**ANNOTATION GUIDE**

[COMPANION CARD](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1OTZQZQH2s8lsoCh4z57RRs5G6WRrQ_ToY67TM62HUGs/edit)

[G FORM](https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSfdOEx1VYRlA5PpCJbUqoOXjxszBLDTJPC2A2uwlBJXMB9-Cw/viewform?usp=sf_link)

We present a systematic review and analysis of existing machine-learning-driven approaches to the detection of misinformation. We identify common sources of leakage in ML detection methods and offer recommendations for redress

We followed the below guidelines for tagging and annotating all papers under consideration, a corpus of about 250 published papers.

DATA SET:

* size, source, temporality
* feature-set selection
  + does it make sense? sufficiently granular?
  + any baked-in biases?

TEST-TRAIN SPLIT:

* how/if it was observed – percentage of total dataset assigned to each category
* any overlap between both sets (should *not* be the case)
* any temporal leakage (i.e., training on data in future and testing on data in past)?

CROSS-VALIDATION PERFORMED:

* size / number of folds
* any development data sets?
* any hyperparameter tuning during x-validation process? Are parameters recorded in paper?

OUT-OF-SAMPLE TESTING

* if any?
* what datasets used for this?
* any evidence of leakage during this process?

THIRD-PARTY REFERENCES

* particularly for claim-based studies that require some form of ground-truth for checking, what *is* the ground truth reference employed by the study?
* is this ground truth site reliable?
* what kind of taxonomy does said site have for labeling true / false statements?