A connective differentiation of textual production in interaction networks

Renato Fabbri[1, a)]

Instituto de Física de São Carlos, Universidade de São Paulo (IFSC/USP)

This paper explores textual production in interaction networks and its relation to topological measures. Measures were taken from open email lists interaction networks. Texts from the email messages were grouped by source: peripheral, intermediary and hub sectors. Correlation of textual and topological measures were observed for the entire network and for each connective sector. The formation of principal components is used for further insights of how measures are related. Network sectors presented discrepant linguistic elaborations and each principal component exhibit predominance of textual or topological measures. Textual discrepancies, correlation and principal components corroborate the stability of such interaction networks reported in previous works. Noteworthy is that the difference in textual production is more prominent between sectors of the same network than between different networks or even same sectors of different networks.

I. INTRODUCTION

Textual production has received considerable attention from the social network analysis community. Sentiment analysis and vocabulary compilation are among a number of examples[10]. The relation of topological and textual measures is the subject of this article, for the following reasons:

- This relation has been set aside in literature, with scattered and vague suggestions of mutual implications of the text produced and topological characteristics of the agents in the network[10].

- The results ease understanding of human interaction, which is useful for the observation of personality and cultural "types"[7].

- There are hypothesis about verbal differentiation of network sections, derived from a previous article by the same authors[11], some of which are herein confirmed.

Next section exposes materials used for this research, its textual and network facets. Section III explains the analysis roadmap, with the measures chosen and methods for understanding data. Section IV is dedicated to detailing results and discussion. Section V has concluding remarks and further works envisioned. The Appendix give directions on data and scripts while Supporting Information hold further tables, figures and results still to interpret.

---

a)Electronic mail: fabbri@usp.br

II. MATERIALS

Email list messages were obtained from the GMANE email archive? , which consists of more than 20,000 email lists and more than 130,000,000 messages? . These lists cover a variety of topics, mostly technology-related. The archive can be described as a corpus with metadata of its messages, including sent time, place, sender name, and sender email address. The GMANE usage in scientific research is reported in studies of isolated lists and of lexical innovations? ? .

We analyzed many email lists (and data from Twitter, Facebook, IRC and Participa.br) but selected only four in order to make a thorough analysis, from which general properties can be inferred. These lists, selected as representative of both a diverse set and ordinary lists, are:

- Linux Audio Users list[1], with participants holding hybrid artistic and technological interests, from different countries. Abbreviated as LAU from now on.

- Linux Audio Developers list[2], with participants from different countries. A more technical and less active version of LAU. Abbreviated LAD from now on.

- Development list for the standard C++ library[3], with computer programmers from different countries. Abbreviated as CPP from now on.

- List for de discussion of the election reform[4]. Abbreviated ELE from now on.

The first 20,000 messages of each list were considered, with total timespan, authors, threads and missing messages indicated in Table I. Furthermore, we used additional networks from Facebook, Twitter, IRC and Participa.br to grasp the generality of the results derived manly from email lists.

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Network formation, topological measures and Erdös sectioning

Figure 1 is illustrative of the formation of interaction networks. Avoiding identical repetition of content, Please refer to[11] for:

- further details on network formation.

- A concise consideration of the basic topological measures of vertex i: degree k_i, in-degree k_i^{in}, out-degree k_i^{out} strength s_i, in-strength s_i^{in}, out-strength s_i^{out}, betweenness centrality bt_i, clustering coefficient cc_i.

- A specification of the symmetry measures for a vertex i: asymmetry asy_i, mean of asymmetry of edges μ_i^{asy}, standard deviation of asymmetry of edges σ_I^{asy}, disequilibrium dis_i, mean of disequilibrium of edges μ_i^{dis}, standard deviation of disequilibrium of edges σ_i^{dis}.

- The partitioning of the real network in periphery, intermediary and hub sectors through a comparison of the real network with an Erdös-Rényi network with the same number of vertices and edges.

Such partition of the network is called "Erdös sectioning" and is herein performed with degree k_i unless stated otherwise.


FIG. 1. The formation of interaction networks from email messages. Each vertex represents a participant. A reply message from B to a message from A is regarded as evidence that B has received information from A and yields a directed edge. Multiple messages add "weight" to a directed edge. Further details are given in[11].

B. Textual measures

This work focuses on the most simple measures from texts, as they proved sufficient for current step. Considered measures are:

- Frequency of characters: letters, vowels, punctuations and uppercase.

- Number of tokens, frequency of punctuations, of known words, of words that has wordnet synsets, of tokens that are stopwords, of words that return synsets and are stop words, etc.

- Mean and standard deviation for word and token sizes.

- Mean and standard deviation of sentence sizes.

- Mean and standard deviation of message sizes.

- Fraction of morphosyntactic classes, such as adverbs, adjectives and nouns, represented by POS (Part-Of-Speech) tags.

To such measures are dedicated Tables II, III, IV, V, VI, VII.

This choice is based on: 1) the lack of such information in literature, as far as authors know; 2) potential relations of these incidences with topological aspects, such as connectivity; 3) the interdependence of textual artifacts suggests that simple measures should reflect complex behaviors and more subtle aspects. A preliminary study, with the complete works from Machado de Assis, made clear that these measures vary with respect to style[13].

C. Relating text and topology

Key observations for a deeper insight about network structure depend on theoretical background and intentions. For this article, were considered:

1. Incidences of linguistic traces in hub, intermediary and peripheral network sectors.

2. Correlation of measures of each vertex, easing pattern detection involving topology of interaction and language used.

3. PCA to gain further insights about how measures combine in principal components formation.

Criteria for this choice include integration with previous topological results, lack of concise results in literature (as far as author knows) that could substantiate correlations of topological and textual traces, and common sense as a long-time member of these networks.

First task, of textual production in hubs, intermediary and peripheral sectors, is observed by Tables II-XV. An adaptation of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to observe differences in textual productions, as exposed in Appendix A.

Second task is addressed by the correlation matrix with both textual and topological measurements of each participant, in Tables XVI-XVIII. Third, principal components composition are in Tables XIX-XXIII.

For sections (hubs, intermediary and peripheral), all messages written by authors in each section were considered together. For the histograms, independent messages were considered from each sector.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Although the results drawn from experiments and statistics were diverse, some fundamental insights can be obtained by going through tables and figures in the Appendix B. Most importantly: connectivity has strong influence in textual production of participants in the network. For example: hubs use more contractions, more adjectives, more common words, and less punctuation if compared to the rest of the network, specially the peripheral sector. In general, rise or fall of a measure was monotonic, but some of them reached extreme values in the intermediary sector.

Next subsections exhibit particular results of interests.

A. General characteristics of activity distribution among participants

Hubs and periphery swap fraction of participants and activity. While peripheral sector has $\approx 75\%$ of participants, it produces $\approx 10\%$ of all messages. Conversely, hubs has $\approx 10\%$ of participants and produces $\approx 75\%$ of all messages. Fewer threads are created in proportion to total messages sent by the hubs, while threads created by peripheral are twice as frequent as general peripheral messages. This suggests a symbiosis of peripheral diversity and hub activity.

Also, comparing lists with a fixed number of messages, the number of threads created seem to increase as the number of participants decrease. These information is condensed in Table I, with further details.

B. Characters

Peripheral vertex use more punctuation characters, digits and uppercase letters. Hubs use more letters and vowels among letters. The use of space does not seem to have any relation to connectivity, with the exception that the intermediary presented a slightly lower incidence of spaces than both peripheral and hub sectors.

Total number of characters in ELE list, in the 20 thousand messages, is more than three times what other lists exhibited. This suggests peculiarities related to communication conventions and style (see Appendix B 1).

Further information is given in Table II.

C. Tokens and words

Largest average size of tokens is with the most wordy list (ELE). This implies that is has more characters, tokens, and characters per token in comparison to the other lists. Longer words used by hubs might be related to the use of a specialized vocabulary. Although the token diversity ($\frac{|tokens\neq|}{|tokens|}$) found in peripheral sector is far greater, this result has the masking artifact that the peripheral sector corpus is smaller, yielding a larger token diversity. This can be noticed by the token diversity of the whole network, which is lower than in the sections. This same discussion applies to the lexical diversity ($\frac{|kw\neq|}{kw}$).

Punctuations among tokens are less abundant in hubs, and discrepancies here are larger that with characters comparisons (subsection IV B). Known words are used more frequently by hubs.

ELE and CPP both exhibit intermediaries with the more frequent production of punctuation, less frequent production of known words, the highest incidence of words with wordnet synsets among known words. This suggests some peculiarity in network structure, such as the intermediary be strong authorities in such networks, using smaller sentences and a larger jargon.

Words with synsets, among known English words, are less frequent in hubs further evidencing the jargon hubs develop.

Further information is given in Table III.

D. Sizes of tokens and words

Sizes of known words are smaller for hubs, which suggests its use of more common words, although some of the previous results suggests that hubs have a very differentiated and specialized vocabulary. Larger words seems to be related to intermediary sector, which might be related to cultured vocabulary.

Further information is given in Table IV.

E. Sizes of sentences

Hubs present the lowest average sentence size, both in characters and in tokens. Also, the incidence of usual known words seems to decay with connectivity, as does the number of known words with synsets.

Further information is given in Table V.

F. Messages

Regarding characters and tokens, connectivity was related to smaller messages. ELE list displayed an inverse situation: the more connected the sector, the longer the messages are. This was considered a peculiarity of the

culture bonded with the political subject of ELE list, to be further verified. Regarding sentences, the size of messages seem to hold steady until hubs are reached.

Further information is given in Table VI.

G. POS tags

Lower connectivity delivers more nouns and less adjectives, adverbs and verbs. This suggests that the networks collect issues important to the world by the peripheral sector. These issues are qualified, elaborated about, by the more connected participants.

Further information is given in Table VII.

H. Differentiation of measures

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was adapted for our need to compare measures. Results suggests that the texts produced by each sector is very distinct. Counterintuitively, intermediary sector sometimes yields a greater difference from periphery and hubs than these extreme sectors themselves (Tables VIII and XII).

At the core of the results presented on this article, are two strong and immediate interpretations that follows Tables VIII-XV:

- Differences of textual production of the primitive sectors are extreme, as can be noticed from the values on these tables, beyond reference values used for considering the null hypothesis (see Appendix A).

- Differences between sectors on the same network (Tables VIII, X, XII and XIV) are bigger than differences between same sector from distinct lists (Tables IX, XI, XIII and XV).

I. Correlation of measures

Correlation of degree (how many participants the participant related to) and strength (how many interactions) measures is substantially smaller for intermediary sector. This raises interesting inquiries, to which the reader is invited, along with further analysis of Tables XVI, XVII and XVIII, as detailing their interpretation goes beyond the scope of this article. Noteworthy is the negative correlation of degree and message size (number of characters, tokens or sentences) that intermediaries presented.

J. Formation of principal components

Principal components formation seem to be the less stable of all features considered. First component, with $\approx 25\%$ of dispersion, relies heavily on POS tags, and slightly on sizes of tokens, sentences and messages. Second component, with almost 12% of dispersion, blends topology, POS tags and size measures. Third component, with about 8.5% is based on nouns frequency and size measures. Fourth and fifth components present less than 5% of total dispersion, but are included for completeness of exposition.

Tables XIX-XXIII exhibit these and further insights.

K. Results still to be interpreted

These networks yield diverse characteristics, some of which were not of core importance for this step of the research. Even so, at least one of these characteristics was found interesting enough to be considered a result and an example of interesting artifacts found.

Histogram differences of incident and existent word sizes were found constant. That is, in each list, when a histogram of word sizes were made with all words written, and another histogram made with sizes of all *different* words, the cumulative positive difference of the two histograms were found constant for all lists analysed. When all known English words were considered, the difference was always ≈ 1.0. When stopwords were discarded, the difference found was different, but still constant, slightly above 0.5. When only stopwords were considered, the difference was ≈ 0.6. When only known English words that does not have wordnet synsets are used, this difference is ≈ 1.2.

These results currently lacks substantial interpretation, which is provocative and should lead at least to a research note. Appendix C and Figures 2-6 are dedicated to this histogram differences.

Typos, *leet*, slang and invented words pose some challenges, by which the methodology was partially shaped. Nonetheless, future work might bring these entries to forefront.

V. FINAL REMARKS

Human interaction networks yield diverse linguistic peculiarities reported by its members. This is a first systematic exploration of such peculiarities with primitive connective sectors (hubs, intermediary and periphery) in mind, as far the author knows. Results were regarded as stronger than envisioned from start, which poses diverse and intriguing questions. This results, confluent with recent research and development, some by the current author, are of core importance for social technologies and transformations, such as collection and diffusion and information, resource recommendation in linked data contexts, and open processes of legal documents refinement[5,6,9,11,12].

All the data used is public, all scripts used are online (see Appendix D).

A. Further work

Results suggests that less connected participants bring external content and concepts, while hubs qualify the content. This hold mainly as periphery uses more nouns while hubs present more adjectives. This should be further verified, maybe with a dedicated article.

Similarity measures of texts in message-response threads has been thought about by the author, and some results are being organized. These are two hypothesis obtained from recent experiments:

- existence of information "ducts", observable through similarity measures. These might coincide with asymmetries of edges between vertexes pairs, with homophily or with message-response threads, to point just a few possibilities.

- Valuable insights can be driven from self-similarity of messages by same authors, of messages sent at the same period of the day, etc. This includes incidences of word sizes, incidences of tags and morphosintactic classes, incidences of particular wordnet synset characteristics and wordnet word distances.

Given current results, diversity and self-similarity should vary with respect to connectivity. Literature usually assumes that periphery holds greater diversity[10], which should be further verified.

Other directions for next steps are:

- Word sets are very useful to derive and confirm hypothesis. As an example, one can observe most incident or most basic words and word types in the English language, curses or words related to food.

- Interpretation of various unveiled results, such as the one exposed in Appendix C, and Figures 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6.

- Extend word class observations to include plurals, gender, common prefixes and suffixes, etc.

- Date and time should also be addressed in textual production of interaction networks, as potentially linked to participation habits and purposes (e.g. low dispersion of sent time). This was tackled by the author for the topological characterization of interaction networks[11], but left aside in this article.

- Balance token diversity with corpus size, as pointed in section IV C.

- The textual features distributions are likely to be have more than one peak or other non-trivial characteristic. Therefore, further analysis should be made for comparing measures of interest.

- Extend analysis to the windowed approach used in the article where hub, peripheral and intermediary sectors where topologically characterized[11].

- For ELE list, the more connected the sector, the longer the messages are. This is the inverse of what was found in the other lists, and was considered a peculiarity of the culture bonded with the political subject of ELE list, to be further verified.

- Tackle Portuguese analysis of interaction networks, as this research have ongoing implications in Brazil[12].

- Analyse other lists.

- Analyse interaction networks from other platforms such as Twitter, Facebook, LinkedIn, Diaspora, etc.

- Emotion classification has not been done and was considered out of the scope for this stage of development, but should be addressed in a near future.

Wordnet synsets incidences was studied as well, as a potentially useful way to characterize networks and sectors. Core aspects understood as useful for this research include:

- Incidence of hypernyms, hyponyms, holonyms and meronyms.

- Use and development of similarity measures of words, phrases and messages, by use of semantic criteria (Wordnet) and bag of words.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

[1] gmane.comp.gcc.libstdc++.devel is list ID in GMANE archive.

[2] gmane.linux.audio.devel is list ID in GMANE archive.

[3] gmane.linux.audio.users is list ID in GMANE archive.

[4] gmane.politics.election-methods is list ID in GMANE archive.

[5] Ontologia de participao social. http://tinyurl.com/p2doueu.

[6] *Produto 5 da consultoria PNUD/ONU de Renato Fabbri.* https://github.com/ttm/pnud4/blob/master/latex/produto.pdf?raw=true.

[7] D. C. Antunes, A. A. Zuin, et al. Do bullying ao preconceito: os desafios da barbárie à educação. *Psicologia & Sociedade*, 20(1):33–42, 2008.

[8] S. Bird, E. Klein, and E. Loper. *Natural language processing with Python.* " O'Reilly Media, Inc.", 2009.

[9] R. P. Cavalcante. Influência dos movimentos sociais na formação da agenda política: as jornadas de junho de 2013 no brasil. 2014.

[10] D. Easley and J. Kleinberg. *Networks, crowds, and markets: Reasoning about a highly connected world.* Cambridge University Press, 2010.

[11] R. F. et al. Stability in human interaction networks: primitive typology of vertex, prominance of measures and activity statistics, May 2014. http://sourceforge.net/p/labmacambira/fimDoMundo/ci/master/tree/textos/evolutionSN/paper.pdf?format=raw.

[12] R. Fabbri. Ensaio sobre o auto-aproveitamento: um relato de investidas naturais na participao social. http://arxiv.org/abs/1412.6868.

[13] R. Fabbri. Incidncia de letras na obra de machado de assis, 2012. http://sourceforge.net/p/labmacambira/rcpln/ci/master/tree/pln/trabLetras/resumoLetras.pdf?format=raw.

[14] K. Marek-Spartz, P. Chesley, and H. Sande. Construction of the gmane corpus for examining the diffusion of lexical innovations. 2012.

Appendix A: Adaptation of the Kolmogotov-Smirnov test

1. Canonical Kolmogorov-Smirnov test

Be $F_{1,n}$ and $F_{2,n'}$ two empirical distribution functions, where n and n' are the number of observations on each sample. The two-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test rejects the null hypothesis if:

$$D_{n,n'} > c(\alpha)\sqrt{\frac{n+n'}{nn'}} \qquad \text{(A1)}$$

where $D_{n,n'} = sup_x[F_{1,n} - F_{2,n'}]$ and $c(\alpha)$ is given for each level of α:

α	0.1	0.05	0.025	0.01	0.005	0.001
$c(\alpha)$	1.22	1.36	1.48	1.63	1.73	1.95

2. Adaptation

We need to compare empirical distribution functions, so $D_{n,n'}$ is given, as are n and n'. Therefore, as all terms in equation A1 are positive and $c(\alpha)$ can be isolated:

$$c(\alpha) < \frac{D_{n,n'}}{\sqrt{\frac{n+n'}{nn'}}} = c'(\alpha) \qquad \text{(A2)}$$

Tables VIII-XV are populated with values for $c'(\alpha)$. When $c'(\alpha)$ is high, low values of α are possible for the test to reject the null hypothesis. Therefore, when $c'(\alpha)$ is greater than ≈ 1.7, it is reasonable to assume that $F_{1,n}$ and $F_{2,n'}$ differ.

Appendix B: Support information

1. Brief description of the email lists chosen

GMANE is a public email list database with some tenths of thousand of lists[14]. Four email lists were selected, in a similar fashion developed in[11], but with MET substituted by ELE list so that all lists are in English. The lists are:

- CPP, the development list of the standard C++ library? . Dominated by specialized computer programmers.

- LAD: Linux Audio Developers list? .

- LAU: Linux Audio Users list? .

- ELE: list for discussion of the election reform? .

Table I has an overview of these lists, in terms of participants, threads and messages in each of the primitive connective sectors.

2. Meaning of achronims and abbreviations in the following tables

symbol	meaning
$\|x\|$	the number of times x was found
kw	known word
$\|x \neq \|$	number of different x found
$kwss$	known word with (wordnet) synset
$kwsw$	known word that is a stopword
$ukwsw$	unknown word that is a stopword
$nsssw$	word without (wordnet) synset that is a stopword

Other symbols are explained on the tables itself. Some concepts, such as *contractions*, *token* and *char* are standard in natural language processing, and the reader is invited to visit[8].

3. Tables

-	CPP				LAD				LAU				ELE			
	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.
$date_1$	3/13/2	-	-	-	6/30/3	-	-	-	06/29/3	-	-	-	3/18/02	-	-	-
$date_M$	8/25/9	-	-	-	10/07/9	-	-	-	07/23/5	-	-	-	8/31/11	-	-	-
N	1052	834	163	55	1268	936	210	122	1183	904	155	124	302	225	36	41
$N_\%$	-	79.28%	15.49%	5.23%	-	73.82%	16.56%	9.62%	-	76.42%	13.10%	10.48%	-	74.50%	11.92%	13.58%
M	19993	1654	2673	15666	19996	2331	3542	14123	19995	3018	2882	14095	19946	1821	2413	15712
$M_\%$	-	8.27%	13.37%	**78.33%**	-	11.65%	17.71%	**70.61%**	-	15.09%	14.41%	**70.47%**	-	9.11%	12.06%	**78.56%**
Γ	4506	924	702	2880	3113	812	670	1631	3373	1121	675	1577	6070	782	1072	4216
$\Gamma_\%$	-	20.51%	15.58%	**63.91%**	-	26.08%	21.52%	**52.39%**	-	33.23%	20.01%	**46.75%**	-	12.88%	17.66%	**69.46%**
$-M$	7	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	54	-	-	-
Δ_Y	7.44	-	-	-	6.25	-	-	-	2.08	-	-	-	9.37	-	-	-

TABLE I. Columns $date_1$ and $date_M$ have dates (month/day/year) of first and last messages from the 20,000 messages considered. N is the number of participants (number of different email addresses). M is number of messages. Γ is the number of threads (count of messages without antecedent). $-M$ is messages missing in the 20,000 collection, $100\frac{54}{20000} = 0.27/100$ in the worst case. ELE notably has the fewer participants and the larger number of threads. This relation holds for pairs of lists considered: as the number of participants increase, the number of threads decrease. A similar role is observed in MET list described in[11], suggesting that 1) Non-technical topics gathers fewer participants and yields shorter threads; 2) MET techno-political characteristic is confirmed by having intermediary $\frac{N}{\Gamma}$ relation, between ELE (politics) and LAD (highly technical - GNU/Linux and music). These results should be further investigated in future research (see section V A). The number of threads started by hubs is significantly lower than activity for all list, this suggests creative exploitation is done by hubs, i.e. hubs acquire/absorb creativity. Δ_Y is number of years involved in the first 20,000 messages of each list. Dates of first and last message is: Mar/13/2002 and Aug/25/2009 for CPP; Jun/30/2003 and Oct/07/2009 for LAD; Jun/29/2003 and Jul/23/2005 for LAU; finally, Abr/18/2002 and Aug/31/2011 for ELE. See section IV and subsection IV A for further directions.

-	CPP				LAD				LAU				ELE			
	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.
$n\ chars$	12708286	11.65	17.65	70.69	12632264	14.21	18.21	67.58	11893325	17.37	15.60	67.04	38719505	7.74	11.17	81.09
$100\frac{|space|}{|char|}$	17.03	17.66	15.68	17.26	18.35	18.50	18.16	18.38	19.17	20.14	19.18	18.91	18.19	17.86	17.82	18.28
$100\frac{|punct|}{|char|-|space|}$	10.10	10.88	12.11	9.45	5.67	6.27	5.81	5.50	5.88	6.66	5.86	5.69	4.68	4.97	5.06	4.60
$100\frac{|digit|}{|char|-|space|}$	2.44	3.18	3.07	2.15	1.63	2.79	1.57	1.40	2.25	3.26	2.54	1.92	0.99	1.21	1.66	0.88
$100\frac{|letter|}{|char|-|space|}$	87.28	85.77	84.47	88.24	92.65	90.86	92.55	93.05	91.82	90.02	91.52	92.35	94.28	93.79	93.18	94.48
$100\frac{|vogal|}{|letter|}$	35.36	36.42	36.08	37.51	34.20	35.93	35.56	37.55	34.65	36.29	35.94	37.34	35.71	36.56	36.24	37.52
$100\frac{|Uppercase|}{|letter|}$	4.60	4.96	5.38	3.55	6.06	6.05	6.19	3.77	5.31	4.88	5.78	4.15	4.20	4.75	5.09	3.44

TABLE II. Measures based on characters of the text produced by network participants, fairly stable. Suggested relations are: 1) punctuations of CPP, that can be expected by its programming language focus and dots and semicolon abundance in such parlance; 2) greater number of letters on ELE is expected by its political disposition; 3) not statistically clear, but higher percentage of vowels might be a sign of erudition. Most of all, number of characters incident in ELE 20,000 messages are more then the other three lists added. MET has an intermediary value of 13,137,042 characters[11], above CPP, LAD, LAU and below ELE. This builds up to a dichotomic typology of networks: technical (more participants, fewer and longer threads, e.g. CPP) – political (less participants, more and shorter threads, e.g. ELE). Higher incidence of digits and lower incidence of letters seem to be associated to technical subjects. See subsection IV B for further discussion and context.

-	CPP				LAD				LAU				ELE			
	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.
$\lvert tokens \rvert$	2839679	0.12	0.18	0.70	2686539	0.14	0.18	0.68	2588673	0.17	0.16	0.67	8019188	0.08	0.11	0.81
$\frac{\lvert chars \rvert - \lvert spaces \rvert}{\lvert tokens \rvert}$	3.71	3.63	3.69	3.73	3.84	3.83	3.84	3.84	3.71	3.68	3.70	3.72	3.95	3.93	3.89	3.96
$100\frac{\lvert tokens \neq \rvert}{\lvert tokens \rvert}$	1.84	5.60	4.08	1.89	2.43	6.55	5.10	2.67	2.42	5.64	5.40	2.73	0.85	3.45	2.83	0.86
$100\frac{\lvert punct \rvert}{\lvert tokens \rvert}$	26.48	27.59	29.96	25.39	17.96	19.89	18.37	17.45	18.29	20.57	18.58	17.63	16.35	17.07	17.32	16.14
$100\frac{\lvert known\,words=kw \rvert}{\lvert tokens \rvert - \lvert punct \rvert}$	76.52	71.24	70.27	78.89	84.42	80.43	83.47	85.49	81.92	76.30	80.69	83.60	90.01	88.58	86.72	90.60
$100\frac{\lvert kw \neq \rvert}{kw}$	0.83	3.83	2.81	1.00	1.06	3.96	3.16	1.36	1.11	3.36	3.50	1.44	0.43	2.55	1.97	0.49
$100\frac{\lvert kw\,with\,wordnet\,synset=kwss \rvert}{\lvert kw \rvert}$	74.21	74.75	75.74	73.80	74.84	75.26	74.80	74.76	74.80	75.54	75.02	74.59	73.49	73.77	74.16	73.38
$100\frac{\lvert kw\,that\,are\,stopwords=kwsw \rvert}{\lvert kw \rvert}$	47.14	46.02	44.32	47.91	49.16	46.62	48.64	49.78	49.26	46.86	48.44	49.98	49.25	48.43	48.16	49.47
$100\frac{\lvert unknown\,words\,that\,are\,sw=ukwsw \rvert}{\lvert kw \rvert}$	2.86	3.39	2.73	2.81	2.56	2.82	2.74	2.46	3.67	4.04	3.68	3.58	1.73	1.90	2.04	1.67
$100\frac{\lvert kw\,that\,are\,stopwords\,and\,have\,synsets \rvert}{\lvert kw \rvert}$	24.29	23.84	23.31	24.57	26.39	24.38	25.83	26.93	26.60	25.20	26.05	27.04	25.22	24.78	24.69	25.33
$100\frac{\lvert stopwords\,without\,synsets \rvert}{\lvert kw \rvert}$	22.85	22.18	21.01	23.34	22.76	22.24	22.81	22.85	22.66	21.67	22.39	22.94	24.03	23.65	23.47	24.14
$100\frac{\lvert contractions \rvert}{\lvert kw \rvert}$	1.65	1.24	1.59	1.72	1.76	1.34	1.59	1.89	2.19	1.73	1.74	2.40	1.43	1.26	1.33	1.46
$100\frac{\lvert kw\,not\,stopwords\,no\,synset \rvert}{\lvert kw \rvert}$	2.94	3.07	3.26	2.86	2.40	2.50	2.39	2.39	2.54	2.79	2.59	2.47	2.48	2.58	2.37	2.48
$100\frac{\lvert kw\,not\,stopword\,has\,synset \rvert}{\lvert kw \rvert}$	49.92	50.92	52.42	49.23	48.44	50.88	48.97	47.84	48.20	50.35	48.97	47.55	48.27	48.99	49.47	48.05

TABLE III. Basic measures on tokens, known English words, stopwords, words with and without synset. Lexical diversity is higher in LAU and LAD, probably linked to these lists hybrid technical interests (music and GNU/Linux). Larger known words and tokens are incident in ELE and LAD. ELE also exhibits larger incidence of stopwords without synsets (prolixity?). Stronger use of words with synsets that are not stopwords is held by CPP. Stopwords that have synset account for $\approx 25\%$ of all known words, which might be an indicative of language complexity (not same as good writing though). See subsection ?? for further discussion and context.

-	CPP				LAD				LAU				ELE			
	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.
$\mu(size\,of\,known\,word = skw)$	4.51	4.53	4.56	4.50	4.44	4.52	4.45	4.42	4.35	4.42	4.36	4.34	4.64	4.65	4.66	4.63
$\sigma(skw)$	2.39	2.38	2.42	2.39	2.35	2.40	2.36	2.34	2.25	2.27	2.25	2.25	2.52	2.54	2.53	2.51
$\mu(\neq skw)$	7.52	7.15	7.29	7.50	7.54	7.24	7.22	7.51	7.43	7.02	7.09	7.41	7.92	7.62	7.69	7.91
$\sigma(\neq skw)$	2.57	2.51	2.56	2.57	2.53	2.54	2.53	2.53	2.51	2.49	2.48	2.51	2.62	2.62	2.63	2.61
$\mu(skwss)$	4.92	4.94	4.95	4.95	4.82	4.94	4.84	4.84	4.70	4.77	4.71	4.71	5.11	5.14	5.14	5.14
$\sigma(skwss)$	2.54	2.52	2.56	2.56	2.50	2.54	2.50	2.50	2.40	2.40	2.38	2.38	2.69	2.70	2.68	2.68
$\mu(\neq skwss)$	7.56	7.20	7.34	7.34	7.57	7.29	7.27	7.27	7.47	7.09	7.14	7.14	7.94	7.66	7.73	7.73
$\sigma(\neq skwss)$	2.54	2.48	2.52	2.52	2.49	2.51	2.50	2.50	2.48	2.46	2.45	2.45	2.58	2.59	2.60	2.60
$\mu(ssw)$	2.89	2.87	2.87	2.89	2.85	2.83	2.85	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.85	2.87	2.88	2.86	2.87	2.88
$\sigma(ssw)$	1.06	1.06	1.07	1.06	1.06	1.05	1.05	1.06	1.05	1.05	1.04	1.05	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.09
$\mu(\neq ssw)$	3.92	3.88	3.90	3.89	3.97	3.92	3.90	3.97	3.97	3.92	3.92	3.97	3.97	3.97	3.97	3.97
$\sigma(\neq ssw)$	1.60	1.58	1.60	1.58	1.68	1.65	1.60	1.69	1.68	1.61	1.60	1.69	1.68	1.69	1.68	1.68
$\mu(snsssw)$	3.01	2.98	2.99	3.02	2.97	2.96	2.96	2.98	2.99	2.99	2.97	2.99	2.99	2.97	2.97	2.99
$\sigma(snsssw)$	1.25	1.23	1.25	1.26	1.25	1.24	1.23	1.25	1.25	1.27	1.24	1.24	1.23	1.22	1.22	1.23
$\mu(\neq snsssw)$	6.32	5.44	5.65	6.14	6.65	5.77	5.81	6.50	6.48	5.31	5.53	6.43	7.37	5.83	6.14	7.30
$\sigma(\neq snsssw)$	3.07	2.83	2.97	3.04	3.07	2.90	2.92	3.08	2.93	2.60	2.70	2.98	3.37	3.02	3.26	3.39

TABLE IV. Sizes of tokens and words. Practically all sizes are greater for ELE. See subsection IV D for discussion and context.

-	CPP				LAD				LAU				ELE			
	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.
$|sents|$	106086	10154	17618	78309	113033	15581	15838	81608	111703	15822	19968	75926	325399	23835	36775	264794
$\mu\left(\frac{chars}{sent}\right)$	118.31	148.63	125.02	112.87	110.52	125.69	116.16	106.54	105.15	120.64	107.55	101.27	117.67	126.06	128.01	115.48
$\sigma\left(\frac{chars}{sent}\right)$	250.34	312.02	259.34	239.11	148.98	243.78	148.28	122.42	208.63	386.51	259.32	120.50	127.57	120.89	122.34	128.79
$\mu\left(\frac{tokens}{sent}\right)$	26.80	34.06	28.91	25.38	23.79	27.04	25.03	22.93	23.20	26.40	23.98	22.33	24.68	26.78	27.29	24.13
$\sigma\left(\frac{tokens}{sent}\right)$	64.74	81.47	64.30	62.36	33.44	51.90	29.21	29.40	38.11	51.39	54.91	27.88	34.48	27.38	29.18	35.69
$\mu\left(\frac{kw}{sent}\right)$	13.88	16.09	12.99	13.80	15.15	15.76	15.67	14.94	14.11	14.39	13.98	14.08	17.03	17.76	17.88	16.84
$\sigma\left(\frac{kw}{sent}\right)$	17.22	22.67	18.33	16.09	13.81	17.71	14.63	12.76	13.48	15.03	15.38	12.58	13.23	13.91	14.14	13.03
$\mu\left(\frac{kwssnsw}{sent}\right)$	6.90	8.13	6.73	6.78	7.26	7.79	7.57	7.09	6.67	7.06	6.69	6.58	8.19	8.60	8.74	8.07
$\sigma\left(\frac{kwssnsw}{sent}\right)$	10.72	14.17	11.76	9.92	7.79	11.11	7.84	6.95	7.54	8.92	9.71	6.49	6.59	7.05	7.13	6.46

TABLE V. Sizes of sentences in characters and in tokens. Hubs produce the smallest sentences and, at the same time, present the lowest incidence of known words and of known words with synsets. See subsection IV E for discussion and context.

-		CPP				LAD				LAU				ELE			
		g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.
$\mu\left(\frac{|chars|}{msg}\right)$		632.81	883.15	841.05	570.09	628.49	763.32	655.59	599.39	591.12	697.59	623.79	561.61	1934.43	1638.41	1796.38	1993.42
$\sigma\left(\frac{|chars|}{msg}\right)$		1761.57	1247.79	3896.49	1101.55	836.23	1136.90	826.08	770.30	831.47	1194.85	982.59	686.75	2642.25	1737.49	1992.88	2819.96
$\mu\left(\frac{|tokens|}{msg}\right)$		143.35	202.36	194.09	128.28	135.99	164.49	141.88	129.81	131.37	153.18	139.27	125.01	406.39	347.64	383.28	417.36
$\sigma\left(\frac{|tokens|}{msg}\right)$		444.20	287.17	940.83	304.37	178.11	237.80	172.03	165.98	173.89	213.52	212.91	152.35	557.29	365.05	435.87	593.08
$\mu\left(\frac{|sents|}{msg}\right)$		5.71	6.39	7.09	5.40	6.12	6.55	6.11	6.04	6.08	6.23	6.23	6.01	17.22	13.74	14.79	18.05
$\sigma\left(\frac{|sents|}{msg}\right)$		16.36	6.29	41.76	6.55	6.75	7.51	6.67	6.61	6.58	8.03	6.87	6.18	23.97	14.06	17.01	25.80

TABLE VI. Mean and standard deviation of message sizes. Greater size of messages from ELE list reflects domain of interest, as does its hubsi sector, which produces the largest texts. See subsection IV F for discussion and context.

-	CPP				LAD				LAU				ELE			
	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.
NN	28.17	30.38	31.13	27.19	26.68	29.29	26.98	26.08	26.64	29.87	28.03	25.58	24.68	25.54	25.35	24.50
NNS	2.51	2.32	2.56	2.53	2.82	2.97	2.92	2.76	2.63	2.63	2.65	2.63	4.41	4.56	4.61	4.36
NNP	0.72	0.75	1.03	0.65	0.70	1.10	0.74	0.61	0.90	0.94	0.94	0.88	0.76	1.13	1.04	0.69
NNPS	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.03	0.05	0.02	0.03
+	31.41	33.46	34.73	30.38	30.21	33.39	30.65	29.47	30.18	33.45	31.63	29.10	29.88	31.29	31.02	29.58
JJ	4.83	4.60	4.72	4.89	5.05	5.03	5.00	5.06	4.65	4.46	4.42	4.75	5.19	5.11	5.24	5.19
JJR	0.45	0.37	0.38	0.48	0.47	0.43	0.48	0.48	0.45	0.36	0.40	0.48	0.66	0.71	0.73	0.65
JJS	0.17	0.15	0.14	0.17	0.25	0.22	0.26	0.26	0.25	0.22	0.22	0.26	0.38	0.41	0.46	0.37
RB	6.43	5.29	5.73	6.76	6.55	5.41	6.30	6.83	6.60	5.74	6.11	6.91	5.78	5.27	5.34	5.89
RBR	0.11	0.08	0.09	0.12	0.12	0.10	0.12	0.12	0.11	0.07	0.09	0.12	0.16	0.14	0.16	0.16
RBS	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.04
RP	0.35	0.30	0.27	0.37	0.39	0.36	0.43	0.39	0.50	0.43	0.50	0.52	0.26	0.30	0.25	0.26
+	12.36	10.79	11.34	12.82	12.86	11.59	12.61	13.17	12.58	11.29	11.76	13.08	12.47	12.00	12.23	12.55
VB	6.25	6.24	6.31	6.25	5.90	5.72	5.91	5.94	5.89	5.98	5.92	5.86	5.22	5.27	5.06	5.24
VBZ	3.94	3.89	3.80	3.97	3.97	3.60	3.87	4.07	3.77	3.48	3.58	3.88	4.16	3.79	4.14	4.20
VBP	3.17	3.07	3.17	3.18	2.84	2.63	2.86	2.87	3.23	2.93	3.11	3.32	2.68	2.64	2.67	2.68
VBN	2.00	2.14	2.06	1.97	1.78	1.85	1.93	1.74	1.74	1.78	1.75	1.72	1.87	2.02	1.80	1.86
VBD	1.52	1.64	1.49	1.50	1.38	1.43	1.47	1.35	1.71	1.64	1.69	1.74	1.49	1.41	1.48	1.51
VBG	1.50	1.66	1.41	1.50	1.57	1.69	1.58	1.54	1.66	1.76	1.71	1.63	1.51	1.59	1.55	1.50
MD	2.20	1.78	2.09	2.28	2.31	2.07	2.20	2.38	2.16	1.99	2.07	2.22	2.44	2.25	2.16	2.51
+	20.58	20.42	20.32	20.66	19.75	18.99	19.82	19.89	20.16	19.55	19.84	20.37	19.37	18.98	18.87	19.48
IN	12.60	12.49	12.08	12.73	12.15	12.17	12.18	12.14	11.97	11.70	11.99	12.02	13.11	13.18	13.06	13.12
DT	10.76	10.96	10.33	10.82	10.81	10.56	10.81	10.86	10.45	10.28	10.48	10.48	11.57	11.77	11.55	11.55
PRP	3.62	2.83	3.02	3.87	4.06	3.40	3.85	4.25	4.34	3.48	3.95	4.63	3.56	3.06	3.21	3.66
PRP$	0.73	0.85	0.56	0.75	0.99	1.01	1.00	0.99	1.15	1.15	1.16	1.14	0.97	0.96	1.04	0.96
PDT	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.09	0.08	0.10	0.08	0.12	0.10
TO	2.93	2.94	2.87	2.94	3.16	3.19	3.20	3.14	3.13	3.15	3.20	3.10	2.92	2.95	2.91	2.92
CC	2.77	2.97	2.54	2.79	3.52	3.55	3.56	3.50	3.61	3.63	3.66	3.59	3.03	2.94	3.16	3.03
WRB	0.58	0.68	0.56	0.56	0.59	0.51	0.55	0.61	0.59	0.60	0.58	0.58	0.64	0.57	0.58	0.66
WDT	0.54	0.53	0.55	0.54	0.54	0.48	0.49	0.56	0.48	0.42	0.45	0.50	0.60	0.56	0.59	0.61
WP	0.32	0.28	0.29	0.33	0.44	0.35	0.41	0.46	0.47	0.42	0.41	0.49	0.58	0.50	0.50	0.60
WP$	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.02
+	34.93	34.62	32.87	35.42	36.34	35.29	36.13	36.61	36.26	34.89	35.98	36.62	37.12	36.60	36.74	37.22
CD	0.38	0.37	0.36	0.38	0.44	0.41	0.44	0.45	0.42	0.37	0.43	0.43	0.79	0.78	0.81	0.79
EX	0.27	0.28	0.29	0.27	0.33	0.29	0.28	0.35	0.33	0.33	0.29	0.34	0.35	0.34	0.31	0.36
UH	0.07	0.04	0.08	0.07	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.05	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
FW	0.01	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.09	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00
+	0.72	0.71	0.74	0.72	0.84	0.74	0.78	0.86	0.82	0.82	0.79	0.83	1.16	1.14	1.13	1.17

TABLE VII. Incidence of Brown Tags. Used Brill tagger with ≈ 85% of correctly identified tags on the Brown Corpus. Most explicit is the peripheral incidence of nouns and hubs incidence of adjectives, adverbs and verbs. See subsection IV G for discussion and context.

list\measure	H-P	H-I	I-P
CPP	5.58	2.54	7.82
LAD	7.67	2.07	8.35
LAU	6.23	1.63	5.98
ELE	3.42	0.77	2.81

TABLE VIII. Kolmogorov $c(\alpha)$ values for substantives. See subsection IV H for discussion and directions.

	CPP-LAD	CPP-LAU	CPP-ELE	LAD-LAU	LAD-ELE	LAU-ELE
P	1.35	4.05	5.80	3.00	5.41	4.94
I	1.27	0.78	4.01	0.84	3.84	3.94
H	0.98	1.94	3.17	1.32	3.82	4.47

TABLE IX. Kolmogorov $c(\alpha)$ values for substantives. Comparrison of the same sector between lists, each author is an observation. See subsection IV H for discussion and directions.

list\measure	H-P	H-I	I-P
CPP	2.76	2.33	0.25
LAD	4.22	2.88	1.02
LAU	4.30	2.45	1.34
ELE	4.77	1.69	2.86

TABLE X. Kolmogorov $c(\alpha)$ values for adjectives. See subsection IV H for discussion and directions.

	CPP-LAD	CPP-LAU	CPP-ELE	LAD-LAU	LAD-ELE	LAU-ELE
P	0.44	0.34	2.57	0.20	2.32	2.37
I	0.74	0.99	3.72	0.32	3.37	3.10
H	0.26	0.32	3.72	0.29	4.36	4.24

TABLE XI. Kolmogorov $c(\alpha)$ values for adjectives. Comparrison of the same sector between lists, each author is an observation. See subsection IV H for discussion and directions.

list\measure	H-P	H-I	I-P
CPP	7.01	4.89	7.95
LAD	9.82	6.13	8.58
LAU	9.66	5.44	7.45
ELE	5.78	2.84	4.69

TABLE XII. Kolmogorov $c(\alpha)$ values for stopwords. See subsection IV H for discussion and directions.

	CPP-LAD	CPP-LAU	CPP-ELE	LAD-LAU	LAD-ELE	LAU-ELE
P	3.31	3.26	6.68	0.57	5.36	5.41
I	1.45	1.08	5.16	0.91	5.00	4.92
H	0.98	0.68	4.35	1.05	4.73	5.01

TABLE XIII. Kolmogorov $c(\alpha)$ values for stopwords. Comparrison of the same sector between lists, each author is an observation. See subsection IV H for discussion and directions.

list\measure	H-P	H-I	I-P
CPP	1.53	0.89	1.45
LAD	2.32	0.97	2.09
LAU	2.10	0.78	1.68
ELE	1.51	1.32	1.15

TABLE XIV. Kolmogorov $c(\alpha)$ values for punctuations/char. See subsection IV H for discussion and directions.

	CPP-LAD	CPP-LAU	CPP-ELE	LAD-LAU	LAD-ELE	LAU-ELE
P	5.74	4.88	8.28	2.23	5.37	6.60
I	3.23	2.49	4.16	0.96	3.40	3.51
H	2.49	1.87	4.02	1.36	3.05	3.71

TABLE XV. Kolmogorov $c(\alpha)$ values for punctuations/char. Comparrison of the same sector between lists, each author is an observation. See subsection IV H for discussion and directions.

-	CPP				LAD				LAU				ELE			
	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.
d - d_i	0.9972	0.8188	0.9477	1.0162	0.9927	0.8268	0.9028	0.9952	0.9906	0.8045	0.7900	0.9948	0.9752	0.8331	0.9057	0.9791
d - d_o	0.9932	0.8517	0.9381	1.0126	0.9907	0.8697	0.8696	0.9904	0.9842	0.8624	0.6289	0.9798	0.9529	0.8760	0.5669	0.8636
d - s	0.9572	0.9167	0.8598	0.9835	0.9525	0.9685	0.8991	0.9592	0.9741	0.9715	0.9066	0.9811	0.9010	0.9557	0.5912	0.8480
d - s_i	0.9539	0.7715	0.8329	0.9893	0.9420	0.8068	0.8366	0.9451	0.9628	0.7926	0.7378	0.9748	0.8695	0.8142	0.6811	0.8588
d - s_o	0.9547	0.7662	0.7574	0.9692	0.9516	0.8406	0.7230	0.9572	0.9668	0.8452	0.4615	0.9575	0.8785	0.8218	0.0913	0.7152
d - bc	0.9698	0.5773	0.7471	0.9921	0.9488	0.4707	0.6327	0.9603	0.9561	0.4917	0.5860	0.9635	0.9277	0.7236	0.8108	0.9057
d - $triangles$	0.9716	0.7773	0.9342	0.9742	0.9789	0.8035	0.8644	0.9981	0.9752	0.7987	0.8110	0.9856	0.9889	0.9213	0.9455	0.9969
d_i - d_o	0.9787	0.3936	0.7615	1.0031	0.9647	0.4389	0.5605	0.9473	0.9481	0.3905	0.0068	0.9283	0.8524	0.4521	0.0925	0.6616
d_i - s	0.9595	0.7348	0.8066	0.9757	0.9529	0.7929	0.7852	0.9548	0.9700	0.7766	0.6592	0.9646	0.8809	0.7564	0.4000	0.7913
d_i - s_i	0.9601	0.9315	0.8802	0.9838	0.9529	0.9675	0.9298	0.9565	0.9749	0.9744	0.9613	0.9800	0.8918	0.9633	0.8697	0.8654
d_i - s_o	0.9523	0.3664	0.6185	0.9587	0.9408	0.4299	0.4345	0.9357	0.9433	0.4010	-0.1314	0.9136	0.8045	0.4266	-0.2781	0.5651
d_i - bc	0.9780	0.4765	0.7036	0.9970	0.9453	0.4052	0.6128	0.9463	0.9612	0.4369	0.5146	0.9617	0.9283	0.7161	0.7301	0.8838
d_i - $triangles$	0.9599	0.5910	0.8621	0.9634	0.9713	0.6370	0.7540	0.9780	0.9683	0.5342	0.5127	0.9636	0.9526	0.6953	0.7154	0.9152
d_o - s	0.9413	0.7934	0.8052	0.9866	0.9338	0.8477	0.8041	0.9329	0.9505	0.8405	0.6325	0.9587	0.8488	0.8652	0.5383	0.7486
d_o - s_o	0.9457	0.8894	0.8084	0.9770	0.9455	0.9626	0.8712	0.9509	0.9682	0.9656	0.9106	0.9759	0.8999	0.9401	0.6816	0.8175
d_o - bc	0.9452	0.4872	0.6967	0.9749	0.9346	0.3945	0.4971	0.9451	0.9211	0.3879	0.2974	0.9207	0.8457	0.5296	0.4184	0.7291
d_o - $triangles$	0.9756	0.7021	0.8903	0.9825	0.9686	0.7215	0.7741	0.9888	0.9550	0.7799	0.6628	0.9710	0.9506	0.8638	0.7274	0.9073
s - s_i	0.9985	0.7926	0.9230	1.0162	0.9951	0.8225	0.8694	1.0002	0.9928	0.8061	0.7107	0.9970	0.9799	0.7942	0.5159	0.9919
s - s_o	0.9971	0.8764	0.9345	1.0146	0.9942	0.8785	0.8727	0.9987	0.9891	0.8795	0.6317	0.9898	0.9631	0.9069	0.7149	0.9383
s - $triangles$	0.9298	0.6961	0.8118	0.9518	0.9616	0.7829	0.7600	0.9471	0.9741	0.7713	0.7583	0.9613	0.8933	0.8715	0.5878	0.7889
s_i - s_o	0.9886	0.3980	0.7088	1.0062	0.9764	0.4482	0.5053	0.9732	0.9617	0.4246	-0.1088	0.9506	0.8801	0.4528	-0.2813	0.8041
s_i - $triangles$	0.9227	0.5365	0.7822	0.9552	0.9492	0.6210	0.6608	0.9281	0.9625	0.5225	0.4700	0.9455	0.8553	0.6719	0.4366	0.7793
s_o - $triangles$	0.9321	0.6209	0.7191	0.9410	0.9626	0.7058	0.6569	0.9504	0.9672	0.7570	0.5478	0.9505	0.8799	0.7989	0.2907	0.6970
bc - $triangles$	0.9055	0.4769	0.6933	0.9031	0.9555	0.2694	0.4095	0.9467	0.9409	0.2329	0.2844	0.9129	0.9255	0.7423	0.7459	0.8793
IC - IP	-1.0010	-1.0012	0.0000	0.0000	-1.0008	-1.0011	0.0000	0.0000	-1.0008	-1.0011	0.0000	0.0000	-1.0033	-1.0045	0.0000	0.0000

TABLE XVI. Correlation of topological measures. See subsection IV I for discussion and directions.

-	CPP				LAD				LAU				ELE			
	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.
nc-nt	1.000	0.978	0.992	1.018	1.000	0.994	1.001	1.008	1.000	0.940	0.995	1.007	1.003	1.002	1.025	1.025
np/(nc-ne)-ntp/nt	0.934	0.936	0.930	0.983	0.893	0.890	0.956	0.932	0.933	0.934	0.961	0.911	0.963	0.963	1.012	0.940
nt-ntd	0.927	0.870	0.837	0.988	0.943	0.918	0.954	0.967	0.956	0.921	0.947	0.967	0.807	0.946	0.948	0.923
Nwss/Nkw-Nwss_/Nkw_	0.805	0.862	-0.107	-0.401	0.877	0.922	0.882	-0.040	0.880	0.920	0.958	-0.010	0.824	0.869	-0.319	-0.394
Nwsw/Nkw-Nwsssw/Nwss	0.890	0.882	0.960	0.995	0.903	0.899	0.935	0.941	0.915	0.912	0.956	0.912	0.931	0.931	0.989	0.884
mtkw-mtkwnsw	0.855	0.868	0.386	0.388	0.941	0.943	0.943	0.769	0.944	0.943	0.971	0.826	0.937	0.940	0.927	0.758
mtkw-mtkwnsw_	0.849	0.878	0.447	0.125	0.915	0.939	0.929	0.426	0.913	0.935	0.951	0.409	0.823	0.904	0.622	0.238
mtkw-mtams	0.855	0.867	0.434	0.450	0.942	0.944	0.946	0.786	0.945	0.944	0.974	0.837	0.951	0.954	0.940	0.785
mtkw-mtams_	0.846	0.873	0.483	0.120	0.916	0.939	0.930	0.428	0.913	0.935	0.953	0.404	0.842	0.922	0.620	0.244
dtkw-dtkw_	0.962	0.969	0.739	0.612	0.979	0.984	0.942	0.660	0.977	0.982	0.966	0.605	0.963	0.972	0.786	0.399
dtkw-mtkwnsw	0.851	0.854	0.788	0.814	0.927	0.926	0.942	0.920	0.919	0.916	0.966	0.836	0.938	0.941	0.956	0.924
dtkw-dtkwnsw	0.903	0.904	0.890	0.833	0.936	0.936	0.952	0.902	0.941	0.940	0.975	0.873	0.938	0.944	0.810	0.902
dtkw-mtkwnsw_	0.833	0.845	0.778	0.564	0.908	0.923	0.920	0.457	0.903	0.916	0.935	0.478	0.837	0.914	0.674	0.399
dtkw-dtkwnsw_	0.879	0.888	0.620	0.507	0.917	0.923	0.917	0.598	0.923	0.927	0.953	0.564	0.924	0.942	0.655	0.358
dtkw-mtams	0.848	0.850	0.825	0.815	0.929	0.929	0.945	0.921	0.921	0.918	0.970	0.848	0.937	0.939	0.965	0.942
dtkw-dtams	0.887	0.887	0.882	0.805	0.928	0.928	0.948	0.902	0.936	0.935	0.972	0.872	0.930	0.935	0.778	0.892
dtkw-mtams_	0.826	0.838	0.784	0.555	0.910	0.925	0.921	0.457	0.904	0.917	0.937	0.475	0.846	0.921	0.673	0.410
dtkw-dtams_	0.867	0.875	0.610	0.506	0.911	0.916	0.914	0.607	0.920	0.923	0.952	0.577	0.921	0.937	0.661	0.385
mtkw_-mtkwnsw_	0.871	0.907	0.912	1.007	0.913	0.941	0.964	0.993	0.916	0.941	0.976	0.993	0.943	0.946	1.002	1.021
mtkw_-mtams_	0.863	0.899	0.901	1.008	0.912	0.941	0.964	0.993	0.915	0.940	0.976	0.995	0.932	0.934	1.002	1.019
mtkw_-mtsw_	0.823	0.773	0.753	0.743	0.889	0.861	0.876	0.790	0.904	0.879	0.945	0.839	0.933	0.935	0.650	0.748
mtkw_-mtsw2_	0.838	0.768	0.774	0.897	0.901	0.867	0.871	0.856	0.906	0.871	0.941	0.860	0.944	0.946	0.744	0.844
dtkw_-mtkwnsw	0.821	0.829	0.598	0.598	0.915	0.917	0.908	0.632	0.905	0.903	0.964	0.563	0.908	0.914	0.686	0.321
dtkw_-dtkwnsw	0.896	0.901	0.687	0.518	0.940	0.941	0.942	0.625	0.939	0.942	0.950	0.540	0.928	0.936	0.736	0.537
dtkw_-mtkwnsw_	0.851	0.860	0.765	0.752	0.920	0.929	0.935	0.696	0.920	0.922	0.974	0.823	0.849	0.912	0.639	0.478
dtkw_-dtkwnsw_	0.929	0.930	0.935	0.992	0.951	0.951	0.993	0.989	0.959	0.957	1.002	0.993	0.971	0.978	0.971	1.004
dtkw_-mtams	0.822	0.829	0.641	0.623	0.917	0.919	0.909	0.625	0.907	0.905	0.965	0.570	0.906	0.911	0.693	0.345
dtkw_-dtams	0.877	0.882	0.679	0.531	0.933	0.934	0.939	0.628	0.934	0.937	0.946	0.534	0.922	0.929	0.708	0.523
dtkw_-mtams_	0.845	0.853	0.770	0.752	0.922	0.931	0.936	0.693	0.921	0.924	0.974	0.824	0.857	0.918	0.656	0.506
dtkw_-dtams_	0.914	0.914	0.929	0.994	0.945	0.944	0.991	0.989	0.955	0.953	1.000	0.993	0.968	0.973	0.978	1.007
mtkwnsw-mtkwnsw_	0.940	0.968	0.754	0.633	0.972	0.990	0.959	0.567	0.968	0.986	0.980	0.609	0.904	0.968	0.767	0.534

-	CPP				LAD				LAU				ELE			
	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.
mtkwnsw-mtams	0.985	0.985	0.986	0.994	0.998	0.998	1.001	1.004	0.997	0.997	1.005	1.003	0.999	1.000	1.025	1.014
mtkwnsw-mtams_	0.930	0.957	0.734	0.620	0.970	0.988	0.958	0.565	0.965	0.982	0.980	0.603	0.911	0.971	0.761	0.539
dtkwnsw-dtkwnsw_	0.959	0.968	0.661	0.459	0.979	0.985	0.939	0.579	0.973	0.981	0.941	0.520	0.943	0.967	0.678	0.497
dtkwnsw-dtams	0.988	0.988	0.993	1.007	0.994	0.994	1.001	1.005	0.992	0.992	1.003	1.002	0.997	0.999	1.019	1.012
dtkwnsw-dtams_	0.951	0.960	0.645	0.441	0.973	0.978	0.937	0.573	0.966	0.973	0.942	0.533	0.943	0.963	0.695	0.527
mtkwnsw_-mtams	0.938	0.965	0.772	0.630	0.969	0.987	0.955	0.562	0.966	0.983	0.978	0.606	0.891	0.959	0.768	0.533
mtkwnsw_-mtams_	0.993	0.992	1.000	1.018	0.998	0.999	1.004	1.007	0.998	0.998	1.006	1.007	1.001	1.001	1.027	1.024
dtkwnsw_-dtams	0.946	0.954	0.648	0.481	0.973	0.978	0.935	0.579	0.965	0.973	0.938	0.514	0.940	0.963	0.666	0.490
dtkwnsw_-dtams_	0.990	0.990	0.991	1.010	0.995	0.995	1.002	1.000	0.994	0.993	1.005	1.004	0.999	1.000	1.018	1.018
mtams-mtams_	0.945	0.973	0.764	0.620	0.971	0.990	0.956	0.562	0.968	0.986	0.979	0.602	0.903	0.969	0.763	0.542
dtams-dtams_	0.958	0.967	0.650	0.466	0.979	0.984	0.936	0.579	0.972	0.980	0.941	0.530	0.949	0.968	0.690	0.516
mtsw-mtsw2	0.885	0.885	0.840	0.494	0.957	0.957	0.980	0.894	0.967	0.965	0.997	0.826	0.989	0.990	0.904	0.920
mtsw_-mtsw2_	0.901	0.885	0.904	0.808	0.952	0.952	0.942	0.783	0.961	0.959	0.980	0.825	0.906	0.967	0.796	0.740
mtsw2_-dtsw2_	0.820	0.746	0.871	0.970	0.848	0.784	0.836	0.932	0.841	0.779	0.914	0.938	0.930	0.855	0.943	0.968
mtTS-mtsTS	0.977	0.977	0.979	1.009	0.981	0.982	0.989	0.990	0.871	0.873	0.987	1.002	0.970	0.972	0.985	0.988
dtTS-dtsTS	0.979	0.980	0.976	1.010	0.956	0.957	0.956	0.990	0.889	0.905	0.926	0.992	0.962	0.949	1.010	1.019
mtsTSkw-mtsTSpv	0.962	0.962	0.967	0.953	0.968	0.969	0.980	0.966	0.961	0.961	0.965	0.998	0.974	0.976	0.984	0.981
dtsTSkw-dtsTSpv	0.969	0.967	0.981	1.003	0.973	0.975	0.959	0.925	0.948	0.945	0.976	0.955	0.956	0.966	0.952	0.973
mtmT-mttmT	0.962	0.957	0.996	1.001	0.991	0.991	0.997	1.002	0.877	0.872	0.995	1.000	0.995	0.996	1.016	1.023
dtmT-dttmT	0.989	0.976	0.997	1.015	0.982	0.980	0.984	0.994	0.874	0.863	0.960	0.996	0.992	0.997	1.007	0.994
mlwss-dlwss	0.804	0.809	0.792	0.648	0.852	0.852	0.889	0.823	0.841	0.837	0.925	0.854	0.904	0.909	0.802	0.906
mtamH-mprof	0.994	0.995	1.004	1.016	0.997	0.997	1.001	1.006	0.997	0.997	1.004	1.005	1.000	1.001	1.026	1.023
dtamH-dprof	0.996	0.997	1.001	1.016	0.999	0.999	1.003	1.000	0.999	0.999	1.006	1.003	1.002	1.003	1.021	1.022

TABLE XVII: Correlation of textual measures. See subsection IV I for discussion and directions.

-	CPP				LAD				LAU				ELE			
	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.
ncont-d_o	0.923	0.335	0.459	0.934	0.836	0.405	0.265	0.744	0.851	0.455	0.476	0.775	0.510	0.682	0.371	0.414
ncont-s	0.915	0.480	0.554	0.904	0.863	0.448	0.345	0.790	0.868	0.486	0.411	0.784	0.531	0.694	0.617	0.379
ncont-s_o	0.907	0.420	0.568	0.888	0.858	0.462	0.380	0.781	0.874	0.484	0.515	0.793	0.575	0.776	0.826	0.457
nc-d	0.930	0.362	0.259	0.930	0.921	0.316	0.368	0.877	0.921	0.371	0.209	0.866	0.592	0.604	-0.064	0.380
nc-d_i	0.923	0.220	0.151	0.917	0.907	0.180	0.259	0.852	0.900	0.209	-0.113	0.831	0.535	0.266	-0.302	0.285

-	CPP				LAD				LAU				ELE			
	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.
nc-d_o	0.929	0.377	0.342	0.942	0.918	0.346	0.400	0.877	0.922	0.396	0.480	0.876	0.616	0.733	0.398	0.463
nc-s	0.951	0.441	0.359	0.962	0.932	0.353	0.415	0.905	0.923	0.400	0.310	0.878	0.734	0.695	0.517	0.620
nc-s_i	0.946	0.258	0.207	0.961	0.915	0.208	0.291	0.881	0.896	0.224	-0.100	0.842	0.717	0.296	-0.311	0.600
nc-s_o	0.951	0.458	0.448	0.957	0.938	0.378	0.427	0.916	0.936	0.431	0.545	0.895	0.704	0.805	0.834	0.568
nc-tri	0.935	0.312	0.276	0.941	0.912	0.312	0.346	0.862	0.922	0.328	0.233	0.877	0.605	0.648	0.090	0.392
nt-d	0.926	0.348	0.244	0.925	0.921	0.326	0.366	0.876	0.923	0.428	0.221	0.865	0.597	0.608	-0.066	0.382
nt-d_i	0.919	0.205	0.144	0.912	0.908	0.188	0.255	0.852	0.901	0.238	-0.113	0.830	0.538	0.275	-0.301	0.282
nt-d_o	0.926	0.369	0.320	0.938	0.918	0.355	0.401	0.875	0.924	0.459	0.498	0.875	0.624	0.731	0.392	0.472
nt-s	0.946	0.424	0.335	0.956	0.932	0.364	0.415	0.905	0.924	0.457	0.317	0.877	0.737	0.701	0.520	0.620
nt-s_i	0.941	0.240	0.195	0.956	0.916	0.215	0.290	0.881	0.897	0.257	-0.106	0.843	0.717	0.309	-0.313	0.597
nt-s_o	0.945	0.447	0.415	0.950	0.937	0.390	0.429	0.914	0.936	0.490	0.561	0.894	0.711	0.804	0.838	0.573
nt-bc	0.865	0.247	0.085	0.845	0.851	0.128	0.180	0.774	0.857	0.173	0.086	0.768	0.501	0.305	-0.185	0.238
nt-tri	0.933	0.295	0.268	0.938	0.911	0.321	0.340	0.859	0.922	0.379	0.241	0.875	0.611	0.649	0.093	0.394
ntd-d	0.905	0.430	0.402	0.903	0.917	0.437	0.428	0.860	0.921	0.557	0.256	0.863	0.827	0.708	-0.039	0.409
ntd-d_i	0.882	0.267	0.292	0.892	0.895	0.272	0.319	0.826	0.886	0.351	-0.086	0.820	0.731	0.403	-0.322	0.286
ntd-d_o	0.925	0.443	0.468	0.912	0.924	0.458	0.446	0.871	0.939	0.563	0.521	0.885	0.882	0.780	0.486	0.536
ntd-s	0.851	0.527	0.537	0.919	0.857	0.474	0.461	0.858	0.881	0.579	0.346	0.856	0.812	0.781	0.518	0.638
ntd-s_i	0.833	0.322	0.372	0.914	0.842	0.298	0.340	0.837	0.847	0.365	-0.084	0.818	0.735	0.436	-0.346	0.574
ntd-s_o	0.867	0.536	0.612	0.919	0.863	0.493	0.459	0.866	0.902	0.590	0.577	0.878	0.855	0.833	0.863	0.654
ntd-bc	0.811	0.243	0.195	0.819	0.806	0.166	0.204	0.751	0.830	0.226	0.085	0.770	0.690	0.399	-0.144	0.282
ntd-tri	0.923	0.363	0.427	0.930	0.868	0.413	0.409	0.851	0.892	0.480	0.284	0.889	0.810	0.708	0.156	0.406
ntd-$in\ cent$	0.523	0.036	-0.019	0.451	0.631	0.096	0.105	0.318	0.666	0.123	0.103	0.367	0.583	0.138	-0.007	0.158
ntd-sector	0.686	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.778	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.784	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.837	0.000	0.000	0.000
ntd/nt-sector	-0.547	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.603	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.571	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.603	0.000	0.000	0.000
mtsw2_-sector	0.555	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.546	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.502	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.683	0.000	0.000	0.000

TABLE XVIII: Correlation of textual and topological measures. See subsection IV I for discussion and directions.

-	CPP				LAD				LAU				ELE			
	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.
λ	17.71	18.46	19.44	30.20	24.14	24.77	24.63	17.28	24.51	24.76	32.44	19.75	27.72	29.35	17.90	18.23
mtkwnsw_	0.09	-1.13	-2.89	0.94	-0.29	-1.85	0.56	0.17	-0.25	1.40	-5.10	0.37	1.97	-0.79	1.40	-1.24
mtsw_	-0.34	1.56	0.86	-0.09	-0.37	-2.48	1.97	-0.55	-1.80	-2.90	1.88	-2.21	-0.85	1.08	6.66	3.57
mtsTS	0.35	-1.20	-2.17	3.16	-1.07	-1.33	1.87	2.74	1.49	-5.17	-1.69	0.84	-0.04	-2.37	-0.90	0.32
dtsTS	0.45	-1.20	-1.49	0.63	0.34	1.72	-0.51	1.06	0.47	-2.67	1.50	5.08	1.47	-1.28	1.12	0.32
mtsTSkw	-0.11	-2.19	0.59	-2.85	0.61	6.11	-0.72	-2.06	1.06	-1.68	-6.03	-1.35	1.75	0.32	-0.35	0.01
dtmT	0.77	8.15	-3.14	0.39	0.17	-1.94	-6.75	2.78	0.74	0.32	2.43	-0.28	-0.69	-0.18	0.09	0.79
dttmT	-0.43	2.51	2.88	1.45	-9.19	5.03	-2.94	-2.30	0.97	-0.84	-0.08	-1.32	-0.41	-2.07	2.13	0.57
mtsmT	-0.45	-2.04	1.25	-1.22	6.29	6.63	-1.57	0.03	2.87	1.75	-2.80	0.37	1.54	-8.42	2.13	0.57
dtsmT	-3.39	1.44	-1.29	0.49	4.84	-2.34	-0.85	1.59	-0.22	-3.08	-3.17	-4.01	-4.11	-5.75	-0.58	-1.05
NN	-2.70	0.60	-4.54	-0.45	-0.16	2.97	3.84	-2.46	5.20	-4.38	-2.69	-2.07	0.52	0.33	-0.58	-1.05
JJR	0.54	3.13	-0.51	-0.51	1.51	-0.94	-1.40	-2.82	-0.00	6.45	0.72	1.21	1.78	-1.02	0.13	0.10
JJS	-8.43	0.16	-3.34	0.59	1.47	0.40	-0.77	-4.28	-0.24	-1.26	1.53	-4.44	2.09	0.55	0.13	0.10
RB	4.07	1.34	2.33	0.59	14.45	-3.72	-0.55	0.94	-0.24	0.50	-0.52	3.25	0.91	-1.73	0.49	-0.00
RBS	0.49	-1.54	-0.87	0.66	-3.89	0.99	-0.82	-0.26	7.90	-0.53	0.54	1.11	7.59	0.81	0.27	-0.92
VBD	1.48	0.09	-0.80	-1.11	-1.23	0.48	0.11	-0.03	1.05	-0.19	0.10	5.06	0.44	-0.01	0.00	0.00
VBG	0.19	-0.68	1.10	-1.29	0.18	0.89	0.37	0.90	5.63	-0.40	0.46	-4.17	-1.61	-1.30	0.00	0.00
IN	-1.74	0.32	-0.56	-1.24	1.55	0.44	-0.23	1.27	-5.74	-0.44	-1.66	-0.60	1.09	0.32	0.00	0.00
PRP$	6.51	0.22	0.29	0.41	-0.77	-0.18	-0.11	0.25	-0.26	0.22	0.14	-0.08	0.14	0.34	0.00	0.00
PDT	5.12	0.11	0.24	0.41	-0.14	-0.15	0.19	-0.25	0.31	0.56	-0.43	0.40	-1.40	-0.37	0.00	0.00

TABLE XIX. Composition of first component (threshold: $|val| > 0.05$). See subsection IV J for discussion and directions.

-	CPP				LAD				LAU				ELE			
	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.
λ	11.48	10.25	12.23	15.72	11.97	9.39	12.05	13.19	11.87	9.76	11.42	11.26	12.49	11.17	15.75	13.31
nc	-5.21	-3.60	3.06	-4.12	4.62	-3.49	2.30	0.94	4.49	3.76	-2.75	-0.53	2.87	-2.66	-3.97	-0.03
Nwsssw/Nwss	0.43	0.34	0.35	-0.66	0.21	-0.10	0.93	-0.30	0.07	0.20	0.23	-0.54	1.10	-0.44	-5.11	4.46
dtsmT	-5.57	0.29	1.79	-1.41	2.42	3.05	2.04	-0.28	-0.33	0.01	-0.16	-1.67	3.51	1.08	0.50	1.02
JJR	0.22	-4.19	0.73	1.98	0.14	1.31	-0.09	-0.11	-0.53	-5.38	-1.45	1.64	-0.69	0.81	0.63	0.11
RB	-0.68	-2.74	0.90	0.22	-6.12	2.64	0.65	-0.29	-0.16	-0.89	-1.69	-1.06	0.30	-0.63	0.21	-0.52
IN	0.46	0.98	-0.35	-0.54	-2.09	1.97	0.19	-0.68	5.08	2.39	2.17	-0.31	-0.45	-1.22	0.00	0.00
WP$	-0.15	1.52	2.10	0.00	-5.22	-0.63	-2.09	0.13	4.57	-1.19	-1.36	-0.94	0.21	0.12	-0.05	-1.11
CD	-5.85	0.15	1.02	0.00	0.78	0.70	-4.05	-0.25	0.05	0.88	-3.35	-1.58	-0.48	-0.76	0.03	-1.11
mtamH	0.31	-0.93	-3.67	0.00	-0.57	3.99	1.73	1.03	-0.23	-0.76	-2.07	6.02	-0.14	2.64	0.41	0.05
dtamH	0.10	-0.35	-1.14	0.21	0.51	-1.88	-5.96	-0.50	-0.31	-6.22	1.31	1.95	-0.74	-0.98	0.41	0.05
mprof	-3.63	2.72	-1.61	0.21	0.20	0.72	-0.57	-2.39	0.81	-1.40	0.49	0.56	0.26	5.42	-0.06	-0.29
dprof	-0.73	1.16	-2.33	0.24	-0.52	0.75	0.44	-1.12	1.18	3.76	7.77	2.01	-0.19	-5.61	-0.06	-0.29
d_o	-0.02	-0.01	-4.02	1.06	0.29	0.64	-0.65	8.56	0.39	1.44	0.35	-1.46	-0.12	1.40	0.03	-0.28
s_o	-0.71	2.39	-1.52	0.25	0.20	8.51	-0.11	0.23	-1.57	-6.21	1.25	-0.36	-1.08	0.47	-0.04	0.08
bc	0.70	1.55	0.11	-0.18	-11.23	-0.12	-0.17	0.05	-11.59	0.59	0.42	0.76	-9.01	-0.59	-0.20	0.78
tri	-0.07	8.58	0.00	-0.45	-5.88	-0.46	0.00	0.00	-2.17	0.02	0.00	-0.00	-3.52	-0.25	-0.98	0.03
$in\ cent$	15.09	-0.00	0.00	0.53	-0.06	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.15	-0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.79	-0.00	0.06	1.25

TABLE XX. Composition of second component (threshold: $|val| > 0.05$). See subsection IV J for discussion and directions.

-	CPP				LAD				LAU				ELE			
	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.
λ	8.97	7.53	7.71	7.19	8.28	8.07	7.97	10.58	8.45	7.40	6.61	8.45	6.56	6.01	11.01	9.85
Nkw/nt	1.81	1.26	-1.38	0.76	-0.58	-0.52	-0.32	-3.03	0.85	1.13	-1.00	-5.90	-1.77	-1.15	5.75	-0.20
mtsw2_	2.46	1.66	-1.23	3.90	0.17	0.55	-1.23	0.16	0.60	-1.59	0.10	6.54	0.27	0.86	0.19	-1.89
mtsTS	0.42	-0.97	-1.76	2.08	-6.73	1.74	-1.53	-1.63	0.74	-2.66	-1.48	0.68	2.08	-4.13	0.35	0.51
dtsTSkw	1.66	2.31	1.25	0.93	3.90	-5.60	-3.81	0.01	3.03	2.75	-1.19	-0.69	0.71	1.29	1.01	0.72
mtsTSpv	0.71	6.83	1.68	-0.24	2.40	-0.32	-0.64	0.14	3.85	-2.97	1.10	3.45	-2.74	0.70	-1.28	-0.08
dtsTSpv	5.50	-2.29	-2.81	0.93	-3.36	3.78	0.86	-0.23	-2.61	1.40	-2.96	1.31	-1.59	-3.64	-1.06	-1.12
mtmT	-2.90	0.60	-0.74	1.75	5.53	-2.22	-2.11	0.37	-2.22	-2.90	2.63	-2.68	-0.44	2.35	-1.06	-1.12
dtmT	1.64	-0.43	0.52	0.21	0.56	-5.70	0.33	2.14	7.11	-3.32	-1.85	-2.08	-2.93	3.07	0.43	-0.43
dttmT	0.90	-0.20	-2.54	2.69	3.68	3.77	-0.22	-0.18	-3.64	2.06	1.57	0.67	5.92	8.07	-1.52	-1.03
mtsmT	-0.33	-5.56	4.20	1.39	5.68	-4.48	2.97	2.34	3.76	-7.62	0.84	1.13	9.98	2.51	-1.52	-1.03
dtsmT	-1.96	0.77	2.26	-0.26	1.79	0.92	0.06	-0.03	5.00	1.80	-2.45	2.24	1.99	-5.87	0.34	1.25
NN	2.78	0.13	0.15	1.10	-0.60	6.82	-0.07	-0.10	-2.70	4.95	1.05	-1.69	0.46	3.08	0.34	1.25

TABLE XXI. Composition of third component (threshold: $|val| > 0.05$). See subsection IV J for discussion and directions.

-	CPP				LAD				LAU				ELE			
	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.
λ	3.81	4.00	6.75	5.52	4.26	4.03	5.79	6.03	3.55	3.68	5.29	7.14	5.65	5.66	7.78	8.31
ncont	2.30	2.60	-2.75	-2.62	-3.27	-3.23	-3.16	-1.59	-3.55	3.47	-2.74	1.75	-2.87	-3.16	5.14	1.67
dtsw	0.58	-0.12	-0.84	-1.52	0.38	-0.19	0.27	-0.83	-0.06	0.10	0.99	-0.62	-0.04	-0.34	12.71	1.12
WRB	-1.39	1.62	-5.39	0.00	-5.16	4.23	0.15	0.36	0.52	-1.58	1.69	1.24	1.54	-5.08	0.07	0.00
WP	-2.35	1.63	-1.44	0.00	3.75	1.90	-2.32	-0.36	7.41	-5.00	-1.92	-0.65	-2.44	-0.32	-0.62	-0.90
WP$	-4.35	2.81	-4.42	0.00	2.29	-0.54	-1.24	-0.70	-3.39	-5.06	-0.68	0.61	0.54	-2.12	-0.62	1.60
EX	-7.04	8.54	-0.88	0.00	-0.70	1.26	-1.12	-3.15	0.36	-0.35	-0.98	-2.34	-0.44	-0.51	-0.23	-0.69
UH	0.99	-1.17	-7.02	0.00	0.55	-0.90	-0.68	0.27	-0.06	-0.13	1.79	0.37	-0.19	-0.29	0.44	-0.69
FW	-1.35	5.80	1.68	0.00	-0.24	0.45	1.10	-2.52	-0.21	1.46	-0.64	-1.17	-0.06	-0.62	0.44	1.35
mlwss	0.53	1.41	-0.79	0.00	1.00	-0.55	0.48	3.77	-0.93	-0.42	-1.96	6.52	-0.39	0.34	0.02	1.66
dlwss	2.83	0.44	-1.10	0.00	0.01	0.47	2.94	-0.95	-1.30	0.85	2.89	6.23	0.82	1.81	0.42	1.66
dprof	-1.24	1.04	-0.39	-0.81	-0.38	0.56	-0.08	5.71	-0.20	-0.17	-1.31	-0.52	-0.37	-0.03	0.19	0.34
d	0.43	-0.91	-1.59	-0.81	-0.21	0.42	-2.60	-6.63	0.49	0.38	4.88	0.20	1.43	1.49	0.65	0.58
s	0.07	-0.50	-0.46	0.80	0.62	-1.12	2.74	3.75	0.30	-0.07	-6.44	1.16	1.27	-1.08	-0.87	0.23
s_i	-0.34	0.18	-0.54	1.27	-1.05	-0.90	-13.22	1.39	0.40	-1.10	9.86	1.39	0.62	-1.29	-0.86	0.23
bc	-0.17	-0.06	0.03	-0.71	-0.11	-0.14	-1.03	-0.92	0.02	0.28	5.11	-0.56	-2.46	1.63	-0.34	0.46
tri	1.09	0.11	0.00	-0.31	0.11	14.18	-0.00	-0.00	1.23	-0.40	-0.00	0.00	3.12	-1.50	-0.49	-0.24
cv	-0.24	0.24	0.00	-0.25	-2.62	-4.41	0.00	0.00	0.34	-15.74	0.00	0.00	14.09	16.09	-0.36	-0.24
$in\ cent$	0.02	-0.00	0.00	-0.25	14.87	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.34	-0.00	-0.00	0.00	3.57	-0.00	-0.36	-0.51

TABLE XXII. Composition of fourth component (threshold: $|val| > 0.05$). See subsection IV J for discussion and directions.

-	CPP				LAD				LAU				ELE			
	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.	g.	p.	i.	h.
λ	3.48	3.38	4.54	4.16	3.42	3.74	4.60	4.41	2.97	3.14	3.83	5.33	3.32	3.58	5.95	7.29
Nkwnssnsw/Nkw	-6.10	-3.15	0.31	0.94	-2.48	-1.57	-0.20	0.43	1.12	1.63	0.33	1.23	-2.41	-0.97	-1.30	1.91
mtsTS	-4.04	-1.67	-1.79	1.54	-1.90	0.84	-5.02	-0.15	-1.53	-1.19	0.50	0.67	1.56	-0.20	0.89	0.24
dtsTS	-0.97	3.59	-1.47	0.09	5.70	0.45	2.78	0.45	-3.19	6.97	1.40	0.12	-1.89	-1.59	-0.20	0.30
dtsTSkw	0.03	-1.95	0.87	-1.14	-5.87	-2.23	0.06	-2.74	-6.87	-4.49	-0.07	1.36	2.53	-0.85	-0.44	-0.20
dtsTSpv	1.87	-0.41	0.82	3.16	2.28	-5.32	-1.16	1.35	4.05	-4.68	3.13	-0.67	3.68	3.04	-0.58	-0.84
sector	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.48	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.00	-0.00	11.05	1.52

TABLE XXIII. Composition of fifth component (threshold: $|val| > 0.05$). See subsection IV J for discussion and directions.

Appendix C: Histograms of existent and incident words

See subsection IV K, and Figures 2-6 for discussion and directions.

FIG. 2. Size of words that are known in English. Crossing of incident and existential sizes is around 5 (Figure 3 shows a shift to length 6-7 when consider only non stopwords). Words with three letters have maximum incidence, while most words have 7 letters. See subsection IV K for discussion and directions.

FIG. 3. Size of words that are known in English and are not stopwords. Crossing of incident and existential sizes is around 6-7 (figure 2 shows a shift to length 5 when considered stopwords). In this case, words with 4 letters have maximum incidence, while most words still have 7 letters. Exception for ELE, which exhibits maximum incidence of words with 5 letters and most words having 8 letters, which might be associated with ELE network typology discussed in tables III and . See subsection IV K for discussion and directions.

FIG. 4. Size of words that are known, are not stopwords and have synsets. Resembles figure 3. Stopword sizes histogram are in figure 5. Differences suggests ≈ 0.5 might be constant. LAD and LAU exquisite vocabulary (GNU/Linux, programming, sound/signal processing, music) might be responsible for higher difference of distributions. See subsection IV K for discussion and directions. See subsection IV K for discussion and directions.

FIG. 5. Size histogram of stopwords. Stopwords with two letters are the most frequent, while most of them have four letters. Differences in distribution seem stable around ≈ 0.6. See subsection IV K for discussion and directions.

FIG. 6. Size histogram of known English words that are not stopwords and do not return synsets. Differences in distribution suggests less stable behavior, with high incidence of few words high number of existing words with many letters. Observe difference ≥ 1, as observed only with all known words, but even higher. See subsection IV K for discussion and directions.

Appendix D: Online scripts, data and writing

All data can be accessed in the GMANE database, which consists of some tenths of thousands of mailing lists, with constant updates[14]. All scripts used on this article are in http://sourceforge.net/p/labmacambira/fimDoMundo/ci/master/tree/python/toolkitGMANE/. The git repository of this article itself is https://github.com/ttm/artigoTextoNasRedes.git.

[1] gmane.comp.gcc.libstdc++.devel is list ID in GMANE archive.

[2] gmane.linux.audio.devel is list ID in GMANE archive.

[3] gmane.linux.audio.users is list ID in GMANE archive.

[4] gmane.politics.election-methods is list ID in GMANE archive.

[5] Ontologia de participao social. http://tinyurl.com/p2doueu.

[6] *Produto 5 da consultoria PNUD/ONU de Renato Fabbri.* https://github.com/ttm/pnud4/blob/master/latex/produto.pdf?raw=true.

[7] D. C. Antunes, A. A. Zuin, et al. Do bullying ao preconceito: os desafios da barbárie à educação. *Psicologia & Sociedade*, 20(1):33–42, 2008.

[8] S. Bird, E. Klein, and E. Loper. *Natural language processing with Python.* " O'Reilly Media, Inc.", 2009.

[9] R. P. Cavalcante. Influência dos movimentos sociais na formação da agenda política: as jornadas de junho de 2013 no brasil. 2014.

[10] D. Easley and J. Kleinberg. *Networks, crowds, and markets: Reasoning about a highly connected world.* Cambridge University Press, 2010.

[11] R. F. et al. Stability in human interaction networks: primitive typology of vertex, prominance of measures and activity statistics, May 2014. http://sourceforge.net/p/labmacambira/fimDoMundo/ci/master/tree/textos/evolutionSN/paper.pdf?format=raw.

[12] R. Fabbri. Ensaio sobre o auto-aproveitamento: um relato de investidas naturais na participao social. http://arxiv.org/abs/1412.6868.

[13] R. Fabbri. Incidncia de letras na obra de machado de assis, 2012. http://sourceforge.net/p/labmacambira/rcpln/ci/master/tree/pln/trabLetras/resumoLetras.pdf?format=raw.

[14] K. Marek-Spartz, P. Chesley, and H. Sande. Construction of the gmane corpus for examining the diffusion of lexical innovations. 2012.