

Mixed Logit Models and Network Formation

Harsh Gupta

Department of Economics, Stanford University,
Stanford, CA 94305, USA

Mason A. Porter

Department of Mathematics, University of California, Los Angeles,
Los Angeles, CA 90095, USA

E-mail address of corresponding author:

(e-mail: hgupta13@stanford.edu)

Abstract

The study of network formation is pervasive in economics, sociology, and many other fields. In this paper, we model network formation as a “choice” that is made by nodes in a network to connect to other nodes. We study these “choices” using discrete-choice models, in which an agent chooses between two or more discrete alternatives. One framework for studying network formation is the multinomial logit (MNL) model. We highlight limitations of the MNL model on networks that are constructed from empirical data. We employ the “repeated choice” (RC) model to study network formation (Revelt & Train, 1998). We argue that the RC model overcomes important limitations of the MNL model and is well-suited to study network formation. We also illustrate how to use the RC model to accurately study network formation using both synthetic and real-world networks. Using synthetic networks, we also compare the performance of the MNL model and the RC model; we find that the RC model estimates the data-generation process of our synthetic networks more accurately than the MNL model. We provide examples of qualitatively interesting questions — the presence of homophily in a teen friendship network and the fact that new patents are more likely to cite older, more cited, and similar patents — for which the RC model allows us to achieve insights.

1 Introduction

The analysis of network formation is a prominent topic in a diverse set of areas (Albert & Barabási, 2002; Goldenberg *et al.*, 2010; Blume *et al.*, 2011; Graham, 2015; Chandrasekhar, 2016). Analyzing the mechanisms behind network formation is helpful for understanding different features of a network. For example, it can yield insights into which factors affect edge formation and network growth, leading to insights on qualitatively interesting questions. For example, an important topic in sociology is to examine how homophily affects the behavior of individuals in a network (Wasserman & Faust, 1994; Pearson *et al.*, 2006). There are studies in economics about how network structure affects risk-sharing (Fafchamps & Gubert, 2007), and scholars have also examined how the formation of sexual networks affects the transmission of sexually-transmitted diseases (Handcock & Jones, 2004). Network formation has also been used for analyzing collective decision-making in political science (Siegel, 2009).

In the present paper, we take the conceptual view that edge formation between nodes (which represent entities in a network) result from “choices” that are made by those nodes. For example, in a directed network, if there is an edge from node i to node j , we suppose that node i has chosen to connect to node j (and perhaps may have chosen not to connect to other nodes in the network). This conceptual framework allows us to employ *discrete-choice* models to study network formation (Train, 2009). One can use a discrete-choice model to analyze the decisions that are made by an agent (or other entity) when choosing between two or more discrete alternatives. Discrete-choice models have several advantageous properties for studying network formation. First, they are flexible and can model several types of growing networks. Moreover, one can study the relative importances of different network-formation models for a given real-world network. Depending on the application at hand, one can also combine multiple network-formation models. Second, using tools like logistic regression, one can readily apply discrete-choice models to real-world networks. Third, there is a well-developed literature on discrete-choice models in economics and statistics that provides tools for inference, testing, and parameter selection (Hosmer & Lemeshow, 1980; Kleinbaum & Klein, 2002; Menard, 2002; Train, 2009). We overview discrete-choice models in Section 3.

Recently, Overgoor *et al.* (2019) reported the first use (to the best of our knowledge) of discrete-choice models to directly study network formation. Additionally, several econometric studies have employed discrete-choice models for empirical estimation (Chandrasekhar, 2016). Many of these econometric studies, as well as the paper by Overgoor *et al.* (2019) have focused largely on the *multinomial logit* model (MNL), which is one of the most popular discrete-models (Train, 2009).

We argue that the MNL model has certain features that are not well-suited to studying network formation. The MNL model assumes that each node makes exactly one choice (so it has an out-degree of 1) and that each node has the same choice set¹. These assumptions are almost never true for real-world networks (Newman, 2018). The violation of these assumptions implies that the estimates from the MNL model are biased, unless the “preferences” are homogeneous². We discuss these limitations of the MNL model in detail in Section 3.3.

To overcome these limitations of the MNL model, we use generalizations of the MNL model that are called *mixed logit* (MX) models (Train, 2009). Specifically, we use a type of MX model called the *repeated-choice* (RC) model (Revelt & Train, 1998). In the RC model, each node can make multiple choices, so nodes can have out-degrees that are larger than 1. Additionally, different nodes can have different choice sets and out-degrees. These properties are helpful for studying network growth. We use the RC model to analyze the statistical associations of various network features with network formation.

The main contribution of the present paper is to describe, employ, and illustrate the RC model in the context of network formation. We demonstrate three applications of the RC model. Our three applications also highlight important limitations — computational cost and complex inference — of the RC model.

¹ We use the terms “set of alternatives”, “alternative set”, and “choice set” interchangeably.

² The qualitative importance of this bias is different for different networks. In Sections 5 and 7, we give some examples in which this bias is qualitatively important.

In our first example, we apply the RC model to an ensemble of synthetic networks, and we find that the RC model is able to accurately estimate the data-generation process of these synthetic networks. For these networks, we show that the RC model is accurate when the “preferences” of the nodes are either homogeneous or heterogeneous, whereas the MNL model is accurate only when the preferences are homogeneous.

In our second example, we apply the RC model to a small friendship network to illustrate how to use the model to examine sociologically interesting questions. Specifically, we provide evidence that supports the claim that most individuals are likely to be friends with individuals who have similar lifestyle habits.

In our third example, we apply the RC model to a large patent citation network. In this example, we face computational constraints because of the large size of the network, so we discuss sampling methods to help overcome such constraints. We perform robustness tests to examine the validity of our results under different sampling methods, and we obtain similar qualitative results when we use different sampling methods. We also apply the MNL model to the citation network, and we argue that the MNL model ignores preference heterogeneity. In comparison to the MNL model, we find that the RC model yields a better understanding of how previous citations, age, and technology classification of a patent affects the probability that a patent will be cited by future patents.

The present paper proceeds as follows. In Section 2, we survey the existing literature on network formation and discuss our contributions in the context of this prior work. In Section 3, we overview discrete-choice models. In Section 4, we discuss MX models and the RC model. In Sections 5, 6, and 7, we apply the RC model to a synthetic network, a friendship network, and a patent citation network, respectively. In Section 8, we discuss the limitations and applicability of the RC model. We summarize and discuss our main results in Section 9.

2 Literature Review

There is a vast literature on network formation across many disciplines (Albert & Barabási, 2002; Goldenberg *et al.*, 2010; Blume *et al.*, 2011; Graham, 2015; Chandrasekhar, 2016; Newman, 2018).

In this section, we discuss how our paper relates to the existing literature.

In economics, there are several models of strategic network formation. (See chapters 5, 6, and 11 of Jackson (2010) and Jackson (2005) for a survey of such models.) The basic idea behind most of these models is that each node chooses which edges to form based on some “utility” that the node gets from the resulting network. An important feature of these models is that nodes have at least partial control over which edges they form. Inspired by previous studies of strategic network formation (Bloch & Jackson, 2006), our paper examines edge formation between nodes that result from choices that are made by the nodes. We explore this conceptual idea using discrete-choice models.

Several studies have used discrete-choice models to study network formation. For example, Overgoor *et al.* (2019) used discrete-choice models to examine sequential network formation, and Yeung (2019) used discrete-choice models to estimate the preferences of participants in bipartite networks. Additionally, discrete-choice models have also been used as building blocks in several empirical network-formation models (Christakis *et al.*, 2010; Goldsmith-Pinkham & Imbens, 2013; Graham, 2014; König, 2016).

Many studies that have used discrete-choice models have focused on the MNL model. We argue in Section 3.3 that the commonly used MNL model has several limitations when studying network formation. We then argue in Section 4.1 that the RC model, which is a discrete-choice model, has several desirable features that helps us overcome the aforementioned limitations.

An important difference between the MNL and RC models is that the parameters of the RC model are unbiased when the preferences are either heterogeneous or homogeneous, whereas the parameters of the MNL model are unbiased only when the preferences are homogeneous. We illustrate this difference using an ensemble of synthetic networks. (Graham, 2014) studied heterogeneity in network formation using fixed effects³. We use the RC model to study heterogeneity in edge formation that may arise due heterogeneity in preferences.

There is a class of network formation models, which are sometimes called “edge-independent models” (Chandrasekhar, 2016), that make the assumption that each edge in a network forms independently of all other edges. Examples of edge-independent network models include preferential-attachment models (Erdős & Rényi, 1960), random geometric graphs (Penrose, 2003), and risk-sharing models (Fafchamps & Gubert, 2007). We illustrate using a teen friendship network how to use the RC to estimate parameters in edge-independent models.

We also illustrate how to use the RC model to estimate parameters in preferential attachment (PA) models (Yule, 1925; Simon, 1955; de Solla Price, 1976; Newman, 2018) of networks. In PA models of networks, one begins with a small seed network and new nodes arise and connect to the network as time marches on. Each new node connects to one or more existing nodes with a probability that is determined by a specified kernel. Estimating parameters in a PA model can help one better understand how a node chooses which edges to form.

3 Discrete-Choice Models

A discrete choice is a choice situation in which an agent chooses between two or more discrete alternatives. For example, a person who is buying a new car is making a discrete choice (Train, 1986). In economics and statistics, it is common to use discrete-choice models to analyze such decisions (Kleinbaum & Klein, 2002; Hosmer & Lemeshow, 1980; Menard, 2002; Train, 2009). One of the most popular discrete-choice models is the multinomial logit (MNL) model (Train, 2009), which we discuss in detail in Section 3.2.

One can view network formation as a consequence of “choices” that are made by nodes. Each node “chooses” to form edges to other nodes. For example, in a directed network, if there is an edge from node i to node j , then node i “chose” to form an edge with node j . Each node has certain characteristics that determines the attachment probability for a node to select it, so this process of choosing leads to the formation and growth of networks.

³ In the context of network formation, “fixed effects” refer to an individual’s specific propensity to form an edge that is invariant across time. See Wooldridge (2006) for a detailed treatment of fixed effects.

For concreteness, let's consider a citation network. For example, in a paper-citation network, a new paper chooses to cite a subset of papers that already exist (Fortunato *et al.*, 2018). The attachment probability to cite an existing paper can depend on many things, including its current number of citations and the particular topics and approaches that it discusses. As new papers appear and cite existing papers, a citation network grows. For example, Overgoor *et al.* (2019) studied a citation network on climatology.

3.1 Benefits of Discrete-Choice Models

Discrete-choice models have several desirable properties for the study of growing networks.

First, using tools such as logistic regression, one can apply discrete-choice models to networks that one constructs from empirical data, and one can also readily estimate the parameters of such models (Train, 2009).

Second, discrete-choice models have been studied extensively in fields such as economics and statistics. The existing literature provides tools for estimation, hypothesis testing, and parameter selection (Hosmer & Lemeshow, 1980; Kleinbaum & Klein, 2002; Menard, 2002; Train, 2009).

Third, discrete-choice models are very flexible. Through appropriate choices of variables, they can model several classes of network-formation models. Specifically, Overgoor *et al.* (2019) showed that one can use the MNL model to construct preferential-attachment (PA) models (such as the ones in (Bianconi & Barabási, 2001; de Solla Price, 1976)), the $G(N, p)$ Erdős–Rényi model (Erdős & Rényi, 1960), and triadic-closure models (Overgoor *et al.*, 2019). One can also use discrete-choice models to construct a network-formation model that combines features of two or more existing models. Moreover, given a network, a discrete-choice model allows one to compare the relative importances of different network-formation models.

3.2 The Basic Structure of Discrete-Choice Models

In a discrete-choice model, a node n (which, for concreteness, we suppose to represent an individual) chooses from $J = |C|$ alternatives, where C denotes the set of alternatives. Each alternative j has a set of observable characteristics x_{nj} that influence individual n 's decision. In principle, the effect of the observable characteristics can take any functional form. However, almost all studies have assumed that the relationship is linear (Train, 2009). Following this convention, we define the *observable utility* to be $U_{nj} = \beta^T x_{nj}$ (Train, 2009). The utility also has a random component ε_{nj} . It is usually assumed that ε_{nj} follows a probability distribution that is an independently and identically distributed (IID) standard type-1 extreme value⁴ (also known as Gumbel distribution). Combining the observable and random utility, the *total utility* of individual n to make choice j is $V_{nj} = U_{nj} + \varepsilon_{nj}$. Individual n chooses an alternative j if it provides them with more utility than all other alternatives⁵.

⁴ The CDF of the standard type-1 extreme value distribution is $F(x) = \exp\{-e^{-x}\}$.

⁵ A tie occurs with probability 0 because the random component is a continuous random variable.

Using this formulation and the assumption that ε_{nj} follows an IID type-1 extreme-value distribution, we write the probability of the choice as

$$P_{nj} = \frac{\exp(\beta^T x_{nj})}{\sum_{i \in C} \exp(\beta^T x_{ni})}, \quad (1)$$

where P_{nj} is the probability that individual n chooses alternative j and C is the set of alternatives. This particular formulation is the MNL model (Train, 2009). One can readily estimate the *choice parameter* β using maximum-likelihood estimation (MLE), and there exist several methods for this statistical inference (Train, 2009). The MNL model is one of the most commonly employed discrete-choice models because it is statistically simple and is supported by a well-developed theory. We provide a brief overview of the MNL model; for a more complete treatment, see Kleinbaum & Klein (2002) or Train (2009).

The MNL model requires certain assumptions that are often violated when studying network formation. We discuss these assumptions and limitations in Section 3.3.

3.3 Limitations of the Multinomial Logit (MNL) Model

There are two key limitations of the MNL model when studying network formation⁶. These limitations restrict the types of networks for which the MNL model is appropriate. These limitations are inherent in the structure of the MNL model, so one needs to generalize the MNL model or use another type of model to overcome them.

The first key limitation is that the MNL model assumes that a node chooses only one of the possible J alternatives. This implies that the out-degree of any new node is equal to 1 when it is added to a network. However, in most situations, this is rarely true in practice (Newman, 2018). This requirement may lead to biases in estimates from using the MNL model in studies of network formation. Biases arise because observations may no longer be IID, as there may be correlations in the choices that a given node makes at different times. For example, in a social network, an individual's choices of friends are likely to be correlated (Wasserman & Faust, 1994). Similarly, a new paper may not choose which papers it cites in an independent way (Slyder *et al.*, 2011).

The second key limitation is that the MNL model assumes implicitly that each individual (i.e., each node) has the same choice set. In the context of network formation, this assumption is often inaccurate. If we consider sequential network formation, in which new nodes appear one after another (perhaps across time), newer nodes typically have a larger choice set than older nodes. For example, newer papers necessarily have a larger set of papers to

⁶ Another limitation of the MNL model is that it assumes independence of irrelevant alternatives (IIA). Intuitively, the principle of IIA states that when choosing between choices x and y , the other alternatives do not affect one's choice. Mathematically, the ratio of the probability of choice of x and probability of choice y does not depend on other alternatives, where the probability of choice of i is defined by equation (1). The assumption of IIA is contested hotly in the decision-theory literature (Hanks *et al.*, 2012; Benson *et al.*, 2016). The MNL model for network growth inherits the IIA assumption. As was shown in Hanks *et al.* (2012) and Benson *et al.* (2016), this assumption is often violated. See page 54 (Chapter 3) of Train (2009) for a simple example in which IIA fails. To apply the MNL model to study network growth, we need to check the validity of the IIA assumption. If it is violated, then it is likely undesirable to use the MNL model, because one of its central assumptions is violated.

cite than their predecessors. Other features of a network can also result in different nodes having different choice sets. The presence of heterogeneous choice sets also leads to biases in the estimates of the MNL model (Train, 2009).

4 Mixed Logit Models

Mixed logit (MX) models are flexible generalizations of the MNL model (Train, 2009). MX models can approximate any random-utility model (McFadden & Train, 2000)⁷. In MX models, the *choice parameters* β can be heterogeneous across individuals.

Let β_n denote the coefficient for individual n . For example, in a citation network, the effect of past citations can be different for different papers. Hypothetically, a discipline u may be more likely to cite more papers than another discipline v , and one can capture this difference with the inequality $\beta_u > \beta_v$. One captures the heterogeneity of the choice parameters across individuals by letting

$$V_{nj} = \beta_n^T x_{nj} + \varepsilon_{nj}. \quad (2)$$

We draw the choice parameters from a distribution $f(\beta_n|\theta)$, where θ is a vector that encodes the *distribution parameters*. The parameters of the distribution specify the distribution of the choice parameters (i.e., β_n). For example, if $f(\beta_n|\theta)$ is normally distributed, then X consists of the mean and variance.

For a specified value of β_n , we write the conditional choice probability as

$$P_{nj}(\beta_n) = \frac{\exp(\beta_n^T x_{nj})}{\sum_{i \in C_n} \exp(\beta_n^T x_{ni})}, \quad (3)$$

where C_n is individual n 's choice set. Note that the choice set can be different for different individuals⁸. To compute the unconditional probability, we take the expectation of the probability measure of $f(\beta_n|\theta)$ by calculating

$$P_{nj} = \int_{\beta_n \in D_{\beta_n}} P_{nj}(\beta_n) f(\beta_n|\theta) d\beta_n, \quad (4)$$

where D_{β_n} is the support of $f(\beta_n|\theta)$. We use MLE and unconditional probabilities to estimate θ .

Choice parameters can be different for different individuals. We use these features of MX models to overcome the associated limitation that we described in Section 3.3.

In Section 3.3, we highlight that the MNL model assumes that each node chooses only a single alternative. In the context of network formation, this assumption implies that all new nodes have an out-degree of 1, which is almost never true in practice (Newman, 2018). However, using MX models to allow multiple choices is challenging. From a theoretical perspective, one can expand the choice set to include multiple choices. If one does so, to have a valid probability measure, one must also expand the choice set to be the power set of

⁷ In a random utility model, the utility (i.e., benefit) of a choosing an alternative is a function of one or more random variables.

⁸ Yamamoto (2010) studied a special case of MX models for situations in which the choice set is different for different groups of individuals.

all of the single-choice alternatives. This results in a choice set with $2^{|C|}$ elements⁹, which can easily render it computationally intractable to perform estimation. Furthermore, from an intuitive perspective, it is not clear how to define and interpret the utility of multiple selections in a network context. For selecting one item $\{j\}$, one can define the utility as $U_{nj} = \beta_n^T x_{nj}$. However, it is not clear how to define the utility of selecting two items $\{j, k\}$. To resolve this issue, we view multiple selections as a sequence of choices. Considering multiple selections as a choice sequence allows us to estimate the distribution of β_n using the repeated-choice (RC) model (Revelt & Train, 1998), which is a special case of MX models.

4.1 The Repeated-Choice Model

The repeated-choice (RC) model, which was first proposed by Revelt & Train (1998), is well-suited to studying network formation. The RC model allows one to study networks with nodes whose out-degree is larger than 1. Additionally, the out-degree can be different for different nodes, and we are able to study networks with different choice sets for different nodes.

In the RC model, an individual n faces a situation in which they choose among J alternatives at each of T_n times. The number of times (i.e., T_n) that individual n chooses can be different for different individuals, and the set of alternatives can also be heterogeneous both across different individuals and across different choice instances for the same individual. Similar to Section 4, the attachment probability is

$$P_{njt}(\beta_n) = \frac{\exp(\beta_n^T x_{njt})}{\sum_{i \in C_{nt}} \exp(\beta_n^T x_{nit})}, \quad (5)$$

where P_{njt} is the probability that individual n chooses alternative j at time t . The vector x_{njt} encodes the covariates for individual n facing alternative j at discrete time t , and C_{nt} denotes the set of alternatives that are available to individual n at time t .

Let $i(n, t)$ denote the choice that is made by individual n at time t . Because we are examining repeated choices across time, we consider the sequence $\{i(n, 1), i(n, 2), \dots, i(n, T_n)\}$ of choices that are made by individual n . Given a value of β_n , these choices are independent. Therefore, we can write the conditional probability of a sequence as

$$S_n(B_n) = \prod_{t=1}^{T_n} P_{ni(n,t)t}(\beta_n). \quad (6)$$

Taking an expectation over β_n yields the unconditional probability

$$P_n(\theta) = \int_{\beta_n \in D_{\beta_n}} S_n(\beta_n) f(\beta_n | \theta) d\beta_n. \quad (7)$$

We use the unconditional probability $P_n(\theta)$ to estimate θ , which determines the distribution of β_n . If β_n is high-dimensional¹⁰, it is difficult to analytically compute $P_n(\theta)$,

⁹ Recall that C is the choice set.

¹⁰ Recall that β_n is a vector of parameters $\beta_n \in \mathbb{R}^k$. We refer to β_n as “high-dimensional” if k is large, although different fields have different notions of what it means to be “large”. In

so we use maximum-simulated-likelihood estimation (MSLE) to determine consistent estimators of the distribution parameters. The simulated log-likelihood function is $L(\theta) = \sum_n \ln[P_n(\theta)]$. Specifically, we use simulations to calculate $P_n(\theta)$. For a given value of θ , we draw from the distribution $f(\beta_n|\theta)$ several times. In our applications, we draw 100 times from $f(\beta_n|\theta)$; a good choice for the number of draws depends both on the application of interest and on the availability of computational resources. For each draw of β_n , we compute $S_n(\beta_n)$. The mean of $S_n(\beta_n)$ across all draws is an asymptotically consistent estimator of $P_n(\theta)$. See Revelt & Train (1998) and Train (2009) for detailed discussions of simulation and estimation methods.

To use the RC model to study network formation, we view a network as an ordered set of *choice sequences*. As the name suggests, a choice sequence is a collection of *choices*.¹¹ There is one choice sequence for each node in a network whose out-degree is at least 1. Each choice sequence consists of a finite number of choices. The number of choices¹² in a sequence is equal to the out-degree of the corresponding node. Each choice consists of a chosen node and a set of alternatives.

For example, consider a network with nodes $\{p, q, r, s\}$ and directed edges $\{(p, q), (p, r), (q, s), (r, s)\}$. We view the network as a set of three choice sequences, because there are three nodes (p , q , and r) with an out-degree of at least 1. We denote the choice sequences for nodes p , q , and r by S_p , S_q , and S_r , respectively.

The sequence S_p consists of two choices because the out-degree of node p is 2. Specifically, $S_p = \{(i(p, 1), C_{p_1}), (i(p, 2), C_{p_2})\}$. The tuple $(i(p, 1), C_{p_1})$ represents the first “choice” that is made by node p . The first element of the tuple (i.e., $i(p, 1)$) denotes the first “chosen” node. The order of the choices in a choice sequence is inconsequential for estimation (Train, 2009)¹³. However, depending on the application and question of interest, one order may be more convenient than others for constructing the choice sequence. For example, if we consider a network that is changing in time, it may be convenient to order the choice sequence using chronological ordering. We arbitrarily set $i(p, 1)$ equal to q (rather than r). The second element of the tuple denotes the set of alternatives (i.e., C_{p_1}) that are available to the node that is “choosing” (i.e., node p).

For each choice, the set of alternatives includes all nodes except the one that is choosing. The alternative set C_{p_1} is equal to $\{q, r, s\}$. We do not include node p in the alternative set because we do not allow self-edges. By the same convention, $i(p, 2)$ is equal to r and C_{p_2} is equal to $\{q, r, s\}$. We use the same convention to construct the choice sequences that correspond to nodes q and r . Specifically, $S_q = \{(i(q, 1), C_{q_1})\}$ and $S_r = \{(i(r, 1), C_{r_1})\}$, where both $i(q, 1)$ and $i(r, 1)$ are equal to s , the alternative set C_{q_1} is equal to $\{p, r, s\}$, and C_{r_1} is equal to $\{p, q, s\}$. We do not construct a choice sequence for node s because its out-

statistics, k is often considered to be large if $k \approx n$, where n is the number of observations (Bühlmann & Van De Geer, 2011).

¹¹ Depending on the application and the question of interest, the ordering of choices in the choice sequence may or may not be important.

¹² In the economics literature, the number of choices is sometimes called the number of “time periods” (Revelt & Train, 1998). To avoid confusion in our applications, we do not adopt this convention in our paper.

¹³ A “choice sequence” is technically a set. We refrain from calling a “choice sequence” a “choice set”, because it is common to use the term “choice set” to refer to an “alternative set”.

degree is 0. We can directly apply the RC model to the set of choice sequences to estimate the distribution parameters.

In our setting, one needs to make two key decisions to apply the RC model to study network formation. First, for each choice made by each node, one has to decide which nodes should be in the set of alternatives. In the simple example discussed in the preceding paragraphs, we assumed for a given node that all other nodes are in the set of alternatives. However, such an assumption is not appropriate for all applications. For example, if a network is generated by the standard random-geometric-graph model (Penrose, 2003), all nodes within a certain radius of a given node should be in the set of alternatives for all the choices that are made by that node (and other nodes should be excluded from the set of alternatives). Additionally, the set of alternatives may be different for different choices that are made by the same node.

Second, one needs to decide which observable characteristics (i.e., which $x_{n,jt}$) influence the choices that are made by a node. For example, in some PA models (Bianconi & Barabási, 2001), the in-degree of existing nodes influences the choices that are made by a new node. A key assumption in the RC model is that the observable characteristics are deterministic when a choice is being made; this restricts the set of observable characteristics that one can be study using the RC model. For example, the observable characteristics cannot include variables that are influenced by the choices made by subsequent nodes, because (by construction) the choices made by future nodes are stochastic. We will illustrate which observable characteristics can be used using specific examples in 6 and 7.

Additionally, we need to assume the distribution type of the choice parameters. In general, it is difficult to know what type of distribution is appropriate and one usually cannot evaluate such an assumption. In our illustrations, we make our assumptions about distributions based on computational convenience and prior knowledge about our applications of interest.

In the next three sections, we discuss applications of the RC model to study network formation.

5 Application: An Ensemble of Synthetic Networks

We illustrate the RC model using an ensemble of synthetic networks, which are useful to study for several reasons. First, we know the true data-generation process of such networks, so we can use them to directly evaluate the performance of our model. Second, we control the sizes of each ensemble of synthetic network and of each network from the ensemble. Third, we can choose a process that allows us to generate data that is free from data-collection errors, which arise often in networks that one constructs from empirical data.

We generate the network data is using the RC model. In 5.1, we describe our data-generation procedure and model specification. If the RC model does not perform well on synthetic data that it generates, then it is unlikely to be successful in networks that one constructs from empirical data.

5.1 Data Construction and Model Specification

We construct an ensemble of 100 synthetic networks in which each network has 1000 nodes. We draw the out-degree of each node uniformly at random and independently from integers between 1 and 20. As we described in Section 4.1, each node has a corresponding choice sequence. The length of a node’s choice sequence is equal to its out-degree. Each choice in each sequence has a “chosen” alternative and a set of alternatives. For each alternative set, we draw the number of alternatives uniformly at random from integers between 1 and 10. For each choice, the probability that an alternative is “chosen” depends on two variables. Specifically, the probability that node n “chooses” alternative j as its t^{th} choice depends on the variables x_{njt} and y_{njt} . The subscript njt denotes the j^{th} alternative that is available to node n for the t^{th} choice in the choice sequence. We sample x_{njt} from a continuous uniform distribution between -1 and 1 (i.e., $x_{njt} \sim \mathcal{U}[-1, 1]$), and we sample y_{njt} from a continuous uniform distribution between 0 and 5 (i.e., $y_{njt} \sim \mathcal{U}[0, 5]$). Using the formulation that we described in Section 4, we represent the choice utility mathematically with the function

$$V_{njt} = \beta_{1n}x_{njt} + \beta_{2n}y_{njt} + \varepsilon_{njt}, \quad (8)$$

where β_{1n} and β_{2n} are the choice parameters and we draw ε_{njt} from an IID Gumbel distribution. The distributions of the choice parameters are $\beta_{1n} \sim \mathcal{N}(3, 4)$ and $\beta_{2n} \sim \text{LogNormal}(0, 1)$. With $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(a, b)$ and $X = \exp(Z)$, it follows that X is distributed log-normally with parameters a and b (i.e., $X \sim \text{LogNormal}(a, b)$).

For each choice in each choice sequence, we draw the “chosen” alternative using the probability mass function (PMF) in equation 5. The “chosen” alternative and the alternative set together form a choice. We repeat this process for each choice in each of the choice sequences. In our model, recall that the set of choice sequences encodes a network.

We apply the RC model to each network in the ensemble. To do this, we first need to assume the distribution type of the choice parameters. (We call this assumption the “distributional assumption”.) We then use the RC model to estimate the distribution parameters. In general, one does not know the true distribution type of the choice parameters.

For our synthetic networks, we do know the true distributions of the choice parameters, because we generated these networks. Consequently, we let $\beta_{1n} \sim \mathcal{N}(m_1, s_1^2)$ and $\beta_{2n} \sim \text{LogNormal}(m_2, s_2^2)$. We use our model to estimate m_1, s_1, m_2 , and s_2 . We call m_1, s_1, m_2 , and s_2 the “distribution parameters”, and we recall that β_{1n} and β_{2n} are the choice parameters.

In our synthetic networks, we know the true distributions of the choice parameters, so the distributional assumption is valid by construction. However, for networks that one constructs from empirical data, one does not know the true distributions, so one guesses — hopefully, they are educated guess — the distribution type(s) of the choice parameters. (Note that this a feature of the RC model.) This is a difficult task, and in general one cannot even evaluate the distributional assumption, although there is some hope. In Section 5.4, we demonstrate how to use the RC model to test whether the choice parameters are random or deterministic. Unfortunately, if the choice parameters are random, we do not know how to evaluate whether a conjectured distribution type is correct. This is a limitation of our model. We discuss this limitation in further detail in Section 8. From a practical

perspective, making useful guesses about distribution types benefit from prior knowledge of an the application. For an example, see Section 7.2.

5.2 Estimation Methodology and Computational Complexity

As we described in Section 4.1, we can use MSLE to provide consistent estimators of our distribution parameters. We independently compute estimates of the distribution parameters for each network in an ensemble, and we use the MLOGIT package in R for estimation (Croissant, 2012). We use simulations (with 100 draws) to determine the unconditional probability of each choice sequence of probabilities from (7). We then use the Berndt–Hall–Hall–Hausman (BHHH) optimization algorithm to determine the distribution parameters that maximize the simulated log-likelihood (Croissant, 2012). For more details, see (Croissant, 2012).

The combined estimation procedure for all of the networks in our ensemble of synthetic networks took approximately 18 hours on a computer with an i7 processor and 16 gigabytes (GB) random-access-memory (RAM). For our other applications, we use the same estimation methodology on the same computer. Therefore, we specify only the execution times for those examples.

5.3 Results

We use our model to independently estimate m_1 , s_1 , m_2 , and s_2 for each network in our ensemble of synthetic networks. This yields a set of estimates for each distribution parameter. We show summary statistics of these estimates in Table 1.

We see that the mean and median estimated values of the parameters are close to those of the true parameters. In expectation, the difference between the true and estimated values is less than 0.07 for all of the parameters. Additionally, the standard error is less than 0.1 for all of the parameters. The maximum difference between the estimated and true values is 0.252, 0.284, 0.103, and 0.004 for m_1 , s_1 , m_2 , and s_2 , respectively.

In this case study, we see that the RC model is able to accurately estimate the distribution parameters for most of the networks in our ensemble.

5.4 Comparison with the MNL Model

We now compare the performance of the MNL model with that of the RC model. We use an ensemble of 50 synthetic networks, where each network has 100 nodes. We draw one network uniformly at random from the ensemble, and we use the results from that network for our comparison. In Appendix A.1, we show the summary statistics of the results from all of the networks in the ensemble. The model specification and network construction are the same as what we described in Section 5.1. In particular, recall that we generate these networks using the RC model.

5.4.1 Random Choice Parameters

The data-generation process that we described in Section 5.1 violates the assumptions of the MNL model. In our data, the number of choices and the alternative set are both

heterogeneous across individuals. Furthermore, the choice parameters are distributed randomly; by contrast, the MNL model assumes that the choice parameters are deterministic. Nevertheless, we ignore these violations and fit the data to the MNL model. We then compare the point estimates of the choice parameters that we compute using the MNL model to the distribution of the choice parameters that compute using the RC model (see Table 1).

The point estimates from the MNL model yield statistically significant results. However, they do not accurately capture the data-generation process. Tables 1 and 2 illustrate that the point estimates from the MNL model are different in magnitude from the central values (both mean and median) of the true distributions. Moreover, the MNL model paints an incorrect picture of the data-generation process. The point estimates imply that the choice parameters are homogeneous across individuals. However, by construction, we know that this is not the case. The MNL model ignores this heterogeneity across individuals. For networks that one constructs from empirical data, this may have a significant impact on the interpretation of the results, because it may yield misleading values for the choice parameters. We revisit the issue of interpretation in Section 7.5. In that discussion, we use a network that we construct from empirical data.

The above discussion helps highlight some of the salient differences between the results from the MNL and RC model. Given our data-generation process (which violates several assumptions of the MNL model), it is not surprising that the MNL produces incorrect results. Because we used the RC model to construct the data, it is also not surprising that the RC model produces accurate results. In Section 5.4.2, we compare the results of the MNL and RC model when the choice parameters are deterministic.

5.4.2 Deterministic Choice Parameters

We construct networks in which the choice parameters are deterministic. The data-generation process and model specification are the same as in Section 5.1. The only difference is that the choice parameters are deterministic, with $\beta_{1n} = -1$ and $\beta_{2n} = 3$. The network is suitable for the MNL model because these parameters are deterministic. Additionally, our assumption in the RC model that the parameters are randomly distributed (specifically, $\beta \sim \mathcal{N}(m_1, s_1^2)$ and $\beta_{2n} \sim \text{LogNormal}(m_2, s_2^2)$) is incorrect. Similar to our computations in Section 5.4.1, we fit the misspecified¹⁴ RC model to the data and compute estimates for the distribution parameters. We report the results from the MNL model and the misspecified RC model in Table 3.

As we expected, the MNL model accurately estimates the choice parameters. However, although the RC model is misspecified for this network, the distribution of the choice parameters are good approximations of the true deterministic choice parameters. The mean of β_{1n} (which is -0.807) gives a reasonable ballpark estimate of the true value of -1 , and the standard deviation of β_{1n} is not equal to 0 with a probability that is less than 0.134. Similarly, the mean of β_{2n} (which is 2.770) gives a reasonable ballpark estimate of the true value of 3, and the standard deviation of β_{2n} is not equal to 0 with a probability

¹⁴ See Ramsey (1969) for a formal definition of “misspecification”.

that is less than 0.454. If a random variable has a standard deviation equal to 0, then it is deterministic, with a value equal to its mean. In this example, our results imply that the standard deviation of the choice parameters is equal to 0 with a large probability; this suggests that the choice parameters are deterministic with a large probability. In this case, the RC model yields results that qualitatively are reasonably accurate, despite the model's misspecification. Deterministic parameters are a special case of random parameters (exactly when the standard deviation is 0). Consequently, the RC model can be helpful for providing accurate estimates for our synthetic networks, even when the choice parameters are deterministic. As we saw in Section 5.4.1, the converse is not true. That is, the MNL model does not necessarily provide accurate results when the choice parameters are random. Moreover, one should not expect it to do so.

The above exercise also highlights a way to test whether choice parameters are random or deterministic. We calculate estimates assuming that the choice parameters are random. If the standard deviation of the choice parameters is equal to 0 with a large probability, then it is likely that the choice parameters are deterministic. This is an advantage of the RC model over the MNL model. The estimates of the MNL model provide no way to check whether the parameters are random or deterministic. Instead, the MNL model assumes that the parameters are deterministic, ignoring the possibility that the choice parameters may be random. By contrast, the RC model allows one to check whether these parameters are random or deterministic. We have not formally developed this test in the present paper. We observe in Section A.2 that the test yields incorrect results. We leave analyzing why this occurs and further developing the test (e.g., analyzing it mathematically) for future research.

6 Application: An Edge-Independent Social Network

In this section, we illustrate our model on a small social network that was constructed from empirical data. We use our model to examine how lifestyle factors correlate with friendship decisions. We assume that all edges form independently of each other. This assumption is mathematically the same as those in (Erdős & Rényi, 1960; Penrose, 2003; Fafchamps & Gubert, 2007).

6.1 Network Data

The social network that we study is a snapshot of the friendships between 50 girls from the Teenage and Lifestyle Study (Michell & Amos, 1997). The friendship data were collected in a survey in 1995. Each node represents a girl, and there is a directed edge from node i to node j if girl i named girl j as a friend in the survey. Each girl could name up to 12 other girls as a friend. Girls could not name themselves, so the network does not have any self-edges. The graph consists of 50 nodes and 113 edges.

As we described in Section 4.1, in the RC model, we represent each node by a choice sequence. The length of the choice sequence is equal to the number of friends named by a girl. In general, the length of the sequence can be different for different girls. Recall that each choice in a choice sequence consists of a "chosen" alternative and a set of alternatives.

For a given choice in girl i 's choice sequence, the “chosen” alternative is one of girl i 's friends.

We assume that the set of alternatives consists of the “chosen” girl and all of the girls that girl i did not name as friends. We exclude girl i 's other friends from the set of alternatives. For example, if girl 1 is friends with girls 4 and 23, then the corresponding choice sequence is $S_1 = \{(i(1,1), C_{11}), (i(1,2), C_{12})\}$, where $i(1,1) = 4$, $i(1,2) = 23$, $C_{11} = \{1, 2, 3, \dots, 49, 50\} \setminus \{1, 23\}$, and $C_{12} = \{1, 2, 3, \dots, 49, 50\} \setminus \{1, 4\}$. Naturally, our procedure entails assumptions about the underlying network-formation process.

6.2 Model Specification

We use the RC model to examine how lifestyle factors influence friendship among the teenage girls in this social network. We use metadata from the survey on the lifestyle of the girls. We consider the four lifestyle factors that were surveyed: sporting activity, smoking, drinking alcohol, and cannabis use, and sporting. The survey asked the respondents to rate their smoking habits on a scale of integers from 1 to 3, alcohol consumption on a scale of integers from 1 to 5, and cannabis use on a scale of integers from 1 to 4. For all three substances, a larger number represents a larger frequency of substance use. For example, ratings of 1, 2, and 3 represent non-smokers, occasional smokers, and regular smokers (which was defined to be people who smoke more than once a week), respectively. The survey also asked the girls if they participated regularly in sporting activities; this yields a categorical variable. If a girl participated regular in such activities, she was assigned an integer value of 2; otherwise, she was assigned an integer value of 1. For more details on the survey, see (Michell & Amos, 1997).

As we described in Section 4, the choice utility for a girl n who chooses to be friends with the j^{th} alternative for the t^{th} choice in the choice sequence is

$$V_{njt} = \beta_{1n}\text{Alc}_{njt} + \beta_{2n}\text{Smoke}_{njt} + \beta_{3n}\text{Drugs}_{njt} + \beta_{4n}\text{Sport}_{njt} + \varepsilon_{njt}, \quad (9)$$

where Alc_{njt} , Smoke_{njt} , and Drugs_{njt} represent the absolute value of the difference in the rating for alcohol use, smoking, and cannabis use, respectively, between girl n and her j^{th} friendship alternative for the t^{th} choice in the choice sequence. For example, if girl n is a regular smoker (that is, she has a rating of 3) and her j^{th} friendship alternative for the t^{th} choice in the choice sequence is a non-smoker (that is, with a rating of 0), then $\text{Smoke}_{njt} = 3$. A larger score differential represents a stronger dissimilarity in substance-use habits between two girls. The quantity Sport_{njt} is 1 if both the girls are regular participants or both are irregular participants in sporting activities; and it is 0 if one girl is a regular participant, but the other girl is an irregular participant.

We assume that all friendship decisions were made contemporaneously and independently of one another. Recall that in the RC model, the variables that affect edge formation are deterministic. In this example, however, variables (such as in-degree) that depend on friendship decisions are stochastic by construction. Consequently, we cannot use the RC model to study how the friendship decision between two girls is influenced by variables that depend on other friendship decisions. For example, we cannot investigate whether more-popular girls (that is, nodes with larger in-degree) are more likely to be named as a friend by more girls in the future.

We assume that all of the choice parameters are independent and normally distributed. That is, $\beta_{in} \sim \mathcal{N}(m_i, s_i^2)$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. We do not wish to restrict the support of the choice parameters *a priori*. Consequently, the distribution of the choice parameters should have support that includes both positive and negative values. Intuitively, we wish to allow some individuals to be friends with similar individuals and some individuals to be friends with dissimilar individuals. There is significant sociological theory that supports the former, which is an indication of homophily (McPherson *et al.*, 2001). If homophily is present in this social network, as is likely, then the posterior distribution will reflect this. However, we do not wish to restrict the prior distribution of the choice parameters. Perhaps homophily is less important for the friendship of some of the girls than it is for others, and perhaps some of them may even seek heterophilic friendships. Among all distributions that have both positive and negative values in their support, we choose the normal distribution because it is convenient computationally. Friendships in social networks tend to skew significantly towards homophilic relations (Wasserman & Faust, 1994), so we expect to observe positive means.

6.3 Estimation Methodology and Computational Complexity

As in Section 5.2, we use the MLOGIT package in R (Croissant, 2012). The estimation procedure, which took 2.5 minutes, is the same as what we described in Section 5.2.

6.4 Results

Using the RC model, we compute estimates for $m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4, s_1, s_2, s_3,$ and s_4 . Recall that these parameters specify the distributions of the choice parameters $\beta_{1n}, \beta_{2n}, \beta_{3n},$ and β_{4n} .

Using Table 4 and given our distributional assumptions, we compute the distributions of the choice parameters. Note that s_1 is not statistically significantly different from 0. This suggests that β_{1n} is deterministic with a large probability. If β_{1n} is deterministic, its value is equal to its mean, so $\beta_{1n} \approx -0.2339$. The mean parameters for Alc and Sport are also not statistically significantly different from 0, although this does not imply that the choice parameters themselves are insignificant. Instead, it implies that, with a large probability, the mean of the distribution of these parameters is close to 0. All other parameters are statistically significant. For example, the choice parameter for Drugs, given our distributional assumption, is distributed normally with a mean of -1.2419 and a standard deviation of 0.7396.

The distribution of the choice parameters are difficult to interpret qualitatively. In general, how one uses the choice distribution for qualitative analysis depends on the application. We explore two possible methods of qualitative analysis.

6.4.1 Inference: Drawing Values

One possible way to conduct a qualitative analysis is to draw specific values from the distributions of the choice parameters $\beta_{1n}, \beta_{2n}, \beta_{3n},$ and β_{4n} . For example, the mean value of the choice parameters for Alc and Drugs are -0.2339 and -1.2419 , respectively. The

negative mean value of Alc indicates that, in expectation, girls who consume alcohol are more likely to be friends with other girls who consume alcohol. Similarly, girls who use cannabis are more likely to be friends with other girls who do the same. In fact, the means of all of the choice parameters ($m_1, m_2, m_3 \leq 0$, and $m_4 > 0$) suggests that individuals are more likely to be friends with similar individuals, with respect to the facets that we consider. Additionally, the magnitude (i.e., absolute value) of the mean for Drugs is higher than that for Alc. This suggests that, assuming that all other variables are the same, two girls who have similar cannabis habits are more likely to be friends than two girls who have similar alcohol habits.

The above discussion illustrates the use of mean values to conduct qualitative analysis. Depending on the application, different quantities (such as median, top quartile, bottom quartile, maximum, or minimum) may be of interest.

6.4.2 Inference: Intervals

In addition to computing specific values from the choice-parameter distributions, we construct intervals of interest. For example, the results in Section 6.4 indicate that, under our distributional assumptions, the choice parameter for Drugs is distributed as $\beta_{3n} \sim \mathcal{N}(-1.242, 0.736^2)$. We use this information to estimate the percentage of individuals who are more likely to be friends with those who have similar cannabis-use habits. We compute this estimate by calculating the probability that $\beta_{3n} < 0$. We obtain $P(\beta_{3n} < 0) \approx 0.9542$, so approximately 95% of the individuals are more likely to be friends with those who have similar cannabis-use habits than with people who have different habits.

6.4.3 Discussion

Our calculations in Sections 6.4.1 and 6.4.2 suggest that most girls who were surveyed are more likely to name girls who have similar lifestyle habits as their friends in a survey. Our results support a conclusion — that teenage girls preferred to have friends with similar substance-use habits — that was found by the study that first used this data set (Pearson *et al.*, 2006). More generally, our results are in line with the pervasiveness of homophily of friendships in social networks (Wasserman & Faust, 1994; McPherson *et al.*, 2001).

Other studies that used this data set examined how social dynamics affect smoking behavior (Michell & Amos, 1997; Michell, 2000) and how social position affects risk-taking behavior (Pearson & West, 2003).

7 Application: A Sequential Patent Citation Network

We now apply the RC model to a large sequential network that we construct from empirical data.

7.1 Network Data

We apply the RC model to a patent citation network. We construct this network from a subset of a patent data set that consists of 2,923,922 United States utility patents that were awarded between 1 January 1963 and 31 December 1999.

We extracted the data from the National Bureau of Economic Research’s (NBER) website; the source of the data is (Hall *et al.*, 2001). This data set has been used extensively to study innovation; see, for example, (Aghion *et al.*, 2013; Bloom *et al.*, 2013). Leskovec *et al.* (2007) used this data set to study how different network properties change over time.

In addition to the citation data, we also have additional information about each patent, including grant year, country of inventor, technology category, the number of patents that it cites (“citations made”), and number of patents that cited it (“citations received”). In our application, we consider the “choices” of patents that were granted in 1975¹⁵.

We study the growth of the patent citation network as new patents are granted in 1975. Each node in the network is a patent, and we use the term “new patent” for any patent that was granted in 1975. Each new patent “chooses” to cite previous patents; there is a directed, unweighted edge from node u to node v if the new patent u “chooses” to cite existing patent v . The new nodes arrive sequentially over time and form edges with existing nodes.

The mean number of citations by each new patent is 4.875, and the median number of citations is 4. Most nodes cite more than 1 existing patent, although about 21.3% of patents cite only 1 patent. Consequently, the single-choice assumption of the MNL is violated, so it seems sensible to examine this network using the RC model.

In the patent citation network, starting from 1975, there are 69,323 new patents that cited at least 1 patent, and there are 636,444 patents that were granted prior to 1975. In the RC model, it is computationally expensive to estimate parameters, and the computational cost increases with the number of nodes. The 1975 patent citation network is too large for us to use the entire network for estimation, so we apply a variety of sampling procedures to make estimation computationally tractable.

From the 69,323 new patents in 1975, we sample 10,000 new patents uniformly at random to form our sample network. As we described in Section 4.1, each node (that is, each new patent) has an associated choice sequence. Recall that each choice in the choice sequence consists of a “chosen” alternative and an alternative set.

We assume that the alternative set consists of all previously granted patents¹⁶. Each new patent can cite any of the previously granted patents (which we interpret as patents from previous years, so we disallow prior patents from the same year), so the size of the alternative set of one new patent is equal to the total number of patents that were granted prior to 1975. Because 636,444 patents were granted prior to 1975, the alternative set is very large, and we need to reduce its size for computational tractability.

Hall *et al.* (2001) assigned each patent to a technology category: chemical (excluding drugs); computers and communications (C & C); drugs and medical (D & M); electrical and electronics (E & E); mechanical; and others. On average, approximately 80% of all of the patents that are cited by a new patent in 1975 are in the same technology category as that new patent. Therefore, to narrow the alternative set, we consider only patents in the same technology category as a potential alternative. Although we make our assumption for convenience, local search models provide some theoretical justification for this sampling

¹⁵ We focus on 1975 because it is the first year for which we have citation data. In Section 7.4.1, we examine additional years.

¹⁶ However, nodes probably only examine a subset of previously existing patents. See (König, 2016) for a model of network formation with partial observability.

choice (Jackson, 2010). The basic idea behind some local search models is that searching for potential nodes with which to link (for patents to cite in the present example) is “costly”. Consequently, nodes may only consider other nodes that are cheap to “find”. In the present example, we are assuming that patents in a different technology category from the “new” patent are too expensive to “find”. Jaffe and Trajtenberg (1999) concluded that patents are 100 times more likely to cite patents in the same technology category than patents in a different category. In Section 7.4.2, we demonstrate that our results are robust to violations of this assumption.

Additionally, in each alternative set, we uniformly-at-random sample 6 patents from all of the patents that were not chosen¹⁷. This reduces the size of the alternative set to 7, as there are 6 patents that are not cited and 1 patent that is cited. This is a substantial reduction of the data. However, as shown in McFadden 1978 and employed in Overgoor *et al.*, as long as the sampling method satisfies the uniform conditioning property (which is true of sampling uniformly at random), the estimates are still statistically consistent. In Section 7.4, we analyze the robustness of our results to different sampling methods.

7.2 Model Specification

We specify a model in which the citation probability depends on three observable factors: citations received (i.e., in-degree), sub-category, and time difference (as measured when the new patent was granted).

Recall that an important assumption of the RC model is that the edge-formation choices depend on observable factors that are deterministic when a choice is made (see Section 4.1). In Section 6, we were unable to study the effect of in-degree on future edge formation. We assumed that edges form independently and contemporaneously. The in-degree of a given node may depend on the choices that are made by other nodes; by construction, these choices are stochastic. Consequently, the in-degree of an alternative is stochastic, so we are unable to study the effect of in-degree on future edge formation using the RC model. Because our patent citation network grows sequentially, the in-degree of an alternative at the time of choice is deterministic. We assume that nodes make their citation decisions one at a time. The in-degree of an alternative for a given node may depend on the choices that are made by previous nodes; however, because those choices have already been made, the in-degree is deterministic. This allows us to study the effect that in-degree at the time of a choice has on edge formation using the RC model.

We normalize the number of citations that are received by a new patent by dividing this number by the number of citations that were made by the new patent. For computational convenience, we assume that the choice parameter for citations received follows a log-normal distribution. Our assumption is guided by results from previous studies, which suggested that previous citations have a non-negative effect on the probability of new citations (Jeong *et al.*, 2003). In other words, having more citations never hurts a patent’s chances of being cited again (although it may not help). There are several distributions

¹⁷ This procedure is often called “negative sampling” (Train, 2009). See (Overgoor *et al.*, 2020) for a recent discussion of negative sampling for relational social data.

that have a non-negative support, and a log-normal one has convenient properties¹⁸. The notion that node degree affects future edge formation is a major focus of the PA models (Newman, 2018), and it seems relevant for our application.

The binary variable ‘Sub-Category’ indicates whether a new patent and old patent belong to the same technology sub-category¹⁹. (For details, see Hall *et al.* (2001).) The idea that patents prefer to cite similar patents is conceptually similar to homophily. We assume that the choice parameter is log-normal because it is computationally convenient.

The time difference is equal to the difference in grant years of the new and old patents. We assume that the choice parameter for time difference is normally distributed. The normal distribution is computationally convenient, and it allows the age of a patent to affect citation probability either positively or negatively.

Combining all of the above factors yields the following utility function:

$$V_{njt} = \beta_{1n} \text{CReceived}_{njt} + \beta_{2n} \text{SubCat}_{njt} + \beta_{3n} \text{TimeDiff}_{njt} + \varepsilon_{njt}, \quad (10)$$

where ‘CReceived’ is the number of citations received, ‘SubCat’ is a Boolean variable that is true if both patents are in the same technology sub-category, and ‘TimeDiff’ is the difference in the grant years of the new patent and the cited patent. The subscript njt denotes the j^{th} alternative for the t^{th} choice in node n ’s choice sequence. From our assumptions, $\beta_{1n} \sim \text{LogNormal}(m_1, s_1^2)$, $\beta_{2n} \sim \text{LogNormal}(m_2, s_2^2)$, $\beta_{3n} \sim \mathcal{N}(m_3, s_3^2)$, and we draw ε_{njt} from an IID Gumbel distribution.

We allow correlations between different choice parameters and report the correlation parameters. We denote the correlation between choice parameters β_{in} and β_{jn} by cor_{ij} .

We estimate the parameters $m_1, m_2, m_3, s_1, s_2, s_3, \text{cor}_{12}, \text{cor}_{13},$ and cor_{23} using the MLOGIT package in R. Our estimation procedure, which took approximately 2 hours, is the same as what we described in Section 5.2.

7.3 Results

We summarize our results in Table 5. These estimates indicate that $\beta_{1n} \sim \text{LogNormal}(-1.4749, 1.5329^2)$, $\beta_{2n} \sim \text{LogNormal}(1.0956, 0.1017^2)$, and $\beta_{3n} \sim \mathcal{N}(-0.0090, 1.3405^2)$. All of the estimates for the distribution parameters are statistically significant. This suggests that there is a strong correlation between attachment probability and the factors that we are studying. Additionally, the correlation parameters are not statistically significant and they have small magnitudes, so any correlations between the choice parameters appear to be weak ones. See Section 7.3.3 for a detailed discussion of the correlation parameters. The standard deviations of all of the choice parameters are statistically different from 0, so these parameters are random with a large probability.

¹⁸ Specifically, it is easy to compute the unconditional probability defined in Equation 7.

¹⁹ Hall *et al.* (2001) classified each patent into a category, which they further sub-classified into sub-categories. For example, the category ‘‘Drugs and Medical’’ was further sub-classified into ‘‘Drugs’’, ‘‘Surgery and Medical Instruments’’, ‘‘Biotechnology’’, and ‘‘Miscellaneous-Drug&Med’’. We use the category level of classification to construct the alternative set 7.1. We use the sub-category level of classification as a variable that affects the choice probability.

Our estimates give distributions of the choice parameters, but these distributions are difficult to interpret directly. We interpret the results using different methods in Sections 7.3.1, 7.3.2, and 7.3.3.

7.3.1 Inference: Example using Median Values

Similar to Section 6.4.1, we compute median values from the distributions of β_{in} to obtain point estimates for the choice parameters.

We interpret the median value of the choice parameters in the same way as the results of the MNL model. For instance, by dividing β_{2n} by β_{1n} , we obtain a “substitution rate” between citations received and patent sub-category. With our model specification, this represents the number of additional citations that a patent of a different sub-category from the new patent needs to have for it to have the same choice probability as a patent from the same category as the new patent.²⁰ Specifically, $\beta_{2n}/\beta_{1n} \approx 13$ additional citations received can compensate for not being in the same sub-category as the new patent. Similarly, receiving $\beta_{3n}/\beta_{1n} \approx 0.03$ additional citations has the same effect as a one-year decrease in time difference. This implies that age has a weak affect on choice probability, whereas citations received and sub-category have strong affects.

7.3.2 Inference: Intervals

We conduct analysis similar to Section 6.4.2, although we consider somewhat different questions for this case study. In Section 6.4.2, we calculated the percentage of individuals who have a parameter value in a specified range. In the present section, we are interested in the range of parameter values for a specific percentage of individuals. The key difference is that we fixed the parameter-value range in our earlier discussion is fixed, whereas we now fix the percentage of individuals.

As an illustration, we construct a 90% interval for the parameter for time difference. Under our distributional assumptions, the parameter for time difference is distributed normally $\beta_{3n} \sim \mathcal{N}(-0.0090, 1.3405^2)$. From a direct computation, we see that $P(-2.278 < \beta_{3n} < 2.260) \approx 0.9095$. Therefore, the time-difference parameter value ranges from -2.2782 to 2.260 for approximately 90% of the nodes. One can also construct intervals of different precisions.

7.3.3 Inference: Correlation Analysis

We also use the RC model to study correlations between choice parameters. Such an investigation helps for examining if a strong affinity for one choice parameter implies a strong affinity for another choice parameter. For instance, do individuals who cite more popular patents also tend to cite older patents? Under the assumptions of our framework, the answer to this question is “yes” if the correlation between β_{1n} and β_{3n} is negative, statistically significant, and has value that is practically significant. From Table 5, we see that the value

²⁰ The units are representative of the variables CReceived and SubCat. The choice parameters are unitless, by definition.

is negative but is not statistically significant. Therefore, correlations between citations received and time difference does not differ significantly from 0. Additionally, we conduct statistical tests (such as Wald tests) to evaluate our hypothesis (Fahrmeir *et al.*, 2013). We conduct a Wald test and likelihood-ratio test to examine the presence of correlations between the choice parameters. Both tests imply that the correlation between the variables is statistically significant. (For example, the p-value of Wald test is less than 0.001.) However, the correlation is small, as indicated by the likelihood-ratio test. Therefore, although we find a correlation between the choice parameters, it is not of practical significance.

7.3.4 Discussion

Our results suggest that attachment probability in the patent citation network has a strong statistical association with the factors that we study. The positive association of the variable SubCat with the attachment probability suggests that there is homophily in the network. Similarly, the positive association of CReceived with the attachment probability is documented by several papers in the PA literature (Jeong *et al.*, 2003; Overgoor *et al.*, 2019).

It is worth noting that we were able to examine homophily and PA simultaneously using the RC model. As we discussed in Section 3.1, this is a substantive advantage of discrete-choice models. We were able to statistically study homophily and PA by choosing appropriate parameters in the RC model without having to make large changes in the RC model. This underscores the flexibility of the RC model that we discussed in Section 3.1. Our results for the patent citation network suggest that PA occurs even if we control for homophily (and vice versa).

7.4 Robustness of Our Results: Different Years and Different Sampling Methods

We now examine patent citation networks from different years and using different sampling methods.

In the beginning of our case study of patent citation networks, we described how we sampled data to reduce computational complexity. For example, we considered new patents only from 1975. In Section 7.4.1, we examine patent citation networks for different years and compare the inferred parameter values across years.

In our previous calculations, after restricting the year of awarded patents, we sampled our data further to reduce its size. First, we sampled 10,000 new patents uniformly at random from all new patents in 1975. Second, we sampled 6 alternatives (in addition to the chosen alternative) uniformly at random to construct the alternative set for each choice in each choice sequence. Third, we only considered patents in the same technology category as valid alternatives.

In the last paragraph of Section 7.1, we argued that applying the RC model on this sampled subset of the data provides statistically consistent parameter estimates (Train, 2009; McFadden, 1978). However, there may be qualitatively important differences in the parameter estimates when considering different years or sampling choices. In Section 7.4.2, we apply the RC to different sampling choices of the data and compare the resulting parameter estimates.

7.4.1 Different Years

In Table 7, we show our parameter estimates for 1975, 1980, 1985, 1990, and 1995. We further sample the data in same way that we described in Section 7.1, and our model specification is the same as the one that we described in Section 7.2.

For each of the years that we consider, the distribution parameters are similar in magnitude and have the same level of statistical significance. The distribution of β_{1n} is qualitatively similar for all of the examined years. For the examined years, we observe a decreasing trend for the parameters m_2 and m_3 . The trend in m_2 suggests that the importance of sub-category has decreased over time. We also observe a decrease in s_2 over time. These observed trends are suggestive of general ones, and examining all years in the patent citation network using temporal network analysis is an important direction for future research (Holme & Saramäki, 2012; Holme, 2015; Holme & Saramäki, 2019).

The correlation (cor_{12}) between β_{1n} and β_{2n} is statistically insignificant for each of the examined years. Similarly, cor_{23} is statistically insignificant for all years except 1995. The associated correlation parameters are small in magnitude for all of these years.

7.4.2 Different Sampling Methods

We now examine the distribution parameters for different numbers of new patents that we sample from the data, different numbers of alternatives in the alternative set of each choice, and without the restriction that valid alternatives must be in the same technology category as the new patent. We report our results in Table 8.

The citations-received, sub-category parameters (i.e., m_1 , s_1 , m_2 , and s_2), and the standard deviation of the time difference (i.e., s_3) are all statistically significant for all of the sampling methods. In the first four columns of Table 8, we observe that the values of these parameters are mostly very similar to each other, although cor_{13} has a larger magnitude in the fourth column than it does in the other columns. Broadly speaking, the parameter values appear to be robust with respect to the choices in these four columns.

In the fifth column of Table 8, we observe that m_1 , m_3 , s_2 , and s_3 have similar magnitudes as in the other columns. In the fifth column, we also observe that s_1 has a smaller magnitude than it does in the other columns. However, m_2 has a larger value than in the other columns. Because we no longer require that the new patent and its alternatives be in the same technology category, one possible explanation for this difference is that we are now measuring field relatedness between patents with the sub-category variable. By definition, if two patents are in the same technology sub-category, they must be in the same technology category, but the converse is not true. Consequently, two patents being in the same technology sub-category is a stronger measure of relatedness when we do not control for technology category. This increases the relative importance of the sub-category variable and helps explain the larger mean of the distribution of β_{2n} .

The correlation parameters in Table 8 are not statistically significant, and they have a small magnitude (with an absolute value less than 0.2) in most cases. This supports our prior conclusions that the correlation between choice parameters is not of practical significance. The mean parameter for time difference (m_3) is not statistically significantly differ-

ent from 0 in three different sampling methods (see the second, third, and fifth columns), and it is close to 0 in magnitude in all cases.

Although we were not exhaustive in our different examples of sampling, the ones that we examined suggest that our qualitative interpretation of the parameter estimates appear to be mostly robust with respect both to differences in the number of new patents we sample and to our different sampling methods.

7.5 Comparison with the MNL Model

We compare our results from the RC model to ones from the MNL model. As we discussed in Section 7.1, our setup violates several assumptions of the MNL model. However, we ignore those violations and fit the data to the MNL model to obtain point estimates for our comparison. Our first observation is that the RC model achieves a much higher likelihood than the MNL model. In a likelihood-ratio test, we see that the difference is significant (with a p-value that is less than 0.001). This highlights that the RC model is a better statistical fit for our data.

The point estimates of the choice parameters in Table 9 and the median values of the distribution of the choice parameters in Table 6 have similar magnitudes. As we saw in Section 5.4.1, this is not always the case. Moreover, the interpretation of results from the RC and MNL models differ substantially. In particular, in the MNL model, we obtain point estimates, which gives the impression that the choice parameters vary less than is actually the case.

The MNL model essentially ignores the heterogeneity of choice parameters across individuals. By treating the choices of an individual across different choices and the choices of two different individuals as the same, the MNL model ignores an important aspect of the data-generation process. In reality, these parameters are heterogeneous across nodes, and the network growth process is stochastic in two aspects. First, the nodes form edges with other nodes via a random process. Second, the importance of factors that affect attachment probability is different for different nodes. The second stochastic aspect is captured by the RC model but ignored by the MNL model.

Additionally, as we discussed in Section 5.4.2, we can use the RC model to detect whether the choice parameters are deterministic or random. In the patent citation case study (see Table 8), we found that the standard deviations of all of the choice parameters are different from 0 with a large probability; this suggests that the choice parameters are random with a large probability. The MNL provides no information about this aspect of the data-generation process. Therefore, the RC model is a more appropriate choice than the MNL model for this case study.

8 Limitations and Applicability

In this section, we highlight several limitations of the RC model.

First, recall that we assumed that the choice parameters follow a particular distribution type, and we cannot test this assumption because the true distribution is unknown in most situations. Consequently, there is a risk of mis-specifying these distributions. However, as we pointed out in Section 5.1, this limitation is not unique to our model. Distri-

butional assumptions are common in discrete-choice models (Kleinbaum & Klein, 2002; Train, 2009). For example, the MNL model assumes implicitly that its parameters are deterministic (Train, 2009).

Another major limitation of the RC model is the computational complexity of using it for distribution parameter estimation. In our applications, the RC model took approximately ten times longer than the MNL model to estimate the relevant parameters. This has two important implications. First, we cannot use the RC model to study large networks without drastic sampling (see Section 7.1). Second, we also need to consider a “convenient” choice parameter distribution because the computational complexity depends on the distribution of the choice parameters. The number of convenient distributions may also be limited, as many researchers desire to use existing statistical packages, and most such packages only allow parameters to have normal, log-normal, uniform, or triangular distributions (Croissant, 2012; Hole, 2007). Given this convenience, we choose to use these distributions for our considerations with the RC model. In theory, the RC model is applicable in more general settings, but it will be helpful for them to be implemented in statistical packages.

In the RC model, we obtain distributions of the choice parameters, instead of point estimates. Unfortunately, it is difficult to directly interpret the qualitative nature of these distributions. In Sections 6.4.1, 6.4.2, 7.3.1, and 7.3.2, we examined different approaches for interpreting distributions of the choice parameters.

The limitations that we have just discussed and the assumptions that we discussed in Section 4.1 inform us about the applicability of the RC model. We posit that the RC model is particularly appropriate for directed, unweighted networks in which a large number of nodes have an out-degree that is larger than 1, the preferences are heterogeneous across nodes, and the choice set is heterogeneous across nodes. These features are common to many networks (Newman, 2018). The RC model is also particularly appropriate for networks in which it is possible to construct the choice set for each node. Small networks (see Section 6) or networks in which nodes appear in a sequential order (see Section 7) are examples of such networks. In the RC model, we assumed that edge formation is affected by deterministic features, and we expect the RC model to be applicable when the features that we seek to study are plausibly deterministic.

9 Conclusions and Discussion

We employed discrete-choice models to study network formation. We argued that the repeated-choice (RC) mixed logit model is more appropriate than the previously employed multinomial logit (MNL) model for studying network formation, and we illustrated this view with case studies of both synthetic and empirical networks. A key difference between the MNL and the RC is that the RC model allows heterogeneous choice parameters.

We also highlighted several characteristics of the RC model that make it well-suited to studying network formation. In particular, the RC model can account for heterogeneity in the “preferences” of nodes that are associated with network’s structure. Moreover, the existing literature on discrete-choice models provides tools for estimation, testing, and parameter selection in the RC model.

We considered case studies with both synthetic and empirical networks. We applied the RC model to synthetic networks in the form of an ensemble of random graphs. Using

this example, we illustrated that the RC model can produce accurate estimates of either homogeneous or heterogeneous “preferences” of the nodes of a network. We also applied the RC model to a small friendship network and a large patent citation network, and we compared our results from the RC model with those from the MNL model. In the latter, we also compared results from a variety of sampling procedures, which we needed to employ because of the significant computational cost of the RC model. In this comparison, we obtained qualitative results that are largely robust with respect to these different sampling procedures.

In Section 5.4.2, we discussed a statistical test to determine whether the choice parameters are random or deterministic. We did not fully develop the test in this paper. Moreover, as we discuss in Section A.2, the test may yield incorrect results. Investigating these errors and further developing the test is an important avenue for future research.

An important limitation of the RC model is that it is computationally expensive. In this paper, we were restricted to using “convenient” distributions for choice parameters and needed to sample large networks very drastically to be able to study them. Future research in computation and simulation methods is necessary to be able to employ a larger set of distributions for choice parameters and study large networks without such sampling. Overgoor *et al.* (2020) recently proposed a technique to improve the computational efficiency of MX models. Another potential approach is to attempt to use Gibbs sampling (Lynch, 2007) to estimate posterior distributions of the choice parameters.

Attachment models are a popular and important type of network model (Newman, 2018), and it is worth developing approaches like the present one further to obtain insights into the properties of networks that are produced by such generative models. Given empirical network data, it will be particularly interesting to try to use such approaches to help infer which mechanisms may have produced it.

10 Acknowledgements

We thank Unchitta Kanjanasaratool for her contributions to the early stages of this research, which started as a class project by her and Harsh Gupta. We thank Arun Chandrashekhkar, Michelle Feng, Matthew Jackson, Jay Lu, and Nina Otter for their many helpful comments. We also thank the participants at Econometrics Workshop and Matthew Jackson’s Discussion Group at Stanford University for their valuable feedback.

References

- Aghion, Philippe, Van Reenen, John, & Zingales, Luigi. (2013). Innovation and institutional ownership. *American economic review*, **103**(1), 277–304.
- Albert, Réka, & Barabási, Albert-László. (2002). Statistical mechanics of complex networks. *Reviews of modern physics*, **74**(1), 47.
- Benson, Austin R., Kumar, Ravi, & Tomkins, Andrew. (2016). On the relevance of irrelevant alternatives. *Pages 963–973 of: Proceedings of the 25th international conference on world wide web*. WWW ’16.
- Bianconi, Ginestra, & Barabási, Albert-László. (2001). Competition and multiscaling in evolving networks. *Europhysics letters (EPL)*, **54**(4), 436–442.

- Bloch, Francis, & Jackson, Matthew O. (2006). Definitions of equilibrium in network formation games. *International journal of game theory*, **34**(3), 305–318.
- Bloom, Nicholas, Schankerman, Mark, & Van Reenen, John. (2013). Identifying technology spillovers and product market rivalry. *Econometrica*, **81**(4), 1347–1393.
- Blume, Lawrence E., Brock, William A., Durlauf, Steven N., & Ioannides, Yannis M. (2011). Identification of social interactions. *Pages 853–964 of: Handbook of social economics*, vol. 1. Elsevier.
- Bühlmann, Peter, & Van De Geer, Sara. (2011). *Statistics for high-dimensional data: methods, theory and applications*. Berlin, Germany: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Chandrasekhar, Arun. (2016). Econometrics of network formation. *Pages 303–357 of: The oxford handbook of the economics of networks*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Christakis, Nicholas A, Fowler, James H, Imbens, Guido W, & Kalyanaraman, Karthik. (2010). *An empirical model for strategic network formation*. Working Paper 16039. National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Croissant, Yves. (2012). Estimation of multinomial logit models in R: The MLOGIT packages. R package version 0.2-2. Available at <http://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/mlogit/vignettes/mlogit.pdf>.
- de Solla Price, Derek. (1976). A general theory of bibliometric and other cumulative advantage processes. *Journal of the american society for information science*, **27**(5), 292–306.
- Erdős, Paul, & Rényi, Alfréd. (1960). On the evolution of random graphs. *Institute of mathematics, hungarian academy of sciences*, **5**(1), 17–60.
- Fafchamps, Marcel, & Gubert, Flore. (2007). Risk sharing and network formation. *American economic review*, **97**(2), 75–79.
- Fahrmeir, Ludwig, Kneib, Thomas, Lang, Stefan, & Marx, Brian. (2013). *Regression: models, methods and applications*. Berlin, Germany: Springer-Verlag.
- Fortunato, Santo, Bergstrom, Carl T., Börner, Katy, Evans, James A., Helbing, Dirk, Milojević, Staša, Petersen, Alexander M., Radicchi, Filippo, Sinatra, Roberta, Uzzi, Brian, Vespignani, Alessandro, Waltman, Ludo, Wang, Dashun, & Barabási, Albert-László. (2018). Science of science. *Science*, **359**(6379).
- Goldenberg, Anna, Zheng, Alice X., Fienberg, Stephen E., & Airoldi, Edoardo M. (2010). A survey of statistical network models. *Foundations and trends in machine learning*, **2**(2), 129–233.
- Goldsmith-Pinkham, Paul, & Imbens, Guido W. (2013). Social networks and the identification of peer effects. *Journal of business & economic statistics*, **31**(3), 253–264.
- Graham, Bryan S. (2014). *An econometric model of link formation with degree heterogeneity*. Working Paper 20341. National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Graham, Bryan S. (2015). Methods of identification in social networks. *Annual review of economics*, **7**(1), 465–485.
- Hall, Bronwyn H., Jaffe, Adam B., & Trajtenberg, Manuel. (2001). *The N.B.E.R. patent citation data file: lessons, insights and methodological tools*. Working Paper 8498. National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Handcock, Mark S., & Jones, James H. (2004). Likelihood-based inference for stochastic models of sexual network formation. *Theoretical population biology*, **65**(4), 413–422.
- Hanks, Andrew S., Just, David R., & Wansink, Brian. (2012). Trigger foods: the influence of irrelevant alternatives in school lunchrooms. *Agricultural and resource economics review*, **41**(1), 114–123.
- Hole, Arne R. (2007). Fitting mixed logit models by using maximum simulated likelihood. *Stata journal*, **7**(3), 388–401.
- Holme, Petter. (2015). Modern temporal network theory: a colloquium. *European physical journal b*, **88**(9), 234.

- Holme, Petter, & Saramäki, Jari. (2012). Temporal networks. *Physics reports*, **519**(3), 97–125.
- Holme, Petter, & Saramäki, Jari (eds). (2019). *Temporal network theory*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.
- Hosmer, David W., & Lemeshow, Stanley. (1980). Goodness of fit tests for the multiple logistic regression model. *Communications in statistics — theory and methods*, **9**(10), 1043–1069.
- Jackson, Matthew O. (2010). *Social and economic networks*. 1st edn. Princeton, New Jersey, USA: Princeton University Press.
- Jeong, Hawoong, Néda, Zoltan, & Barabási, Albert-László. (2003). Measuring preferential attachment in evolving networks. *Europhysics letters (EPL)*, **61**(4), 567–572.
- Kleinbaum, David G., & Klein, Mitchel. (2002). *Logistic regression*. 1st edn. Heidelberg, Germany: Springer.
- König, Michael D. (2016). The formation of networks with local spillovers and limited observability. *Theoretical economics*, **11**(3), 813–863.
- Lynch, Scott M. (2007). *Introduction to applied bayesian statistics and estimation for social scientists*. New York, New York, USA: Springer.
- McFadden, Daniel. (1978). Modeling the choice of residential location. *Transportation research record*, **673**, 72–77.
- McFadden, Daniel, & Train, Kenneth. (2000). Mixed MNL models for discrete response. *Journal of applied econometrics*, **15**(5), 447–270.
- McPherson, Miller, Smith-Lovin, Lynn, & Cook, James M. (2001). Birds of a feather: Homophily in social networks. *Annual review of sociology*, **27**(1), 415–444.
- Menard, Scott. (2002). *Applied logistic regression analysis*. 1st edn. Vol. 106. Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: Sage.
- Michell, Lynn, & Amos, Amanda. (1997). Girls, pecking order and smoking. *Social science & medicine*, **44**(12), 1861–1869.
- Michell, Michael Pearson, Lynn. (2000). Smoke rings: social network analysis of friendship groups, smoking and drug-taking. *Drugs: education, prevention and policy*, **7**(1), 21–37.
- Newman, Mark E. J. (2018). *Networks*. 2nd edn. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Overgoor, Jan, Benson, Austin, & Ugander, Johan. (2019). Choosing to grow a graph: modeling network formation as discrete choice. *Pages 1409–1420 of: The world wide web conference. WWW '19*. ACM.
- Overgoor, Jan, Pakapol Supaniratisai, George, & Ugander, Johan. (2020). Scaling choice models of relational social data. *arXiv:2006.10003*.
- Pearson, Michael, & West, Patrick. (2003). Drifting smoke rings: social network analysis and markov processes in a longitudinal study of friendship groups and risk-taking. *Connections*, **25**(2), 50–76.
- Pearson, Michael, Steglich, Christian, & Snijders, Tom. (2006). Homophily and assimilation among sport-active adolescent substance users. *Connections*, **27**(1), 47–63.
- Penrose, Mathew. (2003). *Random geometric graphs*. Vol. 5. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Revelt, David, & Train, Kenneth. (1998). Mixed Logit with repeated choices: households' choices of appliance efficiency level. *The review of economics and statistics*, **80**(4), 647–657.
- Siegel, David A. (2009). Social networks and collective action. *American journal of political science*, **53**(1), 122–138.
- Simon, H. A. (1955). On a class of skew distribution functions. *Models of man*, **42**, 145–164.
- Slyder, Jacob B., Stein, Beth R., Sams, Brent S., Walker, David M., Jacob Beale, B., Feldhaus, Jeffrey J., & Copenheaver, Carolyn A. (2011). Citation pattern and lifespan: a comparison of discipline, institution, and individual. *Scientometrics*, **89**(3), 955–966.
- Train, Kenneth. (1986). *Qualitative choice analysis: Theory, econometrics, and an application to automobile demand*. 1st edn. Cambridge, MA, USA: MIT Press.

- Train, Kenneth. (2009). *Discrete choice methods with simulation*. 1st edn. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Wasserman, Stanley, & Faust, Katherine. (1994). *Social network analysis: Methods and applications*. 1st edn. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Yule, G. Udney. (1925). A mathematical theory of evolution, based on the conclusions of Dr. J. C. Willis, F. R. S. *Philosophical transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B*, **213**, 21–87.

A Appendix

A.1 *Random Parameters*

In Section 5.4.1, we showed results of applying the MNL model on a network (which we call a “sampled network”) that was generated using the RC model described in Section 5. In this section, we provide summary statistics of our results from applying the MNL model on a set of 50 networks that were independently generated using the RC model. The model specification for the MNL model is the same as in Sections 5.1 5.4.1. We show our results in Table A 1.

The central values (both mean and median) are similar in magnitude to the estimated values of the sampled network, suggesting that the sampled network is not an outlier. The small standard errors suggest that the results from Section 5.4.1 are reflective of most of the networks in the ensemble.

A.2 *Deterministic Parameters*

In Section 5.4.2, we showed the results of applying the MNL model and RC model on a sampled network that generated using the MNL model described in Section 5.4. In this section, we provide summary statistics of the results of applying the MNL model and the RC model on a set of 50 networks that were independently generated using the MNL model. The model specification for the RC model and the MNL is the same as in Section 5.1. We show our results in Table A 2.

For all of the parameters, the central values (both mean and median) are similar in magnitude to the estimated values of the sampled network, suggesting that the sampled network is not an outlier. The small standard errors of β_1 , β_2 , m_1 , and m_2 support the results — that the RC model gives accurate estimates of the parameters when we generate data using the RC model — that we observed in Section 5.4.2.

However, the standard errors for s_1 and s_2 are relatively large. Given the large standard deviation values, the test that we ran in 5.4.2 suggests that the parameters are random. Specifically, for approximately 40% of the networks in our simulations, the test suggests that the parameters are random. Because the parameters are deterministic (by construction), the test leads us to an incorrect conclusion for these networks. We do not study this test in a formal mathematical way in the present paper; further development of it is an important avenue for future research.

Table 1. **Summary Statistics of the Estimated Values of the Distribution Parameters for the Synthetic Networks that we Described in Section 5.3.** The first column specifies the distribution parameters, the second column gives the true values of the parameters, the third column gives the mean estimated values of the parameters, the fourth column gives the median estimated values of the parameters, the fifth column gives the minimum estimated values of the parameters, the sixth column gives the maximum estimated values of the parameters, and the last column gives the standard errors of the estimated values of the parameters.

Parameter	True Value	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum	Standard Error
m_1	3	2.975	2.977	2.748	3.240	0.100
s_1	2	2.035	2.033	1.771	2.284	0.042
m_2	0	0.002	-0.004	-0.097	0.103	0.093
s_2	1	1.004	1.002	0.898	1.147	0.050

Table 2. **Point Estimates from the MNL Model for the Synthetic Networks that we Described in Section 5.3.** The first column specifies the parameters, the second column gives the estimated values of the parameters, the third column gives the standard errors of these estimates, and the last column gives the p-values. For values that are larger than the p-value, the coefficient is significantly different from 0.

Parameter	Coefficient	Standard Error	p-value
β_1	1.9258	0.0094	< 0.001
β_2	0.8052	0.0038	< 0.001

Table 3. Point Estimates from the MNL Model (with Parameters β_{1n} and β_{2n}) and the RC Model (with Parameters m_1 , m_2 , s_1 , and s_2) for the Synthetic Networks that we Generated using the MNL model that we Described in Section 5.4.2. The first column specifies the distribution parameters, the second column gives the estimated values of the parameters, the third column gives the standard errors of these estimates, and the last column gives the p-values. For values that are larger than the p-value, the coefficient is significantly different from 0.

Parameter	Coefficient	Standard Error	p-value
β_1	-0.988	0.035	< 0.001***
β_2	2.963	0.045	< 0.001***
m_1	-0.807	0.108	< 0.001***
s_1	-0.054	0.321	0.866
m_2	1.015	0.051	< 0.001
s_2	0.084	0.139	0.546

‘***’, ‘**’, ‘*’, and ‘•’ represent statistical significances of 0, 0.1%, 1%, and 5%, respectively. The absence of asterisks or ‘•’ indicates that the parameters are not significantly different from 0.

Table 4. **Results from the RC Model for the Girl Friendship Network that we Described in Section 6.** The first column specifies the distribution parameters, the second column gives the estimated values of the parameters, the third column gives the standard errors of the estimates, and the last column gives the p-values. For values that are larger than the p-value, the coefficient is significantly different from 0.

Parameter	Coefficient	Standard Error	p-value
m_1	-0.2339	0.1379	0.090 ●
s_1	0.1945	0.5316	0.7145
m_2	0.1443	0.2706	0.5937
s_2	0.8810	0.3565	0.1344*
m_3	-1.2419	0.3431	0.0003***
s_3	0.7396	0.4481	0.098 ●
m_4	0.5461	0.3760	0.1464
s_4	1.6423	0.6261	0.0087**

‘***’, ‘**’, ‘*’, and ‘●’ represent statistical significances of 0, 0.1%, 1%, and 5%, respectively. The absence of asterisks or ‘●’ indicates that the parameters are not significantly different from 0.

Table 5. **Results from the RC model for the Patent Citation Network that we Described in Section 7.** The first column specifies the distribution parameters, the second column gives the estimated values of the parameters, the third column gives the standard errors of these estimates, and the last column gives the p-values. For values that are larger than the p-value, the coefficient is significantly different from 0.

Parameter	Coefficient	Standard Error	p-value
m_1	-1.4749	0.0269	< 0.0001***
s_1	1.5329	0.0096	< 0.0001***
m_2	1.0956	0.0121	< 0.0001***
s_2	0.1017	0.0063	< 0.0001***
m_3	-0.0090	0.0031	0.0042**
s_3	1.3045	0.0245	< 0.0001***
cor_{12}	-0.1730	0.1064	0.1042
cor_{23}	0.2058	0.2426	0.3962
cor_{13}	-0.0275	0.02756	0.3188

‘***’, ‘**’, ‘*’, and ‘•’ represent statistical significances of 0, 0.1%, 1%, and 5%, respectively. The absence of asterisks or ‘•’ indicates that the parameters are not significantly different from 0.

Table 6. **Median Values of the Choice Parameters for the Patent Citation Network that we Described in Section 7.** The first column specifies the choice parameters, and the second column gives their median values.

Choice Parameter	Median
β_{1n}	0.2287
β_{2n}	2.9909
β_{3n}	-0.009

Table 7. Estimated Parameters for the Patent Citation Network that we Described in Section 7 for 1975, 1980, 1985, 1990, and 1995. We specified the indicated parameters in Section 7.2.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Year	1975	1980	1985	1990	1995
m_1	-1.474***	-1.182***	-1.139***	-1.160***	-1.250***
s_1	1.533***	1.521***	1.530***	1.546***	1.436***
m_2	1.096***	1.064***	0.887***	0.817***	0.734***
s_2	0.102***	0.108***	0.084***	0.073***	0.068***
m_3	-0.001***	-0.034***	-0.050***	-0.062***	-0.078***
s_3	1.305***	1.225***	1.231***	1.227***	1.339***
cor ₁₂	-0.173	-0.097	-0.028	-0.044	-0.008
cor ₁₃	-0.027	0.088***	0.065***	0.013	-0.117***
cor ₂₃	0.206	-0.046	0.050	-0.093	-0.168*

***, **, *, and • represent statistical significances of 0, 0.1%, 1%, and 5%, respectively. The absence of asterisks or • indicates that the parameters are not significantly different from 0.

Table 8. Estimated Parameters for the Patent Citation Network that we Described in Section 7 for Different Sampling Methods. In the first column, we give our baseline sampling method with 10,000 new patents and 6 alternatives. In the second column, we use other sampling methods to sample 10,000 new patents. In the third and fourth columns, we sample 5,000 and 20,000 new patents, respectively; the number of alternatives is 6. In the fifth column, we consider the same sampling method as in the first column, but we no longer require the alternatives to be patents from the same technology category as the new patent. We specified the model parameters in Section 7.2.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Number of New Patents	10,000	10,000	5,000	20,000	10,000
Number of Alternatives	6	3	6	6	6
Restricted Alternatives	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
m_1	-1.474***	-1.299***	-1.360***	-1.469***	-1.308***
s_1	1.533***	1.524***	1.496***	1.510***	0.965***
m_2	1.096***	1.274***	1.112***	1.078***	1.963***
s_2	0.102***	0.111***	0.093***	0.101***	0.093***
m_3	-0.009**	-0.003	-0.007	-0.005*	-0.005
s_3	1.305***	1.281***	1.287***	1.298***	1.032***
cor ₁₂	-0.173	-0.129	-0.216	-0.160*	-0.127
cor ₁₃	-0.027	-0.270***	-0.033	-0.339	0.006
cor ₂₃	0.206	0.145	0.178	0.073	-0.053

‘***’, ‘**’, ‘*’, and ‘•’ represent statistical significances of 0, 0.1%, 1%, and 5%, respectively. The absence of asterisks or ‘•’ indicates that the parameters are not significantly different from 0.

Table 9. **Point Estimates of the Choice Parameters from the MNL Model for the Patent Citation Network that we Described in Section 7.** The first column specifies the distribution parameters, the second column gives the estimated values of the parameters, the third column gives the standard errors of these estimates, and the last column gives the p-values. For values that are larger than the p-value, the coefficient is significantly different from 0.

Parameter	Coefficient	Standard Error	p-value
β_1	0.2004	0.0040	< 0.0001***
β_2	2.1422	0.0161	< 0.0001***
β_3	-0.0186	0.0022	< 0.0001***

‘***’, ‘**’, ‘*’, and ‘•’ represent statistical significances of 0, 0.1%, 1%, and 5%, respectively.

Table A 1. **Summary Statistics of the Estimated Values of the Choice Parameters from the MNL Model for the Synthetic Networks that we Described in Section 5.2.** The first column specifies the distribution parameters, the second column gives the mean estimated values of the parameters, the third column gives the median estimated values of the parameters, the fourth column gives the minimum estimated values of the parameters, the fifth column gives the maximum estimated values of the parameters, and the last column gives the standard errors of these estimated values.

Parameter	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum	Standard Error
β_1	1.845	1.844	1.424	2.310	0.227
β_2	0.806	0.807	0.573	0.966	0.085

Table A 2. **Summary Statistics of the Estimated Values of the Choice Parameters from the MNL and the RC Models for the Synthetic Networks that we Described in 5.1.** The first column specifies the distribution parameters, the second column gives the mean estimated values of the parameters, the third column gives the median estimated values of the parameters, the fourth column gives the minimum estimated values of the parameters, the fifth column gives the maximum estimated values of the parameters, and the last column gives the standard errors of these estimated values.

Parameter	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum	Standard Error
β_1	-1.010	-1.014	-1.324	-0.754	0.114
β_2	3.035	3.053	2.716	3.486	0.142
m_1	-1.020	-1.020	-1.341	-0.773	0.115
s_1	0.053	0.063	-0.363	0.495	0.236
m_2	1.122	1.130	1.000	1.251	0.049
s_2	0.041	0.028	-0.101	0.208	0.079