

Far-reaching consequences of trait-based social preferences for the structure and function of animal social networks

Josefine Bohr Brask^{1,2,3}*, Andreas Koher¹, Darren P. Croft³, Sune Lehmann^{1,2}

1. DTU Compute, Technical University of Denmark (DTU), Denmark
 2. Copenhagen Center for Social Data Science (SODAS), University of Copenhagen, Denmark
 3. Centre for Research in Animal behaviour, University of Exeter, United Kingdom
- * Corresponding author. Email: bohrbrask@gmail.com

Abstract

Social network structures play an important role in the lives of animals by affecting individual fitness, and the spread of disease and information. Nevertheless, we still lack a good understanding of how these structures emerge from the behaviour of individuals. Generative network models based on empirical knowledge about animal social systems provide a powerful approach that can help close this gap. In this study: 1) we develop a general model for the emergence of social structures based on a key generative process of real animal social networks, namely social preferences for traits (such as the age, sex, etc. of social partners); 2) we use this model to investigate how different trait preferences affect social network structure and function. We find that the preferences used in a population can have far-reaching consequences for the population, via effects on the transmission of disease and information and the robustness of the social network against fragmentation when individuals disappear. The study thus shows that social preferences can have consequences that go far beyond direct benefits individuals gain from social partner selection. It also shows that these consequences depend both on the preference types, and on the types of traits they are used with. We discuss the implications of the results for social evolution.

Introduction

Sociality is a central aspect of life on earth. Across animal species, individuals are embedded in non-random social network structures, which emerge from the patterns of social interactions between individuals. These structures have major consequences on both short and long (evolutionary) timescales. The patterns of social connections affect spreading processes such as the transmission of disease and information (1,2), and the social connectedness of individuals has been linked to their health, reproduction and survival in multiple species (3). Similarly to ecological environments, social structures exert selection pressures and hence act as an evolutionary force (4,5). Understanding social structuring is therefore important for understanding the conditions of life for individuals, and the evolution of social systems and species.

A key question for understanding social structures is how they arise. To gain a comprehensive understanding of social structuring, we must understand in depth how the diverse social network structures observed across different species emerge from individual behaviour (6). This is important for our fundamental understanding of sociality, as well as for predicting how changes in social strategies (for example caused by environmental disruptions) may affect social systems (7).

To understand the emergence of social network structures, we need to understand how different generative processes (such as strategies for social partner choice) shape different structural and functional aspects of social networks. Generative network models are an ideal tool for investigating how network structures emerge from underlying processes. These models are in essence algorithms that create simulated networks, based on rules that define how network nodes link to each other. They constitute a central pillar in network science, where they have been used extensively to investigate diverse aspects of networks (for common models see e.g. (8-11)). Generative network models provide a natural approach for investigating the connection between individual behaviour and social network structure, and model construction based on empirical knowledge about animal social structures makes it possible to investigate how generative processes of importance in real animal social systems affect network structure and function.

The empirical study of animal social networks has seen a great development in the last two decades, and social networks have now been quantified and analysed in many species (12). This means that we now have a good understanding of how animal social networks are structured. The large body of empirical studies on animal social networks that is now available makes it possible to draw inferences about generative processes of general importance for the emergence of real social structures. These generative processes can then be investigated with generative network modelling. While generative network models have not yet played as central a role in the study of animal social structures as in wider network science, they have been used to investigate various aspects of these networks, including a number of generative processes (e.g. age-dependent social strategies (13), cooperativeness-based partner choice (14), foraging behaviour (15-16), and social inheritance (17)). However, a general model has been missing for a generative process that is of central importance across species (namely *trait-based social preferences*, explained below). Furthermore, it has not been systematically investigated how empirically important generative processes of animal social networks affect network structure and function. We are thus in need of a map that connects different key processes to different structural features

and network properties. This could significantly advance our understanding of social systems and identify new important directions for the empirical study of sociality.

In this study: 1) we develop a general and flexible generative network model that can create networks based on a key generative process of animal social structures, namely *trait-based social preferences*; and 2) we use the model to investigate how this generative process affects social network structure and function.

Trait-based social preferences in real social systems

We use the term *trait-based social preferences* to refer to behaviour where individuals preferentially socialize with others that have certain trait values – for example a certain sex, age, or body size. Empirical research show that such preferences play a central role for social network structures across species. This is seen by the fact that trait values are frequently found to be non-randomly distributed in the networks. The observed patterns typically take two forms: social assortment of individuals by trait values, and correlations between trait values and individual social connectedness. We call these two types of patterns *similarity patterns* and *popularity patterns*, respectively, which fits with terms we use in our model (explained in the next Section). Such trait patterns in social networks are observed across animal taxa, including insects, reptiles, birds, fish, and mammals (Table 1). They are also commonly observed in human social networks (e.g. (55)).

These widely observed patterns imply that social preferences based on traits play an important role in the formation of real social networks across species, and thus can be considered a fundamental generative process of social networks. The empirical studies also show that the preferences take different forms, and that preferences for several traits often act simultaneously in any given social system (Table 1).

Trait patterns can arise from both active and passive social preferences. Experimental studies have shown that individuals actively use the traits of others in their decisions of who to socialise with, and prefer specific others as social partners depending on their traits (i.e. active social preferences, e.g. (56-58)). Non-random socialization can also arise from an underlying factor instead of active partner choice (i.e. passive social preferences); for example, individuals with similar traits may socialize more with each other due to similar habitat preferences. In this study, we use the term *preference* in a general sense that covers both active and passive preferences, and our model can be used to model both active and passive preferences.

The trait preference model

Our model, which we call the *trait preference model*, is a general method for generating simulated networks based on social preferences for traits. We provide a full mathematical description of the model in Methods. Briefly, the model works by determining the *social attraction* between each pair of individuals, where a higher social attraction gives a higher chance of being socially

Species	References	Investigated similarity patterns	Found similarity patterns	Investigated popularity patterns	Found popularity patterns
forked fungus beetle	18			✓	✓
sleepy lizard	19, 20	✓	✓	✓	-
great tit	21, 22	✓	✓	✓	✓
Gouldian finch	23	✓	✓		
long-tailed manakin	24	✓	(✓)	✓	✓
barnacle goose	25	✓	✓		
guppy	26, 27	✓	✓	✓	✓
Atlantic sturgeon	28	✓	-		
reef manta ray	29	✓	✓	✓	✓
white shark	30	✓	✓		
sand tiger shark	28	✓	✓		
bottlenose dolphin	31-33	✓	✓	✓	✓
humpback dolphin	34	✓	✓	✓	✓
killer whale	35, 36	✓	✓	✓	✓
sea lion	37	✓	✓	✓	✓
Natterer's bat	38	✓	✓	✓	✓
greater horseshoe bat	39	✓	✓	✓	✓
black-tailed prairie dog	40	✓	✓		
yellow-bellied marmot	41	✓	(✓)	✓	✓
raccoon	42	✓	(✓)	✓	-
eastern grey kangaroo	43	✓	✓		
big horn sheep	44	✓	(✓)	✓	✓
mountain goat	45	✓	✓		
giraffe	46, 47	✓	✓	✓	✓
sooty mangabey	48	✓	✓		
chimpanzee	49	✓	✓		
Guinea baboon	50	✓	✓		
Assamese macaque	51, 52	✓	✓		
rhesus macaque	53, 54			✓	✓

Table 1. Examples of species for which non-random trait patterns have been found in their social networks. The list is not exhaustive. *Similarity patterns* refers to social assortment by trait values, and *popularity patterns* refers to correlations between trait values and individual social connectedness. A tick mark in the 'found [...] patterns' columns indicates that the pattern was found for at least one of the traits investigated. A line (-) indicates that the pattern was not found. Parenthesis indicates that several networks from different time periods were tested with the same trait(s) and the pattern was found in one/some but not all of the networks. If a pattern was investigated but not found, it does not necessarily mean that it does not exist in the species, as it could for example exist for traits not considered in the given studies.

connected and a stronger social connection. The social attraction can be affected by the trait values of the individuals, via social preferences for traits. As in the real world, multiple traits may simultaneously affect the social attraction. How a given trait affects the social attraction depends on the type of preference it is combined with. For example, the social attraction may be affected simultaneously by preferences for social partners of one's own sex and a large body size. The traits can be of any type, and they may each be used with any type of trait preference (preference types are described in next section).

The importance of each trait (and hence also the importance of the preference types they are combined with) for the social attraction may differ. This reflects that individuals in the real world may put more weight on one trait than on another when deciding who to socialize with. The traits may also overall be more or less important, reflecting that real networks may be more or less strongly driven by trait-based social preferences. Together this means that the model can generate networks that go across the range from randomly structured to strongly driven by trait-based social preferences, and it can generate networks which are affected by different traits (and different preferences) in any ratio.

In summary, the social attraction (and thereby the chance and strength of a social connection) for each pair of individuals in the modelled population are determined by three things (which are all set by the user): the trait types that are included in the model, the preference type that each trait is combined with, and the importance of each preference-trait combination.

Preference types and preference functions

As a framework to model and study social preferences for traits, we categorize them into two general *preference types*, which we call *similarity preferences* and *popularity preferences* (see Box 1). The terms *similarity* and *popularity* have been used before with various related meanings

Box 1. Two general types of trait-based social preference

Similarity preferences:

Individuals' preference for others as social partners depends on how similar they are to themselves in terms of the trait. They may prefer more similar individuals (known as *homophily* (55), *assortative mixing* (59, 60), or *positive assortment*), or less similar individuals (known as *heterophily*, *disassortative mixing*, or *negative assortment*). For example, individuals may prefer to socialise with individuals of their own sex, or with those that are genetically related (e.g. (52)). Here, the individual's preferred trait values depend on its own value of the trait.

Popularity preferences:

Certain trait values (such as higher values or lower values) are generally preferred, i.e. popular. For example, individuals may prefer to socialise with individuals with a large body size (e.g. (57)), or individuals of one sex may be more popular as social partners than those of the other (e.g. (35)). Here, the individual's preferred trait values do not depend on its own value of the trait.

in connection with networks (e.g. (61)); we adapt them to use specifically for preferences. The two preference types correspond to the two trait patterns considered in the previous section (see the Results and Discussion section for validation of this).

We model similarity and popularity preferences using what we call *preference functions*, which translate the two trait values of a given trait for a pair of individuals into a trait-specific social attraction. In this way, we can model any type of trait preference (by changing the function), and combine it with any type of trait (by using different distributions of trait values). We note that the model has no requirement for the preferences arising actively (see previous section); active and passive preferences can be expressed via identical preference functions, and may be included in the same model.

Using the model for analysing empirical network data

Generative network modelling combined with statistical inference is a key approach for understanding real-world network structures (62). While our main use of the trait preference model in this paper is to generate simulated networks for the investigation of how social preferences affect network structure and function, we here include a brief consideration of the model's potential to be used as a tool for analysing observed networks. When generating simulated networks without real data, the model parameters (the importance of each trait-preference combination) are set by the user. However, the parameters could also be inferred from observed real-world social networks and trait data. This means that the model has the potential to be used for: 1) inferring the importance of different preference-trait combinations for a given observed network structure, and 2) generating artificial network structures based on a given observed network. While estimation of model parameters from data is not our focus in this study, we provide an example of parameter estimation with a simulated dataset to demonstrate the idea (Appendix A in Supplementary Information). Another way to use the model with empirical data is with user-set parameters but with real trait data, which could for example be useful for investigating how a given real trait distribution may affect network structure via different social preferences.

The 'minimal model' version

We now specify a version of the trait preference model, which we use in the simulations described below. This version, which we call *the minimal model*, includes two trait preferences (which can act alone or simultaneously), one for each of the general preference types (similarity and popularity, Box 1). This lets us investigate the effect of the two preference types on network structure and function. We model the preferences with preference functions that correspond to trait patterns that are well-known from the empirical data (Table 1) and simulate the following behaviour: for popularity, individuals prefer those with *higher* trait values as social partners; for similarity, individuals prefer those with trait values that are *closer* to their own value (i.e. those that are more similar to themselves). See Methods for details and mathematical description of the minimal model.

Results and discussion

We now use the trait preference model to study how trait-based social preferences affect social network structure and function. Our approach is to generate sets of networks for different preference-trait combinations by means of the minimal version of the model, and quantify the structure, transmission efficiency, and robustness of the networks. We systematically vary the importance of each preference type (similarity and popularity) from no importance to maximal importance and generate networks across this range. This allows us to study how the network structure, transmission and robustness change with increasing importance of the preference type (in other words, when individuals place increasing weight on the trait with which the preference type is used). We combine the two preference types with three types of traits (simulated data), which correspond to real-world traits that are known to be of importance in animal social networks (for references see Table 1): a categorical trait with two categories (corresponding for example to sex), a continuous, normally distributed trait (corresponding for example to body size), and (for similarity preferences only) a continuous circular trait (corresponding for example to genetics, with trait similarity corresponding to relatedness). See Methods for details.

We consider different aspects of the results in subsections below. Overall, the results show that the types of trait-based social preferences used in a population can shape its social network structure, and that this in turn can lead to effects on social transmission and robustness. For some preference-trait combinations we see much stronger effects than for others, and some of the effects go in different directions. Thus, the preferences have consequences not only for the direct benefits that individuals gain from social partners, but also for the higher-level function of the social system. Trait-based social preferences can therefore have far-reaching effects, which can affect the population both positively and negatively.

Structural diversity of networks created with the model

Real-world animal social networks show diverse structures. For example, the structures of some species and populations are characterised by clear division into social clusters (network communities (63)), while others show more homogeneous or centralized linking patterns. We find that networks generated with the trait preference model show structural diversity (Fig. 3), with structural features varying depending on the trait types, preference types, and the importance of each preference-trait combination (see methods of the below-described simulation study for details of network generation). The model was not designed with the aim of creating diverse structures, but with the aim of modelling different trait-based social preferences. The diversity observed in its output networks therefore suggests that differences in trait-based social preferences could potentially be an important explanatory factor for the diversity observed in real-world social structures.

Effects of trait-based social preferences on social network structure

Figure 1B shows the effect of the trait-based social preferences on two network measures that quantify two trait patterns expected to arise from the two preference types (the two common




Fig. 3. An example of structural diversity in networks generated with the trait preference model. Examples of networks created with the minimal version of the model, which includes two traits that are used with popularity and similarity preferences respectively. Both traits are here categorical. Node colours correspond to the categories of the similarity trait (5 categories) and node sizes correspond to the categories of the popularity trait (2 categories). (A) High importance of popularity preferences, no importance of similarity preferences; (B) Equal importance of popularity and similarity preferences; (C) High importance of similarity preferences, no importance of popularity preferences.

patterns considered in Table 1 above). The results confirm that each preference type gives rise to the expected trait pattern. Fig. 1C shows the effect of the preferences on four network metrics that quantify different aspects of network structure. We see that both the preference type, and the trait type it is combined with, are important for the effect (see a section further down for discussion of the role of the trait types). Also, popularity and similarity preferences differ in terms of which structural aspects they have strongest effects on, with similarity having strongest effects on clustering and distance, and popularity having strongest effects on degree variation and degree assortativity. These results are for networks with 100 individuals (nodes) – a realistic size for social networks in many species; we found similar results for larger networks and other average degrees, and for versions of the network metrics that take edge weights into account (Fig. S3, S4 and S5).

Another way to consider the effects of the preferences is to look at how they move networks around in structural spaces (Fig. 1D). For the categorical trait (which gives the strongest effects for both preference types) we see that similarity preferences have particularly strong influence on the position of the networks in a structural space that we name the small-world space (consisting of two structural dimensions of importance in small-world networks (8)), whereas popularity strongly influences their position in the space that we name the degree space (consisting of two degree-related dimensions). This exemplifies how the trait-based social preferences used in a population can influence - and limit - the areas of structural space that the social network of the population can occupy.




Fig. 1. Effects of trait-based social preferences on social network structure. Results for each combination of preference type (popularity, similarity) and trait type are shown with the same colour throughout the figure (see legend). (A) Example networks for each preference-trait combination (made with maximal importance of the social preferences). Node sizes correspond to degree. (B) Each of the two preference types recovers a common trait-based network pattern. Results are shown for each preference-trait combination. (C) The change in four network metrics with increasing importance of social preferences, for each preference-trait combination. (D) Movement in network metric spaces caused by social preferences (shown for the categorical trait). Black dots indicate positions of networks that are generated based on one mechanism with maximal importance (randomness, popularity, or similarity). Coloured dots indicate networks based on a combination of two mechanisms (across the range of relative importance of the two mechanisms). Each dot indicates the average of 100 networks.

We also see that the relationships between the preference importance and the network metrics are often non-linear (Fig. 1C). Together with the fact that some of the preference-trait combinations have very small effects, this suggests that preferences can be present in social systems that show structures close to random. This is, however, based on network metrics that do not consider trait values. All the preference-trait combinations have effects on the two trait-based measures (Fig. 1B), and the shape of these curves suggest that trait-based social preferences with relatively low importance are more detectable from these measures.

Effects of trait-based social preferences on social network function

To investigate how trait-based social preferences affect social transmission, we simulate transmission processes in all the generated networks and quantify transmission efficiency (measured by how quickly the infection has reached the whole population). To investigate how the preferences affect social network robustness, we study the breakdown of the network structures when individuals are lost from the population. We simulate the loss of individuals by sequentially removing nodes from the networks. We then look at the time point at which the original single network component breaks down (we have also considered other measures of breakdown, which lead to similar conclusions, Fig. S6). See Methods for details.


We find that the effects of trait-based social preferences on social structure can lead to changes in social network transmission and robustness (Fig. 2), and the extent of these changes depends on the preference-trait combination. Furthermore, the effects depend on the type of transmission and the type of node loss. Thus, the results imply that the vulnerability of populations to disease, their efficiency of cultural transmission, and their resilience to structural breakdown when individuals disappear, depend on the social preferences used in the population.

We focus on two types of transmission: 1) *simple transmission*, which is a relevant model for the spread of disease and some types of information, and 2) *complex transmission*, which is relevant for the spread of information of behaviours ((2, 64-66), details in Methods). Results for transmissions that do not depend on edge weights (Fig. 2A) and that do depend on edge weights (Fig. S7) are quite similar. We see that social preferences in most cases give rise to networks that have *slower* transmission (Fig. 2A and S7), although they can also increase transmission (Fig. S7). Thus, both types of preference may protect against the spread of disease and slow the spread of information and behaviours, and similarity preferences may also do the opposite under some conditions.

We focus on four types of loss of individuals (where the nodes are removed either in random order or in order according node centrality measures; details in Methods): 1) *random* loss, 2) loss based on *social connectedness*, where individuals with high social connectedness are more likely to die or disperse (for example trophy hunting of older hub individuals), 3) loss based on *social isolation*, where individuals with low social connectedness are more likely to die or disperse (for example when socially isolated individuals have low health), and 4) loss based on *social bridging*, where individuals that connect social subgroups are more likely to die or disperse (for example if individuals moving between social subgroups have an increased risk of dying). Node removal based on unweighted (Fig. 2B) and weighted (Fig. S8) centrality measures give very similar results. We see that social preferences mostly lead to networks with *decreased* robustness, but they can

Preference-trait combination: Popularity Categorical (sex) Popularity Normal (bodysize) Similarity Categorical (sex) Similarity Circular (relatedness) Similarity Normal (bodysize)

A. Effect of social preferences on social transmission



B. Effect of social preferences on social robustness




Fig. 2. Effects of trait-based social preferences on social transmission and social robustness. Results for each combination of preference type (popularity, similarity) and trait type are shown with the same colour throughout the figure (see legend). (A) The change in transmission efficiency with increasing importance of social preferences, for each preference-trait combination and two types of transmission. (B) The change in robustness with increasing importance of social preferences, for each preference-trait combination and four types of loss of individuals (network nodes); either random or based on measures of the individuals' network positions.

also lead to increased robustness, with the effect depending on the type of loss of individuals. The results imply that if populations use popularity preferences, then they have increased risk of social network fragmentation when mortality and dispersal is not related to social position, and when it is related to high social centrality and social bridging. In contrast, popularity preferences lead to *decreased* risk of fragmentation when mortality and dispersal are related to social isolation. Furthermore, populations that use similarity preferences with a categorical trait (e.g. preference for own sex) may have increased risk of fragmentation, particularly when dispersal and mortality are connected to social isolation and social bridging. Together, these results imply that the social preferences used in a system can have consequences for its risk of fragmenting when individuals disappear from the population – and thereby also for the amount of behavioural compensation (rewiring of social connections) needed to avoid such fragmentation (67).

The role of trait types in social preference effects

An important insight from the results is that the effect of trait-based social preferences depends not only on the preference type but also on the type of trait the preference type is used with. This implies that the distributions of trait values in animal populations play a key role for the effect of trait-based social preferences on network structure and function.

All the investigated preference-trait combinations have effects, but on different scales (Fig. 1 and 2; see Fig. S9 for plots with the continuous traits only, for a more detailed visualization of their effects). In particular, we often see stronger effects on network structure and function when the preferences are combined with a categorical trait. Also, we focused on a categorical trait with two categories, as this corresponds to a key trait of importance for social networks in many species (sex). But more than two trait categories may also occur in real-world systems (e.g. multiple matriline (52)), and we find some variation in effect depending on the number of categories (Fig. S10).

The effect of trait type has interesting implications for real-world systems. In particular, social preferences that concern the sex of social partners may have a disproportionately large effect on network structure and function, compared to other common traits. For example, if individuals have preferences for socialising with others of one's own sex, this could have a much larger effect on the network than if individuals have preferences for socialising with others of a similar body size (for the same level of preference importance). It is possible, however, that individuals could use preference functions that effectively make continuous traits act like categorical traits (for example if individuals prefer those of a body size larger than average, while not discriminating between individuals within the two categories of below-average and above-average). In that case, traits with continuous distributions could have equally strong effects on network structure and function as categorical traits (for a given level of preference importance). The presence of such discretizing preference functions in real social systems could potentially be investigated with behavioural choice experiments (56-58).

Effects of trait-based social preferences on degree distributions

The degree distribution of a network (i.e. the distribution of the number of links connected to each node) can have wide-ranging consequences for processes in networked systems, and this network feature has therefore received much attention in network science (10, 68, 69). We find that the degree distributions of networks created with the different preference-trait combinations are all largely symmetric (Fig. S11). In contrast to other realms of network science, the degree distributions of animal social networks have not been a significant research focus (see (70) for an exception), and underlying distributions may be harder to deduce from data due to the relatively small size of the observed networks. Given the empirical indications of popularity and similarity patterns being widespread in social networks of different species (Table 1), our results suggest that semi-symmetric degree distributions could potentially be frequently underlying real animal social networks. This contrasts with the notion that real-world networks are likely to have power-law distributed degrees (10, 68, 69).

Evolutionary consequences of trait-based social preferences

The role of social network structure in biological evolution has gained considerable recent interest (4-6, 71, 72). While this topic is not the main focus of this study, our results suggest that trait-based social preferences can affect the evolutionary trajectory of populations, via their effect on




Fig. 4. Effects of trait-based social preferences on evolutionary processes. The types of social preference used in a population have consequences for social structure. The social structure can affect inter-individual fitness variation, directly and via network function. Changes to the variation in fitness between individuals can have consequences for the selection on traits and thereby affect their evolution. Changes to fitness and traits can in turn affect social preferences for traits, leading to a feedback loop.

social network structure and function. The effects of social preferences on social structure, transmission and robustness could lead to changes in relative fitness between individuals, thereby affecting evolutionary processes. This could furthermore lead to a feedback loop, where changes in fitness and trait distributions lead to changes in social preferences (Fig. 4). Our results thus suggest that it matters for the evolution of a population (including the evolution of traits and behaviour) which social preferences are used in the system.

Conclusion

Empirical studies imply that social preferences for traits is a key generative process for animal social structures. Here we have introduced a general generative network model that creates networks based on social preferences for traits. The model can be used with any number of traits that can simultaneously affect the network, and with different preference functions and different importance of each trait. It can also generate networks across the continuum from random structure to structure strongly driven by preferences. The model thus provides a flexible tool for generating networks from trait-based preferences. Using this model, we investigated the effect of trait-based social preferences on network structure and function. The results show that the social preferences can have consequences for the vulnerability of populations to epidemics, their efficiency in spreading cultural information, and their ability to withstand breakdown of their social structure when individuals are lost from the population, and they may also affect their evolutionary trajectory. The study thus shows that social preferences for traits can have consequences that go far beyond their effect on direct benefits from social partners. The study also presents a way of thinking about trait-based social preferences, where they are considered as preference functions that translate trait values into social attraction. Finally, the study implies that to understand the emergence of social structures, we must consider both preference types and trait value distributions.

Methods

Mathematical description and details of the trait preference model

The general model

The model can be described mathematically as follows:

$$S(i, j) = \sum_{b \in B} (w_b * S_b(i, j)) + w_{rand} * S_{rand}(i, j) , \quad (1)$$

where

$$S_b(i, j) = f_b(V_b(i), V_b(j)) . \quad (2)$$

The *social attraction* S between two individuals i and j (Eq. 1) depends on their *trait-specific social attractions* S_b (for each trait b in the set of traits B), and their *random social attraction* S_{rand} . The amount of influence each trait has on the social attraction is given by its weight w_b , and the amount of influence of randomness is given by its weight w_{rand} .

For any given trait b , the trait-specific social attraction S_b (Eq. 2) is determined by the two individuals' values of that trait (V_b), and a *preference function* (f_b) that describes the way in which the trait influences the social attraction. This also means that the weight w_b (Eq. 1) for a given trait can be seen both as the importance of the trait, and as the importance of the preference type that the trait is used with (which we exploit in our simulation study in this paper).

To use the model, we need to provide it with one or more traits (trait value distributions), the type of preference used with each trait, and the importance (weight) of each trait. From this, a social attraction score for each pair of individuals is calculated. We can then construct a network by a link drawing procedure where the chance of getting a link (and the link weight in the case of weighted networks) is relative to the social attraction (see the methods for the simulation study below for an example).

Preference functions

The preference functions f_b take the trait values of two individuals for a given trait as input, and give as output a trait-specific social attraction score (see Eq. 2 above). For similarity preferences, the preference function must transform the trait values to a distance (or closeness) measure (i.e. the social attraction score is relative the distance between the two trait values), whereas for popularity, they must transform them to a magnitude measure. Apart from that, the functions may take on different forms within each preference type, and different forms could be used for

different traits in any given edition of the model. Examples of preference function equations can be found in the mathematical description of the minimal model below.

The minimal model

The minimal model involves two traits, which we refer to as the *similarity trait* and the *popularity trait* (as they are used with similarity and popularity preferences, respectively). For the minimal model, the social attraction S between individuals i and j is given by

$$S(i, j) = w_{pop} * S_{pop}(i, j) + w_{sim} * S_{sim}(i, j) + w_{rand} * S_{rand}(i, j) \quad . \quad (3)$$

Here, S_{pop} , S_{sim} , and S_{rand} are partial social attractions based on the popularity trait, the similarity trait, and randomness, and w_{pop} , w_{sim} , and w_{rand} are their respective weights (giving the importance of each trait, and hence also of each preference type, for the social attraction $S(i, j)$). The minimal model thus allows for generating networks based on similarity preferences, popularity preferences, random preferences, or combinations of these in any ratio. The weights w all lie in the interval $[0,1]$ and must sum to 1, and S_{rand} is drawn uniformly at random from the interval $[0,1]$. The trait-specific social attractions are given by the following preference functions:

$$S_{pop}(i, j) = \frac{mag(i, j)}{\max(mag(dyad))} \quad (4)$$

and

$$S_{sim}(i, j) = 1 - \frac{dist(i, j)}{\max(dist(dyad))} \quad , \quad (5)$$

where $mag(i, j)$ and $dist(i, j)$ are, respectively, the joint magnitude of the trait values of i and j , and the distance between the trait values of i and j (details below), with \max taking the maximum of these measures across all dyads. Hence, here higher values of the popularity trait are more popular, and individuals prefer others that have similarity trait values closer to their own. The denominators ensure that the social attractions are between 0 and 1.

It is necessary to specify the joint trait value magnitude (mag) and distance ($dist$) separately for continuous and categorical traits. For continuous traits the joint magnitude and distance are given by:

$$mag(i, j) = V_{pop}(i) + V_{pop}(j) \quad (6)$$

and

$$dist(i, j) = |V_{sim}(i) - V_{sim}(j)| , \quad (7)$$

where V_{pop} and V_{sim} are popularity and similarity trait values, respectively. For categorical traits, the measures are given by:

$$mag(i, j) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } V_{pop}(i) \text{ and } V_{pop}(j) = \text{the popular trait category} \\ 0.5 & \text{if } V_{pop}(i) \text{ or } V_{pop}(j) = \text{the popular trait category} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

and

$$dist(i, j) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } V_{sim}(i) = V_{sim}(j) \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

Methods for simulation study

Generating artificial network ensembles

General procedure:

We use the minimal model (Eq. 3-9), where the weights w all must lie in the interval $[0,1]$ and sum to 1. Together with the condition that S_b and S_{rand} also each lie in the interval $[0,1]$, this ensures that the social attraction S lies between 0 and 1. We vary the importance of each preference type (the weights w_{sim} and w_{pop} , Eq. 3) in the range $[0, 0.99]$ in steps of 0.01 (we do not include 1 because single-component networks cannot be generated when $w_{sim} = 1$) and generate an ensemble of networks for each w_{sim}, w_{pop} combination where the condition that their sum cannot exceed 1 is fulfilled (note that w_{rand} is given by the condition $w_{sim} + w_{pop} + w_{rand} = 1$). Each ensemble consists of 100 networks (replicates). We do this for different types of traits (described below). We then quantify average structural and functional aspects of each network ensemble (described below) and study these ensemble averages as a function of w_{sim} and w_{pop} .

Trait types:

We use three types of simulated traits, which follow different distributions and correspond to traits that are known to be important in real-world animal social networks:

Categorical (for example corresponding to sex): trait values are on a categorical scale and are drawn with equal probability from each category. We use two categories for the main analysis, and we also investigate the effect of more categories.

Continuous normal (for example corresponding to body size): trait values are on a continuous scale with a maximum and minimum, and are drawn from a truncated normal distribution (max = 1, min = 0, mean = 0.5, SD = 0.25).

Continuous circular (for example corresponding to genetics): trait values are on a continuous, circular scale and are drawn from a uniform distribution. The scale has a diameter of 1.

We use the first two trait types with both preference types, and we use the last one only with similarity (where the closeness of trait values on the scale corresponds to genetic similarity of the individuals, i.e. relatedness).

Network construction:

To construct the networks, we use the following procedure. For each network, we first randomly assign popularity and similarity trait values to all nodes, by drawing values from the given similarity and popularity trait distributions for that setting. Using the minimal model (Eq. 3-9), we then calculate the social attraction $S(i, j)$ for each dyad (based on their trait values, and the given w values for that ensemble). To determine the positions of edges, we use a procedure that corresponds to that of the $G(n, L)$ model for Poisson networks but depends on the dyadic social attractions (8): We draw a weighted random sample of L dyads, where the probability of being drawn is proportional to the social attraction $S(i, j)$, and L is the number of links to be placed in the network (given by $L = \bar{k} * n/2$, where \bar{k} is a specified average degree and n is a specified network size, i.e. number of nodes), and we then place an edge between the two nodes of all the drawn dyads. We create unweighted networks by giving each present edge an edge weight of 1, and we create weighted networks by giving each present edge an edge weight drawn from a normal distribution with mean = $S(i, j)$ and sd = 0.05 (and with any drawn values < 0 set to 0.001 and any drawn values > 1 set to 1). We use only networks with a single component (that is, all nodes are at least indirectly connected), such that each network corresponds to a single, unfragmented population. We use a network size of $n = 100$ nodes and an average degree of $\bar{k} = 10$, to reflect real-world social networks, which are of such relatively small sizes for many species (we checked that this choice did not qualitatively affect the conclusions; Fig. S3 and S4).

Quantifying social structure

To investigate the effect of trait-based social preferences on social network structure, we measure average global network metrics for each network ensemble. We use the following network metrics, which measure different key aspects of network structure. We calculate both unweighted metric versions (based on the presence/absence of edges) and weighted versions (based on edge weights). *Unweighted degree* is the number of social links (edges) an individual (node) has, and *weighted degree* is the sum of its edge weights.

Degree variation: The variation in the social connectedness of individuals. Calculated as the variance in the unweighted or weighted degree.

Degree assortativity: The extent to which individuals are primarily connected to others with a similar level of social connectedness. Calculated as Newman assortativity for continuous variables (59, 73), with connectedness measured as unweighted or weighted degree.

Clustering: The extent to which individuals' social partners are connected to each other. Calculated as the ratio of closed triangles in the network divided by the number of connected triples (for the unweighted version), or according to (74) (for the weighted version).

Mean distance: The average social distance between individuals, i.e. the average shortest path length between dyads. The unweighted shortest path length for nodes i and j is measured as the minimum number of edges between them. The weighted shortest path length is measured as the minimum path weight between them. Given that individuals that are connected through stronger social links are socially closer, we calculate the path weight for a path p between i and j as

$$\Lambda_{i,j,p} = \sum_{a \in A_{i,j}} \frac{1}{\Phi_a}, \quad (10)$$

where Φ_a is the edge weight of the edge a , and A is the set of edges on the path.

We furthermore quantify two additional network measures, the purpose of which is primarily to investigate whether the two preference types (similarity and popularity) as expected induce two common trait patterns in the networks. When individuals use popularity preferences with a trait, this should (everything else equal) induce correlation between individuals' values of that trait and their degrees (as individuals with the more popular trait values get more links), and when individuals use similarity preferences with a trait, this should induce assortment by that trait (as individuals with (dis)similar trait values prefer each other). We therefore quantify the following measures:

Popularity trait – degree correlation: the Pearson correlation between the individuals' popularity trait values and their numbers of social links (unweighted degrees).

Similarity trait assortativity: The extent to which individuals are primarily connected to others with similar similarity trait values, calculated as Newman assortativity (59, 73) for categorical or continuous variables (depending on the distribution of the similarity trait).

Quantifying social transmission

To investigate the effect of social preferences on social transmission, we simulate transmission processes in all the generated networks, and measure average transmission efficiency for each

network ensemble. We do this for the two types of transmission described below, and both for a case where edge weights are affecting the transmission, and a case where they are not. For each network in each ensemble, we run 10 replications of each transmission type and measure the average time until all nodes are infected. We calculate transmission efficiency as the inverse average transmission time. We use transmission parameter values (β and γ) of 0.01. Each simulation begins with a single, randomly picked infected node, and proceeds in discrete timesteps until all nodes are infected.

Simple transmission: also known as the SI model. The probability of being infected depends on the number of, or connectivity to, infected network neighbours (depending on whether edge weights affect the transmission). Infected individuals stay infected. When edge weights are taken into account, the probability of being infected for a node i at time t is given by

$$p_{i,t} = 1 - \prod_{j \in m_{i,t}} (1 - \beta * \Phi_{i,j}) , \quad (11)$$

where β is the transmission probability, $\Phi_{i,j}$ is the weight of the edge between i and j , and $m_{i,t}$ is the set of neighbours of i that are infected at time t . For the case where edge weights are not influencing transmission (i.e. for binary networks), this becomes equivalent to

$$p_{i,t} = 1 - (1 - \beta)^{\mu_{i,t}} , \quad (12)$$

where μ is the number of neighbours infected at time t .

Complex transmission: Also known as proportional transmission (64-66). The probability of being infected depends on the proportion of network neighbours that are infected, or the proportion of social connectivity (summed link weights) that goes to infected neighbours (depending on whether edge weights affect the transmission). Infected individuals stay infected. When edge weights are taken into account, the probability of being infected for a node i at time t is given by:

$$p_{i,t} = \frac{\sum_{j \in m_{i,t}} \Phi_{i,j}}{\sum_{j \in M_i} \Phi_{i,j}} * \gamma , \quad (13)$$

where $\Phi_{i,j}$ is the weight of the edge between i and j , $m_{i,t}$ is the set of neighbours of i that are infected at time t , and M_i is set of all neighbours of i . For the case where edge weights are not affecting transmission, this fraction is equivalent to the proportion of neighbours that are infected at time t .

Quantifying social robustness

To investigate the effect of social preferences on social robustness, we simulate loss of individuals in each of the generated networks by sequentially removing nodes, until two nodes are left. We then measure average robustness for each network ensemble. Considering each node removal to equate one timestep, we quantify the following four measures of robustness: 1) the time at which the single network component first breaks down, 2) the maximum number of components reached during the node removal process, 3) the time at which the maximum number of components is first reached, 4) the number of components summed over the full time-range. We use the following four methods for node removal:

Random removal: nodes are removed in random order. Corresponding to a situation where the death or dispersal of individuals is independent of their social network position.

Targeted removal – social connectedness: nodes are removed in order corresponding to their degrees (unweighted or weighted), with highest degree first. Corresponding to a situation where the death or dispersal of individuals is positively correlated with their social connectedness.

Targeted removal – social isolation: nodes are removed in order corresponding to their degrees (unweighted or weighted), with lowest degree first. Corresponding to a situation where the death or dispersal of individuals is negatively correlated with their social connectedness.

Targeted removal – social bridging: nodes are removed in order corresponding to their betweenness, with highest betweenness first. Corresponding to a situation where individuals connecting social subgroups are more likely to die or disperse.

Acknowledgements

This research was funded by a grant from the Carlsberg Foundation to JBB (CF20-0663). We thank Michael N. Weiss, Samuel Ellis, Lauren J. N. Brent and Benjamin F. Maier for discussions that helped improve the paper.

References

1. Pastor-Satorras, R., Castellano, C., Van Mieghem, P., & Vespignani, A. (2015). Epidemic processes in complex networks. *Reviews of modern physics*, 87(3), 925.
2. Evans, J. C., Silk, M. J., Boogert, N. J., & Hodgson, D. J. (2020). Infected or informed? Social structure and the simultaneous transmission of information and infectious disease. *Oikos*, 129(9), 1271-1288.

3. Snyder-Mackler, N., Burger, J. R., Gaydosh, L., et al. (2020) Social determinants of health and survival in humans and other animals. *Science* 368, eaax9553.
4. Kurvers, H., Krause, J., Croft, D. P., Wilson, A. D. and Wolf, M. (2014). The evolutionary and ecological consequences of animal social networks: emerging issues. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 29, 326–335.
5. Fisher, D. N., & McAdam, A. G. (2017). Social traits, social networks and evolutionary biology. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 30(12), 2088-2103.
6. Cantor, M., Maldonado-Chaparro, A. A., Beck, K. B., Brandl, H. B., Carter, G. G., He, P., ... & Farine, D. R. (2021). The importance of individual-to-society feedbacks in animal ecology and evolution. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 90(1), 27-44.
7. Fisher, D. N., Kilgour, R. J., Siracusa, E. R., Foote, J. R., Hobson, E. A., Montiglio, P. O., ... & Wice, E. W. (2021). Anticipated effects of abiotic environmental change on intraspecific social interactions. *Biological Reviews*, 96(6), 2661-2693.
8. Erdős, P. & Rényi, A. (1959). On Random Graphs. I. *Publicationes Mathematicae*. 6: 290–297.
9. Watts, D. J., & Strogatz, S. H. (1998). Collective dynamics of ‘small-world’ networks. *Nature*, 393(6684), 440-442.
10. Barabási, A.-L. & Albert, R. Emergence of scaling in random networks. *Science* 286, 509–512 (1999)
11. Lee, C., & Wilkinson, D. J. (2019). A review of stochastic block models and extensions for graph clustering. *Applied Network Science*, 4(1), 1-50.
12. Krause, J., James, R., Franks, D. W., & Croft, D. P. (Eds.). (2015). *Animal social networks*. Oxford University Press, USA.
13. Siracusa, E. R., Pereira, A. S., Brask, J. B., Negron-Del Valle, J. E., Phillips, D., Cayo Biobank Research Unit, ... & Brent, L. J. (2023). Ageing in a collective: the impact of ageing individuals on social network structure. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 378(1874), 20220061.
14. Darden, S. K., James, R., Cave, J. M., Brask, J. B., & Croft, D. P. (2020). Trinidadian guppies use a social heuristic that can support cooperation among non-kin. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, 287(1934), 20200487.
15. Ramos-Fernández, G., Boyer, D., & Gómez, V. P. (2006). A complex social structure with fission–fusion properties can emerge from a simple foraging model. *Behavioral ecology and sociobiology*, 60, 536-549.
16. Cantor, M., & Farine, D. R. (2018). Simple foraging rules in competitive environments can generate socially structured populations. *Ecology and evolution*, 8(10), 4978-4991.

17. Ilany, A., & Akcay, E. (2016). Social inheritance can explain the structure of animal social networks. *Nature communications*, 7(1), 1-10.
18. Costello, R. A., Cook, P. A., Formica, V. A., & Brodie III, E. D. (2022). Group and individual social network metrics are robust to changes in resource distribution in experimental populations of forked fungus beetles. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 91(4), 895-907.
19. Godfrey, S. S., Ansari, T. H., Gardner, M. G., Farine, D. R., & Bull, C. M. (2014). A contact-based social network of lizards is defined by low genetic relatedness among strongly connected individuals. *Animal Behaviour*, 97, 35-43.
20. Leu, S. T., Bashford, J., Kappeler, P. M., & Bull, C. M. (2010). Association networks reveal social organization in the sleepy lizard. *Animal Behaviour*, 79(1), 217-225.
21. Snijders, L., van Rooij, E. P., Burt, J. M., Hinde, C. A., Van Oers, K., & Naguib, M. (2014). Social networking in territorial great tits: slow explorers have the least central social network positions. *Animal Behaviour*, 98, 95-102.
22. Aplin, L. M., Farine, D. R., Morand-Ferron, J., Cole, E. F., Cockburn, A., & Sheldon, B. C. (2013). Individual personalities predict social behaviour in wild networks of great tits (*Parus major*). *Ecology letters*, 16(11), 1365-1372.
23. Kohn, G. M., Nugent, M. R., & Dail, X. (2022). Juvenile Gouldian finches (*Erythrura gouldiae*) form sibling subgroups during social integration. *Developmental Psychobiology*, 64(4), e22262.
24. Edelman, A. J., & McDonald, D. B. (2014). Structure of male cooperation networks at long-tailed manakin leks. *Animal Behaviour*, 97, 125-133.
25. Kurvers, R. H., Adamczyk, V. M., Kraus, R. H., Hoffman, J. I., van Wieren, S. E., van der Jeugd, H. P., ... & Jonker, R. M. (2013). Contrasting context dependence of familiarity and kinship in animal social networks. *Animal Behaviour*, 86(5), 993-1001.
26. Brask, J. B., Croft, D. P., Edenbrow, M., James, R., Bleakley, B. H., Ramnarine, I. W., ... & Darden, S. K. (2019). Evolution of non-kin cooperation: social assortment by cooperative phenotype in guppies. *Royal Society open science*, 6(1), 181493.
27. Croft, D. P., Krause, J., Darden, S. K., Ramnarine, I. W., Faria, J. J., & James, R. (2009). Behavioural trait assortment in a social network: patterns and implications. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 63, 1495-1503.
28. Roose, R., Oliver, M., Haulsee, D., Breece, M., Carlisle, A., & Fox, D. (2022). The sociality of Atlantic sturgeon and sand tiger sharks in an estuarine environment. *Animal Behaviour*, 193, 181-191.
29. Perryman, R. J., Venables, S. K., Tapilatu, R. F., Marshall, A. D., Brown, C., & Franks, D. W. (2019). Social preferences and network structure in a population of reef manta rays. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 73(8), 1-18.

30. Findlay, R., Gennari, E., Cantor, M., & Tittensor, D. P. (2016). How solitary are white sharks: social interactions or just spatial proximity? *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 70(10), 1735-1744.
31. Foroughirad, V., Frère, C. H., Levensgood, A. L., Kopps, A. M., Krzyszczyk, E., & Mann, J. (2023). Small effects of family size on sociality despite strong kin preferences in female bottlenose dolphins. *Animal Behaviour*, 195, 53-66.
32. Gerber, L., Connor, R. C., King, S. L., Allen, S. J., Wittwer, S., Bizzozzero, M. R., ... & Krützen, M. (2020). Affiliation history and age similarity predict alliance formation in adult male bottlenose dolphins. *Behavioral Ecology*, 31(2), 361-370.
33. Diaz-Aguirre, F., Parra, G. J., Passadore, C., & Möller, L. (2018). Kinship influences social bonds among male southern Australian bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops cf. australis*). *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 72(12), 1-13.
34. Hunt, T. N., Allen, S. J., Bejder, L., & Parra, G. J. (2019). Assortative interactions revealed in a fission–fusion society of Australian humpback dolphins. *Behavioral Ecology*, 30(4), 914-927.
35. Weiss, M. N., Franks, D. W., Giles, D. A., Youngstrom, S., Wasser, S. K., Balcomb, K. C., ... & Croft, D. P. (2021). Age and sex influence social interactions, but not associations, within a killer whale pod. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, 288(1953), 20210617.
36. Reisinger, R. R., Beukes, C., Hoelzel, A. R., & de Bruyn, P. N. (2017). Kinship and association in a highly social apex predator population, killer whales at Marion Island. *Behavioral Ecology*, 28(3), 750-759.
37. Wolf, J. B., Mawdsley, D., Trillmich, F., & James, R. (2007). Social structure in a colonial mammal: unravelling hidden structural layers and their foundations by network analysis. *Animal Behaviour*, 74(5), 1293-1302
38. Zeus, V. M., Reusch, C., & Kerth, G. (2018). Long-term roosting data reveal a unimodular social network in large fission-fusion society of the colony-living Natterer's bat (*Myotis nattereri*). *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 72(6), 1-13.
39. Finch, D., Schofield, H., Firth, J. A., & Mathews, F. (2022). Social networks of the greater horseshoe bat during the hibernation season: a landscape-scale case study. *Animal Behaviour*, 188, 25-34.
40. Kusch, J. M., & Lane, J. E. (2021). Determinants of social structure in a northern population of black-tailed prairie dogs, *Cynomys ludovicianus*. *Animal Behaviour*, 178, 1-10.
41. Wey, T. W., & Blumstein, D. T. (2010). Social cohesion in yellow-bellied marmots is established through age and kin structuring. *Animal Behaviour*, 79(6), 1343-1352.

42. Hirsch, B. T., Prange, S., Hauver, S. A., & Gehrt, S. D. (2013). Genetic relatedness does not predict racoon social network structure. *Animal Behaviour*, 85(2), 463-470.
43. Best, E. C., Dwyer, R. G., Seddon, J. M., & Goldizen, A. W. (2014). Associations are more strongly correlated with space use than kinship in female eastern grey kangaroos. *Animal Behaviour*, 89, 1-10.
44. Vander Wal, E., Gagné-Delorme, A., Festa-Bianchet, M., & Pelletier, F. (2016). Dyadic associations and individual sociality in bighorn ewes. *Behavioral Ecology*, 27(2), 560-566.
45. Godde, S., Côté, S. D., & Réale, D. (2015). Female mountain goats, *Oreamnos americanus*, associate according to kinship and reproductive status. *Animal Behaviour*, 108, 101-107.
46. Ferres, J. M. L., Lee, D. E., Nasir, M., Chen, Y. C., Bijral, A. S., Bercovitch, F. B., & Bond, M. L. (2021). Social connectedness and movements among communities of giraffes vary by sex and age class. *Animal Behaviour*, 180, 315-328.
47. Carter, K. D., Seddon, J. M., Frère, C. H., Carter, J. K., & Goldizen, A. W. (2013). Fission–fusion dynamics in wild giraffes may be driven by kinship, spatial overlap and individual social preferences. *Animal Behaviour*, 85(2), 385-394.
48. Mielke, A., Crockford, C., & Wittig, R. M. (2020). Predictability and variability of association patterns in sooty mangabeys. *Behavioral ecology and sociobiology*, 74(4), 1-13.
49. Bray, J., & Gilby, I. C. (2020). Social relationships among adult male chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes schweinfurthii*): variation in the strength and quality of social bonds. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 74, 1-19.
50. Dal Pesco, F., Trede, F., Zinner, D., & Fischer, J. (2021). Kin bias and male pair-bond status shape male-male relationships in a multilevel primate society. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 75, 1-14.
51. De Moor, D., Roos, C., Ostner, J., & Schülke, O. (2020). Bonds of bros and brothers: kinship and social bonding in postdispersal male macaques. *Molecular Ecology*, 29(17), 3346-3360.
52. De Moor, D., Roos, C., Ostner, J., & Schülke, O. (2020). Female Assamese macaques bias their affiliation to paternal and maternal kin. *Behavioral Ecology*, 31(2), 493-507.
53. Beisner, B., Braun, N., Pósfai, M., Vandeleest, J., D'Souza, R., & McCowan, B. (2020). A multiplex centrality metric for complex social networks: sex, social status, and family structure predict multiplex centrality in rhesus macaques. *PeerJ*, 8, e8712.

54. Brent, L. J. N., Ruiz-Lambides, A., & Platt, M. L. (2017). Persistent social isolation reflects identity and social context but not maternal effects or early environment. *Scientific reports*, 7(1), 17791.
55. McPherson, M., Smith-Lovin, L., & Cook, J. M. (2001). Birds of a feather: Homophily in social networks. *Annual review of sociology*, 415-444.
56. Guttridge, T. L., Gruber, S. H., Gledhill, K. S., Croft, D. P., Sims, D. W., & Krause, J. (2009). Social preferences of juvenile lemon sharks, *Negaprion brevirostris*. *Animal Behaviour*, 78(2), 543-548.
57. Jones, K. A., Croft, D. P., Ramnarine, I. W., & Godin, J. G. J. (2010). Size-Assortative Shoaling in the Guppy (*Poecilia reticulata*): The Role of Active Choice. *Ethology*, 116(2), 147-154.
58. Cattelan, S., & Griggio, M. (2020). Within-shoal phenotypic homogeneity overrides familiarity in a social fish. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 74(4), 1-8.
59. M. E. J. (2003). Mixing patterns in networks, *Phys. Rev. E* 67, 026126
60. Cantwell, G. T., & Newman, M. E. J. (2019). Mixing patterns and individual differences in networks. *Physical Review E*, 99(4), 042306.
61. Papadopoulos, F., Kitsak, M., Serrano, M. Á., Boguná, M., & Krioukov, D. (2012). Popularity versus similarity in growing networks. *Nature*, 489(7417), 537-540.
62. Peel, L., Peixoto, T. P., & De Domenico, M. (2022). Statistical inference links data and theory in network science. *Nature Communications*, 13(1), 6794.
63. Javed, M. A., Younis, M. S., Latif, S., Qadir, J., & Baig, A. (2018). Community detection in networks: A multidisciplinary review. *Journal of Network and Computer Applications*, 108, 87-111.
64. Firth, J. A. (2020). Considering complexity: animal social networks and behavioural contagions. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 35(2), 100-104.
65. Centola, D., & Macy, M. (2007). Complex contagions and the weakness of long ties. *American journal of Sociology*, 113(3), 702-734.
66. Guilbeault, D., Becker, J., & Centola, D. (2018). Complex contagions: A decade in review. *Complex spreading phenomena in social systems*, 3-25.
67. Shizuka, D., & Johnson, A. E. (2020). How demographic processes shape animal social networks. *Behavioral Ecology*, 31(1), 1-11.
68. Broido, A. D., & Clauset, A. (2019). Scale-free networks are rare. *Nature communications*, 10(1), 1-10.

69. Holme, P. (2019). Rare and everywhere: Perspectives on scale-free networks. *Nature communications*, 10(1), 1-3.
70. James, A., McLeod, J. C., Rouco, C., Richardson, K. S., & Tompkins, D. M. (2017). Spatial utilization predicts animal social contact networks are not scale-free. *Royal Society open science*, 4(12), 171209.
71. Sueur, C., Romano, V., Sosa, S., & Puga-Gonzalez, I. (2019). Mechanisms of network evolution: a focus on socioecological factors, intermediary mechanisms, and selection pressures. *Primates*, 60(3), 167-181.
72. Wice, E. W., & Saltz, J. B. (2021). Selection on heritable social network positions is context-dependent in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Nature communications*, 12(1), 1-9.
73. Newman, M. E. J. (2002). Assortative mixing in networks, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 89, 208701
74. Barrat, A., Barthélemy, M., Pastor-Satorras, R., & Vespignani, A. (2004). The architecture of complex weighted networks. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 101(11), 3747-3752.

Appendix A.

Analysis of empirical network data with the trait preference model

Here we demonstrate the idea that the trait preference model can be used for analyzing observed network data. The approach is to estimate the importance (the weight parameters w) of each preference-trait combination, where the combinations are made from combining each observed (measured) trait with each preference type (similarity and popularity). This could be used to statistically infer which traits are important for the observed network structure, and via which preference type they are important. The parameterized model could also be used to generate artificial networks based on the real network. For the parameterization, we combine the model with a Bayesian estimation approach (see below for methodological details).

We note that if one or more preference-trait combinations are found to be important (significant) for a given real network, this could be due to both active and passive preferences (see main text). Thus, inference with the model provides information on which traits are important for the network structure, and whether the structure connected to that trait corresponds to similarity or popularity patterns (trait-based assortment or correlations between trait values and connectedness), and assumed active preferences (active trait-based social partner choice) may then be confirmed by system-specific knowledge or experiments.

To parameterize the model with real data, we would need an observed network and data from the individuals on one or more traits. For the example presented here, we use simulated data where the ground truth is known; the ‘observed’ network here is thus generated with the model, based on set parameters and simulated trait values.




Fig. S1. Inferring the importance of different preference-trait combinations for an observed network. The figure shows the parameter distributions obtained from the parameterization procedure for each combination of preference (similarity, popularity) and trait (those that have been measured, here sex and body length). Distributions that do not overlap with zero can be considered to indicate statistical significance. Dotted lines indicate the ground truth (parameters as they were set in the model when generating the ‘observed’ network to which the parameter estimation was applied). Thus, in this example the result suggests that similarity by sex is playing an important role in the ‘observed’ network, which fits with the ground truth.




Fig. S2. Generating networks based on a trait preference model parameterized by an observed network. The ‘observed’ (original) network is shown together with a network generated by the parameterized model (based on parameters sampled from the parameter distributions). The network node colours correspond to the two categories of the categorical trait (sex).

The Bayesian estimation procedure outputs an inferred parameter distribution for each preference-trait combination (Fig. S1). We find that the inference overall fits with the ground truth, with similarity based on a categorical trait being estimated as being of high importance for the network, and the other preference-trait combinations being estimated as being of low importance, which corresponds to the settings used for generating the ‘observed’ network. This means that we can generate networks with the parameterized model that are very similar to the ‘observed’ network (Fig. S2). Importantly, estimation from real data carries inherent challenges, and while we have here demonstrated the idea using simulated ‘observed’ data, methodology for actual real data needs to be thoroughly tested and refined before it may be used as a parameterization and inference tool in scientific studies.

Methods for estimating model parameters

We use an inference approach that provides a relatively simple and direct way of estimating parameters while respecting the model and parameter interpretation described in the main text. We calculate the trait-specific social attractions (S_b in Eq. 1 in Methods) with the same preference functions as defined for the minimal model (eq. 4-9 in Methods), using observed trait values and a value of 0.5 across all edges for randomness. We normalize the overall social attraction S such that the mean corresponds to the density of the observed network. This gives us the probability $P(i, j)$ of an edge between individuals i and j . To infer the unknown parameters, we choose an uninformative Dirichlet distribution as prior, which ensures that the values sum up to one. Finally, we use a Bernoulli likelihood to compare observed edges with the calculated probabilities $P(i, j)$. The statistical model then reads:

$$w_b \sim \text{Dirichlet}(1) \quad (\text{S1})$$

$$S(i, j) = \sum_b w_b S_b(i, j) \quad \forall i - j \quad (\text{S2})$$

$$P(i, j) = S(i, j) \frac{P}{S} \quad \forall i, j \quad (\text{S3})$$

$$\underline{S} = \frac{1}{N_d} \sum_{i,j} S(i,j) \quad (S4)$$

$$e(i,j) \sim \text{Bernoulli}(P(i,j)), \quad (S5)$$

where b is a social preference mechanism with a specific trait, \underline{P} is the observed network density, N_d is the number of dyads, and $e(i,j)$ indicates if an edge between node i and j exists in the empirical network. We implement the inference algorithm in the Julia programming language (1) using the Turing.jl package (2) for Bayesian inference. Specifically, we estimate the parameters using a No-U-Turn sampler (3), i.e. a variant of the Hamilton Monte-Carlo sampler with a target acceptance rate of 0.9 and a maximum tree-depth of 5. We run 6 parallel chains with 2000 samples each and discard the first 1000 for warm-up. All inference results report no divergent transitions. Also, the maximum Gelman–Rubin diagnostic and R-hat statistics are below 1.1 for all simulations, thus indicating sufficient mixing and convergence of the Monte-Carlo chains.

References for Appendix A

1. Bezanson J, Edelman A, Karpinski S, Shah VB (2017) Julia: A fresh approach to numerical computing. *SIAM review* 59(1), 65–98.
2. Ge H, Xu K, & Ghahramani Z (2018) Turing: a language for flexible probabilistic inference. In: *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, AISTATS 2018*, pp. 1682–1690.
3. Hoffman MD, & Gelman A (2014) The No-U-Turn sampler: adaptively setting path lengths in Hamiltonian Monte Carlo. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 15(1), 1593-1623.

Appendix B. Supplementary figures




Fig. S3. Effects of trait-based social preferences on social network structure for different network sizes. The change in four network metrics with increased importance of social preferences, for each preference-trait combination (see legend), for different network sizes (indicated by row headers. Upper row = setting used in main analysis).




Fig. S4. Effects of trait-based social preferences on social network structure for different average degrees. The change in four network metrics with increased importance of social preferences, for each preference-trait combination (see legend), for different average degrees (indicated by row headers. Middle row = setting used in main analysis).




Fig. S5. Effects of trait-based social preferences on social network structure for weighted network metrics. The change in four weighted (we.) network metrics with increased importance of social preferences, for each preference-trait combination (see legend). A: all preference-trait combinations shown. B: only combinations with continuous traits shown.




Fig. S6. Effects of trait-based social preferences on social robustness, for all robustness measures. The change in robustness with increased importance of social preferences, for each preference-trait combination (see legend), for four types of robustness measure (comp. = component). Each row is for a different node removal type (A: random, B: social connectedness, C: social isolation, D: social bridging).




Fig. S7. Effects of trait-based social preferences on social transmission, where transmission depends on edge weights. The change in transmission efficiency with increased importance of social preferences, for each preference-trait combination (see legend) and two types of transmission, for the case where the probability of transmission between two individuals depends not only on the presence of an edge between them, but also on the weight of the edge.




Fig. S8. Effects of trait-based social preferences on social robustness, for removal based on weighted network metrics. The change in robustness with increased importance of social preferences, for each preference-trait combination (see legend), for two types of loss of individuals (network nodes), where the node removal is based on weighted metrics (high and low weighted degree, respectively).




Fig. S9. Effects of trait-based social preferences on social network structure, with only continuous traits shown. The change in four network metrics with increased importance of social preferences, for each of three preference-trait combination that involve continuous traits (see legend).




Fig. S10. Effects of trait-based social preferences on social network structure for categorical traits with different numbers of categories. Each line corresponds to the effect of either popularity preferences (upper row of plots) or similarity preferences (lower row of plots), combined with a categorical trait with a different number of categories (see legends).




Fig. S11. Degree distributions of networks based on social preferences for traits. Example degree distributions of networks based on the different combinations of preference type and trait type (given by subplot headers) and randomness (no preferences).