

# Dynamics of Cross-Platform Attention to Retracted Papers: Pervasiveness, Audience Skepticism, and Timing of Retractions

Hao Peng<sup>1</sup>, Daniel M. Romero<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Emőke-Ágnes Horvát<sup>4,5,6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*School of Information, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109, USA*

<sup>2</sup>*Center for the Study of Complex Systems, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109, USA*

<sup>3</sup>*Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109, USA*

<sup>4</sup>*School of Communication, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL 60208, USA*

<sup>5</sup>*McCormick School of Engineering, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL 60208, USA*

<sup>6</sup>*Northwestern University Institute on Complex Systems, Evanston, IL 60208, USA*

**Retracted papers often circulate widely on social media, online news outlets and other websites before their official retraction. The spread of potentially inaccurate or misleading results from retracted papers can harm the scientific community and the public. Here we quantify the amount and type of attention 3,985 retracted papers received over time in different online platforms, ranging from social media to knowledge repositories. Comparing to a set of non-retracted control papers, we show that retracted papers receive more attention after publication. This tendency seems to be more pronounced on news outlets and knowledge repositories. This finding indicates that untrustworthy research penetrates even curated platforms and is often shared uncritically, amplifying the negative impact on the public. At the same time, we find that posts on Twitter tend to express more uncertainty about retracted than about control papers, suggesting that these posts could help identify potentially flawed scientific findings. We also find that, around the time they are retracted, papers generate discussions that are mostly about the retraction incident rather than about the results of the paper, showing that by this point papers have exhausted attention to their findings and highlighting the limited effect of retractions in reducing uncritical conversations. Our findings**

**reveal the extent to which retracted papers are discussed on different online platforms and identify at scale audience skepticism towards them. They also show that retractions come too late, which has implications for efforts to better time retraction notices.**

## **Introduction**

Retraction in academic publishing is an important and necessary mechanism for science to self-correct<sup>1</sup>. Prior studies show that the number of retractions has increased in recent years<sup>2-5</sup>. This rise can be explained by many different factors<sup>3-7</sup>. One reason is that the number of publications is increasing exponentially<sup>8</sup>. Meanwhile, as scientific research has become more complex and interdisciplinary than ever before, reviewers are facing a higher cognitive burden<sup>9,10</sup>. This undermines the scientific community's ability to filter out problematic papers. In fact, research shows that prominent journals with rigorous screening and high publishing standards are as likely to publish erroneous papers as less prominent journals<sup>11</sup>. Finally, not all retractions are due to research fraud—some papers are retracted due to unintentional errors or mistakes, which become more likely as research data grows in size and complexity<sup>6</sup>.

Regardless of the reasons behind this increase, a high incidence of retractions in academic literature has the potential to undermine the credibility of scientific communities and reduce public trust in science<sup>6,12</sup>. What's more, the circulation of misleading findings can be harmful to the lay public<sup>6,13-15</sup>, especially given how broadly papers can be disseminated via social media<sup>16</sup>. For instance, there are two retracted papers among the 10 most highly shared papers in 2020 according to Altmetric, a service that tracks the online dissemination of scientific articles<sup>17</sup>. One of them, published in a top biology journal, inaccurately suggested that treatment with chloroquine had no benefit in COVID-19 patients<sup>18</sup>. Another paper, published in a well-regarded general interest journal, falsely claimed that having more female mentors was negatively correlated with post-mentorship impact of junior scholars<sup>19</sup>. Both papers attracted considerable attention before they were retracted, raising questions about their possible negative impact on public trust in science.

As these examples suggest, retracted papers can attain substantial online attention and potentially flawed knowledge can reach the public who often are impacted by the research results<sup>20</sup>. This large-scale spreading of papers occurs as the Web has become the primary channel through which the lay public interacts with scientific information<sup>21–23</sup>. Past research on the online diffusion of science has mainly studied the spread of papers without regard to their retraction status<sup>24–29</sup>. Other work has examined the dissemination of retracted papers in scientific communities, focusing mainly on the associated citation penalty<sup>5,14,30–34</sup>.

However, it is unclear how much attention retracted papers generate in the public sphere, which could help assess the extent of the circulation of erroneous findings and the impact of retraction on their dissemination online. A recent study recognized this crucial gap and used an innovative data combination to show via an aggregated black-box measure that, overall, retracted papers tend to receive more attention than non-retracted ones<sup>35</sup>.

Relying on an expanded version of a similar data mash-up, we address essential open questions about the online attention to retracted papers. First, past research shows that retractions occur most frequently among highly-cited articles published in high-impact journals<sup>11,36</sup>, suggesting a counter-intuitive link between rigorous screening and retraction. Is there a similar tendency online where retracted papers receive more attention on carefully curated platforms such as news outlets than on platforms with limited entry barriers like social media sites? Such a trend would highlight difficulties with identifying unreliable research given their broad visibility in established venues, and could inform attempts to manage the harm caused by retractions.

Second, more than half of retracted papers are flagged because of scientific misconduct such as fabrication, falsification, and plagiarism<sup>4,5</sup>. These papers may receive lots of attention due to skepticism and uncertainty raised by online audiences. Is the attention received by retracted papers due to the uncritical sharing of the findings or is it rather expressing concern? Knowing the answer to this question may uncover missed opportunities to exploit early-warning systems that could help identify papers that require a closer examination.




Figure 1: **Illustration of the research process that compares the online attention received by retracted and control papers.** **A**, We match five control papers to each retracted paper using the Altmetric database. **B-C**, We track the change in mentions over time on four different types of platforms and in top news outlets. As an example, we show here the retracted paper “When Contact Changes Minds: An Experiment on Transmission of Support for Gay Equality” published in *Science* (DOI: 10.1126/science.1256151) and one of its matched control papers “Single  $\beta$ -Actin mRNA Detection in Neurons Reveals a Mechanism for Regulating Its Translatability” (DOI: 10.1126/science.1242939). **D**, We compute the average cumulative number of mentions across all platforms within 6 months after publication (and before retraction) for all retracted and control papers in the dataset. **E**, Similarly, we compute the average cumulative number of mentions within 6 months after retraction. Error bars indicate 95% confidence intervals.

Third, we also lack an understanding of whether the time when the retraction is issued is appropriate for reducing dissemination online. Past research found that authors tend to keep citing retracted papers long after they have been red-flagged, although at a lower rate<sup>5,6,12,14</sup>. This raises the question of whether retraction is effective in reducing public attention beyond the academic literature. Understanding the timing of the retraction relative to the trajectory of attention a paper

receives and the amount of attention after retraction could be helpful for journals to devise policies and practices that maximize the impact of retractions on attention<sup>12,37</sup>.

In this paper, we compiled a dataset to quantify the volume of attention that 3,985 retracted papers received on 14 online platforms, e.g., public social media posts on Twitter, Facebook, and Reddit, their coverage in online news, citations in Wikipedia, and research blogs. We compared their attention with non-retracted papers selected through a matching process based on publication venue and year (Figure 1A and Data and Methods). We obtained retracted papers from Retraction Watch<sup>38</sup>, the largest database to date that records retracted papers, and pulled their complete “trajectory” of mentions over time on various platforms from a service called Altmetric<sup>39</sup> that has been tracking posts about research papers for the past decade. The granularity and scale of the data enabled us to differentiate mentions on four different types of platforms, including social media, news media, blogs, and knowledge repositories (Figures 1B-C). We thus provide the first systematic multi-platform investigation of the online mentions of papers during the time periods between publication and retraction, and after retraction (Figures 1D-E).

Our findings offer insights into how extensively and in what context retracted papers are mentioned in different online platforms over time. We show that retractions come too late to reduce the circulation of potentially flawed findings on all studied platforms. By the time the retraction is issued, most papers have exhausted their online attention. We also contribute a large dataset of identifiers of tweets that mention the papers used in this study and human annotations of whether the tweets express uncertainty with respect to the findings of the papers. This dataset can be useful to the broader research community for the study of uncertainty and skepticism towards scientific articles, and can aid the development of automated methods to detect uncertainty computationally<sup>40</sup>.

## Are Retracted Papers More Popular Even in the News?

To evaluate the amount of attention that retracted papers receive over time, we compared it with the volume of attention for matched non-retracted papers (referred to as “control papers” throughout the analysis) on four types of platforms. We examined their attention trajectories between publication and retraction, and after retraction. We define a tracking window for both time periods and present hereafter results based on papers with a tracking window of at least 6 months (Data and Methods).




Figure 2: **After publication and before retraction mentions.** A-E, Average cumulative number of mentions received within 6 months after publication on four types of platforms and in top news outlets for both retracted and control papers. F, Average cumulative number of mentions on Twitter after excluding uncertain tweets. Comparisons across different types of platforms show that retracted papers receive more attention after publication than non-retracted papers. Error bars indicate 95% confidence intervals.

At first glance, retracted papers attract more overall attention than control papers (Figure 1D). However, does this trend apply to all types of platforms? As shown in Figures 2A-E, across 3,026 retracted and 19,481 control papers, we find that retracted papers receive more attention after publication on all four types of platforms and are even mentioned more in news outlets with high-quality science reporting (see Data and Methods for outlet selection). On average, papers obtain mentions most frequently on social media, followed by news media, and they receive roughly similar amounts of attention on blogs and knowledge repositories. Changing the length of the tracking window produces qualitatively similar results (SI Fig. S1). To consider other fundamental factors that could affect the amount of attention a paper receives, we performed logistic regressions that examine the impact of mentions on the likelihood of retraction, after controlling for a paper's publication year and the number of authors (SI Table S1). Accordingly, the association between more mentions of a paper and a higher chance of retraction is significant across all types of platforms and across different time windows. Given the ability of all the investigated platforms to spread information broadly, potentially flawed findings in retracted papers may circulate widely, possibly misleading the lay public.

Moreover, investigating the ratio of the average number of mentions of retracted papers relative to their control counterparts, we find more attention to retracted papers in news outlets, including top news, and knowledge repositories than in social media and blogs (SI Fig. S2). This suggests that curated content tends to contain more mentions of retracted findings for each mention of non-retracted research than unfiltered contributions by individuals in social media.

### **Are Retracted Papers Shared More Uncritically?**

Since it is possible that the additional mentions of retracted papers are not meant to propagate their findings but to express skepticism or criticism, we repeated the analysis after excluding posts that express uncertainty about the claims of the paper. Here, we focused on Twitter, the single largest platform in our dataset, which accounts for about 80% of all posts in the Altmetric database. We define an *uncertain tweet* as a tweet expressing skepticism, doubt, criticism, concern, confusion,

or disbelief with respect to a paper's findings, data, credibility, novelty, contribution, or other scientific elements. We used a combination of automated and manual methods to label tweets that express uncertainty with high recall. In other words, we were able to identify a large fraction of the truly uncertain tweets after collecting 3-4 independent expert annotations for thousands of tweets (see details and examples in Data and Methods). Figure 2F shows that even after excluding uncertain tweets for both groups of papers (see full regression results in [SI Table S2](#)), retracted papers still receive more mentions on Twitter, suggesting that potentially flawed findings are indeed uncritically mentioned and shared more on social media. This finding is also likely to apply to other platforms such as news outlets, since they are less likely to publish news articles that question a scientific paper. Establishing this finding for news, however, requires further examination.

The number of mentions does not necessarily reflect a paper's true influence since different posts may have different audience sizes. To further validate our finding about the surplus of attention retracted papers receive after publication, we compared the number of followers of users who mention both groups of papers. [SI Fig. S3](#) shows that retracted papers indeed reach more people after publication than control papers.

Our findings enrich a recent result indicating that retracted papers are, overall, more popular online than comparable non-retracted papers<sup>35</sup>. Specifically, we find that, after publication, the higher attention received by retracted papers holds across platforms with varying levels of expert curation. Additionally, we show that retracted papers are shared more often uncritically (excluding uncertainty) than non-retracted papers on social media, potentially misinforming large audiences. However, this does not mean that the fraction of mentions that question retracted papers is not higher than the fraction of uncertain mentions for non-retracted papers, a point we examine next.


### **How Much Uncertainty Is Expressed about Retracted Papers?**

One possible reason why retracted papers receive more attention after publication is that attention leads to scrutiny. In other words, problematic papers may need to generate enough attention to have



their mistakes recognized. If this factor is at play, the attention received after publication could be useful for the early detection of problematic papers. To assess this possibility, we examined how frequently papers receive comments expressing uncertainty about their findings on Twitter.

Twitter is the largest platform in our data (hosting 80% of all posts) that also has a diverse representation of different demographic groups among the users who share scientific content, including academics, practitioners, news organizations, and the lay public<sup>16,41</sup>. For this analysis, we labeled all tweets that mention retracted or control papers before the retraction and reference date, respectively, by applying the same procedure we used when labelling uncertain tweets received within 6 months after publication (cf. Figure 2F; see details in Data and Methods).



**Figure 3: Average cumulative fraction of tweets containing uncertainty within 6 months after publication.** **A**, Control papers are from a first matching process that considers the publication year and publication venue. **B**, Control papers in a second matching process are selected to account for publication venue and the number of pre-retraction tweets. This latter control set allows us to compare retracted and non-retracted papers that have similar levels of attention. Across both matching schemes, retracted papers receive a higher fraction of uncertain tweets. We focused on retracted papers that have at least one tweet mention before retraction.

Figure 3A shows that, compared to control papers, retracted papers receive a higher fraction of uncertain tweets, especially when looking at longer time periods (between 4 and 6 months). This finding is also supported by logistic regression analyses with a paper’s retraction status as the dependent variable and the fraction of uncertain tweets as the independent variable, while

controlling for the publication year and the number of authors. The coefficients of the fraction of uncertain tweets are positive and statistically significant ( $p < 0.001$  for 4 to 6 months, [SI Table S3](#)). However, as shown previously, retracted papers have more mentions than control papers, which might explain why they are questioned more frequently—higher scrutiny could lead to higher uncertainty. To test whether there is more uncertainty about retracted than control papers regardless of their online popularity, we matched retracted papers to a second set of control papers from the same journals that had a similar number of tweets in the tracking window from publication to retraction (see details in Data and Methods). We then annotated the uncertain tweets in this control set as well. Consistent with previous findings, we find that retracted papers receive a higher fraction of uncertain tweets than non-retracted papers (Figure 3B). This result indicates that online public attention does express more uncertainty about retracted papers well before they are retracted, independently of the popularity of the papers.


### **Is the Timing of Retraction Effective in Reducing Attention?**

The fact that retracted papers are mentioned more often after their publication prompts us to ask if they continue to receive outsized attention up until and even beyond their retraction. In other words, we are interested in understanding the effectiveness of the retraction in reducing online attention. We compared the mention volume between retracted and control papers in the months after retraction. Since control papers were not retracted, we used the retraction date of their matched retracted paper as a reference date to begin tracking their mentions (cf. Figure 1C; see Data and Methods).

We found that retracted papers are discussed much more frequently than control papers even over the 6 months after their retraction (See [SI Fig. S4](#)). This is not unexpected, as people often react to the news of retraction in ways that involve mentioning the paper, such as questioning and criticizing the authors' practices, the peer review system, or the publishers.

To more accurately measure the extent to which potentially flawed results from retracted

papers are shared without regard to their problematic nature, we excluded content from the after-retraction period that discussed the retraction itself. To identify such content, we used both automated and manual labeling strategies (see details in Data and Methods). Since our automated heuristic excludes all posts that contain the term “retract”, it might falsely eliminate some posts that are not discussing the retraction. We therefore applied the same filter to the control papers as well for consistency. As Figure 4 shows, based on 2,460 retracted and 12,490 control papers, after excluding posts discussing the retraction, retracted papers are mentioned as much as or less than control papers. This result indicates that the additional attention to retracted papers after their retraction is primarily related to the retraction incident rather than to the paper’s findings.



**Figure 4: Average number of mentions within 6 months before and after the retraction.** Trends are shown on four types of platforms and in top news outlets for data that exclude posts containing the phrase “retract” during the whole time period, for both control and retracted papers. In the case of retracted papers, we also manually excluded all after-retraction posts that discussed the retraction in some form. Comparisons across different types of platforms show that retracted papers do not receive statistically more mentions than control papers before or after retraction. Error bars indicate 95% confidence intervals.

Yet, this finding does not show the effectiveness of the retraction itself. Since online attention tends to decay naturally over time<sup>42</sup>, it is possible that retracted papers already received attention at a similar level as control papers by the time they were retracted. We thus compared the online attention to retracted and control papers before the retraction/reference date by applying the same automated heuristic to both groups of papers (i.e., excluding posts with the term “retract”).

Figure 4 shows that, across different types of platforms, retracted papers are discussed not

statistically more often than control papers immediately before their retraction. Changing the length of the tracking window produces qualitatively similar results (SI Fig. S5). In fact, without excluding any posts, 79.9% of retracted papers receive no mentions over the 6 months preceding their retraction, while 93.5% of them receive no mentions in the last month before retraction. This suggests that by the time the retraction is issued, most papers have already exhausted their attention, meaning that the retraction comes too late. This limits the possible impact of retraction in further reducing online attention, especially given that mentions posted right before the retraction are more likely to question rather than to share unknowingly problematic findings.

We show the robustness of this result in three ways. First, we monitored the average number of tweets before retraction, with uncertain posts excluded (SI Fig. S6). Second, we performed an interrupted time series analysis<sup>43</sup> using the average monthly mention trajectory (without uncertainty) to assess the effect of retraction on attention. This analysis confirms statistically that since online attention to retracted papers is exhausted when the retraction occurs, the retraction itself does not lead to a faster rate of decrease in mentions compared to the pre-retraction trend (SI Table S4). Third, we investigated the fraction of mentions that occurred within the last month before retraction, depending on the time frame between publication and retraction. We found that both the overall attention (Figure 5A) and the Twitter mentions without uncertainty (Figure 5B) were limited in the last month for papers that have been retracted more than a few months after their publication.

## **Discussion**

Our study shows that retracted papers indeed attract more attention after publication than comparable non-retracted papers across a variety of online platforms including social and news media, blogs, and knowledge repositories. Moreover, their popularity surplus relative to non-retracted papers tends to be higher on curated than non-curated platforms. On the platform accountable for most mentions of research papers, retracted papers remain mentioned more often even after excluding tweets that express uncertainty. These findings suggest that retracted papers are dissem-




Figure 5: **Average fraction of mentions in the last month before retraction.** The x-axis represents different time windows between publication and retraction. The green bar plot (left y-axis) shows the number of papers in each time window, excluding those with 0 total mentions between publication and retraction. The black line plot (right y-axis) shows the average fraction of mentions in the last month before retraction. We focused on papers whose retraction happened before the Altmetric access date. Error bars indicate 95% confidence intervals. **A**, Data based on mentions in all platforms. **B**, Similar results for mentions in Twitter, excluding uncertain tweets.

inated widely and through multiple channels before they are eventually retracted, possibly spreading flawed findings throughout the scientific community and the lay public. Retracted papers might receive more attention due to a number of mechanisms. First, problematic papers may naturally attract more attention. For example, if the paper is retracted due to overclaiming, the results are likely to be presented as more significant, exciting, and attention-grabbing than they should. Similarly, if the authors unintentionally make mistakes, they are more likely to publish the paper and receive attention if the results are positive rather than negative<sup>44,45</sup>. Hence, retracted papers are prone to present (false) positive findings and are therefore more eye-catching. Second, attention could increase the likelihood of retraction. If a problematic paper receives more attention, it will have more readership and therefore go through more scrutiny, increasing its chance of retraction. In contrast, a paper that attracts limited attention may present little opportunity for retraction.

Our analysis of paper mentions containing uncertainty indicates that subsequently retracted papers are questioned relatively more often on Twitter after their publication than control papers.

This is nontrivial since retracted papers even passed the peer-review system that science relies on to legitimize new findings through expert evaluation. Our finding is aligned with and extends a recent case study of three retracted COVID-19/SARS-CoV-2 papers<sup>46</sup> in suggesting that collective attention on social media may contain useful early signals related to problematic papers and could contribute to increasing the quality of published scientific literature.

We also find that retracted papers continue to be discussed more than their control counterparts after being retracted. However, those discussions are primarily related to the retraction incident. Surprisingly, retracted papers do not receive more mentions than control papers right before the retraction and the corresponding reference date. This result is essential because it addresses an important open question about whether simply retracting a paper has an impact on the organic online dissemination of its findings, which can be extensive especially in the context of varied and broadly adopted online platforms as well as the increased engagement with science on most platforms<sup>23,47</sup>. For the first time, we showed at scale that retraction has limited impact in reducing the spread of problematic papers in online platforms, as it comes after papers have already exhausted their uncritical attention. This finding thus adds to knowledge about the consequences of retraction beyond the narrow scientific literature and academic sphere.

Although we studied the largest set of retracted papers to date, our work is not without limitations. First, not all problematic papers that should be retracted are retracted<sup>48,49</sup> and not all retracted papers are mentioned and traceable on major online platforms. Our findings are based solely on the subset recorded in the Altmetric database, which may not be representative of all problematic papers. Second, the Altmetric database may not cover all mentions of each paper. For instance, when a news outlet, such as the *New Scientist*, posts a tweet with a link to its piece that covers a research paper, this tweet and its retweets would not necessarily be tracked by Altmetric unless they explicitly contain the unique identifiers of the paper. Third, our two matching schemes controlling for topic, temporal effects, co-author team size, and online popularity leave other potential factors, such as author reputation and prestige of affiliation, uncharted. Future work should thus expand on the matching used here and explore controlling for more factors that could impact

attention volume and might even depend on the research area in question. Fourth, our uncertainty analysis is focused on a single platform. While Twitter accounts for about 80% of all posts in the Altmetric database, future work needs to test our content-related findings on other online platforms.

Our results inform efforts concerned with the trustworthiness of science<sup>50-52</sup> and have crucial implications for the handling of retracted papers in academic publishing<sup>53</sup>. First, it is important to retract problematic papers as they are widely shared online by scholars, practitioners, journalists, and the public, some of whom might have no knowledge of their errors. Second, the fact that people tend to question these papers before retraction could be incorporated into efforts to identify questionable results earlier. Third, our results show that retractions come too late to be effective in reducing the spread of potentially misleading knowledge, which makes it imperative for journals to prominently retract problematic papers and alert readers to a retraction notice in a timely manner. This insight could inform journals' handling of retractions. Beyond contributing insights about the online attention received by retracted papers, our work introduces an analytic framework and contributes a public dataset of scientific uncertainty, which opens up new avenues to study the dissemination of retracted papers beyond strictly academic circles.

## **Data and Methods**

**Altmetric database** The dataset that records online attention to research papers is provided by Altmetric (Oct 8, 2019 version). It monitors a range of online sources, searching their posts for links and references to published research. The database we used contains posts for more than 26 million academic records which are primarily research papers. Each post mentioning a paper contains a URL to its unique identifiers, such as Digital Object Identifier (DOI), PubMed ID, and arXiv ID. Altmetric combines different identifiers for each unique paper, and also collates record of attention for different versions of each paper. The database contains a variety of paper metadata, such as the title, authors, journal, publication date, and article type (research papers, books, book chapters, datasets, editorial pieces, etc.). Our analysis was focused on research papers and their posts written in English. For our uncertainty analysis, we collected all tweets referenced in the

Altmetric database using the Twitter API. Due to users' privacy settings and account deletion, we successfully retrieved 90.7% of the 85,411,606 tweets. When sharing the tweets, we provide only tweet IDs due to our data agreement with Twitter, but the content of these tweets can be retrieved using the Twitter API.

*Four types of platforms.* We categorized the 14 major platforms tracked by Altmetric into 4 groups: (1) social media (“twitter”, “facebook”, “googleplus”, “linkedin”, “pinterest”, “reddit”, “video”), (2) news media (“news media”), (3) blogs (“blogs”), and (4) knowledge repositories (“wikipedia”, “patent”, “f1000”, “q&a”, “peer reviews”). Three platforms (“policy”, “misc”, and “weibo”) were excluded as they do not fit into these categories and make up only a tiny fraction of mentions (less than 1%). During data cleaning, we relabelled as “news media” 30 mislabelled “blogs” (out of 1,262), such as “Scientific American”, “Medical Daily”, and “Popular Science”.

*Top news outlets.* We compiled a list of 27 top news outlets that are trustworthy, have high-quality science reporting, and represent popular media brands across a range of platforms according to the Pew Research Center<sup>54,55</sup>. These outlets (hereafter referred to as “top news”) are: *ABC News, BBC News, Breitbart News Network, Business Insider, BuzzFeed, CBS News, CNN News, FOX News, Huffington Post, MSNBC, NBC News, NPR, New York Post, New York Times, Newsweek, PBS, Politico Magazine, TIME Magazine, The Daily Caller, The Guardian, The Hill, USA Today, Vice, Vox.com, Wall Street Journal, Washington Examiner, and Washington Post.*

**Retraction Watch database** We obtained the set of retracted articles from Retraction Watch<sup>38</sup>. This database consists of 21,850 papers retracted by 2020. Each paper has metadata including the title, journal, authors, publication and retraction date. Out of the 9,201 retracted papers published after June 10, 2011, the launch date of *Altmetric.com*, 8,434 also have DOI information. The majority of papers with missing DOI are conference abstracts. We located 4,210 retracted papers in the Altmetric database based on DOI. Due to inconsistencies in recording and tracking retractions, we had to correct some publication and retraction dates. See details in [SI Methods](#).



**Identifying matched sets of control papers** We used two matching processes in the analysis.

*Matching process 1.* To compare the amount of attention received by retracted and non-retracted papers, we constructed using the Altmetric database a set of 5 control papers that were published in the same venue and year as the retracted papers (the retracted paper was excluded if it had less than 5 matches). The publication year controls for potential temporal variations in the amount of public attention to scientific papers online. Matching based on journal ensures that we are comparing papers from similar research areas, at least in the case of disciplinary venues, which might also affect the volume of attention. In total, we matched 19,925 control papers to 3,985 retracted papers.

*Matching process 2.* For each retracted paper, we found all non-retracted papers that were published in the same journal as the retracted one and counted their number of mentions on Twitter after publication during a time frame which was as long as the number of months between the publication of the retracted paper and its retraction. We then matched one control paper for each retracted paper. The matched paper had the closest number of tweets to the mentions of the retracted paper. In total, we found matches for 2,288 retracted papers that had at least one mention on Twitter. The retracted papers and the papers in this second matched set have a similar average number of tweets (based on t-test for paired samples;  $p = 0.06$ ). Note that when additionally requiring that control and retracted papers are published in the same year, we could still find a set of control papers. However, retracted papers had a statistically higher average tweet count than matched control papers identified with this approach. Thus, to ensure that we find close matches in terms of popularity, we increased the candidate pool by only requiring that the control paper was published in the same journal as the retracted paper.

**Defining tracking windows** To ensure that we are using comparable time scales throughout our analyses, we defined tracking windows for the periods after publication, as well as before and after retraction. For the after publication time, we define the tracking window of retracted papers to be the time from their publication to their retraction date or the Altmetric database access date

of October 9, 2019 (whichever comes first). We consider the tracking window of control papers to be the window from their publication date to the Altmetric database access date. For the after retraction time period, we define a reference date for each paper. Retracted papers have their retraction date as their reference date. Control papers have the retraction date of their matched paper as their reference date. The tracking window for both retracted and control papers is from the reference date to the Altmetric database access date.

**Labeling uncertain tweets** We collected all pre-retraction tweets that mention retracted or control papers from either matching procedure (control papers used the retraction date of their matched papers as reference date). When attempting to identify uncertain tweets in this sample, we found that existing automated methods of uncertainty detection did not work well. One reason is that a tweet can share the finding of a paper which can be uncertain itself (e.g., “A recent paper found that drinking coffee may help you live longer”). The language of this tweet may be labeled as uncertain, but the tweet is not actually expressing uncertainty about the results of the paper. We thus decided to take an approach that combines manual labelling with automated heuristics.

Our approach started with constructing a set of keywords to retrieve candidate tweets that may contain uncertainty. Our goal was for this heuristic to have high recall even if the precision was low. That is, we wanted the list to return a very large fraction of the uncertain tweets, even if it included many false positives. To construct the keyword list, we began with a set of seed words such as “wonder”, “concern”, “suspect”. We then collected a random sample of 500 tweets and manually labeled them. Using these labels, we measured the recall of a simple uncertainty attribution based on whether the tweet contained any of the words from the current keyword list. As long as the recall was not high enough, we expanded our keyword list based on the content of tweets that were labeled as being uncertain but did not include any of the keywords. After two iterations, we achieved a recall of 0.9 with a list of 76 keywords (see [SI Text](#)). We applied this heuristic to pre-retraction tweets and found 9,789 tweets containing at least one of the keywords.

Then, we manually labeled each of these candidate tweets as uncertain or not. We recruited

three annotators for this task. One of the authors trained the annotators by providing them a definition of uncertain tweets, examples, and labeling guidelines. The annotators were also familiarized with various aspects of scientific papers and publishing that are commonly criticized and questioned such as the review process, the validity of the data, the generalizability of the findings, etc. The annotators then labeled a batch of 500 tweets and discussed disagreements with one of the authors. They then labeled a second batch of 500 tweets, which resulted in an average Cohen's kappa score of 0.77, indicating substantial inter-rater agreement<sup>56</sup>. The three annotators then labeled all remaining tweets, resulting in 3 labels per tweet.

Out of the 9,789 tweets, 8,512 had unanimous agreement among the 3 annotators, with 927 being labeled as uncertain. The other authors of the paper provided then a fourth label for the 1,277 tweets that had disagreement among the three annotators. After this step, 733 tweets had a majority label (3 vs. 1) and were labeled accordingly. The other 544 tweets remained ambiguous (2 vs. 2; [SI Table S5](#) shows some examples). We treated these ambiguous tweets as not containing uncertainty. The results are qualitatively similar when treating them as positive cases ([SI Fig. S7](#)).

**Labeling retraction-related posts** To label tweets that discuss the retraction of a paper, we first identified all posts that contained the term “retract”, as it is often used in phrases such as “it has been retracted”, “journal retracts paper”, “retraction of that paper”, etc. All such posts were considered to be discussing the retraction incident (a manual inspection of 50 random such posts on each platform shows no false positive cases). We then manually labeled each post that did not contain this keyword as either discussing the retraction or not. Some examples are: “We have to dig deeper! Science is never settled” and “Be careful when you are expected to believe something because ‘its science’.” Using this heuristic, we labeled all posts in news media and blogs. For social media, we labeled all posts from “twitter” as this is the largest platform in that group. For knowledge repositories, we labeled all posts from “wikipedia”, the second largest platform in this category (the largest one is “patent”, which does not usually discuss retraction). Note that since we did not label posts from all platforms, the mention volume of retracted papers after excluding retraction-related content is an overestimation.

1. Ajiferuke, I. & Adekannbi, J. O. Correction and retraction practices in library and information science journals. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science* **52**, 169–183 (2020).
2. Van Noorden, R. Science publishing: The trouble with retractions. *Nature News* **478**, 26–28 (2011).
3. Steen, R. G. Retractions in the scientific literature: is the incidence of research fraud increasing? *Journal of Medical Ethics* **37**, 249–253 (2011).
4. Fang, F. C., Steen, R. G. & Casadevall, A. Misconduct accounts for the majority of retracted scientific publications. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **109**, 17028–17033 (2012).
5. Shuai, X. *et al.* A multidimensional investigation of the effects of publication retraction on scholarly impact. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology* **68**, 2225–2236 (2017).
6. Budd, J. M., Sievert, M. & Schultz, T. R. Phenomena of retraction: reasons for retraction and citations to the publications. *JAMA* **280**, 296–297 (1998).
7. Steen, R. G., Casadevall, A. & Fang, F. C. Why has the number of scientific retractions increased? *PloS One* **8**, e68397 (2013).
8. Dong, Y., Ma, H., Shen, Z. & Wang, K. A century of science: Globalization of scientific collaborations, citations, and innovations. In *KDD*, 1437–1446 (2017).
9. Lee, C. J., Sugimoto, C. R., Zhang, G. & Cronin, B. Bias in peer review. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* **64**, 2–17 (2013).
10. Jones, B. F., Wuchty, S. & Uzzi, B. Multi-university research teams: Shifting impact, geography, and stratification in science. *Science* **322**, 1259–1262 (2008).
11. Cokol, M., Iossifov, I., Rodriguez-Esteban, R. & Rzhetsky, A. How many scientific papers should be retracted? *EMBO Reports* **8**, 422–423 (2007).

12. Van Noorden, R. The trouble with retractions: A surge in withdrawn papers is highlighting weaknesses in the system for handling them. *Nature* **478**, 26–29 (2011).
13. Marcus, A. A scientist’s fraudulent studies put patients at risk. *Science* (2018).
14. Sharma, K. Patterns of retractions from 1981-2020: Does a fraud lead to another fraud? *arXiv:2011.13091* (2020).
15. O’Grady, C. Honesty study was based on fabricated data. *Science* (2021).
16. Ke, Q., Ahn, Y.-Y. & Sugimoto, C. R. A systematic identification and analysis of scientists on twitter. *PLoS One* **12**, e0175368 (2017).
17. Altmetric.com. The 2020 altmetric top 100. <https://www.altmetric.com/top100/2020/> (2020).
18. Mehra, M. R., Desai, S. S., Ruschitzka, F. & Patel, A. N. Retracted: Hydroxychloroquine or chloroquine with or without a macrolide for treatment of covid-19: a multinational registry analysis. *The Lancet* (2020).
19. AlShebli, B., Makovi, K. & Rahwan, T. Retracted article: The association between early career informal mentorship in academic collaborations and junior author performance. *Nature Communications* **11**, 1–8 (2020).
20. Clauset, A., Larremore, D. B. & Sinatra, R. Data-driven predictions in the science of science. *Science* **355**, 477–480 (2017).
21. Sundar, S. S. Effect of source attribution on perception of online news stories. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* **75**, 55–68 (1998).
22. Flanagin, A. J. & Metzger, M. J. Perceptions of internet information credibility. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* **77**, 515–540 (2000).
23. Scheufele, D. A. & Krause, N. M. Science audiences, misinformation, and fake news. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **116**, 7662–7669 (2019).

24. Morris, M. R., Counts, S., Roseway, A., Hoff, A. & Schwarz, J. Tweeting is believing?: understanding microblog credibility perceptions. In *CSCW*, 441–450 (ACM, 2012).
25. Brossard, D. New media landscapes and the science information consumer. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **110**, 14096–14101 (2013).
26. Scheufele, D. A. Communicating science in social settings. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **110**, 14040–14047 (2013).
27. Milkman, K. L. & Berger, J. The science of sharing and the sharing of science. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **111**, 13642–13649 (2014).
28. Su, L. Y.-F., Akin, H., Brossard, D., Scheufele, D. A. & Xenos, M. A. Science news consumption patterns and their implications for public understanding of science. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* **92**, 597–616 (2015).
29. Zakhlebin, I. & Horvát, E.-A. Diffusion of scientific articles across online platforms. In *ICWSM* (2020).
30. Lu, S. F., Jin, G. Z., Uzzi, B. & Jones, B. The retraction penalty: Evidence from the web of science. *Scientific Reports* **3**, 1–5 (2013).
31. Madlock-Brown, C. R. & Eichmann, D. The (lack of) impact of retraction on citation networks. *Science and Engineering Ethics* **21**, 127–137 (2015).
32. Avenell, A., Stewart, F., Grey, A., Gamble, G. & Bolland, M. An investigation into the impact and implications of published papers from retracted research: systematic search of affected literature. *BMJ Open* **9**, e031909 (2019).
33. Budd, J. M., Coble, Z. & Abritis, A. An investigation of retracted articles in the biomedical literature. *Proceedings of the Association for Information Science and Technology* **53**, 1–9 (2016).

34. Wadhwa, R. R., Rasendran, C., Popovic, Z. B., Nissen, S. E. & Desai, M. Y. Temporal trends, characteristics, and citations of retracted articles in cardiovascular medicine. *JAMA Network Open* **4**, e2118263–e2118263 (2021).
35. Serghiou, S., Marton, R. M. & Ioannidis, J. P. Media and social media attention to retracted articles according to altmetric. *PloS One* **16**, e0248625 (2021).
36. Furman, J. L., Jensen, K. & Murray, F. Governing knowledge in the scientific community: Exploring the role of retractions in biomedicine. *Research Policy* **41**, 276–290 (2012).
37. Brainard, J. & You, J. What a massive database of retracted papers reveals about science publishing’s ‘death penalty’. *Science* **25**, 1–5 (2018).
38. Retraction watch. <https://retractionwatch.com/> (2020).
39. Altmetric.com. <https://www.altmetric.com/> (2019).
40. Pei, J. & Jurgens, D. Measuring sentence-level and aspect-level (un)certainly in science communications. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing* (2021).
41. Kwak, H., Lee, C., Park, H. & Moon, S. What is twitter, a social network or a news media? In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on World Wide Web*, 591–600 (2010).
42. Wu, F. & Huberman, B. A. Novelty and collective attention. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **104**, 17599–17601 (2007).
43. McDowall, D., McCleary, R. & Bartos, B. J. *Interrupted time series analysis* (Oxford University Press, 2019).
44. Olson, C. M. *et al.* Publication bias in editorial decision making. *JAMA* **287**, 2825–2828 (2002).
45. Easterbrook, P. J., Gopalan, R., Berlin, J. & Matthews, D. R. Publication bias in clinical research. *The Lancet* **337**, 867–872 (1991).

46. Haunschild, R. & Bornmann, L. Can tweets be used to detect problems early with scientific papers? a case study of three retracted covid-19/sars-cov-2 papers. *Scientometrics* **126**, 5181–5199 (2021).
47. Hargittai, E., Füchslin, T. & Schäfer, M. S. How do young adults engage with science and research on social media? some preliminary findings and an agenda for future research. *Social Media + Society* **4**, 2056305118797720 (2018).
48. Ioannidis, J. P. Why most published research findings are false. *PLoS Medicine* **2**, e124 (2005).
49. Fanelli, D. Opinion: Is science really facing a reproducibility crisis, and do we need it to? *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **115**, 2628–2631 (2018).
50. Jamieson, K. H., McNutt, M., Kiermer, V. & Sever, R. Signaling the trustworthiness of science. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **116**, 19231–19236 (2019).
51. Grimes, D. R., Bauch, C. T. & Ioannidis, J. P. Modelling science trustworthiness under publish or perish pressure. *Royal Society Open Science* **5**, 171511 (2018).
52. Fanelli, D. & Ioannidis, J. P. Us studies may overestimate effect sizes in softer research. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **110**, 15031–15036 (2013).
53. Resnik, D. B., Wager, E. & Kissling, G. E. Retraction policies of top scientific journals ranked by impact factor. *Journal of the Medical Library Association: JMLA* **103**, 136 (2015).
54. Taneja, H. & Yaeger, K. Do people consume the news they trust? In *CHI*, 1–10 (2019).
55. Jurkowitz, M., Mitchell, A., Shearer, E. & Walker, M. Us media polarization and the 2020 election: A nation divided. *Pew Research Center* **24** (2020).
56. McHugh, M. L. Interrater reliability: the kappa statistic. *Biochem. Med.* **22** (2012).

**Acknowledgements** We thank *Altmetric.com* and Retraction Watch for sharing the data used in this study. The authors thank Annika Weinberg and Berit Ginsberg for labelling uncertain tweets, Danaja Maldeniya for



collecting the tweets used in this study, Jordan Braun for copy-editing, and Aparna Ananthasubramaniam, Danaja Maldeniya, and Ed Platt for helpful suggestions and discussion. This work has been partially funded by NSF CAREER Grant No IIS-1943506 and by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research under award number FA9550-19-1-0029.

**Author Contributions** H.P., D.M.R., and E.Á.H. designed the study; H.P. performed the analyses; H.P., D.M.R., and E.Á.H. wrote the manuscript.

**Competing Interests** The authors declare no competing interests.

**Additional Information** Supplemental material is available for this paper.

**Materials & Correspondence** Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to D.M.R. and E.Á.H.

# Dynamics of Cross-Platform Attention to Retracted Papers: Pervasiveness, Audience Skepticism, and Timing of Retractions (Supplemental Materials)

Hao Peng, Daniel M. Romero, Emőke-Ágnes Horvát

(Dated: October 18, 2021)

## I. SI TEXT

### A. Methods

*Establishing publication date.* Our analysis relies on identifying the correct publication and retraction date for each paper. A paper can have different online and print publication dates (online is usually earlier). The Altmetric database provides both “pubdate” and “epubdate” for each paper. The Retraction Watch database also provides the publication date of retracted papers. We thus set the publication date for each retracted paper as the earliest date recorded by the two databases.

*Correcting retraction date.* Similarly, the retraction date can be considered to be the online or the print version of the retraction notice. For example, the official retraction announcement for the paper “Molecular Characterization and Biological Activity of Interferon- $\alpha$  in Indian Peafowl (*Pavo cristatus*)” [2] was published in print on October 1, 2017, while it was posted online already on September 22, 2017. The retraction date recorded in Retraction Watch contains some inconsistencies, which could influence our analysis of pre- and post-retraction attention if not resolved. To ensure that we accurately separate mentions posted before the retraction from those posted after it, we utilize Twitter posts, the largest single platform in terms of attention volume (nearly 80%), to correct the retraction date for each paper. Our assumption is that if any tweet mentions the retraction of a paper (e.g., “.@PLOSONE announced #retraction of this @XYZ paper, notice will come in 2 weeks. [URL]”) posted before the recorded retraction date, the effective retraction date should be at least as early as the time of this tweet.

We first identified 572 tweets posted before each paper’s retraction date (as per the Retraction Watch database) such that the tweets contain the string “retract” in its lowercase text. Not all such tweets are announcing a retraction (e.g., “Please retract this paper!!!” and “How is it possible that this study hasn’t been retracted?”). Hence, we manually labeled these tweets and found that 469 of them contained a statement of retraction. We corrected the retraction date for 381 papers based on this set of labeled tweets. A manual inspection of a random sample of 20 papers from the remaining retracted papers shows no error in the retraction date recorded in the Retraction Watch database.

### B. 76 uncertainty keywords

Our iterative process to develop a heuristic for pre-selecting potentially uncertain tweets has resulted in the following keywords: verify, problem, really, pretend, fake, raise, believe, story, possible, data, concern, crackpot, intelligence, standard, correction, possibly, wonder, laughable, stupid, distrust, pseudoscience, conclusive, insult, surprise, dumb, unclear, peer review, suspect, criticism, suspicious, replication, unsure, manipulation, ?, validate, plausible, controversy, shame, plausibly, non-expert, confounding, confusing, serious, academic, joke, chance, question, shock, fraud, controversial, nonsense, uncertain, manipulated, replicate, embarrass, verified, confounder, validation, peer-review, claim, publish, not sure, lol, intelligent, reputable, reviewer, reputation, warrant, lying, doubt, lie, academy, flaw, retract, believable, confuse.

## II. SI FIGURES




FIG. S1. **After-publication mentions.** **A-E**, Average cumulative number of mentions received within 3 months after publication on four types of platforms and in top news outlets for both retracted and control papers. **F**, Average cumulative number of mentions on Twitter after excluding uncertain tweets. Comparisons across different types of platforms show that retracted papers receive more attention after publication than non-retracted papers. Error bars indicate 95% confidence intervals. All comparisons shown here and hereafter are based on the control set created with matching process 1 (see details in Data and Methods, main text).




FIG. S2. Ratio of the average number of mentions of retracted papers to that of non-retracted papers on each type of platform. Relative to non-retracted papers, retracted ones tend to be favored more in the amount of coverage on news media, including top news, and knowledge repositories than on social media and blogs. However, the differences are not statistically significant due to imprecise estimation. Error bars indicate 95% bootstrapped confidence intervals.




FIG. S3. **Number of followers for tweets that mention research papers within a given number of months after their publication.** **A**, Average cumulative number of tweets received within 6 months after publication by retracted and control papers. **B**, Same as **A** but extended to the number of followers of those tweets. **C**, Average number of followers per tweet. Error bars indicate 95% confidence intervals. This plot shows that retracted papers indeed reach more people after publication than control papers.




FIG. S4. **After-retraction mentions.** **A-E**, Average number of mentions received within 6 months after retraction on four types of platforms and in top news outlets for 3,313 retracted and 16,565 control papers. Comparisons across different types of platforms show that retracted papers receive more attention even after their retraction than non-retracted papers (solid orange lines). However, excluding retraction-related posts eliminates the surplus of attention that retracted papers receive (dashed orange lines). Error bars indicate 95% confidence intervals.




FIG. S5. **Average number of mentions within 3 months before and after retraction.** Trends are shown on four types of platforms and in top news outlets for 3,084 retracted and 14,865 control papers. In the case of retracted papers, we excluded all after-retraction posts that discussed the retraction in some form. For consistency, we also excluded posts that contain the phrase “retract” when referring to both control and retracted papers in the whole time period. Comparisons across different types of platforms show that retracted papers do not receive statistically more mentions than control papers before or after retraction. Error bars indicate 95% confidence intervals.




FIG. S6. **Before- and after-retraction mentions on Twitter.** Average number of tweets received within 6 months before and after retraction for both retracted and control papers. We excluded after-retraction tweets that discuss the retraction itself for retracted papers. We also excluded tweets that contain the phrase “retract” for both groups of papers in the whole time period. For all papers, we removed uncertain tweets before retraction. Error bars indicate 95% confidence intervals. This result shows that retracted papers are discussed not statistically more often than control papers right before their retraction.




FIG. S7. **Average cumulative fraction of tweets containing uncertainty within 6 months after publication.** We treat ambiguous tweets as expressing uncertainty. Retracted papers receive a higher fraction of uncertain tweets. We focused on retracted papers that have at least one tweet mention before retraction. Error bars indicate 95% confidence intervals.

## III. SI TABLES

Platform type	Time window	Mentions coeff.	Pub. year coeff.	Num. authors coeff.
Social Media	1	0.002**	-0.073***	-0.011*
Social Media	2	0.002**	-0.074***	-0.011*
Social Media	3	0.002**	-0.074***	-0.011*
Social Media	4	0.002**	-0.074***	-0.011*
Social Media	5	0.002**	-0.074***	-0.011*
Social Media	6	0.002**	-0.074***	-0.011*
Blogs	1	0.140***	-0.072***	-0.011*
Blogs	2	0.128***	-0.072***	-0.011*
Blogs	3	0.134***	-0.072***	-0.012*
Blogs	4	0.137***	-0.072***	-0.012*
Blogs	5	0.141***	-0.072***	-0.012*
Blogs	6	0.140***	-0.072***	-0.012*
Knowledge Repositories	1	0.243**	-0.072***	-0.011*
Knowledge Repositories	2	0.291***	-0.071***	-0.012*
Knowledge Repositories	3	0.340***	-0.071***	-0.012*
Knowledge Repositories	4	0.338***	-0.070***	-0.012*
Knowledge Repositories	5	0.360***	-0.070***	-0.013*
Knowledge Repositories	6	0.389***	-0.070***	-0.013*
News Media	1	0.029***	-0.075***	-0.011*
News Media	2	0.027***	-0.075***	-0.011*
News Media	3	0.025***	-0.075***	-0.011*
News Media	4	0.022***	-0.075***	-0.011*
News Media	5	0.021***	-0.075***	-0.011*
News Media	6	0.019***	-0.075***	-0.011*
Top News	1	0.198**	-0.073***	-0.011*
Top News	2	0.198**	-0.073***	-0.011*
Top News	3	0.194**	-0.073***	-0.011*
Top News	4	0.200***	-0.073***	-0.011*
Top News	5	0.195***	-0.073***	-0.011*
Top News	6	0.191***	-0.073***	-0.011*

TABLE S1. Association between number of mentions and retraction within a given number of months after publication. Models control for the publication year and number of authors and are set up to predict whether a paper is retracted or not. Logistic regression coefficients indicate statistically significant correlations between the number of mentions and whether a paper is retracted or not. Each row corresponds to each combination of platform type and time window (in months). The coefficients reveal that one additional mention on knowledge repositories and blogs has a larger impact on retraction probability than a mention on news and social media. It also shows that the magnitude of association between mentions and retraction is relatively stable over time on social media, blogs, and in top news. However, this association is gradually decreasing on news media, indicating that retracted papers enjoy a surplus of popularity mostly in the initial stage of dissemination, and that they experience a faster attention decay on news media than control papers. In contrast, the attention gap between two groups of papers is increasing on knowledge repositories. Differences in temporal patterns on the investigated platforms may be related to different spreading mechanisms and platform audiences, which deserves further investigation in future work. Significance levels: \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , and \*  $p < 0.05$ .

Platform type	Time window	Mentions coeff.	Pub. year coeff.	Num. authors coeff.
Twitter	1	0.003***	-0.047***	-0.005
Twitter	2	0.003***	-0.048***	-0.005
Twitter	3	0.003***	-0.048***	-0.005
Twitter	4	0.003***	-0.048***	-0.005
Twitter	5	0.003***	-0.048***	-0.005
Twitter	6	0.003***	-0.048***	-0.005

TABLE S2. Logistic regression coefficients for the variables: number of mentions on Twitter (excluding uncertain tweets) within a given time window of publication, publication year, and number of authors. The dependent variable is whether a paper is retracted or not. Significance levels: \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , and \*  $p < 0.05$ .

Platform type	Time window	Frac. uncertain tw coeff.	Pub. year coeff.	Num. authors coeff.
Twitter	1	1.195**	-0.045***	-0.004
Twitter	2	1.007*	-0.045***	-0.004
Twitter	3	1.013*	-0.045***	-0.004
Twitter	4	1.210***	-0.045***	-0.004
Twitter	5	1.298***	-0.045***	-0.004
Twitter	6	1.396***	-0.045***	-0.004

TABLE S3. Same as Table S2, but for the fraction of uncertain tweets received after publication.

	Coefficient	P-value	95% Confidence Interval
X1	-0.652	0.006	[-1.063, -0.241]
X2	0.256	0.778	[-1.770, 2.282]
X3	0.619	0.040	[0.038, 1.199]
Intercept	3.886	0.001	[2.287, 5.486]

TABLE S4. Coefficients of the interrupted time series analysis[1] using the average monthly mentions on Twitter for retracted papers (6 months before and 6 months after retraction). We excluded uncertain tweets before retraction and retraction-related tweets after retraction, as well as tweets containing the phrase “retract” throughout.  $X1$  represents the attention trend before retraction. It is negative and significant, indicating that the attention is decreasing over time.  $X2$  represents the change in attention immediately after retraction. It is not significant, suggesting that retraction has no immediate effect on attention change.  $X3$  represents the difference between before- and after retraction slopes. It is positive and significant, indicating that the attention volume is still decreasing, but the magnitude has decreased.

Lol! What a conclusion. [url]
Darlings, another mediterranean diet study claiming lowfat, not lowfat that proves nothing. fat=30% [url] #vegan #dietitian
I can't believe I haven't seen anyone in my feed mentioning this grade. A bull shit [url]
Isn't osmium a tad toxic to be an antitumour agent? (I haven't read the paper yet...) - [url]
Religion and altruism correlated. How exactly is this current biology? [url]

TABLE S5. Five examples of ambiguous tweets with respect to the level of uncertainty. Note that the content of each tweet has been paraphrased for anonymization.

- 
- [1] David McDowall, Richard McCleary, and Bradley J Bartos. *Interrupted time series analysis*. Oxford University Press, 2019.
- [2] Hongjing Zhao, Yu Wang, Juanjuan Liu, Yizhi Shao, Jinglun Li, Hongliang Chai, and Mingwei Xing. Retracted: Molecular characterization and biological activity of interferon- $\alpha$  in indian peafowl (*pavo cristatus*). *DNA and Cell Biology*, 2017.