

# Introduction

## Recent work

- In order to scale with the increasing amount of information, automated news verification systems consider external knowledge databases as evidence.
- Evidence-based approaches achieve high accuracy and offer potential explainability, but they also take considerable human effort.
- Some recent work observed distinctive engagement patterns when social users face versus factual news.

Column 2 shows the time since publication

Columns 4–7 show the distribution of stances (S: Support, D: Deny, C: Comment, and R: Report)

# Introduction

## Engagement of social media users with respect to fake and real news articles

News title (Label)	Time	# Posts	S	D	C	R	Noticeable responses
Virginia Republican Wants Schools To Check Children’s Genitals Before Using Bathroom ( <b>Fake</b> )	3h	38	0.00	0.03	0.19	0.78	“DISGUSED SO TRASNPHOBIK”, “FOR GODS SAKE GET REAL GOP”, “You cant make this up folks”
	3h - 6h	21	0.00	0.10	0.10	0.80	“Ok This cant be real”, “WTF IS THIS BS”, “Rediculous RT”
	6h+	31	0.00	0.10	0.14	0.76	“Cant make this shit up”, “how is this real”, “small govern-ment”, “GOP Cray Cray Occupy Democrats”
1,100,000 people have been killed by guns in the U.S.A. since John Lennon was shot and killed on December 8, 1980 ( <b>Real</b> )	3h	9	0.56	0.00	0.00	0.44	“#StopGunViolence”, “guns r the problem”
	3h+	36	0.50	0.00	0.11	0.39	“Some 1.15 million people have been killed by firearms in the United States since Lennon was gunned down”, “#StopGunViolence”

- The fake news had many engagements shortly after its publication.
- These are mainly verbatim re-circulations with negative sentiment of the original post explained by the typically appalling content of fake news.
- After that short time window, see denial posts questioning the validity of the news, and the stance distribution stabilizes afterwards with virtually no support.