

---

# EPISTEMIC SUBSTITUTION: HOW GROKIPEDIA'S AI-GENERATED ENCYCLOPEDIA RESTRUCTURES AUTHORITY

---

**Aliakbar Mehdizadeh**

Department of Communication  
University of California, Davis  
amehdizadeh@ucdavis.edu

**Martin Hilbert**

Department of Communication  
University of California, Davis  
hilbert@ucdavis.edu

December 4, 2025

## ABSTRACT

A quarter century ago, Wikipedia's decentralized, crowdsourced, and consensus-driven model replaced the centralized, expert-driven, and authority-based standard for encyclopedic knowledge curation. The emergence of generative AI encyclopedias, such as Grokipedia, possibly presents another potential shift in epistemic evolution. This study investigates whether AI- and human-curated encyclopedias rely on the same foundations of authority. We conducted a multi-scale comparative analysis of the citation networks from 72 matched article pairs, which cite a total of almost 60,000 sources. Using an 8-category epistemic classification, we mapped the "epistemic profiles" of the articles on each platform. Our findings reveal several quantitative and qualitative differences in how knowledge is sourced and encyclopedia claims are epistemologically justified. Grokipedia replaces Wikipedia's heavy reliance on peer-reviewed "Academic & Scholarly" work with a notable increase in "User-generated" and "Civic organization" sources. Comparative network analyses further show that Grokipedia employs very different epistemological profiles when sourcing leisure topics (such as Sports and Entertainment) and more societal sensitive civic topics (such as Politics & Conflicts, Geographical Entities, and General Knowledge & Society). Finally, we find a "scaling-law for AI-generated knowledge sourcing" that shows a linear relationship between article length and citation density, which is distinct from collective human reference sourcing. We conclude that this first implementation of an LLM-based encyclopedia does not merely automate knowledge production but restructures it. Given the notable changes and the important role of encyclopedias, we suggest the continuation and deepening of algorithm audits, such as the one presented here, in order to understand the ongoing epistemological shifts.

**Keywords** Generative AI · Algorithmic Authority · Network Analysis · Large Language Models

## 1 Introduction

In late 2025, the paradigm of digital knowledge curation took a concrete new form with the launch of Grokipedia, an AI-first encyclopedia positioned as a "truth-seeking" alternative to Wikipedia, trained by xAI, the parent company of X (formerly Twitter) [1]. Initial claims from its creators centered on correcting perceived political biases. While being an attention-grabbing framing, such pursuits can easily obscure a more profound, structural transformation in the nature, sources, and limits of knowledge, and how it is justified, in short, an epistemological transformation.

The emergence of these kinds of applications of generative large language models (LLMs) introduces systems that position themselves as an automation of Wikipedia's paradigm [2, 3]. Ironically, the largest single source of the first chat-focused LLM, GPT-3, was Wikipedia itself, contributing some 3 billion tokens, or 3 percent of its entire training mix [3]. Yet, these new models do not merely automate tasks within the human-centric framework; they offer to replace the human-consensus process, generating content and, crucially, selecting sources algorithmically. Of course, how exactly this is done depends on the instructions given to the AI. Here, we look at Grokipedia, the first implementation of

an AI-generated encyclopedia. The initial motivation for building Grokipedia, to correct surface-level political leanings, could overlook fundamental differences between the two systems: one built on human consensus and the other on AI-generated content. When a human community and Grokipedia write about the same topic, do they appeal to the same external sources to establish "truth"? Do these two systems rely on the same foundations of authority to make their claims?

## Theoretical Evolution of Epistemological Shifts

To understand the significance of any potential shift provoked by AI-generated encyclopedias, we must contextualize it theoretically, within the evolution of epistemic regimes. For a good quarter of a century, since 2001, Wikipedia has stood as the dominant model for digitally-native, large-scale knowledge curation [4, 5]. Wikipedia proved that epistemic authority could emerge horizontally and dynamically from distributed consensus rather than descend vertically and statically from a credentialed gatekeeper [6], as epitomized by the preceding dominant Encyclopedia Britannica model [7].

Wikipedia’s success is built on a human-centric model of open collaboration, consensus-building, and a policy framework of verifiability through explicit, external, and easily-accessible (hyperlinked) citations [8, 9]. It has evolved from a novel experiment into a core component of the web’s ‘ground truth,’ creating new standards in terms of the epistemology of knowledge production [6, 10, 11]. While Wikipedia has evolved over time, embracing artificial intelligence itself, with bot edits increasing from some 3 percent in 2006 to more than 16 percent by 2010 [12], with noticeable implications for its functioning [13], the core mechanism remained human-mediated verification.

Classical epistemology assumes identifiable knowers who assert propositions and justify them through reasons or evidence [14]. At the core of Wikipedia’s distributed nature is a testimonial responsibility of a human speaker, transparently made public in the revision history tab, that represents a traceable act with a clear line of responsibility. LLM-based systems, by contrast, generate synthetic testimony, producing claims without a determinate speaker. Here, claims are not derived through intentional assertion, but through probabilistic pattern extraction over vast corpora, shifting epistemic authority from human deliberation to computational inference. In other words, the transition to LLM-based encyclopedias represents a shift to "algorithmic authority" [15]. Platforms are not neutral hosts; they are "epistemic infrastructures" that actively shape what counts as knowledge through technical and policy choices [16]. These platforms create new mechanisms of trust-making [17]. Any algorithmically mediated retrieval mechanism might itself be susceptible to forms of algorithmic bias, such as homophily-induced structural errors or emergent peer-pressure effects between the engaged agents [18, 19].

Hence, this transition raises foundational questions about accountability, justification, and the very possibility of epistemic agency in automated systems [20–22]. In essence, the epistemological perspective poses several challenging questions: Do AIs have speech? Who holds the ultimate authority and responsibility for AIs’ generations? How do pattern-generating AIs justify their claims for truth? In this sense, the shift toward LLM-based encyclopedias is not merely technological; rather, it constitutes a deeper philosophical realignment in how digital societies generate and legitimate knowledge.

Therefore, we suggest to look beyond the textual output, or some kind of derivative, like political leaning, and examine the epistemology of sources that justify provided truth claims. Previous scholarship on the epistemology of Wikipedia has often focused on *epistemic consequences*, assessing the reliability, accuracy, and truth-value of the resulting articles [6]. These studies ask whether the distributed consensus model produces true beliefs. In contrast, we suggest in this study to focus on *epistemic antecedents*. We follow the argument that an encyclopedia article is not just a collection of facts, but a "web of testimony" [23]. The validity of a claim depends on the chain of trust established by its sources. When a human editor cites a source, they perform an act of epistemic deference, signaling that they put their trust in the chosen specific institution (e.g., a news outlet, a scholarly journal, or a government) is trustworthy. By the registered act of citing, they take part of the responsibility, and defer parts of it to the cited source. In AI-generated citations, the original source seems to matter even more, because the citing intermediary is replaced by statistical pattern matching. Therefore, we are not focusing on the between the *consequences* of the text (e.g. accuracy, political leaning, etc) and the *profile* of its justification, which makes the epistemological claim for truth.

We define the "Epistemic Profile" of an encyclopedia article not merely as a bibliography, but as the structural composition of its testimonial network. As a practical implementation, we approximate this theoretical goal by mapping which institutions (e.g., Academic, Governmental, Corporate) an encyclopedia grants the authority to speak, as reflected in cited sources.

## Literature Review

*To what extent do AI- and human-curated encyclopedias differ in this structure of truth-justifying authority?* The answer carries significant societal implications. Divergence in epistemic profiles impacts public trust, pitching human against algorithmic processes; it redefines bias, navigating between culturally influenced media ecosystems and concentrated sets of institutional sources; and it holds the potential to fragment public knowledge, creating parallel "truths" built on fundamentally different evidence.

Methodologically, our work is situated within the broader context of algorithm audits [24, 25] and evidence-based generation and citation evaluation [26, 27]. Recent frameworks such as VeriCite [28] and CiteEval [29] have established rigorous metrics for determining whether AI-generated citations textually support the claims they accompany. These studies largely focus on the problem of hallucination and grounding to verify claim-citation consistency. Similarly, the MIRAGE benchmark [30] decomposes claim-level information to assess multimodal grounding.

However, a citation can be *correctly grounded yet epistemically distinct*. A medical claim supported by a peer-reviewed meta-analysis has a different epistemic weight than the same claim supported by a government press release, even if both citations accurately reflect the text. Initial research into Grokipedia has focused on textual similarity. Yasseri [31] conducted a large-scale computational comparison and found that Grokipedia exhibits strong 'semantic and stylistic alignment' with Wikipedia, concluding it 'largely repackages existing human-curated content.'

While this textual analysis provides a crucial foundation, it does not address the underlying structure of authority. We thus move beyond textual similarity to ask: what is the "epistemic profile" that informs each encyclopedia? We do this by scraping and analyzing a large corpus of articles, treating their citation networks as a proxy for their underlying structures of authority [32, 33]. These perspectives could shed light on any possible epistemic substitution that is not merely a shift in content but a restructuring of the infrastructural mechanisms through which authority is produced. To systematically investigate these disparities, we address three core research questions aimed at differences between human- and AI-generated encyclopedias:

### Research Questions regarding the differences between Wikipedia and Grokipedia

**RQ1:** Is there a quantitative difference in the *citation density*?

**RQ2:** Is there a qualitative difference in the *institutional nature* of referenced sources?

**RQ3:** Is there a difference in how diverse *article topics* are epistemologically sourced?

## 2 Methodology

Our comparative analysis was conducted in three phases: (1) data collection via web scraping, (2) automated source classification using a validated LLM classifier, and (3) network construction and analysis.

### Data Collection

To establish a baseline of high-interest and contentious topics, we compiled a list of the 100 most-revised articles on English Wikipedia. Corresponding articles were harvested from both Wikipedia and Grokipedia to create a comparative dataset. A detailed technical description of the scraping architecture and parsing methodology is provided in Appendix C. The initial corpus was filtered to exclude topics where a counterpart page was unavailable on either platform or where the content primarily served as a list representation (e.g., *Deaths in 2021*, *List of...*). This filtration process yielded a final parallel corpus of 72 matched article pairs, see Appendix A.1. This design intentionally prioritizes high-attention topics and therefore does not represent a random sample of Wikipedia or general knowledge. All claims about 'typical' encyclopedic sourcing should therefore be interpreted as conditional on this high-revision, high-attention subset.

Table 1 summarizes the descriptive statistics for the corpus. It is important to note that word counts were derived from the raw extracted text; while sufficient for establishing relative scale and correlation, they did not undergo rigorous preprocessing to remove non-lexical artifacts (e.g., tables, markup, or formatting syntax). Consequently, absolute word count values should be interpreted as approximate indicators of article length rather than precise counts. Despite this limitation, a clear structural distinction emerges. While Grokipedia produces articles that are, on average, longer than their Wikipedia counterparts, they exhibit lower citation per article and, therefore, also notably lower citation density. This confirms the similar finding from Yasseri [31]. It is also noteworthy that the standard deviation of the citation density per 1k words is much lower for Grokipedia (6.2) than for Wikipedia (38.3).

Table 1: Descriptive statistics for the article corpus (N=72 matched pairs). Values represent Mean (Standard Deviation).

Metric	Wikipedia	Grokikipedia
<b>Per-Article Statistics (N=72)</b>		
Mean Word Count	11,439.0 (3,447.8)	14,240.7 (5,044.3)
Mean Citation Count	493.4 (207.9)	320.7 (129.4)
Mean Citation Density in citations per 1k words	47.8 (38.3)	22.4 (6.2)

The relationship between article length and citation volume is illustrated in Figure 1. To characterize the scaling behavior of citation volume, we compared linear and quadratic regression models using backward elimination ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ). For Grokikipedia, the relationship is robustly linear. The quadratic term was not statistically significant ( $p = 0.071$ ), and the final linear model explains the majority of the variance (Adjusted  $R^2 = 0.66$ ). Citations scale with article length at a highly consistent rate,  $\beta = 0.021$  ( $p < 0.001$ ), which implies that some 20 additional sources are added per 1,000 additional words in article length. In contrast, Wikipedia exhibits a much more variable relationship. Visual inspection suggests potential source-citation saturation beyond an article length of 15,000 words. The quadratic term did not reach statistical significance ( $p = 0.100$ ). However, the goodness-of-fit of the linear model for Wikipedia is substantially lower (Adjusted  $R^2 = 0.36$ ) compared to Grokikipedia. Although the nominal accumulation rate is higher ( $\beta = 0.037$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), confirming more citation density with increasing article length, the high variance reflects the heterogeneous nature of human editing. Summing up, we could resort to commonly accepted AI-lingo and suggest that Grokikipedia follows a predictable "scaling law" where reference density is maintained regardless of article length, while Wikipedia articles show wide disparities in citation density and a saturation level beyond article lengths of 15,000 - 20,000 words.

In Appendix D, we reconfirmed this scaling law with an extended dataset of "a centralized watchlist of English Wikipedia's most important articles" [34], the roughly 1,000 most important topics the Wikipedia community thinks every reasonably complete encyclopedia should cover. We also compared the articles with the most- and least citations from each platform, showing, for example, that Wikipedia sees a need to use many sources to justify truth claims about people, while Grokikipedia clearly does not feel such a necessity (see Figure D.2 and TABLE D.2).




Figure 1: **Citation Volume vs. Article Length.** Scatter plot comparison of Total Citations against Word Count. Stepwise regression selected linear models for both platforms (quadratic terms  $p > 0.05$ ). However, Grokikipedia shows a strong predictive fit (Adj.  $R^2 = 0.66$ ) while Wikipedia shows high variance (Adj.  $R^2 = 0.36$ ).



## 2.1 Epistemic Classification of Citations

To analyze the epistemic foundations of all of the cited references, we developed and applied a systematic content coding scheme based on the "Citation Content Coding Manual" (see Appendix B). This methodology classifies sources based on their institutional function. The objective is to assign each unique citation to exactly one of eight mutually exclusive categories (see Table2).

Category	Definition & Scope
<b>1. Academic &amp; Scholarly</b>	Works of peer-reviewed, original research and scholarly communication (e.g., journal articles, conference papers, academic books).
<b>2. Government &amp; Official</b>	Official information, data, services, or legal documents produced by government bodies (e.g., census data, legislation, court records).
<b>3. News &amp; Journalism</b>	Original, factual reporting of current events adhering to professional journalistic standards.
<b>4. NGO &amp; Think Tank</b>	Mission-driven research, policy papers, and advocacy reports from non-profit organizations and civil society groups.
<b>5. Corporate &amp; Commercial</b>	Publications from for-profit corporations regarding their business (e.g., press releases, annual reports, white papers).
<b>6. Opinion &amp; Advocacy</b>	Persuasive commentary, editorials, and advocacy journalism intended to promote a specific ideological perspective.
<b>7. Reference &amp; Tertiary</b>	Works that organize and index information about general topics, such as encyclopedias and dictionaries (subject to the <i>Look-Through Principle</i> ).
<b>8. User-Generated (UGC)</b>	Informal content from private individuals in a non-institutional capacity (e.g., tweets, forum comments, personal blogs).

Table 2: **Epistemic Classification Scheme.** The eight mutually exclusive categories used to map the sourcing fabrics of Wikipedia and Grokipedia.

We undertook much testing of ambiguous classification cases and found two main challenges. The first one refers to different ways of classifying a source’s host (e.g., YouTube would be category ‘User-Generated’) and its content (e.g., a CNN video news report would be category ‘News & Journalism’). The second one refers to the very common practice (especially on Wikipedia) to link to other Wikipedia pages about the cited source (maybe the best example being the curated citations of the Wikipedia article on *Adolf Hitler*). In both cases, our coding manual specifies that the more specific classification of the nature of the source overrules the more general classification of the publishing outlet. This is inscribed in the two methodological axioms, defined below:

### Methodological Axioms: The "Golden Rules"

#### The Specific Work Principle

The classification of the *specific cited work* overrules the general classification of its parent domain.

*Example:* An op-ed published on *nytimes.com* is classified as *Opinion & Advocacy*, even though the domain is broadly *News & Journalism*.

#### The Look-Through Principle

Critical for tertiary sources. If a citation points to a summary (e.g., a Wikipedia page) about a specific underlying work (e.g., a book), it is classified as that underlying work.

*Example:* A citation to the Wikipedia page for John Rawls’ *A Theory of Justice* is classified as *Academic & Scholarly*, whereas a citation to the page for "Justice" is classified as *Reference*.

## Automated Classification & Validation

To assess the reliability of our large-scale automated citation classification, we conducted a focused validation study using a stratified sample of 192 citations (balanced across Wikipedia and Grokipedia and balanced across the eight citation categories). For this evaluation, we treated Gemini Pro 3 as the reference classifier and compared its outputs to Gemini Flash 2.5, which was used for the full-scale corpus annotation. The two models demonstrated a high degree of consistency: overall accuracy was 80.73%, and Cohen’s  $\kappa = 0.78$ , indicating an acceptable agreement.

Table 3 reports the per-category precision, recall, and F1-scores across all categories. These results provide evidence that the large-scale classifications produced by Gemini Flash 2.5 are reliable when benchmarked against a more capable reasoning model. To further validate the automated labels, we manually classified a random sample of 100 citations, achieving a human-model agreement of 81% with the primary classifier (Gemini Flash 2.5) and 91% agreement with the reference model (Gemini Pro 3).

Table 3: Classification performance of Gemini Flash 2.5 benchmarked against Gemini Pro 3 (reference labels).

Category	Precision	Recall	F1-score
Academic & Scholarly	0.96	0.88	0.92
Government & Official	0.96	0.96	0.96
NGO, Civil Society & Think Tank	0.96	0.62	0.75
News & Journalism	0.88	0.81	0.84
Opinion & Advocacy	0.58	0.88	0.70
Corporate & Commercial	0.67	0.89	0.76
Reference & Tertiary Source	0.79	0.76	0.78
User-Generated Content (UGC)	0.67	0.80	0.73

## 2.2 Corpus Topic Classification

Additionally to the automated classification of the sources, we manually classified all 72 articles in the corpus into different topic categories. It is important to note that our choice to work with the most revised articles does not lead to a balanced sample of general knowledge. To avoid unnecessary fragmentation, we developed a six-category classification scheme that specifically reflects the corpus’s empirical composition and enables domain-sensitive analysis:

Topic Category	N	Representative Examples
Sports & Athletics	17	<i>Lionel Messi, Manchester United F.C., WWE</i>
Geographic Entities	16	<i>United States, China, London, New York City</i>
Politics & Conflict	15	<i>George Washington, European Union, Syrian Civil War</i>
Gen. Knowledge & Society	11	<i>Christianity, Climate change, COVID-19 pandemic</i>
Music & Musicians	9	<i>Michael Jackson, The Beatles, Beyoncé</i>
Media & Entertainment	4	<i>Doctor Who, PlayStation 3, Vijay (actor)</i>

Table 4: **Corpus Composition.** We developed a six-category scheme to classify the  $N = 72$  articles. The dataset reflects an empirical skew toward popular culture and geography.

## 3 Results

Our analysis was conducted in five stages to build a comprehensive, multi-scale comparison of the epistemic foundations of Wikipedia and Grokipedia. We began with a high-level aggregate comparison and progressively narrowed our focus to the per-article and network-level structures.

### 3.1 Overall Epistemic Profile

As the first step in our analysis, we compared the epistemic "profile" of the corpus. We distinguish between the *global composition* of the dataset (Table 5) and the *mean sourcing behavior* of the average article. Figure 2 visualizes the sourcing profile per article. The left panel (Figure 2a) displays the mean percentage with 95% confidence intervals, highlighting the variance in sourcing nature, while the right panel (Figure 2b) offers a stacked representation of the average epistemic profile.

This comparison reveals a fundamental divergence in the substrate of authority used by each platform. Wikipedia is anchored by a dual foundation of "News & Journalism" and "Academic & Scholarly" sources. Together, these two

categories account for approximately 64.7% of the global corpus (Table 5). The article-level view (Fig 2a) confirms this consistency, with academic and news sources forming the distinct upper tier of the hierarchy. In Grokipedia, the reliance on "News & Journalism" remains robust, merely being reduced by 20 percent. However, the "Academic" pillar drops significantly, experiencing a 3-fold reduction (see Table 5). Grokipedia substitutes scholarly sources with an increase in citations to *Corporate & Commercial*, *Reference & Tertiary*, *Government & Official*, *Opinion & Advocacy*, –all increasing by almost 50 percent of their Wikipedia share– and especially *NGOs/Think Tanks* (whose share increases by 3x), and *User-Generated Content (UGC)* sources (whose share increases by 4x) (see Table 5).




Figure 2: **Epistemic Profile Analysis (Article-Level)**. Both panels represent the mean sourcing behavior calculated per article ( $N_{Wiki} = 72$ ,  $N_{Grok} = 72$ ), distinct from the global corpus aggregates in Table 5. **(a)** Distribution of citation categories with 95% confidence intervals, highlighting variance across articles. **(b)** The same data visualized as a stacked mean composition, illustrating the average reliance on different epistemic categories.

Table 5: **Global Epistemic Profile**: Aggregate citation counts and corpus-level percentage distribution for Wikipedia and Grokipedia. These values represent the total composition of the dataset ( $N_{Wiki} = 35,525$ ,  $N_{Grok} = 23,092$ ) rather than the per-article average.

Category	Wikipedia		Grokipedia	
	Count	Percent (%)	Count	Percent (%)
Academic & Scholarly	11,305	31.82	2,021	8.75
Corporate & Commercial	2,471	6.96	2,313	10.02
Government & Official	3,517	9.90	3,455	14.96
NGO, Civil Society & Think Tank	1,554	4.37	3,493	15.13
News & Journalism	11,697	32.93	6,569	28.45
Opinion & Advocacy	1,947	5.48	1,597	6.92
Reference & Tertiary Source	2,720	7.66	2,367	10.25
User-Generated Content (UGC)	314	0.88	1,277	5.53
<b>Total</b>	<b>35,525</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>23,092</b>	<b>100.0</b>

### 3.2 Topic-Based Comparison

To investigate whether sourcing patterns are topic-dependent, we segmented the 72 articles into six distinct thematic clusters. Figure 3 presents the "epistemic profile" for each topic as a 100% stacked bar chart. This visualization allows us to contrast how each platform adjusts its sourcing profile to the subject matter.

It turns out that Wikipedia does not only demonstrate a more flexible citation count (see Figure 1), but also high epistemic flexibility when it comes to different topics (see Figure 3). It alters its sourcing hierarchy based on the nature

of the topic. For "Politics & Conflict" and "General Knowledge & Society," Wikipedia relies heavily on *Academic & Scholarly* sources. Conversely, for "Sports & Athletics" and "Media & Entertainment," the academic band shrinks, and the platform pivots appropriately to *News & Journalism*, which dominates the citations. In contrast, Grokikipedia (Figure 3) exhibits a fundamental restructuring of authority in high-stakes domains. While it mirrors Wikipedia's news-heavy approach for entertainment topics, the "Academic & Scholarly" band is critically depleted, especially in "Politics & Conflict," where Grokikipedia substitutes this with a massive influx of *Government & Official* sources and *NGO/Think Tank* reports.





Figure 3: **Epistemic profile by topic.** Normalized citation distribution across six thematic clusters. **(Left)** Wikipedia exhibits "contextuality," expanding the *Academic* band for Politics and Society while shifting to *News* for Sports. **(Right)** Grokikipedia shows "academic avoidance" in complex topics, replacing it with a "Bureaucratic Triad" of *Government*, *NGO*, and *Corporate* sources.

### 3.2.1 Topic-Based Divergence and Diversity


To quantify the topic-dependent profile distributions, we performed a Kruskal-Wallis H-test [35]. We selected this non-parametric test due to the non-normal distribution of divergence scores and varying sample sizes across topics. The analysis revealed a statistically significant difference in divergence across the six topics ( $H = 23.57, p < 0.001$ ), as they are shown in Figure 3. This indicates that the "epistemic sourcing distance" between Grokikipedia and Wikipedia is not constant but is modulated by the subject matter.

We quantified these differences further using Jensen-Shannon Divergence (JSD), visualized in Figure 4a. JSD quantifies how distinguishable two distributions are by measuring how much each diverges from their midpoint (the average of the two distributions, bin by bin), yielding a value between 0 (identical) and 1 (non-overlapping). The topics of *Politics & Conflict* and *General Knowledge & Society* exhibit the highest median divergence. This suggests that for these two rather complex and socially significant topics, the two platforms rely on fundamentally different substrates of truth sourcing. Conversely, *Media & Entertainment* shows the lowest divergence, indicating that both platforms converge on more similar sourcing strategies. It is interesting to notice that the profiles of *Music & Musicians* are more aligned with the distinct topics, as it is rather as divergent as *Politics & Conflict* and not as similar as *Media & Entertainment*, which might suggest that music is rather seen as a cultural and societal issue, not an entertainment issue, like sports.

Figure 4b visualizes the simple Shannon entropy, which is often used as a measure of diversity in population-level evolutionary biology [36, 37]. The higher the entropy, the higher the uniformity of the underlying distribution. Grokikipedia exhibits higher epistemic entropy ('uniformity') than Wikipedia indicating a tendency to mix multiple source types within every article. The diversity among source categories is higher for Grokikipedia in each of the six topics (even if the difference is much larger for some than for others). To quantify this, we calculated Cohen's  $d$  effect sizes for the difference in Shannon Entropy (see Appendix E). The analysis confirms a bifurcation in sourcing logic. Forsociopolitical topics, the divergence is profound: "Politics & Conflict" ( $d = 1.24$ ), "Geographic Entities" ( $d = 1.27$ ), and "General Knowledge & Society" ( $d = 1.09$ ) all exhibit large effect sizes. Conversely, in topics such as "Sports & Athletics" ( $d = 0.37$ ) and "Media & Entertainment" ( $d = 0.39$ ) show small effect sizes with confidence intervals crossing or nearing zero, with *Music & Musicians* taking an intermediate position ( $d = 0.82$ ). This suggests that Grokikipedia's epistemic profile composition diverges most starkly from Wikipedia's when it comes to topics of socio-political relevance, while it is more similar when it comes to entertainment, with cultural topics, like music, experiencing mid-level adjustment.



(a) Epistemic Divergence (JSD)



(b) Epistemic Diversity (Entropy)

Figure 4: **Topic-Based Epistemic Metrics.** (a) Jensen-Shannon Divergence scores sorted by median. (b) Shannon Entropy of citation categories.

### 3.2.2 Article-by-Article Sourcing Divergence

To quantify the epistemic drift for each specific article, we performed a direct vector-based comparison. For each of the 72 articles, we constructed an 8-element “epistemic profile” vector representing the probability distribution of its citations (e.g., [%Academic, %News, ...]). We then calculated the distance between the Wikipedia and Grokipedia vectors using two complementary metrics. As our primary metric, we continue using the Jensen-Shannon Divergence (JSD), which captures the *informational cost* of substituting one sourcing distribution for another. We also report Cosine Similarity to measure the linear alignment between the two vectors. While JSD emphasizes differences in the shape of the probability distributions, highlighting how one distribution diverges from another in terms of information content, Cosine Similarity focuses on the overall directional alignment of the vectors regardless of magnitude. Using both metrics is useful because they complement each other: JSD captures distributional divergence, whereas Cosine Similarity captures proportional similarity, allowing us to detect both nuanced shifts in sourcing proportions and broader directional trends. The results, summarized in Figure 6, reveal a striking bimodality in the sourcing behavior.

As seen in the Cosine distribution, the mode is clustered heavily near 1.0. This indicates that for a significant subset of articles, primarily in *Sports & Entertainment*, Grokipedia effectively mirrors Wikipedia’s sourcing profile. In these instances, the agent acts as a faithful replicator, retaining the proportional weight of news and official sources (sometimes expanding on the length of the article). One illustrative example is shown in Figure 5, which shows a direct copy from the Grokipedia agent of the Wikipedia article, admittedly so. While this end of the distribution confirms the finding that “Grokipedia exhibits strong semantic and stylistic alignment with Wikipedia” [31], on the other end of the distribution we find that the sourcing profile distributions display a “long tail” of divergence.




Figure 5: Comparison of Wikipedia and Grokipedia articles on Cristiano Ronaldo.

The JSD distribution is right-skewed, populated by articles where the sourcing profile has been fundamentally reconstructed. This tail corresponds strictly to political biography and high-stakes social topics. As shown in Table 6, the most dissimilar articles are overwhelmingly concentrated in the *Politics & Conflict* and *General Knowledge* categories. In contrast, the most similar articles are predominantly from *Sports* and *Media*. This pattern highlights that for entertainment and sports-related content, both platforms converge almost perfectly in their sourcing distribution. Overall, Table 6 demonstrates that high-stakes, politically sensitive topics exhibit the largest divergence, whereas lower-stakes or popular culture topics show minimal divergence, suggesting that epistemic drift is topic-dependent.




Figure 6: **Per-Article Divergence Between Wikipedia and Grokipedia.** The figure shows the distribution of divergence metrics across 72 articles. **Left:** Cosine Similarity, indicating linear alignment between citation distributions. **Right:** Jensen-Shannon Divergence, capturing the informational difference between sourcing profiles. Dashed lines indicate the mean value for each metric.

Most Dissimilar				Most Similar			
PageTitle	Topic	JSD	CosSim	PageTitle	Topic	JSD	CosSim
George Washington	Pol. & Conflict	0.44	0.15	John Cena	Sports	0.00	1.00
Ulysses S. Grant	Pol. & Conflict	0.42	0.19	Doctor Who	Media	0.00	1.00
Joseph Stalin	Pol. & Conflict	0.35	0.61	PlayStation 3	Media	0.00	1.00
Adolf Hitler	Pol. & Conflict	0.33	0.37	Wii	Media	0.01	1.00
Jesus	Gen. Knowledge	0.32	0.41	Roger Federer	Sports	0.01	1.00
Jehovah's Witnesses	Gen. Knowledge	0.31	0.25	Lionel Messi	Sports	0.01	0.99
Ronald Reagan	Pol. & Conflict	0.29	0.33	The Undertaker	Sports	0.01	0.98
World War II	Pol. & Conflict	0.25	0.39	WWE Raw	Sports	0.01	1.00

Table 6: Top 8 Most Dissimilar and Most Similar Articles Between Wikipedia and Grokipedia. Metrics shown are Jensen-Shannon Divergence and Cosine Similarity.

### 3.3 The Core Epistemic Network

To isolate the "epistemic backbone" of each platform, we constructed filtered co-occurrence networks (Figure 7). The weight of each edge corresponds to the number of articles in which the two categories co-occur. Rather than visualizing every instance where two sources appear together, we calculated the global mean co-occurrence weight for the entire corpus. We then dichotomized the graph to retain only edges with a weight *strictly greater than the mean*. This high-pass filtering highlights the category pairs that appear together most frequently across the corpus.

The structural difference between the two backbones is profound. *Wikipedia* maintains a heterogeneous core. Its central backbone axis connects *News*, *Reference*, and *Opinion* with institutional pillars like *Government* and *Academic* sources. In the case of *Grokipedia*, the *Academic* node disappears, indicating that scholarly sources rarely co-occur with other categories frequently enough to clear the mean threshold, and, in its place, a new node emerges that was absent in *Wikipedia*'s core: *User-Generated Content (UGC)*. To provide a complementary perspective on the core networks while controlling for citation volume, we also conducted a sensitivity analysis using cosine-similarity normalization (see Appendix E).




Figure 7: **Core Epistemic Networks (Edges > Mean Weight)**. Nodes that became isolated were removed from the visualization. Node size indicates each category’s total co-occurrence with all other categories in the filtered network. Dark red (thicker) lines indicate the strongest connections. The global mean edge weight for Wikipedia is 62.79 and for Grokipedia is 65.04. (a) Wikipedia’s core. (b) Grokipedia’s core.

### 3.4 Analysis 5: Article-Article Homophily Network

To visualize the "epistemic kinship" between articles, we constructed article homophily networks. These graphs reveal emergent clusters, showing whether pages that share a topic also share a sourcing strategy. The analysis proceeded in two stages: First, each of the 72 articles was converted into an 8-element "epistemic profile" vector. Second, we calculated the cosine similarity between every pair of article vectors. An edge was drawn between two articles only if their sourcing profiles had a similarity *strictly greater than 0.75*. We acknowledge that the practice of dichotomizing continuous measures (such as cosine similarity) into binary edges is frequently criticized for discarding information and introducing arbitrary artifacts [38, 39]. A single threshold risks generating topological features that are stochastic rather than structural. To mitigate this risk and ensure our observations are not artifacts of the specific 0.75 cutoff, we employed this threshold primarily for visualization purposes (Figure 8), while validating the structural conclusions through a sensitivity analysis across a range of thresholds that discussed below.

The resulting networks (Figure 8) are visualized using a force-directed layout where nodes are colored by topic and sized by degree centrality.

The topology reveals a fundamental divergence in how the two models organize knowledge. Wikipedia (Figure 8) resembles a *continuous semantic spectrum*. The network forms an elongated chain where *Geographic Entities* act as a central bridge, linking cultural domains like *Sports* and *Music* to domains like *Politics*. This suggests a transitive sourcing logic. In contrast, Grokipedia exhibits a *polarized, "dumbbell" topology*. The network is bifurcated into two disconnected epistemologies. The "Pop Culture" Cluster: A distinct island composed almost exclusively of *Sports*, *Media & Entertainment*, and *Music*. The "Officialdom" Cluster: A dense, undifferentiated mass where *Politics*, *Geographic Entities*, and *General Knowledge* are collapsed together.

To ensure that these topological features are not artifacts of the specific similarity threshold (0.75), we conducted a robustness check by calculating the Assortativity Coefficient ( $r$ ) across a range of thresholds (see Appendix E). The analysis confirms that this structural polarization is stable. As shown in Table E.2 (Appendix), Grokipedia consistently exhibits higher assortativity than Wikipedia. At the standard threshold, Grokipedia’s assortativity ( $r = 0.178$ ) is nearly double that of Wikipedia ( $r = 0.097$ ). This higher score in Grokipedia does not reflect better internal organization, but rather *macro-segregation*: the AI agent effectively maintains two separate sourcing distinct sourcing "modes", one for entertainment and one for serious subjects, with almost no epistemic crossover between them.






Figure 8: **Article Homophily Networks (Similarity > 0.75)**. Nodes are colored by topic. (a) Wikipedia displays a transitive chain structure. (b) Grokipedia displays a polarized "dumbbell" structure.

### Quantifying Epistemic Boundaries

To quantify how strictly these topics are segregated, we analyzed the *Mixing Matrices* (Figure 9). These heatmaps visualize the probability that an article of a given topic (rows) shares significant sourcing with another topic (columns). The Grokipedia matrix reveals a notable *block-diagonal structure*, confirming the existence of two mutually exclusive epistemologies. The matrix is divided into two distinct blocks with virtually zero crossover: The Cultural Block: *Sports*, *Music*, and *Media & Entertainment* connect heavily with each other but have effectively zero connection to the other domain. The Bureaucratic Block: *Politics*, *Geography*, and *General Knowledge* are so deeply conflated that topic distinctiveness is lost. In contrast, Wikipedia (Figure 9a) exhibits *semantic cross-pollination* when it comes to sourcing profiles. The probabilities are distributed more evenly across the matrix, reflecting a more organic, and less strictly divided logic when looking for knowledge sources to inform an encyclopedia article.

## 4 Conclusion

This study provides empirical evidence that the transition from human-curated to AI-generated encyclopedias, in the form of Grokipedia, entails a profound “Epistemic Substitution”. By mapping the citation networks of Wikipedia and Grokipedia, we identified a structural shift in the sources of authority that underpin public knowledge. We identified three main characteristics of this shift:

The most notable signature is that Wikipedia’s truth-justifying process, which is mediated by visible, deliberative human consensus, draws much more heavily on *Academic & Scholarly* work. Since these sources are, in most cases, already peer-reviewed, this seems to suggest that human deliberation (at least when hard-pressed by the highly controversial articles we chose for our sample) ends up selecting sources that have already undergone human vetting in a previous process. On the contrary, our audit reveals that Grokipedia’s algorithmic selection focuses much more heavily on *User-Generated Content* and on knowledge claims made by *NGO*, *Civil Society & Think Tanks*, which usually have not undergone any kind of internal peer-review before publication. This shows that the answer to our RQ2 is that the institutional nature of referenced sources, in the case of Grokipedia, migrates from peer-reviewed academic sources to user-generated and civic organizations. Of course, it is important to remember that this does not necessarily and automatically generalize to any kind of AI-generated encyclopedia, as other LLMs can easily be prompted to re-prioritize.

Second, answering our RQ3 about the topic-sensitivity of the epistemological profiles, our comparative and network analyses reveal deeper structural differences. Grokipedia’s sourcing profile co-occurrence network shows a stark






Figure 9: **Topic Mixing Matrices.** Heatmaps display the row-normalized mixing matrix, representing the conditional probability that an article of a given topic connects to a target topic based on sourcing similarity ( $> 0.75$ ). **(a) Wikipedia** shows distributed connectivity with significant off-diagonal density (lower assortativity). **(b) Grokipedia** shows rigid segregation with strong diagonal density (higher assortativity), indicating articles primarily source-match with their own domain.

distinction between the way knowledge is sourced for leisure and recreation topics (such as *Sports*, *Entertainment*, and *Music*), on the one hand, and civic and sociopolitical topics on the other hand (such as *Politics & Conflict*, *Geographic Entities*, and *General Knowledge & Society*). Wikipedia’s case also shows similar sourcing profiles for leisure and recreation topics (such as *Sports*, *Entertainment*, and *Music*), but the knowledge justification for civic and sociopolitical topics is more heterogeneous and transitive, maintaining connections across journalistic, academic, governmental, and reference sources. These findings suggest that Grokipedia’s algorithm advertently or inadvertently cultivates parallel knowledge regimes for leisure and civic topics. From the perspective of our algorithm audit, we cannot know if Grokipedia has been trained for this or if this is an emergent property of its behavior, but independent from the causal factor, the resulting behavior shows a clear pattern.

Finally, returning to our RQ1 on the density of knowledge sources, we find a clear advantage for artificially produced knowledge sourcing. While collective biological knowledge sourcing seems to hit a clear saturation level when growing toward an article length of around 15,000 words, Grokipedia shows a linear scaling-law with article length. For each additional 1,000 words of an encyclopedia article length, some 20 citations are added.

Ultimately, as generative AI increasingly serves as the default interface for knowledge sourcing by automating the generation of informational patterns, per definition, understanding the characteristics of the emergent epistemic profiles is critical for navigating a future where human and algorithmic realities may fundamentally diverge. Because generative AI is based on machine learning, and since socially embedded neural networks are, per definition, black boxes [40] [41], the most straightforward way to understand them consists in the same way we study other blackbox systems: through external behavioral audits [24] [42] [43]. Similar to how we audit human behavior in psychology and collective behavior in social science studies, and how public authorities audit chicken farms for salmonella and secrete pharmacy recipes for harms, despite the fact that all of them are opaque and impenetrable blackboxes, any kind of algorithmic blackbox system can be audited [44] [25]. In this first, incipient audit of the world’s first AI-generated encyclopedia, we have shown that such algorithm auditing efforts are useful, as they can easily reveal what initially seem to be opaque structures.

## 5 Limitations and Future Work

Several limitations of this study invite further investigation. First, the main analytical corpus of this initial analysis is restricted to 72 high-revision, high-attention Wikipedia articles. While this design captures topics with the highest public and editorial salience, it does not represent the full distribution of encyclopedic content. The epistemic differences reported here should therefore be interpreted as conditional on this subset rather than as universal properties of all

Wikipedia or Grokipedia articles. It is important that follow-up studies expand the sample with the goal to generalize the findings.

Second, Grokipedia is a rapidly evolving platform built atop proprietary LLM architectures. Its retrieval, synthesis, and citation-generation mechanisms may change over time, limiting the temporal generalizability of the results. Similar to how food security cannot be ensured with a single FDA audit, the auditing of algorithmic authority needs to be an ongoing process [44]. Future analyses should track longitudinal updates to determine whether epistemic substitution is stable, transient, or mitigated as the system matures.

Third, despite extensive validation, citation classification relies partly on automated LLM annotation. Although human–model agreement was high, certain borderline cases (e.g., NGO vs. Corporate, journalistic vs. advocacy content) may introduce noise into category-level comparisons.

Fourth, the study focuses on citation structure rather than citation correctness or claim-level grounding. An article may employ structurally different sources while still producing factually consistent text. Integrating epistemic structure with grounding frameworks (e.g., VeriCite, CiteEval) would provide a more comprehensive picture of epistemic reliability.

Future work can extend this research in several directions. A broader corpus across additional languages and topic domains would allow analysis of cross-cultural epistemic substitution. Longitudinal monitoring may reveal whether algorithmic sourcing converges toward or diverges further from human-consensus norms. Multi-agent simulations could test whether homophily, peer-pressure dynamics, or other emergent mechanisms contribute to structural biases in algorithmic citation logic. Finally, qualitative audits of high-divergence articles may help identify the normative and political implications of algorithmically curated knowledge, particularly in domains where public trust and institutional legitimacy are at stake.

**Supplementary Information:** Supplementary material relevant to this study is provided in the appendix.

**Conflict of Interest:** The authors declare no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have influenced the work reported in this paper.

**Data Availability:** Datasets are available by contacting the authors.

**Code Availability:** Code used for network generation and analysis is available from the authors upon request.

**Author Contributions:** AM conceptualized the study and methodology, collected the data, carried out the formal analysis, and wrote the article. MH advised, developed the LLM content classifiers, reviewed, and edited the manuscript.

## References

- [1] Grokipedia Team. Grokipedia: Ai-first encyclopedia launches as "truth-seeking" alternative to wikipedia, 2025. <https://www.grokipedia.com>.
- [2] Rishi Bommasani, Drew A Hudson, Ehsan Adeli, Russ Altman, Simran Arora, Sydney von Arx, Michael S Bernstein, Jeannette Bohg, Antoine Bosselut, Emma Brunskill, et al. On the opportunities and risks of foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07258*, 2021.
- [3] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Nee-lakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- [4] Joseph M. Reagle. *Good Faith Collaboration: The Culture of Wikipedia*. MIT Press, 2010.
- [5] Mostafa Mesgari, Chitu Okoli, Mohamadali Mehdi, Finn Arup Nielsen, and Anders Lanamäki. Wikipedia is more biased than we think: A quantitative analysis of wikipedia coverage of controversial topics. *PloS one*, 10(10):e0139845, 2015.
- [6] Don Fallis. Toward an epistemology of wikipedia. *Journal of the American Society for Information science and Technology*, 59(10):1662–1674, 2008.
- [7] Jim Giles. Special report internet encyclopaedias go head to head. *nature*, 438(15):900–901, 2005.
- [8] Brendan Luyt. The wikipedia debate: New directions in research. *Information Research*, 15(4), 2010.
- [9] Robert A Cropf. Benkler, y.(2006). the wealth of networks: How social production transforms markets and freedom. new haven and london: Yale university press. 528 pp. *Social Science Computer Review*, 26(2):259–261, 2008.
- [10] Yochai Benkler, Aaron Shaw, and Benjamin Mako Hill. Peer production: A form of collective intelligence. *Handbook of collective intelligence*, 175, 2015.

- [11] K Brad Wray. The epistemic cultures of science and wikipedia: A comparison. *Episteme*, 6(1):38–51, 2009.
- [12] R Stuart Geiger and David Ribes. The work of sustaining order in wikipedia: The banning of a vandal. In *Proceedings of the 2010 ACM conference on Computer supported cooperative work*, pages 117–126, 2010.
- [13] Martin Hilbert and David Darmon. Large-scale communication is more complex and unpredictable with automated bots. *Journal of Communication*, 70(5):670–692, 2020.
- [14] Edmund L Gettier. Is justified true belief knowledge? *analysis*, 23(6):121–123, 1963.
- [15] Matt Carlson. Automating judgment? algorithmic judgment, news knowledge, and journalistic professionalism. *New media & society*, 20(5):1755–1772, 2018.
- [16] Tarleton Gillespie. *Custodians of the Internet: Platforms, content moderation, and the hidden decisions that shape social media*. Yale University Press, 2018.
- [17] José Van Dijck, Thomas Poell, and Martijn De Waal. *The platform society: Public values in a connective world*. Oxford university press, 2018.
- [18] Aliakbar Mehdizadeh and Martin Hilbert. Homophily-induced emergence of biased structures in llm-based multi-agent ai systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.02637*, 2025.
- [19] Aliakbar Mehdizadeh and Martin Hilbert. When your ai agent succumbs to peer-pressure: Studying opinion-change dynamics of llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.19107*, 2025.
- [20] Jennifer Lackey. *Learning from words: Testimony as a source of knowledge*. Oxford University Press, 2008.
- [21] Donghee Shin. Automating epistemology: how ai reconfigures truth, authority, and verification. *AI & SOCIETY*, pages 1–7, 2025.
- [22] Federica Russo, Eric Schliesser, and Jean Wagemans. Connecting ethics and epistemology of ai. *Ai & Society*, 39(4):1585–1603, 2024.
- [23] Deborah Perron Tollefsen. Wikipedia and the epistemology of testimony. *Episteme*, 6(1):8–24, 2009.
- [24] Christian Sandvig, Kevin Hamilton, Karrie Karahalios, and Cedric Langbort. Auditing algorithms: Research methods for detecting discrimination on internet platforms. *Data and discrimination: converting critical concerns into productive inquiry*, 22(2014):4349–4357, 2014.
- [25] Martin Hilbert, Arti Thakur, Pablo M Flores, Xiaoya Zhang, Jee Young Bhan, Patrick Bernhard, and Feng Ji. 8–10% of algorithmic recommendations are ‘bad’, but... an exploratory risk-utility meta-analysis and its regulatory implications. *International Journal of Information Management*, 75:102743, 2024.
- [26] Steven A Greenberg. How citation distortions create unfounded authority: analysis of a citation network. *Bmj*, 339, 2009.
- [27] Nicola De Bellis. *Bibliometrics and citation analysis: from the science citation index to cybermetrics*. Bloomsbury Publishing PLC, 2009.
- [28] Haosheng Qian, Yixing Fan, Jiafeng Guo, Ruqing Zhang, Qi Chen, Dawei Yin, and Xueqi Cheng. Vericite: Towards reliable citations in retrieval-augmented generation via rigorous verification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.11394*, 2025.
- [29] Yumo Xu, Peng Qi, Jifan Chen, Kunlun Liu, Rujun Han, Lan Liu, Bonan Min, Vittorio Castelli, Arshit Gupta, and Zhiguo Wang. Citeeval: Principle-driven citation evaluation for source attribution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.01829*, 2025.
- [30] Qinhan Yu, Zhiyou Xiao, Binghui Li, Zhengren Wang, Chong Chen, and Wentao Zhang. Mramg-bench: A comprehensive benchmark for advancing multimodal retrieval-augmented multimodal generation. In *Proceedings of the 48th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 3616–3626, 2025.
- [31] Yasseri Taha. How similar are grokipedia and wikipedia? a multi-dimensional textual and structural comparison. Preprint on SocArXiv, via OSF, 2025. Available at: [https://osf.io/preprints/socarxiv/ydvnq\\_v2](https://osf.io/preprints/socarxiv/ydvnq_v2) (accessed 2025-11-01).
- [32] Mark EJ Newman. The structure of scientific collaboration networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 98(2):404–409, 2001.
- [33] Katy Börner. *Visualizing Knowledge Domains*. Springer, 2003.
- [34] Wikipedia contributors. Wikipedia: Database Vital articles/Level/3. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Vital\\_articles/Level/3](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Vital_articles/Level/3), 2025. Page version ID: 1324928601. [Online; accessed 2025-11-04].

- [35] William H Kruskal and W Allen Wallis. Use of ranks in one-criterion variance analysis. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 47(260):583–621, 1952.
- [36] Evelyn C Pielou. The measurement of diversity in different types of biological collections. *Journal of theoretical biology*, 13:131–144, 1966.
- [37] Anne E Magurran. *Ecological diversity and its measurement*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [38] Robert C MacCallum, Shaobo Zhang, Kristopher J Preacher, and Derek D Rucker. On the practice of dichotomization of quantitative variables. *Psychological methods*, 7(1):19, 2002.
- [39] Douglas G Altman and Patrick Royston. The cost of dichotomising continuous variables. *Bmj*, 332(7549):1080, 2006.
- [40] David Lazer. The rise of the social algorithm. *Science*, 348(6239):1090–1091, 2015.
- [41] Iyad Rahwan, Manuel Cebrian, Nick Obradovich, Josh Bongard, Jean-François Bonnefon, Cynthia Breazeal, Jacob W Crandall, Nicholas A Christakis, Iain D Couzin, Matthew O Jackson, et al. Machine behaviour. *Nature*, 568(7753):477–486, 2019.
- [42] Inioluwa Deborah Raji, Andrew Smart, Rebecca N White, Margaret Mitchell, Timnit Gebru, Ben Hutchinson, Jamila Smith-Loud, Daniel Theron, and Parker Barnes. Closing the ai accountability gap: Defining an end-to-end framework for internal algorithmic auditing. In *Proceedings of the 2020 conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*, pages 33–44, 2020.
- [43] Claudia Wagner, Markus Strohmaier, Alexandra Olteanu, Emre Kıcıman, Noshir Contractor, and Tina Eliassi-Rad. Measuring algorithmically infused societies. *Nature*, 595(7866):197–204, 2021.
- [44] Andrew Tutt. An fda for algorithms. *Admin. L. Rev.*, 69:83, 2017.
- [45] Martin Hilbert. Ai agents: From prompts to multi-agent systems. <https://www.coursera.org/learn/ai-agents-from-prompts-to-multi-agent-systems>, 2025. Online course, Coursera.
- [46] Klaus Krippendorff. Computing krippendorff’s alpha-reliability. Technical report, Citeseer, 2011.
- [47] Andrew F Hayes and Klaus Krippendorff. Answering the call for a standard reliability measure for coding data. *Communication methods and measures*, 1(1):77–89, 2007.

## A List of Appendix Topics

We consulted the Wikipedia page [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Database\\_reports/Pages\\_with\\_the\\_most\\_revisions](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Database_reports/Pages_with_the_most_revisions) on November 2, 2025, and collected the top 100 pages from Namespace 0, i.e. "Main/Article" (other Namespace categories refer to Talk, File, or Template pages, etc). We then cross-referenced this list with topics available on Gropikipedia. We retained only those topics present in both encyclopedias that were not list articles(e.g. Death in 2021), resulting in the topics in Table A.1.

Table A.1: List of Topics Included in the Comparative Analysis.

Topic	Topic	Topic
United States	Donald Trump	George W. Bush
Legalism (Chinese philosophy)	Wikipedia	ATP Tour records
Michael Jackson	Jesus	Barack Obama
Catholic Church	The Undertaker	India
United Kingdom	Adolf Hitler	World War II
Britney Spears	Climate change	Roger Federer
COVID-19 pandemic	George Washington	Beyoncé
New York City	Turkey	The Beatles
European Union	Philippines	Real Madrid CF
Canada	FC Barcelona	Kane (wrestler)
Newcastle United F.C.	Jehovah’s Witnesses	Islam
Israel	England national football team	Ronald Reagan
Russia	Eminem	Wii
Iran	PAOK FC	Lionel Messi
Cristiano Ronaldo	Muhammad	Germany
WWE	Portugal	Led Zeppelin
September 11 attacks	Doctor Who	Mariah Carey
Manchester United F.C.	Pakistan	John Cena
Chicago	London	Red Hot Chili Peppers
Ulysses S. Grant	Syrian civil war	Same-sex marriage
Vijay (actor)	2006 Lebanon War	China
Joseph Stalin	Chelsea F.C.	South Korea
PlayStation 3	Christianity	WWE Raw
United States men’s national soccer team	Elvis Presley	Greece

## B Media Domain Taxonomy Workflow

### Multi-Agent Workflow to Develop Coding Manual

We developed the Citation Content Coding Manual based on state-of-the-art multi-agent prompting workflow techniques involving the Deep Research models of ChatGPT5, Claude Sonnet 4.5, Gemini 2.5 Pro, and Grok4 (the same LLM on which Gropikipedia is built) [45].

As shown in Figure B.1, we started with inductive and exploratory Deep Research (broad brainstorming, based on exemplary few-shot prompting), which identified the ten most common media domains. We then presented each of the four LLMs with the results from the other three LLMs and asked them to consolidate the results down to seven common categories. For Prompt#1 and Prompt#2, see “Box: Prompts used in multi-agent workflow”.




Figure B.1: Multi-Agent Workflow to Develop Coding Manual

**PROMPT#1:**

You are an expert media analyst and librarian. Your task is to classify a list of domains based on their primary content. This first task consists in a deep research about different ways to classify media, for example: - 'Legacy News' (e.g., nytimes.com, wsj.com, bbc.com) - 'Digital News' (e.g., vox.com, dailywire.com, huffpost.com) - 'Opinion/Blog' (Primarily opinion, not reporting) - 'Academic/Journal' (e.g., nature.com, arxiv.org, jstor.org) - 'Corporate' (e.g., tesla.com, spacex.com, openai.com) - 'Government/NGO' (e.g., nasa.gov, un.org, brookings.edu) - 'Social Media' (e.g., x.com, reddit.com, facebook.com) - 'Reference' (e.g., britannica.com, dictionary.com) - 'Other/Unclear' (If it doesn't fit or is too obscure) - etc... Please do some deep research, focusing on academic sources, and come up with a final list of the most common 10 categories.

**PROMPT#2:**

Thanks. I asked three other experts to do the same. Please revise their answers carefully and consider if/how it can help to improve and complete your answer, making it more general and complete. Evaluate if you can merge some categories. If you can, great! Provide a final revised final list of the top seven most important media source categories.

**PROMPT#3:**

Based on this, create a final taxonomy, based on the eight categories outlined in the summary table, and make sure that they are defined in a way that is exhaustive and exclusive, means that any kind of media source can unequivocally be assigned to one, and only one, of the eight categories. Include some illustrative examples for each category. Then, imagine you are an expert in content coding and natural language processing. You are known to elaborate content coding manuals that are as clear and specific that they achieve a very high interrater reliability, such as evidenced by high Krippendorff alpha values. Please convert the previous conclusions of the 8-category taxonomy into a coding manual that allows content coders, especially in the form of Large Language Models (LLMs) to classify media sources into one of the eight categories. The input will be a simple link or platform name, and the LLM content coder should analyze/search that content provider and follow the instructions of the coding manual to clearly and unequivocally classify as belonging to one, and only one, of the eight categories. Provide a machine readable output document in the form of a content coding manual that can be used as a prompt for LLM content coders.

**PROMPT#4:**

Study the attached manual. Pivot to classification of citations instead of domains. How should the categories be changed? Wikipedia is full of self citations. For example, if citation is to a book but Wikipedia page of the book, it should still be categorized as an Academic & Scholarly book.

**Sources (Archived Chat Histories):**

ChatGPT: <https://chatgpt.com/share/69094d6b-58f4-8003-88d9-509113aeddd3>

Claude: <https://claude.ai/share/fc9862d0-6cf7-465d-8e4f-05d9eebea8f6>

Gemini: <https://gemini.google.com/share/ba003c0c7170>

Grok: [https://grok.com/share/c2hhcmQtNQ%3D%3D\\_e53d7382-6307-43c8-b1f5-1a690a688a98](https://grok.com/share/c2hhcmQtNQ%3D%3D_e53d7382-6307-43c8-b1f5-1a690a688a98)

Perplexity: <https://www.perplexity.ai/search/attached-i-give-you-4-differen-Bh66BDLfR7ar.VLBWKmqpQ?preview=1#1>

**Category Synthesis**

Reviewing the results by a human expert, we obtained Table B.1, which shows that different LLMs decided to merge different categories, resulting in a total of eight different categories. We decided to keep all eight and asked Perplexity to develop an exclusive and exhaustive categorization, based on the four proposals, along the summary table logic, and then to develop a content coding manual that can be used for LLM-based classification (see Prompt#3).

Table B.1: LLM Category Identification Summary

	ChatGPT5 Deep Research	Claude S.4.5 Research	Gemini2.5 Pro Deep	Grok4 Expert
1 News & Journalism	1	1	1	1
2 Opinion and Advocacy	1		1	1
3 NGO, Civil Soc. & Think Tank		1	1	1
4 Government & Official	1			1
5 Academic & Scholarly	1	1	1	1
6 Reference & Aggregation	1	1	1	
7 Corporate & Commercial	1	1	1	1
8 Social Media & User Content	1	1	1	1

**Internal Validity Testing**

As an intermediate step, we tested the internal validity of the coding manual that resulted after prompt#3, by feeding it as a prompt into ChatGPT5, Claude Sonnet 4.5, Gemini 2.5 Pro, and Grok4, together with the following instructions:

**Prompt#3validity:** You are an expert in content coding. Please study the attached 8-Category Taxonomy for Media Domain Classification: "LLM CONTENT CODING MANUAL". Based on it, please research the 15 media domains attached and classify them into one of the eight categories described in the coding manual attached. Only chose one category from the taxonomy, the best fitting one. As output, provide a table with the media domains and their category names.

The results, shown in Table B.2, demonstrated high agreement. Traditionally, a Krippendorff’s alpha value of  $\geq 0.90$  shows an excellent, very strong reliability and is considered to be safe for high-stakes conclusions, while any value above 0.8 is considered good and adequate for most purposes [46,47]. Our high values show the high level of internal validity of our LLM-based content classification.

Finally, we used prompt#4 to fine-tune the domain-focused manual to focus on the more fine-grained citation, instead of the broader domain, which resulted in the “Golden Rule 1” and “Golden Rule 2”, as reported in the main article.

**B.1 Core Design Principles & Golden Rules****B.1.1 Two Golden Rules for Citation Classification**

To handle the ambiguity between a host domain and a specific cited work, two rules must be applied *before* the decision tree.

Table B.2: Intercoder Reliability Test Results

Domain	GP	Cl	Ge	Gr	Domain	GP	Cl	Ge	Gr	Domain	GP	Cl	Ge	Gr
digitalspy.co.uk	1	1	1	1	tarunias.com	7	7	7	7	tracesofwar.com	6	-	6	6
estadao.com.br	1	1	1	1	stanstedairport...	7	7	7	7	chelseafc.com	7	7	7	7
wagnerreese.com	7	7	7	7	georgetown.edu	5	5	5	5	tripshock.com	7	7	7	7
hapsc.org	3	3	3	3	trustedreviews...	1	1	1	1	southcoasttoday...	1	1	1	1
electionguide.org	6	6	6	6	bloodyelbow.com	1	1	1	1	livedesignonline...	1	1	1	1
tasteiran.net	7	7	7	7	pagba.com	3	-	3	3	lionsrugby.com	7	7	7	3
capp.ca	3	3	3	3	manchester.ac.uk	5	5	5	5	odi.org	3	3	3	3
iba.edu.pk	5	5	5	5	hitquarters.com	6	-	1	7	tradingeconomics...	6	6	6	6
ballotpedia.org	6	6	6	6	thewrap.com	1	1	1	1	irishtimes.com	1	1	1	1
infobae.com	1	1	1	1	heelbynature.com	1	-	1	1	essence.com	1	1	1	1
c2es.org	3	3	3	3	wdbj7.com	1	1	1	1	chicagotours...	7	7	7	7
wayne.edu	5	5	5	5	onet.pl	1	1	1	1	earlychicago.com	6	6	6	6
padidehzaban.ir	7	-	5	7	wisc.edu	5	5	5	5	discovermoose...	1	1	1	1
cepa.org	3	3	3	3	colonialwill...	3	3	3	3	icraa.org	3	3	3	3
cell.com	5	5	5	5	radaronline.com	1	-	1	1	worldcargonews...	1	1	1	1
<b>K-Alpha</b>	<b>0.982</b>				<b>K-Alpha</b>	<b>0.904</b>				<b>K-Alpha</b>	<b>0.959</b>			

Note: GP=ChatGPT5, Cl=Claude S.4.5, Ge=Gemini 2.5 Pro, Gr=Grok4 Expert. Values 1-8 represent taxonomy categories. "-" indicates missing data.

#### Golden Rule 1: The Specific Work Principle

The classification of a *specific cited work* (e.g., an op-ed, a journal article) overrules the general classification of its *parent domain*.

- **Example:** A citation to an op-ed on *nytimes.com* is classified as **Opinion & Advocacy**, even though the *nytimes.com* domain is broadly **News & Journalism**.

#### Golden Rule 2: The Look-Through Principle

If a citation link points to a **tertiary source** (like Wikipedia, a dictionary) that is *about* another, specific primary/secondary work (like a book or journal article), the citation must be classified as the **underlying work**, not the tertiary summary.

- **Example:** A citation to the *Wikipedia page for "A Theory of Justice" by John Rawls* is classified as **Academic & Scholarly**.
- **Counter-Example:** A citation to the *Wikipedia page for "Justice"* is classified as **Reference & Tertiary Source**.

### B.1.2 Core Principles

1. **Sequential Decision Logic:** The classification algorithm uses a step-by-step decision tree that prioritizes the most distinct categories first.
2. **Operationalized Criteria:** Each category is defined by the observable function of the *work itself*.
3. **Irrelevance Rules:** Classification must ignore:
  - **Content Topic:** A scientist's blog post (UGC) about politics is not **Government**. An op-ed (**Opinion**) about science is not **Academic**.
  - **Business Model:** A paywalled news article is still **News**.
  - **Format/Technology:** A news podcast is **News**. A PDF of a government report is **Government**.

## B.2 Quick Reference: Category Definitions

### B.3 Decision Tree for Citation Classification

Follow these steps sequentially.

**Step 1:** Is the *work* peer-reviewed, original research (e.g., journal article, scholarly book)?

- YES → **ACADEMIC & SCHOLARLY**

**Step 2:** NO. Is the *work* an official publication from a government body (legislative, judicial, or executive)?

- YES → **GOVERNMENT & OFFICIAL**



Category	Primary Function	Key Indicators (for the work)	Examples
<b>Academic &amp; Scholarly</b>	Peer-reviewed, original research and scholarly communication.	Peer-review, university press, scholarly journal, dissertation, conference paper.	nature.com article, jstor.org article, academic book.
<b>Government &amp; Official</b>	Official information, data, services, or legal documents from government bodies.	Government agency author, court records, legislation, official statistics.	NASA report, Census data, .gov publication, UN resolution.
<b>NGO, Civil Society &amp; Think Tank</b>	Mission-driven research and advocacy by non-profits.	Non-profit status, independent research, policy papers, advocacy reports.	Brookings report, Amnesty Int'l document, Greenpeace publication.
<b>News &amp; Journalism</b>	Original, factual reporting of current events.	Verifiable facts, journalistic standards, byline, reporting.	nytimes.com article, BBC report, Reuters dispatch.
<b>Opinion &amp; Advocacy</b>	Persuasive commentary from an ideological perspective.	Op-ed, editorial, commentary, advocacy journalism, ideological positioning.	huffpost.com op-ed, dailywire.com article, blog post arguing a position.
<b>Corporate &amp; Commercial</b>	For-profit business products, services, and marketing.	Press release, annual report, company blog, product white paper, patent.	apple.com press release, Tesla annual report.
<b>Reference &amp; Tertiary Source</b>	Organization and indexing of information from other sources (about a general topic).	Encyclopedia, dictionary, general topic summary. (See Rule 2).	wikipedia.org page for "Justice", dictionary.com.
<b>User-Generated Content (UGC)</b>	Informal content from a private individual.	User profile, forum, personal blog, non-professional social media post.	Tweet, Reddit comment, personal blog post, non-institutional YouTube video.

Table B.3: Citation Category Definitions

**Step 3: NO. Is the *work* a report or publication from a non-profit, mission-driven organization (e.g., think tank, NGO)?**

- YES → **NGO, CIVIL SOCIETY & THINK TANK**

**Step 4: NO. Is the *work* a specific, verifiable, factual report on current events by a journalist/publisher?**

- YES → **NEWS & JOURNALISM**

**Step 5: NO. Is the *work* a piece of commentary intended to persuade (e.g., op-ed, editorial, advocacy post)?**

- YES → **OPINION & ADVOCACY**

**Step 6: NO. Is the *work* a publication from a for-profit corporation about its business (e.g., press release, annual report)?**

- YES → **CORPORATE & COMMERCIAL**

**Step 7: NO. Is the *work* a tertiary source (e.g., encyclopedia, dictionary entry)?**

- YES → **Apply "Look-Through Principle" (Rule 2):**
  - *Check:* Is this tertiary source *about* a specific book, journal article, or other citable work?
    - \* **YES:** Go back to **Step 1** and classify that *underlying* work.
    - \* **NO:** Classify as **REFERENCE & TERTIARY SOURCE**.

**Step 8: NO. Is the *work* created by a private individual in an informal, non-institutional capacity (e.g., tweet, forum post)?**

- YES → **USER-GENERATED CONTENT (UGC)**

## B.4 Boundary Cases with Decisions

## B.5 Validation Checklist

After classification, verify all conditions are met:

- ✓ Classification is based on the **specific work's function**.
- ✓ Classification can be traced through the decision tree.
- ✓ "Golden Rules" 1 and 2 were considered and applied if necessary.
- ✓ Classification did NOT use content TOPIC as a criterion.
- ✓ Classification did NOT use business MODEL as a criterion.
- ✓ Classification did NOT use FORMAT/TECHNOLOGY as a criterion.
- ✓ Classification is **MUTUALLY EXCLUSIVE** (no other category equally valid).

Case	Decision	Reasoning
Wall Street Journal factual article	<b>NEWS</b>	Original factual reporting. (Golden Rule 1)
Wall Street Journal op-ed	<b>OPINION</b>	Persuasive commentary. (Golden Rule 1)
Tesla blog post about technology	<b>CORPORATE</b>	Company-owned marketing/communication.
Wikipedia page for "History of Japan"	<b>REFERENCE</b>	Tertiary summary of a general topic.
Wikipedia page for "The Wealth of Nations"	<b>ACADEMIC</b>	"Look-Through Principle" (Rule 2) applied.
Tweet from a journalist breaking news	<b>NEWS</b>	The work is factual reporting, despite platform.
Tweet from a journalist with an opinion	<b>OPINION</b>	The work is commentary, despite platform.
Tweet from a random user	<b>UGC</b>	Informal, non-institutional source.
Public radio (NPR, BBC) news report	<b>NEWS</b>	Journalism is primary function.
University press release	<b>CORPORATE</b>	Institutional promotion, not research.
University researcher's personal blog	<b>UGC</b>	Not institutionally published or peer-reviewed.

Table B.4: Citation Boundary Cases

## C Data Collection

To ensure a rigorous comparison between human-curated and AI-generated knowledge, we employed a "paired-topic" sampling strategy, ensuring that both platforms. To avoid metric misalignment, we built custom HTML scrapers using the Python BeautifulSoup library to process both datasets identically. This ensures that "Word Count" and "Citation Count" define the same structural features on both platforms.

For Wikipedia and for each selected topic, we deployed a custom scraper (UniversalWikiExtractor) to parse the live article. We extracted references by targeting the `<ol class="references">` lists and `<cite class="citation">` templates. To calculate article length, we isolated the `<div id="mw-content-text">`, stripped all reference lists, and performed a whitespace-delimited count on the remaining plain text.

For Grokipedia, the scraper identified citation sections using heuristic header detection (regex matching headers containing "Reference", "Source", or "Bibliography"). It counted list items (`<li>`) within these sections. We isolated the `<main>` content area and we removed reference lists before calculating the count to prevent the "Bibliography" itself from inflating the article's length.

## D Sourcing Scalability

A key question in automated knowledge generation is whether AI agents replicate the "epistemic friction" of human writing, where citations are added based on the complexity of the claim, or if they merely follow a statistical "quota." To test this, we expanded the dataset with the goal to add external validity to the result presented in Figure 1, i.e. the relationship between Article Length (Word Count) and Sourcing Density (Citation Count) for both platforms on a larger dataset. This additional corpus was seeded from the **Wikipedia Vital Articles (Level 3)** list ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Vital\\_articles/Level/3](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Vital_articles/Level/3)) with around 1,000 articles.

To determine the precise nature of this scaling, we fitted and compared three regression models for each dataset: Linear ( $y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x$ ), Quadratic ( $y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x + \beta_2 x^2$ ), and Exponential ( $y = \alpha e^{\beta x}$ ). We selected the best-fitting model based on the Adjusted  $R^2$  metric to penalize unnecessary model complexity.

Table D.1: **Goodness-of-Fit Comparison** ( $R_{adj}^2$ ). The Linear model offers the most robust fit for both platforms. Adding quadratic complexity yields no improvement, and exponential models fit poorly.

Model Type	Wikipedia ( $R_{adj}^2$ )	Grokipedia ( $R_{adj}^2$ )
<b>Linear (Selected)</b>	<b>0.416</b>	<b>0.596</b>
Quadratic	0.415	0.596
Exponential	0.297	0.383

As shown in Table D.1, the Linear model provided the superior fit for both platforms. However, while the functional form is the same, the internal dynamics (Figure D.1) reveal a fundamental difference in consistency:

- **Grokikipedia (Deterministic):** The linear tendency displays a high degree of predictability ( $R_{adj}^2 \approx 0.60$ ). The relationship between words and citations is tight and consistent, scaling linearly. This suggests a deterministic generation process where the model effectively maintains a "citation rate" regardless of the content. The AI appears to treat citations as a structural requirement of the genre, scaling them linearly with length.
- **Wikipedia (Stochastic):** Humanly generated articles show significantly higher variance and lower predictability ( $R_{adj}^2 \approx 0.42$ ). As seen in Figure D.1, the data is highly dispersed. It also hits a clear saturation level between 15,000 and 20,000 words, which is not there in the case of AI-generated articles. This complexity might reflect organic epistemic necessity: humans cite when a specific claim requires verification, not simply because the text has grown longer.




Figure D.1: **Sourcing Scaling Analysis.** Plots display the relationship between word count and citation count with best-fit linear regression lines. **(Left) Wikipedia** exhibits high variance ( $R^2 = 0.42$ ), suggesting that citation density is driven by context rather than length. **(Right) Grokikipedia** exhibits high predictability ( $R^2 = 0.60$ ), suggesting a mechanical "production rule".

In order to dig a bit deeper, we analyzed the topics of the top-50 articles with the most citations, and the bottom-50 articles with the least citations, from each platform. The most notable difference is that Wikipedia uses a lot of citations when making claims about people, which Grokikipedia uses very few citations in that case. To the contrary, Wikipedia uses, proportionally, less citations when reporting on technology.

Doing a qualitative analysis of the topics of the top-most cited, and bottom-least cited articles, Table D.2 suggests Wikipedia has a need to justify people with many citations, while Grokikipedia shows a clear need to justify places with many citations. At the same time, Grokikipedia does not see a need to back up agents of discovery with many sources, while Wikipedia does not provide much justification for disciplines of physical structures.




Figure D.2: Distribution of the topics of the top-50 articles with the most citations on each platform, and the bottom-50 articles with the least citations

	Human/Social World	Physical/Formal World
<b>Specifics &amp; Agents</b> (The "Actors")	<b>Wikipedia Top 50</b> ( <i>Stalin, Jesus, Israel, The Beatles, New York City</i> )	<b>Grokipedia Bottom 50</b> ( <i>Leonard Euler, Kurt Gödel, Proton, Speed of Light</i> )
<b>Systems &amp; Structures</b> (The "Setting")	<b>Grokipedia Top 50</b> ( <i>Brazil, North America, History of Europe, Internet</i> )	<b>Wikipedia Bottom 50</b> ( <i>Engine, Oven, Electromagnetism, Linear Algebra, Gas</i> )

Table D.2: Comparison of Topic Distribution in Top and Bottom Quartiles

## E Sensitivity Analysis of Network Structures

We conducted an analysis that is more sensitive to rare epistemological profiles—categories that appear infrequently but nonetheless provide distinctive signatures for specific subsets of articles. In the raw co-occurrence networks (Figure 7), such low-frequency profiles often “fall through the cracks” because the visualization is dominated by high-volume categories.

To address this, we applied Cosine Similarity normalization to examine the backbone of category co-occurrences while controlling for category frequency. For each article, we constructed a binary vector indicating the presence or absence of the eight epistemic categories. After transposing the Article–Category matrix, we computed the Cosine Similarity between all category pairs, yielding a category–category similarity matrix. This normalization reduces the influence of highly frequent categories and allows low-frequency categories to form connections if they consistently co-occur with others. We then filtered the networks to retain only edges with similarity scores strictly greater than the global mean. The resulting networks, presented in Figure E.1, offer a complementary perspective to the raw co-occurrence graphs by highlighting structurally significant relationships independent of raw volume.

In Figure E.1a, the *Academic & Scholarly* node becomes peripheral. Although Figure 3 shows that Wikipedia draws on academic sources across many topics, the cosine-normalized network shows that these scholarly citations do not frequently co-occur with certain other categories (e.g., *Corporate & Commercial* or *Opinion & Advocacy*) within individual articles. As a result, the corresponding similarity scores fall below the global mean. In contrast, Grokipedia’s network (Figure E.1b) retains edges between *Academic & Scholarly* sources and other sources. This pattern requires cautious interpretation. Because academic citations are extremely sparse in the Grokipedia corpus (Figure 3), even a few instances in which they co-occur with dominant categories can produce disproportionately high Cosine Similarity values. More generally, Cosine Similarity can generate strong connections for pairs of low-frequency categories when they both appear together in the same small set of articles despite being absent in most others. In this case, data sparsity amplifies the similarity score, pushing these connections above the filtering threshold.




Figure E.1: **Sensitivity Analysis of Epistemic Backbones (Cosine Similarity)**. Edges represent the cosine similarity between citation categories calculated from per-article vectors, filtered for edges greater than the global mean similarity. Node size reflects each category’s weighted degree

### Statistical Effect Sizes of Epistemic Diversity

To quantify the magnitude of the differences in epistemic diversity, we calculated Cohen’s  $d$  effect sizes and 95% confidence intervals for each topic. As detailed in Table E.1, the analysis reveals that the “Epistemic Substitution” is domain-dependent. Large effect sizes ( $d > 0.8$ ) are observed exclusively in high-stakes sociopolitical and geographic topics, whereas pop-culture domains (Sports, Media) show small or negligible structural differences.

Table E.1: **Effect Sizes for Epistemic Diversity (Shannon Entropy)**. Comparisons are paired (Grokikipedia - Wikipedia). Cohen’s  $d$  effect sizes are categorized as Small ( $< 0.5$ ), Medium ( $0.5 - 0.8$ ), or Large ( $> 0.8$ ). The analysis confirms that the epistemic restructuring is most profound in sociopolitical domains.

Topic	Mean Diff.	95% CI	Cohen’s $d$	Interpretation
Geographic Entities	+0.36	[0.21, 0.52]	<b>1.27</b>	<b>Large</b>
Politics & Conflict	+0.90	[0.50, 1.31]	<b>1.24</b>	<b>Large</b>
Gen. Knowledge & Soc.	+0.61	[0.24, 0.99]	<b>1.09</b>	<b>Large</b>
Music & Musicians	+0.30	[0.02, 0.57]	<b>0.82</b>	<b>Large</b>
Media & Entertainment	+0.16	[-0.48, 0.79]	0.39	Small
Sports & Athletics	+0.14	[-0.05, 0.33]	0.37	Small

### Robustness of Homophily Networks

To address potential sensitivity to the cosine similarity threshold, we calculated the Assortativity Coefficient ( $r$ ) across a range of thresholds. Table E.2 confirms that Grokipedia consistently exhibits higher assortativity than Wikipedia, which is in line with the finding from Figure 4b from the main article.

Table E.2: Sensitivity Analysis of Assortativity Coefficient ( $r$ ).

Threshold	Wikipedia ( $r$ )	Grokikipedia ( $r$ )	Difference
0.65	0.076	0.132	+0.057
0.75	0.097	0.178	+0.080
0.85	0.162	0.218	+0.056