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Table S1. Nonparametric Spearman rho correlation matrix of variables selected in the present network

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | PA | IA | A1 | A2 | A3 | A4 | A5 | A6 | A7 |
| Prospective Anxiety (PA) | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inhibitory Anxiety (IA) | 0.58\* | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nervous (A1) | 0.35\* | 0.32\* | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control worry (A2) | 0.36\* | 0.39\* | 0.54\* | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Worry too much (A3) | 0.41\* | 0.42\* | 0.56\* | 0.57\* | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |
| Relax (A4) | 0.34\* | 0.38\* | 0.50\* | 0.57\* | 0.64\* | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| Restless (A5) | 0.27\* | 0.38\* | 0.44\* | 0.54\* | 0.46\* | 0.55\* | 1.00 |  |  |
| Irritable (A6) | 0.31\* | 0.32\* | 0.51\* | 0.50\* | 0.57\* | 0.59\* | 0.51\* | 1.00 |  |
| Afraid (A7) | 0.33\* | 0.35\* | 0.47\* | 0.49\* | 0.52\* | 0.48\* | 0.58\* | 0.54\* | 1.00 |

\* *p* < 0.01 (two-tailed)



Figure S1. Accuracy of edge weights

*Note*: The red line depicts the sample edge weights and the gray bar depicts the bootstrapped confidence interval.



Figure S2. Bootstrapped difference test for edge weights

*Note*: Gray boxes indicate edge weights that do not differ significantly from one another, while black boxes indicate edge weights that do differ significantly. Blue and red boxes on the diagonal correspond to edge weights with positive and negative correlations, respectively.



Figure S3. Stability of node strengths

*Note*: The red bar represents the average correlation between node strengths in the full sample and subsample with the red area depicting the 2.5th quantile to the 97.5th quantile.



Figure S4. Bootstrapped difference test for node strengths

*Note*: Gray boxes indicate node strengths that do not differ significantly from one another, while black boxes indicate node strengths that do differ significantly. The number in the white boxes (i.e., diagonal line) represent the value of node strengths.



Figure S5. Stability of node bridge strengths

*Note*: The red bar represents the average correlation between node bridge strengths in the full sample and subsample with the red area depicting the 2.5th quantile to the 97.5th quantile.



Figure S6. Bootstrapped difference test for node bridge strengths

*Note*: Gray boxes indicate node bridge strengths that do not differ significantly from one another, while black boxes indicate node bridge strengths that do differ significantly.