

Subject: Re: Errors in 'Public perceptions of digital mental health awareness campaign in the Arab Gulf states: a qualitative thematic analysis'
Date: Thursday, March 20, 2025 at 11:13:24 AM Pacific Daylight Time
From: scott scottgraffius.com <scott@scottgraffius.com>
To: nalomair@ksu.edu.sa <nalomair@ksu.edu.sa>, publichealth.editorial.office@frontiersin.org <publichealth.editorial.office@frontiersin.org>, publichealth@frontiersin.org <publichealth@frontiersin.org>
CC: Ghalkhaldi@ksu.edu.sa <Ghalkhaldi@ksu.edu.sa>, nalsadhan@ksu.edu.sa <nalsadhan@ksu.edu.sa>

Noura Alomair and Frontiers in Public Health Editorial/Publishing Team:

I am writing to follow up on my email dated 18 December 2024 (due to time differences or other factors, it may be noted as the following day), regarding my concerns about a factual error and a citation error in the article, “Public perceptions of digital mental health awareness campaign in the Arab Gulf states: a qualitative thematic analysis”

(<https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/public-health/articles/10.3389/fpubh.2024.1477315/full>), published in Frontiers in Public Health. Except for an automatic response*, I have not yet received a reply. So, I am following up.

* The automatic response came from publichealth.editorial.office@frontiersin.org right after I sent my 18 December 2024 email. The automatic response said: “Thank you for reaching out to us. We confirm that we have received your email. Please rest assured that a member of our team will review your message and respond within 5 business days. To ensure your inquiry is handled efficiently, we kindly ask that you hold off on sending follow-up emails during this period. We appreciate your understanding and patience, and we're looking forward to assisting you. Warm regards, Your Frontiers Editorial Office Team”. The automatic reply promised a response “within 5 business days.” It has been 92 days, and I have not yet received a response save the aforementioned automatic response 92 days ago; that is concerning. Why have you failed to act?

As a researcher whose work on the lifespan (half-life) of social media posts was referenced in your publication, I remain honored by the inclusion. However, I outlined two errors in my original email that require attention:

1. A factual error in the data collection section, where “lifespan” was used instead of “half-life,” (unintentionally, I am sure) misrepresenting the data.

However, I suggest that the error can be easily fixed. See my 18 December 2024 email (below) for details.

2. A citation error in the references section, where the formatting, title, and DOI of my work were inconsistent with other entries. Likewise, I suggest that the error can be easily fixed. See my 18 December 2024 email (below) for details.

I imagine that, like me, you value the integrity of the academic record and would want to correct these errors to ensure the accuracy and reliability of the published work. Updating the publication with these corrections would, I believe, align with the high standards of *Frontiers in Public Health* and benefit the broader research community and your readers.

Please:

1. Confirm receipt of this follow-up email,
2. Inform me know when you're scheduled to implement the corrections, and
3. Update me after you've implemented the corrections.

Sincerely,

Scott M. Graffius

From: "scott scottgraffius.com" <scott@scottgraffius.com>

Date: Wednesday, December 18, 2024 at 2:42 AM

To: "nalomair@ksu.edu.sa" <nalomair@ksu.edu.sa>

Cc: "publichealth.editorial.office@frontiersin.org" <publichealth.editorial.office@frontiersin.org>, "publichealth@frontiersin.org" <publichealth@frontiersin.org>

Subject: Errors in 'Public perceptions of digital mental health awareness campaign in the Arab Gulf states: a qualitative thematic analysis'

Noura Alomair,

I'm honored that 'Public perceptions of digital mental health awareness campaign in the Arab Gulf states: a qualitative thematic analysis' (at <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/public-health/articles/10.3389/fpubh.2024.1477315/full>) referenced and used my research on the lifespan (half-life) of social media posts. I'm writing to report a factual error and a citation error.

1. Factual error.

The data collection section on page 03 includes this: "The lifespan of social media posts on most platforms is, at most, 9 days (19)."

However, the metric is half-life. I defined it in my research (which you cited): "The lifespan of posts is of interest, and a helpful metric is half-life. It's the amount of time it takes for a post to receive half of its total engagement (such as likes, shares, and comments)."

Additional information — for background and context only:

- When content is published online, relevance and engagement have a limited lifespan.
- Engagement is typically not distributed as a normal bell curve. Rather, it's generally a unimodal distribution-based, positively skewed curve.
- Here's a description of the prototypical distribution of data (engagement): On average, most posts receive half of their total engagement relatively soon, with the remainder spread out over a comparatively long(er) period.
- For those reasons, an advantageous respective objective metric for posts on social media platforms is half-life. It's the time it takes for a post to receive half of its total engagement (such as likes, shares, and comments).
- Built on a large dataset from multiple sources, Graffius' research reveals the average lifespan (half-life) for posts on different social media platforms.
- Note: Findings from others — including anecdotal experience from select posts or otherwise the experience of one person, one organization, or a limited dataset — may vary from the average half-life data in Graffius' research.

Accordingly, I suggest that this:

“The lifespan of social media posts on most platforms is, at most, 9 days (19).”

is corrected to this (or similar):

“Posts on top social media platforms typically receive half of their total engagement (such as likes, shares, and comments) quickly, ranging from seconds to under nine days. After that half-life point, posts start to get buried in the news feed.”

2. Citation error.

Except for my work, items in the references section reflect the following template/example: “Braun V, Clarke V. Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qual Res Sport, Exerc Health*. (2019) 11:589–97. doi: 10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806”. The reference for my work is shown as: “GRAFFIUS SM. Half-life for posts on different social media platforms. (2024).” My last name is in all caps, which is not consistent with other entries. Additionally, the title is wrong, and the DOI (or, alternatively, link) is missing.

I suggest that it is corrected to this:

“Graffius SM. Lifespan (half-life) of social media posts: update for 2024. (2024). doi: 10.13140/RG.2.2.21043.60965.”

Sincerely,

Scott M. Graffius