

# Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: query\_922b59b4

**VERDICT: FAKE NEWS**

## Query News Sample



"Nov 11 Blast in Delhi's Red Fort"

## 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\_922b59b4

## Final Unified Reasoning

- Detailed Reasoning:

The final classification is FAKE, with high confidence, primarily driven by the strong negative score from the web-based claim verification (Evidence 3). The web search indicates a low support score of -20.0, suggesting the claim is not corroborated by reliable news sources. While the image-image analysis (Evidence 2) showed alignment between the query image and a retrieved image, the context provided in the retrieved image's text (suggesting a terrorist attack) is not supported by the web search results. This discrepancy raises significant concerns about the authenticity of the original claim.

- Arguments FOR FAKE classification:

- **Strong Web Search Result:** The most significant factor is the low support score (-20.0) from the web search. This indicates that reputable news sources do not confirm the claim of a "blast in Delhi's Red Fort" on November 11th.

- **Ambiguous Image Location:** The image-text analysis (Evidence 1) highlighted the ambiguity of the location. While the background might resemble the Red Fort area, it's not definitive, making it possible the image is from a different location entirely.

- **Discrepancy in Context:** The image-image analysis suggested a possible terrorist attack based on the retrieved image's text. However, the web search refuted this claim, creating a contradiction.

- Arguments AGAINST FAKE classification:

- **Sentiment and Event Alignment:** Both the image and text convey a negative sentiment and depict a destructive event (fire), which is consistent.

- **Image-Image Consistency:** The visual elements in the query image and the retrieved image are similar, suggesting they depict a comparable event.

Given the overwhelming evidence from the web search, the ambiguous location in the image, and the conflicting context between the images, the "FAKE" classification is the most appropriate.

# Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: query\_922b59b4

## Image vs. Text Analysis (Query)

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

### STEP 1: Sentiment Alignment

**1. Text Sentiment:** The text "Nov 11 Blast in Delhi's Red Fort" conveys a negative sentiment due to the mention of a "blast," implying a destructive and potentially dangerous event. It evokes feelings of concern, fear, and possibly sadness.

**2. Image Sentiment:** The image depicts a scene of intense fire and what appears to be 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 negative sentiment associated with a destructive event. The text mentions a "blast," and the image visually represents a fire and destruction.

### STEP 2: Entity Consistency

**1. Text Entities:** The text mentions "Delhi's 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 architecture in the background could be consistent with the Red Fort area, but it's not clear.

**3. Comparison:**

- Classification: Entities Ambiguous/Unverifiable
- Reasoning: The text explicitly names "Delhi's Red Fort." While the background in the image might resemble the area, it's not conclusive. The primary focus of the image is the fire and vehicle, not a clear view of the Red Fort itself.

### STEP 3: Event/Action Consistency

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

**2. Image Depiction:** The image depicts a fire, with a vehicle burning. This could be the result of an explosion or a fire caused by other means.

**3. Comparison:**

- Classification: Event/Action Aligned
- Reasoning: While the image doesn't explicitly show an explosion, the fire and destruction are consistent with the aftermath of a blast. It's a plausible visual representation of the event described in the text.

# Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: query\_922b59b4

---

## STEP 4: Final Judgment

- Judgment: FAKE

- Brief Reasoning: While the sentiment and event/action are aligned, the entity consistency is ambiguous. The image doesn't definitively show the Red Fort, and the scene could be from anywhere. The lack of clear visual confirmation of the location, combined with the potential for the image to be unrelated to the stated event, leads to a judgment of "FAKE." The image could be from a different incident entirely.

# Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: query\_922b59b4

## 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. The text in Image 2 reinforces this negative sentiment.

- STEP 2: Entity Consistency

- **Entities in Image 1:** The primary identifiable entity is a burning vehicle (likely a van). The background shows a street and some buildings.

- **Entities in Image 2:** The image also shows a burning vehicle and surrounding damage, consistent with the first image.

- **Comparison:** Entities Aligned

- **Reasoning:** Both images feature the same core entity: a burning vehicle in a similar environment.

- STEP 3: Event/Action Consistency

- **Event/Action in Image 1:** The main event is a vehicle fire, suggesting a possible accident or deliberate act of arson.

- **Event/Action in Image 2:** The image depicts a similar event – a vehicle fire and resulting damage. The text suggests this is related to a terrorist attack.

- **Comparison:** Event/Action Aligned

- **Reasoning:** Both images show the same event: a vehicle fire. While Image 2's text adds context (terrorism), the core action depicted is consistent.

- STEP 4: Final Judgment

- **Judgment:** TRUE

- **Brief Reasoning:** The sentiment, entities, and event/action are all aligned between the two images. The text in Image 2 provides additional context, suggesting a terrorist attack, which is consistent with the visual depiction of destruction. While the images alone don't definitively prove a terrorist attack, they support the claim made in the accompanying text.

# Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: query\_922b59b4

## Text vs. Text Factual Consistency Analysis

### Evidence Snippet #1

**Factual Score:** -1

**Rationale:** Sentence A claims a blast occurred at Delhi's Red Fort on November 11. Sentence B, from a fact-checking source, explicitly states that visuals are being falsely linked to a blast on November 10, 2025, at the Delhi Red Fort. This directly debunks the claim in Sentence A.

### Evidence Snippet #2

**Factual Score:** -1

**Rationale:** Sentence A claims a blast occurred at Delhi's Red Fort on November 11. Sentence B, from a fact-checking source, explicitly states that visuals are being falsely linked to a blast on November 10, 2025, at the Delhi Red Fort. This directly debunks the claim in Sentence A.

### Evidence Snippet #3

**Factual Score:** 1

**Rationale:** Both sentences refer to the same event: an explosion near Delhi's Red Fort. Sentence A states 'Nov 11 Blast in Delhi's Red Fort' and Sentence B confirms this by mentioning a 'car explosion near New Delhi's historic Red Fort'. The timeframe and location align perfectly.

### Evidence Snippet #4

**Factual Score:** 1

**Rationale:** Both sentences describe the same event: an explosion at Delhi's Red Fort. Sentence A states 'Nov 11 Blast in Delhi's Red Fort' and Sentence B confirms this with 'Delhi Red Fort explosion'. Sentence B adds the detail of 'at least eight killed after blast in car', which is a factual detail consistent with the event described in Sentence A.

# Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: query\_922b59b4

## Text vs. Text Analysis (cont.)

### Evidence Snippet #5

**Factual Score:** 1

**Rationale:** Both sentences describe the same event: an explosion at Delhi's Red Fort. Sentence A states 'Nov 11 Blast in Delhi's Red Fort' and Sentence B confirms this with 'Delhi Red Fort explosion'. Sentence B adds the detail of 'at least eight killed after blast in car', which is a factual detail consistent with the event described in Sentence A.

### Evidence Snippet #6

**Factual Score:** 1

**Rationale:** Both sentences describe the same event: an explosion at Delhi's Red Fort. Sentence A states 'Nov 11 Blast in Delhi's Red Fort' and Sentence B confirms this with 'Delhi Red Fort explosion'. Sentence B adds the detail of 'at least eight killed after blast in car', which is a factual detail consistent with the event described in Sentence A.

### Evidence Snippet #7

**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 #8

**Factual Score:** 1

**Rationale:** Both sentences refer to the same event: a blast near Delhi's Red Fort. Sentence B provides additional details (10 dead) which does not contradict Sentence A, but rather expands on it.

# Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: query\_922b59b4

## 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 additional details (8 dead, several injured, location as Old Delhi) that are consistent with the core fact presented in Sentence A (a blast in Delhi's Red Fort).

### Evidence Snippet #10

**Factual Score:** 1

**Rationale:** Both sentences describe the same event: a blast occurring near Delhi's Red Fort. Sentence A states 'Nov 11 Blast in Delhi's Red Fort' and Sentence B confirms this with 'At least 8 as blast rips through car parked near Red Fort'. The timeframe, location, and event are consistent.