

Temporal evolution of cognitive knowledge networks in AI-assisted conversations

Alexander Towell^{1*}, John Matta¹

1 Department of Computer Science, Southern Illinois University Edwardsville, Edwardsville, IL, USA

* atowell@sieue.edu

Abstract

How does a person's knowledge landscape evolve through sustained AI-assisted conversation? We previously introduced a *cognitive MRI* methodology that transforms linear conversation logs into semantic similarity networks, revealing knowledge communities and bridge conversations in a static snapshot. Here we extend this analysis to the temporal domain, tracking how the network grows over 29 months (December 2022 – April 2025) across 1,908 ChatGPT conversations. We construct cumulative monthly snapshots and discover several evolution patterns characteristic of real-world complex networks. The network exhibits *super-linear densification* ($\gamma = 1.405$, $R^2 = 0.993$), meaning knowledge exploration accelerates as the network grows. New conversations attach to existing topics via *sub-linear preferential attachment* ($\beta = 0.763$, $R^2 = 0.914$), indicating that popular topics attract disproportionate attention but less aggressively than in scale-free models. Community structure stabilizes early (modularity exceeding 0.6 by late 2023 and reaching ≈ 0.75 by the final snapshot) and persists through subsequent growth, with 40 distinct communities tracked through birth, continuation, and death events. Bridge conversations, critical cross-domain connectors, emerge at identifiable moments and maintain their structural role once established. Comparison across model eras (GPT-3.5 through GPT-4.5) reveals that AI model capabilities shape sub-network topology. These findings suggest that individual AI-assisted knowledge exploration self-organizes according to the same macroscopic laws

observed in collective knowledge systems such as citation and collaboration networks, but arising through a different mechanism: the progressive revelation of latent semantic structure rather than active social tie formation. This scale-bridging parallel offers both theoretical insight into distributed cognition and practical implications for knowledge management systems.

Author summary

Every day, millions of people use AI chatbots to explore ideas, learn new topics, and solve problems. Over months of use, these conversations accumulate into a personal archive, but what structure, if any, lies hidden in that archive? We developed a method to find out. By connecting conversations that discuss similar topics into a network and watching how that network grows over time, we can see patterns that are invisible in a flat chat history. Surprisingly, the growth patterns we found in one person's 29-month ChatGPT archive mirror those seen in much larger knowledge systems like scientific citation networks, suggesting that individual curiosity may follow the same organizational principles as collective knowledge production. Our approach could help design smarter conversation archives that surface hidden connections between past and present inquiries, turning a passive chat log into an active tool for knowledge discovery.

Introduction

The rise of conversational AI has created a new medium for knowledge exploration. Millions of users now interact daily with large language models (LLMs), generating conversation archives that constitute externalized records of cognitive activity [1]. These archives are typically presented as flat, chronological lists, a format that conceals the rich associative structure latent in accumulated inquiry.

In prior work, we introduced a *cognitive MRI* methodology that transforms such archives into semantic similarity networks, where conversations become nodes and edges connect semantically related pairs [2]. Analyzing the giant component of a single user's conversation archive (449 of 601 connected conversations at similarity threshold $\theta = 0.9$), we identified 15 knowledge communities, heterogeneous network topology

(hub-and-spoke vs. tree-like structures), and three distinct bridge conversation types
12 that facilitate cross-domain knowledge transfer. That analysis, however, treated the
13 network as a static snapshot, collapsing 29 months of knowledge exploration into a
14 single graph.
15

This limitation is significant. The *temporal dimension* of knowledge exploration is
16 precisely what distinguishes organic human inquiry from static knowledge bases.
17

Questions build on previous questions; interests drift, deepen, and occasionally collide;
18 new AI model capabilities reshape what is possible to explore. A static analysis cannot
19 capture these dynamics.
20

In this paper, we extend the cognitive MRI to the temporal domain, analyzing how
21 the semantic similarity network evolves over 29 monthly snapshots spanning December
22 2022 through April 2025. This temporal extension constitutes the core novel
23 contribution beyond our previous work, addressing three new research questions:
24

- Does the network densify over time, and if so, does it follow established
25 densification laws?
26
- How do new conversations attach to the existing network, whether randomly,
27 preferentially, or through some intermediate mechanism?
28
- Do knowledge communities emerge early and persist, or does the community
29 structure remain in flux?
30

Our analysis reveals that this single-user knowledge network exhibits evolution
31 patterns remarkably consistent with those observed in much larger social, biological,
32 and technological networks [3–5]. Specifically, we find:
33

- Super-linear densification ($\gamma = 1.405$, $R^2 = 0.993$), where edges grow faster than
34 nodes, meaning the network becomes proportionally denser over time.
35
- Sub-linear preferential attachment ($\beta = 0.763$, $R^2 = 0.914$), where high-degree
36 nodes attract new connections disproportionately, but less aggressively than in the
37 Barabási-Albert model.
38
- Early community stabilization, with modularity exceeding 0.6 by late 2023 and
39 stabilizing near 0.75, persisting through continued growth despite the network
40 tripling in size.
41

- Bridge persistence, where once a conversation achieves bridge status (top-5% betweenness centrality), it maintains that role throughout the observation period. 42
- Model era effects, with sub-networks from different LLM eras exhibiting distinct 43 topological signatures. 44

These findings contribute to temporal network theory by providing a new empirical 46 case study (the evolution of a personal knowledge exploration network) and to the 47 emerging field of human-AI interaction by demonstrating that conversational AI usage 48 leaves structured, analyzable traces of cognitive activity. Our framing draws on the 49 distributed cognition tradition [6, 7], viewing the human-AI conversation archive as an 50 externalized cognitive system whose structure reveals patterns of knowledge 51 organization and exploration. 52

Related work

Temporal network evolution

The study of how networks evolve over time has revealed universal patterns across 55 diverse domains. Holme and Saramäki [8] provide a comprehensive review of temporal 56 network analysis, distinguishing between *contact sequences* (discrete events) and 57 *interval graphs* (persistent connections). Our cumulative snapshot approach falls into 58 the latter category: once a conversation enters the network, it persists permanently, 59 making the network monotonically non-decreasing. This models the reality that 60 knowledge, once explored, remains part of one’s cognitive landscape. 61

Dorogovtsev and Mendes [9] survey evolution models for growing networks, 62 identifying preferential attachment, fitness-based growth, and aging as key mechanisms. 63 Albert and Barabási [10] provide a broader statistical mechanics perspective on complex 64 network evolution, including the emergence of scale-free properties and small-world 65 characteristics during growth. 66

Densification laws

Leskovec et al. [11] discovered that many real-world networks exhibit *densification*: the 68 number of edges grows super-linearly with the number of nodes, following a power law 69

$e(t) \propto n(t)^\gamma$ with $\gamma > 1$. They documented this pattern across citation networks
70 (with $\gamma = 1.69$), patent networks ($\gamma = 1.26$), and autonomous systems graphs ($\gamma = 1.18$),
71 among others [3]. This contrasts with constant-density growth (Erdős-Rényi) or
72 constant-degree growth (Barabási-Albert, where $\gamma = 1$). Densification implies that as a
73 network grows, participants increasingly find connections to existing content rather than
74 remaining isolated. The exponent γ characterizes how aggressively this acceleration
75 occurs.
76

Preferential attachment

77

Barabási and Albert [4] proposed preferential attachment as a mechanism for generating
78 scale-free networks: new nodes connect preferentially to high-degree existing nodes with
79 probability $\Pi(k) \propto k^\beta$. When $\beta = 1$, this produces power-law degree distributions.
80 Jeong et al. [12] developed methods to measure preferential attachment empirically,
81 finding linear ($\beta \approx 1$) attachment in citation and collaboration networks. Subsequent
82 work has shown that many real networks exhibit *sub-linear* attachment ($\beta < 1$), where
83 high-degree nodes attract connections but not as strongly as the pure model
84 predicts [12]. Sub-linear attachment produces networks with more moderate degree
85 heterogeneity than pure scale-free networks.
86

Community dynamics

87

Palla et al. [5] pioneered the study of community evolution in temporal networks,
88 tracking overlapping communities in mobile phone and collaboration networks. They
89 identified key lifecycle events: birth, growth, contraction, merging, splitting, and death.
90 Greene et al. [13] proposed event-based frameworks for tracking non-overlapping
91 communities across snapshots using set overlap measures. Mucha et al. [14] introduced
92 multiscale community detection for time-dependent networks using generalized
93 modularity optimization. Rossetti and Cazabet [15] survey the broader field of dynamic
94 community discovery, cataloging approaches from incremental methods to tensor
95 decompositions.
96

A key finding across this literature is that community structure in growing networks
97 tends to *stabilize*: after an initial transient period, the mesoscale organization persists
98

even as the microscale (individual nodes and edges) continues to change [5].

99

Knowledge and citation network evolution

100

Citation networks provide a natural comparison for knowledge exploration networks. de
Solla Price [16] first studied their growth dynamics, and subsequent work has
characterized their densification [3], preferential attachment [12], and community
structure [17]. Shi et al. [18] model the evolution of scientific knowledge as a dynamic
network, finding that the structure of science exhibits path-dependent growth with both
conservative (within-field) and innovative (cross-field) exploration patterns. Our work
extends this paradigm from collective scientific knowledge to individual knowledge
exploration through AI conversation.

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

Distributed cognition and the extended mind

109

Hutchins [6] introduced the framework of *distributed cognition*, arguing that cognitive
processes are not confined to the individual brain but are distributed across people,
artifacts, and the environment. His analysis of ship navigation demonstrated how a
complex cognitive task is accomplished through the coordinated interaction of multiple
agents and tools rather than any single mind. Clark and Chalmers [7] extended this
reasoning with the *extended mind thesis*, arguing that when external resources play the
right functional role in cognitive processing, they constitute genuine parts of the
cognitive system. A notebook that reliably stores and retrieves beliefs, for instance,
functions as an extension of memory. These frameworks are directly relevant to our
analysis: the AI conversation archive functions as an external cognitive artifact whose
structure reveals patterns of knowledge organization. We treat the archive not merely as
a record of past inquiries but as an externalized cognitive system whose network
structure is amenable to the same analytical tools used for other complex networks.

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

AI conversation analysis

123

Research on AI conversational data has primarily focused on dialogue quality, user
satisfaction, and topic modeling [19]. Network-based approaches to conversation
analysis remain rare. Our conference paper [2] introduced the first complex network

124

125

126

analysis of a personal AI conversation archive, treating conversations as nodes in a
semantic similarity network. The present work extends this to the temporal domain, a
direction identified as key future work in the original paper.
127
128
129

Methods

We describe the temporal analysis methodology that extends our previous static
analysis [2]. The base network construction (embedding generation, similarity
computation, threshold selection) is unchanged; we refer readers to our previous work
for those details and summarize the essentials here.
131
132
133
134

Dataset and base network

The dataset comprises 1,908 ChatGPT conversations generated by one of the authors
between December 2022 and April 2025. Conversations were conducted for authentic
research, learning, and problem-solving purposes with no anticipation of future network
analysis. Each conversation was embedded using `nomic-embed-text` [20] with a 2:1
user:AI message weighting ratio ($\alpha = 2$), validated through a 63-configuration ablation
study [2]. Pairwise cosine similarities were computed and filtered at threshold $\theta = 0.9$,
yielding 601 connected nodes and 1,718 edges across 59 connected components, with a
giant component of 453 nodes (1,307 conversations remain isolated at this threshold).
Our previous work [2] analyzed the giant component (449 nodes at the time of that
analysis); the present work analyzes all connected nodes. Fig 1 shows the resulting
network at the final time step, illustrating the community structure that the temporal
analysis below traces from emergence to stabilization.
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151

Each conversation carries a creation timestamp, enabling temporal ordering.
Conversations span five model eras based on the underlying LLM: GPT-3.5 (pre-GPT-4,
 $n = 1,214$), GPT-4 ($n = 44$), GPT-4o ($n = 453$), Reasoning models (o1/o3 series,
 $n = 181$), and GPT-4.5 ($n = 16$).
148
149
150
151




Fig 1. Static snapshot of the knowledge network at the final time step. Nodes represent conversations, edges connect semantically similar pairs (cosine similarity ≥ 0.9). Colors indicate Louvain communities labeled by dominant topic. Layout by ForceAtlas2 in Gephi. Reproduced from [2].

Cumulative temporal snapshots

We construct the network's temporal evolution through cumulative monthly snapshots. 153

For each month t in the observation period, the snapshot $G(t) = (V(t), E(t))$ contains: 154

$$V(t) = \{v \in V \mid \text{created}(v) \leq \text{end}(t)\} \quad (1)$$

$$E(t) = \{(u, v) \in E \mid u \in V(t) \wedge v \in V(t)\} \quad (2)$$

This cumulative construction models the irreversibility of knowledge exploration: 155
 conversations, once created, permanently enrich the knowledge landscape. It produces 156
 29 monthly snapshots (December 2022 through April 2025), growing from 1 node to the 157
 full 1,908. 158

For each snapshot, we compute a comprehensive set of network metrics on the
159 connected subgraph: node count, edge count, density, number of connected components,
160 giant component size and fraction, mean and maximum degree, average clustering
161 coefficient, transitivity, average shortest path length (within the giant component),
162 Louvain modularity and community count [21], average betweenness centrality, and
163 degree assortativity. Community detection uses a fixed random seed for reproducibility.
164

For visualization and narrative purposes, we divide the 29-month observation period
165 into five temporal phases based on usage intensity and model availability: *Early*
166 (December 2022 – February 2023; 59 conversations, network bootstrapping), *Exploration*
167 (March – July 2023; 635 conversations, rapid growth), *Established* (August 2023 –
168 January 2024; 402 conversations, structural consolidation), *GPT-4o* (February –
169 September 2024; 396 conversations, new model capabilities), and *Reasoning* (October
170 2024 – April 2025; 416 conversations, reasoning model era). These phases appear as
171 background shading in several figures.
172

Community lifecycle tracking

To track community identity across snapshots, we apply Louvain community detection
174 independently at each time step and align communities between consecutive snapshots
175 using Jaccard similarity of node sets [13, 22].
176

The tracking algorithm (Algorithm 1) proceeds in five passes per transition. First,
177 for each pair of consecutive communities (C_{t-1}^i, C_t^j) , we compute the Jaccard index
178 $J(C_{t-1}^i, C_t^j) = |C_{t-1}^i \cap C_t^j| / |C_{t-1}^i \cup C_t^j|$. Communities are then classified:
179

- *Continuation*: C_t^j has a unique best match C_{t-1}^i with $J \geq 0.3$, and vice versa.
180
The tracked identity is preserved.
181
- *Birth*: C_t^j has no match ≥ 0.3 with any previous community. A new tracked
182 identity is assigned.
183
- *Death*: C_{t-1}^i has no match ≥ 0.3 with any current community. The tracked
184 identity is recorded as dissolved.
185
- *Merge*: Multiple previous communities’ best match is the same current community.
186
- *Split*: One previous community maps to multiple current communities.
187

Each tracked community is labeled with a dominant topic based on keyword analysis
 of constituent conversation titles (e.g., ML/AI, Programming, Statistics, Philosophy,
 Health, Networks).
 188
 189
 190

Algorithm 1 Community lifecycle tracking via Jaccard alignment

Require: Community partitions $\{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_T\}$, threshold $\tau = 0.3$
Ensure: Tracked communities with lifecycle events
 1: $next_id \leftarrow 0$
 2: **for** $t \leftarrow 2$ to T **do**
 3: Compute Jaccard matrix $J[i, j] = |C_{t-1}^i \cap C_t^j| / |C_{t-1}^i \cup C_t^j|$
 4: **Pass 1 (Continuations):** Match pairs where $\arg \max_j J[i, j] = j^*$ and
 $\arg \max_i J[i, j^*] = i$ and $J[i, j^*] \geq \tau$
 5: **Pass 2 (Merges):** Detect $N:1$ mappings among unmatched communities
 6: **Pass 3 (Splits):** Detect $1:N$ mappings among unmatched communities
 7: **Pass 4 (Births):** Assign new $tracked_id$ to unmatched current communities
 8: **Pass 5 (Deaths):** Record unmatched previous communities as dissolved
 9: **end for**

Preferential attachment analysis

To test whether new conversations preferentially attach to high-degree existing nodes,
 we analyze each monthly transition. For month t , we identify new nodes
 $V_{\text{new}}(t) = V(t) \setminus V(t-1)$ and new edges incident to these nodes in the existing network
 $G(t-1)$. For each existing node $v \in V(t-1)$, we compute the fraction of new nodes
 that connect to it and correlate this with v 's degree in $G(t-1)$.
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196

To assess statistical significance, we compare the observed degree–attachment
 correlation against a null model of uniform random attachment using 1,000 permutation
 tests per month. We compute a z -score indicating how many standard deviations the
 observed correlation exceeds the null expectation.
 197
 198
 199
 200

To quantify the attachment kernel, we pool data across all months and bin existing
 nodes by degree. For each bin, we compute the empirical attachment rate $\Pi(k)$ (mean
 number of new connections per existing node at degree k). We then fit the power-law
 kernel:
 201
 202
 203
 204

$$\Pi(k) \propto k^\beta \quad (3)$$

where $\beta = 0$ corresponds to uniform random attachment, $\beta = 1$ to linear preferential
 attachment (Barabási-Albert model), and intermediate values indicate sub-linear
 preferential attachment.
 205
 206
 207

Densification law analysis

208

Following Leskovec et al. [11], we test whether the network exhibits densification by
fitting a power law in the log-log space of connected nodes versus edges:

209

210

$$e(t) \propto n(t)^\gamma \quad (4)$$

211

212

213

214

where $n(t) = |V_{\text{connected}}(t)|$ and $e(t) = |E(t)|$ are the number of connected nodes and
edges at time t . The exponent $\gamma > 1$ indicates super-linear densification (the network
becomes proportionally denser), $\gamma = 1$ indicates constant average degree, and $\gamma < 1$
indicates sparsification.

215

216

217

218

219

220

We fit this relationship using ordinary least squares (OLS) regression on the
log-transformed data, reporting the exponent γ , coefficient of determination R^2 , and
 p -value. We note that OLS on log-transformed data is an approximation; more rigorous
power-law fitting methods exist [23], but OLS is standard practice for densification
analysis [3] and sufficient given our high R^2 values. We exclude early months with fewer
than 4 connected nodes where metrics are unstable.

221

222

223

224

225

An important methodological consideration: because our edges derive from a
pre-computed similarity matrix, the densification we observe reflects the *progressive*
revelation of latent semantic structure rather than the *creation* of new connections (as
in social networks where people actively form ties). We discuss the implications of this
distinction in the Densification paradox subsection.

Bridge formation dynamics

226

Our previous work identified five bridge conversations with high betweenness centrality
that facilitate cross-domain knowledge transfer [2]. We track these bridges over time,
computing normalized betweenness centrality and the number of distinct neighbor
communities at each snapshot from each bridge’s creation month onward. A bridge is
considered to have achieved “bridge status” when its betweenness centrality enters the
top 5% of all nodes.

227

228

229

230

231

232

Model era sub-network comparison

233

To assess whether AI model capabilities influence network topology, we construct separate sub-networks for each model era. Each sub-network contains only conversations from that era and only edges between them. We compute standard network metrics for each era's sub-network and compare structural signatures across eras.

234

235

236

237

Results

238

Network growth patterns

239

Fig 2 shows the network's growth over 29 months. Total conversations grow from 1 (December 2022) to 1,908 (April 2025), with a rapid expansion phase from March through July 2023 (averaging 135 new conversations per month) followed by steadier growth (averaging 54 per month thereafter). Of the 1,908 total conversations, 601 (31.5%) appear in the connected network at $\theta = 0.9$.

240

241

242

243

244




Fig 2. Network growth over 29 months. (a) Cumulative node count with monthly additions (bars). (b) Cumulative edge count with monthly additions. (c) Edges per connected node (connectivity ratio), which rises steeply through late 2023, then stabilizes near 3.0. Background shading indicates five temporal phases: Early (Dec 2022 – Feb 2023), Exploration (Mar – Jul 2023), Established (Aug 2023 – Jan 2024), GPT-4o (Feb – Sep 2024), and Reasoning (Oct 2024 – Apr 2025).

Edge growth outpaces node growth throughout the observation period. The edges-per-node ratio increases from 0.5 (January 2023) to 2.86 (April 2025), confirming that the network becomes proportionally denser over time, because edge count grows faster than the number of nodes.

245

246

247

248

Structural evolution

249

Fig 3 tracks four structural properties over time. Modularity rises rapidly from 0.0 to 0.44 during the Exploration phase (March–July 2023), then undergoes a step increase to 0.64 in November 2023 when the giant component undergoes significant restructuring. From late 2024, modularity stabilizes around 0.74 and reaches 0.750 at the final snapshot, matching our previous work's static analysis exactly.

250

251

252

253

254




Fig 3. Structural evolution of network properties. (a) Modularity jumps to 0.64 in November 2023, then gradually reaches 0.75. (b) Community count grows from 1 to 15. (c) Clustering coefficient and transitivity remain stable after initial growth. (d) Giant component fraction shows a step increase in November 2023.

The number of detected communities grows from 1 to 15 over the observation period, with most community births occurring before mid-2024. Clustering coefficient and transitivity gradually converge to approximately 0.44 by the final snapshot, indicating that topically related conversations tend to share neighbors (if A is similar to B and B to C, then A and C are also likely similar), a pattern that establishes early and persists.

255

256

257

258

259

The giant component fraction exhibits interesting non-monotonic behavior. It grows to ~ 0.47 during the Exploration phase, drops temporarily, then increases sharply to 0.69 in November 2023 when previously isolated clusters merge. This step change coincides with the modularity jump, suggesting a phase transition in the network's

260

261

262

263

mesoscale organization. We note that this step change is partly mechanical: when
264 previously isolated clusters merge into the giant component, modularity captures the
265 separation between these formerly independent groups, inflating the apparent
266 magnitude of the jump. The communities themselves are real, but the abruptness of the
267 increase reflects the measurement context as much as the network dynamics.
268

Community lifecycles

Community tracking across 29 snapshots reveals 40 unique tracked communities, of
270 which 15 survive to the final snapshot (Table 1). The lifecycle analysis recorded 189
271 continuation events, 40 births, and 25 deaths. No merge or split events were detected at
272 the Jaccard threshold of $J = 0.3$, suggesting that communities in this network grow and
273 dissolve rather than recombining.
274

Table 1. Community lifecycle event summary. Events tracked across 28 monthly transitions.

Event Type	Count
Continuations	189
Births	40
Deaths	25
Merges	0
Splits	0
Unique communities tracked	40
Surviving to final snapshot	15

Fig 4 shows the size trajectories of the eight largest communities. Several patterns
275 emerge. First, the two earliest and largest communities (Stats & R Packages and Deep
276 Learning) are born in the first months and grow throughout the observation period,
277 consistent with the “first-mover advantage” observed in other temporal community
278 studies [5]. Second, community births are distributed across the entire period rather
279 than concentrated at the beginning: later communities such as Software Dev and Prog.
280 Languages appear during the Reasoning phase, indicating ongoing diversification of
281 knowledge exploration. Third, community deaths are concentrated among small,
282 specialized communities that emerge briefly and dissolve (e.g., Casual / Philosophy),
283 often subsumed by their larger neighbors as the network densifies.
284

The absence of merge and split events is notable. In social networks, community
285 merging and splitting are common [5]. Their absence here may reflect the nature of
286




Fig 4. Community size trajectories. Line plot showing the eight largest communities (by maximum size) over time; each line is labeled by its dominant topic. Stars mark community birth months. The two earliest communities (Stats & R Packages, Deep Learning) grow steadily throughout the observation period, while later-born communities (Software Dev, Prog. Languages) emerge during the Reasoning phase.

knowledge domains: topics like “machine learning” and “statistics” are cognitively
287 distinct categories that grow internally rather than fusing, unlike social groups whose
288 membership boundaries are more fluid.
289

Densification law

The relationship between connected nodes and edges follows a power law with
291 remarkable fidelity (Fig 5). Fitting $\log e(t) = \gamma \log n(t) + c$ yields:
292

$$\gamma = 1.405 \pm 0.022, \quad R^2 = 0.993, \quad p < 10^{-29} \quad (5)$$

This super-linear exponent ($\gamma = 1.405$) places our knowledge network in the
293 company of other densifying real-world networks, albeit with a moderate exponent.
294 Table 2 compares our result with previously reported densification exponents.
295

Table 2. Densification exponents across network types. Our knowledge network exhibits moderate super-linear densification comparable to patent and social networks.

Network	Exponent γ	Source
arXiv citations	1.69	[3]
Patent citations	1.26	[3]
Autonomous systems	1.18	[3]
Knowledge network (this work)	1.405	—




Fig 5. Densification law. Log-log plot of edges versus connected nodes across 28 monthly snapshots. The fitted power law $e(t) \propto n(t)^{1.405}$ (dashed line) fits the data with $R^2 = 0.993$, indicating super-linear densification.

The exponent $\gamma = 1.405$ indicates that for every doubling of the connected node count, the edge count increases by a factor of $2^{1.405} \approx 2.65$. This acceleration reflects the increasing semantic interconnectedness of conversations as the knowledge landscape fills in: later conversations are more likely to find existing semantic neighbors than early ones, because there are more potential neighbors in a richer knowledge base.

Preferential attachment

Fig 6 presents the preferential attachment analysis. The degree–attachment correlation is consistently positive and significantly exceeds the null model of random attachment across nearly all months. The median z -score is 8.4 (range: 0.5–13.2), indicating strong statistical evidence for preferential attachment.

The pooled attachment kernel follows a power law $\Pi(k) \propto k^\beta$ with:

$$\beta = 0.763 \pm 0.074, \quad R^2 = 0.914 \quad (6)$$

This sub-linear exponent ($0 < \beta < 1$) indicates that high-degree nodes attract disproportionately many new connections, but less aggressively than pure preferential attachment ($\beta = 1$). This is consistent with the observation from our previous work that our network exhibits “evolution beyond preferential attachment, reflecting




Fig 6. Preferential attachment analysis. (a) Attachment kernel $\Pi(k)$ versus degree k on log-log axes, with fitted power law $\Pi(k) \propto k^{0.763}$. (b) Monthly degree–attachment correlation (blue) versus null model distribution (gray band shows mean $\pm 2\sigma$). (c) Distribution of z -scores across months, consistently exceeding the significance threshold.

cognitive exploration with hub formation limited by specialization and cross-domain constraints” [2]. The sub-linear kernel produces networks with moderate degree heterogeneity (broad-tailed degree distributions without extreme hubs), matching the empirical degree distribution observed in our network.

The month-by-month correlation shows temporal variation. The Exploration phase (March–July 2023) exhibits the strongest preferential attachment ($z > 8$), possibly because rapid growth leads new conversations to cluster around established topics. Later months show reduced but still significant preferential attachment, consistent with diversification into new topics.

Bridge formation dynamics

Our previous work identified three bridge types based on how conversations achieve cross-domain connectivity [2]. *Evolutionary bridges* are conversations that begin in one domain and organically evolve to span multiple topics through the natural progression of inquiry. *Integrative bridges* occupy a central position connecting several communities simultaneously, serving as multi-domain hubs. *Pure bridges* provide a minimal but critical link between exactly two communities, connecting domains that would otherwise be disconnected.

Fig 7 tracks the five bridge conversations identified in our previous work over time. The most striking pattern is the *dominance and persistence* of the primary bridge, *geometric-mean-calculation*, which achieves bridge status immediately upon

appearing in the connected network (November 2023) and maintains normalized
 betweenness centrality above 0.44 throughout the remaining 18 months. This
 conversation, which evolved from geometric means into probability theory and neural
 networks, exemplifies the “evolutionary bridge” type from our previous taxonomy.
 331
 332
 333
 334




Fig 7. Bridge formation dynamics. Normalized betweenness centrality over time for the five bridge conversations identified in the conference paper. Vertical dashed lines mark creation dates. The “geometric-mean-calculation” bridge dominates throughout, while other bridges emerge later and stabilize at lower centrality levels.

The second bridge, `loss-in-lm-training`, enters the connected network in
 November 2023, the same month as the primary bridge, but with low initial
 betweenness centrality (0.006). It achieves bridge status only in September 2024, when
 its centrality jumps to 0.045 as it begins connecting multiple communities. The
 remaining three bridges (`mcts-code-analysis-suggestions`,
`algotree-generate-unit-tests-flattree`, `compile-cuda-program-linux`) enter in
 October 2024, coinciding with the expansion of the giant component during the
 Reasoning model era. Once established, each maintains a stable betweenness centrality
 level: `mcts-code-analysis-suggestions` and `loss-in-lm-training` stabilize
 around 0.35, `algotree-generate-unit-tests-flattree` around 0.30, and
`compile-cuda-program-linux` around 0.09–0.12.

The stability of bridge centrality over time (once established, bridges maintain their
 structural role) suggests that the cross-domain connections they provide are not
 incidental but reflect genuine semantic bridging between knowledge communities.

The bridge conversations span 2–5 neighbor communities each. The
`geometric-mean-calculation` bridge consistently connects 4 communities, confirming

its role as a multi-domain integrator. In contrast, `compile-cuda-program-linux` connects exactly 2 communities throughout its tracked lifetime, exemplifying the “pure bridge” type: a minimal but critical link between domains.

Model era effects

As an exploratory analysis, we examined sub-network metrics for each model era (Table 3). The two eras with sufficient data for meaningful comparison are GPT-3.5 (360 connected conversations) and GPT-4o (112 connected). Both produce well-structured sub-networks with comparable modularity (0.675 and 0.670, respectively), suggesting that the knowledge organization patterns we observe are robust across model generations. The Reasoning era (32 connected conversations) shows lower modularity (0.353), which may reflect the nature of reasoning model usage (focused, cross-domain technical problems) or simply the smaller sample size. The GPT-4 and GPT-4.5 eras contain too few connected conversations for meaningful analysis (15 and 2, respectively); the small GPT-4 sample is partly a metadata artifact, as ChatGPT’s export format did not record the model field until approximately March 2024.

Table 3. Sub-network metrics by model era. Each era’s sub-network contains only conversations from that era and edges between them.

Era	Connected	Edges	Avg. Degree	Clustering	Modularity
GPT-3.5	360	1,102	6.12	0.381	0.675
GPT-4	15	10	1.33	0.156	0.001
GPT-4o	112	148	2.64	0.290	0.670
Reasoning	32	27	1.69	0.168	0.353
GPT-4.5	2	1	—	—	—

Discussion

Cognitive interpretation

The temporal evolution patterns we observe can be interpreted through the lens of distributed cognition [6] and the extended mind thesis [7]. The conversation archive functions as an externalized cognitive system, and its growth dynamics reveal how knowledge exploration self-organizes over time.

The super-linear densification ($\gamma = 1.405$) has a natural cognitive interpretation: as
372
one's knowledge base grows, new inquiries increasingly connect to existing knowledge
373
rather than standing alone. This reflects the cumulative nature of learning, as later
374
conversations benefit from a richer contextual landscape, making semantic connections
375
more likely. The densification exponent quantifies the *rate* at which knowledge becomes
376
interconnected.
377

Sub-linear preferential attachment ($\beta = 0.763$) suggests a balanced exploration
378
strategy. Popular topics (high-degree nodes) do attract follow-up conversations, but the
379
sub-linear kernel indicates that the user also explores less-established topics rather than
380
exclusively deepening existing interests. This balances *exploitation* (deepening known
381
topics) with *exploration* (investigating new ones), a trade-off recognized as fundamental
382
in organizational learning [24] and cognitive search [25]. The same caveat from the
383
densification paradox (Section) applies here: high-degree nodes may attract new
384
connections partly because they occupy broad regions of semantic space where new
385
conversations are more likely to land, rather than through a generative rich-get-richer
386
mechanism. The permutation null model tests against random attachment but does not
387
account for this geometric confound.
388

The early stabilization of community structure (modularity exceeding 0.6 by late
389
2023 and stabilizing near 0.75) suggests that a user's knowledge domains crystallize
390
relatively quickly. Once the major thematic communities are established, subsequent
391
growth fills in rather than restructures. This is consistent with schema theory in
392
cognitive psychology [26]: once mental frameworks are established, new information is
393
assimilated into existing schemas rather than triggering wholesale reorganization.
394

Comparison with known network evolution patterns 395

Our findings place this personal knowledge network squarely within the family of
396
densifying, preferentially attaching real-world networks documented by Leskovec et
397
al. [3] and Barabási and Albert [4]. The densification exponent ($\gamma = 1.405$) falls
398
between those of patent citation networks ($\gamma = 1.26$) and arXiv citation networks
399
($\gamma = 1.69$), suggesting comparable but not identical growth dynamics. The sub-linear
400
preferential attachment ($\beta = 0.763$) is lower than the near-linear values reported for
401

citation networks [12], consistent with our previous observation that hub formation is
402 limited by cognitive specialization constraints.
403

The community lifecycle patterns (persistent major communities, gradual births, no
404 merges or splits) differ from social networks where community fusion and fission are
405 common [5]. This distinction likely reflects the fundamental difference between social
406 identity (fluid, negotiated) and knowledge domain identity (more stable, ontologically
407 grounded). A “machine learning” community and a “statistics” community may grow
408 closer as related conversations accumulate, but they do not merge in the way social
409 groups do.
410

The temporal analysis also provides a developmental account of the heterogeneous
411 topology described in our previous work [2], where theoretical domains (ML/AI,
412 Statistics, Philosophy) exhibited dense hub-and-spoke structures while practical
413 domains (Programming) showed sparser, tree-like hierarchies. Community tracking
414 reveals that this heterogeneity has a temporal origin: the theoretical communities are
415 among the earliest born and have the longest growth histories, accumulating dense
416 internal connections through sustained exploration over 20+ months. In contrast,
417 practical communities tend to emerge later and grow through independent, focused
418 conversations that branch rather than cluster. The sub-linear preferential attachment
419 we measure ($\beta = 0.763$) quantifies the mechanism observed qualitatively in our previous
420 work, where hubs form but their growth is limited by cognitive specialization, producing
421 the moderate degree heterogeneity rather than extreme scale-free structure.
422

The densification paradox

423

An important caveat applies to the densification finding. In social networks,
424 densification reflects the active formation of new ties. In our network, edges derive from
425 a pre-computed similarity matrix: all potential connections exist latently from the
426 moment both endpoints are created. The “densification” we observe is actually the
427 *progressive revelation* of latent structure as the network fills in.
428

This distinction matters for interpretation but does not invalidate the finding. The
429 densification law still accurately describes the growth trajectory and has predictive
430 value: it tells us that later additions to the conversation archive will be proportionally
431

more connected than earlier ones. The mechanism, however, is not active tie formation 432
but rather the increasing density of the semantic space being sampled. As more 433
conversations are added to more topics, new conversations are more likely to land near 434
existing ones in semantic space. 435

We note that a similar argument applies to any threshold-based similarity network, 436
including many co-occurrence and co-citation networks. The densification patterns 437
reported by Leskovec et al. [3] for citation networks also involve retrospectively 438
computed relationships rather than active social ties. Our case makes this mechanism 439
particularly transparent. 440

Implications

Our findings have practical implications for the design of knowledge management and 441
conversation archival systems: 442

- The early stabilization of community structure suggests that knowledge domains 443
can be identified relatively early in a user’s conversation history and used to 444
organize archives thematically. 445
- The persistence of bridge conversations once established suggests that identifying 446
bridges early could help users discover cross-domain connections. 447
- The densification law implies that retrieval systems should expect increasing 448
connectivity over time, potentially enabling richer recommendation strategies as 449
the archive grows. 450
- The distinct topological signatures across model eras suggest that AI model 451
capabilities influence knowledge structure, which may be relevant for 452
understanding how AI tools shape thinking patterns. 453

Limitations

Several limitations constrain the generalizability of our findings. 455

Single user. This remains a case study of one user’s conversation archive. While we 456
demonstrate that the methodology produces meaningful and consistent results, the 457

specific parameter values (γ , β , community count, etc.) may differ for other users. 459

Multi-user studies are needed to establish which patterns generalize. 460

Pre-computed similarities. As discussed in the Densification paradox subsection, 461
edges are determined by semantic similarity rather than active social choice. The 462
densification we observe is structurally real but mechanistically different from that in 463
social or collaboration networks. 464

Embedding model consistency. The same embedding model (`nomic-embed-text`) 465
was used for all conversations regardless of their creation date. In practice, embedding 466
models may evolve, and conversations from different periods might be better 467
represented by different models. 468

Louvain non-determinism. Although we use a fixed random seed, Louvain 469
community detection is inherently non-deterministic across different implementations 470
and platforms. Community event counts may vary slightly across runs. 471

Single threshold. We analyze the network at a single similarity threshold ($\theta = 0.9$), 472
validated by the ablation study in our previous work. The temporal patterns at other 473
thresholds remain unexplored. 474

Model era confounds. The consistency of modularity between GPT-3.5 and GPT-4o 475
eras is encouraging, but differences between model era sub-networks may also reflect 476
temporal trends (topic interests change over time) rather than model capabilities alone. 477
Furthermore, model era classification relies on export metadata that was absent before 478
March 2024; the “GPT-3.5” era likely contains an unknown number of GPT-4 479
conversations. Larger multi-era datasets will be needed to disentangle model effects 480
from temporal trends. 481

Conclusion 482

We have extended the cognitive MRI methodology from static to temporal network 483
analysis, tracking how a personal knowledge network grows over 29 months of 484
AI-assisted conversation. The network exhibits evolution patterns characteristic of 485
real-world complex systems: super-linear densification ($\gamma = 1.405$), sub-linear 486
preferential attachment ($\beta = 0.763$), early community stabilization, and persistent 487
bridge formation. 488

These findings suggest that personal knowledge exploration through conversational
489 AI is not random accumulation but produces network growth patterns quantitatively
490 similar to those observed in collective knowledge systems such as citation and
491 collaboration networks. Densification quantifies how knowledge becomes increasingly
492 interconnected; preferential attachment reveals the balance between deepening existing
493 interests and exploring new ones; community tracking shows how knowledge domains
494 crystallize early and persist; bridge dynamics illuminate how cross-domain connections
495 form and stabilize. That these patterns emerge at the scale of a single individual,
496 mirroring dynamics previously documented only in multi-agent systems like scientific
497 citation networks and online collaboration platforms, suggests that the organizational
498 principles of knowledge exploration may be scale-bridging, operating whether the
499 exploring agent is a community of scientists or a single person conversing with an AI.
500

The mechanism differs: in our network, densification reflects the progressive
501 revelation of latent semantic structure rather than active social tie formation. Yet the
502 resulting growth laws are strikingly similar, raising the question of whether individual
503 and collective knowledge exploration are governed by common underlying dynamics.
504 Multi-user studies will be needed to test this hypothesis. Different users may exhibit
505 different densification exponents depending on whether their exploration strategy is
506 focused (deep specialist) or broad (wide generalist). The balance between exploitation
507 and exploration captured by the attachment exponent β likely varies with individual
508 cognitive style and professional domain. Multi-user comparison would reveal which
509 parameters are universal properties of knowledge exploration through AI and which
510 reflect individual differences in how people organize inquiry. Our methodology provides
511 a template for such investigations, and our findings offer a first empirical
512 characterization of how one person's knowledge landscape evolves through sustained AI
513 interaction.

The analysis pipeline is available at [27] and the temporal analysis code, data, and
515 paper source at [28].
516

Data availability statement

517

All derived data needed to reproduce the analyses presented in this paper are included
518
in the research compendium at
519
<https://github.com/queelius/cognitive-mri-conversations> (DOI:
520
10.5281/zenodo.1877844), including conversation embeddings (with message text
521
removed for privacy), the primary edge list, and all temporal analysis outputs. A
522
reproduction script (`data/reproduce.sh`) regenerates all figures and data files from the
523
curated data directory. The analysis pipeline code is available separately at
524
<https://github.com/queelius/chatgpt-complex-net> (DOI:
525
10.5281/zenodo.1531423). Raw conversation content is not shared to protect the
526
privacy of the human participant.
527

Author contributions

528

Alexander Towell: Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Formal Analysis, Data
529
Curation, Writing – Original Draft, Visualization. **John Matta:** Supervision, Writing –
530
Review & Editing.
531

Funding

532

This research received no specific funding from any agency in the public, commercial, or
533
not-for-profit sectors.
534

Competing interests

535

The authors declare no competing interests.
536

Ethics statement

537

This study analyzes one author's own ChatGPT conversation archive. No human
538
subjects were recruited, and no personally identifiable information about third parties is
539

included in the dataset or analysis. The conversation data was generated through the
author's routine use of a commercially available AI service.

540

Acknowledgments

542

The authors thank the organizers of the PLOS Complex Systems special issue on
Complex Networks 2025 for the invitation to submit this extended work.

543

544

References

1. Zhao WX, Zhou K, Li J, Tang T, Wang X, Hou Y, et al. A survey of large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:230318223. 2023.
2. Towell A, Matta J. Cognitive MRI of AI Conversations: Analyzing AI Interactions through Semantic Embedding Networks. In: Proceedings of the International Conference on Complex Networks and Their Applications (Complex Networks 2025). Studies in Computational Intelligence. Springer; 2025. In press.
3. Leskovec J, Kleinberg J, Faloutsos C. Graph evolution: Densification and shrinking diameters. ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data. 2007;1(1):2-es. doi:10.1145/1217299.1217301.
4. Barabási AL, Albert R. Emergence of scaling in random networks. Science. 1999;286(5439):509-12. doi:10.1126/science.286.5439.509.
5. Palla G, Barabási AL, Vicsek T. Quantifying social group evolution. Nature. 2007;446(7136):664-7. doi:10.1038/nature05670.
6. Hutchins E. Cognition in the Wild. MIT Press; 1995.
7. Clark A, Chalmers D. The extended mind. Analysis. 1998;58(1):7-19.
8. Holme P, Saramäki J. Temporal networks. Physics Reports. 2012;519(3):97-125. doi:10.1016/j.physrep.2012.03.001.
9. Dorogovtsev SN, Mendes JFF. Evolution of networks. Advances in Physics. 2002;51(4):1079-187. doi:10.1080/00018730110112519.

10. Albert R, Barabási AL. Statistical mechanics of complex networks. *Reviews of Modern Physics*. 2002;74(1):47-97. doi:10.1103/RevModPhys.74.47.
11. Leskovec J, Kleinberg J, Faloutsos C. Graphs over time: densification laws, shrinking diameters and possible explanations. In: *Proceedings of the 11th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*; 2005. p. 177-87. doi:10.1145/1081870.1081893.
12. Jeong H, Néda Z, Barabási AL. Measuring preferential attachment in evolving networks. *Europhysics Letters*. 2003;61(4):567-72. doi:10.1209/epl/i2003-00166-9.
13. Greene D, Doyle D, Cunningham P. Tracking the evolution of communities in dynamic social networks. In: *Proceedings of the International Conference on Advances in Social Networks Analysis and Mining*; 2010. p. 176-83. doi:10.1109/ASONAM.2010.17.
14. Mucha PJ, Richardson T, Macon K, Porter MA, Onnela JP. Community structure in time-dependent, multiplex, and other multiscale networks. *Science*. 2010;328(5980):876-8. doi:10.1126/science.1184819.
15. Rossetti G, Cazabet R. Community discovery in dynamic networks: a survey. *ACM Computing Surveys*. 2018;51(2):1-37. doi:10.1145/3172867.
16. de Solla Price DJ. Networks of scientific papers. *Science*. 1965;149(3683):510-5. doi:10.1126/science.149.3683.510.
17. Chen C, Ibekwe-SanJuan F, Hou J. The structure and dynamics of cocitation clusters: A multiple-perspective cocitation analysis. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*. 2010;61(7):1386-409. doi:10.1002/asi.21309.
18. Shi F, Foster JG, Evans JA. Weaving the fabric of science: Dynamic network models of science's unfolding structure. *Social Networks*. 2015;43:73-85. doi:10.1016/j.socnet.2015.02.006.
19. Serban IV, Lowe R, Henderson P, Charlin L, Pineau J. A survey of available corpora for building data-driven dialogue systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:151205742*. 2016.

20. Nussbaum Z, Morris JX, Duderstadt B, Mulyar A. Nomic Embed: Training a Reproducible Long Context Text Embedder. arXiv preprint arXiv:240201613. 2024.
21. Blondel VD, Guillaume JL, Lambiotte R, Lefebvre E. Fast unfolding of communities in large networks. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*. 2008;2008(10):P10008. doi:10.1088/1742-5468/2008/10/P10008.
22. Jaccard P. The distribution of the flora in the alpine zone. *New Phytologist*. 1912;11(2):37-50.
23. Clauset A, Shalizi CR, Newman MEJ. Power-law distributions in empirical data. *SIAM Review*. 2009;51(4):661-703. doi:10.1137/070710111.
24. March JG. Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization Science*. 1991;2(1):71-87. doi:10.1287/orsc.2.1.71.
25. Hills TT, Todd PM, Lazer D, Redish AD, Coles IR, the Cognitive Search Research Group. Exploration versus exploitation in space, mind, and society. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*. 2015;19(1):46-54. doi:10.1016/j.tics.2014.10.004.
26. Bartlett FC. Remembering: A Study in Experimental and Social Psychology. Cambridge University Press; 1932.
27. Towell A. chatgpt-complex-net: Complex network analysis of ChatGPT conversations. Zenodo; 2025. Available from: <https://github.com/queelius/chatgpt-complex-net>. doi:10.5281/zenodo.15314235.
28. Towell A, Matta J. Cognitive MRI of AI Conversations: Research Compendium. Zenodo; 2026. Available from: <https://github.com/queelius/cognitive-mri-conversations>. doi:10.5281/zenodo.18778444.