Message

From: Tomas [redacted]/O=THEFACEBOOK/OU=EXTERNAL (FYDIBOHF25SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=[redacted]
Sent: 3/14/2024 10:46:07 PM
To: Tomas [redacted]@meta.com]; Melissa [redacted]@meta.com]
Subject: Message summary [{"otherUserFbId":100021609290728,"threadFbId":null}]

Melissa [redacted] (3/14/2024 12:20:56 PDT):
>this is so crazy to me https://fb.workplace.com/groups/485465535579115/posts/1572130136912644

Melissa [redacted] (3/14/2024 12:21:23 PDT):
>We found groups of new teen users who see Reels just filled with sexualized media after sexualized

Tomas [redacted] (3/14/2024 12:21:25 PDT):
>hmmm

Melissa [redacted] (3/14/2024 12:21:32 PDT):
>like their whole tab

Tomas [redacted] (3/14/2024 12:21:43 PDT):
>I wonder if they seek it out?

Tomas [redacted] (3/14/2024 12:22:52 PDT):
>it also makes you think if we need to look at non-rec dau metrics instead

Tomas [redacted] (3/14/2024 12:22:59 PDT):
>Or on top of prevalence

Melissa [redacted] (3/14/2024 12:24:30 PDT):
>We did an initial look into their searches and didn't find anything. And it's a bigger issue for new users so it seems less likely. Definitely an area we need to go deeper into

Melissa [redacted] (3/14/2024 12:24:40 PDT):
>What would non-rec dau metrics be?

Tomas [redacted] (3/14/2024 12:25:09 PDT):
>% of DAU who see a non-rec impression

Melissa [redacted] (3/14/2024 12:26:19 PDT):
>Adam wants a metric like that so there's on going work into it. We call it reach. But I actually think that metric solves a very different problem. If prevalence is 1%, we expect all power users to see at least one non-rec impression. And seeing just 1 is probably not nearly as bad as seeing mostly non-rec media

Melissa [redacted] (3/14/2024 12:26:32 PDT):
>So we want to measure personal prevalence: look at an individual's prevalence

Melissa [redacted] (3/14/2024 12:26:49 PDT):
>Then you can have a metric like "x% of users have personal prevalence over 20%"

Tomas [redacted] (3/14/2024 12:26:54 PDT):
>I'd look at the numbers to be sure of that assertion though

Melissa [redacted] (3/14/2024 12:26:59 PDT):
>But that's very expensive to measure

Tomas [redacted] (3/14/2024 12:27:14 PDT):
>I agree that power users are more likely to see a non-rec impression

Tomas [redacted] (3/14/2024 12:27:24 PDT):
>But I'm not sure why all of them would

Melissa [redacted] (3/14/2024 12:27:31 PDT):
>yeah I agree with you

Melissa [redacted] (3/14/2024 12:27:44 PDT):
>but as users engage with Reels more, we would expect Reach to climb

Melissa [redacted] (3/14/2024 12:27:48 PDT):
>so it's not an ideal metric

Tomas [redacted] (3/14/2024 12:28:06 PDT):

>yeah it is. Maybe if we choose a 1% of the population to sample?

Melissa [redacted] (3/14/2024 12:28:46 PDT):
>would still be super expensive! we're doing this exercise with 500 random users this month

Tomas [redacted] (3/14/2024 12:29:26 PDT):
>even if you use CEP?

Melissa [redacted] (3/14/2024 12:29:51 PDT):
>That's the proposal but I think the data will be junk. Too much error introduced

Melissa [redacted] (3/14/2024 12:31:20 PDT):
>The way we found this was so crazy. We looked at Reels VM scores for some users of interest and found that there was nearly a perfect linear correlation between the score and the sexual classifier, to the point that when folks saw the chart they were like "why is the sexual classifier an input into the Reels VM" lol

Melissa [redacted] (3/14/2024 12:31:40 PDT):
>so it seems like an issue with diversity of sourcing, that we source exclusively similar content for these users

Tomas [redacted] (3/14/2024 12:34:12 PDT):
>oh yeah it would be great to do an analysis to trace this back to sources

Tomas [redacted] (3/14/2024 12:34:41 PDT):
>This was the case with image originality, where two sources were essentially only recommending unoriginal content

Melissa [redacted] (3/14/2024 12:37:22 PDT):
>yeah I think we should remove certain seeds and clusters that are low quality. this work incredibly really well on Threads

Melissa [redacted] (3/14/2024 12:37:49 PDT):
>link or author name?

Tomas [redacted] (3/14/2024 12:50:11 PDT):
>dmitry

Melissa [redacted] (3/14/2024 13:05:14 PDT):
>[redacted]??? :(:(:(

Tomas [redacted] (3/14/2024 13:06:09 PDT):
>yeah it hasn't been fun

Melissa [redacted] (3/14/2024 13:27:21 PDT):
>that sucks, I'm sorry

Tomas [redacted] (3/14/2024 13:28:13 PDT):
>

Tomas [redacted] (3/14/2024 15:21:41 PDT):
>qq for you

Melissa [redacted] (3/14/2024 15:21:49 PDT):
>yo

Tomas [redacted] (3/14/2024 15:22:26 PDT):
>Do we do any sort of filtering/demotion on stories for people who post too many political news?

Tomas [redacted] (3/14/2024 15:22:43 PDT):
>Context: Relevance is now one team again so I'm overseeing stories

Melissa [redacted] (3/14/2024 15:22:52 PDT):
>congrats :D so fun

Melissa [redacted] (3/14/2024 15:23:13 PDT):
>I don't believe we do anything like that but I can double check. I'm not sure what treatments we have for reshares in stories, that would be more relevant probably

Tomas [redacted] (3/14/2024 15:23:13 PDT):
>And Mosseri just pinged us mentioning that several creators are complaining that their reach is down specifically on stories

Tomas [redacted] (3/14/2024 15:23:40 PDT):
>When we look at examples, they seem to be people who post repeatedly about Israel/Palestine

Tomas [redacted] (3/14/2024 15:24:13 PDT):
>Very excited to work again with Warren and Akritee

Melissa [redacted] (3/14/2024 15:24:33 PDT):
>It's definitely possible that integrity treatments for violence are affecting them

Melissa [redacted] (3/14/2024 15:25:00 PDT):
>Do we know if it's a sharp drop, like a launch, or just a decline? I would also guess their audience is getting exhausted...

Tomas [redacted] (3/14/2024 15:25:01 PDT):
>Ming is OOO

Tomas [redacted] (3/14/2024 15:26:15 PDT):
>it's been mostly a steady decline, with a couple of sharp drops here and there

Melissa [redacted] (3/14/2024 15:27:34 PDT):
>We have been rolling out a new version of AQVM that we expected to have an effect on Israel/Palestine creators because we added more violence signal. That would expect their Stories views via discovery in Search and other places, and the creators would probably know if that was the cause because they can check their account status

Melissa [redacted] (3/14/2024 15:27:46 PDT):
>just pinged the CSI team that owns the politics treatments

Melissa [redacted] (3/14/2024 15:28:08 PDT):
>that sounds to me like an exhausted audience...

Melissa [redacted] (3/14/2024 15:29:08 PDT):
>We also have been testing CS-violation demotions in Stories. They were broken. So if the creators are in that test, it could explain it, too

Tomas [redacted] (3/14/2024 15:29:38 PDT):
>I think so too, but want to cover all angles

Melissa [redacted] (3/14/2024 15:29:59 PDT):
>https://fb.workplace.com/groups/725911788061986/posts/1368203830499442

Tomas [redacted] (3/14/2024 15:32:00 PDT):
>thanks!

Melissa [redacted] (3/14/2024 15:43:19 PDT):
>sounds like there isn't any

Melissa [redacted] (3/14/2024 15:43:42 PDT):
>no politics treatments in stories

Melissa [redacted] (3/14/2024 15:43:53 PDT):
>and an eng (Lucas) checked one of the accounts that complained and didn't find any integrity enforcement on it

Tomas [redacted] (3/14/2024 15:44:07 PDT):
>wonderful, thanks!

Tomas [redacted] (3/14/2024 15:44:18 PDT):
>It's probably fatigue

Tomas [redacted] (3/14/2024 15:44:40 PDT):
>We're of course digging a bit more deeply

Melissa [redacted] (3/14/2024 15:44:42 PDT):
>there was a Stories VM tuning that launched January 23 that might have affected the strength of p(misinfo) but I can't find the metrics on it https://fburl.com/deltoid3/xgjujoyp and given Lucas's finding, wouldn't be relevant to at least that account

Tomas [redacted] (3/14/2024 15:45:28 PDT):
>Sometimes the ranking system amplifies these effects bc we increase the avg position of the pog and then distribution goes down even further

Melissa [redacted] (3/14/2024 15:46:07 PDT):
>yeah