


**Meta Prompts Generated**  
Assign Roles:  
- Prosecution                      - Defense  
- Judge

Opening Statement / Suspicious News

A study allegedly published by the "Global Health Research Center" claims that drinking 5 cups of coffee every day can extend life expectancy by 30 years.

Round 1



**Prosecution (A): Argue the news is fake.**  
This article is highly misleading and lacks scientific credibility. Firstly, the so-called 'Global Health Research Center' is not a recognized organization in the scientific community. Secondly, .....


**Defense (B): Argue the news is genuine.**  
While the article may seem extraordinary, it is possible that the study represents a breakthrough in nutritional science. The lack of immediate access to the full study does not necessarily discredit the findings. Furthermore,

**Judge's Interim Verdict 1:** The Prosecution raises valid concerns about the article's lack of transparency and credible sources. However, the Defense argues that the potential for groundbreaking research cannot be dismissed outright. The verdict remains inconclusive, and further evidence or arguments are needed.

Round 1:  
Prosecution: Argues **Fake**  
Defense: Argues **Genuine**  
Judge: **Interim Verdict**

Role Switching  
Prosecution ↔ Defense

Round 2



**[Role switched] Prosecution (B): Argue the news is fake.**  
After reviewing the claims, it is clear that this article relies on sensationalism rather than science. No credible research institution would publish such extraordinary claims without rigorous testing and peer review. Furthermore, .....

**[Role switched] Defense (A): Argue the news is genuine.**  
Even if the article lacks some details, the scientific community often begins with broad claims to generate interest and funding. Additionally, many health trends, such as the benefits, .....

**Judge's Interim Verdict 2:** The Prosecution (B) makes a compelling case by emphasizing the sensationalist nature of the article and highlighting the lack of rigorous testing and peer-reviewed evidence. On the other hand, the Defense (A) presents a valid counterargument by framing the article within the broader context of scientific communication, .....

Round 2:  
**New Prosecution:** Argues **Fake**  
**New Defense:** Argues **Genuine**  
Judge: **Revised Verdict**

Judge's Revised Verdict

**Verdict:** The news is **Fake**.

**Judge's Final Ruling**  
- Fake or Genuine Verdict  
- Explanation Based on Both Rounds



**Judge Explanation:** The lack of verifiable sources, peer-reviewed evidence, and detailed research methods overwhelmingly suggest that this article is not credible. While the Defense makes a valid point about the speculative nature of early research, the claims made in this article are too extraordinary and poorly substantiated to be taken as genuine.