

AMENDED Exhibit 118

PLAINTIFFS' OMNIBUS OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Case No.: 4:22-md-03047-YGR

MDL No. 3047

In Re: Social Media Adolescent Addiction/Personal Injury Products Liability Litigation

Message

From: [REDACTED] (Google Slides) [comments-noreply@docs.google.com]
Sent: 11/5/2021 1:16:08 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Teen Well-being C... - It will be hard to optimize for inten...

[REDACTED] mentioned you in a comment in the following document

 Teen Well-being Communities 11/8 check-in

Intentional Time Spent



Justin Cheng

It will be hard to optimize for intentional time spent without allowing for regressions in time spent. Is this okay?

(1) Past research on problematic use on Facebook, as well as prior academic research suggests the existence of a U-shaped curve, where people with a moderate number of sessions report the lowest rate of problematic use. As session count increases, more and more people report feeling like they spend a lot of time on Facebook or report sleep problems.

<https://fb.quip.com/IZHOAdPXww9Y>

(2) We also see that NAC prevalence increases with time spent overall, particularly among women. (But to complicate matters, time spent has no association with NAC for teen girls.)

<https://www.internalfb.com/intern/anp/view/?id=1316620>

(3) HLM also suggests that among teens, body image, social comparison and particularly sleep problems are more intense, have higher reach, and/or have more teens saying that IG makes it worse. So arguably we should still be prioritizing these 3 things over problematic use.

<https://fb.workplace.com/photo/?fbid=770076886867158&set=a.753468141861366>



Justin Cheng

Also, here's a document with more context:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1i9u271ftMbVhBSkkJl1YTJvCyd769c7PFJhvzTmwzO8/edit#>



cc [REDACTED]

, and [REDACTED]

Excellent points and research Justin!

██████████ and ██████████ we think it is important to call out the tension in core priorities around defending time spent market cap, particularly for teens, and making meaningful progress on "intentional time spent." We would love to get feedback and direction on how we should approach these tradeoffs. Our POV is where we have identified and have strong conviction on instances of problematic/harmful time spent, then we should be ready to incur the engagement regressions associated with addressing them. Ideally we can find solutions that substitute problematic/harmful time spent with "intentional time spent", but incurring time spent regressions to solve them should be on the table (again condition on good research conviction that we have identified problematic/harmful time spent). Otherwise we are not set up well for success.



██████████
What's the rough x% (of DAP or other topline) of teen girls / teen women in the cohort where work on intentional time spent is most applicable?

Basically, what's the primary addressable market size for time spent-related product experiences?

If it's similar to NAC-related targeting cohorts (low single digits) in terms of reach, then that's good to know. In terms of topline time spent, this sounds like a "whale-y" cohort, so even a small reach group could have disproportionate effects for topline, but this still would seem to set up a pretty clear framing, since not all engagement is good engagement.



██████████ ██████████
██████████, we'll follow up with the addressable market analysis, since the analysis happened a while back, it may be infeasible to get a TAM estimate now. @ ██████████ will clarify.

However, do you think it would be productive to seek clarity on these tradeoffs even before we have any opportunity sizing ready? I'm thinking that clarifying these principles ahead of time would help the team focus on problems where there is already alignment with leads on the tradeoffs that the solutions could entail.



New

Added a discussion question for this.

Open



You have received this email because you are mentioned in this thread. [Change what Google Docs sends you](#). You can reply to this email to reply to the discussion.