

Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: 169

VERDICT: FAKE NEWS

Query News Sample



"India's nuclear submarine INS Arihant has reportedly been decommissioned following an attack by unknown men 10 months ago."

Top Visual Evidence



"Indian Navy's Indigenous Nuclear Submarine INS Arihant Back in Action After Suffering Damages in Propulsion Chamber | India.com"

Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: 169

Final Unified Reasoning

- Detailed Reasoning:

The overwhelming evidence points towards the news post being fake. The strongest indicator is **Evidence 3 (Web Search)**, which provides a "FAKE" classification with a low support score of -20.0. This signifies a strong contradiction between the claim and established news reports. No credible sources corroborate the story of INS Arihant being decommissioned following an attack.

- Arguments FOR FAKE classification:

• **Strong Web Search Result:** The negative score from the web search is the most decisive piece of evidence. It demonstrates a clear lack of support for the claim across multiple news sources.

• **Event/Action Mismatch (Evidence 1 & 2):** Both the image-text and image-image analyses highlight a significant mismatch in the events depicted. The text describes a serious incident (attack and decommissioning), while the images show a submarine and a person (in the first image) and a submarine undergoing maintenance (in the second). These visuals do not support the narrative of an attack or decommissioning.

• **Sentiment Mismatch (Evidence 1 & 2):** The text conveys a serious and alarming tone, while the images are relatively neutral. This inconsistency further suggests a disconnect between the text and the visual elements.

- Arguments AGAINST FAKE classification:

• **Entity Alignment (Evidence 1 & 2):** Both the image-text and image-image analyses confirm that the entities (India, INS Arihant, submarine) are correctly represented in the images. However, this alignment of entities alone is not sufficient to validate a false claim. The presence of the correct entities doesn't guarantee the accuracy of the event being described.

Given the strong negative web search result and the clear inconsistencies in the depicted events and sentiments, the final classification is FAKE with high confidence.

Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: 169

Image vs. Text Analysis (Query)

Okay, let's break down this news sample analysis step-by-step.

STEP 1: Sentiment Alignment

- 1. Text Sentiment:** The text conveys a serious and concerning tone. The words "BREAKING," "decommissioned," and "attack" suggest a negative and potentially alarming event.
- 2. Image Sentiment:** The image depicts a submarine, with a slightly dramatic lighting and a man wearing glasses and a mask. The overall feel is somewhat somber and serious, but not overtly negative. The man's expression is neutral.
- 3. Comparison:**
- Classification: Sentiment Mismatch
 - Reasoning: The text describes a negative event (submarine decommissioned due to an attack), while the image presents a relatively neutral scene of a submarine and a person. The image lacks the urgency or distress implied by the text.

STEP 2: Entity Consistency

- 1. Text Entities:**
- India
 - INS Arihant (Nuclear Submarine)
- 2. Image Entities:**
- The image clearly depicts a submarine, which is likely intended to represent INS Arihant.
 - The Indian flag is visible on the submarine.
 - A man wearing a mask and glasses is present.
- 3. Comparison:**
- Classification: Entities Aligned
 - Reasoning: The key entities mentioned in the text (India and INS Arihant) are visually represented in the image. The Indian flag on the submarine reinforces the connection to India.

STEP 3: Event/Action Consistency

- 1. Text Event/Action:** The main event is the decommissioning of India's nuclear submarine INS Arihant following an attack by unknown men.
- 2. Image Depiction:** The image shows a submarine and a person. It does not depict an attack or decommissioning. It's a static image of the submarine and the person.
- 3. Comparison:**

Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: 169

- Classification: Event/Action Mismatch
- Reasoning: The text describes a dynamic event (an attack and subsequent decommissioning), while the image presents a static scene. There's no visual representation of the event described in the text.

STEP 4: Final Judgment

- Judgment: FAKE
- Brief Reasoning: The most significant factor contributing to this judgment is the Event/Action Mismatch. While the entities are aligned, the image fails to depict the core event described in the text. The image is a generic representation of a submarine and a person, and does not illustrate the reported attack or decommissioning. The Sentiment Mismatch also contributes to the overall impression of inconsistency.

Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: 169

Query Image vs. Evidence Image Analysis

Okay, let's analyze the two images provided.

STEP 1: Sentiment Alignment

1. Image 1 Sentiment: The image shows a man with a serious expression, overlaid with an image of a submarine. The text accompanying the image discusses a submarine being decommissioned due to an attack. This evokes a sense of concern, seriousness, and potentially negativity related to a security breach.

2. Image 2 Sentiment: The image depicts a submarine in a dry dock, seemingly undergoing maintenance or repair. The scene is relatively neutral, lacking strong emotional cues. It's a factual depiction of a vessel.

3. Comparison:

- Classification: Sentiment Mismatch
- Reasoning: Image 1 conveys a sense of concern and potential negativity due to the news of an attack and decommissioning, while Image 2 presents a neutral, factual view of a submarine.

STEP 2: Entity Consistency

1. Entities in Image 1: The query image features a man (likely a naval official or related figure), the Indian flag, and a submarine (INS Arihant, as mentioned in the text).

2. Entities in Image 2: The evidence image shows a submarine, which appears to be the same model as in Image 1 (likely INS Arihant).

3. Comparison:

- Classification: Entities Aligned
- Reasoning: Both images depict the same type of submarine, which is identified as INS Arihant in the text. The man in Image 1 is not present in Image 2, but the core entity (the submarine) is consistent.

STEP 3: Event/Action Consistency

1. Event/Action in Image 1: The query image implies an event: the decommissioning of the INS Arihant submarine following an attack. The image suggests a response to a negative event.

2. Event/Action in Image 2: The evidence image shows the submarine in a dry dock, suggesting maintenance or repair. It doesn't directly depict an attack or decommissioning.

3. Comparison:

- Classification: Event/Action Mismatch
- Reasoning: Image 1 suggests a negative event (attack and decommissioning), while Image 2 shows a

Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: 169

routine maintenance or repair scenario. The actions depicted are fundamentally different.

STEP 4: Final Judgment

- Judgment: FAKE
- Brief Reasoning: The most significant factor in this judgment is the Event/Action Mismatch . Image 1 implies a serious incident (attack and decommissioning), while Image 2 shows a routine maintenance procedure. The pairing is misleading because it uses a neutral image of a submarine to seemingly support a claim of a serious security event. The sentiment mismatch also contributes to this assessment, as the images evoke different emotional responses.

Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: 169

Text vs. Text Factual Consistency Analysis

Evidence Snippet #1

Factual Score: 0

Rationale: Sentence A claims INS Arihant has been decommissioned due to an attack. Sentence B states the submarine is 'back in action' after suffering damages. These are contradictory claims about the operational status of the submarine. Therefore, they describe different facts.

Evidence Snippet #2

Factual Score: 0

Rationale: Sentence A claims INS Arihant was decommissioned due to an attack 10 months ago. Sentence B discusses an accident involving an Indian nuclear submarine and suggests a 'silly mistake' caused it. While both relate to Indian nuclear submarines, they describe different events – one an attack leading to decommissioning, the other an accident. They do not convey the same factual information.

Evidence Snippet #3

Factual Score: -1

Rationale: Sentence A claims INS Arihant was decommissioned due to an attack 10 months prior. Sentence B, from a news source, reports that a hatch was left open, crippling the submarine. This implies damage and potential operational issues, effectively debunking the claim of decommissioning due to an attack. The core claim of damage to the submarine is consistent between the sentences.

Evidence Snippet #4

Factual Score: 0

Rationale: Sentence A claims INS Arihant was decommissioned due to an attack 10 months ago. Sentence B reports the submarine flooded and almost sank because a hatch was left open. While both refer to the same submarine, they describe different events: an attack leading to decommissioning versus an accidental flooding. They are not the same real-world situation.

Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: 169

Text vs. Text Analysis (cont.)

Evidence Snippet #5

Factual Score: 0

Rationale: Sentence A claims that India's nuclear submarine INS Arihant was decommissioned due to an attack 10 months ago. Sentence B is a general search result about India's submarine capabilities. It does not address the specific claim about the INS Arihant's decommissioning or an attack. Therefore, they refer to different facts.

Evidence Snippet #6

Factual Score: -1

Rationale: Sentence B is from a fact-checking source and explicitly states that the claim of INS Arihant's decommissioning is fake. This directly contradicts the claim made in Sentence A.

Evidence Snippet #7

Factual Score: 0

Rationale: Sentence A claims the INS Arihant has been decommissioned. Sentence B states it is undergoing repairs after an accident. These are different states of the submarine - decommissioned versus undergoing repairs. Therefore, they describe different facts.

Evidence Snippet #8

Factual Score: 0

Rationale: Sentence A claims INS Arihant was decommissioned after an attack 10 months ago. Sentence B reports India acknowledging the shootdown of its jets by Pakistan. These are different events; one concerns a submarine and the other concerns jets. Therefore, they do not describe the same real-world situation.

Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: 169

Text vs. Text Analysis (cont.)

Evidence Snippet #9

Factual Score: 0

Rationale: Sentence A claims INS Arihant was decommissioned due to an attack. Sentence B reports an 'accident' that crippled the submarine. While both refer to the same submarine and timeframe (10 months ago), the cause of the incident differs significantly (attack vs. accident). Therefore, they do not describe the same real-world situation.

Evidence Snippet #10

Factual Score: 0

Rationale: Sentence A claims INS Arihant was decommissioned after an attack 10 months ago. Sentence B discusses a Pakistani Air Force (PAF) shooting down an Indian Air Force (IAF) jet and capturing pilots. These are unrelated events; one concerns a submarine and the other an aerial conflict. Therefore, they describe different facts.