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**Figure 4.** Visualized partial correlation network with edge weights displayed

*Note.* Visualized partial correlation network of resilience (A1-C3), coping (D1-F2), and SoB (G1-G2). The lines between the nodes represent edges, green stands for positive associations, red for negative. The thicker the line, the stronger the edge. Additionally, on all existing edges, the corresponding edge weight is displayed with two decimals. The absence of an edge indicates that no correlation between the respective nodes was found, controlling for all other nodes in the network.

To test the network’s accuracy, a bootstrap procedure was run for edge weight variation, see Figure 5. Narrow confidence intervals are preferred as they indicate a low edge weight variation of the bootstrapped samples (Isvoranu et al., 2021). In the present study, the confidence intervals were not exactly narrow, indicating that edge strength differences need to be considered with slight caution (Epskamp et al., 2018). The interpretation of positivity or negativity of the edges and the presence of edges that emerged is unaffected and stays well interpretable with the confidence intervals that were estimated (Epskamp et al., 2018).



**Figure 5.** Edge weight variation

*Note.* All edges that emerged are sorted by edge weight on the Y-axis. The red line represents the actual sample, the black line displays the bootstrapped sample mean, the grey area around the two lines accounts for a confidence interval of 95%.

To evaluate the interpretability of edge weight differences, the significance of Edge weight differences (α < .05) was tested using bootstrapped samples, see Figure 6. A narrow shape of the strongest edges in the top right corner of the graph suggests good interpretability for those edge differences. As the low end of edges on the bottom left corner is mostly covered by grey squares, these edge differences are to be interpreted with caution, as most of these were not found to be significant in the bootstrapping procedure.



**Figure 6.** Significance of edge weight differences

*Note.* All Edges that emerged are sorted by edge weight on the X and Y-axis. Grey squares indicate a non-significant edge weight difference between the corresponding edges, black squares indicate the presence of a significant edge weight difference.

To assess the network’s stability regarding the centrality indices, the significance (α < .05) of node strength difference was tested, see Figure 7. In that procedure, all nodes are first ranked by strength, then all possible node strength comparisons are estimated (Epskamp et al., 2018). Here, a node is on average significantly stronger than the fifth next in ranking, indicating that node strength comparisons can be made, but only with nodes that are approximately five ranks below the corresponding node. In this paper, node strength was predominantly used to point out the strongest and most influential nodes for the network. This is feasible, regarding the testing of significant node strength differences (Epskamp et al., 2018).



**Figure 7.** Significance of node strength differences

*Note.* Nodes are sorted by strength on the X and Y-axis. Grey squares indicate a nonsignificant node strength difference between the corresponding nodes, black squares indicate the presence of a significant node strength difference. The numbers on the diagonal do not display the actual node strength, but the respective z-score.

For the indices node strength, betweenness, closeness, bridge expected influence, and bridge strength, a correlation stability analysis was run, see Figures 8 and 9 of Appendix A. By performing a correlation stability analysis, a percentage of the bootstrapped samples is dropped. With the remaining samples, the correlation between the particular centrality indices in the bootstrapped samples and the actual sample is estimated (Epskamp et al., 2018). A CS-coefficient specifies how many of the bootstrapped samples can be dropped to remain a .7 correlation with the actual sample (Epskamp et al., 2018). The following CS-coefficients were estimated: .673 for node strength, .362 for bridge expected influence, and .44 for bridge strength. A CS-coefficient between .25 and .50 is acceptable, and values between .50 and .75 are good (Epskamp et al., 2018). Therefore, the centrality indices can be seen as stable and well interpretable.



**Figure 8.** Correlation stability analysis: node strength, node betweenness, node closeness

*Note.* The X-axis indicates how much percent of the bootstrapped samples remain; the Y axis shows the average correlation with the original sample. The red line expresses the correlation of the bootstrapped samples with the original sample for the parameter node strength until 70% of the bootstrapped samples are dropped.



**Figure 9.** Correlation stability analysis: bridge expected influence and bridge strength

*Note.* The X-axis indicates how much percent of the bootstrapped samples remain; the Y-axis shows the average correlation with the original sample. The red and blue lines express the correlation of the bootstrapped samples with the original sample for the parameters bridge strength and bridge expected influence until 70% of the bootstrapped samples are dropped.