| Table of contents | |
|-------------------|--|
| 2025-02-03 | |

Meeting Notes

2025-03-13

Meeting Notes 2025-03-13

2025-02-03

• Walked Mark through the in-progress prototype for the claims-based frame extraction (Document will be uploaded later this week).

- Current state of the progress:
 - Take the ABC demo dataset.
 - Use LLM to extract claims made about energy sources.
 - Use a sentiment model to detect the 'vibe' of the claim.
 - Compare these claims to the distribution of the overall discourse to determine if the article frames a piece in a way that is consistent with the 'ground truth'.
 - If it doesn't, then we can also see if it is being contrarian (both polarised and biased against renewables) or presenting a false neutrality (when presenting both sides when one side is not truly present in the ground truth).
- Improvements that I want to make before next fortnight:
 - Multidimensional sentiment analysis: Checking sentiment across multiple concepts, such as cost, harm, effectiveness.
 - Add in additional energy infrastructure.
 - Add in a single score based on the probability the article follows the distribution in the ground truth.
- Will send a better explainer around this week, would love feedback from Simon and Libby

2025-03-04

- I have the demo for the 'claims based extractor' done, now I just need to get the dataset working.
- From the feedback from Simon, I agree that this is a bit reductionist, but I think it is less reductionist than most of the other work.
 - In response to this, I do want to expand the number of dimensions that I am looking at
 evaluations for. Currently, I do kind of just have an economic and 'other' dimension,
 but I think I can do better.
 - This is something that I want to get out after I set the dataset, because I think these will be better as emergent properties rather than things that I think of myself.
- Some other concerns about the current method:
 - Is the framing independent? I know that the probability that one claim occurs will not be independent of the other claims, but does this matter and does it impact it enough to lose the nice explainability?
 - Are there things not being picked up by the extractor?
- For next time, lets get the dataset (meeting with librarian to discuss).
- Present findings to the larger supervision group. Put together a bit of an intermediary commencement document