

# Fields, Bridges, and Foundations: How Researchers Browse Citation Network Visualizations




Figure 1: We identified six patterns that researchers utilize to browse citation networks and discover papers of interest. Component-wise, these patterns can be classified to: Field (*i.e.*, related papers on a single research topic), Bridge (*i.e.*, logical connections between papers or topics), and Foundation (*i.e.*, stages in the broad development of research). For each component, there were two different perspectives: layout-oriented or connection-oriented. Our analysis suggests that the connection-oriented perspective can assist in finding papers that are relevant to the intended purpose, whereas the layout-oriented perspective may be misleading and inaccurate.

## ABSTRACT

Visualizing citation relations with network structures is widely used, but the visual complexity can make it challenging for individual researchers to navigate through them. We collected data from 18 researchers using an interface that we designed using network simplification methods and analyzed how users browsed and identified important papers. Our analysis reveals six major patterns used for identifying papers of interest, which can be categorized into three key components: Fields, Bridges, and Foundations, each viewed from two distinct perspectives: layout-oriented and connection-oriented. The connection-oriented approach was found to be more effective for selecting relevant papers, but the layout-oriented method was adopted more often, even though it led to unexpected results and user frustration. Our findings emphasize the importance of integrating these components and the necessity to balance visual layouts with meaningful connections to enhance the effectiveness of citation networks in academic browsing systems.

**Index Terms:** Literature search, network visualization

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Exploring the relationship between academic literature is crucial in multidisciplinary fields such as Human-Computer Interaction (HCI), which integrates diverse areas such as computer engineering, design, and social sciences [18, 16]. For novice researchers, understanding the foundational theories and history of a specific field, and the connections with other disciplines can be challenging [3]. Researchers engage in individual, topic-oriented browsing to achieve these goals [4, 22, 12, 13]. They typically begin with a few relevant papers for a specific research topic, and these papers are generally called “seed papers”. Seed papers help researchers to progressively expand their knowledge in related areas, and researchers identify additional significant papers and develop a comprehensive perspective on related work.

Citation relationships are a fundamental component of academic databases, providing essential insights into the landscape and trends of a research field. Citation network visualization, which represents papers as nodes and citation relationships as links, is an intuitive and widely used method for illustrating these connections. However, it can be challenging to browse a citation network with ease. For example, Figure 2 displays a crude visualization of the direct references/citations with their interconnections of a single paper. Although the network is based on a single piece of literature, it is already visually complex and hard to cognitively manage.

Most studies featuring citation networks generate visually complex outputs with a large number of nodes and edges, making it only feasible for specific tasks such as detecting macro trends and anomalies [17, 20, 1, 9, 10]. However, tailoring citation networks for a specific goal cannot be expanded for the general browsing of users, who may want to search about a specific topic. While systems designed to browse literature related to specific topics (e.g., Connected Papers [2]) do show the citations among recommended relevant papers, but they do not display all references and citations, limiting users to only passively viewing the graph without the ability to explore other aspects of the network.

One way to enable manual browsing of citation network visualizations is to simplify the graph before user interaction and providing details on-demand. Techniques to summarize graphs have enabled converting graph visualization readable by simplifying their substructures. For example, Dunne [8] proposed representing three motifs—fans, connectors, and (near) cliques—in a glyph form to effectively visually summarize complex graphs. Similarly, although its primary aim is not for visual summarization, Koutra [14] enabled the detection and display of (near) cliques, bipartite cores, stars, and chains within the graph. These methods show a potential use of graph simplification method for individual researchers to directly view and explore citation graphs. However, the graph components used in these studies may vary in importance to individual researchers exploring the citation graph. For instance, why might a researcher want to see a bipartite core in a citation network? Without prior knowledge of what researchers consider relevant or noise, it remains challenging to justify which components should be emphasized, compressed, or hidden.




Figure 2: A citation network comprised of single paper and its first-degree neighboring nodes. The citation relations between the neighboring nodes are included as well.

We explored which components researchers are interested in when exploring citation network visualizations around their seed papers. We designed and deployed an interface that allowed 18 researchers to browse citation graphs based on their research topics, through which we identified six major patterns (Figure 1). There were two distinct perspectives: one focusing on the layout and the other on connection. The connection-oriented perspective proved to be more effective in selecting useful papers, whereas the layout-oriented perspective often led to unexpected results and frustration. Paradoxically, researchers more frequently used the layout-oriented approach, suggesting that primary visual attributes such as layouts tend to attract more attention from the readers. We highlight the need to align layout and connection within literature network visualization.

## 2 METHOD

### 2.1 Pilot Study

Our initial approach was to simplify the citation network by breaking down the large citation network around seed papers into communities small enough to be displayed, as it was impractical to display the graph in its entirety as shown in Figure 2. With given seed papers from participants, we extracted neighboring papers using the Breadth-First Search algorithm using the Semantic Scholar API [19]. The graphs were then segmented into sufficiently small communities around seed papers by recursively applying the Louvain community detection algorithm [6].

The approach was tested on three participants during the pilot study stage, and we found that they were motivated to see bigger networks illustrating the connections between multiple seed papers. We ensured that communities were visualized with fewer than 30 nodes to maintain cognitive manageability, but this typically resulted in communities with a single seed paper and a tree-like structure of cited papers around it. Participants expressed that this structure lacked informational value and were curious about the qualitative differences between nodes included or excluded by the community algorithm, which hindered further thought development. Occasionally, when a community contained more than one seed paper and the connections between them were visible, participants found the structure interesting. Feedback from the initial three participants indicated a need to provide larger graphs that, despite the potential risk of visual complexity, would display multiple seed papers and their interrelations.

### 2.2 Citation Network Browsing Interface

Building on our pilot study experiences, we developed an interface that displays a graph consisting of 100 densely connected papers and their citation relationships, starting from the seed papers given as input by the user. Unlike the system used in the pilot study, which used a Breadth-First Search algorithm to fetch neighboring papers, we designed the interface to fetch nodes in order of their connectivity to the given seed papers. This adjustment addresses

participants’ desire to see connections between multiple seed papers. Consequently, in the new system, as new nodes are discovered and added to the seed paper list within the graph, or as some previous seed papers are removed, the surrounding 100 nodes also change, allowing users to browse the literature space by creating multiple combinations of seed papers and observing the changes in the graph.

Limiting the number of nodes to 100 was an empirical decision made by the authors to avoid excessive visual complexity. However, to provide a smooth visual experience, we applied several graph summarization techniques. The first technique was to modify arrows, which are typically used to represent citation relationships. Instead of using conventional triangular arrowheads, which can overlap and obscure identification in nodes with a high in-degree, we simplified the arrow’s shaft and head by adding color on the tip of the edge (Fig. 4). The second summarization involves merging nodes with the same connection relationships to avoid displaying an excessive number of leaf nodes. This prevents the layout from spreading too widely across the screen when a paper has multiple references without interconnections, which would conflict with the design goal of maximizing the visibility of connections between nodes of interest. We merged nodes with identical predecessors and successors into a single node, serving similar purpose to Dunnes fan and connector motif simplification [8].

Additionally, the system offers three different layout algorithms to facilitate visual navigation (Figure 5). Layouts play a crucial role in interpreting graphs, and certain inherent relationships within a graph can only be perceived effectively in a certain layout that reflects them well. In addition to the commonly used force-directed and circular layouts in previous research [15, 21], we added the DOT layout, a rank-based arrangement that clearly shows node hierarchy. These layouts were calculated using the GraphViz libraries “*sfdp*”, “*twopi*”, and “*dot*” layout engines [11], and provided to users under the names “*connectivity emphasized*,” “*hierarchy emphasized*,” and “*circular arrangement*.” We intentionally did not give users more than these names to encourage them to discover each layout’s unique roles and opportunities without cognitive effort to understand the layout itself.

### 2.3 Task

Participants used the system to explore the citation network around their research’s seed papers and were asked to select ten noteworthy papers for post-assessment. Once the graph was rendered, users could access metadata for each node (*i.e.*, title, authors, citation count, journal, year, abstract) through tooltips and pop-ups. Users could “*star*” noteworthy papers, and they were required to save a total of ten papers for post-assessment. The post-assessment was a procedure of annotating whether the papers were closely related and useful enough to be referenced in their research. Users conducted this assessment using their preferred method, whether by reading the abstract, skimming, or thoroughly reading the papers. As the duration of the post-assessment could vary among users, the system was deployed for two days, during which the users could perform the evaluations freely.

The post-assessment consisted of several questions, as shown in Fig. 3-E. At the top, the graph state at the moment the paper was saved, including the zoom and panning state, was shown. The first question asked why the user found the particular node interesting in the given graph structure. Users could respond by marking lines on the graph in addition to providing text answers. The second question required a true or false response about whether the paper was useful to their research. Subsequent questions asked why they thought the paper was (or was not) useful, why they believed the paper was worth reading, and if their thoughts about the network had changed.

Prior to the experiment, participants were required to watch a



Figure 3: A screenshot of the interface used in the experiment. After inputting seed papers (A), participants were asked to browse the citation network (B, C), identify noteworthy papers (D), and provide feedback on why they were interested in specific parts of the graph and how the papers they found were actually useful (E).




Figure 4: We simplified the graph by using colors on the tip of the link to indicate direction and merging nodes with identical connections.




Figure 5: Examples of the three layouts provided to users: force-directed (left), rank-based (center), and circular (right).

20-minute instructional video and read the user manual, which was followed by two days of individual time for the post-assessment. After completing the task, a 30-minute interview was conducted for debriefing, where we asked how they used the graph, their goals of using the system and overall satisfaction, and how they interpreted the graph structures. Each participant who completed all procedures received a compensation of 20,000 KRW (about 14.5 USD).

### 2.4 Participants and Data Analysis

We recruited researchers from the HCI and social sciences fields, who had at least six months of experience in academic research and were currently engaged in research of a specific topic. We recruited a total of 18 participants (12 female, 6 male) with an average age of 27.0 ( $\sigma = 4.07$ ), ranging from 22 to 40. A total of 179 post-assessment records were collected. To extract patterns of interest in the citation network from these records, we developed a codebook based on the post-assessment records and interview transcripts, identifying six codes. Two authors independently applied closed coding and assessed inter-rater reliability using Krippendorff's alpha [7]. We refined the code definitions and repeated the process until achieving an alpha of 0.80. This method yielded a Cohens Kappa for each code with an average of 0.82 ( $\sigma = 0.09$ ), ranging from 0.70 to 0.94. Any coding discrepancies were resolved through discussions between the authors.

### 3 RESULT

#### 3.1 The Six Patterns of Browsing Citation Networks

Figure 1 illustrates the six patterns identified from our analysis, where each pattern refers to the structures that participants felt interested in while examining networks. We found that individuals adopt either a layout-oriented or connection-oriented perspective when browsing and finding papers of interest. First, papers that were selected from a layout-oriented perspective were examined conceptually within the graph's structure. This approach emphasizes the positions of nodes and the orientations of arrows, aiming to understand the network's overall "shape" rather than the specific citation links. In contrast, those with a connection-oriented perspective recognized and analyzed the actual connections between nodes, which can be seen as a bottom-up approach. We also identified three key elements of interest—Fields, Bridges, and Foundations—for both

Table 1: Six Patterns of Researcher Focus on Citation Network Visualization

Category	Description
<b>Field</b>	The selected node is expected to belong to a field of related papers on a single research topic
<i>Layout-oriented</i>	Assumes that the distance between nodes on the layout to indicate similarity, and that a cluster is a topic.
<i>Connection-oriented</i>	Assumes that nodes with many connections to each other, i.e., near-complete graphs, form a topic.
<b>Bridge</b>	The selected node is expected to be a logical connection point, relating to two or more papers or topics at the same time
<i>Layout-oriented</i>	Assumes that the node located between two clusters will blend topics
<i>Connection-oriented</i>	Assumes that a chain of nodes connecting two papers or areas will blend topics
<b>Foundation</b>	The selected node is expected to belong to a particular (e.g., pioneering, or recent) stage in the macro development of the topic
<i>Layout-oriented</i>	Assumes that each layer in hierarchical layout represents a stage in the macro development of the research
<i>Connection-oriented</i>	Assumes that a paper is seminal when it has many edges to a large number of unspecified nodes

perspectives, thus leading to six distinct patterns of interest and reasons for engagement (Table 1).

### 3.2 Effectiveness of Layout vs. Connection-Oriented Perspectives

The results of the post-assessment showed that when it came to discovering useful papers, the connection-oriented perspective was more effective than the layout-oriented perspective. Cases not belonging to any type (“Others”), and those explored from a layout-oriented perspective focusing on Field and Bridge, had comparable numbers of useful and non-useful records (Figure 6). However, papers explored from a connection-oriented perspective were generally found to be more useful. Logistic regression was conducted to further examine these findings. The independent variables in the regression model were the binary indications of belonging to each of the six types, and the dependent variable was the binary decision of usefulness, using participant ID as a group factor, as there were 10 repeated measures per participant. The results showed significant effects for Bridge and Foundation in connection-oriented and Foundation in layout-oriented perspectives ( $p < .05$ ), with coefficients of 1.37, 1.10, and 1.33, respectively, indicating a strong effect size and suggesting their positive influence in determining usefulness. However, strategies exploring Field and Bridge in layout-oriented showed not only insignificance but also small (layout-oriented Field: 0.44) or even negative coefficient (layout-oriented Bridge: -0.79), suggesting these strategies might not contribute to useful discovery.

Yet, the layout-oriented perspective was more commonly used for discovering the Field component, as illustrated in Figure 6. By employing this approach, participants expressed satisfaction with navigating the graph layout in up-down-left-right directions, facilitating the integration of insights across various cluster areas. For instance, P7 chose a paper node “*belonging to the left area but slightly to the right,*” expecting it to mainly cover the topic of the left area with some of the right area. Others expected the inner-




Figure 6: Users' evaluation of the usefulness of each pattern in post-assessment records. Note that a single post-assessment can belong to more than two types.

most part of a cluster to contain older papers and the outermost part newer papers (P16), or interpreted each layer of a hierarchical layout as representing similarity to the seed papers (P3, P12). Participants in layout-oriented perspectives attributed interpretable axes to the layout and hoped these axes were more explicitly defined. However, when their expectations about the distance and location within the graph diverged from the actual arrangement, they felt frustrated. For example, P11 expressed difficulty in understanding the layout principles and navigating the network when the papers they considered similar and important were not clustered but scattered.

## 4 DISCUSSION

Through our research, we discovered three key components that participants discover new papers based on: Fields, Bridges, Foundations. Each component can be viewed from either a layout-oriented or connection-oriented perspective. Generally, connection-oriented perspectives (e.g., expecting gradual research progression through a citation chain) proved useful, while layout-oriented perspectives (e.g., viewing graph clusters as fields defined by thematic similarity) were less. Nevertheless, layout-oriented views were more prevalent, indicating that even though users understand that network visualization is based on connections, they initially focus on primary visual channels such as position, size, and color.

This underscores the critical task of aligning the initial focus on layout and visual channels with the underlying citation relationships. In our analysis, the Foundation component showed significant positive impacts from both connection-oriented and layout-oriented perspectives, suggesting that participants' assumptions that the hierarchical layout's vertical axis indicated macro development in research aligned well with actual relational connections.

To bridge the gap between these two perspectives, we suggest several approaches. One approach is developing a new layout algorithm that ensures the alignment between the layout and human-imposed assumptions, such as guaranteeing topic similarity in clusters through semantic embedding (e.g., [5]). Additionally, adding explicit axes, such as a temporal axis to layouts, could prevent confusion. In this context, enhancing graph representations by visualizing other metadata such as citation counts could augment semantic interpretability. Visualizing diverse citing contexts [23] is also a potential improvement. Conversely, detecting and presenting appropriate connection relationships in the observed graphs could help users better perceive the relationships despite the complexity of layouts. We recognize an exciting opportunity for future work in detecting connection motifs and incorporating modern AI technology to build systems for human-friendly browsing of citation networks.

## REFERENCES

- [1] H. Alfraidi, W.-S. Lee, and D. Sankoff. Literature visualization and similarity measurement based on citation relations. In *2015 19th International Conference on Information Visualisation*, pp. 217–222. IEEE, 2015. 1
- [2] P. K. Behera, S. J. Jain, and A. Kumar. Visual exploration of literature using connected papers: A practical approach. *Issues in Science and Technology Librarianship*, (104), 2023. 1
- [3] D.-T. . Chen, Y.-M. Wang, and W. C. Lee. Challenges confronting beginning researchers in conducting literature reviews. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 38(1):47–60, 2016. 1
- [4] K. Choe, S. Jung, S. Park, H. Hong, and J. Seo. Papers101: Supporting the discovery process in the literature review workflow for novice researchers. In *2021 IEEE 14th Pacific Visualization Symposium (PacificVis)*, pp. 176–180. IEEE, 2021. 1
- [5] A. Cohan, S. Feldman, I. Beltagy, D. Downey, and D. S. Weld. Specter: Document-level representation learning using citation-informed transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.07180*, 2020. 4
- [6] P. De Meo, E. Ferrara, G. Fiumara, and A. Proveti. Generalized louvain method for community detection in large networks. In *2011 11th international conference on intelligent systems design and applications*, pp. 88–93. IEEE, 2011. 2
- [7] K. De Swert. Calculating inter-coder reliability in media content analysis using krippendorff's alpha. *Center for Politics and Communication*, 15:1–15, 2012. 3
- [8] C. Dunne and B. Shneiderman. Motif simplification: improving network visualization readability with fan, connector, and clique glyphs. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on human factors in computing systems*, pp. 3247–3256, 2013. 1, 2
- [9] A. Emrouznejad and M. Marra. The state of the art development of ahp (1979–2017): A literature review with a social network analysis. *International journal of production research*, 55(22):6653–6675, 2017. 1
- [10] K. R. Felizardo, G. F. Andery, F. V. Paulovich, R. Minghim, and J. C. Maldonado. A visual analysis approach to validate the selection review of primary studies in systematic reviews. *Information and Software Technology*, 54(10):1079–1091, 2012. 1
- [11] E. R. Gansner. Drawing graphs with graphviz. *Technical report, AT&T Bell Laboratories, Murray, Tech. Rep., Tech. Rep.*, 2009. 2
- [12] H. Kang, J. C. Chang, Y. Kim, and A. Kittur. Threddy: An interactive system for personalized thread-based exploration and organization of scientific literature. In *Proceedings of the 35th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*, pp. 1–15, 2022. 1
- [13] H. B. Kang, T. Wu, J. C. Chang, and A. Kittur. Synergi: A mixed-initiative system for scholarly synthesis and sensemaking. In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*, pp. 1–19, 2023. 1
- [14] D. Koutra, U. Kang, J. Vreeken, and C. Faloutsos. Summarizing and understanding large graphs. *Statistical Analysis and Data Mining: The ASA Data Science Journal*, 8(3):183–202, 2015. 1
- [15] J. Li, Y. Liu, and C. Wang. Evaluation of graph layout methods based on visual perception. In *Proceedings of the Tenth Indian Conference on Computer Vision, Graphics and Image Processing*, pp. 1–7, 2016. 2
- [16] Y. Liu, J. Goncalves, D. Ferreira, B. Xiao, S. Hosio, and V. Kostakos. Chi 1994–2013: Mapping two decades of intellectual progress through co-word analysis. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on human factors in computing systems*, pp. 3553–3562, 2014. 1
- [17] R. Nakazawa, T. Itoh, and T. Saito. A visualization of research papers based on the topics and citation network. In *2015 19th International Conference on Information Visualisation*, pp. 283–289. IEEE, 2015. 1
- [18] A. Oulasvirta and K. Hornbæk. Hci research as problem-solving. In *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pp. 4956–4967, 2016. 1
- [19] S. Scholar. Semantic scholar academic graph api, May 2024. 2
- [20] Z. Shen, M. Ogawa, S. T. Teoh, and K.-L. Ma. Biblioviz: a system for visualizing bibliography information. In *Proceedings of the 2006 Asia-Pacific Symposium on Information Visualisation-Volume 60*, pp. 93–102. Citeseer, 2006. 1
- [21] U. Soni, Y. Lu, B. Hansen, H. C. Purchase, S. Kobourov, and R. Maciejewski. The perception of graph properties in graph layouts. In *Computer Graphics Forum*, vol. 37, pp. 169–181. Wiley Online Library, 2018. 2
- [22] N. Sultanum, C. Murad, and D. Wigdor. Understanding and supporting academic literature review workflows with litsense. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Advanced Visual Interfaces*, pp. 1–5, 2020. 1
- [23] A. Yousif, Z. Niu, J. K. Tarus, and A. Ahmad. A survey on sentiment analysis of scientific citations. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 52:1805–1838, 2019. 4