Representing the disciplinary structure of physics: a comparative evaluation of graph and text embedding methods

Isabel Constantino¹, Sadamori Kojaku², Santo Fortunato¹, and Yong-Yeol Ahn^{1,*}

¹Center for Complex Networks and Systems Research, Luddy School of Informatics, Computing, and Engineering, Indiana University, Bloomington

²Thomas J. Watson College of Engineering and Applied Science, Department of Systems Science and Industrial Engineering, Binghamton University, State University of New York

*yyahn@iu.edu

August 31, 2023

Abstract

Recent advances in machine learning offer new ways to represent and study scholarly works and the space of knowledge. Graph and text embeddings provide a convenient vector representation of scholarly works based on citations and text. Yet, it is unclear whether their representations are consistent or provide different views of the structure of science. Here, we compare graph and text embedding by testing their ability to capture the hierarchical structure of the Physics and Astronomy Classification Scheme (PACS) of papers published by the American Physical Society (APS). We also provide a qualitative comparison of the overall structure of the graph and text embeddings for reference. We find that neural network-based methods outperform traditional methods and graph embedding methods such as *node2vec* are better than other methods at capturing the PACS structure. Our results call for further investigations into how different contexts of scientific papers are captured by different methods, and how we can combine and leverage such information in an interpretable manner.

1 Introduction

New discoveries and innovations build upon existing knowledge, often by combining previous knowledge together (Kauffman, 1984; Weitzman, 1998; Steel et al., 2020). Subsequently, new knowledge can be used in many different domains in the future. In this sense, each publication can be largely characterized by its *references and citations* (i.e. the knowledge upon which the publication builds, and how future publications use its knowledge), and its *content*. These two sources of information have thus been used to investigate how the scientific enterprise discovers new knowledge.

Previous studies have analyzed the references of both patents and scientific publications to understand the relationship between the ideas referenced by inventors and scientists, and the impact of their work. A study by Fleming (2001) uses patent data to compare the effects of combining novel versus familiar ideas, finding that new combinations and new components result in less useful or less *successful* patents (i.e. patents receive fewer citations). However, this also results in greater variability in future success. The riskings of exploring new or otherwise unusual combinations of ideas has also been explored in scientific research. Papers that reference both atypical and conventional combinations of ideas are more likely to be highly cited, as well as more "disruptive" (Uzzi et al., 2013; Wu et al., 2019; Lin et al., 2022). That is, such papers are more likely to be cited in future work than the papers they referenced or built on. Furthermore, research citing novel combinations of ideas are more likely to experience delayed recognition, but are also more likely to be cited by other fields (Wang et al., 2017). In these studies, atypicality and novelty are measured in terms of the number of cocitations between pairs of referenced journals. Atypicality and novelty can then be framed as the "distance" between reference pairs: ideas are more distant if they are less likely to be cited together, and combining distant ideas are more likely to result in risky but high-impact research.

Previous studies have also used the keywords and titles of publications to study the interrelatedness and integration of scientific fields over time. Courtial and Law (1989) proposed a co-word analysis of keywords in artificial intelligence papers by creating a keyword-keyword matrix where each entry corresponds to the number of papers that contain both of these keywords. They then show how clusters in this keyword co-occurrence matrix correspond to various subdomains in AI, and how they change over time. In another study by Leahey and Moody (2014), combinations of publication keywords within the same paper are used to measure *subfield integration* in sociological research. They find that papers that span multiple domains, especially unique combinations of domains, are cited more frequently.

Science mapping integrates various efforts to quantify the "space" of knowledge, by obtaining a spatial representation of journals, fields, and papers, where distance and similarity can be quantified. For instance, Boyack, Klavans, and Börner developed a map of scientific journals and disciplines, where similar (i.e. in terms of cocitations and/or co-references) journals are closer to one another (Boyack et al., 2005; Börner et al., 2012; Boyack & Klavans, 2014). On the other hand, the distance between referenced disciplines has been integrated into measures of the interdisciplinarity of research, such as the Rao-Stirling index (Rafols & Meyer, 2010; Leydesdorff & Rafols, 2011; Leydesdorff et al., 2019). These studies in mapping science and evaluating the distance between ideas are crucial in understanding how scientists collectively create, develop, and combine ideas in the context of the "space" of knowledge.

The main caveat in using existing disciplinary categorizations of scientific work, such as the Web of Science subject categories of journals, is that they tend to be rigid and change slowly over time, even when science rapidly develops. In an effort to overcome this limitation, previous studies have applied methods in topic modeling to analyze trends and "hot topics" in science. Specifically, latent Dirichlet allocation (LDA) is used to learn representations of publications as probability distributions over scientific topics, and representations of topics as probability distributions over words (Blei et al., 2003; Griffiths & Steyvers, 2004; Blei, 2012). LDA has also been used to learn representations of authors' body of work as probability distributions over topics (Rosen-Zvi et al., 2004). However, one challenge with LDA and other topic modeling methods is the need to specify the number of topics in the corpus, which is not always known, or may change over time. Moreover, topic modeling approaches documents as "bags of words"; it ignores the order and context of words.

By contrast, representative learning (embedding) methods take into account the context within which words or entities appear, and it represents them into continuous space without the need to use categorization (whether provided or learned from the data). These methods have been shown to be capable at meaningfully representing the space of scientific knowledge. For instance, in a study by Chinazzi et al. (2019), papers published in American Physical Society (APS) journals are represented as "bags of topics". The embeddings are then used to map the various specialties of physics research, and study the production of physics research by various countries. In another study by Peng et al. (2021), journals in the Web of Science (WOS) are represented using their citation network, which are then used to learn analogy graphs of journals, and visualize the "spectra" of soft versus hard science.

Despite the increasing use of embedding methods in the study of scientific production and innovation, relatively little attention has been paid to the systematic comparison of two primary embedding approaches—content and graph embedding. While previous studies (Zhang et al., 2019; Kozlowski et al., 2021) have explored the use of various graph and text embedding methods to represent scientific publications, the methods were evaluated separately. Here, we compare popular graph and text embedding methods in terms of how well the resulting embeddings capture the disciplinary structure of physics. We focus on the field of physics, particularly papers published in the American Physical Society (APS) ("Physical Review Journals", n.d.), which, until recently, has used a hierarchical classification system called the Physics and Astronomy Classification Scheme (PACS). We then conduct a series of experiments to evaluate the embeddings' ability to capture the hierarchical structure of PACS.

2 Data and Methods

2.1 Data

The APS provides a citation network of all articles published in its journals, as well as papers' metadata on authors, affiliations, titles, publication dates, etc. We consider the citation network of all peer-reviewed scientific papers, reviews, and letters in all APS journals published up to the year 2010. We remove articles such as announcements, comments and replies, errata, and retractions. The resulting citation network consists of 452,096 papers and 4,931,143 citations. We note that this includes papers published before 1979, which do not have PACS codes. These are included in all embeddings; however, they are not considered in the evaluation.

For the content embedding, although it would be ideal to use the full text of papers, this is usually not available to researchers. Therefore, we consider the titles and abstracts of the papers in the citation network. Because the data provided by the APS does not contain abstract information, we match entries in the APS to entries in the Web of Science using exact DOI matching. Among the 358,478 papers with exact DOI matches to the Web of Science up to 2010, 159,375 have abstracts. We limit the preprocessing of text data to removing HTML and MathML tags, as well as removing extraneous whitespace.

2.2 Embedding

2.2.1 Graph embedding

We embed the citation network of the 452K papers by using graph embedding. Graph embedding places one paper in a space in relation to other papers. There are two types of relations, i.e., references (out-going citations) and citations (in-coming citations), which provides semantically different views of a paper. The references of a paper imply the knowledge relevant to the content of the paper, while the citations to a paper imply how the paper is utilized by the future papers. We incorporate both aspects of relations into consideration by ignoring the edge directionality and producing the graph embeddings using the undirected citation network.

A traditional family of graph embedding methods is based on matrix factorization, with one of the most popular being Laplacian Eigenmap (Belkin & Niyogi, 2003). Laplacian Eigenmap is a spectral embedding method, which obtains an *m*-dimensional embedding by concatenating the second to the (m + 1)-th largest eigenvectors of the symmetric normalized Laplacian $L = I - D^{-\frac{1}{2}}AD^{\frac{1}{2}}$, where I is the diagonal identity matrix, D is the diagonal degree matrix $D_{ii} = \sum_j A_{ij}$, and A is the graph adjacency matrix.

The second graph embedding method is *node2vec* (Grover & Leskovec, 2016). *node2vec* is a direct application of the skip-gram negative sampling method (SGNS) *word2vec* (Mikolov, Chen, et al., 2013; Mikolov, Sutskever, et al., 2013), a word embedding model that produces an embedding of words from given sentences. *node2vec* is adapted to network embedding by using a random walk, where each sentence is composed of nodes visited by a random walk. *node2vec* allows the random

walker to preferentially visit the previous nodes, or nodes that are not adjacent to previous nodes. This bias is controlled by hyperparameters p and q. A value of p = 1 and q = 1 is equivalent to a uniform random walk. For this study, we use p = 1 and q = 1, similar to previous studies evaluating graph embeddings (Gu et al., 2021; Dehghan-Kooshkghazi et al., 2022; Liu & Eliassi-Rad, 2023).

Finally, the third graph embedding method is residual2vec (Kojaku et al., 2021). residual2vec, also a random walk-based embedding method, uses the bias removal mechanism of the negative sampling method used in node2vec to remove any prescribed bias from the embedding. Here, we consider several structural biases present in the citation network. First, older papers are more likely to have a higher degree (i.e. more citations) due to the time it has to accumulate citations. Second, papers tend to cite more recent references. To address these biases, we use the configuration model as a null model for residual2vec. In other words, we remove the impact of each paper's degree from the embedding. For all graph embeddings, we use dimension d = 128, given that most real-world networks do not require a large number of dimensions, and that the embedding tends not to suffer much from overparametrization of the number of dimensions (Gu et al., 2021). Other parameters we use are: walk length l = 80, walks per node r = 10, context window size k = 10, and random walk restart probability s = 0.01.

2.2.2 Text embedding

We use three popular text embedding methods: doc2vec (Le & Mikolov, 2014), SciBERT (Beltagy et al., 2019), and Sentence-BERT (Reimers & Gurevych, 2019). doc2vec learns document representations by training them to predict words in the document, similar to how word2vec learns word representations by predicting words within its context. We specifically use the Paragraph Vector-Distributed Memory (PV-DM) model of doc2vec, where the paragraph (or document) vector serves as a "memory" that provides a broader context. For doc2vec, we use dimension d = 128, window size 5, and minimum word instance count 5.

The second text embedding method is SciBERT (Beltagy et al., 2019), an extension of BERT (Devlin et al., 2019). BERT is a pretrained deep neural language model that is trained using a bidirectional transformer network, and can be fine-tuned for tasks such as classification and question answering. SciBERT is a BERT model finetuned on a dataset of computer science and biomedical science papers. We use the allenai/scibert_scivocab_uncased model hosted on the Huggingface Transformers library (Wolf et al., 2020). As BERT generates representations for word pieces or punctuation marks (also known as *tokens*), some extra processing is required to obtain representations of "sentences" or documents. The processing is as follows (Reimers & Gurevych, 2019): (1) For each text input or document, obtain the special CLS token; (2) for each CLS token, obtain the vectors from the last 4 hidden layers of the neural network; and (3) sum up the 4 layers.

The last text embedding method is Sentence-BERT (Reimers & Gurevych, 2019). Sentence-BERT extends on BERT using a Siamese network architecture to obtain sentence embeddings that can be directly compared using measures such as cosine similarity. The pretrained model used is **sentence-transformers/paraphrase-mpnet-base-v2**, also hosted by Huggingface. As Sentence-BERT already results in an embedding for each piece of text, no further processing is required. We note that both SciBERT and Sentence-BERT support a maximum of 512 word tokens; any input beyond 512 tokens is ignored.

2.3 Evaluation

What makes a good embedding? There are a multitude of ways in which the parameters of each embedding method can be tuned, and many other ways to judge "similarity" or distance" between two embedded entities. Because we are interested in how each of the two main families of embedding methods can encode the hierarchical disciplinary structure of physics, we evaluate the embeddings based on how well they reflect an existing hierarchical categorization method, the Physics and Astronomy Classification Scheme (PACS) ("Physics and Astronomy Classification Scheme (PACS)", 2008). We summarize the embedding and evaluation framework in Figure 1.

2.3.1 Classification

We first evaluate the embeddings' ability to capture the general clusters of physics research, by running a k-nearest neighbor (KNN) classification task to predict the level 1 (L1) PACS code, that is, its general physics classification. KNN is a supervised machine learning algorithm where data is labeled according to the labels of its k nearest neighbors, as calculated by a distance metric. We



Figure 1: Embedding and evaluation framework for APS papers.

first take the citation network consisting of papers published on or before the year 2010. For each paper, we take all full PACS codes, and take the first digit of each PACS code to get the L1 PACS code. We then take 80% of the papers to be used as a training set, and take note of their L1 PACS codes. The remaining 20% of papers, or the testing set, are labeled with the L1 PACS code of the majority of its k nearest neighbors, as measured by the cosine distance between the paper vectors in the embedding space. For this study, we implement KNN using the *Faiss* library (Johnson et al., 2019), which provides a faster calculation of distance in large, high-dimensional datasets. We repeat for the values $k \in \{2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64, 128\}$. The resulting classification is then evaluated using the micro-F1 score.

2.3.2 Evaluating hierarchical disciplinary structure

We then evaluate whether the embeddings can capture the hierarchical structure of PACS. We do this in two ways. First, we check whether papers of more specific subcategories are closer to one another, compared to papers of general subcategories. Intuitively, sets of papers of a same general topic "cover" more material than sets of papers of a more specific topic. We consider each PACS code at each level. At the highest level, there are 10 PACS codes (00–90) each corresponding to a general physics category such as particle physics, nuclear physics, etc. Each succeeding level then corresponds to a more specific subtopic. Below is an example of a six-digit PACS code: **61.30.Jf**. The first level, **6**, or **60**, corresponds to "the structural, mechanical, and thermal properties of condensed matter". The second level, **61**, then represents "crystallography" and "solid or liquid structures". The third level, **61.30**, refers to "liquid crystals". Finally, the fourth or lowest level, **61.30.Jf**, refers to "defects in liquid crystals". We want to check whether each succeeding PACS level has smaller and smaller variability among its constituent papers. We do this using a measure inspired by the radius of gyration (ROG), or the root mean square distance of an object's parts to the centroid or average of these vectors:

$$\operatorname{ROG}_{C} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in C} \left(1 - \cos(\mathbf{x}, \bar{\mathbf{x}})\right)^{2}}$$
(1)

where C is the PACS code of interest, \mathbf{x} a vector representation of a paper in C, $\mathbf{\bar{x}}$ the centroid of all vectors in C, and $\cos(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ the cosine similarity between vectors \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{b} . We calculate the ROG of each PACS code at each of the 4 levels. We then get the distribution of ROG values at each level. To confirm whether each finer level has smaller or larger ROG values, we perform a one-sample Wilcoxon signed-rank text (Wilcoxon, 1945; Conover, 1999) to test the null hypothesis that the median ROG distribution of a PACS level is greater than or equal to the median ROG distribution of the next lower PACS level.

Second, we evaluate whether pairs of papers of the same PACS code are more likely to be closer to one another in the embedding space, compared to papers of different PACS codes. We sample 15,000 pairs of papers in each of the following categories: (1) random, (2) different discipline or PACS code, (3) same discipline (L1 PACS code), and (4) same subdiscipline (L2 PACS code). We then get the distribution of cosine distance between the pairs of papers in each subcategory. We compare these distributions in two ways. First, we compute the Jensen-Shannon divergence between each of the cosine distance distributions. The Jensen-Shannon (JS) divergence is a similarity measure for two distributions (Endres & Schindelin, 2003). Unlike the popular KL divergence (Kullback & Leibler, 1951), it is symmetric and has a finite range of 0 to 1. However, The Jensen-Shannon divergence does not indicate direction; that is, whether the cosine distance of same-discipline pairs is the same of that of random pairs. Hence, we also conduct one-sample t-tests to compare the distributions. In particular, we test the null hypothesis that the mean distance between random pairs is less than or equal to than the mean distance between same-discipline pairs.

2.3.3 Link prediction

Finally, we evaluate whether the embeddings are useful for predicting links between papers and references, specifically, whether a paper cites or references a previous paper (Adamic & Adar, 2003; Liben-Nowell & Kleinberg, 2007; Shibata et al., 2012). We first take the citation network of APS papers published up to the year 2010. We then take the largest connected component of this citation network, then sample 50% or approximately 149,000 edges from papers published in 2010 (i.e. edges corresponding to citations coming from papers in 2010). This is the "positive" example set. We then sampled the same number of paper pairs (such that one of the papers in each pair is from 2010) that have no edge between them, to serve as the "negative" examples. The "positive" examples or edges are removed from the citation network, and the resulting network is embedded using each of the embedding methods as described in section 2.2. Then, for each embedding, we calculate the cosine similarity of the positive and negative examples. In this case, positive examples, or pairs of papers linked by citation, should have a high cosine similarity, while negative examples should have low cosine similarity. The results are evaluated using the ROC curve, used in binary classification: the ROC curve plots the false positive rate against the true positive rate, denoting how the true positive rate changes as the false positive rate threshold is increased. The area under the ROC curve (AUC) is then calculated to summarize the results. The AUC ranges from 0 to 1, where 1 represents a perfect classification, and an AUC of 0.5 represents a random classification.

3 Results

Figure 2 shows UMAP projections of each embedding, using a sample of 10,000 papers. Each point is colored according to its level 1 PACS code. Here, *Sentence-BERT*—both title and abstract embeddings—*node2vec*, and *residual2vec* provide paper-level embeddings that follow the general clustering structure of research published in APS. The Laplacian Eigenmap embedding also somewhat exhibits a general cluster structure, although it also presents many overlaps among the clusters.



Figure 2: UMAP projections on a sample of the embeddings show that *Sentence-BERT*, *node2vec*, and *residual2vec* all follow the general clustering structure of physics research.

Figure 3 shows the results for the k-nearest neighbor classification. Among the text embeddings, Sentence-BERT has the highest micro-F1 score of approximately 0.75, across multiple values of k. All text embeddings performed worse than the tested graph embeddings, which all resulted in micro-F1 scores of approximately 0.76 to 0.81. In Laplacian Eigenmap, higher values of k result in lower micro-F1 scores. Finally, all embeddings except node2vec performed worse than a baseline citation network-based classification which predicts a paper's level 1 PACS code using a majority vote among its references, although this may indicate a tendency for authors to self-assign PACS codes similar to those of their references.



Figure 3: Classification of PACS by a k-nearest neighbor algorithm (a) with k = 2 to 128; and (b) with micro-F1 score > 0.64 and $k \in \{2, 4, 8\}$. The graph embedding methods outperform all text embedding methods. Among the text embeddings, *Sentence-BERT* performs best, though not as well as the graph embeddings. With *doc2vec*, the abstract embedding results in improved classification performance compared to the title embedding.

Figure 4 shows the distributions of ROG at each PACS level, and Table 1 shows the results of the one-sample Wilcoxon test for the distributions. For all tested graph embedding methods, as well as in *Sentence-BERT*, the median ROG at each level is consistently lower than the median ROG of the preceding level. Hence, for these embeddings, the more specific the subdiscipline of physics, the closer together its papers are in the embedding space. Meanwhile, for *doc2vec* and *SciBERT*, the median ROG of the highest PACS level is lower than or equal to the median ROG of the second PACS level. This may be explained by the "scale" of these text embeddings, where *all* points are relatively close to one another, thereby resulting in very small differences in ROG across the PACS levels. By contrast, in the graph embeddings, the points are more spread out across the embedding space, which results in more dramatic decreases in ROG as the PACS level increases. This is especially apparent in *node2vec* and *residual2vec*.

Figure 5 shows the distributions of sampled paper pairs, Figure 6 shows the Jensen-Shannon (JS) distance matrices for each embedding, and Table 2 shows the results of the t-test to compare these embeddings' distance distributions. In the representations generated using the graph embeddings and *Sentence-BERT*, the mean cosine distance of random paper pairs is consistently greater than that of pairs with the same L1 or L2 PACS code. In addition, the JS distances between the distributions in the *node2vec* and *residual2vec* embeddings are increasing. That is, the JS distance between pairs with the same L1 and L2 PACS codes. However, on *doc2vec* embeddings on titles, we fail to reject the hypothesis that the mean cosine distance of random pairs is not equal to that of random pairs. Moreover, there are no clear differences in Jensen-Shannon distance among the cosine distance distributions of random versus other paper pairs. Meanwhile, on abstracts, although there are also no visible differences in Jensen-Shannon distance, we do reject the hypothesis that the mean cosine distance, we do reject the hypothesis that the mean cosine distance of random pairs.



Figure 4: Box plots indicating the distributions of PACS code ROG show that a deeper PACS level (left to right) only results in a lower or more left-skewed ROG distribution in the *Sentence-BERT*, Laplacian Eigenmap, *node2vec*, and *residual2vec* embeddings.

			# of sam-	Median	Median	Wilcoxon	p-value
			ples	(current)	(previ- ous)	statistic	
Property	Embedding	PACS					
	method	level					
Undirected	Laplacian	2	82	0.7928	0.8693	43	0.0000
Graph	Eigenmap						
		3	941	0.6611	0.7928	17101	0.0000
		5	6434	0.4983	0.6611	2050166	0.0000
	node2vec	2	82	0.1127	0.1502	156	0.0000
		3	941	0.0793	0.1127	53679	0.0000
		5	6434	0.0487	0.0793	3724942	0.0000
	residual2vec	2	82	0.3430	0.4419	382	0.0000
		3	941	0.2381	0.3430	60733	0.0000
		5	6434	0.1360	0.2381	3723006	0.0000
Title	doc2vec	2	82	0.1202	0.1210	1668	0.4385
		3	946	0.1123	0.1202	167476	0.0000
		5	6495	0.0871	0.1123	5446270	0.0000
	SciBERT	2	82	0.0050	0.0053	1339	0.0469
		3	942	0.0045	0.0050	168165	0.0000
		5	6442	0.0033	0.0045	6409506	0.0000
	Sentence-	2	82	0.1871	0.2020	982	0.0004
	DERT	2	042	0 1694	0 1871	76003	0.0000
		5	942 6449	0.1024 0.1312	0.1671	3161325	0.0000
		0		0.1312	0.1024	5101525	0.0000
Abstract	doc2vec	2	76	0.1693	0.1778	1059	0.0182
		3	844	0.1477	0.1693	91863	0.0000
	~	5	5418	0.1148	0.1477	3279790	0.0000
	SciBERT	2	76	0.0104	0.0106	1216	0.1005
		3	844	0.0091	0.0104	136064	0.0000
		5	5418	0.0045	0.0091	4877620	0.0000
	Sentence- BERT	2	76	0.1364	0.1494	883	0.0013
		3	844	0.1151	0.1364	61858	0.0000
		5	5418	0.0929	0.1151	2434065	0.0000

Table 1: One-sample Wilcoxon test results for comparing the median of each PACS level to the previous level (rows highlighted in yellow indicate null hypotheses that we failed to reject). This further shows that for the graph embeddings and *Sentence-BERT*, the ROG decreases as the PACS level increases or becomes more specific. However, this more clearly shows that in *doc2vec* and *SciBERT*, the ROG is also decreasing in all but the most general PACS levels.



Figure 5: A comparison of embedding distance distribution between sampled paper pairs also show that *Sentence-BERT* (title and abstract embeddings), *node2vec*, and *residual2vec* embeddings are more likely to embed papers of the same discipline closer to one another than random pairs of papers.



Figure 6: Jensen-Shannon (JS) distance matrices between cosine distance distributions of paper pairs. Here, *node2vec* and *residual2vec* have the most visible differences in JS distance across the multiple distributions. In particular, the JS distances are smallest along the diagonal, with the distances increasing for paper pairs with the same L1 vs. L2 PACS codes.

Property	Embedding	$ $ H_a	Т	p-value
	method			
Undirected	Laplacian	μ (Different PACS) $\neq \mu$ (Random)	3.3851	0.0007
Graph	Eigenmap			
		μ (Same L1 PACS) < μ (Different PACS)	-15.3104	0.0000
		μ (Same L2 PACS) < μ (Same L1 PACS)	-9.7929	0.0000
	node2vec	μ (Different PACS) $\neq \mu$ (Random)	34.1876	0.0000
		μ (Same L1 PACS) < μ (Different PACS)	-173.5711	0.0000
		μ (Same L2 PACS) < μ (Same L1 PACS)	-88.5119	0.0000
	residual2vec	μ (Different PACS) $\neq \mu$ (Random)	35.3063	0.0000
		μ (Same L1 PACS) < μ (Different PACS)	-143.2327	0.0000
		μ (Same L2 PACS) < μ (Same L1 PACS)	-82.2185	0.0000
Title	doc2vec	μ (Different PACS) $\neq \mu$ (Random)	-1.1306	0.2582
		μ (Same L1 PACS) < μ (Different PACS)	-12.1402	0.0000
		μ (Same L2 PACS) < μ (Same L1 PACS)	-3.2786	0.0005
	SciBERT	μ (Different PACS) $\neq \mu$ (Random)	0.0219	0.9825
		μ (Same L1 PACS) < μ (Different PACS)	4.7426	1.0000
		μ (Same L2 PACS) < μ (Same L1 PACS)	-10.2161	0.0000
	Sentence- BERT	μ (Different PACS) $\neq \mu$ (Random)	18.0919	0.0000
		μ (Same L1 PACS) < μ (Different PACS)	-104.7975	0.0000
		μ (Same L2 PACS) < μ (Same L1 PACS)	-32.8416	0.0000
Abstract	doc2vec	μ (Different PACS) $\neq \mu$ (Random)	2.1069	0.0351
		μ (Same L1 PACS) < μ (Different PACS)	-9.2880	0.0000
		μ (Same L2 PACS) < μ (Same L1 PACS)	-9.9860	0.0000
	SciBERT	$\mu(\text{Different PACS}) \neq \mu(\text{Random})$	-0.2382	0.8117
		μ (Same L1 PACS) < μ (Different PACS)	-1.9838	0.0236
		μ (Same L2 PACS) < μ (Same L1 PACS)	-0.2722	0.3927
	Sentence- BERT	μ (Different PACS) $\neq \mu$ (Random)	9.3059	0.0000
		μ (Same L1 PACS) < μ (Different PACS)	-65.0798	0.0000
		μ (Same L2 PACS) < μ (Same L1 PACS)	-17.3435	0.0000

Table 2: t-test results for comparing the mean cosine distance for each distribution. Rows highlighted in yellow indicate null hypotheses that we failed to reject.



Figure 7: Link prediction results show that the graph embedding methods perform very well in link prediction, especially *node2vec* and *residual2vec*. Among the text embedding methods, *Sentence-BERT* also performs relatively well.

Figure 7 shows the ROC curves and AUC for the link prediction experiments. The graph embedding methods have the highest performance for link prediction, as measured by the area under the ROC curve (AUC). *Sentence-BERT* performs best among the text embedding methods, but it does not perform as well as the random-walk based embedding methods *node2vec* and *residual2vec*.

4 Discussion

We have found that while graph embedding methods use the rich information stored in the citation network structure and generally perform better, *Sentence-BERT*—whether it is trained on titles or abstracts—has a remarkable performance. Our results suggest that the disciplinary structure of physics may be better encoded with graph embedding rather than content embedding. In other words, titles—which are often the only "content" information available for many papers—may not fully capture the content of the paper. Abstracts are able to encode the disciplinary structure better than titles, although abstracts tend to be more limited in availability. Meanwhile, citations are more informative and provide more accurate information about the "location" of a paper. In the future, we may explore further the variety of information captured by different embedding methods, as well as test embedding methods that use both text data and citation information. Embedding text and citation data provides many exciting opportunities to study how scientific knowledge is referenced, created, and shared.

Data and Code Availability

The code used in the analysis is available at https://github.com/sabsconstantino/emb-comp-aps. The American Physical Society dataset is available upon request at https://journals.aps.org/datasets. Abstract data from the Web of Science is proprietary and cannot be made available.

Author Contributions

Isabel Constantino—Conceptualization, Data curation, Methodology, Software, Visualization, Writing original draft, Writing—review and editing. Sadamori Kojaku—Methodology, Software, Writing original draft, Writing—review and editing. Santo Fortunato—Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Methodology, Writing—review and editing. Yong-Yeol Ahn—Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Methodology, Supervision, Writing—original draft, Writing—review and editing.

Funding Information

I.C., S.K., and Y.Y.A. are supported by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research under award number FA9550-19-1-0391. S.F. is supported by the National Science Foundation under award number 1927418, the Air Force Office of Scientific Research under award number FA9550-19-1-0354, and the National Institute of General Medical Sciences of the National Institutes of Health under award number R35GM146974.

References

- Adamic, L. A., & Adar, E. (2003). Friends and neighbors on the Web. Social Networks, 25(3), 211–230. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-8733(03)00009-1
- Belkin, M., & Niyogi, P. (2003). Laplacian Eigenmaps for Dimensionality Reduction and Data Representation. Neural Computation, 15(6), 1373–1396. https://doi.org/10.1162/089976603321780317
- Beltagy, I., Lo, K., & Cohan, A. (2019). SciBERT: A Pretrained Language Model for Scientific Text. Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP), 3613–3618. https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/D19-1371
- Blei, D. M. (2012). Probabilistic topic models. *Communications of the ACM*, 55(4), 77–84. https: //doi.org/10.1145/2133806.2133826
- Blei, D. M., Ng, A. Y., & Jordan, M. I. (2003). Latent dirichlet allocation. The Journal of Machine Learning Research, 993–1022. https://doi.org/10.5555/944919.944937
- Börner, K., Klavans, R., Patek, M., Zoss, A. M., Biberstine, J. R., Light, R. P., Larivière, V., & Boyack, K. W. (2012). Design and Update of a Classification System: The UCSD Map of Science. *PLOS ONE*, 7(7), e39464. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0039464
- Boyack, K. W., & Klavans, R. (2014). Creation of a highly detailed, dynamic, global model and map of science. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 65(4), 670–685. https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.22990
- Boyack, K. W., Klavans, R., & Börner, K. (2005). Mapping the backbone of science. *Scientometrics*, 64(3), 351–374. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-005-0255-6
- Chinazzi, M., Gonçalves, B., Zhang, Q., & Vespignani, A. (2019). Mapping the physics research space: A machine learning approach. *EPJ Data Science*, 8(1), 33. https://doi.org/10.1140/ epjds/s13688-019-0210-z
- Conover, W. (1999). Practical nonparametric statistics. Wiley.
- Courtial, J.-P., & Law, J. (1989). A co-word study of artificial intelligence. Social Studies of Science, 19(2), 301–311. https://doi.org/10.1177/030631289019002005

- Dehghan-Kooshkghazi, A., Kamiński, B., Kraiński, Ł., Prałat, P., & Théberge, F. (2022). Evaluating node embeddings of complex networks.
- Devlin, J., Chang, M.-W., Lee, K., & Toutanova, K. (2019). BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers), 4171–4186. https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/ N19-1423
- Endres, D., & Schindelin, J. (2003). A new metric for probability distributions. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 49(7), 1858–1860. https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.2003.813506
- Fleming, L. (2001). Recombinant uncertainty in technological search. Management Science, 47(1), 117–132. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.47.1.117.10671
- Griffiths, T. L., & Steyvers, M. (2004). Finding scientific topics. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 101 (suppl 1), 5228–5235. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0307752101
- Grover, A., & Leskovec, J. (2016). Node2vec: Scalable Feature Learning for Networks. Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining - KDD '16, 855–864. https://doi.org/10.1145/2939672.2939754
- Gu, W., Tandon, A., Ahn, Y.-Y., & Radicchi, F. (2021). Principled approach to the selection of the embedding dimension of networks. *Nature Communications*, 12(1), 3772. https://doi.org/ 10.1038/s41467-021-23795-5
- Johnson, J., Douze, M., & Jégou, H. (2019). Billion-scale similarity search with GPUs. *IEEE Trans*actions on Big Data, 7(3), 535–547. https://doi.org/10.1109/TBDATA.2019.2921572
- Kauffman, S. A. (1984). Emergent properties in random complex automata. Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena, 10(1), 145–156. https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-2789(84)90257-4
- Kojaku, S., Yoon, J., Constantino, I., & Ahn, Y.-Y. (2021). Residual2Vec: Debiasing graph embedding with random graphs. Thirty-Fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems.
- Kozlowski, D., Dusdal, J., Pang, J., & Zilian, A. (2021). Semantic and relational spaces in science of science: Deep learning models for article vectorisation. *Scientometrics*, 1–30. https://doi. org/10.1007/s11192-021-03984-1

- Kullback, S., & Leibler, R. A. (1951). On Information and Sufficiency. The Annals of Mathematical Statistics, 22(1), 79–86. https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177729694
- Le, Q., & Mikolov, T. (2014). Distributed Representations of Sentences and Documents. International Conference on Machine Learning, 1188–1196.
- Leahey, E., & Moody, J. (2014). Sociological Innovation through Subfield Integration: Social Currents. https://doi.org/10.1177/2329496514540131
- Leydesdorff, L., & Rafols, I. (2011). Indicators of the interdisciplinarity of journals: Diversity, centrality, and citations. *Journal of Informetrics*, 5(1), 87–100. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi. 2010.09.002
- Leydesdorff, L., Wagner, C. S., & Bornmann, L. (2019). Interdisciplinarity as diversity in citation patterns among journals: Rao-Stirling diversity, relative variety, and the Gini coefficient. *Journal of Informetrics*, 13(1), 255–269. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2018.12.006
- Liben-Nowell, D., & Kleinberg, J. (2007). The link-prediction problem for social networks. Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, 58(7), 1019–1031. https: //doi.org/10.1002/asi.20591
- Lin, Y., Evans, J. A., & Wu, L. (2022). New directions in science emerge from disconnection and discord. Journal of Informetrics, 16(1), 101234. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2021.101234
- Liu, D., & Eliassi-Rad, T. (2023). STABLE: Identifying and Mitigating Instability in Embeddings of the Degenerate Core. SIAM International Conference on Data Mining.
- Mikolov, T., Chen, K., Corrado, G., & Dean, J. (2013). Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space.
- Mikolov, T., Sutskever, I., Chen, K., Corrado, G. S., & Dean, J. (2013). Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 26.
- Peng, H., Ke, Q., Budak, C., Romero, D. M., & Ahn, Y.-Y. (2021). Neural embeddings of scholarly periodicals reveal complex disciplinary organizations. *Science Advances*, 7(17), eabb9004. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abb9004
- Physical Review Journals. (n.d.).
- Physics and Astronomy Classification Scheme (PACS). (2008).

- Rafols, I., & Meyer, M. (2010). Diversity and network coherence as indicators of interdisciplinarity: Case studies in bionanoscience. *Scientometrics*, 82(2), 263–287. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s11192-009-0041-y
- Reimers, N., & Gurevych, I. (2019). Sentence-BERT: Sentence embeddings using Siamese BERT-Networks. Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP), 3982–3992. https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/D19-1410
- Rosen-Zvi, M., Griffiths, T., Steyvers, M., & Smyth, P. (2004). The author-topic model for authors and documents. Proceedings of the 20th conference on uncertainty in artificial intelligence, 487–494.
- Shibata, N., Kajikawa, Y., & Sakata, I. (2012). Link prediction in citation networks. Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, 63(1), 78–85. https://doi.org/ 10.1002/asi.21664
- Steel, M., Hordijk, W., & Kauffman, S. A. (2020). Dynamics of a birth-death process based on combinatorial innovation. Journal of Theoretical Biology, 491, 110187. https://doi.org/10. 1016/j.jtbi.2020.110187
- Uzzi, B., Mukherjee, S., Stringer, M., & Jones, B. (2013). Atypical Combinations and Scientific Impact. Science, 342(6157), 468–472. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1240474
- Wang, J., Veugelers, R., & Stephan, P. (2017). Bias against novelty in science: A cautionary tale for users of bibliometric indicators. *Research Policy*, 46(8), 1416–1436. https://doi.org/10. 1016/j.respol.2017.06.006
- Weitzman, M. L. (1998). Recombinant Growth*. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 113(2), 331– 360. https://doi.org/10.1162/003355398555595
- Wilcoxon, F. (1945). Individual Comparisons by Ranking Methods. Biometrics Bulletin, 1(6), 80– 83. https://doi.org/10.2307/3001968
- Wolf, T., Debut, L., Sanh, V., Chaumond, J., Delangue, C., Moi, A., Cistac, P., Rault, T., Louf, R.,
 Funtowicz, M., Davison, J., Shleifer, S., von Platen, P., Ma, C., Jernite, Y., Plu, J., Xu, C.,
 Le Scao, T., Gugger, S., ... Rush, A. (2020). Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language
 processing. Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language

Processing: System Demonstrations, 38–45. https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.emnlp-demos.6

- Wu, L., Wang, D., & Evans, J. A. (2019). Large teams develop and small teams disrupt science and technology. Nature, 566 (7744), 378–382. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-0941-9
- Zhang, Y., Zhao, F., & Lu, J. (2019). P2V: Large-scale academic paper embedding. *Scientometrics*, 121(1), 399–432. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-019-03206-9