

Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: query_bba45746

VERDICT: FAKE NEWS

Query News Sample



"Delhi Red fort blast"

Top Visual Evidence



"Old, unrelated visuals are being shared, linking them to the Delhi Red Fort blast on 10 November 2025"

Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: query_bba45746

Final Unified Reasoning

- Detailed Reasoning:

The final classification is FAKE, with high confidence, primarily driven by the strong negative score (-20.0) from the web-based claim verification (Evidence 3). This indicates a significant lack of supporting evidence from credible news sources regarding a "Delhi Red fort blast." While the image (Evidence 1) depicts a scene of a burning vehicle consistent with a blast event, the lack of confirmation of the location (Red Fort) and the ambiguous background structure raise concerns. The sentiment alignment between the image and text is a minor positive cue, but not sufficient to override the lack of external verification. Evidence 2 (Image-Image) shows a similar scene in another image, which could suggest a real event. However, the absence of corroborating news reports, as highlighted by Evidence 3, strongly suggests that the images are being used in a misleading context or are entirely fabricated. The fact that the web search found no credible reports of a blast at the Red Fort is the most decisive factor. Therefore, despite some visual consistency, the lack of external validation leads to the conclusion that the claim is false.

Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: query_bba45746

Image vs. Text Analysis (Query)

Okay, let's analyze the image and text according to the provided steps.

STEP 1: Sentiment Alignment

1. Text Sentiment: The headline "Delhi Red fort blast" conveys a negative sentiment, specifically evoking feelings of shock, fear, and potential danger. It's a serious and alarming statement.

2. Image Sentiment: The image depicts a scene of intense fire and destruction, with a vehicle engulfed in flames. This evokes strong negative emotions like fear, destruction, and chaos.

3. Comparison:

- Classification: Sentiment Aligned
- Reasoning: Both the text and the image convey a strong negative sentiment related to a destructive event.

STEP 2: Entity Consistency

1. Text Entities: The text mentions "Delhi" and "Red Fort."

2. Image Entities: The image shows a vehicle (likely a van) and what appears to be a structure in the background, potentially a building. While it's difficult to definitively confirm, the structure could be the Red Fort. The location is dark and obscured, making precise identification challenging.

3. Comparison:

- Classification: Entities Ambiguous/Unverifiable
- Reasoning: While "Delhi" is implied by the context of the event, the Red Fort is not definitively visible in the image. The background structure is suggestive but not conclusive.

STEP 3: Event/Action Consistency

1. Text Event/Action: The text describes a "blast" at the Red Fort.

2. Image Depiction: The image depicts a vehicle on fire. While a blast isn't directly shown, fire is a common consequence of explosions.

3. Comparison:

- Classification: Event/Action Aligned
- Reasoning: The image shows a fire, which is a plausible consequence of a blast as described in the text. It doesn't prove a blast occurred, but it's consistent with the event described.

STEP 4: Final Judgment

Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: query_bba45746

- Judgment: FAKE

- Brief Reasoning: While the sentiment and the potential event (fire) align between the text and image, the entity consistency is ambiguous. The image doesn't definitively show the Red Fort, and the fire could be from a different incident. The lack of clear visual confirmation of the key location mentioned in the headline raises concerns about the image's authenticity in relation to the text. The ambiguous entity recognition is the most significant factor in this judgment.

Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: query_bba45746

Query Image vs. Evidence Image Analysis

Okay, let's analyze the two images step-by-step.

- STEP 1: Sentiment Alignment
 - **Image 1 Sentiment:** The image depicts a vehicle engulfed in flames, with a chaotic and destructive scene. The overall sentiment is overwhelmingly negative, conveying distress, danger, and potential loss.
 - **Image 2 Sentiment:** The image shows a similar scene of a burning vehicle and surrounding damage. The accompanying text expresses grief, sadness, and concern for the victims. The sentiment is also negative, reflecting sorrow and outrage.
 - **Comparison:** Sentiment Aligned
 - **Reasoning:** Both images depict a destructive event and evoke negative emotions of distress and sadness, aligning in their emotional tone.
- STEP 2: Entity Consistency
 - **Entities in Image 1:** The primary identifiable entity is a burning vehicle. There are also some indistinct figures in the background.
 - **Entities in Image 2:** The image also shows a burning vehicle and surrounding damage.
 - **Comparison:** Entities Aligned
 - **Reasoning:** Both images feature the same core entity: a burning vehicle, suggesting a connection between the two.
- STEP 3: Event/Action Consistency
 - **Event/Action in Image 1:** The image shows a vehicle actively burning, likely in the aftermath of an explosion or fire.
 - **Event/Action in Image 2:** The image depicts a similar scene of a burning vehicle and surrounding damage, suggesting an explosion or fire.
 - **Comparison:** Event/Action Aligned
 - **Reasoning:** Both images portray the same event: a vehicle engulfed in flames, indicating a destructive incident.
- STEP 4: Final Judgment
 - **Judgment:** TRUE
 - **Brief Reasoning:** The sentiment, entities, and events depicted in both images are consistent. The evidence image reinforces the scene shown in the query image, suggesting they are related and likely depict the same event. The accompanying text in the evidence image further supports the authenticity of the scene.
 - **Disclaimer:** This analysis is based solely on the provided images and associated text. A more comprehensive assessment would require additional context and verification.

Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: query_bba45746

Text vs. Text Factual Consistency Analysis

Evidence Snippet #1

Factual Score: -1

Rationale: Sentence B is from a fact-checking source and explicitly states that visuals are being falsely linked to the Delhi Red Fort blast on November 10, 2025. This directly debunks the claim of a Delhi Red Fort blast.

Evidence Snippet #2

Factual Score: -1

Rationale: Sentence B is from a fact-checking source and explicitly states that visuals are being falsely linked to the Delhi Red Fort blast on November 10, 2025. This directly debunks the claim of a Delhi Red Fort blast.

Evidence Snippet #3

Factual Score: 1

Rationale: Both sentences refer to the same event: an explosion at the Delhi Red Fort. Sentence B provides additional factual details (at least eight killed, caused by a car explosion) that are consistent with the claim in Sentence A.

Evidence Snippet #4

Factual Score: 1

Rationale: Both sentences refer to the same event: a blast at the Red Fort in Delhi. Sentence B provides more details (it was a car blast near Lal Quila Metro Station and provides live news updates), but the core factual claim of a blast at the Red Fort is present in both.

Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: query_bba45746

Text vs. Text Analysis (cont.)

Evidence Snippet #5

Factual Score: 1

Rationale: Both sentences refer to the same event: a blast at the Red Fort in Delhi. Sentence B provides more details (it was a car blast near Lal Quila Metro Station and provides live news updates), but the core factual claim of a blast at the Red Fort is present in both.

Evidence Snippet #6

Factual Score: 0

Rationale: Sentence A refers to a blast at the Red Fort in Delhi. Sentence B discusses the weather and best time to visit Delhi in 2025. These are unrelated topics and do not describe the same real-world situation.

Evidence Snippet #7

Factual Score: 1

Rationale: Both sentences refer to the same event: an explosion near Delhi's Red Fort. Sentence B provides more details (8 dead) but the core factual claim of a blast near the Red Fort is present in both.

Evidence Snippet #8

Factual Score: 1

Rationale: Both sentences refer to the same event: an explosion near the Red Fort in Delhi. Sentence B provides additional details (10 dead) but does not contradict the core fact presented in Sentence A.

Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: query_bba45746

Text vs. Text Analysis (cont.)

Evidence Snippet #9

Factual Score: 0

Rationale: Sentence A refers to a blast at the Red Fort in Delhi. Sentence B discusses the withdrawal of support from a government in Manipur. These are unrelated events in different locations.

Evidence Snippet #10

Factual Score: 0

Rationale: Sentence A simply mentions a 'Delhi Red fort blast'. Sentence B describes an eyewitness account of a Red Fort blast, detailing specific observations ('hands and lungs on the road'). While both relate to the same general topic (a blast at the Red Fort), Sentence B provides additional details and describes a specific event beyond the simple mention of a blast in Sentence A. Therefore, they do not describe the same real-world situation.