

# Adaptability and the Pivot Penalty in Science

Ryan Hill<sup>1,2¶</sup>, Yian Yin<sup>1,3,4¶</sup>, Carolyn Stein<sup>5¶</sup>, Dashun Wang<sup>1,2,3,4\*</sup>, Benjamin F. Jones<sup>1,2,3,6\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Center for Science of Science and Innovation, Northwestern University, Evanston IL

<sup>2</sup>Kellogg School of Management, Northwestern University, Evanston IL

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

<sup>4</sup>McCormick School of Engineering, Northwestern University, Evanston IL

<sup>5</sup>Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge MA

<sup>6</sup>National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge MA

¶These authors contributed equally to this work.

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

**The ability to confront new questions, opportunities, and challenges is of fundamental importance to human progress and the resilience of human societies, yet the capacity of science to meet new demands remains poorly understood. Here we deploy a new measurement framework to investigate the scientific response to the COVID-19 pandemic and the adaptability of science as a whole. We find that science rapidly shifted to engage COVID-19 following the advent of the virus, with scientists across all fields making large jumps from their prior research streams. However, this adaptive response reveals a pervasive “pivot penalty,” where the impact of the new research steeply declines the further the scientists move from their prior work. The pivot penalty is severe amidst COVID-19 research, but it is not unique to COVID-19. Rather it applies nearly universally across the sciences, and has been growing in magnitude over the past five decades. While further features condition pivoting, including a scientist’s career stage, prior expertise and impact, collaborative scale, the use of new coauthors, and funding, we find that the pivot penalty persists and remains substantial regardless of these features, suggesting the pivot penalty acts as a fundamental friction that governs science’s ability to adapt. The pivot penalty not only holds key implications for the design of the scientific system and human capacity to confront emergent challenges through scientific advance, but may also be relevant to other social and economic systems, where shifting to meet new demands is central to survival and success.**

Adaptability to emergent threats and opportunities is central to the progress and decline of organizations, societies, and ecosystems [1-4]. In a similar frame, science has been described as an endless frontier [5-8], engaging an ever-evolving array of questions, opportunities, and challenges [9, 10]. New areas emerge, from synthetic biology to climate change to the COVID-19 pandemic, that demand new and potentially diverse forms of attention [11-14]. Science's ability to adapt to novel demands is thus critical to scientific and human progress [5-7]. Confronted by the COVID-19 pandemic, the world has looked to science to understand, manage, and construct solutions, all in rapid fashion. Given that few scientists were studying coronaviruses or pandemics prior to 2020—and until recently exactly zero were studying COVID-19 specifically—the advent of COVID-19 called upon scientists across the frontiers of knowledge to consider a directional change or “pivot” in their research [15], which offers a high-scale opportunity to study the adaptability of science. Here we take stock of science's reaction to the pandemic across all scientific fields. We reveal both COVID-specific lessons together with novel and systematic facts about the adaptability of scientific research as a whole, informing the nature of scientific progress and human capacity to confront emergent opportunities and challenges.

As social, scientific, and technological demands change, science policy and institutions must be designed in line with the capabilities and constraints that condition science's adaptive success. Yet in understanding adaptability there are fundamental unknowns. On the one hand, research suggests that pivoting into new research areas may be difficult. The specialization of expertise [16], the design of funding systems [17, 18], and the nature of scientific incentives, culture, and communities [19-22] may all limit the capacity of science and scientists to respond effectively to changing demands [23-26], and even with substantial new funding opportunities scientists can be reluctant to engage new research directions [27]. On the other hand, the value of novelty [28-30] and exploration [31-33] in creative search suggests that large pivots and associated novel perspectives might be especially fruitful in propelling high-impact advances [34, 35]. Further, the rise of teams in science may help to overcome individual limits and facilitate fruitful pivots [16, 36-41]. The COVID-19 shock provides a new lens to understand science's adaptability and its constraints, raising several fundamental questions. Who exactly shifts the direction of their research? How far do they travel from their prior work? What factors condition their response and, critically, what is the impact of the research that results?

To study the adaptability of science, this paper integrates high-scale databases of scientific production and introduces a measurement framework for scientific pivots. Our central database, Dimensions, incorporates 116 million scientific articles, with coverage through December 31, 2020. We further identify COVID-19 related articles using keyword searches [42, 43] of titles and abstracts, yielding 95,511 COVID-19 articles in 2020, which include both peer-reviewed publications and preprints (see SM for further details). We additionally integrate funding databases from Dimensions, which incorporates 600 funding organizations worldwide, and link grants to authors and publications, and separately integrate the 2020 COVID-specific funding information from the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the National Science Foundation (NSF) in the United States.

We first consider the responsiveness to COVID-19 across the landscape of all scientific research. Although the first paper on COVID-19 did not appear until January 2020 [44, 45], by May, 4.5% of all new scientific papers were related to COVID-19 (Fig. 1A), showing that the pandemic promptly and substantially altered the trajectory of scientific work. Indeed, across 2020, 3.3% of all research papers concerned COVID-19, and 6.3% of publishing scientists in 2020 authored at least one COVID-19 paper. Comparing the 22 major fields indexed by Dimensions, we find that while fields differ in their rate of pivoting, all fields pivoted to COVID-19 related research (Fig. 1B). Medical and health sciences not surprisingly exhibit the greatest COVID-19 orientations, with 7.3% of 2020 papers focused on COVID-19. The disciplines of chemical, physical, and earth sciences, and engineering show the smallest rates of pivoting among major fields, yet even here a non-negligible number of papers contributed to COVID-19 research (3,866 papers in 2020). Interestingly, social science fields – including economics (3.6% of papers), education (3.4%), and law (3.0%) – engaged COVID-19 relatively heavily, speaking to the socioeconomic challenges of the disease [42, 43]. The ubiquitous yet heterogeneous shift to COVID-19 is even more pronounced at higher field specificity. Examining the 154 subfields in Dimensions (Fig. S1), we find especially high COVID-19 paper shares in specific health fields – including medical microbiology (19.0%), public health (12.0%), and immunology (9.1%) – and in non-health fields such as tourism (6.0%). Overall, 92.9% of the 154 subfields published at least one COVID-19 related paper in 2020.

Fig. 1C considers shifts into COVID-19 based on the subject matter of a scientist’s prior research. To capture prior proximity to COVID-related work, we collect the references in all the COVID-19 articles and count the total citations that every scientist’s pre-2020 work receives among this set (excluding self-citations); this allows us to define a measure for how COVID-relevant a given author’s prior work has been. We find that a scientist’s propensity to write a COVID-19 paper is strongly predicted by the relevance of his or her prior work (Fig. 1C). Among all authors who published in 2020, those who had not participated in producing this prior body of work had a 4.8% chance of writing a COVID-19 paper. By contrast, those who participated most substantially in producing the relevant corpus of prior work had a 50.1% probability of writing at least one COVID-19 paper, corresponding to a nearly eight-fold increase over the baseline rate. Fig. S2 considers alternative author proximity metrics, based on (i) title keyword similarity between COVID-19 papers and the scientist’s pre-pandemic research or (ii) a simple count of the author’s relevant prior papers, uncovering similar findings. Together, these results show that scientists are far more likely to write COVID-19 papers when their prior work is quantifiably more relevant. Yet at the same time, such already-proximate scientists are rare. The vast majority of scientists who publish in 2020 (87.1%) have no prior papers in the reference corpus of COVID-19 work (Fig. 1C). Further, because this group is so large, these scientists collectively account for 67% of all researchers who wrote at least one COVID paper. These findings suggest that, amidst a strong response from the scientific community, scientists were substantially adapting their research streams to engage COVID-19, prompting us to further examine the degree of scientists’ pivots from their prior work and how successful these pivots are.

To quantify scientific pivots for individual scientists, both for COVID-19 papers and more generally in scientific research, we introduce a cosine-similarity metric (Fig. 2A) that measures the extent to which a given paper departs from a scientist’s prior body of work. Specifically, for an author  $i$  and a focal paper  $j$ , we calculate a vector  $R_i^j$ , representing the distribution of journals referenced by  $j$ . Similarly, we count the frequency in which different journals are referenced in the union of  $i$ ’s prior work, defining a vector  $R_i$ . The pivot measure,  $\Phi_i^j$ , is then defined as 1 minus the cosine of these two vectors:

$$\Phi_i^j = 1 - \frac{R_i^j \cdot R_i}{\|R_i^j\| \|R_i\|}$$

The measure  $\Phi_i^j$  thus takes the value 0 (“zero pivot”) if the focal paper draws on the exact same distribution of journals as the author’s prior work and takes the value 1 (“full pivot”) if the focal paper draws entirely on a novel set of journals. The measure featured in the main text calculates pivoting in the focal paper compared to the prior three years of the author’s work. We also calculate our measure by using all prior work of a given author, arriving at similar results (see SM and Fig. S3).

We find that scientists who write COVID-19 related papers make unusually large pivots. Fig. 2B examines all 2020 papers and shows that pivot sizes, which in general tend to be widely dispersed, are heavily right-shifted for COVID-19 papers. Whereas non-COVID papers in 2020 present a median of  $\bar{\Phi} = 0.60$ , COVID-19 papers present a substantially larger median pivot size of  $\bar{\Phi} = 0.82$  ( $p < .0001$ ). Full pivots ( $\Phi_i^j = 1$ ) appear 1.83 times more often among COVID-19 authors ( $p < .0001$ ). Fig. 2C further tracks a cohort of researchers, comparing authors who have written a COVID paper and a control set of authors who have not. The control authors are matched to the COVID authors by cohort, field, and publication rate (see SM for details). We see that the two groups of authors track closely. The average pivot size presents a broadly stable pattern over time yet features a clear jump for COVID-related work in 2020. Scientists writing COVID-19 papers exhibit substantially larger pivots compared to (1) their own prior pivoting behavior; (2) other papers they write in 2020; and (3) papers written by the matched authors. Furthermore, while fields inherently differ in their propensities to produce COVID-19 research (Fig. 1B, Fig. S1), we find that scientists in every field undertake unusually large pivots when writing COVID-19 related papers (Fig. 2D). Thus, uncommonly large individual pivots are a universal phenomenon of COVID-19 within all fields of science. Even in the most proximate fields like medical microbiology scientists are pivoting to an unusual degree. Indeed, we consider again scientists with relatively near or distant positions to the reference corpus of COVID-19 work (Fig. 1C). While pivot sizes decrease among scientists who were ex-ante closer to the COVID-19 corpus, as one would expect, even those most closely situated to COVID-19 exhibit unusually high pivot sizes compared to their own prior work (Fig. S4). Altogether, COVID-related papers represent an

unusual degree of departure from the authors' usual work, which appears universally across scientific fields and even among authors whose prior research was most closely related to COVID-19.

As scientists shift into new areas, a central question is how impactful their work becomes. Consider first 37 million papers published from 1970 to 2020, presenting general findings for all of science, both historically and today. To quantify impact, we calculate the paper-level hit rate, a binary indicator for whether a given paper was in the upper 5% of citations received within its field and year [36]. Fig. 3A reveals a striking and fundamental fact: larger pivots are systematically associated with lower impact. Indeed, we observe a large and monotonic decrease in the average hit rate as the pivot size rises. The lowest-pivot work is high impact 7.4 percent of the time, 48% higher than the baseline rate, whereas the highest-pivot work is high impact only 1.8 percent of the time, a 64% reduction from the baseline. Furthermore, quantifying this “pivot penalty” over time reveals another pervasive finding: The relationship between pivot size and impact has become increasingly negative over the past five decades (Fig. 3B). These findings generalize widely across science. Studying separately each of the 154 subfields, we find that the negative relationship between impact and pivot size holds for 93% of fields, and the increasing severity of the pivot penalty over time occurs in 88% of all scientific fields (Table S1). Thus in science, larger pivots present a substantial and increasing penalty in the impact of the work. In balancing the tension between exploiting one's existing research streams and exploring new ones [31], these findings highlight the difficulty of venturing into new areas.

The growing impact advantage to narrowness in the ambit of research is consistent with scientists becoming increasingly specialized as scientific knowledge deepens [16, 46] and heightens the general concern in science communities that research with wide reach, interdisciplinary character, or novel orientations, while perhaps highly valued, is challenging [14, 47-49]. In the context of this general and growing pivot penalty, we next consider papers published in 2020, separating them into COVID and non-COVID (red vs blue lines in Fig. 3C). Given that 2020 papers have had relatively little chance to receive citations [50], we feature a journal placement measure for impact, where each journal is assigned the historical hit rate of its publications within its field and year (see SM S2.2). We find that overall there is a large impact premium associated with COVID-19

papers, as reflected by the visible upward shift in journal placement, consistent with the extreme interest in the pandemic. At the same time, the negative relationship between pivoting and impact appears in both groups and is especially steep for COVID research. Thus, scientists who traveled further from their prior work to write COVID-19 papers were not immune to the pivot penalty; rather they produced research with substantially less impact on average relative to low-pivot COVID papers. Crucially, the COVID impact premium is mostly offset by the unusually large pivots associated with COVID research. Comparing at the median pivot size within each group, the journal placement of COVID papers appears on par with non-COVID papers, despite the clear impact premium conferred upon COVID research. Indeed, the upper 45% of COVID-19 papers by pivot size turn out to have lower average journal placement than papers with less than or equal to the median pivot size among non-COVID work. We see a similar surge in interest, and penalty for high pivots, using citations to the specific papers (Fig. S5). Overall, we observe two extremely strong yet sharply contrasting relationships regarding impact. On the one hand, COVID-related work has experienced a large impact premium; on the other hand, greater pivot size markedly predicts less impactful work. These findings unearth a central tension in the adaptability of science: while engaging a high-demand area has value, pivoting exhibits offsetting penalties, as traversing larger distances from one's prior work predicts substantially less impactful outcomes.

The pivot penalty in Fig. 3 presents a potentially fundamental challenge for scientific adaptability. Drawing on the science of science literature [51-53], we next consider further critical features that may help science adapt. First, what is the relationship between an individual's career stage and pivoting? Second, what role does collaboration play in facilitating pivots? Third, what role does funding play? Finally, can any of these features overcome the pivot penalty seen above?

Fig. 4A examines scientists' entry into COVID research based on career age and prior impact, uncovering two key findings. First, higher-impact scientists were more likely to engage COVID-19 research. Among scientists who publish in 2020, only 4.8% wrote a COVID-19 paper among the lowest-impact group (measured by total citations to the scientist's prior five years of work before 2020); this rate doubled for the highest-impact group (9.6% wrote a COVID-19 paper). Second, career age matters greatly for pivoting. At higher-impact levels, scientists further into their careers proved far more likely to write a COVID-19 paper: 7.2% of the highest-impact scientists

in the 2010-2019 cohort engaged COVID-19 research, rising to 10.3% in the 2000-2009 cohort and 13.9% in the 1990-1999 cohort. This finding runs counter to “Planck’s Principle” [20, 22], which posits that younger scientists will be more likely to engage novel research streams. Yet here we find that older scientists were disproportionately more likely to pivot into COVID research. These results hold for a large majority of fields (Fig. S6A-B). Together, these results indicate that exceptionally high impact scientists were leaders in engaging COVID-19 research – yet much less so among the young, suggesting that science overall may be missing out on valuable contributions and perspectives. Indeed, while bringing established field leaders into the COVID-19 landscape might be seen as auspicious for science’s response, these results suggest that emerging field leaders – younger cohorts who may have fresh ideas and otherwise help scale up the adaptive response – were substantially left out.

Teamwork may be an additional and critical feature for understanding adaptability. Indeed, not only are teams increasingly responsible for producing high-impact and novel research [28, 33, 36, 38], they can also aggregate individual expertise [16], extending the reach of individual scientists and promoting subject-matter flexibility [29, 54]. We find that team size has indeed been larger for COVID-19 papers than is typical in the respective field. Compared to field means, COVID-19 papers see 1.5 additional coauthors on average (a 28% increase in team size, Fig. S6C), supporting the broad importance of collaborations in science’s response to the pandemic. Further, COVID-19 authors have worked to an unusual degree with new coauthors (Fig. 4B), rather than existing collaborators, engaging new coauthors at a much higher rate than (1) that same scientist did in prior years, (2) that same scientist did on their other 2020 papers, and (3) other matched, non-COVID-19 scientists do. Moreover, engaging new coauthors tends to be associated with larger pivots (Fig. S7A-B). Overall, these results are consistent with teamwork expanding reach [16, 39, 40]. Yet at the same time, these new collaborators mostly came from within the same institution (Fig. S7C-D) or primary field (Fig. S7E-F), suggesting new collaborations in COVID research are forming within pre-existing boundaries as opposed to drawing from a broader front that spans across geographic or disciplinary landscapes. Overall, while the scope of new collaborative opportunities may be constrained, the results show that collaboration indeed appears to be a central feature in science’s adaptive response.



We further probe science’s adaptability through the lens of funding. Drawing on over 600 different funding sources worldwide, we measure the proportion of grant-supported research for all 2020 papers, separating them into COVID and non-COVID (red vs blue lines in Fig. 4C). There is a large and monotonic decrease in grant-supported research as pivot size increases for both COVID and non-COVID papers. And this relationship is especially pronounced for COVID-19 papers, which are substantially less likely to cite a funding source across all pivot sizes (Fig. 4C). Hence while COVID papers are characterized by larger pivots, grant-supported research disproportionately features small pivots. These findings are natural to the extent that existing projects are tied to specific agendas, so that large pivots in general, and COVID-19 pivots in particular, tend to occur without acknowledging specific grants. Further examining COVID-specific funding mechanisms of the NIH and NSF, we find that COVID-specific grants were issued rapidly, peaking from late spring to early fall (Fig. S8). Yet at the same time, among the funded PIs who published a COVID-19 paper in 2020, 59% (NIH) and 32% (NSF) of PIs had published at least one COVID-19 paper *before* receiving the grant, suggesting the adaptive funding may still lag the early adaptive research efforts. Overall, these results show that grant funding in science is associated with less pivoting, and appears to facilitate scientists engaged in consistent rather than adaptive research streams. In the case of COVID-19, despite the adaptive efforts by funders such as the NSF and NIH, science’s response came largely without project-specific funding, especially in the critical, early phase of the pandemic.

Together, Fig. 4A-C present key features that condition the adaptability of science. Can these features alleviate the pivot penalty? For example, do high-impact scientists, well-funded scientists, or those working in novel collaborations manage to achieve large shifts in research direction without facing a severe penalty in the impact of the work? We separate scientists by their prior impact (Fig. S9A), career age (Fig. S9B), team size (Fig. S9C), use of new collaborators (Fig. S9D), and funding status (Fig. S9E), and repeat our analyses for the pivot penalty seen in Fig. 3A. We find that, regardless of the scientist’s individual characteristics, funding status, or collaborative orientation, the pivot penalty persists. We further use regression methods to control for all these features together, finding that net of all these features, the pivot penalty remains substantial in magnitude (Fig. 4D). Together, these results suggest that the pivot penalty acts as a fundamental friction that limits science’s ability to adapt.

Science must regularly adapt to new opportunities and challenges. The COVID-19 pandemic has produced enormous demand for relevant scientific research [55] and provides a high scale event to examine the adaptability of science. We find that science faces systematic challenges to pivoting research, which may not be easy to overcome. Although an extremely broad frontier of science engaged in COVID-related research, the highest-impact work came from those pre-situated closely to the subject, and even these individuals were pivoting to a personally unusual degree. COVID-19 authors tended to be high-impact scientists, but not young ones, often worked in large teams and with novel coauthors, and they pivoted largely without project-specific funding. Most importantly, the response betrays a deep tension, where the further people pivot, the less impactful the work tends to be. This ‘pivot penalty’ appears not only among COVID-19 research but also across the sciences, and it has become increasingly pronounced over the past five decades.

Overall, the findings suggest that, despite the strong response by the scientific community to the pandemic, science faces fundamental constraints on its capacity to adapt, with potentially first-order policy implications. While funding systems and science institutions can develop programs to facilitate rapid response, as seen in this pandemic, funding may come with substantial lags. And during this pandemic, many researchers, including highly productive young researchers, stayed on the sidelines, suggesting untapped opportunities to create more forceful responses through policy and institutional design. Ultimately, however, the pre-positioning of scientists appears to be a fundamental constraint, which has implications for both emergencies and ordinary times.

In an emergency context such as the coronavirus pandemic, the world is constrained by the existing scientific expertise and relatively proximate scientists already in existence when the crisis hits. This suggests that success against the next pandemic or other emergency depends on the ability to scale and position science beforehand. Indeed, in Louis Pasteur’s famous words, “chance favors only the prepared mind.” Without pre-pandemic developments in scientific knowledge, including mRNA vaccines [56], and the pre-positioning of relevant human capital, the pandemic would likely have been still more costly. Outside the emergency context, these findings also challenge the notion of outsiders offering fresh insights, further emphasizing the importance of expertise and accumulation of knowledge. Research on creative search has documented the benefits of exploration [31] and out-of-box thinking [22, 57, 58]. The pivot penalty suggests that, while

individuals are indeed capable of traversing long distances, domain-specific expertise is increasingly crucial for producing impactful outcomes. This expertise advantage and associated pivot penalty has implications for science institutions in their hiring and funding strategies in pursuit of generating high-impact work. It may further inform organizational survival; for example, leading businesses often fail to successfully exploit new technologies and must choose workforce strategies to facilitate adaptation [59-61].

Our findings have further implications for the development and nurturing of the scientific workforce as a whole. Portfolio theory points to diversified investments as a key tool to manage risk [62]. But the pivot penalty suggests that, unlike typical investments, adjustments to the science portfolio are governed by deep inertia [63]. From this perspective, investing in a large and diverse “bench” of scientists becomes essential from a risk management standpoint, advancing the capacity of humanity to respond effectively to developing threats and opportunities. Viewing science as a range of specialized endeavors with increasingly specialized researchers [16, 46], a “prepared mind” in science means a “collectively prepared mind.” A diverse portfolio of high-scale investments can then play essential roles in both advancing human progress and seizing high social returns in ordinary times [22, 64] while also expanding human capacity to confront novel challenges.

Science presents evolving demands from many areas – from artificial intelligence to genetic engineering to climate change – creating complex issues, risks, and urgency. This paper shows generally that pivoting research directions is both hard and costly, with scientists’ pivots facing a growing impact penalty, which governs the adaptability of science. Given the uniqueness of the pandemic, it is notable that the pivot penalty applies not just to COVID-19 research but also generalizes across the sciences. Nevertheless, studying the adaptability of science in different settings and time scales, beyond emergencies and extending to longer-run research shifts, are key areas for future work. Moreover, the pivot penalty uncovered here is measured through the citation impact and journal placement of the resulting papers; studying other characteristics may further enrich our understanding about the costs and benefits of scientific pivots. Lastly, pivoting to engage new challenges is not unique to science but may underpin the dynamics of success and survival for individuals, firms, and governments across human society [4, 13, 61, 65-67],


suggesting the uncovered pivot penalty may be a generic property of many social and economic systems, with potential applicability in broader domains.

**Acknowledgements** This work is supported by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research under award numbers FA9550-17-1-0089 and FA9550-19-1-0354, National Science Foundation grant SBE 1829344, and the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation grant G-2019-12485.


**Competing interests** We declare no competing interests.

**Data availability** Deidentified data necessary to reproduce all plots and statistical analyses will be made freely available. Those who are interested in accessing the raw data from Dimensions should contact Digital Science directly.


**Code availability** Code will be made freely available.




**Figure 1. Science engages COVID-19.** (A) Science rapidly shifted to COVID-19 research, with COVID-19 publications rising to 4.5% of all science publications in May 2020 and maintaining similarly high rates thereafter. (B) While health sciences and social sciences featured the strongest responses, all scientific fields engaged COVID-19 research. (C) Scientists were more likely to write COVID-19 papers the more relevant their own prior work, but scientists with relevant prior work were rare (inset).



**Figure 2. Quantifying scientific pivots.** (A) The pivot measure compares a focal paper against prior papers authored by the same scientist. An increasing value on the  $[0,1]$  interval indicates a larger pivot from the scientist’s prior work. (B) COVID-19 papers show substantially larger pivots than other scientific work published in 2020. (C) Scientists who write COVID-19 papers pivot to a greater extent than they do in their prior work, their other 2020 work, or matched control scientists’ do. (D) Comparing COVID and non-COVID papers within each field in 2020, unusually large pivots have been a universal feature of COVID-19 research in all 154 subfields of science.



**Figure 3. The Pivot Penalty.** (A) The probability of being a hit paper is a decreasing function of pivot size. This panel includes 37 million papers published from 1970-2019. (B) The pivot penalty is increasingly steep with time: in recent decades, larger pivots by scientists appear increasingly low impact. (C) COVID-19 papers experience an impact premium, but the pivot penalty appears within both COVID and non-COVID work. Comparing at the median pivot sizes (dashed lines), the COVID-19 impact premium is substantially offset by the pivot penalty, given its larger median pivot size.



**Figure 4. Further Features Condition Adaptability but the Pivot Penalty Persists.** (A) We group scientists into three cohorts based on their first publication year. Within each cohort, we find that the probability that a scientist writes a COVID paper is an increasing function of his/her prior impact, as measured by the number of citations accrued from 2015-2019. Comparing across the three cohorts shows that older scientists are substantially more likely than younger scientists to pivot into COVID-19 research. (B) Engaging new collaborators was especially common for COVID-19 researchers, who worked with new collaborators to an unusual degree compared to their own prior history, their other 2020 publications, and control scientists. The control group is matched by field and number of publications from 2015-2019. (C) Funding support is heavily oriented to lower pivot work. Higher-pivot work is substantially less likely to acknowledge funding support in the sciences as a whole (blue) and among COVID-19 papers (red). COVID-19 papers were especially unlikely to acknowledge grant support. (D) While individual, collaborative, and funding features sharply condition the adaptive response of science, in regression analysis they do not individually or collectively overcome the fundamental pivot penalty. See SM S2.5 for details.



1. Thomas, C.D., et al., *Extinction risk from climate change*. Nature, 2004. **427**(6970): p. 145-148.
2. Harford, T., *Adapt: Why success always starts with failure*. 2011: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
3. Teece, D.J., G. Pisano, and A. Shuen, *Dynamic capabilities and strategic management*. Strategic management journal, 1997. **18**(7): p. 509-533.
4. Diamond, J., *Collapse: How societies choose to fail or succeed*. 2011: Penguin.
5. Bush, V., *Science, the Endless Frontier: A report to the President*. 1945, Washington: Government Printing Office.
6. Gross, D.P. and B.N. Sampat, *The Economics of Crisis Innovation Policy: A Historical Perspective*. 2021, National Bureau of Economic Research.
7. Ahmadpoor, M. and B.F. Jones, *The dual frontier: Patented inventions and prior scientific advance*. Science, 2017. **357**(6351): p. 583-587.
8. Bornmann, L., *What is societal impact of research and how can it be assessed? A literature survey*. Journal of the American Society for information science and technology, 2013. **64**(2): p. 217-233.
9. Guimera, R., et al., *Team assembly mechanisms determine collaboration network structure and team performance*. Science, 2005. **308**(5722): p. 697-702.
10. Omenn, G.S., *Grand challenges and great opportunities in science, technology, and public policy*. SCIENCE-NEW YORK THEN WASHINGTON-, 2006. **314**(5806): p. 1696.
11. Cameron, D.E., C.J. Bashor, and J.J. Collins, *A brief history of synthetic biology*. Nature Reviews Microbiology, 2014. **12**(5): p. 381-390.
12. Yang, P. and X. Wang, *COVID-19: a new challenge for human beings*. Cellular & molecular immunology, 2020. **17**(5): p. 555-557.
13. Field, C.B., et al., *Managing the risks of extreme events and disasters to advance climate change adaptation: special report of the intergovernmental panel on climate change*. 2012: Cambridge University Press.
14. National Academies of Sciences, E. and Medicine, *Global Change Research Needs and Opportunities for 2022-2031*. 2021, Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. 101.
15. Zhang, Y., et al., *Topic evolution, disruption and resilience in early COVID-19 research*. Scientometrics, 2021: p. 1-29.
16. Jones, B.F., *The burden of knowledge and the "death of the renaissance man": Is innovation getting harder?* The Review of Economic Studies, 2009. **76**(1): p. 283-317.
17. Azoulay, P., J.S. Graff Zivin, and G. Manso, *Incentives and creativity: evidence from the academic life sciences*. The RAND Journal of Economics, 2011. **42**(3): p. 527-554.
18. Kaplan, D., *How to improve peer review at NIH: a revamped process will engender innovative research*. The Scientist, 2005. **19**(17): p. 10-11.
19. Kuhn, T.S., *The structure of scientific revolutions*. 1962: University of Chicago press.
20. Hull, D.L., P.D. Tessen, and A.M. Diamond, *Planck's principle*. Science, 1978. **202**(4369): p. 717-723.
21. Banerjee, A.V., *A simple model of herd behavior*. The quarterly journal of economics, 1992. **107**(3): p. 797-817.
22. Azoulay, P., C. Fons-Rosen, and J.S. Graff Zivin, *Does science advance one funeral at a time?* American Economic Review, 2019. **109**(8): p. 2889-2920.

23. Jones, B.F., *As science evolves, how can science policy?*, in *Innovation Policy and the Economy, Volume 11*. 2011, University of Chicago Press. p. 103-131.
24. Jia, T., D. Wang, and B.K. Szymanski, *Quantifying patterns of research-interest evolution*. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 2017. **1**(4): p. 0078.
25. Foster, J.G., A. Rzhetsky, and J.A. Evans, *Tradition and innovation in scientists' research strategies*. *American Sociological Review*, 2015. **80**(5): p. 875-908.
26. Stoeger, T. and L.A.N. Amaral, *Meta-Research: COVID-19 research risks ignoring important host genes due to pre-established research patterns*. *Elife*, 2020. **9**: p. e61981.
27. Myers, K., *The elasticity of science*. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 2020. **12**(4): p. 103-34.
28. Uzzi, B., et al., *Atypical combinations and scientific impact*. *Science*, 2013. **342**(6157): p. 468-472.
29. Lee, Y.-N., J.P. Walsh, and J. Wang, *Creativity in scientific teams: Unpacking novelty and impact*. *Research policy*, 2015. **44**(3): p. 684-697.
30. Kelly, B., et al., *Measuring technological innovation over the long run*. 2018, National Bureau of Economic Research.
31. March, J.G., *Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning*. *Organization science*, 1991. **2**(1): p. 71-87.
32. Rosenkopf, L. and A. Nerkar, *Beyond local search: boundary - spanning, exploration, and impact in the optical disk industry*. *Strategic management journal*, 2001. **22**(4): p. 287-306.
33. Zeng, A., et al., *Increasing trend of scientists to switch between topics*. *Nature communications*, 2019. **10**(1): p. 1-11.
34. Fleming, L., *Recombinant uncertainty in technological search*. *Management science*, 2001. **47**(1): p. 117-132.
35. Liu, L., et al., *Understanding the onset of hot streaks across artistic, cultural, and scientific careers*. arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.01256, 2021.
36. Wuchty, S., B.F. Jones, and B. Uzzi, *The increasing dominance of teams in production of knowledge*. *Science*, 2007. **316**(5827): p. 1036-1039.
37. Jones, B.F., S. Wuchty, and B. Uzzi, *Multi-university research teams: shifting impact, geography, and stratification in science*. *science*, 2008. **322**(5905): p. 1259-1262.
38. Wu, L., D. Wang, and J.A. Evans, *Large teams develop and small teams disrupt science and technology*. *Nature*, 2019. **566**(7744): p. 378.
39. Freeman, R.B., I. Ganguli, and R. Murciano-Goroff, *I. Why and Wherefore of Increased Scientific Collaboration*. 2015: University of Chicago Press.
40. Zeng, A., et al., *Fresh teams are associated with original and multidisciplinary research*. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 2021: p. 1-9.
41. Adams, J.D., et al., *Scientific teams and institutional collaborations: Evidence from US universities, 1981–1999*. *Research policy*, 2005. **34**(3): p. 259-285.
42. Yin, Y., et al., *Coevolution of policy and science during the pandemic*. *Science*, 2021. **371**(6525): p. 128-130.
43. Kousha, K. and M. Thelwall, *COVID-19 publications: Database coverage, citations, readers, tweets, news, Facebook walls, Reddit posts*. *Quantitative Science Studies*, 2020. **1**(3): p. 1068-1091.
44. Else, H., *How a torrent of COVID science changed research publishing-in seven charts*. *Nature*, 2020. **588**(7839): p. 553-553.

45. Fry, C.V., et al., *Consolidation in a crisis: Patterns of international collaboration in early COVID-19 research*. PloS one, 2020. **15**(7): p. e0236307.
46. Einstein, A., *The World as I See It*. 1949, Secaucus NJ: Citadel Press.
47. Council, N.R., *Convergence: Facilitating Transdisciplinary Integration of Life Sciences, Physical Sciences, Engineering, and Beyond*. 2014, Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. 152.
48. Sciences, N.A.o., N.A.o. Engineering, and I.o. Medicine, *Facilitating Interdisciplinary Research*. 2005, Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. 332.
49. National Academies of Sciences, E. and Medicine, *Fostering the culture of convergence in research: Proceedings of a workshop*. 2019.
50. Wang, D., C. Song, and A.-L. Barabási, *Quantifying long-term scientific impact*. Science, 2013. **342**(6154): p. 127-132.
51. Wang, D. and A.-L. Barabási, *The science of science*. 2021: Cambridge University Press.
52. Fortunato, S., et al., *Science of science*. Science, 2018. **359**(6379): p. eaao0185.
53. Azoulay, P., et al., *Toward a more scientific science*. Science, 2018. **361**(6408): p. 1194-1197.
54. Jones, B.F. and B.A. Weinberg, *Age dynamics in scientific creativity*. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 2011. **108**(47): p. 18910-18914.
55. Azoulay, P. and B. Jones, *Beat COVID-19 through innovation*. Science, 2020.
56. Fauci, A.S., *The story behind COVID-19 vaccines*. 2021, American Association for the Advancement of Science.
57. Galenson, D.W., *Old masters and young geniuses: The two life cycles of artistic creativity*. 2011: Princeton University Press.
58. Jones, B., E. Reedy, and B.A. Weinberg, *Age and scientific genius*. 2014, National Bureau of Economic Research.
59. Christensen, C.M., *The innovator's dilemma: when new technologies cause great firms to fail*. 2013: Harvard Business Review Press.
60. Tushman, M.L. and C.A. O'Reilly III, *Ambidextrous organizations: Managing evolutionary and revolutionary change*. California management review, 1996. **38**(4): p. 8-29.
61. Henderson, R.M. and K.B. Clark, *Architectural innovation: The reconfiguration of existing product technologies and the failure of established firms*. Administrative science quarterly, 1990: p. 9-30.
62. Markowitz, H.M., *Foundations of portfolio theory*. The journal of finance, 1991. **46**(2): p. 469-477.
63. Goolsbee, A., *Does government R&D policy mainly benefit scientists and engineers?* The American Economic Review, 1998. **88**(2): p. 298-302.
64. Jones, B.F. and L.H. Summers, *A Calculation of the Social Returns to Innovation*. 2020, National Bureau of Economic Research.
65. Azoulay, P., et al., *Immigration and Entrepreneurship in the United States*. 2020, National Bureau of Economic Research.
66. Berkes, E., et al., *Lockdowns and Innovation: Evidence from the 1918 Flu Pandemic*. 2020, National Bureau of Economic Research.
67. Hidalgo, C.A., et al., *The product space conditions the development of nations*. Science, 2007. **317**(5837): p. 482-487.