**Discussion**

There are several methodological considerations that are important to aware of related to our project. This is especially with regards to the quality of our data and sampling strategy. As a starting point, we chose to use lists scientists of the social science disciplines, anthropology, sociology, economy, psychology, and political science from Wikipedia to decide which pages to gather. A significant drawback to this approach is that these lists seem slightly arbitrary considering who appear on the lists and how they have been constructed. The lists differ significantly in size, the list of economists is for instance four times bigger than the list of anthropologists. Though, there might be more famous economists than anthropologists, this can also be a consequence of inconsistent selection strategies of the people constructing the lists. We argue that our lacking knowledge of these strategies are problematic, and when we qualitatively go through the lists, we stumble upon instances that from our perspective as students of social science disciplines seem misplaced. For instance, Plato and Aristotle appear respectively on the list of economists and sociologists, and we argue that these should not be represented as they are commonly referred to as classical philosophers. Nevertheless, we acknowledge that it might be difficult to set up clear rules for how to divide scientists, and that this bias in selection of scientists is difficult to escape. By focusing our analysis on scientists appearing the giant component of our network, we hope to get rid of some of the borderline cases, as a lot these are likely not to be mentioned form edges through their Wikipedia-pages. However, Plato and Aristotle remain in the giant component and appear as influential scientists as they are within the top 20 with regards to in-degree distribution.

There are several instances of scientists that appear on more than one list. We have assigned these to a separate category called “Multiple”. This category does not make sense to analyze as a separate discipline, as then category includes scientists from all disciplines. While the “Multiple”-category has caused difficulties in our analysis process, it is an interesting category for our final conclusions as in affirms our suggestion of softening the traditional categorization of the social sciences as these are not always clear.

It also important to consider the source and the quality of the data and the possible consequences this might have for the project. Wikipedia-pages are written and maintained by volunteers and thus the pages are not reviewed. Thus, we cannot be sure of the quality of the Wikipedia-pages we gather, nor can we know the strategy or agenda behind the creation of the pages. This complicates our interpretation the patterns we find in our networks. An example is, that we cannot interpret the implications of edges. We have created directed edges between two scientists when one is mentioned in the Wikipedia-page of the other, but we do not know whether a scientist is mentioned because of relations of inspiration, opposition, intimacy, or something else. Furthermore, it is different how much there is written about the scientific contributions of each scientist. This becomes challenging for our analysis of topical similarities in the textual content of the Wikipedia-pages, as we are mainly concerned with contributions and leave out topics from the hSBM related to academic prestige and career.

Another approach to data collecting that might have resulted in less methodological pitfalls could be to gather academic articles from discipline specific academic journals and use the references in the articles as edges in our network. This would make interpretation of edges easier and a topics would be likely to only relate to scientific contributions. However, we would still face the problem of scientists appearing in multiple disciplines, as it is possible for scientists to contribute to different journals.

**Conclusion**

With this project, we set out to explore the boundaries and intersections of the social sciences. We have found communities and topics affirming the traditional categorization of the social science disciplines; however, we also find several examples of the opposite tendency. Hence, we do neither suggest an abolishment of the traditional categorizations nor to strictly stick to them, instead we propose a more nuanced view of the traditional division of social sciences. We emphasize the community of “Marx, Freud, and Weber” as well as the topic of “World Order” as important findings that support this proposal. The community “Marx, Freud, and Weber” is the second largest. It contains social scientists across disciplines including old, classical theorists that seem to be characterized by engagement with philosophy but also a range of other words and topics. This community is the second largest of the identified community and its existence emphasize how social scientists relate to and draw on each other across traditional disciplinary boundaries. Furthermore, the topic surrounding “World Order” characterized by words such as ”world”, ”people”, ”interest”, ”general”, and “order” appear to be a topic that many scientists contribute to across all disciplines. Thus, we argue through our project that the framing of the social science disciplines as clearly distinct categories can advantageously be nuanced, and the boundaries softened as there are dynamics uniting them. Many researchers of the social science disciplines engage with the same issues and might advantageously join together to learn from each other.