Supplementary Figures
Simple contagion: probabilistic

**Figure S3** Relative effectiveness of interventions over all measures for each transmission probability. Interventions with equal effectiveness are assigned equal rank. With the exception of the *Persuasive* intervention, the pattern for each column (probability) is similar.

**Figure S4** Relative effectiveness of interventions as measured by the proportion of network adopted after one timestep (1-hop reach) under simple contagion. Equal ranks distributed randomly. The thickness of the line indicates the number of simulations where the named intervention is ranked first (left) to seventh (right) in effectiveness. The sequence of the intervention ranks can be read by following the thicker lines from left to right.
Complex contagion: threshold

**Figure S5** Relative effectiveness of interventions over all simulations (regardless of whether post-seed adoptions occurred) for 1-hop reach, 2-hop reach and penetration combined, by threshold. Interventions with equal effectiveness are assigned equal rank.

**Figure S6** Relative effectiveness of interventions as measured by the proportion of network adopted after two time steps (2-hop reach) under complex contagion. Equal ranks distributed randomly. The thickness of the line indicates the number of simulations where the named intervention is ranked first (left) to seventh (right) in effectiveness. The sequence of the intervention ranks can be read by following the thicker lines from left to right. Restricted to simulation sets with threshold of 0.4, 0.5 or 0.6. Other threshold values provided little discrimination between the interventions.
**Figure S7** Relative effectiveness of interventions as measured by the proportion of simulations where at least one secondary adoption occurred under complex contagion. Equal ranks distributed randomly. The thickness of the line indicates the number of simulations where the named intervention is ranked first (left) to seventh (right) in effectiveness. The sequence of the intervention ranks can be read by following the thicker lines from left to right. Restricted to simulation sets with threshold of 0.4, 0.5 or 0.6. Other threshold values provided little discrimination between the interventions.

**Figure S8** Relative effectiveness of interventions as measured by the proportion of network adopted after two time steps (2-hop reach), given that at least one secondary adoption occurred, under complex contagion. Equal ranks distributed randomly. The thickness of the line indicates the number of simulations where the named intervention is ranked first (left) to seventh (right) in effectiveness. The sequence of the intervention ranks can be read by following the thicker lines from left to right. Restricted to simulation sets with threshold of 0.4, 0.5 or 0.6. Other threshold values provided little discrimination between the interventions.