

14 June 2026

Please note the correction at the end of the story that lists the updates:

A graphic which previously appeared in this story has been removed. It included the names of non-existent political parties in South Australia. The story has also been updated to note the use of Gemini in data analysis, remove an incorrect reference to statewide preference flows and include additional details about preference flows in the seats of Elizabeth and Reynell.

Answers to Media Watch questions from an Australian Financial Review spokesperson:

1) What data was used to create the now removed graph on the South Australian elections?

The raw data was published by the South Australian Electoral Commission and then analysed by the AFR's data journalist, with the assistance of Gemini, in order to examine preference flows. <https://result.ecsa.sa.gov.au/>

2) How were the non-existent parties created?

They were created by Gemini when the journalist was analysing the data

3) Can we infer from the correction AI was used to create the now-removed South Australian graph?

AI was not used to make the graphic, but was in the research information which was then entered in to the graphic.

4) We consulted with Antony Green about this story and he says this kind of data hasn't been published for the South Australian elections. Where does the data which informed the South Australian graph come from?

See the answer to question 1

5)Mr Green also says that his analysis shows that at best 20% of Greens preferences flowed to One Nation. How did you come to the conclusion a third of Greens votes flowed to One Nation in South Australia?

The story has been corrected to specify that about one-third of Greens preferences flowed to One Nation in the seats of Elizabeth and Reynell. This mistake was made by the journalist and is not related to AI use.