

Sensitivity of Centrality Measures Against Strategic Manipulation Supplementary Materials

Paper #4212

1 Proofs

As mentioned in the main paper, we focus on the following question:

*Given a centrality measure c , an target $T^\dagger \in V$, and a class of edges $\zeta^\dagger \in \{\zeta_1^\dagger, \zeta_2^\dagger, \zeta_3^\dagger\}$, can the **addition** of an edge $e \in \zeta^\dagger$ to a network $(V, E) : e \notin E$ increase, or decrease, or leave unchanged, the ranking of T^\dagger according to c ? How about the **removal** of e from a network $(V, E) : e \in E$? Can it increase, or decrease, or leave unchanged, the ranking of T^\dagger according to c ?*

Table ?? summarizes our theoretical results, which address this question. Theorems 1 and 2 were presented in the main paper. In this appendix we present the remaining theorems. As mentioned in the main paper, the theorems focus on the effect of *adding* an edge to a network; as for the *removal* of an edge, the results immediately follow (see Proposition 1).

Theorem 4. *Let T^\dagger be a node in V and let ζ^\dagger be a class in $\{\zeta_1^\dagger, \zeta_2^\dagger, \zeta_3^\dagger\}$. Furthermore, let c be a centrality measure in $\{c_{degr}, c_{clos}, c_{betw}\}$. There exists a network $G = (V, E)$ and an edge $e \in \zeta^\dagger : e \notin E$ such that the addition of e to G **does not change** the ranking of T^\dagger according to c .*

Proof. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a network as depicted in Figure ??, with $k > 4$. In this network, we have:

- $c_{degr}(G, T^\dagger) = k$;
- $c_{degr}(G, x_i) = 1, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$;
- $c_{degr}(G, y_i) = 2, \forall i \in \{1, 2\}$;
- $c_{clos}(G, T^\dagger) = \frac{1}{k+4}$;
- $c_{clos}(G, x_i) \leq \frac{1}{2k+5}, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$;
- $c_{clos}(G, y_i) = \frac{1}{2k+3}, \forall i \in \{1, 2\}$;
- $c_{betw}(G, T^\dagger) = \frac{k^2+3k-2}{2}$;
- $c_{betw}(G, x_i) = 0, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$;
- $c_{betw}(G, y_i) = k+1, \forall i \in \{1, 2\}$.

Hence, the node T^\dagger is ranked first in G according to every centrality measure $c \in \{c_{degr}, c_{clos}, c_{betw}\}$.

Now, let G'_1 be the network that results from adding $(T^\dagger, x_1) \in \zeta_1^\dagger$ to G . Formally, $G'_1 = (V, E \cup \{(T^\dagger, x_1)\})$. In this network, we have:




Figure S1: The network used in the proof of Theorem ??.

- $c_{degr}(G'_1, T^\dagger) = k+1$;
- $c_{degr}(G'_1, x_i) \leq 2, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$;
- $c_{clos}(G'_1, T^\dagger) = \frac{1}{k+3}$;
- $c_{clos}(G'_1, x_i) \leq \frac{1}{2k+3}, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$;
- $c_{betw}(G'_1, y_1) = 0$.

The remaining centrality values do not change in comparison to G . As can be seen, the node T^\dagger is still ranked first according to every $c \in \{c_{degr}, c_{clos}, c_{betw}\}$. We have shown that it is possible to add an edge $e \in \zeta_1^\dagger$ to a network without changing the ranking of T^\dagger according to each of the centrality measures in $\{c_{degr}, c_{clos}, c_{betw}\}$.

Let G'_2 be the network that results from adding $(y_1, y_2) \in \zeta_2^\dagger$ to G . More formally, $G'_2 = (V, E \cup \{(y_1, y_2)\})$. In G'_2 we have:

- $c_{degr}(G'_2, y_i) = 3, \forall i \in \{1, 2\}$;
- $c_{clos}(G'_2, y_i) = \frac{1}{2k+1}, \forall i \in \{1, 2\}$;
- $c_{betw}(G'_2, T^\dagger) = \frac{k^2+3k-10}{2}$.

The remaining centrality values do not change compared to G . As can be seen, the node T^\dagger is still ranked first according to every $c \in \{c_{degr}, c_{clos}, c_{betw}\}$. This implies that it is possible to add an edge $e \in \zeta_2^\dagger$ to a network without changing the ranking of T^\dagger according to each of the centrality measures in $\{c_{degr}, c_{clos}, c_{betw}\}$.

Let G'_3 be the network that results from adding $(x_1, x_2) \in \zeta_3^\dagger$ to G . More formally, $G'_3 = (V, E \cup \{(x_1, x_2)\})$. In this network, we have:

	$e \in \zeta_1^\dagger$					
	Add e to a network $(V, E) : e \notin E$			Remove e from a network $(V, E) : e \in E$		
	Increase T^\dagger ranking	No change in T^\dagger ranking	Decrease T^\dagger ranking	Increase T^\dagger ranking	No change in T^\dagger ranking	Decrease T^\dagger ranking
Degree	✓ (Theorem ??)	✓ (Theorem ??)	✗ (Theorem 1)	✗ (Theorem 1)	✓ (Theorem ??)	✓ (Theorem ??)
Closeness	✓ (Theorem ??)	✓ (Theorem ??)	✓ (Theorem ??)	✓ (Theorem ??)	✓ (Theorem ??)	✓ (Theorem ??)
Betweenness	✓ (Theorem ??)	✓ (Theorem ??)	✓ (Theorem ??)	✓ (Theorem ??)	✓ (Theorem ??)	✓ (Theorem ??)

	$e \in \zeta_2^\dagger$					
	Add e to a network $(V, E) : e \notin E$			Remove e from a network $(V, E) : e \in E$		
	Increase T^\dagger ranking	No change in T^\dagger ranking	Decrease T^\dagger ranking	Increase T^\dagger ranking	No change in T^\dagger ranking	Decrease T^\dagger ranking
Degree	✗ (Theorem 1)	✓ (Theorem ??)	✓ (Theorem ??)	✓ (Theorem ??)	✓ (Theorem ??)	✗ (Theorem 1)
Closeness	✗ (Theorem 2)	✓ (Theorem ??)	✓ (Theorem ??)	✓ (Theorem ??)	✓ (Theorem ??)	✗ (Theorem 2)
Betweenness	✓ (Theorem ??)	✓ (Theorem ??)	✓ (Theorem ??)	✓ (Theorem ??)	✓ (Theorem ??)	✓ (Theorem ??)

	$e \in \zeta_3^\dagger$					
	Add e to a network $(V, E) : e \notin E$			Remove e from a network $(V, E) : e \in E$		
	Increase T^\dagger ranking	No change in T^\dagger ranking	Decrease T^\dagger ranking	Increase T^\dagger ranking	No change in T^\dagger ranking	Decrease T^\dagger ranking
Degree	✗ (Theorem 1)	✓ (Theorem ??)	✓ (Theorem ??)	✓ (Theorem ??)	✓ (Theorem ??)	✗ (Theorem 1)
Closeness	✓ (Theorem ??)	✓ (Theorem ??)	✓ (Theorem ??)	✓ (Theorem ??)	✓ (Theorem ??)	✓ (Theorem ??)
Betweenness	✓ (Theorem ??)	✓ (Theorem ??)	✓ (Theorem ??)	✓ (Theorem ??)	✓ (Theorem ??)	✓ (Theorem ??)

Table S1: **Summary of our theoretical results.** For any given target $T^\dagger \in V$, we study three classes of edges: ζ_1^\dagger , ζ_2^\dagger and ζ_3^\dagger , and three centrality measures: Degree, Closeness and Betweenness. For every class and every measure, we study the effect of adding or removing an edge from that class on the centrality-based ranking of T^\dagger ; this effect can either be an “increase”, a “decrease”, or “no change” in the ranking of T^\dagger . The “✓” and “✗” indicate whether such an effect is “possible”, or “impossible”, respectively.

- $c_{degr}(G'_3, x_i) \leq 2, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$;
- $c_{clos}(G'_3, y_i) = \frac{1}{2k+2}, \forall i \in \{1, 2\}$;
- $c_{betw}(G'_3, T^\dagger) = \frac{k^2+3k-8}{2}$;
- $c_{betw}(G'_3, x_i) \leq 1, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$;
- $c_{betw}(G'_3, y_i) = k - 1, \forall i \in \{1, 2\}$.

The remaining centrality values do not change in comparison to G . Based on these values, the node T^\dagger is still ranked first. We have shown that there exists a network G and an edge $e \in \zeta_3^\dagger$ such that the addition of e to G does not change the ranking of T^\dagger according to each of the centrality measures in $\{c_{degr}, c_{clos}, c_{betw}\}$. \square

Theorem 5. Let T^\dagger be a node in V . Then:

- There exists a network $G = (V, E)$ and an edge $e \in \zeta_1^\dagger : e \notin G$ such that the addition of e to G **increases** the ranking of T^\dagger according to **degree** centrality;
- There exists a network $G = (V, E)$ and an edge $e \in \zeta_2^\dagger : e \notin G$ such that the addition of e to G **decrease** the ranking of T^\dagger according to **degree** centrality;
- There exists a network $G = (V, E)$ and an edge $e \in \zeta_3^\dagger : e \notin G$ such that the addition of e to G **decrease** the ranking of T^\dagger according to **degree** centrality.

Proof. Consider adding an edge $(T^\dagger, z) \in \zeta_1^\dagger$ to the network depicted in Figure ??(a). Before this addition, T^\dagger is ranked second according to degree centrality, whereas after the addition it is ranked first (ex aequo with node y).

Now, consider adding an edge (x, y) to either the network depicted in Figure ??(b) (in which case $(x, y) \in \zeta_2^\dagger$) or to the




Figure S2: The networks used in the proof of Theorem ??.

network depicted in Figure ??(c) (in which case $(x, y) \in \zeta_3^\dagger$). In both cases, T^\dagger is ranked first according to degree centrality (ex aequo with nodes x and y) before the addition of (x, y) , but ranked third after this addition. \square

Theorem 6. Let T^\dagger be a node in V . Then:

- There exists a network $G = (V, E)$ and an edge $e \in \zeta_1^\dagger : e \notin G$ such that the addition of e to G **increases** the ranking of T^\dagger according to **closeness** centrality;
- There exists a network $G = (V, E)$ and an edge $e \in \zeta_3^\dagger : e \notin G$ such that the addition of e to G **increases** the ranking of T^\dagger according to **closeness** centrality.

Proof. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a network as depicted in Figure ??, with $k \geq 4$. In this network, the nodes x_k and x_{k+1} have the highest closeness centrality, followed by the nodes x_{k-1} and x_{k+2} , and then the nodes x_{k-2} and x_{k+3} , etc.. This implies that the closeness-based rankings of x_1 and x_3 are $2k - 1$ and $2k - 5$, respectively.

Now, consider the network $G' = (V, E \cup \{(x_1, x_{2k})\})$. Since G' is a ring, all nodes have the same closeness centrality, and thus the same (first) ranking. Then:




Figure S3: The network used in the proof of Theorems ?? and ??.

- If the target is x_1 , i.e., if $T^\dagger = x_1$, then the added edge (x_1, x_{2k}) belongs to the class ζ_1^\dagger ;
- If the target is x_3 , i.e., if $T^\dagger = x_3$, then the added edge (x_1, x_{2k}) belongs to the class ζ_3^\dagger .

In either case, adding (x_1, x_{2k}) results in an increase in the closeness-based ranking of T^\dagger . \square

Theorem 7. Let T^\dagger be a node in V . There exists a network $G = (V, E)$ and an edge $e \in \zeta_1^\dagger : e \notin G$ such that the addition of e to G **decreases** the ranking of T^\dagger according to **closeness centrality**.

Proof. Let $G = (V, E)$ be the network depicted in Figure ?? . In this network we have:

- $c_{clos}(G, y) = \frac{1}{20}$;
- $c_{clos}(G, x) = \frac{1}{23}$;
- $c_{clos}(G, T^\dagger) = \frac{1}{28}$;
- $c_{clos}(G, z) = \frac{1}{29}$;
- $c_{clos}(G, b_i) = \frac{1}{31}, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, 5\}$;
- $c_{clos}(G, a_i) = \frac{1}{39}, \forall i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$;
- $c_{clos}(G, w) = \frac{1}{40}$.

As can be seen, the node T^\dagger is ranked third in G according to closeness centrality.




Figure S4: The network used in the proof of Theorem ??.

Now, let G' be the network that results from adding $(T^\dagger, z) \in \zeta_1^\dagger$ to G . More formally, $G' = (V, E \cup \{(T^\dagger, z)\})$. In this network, we have:

- $c_{clos}(G', y) = \frac{1}{20}$;
- $c_{clos}(G', z) = \frac{1}{21}$;
- $c_{clos}(G', x) = \frac{1}{23}$;
- $c_{clos}(G', T^\dagger) = \frac{1}{24}$;
- $c_{clos}(G', b_i) = \frac{1}{31}$;
- $c_{clos}(G', w) = \frac{1}{32}$;

- $c_{clos}(G', a_i) = \frac{1}{35}$.

As can be seen, the node T^\dagger is ranked fourth in G' according to closeness centrality. We have shown that it is possible to decrease the closeness-based ranking of T^\dagger by adding an edge $e \in \zeta_1^\dagger$. \square

Theorem 8. Let T^\dagger be a node in V . Then:

- There exists a network $G = (V, E)$ and an edge $e \in \zeta_2^\dagger : e \notin G$ such that the addition of e to G **decrease** the ranking of T^\dagger according to **closeness centrality**;
- There exists a network $G = (V, E)$ and an edge $e \in \zeta_3^\dagger : e \notin G$ such that the addition of e to G **decrease** the ranking of T^\dagger according to **closeness centrality**.

Proof. Consider the network $G = (V, E)$ depicted in Figure ??(a). In this network, we have:

- $c_{clos}(G, T^\dagger) = \frac{1}{4k+2}$;
- $c_{clos}(G, x) = c_{clos}(G, y) = \frac{1}{4k+3}$;
- $c_{clos}(G, a_i) = c_{clos}(G, b_i) = \frac{1}{5k+5}, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$.

Based on these values, T^\dagger is ranked first in G according to closeness centrality.




Figure S5: The networks used in the proofs of Theorems ?? and ??.

Now, let G' be the network that results from adding (x, y) (which is an edge in ζ_2^\dagger) to the network G . More formally, $G' = (V, E \cup \{(x, y)\})$. In this network, we have:

- $c_{clos}(G', T^\dagger) = \frac{1}{4k+2}$;
- $c_{clos}(G', x) = c_{clos}(G', y) = \frac{1}{3k+2}$;
- $c_{clos}(G', a_i) = c_{clos}(G', b_i) = \frac{1}{4k+4}, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$.

As such, T^\dagger is ranked third in G' according to closeness centrality. We have shown that it is possible to decrease the closeness-based ranking of T^\dagger by adding an edge $e \in \zeta_2^\dagger$.

Analogically, in the network depicted in Figure ??(b), one can show that the closeness-based ranking of T^\dagger decreases after adding (x_1, y_1) , which is an edge in ζ_3^\dagger . \square

Theorem 9. Let T^\dagger be a node in V . There exists a network $G = (V, E)$ and an edge $e \in \zeta_1^\dagger : e \notin G$ such that the addition of e to G **increases** the ranking of T^\dagger according to **betweenness centrality**.

Proof. Let $G = (V, E)$ be the network depicted in Figure ?? . Here, we have:

- $c_{betw}(G, w) = (k+5)^2$;

- $c_{betw}(G, y_i) = (k+4)(k+6)$;
- $c_{betw}(G, x_i) = k(k+10) + 3(k+7)$;
- $c_{betw}(G, T^\dagger) = c_{betw}(G, z) = 2(2k+8)$;
- $c_{betw}(G, v) = 0, \forall v \in \{a_1, \dots, a_k, b_1, \dots, b_k, c_1, c_2, d_1, d_2\}$.

Based on this, T^\dagger is ranked sixth in G according to betweenness centrality (ex aequo with node z).




Figure S6: The network used in the proof of Theorem ??.

Now, let G' be the network that results from adding $(T^\dagger, y) \in \zeta_1^\dagger$ to G . More formally, $G' = (V, E \cup \{(T^\dagger, y)\})$. The, in G' we have:

- $c_{betw}(G, w) = 2(k+2)$;
- $c_{betw}(G, y_i) = 2k+5$;
- $c_{betw}(G, x_i) = k(k+10) + 6$;
- $c_{betw}(G, T^\dagger) = c_{betw}(G, z) = (k+1)^2 + 2(2k+8) + 3$;

The betweenness centrality of all remaining nodes remains unchanged in comparison to G . Hence, T^\dagger is ranked third in G' according to betweenness centrality (ex aequo with node z). We have shown that it is possible to increase the betweenness-based ranking of T^\dagger by adding an edge $e \in \zeta_1^\dagger$. \square

Theorem 10. Let T^\dagger be a node in V . There exists a network $G = (V, E)$ and an edge $e \in \zeta_2^\dagger : e \notin G$ such that the addition of e to G **increases** the ranking of T^\dagger according to **betweenness centrality**.

Proof. Let $G = (V, E)$ be the network depicted in Figure ??.

In this network, we have:

- $c_{betw}(G, T^\dagger) = \frac{(k+1)^2}{3} + 2k + 5 + \frac{k+1}{2}$;
- $c_{betw}(G, x) = \frac{2(k+1)^2}{3} + \frac{3(k+1)}{2} + 1$;
- $c_{betw}(G, y) = \frac{2(k+1)^2}{3} + 2(k+1) + 1$;
- $c_{betw}(G, z) = \frac{(k+1)^2}{3} + \frac{k+1}{2}$;
- $c_{betw}(G, w_i) = k(k+6), \forall i \in \{1, 2\}$;
- $c_{betw}(G, v) = 0, \forall v \in \{c, a_1, \dots, a_k, b_1, \dots, b_k\}$.

Based on these values, T^\dagger is ranked fifth in G according to betweenness centrality.

Now, let G' be the network that results from adding the edge $(y, w_2) \in \zeta_2^\dagger$ to G . Then, in G' we have:

- $c_{betw}(G', T^\dagger) = 2k + 5$;




Figure S7: The network used in the proof of Theorem ??.

- $c_{betw}(G', x) = \frac{k+1}{2} + 1$;
- $c_{betw}(G', y) = (k+1)^2 + \frac{5(k+1)}{2} + 1$;
- $c_{betw}(G', z) = \frac{k+1}{2}$;
- $c_{betw}(G', w_i) = k(k+6), \forall i \in \{1, 2\}$.

All remaining betweenness centralities remain unchanged compared to G' . Based on these values, T^\dagger is ranked fourth in G' according to betweenness centrality ranking. We have shown that it is possible to increase the betweenness-based ranking of T^\dagger by adding an edge $e \in \zeta_2^\dagger$. \square

Theorem 11. Let T^\dagger be a node in V . There exists a network $G = (V, E)$ and an edge $e \in \zeta_3^\dagger : e \notin G$ such that the addition of e to G **increases** the ranking of T^\dagger according to **betweenness centrality**.

Proof. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a network as depicted in Figure ??, with $k \geq 4$. Here, nodes x_k and x_{k+1} have the highest betweenness centrality, followed by the nodes x_{k-1} and x_{k+2} , and then the nodes x_{k-2} and x_{k+3} , etc.. This implies that the betweenness-based ranking of x_3 is $2k-5$.

Now, consider the network $G' = (V, E \cup \{(x_1, x_{2k})\})$. Since G' is a ring, all nodes have the same betweenness centrality, and thus the same (first) ranking. If the target is x_3 , i.e., if $T^\dagger = x_3$, then the added edge (x_1, x_{2k}) belongs to the class ζ_3^\dagger , and adding it increases the betweenness-based ranking of T^\dagger . \square

Theorem 12. Let T^\dagger be a node in V . There exists a network $G = (V, E)$ and an edge $e \in \zeta_1^\dagger : e \notin G$ such that the addition of e to G **decreases** the ranking of T^\dagger according to **betweenness centrality**.

Proof. Let $G = (V, E)$ be the network depicted in Figure ??.

In this network, we have:

- $c_{betw}(G, y) = 80$;
- $c_{betw}(G, x) = 55$;
- $c_{betw}(G, T^\dagger) = 30$;
- $c_{betw}(G, z) = 16$;
- $c_{betw}(G, v) = 0, \forall v \in V \setminus \{x, y, z, T^\dagger\}$.

Based on these values, the node T^\dagger is ranked third in G according to betweenness centrality.

Now, let G' be the network that results from adding the edge $(T^\dagger, z) \in \zeta_1^\dagger$ to G . That is, $G' = (V, E \cup \{(T^\dagger, z)\})$. In G' we have:




Figure S8: Network used in the proof of Theorem ??.

- $c_{betw}(G', y) = 72$;
- $c_{betw}(G', x) = 32.5$;
- $c_{betw}(G', z) = 32.5$;
- $c_{betw}(G', T^\dagger) = 32$;
- $c_{betw}(G, v) = 0, \forall v \in V \setminus \{x, y, z, T^\dagger\}$.

The node T^\dagger is now ranked fourth in G' according to betweenness centrality. We have shown that it is possible to decrease the betweenness-based ranking of T^\dagger by adding an edge $e \in \zeta_1^\dagger$. \square

Theorem 13. Let T^\dagger be a node in V . Then:

- There exists a network $G = (V, E)$ and an edge $e \in \zeta_2^\dagger$: $e \notin G$ such that the addition of e to G **decreases** the ranking of T^\dagger according to **betweenness** centrality;
- There exists a network $G = (V, E)$ and an edge $e \in \zeta_3^\dagger$: $e \notin G$ such that the addition of e to G **decreases** the ranking of T^\dagger according to **betweenness** centrality.

Proof. Let $G = (V, E)$ be the network depicted in Figure ??(a). In this network, we have:

- $c_{betw}(G, T^\dagger) = (k+1)^2$;
- $c_{betw}(G, x) = c_{betw}(G, y) = k(k+2)$;
- $c_{betw}(G, a_i) = c_{betw}(G, b_i) = 0$.

Based on these values, T^\dagger is ranked first in G according to betweenness centrality.

Now, let G' be the network that results from adding the edge $(x, y) \in \zeta_2^\dagger$ to the network G . That is, $G' = (V, E \cup \{(x, y)\})$. In G' we have:

- $c_{betw}(G', T^\dagger) = 0$;
- $c_{betw}(G', x) = c_{betw}(G', y) = k(k+2)$;
- $c_{betw}(G', a_i) = c_{betw}(G', b_i) = 0$.

Here, T^\dagger is ranked third in G' according to betweenness centrality. We have shown that it is possible to decrease the betweenness-based ranking of T^\dagger by adding an edge $e \in \zeta_2^\dagger$.

Analogically, in the network depicted in Figure ??(b), one can show that the betweenness-based ranking of T^\dagger decreases after adding (x_1, y_1) , which is an edge in ζ_3^\dagger . \square

Proof of Theorem 3 from the Main Paper

Proof. Notice that constructions from the proofs of Theorems ?? and ?? (part for ζ_3^\dagger), from the proofs of Theorems ?? and ??, as well as the proofs of Theorems ?? and ?? (part for ζ_3^\dagger) are already indistinguishable according to assumptions of this theorem.

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a network as depicted in Figure ?? . In this network, the nodes x_k and x_{k+1} have the highest closeness centrality, followed by the nodes x_{k-1} and x_{k+2} , and then the nodes x_{k-2} and x_{k+3} , etc.. This implies that the closeness-based rankings of x_1 is $2k - 1$.




Figure S9: Network used in the proof of Theorem 3.

Now, consider the network $G' = (V, E \cup \{(x_1, x_{2k})\})$. In G' node x_1 has the highest possible closeness centrality, as all nodes in the rings has the same sum of distances to other nodes on the ring, while it is closest to nodes a_i and b_i . Hence it is first in the closest centrality ranking (ex aequo with node x_{2k}). Adding (x_1, x_{2k}) results in an increase in the closeness-based ranking of x_1 .

Now, this construction and the construction from the proof of Theorem ?? are indistinguishable.

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a network as depicted in Figure ?? . In this network, we have:

- $c_{betw}(G, T^\dagger) = 2(2k+3) + (k+1)(k+2)$;
- $c_{betw}(G, y) = (k+1)(k+4)$;
- $c_{betw}(G, w_i) = k(k+5)$;
- $c_{betw}(G, v) = 0, \forall v \in \{x_1, x_2, a_1, \dots, a_k, b_1, \dots, b_k\}$.

Based on these values, T^\dagger is ranked first in G according to betweenness centrality.




Figure S10: Network used in the proof of Theorem 3.

Now, consider the network $G' = (V, E \cup \{(y, w_2)\})$. Then, in G' we have $c_{betw}(G', T^\dagger) = 2(2k+3)$. All remaining

betweenness centralities remain unchanged compared to G' . Based on these values, T^\dagger is ranked fourth in G' according to betweenness centrality ranking. We have shown that it is possible to decrease the betweenness-based ranking of T^\dagger by adding an edge $e \in \zeta_2^\dagger$.

Now, this construction and the construction from the proof of Theorem ?? are indistinguishable. \square

2 Experimental Results

Figures ?? and ?? present results for random networks generated using Erdos-Renyi and Watts-Strogatz models.




Figure S11: Percentage of edge modifications that resulted in a given change in node's centrality ranking for 100 RandomGraph(100, 8) networks.




Figure S12: Percentage of edge modifications that resulted in a given change in node's centrality ranking for 100 SmallWorld(100, 8, $\frac{1}{4}$) networks.