Tie Strength Distribution in Scientific Collaboration Networks

Qing Ke and Yong-Yeol Ahn*
Center for Complex Networks and Systems Research,
School of Informatics and Computing, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA
(Dated: February 27, 2022)

Science is increasingly dominated by teams. Understanding patterns of scientific collaboration and their impacts on the productivity and evolution of disciplines is crucial to understand scientific processes. Electronic bibliography offers a unique opportunity to map and investigate the nature of scientific collaboration. Recent work have demonstrated a counter-intuitive organizational pattern of scientific collaboration networks: densely interconnected local clusters consist of weak ties, whereas strong ties play the role of connecting different clusters. This pattern contrasts itself from many other types of networks where strong ties form communities while weak ties connect different communities. Although there are many models for collaboration networks, no model reproduces this pattern. In this paper, we present an evolution model of collaboration networks, which reproduces many properties of real-world collaboration networks, including the organization of tie strengths, skewed degree and weight distribution, high clustering and assortative mixing.

arXiv:1401.5027v3 [physics.soc-ph] 6 Jul 2014

I. INTRODUCTION

Teams are increasingly overshadowing solo authors in production of knowledge [1]. Examining patterns of scientific collaboration is therefore crucial to understand the scientific processes, knowledge production [1], research productivity [2], the evolution of disciplines [3], and scientific impact [4, 5], etc. Electronic bibliographic data and the development of network science make it possible to systematically investigate scientific collaboration at a large scale [6–8]. A common approach to studying scientific collaboration is to construct a network of collaboration, where nodes represent authors and two authors are connected by co-authorship [9]. Various aspects of collaboration networks have been widely explored, including basic structural properties [9, 10], evolution [11], robustness [12, 13], assortative mixing [14], and rich-club ordering [15, 16]. Since coauthors usually know each other, collaboration networks have often been considered as proxies of social networks [9]. This viewpoint has been widely adopted, because collaboration networks can be systematically constructed without any subjective bias [9] and the size of these networks can be large.

However, recent studies have revealed that collaboration networks possess unique properties that are not presented in other proxies of real-world social networks such as mobile communication networks and online social networks. One example is the atypical distribution of weak and strong ties. Like most other networks, collaboration networks exhibit cohesive groups ('communities') [17–20]. Since Granovetter pioneered the ideas of the relationship between network structure and tie strength, it has been assumed that strong ties tend to exist in the communities, while weak ties tend to connect these groups [17, 21]. Here we refer 'communities' in a purely structural point of view, ignoring weights and 'weak' and 'strong' ties refer the weight of edges. This organizational principle has been repeatedly confirmed in many networks [22–27]. However, scientific collaboration networks exhibit the opposite pattern; weak ties constitute communities, while strong ties connect these research communities [27, 28]. This counter-intuitive observation raises a question: How and why collaboration networks are shaped in this way?

Although there are many models of scientific collaboration networks or similar weighted networks [3, 11, 29–35], the organization of tie strength and their roles on global connectivity have not been fully explored. Here we propose that the academic advising system, the patterns of academic career trajectory, and the active inter-group collaboration may provide an explanation. Our key notion is that weak ties are mainly formed from short-term collaborations between students and their advisors, while strong ties are formed through long-term collaborations between groups [28]. Built on this notion, our model reproduces the tie-strength distribution as well as other common properties, such as skewed degree and weight distribution, high clustering, and assortative mixing.

II. STRUCTURE AND LINK WEIGHT

To test the universality of the atypical tie-strength distributions in scientific collaboration reported in [27, 28], we analyze four scientific collaboration networks: Network Science, High-energy Physics, Astrophysics, and Condensed Matter. Link weights in these networks are defined by $w_{ij} = \sum_p \frac{1}{n_p - 1}$, where n_p is the number of authors in paper p in which i and j participated [10, 36]. Although this particular definition of weight is not unique, it has been widely accepted as a standard metric (See Section III in [36] for a detail and thorough discussion about it). Table I lists basic statistics of these networks. As many studies demonstrated, both degree and link weights are broadly distributed [9, 10].

Figure 1 shows the relationship between link weight

* yyahn@indiana.edu

Name	N	M	$\langle k\rangle$	$\langle w\rangle$	c	r	Time
Net-sci	379	914	4.823	0.536	0.741	-0.0817	-
Hep-th	5,835	13,815	4.74	0.990	0.506	0.185	1995 – 1999
Astro-ph	14,845	119,652	16.12	0.279	0.670	0.228	1995 – 1999
Cond-mat	36,458	171,735	9.42	0.506	0.657	0.177	1995 – 2005

TABLE I. Structural statistics for weighted scientific collaboration networks include number of nodes N, number of links M, mean node degree $\langle k\rangle$, mean link weight $\langle w\rangle$, clustering coefficient c [37], and assortativity coefficient r [14]. Net-sci is based on the coauthorship of scientists working on network science [38]. Hep-th, Astro-ph, and Cond-mat are constructed based on the papers posted on High-energy Physics E-Print Archive (`http://arxiv.org/archive/hep-th`), Astrophysics E-Print Archive (`http://arxiv.org/archive/astro-ph`), and Condensed Matter E-Print Archive (`http://arxiv.org/archive/cond-mat`), respectively [9]. For each network, we only consider the largest connected component. All the 4 networks are downloaded from `http://www-personal.umich.edu/~mejn/netdata/`.

w_{ij} and local clustering defined by the overlap measure $O_{ij} = \frac{n_{ij}}{d_i - 1 + d_j - 1 - n_{ij}}$, where n_{ij} is the number of common neighbors of node i and j, and d_i (d_j) is the degree of node i (j) [23]. O_{ij} quantifies the overlap between the neighbors of two end-points and measures *embeddedness* of an edge. For instance, $O_{ij} = 0$ indicates that nodes i and j have no common neighbors and the link is likely to connect communities. For a large portion of links, overlap decreases with weights. For a small portion of strongest links (20% links with $w_{ij} > 0.640$ for Net-sci, 4.3% links with $w_{ij} > 3.327$ for Hep-th, 7.8% links with $w_{ij} > 0.765$ for Astro-ph, and 14% links with $w_{ij} > 0.869$ for Cond-mat), overlap increases with weights. These results indicate that weak ties mainly constitute dense local clusters, whereas strong ties are connecting these clusters. In order to further confirm the universality of weight-topology coupling patterns in scientific collaboration networks, we examine network connectivity under link removal [23, 25, 28]. We remove links based on descending or ascending order of link weights and track the relative size of Largest Connected Component (LCC) R_{LCC} as a function of the fraction of removed links. Figure 2 shows that removing strong links breaks the networks into disconnected components faster than removing weak links, indicating that strong links are more important in maintaining global network connectivity. Strong links connect clusters (Fig. 3B), while weak links reside inside communities (Fig. 3C).




FIG. 1. The correlation between link overlap O_{ij} and link weight w_{ij} in scientific collaboration network of (A) Network Science, (B) High-energy Physics, (C) Astrophysics, and (D) Condensed Matter. We use logarithmic binning for w_{ij}. The error bars indicate the standard error of the mean O_{ij}. For a large portion of links, overlap decreases with weight. For a small portion of strongest links, overlap increases with weight.

III. MODEL

Many models have been proposed to explain the known properties of scientific collaboration networks. However, these models either do not consider link weights or do not capture the role of strong ties in maintaining global connectivity. Some models focus on assortative mixing [29, 30]. Some study the self-organizing evolution of collaboration networks as preferential attachment and "rich-get-richer" [11, 31, 32]. Others emphasize the evolution of disciplines [33] or social interaction of scientists [3]. The weak-tie hypothesis has often been considered as an evident truth about networks, and most models that produce community structures assume so [40, 41].

By contrast, our model is based on the following observations: (i) scientific collaboration networks grow in time, as new papers and scientists join continuously; (ii) junior scientists become inactive with high probability; indeed, recent work on analysis of the APS dataset reveals that 40% of authors only publish one paper in their entire career [28]; and (iii) long-term collaboration usually occurs between senior scientists who have their own research groups [28].

Our model has two mechanisms of producing new papers: intra-group and inter-group collaboration. Starting with a research group of an advisor and a student, the collaboration network grows over time. At every time step:

- With probability c, each group publishes one paper by itself. The parameter c controls the ratio of total number of authors to total number of papers. Each paper is written by the advisor and $l-1$ co-authors preferentially chosen from the same group based on the students' scientific expertise e. The probability to be chosen is proportional to e. If a student joins




FIG. 2. The robustness of scientific collaboration network of (A) Network Science, (B) High-energy Physics, (C) Astrophysics, and (D) Condensed Matter under the removal of strong (weak) ties. The control parameter f means the fraction of removed links. The removal of links is on the basis of their strength w_{ij}. The black dashed curves correspond to the removal of links from weak to strong. The red solid curves correspond to the removal of links from strong to weak. The relative size of Largest Connected Component (LCC) $R_{LCC} = N_{LCC}/N$ indicates that the removal of strong links leads to a faster breakdown of networks.




FIG. 3. Visualization of the structure of Network Science collaboration network and link removal process. (A) The whole network structure with 379 nodes and 914 links. The color of each node indicates its community membership obtained by Louvain method [39]. (B) The remaining subgraph after removal of 43% strongest links. The shaded region indicates Largest Connected Component. (C) The remaining subgraph after removal of 43% weakest links.

a group at time τ, with initial expertise $e(\tau) = 1$, e increases linearly with time: $e(t) = t - \tau + 1$;

- Each group may publish up to α papers with another group. If the group has not had any external collaboration, it chooses a group randomly and establish a permanent preferred collaboration relationship. The group tries to write α papers, each with probability c; Each paper still have l authors, among which two are the two advisors from each group and $l-2$ are randomly chosen from the pool of students of the two groups with probability proportional to their expertise; The parameter α controls the ratio of inter-group collaborations to that of intra-group.

Parameter	Meaning
c	Probability to publish paper
l	Number of authors in each paper
G	Expertise threshold for students to graduate
f	Probability of graduates to form new groups
α	Ratio of inter-group to intra-group collaborations

TABLE II. Model parameters and their explanations.

- Each group has one new student;

- When the expertise reaches a threshold G, the student forms a new group with probability f or becomes inactive with probability $1 - f$.

A. Simulation Results

In setting the parameter values (or distributions), we incorporate as many empirically measured values as possible. First, we assume the following parameters to be constants, namely $c = 0.4$, $G = 7$, and $f = 0.2$ in our analysis. The choice for $c = 0.4$ is based on the ratio of total number of scientists to that of papers in the APS dataset. The other parameters G and f are also chosen based on real-world observations [42]. The number of authors in each paper, l, is a random variable with the underlying probability distribution obtained from the APS dataset. The only free parameter is α and we have performed a robustness analysis of α and the other parameters in Section III C. Table II shows the meanings of the model parameters.

We have one free parameter, α, and we investigate the impact of inter-group collaboration by varying it. Fig. 4A-C demonstrate that the v-shaped pattern between overlap and weight can be reproduced when $\alpha \geq 1$, *i.e.*, when there are active inter-group collaborations. Fig. 4D-F show that, on the other hand, the strong ties increasingly maintain global connectivity if we decrease α. As we will demostrate in the next section, when $\alpha \simeq 3.44$, the difference between intra- and inter-group tie strength is 0. Our model seems to exhibit the most similar weight organization with the real collaboration networks around $\alpha = 1$. All the results below are obtained when $\alpha = 1$. These results indicate that the inter-group collaborations plays an important role in explaining the atypical tie-strength distributions in scientific collaboration networks.

Furthermore, our model reproduces other common properties of scientific collaboration networks: (i) skewed distribution of degree and link weights, as shown in Fig. 5 and (ii) strong clustering (average clustering coefficient is 0.55 when $\alpha = 1$).




FIG. 4. Model results with different α. Top: correlation between O_{ij} and w_{ij}; Bottom: model network robustness to link removal. Left: $\alpha = 0$; Middle: $\alpha = 1$; Right: $\alpha = 3$.




FIG. 5. Our model produces skewed degree and weight distributions. Complementary cumulative (Top) degree and (Bottom) weight distributions. Left: $\alpha = 0$; Middle: $\alpha = 1$; Right: Hep-th.

B. Analytical Results

By calculating the gained tie strength within a group and between groups at each time step, we show that when $\alpha \simeq 3.44$, the difference between intra- and inter-group tie strength is 0. We focus on stationary groups with G students and with total expertise $G(G+1)/2$. With probability c, the advisor a in group g writes one paper with the group members. It will add the weight of $\frac{1}{l-1}$ to the link between the advisor and a chosen student. Let $p_i(e)$ be the probability that a student with expertise e is chosen in an intra-group paper (see Appendix B for its calculation). Then the gained link weight between the advisor and the student is

$$w_{a,e}^{(i)} = \frac{c}{l-1} p_i(e). \tag{1}$$

Let $p_i(e_1, e_2)$ be probability that two students in the group g with expertise e_1 and e_2 are chosen in an intra-group paper. Then the gained link weight between the two students is

$$w_{e_1,e_2}^{(i)} = \frac{c}{l-1} p_i(e_1, e_2). \tag{2}$$

Meanwhile, the advisor a in group g writes on average αc papers with another group g'. The weight between the two advisors increases by

$$w_{a,a'} = \frac{\alpha c}{l-1}. \tag{3}$$

Let $p_b(e)$ be the probability that a student with expertise e is chosen in an inter-group paper. Then the expected gain, through inter-group collaborations, of weights between an advisor and a student with expertise e either in the same group ($w_{a,e}^{(i')}$) or the other group ($w_{a,e}^{(b)}$) are represented as follows:

$$w_{a,e}^{(i')} = w_{a,e}^{(b)} = \frac{\alpha c}{l-1} p_b(e). \tag{4}$$

Let $p_b(e_1, e_2)$ be the probability that two students with expertise e_1 and e_2 are chosen in an inter-group paper. Then

$$w_{e_1,e_2}^{(i')} = w_{e_1,e_2}^{(b)} = \frac{\alpha c}{l-1} p_b(e_1, e_2). \tag{5}$$

So the gained tie strength within a group at each time step is

$$W^{(i)} = \sum_{e=1}^{G} w_{a,e}^{(i)} + \sum_{e_1 \neq e_2} w_{e_1,e_2}^{(i)} + \sum_{e=1}^{G} w_{a,e}^{(i')} + \sum_{e_1 \neq e_2} w_{e_1,e_2}^{(i')}. \tag{6}$$

The total gained tie strength between the two groups is

$$W^{(b)} = w_{a,a'} + \sum_{e=1}^{G} w_{a,e}^{(b)} + \sum_{e_1=1}^{G} \sum_{e_2=1}^{G} w_{e_1,e_2}^{(b)}. \tag{7}$$

The difference between inter-group tie strength and intra-group tie strength is

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta W &= W^{(i)} - W^{(b)} \\ &= \frac{c}{l-1} \left(\sum_{e=1}^{G} p_i(e) + \sum_{e_1 \neq e_2} p_i(e_1, e_2) - \alpha - \alpha \sum_{e=1}^{G} p_b(e, e) \right) \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

$\Delta W = 0$ when

$$\alpha_c = \frac{\sum_{e=1}^{G} p_i(e) + \sum_{e_1 \neq e_2} p_i(e_1, e_2)}{1 + \sum_{e=1}^{G} p_b(e, e)} \simeq 3.44. \quad (9)$$

Indeed, Fig. 4*F* shows that with $\alpha = 3$, the removal of weak and strong ties similarly affects the connectivity of the network until about 60% of the edges removed.

We next derive the number of groups $n_g(t)$ and the number of students $n_s(t)$ at t. Let $n_s^{(e)}(t)$ be the number of students at the expertise level e at time step t. The expertise e increases in time and the students graduate when the expertise reaches G. Graduates create their own group with the probability f, namely

$$n_g(t) = n_g(t-1) + f n_s^{(G-1)}(t-1), \quad (10)$$

with $n_g(0) = \ldots = n_g(G-2) = 1$. At each time step, there are the same number of new students as the number of groups

$$n_s^{(1)}(t) = n_g(t). \quad (11)$$

The number of students with expertise $e \geq 2$ is the same as the number of students with expertise $e-1$ in the previous time step

$$n_s^{(e)}(t) = \ldots = n_s^{(1)}(t-(e-1)) = n_g(t-e+1). \quad (12)$$

Therefore, the number of groups is

$$n_g(t) = n_g(t-1) + f n_g(t-G+1). \quad (t \geq G-1) \quad (13)$$

The number of students is

$$n_s(t) = \sum_{e=1}^{G} n_s^{(e)}(t) = \sum_{e=1}^{G} n_g(t-e+1). \quad (t \geq G-1) \quad (14)$$

with $n_s(t) = t+1$ for $t \leq G-2$. The increased number of nodes is the number of groups in the previous time step

$$N(t) = N(t-1) + n_g(t-1) \quad (15)$$

with $N(0) = 0$ and $N(t) = t+1$ for $1 \leq t \leq G-2$. These analytical results are in agreement with the numerical results, as shown in Fig. 6.

Finally, we offer the calculation of the mean degree $\langle d \rangle$ of model networks in Appendix A.

C. Robustness Analysis

We now investigate the model's sensitivity to the parameters G and f. Fig. 7 and 8 show that our model is robust to the choices of parameters G and f. The two observations are still produced when (Fig. 7) $G = 6$ or $G = 8$ and when (Fig. 8) $f = 0.1$ or $f = 0.3$.




FIG. 6. Comparison of calculation results with numerical results of (*A*) number of of groups $n_g(t)$ and (*B*) number of students $n_s(t)$. The numerical results are averaged over 100 repetitions.




FIG. 7. (Top) Weight-overlap correlation and (Bottom) robustness to link removal when (Left) $G = 6$ and (Right) $G = 8$.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we explore the weight organization of scientific collaboration networks. We propose a model, which incorporates intra- and inter-group collaborations and reproduces many properties of real-world collaboration networks. We also provide detailed analysis of our model. Our work also raises further questions such as: How did the collaboration pattern change in time? How do scientific ideas flow through strong and weak ties? Are there any general coupling patterns (or classes) between structure and weights?

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank Lilian Weng, Nicola Perra, Márton Karsai, Filippo Menczer, Alessandro Flammini, Filippo Radicchi, Martin Rosvall, Jie Tang, and Honglei Zhuang for helpful discussions, and John




FIG. 8. (Top) Weight-overlap correlation and (Bottom) robustness to link removal when (Left) $f = 0.1$ and (Right) $f = 0.3$.

McCurley for editorial assistance.

Appendix A: Calculation of mean degree

In order to get the expected degree of an advisor when graduation, we track it from time step τ when she joined a stationary group g as a student a_1 with initial expertise $e = 1$ to $\tau + G - 1$ when graduation with expertise G. For intra-group collaboration, there are already a total of $G - 2$ students in group g at τ. From $t = \tau + 1$ to $t = \tau + G - 2$, there are another $G - 2$ new students joining in the group. Let $I(a_1, a_2)$ ($\Pr(a_1, a_2)$) be the indicator function (probability) that a_1 have collaborated with a_2. The number of different students collaborators in the group g for a_1 is

$$\begin{aligned} d_i &= \sum_{a_e \in g} I(a_1, a_e) = \sum_{a_e \in g} 1 \times \Pr(a_1, a_e) \\ &= \sum_{a_e \in g} 1 - \overline{\Pr}(a_1, a_e) \\ &= 2(G-2) - \sum_{a_e \in g} \overline{\Pr}(a_1, a_e). \end{aligned} \tag{A1}$$

Consider the student a_2 with expertise $e = 2$ at time $t = \tau$, a_1 and a_2 will be in the same group until the expertise of a_2 reaches $G - 1$. Let $\bar{p}(e_1, e_2)$ be the probability that two students with expertise e_1 and e_2 are not chosen in the one intra-group paper

$$\bar{p}(e_1, e_2) = (1 - c) + c(1 - p_i(e_1, e_2)). \tag{A2}$$

Then $\overline{\Pr}(a_1, a_2)$ is the probability that a_1 do not collaborate with a_2 from $t = \tau$ to $t = \tau + G - 3$

$$\overline{\Pr}(a_1, a_2) = \prod_{e=1}^{G-2} \bar{p}(e, e+1).$$

Similarly, for student $a_3, \ldots, a_{G-1}$ with expertise $e = 3, \ldots, G - 1$ at time $t = \tau$

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\Pr}(a_1, a_3) &= \prod_{e=1}^{G-3} \bar{p}(e, e+2), \\ &\cdots \\ \overline{\Pr}(a, a_{G-1}) &= \prod_{e=1}^{1} \bar{p}(e, e+G-2). \end{aligned}$$

From time step $t = \tau + 1$ to $t = \tau + G - 2$, the expertise of a_1 increases from $e = 2$ to $G - 1$. A new student joins the group at each time step

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\Pr}(a_1, a_G) &= \prod_{e=2}^{G-1} \bar{p}(e, e-1), \\ &\cdots \\ \overline{\Pr}(a_1, a_{2G-3}) &= \prod_{e=G-1}^{G-1} \bar{p}(e, e-(G-2)). \end{aligned}$$

The intra-group degree for student collaborators (Eq. A1) now is

$$d_i = 2(G-2) - \sum_{j=1}^{G-2} \prod_{e=1}^{G-1-j} \bar{p}(e, e+j) - \sum_{j=2}^{G-1} \prod_{e=j}^{G-1} \bar{p}(e, e-(j-1)). \tag{A3}$$

The inter-group degree d_b is similar except different probability form. There are a total of $2(G-2)+1$ number of different students (one more student in group g' with expertise 1). Let $\bar{p}_b^{(\alpha)}(e_1, e_2)$ be the probability that two students with expertise e_1 and e_2 are not chosen in any of the α inter-group papers. Then, the number of student collaborators in another group g' is

$$d_b = 2G - 3 - \sum_{j=0}^{G-2} \prod_{e=1}^{G-1-j} \overline{p}^{(\alpha)}(e, e+j) - \sum_{j=2}^{G-1} \prod_{e=j}^{G-1} \overline{p}^{(\alpha)}(e, e-(j-1)). \tag{A4}$$

Considering two advisers, we get the degree of the student a_1 when graduation

$$d = d_i + d_b + 2. \tag{A5}$$

After graduation, a_1 becomes an advisor with probability f. The increased degree at each time step now is the probability of collaborating with the two newly joined students

$$\Delta d_m = (1 - (1 - p_i(1))) + (1 - (1 - p_b(1))^{\alpha}). \tag{A6}$$

The total degree of advisors at time step t is

$$D_m(t) = \sum_{\tau=G-1}^{t-1} \left\{ n_s^{(G-1)}(\tau) \cdot f \cdot [d + (t - \tau + 1)\, \Delta d_m] \right\}. \tag{A7}$$

Using the same idea, we can get the degree of a student with expertise e ($e \leq G-1$) at time step t. This is a general case of Equations A3 and A4

$$d_i^{(e)}(t) = 2(G-2) - \sum_{i=1}^{G-1-e} \prod_{j=1}^{e} \bar{p}(j, j+i) - \sum_{i=1}^{e-1} \prod_{j=1}^{e-i} \bar{p}(j, j+G-1-(e-i)) - \sum_{i=2}^{e} \prod_{j=i}^{e} \bar{p}(j, j-(i-1)),$$

$$d_b^{(e)}(t) = 2G - 3 - \sum_{i=0}^{G-1-e} \prod_{j=1}^{e} \bar{p}^{(\alpha)}(j, j+i) - \sum_{i=1}^{e-1} \prod_{j=1}^{e-i} \bar{p}^{(\alpha)}(j, j+G-1-(e-i)) - \sum_{i=2}^{e} \prod_{j=i}^{e} \bar{p}^{(\alpha)}(j, j-(i-1)).$$

$$d^{(e)}(t) = d_i^{(e)}(t) + d_b^{(e)}(t) + 2. \tag{A8}$$

So the mean degree $\langle d \rangle$ at time step t is

$$\langle d \rangle (t) = \frac{1}{N(t)} [D_m(t) + \sum_{e=1}^{G-1} n_s^{(e)}(t) d^{(e)}(t)]. \tag{A9}$$

Appendix B: Calculation of $p_i(e)$

We describe how to calculate $p_i(e)$, $p_b(e)$, $p_i(e_1, e_2)$, and $p_b(e_1, e_2)$. Recall that $p_i(e)$ is the probability that a student with expertise e is chosen for one intra-group paper. Its distribution is the sum of multiple multivariate Wallenius' noncentral hypergeometric distributions [43] and can be calculated by using package `BiasedUrn` in R [44]. The calculations for $p_b(e)$, $p_i(e_1, e_2)$, and $p_b(e_1, e_2)$ are similar.

[1] S. Wuchty, B. F. Jones, and B. Uzzi, Science **316**, 1036 (2007).
[2] D. B. de Beaver and R. Rosen, Scientometrics **1**, 133 (1979).
[3] X. Sun, J. Kaur, S. Milojević, A. Flammini, and F. Menczer, Scientific Reports **3**, 1069 (2013).
[4] B. F. Jones, S. Wuchty, and B. Uzzi, Science **322**, 1259 (2008).
[5] B. Uzzi, S. Mukherjee, M. Stringer, and B. Jones, Science **342**, 468 (2013).
[6] M. E. J. Newman, SIAM Review **45**, 167 (2003).
[7] R. Albert and A.-L. Barabási, Rev. Mod. Phys. **74**, 47 (2002).
[8] S. Boccaletti, V. Latora, Y. Moreno, M. Chavez, and D.-U. Hwang, Physics Reports **424**, 175 (2006).
[9] M. E. J. Newman, PNAS **98**, 404 (2001).
[10] A. Barrat, M. Barthélemy, R. Pastor-Satorras, and A. Vespignani, PNAS **101**, 3747 (2004).
[11] A.-L. Barabási, H. Jeong, Z. Neda, E. Ravasz, A. Schubert, and T. Vicsek, Physica A **311**, 590 (2002).
[12] P. Holme, B. J. Kim, C. N. Yoon, and S. K. Han, Phys. Rev. E **65**, 056109 (2002).

[13] X.-F. Liu, X.-K. Xu, M. Small, and C. K. Tse, PLoS ONE **6**, e26271 (2011).
[14] M. E. J. Newman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 208701 (2002).
[15] V. Colizza, A. Flammini, M. A. Serrano, and A. Vespignani, Nature Physics **2**, 110 (2006).
[16] T. Opsahl, V. Colizza, P. Panzarasa, and J. J. Ramasco, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 168702 (2008).
[17] M. Girvan and M. E. J. Newman, PNAS **99**, 7821 (2002).
[18] S. Fortunato, Physics Reports **486**, 75 (2010).
[19] M. Rosvall and C. T. Bergstrom, PNAS **105**, 1118 (2008).
[20] Y.-Y. Ahn, J. P. Bagrow, and S. Lehmann, Nature **466**, 761 (2010).
[21] M. S. Granovetter, American Journal of Sociology **78**, 1360 (1973).
[22] N. Friedkin, Social Networks **2**, 411 (1980).
[23] J.-P. Onnela, J. Saramäki, J. Hyvönen, G. Szabó, D. Lazer, K. Kaski, J. Kertész, and A.-L. Barabási, PNAS **104**, 7332 (2007).
[24] J.-P. Onnela, J. Saramäki, J. Hyvönen, G. Szabó, M. A. de Menezes, K. Kaski, A.-L. Barabási, and J. Kertész, New Journal of Physics **9**, 179 (2007).
[25] X.-Q. Cheng, F.-X. Ren, H.-W. Shen, Z.-K. Zhang, and T. Zhou, J. Stat. Mech. **2010**, P10011 (2010).
[26] P. A. Grabowicz, J. J. Ramasco, E. Moro, J. M. Pujol, and V. M. Eguiluz, PLoS ONE **7**, e29358 (2012).
[27] S. Pajevic and D. Plenz, Nature Physics **8**, 429 (2012).
[28] R. K. Pan and J. Saramaki, EPL **97**, 18007 (2012).
[29] M. E. J. Newman and J. Park, Phys. Rev. E **68**, 036122 (2003).
[30] M. Catanzaro, G. Caldarelli, and L. Pietronero, Phys. Rev. E **70**, 037101 (2004).
[31] J. J. Ramasco, S. N. Dorogovtsev, and R. Pastor-Satorras, Phys. Rev. E **70**, 036106 (2004).
[32] K. Börner, J. T. Maru, and R. L. Goldstone, PNAS **101**, 5266 (2004).
[33] R. Guimera, B. Uzzi, J. Spiro, and L. A. N. Amaral, Science **308**, 697 (2005).
[34] K.-I. Goh, B. Kahng, and D. Kim, Phys. Rev. E **72**, 017103 (2005).
[35] K.-I. Goh, Y.-H. Eom, H. Jeong, B. Kahng, and D. Kim, Phys. Rev. E **73**, 066123 (2006).
[36] M. E. J. Newman, Phys. Rev. E **64**, 016132 (2001).
[37] D. J. Watts and S. H. Strogatz, Nature **393**, 440 (1998).
[38] M. E. J. Newman, Phys. Rev. E **74**, 036104 (2006).
[39] V. D. Blondel, J.-L. Guillaume, R. Lambiotte, and E. Lefebvre, J. Stat. Mech. **2008**, P10008 (2008).
[40] H.-H. Jo, R. K. Pan, and K. Kaski, PLoS ONE **6**, e22687 (2011).
[41] J. M. Kumpula, J.-P. Onnela, J. Saramäki, K. Kaski, and J. Kertész, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 228701 (2007).
[42] The expertise threshold for students to graduate, G, reflects the median year to earn a Ph.D. degree reported in [45]; probability of graduates to form new groups, f, is based on the percentage of Ph.D. students who land academic jobs by graduation [46].
[43] J. Chesson, J. Appl. Probab. **13**, 795 (1976).
[44] A. Fog, *Biasedurn: Biased urn model distributions*, `http://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/BiasedUrn/index.html` (2013), [Online; Accessed on 1-Nov-2013].
[45] T. B. Hoffer and V. Welch, *Time to Degree of U.S. Research Doctorate Recipients*, `http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/infbrief/nsf06312/` (2006), [Online; Accessed on 29-Mar-2014].
[46] J. Weissmann, *How Many Ph.D.'s Actually Get to Become College Professors?*, `http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2013/02/how-many-phds-actually-get-to-become-college-professors/273434/` (2013), [Online; Accessed on 29-Mar-2014].