



Pharma Twittersphere

Whydot's market research study and syndicated advisory service benchmarking how pharma companies engage via Twitter

About Pharma Twittersphere

Pharma Twittersphere is Whydot's market research study and syndicated advisory service benchmarking how pharma companies engage via twitter. The study objectives are to analyze how companies use twitter to engage in social media, as well as who follows pharma twitter accounts: segmenting followers by stakeholder, activity and therapeutic area interest.

The study is fielded annually in Q3 among the 15 pharma twitter accounts below:



The pharma twitter analysis is probably the most extensive study undertaken on the topic up to date: a benchmark of 15 pharma twitter accounts and its 50,000 followers! We chose only corporate communication accounts to ensure comparability. All accounts benchmarked were Global, except for AstraZeneca, Boehringer Ingelheim and GSK, where also US accounts were included.

RESEARCH TOPICS COVERED

1. Pharma Twittersphere
 - Overview: How does the pharma presence on twitter compare to other industries? To overall twitter followers?
 - Follower Overlap: To what degree do followers overlap between pharma companies? Which stakeholders follow/interact with pharma most?
2. Pharma Geography benchmark:
 - Where are followers located? Which countries are over/underrepresented?
 - How does the geographic make up of followers compare to overall twitter statistics or the countries' population? Amongst pharma accounts?
 - Does localization of twitter accounts work? Where should you localize accounts?
3. Pharma Engagement Matrix
 - Twitter Account Benchmark: Which companies use twitter to communicate with their stakeholders? How is their engagement evolving?
 - Twitter Echo: Which stakeholders engage most with pharma content on twitter? (@replies, RTs)
4. Follower Stakeholder segments:
 - How can stakeholders on twitter be segmented? Which segments are over/underrepresented versus country demographics?
5. Pharma Stakeholder Benchmark
 - Which stakeholders should pharma target with which information? Which companies attract most relevant stakeholders?

The following report focuses on the stakeholder segmentation of pharma twitter accounts and how it compares to overall demographics and twitter use.

Table of content

Separating the wheat from chaff	7
Segmentation basics	8
<i>Fig. 4.1 Segments and subsegment categories of pharma stakeholders</i>	8
<i>Fig. 4.2 Therapeutic and disease area interests of pharma stakeholders</i>	9
<i>Fig. 4.3: Pharma followers by size and sum of followers</i>	10
<i>Fig. 4.4: Pharma followers by size; entity vs. individual account</i>	11
<i>Fig.4.5: Pharma followers by size; gender segmentation of individual accounts</i>	11
<i>Fig.4.6: Pharma followers by size; main interests of accounts</i>	12
Stakeholder anatomy	13
<i>Fig. 4.8: Stakeholder segments by size of number of followers</i>	13
<i>Fig. 4.9: Stakeholder segments by size of number of followers and reach, in mio</i>	14
<i>Fig. 4.10: Stakeholder segments by size of number of followers and tweets, in mio</i>	14
Therapeutic focus	16
<i>Fig.4.11: Pharma followers main therapy/disease area focus by account</i>	16
<i>Fig. 4.11: Stakeholder segments by top 5 therapy interest</i>	18
<i>Fig. 4.12: Stakeholder segments by top 5 therapy interest, by sum of followers (reach)</i>	18
Reach redefined, reconsidered and reframed	19
The Media	19
<i>Fig. 4.14: Wordle of all profile information from pharma media followers</i>	19
<i>Fig. 4.15: Media by percentage of count and sum of followers (reach)</i>	20
<i>Fig. 4.16: Top traditional media amongst pharma followers, by sum of followers (reach)</i>	21
<i>Fig. 4.17: Top investor relations media amongst pharma followers, by sum of followers (reach)</i>	22

<i>Fig. 4.18: Med/science news by therapeutic area, number of pharma followers</i>	23
<i>Fig. 4.19: Top Med/science news amongst pharma followers, by sum of followers (reach)</i>	23
<i>Fig. 4.20: Media subsegments by geography, n=802</i>	24
<i>Fig. 4.21: Top relevant journalists following pharma</i>	25

The Health care professionals **26**

<i>Fig. 4.22: Map of HCPs amongst pharma followers</i>	26
<i>Fig. 4.23: HCPs by percentage of count and sum of followers (reach)</i>	27
<i>Fig. 4.24 HCP sub-segments by size of accounts and number of followers</i>	27
<i>Fig. 4.25: Top physicians that follow pharma</i>	28
<i>Fig. 4.26: HCPs and physicians by therapeutic focus</i>	29
<i>Fig. 4.27: Top health care centers amongst pharma followers</i>	30
<i>Fig. 4.28: Top scientists amongst pharma followers</i>	30
<i>Fig. 4.29: HCP sub- segments by geography</i>	31

The Advocacy **32**

<i>Fig. 4.30: Top advocacy groups amongst pharma followers</i>	32
<i>Fig. 4.31: Advocacy by percentage of count and sum of followers (reach)</i>	32
<i>Fig. 4.32: Top non-patient advocacy groups amongst pharma followers</i>	33
<i>Fig. 4.33: Patient advocacy groups by therapeutic and disease interest</i>	34
<i>Fig. 4.34: Top Oncology patient advocacy groups amongst pharma followers</i>	35
<i>Fig. 4.35: Top Infectious disease patient advocacy groups amongst pharma followers</i>	35
<i>Fig. 4.36: Top Endocrinology patient advocacy groups amongst pharma followers</i>	36
<i>Fig. 4.37: Advocacy sub-segments by geography</i>	37

The Influe-holders **38**

<i>Fig. 4.38: "Influe-holders" by percentage of count and sum of followers (reach)</i>	39
<i>Fig. 4.39: E-patients by therapeutic and disease interest</i>	39

<i>Fig. 4.40: Top e-patients amongst pharma followers</i>	40
<i>Fig. 4.41: Top “Influe-holders”, non e-patient, amongst pharma followers</i>	40
<i>Fig. 4.42: “Influe-holder” sub-segments by geography</i>	41
The Pharma	42
<i>Fig. 4.43: Pharma by percentage of count and sum of followers (reach)</i>	42
<i>Fig. 4.44: Pharma sub-segments by geography</i>	43
The Payors	44
<i>Fig. 4.45: Payors by percentage of count and sum of followers (reach)</i>	44
<i>Fig. 4.46: Top “Payors” amongst pharma followers</i>	45
Minding the gap	46
<i>Fig. 4.47: US hospital centers using twitter vs. pharma followers</i>	47
<i>Fig. 4.48: Twitter accounts participating at ASCO vs. pharma followers</i>	49
Conclusion	50