

Politics and Propaganda on Social Media: How Twitter and Meta Moderate State-Linked Information Operations

Nihat Mugurtay¹, Umut Duygu², Onur Varol^{1,3,*}

¹Faculty of Engineering and Natural Sciences, Sabanci University

²Sabanci University, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Sabanci University

³Center of Excellence in Data Analytics, Sabanci University

*Corresponding author: onur.varol@sabanciuniv.edu

Abstract

Why do Social Media Corporations (SMCs) engage in state-linked information operations? Social media can significantly influence the global political landscape, allowing governments and other political entities to engage in concerted information operations, shaping or manipulating domestic and foreign political agendas. In response to state-linked political manipulation tactics on social media, Twitter and Meta carried out take-down operations against propaganda networks, accusing them of interfering foreign elections, organizing disinformation campaigns, manipulating political debates and many other issues. This research investigates the two SMCs' policy orientation to explain which factors can affect these two companies' reaction against state-linked information operations. We find that good governance indicators such as democracy are significant elements of SMCs' country-focus. This article also examines whether Meta and Twitter's attention to political regime characteristics is influenced by international political alignments. This research illuminates recent trends in SMCs' take-down operations and illuminating interplay between geopolitics and domestic regime characteristics.

Introduction

Political actors are using social media platform to campaign for themselves and influence political agendas in their countries or international relations. Online platforms have become tools for social and political contestation, public opinion, electoral manipulation, disinformation, inauthentic behavior, smear campaigns, and various other forms of online political activities [1–9]. A number of international and domestic measures have been taken in response to these state-linked concerted actions. SMCs are requested to provide information about activities on their platforms and mitigation plans by governments and platform users. Since 2018, Twitter and Meta have initiated numerous take-down operations against state-linked coordinated activities across the globe. SMCs had various reasons for paying attention to specific networks across different countries: interference in foreign elections, suppression of political opposition, government-affiliated fake news and social bot accounts, and propaganda aimed at legitimizing authoritarian regimes. We examine the premises of Twitter’s and Meta’s response to state-linked information operations. We explore the politics of social media take-downs originating in many countries, by first exploring the proposed logic of social media take-downs and then using a regression analysis to capture a more delicate analysis of multiple variables, we explore the politics of social media take-downs.

Social media provides a useful modality of public diplomacy, and governments prioritize their digital existence as a part of their national priorities [10]. At this point, there emerge a complex and interesting phenomenon regarding two American SMCs’ response to state-linked information operations. The procedure of taking-down users from specific countries does not merely involve a simple content moderation, but also involves a very close attention to coordinated and state-linked propaganda channels that disseminate political disinformation and government propaganda. Scrutinizing multiple users, groups and companies from different countries, the two SMCs detect concerted political actions which are linked to the governments. This action is directly political in the sense that they focus on government-affiliated entities and decide when, where, and what to moderate. These state-linked actors can be governments, government-related social media companies, political parties, military, security branches of government, individual politicians, municipalities, military, and paramilitary groups [11]. Therefore, both Twitter and Meta use their own assessment mechanism, regardless of countries’ or political regions’ *de-jure* framework. When it comes to attempting to take down concerted state-affiliated networks, SMCs have a certain amount of discretion in selecting when, where, and who to target.

In addition, revenue extraction is also vital for investing in other countries. Giving the fact that content moderation of these companies can be affected from their commercial interests [12, 13], conducting state-linked disinformation take downs against governmental entities and private enterprises might result in disrupting their relations with these governments. This becomes more salient with the existence authoritarian challenge across the world, where SMCs establish local partnerships, helping Meta and Twitter to generate more wealth by

locational advantages. Social media giants need to establish good relations with large economies and populations (users) to extract more revenues. On the other hand, democratic countries as well are also subject to coordinated inauthentic activities, which is sometimes initiated by pro-US actors [14]. Therefore, SMCs also respond to state-linked information operations in the Western Hemisphere, where their main headquarters and decision-making mechanism are located. In this sense, two US-based social media giants are taking action on multiple fronts -in a polarizing geopolitical environment- in response to coordinated-political and state-linked operations. This multi-faceted political, economic, and international dynamics create a puzzle to uncover which factors are significant for take-down policies. For instance, Twitter’s last report on state-linked information operations was announced just prior to Elon Musk’s acquisition of the company turning it into a private entity. During the acquisition topics relevant to platform safety such as social bots and misinformation were raised for discussion [15, 16]. Couple months later, Musk laid off the team responsible for investigating misinformation campaigns on the platform. Consequently, our research covers the period between 2018 and 2022, beginning with the SMCs’ reaction against state-linked information operations and Musk’s acquisition of Twitter.

We examine the factors that can be associated with the take down of Meta and Twitter by scrutinizing the states associated with these networks. Domestic political configuration, international politics, and SMCs’ focus on revenue extraction from these countries can be significant factors of their reaction against state-linked operations. Therefore, we focus on regime types, countries’ international political positioning, and their potential for revenue extraction. At this point, we underline that the two American SMCs’ reaction against state-linked information operations exist in a complex international environment. Cyberspace and information operations exist with the increasing salience geopolitical setting [17]. We uncover which factors can explain take-down policies of these corporations.

Building on this puzzle, the challenges of SMCs’ political action become more diverse and contentious because these companies deal with political spectrum in multiple countries. This point is significant to show similarities and differences between the two social media giants. In our initial analysis, we find significant parallel and diverging patterns in terms of taking down accounts from specific countries. In this sense, our research scrutinizes Twitter and Meta’s take downs in two ways: First, we analyze Twitter and Meta’s take-down operations by utilizing an exploratory analysis on countries involved in these operations. We provide a detailed information on why they select specific countries also by analyzing their general discourse and announcements. As a second step, we offer different regression models to determine which variables explains the take downs. We test multiple hypotheses regarding democracy, political stability and violence, and economic indicators.

Background on Information Operations

The actions taken by private SMCs against perilous agents are not a novel phenomenon, yet their policies towards state-linked information operations are relatively new. The literature on SMCs' reaction against inauthentic behavior and online manipulation are mostly associated with content moderation. This is primarily related to insulting, harassment, hate speech, harmful or illegal contents which are also mostly within the scope of countries' domestic legal framework [18]. Debates on freedom expression [19], SMCs' attention for commercial interests [12, 13], or regulating content moderation with constitutional and democratic values [20, 21] have been significant topics for SMCs. Indeed, SMCs' action against governments' information operations go beyond the issues of content moderation.

A state-linked propaganda campaign involves strategic efforts to sway the opinions of targeted groups through a variety of communications tactics with the purpose of achieving a specific outcome [22–24]. Coordinated inauthentic behavior on social media encompasses political, social, and psychological dimensions [25]. Individuals often persistently adhere to false belief [26, 27] and political actors tend to take the advantage of this misinformation environment. Disinformation proliferation has manifested a significant increase, transcending national boundaries and becoming a more globalized concern [28, 29]. Within this realm, state-linked propaganda as a political communication tool are getting more attention [30]. Through the involvement of organized groups, online platforms have become an increasingly important component of public diplomacy. Disinformation comes into play when misinformation, polarization, fake news or conspiracy theories are deliberately transformed through intentional interventions by governments, political parties, automated bots, coordinated actions by citizens, and internet trolls [24, 31–41]. Indeed, particularly bots or concerted disinformation operations are very useful to disseminate low-credible inauthentic content [42–46]. Social and political turmoils [47] –including electoral periods–are permissive processes for shaping public discourse via disinformation [48–50]. In such a disinformation environment, government-run inauthentic social media campaigns grown in response to the mass political mobilizations, and often intend to manipulate elections [8, 9, 51–53].

Twitter and Meta can take-down users from different countries based on inter-state or intra-state factors [54]. These two modes of concerted action by perilous networks has multiple modalities. Within the context of intra-state objectives, state-affiliated domestic cyber and information maneuvers are frequently tied to governmental strategies aimed at manipulating narratives to gain support from domestic audience. However, in the international arena, foreign governments use disinformation strategies and many online manipulation tactics to influence geopolitical or foreign domestic processes. Digital sphere can also be an arena of contestation between countries such as China and the United States [55], and government-linked inauthentic behavior might target other nations and foreign elections [29, 56]. In both domestic and international realm, fake news, trolls, disinformation campaigns, conspiracy theories and coordinated authentic

or inauthentic actions are the subject matters of these state-linked information operations [57–59]. With existence of strong authoritarian countries, the issue of disinformation becomes more interesting to investigate [60]. In addition, democratic countries also have become an arena of disinformation contest [14, 61, 62]. This makes state-linked information operations more complex because having alternative source of information [63] (i.e, social media) is crucial point for democratic regimes. SMCs react against these political manipulation tactics. Focusing on which countries more likely to get attention from SMCs is worthwhile endeavor to illuminate similar or varying patterns. Deciding on which country to focus on against state-linked operations entails a in-house consistent policy-harmonization. Therefore, we also focus on countries’ political orientation towards the United States and other great powers. In this sense, we also search for the factors that might dilute regimes characteristics with geopolitical orientations. At least, we can suggest that the politics of multinationals’ matter with the existing polarizing international environment [10, 14, 17, 64–66].

Our research is the first in terms of conducting multi-platform analysis on *state-linked information operations*. We inquiry the political moment transcending a comparison of content moderation policies. By this way, we manifest the trends in take-down strategies. Detecting take-downs and selection specific groups in different countries entail a policy-vision that illuminate different trends for SMCs. In this research, our descriptive and inferential research design uncover these trends. Overall, estimating possible premises of SMCs’ state-linked information operations is a substantial contribution to the literature on SMCs’ policy outlook.

The Politics of Twitter and Meta’s Information Operations

Twitter began to disclose its actions against state-linked information operations after 2018. We should also note that SMCs can outsource their counter-action against state-linked information operations. For instance, Stanford Observatory, the institution Twitter cooperates for take-downs, was mentioned in multiple Twitter reports explaining the logic of state-linked information operations. Meta also initially mentioned their partnership with Atlantic Council’s Digital Forensic Lab (DFRLab) in taking-down state-linked political networks. Initially, users from a selected number of countries were taken-down for their government-related coordinated behavior. It is crucial to understand that the motivations behind these take downs vary across countries, as each government engages in specific coordinated activities to shape their social and political agenda. Twitter justifies these take-downs based on both domestic and foreign (inter-state) factors [54]. Domestically, Twitter has taken action against accounts involved in government propaganda against opposition or ethnic minorities. Internationally, it cites interference in elections on social media as a primary concern [54]. For instance, Twitter’s action against Iran-linked information operations primar-




Figure 1: **Take-down operations statistics and country interaction networks for different platforms.** Countries listed by the number of take-down operations held in their country. Discrepancies for Meta (left) and Twitter (right) can be seen by comparing the ranks and the numbers of operations. Networks of interactions are also presented between countries (nodes) and operations (edges from targeting to targeted country). Domestic information operations represented with self-loops and some of the isolated nodes corresponds to these countries. Node colors represents the out-strengths to measure activities of these countries.

ily focused on accounts who allegedly dealt with the US presidential election. In some other cases, Twitter closures are associated with domestic or ethnic issues such as Indonesia’s action against West Papua, the 2017 Catalonia’s independence referendum. In total Twitter focused on 22 countries around the globe as shown in the supplementary information (SI:Table-1). In Figure 1, we mapped out top countries that Twitter and Meta’s take action against state-linked information operations. For example, Twitter has taken down accounts originating in Iran and Russia due to their alleged interference in the international affairs and domestic politics of the United States. Also, it took down accounts originating in China as they involve in Hong Kong and other regional issues. In some other cases, Russia’s Internet Research Agency (IRA) conduct operations in Ghana and Nigeria, where suspended accounts dealt with mostly race and civil rights [67]. These operations are conducted by opening accounts in many African countries. Twitter were able to detect some of these accounts that are working for Russian interests, which are directly affiliated with Russia’s IRA. Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and Venezuela are other examples for Twitter platform due to their alleged state-linked information operations. For each platform, we built networks mapping of all information operations and their respective target countries through directed edges. In Figure 1(right) illustrates that Twitter has primarily concentrated on perilous networks originating from Saudi Arabia, China, Egypt, Iran, UAE, and Russia. Overall, Twitter has taken measures against perilous networks from 22 different countries, leading to the suspension




Figure 2: **Positions of countries in different measures.** Ranking of countries taken down by Meta (left) and Twitter (right) presented as red bars. Each row presents different state characteristics scores for years between 2018 and 2021.

of several of these networks. However the network constructed from the information operations on Meta suggests Iran and Russia are primary actors and mainly targeting USA.

When compared to Twitter’s reaction against state-linked information operations, Meta’s Coordinated Inauthentic Behavior (CIB) policy focus on various countries in many different regions. In total, we collected information about taken-down perilous networks from 48 countries by Meta, which is significantly more than reported numbers for Twitter. The corporation mainly focuses on concerted users from specific countries claiming they violate the Meta’s misrepresentation policy. Different from Twitter, Meta announces both state-linked inauthentic networks and other coordinated political activities under one harmonized framework. Coordinated inauthentic activities driven by commercial interests have also been announced by the Meta. Looking at the content of the Meta suspensions, we also encounter many government-related (executive, military, state-linked companies, municipalities) actions examined by the platform. Meta -for a while- used a specific take-down policy called, *Foreign and Government Inauthentic Behavior (FGI)*, aiming to take-down coordinated activities by such state-linked information operations. However, FGI does not cover all years between 2018 and 2022. Therefore, we manually checked each announcement and document related to CIB and created a full list of Meta’s action against *state-linked* information operations. We also discovered that even some accounts publish mainly non-political content about beauty and physical well-being, the Meta detected that these pages are in affiliation with Myanmar military [68].

The platform suggests that celebrity and beauty pages are useful places to boost state-affiliated networks' impact. This operation against Myanmar-linked accounts has been explained by Meta's emphasis on human rights violations and oppression in the country. In some other instances, Meta revealed a significant portion of inauthentic networks from Russia, and detected that a group of people disguised themselves as journalists and disseminate content about Ukraine and Crimea. The platform claims that this suspended network was in relation with the Russian military. In one example, Meta detected a network affiliated with Islamic Republic of Iran's Press TV, the main broadcasting apparatus of Iran [69]. Meta also pays attention to de-facto or de-jure sub-state entities such as West Bank and Gaza and Kurdistan Regional Government.

We also have some complex cases, where Meta take downs specific non-state actors such as Muslim Brotherhood, which is an Islamist organization known by their influence on various Islamist movements from charitable organizations to political parties. Accounts originated in Egypt, Turkey, and Morocco have been taken down by Meta accusing them of committing coordinated information campaigns [70]. In a different particular case, Meta closed accounts from Albania, where a group of Iranians exiled in the country committed coordinated inauthentic behavior [71]. In such complex circumstances, we omitted such governments as targeted by the two SMCs. It is because Turkey, Morocco, and Albania governments were not designated as a part of state-linked information operations by the two SMCs directly. In other words, we coded these countries as being targeted by Twitter and META, if these two SMCs find out a state-linked information networks. We curated a complete picture of Meta's take-down practice by detecting actual state-linked information operations. This entailed an extra layer of hardness to compile Meta's data in detail. In the Western hemisphere, the Meta also carried out its operations against accounts originated countries like Canada and France. In another example, Meta suggested that their teams find a coordinated inauthentic behavior in relation with the French military. At the first sight, as shown in Table 1 in the SI, Meta's operations seem geographically diverse and uncover coordinated and state-linked accounts based on multiple state entity including military, political party, municipality, and any other governmental entity.

Due to the fact that oscillating regimes towards authoritarianism can oppress their domestic media and find alternative ways of manipulating audience [72], both Meta and Twitter appeals to *human rights* and some other governance-related humanitarian emphasis when they announce their suspensions. Second, Twitter and Meta suspend accounts where they see a foreign intervention in other countries' domestic or regional politics. This creates a puzzle regarding their stance based on these premises because there is an important variation in their country-focus list as seen in Figure 1. This also puts significant questions about their state-linked operations since we expect a more harmonized approach due to the global nature of such coordinated misinformation campaigns.

To describe Meta and Twitter's practice against state-linked information operations, we ranked countries based on different political variables. In Figure 2, we present different metrics to provide a basis for comparison, with red

bars signifying ranks of these countries that manifest state-linked information operations on that particular scale. Each row indicates measures used for comparison such as V-Dem Polyarchy, political similarity with the United States, Political Stability and Absence of Violence (PVE) and Freedom House Index [73, 74]. V-Dem Polyarchy score relies on a robust understanding of democracy, which inspired from Robert Dahl’s democratic theory. The measure includes electoral institutions, free press and media and many other civil liberties such as right to protest [75]. To quantify statistical significance of separation between the countries taken down by SMCs and other by using Mann-Whitney test. This test estimates higher scores if two groups of countries differ in terms of their ranking of the particular metric. For instance, it is visible that countries (red bars) clustered around the low score V-Dem’s Polyarchy Index, PVE, and Freedom House meaning that both Meta and Twitter more likely to focus on countries with lower democracy and freedom scores. Dark blue rectangles next to ranking plots indicates significant (P-values lower than 0.01) ranking differences by 95 percent confidence level, while light blue denotes non-significance. These scores further reinforce the notion that a country’s regime type, freedom scores and political stability are more significant differentiation than geopolitical alignments. As Figure 2 illustrates, generally good governance indicators such as democracy and political stability emerge as the most distinguishing factors among when compared to geopolitical stances. However, this initial description needs a more detailed investigation since we still need to detect which premises are the most relevant when compared to others. This is why we employed a regression analysis to capture the politics of Meta and Twitter’s information operations.

Indeed, such an initial observation lead us to key questions: Why does Twitter and Meta specifically focus on certain countries for account take downs, alleging disinformation and manipulation? Are these actions due to these nations engaging in more disinformation compared to others, or are they driven by considerations of human rights, democracy, or geopolitical concerns? Twitter and Meta’s justifications encompass political disinformation elements, making it vital to discern which state characteristics factor into these take downs.

Hypotheses and Data

Meta and Twitter -as being American multinational SMCs- are giant commercial enterprises that often have complicated relationship with the authoritarian governments and different regime types [76, 77]. In different circumstances, authoritarian countries offer permissive or difficult conditions for multinational international investments. However, this relationship become more salient due to increasing importance of social media as an alternative source of information. Fake news and online manipulation are shown to be effective weapons to undermine democratic ideals [78]. Both Twitter and Meta mention governance-related issues such as democracy, elections, justice, and human rights in their reports, and we expect from both that authoritarian regimes are on the top

of their priorities in global information landscape [61, 62]. State-linked information operations are also manipulation tools for diverting both domestic and foreign attention. China, Iran, and Russia are notable instances of information operations. Particularly, their online intervention in regional and electoral agendas are well pronounced by the SMCs. More authoritarian governments can use social media as a public diplomacy tool to divert the public’s attention from their oppression. However, we also have other non-authoritarian countries that were scrutinized by SMCs. It shows that information operations are not unique to only autocratic governments. However, we need to have a clear measure if SMCs focus on authoritarian countries more than democratic governments. In order to identify possible differences between Meta and Twitter’s emphasis on authoritarian inclinations, we operationalize different political and governance-related variables.

H1. Social media platforms are more likely to take actions against state-linked information operations if they originate in more authoritarian countries.

The geographical variation of state-linked information operations may not be explained solely by regime oscillations and companies’ reactions against more authoritarian regimes. However, not all authoritarian countries have the same level of repressiveness or political instability. From another perspective, there can be more democratic countries with higher levels of political instability and violence. In democratic countries with higher political instability, political parties and different segments of state bureaucracy can use disinformation and other online manipulation tactics to convey their propaganda. These less authoritarian countries can be more open to state-linked information operations including countries such as Mexico, Nigeria, and Ukraine. Alternatively, we can expect that non-democratic countries with more stability focus on their people’s well-being, while some authoritarian countries use their force to oppress domestic dissent. The Meta documents clearly emphasize on human-rights violations committed by oppressive regimes. These regimes are primarily target the physical integrity of their own population. Large SMCs may take down accounts originating in countries with less political stability, reflecting concerns about domestic violence and other relevant issues. To examine this hypothesis, we used the “absence of violence” variable from the World Bank’s Good Governance Indicators.

H2. Social media platforms carry out take-down actions against users where political violence and political instability more likely to take place.

In addition to governance indicators, Cyberspace has been an arena of international relations [64]. This space creates a policy pressure on the United States to be more active against state-linked information operations [65]. In such a geopolitical environment, some countries are following the footsteps of great powers and express changing levels of similarity in political outcomes [79]. We note that both Meta and Twitter are multinational corporations. In




Figure 3: **UNGA Voting similarities of countries to US and China.** UNGA voting similarity shows negative association between United States and China. More democratic countries in V-Dem Polyarchy index have similar voting pattern to US (left) and Nato members also more likely to align with preferences of US (right).

other words, they can establish local partnerships with other parties, outsource some of their operations to third parties and open branches in multiple geographies. They can also be affected from host countries’ political conditions [80]. Although they tend to globalize their commercial activities, they are American multinational SMCs, meaning that their headquarters and decision-making process take place in the United States. Multinational SMCs are not exempt from their country-of-origin characteristics and are affected by the international geopolitical agenda of their home countries [81, 82]. Therefore, international alignments might be an influential factor for SMCs. United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) voting patterns is a useful tool to test if countries have a similar mindset or policy-orientation in international affairs. It should be noted that UNGA Similarity does not directly manifest the strong de-facto or de-jure political alliances, but it shows how countries are similar to each other in international politics. It gives a picture of how countries cast their votes similarly at the international level. We investigate if multinationals carry out their take-down operations focusing on the countries with less UNGA voting similarity or not. With this regard, we expect that international political similarity is a significant factor of take-down policies of MNCs.

H3. Users originating from countries with higher political similarity to the United States are less likely to have their accounts taken down by Meta and Twitter.

Foreign policy and geopolitical concerns are becoming more substantial for multinational companies [66]. Concerns for human rights and democracy exist

in such a geopolitical setting [83]. SMCs operate under the pressure of a geopolitical and polarized world where authoritarian countries emerge as contending actors, and social media operations are part of great power politics [17]. In this sense, we investigate if Twitter and Meta’s reaction against more authoritarian countries are moderated by these countries’ political similarity with the United States or China. To address this, we concentrate on a possible conditional effects illuminating if good governance indicators (democracy and absence of violence) interact with great powers’ positioning in international issues. We take this similarity as a reflection of general political like-mindedness in the international system (not as a reflection of de-jure or de-facto political alliances). Indeed, these similarity matters because great powers usually manifest a clear divergence from each other. To illustrate, as seen in the Figure 3, if a country has a high voting similarity with the United States, then this country more likely to have a low voting similarity with China between 2000 and 2021. Because UNGA voting patterns show opposite trends for great powers, we are confident to use UNGA Voting similarity to measure countries like-mindedness in the political realm. In Biden-Harris National Security Strategy, China is also defined as “the only competitor” that has a potential to transform the international political and economic landscape [84]. We also suggest that China is labelled as the geostrategic rival by the US authorities. It is also visible that NATO member countries have relatively higher UNGA voting similarity with the United States, indicating how UNGA voting similarity reflects a systemic understanding. Therefore, using UNGA voting similarity with China will be appropriate to see if it follows our findings on the US case.

There is a geopolitical issue here when it comes to democratic backsliding, authoritarian regimes and multinational corporations. Moreover, Figure 3 (left) shows that higher V-Dem Polyarchy scores are associated with more political similarity with the United States. Therefore, UNGA agreement scores can not only reflect geopolitical orientations but also a partnership of democratic countries at the international level. Multinational SMCs are not immune to these global trends since economic blocks, regionalization, and degrading globalization are substantial challenges. For instance, home countries call some of their high-tech companies to return back by channeling significant amount of incentives. In some other examples, geopolitical changes divert capital from rouge states to more politically like-minded countries. Therefore, as American multinationals, Meta and Twitter might more openly examine state-linked information operations in countries that have a low level of political similarity with the United States. Here, we do not offer a causal link but we expect a negative association between SMCs’ take-down operations and UNGA voting similarity with the United States.

H4. More authoritarian or oppressive countries with higher political similarity to the United States are less likely to be scrutinized by Meta and Twitter.

An important indicator of SMC investments is the number of users and revenue extracted from a country. SMCs’ global outreach is a useful tool to

establish local partnerships and extract more revenue. In simpler terms, large populations are essential for growing markets and they can be the focus of big SMCs. In similar fashion, we observe a strong correlation between the population and the number of social media users (SI, Fig-2). Therefore, population can be used to assess the global outreach and power of SMCs.

We also suggest that the economic power of countries may act as a deterrent for SMCs not to interfere with state-linked operations. A social media company makes its profit globally as a multinational actor investing in variety of countries across the globe. They form alliances with local partners for a variety of profit-making purposes. Consequently, wealthier countries become attractive economic markets due to increasing business, advertising, and their high demand for technology. For example, focusing on India and Brazil, and other countries with emerging markets, SMCs specifically tailor their services to the domestic audience in these regions.

However, users' marginal economic contribution also appears to be more important than the revenue opportunities provided by wealthier countries based on advertisements, marketing, and other commercial activities. In particular, average revenue per user (ARPU), which is a key indicator of the profitability, indicates whether or not SMCs will generate a greater amount of revenue from one additional user. Generally, revenue generation is centered in regions with high ARPUs. Currently, we are using regional estimates provided by Meta and Twitter [85]. Taking down state-linked accounts from countries with higher ARPUs could be avoided by Meta and Twitter. In contrast, we do not have ARPU for all countries. Thus, since ARPU is directly related to GDP per capita, we use that as proxy for ARPU and assumes adding one more user from countries with a higher GDP per capita will result in greater revenue for SMCs. Taking down users from such countries can be costly for SMCs.

H5. Twitter and Meta are less likely to focus on countries with larger populations and higher GDP per capita.

Research Design

To address the hypothesis introduced in the previous session, we use a binary dependent variable model, and operationalize different logistic regression models. These models capture factors that are associated with Twitter and Meta's take-downs in particular countries. We first used pooled logistic models to observe between-unit trends in time with clustered standard errors (CSE). Using CSE at the country level in pooled models overcome the problems associated with serial correlation and heteroskedasticity. The first equation shows our first estimation for non-interaction models. The second equation shows an example of interaction models of good governance indicators and political similarity with the United States. For more robustness, we also used linear probability models to demonstrate if our models follow a similar output pattern as seen in tables 2 and 3 in the supplementary material (SI:Table 2 and 3).

Our regression model in Table 1 covers the years between 2018 and 2022, since Twitter reported state-linked operations until 2022. To analyze and illustrate the differences between countries, we marked countries as 1 for all years between 2018 and 2022 if they experienced a take-down operation by Twitter or Meta during these years. This also touches the point that Meta and Twitter handled their reaction to state-linked information operations. They follow these coordinated networks for a long time to see how they operate [69]. Therefore, scrutinizing a perilous network can take even two or more years. Even this might be the case, we used also cross-sectional logistic models with robust standard errors to capture between-unit variance more clearly. In these models, our continuous predictors are four-year averages between 2018 and 2022.

To test our hypotheses, we curated a dataset from Twitter and Meta’s official web pages. We find out that not all Meta’s politics-related focus is addressing state-linked information operations. We checked each announcement to see if Meta builds a linkage between inauthentic networks and governments. If they underline these linkages, then we coded this operation as state-linked.

$$\log \left(\frac{P(T=1)}{1 - P(T=1)} \right) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{V-Dem Polyarchy} + \beta_2 \text{UNGA(w/USA)} \\ + \beta_3 \text{Political Stability} + \beta_4 \text{GDP per capita(log)} \\ + \beta_5 \text{Population(log)} + \epsilon \quad (1)$$

$$\log \left(\frac{P(T=1)}{1 - P(T=1)} \right) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{V-Dem Polyarchy} + \beta_2 \text{UNGA(w/USA)} \\ + \beta_3 \text{V-Dem Polyarchy} \times \text{UNGA(w/USA)} \\ + \beta_4 \text{Political Stability} + \beta_5 \text{GDP Per Capita(log)} \\ + \beta_6 \text{Population(log)} + \epsilon \quad (2)$$

To explore state-characteristics, we provide general datasets and their scores encompassing regime type, freedoms, corruption, and UN-Voting similarity with the United States. For each model, we used V-Dem Polyarchy Score [75], Political Stability and Absence of Violence [73], UN-Voting Similarity estimates [86], Gross Domestic Product (GDP), and Population from World Bank. We transformed GDP Per Capita and population with their logarithms in base 10. According to the variance inflation factors (VIF) provided in the supplementary material (SI:Table-7), we did not find any multicollinearity between the V-Dem Polyarchy Index and Political Stability score.

Since, user statistics is another important indicator of SMCs’ market potential in a country, we have substituted population data with user statistics and incorporated our regression models, as detailed in supplementary information (SI:Table-5). Although this approach provide more robustness to our findings, we want to point that China, Iran, and Russia (the most scrutinized countries) lacks official user statistics for these platforms. This explains the reasons we have to rely on population data instead of user statistics.

Table 1: Regression Results (Logit Estimates, Pooled Time-Series)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	Meta	Twitter	Meta	Twitter	Meta	Twitter	Meta	Twitter	Meta	Twitter
V-Dem Polyarchy	-2.146*** (0.72)	-3.540*** (1.19)	-1.344 (0.90)	-3.631*** (1.33)	-2.316** (1.08)	-3.731** (1.59)	-0.803 (2.33)	1.641 (3.38)	-1.573 (1.07)	-3.108** (1.57)
PVE			-0.409* (0.21)	0.059 (0.22)	-0.183 (0.28)	0.198 (0.39)	-0.192 (0.29)	0.244 (0.42)	1.637** (0.64)	1.332** (0.64)
UNGA Voting (w/USA)					0.806 (1.88)	-2.606 (2.31)	4.292 (5.19)	9.322 (6.90)	-0.022 (1.96)	-3.430 (2.27)
GDP Per Capita (log)					0.216 (0.18)	0.577** (0.29)	0.257 (0.19)	0.655** (0.29)	0.335* (0.20)	0.626** (0.30)
Population (log)					0.640*** (0.16)	0.841*** (0.27)	0.652*** (0.16)	0.862*** (0.27)	0.690*** (0.16)	0.848*** (0.27)
V-Dem Polyarchy × UNGA Voting (w/USA)							-5.317 (7.22)	-18.908* (10.92)		
PVE × UNGA Voting (w/USA)									-6.811*** (2.51)	-4.262** (1.80)
Constant	0.030 (0.39)	-0.482 (0.50)	-0.496 (0.49)	-0.419 (0.60)	-12.649*** (3.02)	-18.639*** (5.09)	-14.113*** (3.88)	-22.723*** (5.06)	-14.351*** (3.30)	-19.096*** (5.03)
Number of clusters	168	168	168	168	168	168	168	168	168	168
Number of observations	672	672	672	672	672	672	672	672	672	672

Table 2: Regression Results (Logit Estimates, Crosssection)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	Meta	Twitter	Meta	Twitter	Meta	Twitter	Meta	Twitter	Meta	Twitter
V-Dem Polyarchy	-2.271*** (0.73)	-3.601*** (1.21)	-1.368 (0.92)	-3.691*** (1.35)	-2.471** (1.16)	-3.758** (1.66)	-0.796 (2.55)	2.033 (3.58)	-1.700 (1.15)	-3.105* (1.64)
PVE			-0.460** (0.22)	0.059 (0.22)	-0.195 (0.30)	0.201 (0.40)	-0.206 (0.30)	0.246 (0.44)	1.788** (0.79)	1.445** (0.69)
UNGA Voting (w/USA)					1.102 (2.07)	-2.625 (2.53)	5.057 (6.02)	10.712 (7.65)	0.321 (2.20)	-3.470 (2.40)
GDP Per Capita (log)					0.191 (0.18)	0.588* (0.30)	0.235 (0.20)	0.664** (0.30)	0.319 (0.20)	0.637** (0.31)
Population (log)					0.665*** (0.16)	0.839*** (0.28)	0.680*** (0.16)	0.861*** (0.28)	0.719*** (0.17)	0.851*** (0.28)
V-Dem Polyarchy × UNGA Voting (w/USA)							-5.960 (8.21)	-20.669* (11.82)		
PVE × UNGA Voting (w/USA)									-7.547** (3.26)	-4.658** (1.88)
Constant	0.122 (0.39)	-0.455 (0.51)	-0.473 (0.50)	-0.392 (0.61)	-12.867*** (3.10)	-18.696*** (5.16)	-14.506*** (4.14)	-23.134*** (5.13)	-14.707*** (3.45)	-19.234*** (5.11)
Number of observations	168	168	168	168	168	168	168	168	168	168

Regarding the political economy of multinational SMCs, we also add the UNGA Voting Patterns for China in the supplementary material (SI:Table-4). If there is a moderating effect of UNGA Similarity with the United States, then we should at least observe a moderating effect of political similarity with China and Russia. This will provide more robustness if we find such a tendency, reflecting the existing environment for take-down operations. Indeed, our main interest here is to show how UNGA Voting Patterns with the United States change Meta and Twitter’s attention for more authoritarian countries. Our exploratory analysis and regression output show significant parallel trends between Twitter and Meta.

Results and Discussion

Our pooled and cross-sectional logit estimates show significant implications to test hypotheses presented in this work. Table 1 shows the time-series pooled logit estimates for 2018-2022, while Table 2 is the cross-sectional version of same models. Since H1 and H2 are related to governance-related issues, models 1-4 in both regression tables shows the association between governance indicators and




Figure 4: Conditional Effects of Polyarchy and Political Stability on Meta and Twitter’s Country Focus

SMCs take-downs. We initially assessed whether Twitter and Meta’s take-down operations focus more on authoritarian countries. The bi-variate regression model in the first two columns indicates that both are concentrating on less democratic countries. In simpler terms, the likelihood of SMCs directing their actions towards countries rises as V-Dem scores decrease. Although Meta and Twitter may focus on varying numbers of countries, they exhibit a similarity in addressing accounts originating from less democratic nations. This effect is more strong and significant for Twitter. Our analysis in Figure 2 also reflects this finding.

Authoritarian countries vary in repressiveness and political instability. Some democracies face higher political instability and violence. Political parties and state bureaucracies in these democracies may use disinformation and online manipulation for propaganda, making them sensitive to state-linked information operations. Models 3 and 4 in both tables reveal that Meta primarily focuses on accounts originating from countries with higher levels of political instability. Conversely, Twitter continues to direct its attention towards countries with more authoritarian tendencies, even after including the political stability variable, as seen in Model 4. After adding other independent variables, we observe that good-governance indicators protect their effect on SMCs’ take-downs for columns 5 and 6. On Column 5 and 6 of 2 and 1, we see a significant negative association between Twitter and META’s take-downs and countries’ democracy score at 95 percent confidence level.

In summary, the initial six models without interaction terms indicate that governance indicators, particularly play a significant role in the SMCs’ country

focus vis a vis other variables. Based on this, H1 is corroborated for the first six regression column of Table 2 and 1.

We also put a caution here. Our findings do not suggest that more authoritarian countries commit more state-linked information operations. We estimate our regression models based on what Twitter and META reported. Such operations are not unique to authoritarian countries. For instance, we see META also focuses on United States and France if they detect a state-linked network, meaning that Western democracies also can be focused on by SMCs. If such take-downs happen, it means that democratic countries are also subjects of state-linked information campaigns. However, Meta and Twitter's take-down policies reflect divergences in investigating Western democracies. For instance, Twitter never carried-out its take-down operations in relation with any Western Democracies. This puts a question mark regarding the politics of take-down operations. This brings us the idea behind H3 and H4. We also investigate if there is an underlying geopolitical logic in these two SMCs' information operations. Domestic state regime characteristics may be influenced by the presence of realpolitik in international affairs.

Multinational companies are powerful actors regarding market information and their competitiveness in domestic markets, which complicates their relationship with the sovereign states [87–89]. Since these companies might be affected by international politics, we add UNGA Voting similarity with the United States. Model 5 and 6 in both Table 2 and 1 manifest non-interaction models with other independent variables including UNGA Voting (w/USA), Population (log) and GDP Per Capita (log). These analysis yield no significant relationship between SMCs' take-downs and countries' political similarity with the United States. In other words, Twitter and Meta take actions for countries regardless of their political like-mindedness with the US at the international level. This finding is valid for our all models, which falsifies H3. These finding is important because these take-down operations also carried out for many reasons including international reasons such as election intervention, anti-American propaganda. Indeed, we do not find a significant effect of political like-mindedness with the United States on the two SMCs' take-down operations.

Since disinformation landscapes are a complex amalgam of domestic and international politics, we used an interaction variable based on good governance indicators and UNGA Voting similarity with the United States. Models 7-10 reflects this idea focusing on if international political similarity moderates the effect of good-governance indicators. In these models, we observe that political similarity with the United States has a moderating effect on good governance indicators, particularly in columns 8, 9 and 10 in both tables. In other words, the effect of democracy and political stability changes with different levels of UNGA Voting (w/USA). Since regression coefficients in logistic models are odd-plotting marginal and conditional effects are useful tool to interpret interaction coefficients. We plotted conditional effect of good governance indicators' as seen in the Figure 4. All four figures show how the effect of good governance indicators vary for different levels of UNGA Voting Similarity with the US. Subplots on the top row show that the conditional effect of absence of violence and V-Dem

democracy scores on Meta’s take-downs changes for different levels of UNGA Voting Similarity (w/USA). For Meta, we find that the effect of good governance indicators are more visible for higher values of political similarity with the United States. This is valid for both political stability and democracy scores. For Twitter, the interaction effect is more visible for V-Dem Democracy score (lower right in Fig.4). But, the same is not valid for absence of violence. This can also be seen in the different models of regression tables, and this conditional effect is more pronounced for higher levels of UNGA Voting (w/USA).

It is interesting that although political similarity with the United States is not significant based on main effects as seen in models 5-6, it has a interaction effect on good-governance indicators. At this point, we suggest that our models 7-10 corroborates H4. However, we approach this finding with a caution. As seen in Figure 4, we have also included a histogram of UNGA Voting (w/USA) to determine if its distribution is skewed. Its distribution, evident in the four figures, demonstrates a skew towards lower values. Given this, we need to pay attention in interpreting its effects beyond the 0.6 mark, where the data points are notably sparse. While corroborating our H4, we do not offer any causality regarding this moderating effect.

In addition to good governance indicators and international alignments, we tested whether countries’ economic power and population manifest an association between Twitter and Meta’s reaction to information operations. As seen in H5, we expected that there can be an economic logic for SMCs, preventing them carrying out their take-down operations. However, it is observed that users originating in countries with larger populations are more likely to be taken down by SMCs, a trend consistent across all regression models for both tables. This important because larger populations imply larger user statistics and revenue extraction (SI:Table-6 and Figure-2). Also, we propose that a higher GDP Per Capita represents an additional potential for revenue extraction by users. Contrary to expectations, our analysis did not confirm that SMCs are less inclined to take down accounts originating in countries with higher GDP per capita. As a result, we found no economic rationale underlying the take-down policies of SMCs. Interestingly, we discovered evidence that Meta conducts counter-operations even against the United States, which is the country where it generates the highest revenue [90]. This is the opposite of what we expected. It illustrates that while scrutinizing state-linked accounts originating in countries, Meta and Twitter is carrying out their operations against state-linked coordinated activities regardless of countries’ economic power.

These findings can explain how Meta and Twitter are similar or different in terms of their response to state-linked information operations in different countries. While they are more hesitant to different good-governance indicators, political similarity with the US has a moderating effect for both SMCs. We demonstrated that both Twitter and Meta are responsive to countries’ good governance indicators such as democracy and political stability, based on pooled logit and cross-sectional estimations. However, we also underline the importance of political similarity with great powers at the international level. Therefore, a demarcation line between authoritarian and democratic countries -regarding

SMCs' response to state-linked information operations- can be misleading. This is the point that we observe the possible conditional effect of international alignments on SMCs' action against different states.

There is a trend towards authoritarianism globally. However, these authoritarian inclinations occur in a multi-polar international landscape. Disinformation and concerted perilous networks can nurture in places when they are protected by a powerful state apparatus such as military or security entities. These networks operate in an international landscape, where geopolitical shifts take place including inter-state and civil-wars. While multinational corporations seek more revenue globally, they also suffer acute or long-term geopolitical crises. Countries such as China, Iran, North Korea and Russia ban access to the two SMCs. The countries are also politically distant from the United States and other western countries. Thus, we can see how autocratic tendencies meddle with international alignments. Our study suggests two possible interpretations regarding the prevalence of state-linked information operations. First, it is conceivable that authoritarian regimes provide a permissive environment for the proliferation of state-linked information operations, which would explain the higher frequency of account take-downs by SMCs. Secondly, it is plausible to consider that SMCs utilize a selective mechanism in their regulatory actions, focusing not only on the oppressive nature of these operations but also on their involvement in international affairs, including interference in foreign elections and domestic politics. Several networks have been targeted for this purpose, including those linked to China, Iran, and Russia. For instance, Meta, through 116 separate announcements on state-linked operations, identified 38 of them as foreign interference. Within this 38 foreign operations, Meta reports that United States was targeted by seven times by other country-linked perilous networks such as Russia, Iran and China. However, Egypt and the UAE-linked networks target multiple countries including Iran(7), Turkey(5) and Qatar(5)¹. Based on Twitter's 48 released datasets (separate announcements), United States has been the top country targeted by these state-linked information operations (SI: Table 8). Qatar, Hong Kong and Turkey are other countries as being targeted by state-linked perilous networks. That is, when it comes to target of taken-down networks, we see variations across different SMC platforms. According to Twitter reports and our statistical analysis, it pays more attention to domestic-based actions.

This underscores the complex and dynamic nature of digital geopolitical landscape, where state-linked information operations are not confined to a single strategy or target. It highlights the need for ongoing outlook and adaptive strategies by SMCs to counter these evolving threats and protect the integrity of global information landscapes. It is important to note, however, we do not provide any anecdotal or qualitative evidence. Indeed, our findings regarding conditional effects show how regime characteristics and international political similarity interact with each other statistically.

All findings above would be challenged or corroborated with with more data

¹Number of separate operations in parenthesis

coming from SMCs. Each social media or information technology company has different levels of transparency[91]. Twitter offers user-level metadata, which allows researchers to analyze take-down operations in a comprehensive manner. User characteristics and tweets inform us about their possible network, replies, quote tweets and many other user-level traits. However, Meta or Facebook does not provide open access to this type of information. If an in-depth individual-level data were available for both platforms, a deeper understanding of the underlying premises guiding their take-down operations would be possible. In-country and between-country comparisons would be possible and helpful to understand how they detect these networks. Researchers can extend their research on SMCs' take-down policies, which would be an integral part of transparency in the cyberspace and disinformation landscape.

Conclusion

SMCs operate in a challenging global environment. This includes dealing with authoritarian regimes in a world with many powerful nations. The shift away from democracy is an important factor for the spread of misinformation. Social media emerges a key and contested arena for countries to implement their (dis)information strategies. These efforts often aim to bolster their domestic and international agendas. Governments can use this to build support locally or to distort the truth about events to gain international backing, since social media is a common platform for interaction among individuals, political parties, and politicians. Based on Meta and Twitter's reports, this is evident in actions by countries like Russia, Iran, and China and many other countries, where they have a capability to influence foreign elections, create fake news, engage in misleading public diplomacy, and spread misinformation. Therefore, it is crucial for SMCs to develop a coherent approach against these state-linked activities and to fight misinformation through social media. When SMCs address these issues, they act in a political environment because the subjects of their take-down operations are state-linked. This is the main difference between these operations and classical content moderation.

This study provides significant insights into the behavior of SMCs, specifically for Meta and Twitter. We have found that domestic governance indicators are important for both SMCs. Our findings indicate that SMCs tend to focus on countries with lower democracy scores and higher levels of political instability. This suggests that governance indicators play a crucial role in shaping SMCs' focus, which aligns with the hypothesis that less democratic nations are more likely to experience such operations.

However, we also questioned if good governance indicators' impact is affected by international political tendencies. In other words, we ask if the impact of good governance indicators is moderated by UNGA Voting Similarity with the U.S. Despite the lack of direct evidence between SMCs' actions and international political like-mindedness, it is interesting to note that we find a modest evidence that the effect of good governance indicators change with different lev-

els of like-mindedness with the United States and China. Considering both internal governance structures and international relations when analyzing SMCs' operational strategies highlights the multifaceted nature of their responses to global information manipulation. The politics of Twitter and Meta's operations matter in such a geopolitical landscape. We can conclude that authoritarian challenges occur in a geopolitical landscape which is a reflection of differentiating geographical orientations in world politics.

Two problems are identified throughout our analysis. First, there is no harmonized approach across the two social media platforms. Second, the scope and vision of both SMCs differ significantly when it comes to geographical variations in their take-down operations. While we observe parallel trends in terms of their interest in regime characteristics, defining state-linked networks, detecting those networks, and establishing the main premises of their operations to take down these networks require a more coherent approach. As a part of such policy-relevant outlooks, transparency concerns are also important. Meta, for example, does not provide user-level meta data, making further analysis difficult. More data will enable the use of more fruitful analyses, such as comparisons within and between countries.

However, we also note that a possible problem for external validity arises with the existence of other US or China-based social media platforms. YouTube, TikTok and many other social media environments have a content moderation policy. Assuming they made their state-linked operations public, we would know more about the political nature of SMCs' take-down operations. This would be more interesting with TikTok, which has been under pressure by US authorities as a Chinese social media corporation. This could cause a potential bias in terms of how we evaluate the effectiveness of SMCs' take-down operations. We need to consider the possibility that these platforms have different policies, which could impact our findings. This could lead to different conclusions about the political nature of SMCs' take-down operations. Therefore, further studies can change our findings or generate more robustness. However, a level of transparency is needed to deal with the problem of SMCs' reaction to state-linked information operations.

References

- [1] Selman Selim Akyüz. The impact of misinformation and preferences of news sources on institutional trust perception in the covid-19 process. In *Impact of Infodemic on Organizational Performance*, pages 291–310. IGI Global, 2021.
- [2] Samantha Bradshaw and Philip N Howard. The global organization of social media disinformation campaigns. *Journal of International Affairs*, 71(1.5):23–32, 2018.
- [3] Prateek Dewan, Shrey Bagroy, and Ponnurangam Kumaraguru. Hiding in plain sight: The anatomy of malicious pages on facebook. *Social Network*

Based Big Data Analysis and Applications, pages 21–54, 2018.

- [4] Çiğdem Bozdağ. Bottom-up nationalism and discrimination on social media: An analysis of the citizenship debate about refugees in turkey. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 23(5):712–730, 2020.
- [5] Elif Yolbulan Okan, Ayper Topcu, and Serhat Akyüz. The role of social media in political marketing: 2014 local elections of turkey. *European Journal of business and Management*, 6(22):131–140, 2014.
- [6] Elif Yolbulan Okan, Ayper Topcu, and Serhat Akyüz. The role of social media in political marketing: 2014 local elections of turkey. *European Journal of business and Management*, 6(22):131–140, 2014.
- [7] Seçil Toros and Emre Toros. Social media use and political participation: the turkish case. *Turkish Studies*, 23(3):450–473, 2022.
- [8] Panagiotis T Metaxas and Eni Mustafaraj. Social media and the elections. *Science*, 338(6106):472–473, 2012.
- [9] Ashok Deb, Luca Luceri, Adam Badaway, and Emilio Ferrara. Perils and challenges of social media and election manipulation analysis: The 2018 us midterms. In *Companion proceedings of the 2019 world wide web conference*, pages 237–247, 2019.
- [10] Britney Harris. Diplomacy 2.0: the future of social media in nation branding. *Exchange: The Journal of Public Diplomacy*, 4(1):3, 2013.
- [11] Bilge Yesil. Social media manipulation in turkey: Actors, tactics, targets. In *The Routledge Companion to Media Disinformation and Populism*, pages 386–396. Routledge, 2021.
- [12] Sarah T Roberts. Digital detritus: ‘error’ and the logic of opacity in social media content moderation. *First Monday*, 2018.
- [13] Sarah T Roberts. Commercial content moderation: Digital laborers’ dirty work. 2016.
- [14] S. Frenkel and T. Hsu. Facebook, twitter and others remove pro-u.s. influence campaign. *The New York Times*, August 2022.
- [15] Onur Varol. Should we agree to disagree about twitter’s bot problem? *Online Social Networks and Media*, 37:100263, 2023.
- [16] Deana A Rohlinger, Kyle Rose, Sarah Warren, and Stuart Shulman. Does the musk twitter takeover matter? political influencers, their arguments, and the quality of information they share. *Socius*, 9:23780231231152193, 2023.
- [17] Todd Helmus. Social media and influence operations technologies: Implica-

- tions for great power competition. *Strategic Assessment 2020: Into a New Era of Great Power Competition*, pages 153–166, 2020.
- [18] Ángel Díaz and Laura Hecht-Felella. Double standards in social media content moderation. *Brennan Center for Justice at New York University School of Law*. <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/double-standards-socialmedia-content-moderation>, 2021.
- [19] Dominik Bär, Nicolas Pröllochs, and Stefan Feuerriegel. New threats to society from free-speech social media platforms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.01229*, 2023.
- [20] Kyle Langvardt. Regulating online content moderation. *Geo. LJ*, 106:1353, 2017.
- [21] Onur Varol. Spatiotemporal analysis of censored content on twitter. In *Proceedings of the 8th ACM Conference on Web Science*, pages 372–373, 2016.
- [22] Edward L Bernays. Manipulating public opinion: The why and the how. *American journal of sociology*, 33(6):958–971, 1928.
- [23] Garth S Jowett and Victoria O’donnell. *Propaganda & persuasion*. Sage publications, 2018.
- [24] Daniel Arnaudo, Samantha Bradshaw, Hui Hui Ooi, Kaleigh Schwalbe, V Zakem, and A Zink. Combating information manipulation: A playbook for elections and beyond. *The International Republican Institute & The National Democratic Institute & The Stanford Internet Observatory*, 2021.
- [25] Facebook. Removing bad actors on facebook, Jul 2018.
- [26] Jennifer Jerit and Yangzi Zhao. Political misinformation. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 23:77–94, 2020.
- [27] James H Kuklinski, Paul J Quirk, Jennifer Jerit, David Schwieder, and Robert F Rich. Misinformation and the currency of democratic citizenship. *The Journal of Politics*, 62(3):790–816, 2000.
- [28] Samantha Bradshaw and Philip N Howard. The global organization of social media disinformation campaigns. *Journal of International Affairs*, 71(1.5):23–32, 2018.
- [29] Samantha Bradshaw and Philip N Howard. The global organization of social media disinformation campaigns. *Journal of International Affairs*, 71(1.5):23–32, 2018.
- [30] Samuel C Woolley and Philip N Howard. Political communication, computational propaganda, and autonomous agents: Introduction. *International journal of Communication*, 10, 2016.

- [31] Kai Shu, Suhang Wang, Dongwon Lee, and Huan Liu. *Disinformation, misinformation, and fake news in social media*. Springer, 2020.
- [32] Erkan Saka. Siyasi trollük örneği olarak aktroller. *Birikim*,(322), pages 17–21, 2016.
- [33] Turgay Yerlikaya and Seca Toker Aslan. Social media and fake news in the post-truth era. *Insight Turkey*, 22(2):177–196, 2020.
- [34] Seong Jae Min. Who believes in conspiracy theories? network diversity, political discussion, and conservative conspiracy theories on social media. *American Politics Research*, 49(5):415–427, 2021.
- [35] Erkan Saka. Social media in turkey as a space for political battles: Aktrolls and other politically motivated trolling. *Middle East Critique*, 27(2):161–177, 2018.
- [36] Kai Shu, Suhang Wang, Dongwon Lee, and Huan Liu. *Disinformation, misinformation, and fake news in social media*. Springer, 2020.
- [37] Yannis Theocharis, Ana Cardenal, Soyeon Jin, Toril Aalberg, David Nicolas Hopmann, Jesper Strömbäck, Laia Castro, Frank Esser, Peter Van Aelst, Claes de Vreese, et al. Does the platform matter? social media and covid-19 conspiracy theory beliefs in 17 countries. *new media & society*, page 14614448211045666, 2021.
- [38] Matthew Atkinson, Darin DeWitt, Joseph E Uscinski, JC Lucas, CJ Galdieri, and TS Sisco. Conspiracy theories in the 2016 election. *Conventional Wisdom, Parties, and Broken Barriers in the 2016 Election*, 163, 2017.
- [39] Nir Grinberg, Kenneth Joseph, Lisa Friedland, Briony Swire-Thompson, and David Lazer. Fake news on twitter during the 2016 us presidential election. *Science*, 363(6425):374–378, 2019.
- [40] Ergin Bulut and Erdem Yörük. Mediatized populisms— digital populism: Trolls and political polarization of twitter in turkey. *International Journal of Communication*, 11:25, 2017.
- [41] Samantha Bradshaw and Philip Howard. Troops, trolls and troublemakers: A global inventory of organized social media manipulation. *Computational Propaganda Research Project*, 2017.
- [42] Onur Varol and Ismail Uluturk. Deception strategies and threats for online discussions. *First Monday*, 2018.
- [43] Chengcheng Shao, Giovanni Luca Ciampaglia, Onur Varol, Kai-Cheng Yang, Alessandro Flammini, and Filippo Menczer. The spread of low-credibility content by social bots. *Nature communications*, 9(1):1–9, 2018.

- [44] Emilio Ferrara, Onur Varol, Clayton Davis, Filippo Menczer, and Alessandro Flammini. The rise of social bots. *Communications of the ACM*, 59(7):96–104, 2016.
- [45] Onur Varol, Emilio Ferrara, Clayton Davis, Filippo Menczer, and Alessandro Flammini. Online human-bot interactions: Detection, estimation, and characterization. In *Proceedings of the international AAAI conference on web and social media*, volume 11, pages 280–289, 2017.
- [46] Onur Varol and Ismail Uluturk. Journalists on twitter: self-branding, audiences, and involvement of bots. *Journal of Computational Social Science*, 3(1):83–101, 2020.
- [47] Onur Varol, Emilio Ferrara, Christine L Ogan, Filippo Menczer, and Alessandro Flammini. Evolution of online user behavior during a social upheaval. In *Proceedings of the 2014 ACM conference on Web science*, pages 81–90, 2014.
- [48] Gordon Pennycook and David G Rand. Examining false beliefs about voter fraud in the wake of the 2020 presidential election. *The Harvard Kennedy School Misinformation Review*, 2021.
- [49] Max Bader. Disinformation in elections. *Security and Human Rights*, 29(1-4):24–35, 2018.
- [50] Ashok Deb, Luca Luceri, Adam Badaway, and Emilio Ferrara. Perils and challenges of social media and election manipulation analysis: The 2018 us midterms. In *Companion proceedings of the 2019 world wide web conference*, pages 237–247, 2019.
- [51] Ayla Albayrak and Joe Parkinson. Turkey’s government forms 6,000-member social media team. *The Wall Street Journal*, 16, 2013.
- [52] E. K. Sozeri. Mapping turkey’s twitter trolls, October 2015.
- [53] Duygu Karatas and Erkan Saka. Online political trolling in the context of post-gezi social media in turkey. *International Journal of Digital Television*, 8(3):383–401, 2017.
- [54] Xinyu Wang, Jiayi Li, Eesha Srivatsavaya, and Sarah Rajtmajer. Evidence of inter-state coordination amongst state-backed information operations. *Scientific reports*, 13(1):7716, 2023.
- [55] Maria Repnikova and Keyu Alexander Chen. Asymmetrical discursive competition: China–united states digital diplomacy in africa. *International Communication Gazette*, 85(1):15–31, 2023.
- [56] Samantha Bradshaw and Philip N Howard. Challenging truth and trust: A global inventory of organized social media manipulation. *The computational propaganda project*, 1:1–26, 2018.

- [57] Maya Merhi, Sarah Rajtmajer, and Dongwon Lee. Information operations in turkey: Manufacturing resilience with free twitter accounts. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, volume 17, pages 638–649, 2023.
- [58] Elif Yolbulan Okan, Ayper Topcu, and Serhat Akyüz. The role of social media in political marketing: 2014 local elections of turkey. *European Journal of business and Management*, 6(22):131–140, 2014.
- [59] Seçil Toros and Emre Toros. Social media use and political participation: the turkish case. *Turkish Studies*, 23(3):450–473, 2022.
- [60] Jessica Brandt. How autocrats manipulate online information: Putin’s and xi’s playbooks. *The Washington Quarterly*, 44(3):127–154, 2021.
- [61] Jessica Brandt. How democracies can win an information contest without undercutting their values. *Carnegie Endowment*, August, 2, 2021.
- [62] T. Peel. The coalition’s twitter fraud and deception. *Independent Australia*, June 2013.
- [63] Robert A Dahl. What political institutions does large-scale democracy require? *Political Science Quarterly*, 120(2):187–197, 2005.
- [64] Jan-Frederik Kremer and Benedikt Müller. *Cyberspace and international relations: Theory, prospects and challenges*. Springer, 2013.
- [65] A. Segal. A new u.s. foreign policy for cyberspace, July 2022.
- [66] J. Chipman. Why your company needs a foreign policy: Multinationals must address growing geopolitical volatility. *Harvard Business Review*, September 2016.
- [67] Alex Hern and Luke Harding. Russian-led troll network based in west africa uncovered. *The Guardian*, Mar 2020.
- [68] Facebook. Removing myanmar military officials from facebook, Aug 2018.
- [69] Meta. Taking down more coordinated inauthentic behavior, Aug 2018.
- [70] Meta. October 2020 coordinated inauthentic behavior report, Nov 2020.
- [71] Meta. March 2021 coordinated inauthentic behavior report, Apr 2021.
- [72] Berk Esen and Sebnem Gumuscu. Rising competitive authoritarianism in turkey. *Third World Quarterly*, 37(9):1581–1606, 2016.
- [73] Daniel Kaufmann and Aart Kraay. Worldwide governance indicators, 2023 update. <http://www.govindicators.org>, 2023. Accessed on 19 October 2023.

- [74] Freedom House. Freedom in the world. <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world#Data>, 2023. Accessed: [date of access].
- [75] Michael Coppedge, John Gerring, Carl Henrik Knutsen, Staffan I. Lindberg, Jan Teorell, Lisa Gastaldi, Sandra Grahn, Natalia Natsika, Josefine Pernes, Oskar Rydén, and Johannes von Römer. V-Dem [Country-Year/Country-Date] Dataset v13. Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem) Project, 2023.
- [76] L Jeremy Clegg, Hinrich Voss, and Janja A Tardios. The autocratic advantage: Internationalization of state-owned multinationals. *Journal of World Business*, 53(5):668–681, 2018.
- [77] Nathan M Jensen. Democratic governance and multinational corporations: Political regimes and inflows of foreign direct investment. *International organization*, 57(3):587–616, 2003.
- [78] Susan Morgan. Fake news, disinformation, manipulation and online tactics to undermine democracy. *Journal of Cyber Policy*, 3(1):39–43, 2018.
- [79] Erik Voeten, Anton Strezhnev, and Michael Bailey. United Nations General Assembly Voting Data, 2009.
- [80] Matthias Busse and Carsten Hefeker. Political risk, institutions and foreign direct investment. *European journal of political economy*, 23(2):397–415, 2007.
- [81] Niels G Noorderhaven and Anne-Wil Harzing. The “country-of-origin effect” in multinational corporations: Sources, mechanisms and moderating conditions. In *Management and International Review: Can Multinationals Bridge the Gap Between Global and Local?*, pages 47–66. Springer, 2003.
- [82] Bruce Kogut and Harbir Singh. The effect of national culture on the choice of entry mode. *Journal of international business studies*, 19:411–432, 1988.
- [83] Joakim Kreutz. Human rights, geostrategy, and eu foreign policy, 1989–2008. *International organization*, 69(1):195–217, 2015.
- [84] The White House. National security strategy, October 2022.
- [85] Facebook users, stats, data & trends. <https://datareportal.com/essential-facebook-stats>, 2023. Accessed: [date of access].
- [86] Erik Voeten, Anton Strezhnev, and Michael Bailey. United Nations General Assembly Voting Data. 2009.
- [87] Joseph S Nye. Multinational corporations in world politics. *Foreign Affairs*, 53(1):153–175, 1974.
- [88] Hongfei Gu. Data, big tech, and the new concept of sovereignty. *Journal of Chinese Political Science*, pages 1–22, 2023.

- [89] Maxwell Lowe. Social media is blurring the lines of national sovereignty, 4 2021.
- [90] Meta. Meta’s adversarial threat report, third quarter 2022, Nov 2022.
- [91] Aleksandra Urman and Mykola Makhortykh. How transparent are transparency reports? comparative analysis of transparency reporting across online platforms. *Telecommunications Policy*, 47(3):102477, 2023.

A Supplementary Information

Compiling Data for Meta and Twitter’s Take Down Operations

We compiled our data from Twitter and Meta’s announcements. In each news, they announced country of origin, targeted countries, modality of operation and many other information such as domestic and foreign elements. We curated a dataset for reports between 2018 and 2022. During this time, they targeted different countries for state-linked operations. Table SI-1 shows all countries that Meta and Twitter focused on regarding different information operations. For instance, Russia originated operations identified by Meta and Twitter for 21 and 9 times, respectively for state-linked operations.

Meta carry out its take-down operations against accounts originating in 48 distinct countries. We only coded state-linked operations if Meta clearly emphasized any linkage with governments, military, political parties and municipalities. This provided more insight to compare Meta with Twitter’s take-down operations, since Twitter -from the beginning- announced state-linked operations. In the case of Twitter, Russia can set up networks in other countries such as Ghana and Nigeria. In such cases, we did not coded Ghana and Nigeria as being targeted by Twitter’s counter operations.² We should also note that Twitter make user-level data public, while Meta does not provide such data. This is a significant difference between these SMCs. User level data is significant to understand the inherent mechanism of disinformation networks.

Regarding regression sample, we excluded some countries because of lack of data. For instance, we cannot retrieve GDP Per Capita data for Eritrea, South Sudan and Venezuela. Therefore, software automatically omits row with missing variables.

Table SI-1 shows which countries are focused by Meta and Twitter. We observe that Meta was more active than Twitter in taking action against state-linked operations. There are 48 unique countries for Meta and this number is 22 for Twitter.

²<https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2020/mar/13/facebook-uncovers-russian-led-troll-network-based-in-west>

Table SI-1: Country Summary of Meta and Twitter’s Geographic Response (2018-2021)

Country List		
Country	Number of Meta-Target	Number of Twitter-Target
Russia	21	9
Iran	12	7
Mexico	8	1
Myanmar	8	-
Brazil	4	-
China	4	6
Georgia	4	-
Kyrgyzstan	3	-
Pakistan	3	-
WB/Gaza	2	-
El Salvador	2	-
Peru	2	-
Spain	2	2
Azerbaijan	2	-
Morocco	2	-
Ukraine	2	-
Nigeria	1	1
Nicaragua	1	-
Romania	1	-
Philippines	1	-
Saudi Arabia	1	4
Serbia (Yugoslavia)	1	1
Sudan	1	-
Thailand	1	1
Uganda	1	1
United States	1	-
Moldova	1	-
Algeria	1	-
Malaysia	1	-
KRG	1	-
Azerbaijan	1	-
Bangladesh	1	1
Belarus	1	-
Benin	1	-
Bolivia	1	-
Comoros	1	-
Costa Rica	1	-
Cuba	1	1
DRC	1	-
Ecuador	1	1
Egypt	1	2
Ethiopia	1	-
France	1	-
Ghana	-	1
Honduras	1	1
India	1	-
Indonesia	1	1
Israel	1	-
Jordan	1	-
Kazakhstan	1	-
Armenia	-	1
Tanzania	-	1
Turkey	-	1
United Arab Emirates	-	1
Venezuela	-	4

Robustness analysis for regression models

Table SI-2: Regression Results (Linear Probability Modes-Pooled Time Series)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	Meta	Twitter	Meta	Twitter	Meta	Twitter	Meta	Twitter	Meta	Twitter
	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se
V-Dem Polyarchy	-0.402*** (0.13)	-0.322*** (0.10)	-0.228 (0.17)	-0.359** (0.14)	-0.327* (0.17)	-0.359** (0.14)	-0.025 (0.39)	0.145 (0.27)	-0.237 (0.17)	-0.327** (0.14)
PVE			-0.080* (0.04)	0.017 (0.03)	-0.035 (0.05)	0.035 (0.04)	-0.035 (0.05)	0.033 (0.04)	0.206*** (0.07)	0.120** (0.05)
UNGA Voting (w/USA)					0.050 (0.28)	-0.245* (0.15)	0.760 (0.87)	0.942 (0.62)	0.037 (0.23)	-0.249 (0.15)
GDP Per Capita (log)					0.038 (0.03)	0.049** (0.02)	0.047 (0.03)	0.063*** (0.02)	0.057** (0.03)	0.056** (0.02)
Population (log)					0.092*** (0.02)	0.063*** (0.02)	0.095*** (0.02)	0.068*** (0.02)	0.096*** (0.02)	0.064*** (0.02)
V-Dem Polyarchy × UNGA Voting (w/USA)							-1.064 (1.20)	-1.778** (0.86)		
PVE × UNGA Voting (w/USA)									-0.873*** (0.18)	-0.312** (0.14)
Constant	0.474*** (0.08)	0.283*** (0.07)	0.367*** (0.10)	0.306*** (0.09)	-1.399*** (0.36)	-1.048*** (0.28)	-1.705*** (0.53)	-1.559*** (0.39)	-1.628*** (0.36)	-1.130*** (0.28)
Number of clusters	168	168	168	168	168	168	168	168	168	168
Number of observations	672	672	672	672	672	672	672	672	672	672
R-squared	0.053	0.065	0.072	0.067	0.197	0.190	0.201	0.212	0.253	0.204

Table SI-3: Regression Results (Linear Probability Modes-Corsection)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	Meta	Twitter	Meta	Twitter	Meta	Twitter	Meta	Twitter	Meta	Twitter
	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se
V-Dem Polyarchy	-0.372*** (0.13)	-0.303*** (0.10)	-0.179 (0.17)	-0.290* (0.15)	-0.322* (0.18)	-0.288* (0.16)	0.080 (0.44)	0.347 (0.32)	-0.226 (0.18)	-0.249 (0.16)
PVE			-0.086* (0.04)	-0.006 (0.03)	-0.039 (0.06)	0.028 (0.04)	-0.040 (0.06)	0.027 (0.04)	0.215*** (0.07)	0.133** (0.06)
UNGA Voting (w/USA)					-0.023 (0.34)	-0.292 (0.18)	0.909 (1.01)	1.185* (0.71)	-0.030 (0.26)	-0.294 (0.19)
GDP Per Capita (log)					0.037 (0.03)	0.048* (0.02)	0.048 (0.03)	0.065** (0.03)	0.056* (0.03)	0.056** (0.02)
Population (log)					0.091*** (0.02)	0.074*** (0.02)	0.095*** (0.02)	0.079*** (0.02)	0.097*** (0.02)	0.076*** (0.02)
V-Dem Polyarchy × UNGA Voting (w/USA)							-1.411 (1.38)	-2.235** (0.99)		
PVE × UNGA Voting (w/USA)									-0.923*** (0.21)	-0.378** (0.17)
Constant	0.454*** (0.08)	0.285*** (0.07)	0.337*** (0.10)	0.277*** (0.09)	-1.365*** (0.37)	-1.221*** (0.30)	-1.761*** (0.58)	-1.847*** (0.43)	-1.614*** (0.38)	-1.323*** (0.31)
Number of clusters	173	173	172	172	166	166	166	166	166	166
Number of observations										

Table SI-4: Regression Results (Logit Estimates, Cross-section, with UNGA Voting with China)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	Meta	Twitter	Meta	Twitter	Meta	Twitter	Meta	Twitter	Meta	Twitter
	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se
main										
V-Dem Polyarchy	-2.271*** (0.73)	-3.601*** (1.21)	-1.368 (0.92)	-3.691*** (1.35)	-2.518** (1.15)	-3.561** (1.76)	-7.294 (8.62)	-28.594** (12.95)	-1.764 (1.14)	-2.921* (1.76)
PVE			-0.460** (0.22)	0.059 (0.22)	-0.184 (0.29)	0.176 (0.41)	-0.181 (0.30)	0.291 (0.43)	-7.722** (3.11)	-5.271*** (2.02)
UNGA Voting Similarity with China					-1.540 (2.50)	4.027 (3.31)	-5.386 (7.48)	-15.116 (9.29)	-0.350 (2.57)	5.208 (3.29)
GDP Per Capita (log)					0.185 (0.18)	0.613** (0.31)	0.217 (0.20)	0.694** (0.30)	0.285 (0.19)	0.649** (0.31)
Population (log)					0.671*** (0.16)	0.824*** (0.28)	0.689*** (0.16)	0.910*** (0.27)	0.746*** (0.17)	0.859*** (0.29)
V-Dem Polyarchy × UNGA Voting Similarity with China							5.735 (10.26)	29.964** (15.15)		
PVE × UNGA Voting Similarity with China									9.043** (3.58)	6.516*** (2.40)
Constant	0.122 (0.39)	-0.455 (0.51)	-0.473 (0.50)	-0.392 (0.61)	-11.320*** (4.25)	-22.808*** (6.76)	-8.626 (6.09)	-8.642 (8.50)	-14.481*** (4.42)	-24.842*** (6.54)
Number of clusters	168	168	168	168	168	168	168	168	168	168
Number of observations										




Figure SI-1: Conditional Effects of Polyarchy and Political Stability on Meta and Twitter's Country Targeting

Table SI-5: Regression Results (Logit Estimates, Cross-section, with User Statistics)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	Meta	Twitter	Meta	Twitter	Meta	Twitter	Meta	Twitter	Meta	Twitter
	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se
main										
V-Dem Polyarchy	-2.271*** (0.73)	-3.601*** (1.21)	-1.368 (0.92)	-3.691*** (1.35)	-1.943* (1.07)	-2.916* (1.58)	-2.883 (2.39)	4.142 (4.09)	-1.402 (1.06)	-2.277 (1.56)
PVE			-0.460** (0.22)	0.059 (0.22)	-0.824** (0.36)	-0.503 (0.31)	-0.821** (0.36)	-0.519* (0.30)	0.768 (0.72)	0.472 (0.55)
UNGA Voting (w/USA)					2.547 (1.63)	-0.230 (2.13)	0.445 (4.88)	14.071* (7.67)	2.256 (1.90)	-1.802 (2.46)
GDP Per Capita (log)					-0.101 (0.27)	0.457 (0.30)	-0.135 (0.29)	0.606* (0.33)	0.043 (0.28)	0.495 (0.31)
Facebook Users (%Population)					2.953** (1.46)		3.077** (1.52)		2.305 (1.45)	
Twitter Users (% Population)						0.171 (1.49)		-0.194 (1.51)		0.181 (1.47)
V-Dem Polyarchy × UNGA Voting (w/USA)							3.218 (7.15)	-24.207* (14.48)		
PVE × UNGA Voting (w/USA)									-5.927** (2.64)	-3.586* (1.93)
Constant	0.122 (0.39)	-0.455 (0.51)	-0.473 (0.50)	-0.392 (0.61)	-1.440 (1.96)	-4.843* (2.49)	-0.636 (2.72)	-9.943** (3.87)	-2.411 (2.13)	-4.894* (2.54)
Number of observations	168	168	168	168	162	160	162	160	162	160




Figure SI-2: User Statistics and Population. On the left, we plotted the correlation between user statistics and population. We captured a strong positive correlation between user statistics and population.

Table SI-6: Correlation Table

	Population	Facebook Users'23	Twitter Users'23
Population	1.0000		
Facebook Users 2023	0.9126	1.0000	
Twitter Users 2023	0.4589	0.6350	1.0000

Table 6 statistically shows the association between user statistics and population. For Facebook, the correlation is .91, which is stronger than the association between Twitter's. Indeed, statistics with user statistics do not change our estimations as seen in Table 5. Since China, Iran and Russia do not have official user statistics for Facebook and Twitter, we replaced user statistics with population for a more comprehensive sampling. Our models with population and user statistics manifest similar results, as expected.

Table SI-7: Variance inflation factors

	Meta	Twitter
PVE	2.707492	2.707492
V-Dem Polyarchy	2.041271	2.041271
GDP Per Capita (log)	2.405718	2.405718
UNGA Voting (w/USA)	2.07146	2.07146
Population(log)	1.329778	1.329778
N	166	166

Target of State-Linked Info-Ops (Meta)	Target of State-Linked Info-Ops (Twitter)
United States(7), Qatar(7), Iran(6), United Kingdom(5), Yemen(5), Turkey(5), Morocco(4), Sudan(4), Lebanon(4), Egypt(3), Libya(3), Saudi Arabia(3), Syria(3), Tunisia(3), Ukraine(3), Jordan(3), Kazakhstan(2), Bahrain(2), Germany(2), India(2), Indonesia(2), Israel(2), Spain(2), Hong Kong(2), Comoros(2), Romania(1), Latvia(1), Estonia(1), Lithuania(1), Armenia(1), Azerbaijan(1), Georgia(1), Tajikistan(1), Uzbekistan(1), Moldova(1), Russia(1), Kyrgyzstan(1), Afghanistan(1), Albania(1), Algeria(1), France(1), Iraq(1), Mexico(1), Pakistan(1), Serbia(1), South Africa(1), Italy(1), Austria(1), Nigeria(1), Senegal(1), Togo(1), Angola(1), China(1), UAE(1), West Bank and Gaza(1), Somalia(1)	USA (5), Qatar (5), Hong Kong (4), Turkey (2), Uyghurs (2), Iran (1), Catalonia (1), Israel (1), Yemen (1), Spain (1), West Papua (1), Azerbaijan (1), NATO (1), EU (1), Central African Republic (1)

Table SI-8: Targets of State-Linked Information Networks Taken Down by Meta and Twitter

We have identified that out of 196 operations where Meta took action to suspend or take down accounts, 116 were associated with state-linked activities. Within these 116 operations, 38 featured as involving inter-state state-linked information operations (the remaining networks deal with domestic propaganda). Similarly, for Twitter, all 47 datasets (as reported in separate announcements) are connected to state-linked activities. The targets of these state-linked operations encompass regional, domestic, and inter-state entities. Twitter explicitly lists the names of countries targeted in the second column of Table 8. This table provides a comprehensive overview of the countries, as well as regions, de facto states, and organizations, targeted by these state-linked information operations.