

1 Introducing *SoNHR* – Reporting guidelines for social networks in health research

2

3 Douglas A. Luke^{1*}, Edward Tsai², Bobbi J. Carothers¹, Sara Malone³, Beth Prusaczyk⁴,
4 Todd B. Combs¹, Mia T. Vogel⁵, Jennifer Watling Neal⁶, Zachary P. Neal⁶

5

6 Affiliations:

7 ¹Center for Public Health Systems Science, Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, MO, United
8 States of America

9 ²Office of Community Engagement and Health Equity, University of Illinois Cancer Center, University of
10 Illinois-Chicago, Chicago, IL, United States of America

11 ³Department of Surgery, School of Medicine, Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, MO, United
12 States of America

13 ⁴Institute for Informatics, Data Science, and Biostatistics, School of Medicine, Washington University in
14 St. Louis, St. Louis, MO, United States of America

15 ⁵Brown School, Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, MO, United States of America

16 ⁶Department of Psychology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, United States of America

17

18 * Corresponding author

19

20

21 **Abstract**

22 *Objective*

23 The overall goal of this work is to produce a set of recommendations (*SoNHR* – Social Networks in
24 Health Research) that will improve the reporting and dissemination of social network concepts,
25 methods, data, and analytic results within health sciences research.

26 *Methods*

27 This study used a modified-Delphi approach for recommendation development consistent with best
28 practices suggested by the EQUATOR health sciences reporting guidelines network. An initial set of 28
29 reporting recommendations was developed by the author team. A group of 67 (of 147 surveyed)
30 experienced network and health scientists participated in an online feedback survey. They rated the
31 clarity and importance of the individual recommendations, and provided qualitative feedback on the
32 coverage, usability, and dissemination opportunities of the full set of recommendations. After
33 examining the feedback, a final set of 18 recommendations was produced.

34 *Results*

35 The final *SoNHR* reporting guidelines are comprised of 18 recommendations organized within five
36 domains: *conceptualization* (how study research questions are linked to network conceptions or
37 theories), *operationalization* (how network science portions of the study are defined and
38 operationalized), *data collection & management* (how network data are collected and managed),
39 *analyses & results* (how network results are analyzed, visualized, and reported), and *ethics & equity*
40 (how network-specific human subjects, equity, and social justice concerns are reported). We also

41 present a set of exemplar published network studies which can be helpful for seeing how to apply the
42 SoNHR recommendations in research papers. Finally, we discuss how different audiences can use these
43 reporting guidelines.

44 *Conclusions*

45 These are the first set of formal reporting recommendations of network methods in the health
46 sciences. Consistent with EQUATOR goals, these network reporting recommendations may in time
47 improve the quality, consistency, and replicability of network science across a wide variety of
48 important health research areas.

49 *Introducing SoNHR – Reporting Guidelines for Social Networks in Health Sciences*

50 *Research*

51 **Introduction**

52 Despite the dominance of the medical model of health in the 20th and 21st centuries[1], we have
53 always understood that health is very much socially determined. Family and peer influences on
54 smoking and diet; the role of social support on longevity and quality of life; social class and income
55 inequality influencing access to health care; social isolation as a risk factor for depression and suicide;
56 relational and structural factors shaping the course of pandemics – these are just some of the
57 examples of how social factors are involved with individual, community, and population health [2].
58 Network science is the use of relational and structural theories to study network representations of
59 complex social and physical systems. Although the roots of network science go back over a hundred
60 years, its application within the health sciences is more recent. Driven by theoretical advances [3],
61 modern computational power, and the increased availability of socially structured health data [4], the
62 application of network designs and analytic methods within the health sciences has increased
63 dramatically in the past few decades [5]. For example, Figure 1 shows the increase in network analytic
64 studies over the past 20 years—with health-related network studies currently accounting for as much
65 as 26% of all network publications.

66 **Fig 1. While network analysis studies have grown in general over the past two decades, the**
67 **percentage of those specifically from health fields has grown from just 3% in 2002 to 26% in 2021.**

68 **(The data for this figure come from SCOPUS searches for ‘network analysis’ first overall and then**
69 **limited to publications focusing on health fields.)**

70

71 Modern health science has benefited greatly from the reporting guidelines movement, where
72 methodological, analytical, and reporting best practices are used to improve research quality, validity,
73 and impact [6,7]. Numerous reporting guidelines exist across the social and health sciences that help
74 guide practice and reporting of clinical trials (i.e., CONSORT), systematic reviews (PRISMA),
75 epidemiologic studies (STROBE), and implementation science studies (StaRI), to name just a few.
76 However, until now there has not been a similar set of guidelines for reporting the results of network
77 studies in the health sciences. This is an important gap to fill, most directly because of the prevalence
78 of network studies, as suggested above [8]. However, a set of network reporting best practices will also
79 benefit a notable training gap among network analysis professionals. Training in network science and
80 analytic methods is still not regularly featured in most medical schools, schools of public health, and
81 even many social science departments.

82 The overall goal of this work is to produce a set of recommendations that will improve the reporting
83 and dissemination of social network concepts, methods, data, and analytic results within health
84 research. These recommendations, called Social Networks in Health Research (SoNHR), focus
85 specifically on *reporting*, not on how to do better network science. There already exist many excellent
86 network analysis texts, for example, those by Scott (2017) [9] or Borgatti, Everett, and Johnson (2018)
87 [10]. And although the primary emphasis is on reporting network studies in peer-reviewed scientific
88 publications, we anticipate that these recommendations will be useful in other contexts including

89 evaluation reporting, and in training and teaching. The paper is structured in three parts: first, we
90 describe the process we took for developing the network reporting guidelines. Second, we present and
91 discuss the recommendations themselves. We then conclude with some recommendations on how to
92 use the recommendations in different contexts and present some helpful resources including examples
93 of the recommendations in practice.

94

95 **Methods**

96 **Overview**

97 This is a guidelines development study with the main goal of producing a set of reporting
98 recommendations for studies using network data and methods in the health sciences. The general
99 methodological approach we used for developing these recommendations was a modified expert panel
100 consensus process, as recommended by EQUATOR (Enhancing the QUALity and Transparency Of health
101 Research; <https://www.equator-network.org/>) and implemented by other reporting guidelines
102 development teams (e.g., Pinnock, et al., 2017) [11]. This study was approved by the Institutional
103 Review Board of Washington University in August 2021 (ID: 202108053).

104

105 **Development of initial set of recommendations and expert panel survey**

106 An initial set of network reporting recommendations was developed by the author team, based on an
107 informal review of the network science and health science literatures, as well as their experience using

108 network methods. Collectively, the author team has decades of experience conducting network
109 studies, disseminating network studies to health and social science audiences, teaching and training
110 students in network methods, publishing network methods texts, and reviewing grants and
111 manuscripts using network and systems science methods. In this development phase, we produced a
112 set of 28 candidate recommendations, grouped into five categories: 1) conceptualization, 2)
113 operationalization, 3) data collection & management, 4) analyses & results, and 5) ethics & equity.
114 These categories broadly represent the phases of empirical research, along with an overarching
115 category focusing on ethical and equity aspects of network science [12].

116 Originally, we planned to convene network science experts to provide input and feedback on the
117 recommendations. However, because of COVID-19 we switched to an online survey approach. The
118 survey was developed in Qualtrics and focused on two types of feedback. Usability ratings were
119 assessed using two items: *importance* of the recommendation, and *clarity* of the recommendation.
120 Importance was defined as “the degree to which you feel that the particular guideline is critical for
121 researchers to understand and follow in their empirical studies which apply SNA methods” and was
122 rated on a 1 (Not at all Important) to 5 (Very Important) scale. Clarity was defined as “the degree to
123 which the wording of the guideline clearly communicates to researchers using these reporting
124 guidelines the type of information needed to satisfy the guideline” and was rated on a 1 (Not at all
125 Clear) to 5 (Very Clear) Likert scale.

126 In addition to these quantitative items, participants were asked to respond to a series of open-ended
127 questions focusing on general improvements to the guidelines, suggestions for disseminating the
128 guidelines, and how they might use the guidelines in their own work. Appendix A contains the expert
129 panel feedback survey, including the initial set of 28 recommendations.

130

131 **Participants**

132 Our goal was to identify individuals who were experts in social network analysis applied to health
133 contexts. To that end, we identified five stakeholder groups that should be represented: experts in
134 applied health research, social network methodologists, network methods instructors, journal editors,
135 and funders. Using these groups as guiding principles, we identified individuals who authored well-
136 known papers, books, and analysis software; colleagues from federal funding agencies (NIH, CDC, etc.);
137 participants in network analysis trainings (e.g., Systems Science for Social Impact); and members of the
138 International Network for Social Network Analysis (INSNA). We invited a total of 147 people to
139 participate, of whom 67 responded for a response rate of 45.6 %. The survey ran from December 2021
140 through April 2022. Responses were treated as confidential; specific identifying information was
141 stripped from the data files prior to analyses.

142 Participant characteristics are presented in Tables 1 and 2. The participants as a group were
143 experienced network and health scientists, working across a wide variety of fields and research areas.
144 Over 80% of the participants had at least six years of experience using network designs and methods,
145 with over 20% having at least two decades of experience. Nearly all participants had published network
146 papers and reviewed network-focused papers or grants during the past five years (94% and 88%,
147 respectively). The participant group included ten members who have worked in an organization that
148 funds network research activities.

149

150 Table 1. Professional characteristics of expert panel members. (Percentages can add up to more than
 151 100% because of multiple choice options.)

	Frequency	Percentage
<i>Network Research Experience</i>		
20+ years	14	21.5
11-20 years	22	33.8
6-10 years	18	27.7
1-5 years	11	16.9
<i>Network Science Activities (past 5 years)</i>		
Published paper	61	93.8
SNA professional organization	58	89.2
Reviewed SNA papers/grants	57	87.7
Taught SNA	48	73.8
Worked in org. funding SNA	10	15.4
<i>Primary Disciplinary Focus</i>		
Public health	38	58.5
Sociology	29	44.6
Statistics, Math, CS	13	20.0
Organizational research	13	20.0
Psychology	11	16.9
Medicine	8	12.3
Social Work	7	10.8
All others (15)	31	47.6
<i>Health Science Applications</i>		
Implementation science	25	38.5
Health disparities, equity, justice	25	38.5
Community-focused	22	33.8
Methods development	21	32.3
Program evaluation	19	29.2
Health services	18	27.7
Mental health	17	26.2
Epidemiology	16	24.6
Health promotion	15	23.1
Addiction, substance use	14	21.5
Health policy	13	20.0
Children, youth, families	13	20.0
Older adults	12	18.5
Cancer	11	16.9
Infectious disease	11	16.9
All others (17)	67	101.5

152

153 Table 2. Demographic characteristics of expert panel members.

	Frequency	Percentage
<i>Gender Identity</i>		
Woman	41	63.1
Man	23	35.4
Prefer not to say	1	1.5
<i>Identify as Transgender</i>		
No	64	98.5
Prefer not to say	1	1.5
<i>Race</i>		
White	53	81.5
Asian	7	10.8
Black or African American	1	1.5
Other race not listed	2	3.1
Prefer not to say	4	6.2
<i>Hispanic/Latinx Ethnicity</i>		
No	59	90.8
Yes	6	9.2

154

155

156

157 **Development of final set of network reporting recommendations**

158 Data from the expert panel survey were summarized and analyzed. Specifically, descriptive statistics
159 and distributional characteristics of the importance and clarity items were examined to identify
160 recommendations that could be dropped or recommendations that needed improvement. Thematic
161 summaries were prepared for the open-ended questions and were also used to help differentiate
162 between strong and weaker recommendations.

163

164 Results

165 Recommendations development

166 The quantitative results of the preliminary network reporting recommendations from the Delphi
167 survey are presented in Table 3. In general, the preliminary recommendations received high scores on
168 *importance* and *clarity*. The operationalization recommendations scored the highest, with average
169 importance ratings of 4.7 (out of 5) and clarity ratings of 4.6. The five preliminary visualization
170 recommendations scored lowest in importance (mean = 3.5). Closer examination of the visualization
171 ratings suggested that participants fell into one of two categories—some felt these recommendations
172 were quite important, but a substantial number clearly felt that visualizations in general were less
173 important in network science. The detailed, item-level survey responses (including dot-plots) are
174 available in Appendices B and C.

175 Table 3. Summary of importance and clarity ratings of preliminary set of network reporting
176 recommendations.

177

<i>Domain</i>	<i>No. of Recs.</i>	<i>Importance</i>		<i>Clarity</i>	
		<i>Mean</i>	<i>Range</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Range</i>
Conceptualization	3	4.3	4.1 – 4.6	4.2	3.7 – 4.4
Operationalization	4	4.7	4.4 – 4.9	4.6	4.4 – 4.7
Data Collection & Management	6	4.3	4.0 – 4.6	4.1	3.8 – 4.5
Analysis & Results - Description	2	4.3	4.2 – 4.4	4.1	4.0 – 4.2
Analysis & Results - Visualization	5	3.5	3.1 – 3.8	4.1	3.9 – 4.3
Analysis & Results – Modeling & Simulation	4	4.4	4.2 – 4.7	4.2	3.9 – 4.4
Ethics & Equity	4	4.2	3.8 – 4.6	4.3	3.8 – 4.5

178

179

180 The responses to the open-ended questions indicated general enthusiasm for the network reporting
181 recommendations (e.g., “These are awesome and well needed. Bravo!”), but more importantly
182 included many suggestions on how to improve individual recommendations as well as their overall
183 structure. Participants also provided numerous suggestions on how to disseminate the guidelines as
184 well as how they might use the recommendations in their own work (see Discussion below).

185 Taking the importance, clarity, and qualitative feedback into account, the team revised the
186 recommendations by dropping, rewriting, and reordering items. Items were dropped if they received
187 lower importance or clarity ratings, or if on further reflection they seemed to be redundant with other
188 items or were too narrow in scope. For example, one of the preliminary 28 guideline recommendations
189 that was dropped was, “For valued networks, describe reconciliation of conflicting values when
190 provided by both members of the dyad.” This item was overly complicated (receiving the lowest clarity
191 score in its group) and it applies to relatively few types of network studies. The main structural change
192 we made was to combine two separate recommendation sections (*Network Description* and *Network
193 Visualization*) into one section.

194

195 **Final reporting guidelines for social networks in health research (SoNHR)**

196 Table 4 presents our final set of 18 recommendations for reporting social network methods and
197 results, particularly within health sciences research (SoNHR). These recommendations are not a formal

198 checklist; we do not expect all these recommendations to apply to every specific network paper.
199 However, the use of these recommendations will help ensure that network methods and results are
200 reported as clearly as possible, benefiting future research.

201

202 Table 4. Final reporting guidelines - Social Networks in Health Research (SoNHR).

Conceptualization
C1. Clearly describe how and why networks are relevant for addressing the study's research question(s).
C2. Make the value of a network analysis apparent by explaining what kind of information a network analysis tells us that a more traditional approach would not.
Operationalization
O1. Define the <i>nodes</i> to make it clear what a node represents.
O2. Define the <i>ties</i> so that it is clear what each type of tie represents. Make sure to indicate if ties are directed or undirected and if ties are binary or weighted.
O3. Define the boundaries of the network so that it is clear who is included and not included in the network.
O4. State clearly the basic type of network that is being analyzed (<i>e.g.</i> , complete network, ego networks, affiliation/2-mode/bipartite networks).
Data Collection & Management
D1. Describe network data collection <i>procedures</i> and tools (<i>e.g.</i> , surveys and software) in enough detail to support replication. When possible, provide access to all surveys, instruments, and tools used.
D2. Describe the network <i>data</i> used in the study, including pre-existing data sources, how the data are stored, managed, and whether/where they are publicly available.
D3. Discuss missingness in the network data, its implications, and any attempts to impute or account for missing data (<i>e.g.</i> , rationale for requiring one or both responses when only one member of a dyad reports a relationship).
D4. Report all data transformations (<i>e.g.</i> , aggregation of person-level to organization-level nodes, reconciliation of conflicting link values when provided by both members of a dyad, etc.).
Analyses & Results
<i>Description & Visualization</i>
AD1. When discussing network statistics, be clear about the unit of analysis (<i>e.g.</i> , node, dyad, sub-network, whole network).
AD2. Report network statistics (<i>e.g.</i> , centrality, centralization, homophily, etc.) in terms of the real-world property of the setting being assessed (<i>e.g.</i> , what does it mean for a particular node to have high degree centrality, for a network to have high betweenness centralization, or for nodes with similar characteristics to cluster together?)
AD3. Network visualizations should clearly illustrate study findings using design principle best practices that are appropriate for network characteristics and the goals of the visualization (<i>e.g.</i> , using node color or shape to convey categorical properties, using node size to convey quantitative properties, limited use of labels and different shapes in large networks, varying line weights or colors in small networks).
<i>Modeling & Simulation</i>
AM1. Explain the theoretical foundations that drive the model or simulation development and testing.
AM2. If statistical network models or simulations are used, clearly specify model mechanisms and outcomes (<i>e.g.</i> , tie formation). When possible, provide reproducible statistical programming code used in the analyses to support replication.

AM3. Present some information on how well the network model fits with the observed network data and discuss any important implications of model fit.

Ethics & Equity

- E1. Discuss how confidentiality was explained to participants and how their confidentiality was ensured, including considerations of identifiability in network visualizations and reporting. Clarify how participants understood that information could be collected about them even if they chose not to participate, *or* that non-participation precluded information being collected about them.
- E2. Discuss any potential biases within network structures and results that may be rooted in the network study methods (*e.g.*, failure to capture complete networks, organizational or specific group non-participation, over-representation). Think in terms of equity and social, economic, and health justice when doing so.

203

204 **Conceptualization**

205 The first two recommendations refer to the basic *conceptualization* of the research project as reported
206 in the publication. Network studies are inherently structural or relational; they concern themselves
207 with how social objects (*e.g.*, persons, organizations) relate to one another, or how social structures
208 shape the flow of physical or social things such as viruses, information, money, behavior, etc. [13]. The
209 first recommendation is to make the structural and relational conceptualizations that drive the
210 research questions clear to the reader. This provides the basic rationale for using network methods in
211 the first place. The second recommendation is similar but focuses on the network methods
212 themselves. How are these network methods used in the study necessary or advantageous, given the
213 research questions driving the study?

214 **Operationalization**

215 The second set of recommendations is focused on *operational definitions* of the various pieces of the
216 network study, *i.e.*, who is in the network, what the ties represent, and what kind of network is being
217 analyzed. Definitions of the nodes are usually straightforward, but they may need additional details if

218 the nodes are not persons (e.g., organizations), or in the case of 2-mode networks, where both types of
219 nodes need to be clearly defined. For example, in an infectious disease contact tracing study, one type
220 of node would be people who are infected, and the other type of node would be defined as a specific
221 physical location where people come into contact with one another [14].

222 Defining the network ties used in a study often requires careful attention to detail. At a minimum, the
223 description of network ties should include a statement of what the tie represents (e.g., contact
224 frequency, trust, sexual contact) and how it was measured (e.g., self-report using a 5-point scale with
225 each anchor point defined). This is particularly important when more than one type of tie is collected
226 and analyzed in the study. Moreover, once ties have been defined, it is a good practice to refer to that
227 type of tie specifically (e.g., ‘friendship tie’) rather than a more generic term like ‘ties,’ or ‘connections.’
228 Otherwise, this can lead to the impression by the reader that a network has only one type of
229 relationship among network members when any network contains many different kinds of social
230 relationships, whether measured in the study or not.

231 It is always important to describe who is in the network, and, conversely, who is not in the network.
232 Thus, the boundaries of the network should be clear, especially for complete network studies [15]. And
233 this leads to the last recommendation in this section, which is a clear description of the type of
234 network being analyzed. First, state whether this network is *complete*, where most or all members of a
235 boundary-defined network are included (e.g., ‘all cancer healthcare providers in St. Louis County’); or
236 *ego-centric*, where networks are constructed from the perspective of individual members or ‘egos’
237 (e.g., personal support networks of people in a study of the effects of social support). In addition, it is
238 often important to define the network in terms of the types of ties—are the ties directed or non-
239 directed, and are the ties valued or binary?

240 **Data Collection & Management**

241 The third set of recommendations concerns reporting of *data collection and management* details.
242 Network data are quite different from the data used in the vast majority of other health and social
243 science research. They are fundamentally relational, which implies different kinds of data collection,
244 management, and subsequent analytic practices. Therefore, authors may need to provide more
245 information on these data management steps than they normally would. Taken together, these data
246 management recommendations support future replication. They also suggest network-specific data
247 issues. For example, missing data in network studies represent more serious threats to accurate
248 interpretation and bias [16,17], so it is important to describe how missing data are handled in any
249 network study. Furthermore, a common data issue in survey-based network analysis is when
250 individuals in a dyad give conflicting information about a shared tie. If this is the case, then authors
251 should report how that conflicting information is resolved [18]. In addition, enough details on any
252 network data transformation (e.g., turning 2-mode into 1-mode network data [14]) should be
253 presented to support full understanding and potential future replication.

254 **Analyses & Results**

255 The first set of recommendations under analyses and results helps ensure that readers will fully
256 understand the results coming out of basic *descriptive network analysis* studies. First, make sure to
257 clarify what the network *unit-of-analysis* is for any particular set of network statistics. Readers may not
258 fully appreciate how network results can focus on individual network members, pairs of network
259 members, subnetworks, or complete network characteristics. Second, it is very important to convey
260 how a particular network statistic measures or captures an underlying behavioral, structural, or

261 relational characteristic of the network or network member. For example, in a communication network
262 study, do not simply report the technical formula for a statistic such as network *centralization*, but
263 describe how this measure assesses the extent to which the communication structure is more or less
264 hierarchical in nature. Finally, many network studies employ visualizations, so it is important to design
265 them in such a way that it is clear how the visualization supports or reveals the underlying network
266 characteristic or analytic result. This is likely to require both general information visualization skills
267 (e.g., Tufte, 2001), as well as network-specific graphic design principles (e.g., Shneiderman & Dunne,
268 2012; Ognyanova, 2021).

269 The second section of recommendations under analyses and results refers to good practices for
270 reporting results from *network modeling or simulation* studies. These types of studies move beyond
271 simple network descriptions and visualizations to using data and theory to pose and test hypotheses
272 about network structures and influences. Taken together, these three recommendations will help
273 ensure that readers will understand the theory or framework that drives the network modeling
274 analyses, will have enough technical information to support further research replication using these
275 models, and appreciate how well the network model or simulation fits with the observed network data
276 [22].

277 **Ethics & Equity**

278 The final set of recommendations refers to special considerations around *ethics and equity* in network
279 studies. Standard non-network surveys and similar methods of data collection allow for anonymity and
280 confidentiality. However, when collecting data on networks anonymity is not possible, as the
281 individuals or organizations in the network must be named to create ties in subsequent analyses. Even

282 if a person or organization chooses not to participate in a network study, they might be named by
283 others during data collection. Offering informed consent or even *truly informed consent* for
284 participants in network studies is a promising practice to ensure confidentiality [12,23]. As part of this
285 process, those choosing not to participate should be aware that they may be named by others.
286 Omitting non-consenters in a network study is dangerous and can greatly impact network structures,
287 analyses, results, and interpretations [24]. More appropriate strategies for maintaining confidentiality
288 are to anonymize data as soon as possible after data collection and to reduce the number of people
289 who have access to the data [23,25].

290 Equity is an essential consideration in all scientific research, and in network analysis its importance is
291 amplified. As stated above, maximizing response rates and capturing complete networks are also
292 especially important in network studies. It is important to identify all who influence or are affected by
293 the substantive area of the network under consideration, including historically underrepresented types
294 of network members such as patients in individual networks or relatively small agencies in
295 organizational networks. Researchers should monitor recruitment and look for patterns in non-
296 responses. For example, one study found that network studies of sex workers commonly
297 underrepresented men in their roles as sex workers and designed a purposeful sampling strategy more
298 inclusive of them [26]. Similar to the ethical concerns around reporting incomplete network study
299 findings, the underrepresentation of certain groups or organizations can distort results, or even worse,
300 exacerbate existing inequities through exclusion.

301

302

303 Discussion

304 The SoNHR (Social Networks in Health Research) guidelines were developed to promote the clear and
305 comprehensive reporting of network studies in the literature among health researchers. Already a
306 well-established theoretical and methodological frame, the use of network science in health research
307 continues to increase. However, without reporting guidelines, the utility, replicability, and impact of
308 network science studies are diminished. These guidelines were created through an iterative, expert
309 consensus building process and the resulting recommendations can be applied broadly across health
310 research studies, including those in the clinical, social science, community, and population/public
311 health research fields.

312

313 Suggested audiences and supporting resources

314 These guidelines have the potential to benefit at least five distinct audiences – instructors, authors,
315 journal editors, reviewers, and readers – that capture the full process of scientific knowledge
316 generation and dissemination.

317 First, these guidelines offer *authors* recommendations about how to report the design and results of
318 their health-related social network research clearly and consistently. We anticipate this is especially
319 helpful and important because social network methods are both diverse and rapidly developing, which
320 can lead to confusion among authors about what essential aspects to report. Although the guidelines
321 themselves offer specific recommendations, Table 5 provides examples of published research that
322 have followed these recommendations, and thus that can serve as exemplars for authors. Although not

323 exhaustive, these examples represent a collection of “best practices” for each of the recommendations
324 and illustrate how each of the recommendations can be put into action.

325 Table 5. Non-exhaustive list of published network studies demonstrating network reporting recommendations.

Rec.	1 st Author & Year	Title	Description	Pointer
<i>Conceptualization</i>				
C1	Bearman (2004) [33]	Chains of affection: The structure of adolescent romantic and sexual networks.	Links theoretical models of disease transmission to network properties.	Pages 47-52
C1	DeLay (2017) [34]	Assessing the impact of homophobic name calling on early adolescent mental health: A longitudinal social network analysis of competing peer influence effects.	Provides a theoretical rationale for the relational nature of homophobic name calling and for studying network selection and influence processes.	Page 957
C2	McGlashan (2019) [35]	Collaboration in complex systems: Multilevel network analysis for community-based obesity prevention Interventions.	Lays out the role of multilevel network analysis for unpacking the complexities inherent in community-based systems interventions for obesity prevention.	Abstract
C2	Valente (2019) [36]	Effects of a social-network method for group assignment strategies on peer-led tobacco prevention programs in schools.	Links the social science literature on peer influence to the rationale for the network intervention.	Page 1837, last paragraph
<i>Operationalization</i>				
O1	Lee (2011) [37]	Social network analysis of patient sharing among hospitals in Orange County, California.	Clearly describes the nodes as hospitals and providers characteristics of these hospitals.	Last paragraph of Background and first paragraph of Methods.
O1	Fuller (2007) [38]	Use of social network analysis to describe service links for farmers' mental health.	The nodes are described as “agencies known to have contact with” farming families about mental health and wellbeing in a specific town.	Second paragraph in Methods.
O2	Koehly (2003) [39]	A social network analysis of communication about hereditary nonpolyposis colorectal cancer genetic testing and family functioning.	Ties were clearly defined through measures of communication, cohesiveness, affective involvement, leadership, and conflict.	Measures sub-section under “Materials and Methods” section.
O2	Bruening (2018) [40]	Friendship as a social mechanism influencing body mass index (BMI) among emerging adults.	The description effectively communicates that ties represent friendships and are binary and directed.	Page 4 in “Friendships” subsection of Measurements
O3	McGlashan (2019) [35]	Collaboration in complex systems: Multilevel network analysis for community-based obesity prevention Interventions.	Clear operational definition of network boundaries, specifically how network members were formally engaged in the steering committees.	Participants subsection within the Methods section.

O3	Cauchemez (2010) [41]	Role of social networks in shaping disease transmission during a community outbreak of 2009 H1N1 pandemic influenza.	Clearly describes inclusion criteria based on an outbreak investigation in Pennsylvania.	1 st paragraph in Results section.
O4	Broccatelli (2021) [42]	Social network research contribution to evaluating process in a feasibility study of a peer-led and school-based sexual health intervention.	Defined variables of interest as the offline friendship ties among students and student's embeddedness in online Facebook groups.	Second paragraph of Analytical Method section.
O4	Dhand (2019) [43]	Social networks and risk of delayed hospital arrival after acute stroke.	Links network metrics (e.g., size and connectivity) to the underlying scientific constructs (e.g., conduits for information entry, exchange, and disruption).	Last paragraph of Introduction.

Data Collection & Management

D1	Van der Gaag (2005) [44]	The Resource Generator: social capital quantification with concrete items.	Specific resource generator items and a clear definition about what counts as "knowing" a person are provided.	Table 2.
D1	Lorant (2017) [45]	Optimal network for patients with severe mental illness: a social network analysis.	Survey questions and response choices are clearly explained.	Two paragraphs under Data Collection sub-section
D2	Kim (2020) [46]	COVID-19 health communication networks on Twitter: Identifying sources, disseminators, and brokers.	Description of a pre-existing, publicly-available dataset and its existing structures is clear. Provides a good demonstration of how to sample the most important nodes from a large dataset. Discussion of how retweets and mentions are used to measure indegree and outdegree and highlight information sources.	Pages 131-132 "Construction of retweet and mention networks" section. Page 133 "User level" section.
D2	Ahmed (2020) [47]	COVID-19 and the 5G conspiracy theory: Social network analysis of Twitter data.	Twitter dataset is described clearly, including what hashtags were mined	Two paragraphs under Methods section
D3	Gile (2017) [48]	Analysis of networks with missing data with application to the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health.	Demonstrates ERGMs of a network with missing data using four approaches: all observations (as-is), complete-case (removing nodes of non-responders), incomplete-case (uses all nodes but not the links between any dyads including non-responders), and differential popularity (models differences between respondents and non-respondents to partially compensate).	Pages 507-517, "Analyzing adolescent friendship networks" section.
D3	De Moor (2020) [49]	Assessing the missing data problem in criminal network analysis using forensic DNA data.	Information on how previous research has handled missing data and how the current	Section 4.2 under the Methods section

D4	Carothers (2022) [50]	Mapping the lay of the land: Using interactive network analytic tools for collaboration in rural cancer prevention and control.	study handled their missing data is clearly presented	Pages 1160-1161, "Network data management" section.
D4	Scott (2005) [51]	Social network analysis as an analytic tool for interaction patterns in primary care practices.	Discusses aggregation of individual responses to agency-level nodes, symmetrization of non-directed networks, and reconciliation of one valued network and one directed network. Describes how direct observations were transcribed into directed and undirected adjacency matrices that then formed the basis of the network data.	Pages 444-445

Analyses & Results (Description & Visualization)

AD1	de la Haye (2017) [52]	The dual role of friendship and antipathy relations in the marginalization of overweight children in their peer networks: The TRAILS Study.	Clearly indicated the unit of analysis in ERGMS: "The unit of the analysis is the ordered pair of students in a classroom (xij), and the dependent variable is the observed value of a friendship or dislike tie (1 = present, 0 = absent)."	Page 3
AD1	Hawe (2008) [53]	Use of social network analysis to map the social relationships of staff and teachers at school.	Analyses are clearly described in terms of node vs. network unit if analysis, such as centralization.	Paragraphs 5-10 under Methods section.
AD2	Weeden (2021) [54]	Still a small world? University course enrollment networks before and during the COVID-19 pandemic.	Interpreted changes in node degree, proportion of students in largest bi-component, average distance, and within-field clustering within a university course enrollment network before and during the COVID-19 pandemic.	p. 76-79
AD2	Cappella (2013) [55]	Classroom peer relationships and behavioral engagement in elementary school: The role of social network equity.	Introduces, defines, and interprets a new network statistic measuring social network equity.	Page 371
AD3	Block (2020) [56]	Social network-based distancing strategies to flatten the COVID-19 curve in a post-lockdown world.	Good use of figure design (especially node color and tie bolding) to clearly communicate shortest pathways and infection risk.	Figures 1 & 2
AD3	Ahn (2011) [57]	Flavor network and the principles of food pairing.	Good use of color, node size, and tie size to designate food groups and network structures.	Figure 2

Analyses & Results (Modeling & Simulation)

AM1	Bond (2014) [58]	Friends or foes? Relational dissonance and adolescent psychological wellbeing.	Provides a description of ERGMs & the foundations underlying ERGM models. Figure 1	Page 4 & Figure 1
-----	------------------	--	--	-------------------

AM1	Kiuru (2012) [59]	Is depression contagious? A test of alternative peer socialization mechanisms of depressive symptoms in adolescent peer networks.	provides a description of what each parameter included in the model tests. Tests two different mechanisms of socialization (contagion & convergence) and describes how different parameters (average alter & average similarity) were used in SAOMs to test each.	Page 252
AM2	Combs (2022) [60]	Simulating the role of knowledge brokers in policy making in state agencies: An agent-based model.	"A week in the life of an agent" illustrates how opinions about health policies diffuse across the social networks in the agent-based model.	Sections 2.3.4
AM2	Mercken (2009) [61]	Dynamics of adolescent friendship networks and smoking behavior: Social network analyses in six European countries.	Clearly lays out how the network model is able to distinguish between social influence and social selection mechanisms for adolescent smoking behavior.	Figure 1 & Table 2
AM3	Luke (2010) [62]	Systems analysis of collaboration in 5 national tobacco control networks.	Presents model fit statistics and graphics for the main ERGM model.	Figure 2 and text on page 1294
AM3	Morris (2009) [63]	Concurrent partnerships and HIV prevalence disparities by race: linking science and public health practice.	Conducts a simulation to examine how assortative mixing drives racial disparities in HIV prevalence; compares results of the simulations to observed survey data, particularly AddHealth.	Results section, particularly the 2 nd column on page 1027

Ethics & Equity

E1	D'Angelo (2021) [12]	The presentation of the networked self: Ethics and epistemology in social network analysis.	'Encounters in the field' section contains three case studies of network analysis that help to illustrate the importance of confidentiality.	Pages 23-26
E1	Banbury (2017) [64]	Can videoconferencing affect older people's engagement and perception of their social support in long-term conditions management: a social network analysis from the Telehealth Literacy Project.	'Procedure' section discusses how researchers explained confidentiality to participants and obtained informed consent.	Page 940
E2	Bungay (2016) [26]	Addressing underrepresentation in sex work research: Reflections on designing a purposeful sampling strategy.	'Designing a Purposeful Sampling Strategy' section explains how the study increased inclusion of historically underrepresented network members.	Pages 969-971
E2	Lobb (2014) [65]	Using organizational network analysis to plan cancer screening programs for vulnerable populations.	The 'Discussion' section explains that although community health centers are important in cancer care networks, they are often peripheral to or isolated from disconnection to provincial providers in Canada.	Pages 361-363

327 Second, these guidelines can be used by *instructors* of social network coursework to inform the topics
328 covered in such courses, and by their students to rapidly develop an understanding of the most
329 important features of social network research. For example, modules in an introductory course on
330 social network analysis could roughly follow the major headings of the guidelines, while individual
331 recommendations under each of these headings could serve as learning objectives within these
332 modules.

333 Third, these guidelines can serve as a helpful checklist for *reviewers* when evaluating health-related
334 social network research. Reviewers can use the guidelines and individual recommendations to ensure
335 the completeness of their evaluations of social network studies. In addition, following these guidelines
336 to evaluate social network research may improve the consistency between reviewers, which is often
337 quite low [27], as they provide a common set of reporting standards to evaluate.

338 Fourth, these guidelines can be required as reporting standards by *journal editors* who publish health-
339 related social network research to ensure the standardized reporting of social network methods and
340 results. This type of editorial requirement is not without precedent. For example, many journal editors
341 already require reporting guidelines developed for other methods including PRISMA for systematic
342 reviews and meta-analyses [28], JARS-QUAL for qualitative research [29], JARS-QUANT for quantitative
343 research [30], and CONSORT for randomized trials [31].

344 Finally, these guidelines have benefits for *readers* of health-related social network research. When
345 implemented, these guidelines should improve the detail, clarity, and transparency of social network
346 methods and results for readers. Additionally, when put into practice, these guidelines should ensure

347 that critical methodological and analytic details are provided in social network papers, making it easier
348 to re-use published social network research in meta-analyses and systematic reviews.

349

350 **Strengths, gaps, and next steps**

351 This is among the first set of reporting guidelines for social network science concepts, methods, and
352 results. Although a number of network *data* formatting and reporting guidelines exist (e.g., Bagrow,
353 2022) [32], to our knowledge there are no guidelines focusing on best reporting practices in scientific
354 dissemination, especially within health research. These guidelines are being published in EQUATOR,
355 which will increase their visibility and longevity and hopefully enhance their effectiveness. Finally,
356 these reporting guidelines include equity and ethical considerations, which are important, require
357 special consideration in network science, and have previously been underdiscussed.

358 Although we developed these reporting guidelines to be broadly applicable to many kinds of network
359 studies, they may be less helpful (or need to be adapted) for some kinds of network study designs or
360 analytic frameworks (e.g., purely qualitative network studies, ego-centric designs, dynamic analyses,
361 etc.). Similarly, the scope of these recommendations is somewhat high-level, we deliberately left out
362 extremely specific reporting suggestions (e.g., guidance around the use of weighted ties in network
363 visualizations) that would not be applicable to many network studies. Finally, for the expert panel
364 consensus process, we may have missed some important viewpoints and distinct experiences that
365 could have helped inform the network reporting guidelines. However, the relatively large, experienced,
366 and diverse set of participants we ended up with (see Tables 1 & 2) somewhat mitigates that concern.

367 We will continue to work on disseminating the SoNHR guidelines beyond EQUATOR and then hosting
368 these guidelines on relevant websites (including at cphss.wustl.edu). We also encourage interested
369 partners to further spread the guidelines and share how they have used them (see above). In
370 particular, case studies of the application of the network reporting recommendations would be useful
371 for the field of network health research.

372 As we gain a better understanding of how social connections, structures, and dynamics are implicated
373 in human disease processes, effective healthcare delivery, and promotion of public health, there will
374 be a concomitant need for appropriate scientific frameworks, study designs, and analytic approaches.
375 Network science and social network analysis are particularly well-suited for these types of health
376 research. The network reporting guidelines presented here will be helpful for ensuring that the
377 knowledge generated in these studies can have the broadest impact, both scientifically and socially.

378

379

380

381 **Acknowledgements**

382 We are grateful for the contributions and expertise of our recommendations development expert
383 panel. They were crucial for helping us develop and finalize the SoNHR recommendations.

384

385

386

387 **References**

- 388 1. Engel GL. The need for a new medical model: a challenge for biomedicine. *Science*. 1977;196:
389 129–136. doi:10.1126/SCIENCE.847460
- 390 2. Luke DA, Prusaczyk B. Network Analysis: The Social Bridge to Health. *The SAGE Handbook of*
391 *Social Studies in Health and Medicine*. 2022; 122–142. doi:10.4135/9781529714357.N7
- 392 3. Berkman LF, Glass T, Brissette I, Seeman TE. From social integration to health: Durkheim in the
393 new millennium. *Soc Sci Med*. 2000;51: 843–857. doi:10.1016/S0277-9536(00)00065-4
- 394 4. Brandes U, Robins G, Anif AM, Wasserman S. What is network science? *Network Science*.
395 2013;1: 1–15. doi:10.1017/NWS.2013.2
- 396 5. Smith KP, Christakis NA. *Social Networks and Health*.
397 <https://doi.org/101146/annurev.soc34040507134601>. 2008;34: 405–429.
398 doi:10.1146/ANNUREV.SOC.34.040507.134601
- 399 6. Marušić A, Campbell H. Reporting guidelines in global health research. *J Glob Health*. 2016;6.
400 doi:10.7189/JOGH.06.020101
- 401 7. Simera I, Moher D, Hirst A, Hoey J, Schulz KF, Altman DG. Transparent and accurate reporting
402 increases reliability, utility, and impact of your research: Reporting guidelines and the EQUATOR
403 Network. *BMC Med*. 2010;8: 1–6. doi:10.1186/1741-7015-8-24/TABLES/1
- 404 8. Neal ZP, Neal JW. *Network Analysis in Community Psychology: Looking Back, Looking Forward*.
405 *Am J Community Psychol*. 2017;60: 279. doi:10.1002/AJCP.12158
- 406 9. Scott J. *Social Network Analysis*. 1 Oliver’s Yard, 55 City Road London EC1Y 1SP : SAGE
407 Publications Ltd; 2017. doi:10.4135/9781529716597
- 408 10. Borgatti SP, Everett MG, Johnson JC. *Analyzing Social Network*. 2018; 266–269.
- 409 11. Pinnock H, Barwick M, Carpenter CR, Eldridge S, Grandes G, Griffiths CJ, et al. Standards for
410 Reporting Implementation Studies (StaRI): explanation and elaboration document. *BMJ Open*.
411 2017;7: e013318. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2016-013318
- 412 12. D’Angelo A, Ryan L. The presentation of the networked self: Ethics and epistemology in social
413 network analysis. *Soc Networks*. 2021;67: 20–28. doi:10.1016/j.socnet.2019.06.002
- 414 13. Monge PR, Contractor N. *Theories of Communication Networks*. Oxford University Press; 2003.
415 doi:10.1093/oso/9780195160369.001.0001
- 416 14. Borgatti SP, Everett MG. Network analysis of 2-mode data. *Soc Networks*. 1997;19: 243–269.
417 doi:10.1016/S0378-8733(96)00301-2

- 418 15. Laumann E, Marsden P, Prensky D. The Boundary Specification Problem in Network Analysis.
419 Applied Network Analysis: A Methodological Introduction. 1983;61.
- 420 16. Krause RW, Huisman M, Steglich C, Snijders T. Missing data in cross-sectional networks – An
421 extensive comparison of missing data treatment methods. Soc Networks. 2020;62: 99–112.
422 doi:10.1016/j.socnet.2020.02.004
- 423 17. Kossinets G. Effects of missing data in social networks. Soc Networks. 2006;28: 247–268.
424 doi:10.1016/j.socnet.2005.07.002
- 425 18. An W, Schramski S. Analysis of contested reports in exchange networks based on actors’
426 credibility. Soc Networks. 2015;40: 25–33. doi:10.1016/j.socnet.2014.07.002
- 427 19. Tufte ER. The visual display of quantitative information. : 197.
- 428 20. Shneiderman B, Dunne C. Interactive Network Exploration to Derive Insights: Filtering,
429 Clustering, Grouping, and Simplification. 2012. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-36763-2_2
- 430 21. Ognyanova K. Network visualization with R. 2021 [cited 5 Mar 2023]. Available: Ognyanova, K.
431 (2021) Network visualization with R. Retrieved from www.kateto.net/network-visualization.
- 432 22. Amati V, Lomi A, Mira A. Social Network Modeling. Annu Rev Stat Appl. 2018;5: 343–369.
433 doi:10.1146/annurev-statistics-031017-100746
- 434 23. Borgatti SP, Molina J-L. Toward ethical guidelines for network research in organizations. Soc
435 Networks. 2005;27: 107–117. doi:10.1016/j.socnet.2005.01.004
- 436 24. Harris J. Consent and Confidentiality: Exploring Ethical Issues in Public Health Social Network
437 Research. 2008.
- 438 25. Borgatti SP, Molina JL. Ethical and Strategic Issues in Organizational Social Network Analysis. J
439 Appl Behav Sci. 2003;39: 337–349. doi:10.1177/0021886303258111
- 440 26. Bungay V, Oliffe J, Atchison C. Addressing Underrepresentation in Sex Work Research:
441 Reflections on Designing a Purposeful Sampling Strategy. Qual Health Res. 2016;26: 966–978.
442 doi:10.1177/1049732315613042
- 443 27. Kravitz RL, Franks P, Feldman MD, Gerrity M, Byrne C, Tierney WM. Editorial Peer Reviewers’
444 Recommendations at a General Medical Journal: Are They Reliable and Do Editors Care? PLoS
445 One. 2010;5: e10072. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0010072
- 446 28. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020
447 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. International Journal of
448 Surgery. 2021;88: 105906. doi:10.1016/j.ijsu.2021.105906
- 449 29. Levitt HM, Bamberg M, Creswell JW, Frost DM, Josselson R, Suárez-Orozco C. Journal article
450 reporting standards for qualitative primary, qualitative meta-analytic, and mixed methods

- 451 research in psychology: The APA Publications and Communications Board task force report.
452 American Psychologist. 2018;73: 26–46. doi:10.1037/amp0000151
- 453 30. Appelbaum M, Cooper H, Kline RB, Mayo-Wilson E, Nezu AM, Rao SM. Journal article reporting
454 standards for quantitative research in psychology: The APA Publications and Communications
455 Board task force report. American Psychologist. 2018;73: 3–25. doi:10.1037/amp0000191
- 456 31. Schulz KF, Altman DG, Moher D. CONSORT 2010 statement: Updated guidelines for reporting
457 parallel group randomised trials. J Pharmacol Pharmacother. 2010;1: 100–107.
458 doi:10.4103/0976-500X.72352
- 459 32. Bagrow J, Ahn Y-Y. Network cards: concise, readable summaries of network data. Appl Netw Sci.
460 2022;7: 84. doi:10.1007/s41109-022-00514-7
- 461 33. Bearman PS, Moody J, Stovel K. Chains of Affection: The Structure of Adolescent Romantic and
462 Sexual Networks. American Journal of Sociology. 2004;110: 44–91. doi:10.1086/386272
- 463 34. DeLay D, Hanish LD, Zhang L, Martin CL. Assessing the Impact of Homophobic Name Calling on
464 Early Adolescent Mental Health: A Longitudinal Social Network Analysis of Competing Peer
465 Influence Effects. J Youth Adolesc. 2017;46: 955–969. doi:10.1007/s10964-016-0598-8
- 466 35. McGlashan J, de la Haye K, Wang P, Allender S. Collaboration in Complex Systems: Multilevel
467 Network Analysis for Community-Based Obesity Prevention Interventions. Sci Rep. 2019;9:
468 12599. doi:10.1038/s41598-019-47759-4
- 469 36. Valente TW, Hoffman BR, Ritt-Olson A, Lichtman K, Johnson CA. Effects of a Social-Network
470 Method for Group Assignment Strategies on Peer-Led Tobacco Prevention Programs in Schools.
471 Am J Public Health. 2003;93: 1837–1843. doi:10.2105/AJPH.93.11.1837
- 472 37. Lee BY, McGlone SM, Song Y, Avery TR, Eubank S, Chang C-C, et al. Social Network Analysis of
473 Patient Sharing Among Hospitals in Orange County, California. Am J Public Health. 2011;101:
474 707–713. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2010.202754
- 475 38. Fuller J, Kelly B, Sartore G, Fragar L, Tonna A, Pollard G, et al. Use of social network analysis to
476 describe service links for farmers’ mental health. Australian Journal of Rural Health. 2007;15:
477 99–106. doi:10.1111/j.1440-1584.2007.00861.x
- 478 39. Koehly LM, Peterson SK, Watts BG, Kempf KKG, Vernon SW, Gritz ER. A social network analysis of
479 communication about hereditary nonpolyposis colorectal cancer genetic testing and family
480 functioning. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev. 2003;12: 304–13.
- 481 40. Bruening M, van Woerden I, Schaefer DR, Hruschka D, Brewis A, Whisner CM, et al. Friendship as
482 a social mechanism influencing body mass index (BMI) among emerging adults. PLoS One.
483 2018;13: e0208894. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0208894

- 484 41. Cauchemez S, Bhattarai A, Marchbanks TL, Fagan RP, Ostroff S, Ferguson NM, et al. Role of social
485 networks in shaping disease transmission during a community outbreak of 2009 H1N1 pandemic
486 influenza. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2011;108: 2825–2830.
487 doi:10.1073/pnas.1008895108
- 488 42. Broccatelli C, Wang P, McDaid L, McCann M, Simpson SA, Elliott L, et al. Social Network Research
489 contribution to evaluating process in a feasibility study of a peer-led and school-based sexual
490 health intervention. *Sci Rep*. 2021;11: 12244. doi:10.1038/s41598-021-90852-w
- 491 43. Dhand A, Luke D, Lang C, Tsiaklides M, Feske S, Lee J-M. Social networks and risk of delayed
492 hospital arrival after acute stroke. *Nat Commun*. 2019;10: 1206. doi:10.1038/s41467-019-09073-
493 5
- 494 44. van der Gaag M, Snijders TAB. The Resource Generator: social capital quantification with
495 concrete items. *Soc Networks*. 2005;27: 1–29. doi:10.1016/j.socnet.2004.10.001
- 496 45. Lorant V, Nazroo J, Nicaise P. Optimal Network for Patients with Severe Mental Illness: A Social
497 Network Analysis. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services
498 Research*. 2017;44: 877–887. doi:10.1007/s10488-017-0800-7
- 499 46. Kim I, Valente TW. COVID-19 Health Communication Networks on Twitter: Identifying Sources,
500 Disseminators, and Brokers. *Connections*. 2020;40: 129–142. doi:10.21307/connections-
501 2019.018
- 502 47. Ahmed W, Vidal-Alaball J, Downing J, López Seguí F. COVID-19 and the 5G Conspiracy Theory:
503 Social Network Analysis of Twitter Data. *J Med Internet Res*. 2020;22: e19458.
504 doi:10.2196/19458
- 505 48. Gile KJ, Handcock MS. Analysis of Networks with Missing Data with Application to the National
506 Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health. *J R Stat Soc Ser C Appl Stat*. 2017;66: 501–519.
507 doi:10.1111/rssc.12184
- 508 49. de Moor S, Vandeviver C, vander Beken T. Assessing the missing data problem in criminal
509 network analysis using forensic DNA data. *Soc Networks*. 2020;61: 99–106.
510 doi:10.1016/j.socnet.2019.09.003
- 511 50. Carothers BJ, Allen P, Walsh-Bailey C, Duncan D, Pacheco RV, White KR, et al. Mapping the Lay of
512 the Land: Using Interactive Network Analytic Tools for Collaboration in Rural Cancer Prevention
513 and Control. *Cancer Epidemiology, Biomarkers & Prevention*. 2022;31: 1159–1167.
514 doi:10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-21-1446
- 515 51. Scott J. Social Network Analysis as an Analytic Tool for Interaction Patterns in Primary Care
516 Practices. *The Annals of Family Medicine*. 2005;3: 443–448. doi:10.1370/afm.344

- 517 52. de la Haye K, Dijkstra JK, Lubbers MJ, van Rijsewijk L, Stolk R. The dual role of friendship and
518 antipathy relations in the marginalization of overweight children in their peer networks: The
519 TRAILS Study. *PLoS One*. 2017;12: e0178130. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0178130
- 520 53. Hawe P, Ghali L. Use of social network analysis to map the social relationships of staff and
521 teachers at school. *Health Educ Res*. 2007;23: 62–69. doi:10.1093/her/cyl162
- 522 54. Weeden K, Cornwell B, Park B. Still a Small World? University Course Enrollment Networks
523 before and during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Sociol Sci*. 2021;8: 73–82. doi:10.15195/v8.a4
- 524 55. Cappella E, Kim HY, Neal JW, Jackson DR. Classroom peer relationships and behavioral
525 engagement in elementary school: the role of social network equity. *Am J Community Psychol*.
526 2013;52: 367–79. doi:10.1007/s10464-013-9603-5
- 527 56. Block P, Hoffman M, Raabe IJ, Dowd JB, Rahal C, Kashyap R, et al. Social network-based
528 distancing strategies to flatten the COVID-19 curve in a post-lockdown world. *Nat Hum Behav*.
529 2020;4: 588–596. doi:10.1038/s41562-020-0898-6
- 530 57. Ahn Y-Y, Ahnert SE, Bagrow JP, Barabási A-L. Flavor network and the principles of food pairing.
531 *Sci Rep*. 2011;1: 196. doi:10.1038/srep00196
- 532 58. Bond L, Lusher D, Williams I, Butler H. Friends or Foes? Relational Dissonance and Adolescent
533 Psychological Wellbeing. *PLoS One*. 2014;9: e83388. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0083388
- 534 59. Kiuru N, Burk WJ, Laursen B, Nurmi J-E, Salmela-Aro K. Is depression contagious? A test of
535 alternative peer socialization mechanisms of depressive symptoms in adolescent peer networks.
536 *J Adolesc Health*. 2012;50: 250–5. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2011.06.013
- 537 60. Combs T, Nelson KL, Luke D, McGuire FH, Cruden G, Henson RM, et al. Simulating the role of
538 knowledge brokers in policy making in state agencies: An agent-based model. *Health Serv Res*.
539 2022;57 Suppl 1: 122–136. doi:10.1111/1475-6773.13916
- 540 61. Mercken L, Snijders TAB, Steglich C, de Vries H. Dynamics of adolescent friendship networks and
541 smoking behavior: Social network analyses in six European countries. *Soc Sci Med*. 2009;69:
542 1506–1514. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2009.08.003
- 543 62. Luke DA, Harris JK, Shelton S, Allen P, Carothers BJ, Mueller NB. Systems analysis of collaboration
544 in 5 national tobacco control networks. *Am J Public Health*. 2010;100: 1290–7.
545 doi:10.2105/AJPH.2009.184358
- 546 63. Morris M, Kurth AE, Hamilton DT, Moody J, Wakefield S. Concurrent partnerships and HIV
547 prevalence disparities by race: linking science and public health practice. *Am J Public Health*.
548 2009;99: 1023–31. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2008.147835
- 549 64. Banbury A, Chamberlain D, Nancarrow S, Dart J, Gray L, Parkinson L. Can videoconferencing
550 affect older people’s engagement and perception of their social support in long-term conditions

551 management: a social network analysis from the Telehealth Literacy Project. Health Soc Care
552 Community. 2017;25: 938–950. doi:10.1111/hsc.12382

553 65. Lobb R, Carothers BJ, Lofters AK. Using Organizational Network Analysis to Plan Cancer
554 Screening Programs for Vulnerable Populations. Am J Public Health. 2014;104: 358–364.
555 doi:10.2105/AJPH.2013.301532

556

557

558

559

560 **Supporting information**

561 **S1 File. Appendix A.**


562 **S2 Table. Appendix B.**

563 **S3 Fig. Appendix C.**

564 **S4 File. Feedback Data**

565 **S5 File. Feedback Data Variable Dictionary**

Growth in overall and health science publications using network methods



Percentage growth of health-science specific publications using network methods (% of overall)




Figure 1