

# Targeting heuristics for cost-optimized institutional incentives in heterogeneous networked populations

Dhruv Mittal<sup>1,\*</sup>, Fátima González-Novo López<sup>2</sup>, Sara Constantino<sup>3,4,5,6</sup>, Shaul Shalvi<sup>7</sup>, Xiaojie Chen<sup>8</sup>, and Vítor V. Vasconcelos<sup>1,9,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Computational Science Lab, Informatics Institute, University of Amsterdam, 1098 XH Amsterdam, The Netherlands

<sup>2</sup>Graduate School of Informatics, University of Amsterdam, 1098 XH Amsterdam, The Netherlands

<sup>3</sup>Doerr School of Sustainability, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305, USA

<sup>4</sup>School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA

<sup>5</sup>Department of Psychology, Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115, USA

<sup>6</sup>School of Public and Urban Affairs, Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115, USA

<sup>7</sup>Center for Research in Experimental Economics and political Decision making (CREED), Amsterdam School of Economics, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

<sup>8</sup>School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, Chengdu 611731, People's Republic of China

<sup>9</sup>POLDER center, Institute for Advanced Study, University of Amsterdam, 1012 GC Amsterdam, The Netherlands

\*Correspondence: [d.mittal@uva.nl](mailto:d.mittal@uva.nl) and [v.v.vasconcelos.uva.nl](mailto:v.v.vasconcelos.uva.nl)

## SUMMARY

The world is currently grappling with challenges on both local and global scales, many of which demand coordinated behavioral changes. However, breaking away from the status is often difficult due to deeply ingrained social norms. In such cases, social systems may require seemingly exogenous interventions to set off endogenous, largely irreversible processes that drive change—social tipping. While studies have looked at targeted interventions, real-life constraints faced by policymakers, like minimizing costs while ensuring a quick and fair transition, remain understudied. To address this complexity, we introduce a game-theoretic framework that accounts for individual heterogeneity and networks of local influence. We implement various heuristics based on information about individual preferences and commonly used local network properties. Results show that where the change is initiated in the population and the direction in which it propagates is essential to the effectiveness of interventions. We identify optimal strategies under different scenarios, such as varying levels of resistance to change, preference heterogeneity, and homophily. These results provide insights that can be experimentally tested and help policymakers to better direct incentives.

## INTRODUCTION

Societies worldwide face urgent challenges that demand large-scale shifts toward sustainable behaviors, technologies, and infrastructures [1]. Achieving these transformations can be accelerated through straightforward measures, such as encouraging household-level changes that significantly and rapidly reduce carbon emissions [2, 3], which can be expensive, yet long-term guidance must consider the need for careful stewardship of global collective behavior to address complex sustainability issues [4], and the complexity may lead to unintended consequences, which means interventions should be minimal. Even when external situations change and society suffers from the consequences of its previous choices, it can remain entrenched in the status quo or lag strongly [5]. Real-world transitions often stall due to entrenched norms [6, 7], biased perceptions [8], low risk-awareness or high uncertainty of the need for transformation [9–11], and misaligned incentives [5]. Segregation and clustering of preferences further erode the capacity for socially beneficial coordination [12] and can reinforce collective action deadlocks.

A key question, therefore, is how to strategically and cost-effectively intervene to overcome these deadlocks and jumpstart broad behavioral shifts. This question has been posed in the context of viral marketing [13] but has focused on diffusion under latent, non-explicit preferences and, thus, non-explicit costs [14]. The challenge includes identifying who to target to get the most out of limited resources and ensuring that interventions are efficient and fair in their distribution of incentives. Since budget, time, and looming unintended consequences constrain the possible interventions, they need to be well-directed. Incentive schemes that help early adopters overcome initial barriers can initiate a cascade of behavioral change [3] which may minimize total cost. Giving incentives aims to reduce resistance faced by behavioral change, both directly, in the case of those receiving them, and indirectly, as their adoption fosters positive reinforcement in their social neighborhoods [7, 15]. Targeting those incentives may promote fairness in how these incentives are allocated. Thus, incentive-based strategies must be carefully crafted to minimize spending while effectiveness is maximized, with particular attention to inequality and fairness in who receives support.

Social norms can serve as potent solutions to collective action problems, providing pathways to rapid, self-sustaining change [3, 6]. Even small, strategically designed interventions can lead to social tipping points that trigger large-scale behavioral transformations [15]. However, identifying these tipping points or “who to target” is not straightforward. Real-world collective action problems often occur in complex social networks of heterogeneous individuals, where locally firmly held social norms or deeply lodged technologies can make it difficult to achieve widespread, beneficial coordination. Heterogeneity influences whether social norms remain stable or shift [7], and network segregation and clustering of preferences hinder the diffusion of desirable behaviors [12].

Building on threshold models of collective behavior, which explain how individual decisions accumulate into large-scale shifts [16], recent research clarifies that large-scale transitions often emerge from complex contagion processes—patterns of adoption requiring multiple reinforcing exposures before spreading reliably [17, 18]. Such processes depend strongly on network structures that allow behaviors to gain momentum only when nodes receive multiple confirming signals [19, 20]. Optimal seeding strategies differ based on preference heterogeneity [21] as well as social network information to optimize the spreading of information and the adoption of behavior [18–20, 22, 23]. Prior work has also examined influence maximization and seeding strategies under budget constraints, demonstrating that careful targeting can enhance diffusion [24–29]. However, few studies have fully integrated the realism of heterogeneity in agent preferences, cost structures, fairness considerations, and time constraints.

This presents a critical gap: While we know that transitions can be catalyzed through well-chosen

interventions and that network and preference distributions shape the outcome, we still lack clear guidelines on efficiently and equitably allocating incentives to achieve large-scale, durable transformations. Given information about heterogeneous distributions of preferences (e.g., assessed in willingness-to-pay), network structure, and preference clustering in that network, which intervention strategy is most cost-effective, timely, and fair?

The present study addresses this gap by employing a game-theoretic and computational modeling framework to identify incentive strategies that promote sustainable technology adoption in a cost-effective and context-sensitive manner. We consider different distributions of preferences, ranging from uni- to bimodal, and examine a variety of network topologies (e.g., homogeneous Erdos-Renyi and heterogeneous Barabási-Albert networks, modular and non-modular). The cost of incentivizing an individual depends on their specific preference and their position in the network, and the total cost depends is derived from the rule that defines the pool of who to target. We implement different targeting heuristics relying on information about individual preferences and local network properties to identify low-cost strategies. The efficiency of these strategies is evaluated in terms of total cost, time to reach a target adoption level (90%), and the inequality of incentive distribution as measured by the Gini coefficient. We show which strategies are most cost-effective and equal for a given context by systematically exploring how resistance to change and segregation levels influence outcomes. Our results offer valuable insights for policymakers seeking to leverage population information to customize incentive schemes, thus, bridging the gap between theoretical insights and practical strategies for guiding societies toward more sustainable futures.


## RESULTS

We consider a population of individuals, each characterized by intrinsic preferences towards a specific technology and local benefits to conform. Preferences and local conformity create, at a given time, a distribution of incentives that could be provided to each agent individually, which would make them take a set option. The difference between the minimal incentive to change and the option cost is the individual's willingness to pay. Thus, as adoption starts, willingness to pay will change as local pressures to conform change, even as intrinsic preferences remain fixed. This endogenous change in willingness to pay may lead to self-sustained adoption of a technology. For simplicity, we take these intrinsic preferences and the network of influences as fixed and, thus, as the defining characteristics of the population.

We focus on optimizing the cost of seeding a small subset of early adopters. We test different targeting heuristics based on personal preferences and local network properties, namely, degree centrality and local clustering. We also test a random targeting strategy. In supplementary material, we also test strategies combining preferences and network structures (Fig S1). For each population configuration, we identify the minimum intervention size for all strategies required to achieve 90% of technology adoption reliably. The strategy which, on average, costs the least is designated as the cost-effective strategy for that set of parameters.

In the first scenario, we consider a population of individuals who influence each other in a Barabási-Albert heterogeneous network where a few nodes have a lot of connections, and most have few and examine the role of preference distribution in determining the cost-effectiveness of strategies. We vary the homogeneity of the distribution and the average relative preference for the new option. The symmetric beta distribution is used to model preference distribution and is tuned from unimodal to bimodal.


First, we consider a situation in which the intervenor only has information regarding the preference distribution to determine the cost-effective strategy in [Figure 1](#). Among the preference-informed strategies and the random strategy, targeting amenable individuals—individuals with a high preference for change—



**Figure 1. Strategies need to account for the distribution of preferences** The most cost-effective strategies to achieve 90 % adoption are plotted for different preference distributions (symmetric beta distributions  $(\alpha, \alpha)$ ) characterized by varying average preference for change and homogeneity controlled through  $\alpha$ . In A, the preference distributions are plotted corresponding to 5 points in the parameter space depicted using stars in B with matching colors. We test strategies based on information about preference distribution (B), networks (C), and the random targeting strategy. We then compare all strategies in D. Among strategies based on preferences (B) the amenable strategy is cost-effective across all preference distributions. In C, we see that in case of high resistance to change, it is better to target the highly connected nodes while targeting peripheral nodes when the population is more amenable to change. In D, we see that as preference distribution gets more heterogeneous, the amenable strategy outperforms network-based strategies over a greater range of average preferences. The population size is 1000 and is connected via a Barabási-Albert network (min  $k=10$ ) with penalty  $p = 0.5$ .

emerges as the cost-effective strategy across all tested preference distributions [Figure 1B](#).

When the intervenor only has information about the network topology, they can apply network-informed strategies ([Figure 1C](#)). In that case, targeting agents with high(low) degree-centrality is most effective when the population is highly resistant(amenable) to change—i.e., has a strong preference for the current (new) option. For intermediate resistance targeting nodes of high local clustering is the best strategy, providing an optimal combination of low-degree and high-degree nodes (Fig S2). Thus, choosing the appropriate direction of technology propagation, i.e., from the center to the periphery, vice-versa, or emanating from in between the two, can help minimize cost depending on the resistance in the population. Suppose the intervenor has both types of information, on comparing all strategies together([Figure 1D](#)).



**Figure 2. Optimal strategies in segregated and clustered populations** The most cost-effective strategies to achieve 90 % adoption are plotted for varying average preferences for change and levels of homophily in the network. In A, networks corresponding to corner cases and the center of the parameter space are depicted. We test strategies based on information about preference distribution (B), networks (C), and the random targeting strategy. We then compare all strategies in D. In B, we see that while amenable strategy works for low homophily networks, for more segregated networks random strategy works better in case of high resistance while targeting resistant individuals works when the population is more amenable on average. In C, we see that homophily doesn't change the ordering of network-informed strategies. In D, we see that as the networks get more segregated, the network-informed strategies outperform preference-informed strategies over a greater range of average preferences. The population size is 1000 and is connected via a homophilous Barabási-Albert network (min  $k = 10$ ) with penalty  $p = 0.5$  and  $\alpha = 2$ .

In that case, the amenable strategy emerges as the best strategy over a big part of the tested parameter space, especially when there are no strong preferences for either and there is high heterogeneity in preferences.

These results hold as we vary the heterogeneity of networks except in more homogeneous networks,

the amenable strategy outperforms the network-based strategy for all average preference strengths (Fig S3). Further, simulations on empirical networks [30] yield similar results (Fig S4).

These findings align with the idea that the “influentials hypothesis” has a limited range of validity [31]. To further explore this, we test a variation of the model where agents who switch to the new choice cannot revert to the previous one (Fig S5). In this case, targeting high-degree individuals becomes cost-effective over a larger parameter space. This suggests that while influential individuals have greater reach, they are also more susceptible to social push-back from their numerous connections, which can lead them to revert when early adoption is possible. Conversely, peripheral individuals face less social resistance but have limited reach, making this strategy effective only when the population strongly prefers change. The amenable strategy remains robust because it targets a mix of influential and peripheral individuals who, due to their stronger preference for change, are less likely to revert to the status quo. However, with the ratcheted system the strategy of targeting resistant individuals also gains ground.


The size of the target group also influences the likelihood of backsliding. A strategy that generates large spillovers may also increase the risk of reversal within the target group due to greater exposure to opposing social influences. This underscores the trade-off between maximizing reach and ensuring sustained adoption.

Further evidence of this trade-off emerges when we vary the degree assortativity in Barabási-Albert networks (Fig S6). As the network becomes more disassortative—meaning high-degree nodes are more likely to connect with low-degree nodes—targeting hubs becomes less effective. This may be due to the relatively small target group size, which, in the absence of strong in-group reinforcement, becomes more vulnerable to backsliding. On the other hand, targeting peripheral individuals gains effectiveness over a wider parameter space, as their reach improves while maintaining enough in-group links to sustain the change. In highly assortative networks, where high-degree nodes tend to connect primarily with other high-degree nodes, both degree-based strategies become less efficient, highlighting the complex interplay between network structure and intervention success.


In the second scenario, we study the cost-effectiveness of strategies when the population is segregated based on preferences Figure 2. We use homophilous Barabási-Albert graphs to generate networks with increasing levels of segregation between the two communities. This can be viewed as a proxy for populations of varying issue-based and affective polarization scenarios [12].

Once again, we begin with an intervenor that only has information about the preferences of individuals. (Figure 2B) As the level of homophily increases and the bridge between the communities becomes weaker, interventions in the amenable community cannot produce spillover in the resistant population. Targeting resistant individuals becomes the more effective strategy when the population, on average, favors change. However, in the face of greater resistance to change, targeting randomly outperforms the preference-informed strategies. We see that as the preferences become sorted in the network, for high average amenability to change, the cost of implementing preference-based strategies decreases (Fig S7). This can be because the clustering of early adopters helps prevent them from backsliding by providing reinforcement.

Segregation and clustering of preferences make preference-based strategies less effective compared to the network-based strategies as they target parts of both communities, thus, compensating for the weak bridge between the communities. For highly resistant populations, we recover the classical result that targeting high-degree nodes is a good strategy [32]. Beyond minimal costs, each strategy has different implications. We now look into other essential considerations of interventions—the time taken to achieve 90 % adoption, the heterogeneity of incentives distributed, and the number of people incentivized for the different targeting strategies. In Figure 3 we show the time-effectiveness of strategies for population



**Figure 3. Time taken for 90% adoption** The time taken to reach 90% adoption is plotted against the cost of implementing different heuristics for Barabási-Albert networks (A, B) and Barabási-Albert networks with homophily = 0.45 (C, D). In A, C the cost and time taken by minimum intervention using different strategies is plotted. Time is measured in generations ( $N$  time steps). Each point represents the average value for a given configuration of network and preference distribution over 50 replicates. We consider 2500 configurations for each heuristic (50 networks and 50 preference distributions). The 5-95 percentile bands are shown along both axes. The average minimum interventions sizes which are indicated as percentages of the population. In B(D), as intervention sizes are increased beyond the minimum levels observed in A(C), the cost vs time plot shows an inflection point for all the tested heuristics. In the homophilous networks, all strategies take more time to achieve 90% adoption. Further, the resistant strategy becomes cost-effective while taking significantly more time. The population size is 1000, with a preference distribution given by beta distribution( $\alpha, \alpha$ ), with  $\alpha = 2$  and average preference = 1.



**Figure 4. Gini coefficient of incentives** The Gini coefficient of the incentives given is plotted for the target group (A, B) and the whole population (C, D). In A and C, the Gini coefficient is plotted against the cost of the minimum intervention sizes. As intervention sizes are increased beyond the minimum levels observed in Figure 3. In B we see that the Gini coefficient within the target group increases with greater intervention size for network-informed strategies, and converges to the random strategy which remains unaffected by increasing intervention size being representative of the population heterogeneity. Thus smaller target groups are more relatively more homogeneous. In D, we see the intuitive result that greater intervention size decreases the Gini coefficient for the population (target and non-target group). The population size is 1000 connected by a Barabási-Albert network, with a preference distribution given by beta distribution( $\alpha, \alpha$ ), with  $\alpha = 2$  and average preference = 1.



connected by a BA network with a particular distribution of preferences (average preference = 1 and  $\alpha = 2$ ). Targeting high degree agents generates the biggest spillovers while the intervention size required is largest while targeting peripheral agents. Further, we increased intervention sizes for the different strategies to estimate the trade-off between the extra cost incurred and the reduction in time taken to achieve 90% adoption (Figure 3B). The cost vs time plot follows a convex curve for the tested strategies, showing that beyond certain intervention sizes the costs pile up without substantial gains in terms of time. This happens at similar rates for different strategies.

We compare these results with populations with the same preference distribution, but segregated according to preferences (Figure 3C, D). All strategies take more time to achieve 90% adoption. Further, targeting the resistant individuals while being cost-effective takes much longer on average than the other strategies and it requires targeting individuals in the amenable subpopulation to make substantial gains in time-effectiveness.

Next, we look at the equality of intervention in the target group and in the entire population which also considers those that are not incentivized by calculating the Gini coefficient in the incentives given out Figure 4. This analysis is done for the same population setup used in Figure 3 A, B. Targeting peripheral is the most equitable distribution of funds, because of the homogeneity of degree within this subgroup, the size of intervention required and also because of the relative small incentive required per individual. On the other hand hubs, face the most social pressure and, need the biggest incentives. Targeting hubs, thus concentrates the funds in a much smaller section of the population, making this strategy less equitable (Figure 4 C). The rest of the strategies, on the other hand, require a much bigger seeding base which results in a more equitable distribution of funds.

The Gini coefficient within the target group increases with greater intervention size for network-informed strategies and converges to the random strategy which remains unaffected by increasing intervention size being representative of the population's heterogeneity in willingness to pay (Figure 4 B). Further, as intuition suggests, interventions targeting bigger groups are more equitable when considering the entire population (Figure 4 D).

We also test a version of the model in which the influence a neighbor has on the utility is dependent on the degree of the focal node— individuals with fewer connections (low node degree) place higher importance on each neighbor and individuals with a higher node degree assign less weight to each neighbor (Fig S8). This model is representative of cases when the social influence is psychological. In such cases, targeting central individuals maximizes spillover effects without incurring additional costs.

## DISCUSSION

In this paper, we explore the cost optimization of seeding early adopters in heterogeneous, networked populations by leveraging information about preference distributions and the social network structure. We contextualize the costs of interventions using a game-theoretic model, which enables us to identify targeting heuristics aimed at minimizing costs. This approach also informs the fairness of incentive distribution schemes and the timeliness of intended social transformations.

Our model is designed for cases where individuals directly benefit from coordination with one's neighbors. All individuals are equally influenced by their neighbors and this can be representative of cases where social influence is economic in nature. Our findings suggest that the direction in which the behavioral change is propagated on a network becomes crucial. Cost optimality is achieved by striking a balance between the self-reinforcement within the target group and the indirect influence that be achieved, particularly when change in behavior is reversible. The heterogeneity and clustering of preferences and

the network, thus determine the cost-optimal targeting strategy. Further, as the average strength in preferences is varied, and consequently the required intervention sizes, the efficiency of a target group also varies based on its composition.

Several simplifying assumptions underpin our model. First, we assume timescales to be short enough to neglect dynamic changes in preferences or networks. Second, we posit that the policymaker has access to detailed micro-level information—an assumption that, while useful for modeling, is often unfeasible in large-scale settings and raises potential ethical concerns. Additionally, we assume that all individuals targeted by interventions respond positively. We do not consider push-back effects or differential responses to interventions observed in real-world social norm interventions [22, 33].

While our model assumes a linear relationship between utility and the frequency of choices in the neighborhood, real-world dynamics can be nonlinear. For instance, in the context of electric vehicle adoption, a neighborhood might only install charging stations after a critical mass of residents own electric cars. Further, we assume that all individuals are equally affected by social pressure. This assumption can be relaxed for more realistic scenarios to account for heterogeneity, i.e., having susceptible, insusceptible/non-conforming, or even anti-conforming individuals [5, 28]. This presents an additional layer of complexity that affects the efficacy of targeting strategies while also presenting a different set of potential strategies accounting for conforming tendencies.

The literature suggests targeting resistant individuals to maximize spillover effects and random targeting for more robust outcomes [22]. Our results, however, suggest that targeting amenable individuals can be a better strategy. This apparent contradiction arises because the study in mention assumes that the cost of changing an individual's behavior is the same for all individuals, while we specifically do away with this simplification.

With cost considerations, we are able to identify population setups where different network-based strategies, ranging from targeting central to peripheral agents, are optimal [18–20]. This helps reconcile differing proposed targeting strategies like the billboard and the handbill strategy [27].

In our work, our goal has been to understand the targeting potential of individuals and relate it to simple characterizations of these individuals. We have thus focused on strategies driven by a single criterion, but more sophisticated targeting using information about the preference distribution and the network can yield greater optimization. We try out a strategy that targets individuals with a high ratio of social influence to the cost of incentive. These are peripheral individuals with a high preference for change. This strategy outperforms other strategies for a considerable part of the parameter space, but becomes inefficient in the case of network segregation. Similarly, other optimal combinations can potentially be worked out for different population setups. Further, we incentivize all targeted individuals simultaneously in the beginning. A more nuanced approach accounting for an optimal targeting sequence can offer even more cost-effective solutions.

While our study provides theoretical insights, these can be empirically tested in experimental setups. Future research could explore feedback loops between behavior and environmental changes, where shifts in the environment influence individual preferences in turn.

## METHODS

### Computer simulations

We consider a population of  $N$  individuals who adopt one of two different products, A or B. At each time step, an individual is asynchronously selected to consider changing the product they currently use. The

decision process is based on a game-theoretic framework of collective decision-making, which captures (reversible) complex contagion behavior from microscopic principles [5, 7, 34]. An agent  $i$  faces two options and makes decisions that maximize their utility. The utility of each choice is characterized by net intrinsic individual preferences  $o_i^A$  and  $o_i^B$  for product A and B, and by a term derived from the products adopted in their social network. The decision weighs both, i.e.,  $\Delta o_i = o_i^A - o_i^B$ , along with the net influence exerted through the immediate social network,  $p(\#_i^A - \#_i^B)$ , where  $\#_i^A$  ( $\#_i^B$ ) denotes the number of neighbors of  $i$  choosing A (B). The net social influence can be described in terms of the benefits derived from coordination on a choice or in terms of the penalty received in the case of miscoordination. The two cases are equivalent. The utility of option  $X \in \{A, B\}$  is  $U_i^X = o_i^X + p\#_i^X$ . Thus, the marginal utility of choice A,  $\Delta U_i \equiv U_i^A - U_i^B$ , is

$$\Delta U_i = \Delta o_i + p(\#_i^A - \#_i^B). \quad (1)$$

When  $\Delta U_i$  is positive (negative) agent  $i$  chooses A (B). Thus, each agent is characterized by a threshold number of As in their neighborhood above which they will act A and below which they will act B. That threshold is simply  $T_i = k_i/2 - \Delta o_i/(2p)$ . Agents are also characterized by a benefit to action A above which they would adopt action A, given by  $b_i = p(k_i - 2\#_i^A) - \Delta o_i$ . Further, agent's choices are reversible, i.e., they can change their choice if they do not experience enough reinforcement in their neighborhood.

## Intervention implementation

The targeting strategies tested were based on individual preferences and network properties, namely degree centrality and local clustering centrality. We chose node degree as the centrality measure as other measures like between-ness centrality and eigenvector centrality are highly correlated with node degree for the networks we used.

The agents are first sorted according to the property on which the strategy is based and then the individuals from the top (or bottom) of the sorted list are selected based on the intervention size. The utility of the new technology perceived by targeted individuals is determined and accordingly, they are given personalized incentives that are just enough to tip them over the point of indifference. This is done at the start of the simulation and then the collective decision-making is allowed to take over. This helps us identify the minimum interventions required to achieve social transition reliably, i.e., when the intervention leads to 90 % adoption or more for at least 75 % of all the population configurations.

For a given set of seeded individuals,  $X$ , the cost of the intervention is given by  $\sum_{i \in X} b_i$  with  $\#_i^A = 0$ .

## Networks

### Homophilous networks

To generate homophilous networks, we sort the population according to preferences and split it into two communities. Then we modify the preferential attachment algorithm to include the node's preference to form an edge with another node from the same community. The homophily parameter tunes this preference of attaching within the group, for homophily = 0, there is an equal chance of connecting with nodes in both communities, while for homophily = 1, a node only connects within the same community.

### **Networks with varying heterogeneity**

To generate networks, ranging from homogeneous (Poisson degree distribution) to heterogeneous (scale-free degree distribution) we calculate the weighted average of the two probability distributions of degree, tune the weights and then use a configuration model to generate networks with the corresponding degree distribution. This helps us tune the heterogeneity of the networks using one weight parameter.

### **Networks with varying degree-assortativity**

Assortative networks are generated using a reshuffling algorithm[35].

### **Empirical networks**

We use 74 networks from the Add Health Dataset[30, 36].

### **Data and Code Availability**

The static version of the code used for simulations will be made available as a Zenodo repository.

### **Acknowledgements**

D.M. and V.V.V. acknowledge funding from the Computational Science Lab and ENLENS under the project "The Cost of Large-Scale Transitions: Introducing Effective Targeted Incentives."

### **Competing Interests**

The authors declare no competing interests.


## References

1. Creutzig, F., Roy, J., Devine-Wright, P., Díaz-José, J., Geels, F., Grubler, A., Maïzi, N., Masanet, E., Mulugetta, Y., Onyige, C., et al. (2022). "Demand, Services, and Social Aspects of Mitigation". *Climate Change 2022: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Ed. by P. Shukla, J. Skea, R. Slade, A. A. Khourdajie, R. van Diemen, D. McCollum, M. Pathak, S. Some, P. Vyas, R. Fradera, et al. <https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg3/chapter/chapter-5/>. Cambridge, UK & New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157926.007>.
2. Dietz, T., Gardner, G. T., Gilligan, J., Stern, P. C., and Vandenberg, M. P. (2009). Household actions can provide a behavioral wedge to rapidly reduce US carbon emissions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* *106*, 18452–18456.
3. Otto, I. M., Donges, J. F., Cremades, R., Bhowmik, A., Hewitt, R. J., Lucht, W., Rockström, J., Allerberger, F., McCaffrey, M., Doe, S. S., et al. (2020). Social tipping dynamics for stabilizing Earth's climate by 2050. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* *117*, 2354–2365.
4. Bak-Coleman, J. B., Alfano, M., Barfuss, W., Bergstrom, C. T., Centeno, M. A., Couzin, I. D., Donges, J. F., Galesic, M., Gersick, A. S., Jacquet, J., et al. (2021). Stewardship of global collective behavior. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* *118*, e2025764118.
5. Mittal, D., Constantino, S. M., and Vasconcelos, V. V. (2024). Anti-conformists catalyze societal transitions and facilitate the expression of evolving preferences. *PNAS nexus*, pgae302.
6. Nyborg, K., Anderies, J. M., Dannenberg, A., Lindahl, T., Schill, C., Schlüter, M., Adger, W. N., Arrow, K. J., Barrett, S., Carpenter, S., et al. (2016). Social norms as solutions. *Science* *354*, 42–43.
7. Gavrillets, S. (2020). The dynamics of injunctive social norms. *Evolutionary Human Sciences* *2*, e60.
8. Santos, F. P., Levin, S. A., and Vasconcelos, V. V. (2021). Biased perceptions explain collective action deadlocks and suggest new mechanisms to prompt cooperation. *Iscience* *24*.
9. Santos, F. C. and Pacheco, J. M. (2011). Risk of collective failure provides an escape from the tragedy of the commons. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* *108*, 10421–10425.
10. Vasconcelos, V. V., Santos, F. C., and Pacheco, J. M. (2015). Cooperation dynamics of polycentric climate governance. *Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences* *25*, 2503–2517.
11. Weber, E. U. (2006). Experience-based and description-based perceptions of long-term risk: Why global warming does not scare us (yet). *Climatic change* *77*, 103–120.
12. Vasconcelos, V. V., Constantino, S. M., Dannenberg, A., Lumkowsky, M., Weber, E., and Levin, S. (2021). Segregation and clustering of preferences erode socially beneficial coordination. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* *118*, e2102153118.
13. Domingos, P. and Richardson, M. (2001). "Mining the network value of customers". *Proceedings of the seventh ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, 57–66.

14. Kempe, D., Kleinberg, J., and Tardos, É. (2003). "Maximizing the spread of influence through a social network". *Proceedings of the ninth ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, 137–146.
15. Andreoni, J., Nikiforakis, N., and Siegenthaler, S. (2021). Predicting social tipping and norm change in controlled experiments. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 118, e2014893118.
16. Granovetter, M. (1978). Threshold models of collective behavior. *American journal of sociology* 83, 1420–1443.
17. Centola, D. and Macy, M. (2007). Complex contagions and the weakness of long ties. *American journal of Sociology* 113, 702–734.
18. Centola, D. (2018). *How behavior spreads: The science of complex contagions*. Vol. 3. Princeton University Press Princeton, NJ.
19. Centola, D. (2021). Influencers, backfire effects, and the power of the periphery. *Personal Networks: Classic Readings and New Directions in Egocentric Analysis* 51, 73.
20. Leemput, I. A. van de, Bascompte, J., Buddendorf, W. B., Dakos, V., Lever, J. J., Scheffer, M., and Nes, E. H. van (2024). Transformation starts at the periphery of networks where pushback is less. *Scientific Reports* 14, 11344.
21. Ehret, S., Constantino, S. M., Weber, E. U., Efferson, C., and Vogt, S. (2022). Group identities can undermine social tipping after intervention. *Nature human behaviour* 6, 1669–1679.
22. Efferson, C., Vogt, S., and Fehr, E. (2020). The promise and the peril of using social influence to reverse harmful traditions. *Nature human behaviour* 4, 55–68.
23. Nejad, M. G., Amini, M., and Babakus, E. (2015). Success factors in product seeding: The role of homophily. *Journal of Retailing* 91, 68–88.
24. Aral, S., Muchnik, L., and Sundararajan, A. (2013). Engineering social contagions: Optimal network seeding in the presence of homophily. *Network Science* 1, 125–153.
25. Banerjee, A., Chandrasekhar, A. G., Duflo, E., and Jackson, M. O. (2013). The diffusion of microfinance. *Science* 341, 1236498.
26. Bakshy, E., Hofman, J. M., Mason, W. A., and Watts, D. J. (2011). "Everyone's an influencer: quantifying influence on twitter". *Proceedings of the fourth ACM international conference on Web search and data mining*, 65–74.
27. Han, S., Zhuang, F., He, Q., and Shi, Z. (2014). "Balanced seed selection for budgeted influence maximization in social networks". *Advances in Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining: 18th Pacific-Asia Conference, PAKDD 2014, Tainan, Taiwan, May 13-16, 2014. Proceedings, Part I* 18. Springer, 65–77.
28. Hu, H.-h., Lin, J., Qian, Y., and Sun, J. (2018). Strategies for new product diffusion: whom and how to target? *Journal of Business Research* 83, 111–119.


29. De Souza, R., Figueiredo, D. R., Rocha, A. d. A., and Ziviani, A. (2020). Efficient network seeding under variable node cost and limited budget for social networks. *Information Sciences* 514, 369–384.
30. Jeon, K. C. and Goodson, P. (2015). US adolescents' friendship networks and health risk behaviors: a systematic review of studies using social network analysis and Add Health data. *PeerJ* 3, e1052.
31. Watts, D. J. and Dodds, P. S. (2007). Influentials, networks, and public opinion formation. *Journal of consumer research* 34, 441–458.
32. Chen, W., Wang, Y., and Yang, S. (2009). "Efficient influence maximization in social networks". *Proceedings of the 15th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, 199–208.
33. Efferson, C., Ehret, S., Flüe, L. von, and Vogt, S. (2024). When norm change hurts. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B* 379, 20230039.
34. Yang, L., Constantino, S. M., Grenfell, B. T., Weber, E. U., Levin, S. A., and Vasconcelos, V. V. (2022). Sociocultural determinants of global mask-wearing behavior. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 119, e2213525119.
35. Xulvi-Brunet, R. and Sokolov, I. M. (2004). Reshuffling scale-free networks: From random to assortative. *Physical Review E—Statistical, Nonlinear, and Soft Matter Physics* 70, 066102.
36. Guilbeault, D. and Centola, D. (2021). Topological measures for identifying and predicting the spread of complex contagions. *Nature communications* 12, 4430.

## Supplemental Figures




**Figure S1. Targeting based on information about preferences as well the network** We test a strategy to target individuals who have a high influence in the network relative to the cost of incentivizing them to change their behavior. This strategy is included in the analysis shown in figure 1 and 2 in the main text. The strategy outperforms other strategies for many different preference distributions (A) but its efficiency is negatively affected by segregation and clustering of preferences.







**Figure S2. Node degree plotted against local clustering** The node degree is plotted against the local clustering for a BA network with each point representing a node. Nodes with high local clustering are close to the network's periphery while nodes with low local clustering can be close to the center. This helps us understand the composition of target groups based on local clustering.




**Figure S3. Varying network heterogeneity** The strategies are tested for varying levels of network heterogeneity, with degree distribution varying from Poisson distribution to a scale-free distribution. The order of network-based strategies (A) is unaffected by network heterogeneity. For low network heterogeneity, the amenable strategy outperforms the network-based properties (B). The population size is 1000 with the average node degree for all networks = 20,  $\alpha=2$  and penalty = 0.5




**Figure S4. Simulation results for empirical networks** The most cost-effective strategies to achieve 90 % adoption are plotted for different preference distributions (symmetric beta distributions( $\alpha, \alpha$ )) characterized by varying average preference for change and homogeneity controlled through  $\alpha$ . The simulations are done on 74 networks from Add Health Dataset<sup>30</sup>. These networks vary in population size and average degree. We test strategies based on information about preference distribution (A), networks (B), and the random targeting strategy. We then compare all strategies in C. The strategy which is cost-effective for the most number of networks is selected is plotted for different preference distributions. We recover similar results obtained for synthetic Barabasi-Albert networks shown in Figure 1 in the main text. The penalty value  $p = 0.5$ .




**Figure S5. Model with ratcheted decision-making** The most cost-effective strategies to achieve 90 % adoption are plotted for different preference distributions (symmetric beta distributions( $\alpha, \alpha$ )) characterized by varying average preference for change and homogeneity controlled through  $\alpha$ . The model tested here is ratcheted, — agents do not revert after adopting the new behavior. We test strategies based on information about preference distribution (A), networks (B), and the random targeting strategy. We then compare all strategies in C. Compared to Figure 1 in the main text, the strategy targeting resistant individuals becomes cost-effective in parts of the parameter space (A). In B and C, targeting the highly connected nodes is cost-effective over a large parameter space as they sustain change in behavior without social pushback affecting them. The population size is 1000 and is connected via a Barabási-Albert network (min  $k=10$ ) with penalty  $p = 0.5$ .



**Figure S6. Effect of degree assortativity on the efficiency of network-based targeting** The most cost-effective strategies to achieve 90 % adoption are plotted for different preference distributions (symmetric beta distributions( $\alpha, \alpha$ )) characterized by varying average preference for change and degree assortativity. We test strategies based on information about preference distribution (A), networks (B), and the random targeting strategy. We then compare all strategies in C. In B, the degree-based strategies become relatively less effective as the assortativity increases. The population size is 1000 and is connected via Barabási-Albert networks (min  $k=10$ ) rewired to tune degree assortativity with penalty  $p = 0.5$ .



**Figure S7. Segregation in more amenable populations can make preference-based targeting more cost-effective** In B we show the average costs of incentives corresponding to the best-performing preference-based strategies shown in A (Fig2B in main text). For a high average preference for change, segregation of preferences decreases the cost of interventions. Clustering of targeted individuals prevents backsliding increasing the efficiency of strategies targeting resistant and amenable individuals.



**Figure S8. Model with social influence as a function of the fraction of adopters in the neighborhood** The most cost-effective strategies to achieve 90 % adoption are plotted for different preference distributions (symmetric beta distributions  $(\alpha, \alpha)$ ) characterized by varying average preference for change and homogeneity controlled through  $\alpha$ . We test strategies based on information about preference distribution (A), networks (B), and the random targeting strategy. We then compare all strategies in C. Among strategies based on preferences (A) the amenable strategy is cost-effective across all preference distributions. In B and C, targeting the highly connected nodes is cost-effective over a large parameter space as a higher degree does not translate to greater social pressure. The population size is 1000 and is connected via a Barabási-Albert network (min  $k=10$ ) and the maximum social influence an individual receives is 5.