the empirical setting of Chilean astronomers, we argue that coauthors affect which works are cited, but, reversely, the cited work does not affect the coauthors (Espinosa-Rada et al., 2024). Therefore, we assume that the set of authors (“*sender*”) is first determined for publication, then the references (“*receiver*”) are decided upon conditional on the set of authors. Our model, thereby, parallels other network actor-oriented models such as the stochastic actor-oriented model (Snijders, 2001) or the dynamic network actor model (Stadtfeld et al., 2017; Stadtfeld and Block, 2017).

Mathematically, this implies a conditional independence assumption between the set of authors and its reference list, yielding the *Author-Oriented Relational HyperEvent Model* (AuthRHEM). This model comprises an author model determining the coauthors and a citation model governing the citations conditional on the set of authors and the size of the citation list. Both models take the general form of a relational event model for hyperevents involving multiple actors as proposed by Lerner et al. (2021). Since the

citation model governs the decision on a particular set of citations conditional on the set of authors and the size of the citation list, we state it as a multinomial choice model proposed by McFadden (1973). For both models, the available information at timepoint  $t \in \mathcal{T}$  includes the entire coauthorship and citation past, denoted by  $\mathcal{W}(t)$ . As a result, the intensity to observe a publication of the set of authors  $A \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  with references to  $C \subseteq \mathcal{W}(t)$  at time point  $t$  is given by:

$$\lambda_{A,C}(t \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, |C|) = \underbrace{\lambda_A(t \mid \boldsymbol{\theta})}_{\text{Author Model}} \underbrace{p_{C|A}(t \mid \boldsymbol{\gamma}, A, |C|)}_{\text{Citation Model}} \quad (1)$$

with

$$\lambda_A(t \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \lambda_{0,A}(|A|, t) \exp\left(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top s(\mathcal{W}(t), A)\right) \quad (2)$$

and

$$p_C(t \mid \boldsymbol{\gamma}, A, |C|) = \frac{\exp\left(\boldsymbol{\gamma}^\top h(\mathcal{W}(t), C, A)\right)}{\sum_{W \in \mathcal{J}(t, |C|)} \exp\left(\boldsymbol{\gamma}^\top h(\mathcal{W}(t), W, A)\right)}, \quad (3)$$

defining the author and citation model, respectively, where


- $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^P$  and  $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \in \mathbb{R}^Q$  are parameter vectors estimated from data that govern the author and citation model, respectively (see Appendix D, for additional information on how they are estimated);
- $\lambda_0^A(|A|, t)$  is a nonparametric baseline intensity depending on the size of the author set and time  $t$ ;
- $s(\mathcal{W}(t), A) \in \mathbb{R}^P$  and  $h(\mathcal{W}(t), C, A) \in \mathbb{R}^Q$  are vectors of statistics characterizing for the author and citation model, separately. These statistics detail how the intensity of observing author set  $A$  and citation set  $C$  given author set  $A$  at time  $t \in \mathcal{T}$  are affected by the bibliographic data of the past, denoted by  $\mathcal{W}(t)$ . This means that observing a specific group of authors or cited works depends on the authors of previous works and who they cited.

## 5.2 Specification

To adapt this general framework to the theory at hand, we need to specify the vectors of statistics  $s(\mathcal{W}(t), A)$  and  $h(\mathcal{W}(t), C, A)$  to act as proxies for the hypotheses developed in Section 2 and control for other effects representing alternative explanations (or “control

effects”) for citations or coauthorship relations (Lerner et al., 2024). The mathematical formulation of and further details on all effects employed in our model specification are provided in Appendix C. Most of the hypotheses are based on the citation side; however, we also consider the author model to investigate intercitation.


For H1, we employ three different micro-temporal mechanisms. The first effect is “*Citation Popularity of Work*” (Fig. 3a), which accounts for the effect of a paper’s popularity as a process of preferential attachment. This effect evaluates if more frequently cited publications are more likely to receive additional citations from the academic community. “*Citation Repetition*” (Fig. 3b) approximates the Matthew effect as a ritual process, where the same researchers repeatedly cite the same papers, typically within specific scientific specialties, promoting the cognitive group. We do not explicitly consider these two effects part of the general mechanisms but use them to control for basic patterns in citation events. Finally, we use the “*Cite much Cited Authors*” (Fig. 3c) effect to capture socio-cognitive structures. Authors and works are interrelated, since researchers cite works of authors that have published highly cited other publications before.



**Figure 3** Statistics included for H1.

The following effects approximate the intercitation mechanism. The first effect, “*Author cites Author Repetition*” (Fig. 4a), tests H2a and controls for researchers’ inclination to follow the work of prominent figures, often leaders in their specialties, by promoting their research agenda (Mullins and Mullins, 1973). The second effect, “*Author cites Author Reciprocation*” (Fig. 4b), also concerns H2a and complements the first effect by incorporating reciprocity. Thereby, we capture mutual admiration or recognition that may occur among researchers interested in similar topics. A third effect for H2b considers the author’s model by investigating whether scientists are more likely to coauthor papers with those who cited their previous work (“*Collaborate with Citing Author*” in Fig. 4c).

Finally, for H2c, we employ the “*Cite Coauthor Works*” effect (Fig. 4d), which can be comprehended as an effect reversing the temporal order of “*Collaborate with Citing Author*” in that scientists are first coauthors and then cite each other.




**Figure 4** Statistics included for H2.

As in H1, we use three effects to investigate H3, where the first effect represents the hypothesis related to author cocitation, and the other two control for alternative explanations for cocitation. The effect of “*Author Cocitation*” (Fig. 5a) aims to identify the recurrence of authors perceived as working on similar topics by later publications. However, in the case of “*Cocitation Popularity (Pair)*” (Fig. 5b) and “*Cocitation Popularity (Triple)*” (Fig. 5c), instead of using author cocitation (White and Griffith, 1981), we control for standard cocitation at the level of works (Small, 1973). The main difference is that in the former case, we emphasize the duality of authors and works, while in the latter, the focus is on the cognitive dimension without considering which authors are behind the publication.


We use two variants specified in H4a and H4b to investigate the described group mechanisms. We test hypothesis H4a using “*Adopt Coauthor Citation*” (Fig. 6a), which is a “*social influence*” effect in which scientists cite some of the works cited by their former





**Figure 5** Statistics included for H3.

coauthors. To test H4b, we consider the statistic “Cocite Coauthor Pair”(Fig. 6b), which represents the pattern of cociting papers of a pair of coauthors.



**Figure 6** Statistics included for H4.

In the author model, we include additional control effects such as the ratio of Chileans in author teams compared to foreigners (“Ratio Chileans”) and the heterogeneity of the team of coauthors concerning Chilean nationality (“Heterogeneity Chilean”). We also consider some degree-based effects such as “Citation Popularity of Authors”, “Publication Activity”, and “Coauthor Repetition” (for pairs, triples, and quartets of authors). Additionally, we explore other transitivity-based effects for social (“Closure by Coauthor”) and cognitive (“Closure by Citing Same Work”) structures. In the citation model, we account for further effects including “Outdegree Popularity”, which controls for the tendency to cite papers with long reference lists, “Cite Work and its References,” as an appropriation of knowledge from the baseline publication, and “Self-Citation”, as the effect of authors citing their own past work.

## 6 Results

Before presenting the results of the specified model, note that the interpretation of the estimated coefficients is detailed in Appendix B.

### 6.1 Author model

The author model explains the set of authors  $A(w)$  of the published work  $w$ , irrespective of the citations  $C(w)$ . Findings are given in the upper part of Table 2.

**Hypotheses Effects.** Related with H2b we find a positive effect to “*Collaborate with Citing Author*”. This suggests that scientists tend to coauthor works with those who cited their own work in the past, as predicted by H2b. That is, there is a social selection of coauthors having cited their own work. From another point of view, there is a cross-network effect in the sense that if author  $a_1$  has cited the work of author  $a_2$ , then it is more likely that  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  become coauthors in the future.

**Other Effects.** Foreigners are more likely to be included in sets of authors than Chileans (negative effect of “*Ratio Chilean*”, significant at the 10% level), and groups of coauthors are more heterogeneous than groups of randomly sampled scientists. That is, teams of coauthors are often mixed with Chileans and foreigners (positive effect of “*Heterogeneity Chilean*”).

There is a positive effect of the number of citations that an author’s works have received in the past (“*Citation Popularity*”). That is, those scientists whose works have been cited more in the past publish at a higher rate in the future, i.e., they are more likely to be included as coauthors. There is a negative effect of “*Publication Activity*” on the publication rate. That is, scientists who have published more in the past will publish at a lower rate in the future. This latter effect works towards equalizing publication counts in the population of scientists.

There is evidence for “*Coauthorship Repetition*” among groups of scientists of sizes two, three, and four. That is, those groups of the given sizes who have coauthored more in the past are more likely to coauthor work in the future.

There is a significant negative triadic closure (“*Closure by Coauthor*”) in the coauthoring network. According to Lerner and Lomi (2022); Lerner and Hâncean (2023),

**Table 2** Results of the AuthRHEM: The first column shows the estimated coefficients, the second column the standard errors, and the third column the p-values.

	Estimate	Std. Error	p-Value
Author Model			
Ratio Chileans	-0.147	0.075	0.051
Heterogeneity Chilean	0.800	0.166	<0.001
Citation Popularity of Author	0.173	0.028	<0.001
Publication Activity	-0.089	0.033	0.008
Coauthor-pair Repetition	1.187	0.042	<0.001
Coauthor-triple Repetition	0.219	0.012	<0.001
Coauthor-quartet Repetition	0.073	0.007	<0.001
Collaborate with Citing Author	0.351	0.030	<0.001
Closure by Coauthor	-0.805	0.079	<0.001
Closure by Citing same Work	-0.175	0.029	<0.001
Citation Model			
Citation Popularity of Work	-0.243	0.139	0.081
Cocitation Popularity: Pair	0.289	0.026	<0.001
Cocitation Popularity: Triple	0.071	0.005	<0.001
Citation Repetition	0.182	0.048	<0.001
Outdegree Popularity	-0.679	0.104	<0.001
Cite Work and its Citations	0.295	0.021	<0.001
Self Citation	1.538	0.111	<0.001
Adopt Citation of Coauthor	-0.022	0.080	0.786
Cite Work of Coauthor	-0.281	0.129	0.029
Author cites Author Repetition	0.615	0.203	0.002
Author cites Author Reciprocation	-0.195	0.204	0.339
Cite much Cited Authors	-0.483	0.100	<0.001
Cocite Coauthor Pairs	0.451	0.110	<0.001
Author Cocitation	-0.194	0.111	0.080

negative closure points to actors occupying stable broker positions (actors surrounded by structural holes, that is, actors bridging between communities). A positive closure effect would imply a tendency to close structural holes. Still, the negative closure effect found in our model suggests that authors are likely to keep structural holes open so that the “third author”, i. e., the one connected to the two others, is likely to keep her broker position. Likewise, if two scientists cited the same works, they are less likely to jointly publish a work (“*Closure by Citing Same Work*”).

## 6.2 Citation Model

The citation model explains the list of citations  $C(w)$  of a published work  $w$ , conditioning on its group of authors  $A(w)$ . Findings are given in the lower part of Table 2.

**Hypotheses Effects.** Hypothesis H1 is represented by the effect “*Cite Much Cited Authors*”, displayed in Fig. 3c. In the example given in that figure,  $a_2$  authored the work  $w_1$ , which received many citations in the past, and  $a_2$  also authored work  $w_2$ . H1 predicts that  $w_2$  has an increased probability of being cited in the future, so there is a “*spill-over*” of the popularity of  $w_1$  to the work  $w_2$  written by the same author. Contrary to these expectations, we find a negative effect of “*Cite Much Cited Authors*”, so that – in the given example –  $w_2$  gets cited at a lower rate in the future. We note, however, that this finding must be interpreted alongside several other effects that control for repeatedly citing the same works or the same authors. Notably, we find a positive tendency for “*Citation Repetition*”, displayed in Fig. 3b, suggesting that if author  $a_1$  has already cited work  $w_1$ , then the same author  $a_1$  is more likely to cite  $w_1$  again when publishing another paper and we find a positive effect for “*Author Cites Author Repetition*”, displayed in Fig. 4a and operationalizing H2a, suggesting that if  $a_1$  has already cited work  $w_2$  of author  $a_2$ , then the same author  $a_1$  is more likely to cite another paper ( $w_1$ ) of  $a_2$  in the future. Yet another control effect, “*Citation Popularity of Work*”, displayed in Fig. 3a, gets a negative parameter (significant at the 10% level). This suggests that works that received many citations in the past get cited at a lower rate in the future, controlling for all other effects.

Hypothesis H2a is represented by “*Author Cites Author Repetition*” (Fig. 4a) and *Author Cites Author Reciprocation* (Fig. 4b). Consistent with H2a, we find a positive

effect of repetition, implying that if author  $a_1$  has cited work of  $a_2$ , then  $a_1$  is more likely to cite a (possibly different) work of  $a_2$  in the future. There is no significant finding for the reverse effect (reciprocation). The latter effect predicts that if author  $a_1$  has cited work of  $a_2$ , then  $a_2$  is more likely to cite work of  $a_1$  in the future; thus, it reverses the roles of the citing and cited authors.

Hypothesis H2c is represented in Fig. 4d “*Cite Work of Coauthor*”. In the example given in this figure,  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  have coauthored work  $w_2$  and  $a_2$  has published  $w_1$ . Given this precondition, H2c predicts that  $a_1$  is more likely to cite the work  $w_1$  of her coauthor in the future. Contrary to the predictions of H2c, we find a negative effect to cite the work of former coauthors. We recall that H2b, “*Collaborate with Citing Author*”, has been (positively) tested with the author model, discussed above.

Hypothesis H3 is represented by “*Author Cocitation*”, displayed in Fig. 5a. This effect predicts that if (possibly different) works of authors  $a_2$  and  $a_3$  jointly appear in the reference list of a past work  $w_5$ , then a future work  $w_6$  is more likely to cocite (possibly yet other and possibly different) works of  $a_2$  and  $a_3$ . With the effects displayed in Figs. 5b and 5c – cocitation popularity of pairs and triples of works – we control for the baseline effect to repeatedly cocite the same (pairs or triples of) works, rather than to cocite different works of the repeated pair of authors. Contrary to the predictions of H3, we find a negative effect (significant at the 10% level) to repeatedly cocite authors. In contrast, repeated cocitation to pairs and triples of papers is significantly positive.

Hypothesis H4a is represented in Fig. 6a “*Adopt Citations of Coauthors*” and H4b is represented in Fig. 6b “*Cocite Coauthor Pairs*”. In the example given in these figures, “*Adopt Citations of Coauthors*” has as precondition that  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  are coauthors (having coauthored work  $w_3$ ) and  $a_2$  has cited  $w_1$  when publishing  $w_2$ . Given this precondition,  $a_1$  is predicted to be more likely to also cite work  $w_1$  when publishing another future work  $w_4$ . However, we find no significant effect in adopting citations of coauthors, contrary to the predictions of H4a. The Effect “*Cocite Coauthor Pairs*” has as a precondition that  $a_2$  and  $a_3$  have coauthored work  $w_3$  and have individually published  $w_2$  and  $w_1$ . Given this precondition, the effect predicts that  $w_1$  and  $w_2$  have an increased probability to be cocited by the future work  $w_4$ . Consistent with the predictions of H4b we find a positive effect to cocite works individually published by former pairs of coauthors.

**Other Effects.** We find a positive tendency to “*Cite Work and its References*”. There are different possible explanations of this effect, as discussed in Lerner et al. (2024). Among others, it may be that authors copy parts of the reference lists of works they cite; that authors search for citations to a work they cite (and subsequently cite some of the citing works); or that work  $w_2$  is topically similar to the work  $w_1$  it cites, increasing the probability that  $w_2$  and  $w_1$  get cocited in the future. Works with longer reference lists – Effect “*Outdegree Popularity*” – are less likely to be cited. Moreover, authors frequently cite their own works (“*Self Citation*”).

## 7 Discussion

Using bibliometric data to analyze a scientific community of astronomers in Chile, we investigated social and cognitive ties. By delimiting the context, we explored the social dimension (often related to invisible colleges (Crane, 1972; Zuccala, 2006)) underpinning knowledge production as a dual process of authors and their works (Bellotti and Espinosa-Rada, 2024). This exploration followed the tradition of “*duality*” (Breiger, 1974; Mützel and Breiger, 2020) by explicitly considering science’s structural and cultural forms as socio-cognitive networks. These processes and the different micro-temporal mechanisms under investigation allowed us to identify which patterns contribute to the effect of authors to cite other works. This measure is often used to evaluate the impact of researchers, but it has consequences overall on the stratification of science.

While the literature consistently states that there is a process of social stratification in science (de Solla Price, 1965; Cole and Cole, 1973; Newman, 2001; Barabási et al., 2002), our results indicate that actors do not send more ties to those who have received more ties before. Although stratification may be observed in more extensive networks, authors in this case do not accumulate recognition and are cited at a lower rate in the future. Similarly, works that received many citations in the past are cited at a lower rate in the future, highlighting the increasing relevance of novel research for citation. We did not investigate whether this process differs between younger and more senior researchers. Nonetheless, the accumulation of recognition through citation is related to previously cited works. Thus, we interpret these findings as a preference towards novelty among Chilean astronomers in scientific production.

Regarding socio-cognitive ties, White (2011) believes that the “*true glue*” binding scientists and scholars together is what members can competently write about rather than whom they know. Recent research (Espinosa-Rada et al., 2024) has challenged this asseveration by restating the relevance of the social dimension in the study of socio-cognitive networks. However, we see different evidence than (Espinosa-Rada et al., 2024), while in their case, previous collaboration leads to citation, and previous citations did not lead to collaboration; in our case, we see the contrary effect. Lerner et al. (2024) found that scientists coauthor with those who cited their work and a tendency to cite coauthors’ papers. In our case, authors collaborate with those who cited their work but do not cite their coauthors’ works in future research. It is unclear why our results differ, and further research is needed.

Cocitation is often considered a key explanation for why researchers are cited. Classical research (Small and Griffith, 1974) mentioned that cocitation identifies the relationship between publications deemed important by authors in a specialty. White and Griffith (1981) extended this to author cocitation, determining how authors whose works are generally seen as related are clustered in knowledge maps. Our results indicate that authors frequently cited together will not be cited more often in future publications. We observe a similar effect when considering the repeated cocitation of works (pairs and triples) rather than authors. These results indicate that in the local astronomical community, cocited authors are becoming less relevant compared to works for the development of scientific specialties.

In this research, we also provide more relevance in exploring the role of “coherent groups”. These groups have been theoretically important in the past as a way of explaining how scientific specialties evolve Mullins and Mullins (1973), and recent trends in the study of scientific networks claim that science is becoming increasingly more team-oriented (Wuchty et al., 2007; Jones et al., 2008; Leahey, 2016). We leverage this fact by explicitly considering the effect of these groups in citing publications. Our results show that collaborating authors will not tend to cite similar references in their publications. However, authors that collaborate will be cocited more frequently in subsequent publications. This effect implies that even when researchers differentiate, the astronomical community will likely cite teams.

From a methodological perspective, we contribute to the study of scientific networks

by avoiding the aggregation of citation data, as is often done in empirical research and the classical projection suggested in Breiger (1974), and instead using the set-to-set structure of the data. Also, we expand the capability of a relatively recent author-oriented relational event model for hyperevents (AuthRHEM) by investigating a new case study and extending the model to new effects capable of exploring complex structures involving multiple ties and nodes. These novel approaches allowed us to dissect the mechanisms in more detail by moving the analysis beyond dyadic representations and providing a robust methodology for exploring dualities, such as author and scientific publications, as has been studied in this research. These methods offer a unique opportunity to investigate hyperevents and situations in which authors decide what to do first and then act upon the decision. This strategy also provided a way of disentangling between selection and influence processes. In our case, to identify if the coherent group can influence other members by promoting the authors to adopt the past citations of their past coauthors or to cite the papers of their coauthors, or if they might also expand the group by being cocited by third authors.

While we have advanced the knowledge about socio-cognitive networks among researchers, several limitations need to be addressed. Our study's time frame was restrictive (2013 – 2015), focusing on a short period. New applications could incorporate extended periods, but increasing the time window requires careful consideration of the awareness assumption necessary for inter citations. Additionally, our study is only a case study; we believe that comparisons between disciplines and the inclusion of interdisciplinary research areas can enhance the exploration of complex networks. Finally, moving beyond bibliometric data can also help explore the social dimension underpinning the scientific network. Further research should go beyond formal communication channels in science.

## References

- Barabási, A. L., H. Jeong, Z. Néda, E. Ravasz, A. Schubert, and T. Vicsek (2002). Evolution of the social network of scientific collaborations. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 311(3), 590–614.
- Batagelj, V. (2020). On fractional approach to analysis of linked networks. *Scientometrics* 123(2), 621–633.



- Batagelj, V. and M. Cerinšek (2013). On bibliographic networks. *Scientometrics* 96(3), 845–864.
- Bellotti, E. and A. Espinosa-Rada (2024). Scientific networks. In N. Crossley and P. Widop (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Networks and Culture*. Edward Elgar.
- Breiger, R. L. (1974). The duality of persons and groups. *Social Forces* 53(2), 181–190.
- Brieger, R. L. (1976). Career attributes and network structure: A blockmodel study of a biomedical research specialty. *American Sociological Review*, 117–135.
- Burgdorf, K., M. Wittek, and J. Lerner (2024). Communities of style: Artistic transformation and social cohesion in Hollywood, 1930 to 1999. *Socius* 10, 23780231241257334.
- Butts, C. T., A. Lomi, T. A. B. Snijders, and C. Stadtfeld (2023). Relational event models in network science. *Network Science* 11(2), 175–183.
- Chubin, D. E. (1976). The conceptualization of scientific specialties. *The Sociological Quarterly* 17(4), 448–476.
- Chubin, D. E. and K. E. Studer (1979). Knowledge and structures of scientific growth measurement of a cancer problem domain. *Scientometrics* 1(2), 171–193.
- Cole, J. R. and S. Cole (1973). *Social Stratification in Science*. University of Chicago Press.
- Crane, D. (1969). Social structure in a group of scientists: A test of the “invisible college” hypothesis. *American Sociological Review* 34, 335–352.
- Crane, D. (1972). *Invisible colleges: diffusion of knowledge in scientific communities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- de Solla Price, D. J. (1965). Networks of scientific papers. *Science* 149(3683), 510–515.
- de Solla Price, D. J. and D. Beaver (1966). Collaboration in an invisible college. *American Psychologist* 21, 1011–1018.
- Edge, D. (1979). Quantitative measures of communication in science: A critical review. *History of Science* 17(2), 102–134.

- Espinosa-Rada, A. (2021). *A network approach for the sociological study of science and knowledge: Modelling a dynamic multilevel network*. Phd thesis, The University of Manchester.
- Espinosa-Rada, A., E. Bellotti, M. Everett, and C. Stadtfeld (2024). Co-evolution of a socio-cognitive scientific network: A case study of citation dynamics among astronomers. *Social Networks* 78, 92–108.
- Espinosa-Rada, A. and F. Ortiz (2022). Gender and researchers with institutional affiliations in the global south/north in social network science. *Applied Network Science* 7(1), 40.
- Fararo, T. J. and P. Doreian (1984). Tripartite structural analysis: Generalizing the breiger-wilson formalism. *Social Networks* 6(2), 141–175.
- Ferligoj, A., L. Kronegger, F. Mali, T. A. B. Snijders, and P. Doreian (2015). Scientific collaboration dynamics in a national scientific system. *Scientometrics* 104(3), 985–1012.
- Fritz, C., G. De Nicola, S. Kevork, D. Harhoff, and G. Kauermann (2023). Modelling the large and dynamically growing bipartite network of German patents and inventors. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society* 186(3), 557–576.
- Gallagher, C., D. Lusher, J. Koskinen, B. Roden, P. Wang, A. Gosling, A. Polyzos, M. Stenzel, S. Hegarty, T. Spurling, and G. Simpson (2023). Network patterns of university-industry collaboration: A case study of the chemical sciences in australia. *Scientometrics* 128(8), 4559–4588.
- Garfield, E. (1964). *Citation Data in Writing the History of Science*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA.
- Griffith, B. C. and N. C. Mullins (1972). Coherent social groups in scientific change. *Science* 177(4053), 959–964.
- Hagstrom, W. O. (1965). *The scientific community*. New York: basic books.
- Holland, P. W. and S. Leinhardt (1974). Measurement error in sociometry. In H. Blalock (Ed.), *Measurement in the Social Science: Theories and Strategy* (University of Washington ed.), pp. 187–211. Washington, D.C.

- Hummon, N. P. and P. Doreian (1989). Connectivity in a citation network: The development of dna theory. *Social Networks* 11(1), 39–63.
- Jones, B. F., S. Wuchty, and B. Uzzi (2008). Multi-university research teams: Shifting impact, geography, and stratification in science. *Science* 322(5905), 1259–1262.
- Kadushin, C. (1966). The friends and supporters of psychotherapy: On social circles in urban life. *American Sociological Review* 31(6), 786–802.
- Kronegger, L., A. Ferligoj, and P. Doreian (2011). On the dynamics of national scientific systems. *Quality & Quantity* 45(5), 989–1015.
- Kuhn, T. S. (2012). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. University of Chicago Press.
- Leahey, E. (2016). From sole investigator to team scientist: Trends in the practice and study of research collaboration. *Annual Review of Sociology* 42, 81–100.
- Lerner, J. and M.-G. Hâncean (2023). Micro-level network dynamics of scientific collaboration and impact: relational hyperevent models for the analysis of coauthor networks. *Network Science* 11(1), 5–35.
- Lerner, J., M.-G. Hâncean, and A. Lomi (2024). Relational hyperevent models for the co-evolution of coauthoring and citation networks. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society* qnae068.
- Lerner, J. and A. Lomi (2022). A dynamic model for the mutual constitution of individuals and events. *Journal of Complex Networks* 10(2), cnac004.
- Lerner, J. and A. Lomi (2023). Relational hyperevent models for polyadic interaction networks. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society* 186(3), 577–600.
- Lerner, J., A. Lomi, J. Mowbray, N. Rollings, and M. Tranmer (2021). Dynamic network analysis of contact diaries. *Social Networks* 66, 224–236.
- Leydesdorff, L. (1998). Theories of citation? *Scientometrics* 43, 5–25.
- Leydesdorff, L. and L. Vaughan (2006). Co-occurrence matrices and their applications in information science: Extending aca to the web environment. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 57(12), 1616–1628.

- McFadden, D. (1973). Conditional logit analysis of qualitative choice behaviour. In P. Zarembka (Ed.), *Frontiers in Econometrics*, pp. 105–142. New York, NY, USA: Academic Press New York.
- Merton, R. K. (1968). The matthew effect in science: The reward and communication systems of science are considered. *Science* 159(3810), 56–63.
- Merton, R. K. (1988). The matthew effect in science, ii: Cumulative advantage and the symbolism of intellectual property. *Isis* 79(4), 606–623.
- Merton, R. K. (2000). On the garfield input to the sociology of science: A retrospective collage. In B. Cronin and H. B. Atkins (Eds.), *The web of knowledge: A festschrift in honor of Eugene Garfield*, pp. 435–448. Medford, New Jersey: Information Today, Inc.
- Moody, J. (2004). The structure of a social science collaboration network: Disciplinary cohesion from 1963 to 1999. *American Sociological Review* 69(2), 213–238.
- Moody, J. and R. Light (2006). A view from above: The evolving sociological landscape. *The American Sociologist* 37(2), 67–86.
- Mullins, N. C. (1972). The development of a scientific specialty: The phage group and the origins of molecular biology. *Minerva* 10, 51–82.
- Mullins, N. C. (1973). The development of specialties in social science: The case of ethnomethodology. *Science Studies* 3(3), 245–273.
- Mullins, N. C., L. L. Hargens, P. K. Hecht, and E. L. Kick (1977). The group structure of cocitation clusters: A comparative study. *American Sociological Review*, 552–562.
- Mullins, N. C. and C. J. Mullins (1973). *Theories and Theory Groups in Contemporary American Sociology*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Mützel, S. and R. L. Breiger (2020). Duality beyond persons and groups. In R. Light and J. Moody (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Social Networks*, pp. 392–413. Oxford University Press.
- Newman, M. E. J. (2001). Clustering and preferential attachment in growing networks. *Physical Review E* 64(2), 025102.

- Nicolaisen, J. (2007). Citation analysis. *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology* 41(1), 609–641.
- Rivera, M. T., S. B. Soderstrom, and B. Uzzi (2010). Dynamics of dyads in social networks: Assortative, relational, and proximity mechanisms. *Annual Review of Sociology* 36, 91–115.
- Schrum, W. and N. C. Mullins (1988). *Network analysis in the study of science and technology*, pp. 107–133. Elsevier Science Publishers B.V. (North-Holland).
- Small, H. (1973). Co-citation in the scientific literature: A new measure of the relationship between two documents. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 24(4), 265–269.
- Small, H. and B. C. Griffith (1974). The structure of scientific literatures i: Identifying and graphing specialties. *Science Studies* 4(1), 17–40.
- Small, H. G. (1978). Cited documents as concept symbols. *Social Studies of Science* 8(3), 327–340.
- Snijders, T. A. B. (2001). The statistical evaluation of social network dynamics. *Sociological Methodology* 31(1), 361–395.
- Stadtfeld, C. and V. Amati (2021). Network mechanisms and network models. In M. Gianluca (Ed.), *Research Handbook on Analytical Sociology*, pp. 432–452. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Stadtfeld, C. and P. Block (2017). Interactions, actors, and time: Dynamic network actor models for relational events. *Sociological Science* 4, 318–352.
- Stadtfeld, C., J. Hollway, and P. Block (2017). Dynamic network actor models: Investigating coordination ties through time. *Sociological Methodology* 47(1), 1–40.
- Stark, T. H., J. A. Rambaran, and D. A. McFarland (2020). The meeting of minds: Forging social and intellectual networks within universities. *Sociological Science* 7, 433–464.
- Wang, F., J. Qiu, and H. Yu (2012). Research on the cross-citation relationship of core authors in scientometrics. *Scientometrics* 91(3), 1011–1033.

- White, H. D. (2011). Scientific and Scholarly Networks. In J. Scott and P. Carrington (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Social Network Analysis*, pp. 271–285. Sage.
- White, H. D. and B. C. Griffith (1981). Author cocitation: A literature measure of intellectual structure. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 32(3), 163–171.
- White, H. D., B. Wellman, and N. Nazer (2004). Does citation reflect social structure?: Longitudinal evidence from the “globenet” interdisciplinary research group. *Journal of the American Society for information Science and Technology* 55(2), 111–126.
- Wittek, M., C. Bartenhagen, and F. Berthold (2023). The development of stratification and segregation in a new scientific field: A study of collaboration among scientists in neuroblastoma research between 1975 and 2016. *Social Networks* 72, 80–107.
- Wuchty, S., B. F. Jones, and B. Uzzi (2007). The increasing dominance of teams in production of knowledge. *Science* 316(5827), 1036–1039.
- Zhao, D. and A. Strotmann (2008). Author bibliographic coupling: Another approach to citation-based author knowledge network analysis. *Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 45(1), 1–10.
- Zuccala, A. (2006). Modeling the invisible college. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 57(2), 152–168.

# Supplementary Material: Socio-cognitive Networks between Researchers

A	Related Models . . . . .	1
B	Interpretation of the Coefficients . . . . .	2
C	Specification of Statistics . . . . .	3
C.1	Definition of Network Attributes . . . . .	3
C.2	Statistics of the Author Model . . . . .	5
C.3	Statistics of the Citation Model . . . . .	9
D	Estimation . . . . .	15

## A Related Models

We define a probabilistic model for  $\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{T}) = \{w; t(w) \in \mathcal{T}\}$  encompassing the published work of the astronomers in Chile between 2013 and 2015. To empirically assess the socio-cognitive mechanisms specified in Sections 2 and 3, this framework should allow the specification of structural covariates and accommodate high-order interactions. Relational Event Models (REM) for dyadic interactions proposed by Butts (2008) are commonly employed for timestamped data since they can use fine-grained temporal information without the need for aggregation, which would be necessary for alternative methods, such as Temporal Exponential Graph Models (Robins and Pattison, 2001) and Stochastic Actor Oriented Models (Snijders, 2001; Snijders et al., 2010). Dyadic interactions cover settings where we are, e.g., interested in modeling the citations between works (Filippini-Mazzola and Wit, 2024) or co-authoring work (Fritz et al., 2023) but fail to capture higher-order interactions involving more than one sender and receiver for each event, which we call hyperevents. Adaptions of the framework based on latent variables (Rastelli and Corneli, 2023) or actor-oriented models (Stadtfeld et al., 2017; Stadtfeld and Block, 2017) are similarly not tailored towards hyperevents and are, in the former case, not able to incorporate theory-driven covariates derived from Section 2.

## B Interpretation of the Coefficients

One can interpret the coefficients  $\theta$  and  $\gamma$  in the same manner as coefficients for proportional hazard models. With  $p \in \{1, \dots, P\}$ , take two possible author sets  $A \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  and  $A^* \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  with  $A \neq A^*$  and let  $\theta_p$  and  $s_p(\mathcal{W}(t), A)$  refer to the  $p$ th coefficient and statistic of the author model in (2). If  $s_k(\mathcal{W}(t), A) = s_k(\mathcal{W}(t), A^*)$  for all  $k \neq p$  and  $s_p(\mathcal{W}(t), A) = s_p(\mathcal{W}(t), A^*) + 1$ ,  $\theta_p > 0$  is the multiplicative change that we are more likely to observe the author set  $A^*$  than  $A$ . The same interpretation holds for  $\gamma$  with the only difference that we compare two possible citation lists in a work while conditioning on the authors  $A$  and size of cited works  $C$ .

We illustrate this interpretation of coefficients with the statistic “*Heterogeneity Chilean*”, which is the ratio of author-pairs  $\{i, j\} \subset A$ , such that  $i$  is Chilean and  $j$  is not ( $\text{Chilean}(i) = 1$  and  $\text{Chilean}(j) = 0$ ) and described in Section C.1. The values of this statistic theoretically range from zero (all authors in  $A$  are Chilean, or none is Chilean) to one ( $A$  contains exactly two authors, of which one is Chilean and the other is not). The coefficient of this statistic in the author model is 0.8. This means that a set of authors  $A$  with  $s_{\text{Het. Chilean}}(\mathcal{W}(t), A) = 1$  is predicted to be  $\exp(0.8) = 2.23$  times more likely to be the set of coauthors of a published work than another set of authors  $A^*$  with  $s_{\text{Het. Chilean}}(\mathcal{W}(t), A^*)$ , all other statistics being equal. To provide another example, a set of authors  $A$  with  $s_{\text{Het. Chilean}}(\mathcal{W}(t), A) = 0.25$  is predicted to be  $\exp(0.25 \times 0.8) = 1.22$  times more likely to be the set of coauthors of a published work than a set of authors  $A^*$  with  $s_{\text{Het. Chilean}}(\mathcal{W}(t), A^*) = 0$ .

**Transformation of statistics.** We transform all endogenous statistics, that is, all statistics except “*Ratio Chilean*” and “*Heterogeneity Chilean*”, applying the square-root  $x \mapsto \sqrt{x}$ , as this typically leads to better model fit (Lerner and Lomi, 2023) by scaling down large values and hence attenuating skewness of statistics. Subsequently, we standardize statistics to mean zero (subtracting the mean value) and standard deviation one (dividing by the standard deviation). Division by the standard deviation scales parameters and standard errors in the opposite direction (i. e., multiplies them with the standard deviation) and hence does not affect parameter signs, z-values, or p-values. The standardization is motivated by considering one standard deviation a “typical variation” of statistics values among instances. A unit change in a statistic hence means a change by



one standard deviation. Centering statistics to mean zero has no effect on estimated parameters – already for the fact that the `coxph` function in the `survival` package centers covariates before estimation.

## C Specification of Statistics

The statistics at time point  $t \in \mathcal{T}$  for the set of authors  $A \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  and set of cited works  $C \subseteq \mathcal{W}(t)$ , denoted by  $s(\mathcal{W}(t), A)$  and  $h(\mathcal{W}(t), C, A)$  for the author and citation model, respectively, are functions of  $\mathcal{W}(t)$ , which includes the entire bibliographic information up until but not including  $t$ . As in the notation introduced in the main manuscript, the static exogenous binary information on whether a particular astronomer in the data is Chilean is included in  $\mathcal{W}(t)$ . In Section C.1, we define several time-dependent functions, which we call “*network attributes*”, summarizing past author-work, author-author, and work-work interactions. These network attributes act as building blocks for stating the statistics in our model, which we introduce consecutively (for the author model in Section C.2 and the citation model in Section C.3).

Most employed statistics are defined in Lerner et al. (2024). To produce a self-contained manuscript and adapt to the notation used in this paper, we provide a complete list of formulae defining the full model specification employed in Section 6.

### C.1 Definition of Network Attributes

**Author-Work Interaction:** The extent to which a set of authors  $A \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  has cited a set of works  $C \in \mathcal{W}(t)$  for  $t \in \mathcal{T}$  in joint publications is given by:

$$\text{cite}_t^{(a \rightarrow w)}(A, C) = \sum_{l \in \mathcal{W}(t)} \mathbb{1}(A \subseteq A(l) \wedge C \subseteq C(l)) .$$

Let  $\text{auth}_t^{(a \rightarrow w)}(i, h)$  be a binary attribute indicating if author  $i \in \mathcal{A}$  was an author of work  $h \in \mathcal{W}(t)$

$$\text{auth}_t^{(a \rightarrow w)}(i, h) = \mathbb{1}(i \in A(h)) .$$

Another attribute that serves as a base to define several different types of statistics characterizing our model is called *subset repetition of order*  $(k, k^*)$  with  $k, k^* \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ , not both being equal to zero. With this information, we quantify: (1) if a set of authors

$A \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  already coauthored one or several publications (possibly together with others); (2) if a set of publications  $C \in \mathcal{W}(t)$  published before  $t \in \mathcal{T}$  has been co-cited (possibly within a larger list of references); (3) if a set of authors  $A \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  have coauthored a publication citing a set of works  $C \in \mathcal{W}(t)$ . The two-dimensional order  $(k, k^*)$  with  $k, k^* \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$  of the subset repetition attribute evaluated for the set of authors  $A \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  and set of publications  $C \in \mathcal{W}(t)$  at  $t \in \mathcal{T}$  relates to the sizes of the subsets of authors and works that are repeated:

$$\text{subrep}_t^{(k, k^*)}(A, C) = \sum_{(A^*, C^*) \in \text{sub}(A, k) \times \text{sub}(C, k^*)} \frac{\text{cite}_t^{(a \rightarrow w)}(A^*, C^*)}{\binom{|A|}{k} \cdot \binom{|C|}{k^*}},$$

where  $\text{sub}(A, k)$  and  $\text{sub}(C, k^*)$  denote all possible subsets of actor set  $A$  of size  $k$  and all possible subsets of cited works  $C$  of size  $k^*$ , respectively.

**Author-Author Interaction:** For two authors  $i, j \in \mathcal{A}$ , past author-to-author citations are given by

$$\text{cite}_t^{(a \rightarrow a)}(i, j) = \sum_{l \in \mathcal{W}(t)} \mathbb{1} \left( \text{auth}_t^{(a \rightarrow w)}(i, l) \wedge \left( \sum_{m \in C(l)} \text{auth}_t^{(a \rightarrow w)}(j, m) \geq 1 \right) \right).$$

The network attribute  $p_t(i)$  for  $i \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $t \in \mathcal{T}$  denotes the citation popularity of  $i$ , i.e., how much past work of  $i$  is cited before  $t$ :

$$p_t^{(a)}(i) = \sum_{l \in \mathcal{W}(t)} \mathbb{1} \left( \left( \sum_{m \in C(l)} \text{auth}_t^{(a \rightarrow w)}(i, m) \right) \geq 1 \right).$$

Finally, we write

$$\text{coauth}_t^{(a)}(i, j) = \text{cite}_t^{(a \rightarrow w)}(\{i, j\}, \emptyset)$$

for authors  $i, j \in \mathcal{A}$  to indicate the number of coauthored papers of  $i$  and  $j$  before time  $t \in \mathcal{T}$ .

**Work-Work Interaction:** For the works  $h, k \in \mathcal{W}(t)$  published before  $t \in \mathcal{T}$ , the work-to-work interactions are represented by

$$\text{cite}_t^{(w \rightarrow w)}(k, h) = \mathbb{1}(h \in C(k)),$$

being the indicator of whether work  $h$  was cited in work  $k$ ,

## C.2 Statistics of the Author Model

The vector of statistics in the author model  $s(\mathcal{W}(t), A) \in \mathbb{R}^P$ , encompasses  $P \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$  separate terms, each capturing different facets how the author team  $A \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  is determined at time  $t \in \mathcal{T}$  given the bibliographic information from the past, which is denoted by  $\mathcal{W}(t)$ . Next, we describe each entry of this vector separately. We denote each entry of  $s(\mathcal{W}(t), A)$  by its name. For instance, if the statistic is called “*text*”, the statistic is denoted by  $s_{\text{text}}(\mathcal{W}(t), A)$  with corresponding coefficient  $\theta_{\text{text}}$ . In some cases, we shorten a statistic’s name for better readability. All statistics are visualized in Figure 7 and are given by:

$$s(\mathcal{W}(t), A) = \left( s_{\text{Ratio Chilean}}(\mathcal{W}(t), A), s_{\text{Het. Chilean}}(\mathcal{W}(t), A), \right. \\ f(s_{\text{Citation Pop. Author}}(\mathcal{W}(t), A)), f(s_{\text{Coauthor-Pair Rep.}}(\mathcal{W}(t), A)), \\ f(s_{\text{Coauthor-Triplet Rep.}}(\mathcal{W}(t), A)), f(s_{\text{Coauthor-Quartet Rep.}}(\mathcal{W}(t), A)), \\ f(s_{\text{Coll. with Citing Author}}(\mathcal{W}(t), A)), f(s_{\text{Clos. by Coauthor}}(\mathcal{W}(t), A)), \\ \left. f(s_{\text{Clos. by Work}}(\mathcal{W}(t), A)) \right),$$


where  $f : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  is the transformation function (square root and normalization) described in Section B.

**Exogenous Information on Authors** We define the ratio of Chilean scientists in a set of authors  $A \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  via the covariate

$$s_{\text{Ratio Chilean}}(\mathcal{W}(t), A) = \sum_{i \in A} \frac{\text{Chilean}(i)}{|A|},$$

where  $\text{Chilean}(i)$  is the binary indicator that is one if  $i$  is Chilean and zero otherwise. If  $\theta_{\text{Ratio Chilean}} > 0$ , the model suggests that Chileans are more likely to be included in the set of coauthors or, from another point of view, that Chileans publish at a higher rate than non-Chileans in our data set.

We define the heterogeneity of a group of scientists  $A \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  with respect to Chilean



**Figure 7** Statistics included in the Author Model.

nationality via the covariate

$$s_{\text{Het. Chilean}}(\mathcal{W}(t), A) = \sum_{\{i,j\} \in \text{sub}(A,2)} \frac{|\text{Chilean}(i) - \text{Chilean}(j)|}{\binom{|A|}{2}},$$

If  $\theta_{\text{Het. Chilean}} > 0$ , the model suggests that groups of authors tend to be more diverse with respect to Chilean nationality than expected by random selection of authors, that is, that groups of authors tend to mix Chileans with Non-Chileans.

**Citation Popularity of Author (Figure 7a)** We define the average citation popularity of a set of authors  $A \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  via the covariate

$$s_{\text{Citation Pop. Author}}(\mathcal{W}(t), A) = \sum_{i \in A} \frac{P_i^{(a)}(i)}{|A|}.$$

If  $\theta_{\text{Citation Pop. Author}} > 0$ , the model suggests that authors whose works have been cited more often in the past are more likely to publish future papers.

**Publication Activity by Groups of Authors (Figures 7b, 7c, 7d, and 7e)** For a set of authors  $A \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ , the average number of prior joint work is given by the statistic

$$s_{\text{Publication Act.}}(\mathcal{W}(t), A) = \text{subrep}_t^{(1,0)}(A, \emptyset),$$

which can be comprehended as a measure of the average past publication activity of authors in  $A$ . If  $\theta_{\text{Publication Activity}} > 0$ , then the model suggests that authors who have published more in the past publish at a higher rate in the future.

Previous collaboration among pairs of authors is captured by

$$s_{\text{Coauthor-Pair Rep.}}(\mathcal{W}(t), A) = \text{subrep}_t^{(2,0)}(A, \emptyset),$$

which averages the number of coauthored papers over all unordered pairs of authors in  $A$ . The statistics  $s_{\text{Coauthor-Triple Repetition}}(\mathcal{W}(t), A)$  and  $s_{\text{Coauthor-Quartet Repetition}}(\mathcal{W}(t), A)$  are defined along the same lines by using subset repetition of order  $(3, 0)$  and  $(4, 0)$ . If  $\theta_{\text{Coauthor-Pair Repetition}} > 0$ , then the model suggests that pairs of authors who have co-authored more papers in the past are more likely to be coauthors in the future. If  $\theta_{\text{Coauthor-Triple Repetition}} > 0$ , then the model suggests that triples of authors who have jointly co-authored more papers in the past are more likely to be coauthors in the future – on top of what is possibly explained by Coauthor-Pair Repetition. If  $\theta_{\text{Coauthor-Quartet Repetition}} > 0$ , then the model suggests that sets of four authors who have jointly co-authored more papers in the past are more likely to be coauthors in the future – on top of what is possibly explained by Repetition of Coauthor-Pairs or Triples.

**Collaborate with Citing Author (Figure 7f)** The tendency of authors to coauthor works with those who cited the authors previous work is captured by a statistic measuring

the past citation density within a set of authors  $A \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ :

$$s_{\text{Coll. with Citing Author}}(\mathcal{W}(t), A) = \sum_{\{i,j\} \in \text{sub}(A,2)} \frac{\text{cite}_t^{(a \rightarrow a)}(i, j) + \text{cite}_t^{(a \rightarrow a)}(j, i)}{2 \binom{|A|}{2}}.$$

If  $\theta_{\text{Coll. with Cit. Author}} > 0$ , then the model suggests that two authors  $i, j$  are more likely to coauthor a paper in the future if  $i$  has cited papers of  $j$  in the past, and/or if  $j$  has cited papers of  $i$  in the past.

**Closure by Author (Figure 7g)** Using the definition of  $\text{coauth}_t^{(a)}(i, j)$  from (1), the extent of authors in  $A \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  to coauthor works with the same “third” author is captured by:


$$s_{\text{Clos. by Coauthor}}(\mathcal{W}(t), A) = \sum_{\{i,j\} \in \text{sub}(A,2)} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{A}: k \neq i, j} \frac{\min\{\text{coauth}_t^{(a)}(i, k), \text{coauth}_t^{(a)}(j, k)\}}{\binom{|A|}{2}}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\min\{X\} \in \mathbb{R}$  denotes the minimum value in set  $X \subset \mathbb{R}$ . The “third” author in (1) is  $k \in \mathcal{A}$ , which has to be different from the authors of  $i, j \in A$ . If  $\theta_{\text{Clos. By Auth.}} > 0$ , then the model suggests that two authors  $i, j$  are more likely to coauthor a publication in the future if there is one (or more) “third” author  $k$  such that  $i$  has coauthored with  $k$  and  $j$  has coauthored (possibly different papers) with  $k$ .

**Closure by Citing same Work (Figure 7h)** A related covariate captures how much authors in  $A \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  have cited the same works in the past:

$$s_{\text{Clos. by Work}}(\mathcal{W}(t), A) = \sum_{\{i,j\} \in \text{sub}(A,2)} \sum_{l \in \mathcal{W}(t)} \frac{\min\{\text{cite}_t^{(a \rightarrow w)}(\{i\}, \{l\}), \text{cite}_t^{(a \rightarrow w)}(\{j\}, \{l\})\}}{\binom{|A|}{2}}.$$

If  $\theta_{\text{Clos. By Cit. same Work}} > 0$ , then the model suggests that two authors  $i, j$  are more likely to coauthor a publication in the future if  $i$  and  $j$  have cited the same work(s)  $l$  in the past (possibly when publishing different publications).



**Figure 8** Statistics included in the Citation Model.

### C.3 Statistics of the Citation Model

The vector of sufficient statistics of the citation model  $h(\mathcal{W}(t), \mathcal{C}, A) \in \mathbb{R}^Q$  encompasses  $Q \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$  separate terms, each capturing different facets how the set of citations  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{W}(t)$  is determined at time  $t \in \mathcal{T}$  given the bibliographic information from the past, which is denoted by  $\mathcal{W}(t)$ , and the author team  $A \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ . Similar to Section C.2, we describe each entry of this vector separately. We denote each entry of  $h(\mathcal{W}(t), \mathcal{C}, A)$  by its name. For instance, if the statistic is called “text”, the statistic is denoted by  $h_{\text{text}}(\mathcal{W}(t), \mathcal{C}, A)$  with corresponding coefficient  $\gamma_{\text{text}}$ . In some cases, we shorten a statistic’s name for better

readability. All statistics are visualized in Figures 8 and 9 and are given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
h(\mathcal{W}(t), C, A) = & \left( f(h_{\text{Cit. Pop. of Work}}(\mathcal{W}(t), C, A)), f(h_{\text{Cocitation Pop.: Pair}}(\mathcal{W}(t), C, A)), \right. \\
& f(h_{\text{Cocitation Pop.: Tri.}}(\mathcal{W}(t), C, A)), h_{\text{Citation Rep.}}(\mathcal{W}(t), C, A)), \\
& f(h_{\text{Outdegree Pop.}}(\mathcal{W}(t), C, A)), f(h_{\text{Cite Work and its Cit.}}(\mathcal{W}(t), C, A)), \\
& f(h_{\text{Self-Citation}}(\mathcal{W}(t), C, A)), f(h_{\text{Adopt Cit. of Coauth.}}(\mathcal{W}(t), C, A)), \\
& f(h_{\text{Cite Work of Coauthor}}(\mathcal{W}(t), C, A)), f(h_{\text{Author Cit. Author Rep.}}(\mathcal{W}(t), C, A)), \\
& f(h_{\text{Author Cit. Author Rec.}}(\mathcal{W}(t), C, A)), f(h_{\text{Cite much Cited Authors}}(\mathcal{W}(t), C, A)), \\
& \left. f(h_{\text{Cocite Coauthor Pairs}}(\mathcal{W}(t), C, A)), f(h_{\text{Author Cocitation}}(\mathcal{W}(t), C, A)) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where  $f : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  is the transformation function (square root and normalization) described in Section B.

**Citation and Co-citation Popularity (Figures 8a, 8b, and 8c)** For a set of works  $C \subseteq \mathcal{W}(t)$  that can be cited by author set  $A \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  at time  $t \in \mathcal{T}$ , the average number of past citations is captured by the statistic “*Citation Popularity of Work*”

$$h_{\text{Cit. Pop. of Work}}(\mathcal{W}(t), C, A) = \text{subrep}_t^{(0,1)}(\emptyset, C).$$

If  $\gamma_{\text{Cit. Pop. of Work}} > 0$ , a “rich get richer” effect is suggested such that academic works with a higher number of citations until time  $t$  are also more likely to be cited in the future. Co-citations of pairs and triples of publications are captured by

$$\begin{aligned}
h_{\text{Cocitation Pop.: Pair}}(\mathcal{W}(t), C, A) &= \text{subrep}_t^{(0,2)}(\emptyset, C) \\
h_{\text{Cocitation Pop.: Tri.}}(\mathcal{W}(t), C, A) &= \text{subrep}_t^{(0,3)}(\emptyset, C).
\end{aligned}$$

Positive parameters for these covariates suggest that pairs (or triples) of publications that were jointly cited before time  $t$  are more likely to be co-cited again in the future.

**Citation Repetition (Figure 8d)** To check if some authors in  $A \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  repeatedly cite the same work in  $C \subseteq \mathcal{W}(t)$ , we incorporate the following statistic:

$$h_{\text{Citation Rep.}}(\mathcal{W}(t), C, A) = \text{subrep}_t^{(1,1)}(A, C).$$



For  $\gamma_{\text{Citation Rep.}} > 0$ , the model implies that works previously cited by authors in  $A$  before time  $t$  are more likely to be cited again by authors in  $A$ .

**Outdegree Popularity (Figure 8e)** The average length of reference lists of a set of works  $C \subseteq \mathcal{W}(t)$  published before time  $t \in \mathcal{T}$  is given by

$$h_{\text{Outdegree Pop.}}(\mathcal{W}(t), C, A) = \frac{1}{|C|} \sum_{l \in C} |l|.$$

If  $\gamma_{\text{Outdegree Pop.}} > 0$ , we can interpret the result as a tendency to prefer citing works that, in turn, cite many other publications.

**Cite Work and its Citations (Figure 8f)** The tendency to adopt (some of) the references of a cited work is represented by the past citation density within a set of cited works  $C \subseteq \mathcal{W}(t)$  published before time  $t \in \mathcal{T}$ :

$$h_{\text{Cite Work and its Cit.}}(\mathcal{W}(t), C, A) = \sum_{\{h,k\} \in \text{sub}(C,2)} \frac{\text{cite}_t^{(w \rightarrow w)}(h, k) + \text{cite}_t^{(w \rightarrow w)}(k, h)}{\binom{|C|}{2}}.$$

If  $\gamma_{\text{Cite Work and its Cit.}} > 0$ , the model suggest that two publications  $h$  and  $k$  are more likely to be cocited in a future publication if  $h$  has cited  $k$  or if  $k$  has cited  $h$ .

**Self-Citation (Figure 9a)** To understand whether authors tend to cite their own past work we define the statistic “*Self-Citation*” being the density of the two-mode subgraph connecting a set of authors  $A \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  and a set of cited works  $C \subseteq \mathcal{W}(t)$ :

$$h_{\text{Self-Citation}}(\mathcal{W}(t), C, A) = \sum_{i \in A, k \in C} \frac{\text{auth}_t^{(a \rightarrow w)}(i, k)}{|A| \cdot |C|}.$$

If  $\gamma_{\text{Self-Citation}} > 0$ , the model suggest that a publication  $k$  is more likely to be cited by a publication having  $i$  among its authors, if  $i$  is an author of  $k$ .

**Adopt Citation of Coauthor (Figure 9b)** The amount to which authors  $A \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  cite works that have been cited before  $t \in \mathcal{T}$  by their coauthors is captured by the following statistic:

$$h_{\text{Adopt Cit. of Coauth.}}(\mathcal{W}(t), C, A) = \sum_{i \in A} \sum_{j \neq i} \sum_{l \in C} \frac{\min\{\text{coauth}_t^{(a)}(i, j), \text{cite}_t^{(a \rightarrow w)}(\{j\}, \{l\})\}}{|A| \cdot |C|}.$$

If  $\gamma_{\text{Adopt Cit. of Coauth}} > 0$ , the model suggest that a publication  $l$  is more likely to be cited by a publication having  $i$  among its authors, if there is one, or several, past coauthors  $j$  of  $i$  who has cited  $l$  in their prior work.

**Cite Work of Coauthor (Figure 9c)** Similarly, the propensity of authors to cite work that has been published by their past coauthors is measured by

$$h_{\text{Cite Work of Coauthor}}(\mathcal{W}(t), C, A) = \sum_{i \in A} \sum_{j \neq i} \sum_{l \in C} \frac{\min \{ \text{coauth}_i^{(a)}(i, j), \text{auth}_i^{(a \rightarrow w)}(j, l) \}}{|A| \cdot |C|} .$$

If  $\gamma_{\text{Cite Work of Coauthor}} > 0$ , the model suggest that a publication  $l$  is more likely to be cited by a publication having  $i$  among its authors, if there is one (or several) past coauthor  $j$  who is an author of  $l$ .

**Author Cites Author Repetition (Figure 9d)** The tendency of authors to repeatedly cite the work of the same authors is measured by


$$h_{\text{Author Cit. Author Rep.}}(\mathcal{W}(t), C, A) = \sum_{i \in A} \sum_{j \neq i} \sum_{l \in C} \frac{\min \{ \text{cite}_i^{(a \rightarrow a)}(i, j), \text{auth}_i^{(a \rightarrow w)}(j, l) \}}{|A| \cdot |C|} .$$

If  $\gamma_{\text{Author Cit. Author Rep}} > 0$ , the model suggest that a publication  $l$  is more likely to be cited by a publication having  $i$  among its authors, if there is one (or several) author  $j$  of  $l$ , such that  $i$  has already cited one (or several) past work of  $j$  (note that the past work of  $j$  that has been cited by  $i$  may be different from  $l$ ).

**Author Cites Author Reciprocation (Figure 9e)** The statistic “*Author Cites Author Reciprocation*” captures the extend to which authors cite works of other authors who have previously cited their work:

$$h_{\text{Author Cit. Author Rec.}}(\mathcal{W}(t), C, A) = \sum_{i \in A} \sum_{j \neq i} \sum_{l \in C} \frac{\min \{ \text{cite}_i^{(a \rightarrow a)}(j, i), \text{auth}_i^{(a \rightarrow w)}(j, l) \}}{|A| \cdot |C|} .$$

If  $\gamma_{\text{Author Cit. Author Rec}} > 0$ , the model suggest that a publication  $l$  is more likely to be cited by a publication having  $i$  among its authors, if there is one (or several) author  $j$  of  $l$ , such that  $j$  has already cited one (or several) past work of  $i$ . The difference to the author cites author repetition is that here the direction of past citations among  $i$  and  $j$



**Figure 9** Statistics included in the Citation Model (continued).

are reversed.

**Cite much Cited Authors (Figure 9f)** The tendency of citing work of authors whose (potentially other) work has received many citations before time  $t \in \mathcal{T}$  is captured in our model via the following statistic:

$$h_{\text{Cite much Cited Authors}}(\mathcal{W}(t), \mathcal{C}, A) = \sum_{l \in \mathcal{C}} \frac{\max \{p_t^{(a)}(i) : i \in A(l)\}}{|\mathcal{C}|}.$$

For each of the works  $l \in \mathcal{C}$ , we use the maximum citation popularity of any author  $i$  of  $l$ . Recall that the citation popularity of an author  $i$  at time  $t$  is the cumulative number of citations that any of  $i$ 's publication received strictly before  $t$ . This maximum

citation popularity is then averaged over all works in the possible list of citations  $C$ . If  $\gamma_{\text{Cite much Cited Authors}} > 0$ , the model suggests that a paper  $l$  is more likely to be cited if it has a scientist  $i$  with high citation popularity among its authors.

**Cocite Coauthor Pairs (Figure 9g)** The tendency to cocite pairs of publications that have been written by former coauthors is measured by the following statistics:

$$h_{\text{Cocite Coauthor Pairs}}(\mathcal{W}(t), C, A) = \sum_{\{k,l\} \in \binom{C}{2}} \frac{\mathbb{1} \left\{ \exists i, j \in \mathcal{A} : (\text{coauth}_i^{(a)}(i, j) > 0) \wedge \text{auth}_i^{(a \rightarrow w)}(i, k) \wedge \text{auth}_i^{(a \rightarrow w)}(j, l) \right\}}{\binom{|C|}{2}} .$$

The statistic computes the fraction of all pairs of works  $k, l$  in  $C$  in which an author  $i$  of  $k$  and an author  $j$  of  $l$  have coauthored at least one publication before  $t$ . If  $\gamma_{\text{Cocite Coauthor Pairs}} > 0$ , the model suggests that two papers  $k, l$  are more likely to be cocited if there are former coauthors  $i, j$  such that  $i$  is an author of  $k$  and  $j$  is an author of  $l$ . Note that the publication(s) coauthored by  $i$  and  $j$  may be different from  $k$  and different from  $l$ .

**Author Cocitation (Figure 9h)** The tendency to cocite pairs of publications that have been written by formerly cocited authors is measured by the following statistics.

$$h_{\text{Author Cocitation}}(\mathcal{W}(t), C, A) = \sum_{\{k,l\} \in \binom{C}{2}} \frac{\mathbb{1} \left\{ \exists i, j \in \mathcal{A} : (\text{cocite}_i^{(a)}(i, j) > 0) \wedge \text{auth}_i^{(a \rightarrow w)}(i, k) \wedge \text{auth}_i^{(a \rightarrow w)}(j, l) \right\}}{\binom{|C|}{2}} .$$

where  $\text{cocite}_i^{(a)}(i, j)$  denotes the count of publications published before  $t$  that cite at least one publication of authors  $i$  and at least one publication of authors  $j$  with  $i \neq j$  and  $i, j \in \mathcal{A}$ . The statistic computes the fraction of all pairs of works  $k, l$  in  $C$ , such that there is an author  $i$  of  $k$  and there is an author  $j$  of  $l$  that have been cocited by at least one publication before  $t$ . If  $\gamma_{\text{Author Cocitation}} > 0$ , the model suggests that two publications  $k, l$  are more likely to be cocited if there is an author  $i$  of  $k$  and there is an author  $j$  of  $l$  such that  $i$  and  $j$  have been cocited before by some work.

## D Estimation

Estimation of the unknown parameters  $\theta$  and  $\gamma$  is carried out by separately maximizing a case-control approximation of the partial likelihood arising from models (2) and (3) (for further information on this, we refer to Lerner et al., 2024). For estimating the authors model, we sample for every observed set of authors  $A$  up to 30,000 randomly selected alternative sets of authors  $A^* \neq A$  (“non-events” or “controls”) with  $|A^*| = |A|$ . For estimating the citation model, we sample for every observed set of references  $C$  up to 10,000 randomly selected alternative sets of works  $C^* \neq C$  (“non-events” or “controls”) with  $|C^*| = |C|$ . If the risk set size is smaller than 30,000 or 10,000 in the respective model, we use the entire risk set. (This is especially likely to happen in the author model for small sets of authors.)

We compute statistics of all events and sampled controls with the `eventnet` software (Lerner and Lomi, 2023) and estimate parameters with the `coxph` function of the R-package `survival` (Therneau, 2024), using robust estimation (Therneau and Grambsch, 2000). This is recommended for these types of models in cases where it cannot be guaranteed that the specified statistics capture all dependence on the past; see Aalen et al. (2008) and the discussion given in Lerner et al. (2024).

## Supplementary Material References

- Aalen, O. O., O. Borgan, and H. H. K. Gjessing (2008). *Survival and event history analysis: A process point of view*. New York: Springer.
- Butts, C. T. (2008). A relational event framework for social action. *Sociological Methodology* 38(1), 155–200.
- Filippi-Mazzola, E. and E. C. Wit (2024). A stochastic gradient relational event additive model for modelling US patent citations from 1976 to 2022. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series C: Applied Statistics* qlae023.
- Fritz, C., G. De Nicola, S. Kevork, D. Harhoff, and G. Kauermann (2023). Modelling the large and dynamically growing bipartite network of German patents and inventors. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society* 186(3), 557–576.

- Lerner, J., M.-G. Hâncean, and A. Lomi (2024). Relational hyperevent models for the co-evolution of coauthoring and citation networks. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society* *qnae068*.
- Lerner, J. and A. Lomi (2023). Relational hyperevent models for polyadic interaction networks. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society* *186*(3), 577–600.
- Rastelli, R. and M. Corneli (2023). Continuous latent position models for instantaneous interactions. *Network Science* *11*(4), 560–588.
- Robins, G. and P. Pattison (2001). Random graph models for temporal processes in social networks. *Journal of Mathematical Sociology* *25*(1), 5–41. Publisher: Taylor & Francis.
- Snijders, T. A. B. (2001). The statistical evaluation of social network dynamics. *Sociological Methodology* *31*(1), 361–395.
- Snijders, T. A. B., G. G. van de Bunt, and C. E. Steglich (2010). Introduction to stochastic actor-based models for network dynamics. *Social Networks* *32*(1), 44–60.
- Stadtfeld, C. and P. Block (2017). Interactions, actors, and time: Dynamic network actor models for relational events. *Sociological Science* *4*, 318–352.
- Stadtfeld, C., J. Hollway, and P. Block (2017). Dynamic network actor models: Investigating coordination ties through time. *Sociological Methodology* *47*(1), 1–40.
- Therneau, T. M. (2024). *A Package for Survival Analysis in R*. R package version 3.5-8.
- Therneau, T. M. and P. M. Grambsch (2000). *Modeling Survival Data: Extending the Cox Model*. New York: Springer.