

AMENDED Exhibit 943

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

From: Rachel Racusen [REDACTED]
Sent: 8/10/2018 8:17:41 AM
To: [REDACTED]
CC: Mary Ritti [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Snapchat dysmorphia

I think that's all right. This cycle definitely continues to remain much smaller than Snap Maps, Kylie, etc -- and I don't think we should change what we are doing from a comms approach.

I also think the Fox Biz segment had a good point from the doctor questioning why plastic surgeons should be treating teens to begin with. To some extent this has always been an issue for teens (magazines used to do the same thing -- it just can be argued that lenses makes the possibility of a different look even more accessible to them).

It would be nice if we had some third parties voices who might be willing to speak out with a different view here -- either:

- Making the point that this isn't new stuff
- Talk about the positive/confidence building nature of this
- Talk about the comfort/anonymity piece that Jen Stout points to

If one of those voices was willing to write a piece someone -- might be a helpful counterpoint to have out there.

On Fri, Aug 10, 2018 at 11:10 AM, [REDACTED] wrote:

I do not think there are internal efforts to rethink Lenses. Strangely enough, that team is perhaps the most user-led and data-driven team in the company right now. They have dramatically increased output of Lenses, generally keep beautification as a default, and if a Lens doesn't perform well it gets swapped out within the carousel fairly quickly with one that does. If they toned down beautification it would show up immediately in the numbers. When we've intentionally toned down beautification for things like international women's day Lenses, those Lenses simply do not perform well. All to say, i don't see us switching gears from a product perspective without an exec-level decision to do so that would have a pretty significant impact on usage.

For me, the most unfortunate thing about this whole cycle is the term "Snapchat Dysmorphia," because it combines our brand name with a mental health disorder. The opportunity for us — as I see it — is to find ways to push hard on a counter narrative of confidence-building communication and free expression. Unfortunately if we do that on-record as part of these particular stories, we will make Snapchat even more of a focus, as you know. But maybe we've reached a point in coverage where the Snapchat angle is already so large that we don't have much downside? That being said, and would maybe be helpful to have data that supports/contradicts this, my guess is this cycle is still smaller than Maps privacy fears, smaller than speed filter lawsuit, and dramatically smaller than Kylie Tweet.

Another upside as I was watching the Fox Business segment for instance, is that it contained almost three minutes of our b-roll, of people smiling while playing with the app. Also in that segment the anchor said it seems like this problem isn't with the platforms — it's with the surgeons who allow this, and with the users themselves who take this preoccupation to an unhealthy place. While i wish this cycle never happened, and haven't watched the Today segment yet, my guess is it hasn't led to a reduction in Lens usage and if anything would lead to the opposite.

I think you're right that it's worth having a philosophical debate with Lens team about the percentage of Lenses that focus on beautification. But with Lens Explorer and Snappables and other things i feel like we're already evolving in the right direction from a product perspective. So maybe we just continue to do what we're

doing on Comms front and just go hard with self-expression and confidence-building messaging in future releases?

On Fri, Aug 10, 2018 at 07:51 Rachel Racusen [REDACTED] wrote:

Wanted to send a follow up note to this group about the Snapchat dysmorphia cycle -- not because I think we should change our press approach at the moment, but to just ask a few questions to see if there are actions we should consider.

- While most of our tech reporters are not covering this, and don't think this is a real phenomenon, it's a different story with consumer media. There isn't tons of ongoing coverage there, but I can see some continuing to pick this up.
- As we all know, some of our lenses really add more beautification elements than Insta and other platforms. What Savannah Sellers talked about on TODAY Show is tricky for us -- she reached out to Snapchatters who follow her and and got overwhelmed with responses of kids saying they do feel like lenses alter their views of themselves, etc.
- Do we know if there are any internal efforts to examine/rethink this? I imagine this is insanely touchy -- and I'm not saying I buy into this as a widespread epidemic, but seems like a question we should at least know the answer to for our own knowledge.
- This all said -- the term Snapchat Dysmorphia really unfairly and squarely pins the focus on us. It was coined by one plastic surgeon in the UK -- but the use of it encourages TV folks, for example, to put up our logo behind them when doing segments on this. I know we can clearly point this out to reporters when we get incoming and ask them not to use it -- but wondering if there is any other action we can take here? I'm not suggesting we consider legal action that would fan press flames more, but just raising this point.

This is long and a little ramby, but just wanted to get a sense of what you guys thought given that this is still getting some attention a week later.

--

[REDACTED]

Rachel Racusen
Director of Communications

[REDACTED]

--

[REDACTED]

Rachel Racusen
Director of Communications

[REDACTED]