

# Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: query\_016bfdc8

**VERDICT: TRUE NEWS**

## Query News Sample



"Blast in Delhi Near Red fort"

## Top Visual Evidence



"Live Delhi Blast: 10 dead in explosion near Red Fort Metro ..."

# Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: query\_016bfdc8

## Final Unified Reasoning

- Detailed Reasoning:

The final classification is REAL, with high confidence, primarily due to the strong support (0.9) from the web-based claim verification (Evidence 3). This indicates a high likelihood that a blast did occur near the Red Fort in Delhi, aligning with the news post's claim.

- Arguments FOR the REAL classification:

- **Strong Web-Based Verification:** Evidence 3 provides the most compelling support, indicating a high probability that the event described in the text actually happened. This outweighs concerns raised by other evidence.

- **Sentiment Alignment:** Evidence 1 shows alignment in sentiment between the text and the image. Both convey a negative and destructive event, which is consistent with a blast.

- **Event/Action Alignment:** Evidence 1 also notes alignment in the event/action. The image depicts a fire, which could be a consequence of a blast.

- Arguments AGAINST the REAL classification (and why they are less impactful):

- **Entity Ambiguity (Evidence 1):** The image doesn't definitively show the Red Fort. However, the text only states "near" the Red Fort, allowing for some distance. The urban setting in the image is consistent with Delhi.

- **Image-Image Mismatch (Evidence 2):** The images are inconsistent in terms of sentiment, entities, and event/action. However, this doesn't necessarily invalidate the claim. The initial image could be a snapshot of the immediate aftermath, while the other image shows a later scene. It's possible the images were taken at different times or locations related to the same event. The inconsistency in the images doesn't disprove the claim itself.

Given the strong support from web-based verification, the other evidence, while presenting some inconsistencies, does not sufficiently refute the claim. Therefore, the news post is classified as REAL.

# Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: query\_016bfdc8

## 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 text "Blast in Delhi Near Red Fort" conveys a negative sentiment due to the implication of a dangerous and destructive event. It evokes feelings of concern, fear, and potential tragedy.

**2. Image Sentiment:** The image depicts a scene of intense fire and destruction, with a vehicle engulfed in flames. This strongly conveys a negative sentiment – fear, chaos, and devastation.

**3. Comparison:**

- Classification: Sentiment Aligned
- Reasoning: Both the text and the image evoke a negative emotional tone 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 and what appears to be a street scene. While it's difficult to definitively confirm the location, the presence of buildings in the background could suggest an urban environment like Delhi. The Red Fort is not visually identifiable in the image.

**3. Comparison:**

- Classification: Entities Ambiguous/Unverifiable
- Reasoning: While "Delhi" is plausible given the urban setting, the Red Fort is not visible. The image doesn't definitively confirm the location mentioned in the text.

### STEP 3: Event/Action Consistency

**1. Text Event/Action:** The text describes a "Blast."

**2. Image Depiction:** The image depicts a vehicle on fire, suggesting a significant event involving fire and potential explosion.

**3. Comparison:**

- Classification: Event/Action Aligned
- Reasoning: The image shows a fire, which could be a consequence of a blast as described in the text. While not a direct depiction of an explosion, the fire aligns with the potential aftermath of such an event.

### STEP 4: Final Judgment

# Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: query\_016bfdc8

---

- Judgment: FAKE

- Brief Reasoning: While the sentiment and event/action are aligned (both convey a negative, destructive event), the entity consistency is ambiguous. The image doesn't definitively show the Red Fort, a key location mentioned in the text. This lack of verifiable location information raises concerns about the image's authenticity in relation to the text. The image could depict a fire in any urban area, not specifically near the Red Fort. Therefore, the pairing is likely fabricated or misleading.

# Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: query\_016bfdc8

## 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 dominant color is orange/red, associated with fire and danger. The overall sentiment is strongly **negative**, conveying fear, destruction, and potential tragedy.
  - **Image 2 Sentiment:** The image shows a scene with people gathered, possibly observing or responding to an event. The atmosphere appears somber and subdued, with a sense of aftermath or investigation. The sentiment is **negative**, but less intense than Image 1, suggesting a more reflective or investigative mood.
  - **Comparison:** Sentiment Mismatch
  - **Reasoning:** Image 1 is highly charged with the immediate impact of a destructive event, while Image 2 shows a more subdued, post-event scene. The emotional intensity differs significantly.

- STEP 2: Entity Consistency
  - **Entities in Image 1:** The most prominent entity is a vehicle (likely a van) that is on fire. There are also indistinct figures in the background.
  - **Entities in Image 2:** The image shows a building, a group of people, and what appears to be a train station or similar structure. There is no visible vehicle on fire.
  - **Comparison:** Entities Mismatch
  - **Reasoning:** While both images depict people and a structure, the key element of Image 1 (the burning vehicle) is absent in Image 2.

- STEP 3: Event/Action Consistency
  - **Event/Action in Image 1:** The primary event is a vehicle fire, likely an accident or deliberate act of arson. The scene is dynamic and chaotic.
  - **Event/Action in Image 2:** The event appears to be a gathering of people, possibly observing the aftermath of an incident or conducting an investigation. The scene is static and observational.
  - **Comparison:** Event/Action Mismatch
  - **Reasoning:** Image 1 shows an active event (fire), while Image 2 depicts a response to an event, not the event itself. The actions and scenes are fundamentally different.

- STEP 4: Final Judgment
  - **Judgment:** FAKE
  - **Brief Reasoning:** The combination of Sentiment Mismatch , Entities Mismatch , and Event/Action Mismatch strongly suggests that the images are not directly related or intended to represent a consistent narrative. The images likely depict different events or locations, and pairing them together is misleading. The dramatic fire in Image 1 is not supported by the calmer, post-event scene in Image 2.

# Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: query\_016bfdc8

## Text vs. Text Factual Consistency Analysis

### Evidence Snippet #1

**Factual Score:** 1

**Rationale:** Both sentences describe the same event: a blast near the Red Fort in Delhi. Sentence B provides additional details (10 dead, explosion near Red Fort Metro) which are consistent with the claim in Sentence A.

### Evidence Snippet #2

**Factual Score:** 1

**Rationale:** Both sentences describe the same event: a blast near the Red Fort in Delhi. Sentence B provides additional details (8 deaths, several injuries, location as Old Delhi) that are consistent with the core fact presented in Sentence A.

### Evidence Snippet #3

**Factual Score:** 1

**Rationale:** Both sentences describe the same event: a blast occurring near Delhi's Red Fort. Sentence B provides additional details (8 dead) which does not contradict Sentence A, but rather expands on the initial claim.

### Evidence Snippet #4

**Factual Score:** 1

**Rationale:** Both sentences describe the same event: a blast occurring near the Red Fort in Delhi. Sentence B provides a detail (at least 8 people affected) that expands on the initial claim in Sentence A, but does not contradict it. They both refer to the same location and event.

# Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: query\_016bfdc8

## Text vs. Text Analysis (cont.)

### Evidence Snippet #5

**Factual Score:** 1

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

### Evidence Snippet #6

**Factual Score:** 1

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

### Evidence Snippet #7

**Factual Score:** 1

**Rationale:** Both sentences describe the same event: a blast near the Red Fort in Delhi. Sentence B provides more details (location near Lal Quila Metro Station, it was a car blast) but does not contradict the core fact presented in Sentence A.

### Evidence Snippet #8

**Factual Score:** 1

**Rationale:** Both sentences describe the same event: a blast near the Red Fort in Delhi. Sentence B provides more details (location near Lal Quila Metro Station, it was a car blast) but does not contradict the core fact presented in Sentence A.

# Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: query\_016bfdc8

## Text vs. Text Analysis (cont.)

### Evidence Snippet #9

**Factual Score:** 1

**Rationale:** Both sentences describe the same event: a blast near the Red Fort in Delhi. Sentence B provides more details (location near Lal Quila Metro Station, it was a car blast) but does not contradict the core fact presented in Sentence A.

### Evidence Snippet #10

**Factual Score:** 0

**Rationale:** Sentence A states a 'blast in Delhi near Red Fort'. Sentence B refers to 'Delhi blast: The night that shook India's capital city'. While both relate to a blast in Delhi, Sentence B is too vague to confirm it refers to the same event as Sentence A (near Red Fort). They describe different, potentially unrelated, events.