







# Tracing the Flow of Knowledge From Science to Technology Using Deep Learning\*

Michael E. Rose <sup>1</sup>, Mainak Ghosh <sup>1</sup>, Sebastian Erhardt <sup>1</sup>, Cheng Li <sup>1</sup>, Erik Buunk <sup>1</sup>, and Dietmar Harhoff <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Max Planck Institute for Innovation and Competition, Munich, Germany

## Abstract

We develop a language similarity model suitable for working with patents and scientific publications at the same time. In a horse race-style evaluation, we subject eight language (similarity) models to predict credible Patent-Paper Citations. We find that our Pat-SPECTER model performs best, which is the SPECTER2 model fine-tuned on patents. In two real-world scenarios (separating patent-paper-pairs and predicting patent-paper-pairs) we demonstrate the capabilities of the Pat-SPECTER.

We finally test the hypothesis that US patents cite papers that are semantically less similar than in other large jurisdictions, which we posit is because of the duty of candor. The model is open for the academic community and practitioners alike.

**Keywords:** language similarity model; semantic similarity; patents; publications; technology transfer; duty of candor

---

\*Our work has been enabled by grant 2023/8401 from the European Patent Office under their Academic Research Programme (EPO-ARP) 2021. The project has benefited from discussions with Fabian Gaessler, Karin Hoisl, Matt Marx and Felix Poege. We furthermore thank participants at the NBER I3 Technical Working Group Meeting in Fall 2024 in Cambridge, MA as well as EPIP 2025 in Antwerp for helpful feedback and suggestions. Finally, we also thank seminar participants at Polytechnic University of Milan, Manchester University (Alliance Manchester Business School) and University of Sussex for helpful comments.

# 1 Introduction

The translation of science to industrial applications is pivotal for modern innovation processes. Firms rely on knowledge generated in the public sector (Aghion, Dewatripont, & Stein, 2008), yet inventors face an enormous search and attention problem when engaging with academic literature (Bikard, 2018).

At the same time, scholars and evaluators are interested in tracing the flow of knowledge from science to technology to understand innovation processes. The dominant approach for tracing knowledge flows is the analysis of explicit citations in scientific publications and patents. Such citations acknowledge intellectual priority and delineate the foundations upon which new inventions are built. This method, however, has significant limitations, such as the sparsity of citation graphs and the strategic or opportunistic selection of citations.

To overcome both problems, we present a transformer-based similarity model that can be used for patent-publication comparisons. We identify four suitable transformer models and test them rigorously in a horse race. These models include SPECTER, developed by Cohan et al. (2020) for work with publications, and PaECTER, developed by Ghosh et al. (2024) for work with patents, as well as derivations from these two models. We benchmark the models using standard test metrics on small datasets derived from Patent Paper citations by Marx and Fuegi (2022) and Marx (2023).

The winning model, Pat-SPECTER, is the SPECTER model fine-tuned on patents. The open-source model generates embeddings that allow semantic comparisons of English publications and patents at the same time.

To validate the Pat-SPECTER, we apply the model to two real-world scenarios, namely the separation of patent-paper pairs from random patent-to-paper pairings, and the prediction of patent paper pairs among millions of possible documents. We utilize an ElasticSearch database in the Logic Mill search system by Erhardt et al. (2024) to identify (approximate) nearest neighbors among all of PATSTAT and OpenAlex.

To show the model’s strength, we finally investigate a question at the core of innovation research: when does transfer from science to technology take place? More specifically, we investigate when citations to publications on patents are semantically similar to the patent. We find that in jurisdictions that require applicants to perform a ‘duty of candor’, cited papers tend to be less related to the focal patent. The duty of candor includes an affirmative obligation to disclose all known material prior art, and violations can render a patent unenforceable. The duty of candor is a functional feature of the USPTO but also at the Israeli Patent Office (where it is called ‘Affirmative Duty of Disclosure’).

Michel and Bettels (2001) have argued that the USPTO’s duty of candor induces applicants to cite more than is necessary – a hypothesis that Cotropia, Lemley, and Sampat (2013) have tested and confirmed quantitatively by asking whether patent examiners actually use applicant-provided citations. Their answer is negative. Recently, Tur and Pasimeni (2024) argue that the duty of candor leads applicants to cite a large amount of references, especially after a company sees its patents challenged in court. Though neither study distinguishes by type of cited document (patent or paper or else), the insights suggest that mandatory disclosure of prior art tends to produce irrelevant citations. By testing our model, we thus add a

qualitative dimension to the existing quantitative analysis.

The motivation for our research is a lack of tools for innovation economists. In the patent domain, citations to scientific literature are used to link patented inventions to their scientific underpinnings. As many patents do not have direct references to the non-patent literature, Ahmadpoor and Jones (2017) propose the notion of “distance to the science frontier”. Patents citing scientific publications directly are taken to be at the science frontier.

Poege et al. (2019) show that highly cited scientific publications often serve as the foundation for particularly impactful patented inventions, highlighting the critical role of science in driving technological innovation. Poege et al. (2019) linked around 950,000 patent families to over 2.2 million scientific articles, demonstrating that foundational scientific research significantly contributes to breakthrough inventions. Related studies such as Marx and Fuegi (2020) also use large-scale citation graphs to derive conclusions for innovation policy.

However, the use of explicit citations has serious disadvantages, even if indirect links are taken into account. Citations are rare, and they may be selected strategically or opportunistically (Jaffe & Rassenfossé, 2017).

As an alternative to citations, scholars have investigated the possibility of using text as input data and comparing two documents to gauge their similarity. When vectors represent individual documents, vector operations (such as Cosine distance, Manhattan distance, Euclidean distance or others) yield similarity estimates.

In his dissertation, Natterer (2014) uses a term frequency–inverse document frequency (TF-IDF) model of textual similarity for technical texts. A more recent example is Kelly et al. (2021), who identify breakthrough patents as patents with low textual similarity to the existing patent text corpus. They then establish that sectors with many breakthrough patents experience higher growth. This relationship could not have been demonstrated convincingly using patent citations, as the authors point out.

Yet, turning massive amounts of text into data is challenging, and so far there exists no scalable solution that at the same time spans diverse text corpora. All applications intended to find similarities between patents or scientific publications suffer from one or several of the following shortcomings: they are specific to only one text corpus (i.e., only patents, such as patent maps); they do not account for semantic structure across different text corpora; they do not scale well.

A common yet simple approach to transform text into a vector is the bag-of-words approach. Typically researchers used a weighted incarnation of this approach, the so-called term frequency–inverse document frequency (TF-IDF).

TF-IDF vectorization, simple as it is, has two important limitations. First, it ignores the relative positioning of terms (to each other and within the document) and scales badly. For example, including new documents in the corpus may require the re-computation of the entire matrix. Thus, it becomes computationally expensive with the growing number of documents. Secondly, the TF-IDF matrix is sparse and high-dimensional, which leads to higher memory consumption. The loss of information of the location of a term within a sentence, within a paragraph and within a document is presumably the most severe limitation.

Recent advances in Natural Language Processing, especially the Word2vec (Mikolov et al., 2013), and Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers (BERT) (Devlin et al., 2019), have made it possible for non-computer scientists to work with

textual data while retaining full syntactical information.

The BERT model leverages the attention layer (Vaswani et al., 2017), which efficiently estimates which tokens of a sentence to what extent are valuable in understanding the sentence. In this family of models, words in a sentence do not have equal weight, as is the case for TF-IDF. BERT is pre-trained on newspaper articles and Wikipedia and focuses on the 40,000 most important tokens.<sup>1</sup>

To date, many thousands of specialized transformers exist. Two notable models are SciBERT (Beltagy, Lo, & Cohan, 2019) and BERT for patents (Srebrovic & Yonamine, 2020). SciBERT is a BERT model specific to scientific publications. It has learned the 40,000 most important tokens used in scientific publications. In the patent domain, Google’s BERT for patents was trained on 100 million granted USPTO patents.

The computational requirements to train a BERT from scratch are immense, however. Beltagy, Lo, and Cohan (2019) state on their SciBERT paper that 16 TPUv3 (Tensor Processing Units of the third generation) chips were used for 4 days to train BERT’s largest model - 8 GPUs (Graphics Processing Unit) are expected to take 40-70 days for the same task. Training a base model can become very expensive and time-consuming. Thus, in our approach, we fine-tune existing models, as this is more efficient and allows us to leverage the knowledge already incorporated in the more fundamental models.

Since BERT’s token vocabulary is likely not representative of every domain, multiple domain-specific BERT derivatives have been trained. For example, SciBERT, whose 30k most important tokens overlap with the original general purpose BERT’s vocabulary at the rate of 42%.

In the patent domain, there are three models trained on patent text, namely PatentBERT by Lee and Hsiang (2020), Google’s BERT for patents (Srebrovic & Yonamine, 2020) and the SEARCHFORMER (not publicly available) by Vowinckel and Hähnke (2023).

Because BERT models were trained to predict masked tokens and the next sentence, they do not perform effectively at identifying similar documents. This is a necessary prerequisite to identify potential knowledge flows between documents. The SPECTER model (Cohan et al., 2020) and its successor SPECTER2 (Singh et al., 2023) address these limitations through citation-informed learning. The difference between SPECTER and SPECTER2 is simply the underlying training dataset: At the time of training of SPECTER, Semantic Scholar consisted only of biomedical publications and those from computer science. SPECTER2 uses a more recent version of Semantic Scholar, encompassing all scientific disciplines. More specifically, the authors fine-tuned SciBERT via contrastive learning between two publications, an actually cited publication and an uncited random publication.

However, SPECTER was only trained on scientific publications and the language specific to patents likely differs from that relevant to scientific publications. Recently, Ghosh et al. (2024) develop the PaECTER model. It was trained in a similar way as SPECTER/SPECTER2 as it leverages credible citation information between patents. Credible citation information refers to citations added by examiners at the European Patent Office (EPO).

Thus we strive to fill the gap by presenting a rigorously trained and tested cross-corpus language model.

---

<sup>1</sup>A token usually represents a word or a part of a word.

## 2 Data

For training and the evaluations, we use the *Reliance on Science* dataset provided by Marx and Fuegi (2020, 2022). Both of these data sets are rigorously curated, lending a high degree of reliability and applicability. The dataset contains two parts: The Patent-Paper Pairs (PPP) and Patent-to-Paper Citations (PPC). All datasets contain the patent publication number and the OpenAlex IDs of the publications. OpenAlex is a comprehensive, community-curated database of scholarly works, authors, institutions, and more (Priem, Piwowar, & Orr, 2022).

The PPP data links USPTO patents to publications that are about the same invention. To qualify, a publication must be co-authored by at least one inventor and published within 9 years around the patent publication. Matches are then verified. The PPP dataset provides four confidence scores based on how certain algorithm and human judgment are that the reference and the scientific publication belong together.<sup>2</sup>

The PPC data set is a patent data set with all the cited scientific publications for each patent. The data set contains around 47 million citation links for about 7 million unique patents. It includes several authorities, including USPTO (approx. 34 million), EPO (5.7 million), WIPO (4.1 million). The PPC data contains confidence scores ranging from 1 (lowest) to 10 (highest).

In some cases, the PPC and PPP overlap. Yet in most of the cases, there are no direct citations between the patent and the paper or vice versa. In the most obvious case, this would not be possible. If a patent cites a publication on the same invention, it would destroy the novelty. However, there are many publications with an earlier publication date than the patent, due to the grace period. In these cases, the publication already exists but is not cited by the patent.

## 3 Fine-tuning SPECTER2 and PaECTER

Hitherto, in innovation studies, there exist only language models specific to one corpus: either publications or patents. Thus we develop two cross-corpus models, Pat-SPECTER and Pub-PaECTER.

Pat-SPECTER and Pub-PaECTER are derivatives of SPECTER and PaECTER respectively. Pat-SPECTER is the SPECTER2 model fine-tuned on the training data set for the PaECTER, and the Pub-PaECTER is the original PaECTER fine-tuned on the training data set of the SPECTER.

### 3.1 Training Data

The training dataset of SPECTER and SPECTER2 are constructed in the same way: For each focal document, they use five triples, where the second element is a cited document (called "positive") and the third element is a non-cited document (called "negative"). Negatives are furthermore separated into easy negatives and hard negatives. Easy negatives are randomly selected uncited documents, while hard negatives are indirectly cited documents (publications cited by cited publications but not by the focal document).

---

<sup>2</sup>The cutoff values are 0.99 for category 4 (very high), 0.9 for category 3 (high), 0.8 for category 2 (medium), and 0.7 for category 1 (low).


The training dataset of PaECTER (Ghosh et al., 2024) is akin to the SPECTER/SPECTER2 approach: For each of the 300k patent documents, there are also five triplets with positives and negatives. Positives are patents cited with citation category X, Y, I and A. Easy negatives are patents sharing at least some CPC classes, while hard negatives are indirectly cited patents. Crucial for the analysis, only EPO patents are considered, because at the EPO references to other patents are solely added by examiners, and with specific citation categories.

## 3.2 Training

Equipped with these models and datasets, we fine-tune them in a cross-corpus manner: First, we fine-tune SPECTER2 (base) on the training dataset of PaECTER. The resulting model is called *Pat-SPECTER*. Second, we fine-tune PaECTER on the training dataset of SPECTER. The resulting model is called *Pub-PaECTER*. Both models are trained on 4 NVIDIA A100-SXM4-40GB GPUs using *Decoupled Weight Decay Regularization* (Loshchilov & Hutter, 2019) with a triplet loss margin of 1.

*Pat-SPECTER* is trained for one epoch with a per-device batch size of 8 and a learning rate of  $1e-5$ . This requires about 19 hours per epoch with validation every 2000 steps. *Pub-PaECTER* is trained for two epochs with a per-device batch size of 4 and gradient accumulation of 4, a learning rate of  $5e-6$ , and the same validation schedule. This takes about 18 hours per epoch. The number of epochs for both models was determined based on the observation that further training degraded validation performance. All fine-tuning was performed at the Max Planck Computing and Data Facility (MPCDF). Figure 1 illustrates how the models relate to each other.

Figure 1: Overview of the models used in the comparisons



**Notes:** BERT (Devlin et al., 2019) is a general language model for the English language trained on a variety of public corpora. SciBERT (Beltagy, Lo, & Cohan, 2019) is a BERT with a vocabulary specific to scientific papers (biomedical and computer science). BERT for Patents (Srebrovic & Yonamine, 2020) is a BERT with a vocabulary specific to patents. SPECTER (Cohan et al., 2020) augments the SciBERT model using paper citations. PaECTER (Ghosh et al., 2024) augments the BERT for Patents model using patent citations. Pat-SPECTER and Pub-PaECTER are developments reported in this paper.

## 4 Finding a cross-corpus language model

### 4.1 Experimental setup


Our goal is to assess which similarity models trace knowledge flows from science to technology best. We compare the following models against each other: BERT, SciBERT, BERT for Patents, SPECTER, SPECTER2, PaECTER, Pat-SPECTER, Pub-PaECTER. For comparison we also add BM25.

For each of these models, the task is to rank 5 related publications out of 30 as high as possible. One can think of this task as a citation recommendation where a potential examiner seeks to read related non-patent literature. A good recommendation machine is one that suggests only relevant publications.

As ground-truth data, we use EPO patents with at least 5 certain references to different NPL. We derive this data from the Patent-Paper-Citation dataset but



Figure 2: KDE of the time lag between citing patent and cited paper



**Notes:** This Kernel-Density Estimation plots the distribution of the time lag in years between the publication date of a cited paper and the publication date of the citing patent. Only papers with English abstract and valid publication date considered.

conduct the analysis at the DocDB family level. That is, we deduplicate patents at the family level and use the earliest publication year for all patents of the family. If the family cites more than 5 papers, we randomly select 5 of these, which we call "positives". These are contrasted with non-cited papers called "negatives". We only consider patent-paper citations of the highest confidence, that is score 10. Overall, we find 52,696 DocDB families satisfying the criteria.

We derive titles and abstracts of patents from PATSTAT Autumn 2024, and the titles and abstracts of publications from OpenAlex and Scopus.<sup>3</sup> We only consider English patents and publications. In some cases, OpenAlex does not provide a language flag, in which case we estimate the language ourselves; in other cases, the language flag is incorrect, but we choose not to do anything about this.

In total, we find 521,481 citation links to 273,175 distinct papers. The time lag between the publication date of the paper and that of the patent can be substantial. Figure 2 shows that the median age is 8 years (meaning, the paper got published 8 years before the patent), while the 1st percentile equals 38 years. In a few thousand cases, the paper was published after the patent.

Because of this citation lag pattern, we restrict the risk set of negative (i.e., not cited) papers to 1 to 38 years prior to the publication date of the patent. Out of this patent-specific risk set, for each patent we sample the 25 negative papers provided an that English abstract exists in either OpenAlex or Scopus.

<sup>3</sup>For several publishers, OpenAlex does not provide a work's abstract. We attempt to replenish the abstract from Scopus via the work's DOI.



## 4.2 Results

The test protocol is hence as follows:

1. The model generates embeddings for all 31 documents in a triplet (the focal patent and the 30 publications).
2. We calculate the similarity between the focal patent’s embeddings and the embeddings of the 30 publications.
3. The documents are then ranked from most similar to least similar based on the cosine distance.

This process is repeated for each of the 750,000 triplets.

Each model’s goal is to place the actually cited publications as highly as possible, ideally they should be the first five.

We use three standard metrics from Information Retrieval and Machine Learning to assess the quality of ranked lists: Average Rank of First Relevant (RFR), Mean Average Precision (MAP), and Mean Reciprocal Rank at 10 (MRR@10). RFR is the simplest, denoting the position in the ranked list at which the first relevant item appears. Lower values indicate better performance, as relevant items appear earlier. The metric is then averaged over all triplets.

Mean Average Precision (MAP) averages the precision scores across all relevant items in the ranking for each query and then averages across all queries  $q \in Q = 1000$  according to formula (1):

$$\text{MAP} = \frac{1}{Q} \sum_{q=1}^Q \left( \frac{1}{R_q} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{R}_q} \text{Precision}@k \right) \quad (1)$$

Here,  $R_q = 5 \forall q$ , while  $\text{Precision}@k$  denotes the proportion of relevant documents among the top  $k$ , i.e., the proportion of relevant documents in the top  $k$  results. This metric rewards systems that not only retrieve relevant results but also order them effectively throughout the ranking.

Mean Reciprocal Rank at 10 (MRR@10) computes the average of reciprocal ranks of the first relevant result over all queries, restricted to the top 10 results. For  $q \in Q$ , the metric is calculated according to formula (2):

$$\text{MRR@10} = \frac{1}{Q} \sum_{q=1}^Q \frac{1}{\text{rank}_q} \quad (2)$$

If no relevant result appears in the top 10, the reciprocal rank is 0 for that query. MRR@10 emphasizes early correct retrieval and is commonly used when a single relevant result is sufficient.

The results in Table 1 reveal that Pat-SPECTER performs well in terms of *avg. RFR* and *MRR@10* compared to other models. However, it comes out only second to SPECTER in terms of *MAP* metric, though the difference is not statistically significant (see Table 4 in Appendix).

Since *avg. RFR* and *MRR@10* evaluate the rank of the most similar publication for a given patent, Pat-SPECTER’s strong performance in these metrics suggests that it excels at early detection of the most relevant publications. In general, its

Table 1: Rank-Aware Evaluation of Different Models on the Cross-Corpus Dataset

Model	Avg. RFR		MAP		MRR@10	
	CLS	Mean	CLS	Mean	CLS	Mean
BERT	2.51	1.28	47.13	80.83	68.96	91.80
SciBERT	3.70	1.73	40.69	67.88	60.78	86.32
GTE-large	2.28	1.07	52.79	93.23	75.75	98.39
BERT for Patents	1.20	1.16	78.90	86.97	93.48	95.98
PatentSBERTa	1.10	1.09	88.67	88.43	97.08	96.99
SPECTER	1.09	1.23	91.64	84.50	97.37	94.63
SPECTER2	1.11	1.26	89.89	80.17	96.21	93.31
PaECTER	1.09	1.07	89.42	91.89	97.43	98.03
<b>Fine-tuned Models</b>						
Pat-SPECTER	<b>1.06</b>	1.12	<b>93.11</b>	88.85	<b>98.06</b>	96.51
Pub-PaECTER	1.44	1.37	73.02	76.56	89.73	91.65

**Notes:** "Avg. RFR" is the average rank of the first relevant (i.e., actually cited) publication. "MAP" is the mean-average precision, which takes into account the precision and the recall at every position where a relevant item appears (equation (1)). "MRR@10" is the mean reciprocal rank of the first relevant publication within the 10 closest publications (equation (2)). "CLS" and "Mean" refer to different ways we compute embeddings for a text of multiple sentences: "CLS" concatenates all sentences into one sentence while "Mean" takes the average of the sentences' embeddings.

slightly lower performance in *MAP*, which considers the ranks of all relevant publications, indicates that it may need to retrieve more publications to identify all relevant ones.

Thus we conclude that Pat-SPECTER is the most suitable model for cross-corpus comparison involving scientific publications and patents. The runner-up model is SPECTER, but Pat-SPECTER statistically dominates SPECTER.

## 5 Validation Exercises

To make the Pat-SPECTER model more palpable, we test it on two applications which we detail in this section.

The tasks at hand are these:

1. Can the Pat-SPECTER distinguish between Patent-Paper Pairs, Patent-Paper Citations and random patent-paper pairing?
2. Can Pat-SPECTER predict the paper belonging to a Patent Paper Pair?

All applications make use of the Logic Mill system (Erhardt et al., 2024). Logic Mill is a scalable and openly accessible software system with the goal to identify semantically similar documents either within and between corpora. Currently, Logic Mill provides Pat-SPECTER embeddings for scientific publications (all OpenAlex works with English-language abstract) and patent documents (all DocDB families

represented by their English-language representative, provided it exists). Under the hood it uses an ElasticSearch database, which allows for approximate nearest-neighbor searches across the universe of documents.

However, Logic Mill encodes just one patent document per DocDB family. This representative document does not always coincide with the patent provided in the Reliance on Science-dataset. When the DocDB patent family includes a patent document from the EPO, it takes precedence. More specifically, the pecking order within a DocDB family is EP > WO > US > JP > CN > KR > DE > FR > GB > IT > ES > SE > NL > Other. Lower application IDs break ties. The textual similarity should be extremely high however, if the texts are not actually identical.

## 5.1 Separating Patent-Paper Pairs from Patent-Paper Citations

Our first exercise is to compare the semantic similarity between Patent-Paper Pairs (PPPs) and Patent-Paper citations. Since PPPs are about the same invention, we expect that PPPs should be more similar on average than PPCs.

For our analysis, we use all patent-paper pairs and all patent-paper citations, provided an English abstract exists for both the patent and the paper. We source abstracts from the OpenAlex database and replenish with Scopus, if necessary. Patent abstracts originate from PATSTAT Autumn 2025, however we prioritize abstracts of applications over granted patents if available.

Though both PPPs and PPC come with confidence scores, we chose to include all available pairs and do not restrict to say the highest confidence classes. This approach should yield more conservative estimates as the presence of false PPP or PPC biases them downwards.

Some abstracts contain structure elements (such as headings) or contain copyright statements. These elements are typical for certain journals. Since the abstracts appear to be more similar, it may introduce an unwanted bias. We remove these elements with our abstract cleaning tool.<sup>4</sup>

Given the embeddings obtained with the Pat-SPECTER, we calculate the cosine similarity for each patent-paper pair. Since some PPP are also PPC, we exclude a PPC if it is also a PPP.


The results in Figure 3 demonstrate a clear separation between the patent-paper pairs and the patent-paper citations. We conclude that Pat-SPECTER is able to reproduce expected semantic similarities. However, the distributions overlap partially.

In practical applications, it is advised to use additional metadata as pre- or post-filtering criteria. For instance, author names could be used to pre-filter documents, refining the search space for identifying PPPs. Within this refined subset, a nearest-neighbor search would be conducted. Documents exceeding the similarity threshold would then be treated as PPPs.

---

<sup>4</sup>To create the embeddings, we use the title and abstract and concatenate these with the [SEP] from Autotokenizer.

Figure 3: Distributions of Pat-SPECTER cosine similarities by type of pair



**Notes:** These Kernel-Density Estimations plot the distribution of the cosine similarity between Pat-SPECTER embeddings representing a patent and a publication. Only papers with English abstract and valid publication date considered.

## 5.2 Predicting Patent Paper Pairs in the patent-publication universe

The strength of a nearest-neighbor database is to allow for semantic searches. In this exercise we thus strive to find the paper belonging to a PPP pair. Again, we include all 327,666 patent-paper-pairs where both the patent and the paper are present in Logic Mill.

For each DocDB family with a patent in the PPP dataset, we then retrieve the 1,000 most similar publications according to the Pat-SPECTER model, provided the publication was published within a window of 9 years prior to and 9 years after the patent publication. Then we assess the rank of the actually paired paper. Ideally this should be as low as possible.

Overall we find the corresponding paper for 251,407 patent-paper pairs among the 1000 most similar candidates. This amounts to a match rate of  $\approx 75.6\%$  (Table 2). Yet, the match rate amounts to as much as 89.6% for the highest confidence level.

The ECDF in Figure 4 displays the match quality for the matched PPPs graphically. The black line represents the total, while the dotted colored lines represent subsets of the data by confidence score. The lines indicate that for most pairs it holds that the matched paper comes early in the distribution. In about 65% of matched cases, the paper has a rank below 100, and in 90% of the cases, the true paper ranks below 500. However, the distribution is much denser for the highest confidence.

When we assess the rank of the suggested papers by PPP category, the results


Table 2: Matching statistics for the PPP exercise

Conf. level	# of obs	Share (in %)	Median	Mean	Std. dev.
1	62,644	63.7	58	175.8	240.9
2	74,874	69.9	44	156.4	230.2
3	113,053	79.8	26	125.4	208.0
4	77,095	89.6	7	74.0	162.5
Total	327,666	75.6	26	130.0	213.7

**Notes:** Match rate and rank summary statistics for the paper search for a given US patent among the Patent-Paper pair dataset, by confidence level. Confidence levels relate to algorithmic confidence of the Reliance of Science dataset, with category 4 being the highest confidence.

become even better. Table 2 gives the corresponding values including the match rate by PPP confidence level.

Figure 4: Empirical Cumulative Distribution of the rank for the matched PPPs



**Notes:** Empirical cumulative density functions for all matched Patent-Paper pairs, by confidence level. Confidence levels relate to algorithmic confidence of the Reliance of Science dataset, with category 4 being the highest confidence. Table 2 gives mean and median values.

### 5.3 Data limitations

The most severe limitation stems from lack and incompleteness of our data sources. OpenAlex misses a substantial amount of abstracts. In the May 2024 version, we found that as many as 45.5% of all works lack an English abstract. Without abstract however, we cannot represent the corresponding document. Thus these documents are exempt from the comparison.

Missing abstracts exist due to many reasons. For instance, abstracts for publications published in journals belonging to Elsevier or Springer Nature are missing, unless they are open access. A second reason is that many works do have an abstract, but not in English. Another reason is the definition of a "work". For OpenAlex, "Works" includes documents published by journals which are not commonly referred to as scientific publications. front matters, back matters, table of contents, advertisements, etc. Even though Logic Mill excludes works labeled as paratext, misclassifications and other errors in OpenAlex perpetuate into Logic Mill.

## 6 From Science to Technology

Having shown that Pat-SPECTER reproduces expected results when it comes to semantic similarity between the universe of English-language patents and English-language publications, we now turn to our research question. Our research question is to study which kind of patents cite unrelated NPL. A paper is considered unrelated if the semantic distance according to the Pat-SPECTER is too large.

We hypothesize that the duty of candor at the USPTO and the Israeli Patent Office results in more unrelated paper citations than at any other authority. The

duty of candor requires applicants to disclose (i.e., cite) all related prior art, and violations can render a patent unenforceable. Cotropia, Lemley, and Sampat (2013) document that this duty of candor induces applicants to cite more papers than may be necessary. We add a qualitative perspective to their quantitative finding.

For this task we use all Patent-Paper Citations (PPC) that belong to patents filed between 1970 and 2024. We restrict ourselves to all authorities with at least 10k observations (pairs) in the dataset, excluding WIPO and the Soviet Union. We also drop all pairs where no English abstract for either the cited paper or any member of the patent’s DocDB family exists, and we deduplicate patents at the DocDB family level.

Our final sample thus includes 2,855,109 patents and 4,812,869 papers which are connected through 15,943,404 links. 68% of these have the highest confidence score, and only 3% have the lowest confidence score.

The dependent variable is whether the actually cited paper is among the 1000 semantically most similar papers published prior to the patent filing. Specifically, given each patent’s Pat-SPECTER embedding (or the Pat-SPECTER embedding of the DocDB family’s representative document), we perform a  $k$ -nearest neighbor search for all OpenAlex works published in or before the year of patent filing, with  $k = 3000$

Out of 15,943,404 potential links, we find the cited paper among the 1k most similar documents in 2,150,780 cases (13%). Thus, in the majority of cases, cited papers are not specifically similar. Figure 5 shows share of matched citations per patent, since many patents cite multiple papers.

To explain why some PPC are semantically similar and others not, we run a simple regression of the following form:

$$\mathbb{1}\{\text{rank}_p(c) < 1000\} = \alpha + \beta_1 A_p + \beta_2 l_{c,p} + \beta_3 \mathbf{M}_p + \gamma s_{c,p} + \tau_p + \epsilon_p \quad (3)$$

where for every citation  $c$  of a patent  $p$ , we model whether its similarity rank is less than 1000, in relation to the authority  $A$ , the citation location  $l$  and the CPC matrix  $M$ . The reference authority is the EPO. We control for the confidence score  $s_{c,p}$ , the patent’s number of citations to papers, and the filing year  $\tau$  of the patent. Because of the high dimensionality, we have to resort to a linear model (OLS).

Following the above hypothesis, we expect that USPTO and Israeli patents will have a lower matching rate (i.e., the dependent variable will be 0 more often) because of its duty of candor.

Table 3 shows the results. We enter control variables one-by-one with column (5) being the most saturated one. Figure 6 presents the coefficients for the authorities relative to the EPO graphically. All else equal, patents from several authorities are more likely to cite semantically similar publications, namely: Germany, Korea, France, Italy, Russia, Spain, China, Great Britain, and the Eurasian Patent Office. Likewise, compared to the EPO and all else equal, patents filed at the patent authorities of Taiwan, Japan, Israel, Canada and the US are less likely to cite semantically related publications. This finding holds even without all controls (column (1)).

The finding for US and IL patents confirms our hypothesis: Publications cited in US or IL patents are 7% less likely to be among the 1000 most similar ones as compared to the EPO, even for the same CPC classes. We thus conclude that Pat-SPECTER produces results that show that the system works.



Figure 5: Distribution of the share of matched paper by patent





Table 3: Regression results for whether the cited paper is among the 1000 most similar documents

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Intercept	0.16*** (0.00)	0.17*** (0.00)	0.25*** (0.00)	0.20*** (0.00)	0.30*** (0.00)
AU	-0.05*** (0.00)	-0.06*** (0.00)	-0.01*** (0.00)	-0.04*** (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)
CA	-0.11*** (0.00)	-0.11*** (0.00)	-0.08*** (0.00)	-0.10*** (0.00)	-0.06*** (0.00)
CN	0.08*** (0.00)	0.07*** (0.00)	0.12*** (0.00)	0.06*** (0.00)	0.09*** (0.00)
DE	0.02*** (0.00)	0.02*** (0.00)	0.03*** (0.00)	0.01*** (0.00)	0.01*** (0.00)
EA	0.14*** (0.01)	0.13*** (0.01)	0.15*** (0.01)	0.15*** (0.01)	0.16*** (0.01)
ES	0.07*** (0.00)	0.07*** (0.00)	0.09*** (0.00)	0.07*** (0.00)	0.09*** (0.00)
FR	0.08*** (0.00)	0.07*** (0.00)	0.07*** (0.00)	0.06*** (0.00)	0.04*** (0.00)
GB	0.10*** (0.00)	0.09*** (0.00)	0.12*** (0.00)	0.09*** (0.00)	0.11*** (0.00)
IL	-0.12*** (0.00)	-0.12*** (0.00)	-0.05*** (0.00)	-0.09*** (0.00)	-0.03*** (0.00)
IT	0.06*** (0.00)	0.05*** (0.00)	0.08*** (0.00)	0.05*** (0.00)	0.07*** (0.00)
JP	-0.06*** (0.00)	-0.06*** (0.00)	-0.02*** (0.00)	-0.06*** (0.00)	-0.02*** (0.00)
KR	0.02*** (0.00)	0.01*** (0.00)	0.05*** (0.00)	0.00*** (0.00)	0.04*** (0.00)
RU	0.09*** (0.00)	0.08*** (0.00)	0.11*** (0.00)	0.07*** (0.00)	0.09*** (0.00)
TW	-0.06*** (0.00)	-0.06*** (0.00)	-0.01*** (0.00)	-0.06*** (0.00)	-0.01*** (0.00)
US	-0.06*** (0.00)	-0.07*** (0.00)	-0.05*** (0.00)	-0.07*** (0.00)	-0.07*** (0.00)
Front and body citation	0.06*** (0.00)	0.05*** (0.00)	0.05*** (0.00)	0.06*** (0.00)	0.05*** (0.00)
Self-citation	0.14*** (0.00)	0.14*** (0.00)	0.14*** (0.00)	0.14*** (0.00)	0.13*** (0.00)
Appln.Filing_Year FE			✓		✓
CPC dummies				✓	✓
Confscore FE		✓			✓
N	15,996,077	15,996,077	15,996,077	15,996,077	15,996,077
BIC	10612621.65	10545501.14	10463810.85	10507507.71	10267803.19
Log-Likelihood	-5306161.53	-5272526.64	-5231316.56	-5253529.92	-5133163.43

**Notes:** OLS estimates corresponding to model (3). Standard errors in parenthesis. "Self-citation" equals 1 if one of the inventors is author of the cited paper. "Front and body citation" equals 1 if the paper is cited in the front text and the body of a patent.


\* p<.1, \*\* p<.05, \*\*\*p<.01

Figure 6: Coefficient plot for authorities



**Notes:** This coefficient plot shows the estimated coefficients for the "authority" variable for model (3) relative to the EPO. Numerical values are in column (5) of Table (3). Coefficients statistically significant with  $p < 0.1$  highlighted in blue.

Figure 7: Coefficient plot for classes



**Notes:** This coefficient plot shows the estimated coefficients for the "CPC" variable for model (3). Numerical values are omitted from Table (3). Coefficients statistically significant with  $p < 0.1$  highlighted in blue.

Finally, in Figure 7 we present the coefficients for the CPC matrix from equation (3). There is no reference CPC class since they are not mutually exclusive. We find that patents linked to CPC classes A (Human necessities), C (Chemistry; metallurgy) or B (Performing operations; transporting) are less likely to cite semantically similar publications than patents not linked to these CPC classes. On the other hand, patents linked to CPC classes H (Electricity), F (Mechanical engineering; lighting; heating; weapons; blasting engines or pumps), G (Physics), E, (Fixed constructions) and D (Textiles; paper) are more likely to cite semantically similar publications. Only the heterogeneous residual category Y (for new technological developments) displays a precise 0 coefficient.

## 6.1 Interpretability

Pat-SPECTER, like SPECTER2 and PaECTER, is the result of contrastive learning. Contrastive learning models produce embeddings whose cosine similarities are highly similar. In our case, they are clustered around 0.86, while we never observe minimum cosine similarities smaller than 0.7.

Hence, we caution against the interpretation of the absolute cosine similarities of two Pat-SPECTER embeddings. The model was trained to produce ordinal rankings, and answers question like: Which document is more similar to my focal document than others? It is not trained state that a document is twice as similar to a focal document than another one.

## 7 Conclusion

As transformer-based language and similarity models are trained on a single corpus (such as patents), they often perform poorly on other corpora (such as publications). We train multiple self-trained cross-corpus language models and benchmark them on the same prediction task.

The winning language model, Pat-SPECTER, demonstrates promising performance in finding semantically related publications for a given patent, and vice versa. It uses the latest advances in machine learning, makes efficient use of all textual information (within the 512-token limit), is publicly available and produces replicable results.

The Pat-SPECTER can thus link documents in the technology domain to documents in the science domain in the absence of citations, or in the presence of strategic citations. As such, it can be helpful in many analyses at the heart of innovation economics. These include knowledge transfer, direction of technological and scientific development, and prior art search.

As many of these analyses require comparisons against the entire corpus, we recommend using the Logic Mill system (Erhardt et al., 2024). It stores Pat-SPECTER embeddings for all DocDB patent families (with an English-language member) and all OpenAlex works (with an English-language abstract) for fast and convenient (approximate) Nearest Neighbor searches. We hope this may overcome the search problems that inventors face when engaging with academic literature (Bikard, 2018).

Future analyses might experiment with representation of other patent parts, such as claims, and the incorporation of patent metadata, such as CPC classes.

## References

- Aghion, Philippe, Mathias Dewatripont, and Jeremy C. Stein (2008). “Academic freedom, private-sector focus, and the process of innovation”. In: *The RAND Journal of Economics* 39.3, pp. 617–635. DOI: [10.1111/j.1756-2171.2008.00031.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1756-2171.2008.00031.x).
- Ahmadpoor, Mohammad and Benjamin F. Jones (2017). “The dual frontier: Patented inventions and prior scientific advance”. In: *Science* 357.6351, pp. 583–587. DOI: [10.1126/science.aam9527](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aam9527).
- Beltagy, Iz, Kyle Lo, and Arman Cohan (2019). “SciBERT: A Pretrained Language Model for Scientific Text”. In: *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*. Hong Kong, China: Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 3613–3618. DOI: [10.18653/v1/D19-1371](https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/D19-1371).
- Bikard, Michaël (2018). “Made in Academia: The Effect of Institutional Origin on Inventors’ Attention to Science”. In: *Organization Science* 29.5, pp. 818–836. DOI: [10.1287/orsc.2018.1206](https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2018.1206).
- Cohan, Arman et al. (2020). “SPECTER: Document-level Representation Learning using Citation-informed Transformers”. In: *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Online: Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 2270–2282. DOI: [10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.207](https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.207).
- Cotropia, Christopher A., Mark A. Lemley, and Bhaven Sampat (2013). “Do applicant patent citations matter?”. In: *Research Policy* 42.4, pp. 844–854. DOI: [10.1016/j.respol.2013.01.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2013.01.003).
- Devlin, Jacob et al. (2019). “BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding”. In: *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 4171–4186. DOI: [10.18653/v1/N19-1423](https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/N19-1423).
- Erhardt, Sebastian et al. (2024). “Logic Mill – A Knowledge Navigation System”. In: *Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Patent Text Mining and Semantic Technologies (PatentSemTech 2024)*, Washington D.C., USA, July 28th, 2024. Workshop on Patent Text Mining and Semantic Technologies (PatentSemTech. arXiv:2301.00200 [cs]. Washington D.C., USA: arXiv. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2301.00200](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2301.00200).
- Ghosh, Mainak et al. (2024). *PaECTER: Patent-level Representation Learning using Citation-informed Transformers*. Version Number: 1. DOI: [10.48550/ARXIV.2402.19411](https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2402.19411).
- Jaffe, Adam B. and Gaétan de Rassenfosse (2017). “Patent citation data in social science research: Overview and best practices”. In: *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology* 68.6, pp. 1360–1374. DOI: [10.1002/asi.23731](https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23731).
- Kelly, Bryan et al. (2021). “Measuring Technological Innovation over the Long Run”. In: *American Economic Review: Insights* 3.3, pp. 303–320. DOI: [10.1257/aeri.20190499](https://doi.org/10.1257/aeri.20190499).
- Lee, Jieh-Sheng and Jieh Hsiang (2020). “Patent classification by fine-tuning BERT language model”. In: *World Patent Information* 61, p. 101965. DOI: [10.1016/j.wpi.2020.101965](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wpi.2020.101965).

- Loshchilov, Ilya and Frank Hutter (2019). “Decoupled Weight Decay Regularization”. In: *Proceedings of the ICLR 2019*. New Orleans, LA. DOI: [10.48550/ARXIV.1711.05101](https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1711.05101).
- Marx, Matt (2023). *From Patent-Paper Citations to Patent-Paper Pairs*. Cambridge, MA, USA.
- Marx, Matt and Aaron Fuegi (2020). “Reliance on science: Worldwide front-page patent citations to scientific articles”. In: *Strategic Management Journal* 41.9, pp. 1572–1594. DOI: [10.1002/smj.3145](https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.3145).
- (2022). “Reliance on science by inventors: Hybrid extraction of in-text patent-to-article citations”. In: *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy* 31.2, pp. 369–392. DOI: [10.1111/jems.12455](https://doi.org/10.1111/jems.12455).
- Michel, Jacques and Bernd Bettels (2001). “Patent citation analysis. A closer look at the basic input data from patent search reports”. In: *Scientometrics* 51.1, pp. 185–201. DOI: [10.1023/A:1010577030871](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010577030871).
- Mikolov, Tomas et al. (2013). *Efficient Estimation of Word Representations in Vector Space*. arXiv:1301.3781 [cs]. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.1301.3781](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1301.3781).
- Natterer, Michael (2014). “Entwicklung, empirische Validierung und ökonomische Anwendung eines texbasierten Ähnlichkeitsmaßes”. Inauguraldissertation. Munich: Ludwig Maximilians University.
- Poege, Felix et al. (2019). “Science quality and the value of inventions”. In: *Science Advances* 5.12, eaay7323. DOI: [10.1126/sciadv.aay7323](https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aay7323).
- Priem, Jason, Heather Piwowar, and Richard Orr (2022). *OpenAlex: A fully-open index of scholarly works, authors, venues, institutions, and concepts*. Version Number: 2. DOI: [10.48550/ARXIV.2205.01833](https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2205.01833).
- Singh, Amanpreet et al. (2023). “SciRepEval: A Multi-Format Benchmark for Scientific Document Representations”. In: *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Singapore: Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 5548–5566. DOI: [10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.338](https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.338).
- Srebrovic, Rob and Jay Yonamine (2020). *Leveraging the BERT algorithm for Patents with TensorFlow and BigQuery*. Tech. rep. Google.
- Tur, Elena M. and Francesco Pasimeni (2024). “Extreme citing behaviors in patents: When the duty of candor backfires”. In: *World Patent Information* 79, p. 102317. DOI: [10.1016/j.wpi.2024.102317](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wpi.2024.102317).
- Vaswani, Ashish et al. (2017). “Attention Is All You Need”. In: *NIPS’17: Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*. DOI: [10.5555/3295222.3295349](https://doi.org/10.5555/3295222.3295349).
- Vowinkel, Konrad and Volker D. Hähnke (2023). “SEARCHFORMER: Semantic patent embeddings by siamese transformers for prior art search”. In: *World Patent Information* 73, p. 102192. DOI: [10.1016/j.wpi.2023.102192](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wpi.2023.102192).



## 8 Appendix: Statistical Significance Test Pat-SPECTER

Table 4: Statistical Significance Testing of Rank-Aware Evaluation of Pat-SPECTER versus Different Models on a Cross-Corpus Dataset

	Avg. RFR	MAP	MRR@10
BERT	0.214*** (0.007)	-0.123*** (0.001)	-0.063*** (0.001)
SciBERT	0.668*** (0.007)	-0.252*** (0.001)	-0.117*** (0.001)
BERT for Patents	0.095*** (0.007)	-0.061*** (0.001)	-0.021*** (0.001)
SPECTER	0.028*** (0.007)	-0.015*** (0.001)	-0.007*** (0.001)
SPECTER2	0.049*** (0.007)	-0.032*** (0.001)	-0.019*** (0.001)
PaECTER	0.006 (0.007)	-0.012*** (0.001)	-0.000 (0.001)
Pub-PaECTER	0.304*** (0.007)	-0.166*** (0.001)	-0.064*** (0.001)
Constant	1.063*** (0.005)	0.931*** (0.001)	0.981*** (0.001)
Adjusted $R^2$	0.034	0.180	0.044
Observations	421,568	421,568	421,568

**Notes:** Standard errors in parentheses. Base level model is Pat-SPECTER. All models use their best pooling method, as derived from Table 1.

\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$