

# Interdisciplinary Papers Supported by Disciplinary Grants Garner Deep and Broad Scientific Impact

Minsu Park<sup>1,2,3,4</sup>, Suman Kalyan Maity<sup>2,3,4</sup>, Stefan Wuchty<sup>5,6,7,8</sup>, Dashun Wang<sup>2,3,4,9,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Division of Social Science, New York University Abu Dhabi, Abu Dhabi, UAE

<sup>2</sup> Center for Science of Science and Innovation, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL, USA

<sup>3</sup> Northwestern Institute on Complex Systems, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL, USA

<sup>4</sup> Kellogg School of Management, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL, USA

<sup>5</sup> Department of Computer Science, University of Miami, Coral Gables, FL, USA

<sup>6</sup> Department of Biology, University of Miami, Coral Gables, FL, USA

<sup>7</sup> Sylvester Comprehensive Cancer Center, University of Miami, Miami, FL, USA

<sup>8</sup> Institute of Data Science and Computing, University of Miami, Miami, FL, USA

<sup>9</sup> McCormick School of Engineering, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL, USA

\* Correspondence to: [dashun.wang@northwestern.edu](mailto:dashun.wang@northwestern.edu)

**Interdisciplinary research has emerged as a hotbed for innovation and a key approach to addressing complex societal challenges<sup>1-7</sup>. The increasing dominance of grant-supported research in shaping scientific advances<sup>8-16</sup>, coupled with growing interest in funding interdisciplinary work<sup>2,7,14,17-20</sup>, raises fundamental questions about the effectiveness of interdisciplinary grants in fostering high-impact interdisciplinary research outcomes. Here, we quantify the interdisciplinarity of both research grants and publications, capturing 350,000 grants from 164 funding agencies across 26 countries and 1.3 million papers that acknowledged their support from 1985 to 2009. Our analysis uncovers two seemingly contradictory patterns: Interdisciplinary grants tend to produce interdisciplinary papers, which are generally associated with high impact. However, compared to disciplinary grants, interdisciplinary grants on average yield fewer papers and interdisciplinary papers they support tend to have substantially reduced impact. We demonstrate that the key to explaining this paradox lies in the power of disciplinary grants in propelling high-impact interdisciplinary research. Specifically, our results show that highly interdisciplinary papers supported by deeply disciplinary grants garner disproportionately more citations,**

**both within their core disciplines and from broader fields. Moreover, disciplinary grants, particularly when combined with other similar grants, are more effective in producing high-impact interdisciplinary research. Amidst the rapid rise of support for interdisciplinary work across the sciences, these results highlight the hitherto unknown role of disciplinary grants in driving crucial interdisciplinary advances, suggesting that interdisciplinary research requires deep disciplinary expertise and investments.**

Many scientific challenges today, from climate change to global pandemics, increasingly require expertise and resources bridging diverse disciplines<sup>1-3,5,7</sup>. Amidst the rapid growth in scale and complexity of the modern scientific enterprise<sup>2,3,21</sup>, coupled with the increasing specialization of individual expertise<sup>22,23</sup>, funding agencies and policymakers have been progressively focusing on grant programs that promote interdisciplinary work<sup>1,2,14,19</sup>. However, despite debates about the risks and benefits of interdisciplinary work among researchers and research institutions<sup>6,19,24,25</sup>, our knowledge of how interdisciplinary grants shape the interdisciplinary research landscape remains limited, obscuring best practices for nurturing interdisciplinary funding mechanisms, which are crucial for effectively supporting high-impact interdisciplinary endeavors.

Prior studies have underscored the growing significance and impact of interdisciplinary work across scientific disciplines<sup>7,20,26-30</sup> by employing metrics to quantify the interdisciplinarity of research *papers*<sup>29-32</sup>. Recent studies have begun to examine the impact of *grants* on their research outputs<sup>33-35</sup>, including efforts to predict grant productivity using machine learning techniques<sup>36,37</sup>. While these studies typically rely on data from a single agency or country<sup>13,36-40</sup>, they generally highlight the critical role of funding in propelling scientific progress, amidst the growing scale and complexity of science<sup>8,33</sup> and fiscal scarcity<sup>38</sup>. Overall, a notable gap remains in our understanding of the broader relationship between interdisciplinary grants and high-impact interdisciplinary advances they support.

To address this gap, we analyze 350 thousand grants from 164 funding agencies across 26 countries and 1.3 million research papers that acknowledged the support of these grants from 1985 to 2009 (see **Methods** for more details). We provide a descriptive account rather than test hypotheses of specific mechanisms that drive funding and research production activities. Our contribution lies in providing an extensive and robust empirical foundation through a systematic examination of the relationships between grant and their supported publications, with a particular

emphasis on interdisciplinary research and its outcomes based on the interdisciplinary attributes of both the publications and their supporting grants.

Specifically, we combine data from two large-scale grant and publication databases, the Dimensions<sup>41</sup> and the Microsoft Academic Graph (MAG)<sup>42</sup>, which are among the most comprehensive databases that cover scientific publications and grants<sup>43</sup>. Dimensions captures over 110 million publications, which acknowledge the support of more than 5 million research grants worldwide, while MAG contains more than 250 million research papers with standardized scientific field annotations for each paper. In defining research fields, we align with the notion of topical coherence as the systematic production of knowledge, particularly as manifested in content<sup>44–46</sup>. This approach, also grounded in the indexing and classification of publications in MAG, offers a common basis for our analysis. Similarly, contrary to views that define interdisciplinarity by the disciplinary backgrounds of grant recipients or paper authors, our study focuses on the thematic content of proposals and publications. This perspective is crucial for understanding the thematic continuity between a grant’s objectives and the resulting research output, highlighting the tangible link between the nature of a grant and the characteristics of the research it supports.

Our definition of interdisciplinarity emphasizes ‘diversity’ and ‘coherence,’ reflecting the integration of knowledge from multiple research fields and the intensity of relations between these knowledge bodies<sup>46</sup>. To operationalize this, we employ the Rao–Stirling diversity index, a well-established metric that allows us to capture the number of fields represented, their distribution, and their degree of difference<sup>20,26,29–32,47</sup> (see **Methods** for more details). While measuring the interdisciplinarity of papers is well established in the literature using bibliometric techniques based on references and citations<sup>20,26,29–32,47</sup>, existing methods are not directly applicable to assessing the interdisciplinarity of grants, partly due to the lack of a consistent field classification scheme and standardized reference systems in grants.

To assign grants from different agencies to research fields in one coherent framework, we use field classifications of papers and their abstracts in the MAG dataset (**Fig. 1a**) to learn text representations of each scientific field (**Fig. 1b**) using a supervised topic modeling method, Labeled-Latent Dirichlet Allocation (Labeled-LDA; see **Methods**). This method estimates word associations for each field, enabling us to calculate the probabilities of a grant’s association with scientific fields based on its abstract (**Fig. 1c**). We validate our model through various approaches,

including both human ratings and out-of-sample predictions, demonstrating reliable model outputs (see Supplementary Note 3). To determine the probability that a given publication is associated with a particular field, we use the fraction of paper's references or citations in that field as a proxy of topical inspiration or appeal, respectively (**Fig. 1d**; see **Methods**). We then quantify the level of interdisciplinarity of individual publications and grants on a scale from zero to one using the Rao-Stirling diversity, where a score of 0 indicates deeply disciplinary work and a score of 1 indicates the highest level of interdisciplinarity. This measure incorporates three sets of information (**Fig. 1f**), including the number of research fields (*volume*; **Fig. 1c,d**), their relative distribution (*balance*; **Fig. 1c,d**), and their differences (*disparity*; **Fig. 1e**). These data and methods provide a unique opportunity to study grants and papers under a unified field classification scheme.

**Figure 2a** shows an overall increasing trend in interdisciplinary research across the sciences over the past 25 years (see also Supplementary **Figs. S1,S2**), in line with previous observations<sup>7,20</sup>. Notably, since the mid-1990s, papers that acknowledged grant support have exhibited a higher level of interdisciplinarity, hinting at the relevant role of funding in fostering interdisciplinary work (see Supplementary **Fig. S3** for the robustness of this result controlling for author prominence and team size). We then examine 2,213,187 grant-paper pairs, capturing 1,293,934 publications and 350,526 supporting grants, and uncover two seemingly contradictory patterns.

Firstly, we observe that grants with higher interdisciplinarity tend to result in more interdisciplinary papers (**Fig. 2b** and Supplementary **Fig. S4**), and papers supported by interdisciplinary grants are found to attract citations from a wide range of disciplines (inset, **Fig. 2b**). Additionally, by calculating the paper-level hit rate, defined as the probability of a paper being in the top 5% of citations in its field and year<sup>48</sup>, we find that highly interdisciplinary papers tend to be more impactful (**Fig. 2c** and Supplementary **Fig. S5**). These findings suggest that interdisciplinary grants appear to fulfill their intended goal of producing high-impact interdisciplinary advances<sup>19,27,28</sup>.

However, a contrasting pattern emerges when we consider all grants regardless of their output. Surprisingly, interdisciplinary grants, on average, yield fewer papers compared to their disciplinary counterparts (**Fig. 2d**). Furthermore, despite an overall impact advantage of interdisciplinary papers (**Fig. 2c**), publications supported by interdisciplinary grants tend to have a significantly reduced impact (**Fig. 2e**). We confirm the robustness of these results across different

sample frames, including variations in funding agencies, time periods, disciplines, and countries (see Supplementary Note 5). Together, the results in **Fig. 2** highlight the importance of considering the interdisciplinary orientation of both grants and their supported papers to understand the success of grants and their research outcomes. This leads us to further investigate the joint distribution of grant-paper pairs.

To that end, we categorize grant-paper pairs based on the interdisciplinary orientations of both papers and their supporting grants and report the average hit rate of papers in each category (**Fig. 3**). While the hit rate tends to increase with the interdisciplinarity of publications (**Fig. 2c** and Supplementary **Fig. S5**), **Fig. 3a** reveals that highest-impact papers are predominantly found in the upper left corner, suggesting that interdisciplinary papers supported by disciplinary grants tend to garner disproportionately high impacts. Note that disciplinary grants are less likely to produce interdisciplinary papers on average (**Fig. 2b** and Supplementary **Fig. S4**). Nevertheless, our findings indicate a systematic decline in the impact of papers as the interdisciplinarity of their supporting grants increases, even when controlling for the level of paper interdisciplinarity (**Fig. 3b** and Supplementary **Fig. S6**). We further split our samples by different funding agencies, time periods, disciplines, and countries and repeat our analyses, pointing to the same results (see Supplementary Note 5).

While our results suggest that disciplinary grants appear to play an especially important role in supporting high-impact interdisciplinary advances, they also raise the question of why disciplinary grants tend to produce higher-impact interdisciplinary papers. One possibility is that disciplinary grants, born out of more established funding mechanisms<sup>1,14</sup>, might receive larger funding support and therefore are more likely to produce higher-impact work. However, we find that interdisciplinary grants, on average, garner larger funding amounts compared to disciplinary grants<sup>49</sup> (**Fig. 4a**). Moreover, we observe increased publication productivity and impact of disciplinary grants even when controlling for funding size. Specifically, as the interdisciplinarity of grants increases, both the average number of papers produced and the hit rate of papers supported by large- (**Fig. 4b**) and medium-sized (**Fig. 4c**) grants decrease sharply. Note that this decreasing pattern is more pronounced with larger funding while the baselines of productivity and impact rise with increasing funding size (see Supplementary **Fig. S7**).

Another potential explanation for the impact of disciplinary grants centers around the reception of ideas within disciplinary boundaries. For example, papers that were supported by

deeply disciplinary grants may have home-field advantages, allowing them to acquire more citations, particularly from within their own fields. To investigate this, we trace the top and bottom 25% of papers and supporting grants ranked by their interdisciplinarity. We then calculate the average number of citations that these papers received from within and outside their own field. **Fig. 4d** reveals that papers supported by disciplinary grants (top and bottom left) indeed enjoy a home-field advantage, as they accumulate more citations than expected from their own field. More importantly, interdisciplinary publications supported by disciplinary grants (top left) tend to garner higher impact not just within their core disciplines but also across broad and distant fields. This finding suggests that interdisciplinary papers supported by disciplinary grants are associated with both deep and broad scientific impact.

Finally, as teams are increasingly responsible for producing high-impact advances<sup>22,48,50-54</sup>, we ask whether specific combinations of grants are particularly suited for the production of high-impact interdisciplinary publications. For instance, highly disciplinary grants from distant disciplines may foster interdisciplinary advances by combining deep disciplinary expertise across disparate scientific fields. To investigate this, we consider papers that acknowledged support from multiple grants. For each paper, we compute both the average interdisciplinarity of the supporting grants and the average disciplinary distance between them. We then categorize these papers into four groups based on the interdisciplinarity and distance scores of their supporting grants. These groups represent different collaborative grant formats: proximate disciplinary grants; distant disciplinary grants; proximate interdisciplinary grants; and distant interdisciplinary grants (from left to right in **Fig. 4e**). Upon comparing the impact of papers supported by these four distinct collaborative formats, we find that papers garner the highest impact when they are highly interdisciplinary and supported by multiple disciplinary grants that are proximate in their intellectual space. Conversely, the impact of papers decreases when supported by distant disciplinary grants, and it further sinks for publications resulting from collaborations involving distant interdisciplinary grants. These patterns are robust after controlling for a range of funding- and author-level factors (see Supplementary Note 4). Overall, our results suggest that while distant disciplinary grants can span broader intellectual terrains, closely-related disciplinary grants tend to be more effective in producing impactful interdisciplinary work, further highlighting the significant role of disciplinary grants in fostering high-impact interdisciplinary advances (see Supplementary

Note 5 for the robustness of our key results across different funding agencies, time periods, disciplines, and countries).

Taken together, our results show that the broad and deep impacts of disciplinary grants are not simply a consequence of funding size, reception of ideas within disciplinary boundaries, or collaborative grant formats. Instead, even with comparable funding resources, disciplinary grants tend to be more effective in producing high-impact interdisciplinary advances than their interdisciplinary counterparts and seem especially powerful when paired with other closely related disciplinary grants. A contributing factor to this observation may be the tendency of interdisciplinary work, when fueled by disciplinary grants, to draw attention and garner citations from both its core field and broad external fields. While our analyses are correlational by nature and do not allow causal interpretations, these results are consistent with the view that “narrow work has broad impact”<sup>20</sup> and further emphasize the advantage of deep disciplinary expertise in the ambit of research<sup>22,55</sup>. At the same time, amidst the broad shifts toward interdisciplinary sciences<sup>7,20,26</sup>, our results highlight the enduring challenges of interdisciplinary work, suggesting that the fruits of interdisciplinary programs are not always guaranteed. While interdisciplinary grants appear to produce intended outcomes (i.e., papers with high interdisciplinarity), we find that highly interdisciplinary grants tend to produce fewer papers and see a reduced probability of producing highly impactful papers, despite having larger funding on average.

While unveiling the often-overlooked role of disciplinary grants in producing high-impact interdisciplinary advances, our findings suggest that funding bodies could more effectively gauge the potential success of research proposals by considering these insights with other relevant factors such as team size and composition<sup>48,51</sup> and research novelty<sup>54</sup>. Yet, our findings further reflect the substantial costs and risks of interdisciplinary research, emphasizing the need to manage tensions between different disciplinary and professional approaches (for research communities) and integrate deep disciplinary expertise to drive interdisciplinary work (for individual researchers and teams). Challenges might arise in particular from the difficulties in collaborative relationships<sup>56–58</sup>, developing a common language<sup>57,59,60</sup>, and focusing on a shared perspective from disparate viewpoints, cultures, and traditions<sup>1,59,61,62</sup>. The power of disciplinary grants in producing interdisciplinary advances that garner deep and broad impacts, therefore, raises key questions for academics, funders, and policymakers on how to best unleash the full potential of interdisciplinary research and programs.

## Methods

**Dataset of research grants and articles.** The Dimensions dataset<sup>41</sup> traces both scientific publications and the grants that they acknowledge. In this study, we focus on grants that were awarded after 1985. In total, we obtain 1,293,934 papers that were published before 2009 with at least one reference and one citation and acknowledged support from one of the 350,526 grants that were awarded in this timeframe. Overall, these papers and grants cover 292 fields and 164 funding agencies across 26 countries. We further complement this dataset with abstracts, fields of study labels, and reference and citation information from corresponding papers by merging the Dimensions data with the Microsoft Academic Graph (MAG) dataset<sup>42</sup>. Note that we provide further details on the extensive coverage and comprehensiveness of our data sources, which surpass those of other widely-used databases<sup>43</sup>, along with discussions addressing potential concerns in Supplementary Note 1.

**Fields of study.** Among the widely-used large-scale databases, including Scopus and the Web of Science (WoS), MAG uniquely classifies papers into fields of study based on their content, irrespective of the source of publication. This content-based classification aligns with our approach of defining a field of study by its systematic production of knowledge as manifested in publications<sup>44,45</sup>. Also, given the limitations of journal-based categorizations, especially in fields where journals are not the primary medium of scientific communication (e.g., Computer and Information Sciences), MAG's content-based classification offers a more coherent and comprehensive scheme.

In this study, we use the field information from the MAG dataset, which assigns each paper to at least one research field using a four-level hierarchical classification. Specifically, we associate each publication with 292 level-1 fields, which are comparable to the granularity of classifications in other popular bibliographic databases such as WoS. The validity of our approach is demonstrated by the similarity of our results on the longitudinal trends of interdisciplinarity of publications (**Fig. 2a**) with those reported in Gates et al. (2019)<sup>20</sup>, which relied on WoS data.

**Field representation in a grant (Labeled-LDA).** A key empirical challenge in quantifying the interdisciplinarity of grants is to systematically assign grants to the research fields that they belong to. Here, we develop a new method using Labeled-LDA<sup>63</sup>, allowing us to estimate the probability that a given grant is associated with a particular scientific field based on its abstract. Specifically,

we train our model on a sample of 572,302 paper abstracts and their corresponding field of study labels. We obtain this sample through random sampling of 1 million papers from the MAG dataset but exclude papers without level-1 field label or with abstracts under 100 words. The resulting model constructs a one-to-one correspondence between latent topics and labels, enabling us to learn a probability distribution of word-field associations. We validate our model through manual inspections on word-field associations as well as out-of-sample classification tasks (see Supplementary Note 3). Additionally, by applying our methods to papers, we find that the distances between fields computed by the Labeled-LDA method and citation patterns (described in the section on ‘Distance between fields’ below) are highly similar (Pearson’s  $r = 0.451$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ), showing high consistency between our method and the literature. These validation results also indicate that the used field categories are conceptually coherent and align well with general understandings of fields of study, thereby supporting the validity of MAG’s field categories.

In applying the trained Labeled-LDA model to individual grant abstracts, we calculate the probability of a grant being associated with specific scientific fields. In our assessment of grant interdisciplinarity, we re-normalize the field probabilities by excluding those with the lowest probability score, deemed irrelevant, to vary the number of pertinent fields (capturing the notion of volume and variety in the defined interdisciplinarity below). The estimation of field probabilities of grants is analogous to the vector of probabilities that a publication is associated with research fields as described below (see the section on ‘Field representation in a paper’). Note that we replicate the main results without the re-normalization process. Furthermore, our approach is not confined to a mere classification task. It is highly adept at estimating document-label *relevance* in probabilities across multiple pre-defined labels, which is particularly useful when a coherent labeling scheme is absent in one system (i.e., ‘grants’) but can be extrapolated from another (i.e., ‘papers’). This capability enables us to analyze both research grants and publications under a unified field classification scheme (see Supplementary Note 3 for more details).

**Field representation in a paper.** Following previous research<sup>20,26</sup>, we use a paper’s references to estimate interdisciplinary inspiration and its citations to estimate the interdisciplinary impact of a paper. We first represent each publication by a vector over 292 scientific fields,  $p$ . By considering all references of a paper, we compute the paper’s probability to belong to field  $i$  ( $p_i$ ) as a fraction of references that are associated with field  $i$ . We apply the same process when we consider citations of a paper.

**Distance between fields.** As scientific fields vary in their proximity, we compute the distance between fields by estimating the overall knowledge stock within a discipline. In particular, we consider the cumulative reference or citation vectors  $v_i$  over a set of  $n$  papers within the field  $i$ , where  $v_i = \{p_{1,i}, \dots, p_{n,i}\}$ . The distance,  $d_{ij}$ , is then defined as the cosine distance between fields  $i$  ( $v_i$ ) and  $j$  ( $v_j$ ),  $d_{ij} = 1 - \frac{v_i \cdot v_j}{|v_i| \cdot |v_j|}$ . Here, fields whose papers have very similar reference or citation patterns have a small distance  $d_{ij} \approx 0$ , while fields whose papers have very different reference or citation patterns have a large distance  $d_{ij} \approx 1$ . Using a  $M \times N$  discipline proportion matrix of  $p_i$  values (for each row, i.e., paper,  $\sum_i p_i = 1$ ), we compute the cosine distances between all field pairs. Note that the distances between fields that were determined from references and citations are highly similar (Pearson's  $r = 0.978$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ), indicating the robustness of this approach.

**Grant and paper interdisciplinarity (Rao-Stirling diversity).** Numerous metrics, including network and entropy measures, have been proposed to assess interdisciplinarity, possibly yielding inconsistent results<sup>46,64–66</sup>. However, consensus among scholars stipulates that simply counting the number of disciplines that occur in references and citations is inadequate for properly quantifying interdisciplinarity. A more comprehensive approach considers not only the count but also the relative proportion of each discipline (capturing entropy) and the distance between disciplines (reflecting the intrinsic dissimilarity between disciplines)<sup>20,29,66,67</sup>. For example, a paper primarily referencing computer science and information science is less diverse than one that equally draws from both computer science and economics. Consequently, the Rao-Stirling Diversity has emerged as a common measure to quantify interdisciplinary research<sup>20,26,29,32,47,66</sup>, despite potential areas for improvement. The Rao-Stirling index of a grant or a paper is defined as  $RS(p) = 2 \cdot \sum_{i \neq j} p_i p_j d_{ij}$ , where  $p_i$  ( $p_j$ ) is the probability that the underlying grant (or paper) is associated to discipline  $i$  ( $j$ ) while  $d_{ij}$  is the distance between discipline  $i$  and  $j$ . An RS score of 0 reflects a lack of interdisciplinarity (i.e., all references, citations, or grants are from the same discipline), whereas an RS score of 1 corresponds to the highest level of interdisciplinarity.

To provide more comprehensive understanding, in Supplementary Note 2, we discuss discrepancies in various measurement approaches of interdisciplinarity and potential confounding factors related to our interdisciplinary measure.

## References

1. Bromham, L., Dinnage, R. & Hua, X. Interdisciplinary research has consistently lower funding success. *Nature* **534**, 684–687 (2016).
2. Rylance, R. Grant giving: Global funders to focus on interdisciplinarity. *Nature* **525**, 313–315 (2015).
3. Ledford, H. How to solve the world’s biggest problems. *Nature* **525**, 308–311 (2015).
4. Szell, M., Ma, Y. & Sinatra, R. A Nobel opportunity for interdisciplinarity. *Nat. Phys.* **14**, 1075–1078 (2018).
5. and Institute of Medicine of the National Academies National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering. *Facilitating Interdisciplinary Research. Facilitating Interdisciplinary Research* (Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2005). doi:10.17226/11153.
6. Rhoten, D. & Parker, A. Risks and rewards of an interdisciplinary research path. *Science* **306**, 2046 (2004).
7. Van Noorden, R. Interdisciplinary research by the numbers. *Nature* **525**, 306–307 (2015).
8. Price, D. J. D. S. Little Science, Big Science. *Little Sci. Big Sci.* (1963) doi:10.7312/PRIC91844/HTML.
9. Stephan, P. *How Economics Shapes Science. How Economics Shapes Science* (Harvard University Press, 2012). doi:10.4159/harvard.9780674062757.
10. Lane, J. Assessing the impact of science funding. *Science* **324**, 1273–1275 (2009).
11. Ma, A., Mondragón, R. J. & Latora, V. Anatomy of funded research in science. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **112**, 14760–14765 (2015).
12. Wang, J., Lee, Y. N. & Walsh, J. P. Funding model and creativity in science: Competitive versus block funding and status contingency effects. *Res. Policy* **47**, 1070–1083 (2018).
13. Yan, E., Wu, C. & Song, M. The funding factor: a cross-disciplinary examination of the association between research funding and citation impact. *Scientometrics* **115**, 369–384 (2018).
14. Lyall, C., Bruce, A., Marsden, W. & Meagher, L. The role of funding agencies in creating interdisciplinary knowledge. *Sci. Public Policy* **40**, 62–71 (2013).
15. King, D. A. The scientific impact of nations. *Nature* **430**, 311–316 (2004).
16. Fleming, L., Greene, H., Li, G., Marx, M. & Yao, D. Government-funded research increasingly fuels innovation. *Science* **364**, 1139–1141 (2019).
17. Bloch, C. & Sørensen, M. P. The size of research funding: Trends and implications. *Sci. Public Policy* **42**, 30–43 (2015).
18. Bozeman, B. & Boardman, P. C. Managing the New Multipurpose, Multidiscipline University Research Centers: *Transform. Organ. Ser. - IBM Cent.* (2003).
19. Leahey, E., Beckman, C. M. & Stanko, T. L. Prominent but Less Productive: The Impact of Interdisciplinarity on Scientists’ Research. *Adm. Sci. Q.* **62**, 105–139 (2017).
20. Gates, A. J., Ke, Q., Varol, O. & Barabási, A. L. Nature’s reach: narrow work has broad impact. *Nature* **575**, 32–34 (2019).

21. Bloom, N., Jones, C. I., van Reenen, J. & Webb, M. Are ideas getting harder to find?†. *Am. Econ. Rev.* **110**, 1104–1144 (2020).
22. Jones, B. F. The burden of knowledge and the ‘death of the renaissance man’: Is innovation getting harder? *Rev. Econ. Stud.* (2009) doi:10.1111/j.1467-937X.2008.00531.x.
23. Teodoridis, F. Understanding team knowledge production: The interrelated roles of technology and expertise. *Manag. Sci.* **64**, 3625–3648 (2018).
24. Leahey, E. & Barringer, S. N. Universities’ commitment to interdisciplinary research: To what end? *Res. Policy* **49**, 103910 (2020).
25. Leahey, E. The Perks and Perils of Interdisciplinary Research. *Eur. Rev.* **26**, S55–S67 (2018).
26. Porter, A. L. & Rafols, I. Is science becoming more interdisciplinary? Measuring and mapping six research fields over time. *Scientometrics* **81**, 719–745 (2009).
27. Chen, S., Arsenault, C. & Larivière, V. Are top-cited papers more interdisciplinary? *J. Informetr.* **9**, 1034–1046 (2015).
28. Okamura, K. Interdisciplinarity revisited: evidence for research impact and dynamism. *Palgrave Commun.* **5**, (2019).
29. Wang, J., Thijs, B. & Glänzel, W. Interdisciplinarity and impact: Distinct effects of variety, balance, and disparity. *PLoS ONE* **10**, (2015).
30. Yegros-Yegros, A., Rafols, I. & D’Este, P. Does interdisciplinary research lead to higher citation impact? The different effect of proximal and distal interdisciplinarity. *PLoS ONE* **10**, (2015).
31. Porter, A. L., Roessner, J. D., Cohen, A. S. & Perreault, M. Interdisciplinary research: Meaning, metrics and nurture. *Res. Eval.* **15**, 187–195 (2006).
32. Wagner, C. S. *et al.* Approaches to understanding and measuring interdisciplinary scientific research (IDR): A review of the literature. *J. Informetr.* **5**, 14–26 (2011).
33. Fortin, J. M. & Currie, D. J. Big Science vs. Little Science: How Scientific Impact Scales with Funding. *PLoS ONE* **8**, e65263 (2013).
34. Jacob, B. A. & Lefgren, L. The impact of research grant funding on scientific productivity. *J. Public Econ.* **95**, 1168–1177 (2011).
35. Rigby, J. Looking for the impact of peer review: Does count of funding acknowledgements really predict research impact? *Scientometrics* **94**, 57–73 (2013).
36. Tohalino, J. A. V. & Amancio, D. R. On predicting research grants productivity via machine learning. *J. Informetr.* **16**, 101260 (2022).
37. Jang, H. Predicting funded research project performance based on machine learning. *Res. Eval.* **31**, 257–270 (2022).
38. Li, D., Azoulay, P. & Sampat, B. N. The applied value of public investments in biomedical research. *Science* **356**, 78–81 (2017).
39. Leydesdorff, L. & Wagner, C. Macro-level indicators of the relations between research funding and research output. *J. Informetr.* **3**, 353–362 (2009).

40. Wang, J. & Shapira, P. Funding acknowledgement analysis: An enhanced tool to investigate research sponsorship impacts: The case of nanotechnology. *Scientometrics* **87**, 563–586 (2011).
41. Herzog, C., Hook, D. & Konkiel, S. Dimensions: Bringing down barriers between scientometricians and data. *Quant. Sci. Stud.* **1**, 387–395 (2020).
42. Wang, K. *et al.* Microsoft academic graph: When experts are not enough. *Quant. Sci. Stud.* **1**, 396–413 (2020).
43. Visser, M., van Eck, N. J. & Waltman, L. Large-scale comparison of bibliographic data sources: Scopus, Web of Science, Dimensions, Crossref, and Microsoft Academic. *Quant. Sci. Stud.* **2**, 20–41 (2021).
44. Abbott, A. *Chaos of Disciplines*. (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 2001).
45. Sugimoto, C. R. & Weingart, S. The kaleidoscope of disciplinarity. *J. Doc.* **71**, 775–794 (2015).
46. Wang, Q. & Schneider, J. W. Consistency and validity of interdisciplinarity measures. *Quant. Sci. Stud.* **1**, 239–263 (2020).
47. Stirling, A. A general framework for analysing diversity in science, technology and society. *J. R. Soc. Interface* (2007) doi:10.1098/rsif.2007.0213.
48. Wuchty, S., Jones, B. F. & Uzzi, B. The increasing dominance of teams in production of knowledge. *Science* **316**, 1036–1039 (2007).
49. Ebadi, A. & Schifffauerova, A. How to receive more funding for your research? get connected to the right people. *PLoS ONE* (2015) doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0133061.
50. Stvilia, B. *et al.* Composition of scientific teams and publication productivity at a national science lab. *J. Am. Soc. Inf. Sci. Technol.* **62**, 270–283 (2011).
51. Jones, B. F., Wuchty, S. & Uzzi, B. Multi-university research teams: Shifting impact, geography, and stratification in science. *Science* **322**, 1259–1262 (2008).
52. Haeussler, C. & Sauermann, H. Division of labor in collaborative knowledge production: The role of team size and interdisciplinarity. *Res. Policy* **49**, (2020).
53. Wu, L., Wang, D. & Evans, J. A. Large teams develop and small teams disrupt science and technology. *Nature* **566**, 378–382 (2019).
54. Uzzi, B., Mukherjee, S., Stringer, M. & Jones, B. Atypical combinations and scientific impact. *Science* **342**, 468–472 (2013).
55. Hill, R., Yin, Y., Stein, C., Wang, D. & Jones, B. F. Adaptability and the Pivot Penalty in Science. *SSRN Electron. J.* (2021) doi:10.2139/ssrn.3886142.
56. Kraut, R., Galegher, J. & Egido, C. Relationships and tasks in scientific research collaborations. in *Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work, CSCW 229–245* (Association for Computing Machinery, 1986). doi:10.1145/637069.637098.
57. Hara, N., Solomon, P., Kim, S. L. & Sonnenwald, D. H. An emerging view of scientific collaboration: Scientists' perspectives on collaboration and factors that impact collaboration. *J. Am. Soc. Inf. Sci. Technol.* **54**, 952–965 (2003).

58. Cummings, J. N. & Kiesler, S. Collaborative research across disciplinary and organizational boundaries. *Soc. Stud. Sci.* **35**, 703–722 (2005).
59. Jeffrey, P. Smoothing the Waters: Observations on the Process of Cross-Disciplinary Research Collaboration. *Soc. Stud. Sci.* **33**, 539–562 (2003).
60. Bracken, L. J. & Oughton, E. A. ‘What do you mean?’ The importance of language in developing interdisciplinary research. *Trans. Inst. Br. Geogr.* **31**, 371–382 (2006).
61. Laudel, G. Conclave in the Tower of Babel: How peers review interdisciplinary research proposals. *Res. Eval.* **15**, 57–68 (2006).
62. Goring, S. J. *et al.* Improving the culture of interdisciplinary collaboration in ecology by expanding measures of success. *Front. Ecol. Environ.* **12**, 39–47 (2014).
63. Ramage, D., Hall, D., Nallapati, R. & Manning, C. D. Labeled LDA: A supervised topic model for credit attribution in multi-labeled corpora. in *Proceedings of the 2009 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing* 248–256 (Association for Computational Linguistics, Singapore, 2009).
64. Adams, Jonathan, Loach, Tamar, & Szomszor, Martin. Interdisciplinary Research: Methodologies for Identification and Assessment. *Digital Science* <https://www.digital-science.com/resource/methodologies-for-identification-and-assessment/> (2016).
65. Leydesdorff, L. & Rafols, I. Indicators of the interdisciplinarity of journals: Diversity, centrality, and citations. *J. Informetr.* **5**, 87–100 (2011).
66. Qun, Z. & Menghui, Y. An efficient entropy of sum approach for measuring diversity and interdisciplinarity. *J. Informetr.* **17**, 101425 (2023).
67. Larivière, V., Haustein, S. & Börner, K. Long-Distance Interdisciplinarity Leads to Higher Scientific Impact. *PLOS ONE* **10**, e0122565 (2015).


**Acknowledgements:** This work uses data sourced from Dimensions.ai through researcher access plans. The major part of this research is carried out during M.P.’s research fellowship at the Center for Science of Science and Innovation at Northwestern University.

**Funding:** D.W. is supported by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research under award numbers FA9550-17-1-0089 and FA9550-19-1-0354, National Science Foundation grant SBE 1829344, the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation G-2019-12485, and Peter G. Peterson Foundation 21048. S.W. is supported by National Science Foundation grants 2123635 and 2210023.

**Author contributions:** D.W., S.W., and M.P. conceived the project and designed the experiments; D.W. secured data; M.P. and S.K.M. performed empirical analyses with the help from D.W. and S.W.; M.P., S.W., and D.W. discussed and interpreted results; M.P., S.W., and D.W. wrote and edited the manuscript.


**Competing interests:** The authors declare no competing interests.

**Data and materials availability:** The data and code necessary to reproduce the main and supplementary results will be shared in a permanent repository.




**Fig. 1 | Quantifying the level of interdisciplinarity of individual publications and grants.**


Major publication databases assign each paper to certain scientific fields, while grant classifications are specific to individual funding agencies. **a**, We collect abstract and field labels of each publication from the Microsoft Academic Graph (MAG) database to build a semi-supervised topic model. **b**, Based on a large-scale representative sample of publications, we associate each word in an abstract with the field of study labels of the corresponding paper and *vice versa* using Labeled-Latent Dirichlet Allocation (Labeled-LDA), allowing us to obtain a robust representation of word associations for each scientific field. **c**, Using our trained Labeled-LDA model, we estimate the posterior probabilities that a grant belongs to a given scientific field based on the word distribution in the corresponding grant abstract. **d**, In turn, we calculate the probabilities that a paper belongs to a scientific discipline based on the fields of referenced and citing publications, respectively. **e**, We estimate the distances between scientific fields using cosine similarity between the reference (or citation) vectors that we obtain from corresponding publications in each field. Note that the reference- and citation-based distances are highly correlated with each other (Pearson’s  $r = 0.978$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ), suggesting that our result is insensitive to the measurement specification. **f**, Based on the field-relevance probabilities of grants and papers computed in **c,d** and distances between fields computed in **e**, we calculate the level of interdisciplinarity of each grant and paper with the Rao–Stirling diversity measure.



**Fig. 2 | Impacts of interdisciplinary grants.** **a**, Paper interdisciplinarity has been rising steadily from 1985-2009, and the increase of interdisciplinarity is more pronounced when we consider papers with grant support. **b**, Paper interdisciplinarity, as measured through paper references, increases as a function of the interdisciplinarity of supporting grants. Inset shows similar results when we consider paper interdisciplinarity based on citations. **c**, Papers with high interdisciplinarity inspirations (i.e., reference-based paper interdisciplinarity) have a higher chance to be hit papers (dashed line as the baseline). This relationship also holds for grant-supported papers. The number of papers resulting from a grant (**d**) and the propensity to produce hit papers (**e**) systematically decrease as grant interdisciplinarity increases.



**Fig. 3 | Impact of interdisciplinary papers as a function of grant interdisciplinarity. a,** Interdisciplinary papers from more disciplinary grants tend to be associated with higher impact. **b,** While the baseline average of impacts increases with paper’s interdisciplinarity (from Quintile 1 to Quintile 5), interdisciplinarity grants have an overall reduced probability of supporting impactful papers when controlling for papers with the same level of interdisciplinarity (based on references).



**Fig. 4 | Disciplinary grants and high-impact interdisciplinary papers.** **a**, Interdisciplinary grants tend to feature larger funding amounts. **b**, Considering only grants with large funding amounts (top 10%), we observe a sharp decline in both productivity (purple) and impact (orange) as a function of grant interdisciplinarity. **c** shows a similar pattern of diminishing returns when we focus on grants with median funding amounts (middle 10%). **d**, Interdisciplinary papers supported by disciplinary grants (top left) tend to have a similar or higher number of citations than baselines (dashed lines) both from inside and outside of their own fields. Other papers attract more citations than the random baseline either from their own field (disciplinary papers supported by disciplinary grants; bottom left), outside their own field (interdisciplinary papers supported by interdisciplinary grants; top right), or neither (disciplinary papers supported by interdisciplinary grants; bottom right). In **e**, we consider sets of the top and bottom 10% interdisciplinary papers based on their references that were supported by multiple grants. We calculate the distance between grants and further divide the groups of publications into sets of highly (dis)similar pairs of (inter)disciplinary grants. We find that high-impact interdisciplinary papers tend to acknowledge the support of closely related disciplinary grants.

Supplementary Information for  
**Interdisciplinary Papers Supported by Disciplinary Grants  
Garner Deep and Broad Impact**

Minsu Park<sup>1,2,3,4</sup>, Suman Kalyan Maity<sup>2,3,4</sup>, Stefan Wuchty<sup>5,6,7,8</sup>, Dashun Wang<sup>2,3,4,9</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Division of Social Science, New York University Abu Dhabi, Abu Dhabi, UAE

<sup>2</sup> Center for Science of Science and Innovation, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL, USA

<sup>3</sup> Northwestern Institute on Complex Systems, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL, USA

<sup>4</sup> Kellogg School of Management, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL, USA

<sup>5</sup> Department of Computer Science, University of Miami, Coral Gables, FL, USA

<sup>6</sup> Department of Biology, University of Miami, Coral Gables, FL, USA

<sup>7</sup> Sylvester Comprehensive Cancer Center, University of Miami, Miami, FL, USA

<sup>8</sup> Institute of Data Science and Computing, University of Miami, Miami, FL, USA

<sup>9</sup> McCormick School of Engineering, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL, USA

**This document includes:**

Supplementary Note 1: Data Sources and Potential Biases

Supplementary Note 2: Potential Issues in the Interdisciplinarity Measurement

Supplementary Note 3: Validation of Labeled-LDA Model

Supplementary Note 4: Multivariate Analysis

Supplementary Note 5: Robustness of the Results

Supplementary References 1-20

Supplementary Figures S1-14

Supplementary Tables S1-3

## **Supplementary Note 1: Data Sources and Potential Biases**

### **1.1 Potential Biases in the Coverage of Dimensions and Microsoft Academic Graph**

Our study uses two primary data sources, Dimensions<sup>1</sup> and the Microsoft Academic Graph (MAG)<sup>2</sup>. Dimensions is currently the only data source that offers extensive information on grants across various agencies, making it an invaluable resource for our analysis. A recent paper (Lin et al., 2023) highlighted that Dimensions encompasses 83.7% of grant-paper pairs from the NSF and 99.7% from the NIH, underscoring the dataset's coverage. On the other hand, MAG stands out for its comprehensive coverage of the scientific literature. In direct comparisons, such as the study by Visser et al. (2021)<sup>3</sup>, MAG has been shown to surpass other widely-used databases like Scopus, Web of Science (WoS), and Crossref, particularly in terms of comprehensiveness within specific publication types and the breadth of covered publication types. Notably, MAG includes not only conventional journals but also conference proceedings—a primary publication avenue in fields like Computer and Information Sciences—and non-English publications.

In our dataset, out of 5,796,221 papers supported by grants from 1985 to 2009 in Dimensions, only 360,985 papers could not be matched with their corresponding publications in MAG, resulting in a 93.8% match rate. We are, therefore, confident that the linkage between the two data sources does not introduce discernible biases. Furthermore, our various robustness checks, described in the Supplementary Note 4, involve applying specific filters to focus on select segments of the grants and publications. The consistency in our results across these subsamples bolsters the reliability of our conclusions and addresses concerns about potential biases stemming from the different coverages of the data sources.

### **1.2 Completeness of MAG and Its Implications**

While no dataset is perfectly exhaustive, MAG stands out for its extensive coverage and comprehensiveness of scientific literature, as mentioned above<sup>3</sup>. The completeness of MAG may vary over time—with more recent years being more complete—and across different countries of publication. However, our analyses have shown consistent results across various time periods and countries, as reported in Supplementary Note 4. This robustness alleviates concerns about the potential impact of any incompleteness in the dataset on the results and conclusions of our study. Furthermore, using the Web of Science (WoS) dataset, a recent study by Gates et al. (2019)<sup>4</sup> identified longitudinal trends in interdisciplinarity that closely mirror our findings. This

congruence indicates that the primary observations and conclusions of our study are likely to be replicated with other extensive datasets.

### **1.3 Availability of Dimensions Data and Reproducibility**

Regarding reproducibility concerns, it is important to note that MAG is publicly available, facilitating the replication of our study. The Dimensions dataset, while accessible, is not freely available. Researchers or institutions with access to Dimensions can directly reproduce our results. For those without access, SciSciNet<sup>5</sup> offers a viable alternative. It provides access to data from the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the National Institutes of Health (NIH), enabling researchers to validate key components of our findings. Although SciSciNet may not cover the entire scope of our analysis, it is particularly useful for replicating aspects of our study that rely primarily on NSF and NIH grants.

### **1.4 Geographical Distribution of the Grants and Papers**

A significant portion of our sample is concentrated in a number of countries, with the United States (62.9%), Japan (11.2%), China (8.8%), United Kingdom (3.9%), Belgium (3.9%), Russia (2.8%), and the Czech Republic (1.5%) being the most represented. Each of these countries accounts for more than 5,000 grants paired with at least one paper outcome. We acknowledge that this distribution may suggest a bias towards the scientific outputs and funding patterns prevalent in developed countries, particularly those with substantial investments in scientific research. However, this concentration is reflective of the global research landscape, where a few countries dominate scientific production and funding. Thus, we believe that the trends and patterns identified in our study offer valuable insights that are broadly applicable, especially in understanding the dynamics of interdisciplinary research and its impact. The cross-cultural robustness of our findings, as demonstrated in Supplementary **Fig. S11**, suggests that the principles and relationships we have explored are likely to be the case in other national contexts, though the specific magnitudes may differ.

To further bolster the cross-cultural validity of our results, we have extended our analysis to additional countries, including Japan, the United Kingdom, and Belgium, each with over 10,000 grant-paper pairings in our dataset, allowing for comprehensive replication. It is important to note a few exceptions that do not detract from our broader conclusions: In the UK, contrary to the general

trend, we observe a marginal decline rather than an increase in average funding amounts as grant interdisciplinarity rises. Similarly, in Belgium, the anticipated decrease in publication numbers with increasing grant interdisciplinarity is not observed; instead, these numbers appear to have plateaued. This consistency in findings across different countries further clarifies the generalizability of our results, particularly emphasizing their relevance to developed countries with significant scientific investments.

### **1.5 Distribution of Grants and Papers by Funding Types**

The distribution of grants and papers by funding types, particularly concerning the career stages of the investigators, can be another concern. For example, grants awarded to early-career researchers versus established scientists may exhibit significant differences in interdisciplinarity. Since our dataset does not provide detailed information on whether specific types of funding were designated for researchers at varying career stages, this limitation precludes us from directly analyzing the impact of career stage on research interdisciplinarity.

Nevertheless, we have indirectly examined this aspect through the lens of funding size as a proxy for the type and target of the funding. As reported in our study, while funding size does have a positive and significant impact on the success of publications, our analysis reveals that the influence of the interdisciplinarity of grants and papers on a paper's success is largely independent of the funding size (see Supplementary Note 4). This finding suggests that the interdisciplinarity inherent in the research, both from the perspective of grants and papers, plays a significant role in determining research success, along with other important factors like funding amount. Despite the absence of specific data on funding types for different career stages, this aspect of our analysis provides valuable insights into the role of interdisciplinarity in research success.

## **Supplementary Note 2: Potential Issues of the Interdisciplinarity Measurement**

### **2.1 Discrepancies in Measurement Approaches**

In the field of interdisciplinarity research, discrepancies in results across different measures often arise from the chosen unit of analysis. For example, assessing interdisciplinarity at higher groupings, such as fields or journals, can introduce complexities due to different methods of measuring aggregate interdisciplinarity. Our study, however, focuses on individual papers and grants as the primary units of analysis. In this specific context, different measures of

interdisciplinarity are expected to yield similar outcomes<sup>6</sup>, thereby ensuring a reasonable assessment of interdisciplinarity and avoiding the potential pitfalls of aggregate measurements.

Additionally, it is also important to note that the Rao-Stirling index, our chosen measure, is sensitive to the choice of the distance parameter. To mitigate this issue, we have used cosine distance, a recommended approach that suppresses the sensitivity to distance parameters<sup>7,8</sup>.

## **2.2 Relationships between Interdisciplinarity and Potential Confounding Factors**

### **2.2.1 Number of References and Citations**

Given that the reference and citation counts of papers have also been increasing over time<sup>9,10</sup>, somewhat mirroring the longitudinal trends in paper interdisciplinarity we observe (**Fig. 2a** and Supplementary **Fig. S1**), there may be concerns that our reported longitudinal trends are predominantly driven by the number of references cited in a paper and the number of citations it receives. However, Gates et al. (2019)<sup>4</sup> demonstrated that the Rao-Stirling Index, when conditioned on the number of references or citations, exhibits consistent trends over time, albeit with varying baselines. This means that the average trends over all articles (i.e., what we present) align with the qualitative trends observed when considering the number of references or citations. To maintain clarity in our presentation, we have chosen to report the average statistic for all articles, without differentiating based on reference or citation count.

To further ensure that the relationship between the impact and interdisciplinarity of papers is not confounded by the number of references, we added the number of references as a control variable in the regression and confirm that the results are identical (see Supplementary Note 4).

### **2.2.2 Number of Authors**

The trend of increasing authorship in papers over time<sup>11,12</sup> can raise questions about the stability of interdisciplinarity measures for analysis on longitudinal trends. To address this, we incorporated various team-related factors into our regression analysis, including proxies for team size such as the number of authors, grants, and institutes (see Supplementary Note 4 for more details). We also considered factors influencing success, like cross-cultural collaboration, as indicated by the number of funding countries. Our analysis shows that the effect sizes of our primary variables—paper interdisciplinarity, average grant interdisciplinarity, and grant-grant similarity—remain robust, suggesting that the increasing number of authors does not unduly influence the stability of interdisciplinarity patterns in our study.

### 2.2.3 Number of Research Fields

As the number of fields associated with a paper has been increasing over time—roughly about 3% from 1985 to 2009 (see Supplementary Fig. S8a)—and the average increase of the number of fields associated with a paper is also highly correlated with the average increase of the interdisciplinarity over time ( $r = 0.929$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ), there may be concerns about potential biases in our interdisciplinarity index, possibly explaining the increasing trend of interdisciplinarity shown in Fig. 2a. However, the interdisciplinarity conditioned on the number of fields associated with a paper shows the same trends over time (only the baseline is different; see Supplementary Fig. S8b). In other words, the average trends over all articles (i.e., what we present) matches the qualitative trends conditioned on the number of fields associated with a paper. This means that the interpretation of results and conclusion drawn from those results are not affected by this fact. Therefore, to simplify our presentation, we only report the average statistic over all articles regardless of the number of fields associated with a paper.

### Supplementary Note 3: Validation of Labeled-LDA Model

To estimate grant-field associations, we trained a Labeled-LDA model<sup>13</sup> using 573,302 abstracts randomly selected from the MAG database<sup>2</sup>, each associated with one or more of 292 field labels. Our choice of Labeled-LDA over other methods was informed by several considerations: (1) a widely-used text classifier such as Support Vector Machine (SVM)<sup>14</sup> does not provide a word-to-category probability distribution, which is essential information for interpretability of the classification outcomes; (2) such classifiers typically assign each document to a single label, which is not optimal for multi-label classifications; and (3) while standard topic models like Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA)<sup>15</sup> compute a word-to-category distribution, they are not designed for such computation with pre-defined classes, since they are unsupervised learning methods.

While approaches based on a Large Language Model (LLM) can offer an advanced classifier, they require the use of an arbitrary threshold to filter out irrelevant categories and do not inherently provide a probability distribution. In contrast, by employing a Dirichlet prior, topic models inherently produce a probability distribution across topics. Additionally, given that each document is represented by a limited number of topics (i.e., field labels), the less relevant topics are consequently assigned minimal or zero probability scores. This model behavior allows for the

intuitive identification of irrelevant fields without the need for an explicit threshold, while offering an accurate and probabilistic depiction of relevance across various fields<sup>13</sup>. This model behavior is particularly crucial for accurately and probabilistically depicting relevance across various fields.

Since we aimed to build a model that learns word distributions with document-specific label distributions (unlike SVM), incorporates supervision by constraining the topic model to use only those topics that correspond to a document's observed label set (unlike LDA), and automatically select relevant topics without introducing an arbitrary threshold (unlike LLM-based approaches), Labeled-LDA was an appropriate option. The resulting model constructed a one-to-one correspondence between latent topics and labels (fields), from which a word-label (i.e., word-field) distribution could be learned (see Supplementary **Table S1** for the top 10 words in each field by probability and FREX score<sup>16</sup>, a harmonic mean of relative frequency and exclusivity).

We evaluated the quality of our Labeled-LDA model using both human-centered and automated approaches as described below:

- **Direct human ratings:** We first estimated topic quality through direct ratings. We required an adequate number of raters to ensure sufficient statistical power (at least  $1 - \beta = 0.9$ ) and draw meaningful conclusions from human annotations. Following Hoyle et al. (2021)<sup>17</sup>, we had eighteen independent raters for each topic to obtain significance at  $\alpha = 0.05$ . These raters, all of whom held graduate degrees and resided in the United States, were recruited via Amazon Mechanical Turk and were compensated at a rate of 1.5 USD per survey, equivalent to roughly 18 USD/hour.

For the evaluation, we randomly selected 20 fields. For each field, we pulled the top 10 words by probability and the top 10 words by FREX score, resulting in a total of 20 words. Each rater was provided with ten field-word sets (as shown in Supplementary **Table S1**), randomly chosen from the 20 fields, and was asked to give the topic quality on a conventional three-point ordinal scale ranging from 1 (not very related) to 3 (very relevant)<sup>17,18</sup>. The average quality score was  $2.414 \pm 0.245$ , with all scores falling within the range of 1.722 to 2.778, indicating the high reliability of our topic model.

- **Out-of-sample prediction.** We further examined the model's multi-label classification performance using out-of-sample paper abstracts and their corresponding field labels. We randomly sampled 5,000 papers as testing data, yielding an average precision of 0.461, significantly higher than the random baseline of 0.006.

- **Distance between predicted and ground truth labels.** We trained the Labeled-LDA model to infer field-to-grant associations of grants using their abstracts. In this particular application, the outcome of posterior inference can be considered acceptable even if the field with the highest probability does not match the ground truth. For example, if the field with the highest probability of a grant is ‘Humanities’ while the ground truth is ‘Classics,’ the inference is still considered valid due to the conceptual similarity between these fields.

To test whether our model captures the perceived similarity/distance between fields properly, we computed the distance between predicted and ground truth labels using field-field similarities inferred by Labeled-LDA. In other words, we determined pairwise topic similarity based on word probability distributions (note that the Pearson correlation between pairwise distances of fields inferred by Labeled-LDA and citation patterns in **Fig. 1e** is 0.451,  $P < 0.001$ ), where a distance of 0 represents a perfect match and 1 indicates that the predicted field is conceptually the most distant field to the ground truth. The mean distance was 0.311, significantly smaller than the random baseline of 0.606 ( $P < 0.001$ ).

In sum, these validations ensure that the topic representation reasonably captures the nuances of each field and infers the field-grant associations effectively.

#### **Supplementary Note 4: Multivariate Analysis**

We additionally examined the robustness of the relationships between the paper’s impact and grant and paper interdisciplinarity using Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regressions. **Supplementary Table S2** reports the results of regression analyses of paper impact, operationalized as normalized 10-year citations (year and field controlled). The interdisciplinarity model (Model 1) consists of a paper’s interdisciplinary inspirations, mean interdisciplinarity of supporting grants, and mean grant-grant field similarity. The non-interdisciplinarity model (Model 2) includes the number of supporting grants, institutes, and funding countries as well as the total funding amounts in USD as grant-specific conditions and the number of authors as author-related conditions. We excluded other grant- and author-related variables such as the number of grant investigators and institutes involved in the paper due to multicollinearity. The combined model (Model 3) reports the effects of grant and paper interdisciplinarity net of non-interdisciplinary conditions. Note that we log-transformed the normalized 10-year citations, the total funding amounts, and the number of

supporting grants, institutes, funding countries, and authors to correct for the skewed distribution.

As shown in Supplementary **Table S2**, interdisciplinarity measures indeed make an additive contribution to the full models' explanatory power (0.060 in Model 3) as these measures improve the adjusted  $R^2$  of Model 2 (0.052) as much as the adjusted  $R^2$  of Model 1 (0.008) without significant changes in coefficients. Consistent with our main observations, the paper's level of interdisciplinary inspiration, the number of supporting grants, and the total funding amounts all exhibit positive impacts on the success of the paper ( $P < 0.001$  for all of these variables). Furthermore, the mean interdisciplinarity of grants has a negative impact on the paper's success ( $P < 0.001$ ), indicating that papers from more disciplinary research programs are more likely to be successful. The average similarity between supporting grants shows a positive relationship with the paper's success ( $P < 0.001$ ), indicating that papers are more successful if they were supported by more closely related grants instead of highly diverse grants, clearly confirming our main results. Finally, as reported previously<sup>19</sup>, the number of authors, grant-supporting institutes, and funding countries all show significant positive coefficients as well ( $P < 0.001$ ).

To further validate our results, we included an additional set of models in our regression analyses with year and disciplines as dummy variables, controlling for temporal trends and other factors associated with interdisciplinarity for both papers and grants. For these models, we did not normalize the dependent variable, C10, by year and field of study to avoid over-controlling these factors. We also standardized all continuous variables to address potential multicollinearity issues. The results, presented in Supplementary **Table S3**, show consistent findings even with the inclusion of those dummy variables, reinforcing the reliability of our results. Note that we have assessed multicollinearity using standard metrics, including the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) and condition indices, and found no concerns in our study. Specifically, the condition number is within acceptable limits, and the VIF values do not exceed the commonly used thresholds of 5 (all fall in the range of 1.07-1.74). This careful consideration of potential confounding factors and multicollinearity ensures that our conclusions are based on sound statistical analysis.

### **Supplementary Note 5: Robustness of the Results**

To confirm the robustness of our results based on all of the grant and publication data from 1985 to 2009, we replicated our key analyses in **Figs. 2b,d**, **Fig. 3a**, and **Figs. 4a,d**, considering different


funding agencies (NIH and NSF; Supplementary **Fig. S9**), time windows (before and after 2000; Supplementary **Fig. S10**), countries (United States and China, among others; Supplementary **Fig. S11**), and disciplines (Applied Sciences, Formal Sciences, Humanities, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences; Supplementary **Fig. S12-14**). While these results are almost identical to the observations we reported in the main text based on the entire data, there are a few key exceptions in cross-discipline analysis, summarized as follows:

- In Formal Sciences (including Computer Science and Mathematics), we found that more interdisciplinary grants tend to produce a higher number of papers.
- In Humanities (encompassing Art, History, and Philosophy), we observed that highly disciplinary papers supported by highly disciplinary grants tend to receive more citations, both from their core field and externally. Additionally, the number of papers plateaus even as the interdisciplinarity of grants increases. However, due to limited data points in this discipline, these statistics should be interpreted with caution.
- For other disciplines, such as Applied Sciences (Business, Engineering, Materials Science, and Medicine), Social Sciences (Economics, Geography, Geology, Sociology, Political Science, and Psychology), and Natural Sciences (Biology, Chemistry, Environmental Science, and Physics), all the patterns align closely with our main findings.


### Supplementary References

1. Herzog, C., Hook, D. & Konkiel, S. Dimensions: Bringing down barriers between scientometricians and data. *Quant. Sci. Stud.* **1**, 387–395 (2020).
2. Wang, K. *et al.* Microsoft academic graph: When experts are not enough. *Quant. Sci. Stud.* **1**, 396–413 (2020).
3. Visser, M., van Eck, N. J. & Waltman, L. Large-scale comparison of bibliographic data sources: Scopus, Web of Science, Dimensions, Crossref, and Microsoft Academic. *Quant. Sci. Stud.* **2**, 20–41 (2021).
4. Gates, A. J., Ke, Q., Varol, O. & Barabási, A. L. Nature’s reach: narrow work has broad impact. *Nature* **575**, 32–34 (2019).
5. Lin, Z., Yin, Y., Liu, L. & Wang, D. SciSciNet: A large-scale open data lake for the science of science research. *Sci. Data* **10**, 315 (2023).
6. Wang, Q. & Schneider, J. W. Consistency and validity of interdisciplinarity measures. *Quant. Sci. Stud.* **1**, 239–263 (2020).


7. Leydesdorff, L. & Rafols, I. Indicators of the interdisciplinarity of journals: Diversity, centrality, and citations. *J. Informetr.* **5**, 87–100 (2011).
8. Qun, Z. & Menghui, Y. An efficient entropy of sum approach for measuring diversity and interdisciplinarity. *J. Informetr.* **17**, 101425 (2023).
9. Nicolaisen, J. & Frandsen, T. F. Number of references: a large-scale study of interval ratios. *Scientometrics* **126**, 259–285 (2021).
10. Bornmann, L. & Mutz, R. Growth rates of modern science: A bibliometric analysis based on the number of publications and cited references. *J. Assoc. Inf. Sci. Technol.* **66**, 2215–2222 (2015).
11. Fortunato, S. *et al.* Science of science. *Science* **359**, eaao0185 (2018).
12. Wuchty, S., Jones, B. F. & Uzzi, B. The increasing dominance of teams in production of knowledge. *Science* **316**, 1036–1039 (2007).
13. Ramage, D., Hall, D., Nallapati, R. & Manning, C. D. Labeled LDA: A supervised topic model for credit attribution in multi-labeled corpora. in *Proceedings of the 2009 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing* 248–256 (Association for Computational Linguistics, Singapore, 2009).
14. Tong, S. & Koller, D. Support Vector Machine Active Learning with Applications to Text Classification. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 45–66 (2001) doi:10.1162/153244302760185243.
15. Blei, D. M., Ng, A. Y. & Jordan, M. I. Latent Dirichlet allocation. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* **3**, 993–1022 (2003).
16. Bischof, J. M. & Airoldi, E. M. Summarizing topical content with word frequency and exclusivity. in *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML 2012)* vol. 1 201–208 (2012).
17. Hoyle, A. *et al.* Is Automated Topic Model Evaluation Broken?: The Incoherence of Coherence. in *Proceedings of the Conference on Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2021)* (2021).
18. Mimno, D., Wallach, H. M., Talley, E., Leenders, M. & McCallum, A. Optimizing semantic coherence in topic models. in *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP 2011)* 262–272 (Association for Computational Linguistics, 2011).
19. Jones, B. F., Wuchty, S. & Uzzi, B. Multi-university research teams: Shifting impact, geography, and stratification in science. *Science* **322**, 1259–1262 (2008).
20. Rinia, E. J., Van Leeuwen, T. N., Bruins, E. E. W., Van Vuren, H. G. & Van Raan, A. F. J. Citation delay in interdisciplinary knowledge exchange. *Scientometrics* **51**, 293–309 (2001).




**Supplementary Fig. S1 | Mean interdisciplinarity of papers based on citations increased over time.** We obtained similar results to those in **Fig. 2a** when we considered the interdisciplinarity of papers through their received citations as a proxy for a publication's broad appeal. In turn, we observed a recent decline in the interdisciplinarity of citations that papers garnered that appeared to be roughly independent of grant support. Such an observation may be rooted in the fact that cross-discipline citations tend to emphasize older papers, suggesting that papers need time to accumulate more interdisciplinarity citations<sup>20</sup>.




**Supplementary Fig. S2 | Mean interdisciplinarity of grants increased over time.** While more interdisciplinary grants have been awarded over time, we curiously find that grants that produced published papers are less interdisciplinary than grants that produced no papers.




**Supplementary Fig. S3. Increased interdisciplinarity of grant supported papers, controlling for author prominence.** **a**, Papers acknowledging grant support (red lines) display a persistently higher reference-based interdisciplinarity compared to those without grant support (blue lines), across varying team sizes. **b**, This pattern is consistent when controlled for author prominence, measured by the highest citation counts among authors, where grant-supported papers (pink lines) maintain a higher interdisciplinarity than those without grant support (brown lines), especially when compared to papers of similar author prominence levels (same line types). **c** and **d**, Grant support is associated with increased citation-based interdisciplinarity, as well, with larger effects.




**Supplementary Fig. S4 | As expected, interdisciplinary grants were more likely to produce interdisciplinary papers while disciplinary grants tended to produce disciplinary papers.** Sorting publications according to their interdisciplinarity based on their references (ITD), we found that interdisciplinary grants tended to produce an increasing fraction of highly interdisciplinary papers (blue) that we defined as the top 10% of the papers ranked by interdisciplinarity. In turn, disciplinary grants supported more disciplinary publications (orange), which were defined as the bottom 10% of the papers ranked by interdisciplinarity.




**Supplementary Fig. S5 | The impact of papers increased with the higher diversity of disciplines that the paper influenced.** The hit rate of papers is the probability that a paper appears in the top 5% in the field and year in terms of the number of citations. By measuring the hit rate of papers as a function of interdisciplinarity appeal (i.e., citation-based paper interdisciplinarity), we find that more interdisciplinarity papers have a greater impact. Furthermore, trends are enforced when we considered papers supported by grants.




**Supplementary Fig. S6 | Interdisciplinary papers from more disciplinary grants tended to be associated with greater impact.** While interdisciplinary papers as a function of their citations had a greater chance of being hit papers (from Quintile 1 to Quintile 5), more disciplinary grants tended to support research with higher impact when comparing papers within the same interdisciplinarity level.




**Supplementary Fig. S7 | Increased publication productivity and impact of disciplinary grants at varied funding sizes.** **a**, Within each quintile of funding amounts, we find a trend of diminishing returns in paper production as grant interdisciplinarity grows. Notably, this effect is more pronounced for grants with larger funding amounts (from Quintile 1 to 5, ranging from smaller to larger funding amounts). Nevertheless, grants with larger budgets maintain a higher baseline for average publication numbers. **b**, Highly funded (Quintile 5), discipline-focused grants are most likely to yield hit papers. Across all but the lowest funding levels, there is a consistent rise in the average hit rate as grants become more discipline-specific, with this relationship strengthening in tandem with grant size.




**Supplementary Fig. S8 | Consistent temporal increase in the interdisciplinarity of papers, observed even when conditioned on the number of Fields of Study (FOS) associated with each paper. a,** The average FOS labels per paper shows an incremental rise of around 3% from 1985 to 2009. **b,** The level of paper interdisciplinarity, as measured by references, increases from 1985 to 2009. The increasing trend in the interdisciplinarity is highly similar across papers with different numbers of associated FOS. However, papers associated with a greater number of FOS exhibit a higher baseline level of interdisciplinarity.




**Supplementary Fig. S9 | Robustness of main results across different major funding agencies, including NIH (a-e) and NSF (f-j).** Consistently, more interdisciplinary grants tend to secure larger funding amounts (a, f). The interdisciplinarity of papers, based on references (citations; inset), increases with the interdisciplinarity of the supporting grants (b, g). Highly interdisciplinary grants show a lower propensity to produce publications (c, h). Interdisciplinary papers supported by more disciplinary grants tend to garner higher impact (d, i). Interdisciplinary papers backed by disciplinary grants (top left) tend to receive similar or more citations than random baselines, both from within and outside their fields. In contrast, other types of papers attract comparable or more citations than the random baseline either from their own field (disciplinary papers supported by disciplinary grants; bottom left), from outside their field (interdisciplinary papers supported by interdisciplinary grants; top right), or neither (disciplinary papers supported by interdisciplinary grants; bottom right; e, j).




**Supplementary Fig. S10 | Robustness of main results across different time windows, before 2000 (a-e) and after 2000 (f-j).** Consistently, more interdisciplinary grants tend to secure larger funding amounts (a, f). The interdisciplinarity of papers, based on references (citations; inset), increases with the interdisciplinarity of the supporting grants (b, g). Highly interdisciplinary grants show a lower propensity to produce publications (c, h). Interdisciplinary papers supported by more disciplinary grants tend to garner higher impact (d, i). Interdisciplinary papers backed by disciplinary grants (top left) tend to receive similar or more citations than random baselines, both from within and outside their fields. In contrast, other types of papers attract comparable or more citations than the random baseline either from their own field (disciplinary papers supported by disciplinary grants; bottom left), from outside their field (interdisciplinary papers supported by interdisciplinary grants; top right), or neither (disciplinary papers supported by interdisciplinary grants; bottom right; e, j).




**Supplementary Fig. S11 | Robustness of main results across culturally different countries, including the United States (a-e) and China (f-j).** Consistently, more interdisciplinary grants tend to secure larger funding amounts (a, f). The interdisciplinarity of papers, based on references (citations; inset), increases with the interdisciplinarity of the supporting grants (b, g). Highly interdisciplinary grants show a lower propensity to produce publications (c, h). Interdisciplinary papers supported by more disciplinary grants tend to garner higher impact (d, i). Interdisciplinary papers backed by disciplinary grants (top left) tend to receive similar or more citations than random baselines, both from within and outside their fields. In contrast, other types of papers attract comparable or more citations than the random baseline either from their own field (disciplinary papers supported by disciplinary grants; bottom left), from outside their field (interdisciplinary papers supported by interdisciplinary grants; top right), or a mix (disciplinary papers supported by interdisciplinary grants; bottom right; e, j).



**Supplementary Fig. S12 | Robustness of main results across different disciplines, including Applied Sciences (a-e) and Formal Sciences (f-j).** Consistently, more interdisciplinary grants tend to secure larger funding amounts (a, f). The interdisciplinarity of papers, based on references (citations; inset), increases with the interdisciplinarity of the supporting grants (b, g). In Applied Sciences, highly interdisciplinary grants are less likely to produce publications (c), whereas more interdisciplinary grants tend to result in a higher number of papers in Formal Sciences (h). In both disciplines, papers that are interdisciplinary and supported by disciplinary grants tend to achieve higher impact (d, i). In both Applied Sciences and Formal Sciences, interdisciplinary papers backed by disciplinary grants tend to receive similar or higher citation counts than random baselines, both from within and outside their fields (top left in e and j). But, in Formal Sciences, highly interdisciplinary papers supported by highly interdisciplinary grants tend to receive significantly more citations from outside their core field, while maintaining expected citation levels from within the core field (top right in j).



**Supplementary Fig. S13 | Robustness of main results across different disciplines, including Humanities (a-e) and Social Sciences (f-j).** In both Humanities and Social Sciences, grants with higher interdisciplinarity typically secured larger funding amounts (a, f). Paper interdisciplinarity based on references (citations; inset) increased as a function of grant interdisciplinarity (b, g). The number of papers supported by grants in Humanities plateaued with increasing grant interdisciplinarity (c), whereas a decreasing trend was observed in Social Sciences, similar to other conditions (h). The hit rate, conditional on both grant and paper interdisciplinarity, was less clear in Humanities due to limited data points (d), but, in Social Sciences, interdisciplinary papers supported by more disciplinary grants were associated with higher impact, aligning with trends in other conditions (i). In Humanities, highly disciplinary papers supported by disciplinary grants garnered more citations than expected from both within and outside their own field (bottom left in e). In contrast, this high and broad impact was observed for highly interdisciplinary papers supported by highly disciplinary grants in Social Sciences (top left in j). Note that the results pertaining to Humanities should be interpreted with caution due to the limited number of data points, which affects statistical reliability.



**Supplementary Fig. S14 | Robustness of main results in Natural Sciences.** Consistently, more interdisciplinary grants tend to secure larger funding amounts (a). The interdisciplinarity of papers, based on references (citations; inset), increases with the interdisciplinarity of the supporting grants (b). Highly interdisciplinary grants show a lower propensity to produce publications (c). Interdisciplinary papers supported by more disciplinary grants tend to garner higher impact (d). Interdisciplinary papers backed by disciplinary grants (top left; e) tend to receive similar or more citations than random baselines, both from within and outside their fields. In contrast, other types of papers attract comparable or more citations than the random baseline either from their own field (disciplinary papers supported by disciplinary grants; bottom left), from outside their field (interdisciplinary papers supported by interdisciplinary grants; top right), or neither (disciplinary papers supported by interdisciplinary grants; bottom right).

**Supplementary Table S1.** Fields with most representative words by probability and FREX score.

Field	Weight Type	Top 10 Words
Accounting	Probability	account, financi, manag, corpor, use, compani, audit, studi, govern, report
	FREX	auditor, audit, ifr, accrual, disclosur, gaap, csr, cpa, ceo, sharehold
Acoustics	Probability	use, acoust, frequenc, measur, sound, nois, signal, result, method, wave
	FREX	acoust, transduc, microphon, masker, loudspeak, hydrophon, reverber, piezoelectr, interaur, sonar
Actuarial Science	Probability	insur, risk, use, model, cost, studi, health, financi, paper, rate
	FREX	insur, annuiti, hmo, actuari, medicar, qali, nonfinanci, enrolle, mco, fsa
Advertising	Probability	advertis, use, product, media, consum, studi, market, brand, sport, effect
	FREX	advertis, wom, volleybal, basketbal, championship, brand, garvey, televis, c2c, olymp
Aeronautics	Probability	aircraft, flight, develop, system, aviat, air, crew, mission, control, safeti
	FREX	visor, warhead, powerpl, airspac, aircrew, cross-kick, front-row, usafa.edu, gadss, ohb
Aerospace Engineering	Probability	use, flight, design, system, test, perform, result, model, aircraft, develop
	FREX	hyperson, scramjet, thruster, airship, airfram, flowfield, hover, rocket, railgun, cubelab
Aesthetics	Probability	cultur, aesthet, art, work, music, one, life, also, modern, form
	FREX	aesthet, beckett, beauti, kemal, kemalist, alaranta, skin-bleach, woodcock, yang-m, doll
Agricultural Economics	Probability	product, agricultur, use, farm, price, increas, land, food, develop, farmer
	FREX	acreag, smallhold, t+1, pakcoy, post-harvest, sokoto, basod, fuelwood, obr, mendong
Agricultural Engineering	Probability	crop, agricultur, water, develop, rice, irrig, system, use, method, model
	FREX	sprinkler, harrow, eucommia, wacm, non-cultiv, capacity-bas, scallion, htp, hill-drop, fertilizer-middl
Agricultural Science	Probability	product, farmer, farm, use, studi, agricultur, market, crop, produc, research
	FREX	a©, gapoktan, lkm-a, bugday, kvk, khat, komponen, produktivita, petani, sistim
Agroforestry	Probability	forest, use, speci, soil, tree, product, land, manag, area, plant
	FREX	agroforestri, plantat, shrub, woodi, savanna, grassland, understori, woodland, homegarden, rangeland
Agronomy	Probability	soil, yield, plant, increas, n, effect, crop, use, differ, fertil
	FREX	tiller, weed, tillag, ryegrass, mulch, manur, npk, sorghum, panicl, clover
Algebra	Probability	algebra, gener, group, paper, use, teori, result, function, represent, properti
	FREX	drinfeld, quasi-hopf, monoid, lusztig, groebner, bialgebra, morita, galoi, pbw, krasner

<b>Algorithm</b>	<b>Probability</b>	algorithm, use, method, propos, result, base, data, model, paper, perform
	<b>FREX</b>	ldpc, precod, doa, ofdm, step-siz, glrt, papr, decod, frequency-select, watermark
<b>Analytical Chemistry</b>	<b>Probability</b>	use, film, temperatur, measur, sampl, surfac, result, increas, studi, method
	<b>FREX</b>	sputter, anneal, magnetron, xp, undop, photoluminesc, voltammetri, photoelectron, dope, as-deposit
<b>Anatomy</b>	<b>Probability</b>	cell, muscl, studi, nerv, use, differ, result, develop, increas, neuron
	<b>FREX</b>	axon, innerv, ganglion, nerv, dorsal, immunoreact, caudal, ventral, cartilag, myelin
<b>Ancient History</b>	<b>Probability</b>	centuri, histori, dynasti, period, war, time, year, first, one, empir
	<b>FREX</b>	shang, emperor, ottoman, zoroastrian, seljuk, constantinopl, jori, haile-selassi, yohann, patani
<b>Andrology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	group, sperm, embryo, cell, oocyt, rate, use, day, fertil, studi
	<b>FREX</b>	spermatozoa, acrosom, sperm, blastocyst, semen, cryopreserv, vitrif, oocyt, frozen-thaw, vitrifi
<b>Anesthesia</b>	<b>Probability</b>	group, patient, effect, studi, use, blood, treatment, p, increas, control
	<b>FREX</b>	anesthesia, analgesia, propofol, anaesthesia, anesthet, epidur, bupivacain, fentanyl, lidocain, intub
<b>Animal Science</b>	<b>Probability</b>	p, group, weight, day, differ, diet, effect, increas, feed, use
	<b>FREX</b>	heifer, calv, ewe, carcass, wean, sire, crossbr, holstein, rumen, cow
<b>Anthropology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	cultur, studi, anthropolog, social, articl, peopl, histori, paper, research, polit
	<b>FREX</b>	shaman, anthropologist, saami, gvp, bugi, ethnolog, anthropolog, nuer, comodif, ethnograph
<b>Applied Mathematics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	method, model, equat, use, problem, solut, function, system, estim, numer
	<b>FREX</b>	pitd, b-poli, ode, divergence-clean, karhunen-loev, krylov, volterra, sode, md-lvq, hemivari
<b>Applied Psychology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	use, studi, research, job, train, work, perform, psycholog, result, effect
	<b>FREX</b>	coach, hockey, rdm, emoji, mouthguard, bulli, luckasson, shiftwork, workout, ebd
<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	archaeolog, site, use, studi, cultur, area, date, new, one, period
	<b>FREX</b>	archaeolog, potteri, prehistor, neolith, archaeologist, bronz, figurin, sherd, palaeolith, obsidian
<b>Architectural Engineering</b>	<b>Probability</b>	build, design, energi, use, system, paper, space, studi, architectur, construct
	<b>FREX</b>	courtyard, hvac, glaze, bipv, leed, air-condit, occupants', multi-famili, gshp, biophil
<b>Arithmetic</b>	<b>Probability</b>	arithmet, number, use, adder, comput, multipli, method, design, multipl, paper
	<b>FREX</b>	soal, h*-algebra, kisi-kisi, ohm, place-valu, n-bit, clz, adder, m-spotti, jscac
<b>Art History</b>	<b>Probability</b>	work, de, art, new, one, book, first, year, time, histori
	<b>FREX</b>	rembrandt, abbott, painter, tarzan, terezin, nin, perrudja, welbi, matiss, kaempfer
<b>Artificial Intelligence</b>	<b>Probability</b>	use, model, system, network, learn, method, data, paper, propos, algorithm
	<b>FREX</b>	neural, cnn, backpropag, unsupervis, perceptron, mlp, dnn, robot, lstm, semi-supervis

<b>Astrobiology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	earth, mar, atmospher, surfac, impact, crater, planet, meteorit, solar, asteroid
	<b>FREX</b>	martian, meteorit, crater, asteroid, regolith, chondrit, astrobiolog, titan', shergottit, uranu
<b>Astronomy</b>	<b>Probability</b>	star, galaxi, observ, use, cluster, mass, system, present, result, stellar
	<b>FREX</b>	ngc, galaxi, photometri, stellar, photometr, dwarf, gyr, star, fe/h, mag
<b>Astrophysics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	observ, model, emiss, star, galaxi, line, x-ray, sourc, use, field
	<b>FREX</b>	pulsar, agn, grb, supernova, galact, quasar, accret, flare, redshift, halo
<b>Atmospheric Sciences</b>	<b>Probability</b>	model, observ, atmospher, measur, use, aerosol, cloud, temperatur, data, result
	<b>FREX</b>	stratospher, aerosol, tropospher, ozon, mesospher, microphys, thermospher, cirru, updraft, ppbv
<b>Atomic Physics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	energi, electron, state, use, ion, plasma, calcul, atom, result, measur
	<b>FREX</b>	rydberg, photoion, ioniz, cyclotron, autoion, kev, collision, auger, attosecond, vibron
<b>Audiology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	hear, patient, studi, use, test, result, subject, group, differ, auditori
	<b>FREX</b>	cochlear, tinnitu, hear, vestibular, nystagmu, sensorineur, audiometri, audiolog, abr, dpoae
<b>Automotive Engineering</b>	<b>Probability</b>	system, engin, vehicl, control, fuel, use, power, energi, electr, design
	<b>FREX</b>	brake, powertrain, egr, diesel, hev, gasolin, throttl, turbocharg, supercharg, phev
<b>Biochemical Engineering</b>	<b>Probability</b>	use, develop, chemic, method, bioreactor, system, engin, biolog, materi, cell
	<b>FREX</b>	kms005, c.robustum, mobili, microbiotest, bio-deriv, awc, efc, electroorgan, model-system, semi-mechanist
<b>Biochemistry</b>	<b>Probability</b>	activ, protein, acid, cell, enzym, effect, use, increas, studi, result
	<b>FREX</b>	microsom, reductas, pyruv, atpas, phospholipid, dehydrogenas, synthetas, phospholipas, purifi, kda
<b>Bioinformatics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	gene, use, protein, diseas, studi, develop, data, cancer, sequenc, method
	<b>FREX</b>	bioinformat, gwa, genome-wid, ptm, non-cod, mirna, pharmacogenom, lncrna, protocadherin, rna-seq
<b>Biological System</b>	<b>Probability</b>	model, predict, cell, network, data, paramet, protein, structur, quantit, develop
	<b>FREX</b>	smlm, time-aggreg, horse-tooth, d.e, bull', frap, mbei, rigescen, flow-ieg, tgt
<b>Biomedical Engineering</b>	<b>Probability</b>	use, tissu, cell, measur, studi, bone, method, imag, model, result
	<b>FREX</b>	scaffold, decellular, microneedl, tissue-engin, biomateri, biocompat, microbubbl, ivd, osteochondr, peuu
<b>Biophysics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	cell, membran, protein, use, channel, studi, activ, effect, structur, mechan
	<b>FREX</b>	ca <sup>2+</sup> , myosin, nucleosom, phospholamban, patch-clamp, pseudopod, protofibril, voltage-depend, psii, ncx
<b>Biotechnology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	product, use, plant, develop, food, genet, research, resist, method, new
	<b>FREX</b>	biotech, biotechnolog, germplasm, gmo, basmati, anuradhapura, bioprocess, single-cross, kirik, mycotoxin
<b>Botany</b>	<b>Probability</b>	plant, speci, use, differ, root, studi, growth, result, show, effect
	<b>FREX</b>	callu, auxin, plantlet, anther, phloem, cotyledon, xylem, mycorrhiz, explant, aphid

<b>Business Administration</b>	<b>Probability</b>	dan, yang, innov, ini, employe, research, der, develop, dalam, dengan
	<b>FREX</b>	personalo, ptsp, kjk, pemilihan, instansi, ka[zvetlen, bisinasi, organisasi, pplh, rhodia
<b>Calculus</b>	<b>Probability</b>	problem, teori, mathemat, calculu, method, use, paper, function, chapter, develop
	<b>FREX</b>	yanduan, homeorhesi, lpa2v, veiculo, paraconsist, sea-wav, coimplic, semi-uninorm, micro-perfor, bigeometr
<b>Cancer Research</b>	<b>Probability</b>	cell, cancer, express, tumor, gene, activ, effect, protein, studi, inhibit
	<b>FREX</b>	pten, survivin, cyclin, p53, emt, p16, xenograft, hypermethyl, myc, pdac
<b>Cardiology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	patient, coronari, heart, arteri, ventricular, left, cardiac, p, myocardi, group
	<b>FREX</b>	ventricular, atrial, mitral, coronari, echocardiographi, myocardi, tachycardia, aortic, angina, echocardiograph
<b>Cartography</b>	<b>Probability</b>	map, de, use, spatial, area, studi, data, la, urban, model
	<b>FREX</b>	cartograph, cartographi, ið, denizli, við, troca, tað, linfoma, gebaud, cyberbulli
<b>Cell Biology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	cell, protein, activ, signal, express, regul, function, role, studi, pathway
	<b>FREX</b>	autophagi, cytoskeleton, microtubul, golgi, integrin, endosom, mitosi, gtpase, actin, endocytosi
<b>Ceramic Materials</b>	<b>Probability</b>	void/modulu, wang, pi=0.475, treatment.”58, menella, si□f, spin-hyperfin, spin-flavour, feminist/gend, triglyceride/cholesteryl
	<b>FREX</b>	void/modulu, pi=0.475, wang, amyloid-depend, acid-grown, drug-bear, melatonin-pretr, globulin-γ, lmrnl/l, channel-perm
<b>Chemical Engineering</b>	<b>Probability</b>	use, surfac, result, film, particl, structur, prepar, temperatur, show, properti
	<b>FREX</b>	tio2, calcin, mesopor, anatas, tio, mah, nanocomposit, titania, pani, nanospher
<b>Chemical Physics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	struktur, surfac, dynam, molecul, molecular, model, studi, interact, use, simul
	<b>FREX</b>	h-bn, xe-129, nanopor, nanobubbl, dsdna, single-fil, nemat, thermophoresi, b-graphdiyn, counterion
<b>Chromatography</b>	<b>Probability</b>	use, method, extract, determin, sampl, concentr, acid, result, studi, detect
	<b>FREX</b>	chromatograph, chromatographi, hplc, elut, rsd, c18, reversed-phas, derivat, eluent, electrospray
<b>Civil Engineering</b>	<b>Probability</b>	construct, design, use, build, system, paper, structur, method, project, engin
	<b>FREX</b>	precast, formwork, pavement, asphalt, masonri, geotextil, semi-integr, geo-hazard, hma, dhw
<b>Classical Economics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	econom, growth, qualiti, russian, research, author, export, studi, structur, gener
	<b>FREX</b>	g-trust, russian, uber, decease”, trusted’, survey,2, trust.1, non-commod, coyl, savour
<b>Classical Mechanics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	equat, model, flow, use, wave, result, field, solut, effect, numer
	<b>FREX</b>	vortic, axisymmetr, incompress, reynold, vortex, streamwis, newtonian, inviscid, viscou, mech
<b>Classics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	histori, one, book, first, work, centuri, year, studi, time, univers
	<b>FREX</b>	herakl, andrew’, lind, nereu, crapsey, wawruch, swett, haggadah, rita, powhatan
<b>Climatology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	model, climat, temperatur, chang, region, use, precipit, data, period, increas
	<b>FREX</b>	sst, enso, monsoon, interannu, westerli, reanalysi, eof, anticyclon, downscal, extratrop

<b>Clinical Psychology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	studi, use, depress, group, result, measur, symptom, scale, effect, associ
	<b>FREX</b>	ptsd, posttraumat, subscal, perfection, anxieti, nssi, adhd, alexithymia, beck, ideat
<b>Cognitive Psychology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	task, memori, process, studi, effect, experi, result, differ, use, cognit
	<b>FREX</b>	distractor, prefront, nonword, fmri, other-rac, metacognit, event-rel, aphas, recollect, precuneu
<b>Cognitive Science</b>	<b>Probability</b>	cognit, process, theori, develop, research, brain, human, system, concept, model
	<b>FREX</b>	self-knowledg, neurosci, barsal, mouse-track, neuroscientist, languag.-, sociocomplex, spivey, marr, mahasiswa
<b>Combinatorial Chemistry</b>	<b>Probability</b>	peptid, compound, use, synthesi, activ, librari, develop, select, new, drug
	<b>FREX</b>	flupep, thioester, ba-tpq, m6a, galectin-1, desthpactylolid, ba-tpq-hydrogel, oeg, drug-lik, chemoinformat
<b>Combinatorics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	n, graph, g, k, x, number, set, p, f, r
	<b>FREX</b>	digraph, subgraph, undirect, vertex, matroid, hypergraph, polytop, cliqu, graph, n^
<b>Commerce</b>	<b>Probability</b>	market, product, industri, develop, retail, consum, trade, competit, countri, good
	<b>FREX</b>	cashless, upholst, bitcoin, sofa, the□, jewelleri, to□, mt103, sc4, padano
<b>Communication</b>	<b>Probability</b>	experi, differ, visual, two, use, result, effect, present, respons, task
	<b>FREX</b>	saccad, playback, distractor, duckl, courtship, stroph, svv, basc, conspecif, fepc
<b>Composite Material</b>	<b>Probability</b>	use, composit, properti, materi, result, increas, mechan, temperatur, effect, surfac
	<b>FREX</b>	tensil, filler, epoxi, modulu, mortar, ceram, flexur, polypropylen, sinter, indent
<b>Computational Biology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	use, protein, gene, sequenc, genom, method, model, studi, structur, approach
	<b>FREX</b>	dpcr, conopeptid, pri-mirna, srna, tfbss, bcr-abl1, metaproteom, decon, crispr/cas9, proteom
<b>Computational Chemistry</b>	<b>Probability</b>	calcul, energi, use, structur, method, molecul, function, state, electron, bond
	<b>FREX</b>	initio, b3lyp, ccsd, mp2, hartree-fock, hyperpolariz, solvat, multirefer, chem, semiempir
<b>Computational Physics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	field, method, simul, use, calcul, model, particl, plasma, magnet, result
	<b>FREX</b>	zdr, altp, line-pair, vlf/lf, rbed, beh, kdp, zh, water-ic, cr39
<b>Computational Science</b>	<b>Probability</b>	comput, use, simul, parallel, method, mesh, develop, algorithm, problem, grid
	<b>FREX</b>	mamico, thin-sheet, layer-pack, esfm, molecular-continuum, networks.-, cggverita, msmp, parallelis, meshfre
<b>Computer Architecture</b>	<b>Probability</b>	architectur, design, comput, system, perform, hardwar, use, applic, model, parallel
	<b>FREX</b>	sureselect, skx, soda-ii, mcsoc, peppher, ccga, vhd1-am, cross-cor, musra, subcachelin
<b>Computer Engineering</b>	<b>Probability</b>	design, comput, problem, model, process, system, data, applic, use, algorithm
	<b>FREX</b>	algor, mm-wave, hylcam, bg-gamp, tridaq, dcnn, nontermin, closest-vector, sub-6-ghz, efpicient
<b>Computer Graphics (Images)</b>	<b>Probability</b>	use, imag, model, graphic, data, display, visual, render, comput, system
	<b>FREX</b>	opengl, gamut, otogra, projector, stippl, shader, hologram, cd-atla, vtk, crossref

<b>Computer Hardware</b>	<b>Probability</b>	system, use, data, design, control, process, hardwar, implement, paper, signal
	<b>FREX</b>	overview.-, cpld, xilinx, mcu, chip.-, eeprom, a/d, micropost, fastbu, daq
<b>Computer Network</b>	<b>Probability</b>	network, propos, use, node, paper, perform, protocol, wireless, system, rout
	<b>FREX</b>	multicast, packet, manet, tcp, qo, handov, wsn, handoff, multi-hop, vanet
<b>Computer Security</b>	<b>Probability</b>	secur, system, attack, use, data, paper, inform, user, network, propos
	<b>FREX</b>	malici, password, malwar, authent, encrypt, ddo, cyber, signer, revoc, attack
<b>Computer Vision</b>	<b>Probability</b>	imag, use, method, propos, algorithm, result, object, base, detect, paper
	<b>FREX</b>	watermark, stereo, camera, pixel, hough, slam, jpeg, scene, rgb, registr
<b>Condensed Matter Physics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	magnet, temperatur, field, structur, effect, electron, result, state, phase, use
	<b>FREX</b>	ferromagnet, antiferromagnet, superconductor, phonon, magnetoresist, superconduct, josephson, kondo, superlattic, ferroelectr
<b>Construction Engineering</b>	<b>Probability</b>	construct, project, manag, design, engin, build, paper, inform, method, system
	<b>FREX</b>	fuze, civil-militari, ap1000, iptc, shipbreak, mine□select, lawnmow, sshac, self-seal, highway'
<b>Control Engineering</b>	<b>Probability</b>	control, system, use, model, paper, design, power, method, robot, propos
	<b>FREX</b>	microgrid, servo, stator, droop, teleoper, brushless, pmsm, robot, mechatron, dfig
<b>Control Theory</b>	<b>Probability</b>	control, system, use, model, method, propos, paper, result, design, base
	<b>FREX</b>	pid, closed-loop, lyapunov, lmi, time-delay, feedforward, kalman, backstep, pwm, discrete-tim
<b>Criminology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	crime, crimin, violenc, polic, offend, social, victim, justic, studi, prison
	<b>FREX</b>	homicid, offend, crime, criminolog, gang, crimin, prison, offenc, recidiv, probat
<b>Crystallography</b>	<b>Probability</b>	structur, crystal, atom, two, phase, x-ray, c, complex, form, diffract
	<b>FREX</b>	orthorhomb, monoclin, single-cryst, triclin, tetragon, octahedr, tetrahedra, trigon, octahedra, unit-cel
<b>Data Mining</b>	<b>Probability</b>	data, use, method, model, algorithm, propos, base, result, system, paper
	<b>FREX</b>	itemset, skylin, outlier, apriori, k-mean, biclust, kdd, c4.5, top-k, e-contract
<b>Data Science</b>	<b>Probability</b>	data, research, use, inform, analysi, model, system, develop, paper, method
	<b>FREX</b>	predispens, vgi, bibliometr, cmda, aloja, cyberinfrastructur, epigenom, sherborn', pridal, datam
<b>Database</b>	<b>Probability</b>	data, databas, system, use, inform, applic, manag, develop, paper, queri
	<b>FREX</b>	sql, hadoop, ldap, oracl, olap, warehous, databas, mysql, postgresql, hsct
<b>Demographic Economics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	incom, educ, inequ, household, effect, increas, countri, rate, women, growth
	<b>FREX</b>	de-industri, hukou, bribe, nonmetropolitan, in-migr, heirs', efu, k12, deconcentr, otl
<b>Demography</b>	<b>Probability</b>	age, studi, year, use, rate, women, popul, among, mortal, risk
	<b>FREX</b>	non-hispan, menarch, age-adjust, condom, age-specif, skinfold, lbw, bmi, breakfast, overweight

<b>Dentistry</b>	<b>Probability</b>	group, use, studi, dental, teeth, bone, result, patient, implant, treatment
	<b>FREX</b>	periodont, dentin, cari, gingiv, teeth, dentur, endodont, enamel, tooth, edentul
<b>Dermatology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	patient, skin, treatment, case, diseas, clinic, report, lesion, use, studi
	<b>FREX</b>	psoriasi, erythema, dermat, dermatolog, dermatologist, acn, tinea, papul, alopecia, nevu
<b>Development Economics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	econom, countri, develop, polit, state, polici, region, social, nation, govern
	<b>FREX</b>	asean, zanzibar, neopatrimoni, hiv aid, anti-american, authoritarian, dhow, burundi, macapag, geopolit
<b>Developmental Psychology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	children, studi, differ, use, behavior, result, parent, age, group, test
	<b>FREX</b>	autism, iq, asd, preschool, prosoci, subtest, toddler, stutter, parent-child, adhd
<b>Discrete Mathematics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	set, function, gener, problem, use, result, n, algorithm, paper, show
	<b>FREX</b>	boolean, codeword, nondeterminist, automaton, polynomial-tim, submodular, t-norm, undecid, non-mal, pushdown
<b>Distributed Computing</b>	<b>Probability</b>	system, network, use, model, distribut, applic, comput, propos, paper, servic
	<b>FREX</b>	p2p, middlewar, replica, peer-to-p, datacent, qo, deadlock, self-stabil, sdn, fat-tre
<b>Earth Science</b>	<b>Probability</b>	earth, geolog, studi, use, scienc, geotherm, area, climat, ocean, isotop
	<b>FREX</b>	micro-xrf, rsl, kunlun, ygrc, nsb, geopp, garzanti, bruneau-grand, fine-s, weiser
<b>Ecology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	speci, popul, use, studi, differ, result, increas, effect, habitat, area
	<b>FREX</b>	habitat, predat, prey, herbivor, forag, parasitoid, brood, trophic, microhabitat, macroinvertebr
<b>Econometrics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	model, use, estim, data, result, method, paper, price, studi, test
	<b>FREX</b>	copula, garch, arima, out-of-sampl, autoregress, heteroskedast, semiparametr, cointegr, econometr, heteroscedast
<b>Economic Geography</b>	<b>Probability</b>	urban, citi, spatial, industri, region, econom, develop, agglomer, structur, growth
	<b>FREX</b>	agroecolog, industrial/sector, man-land, lan-xin, border-region, xi'an, homeplace-bas, cmrg', gprd, wef
<b>Economic Growth</b>	<b>Probability</b>	develop, health, educ, countri, econom, social, rural, polici, govern, system
	<b>FREX</b>	mdg, microfin, rural, poverti, peasant, empower, unicef, countrysid, hiv/aid, livelihood
<b>Economic History</b>	<b>Probability</b>	war, polit, new, nation, histori, state, revolut, centuri, year, world
	<b>FREX</b>	stalin, lula, petrograd, unita, tonghak, shikai, i939, bolshevik, viet, lietuvinkai
<b>Economic Policy</b>	<b>Probability</b>	polici, econom, countri, govern, tax, fiscal, develop, reform, financi, public
	<b>FREX</b>	ceec, waemu, anti-money, bailout, re-elect, mdb, emtr, paygo, unibi, extra-budgetari
<b>Economic System</b>	<b>Probability</b>	develop, econom, economi, industri, system, social, region, polici, countri, govern
	<b>FREX</b>	soe, internationalis, post-socialist, subnat, inoguchi, foreign-invest, tnc, self-innov, europeanis, eoi
<b>Economy</b>	<b>Probability</b>	develop, econom, economi, region, industri, countri, paper, new, citi, market
	<b>FREX</b>	croissanc, zenmai, reunif, malaya, non-credit, wuppert, yodo, wine-mak, kib, mercosur

<b>Electrical Engineering</b>	<b>Probability</b>	power, system, use, voltag, current, circuit, design, paper, oper, high
	<b>FREX</b>	capacitor, breaker, igt, inductor, kv, voltag, thyristor, overvoltage, high-voltage, charger
<b>Electronic Engineering</b>	<b>Probability</b>	use, system, design, propos, result, power, paper, signal, perform, present
	<b>FREX</b>	cmo, ofdm, antenna, microstrip, uwb, ghz, wideband, vco, demodul, bandpass
<b>Embedded System</b>	<b>Probability</b>	system, design, use, control, paper, applic, softwar, base, data, test
	<b>FREX</b>	zigbe, microcontrol, bluetooth, s-box, mpso, usb, ethernet, arm9, puf, mcu
<b>Emergency Medicine</b>	<b>Probability</b>	patient, hospit, care, use, studi, ed, emerg, result, medic, rate
	<b>FREX</b>	readmiss, ed, pddi, triag, delirium, in-hospit, stemi, triss, dvt, micu
<b>Endocrinology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	rat, increas, effect, cell, activ, level, express, receptor, studi, respons
	<b>FREX</b>	angiotensin, melatonin, acth, ang, adren, hypothalam, prolactin, corticosteron, hypothalamu, pituitari
<b>Engineering Drawing</b>	<b>Probability</b>	design, use, system, process, method, develop, machin, model, paper, part
	<b>FREX</b>	pro/e, lath, autocad, knit, solidwork, fixtur, cad/cam, cnc, pro/toolkit, cutting-stock
<b>Engineering Ethics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	research, educ, develop, scienc, ethic, practic, technolog, engin, scientif, new
	<b>FREX</b>	jmd, mfr, strengths-bas, ebm, magdi, qir, backsourc, quality-ori, hta, wil
<b>Engineering Management</b>	<b>Probability</b>	manag, system, develop, project, engin, teach, technolog, paper, educ, design
	<b>FREX</b>	bcit, school-enterpris, comptia, cloudsm, iso9000, ssme, cdio, risk-inform, aiello, ganesha
<b>Engineering Physics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	materi, student, univers, engin, technolog, scienc, chemistri, research, energi, physic
	<b>FREX</b>	nbt, microvia, ipvt, hsinchu, screenprint, ibad, nemfet, solexel, cu3vo4, lmro
<b>Environmental Chemistry</b>	<b>Probability</b>	concentr, soil, water, use, organ, studi, sampl, metal, sediment, result
	<b>FREX</b>	pah, pbde, bioaccumul, ng/g, polychlorin, congen, pcdd/f, humic, pcb, mehg
<b>Environmental Economics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	energi, electr, system, develop, use, power, environment, econom, effici, model
	<b>FREX</b>	gscm, self-consumpt, feed-in, upss, ccgt, indc, pev, ricoh, v2g, growthfad
<b>Environmental Engineering</b>	<b>Probability</b>	water, use, concentr, studi, pollut, system, result, model, qualiti, emiss
	<b>FREX</b>	pm10, wwtp, coliform, denitrif, pm2.5, influent, biofilt, effluent, landfil, aerat
<b>Environmental Ethics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	human, cultur, develop, natur, social, societi, environment, ethic, peopl, life
	<b>FREX</b>	kinabalu, samskara, anthropocen, de-extinct, spondyloarthr, ecofeminist, samskara™, bajau, gada, flee
<b>Environmental Health</b>	<b>Probability</b>	health, use, studi, risk, exposur, among, result, diseas, associ, data
	<b>FREX</b>	asbesto, malaria, smokeless, smoke-fre, idu, stunt, farmwork, snack, tobacco, smoke
<b>Environmental Planning</b>	<b>Probability</b>	develop, urban, plan, environment, water, manag, area, use, land, citi
	<b>FREX</b>	resettl, eia, waterfront, brownfield, greenway, shadegan, sainj, parbati, city', land-use/cov

<b>Environmental Protection</b>	<b>Probability</b>	water, area, develop, environment, use, region, land, pollut, studi, protect
	<b>FREX</b>	icbp, bhutan, stockout, loch, possum, redd, tokai, tungiasi, geopark, wtr
<b>Environmental Resource Management</b>	<b>Probability</b>	develop, use, manag, environment, chang, sustain, system, resourc, studi, ecolog
	<b>FREX</b>	ecosystem, redd+, biodivers, social-ecolog, ecolog, emergi, esv, iczm, eco-econom, resili
<b>Epistemology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	theori, one, concept, natur, human, scienc, philosophi, paper, social, develop
	<b>FREX</b>	metaphys, kant, epistem, epistemolog, hegel, heidegg, philosoph, hume, nietzsch, husserl
<b>Ethnology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	de, le, et, la, cultur, histori, peopl, dan, nation, du
	<b>FREX</b>	mijikenda, haida, saramaka, beriberi, acadian, afro-hispan, anne, canadien, biafra, aiy
<b>Evolutionary Biology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	genet, speci, popul, evolut, select, gene, evolutionari, use, studi, differ
	<b>FREX</b>	phylogeni, supertre, cheater, half-chromatid, eutherian, neandert, trpr, simulan, angraecum, evol
<b>Family Medicine</b>	<b>Probability</b>	patient, health, care, use, studi, medic, clinic, result, practic, provid
	<b>FREX</b>	pharmacist, farmaci, physician, pediatrician, condom, dietitian, prep, dentist, std, fgm
<b>Finance</b>	<b>Probability</b>	financi, bank, market, financ, invest, capit, use, manag, risk, firm
	<b>FREX</b>	financ, ipo, mortgag, underwrit, buyback, loan, cash, investor, ventur, estat
<b>Financial Economics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	market, price, stock, return, model, use, risk, result, volatil, trade
	<b>FREX</b>	arbitrag, hedg, dividend, reit, nyse, mean-vari, portfolio, capm, illiquid, cdo
<b>Financial System</b>	<b>Probability</b>	bank, financi, market, credit, risk, loan, system, crisi, sector, develop
	<b>FREX</b>	launder, npa, bank', payout, sbi, non-perform, inflasi, asset-bas, credit-spread, nonperform
<b>Fishery</b>	<b>Probability</b>	fish, speci, water, use, fisheri, studi, growth, differ, sea, rate
	<b>FREX</b>	spawn, salmon, fisheri, trout, hatcheri, crayfish, prawn, scallop, her, eel
<b>Food Science</b>	<b>Probability</b>	acid, use, product, content, studi, effect, increas, result, food, differ
	<b>FREX</b>	chees, juic, flour, whey, sausag, aroma, ferment, yogurt, dough, ddg
<b>Forensic Engineering</b>	<b>Probability</b>	use, accid, fire, paper, design, structur, method, concret, develop, caus
	<b>FREX</b>	flashov, smolder, picklex, stem-cement, lime-soil, windscreen, bloodstain, mbi, dnatypertm15, bomblet
<b>Forestry</b>	<b>Probability</b>	de, forest, area, tree, la, use, stand, le, studi, speci
	<b>FREX</b>	jalur, só, huevo, amenaza, ind./hm2in, larven, grain/m2, hoc, oncophora, larv
<b>Gastroenterology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	patient, group, treatment, liver, diseas, case, effect, rate, p, studi
	<b>FREX</b>	cirrrosi, pylori, gastriti, coliti, peptic, gerd, duoden, helicobact, omeprazol, dyspepsia
<b>Gender Studies</b>	<b>Probability</b>	women, cultur, gender, social, studi, ident, work, articl, sexual, polit
	<b>FREX</b>	feminist, masculin, femin, queer, lesbian, gay, transgend, lgbt, patriarchi, heterosexu

<b>Genealogy</b>	<b>Probability</b>	famili, name, time, histor, new, gener, year, present, one, histori
	<b>FREX</b>	cayuga, jungermannia, forfar, surnam, yup'ik, speck, tlingit, tik-tsam-sia, maji, sinodont
<b>General Surgery</b>	<b>Probability</b>	patient, surgeri, cancer, case, laparoscop, surgic, studi, oper, resect, perform
	<b>FREX</b>	laparoscop, hernia, cholecystectomi, gastrectomi, esophagectomi, laparotomi, anastomot, colostomi, laparoscopi, colectomi
<b>Genetics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	gene, sequenc, mutat, genet, genom, use, studi, dna, chromosom, region
	<b>FREX</b>	allel, chromosom, loci, exon, qtl, intron, haplotyp, codon, locu, telomer
<b>Geochemistry</b>	<b>Probability</b>	rock, deposit, miner, age, composit, isotop, melt, zone, element, magma
	<b>FREX</b>	plagioclas, granitoid, pluton, gneiss, zircon, mafic, clinopyroxen, xenolith, porphyri, granit
<b>Geodesy</b>	<b>Probability</b>	use, data, model, graviti, result, observ, gp, orbit, determin, satellit
	<b>FREX</b>	geoid, vlbi, goce, geodet, itr, geopotenti, geodesi, dcb, insar, wgs-84
<b>Geometry</b>	<b>Probability</b>	surf, use, method, model, geometri, point, result, curv, flow, two
	<b>FREX</b>	precut, $\alpha'$ , $r\sim$ , sg20, microgroov, quasi-b-splin, hex-domin, efpim, vgtv, nonagon
<b>Geomorphology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	sediment, deposit, basin, area, structur, fault, result, rock, studi, region
	<b>FREX</b>	turbidit, morain, fluvial, glacier, prograd, foreland, tephra, dune, erosion, lacustrin
<b>Geophysics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	model, field, observ, wave, magnet, data, mantl, use, region, result
	<b>FREX</b>	substorm, auror, magnetospher, mantl, lithospher, magnetopaus, magnetotail, geomagnet, magnetosheath, daysid
<b>Geotechnical Engineering</b>	<b>Probability</b>	use, soil, model, test, result, rock, method, stress, effect, studi
	<b>FREX</b>	pile, grout, embank, triaxial, geotechn, subgrad, asphalt, seepag, undrain, scour
<b>Gerontology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	health, studi, age, use, activ, year, older, physic, associ, particip
	<b>FREX</b>	frailti, community-dwel, dementia, caregiv, sarcopenia, frail, sedentari, geriater, gerontolog, adl
<b>Gynecology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	de, women, patient, cancer, use, studi, la, group, result, rate
	<b>FREX</b>	pacient, hpv, patienten, viaskin, endometri, iud, clomiphen, colposcopi, tratamiento, progestogen
<b>Horticulture</b>	<b>Probability</b>	fruit, plant, seed, effect, differ, increas, content, treatment, growth, result
	<b>FREX</b>	strawberri, ga3, bg, gourd, vine, rootstock, pusa, corm, uniconazol, postharvest
<b>Humanities</b>	<b>Probability</b>	de, la, en, que, el, e, lo, se, da, del
	<b>FREX</b>	relacion, educacion, mujer, aprendizaj, educativa, trabajo, texto, proceso, conocimiento, articulo
<b>Human-Computer Interaction</b>	<b>Probability</b>	user, use, system, design, interact, interfac, paper, develop, present, visual
	<b>FREX</b>	hci, human-comput, human-robot, usabl, sonif, gestur, multi-touch, tabletop, human-human, multitouch
<b>Hydrology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	water, model, use, river, area, flow, studi, soil, result, data
	<b>FREX</b>	runoff, catchment, hydrolog, aquif, recharg, groundwat, watershed, streamflow, evapotranspir, floodplain

<b>Immunology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	cell, patient, respons, studi, activ, immun, diseas, express, use, result
	<b>FREX</b>	nk, cd4+, treg, gvhd, cytokin, ige, lymphocyt, autoimmun, cd8, t-cell
<b>Industrial Engineering</b>	<b>Probability</b>	system, model, product, process, time, use, control, paper, oper, optim
	<b>FREX</b>	wlm, milk-run, sm-cc, windpov, moneymak, time-disturb, strali, a.d.hal, pert/cpm, prox-funct
<b>Industrial Organization</b>	<b>Probability</b>	industri, develop, market, firm, product, competit, innov, technolog, enterpris, paper
	<b>FREX</b>	subsidiari, tanzanit, sericultur, nev, aftermarket, msme, fables, small-medium, decisions.-, shocks.-
<b>Information Retrieval</b>	<b>Probability</b>	use, inform, queri, document, retriev, user, search, data, semant, system
	<b>FREX</b>	queri, xqueri, ontolog, trec, sparql, rdf, dbpedia, wikipedia, searcher, ontology-bas
<b>Inorganic Chemistry</b>	<b>Probability</b>	oxid, use, reaction, surfac, activ, catalyst, complex, studi, solut, result
	<b>FREX</b>	catalyst, zeolit, voltammetri, electrocatalyt, electrocatalyst, catalyt, electrolyt, adsorpt, bimetal, cobalt
<b>Intensive Care Medicine</b>	<b>Probability</b>	patient, use, treatment, studi, clinic, diseas, care, infect, therapi, risk
	<b>FREX</b>	icu, dialysi, nosocomi, sepsi, hemodialysi, septic, aki, ard, ckd, pneumonia
<b>Internal Medicine</b>	<b>Probability</b>	patient, group, level, studi, p, associ, diabet, control, diseas, risk
	<b>FREX</b>	insulin, lipoprotein, cholesterol, leptin, triglycerid, ldl, mellitu, adiponectin, mg/dl, hdl
<b>International Economics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	trade, countri, foreign, effect, import, growth, intern, fdi, develop, econom
	<b>FREX</b>	renminbi, unfccc, iit, oca, exc, brics+matik, cross-bord, austria', snga, forex
<b>International Trade</b>	<b>Probability</b>	trade, countri, develop, intern, export, econom, market, product, import, polici
	<b>FREX</b>	wto, fta, antidump, mne, trade, gatt, nafta, export, tariff, asean
<b>Internet Privacy</b>	<b>Probability</b>	inform, use, privaci, social, data, user, internet, network, person, protect
	<b>FREX</b>	calea, spam, youtub, biosimilar, medwatch, ipharmacist, p3p, banknot, rota, h2h
<b>Keynesian Economics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	inflat, rate, econom, unemploy, model, money, theori, use, keynesian, monetari
	<b>FREX</b>	weitzman, nairu, lsap, subjectivist, brainard, keynesian, deflat, keynes', price-level, wage-
<b>Knowledge Management</b>	<b>Probability</b>	knowledg, manag, inform, use, system, develop, research, studi, technolog, paper
	<b>FREX</b>	e-govern, e-learn, tacit, organiz, telework, m-learn, e-servic, egovern, ict, coci
<b>Labour Economics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	employ, wage, labor, worker, effect, increas, market, use, incom, labour
	<b>FREX</b>	wage, unemploy, labour, part-tim, labor, unskil, retir, overtim, worker, pension
<b>Law</b>	<b>Probability</b>	law, state, right, court, legal, articl, case, one, intern, polit
	<b>FREX</b>	court, suprem, judici, lawyer, statut, litig, arbitr, attorney, tribun, liberti
<b>Law and Economics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	law, right, legal, properti, system, one, econom, use, state, principl
	<b>FREX</b>	lien, accessio, honesti, coas, korupe, pejovich, benhabib, rcss, bgb, chattel

<b>Library Science</b>	<b>Probability</b>	librari, univers, research, journal, scienc, public, publish, use, paper, inform
	<b>FREX</b>	librarian, librarianship, alct, archivist, ebook, librari, jstor, lists”, scientometr, kirkconnel
<b>Linguistics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	languag, use, english, studi, word, linguist, differ, paper, mean, translat
	<b>FREX</b>	verb, phonolog, phonet, linguist, pronoun, sociolinguist, grammat, mandarin, morphem, adverb
<b>Literature</b>	<b>Probability</b>	work, one, cultur, text, literari, novel, also, critic, histori, book
	<b>FREX</b>	poetri, poem, poetic, poet, shakespear, literari, byron, comedi, fiction, satir
<b>Machine Learning</b>	<b>Probability</b>	svm, kernel, motif, p, protein, v, multi-label, nmf, seizur, wound
	<b>FREX</b>	twsvm, pltss, tsvm, tractogram, kenreg, besurek, svddb, sonfn, kir3dl1, i^
<b>Macroeconomics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	growth, polici, model, rate, econom, countri, effect, use, paper, inflat
	<b>FREX</b>	cointegr, granger, disinfl, dsge, ardl, laffer, expansionari, interest-sensit, counter-cycl, balassa-samuelson
<b>Management</b>	<b>Probability</b>	manag, research, develop, busi, univers, new, work, compani, educ, year
	<b>FREX</b>	i¾, mcvicker, hrm, jcl, evaluationen, sethi, drexel, mitch, mintzberg, cio
<b>Management Science</b>	<b>Probability</b>	model, research, use, develop, decis, method, approach, process, system, studi
	<b>FREX</b>	foresight, sisp, infrasystem, neuromarket, megaproject, mcdm, abm, geoengin, desn, mbdd
<b>Manufacturing Engineering</b>	<b>Probability</b>	product, manufactur, process, design, industri, technolog, system, develop, use, paper
	<b>FREX</b>	cim, poka-yok, mrpii, ferroalloy, foundri, servit, okp, amt, qfd, holon
<b>Marine Engineering</b>	<b>Probability</b>	wind, use, ship, turbin, design, system, model, oper, water, result
	<b>FREX</b>	hydrofoil, tow, vawt, riser, auv, rov, rudder, moor, subsea, fpso
<b>Market Economy</b>	<b>Probability</b>	market, econom, economi, develop, industri, enterpris, privat, capit, invest, competit
	<b>FREX</b>	pineappl, ivorian, cic, i919, agriculture-rel, i920, anti-dumpl, ocab, oil-for-food, interactiv
<b>Marketing</b>	<b>Probability</b>	market, studi, use, research, product, servic, custom, develop, manag, consum
	<b>FREX</b>	brand, loyalti, hotel, franchis, consumers’, custom, customers’, retail, tourist, b2b
<b>Mathematical Analysis</b>	<b>Probability</b>	equat, solut, method, problem, function, use, result, system, paper, condit
	<b>FREX</b>	dirichlet, cauchi, galerkin, sobolev, laplac, lipschitz, semilinear, eigenfunct, blow-up, well-posed
<b>Mathematical Economics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	game, model, equilibrium, theori, paper, gener, result, player, use, nash
	<b>FREX</b>	nash, payoff, shapley, strategy-proof, maxmin, wilki, equilibria, remarks.-, homothet, anarchi
<b>Mathematical Optimization</b>	<b>Probability</b>	problem, optim, algorithm, method, use, model, propos, solut, result, paper
	<b>FREX</b>	pso, multi-object, swarm, multiobject, subproblem, tabu, np-hard, metaheurist, nonconvex, salesman
<b>Mathematical Physics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	equat, theori, field, solut, gener, n, model, x, de, function
	<b>FREX</b>	string.-, brillouin-wign, h.j, l/r, l'impuls, duff, e2-instanton, bm.-, formalism.-, cartan’

<b>Mathematics Education</b>	<b>Probability</b>	student, teach, learn, use, teacher, studi, educ, school, research, mathemat
	<b>FREX</b>	teachers', students', teacher, siswa, student', pre-servic, belajar, classroom, efl, pembelajaran
<b>Mechanical Engineering</b>	<b>Probability</b>	use, design, model, process, system, result, paper, method, heat, machin
	<b>FREX</b>	workpiec, ejector, spool, gripper, grind, compressor, gear, warpag, micropump, louver
<b>Mechanics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	flow, model, use, result, pressur, effect, veloc, heat, studi, simul
	<b>FREX</b>	reynold, unstead, streamwis, nusselt, flame, nozzl, swirl, laminar, inlet, vortex
<b>Media Studies</b>	<b>Probability</b>	cultur, new, univers, one, work, commun, year, polit, media, studi
	<b>FREX</b>	cheerlead, siskin, journalist, bikini, isbn, theatr, hahn, paperback, regift, shadowplay
<b>Medical Education</b>	<b>Probability</b>	student, educ, medic, use, studi, train, program, teach, school, research
	<b>FREX</b>	faculti, clerkship, interprofession, internship, postgradu, mentor, traine, osc, pbl, ipe
<b>Medical Emergency</b>	<b>Probability</b>	patient, hospit, medic, use, emerg, care, injuri, studi, system, health
	<b>FREX</b>	prehospit, ohca, cpr, resuscit, handov, ambul, triag, out-of-hospit, telemedicin, paramed
<b>Medical Physics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	use, radiat, clinic, dose, imag, patient, treatment, studi, develop, result
	<b>FREX</b>	brachytherapi, pneumon, locoregion, yb-169, intensity-modul, dosimetri, late-cours, radiologist, boost-imrt, aapm
<b>Medicinal Chemistry</b>	<b>Probability</b>	compound, c, co, n, h, reaction, ring, atom, die, complex
	<b>FREX</b>	me3si, intermolecular, pph4, intramolecular, sime, pme3, molecul, n—h···o, pph4cl, c—h···o
<b>Metallurgy</b>	<b>Probability</b>	alloy, temperatur, use, steel, result, process, increas, surfac, materi, coat
	<b>FREX</b>	alloy, austenit, martensit,orros, carbid, stainless, sinter, solder, microstructur, microhard
<b>Meteorology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	model, wind, use, data, result, observ, measur, studi, temperatur, forecast
	<b>FREX</b>	thunderstorm, typhoon, wrf, gust, meteorolog, tornado, mesoscal, trmm, radiosond, lightn
<b>Microbiology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	strain, isol, resist, use, bacteria, infect, studi, gene, activ, result
	<b>FREX</b>	aeruginosa, esbl, virul, streptococcu, faecali, imipenem, baumannii, jejuni, o157, albican
<b>Microeconomics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	price, model, market, paper, use, cost, product, firm, effect, result
	<b>FREX</b>	auction, collus, bidder, monopolist, cournot, seller, oligopoli, duopoli, oligopolist, buyer
<b>Mineralogy</b>	<b>Probability</b>	miner, use, sampl, studi, temperatur, result, content, water, rock, differ
	<b>FREX</b>	calcit, kaolinit, feldspar, pyrit, illit, hematit, aragonit, ilmenit, tourmalin, smectit
<b>Mining Engineering</b>	<b>Probability</b>	mine, coal, area, geolog, water, seam, method, rock, ore, use
	<b>FREX</b>	seam, coalfield, workfac, opencast, stope, orebodi, inrush, collieri, tabuliformi, gangu
<b>Molecular Biology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	cell, express, protein, gene, activ, dna, use, human, result, bind
	<b>FREX</b>	cdna, transfect, plasmid, blot, immunoprecipit, mrna, transactiv, luciferas, c-myc, rnase

<b>Molecular Physics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	structur, surfac, calcul, energi, molecul, vibrat, electron, state, defect, molecular
	<b>FREX</b>	v/sia, shear/mix, v-sio2, lipss, pre-arc, ssic, gnf, a-si, band-a, double-excit
<b>Monetary Economics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	rate, market, exchang, bank, monetari, polici, price, effect, model, paper
	<b>FREX</b>	monetari, ecb, fii, pass-through, mudaraba, fiat, interbank, countercycl, kwacha, trend-follow
<b>Multimedia</b>	<b>Probability</b>	use, learn, system, student, design, develop, paper, technolog, teach, comput
	<b>FREX</b>	multimedia, coursewar, moodl, e-learn, brail, playlist, conferenc, audio, actionscript, video
<b>Nanotechnology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	use, materi, applic, surfac, structur, nanoparticl, develop, properti, process, cell
	<b>FREX</b>	nanostruttur, nanowir, nanotub, cnt, nanotechnolog, nanomateri, graphen, microfluid, aunp, nanoscal
<b>Natural Language Processing</b>	<b>Probability</b>	languag, word, text, translat, sentenc, semant, corpu, english, annot, lexic
	<b>FREX</b>	tagger, treebank, part-of-speech, nlp, metaschema, phrase-bas, lemmat, paraphras, stemmer, transliter
<b>Natural Resource Economics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	energi, develop, resourc, emiss, product, econom, industri, use, environment, increas
	<b>FREX</b>	non-co2, flng, biohydrogen, gudawang, bio-diesel, nsgg, ngir, rutf, non-monetari, climate-rel
<b>Neoclassical Economics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	theori, econom, capit, keyn, marx, product, modern, gener, economi, valu
	<b>FREX</b>	tiebout, radjou, sismondi, frugal, surplus-valu, nicancioglu, buchanan, anieva, sraffa, prosumpt
<b>Neuroscience</b>	<b>Probability</b>	neuron, activ, brain, function, studi, cell, respons, use, cortex, system
	<b>FREX</b>	synapt, synaps, excitatori, hippocamp, neuron, hippocampu, interneuron, postsynapt, cortex, amygdala
<b>Nuclear Chemistry</b>	<b>Probability</b>	use, concentr, result, acid, solut, studi, show, ph, effect, prepar
	<b>FREX</b>	biosorpt, biosorb, ap-al, agnp, zntcp, pseudo-second-ord, inchikey, dalapon, desfer, rofa
<b>Nuclear Engineering</b>	<b>Probability</b>	reactor, fuel, use, system, design, heat, oper, power, nuclear, result
	<b>FREX</b>	burnup, pwr, thermal-hydraul, divertor, loca, coolant, htgr, burn-up, bwr, tfe
<b>Nuclear Magnetic Resonance</b>	<b>Probability</b>	magnet, field, use, measur, reson, imag, result, temperatur, studi, method
	<b>FREX</b>	hyperfin, mossbauer, magn, quadropol, spin-lattic, quadropolar, spin-echo, heteronuclear, coil, gmi
<b>Nuclear Medicine</b>	<b>Probability</b>	use, dose, imag, patient, method, studi, measur, result, differ, treatment
	<b>FREX</b>	spect, fdg, vmat, pet/ct, imrt, dosimetr, ptv, isocent, sbrt, oar
<b>Nuclear Physics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	energi, measur, use, neutron, data, nuclear, result, reaction, experi, detector
	<b>FREX</b>	pion, muon, rhic, gev/c, deuteron, antiproton, mev, cern, au+au, heavy-ion
<b>Nursing</b>	<b>Probability</b>	care, nurs, health, patient, use, studi, servic, practic, provid, hospit
	<b>FREX</b>	nurs, palli, midwiv, hospic, midwiferi, carer, nurses', care, breastfeed, patient-cent
<b>Obstetrics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	women, pregnanc, studi, group, risk, birth, matern, use, patient, deliveri
	<b>FREX</b>	cesarean, trimest, caesarean, gestat, gdm, misoprostol, obstetr, pregnanc, perinat, preterm

<b>Oceanography</b>	<b>Probability</b>	water, sea, sediment, ocean, surfac, chang, studi, increas, concentr, area
	<b>FREX</b>	phytoplankton, foraminifera, upwel, benthic, gyre, zooplankton, kuroshio, plankton, foraminifer, chukchi
<b>Oncology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	cancer, patient, breast, surviv, treatment, studi, chemotherapi, tumor, therapi, use
	<b>FREX</b>	nsclc, docetaxel, neoadjuv, trastuzumab, cetuximab, chemotherapi, mcrc, non-smal, carboplatin, progression-fre
<b>Operating System</b>	<b>Probability</b>	system, use, applic, oper, server, file, comput, data, softwar, develop
	<b>FREX</b>	servlet, linux, hypervisor, unix, vmm, filesystem, xen, sharepoint, scsi, nrd
<b>Operations Management</b>	<b>Probability</b>	use, manag, system, cost, product, model, studi, perform, develop, process
	<b>FREX</b>	jit, remanufactur, qfd, subcontractor, lot-siz, tqm, kanban, retailer-l, scqi, wind-pow
<b>Operations Research</b>	<b>Probability</b>	model, use, system, problem, paper, method, decis, cost, develop, time
	<b>FREX</b>	abrf, genco, topsi, travelers', cplex, mcdm, vrp, schedule-bas, mixed-integ, macchiarini
<b>Ophthalmology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	eye, patient, visual, group, retin, result, studi, use, corneal, glaucoma
	<b>FREX</b>	iop, macular, iol, intraocular, vitrectomi, glaucoma, keratoplasti, rnfl, phacoemulsif, intravitri
<b>Optics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	use, optic, measur, laser, result, method, system, imag, beam, light
	<b>FREX</b>	grate, waveguid, interferomet, bragg, wavefront, birefring, coupler, mode-lock, femtosecond, speckl
<b>Optoelectronics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	use, devic, layer, film, structur, laser, optic, high, current, temperatur
	<b>FREX</b>	diod, gan, photodetector, heterojunct, gaa, schottki, photodiod, electroluminesc, epitaxi, heterostruktur
<b>Optometry</b>	<b>Probability</b>	eye, visual, vision, acuiti, refract, use, patient, cataract, test, measur
	<b>FREX</b>	amblyopia, optometri, anisometropia, optometrist, stereopsi, logmar, spectacl, ophthalmologist, lowercas, optotyp
<b>Organic Chemistry</b>	<b>Probability</b>	reaction, acid, use, compound, yield, group, product, studi, activ, structur
	<b>FREX</b>	enantioselect, keton, aldehyd, cycliz, alken, allyl, olefin, stereoselect, enantiomer, ester
<b>Orthodontics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	use, patient, studi, group, measur, differ, treatment, result, method, mandibular
	<b>FREX</b>	malocclus, cephalometr, orthognath, orthodont, cephalogram, mandibular, tmj, overbit, incisor, osteotomi
<b>Paleontology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	format, speci, fossil, earli, late, new, deposit, age, basin, lower
	<b>FREX</b>	cambrian, conodont, biostratigraph, ordovician, brachiopod, silurian, trilobit, ammonit, miocen, devonian
<b>Parallel Computing</b>	<b>Probability</b>	parallel, perform, use, algorithm, comput, implement, memori, system, processor, paper
	<b>FREX</b>	gpu, prefetch, speedup, cuda, simd, openmp, hypercub, multiprocessor, gpgpu, multi-cor
<b>Particle Physics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	model, mass, decay, quark, neutrino, data, use, result, b, energi
	<b>FREX</b>	higg, lepton, quark, neutrino, electroweak, tev, parton, hadron, tevatron, mssm
<b>Pathology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	patient, cell, tumor, case, studi, diseas, cancer, use, express, clinic
	<b>FREX</b>	immunohistochem, lymphoma, neoplasm, immunohistochemistri, squamou, papillari, tumour, ihc, pleural, carcinoma

<b>Pattern Recognition</b>	<b>Probability</b>	imag, method, featur, use, propos, algorithm, base, result, classif, paper
	<b>FREX</b>	denois, gabor, svm, histogram, wavelet, palmprint, minutia, c-mean, k-nearest, vq
<b>Pedagogy</b>	<b>Probability</b>	educ, student, teacher, school, learn, studi, teach, develop, use, research
	<b>FREX</b>	teacher, classroom, teachers', pedagogi, pedagog, pre-servic, preservic, literaci, curriculum, intercultur
<b>Pediatrics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	patient, children, studi, age, year, infant, case, diseas, group, result
	<b>FREX</b>	infant, wheez, varicella, pertussi, measl, breastf, breastfeed, thalassemia, vlbw, pneumococc
<b>Petroleum Engineering</b>	<b>Probability</b>	oil, ga, well, reservoir, product, use, pressur, water, develop, field
	<b>FREX</b>	wellbor, oilfield, proppant, eor, waterflood, coalb, downhol, sagd, non-darci, gas-oil
<b>Petrology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	reservoir, rock, ga, fault, oil, well, faci, format, data, flow
	<b>FREX</b>	pseudotachylit, yacheng, xu-2, qoltag, block-off, fault-block, chinl, diagenet, kupukuziman, k1q2
<b>Pharmacology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	effect, drug, studi, activ, use, dose, cell, treatment, rat, result
	<b>FREX</b>	pharmacokinet, antinocicept, cmax, morphin, pharmacodynam, cannabinoid, anticonvuls, cyp3a4, hepatotox, concentration-tim
<b>Photochemistry</b>	<b>Probability</b>	reaction, complex, electron, fluoresc, use, radic, studi, state, result, abstract
	<b>FREX</b>	photolysi, phosphoresc, porphyrin, photophys, chromophor, photoinduc, photosystem, singlet, photochem, photoreact
<b>Physical Chemistry</b>	<b>Probability</b>	reaction, k, use, temperatur, calcul, energi, phase, studi, system, der
	<b>FREX</b>	calphad, feroxyhyt, ssz-24, eutectic-point, j-k, libh, inapnh, h2o-molekeln, mol/sup, ho/sub
<b>Physical Geography</b>	<b>Probability</b>	area, chang, climat, land, studi, region, temperatur, increas, use, year
	<b>FREX</b>	ba/cashel, ptarmigan, desertif, uraphylla, marmot, lucc, euphratica, lahar, wangkun, ghrr
<b>Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation</b>	<b>Probability</b>	muscl, use, studi, measur, activ, group, subject, perform, result, function
	<b>FREX</b>	gait, ankl, spastic, emg, quadricep, isokinet, hemipleg, hamstr, orthosi, femori
<b>Physical Therapy</b>	<b>Probability</b>	patient, studi, use, group, pain, result, treatment, effect, assess, p
	<b>FREX</b>	copd, osteoarthr, acupunctur, sf-36, migrain, percnt, rheumatolog, arthriti, musculoskelet, physiotherapi
<b>Physiology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	group, studi, level, age, effect, blood, differ, femal, control, physiolog
	<b>FREX</b>	flight-, hfh, progin, anem, power-, zuntz, e1c, dmr, mcpyv, ferritin
<b>Political Economy</b>	<b>Probability</b>	polit, state, social, polici, econom, develop, govern, parti, nation, new
	<b>FREX</b>	nato, democrat, democraci, authoritarian, insurg, full.click, elector, parti, superpow, soviet
<b>Polymer Chemistry</b>	<b>Probability</b>	polym, polymer, copolym, poli, use, group, chain, monom, temperatur, reaction
	<b>FREX</b>	copolymer, methacryl, copolym, polyimid, atrp, mma, polycondens, poli, polymer, styren
<b>Polymer Science</b>	<b>Probability</b>	polym, silk, control, structur, properti, system, materi, use, a., releas
	<b>FREX</b>	pyssp2, trantolo, oxygen-barri, gresser, weipert, chi-652, noil, vulcaniz, making-up, aroma-barri

<b>Positive Economics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	econom, teori, model, social, economist, develop, discuss, argu, studi, ration
	<b>FREX</b>	igo, bureau-shap, transfer', zeliz, drawing', self-respect, frankel, heterodox, policy-mak, shackl
<b>Process Engineering</b>	<b>Probability</b>	process, system, use, product, energi, oper, model, design, develop, technolog
	<b>FREX</b>	exergi, exerget, flowsheet, polygener, hrsrg, photodesmear, aspen, pervapor, gasifi, nebulis
<b>Process Management</b>	<b>Probability</b>	manag, process, busi, system, develop, model, enterpris, inform, servic, use
	<b>FREX</b>	scorecard, bpm, bpr, bpmn, scrumban, plm, uaa, omd, rpjmd, group.-
<b>Programming Language</b>	<b>Probability</b>	program, languag, use, system, model, paper, implement, code, specif, develop
	<b>FREX</b>	refactor, prolog, byteced, haskel, debugg, acl2, cobol, rfun, prover, mizar
<b>Psychiatry</b>	<b>Probability</b>	patient, disord, studi, use, depress, treatment, symptom, health, mental, result
	<b>FREX</b>	psychiatr, schizophrenia, antipsychot, antidepress, psychot, psychosi, suicid, psichiatri, schizophren, ptsd
<b>Psychoanalysis</b>	<b>Probability</b>	work, one, life, psychoanalysisi, way, psychologist, author, book, freud, person
	<b>FREX</b>	psychoanalysisi, freud, jung, psychoanalyt, freudian, freud', deadhead, fyne, jungian, fetish
<b>Psychotherapist</b>	<b>Probability</b>	therapi, treatment, patient, famili, therapist, psychotherapi, use, clinic, therapist, process
	<b>FREX</b>	psychotherapi, therapist, hypnosi, psychotherapeut, cbt, grief, countertransfer, psychotherapist, ipt, psychodynam
<b>Public Administration</b>	<b>Probability</b>	govern, polici, public, polit, state, develop, administr, nation, system, educ
	<b>FREX</b>	senat, elector, presidenti, bucraci, charter, congression, parliamentari, poll, referendum, parliament
<b>Public Economics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	tax, polici, public, use, econom, govern, paper, effect, develop, social
	<b>FREX</b>	taxpay, eco-label, i.r.c, hine, nudg, schedular, hwf, sunstein, vat/gst, dehesa
<b>Public Relations</b>	<b>Probability</b>	research, public, social, commun, develop, manag, use, studi, educ, work
	<b>FREX</b>	nonprofit, csr, newsroom, fundrais, crowdfund, advocaci, non-profit, organiz, leadership, employe
<b>Pulp and Paper Industry</b>	<b>Probability</b>	use, process, product, oil, remov, wastewat, result, treatment, studi, effect
	<b>FREX</b>	kraft, anammox, bioplast, laccas, pome, bagass, sawdust, white-rot, delignif, hemicellulos
<b>Pure Mathematics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	space, algebra, group, gener, x, function, oper, theorem, paper, result
	<b>FREX</b>	c*-algebra, eisenstein, finsler, hypergroup, r-algebra, union-soft, p-set, subvarieti, near-r, artin
<b>Quantum Electrodynamics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	teori, field, model, gaug, use, effect, gener, function, equat, result
	<b>FREX</b>	yang-mil, massless, supergrav, one-loop, fermion, supersymmetr, supersymmetri, d-brane, tachyon, two-loop
<b>Quantum Mechanics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	quantum, state, system, use, teori, field, model, gener, function, result
	<b>FREX</b>	entangl, qubit, decoher, quantum, soliton, semiclassical, wavefunct, wigner, bec, squeeze
<b>Radiochemistry</b>	<b>Probability</b>	use, irradi, neutron, dose, measur, sampl, activ, determin, radiat, method
	<b>FREX</b>	bq, plutonium, dosimet, radiochem, bq/kg, bnct, polonium, thorium, kgi, hto

<b>Radiology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	patient, imag, case, use, ct, lesion, studi, diagnosi, arteri, tumor
	<b>FREX</b>	aneurysm, angiographi, embol, endovascular, sonographi, mediastin, contrast-enhanc, stent, vena, arterioven
<b>Real-Time Computing</b>	<b>Probability</b>	system, use, time, data, propos, network, perform, sensor, paper, result
	<b>FREX</b>	rssi, arq, dvf, macroblock, harq, stuck-at, nlo, ads-b, timeout, viewport
<b>Regional Science</b>	<b>Probability</b>	develop, region, citi, innov, tourism, research, paper, studi, econom, system
	<b>FREX</b>	rebam, placentam, rural-bas, form-funct, non-perman, laboratory', ipalr, brussels-capit, circle-shap, kul
<b>Reliability Engineering</b>	<b>Probability</b>	system, reliabl, use, test, model, method, failur, power, paper, analysi
	<b>FREX</b>	phm, fmea, hazop, outag, mtbf, substat, switchgear, burn-in, lole, fdd
<b>Religious Studies</b>	<b>Probability</b>	christian, religion, religi, church, theolog, one, islam, studi, polit, god
	<b>FREX</b>	heschel, raju, judaism, sufism, zionism, anti-semit, catholic, rabbi, anabaptist, dharma
<b>Remote Sensing</b>	<b>Probability</b>	use, data, imag, measur, model, system, method, result, satellit, area
	<b>FREX</b>	lidar, radiomet, modi, hyperspectr, polarimetr, landsat, radianc, sar, multispectr, spaceborn
<b>Risk Analysis (Engineering)</b>	<b>Probability</b>	risk, system, safeti, manag, assess, develop, process, use, product, method
	<b>FREX</b>	haccp, qra, htr-pm, sift-proof, sva, microbicid, bepg, moniqa, grft, cipcast
<b>Seismology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	earthquak, seismic, fault, data, use, model, event, region, result, zone
	<b>FREX</b>	aftershock, earthquak, tsunami, seismolog, strike-slip, coseism, epicent, mainshock, teleseism, seismic
<b>Simulation</b>	<b>Probability</b>	use, simul, system, model, result, control, perform, robot, develop, design
	<b>FREX</b>	humanoid, exoskeleton, bipe, haptic, overtak, robot, afo, via-point, car-follow, loader
<b>Social Psychology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	studi, use, social, research, differ, result, effect, behavior, relationship, group
	<b>FREX</b>	self-esteem, stereotyp, intergroup, interperson, empathi, divorc, prejudic, accultur, self-concept, shame
<b>Social Science</b>	<b>Probability</b>	social, research, polit, cultur, studi, articl, develop, educ, use, paper
	<b>FREX</b>	sociolog, sociologist, bourdieu, haberma, chautauqua, durkheim, marxism, pequot, ecec, neoliberal
<b>Socioeconomics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	studi, area, household, use, popul, rural, social, health, develop, urban
	<b>FREX</b>	kirsal, turizm, eav, kākā, haor, wpv, non-farm, jiedao, ardahan, padwcm
<b>Software Engineering</b>	<b>Probability</b>	softwar, system, develop, design, use, model, process, paper, applic, requir
	<b>FREX</b>	uml, model-driven, blender, service-ori, reusabl, soa, vph-share, idoc, cmmi, ippa
<b>Soil Science</b>	<b>Probability</b>	soil, water, use, content, model, differ, studi, organ, increas, result
	<b>FREX</b>	topsoil, macroaggreg, chernozem, loam, humu, gross-beta, humif, loami, soil, sorptiv
<b>Speech Recognition</b>	<b>Probability</b>	speech, use, recognit, signal, system, model, method, result, propos, perform
	<b>FREX</b>	phonem, asr, hmm, speech, cepstral, mfcc, formant, pronunci, triphon, vowel

<b>Statistical Physics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	model, system, simul, use, dynam, method, result, distribut, scale, time
	<b>FREX</b>	pott, scale-fre, self-avoid, langevin, ise, finite-s, ut-soi, nonextens, nonequilibrium, tricrit
<b>Statistics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	model, estim, use, method, data, test, distribut, sampl, statist, studi
	<b>FREX</b>	nonparametr, censor, semiparametr, quantil, lasso, bootstrap, jackknif, minimax, imput, two-sampl
<b>Stereochemistry</b>	<b>Probability</b>	structur, compound, activ, bind, complex, acid, group, two, c, r
	<b>FREX</b>	stereochemistri, stereoselect, nucleosid, subsit, enantiom, aglycon, stereochem, diterpen, structure-act, diterpenoid
<b>Structural Engineering</b>	<b>Probability</b>	model, use, structur, result, load, method, test, design, analysi, stress
	<b>FREX</b>	buckl, prestress, girder, bolt, stiffen, cfrp, damper, truss, crack, stiff
<b>Surgery</b>	<b>Probability</b>	patient, case, group, use, result, treatment, studi, surgeri, year, method
	<b>FREX</b>	arthroplasti, flap, femor, pedicl, postop, sutur, hematoma, arthroscop, decompress, debrid
<b>Systems Engineering</b>	<b>Probability</b>	system, design, develop, model, process, use, paper, product, softwar, requir
	<b>FREX</b>	mde, bim, avion, fieldbu, gm-vv, soss, nfr, csdp, vbe, sdec
<b>Telecommunications</b>	<b>Probability</b>	system, technology, network, commun, servic, use, mobil, paper, develop, telecommun
	<b>FREX</b>	telecom, telecommun, intelsat, broadband, satcom, wban, fcc, umt, subscrib, tvw
<b>Theology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	theolog, god, christian, church, articl, one, work, also, new, studi
	<b>FREX</b>	radd, eucharist, trinitarian, ecclesiolog, sermon, maimonid, christolog, mennonit, qur'an, colonna
<b>Theoretical Computer Science</b>	<b>Probability</b>	use, model, algorithm, system, comput, problem, paper, graph, network, propos
	<b>FREX</b>	hash, cryptanalysi, lineariz, cryptosystem, bdd, cipher, automata, plaintext, zero-knowledg, diffie-hellman
<b>Theoretical Physics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	theori, physic, quantum, model, univers, gener, one, use, discuss, time
	<b>FREX</b>	mcat, einstein', antiscalar, lqc, pii, gsl, delayed-choic, jarzynski, neurcitosti, w3u
<b>Thermodynamics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	heat, temperatur, model, use, result, experiment, system, transfer, flow, pressur
	<b>FREX</b>	nanofluid, nusselt, boil, prandtl, subcool, supercool, undercool, thermophys, vapor-liquid, superh
<b>Topology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	space, group, x, n, gener, topolog, result, algebra, show, g
	<b>FREX</b>	submanifold, hypersurfac, homeomorph, cohomolog, riemannian, homotopi, holomorph, codimens, quiver, indecompos
<b>Toxicology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	exposur, use, effect, toxic, studi, test, concentr, control, level, result
	<b>FREX</b>	deltamethrin, insecticid, pyrethroid, cypermethrin, diazinon, genotox, chlorpyrifo, imidacloprid, neem, ddvp
<b>Traditional Medicine</b>	<b>Probability</b>	extract, use, medicin, activ, effect, studi, plant, group, tradit, method
	<b>FREX</b>	herbal, rhizoma, herb, ethnopharmacolog, decoct, ekstrak, phytochem, ethnobotan, chm, ayurved
<b>Transport Engineering</b>	<b>Probability</b>	traffic, transport, use, system, road, model, vehicl, develop, studi, paper
	<b>FREX</b>	pedestrian, freeway, lane, freight, highway, passeng, roundabout, ridership, rail, toll

<b>Urology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	patient, group, prostat, renal, bladder, urinari, studi, treatment, use, p
	<b>FREX</b>	prostatectomi, transurethr, bph, ureter, detrusor, gfr, urodynam, bladder, intraves, turp
<b>Veterinary Medicine</b>	<b>Probability</b>	infect, studi, sampl, anim, use, diseas, group, differ, preval, cattl
	<b>FREX</b>	helminth, brucellosi, seropreval, teat, zoonot, eimeria, tick, wnv, contortu, strongyl
<b>Virology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	infect, viru, vaccin, use, cell, antibodi, studi, viral, detect, patient
	<b>FREX</b>	viru, hiv-1, virus, viral, virion, hbv, hcv, capsid, env, hsv-1
<b>Visual Arts</b>	<b>Probability</b>	art, work, music, artist, use, design, new, cultur, paint, imag
	<b>FREX</b>	sculptur, veld, lipstick, costum, b-boy, conlon, salon, brocad, artist, dega
<b>Waste Management</b>	<b>Probability</b>	use, wast, process, product, system, energi, result, fuel, water, studi
	<b>FREX</b>	boiler, bioga, sludg, inciner, flue, msw, compost, wast, gasif, desulfur
<b>Water Resource Management</b>	<b>Probability</b>	water, resourc, irrig, use, river, area, system, develop, manag, suppli
	<b>FREX</b>	meus, micro-irrig, km~2, mkayel, lulcc, water-sav, dongp, hemavathi, geum-riv, river-basin
<b>Welfare Economics</b>	<b>Probability</b>	de, la, le, en, e, que, da, et, lo, el
	<b>FREX</b>	monetaria, empresa, majoritarian, contabilidad, gazdasagi, oepnv, fenntarthato, cout, inflacao, gobierno
<b>World Wide Web</b>	<b>Probability</b>	web, servic, inform, use, user, system, data, develop, paper, applic
	<b>FREX</b>	web, metadata, browser, html, orcid, hypertext, ajax, w3c, e-book, uddi
<b>Zoology</b>	<b>Probability</b>	speci, new, genu, describ, sp, two, nov., morpholog, n., group
	<b>FREX</b>	nov., n.sp., subgenu, blakea, penney, redescr, seta, synonymi, almeda, sp.n

**Supplementary Table S2.** The impact of paper and grant interdisciplinarity on paper success, measured by normalized 10-year citations (year and field controlled).

	Model (1)	Model (2)	Model (3)
Paper Interdisciplinarity (Reference)	0.215*** (0.004)		0.202*** (0.004)
Avg. Grant Interdisciplinarity	-0.124*** (0.004)		-0.098*** (0.004)
Avg. Grant-Grant Similarity	0.010*** (0.002)		0.041*** (0.002)
Number of Authors		0.180*** (0.002)	0.178*** (0.002)
Number of Grants		0.078*** (0.004)	0.067*** (0.004)
Number of Institutes		0.027*** (0.004)	0.035*** (0.004)
Number of Funding Countries		0.076*** (0.014)	0.109*** (0.014)
Total Funding Amounts (USD)		0.064*** (0.001)	0.066*** (0.001)
Constant	0.442*** (0.004)	-0.133*** (0.006)	-0.237*** (0.007)
N	486193	486193	486193
R <sup>2</sup>	0.008	0.052	0.060

Standard errors in parentheses.

\* p<.05, \*\* p<.01, \*\*\* p<.001

**Supplementary Table S3.** The impact of paper and grant interdisciplinarity on paper success, measured by 10-year citation count with year and field controlled as dummy variables.

	Model (1)	Model (2)	Model (3)	Model (4)
Paper Interdisciplinarity (Reference)	0.024*** (0.001)		0.024*** (0.001)	0.014*** (0.001)
Avg. Grant Interdisciplinarity	-0.027*** (0.002)		-0.029*** (0.002)	-0.018*** (0.002)
Avg. Grant-Grant Similarity	0.001 (0.001)		0.008*** (0.001)	0.007*** (0.001)
Number of Authors		0.096*** (0.001)	0.096*** (0.001)	0.104*** (0.001)
Number of Grants		0.053*** (0.002)	0.051*** (0.002)	0.038*** (0.002)
Number of Institutes		-0.002 (0.002)	-0.001 (0.002)	0.007*** (0.002)
Number of Funding Countries		0.017*** (0.001)	0.018*** (0.001)	0.017*** (0.001)
Total Funding Amounts (USD)		0.031*** (0.001)	0.034*** (0.001)	0.035*** (0.001)
Number of References				0.177*** (0.001)
Dummy - Year	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Dummy - Discipline	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Constant	-0.443*** (0.106)	-0.436*** (0.105)	-0.404*** (0.105)	-0.253* (0.105)
N	515796	515796	515796	515796
R <sup>2</sup>	0.015	0.030	0.031	0.060

Standard errors in parentheses.

\* p<.05, \*\* p<.01, \*\*\* p<.001