



HIKMA Fact-Check Report

Comprehensive authenticity analysis and verification

Paper Verified

"We See It, but No One Believes Us": Trustworthiness in Community Testimony and Data Reporting during Gaza's 2024–2025 Reconstruction

4.7 out of 10

OVERALL FACT SCORE

X REJECT

RECOMMENDATION

15

CLAIMS VERIFIED



issues with reference alignment or data consistency that need attention. Some statements lack adequate supporting evidence or may misrepresent cited sources. Revision is recommended to address these concerns and improve the overall credibility and accuracy of the manuscript.

Overall Assessment:


5 out of 10

Reference Authenticity

Verifies that cited references exist and are correctly attributed



Score Distribution



0: References are fabricated or non-existent


10: All references are verified and correctly attributed

Claim-Reference Alignment

Checks if claims accurately reflect the content of cited references




Score Distribution



0: Claims completely misrepresent the cited sources

10: Claims perfectly align with cited source content




0: Numerical data contains major inconsistencies


10: All data is internally consistent and accurate

Scientific Consensus

Evaluates if claims align with established scientific consensus



Score Distribution



0: Claims contradict established scientific consensus

10: Claims fully align with scientific consensus

Hallucination Check

Detects fabricated or unsupported statements



Score Distribution



0: Contains fabricated or unsupported statements

10: All statements are well-supported and verified



AI Scholar Frontier

Advanced Research Verification & Knowledge Discovery Platform



AI SCHOLAR FRONTIER





records from October 7, 2023 to June 17, 2024."

Ref Auth

1 out of 2

Alignment

2 out of 2

Data

2 out of 2

Consensus

1 out of 2

Halluc

1 out of 2

Final Score: 7.0 out of 10 **Notes:** Dataset exists but source is a Kaggle URL; authority and consensus unverifiable.

✓ **Supporting:** Sikander, 2024



Ref Auth
1 out of 2

Alignment
2 out of 2

Data
2 out of 2

Consensus
1 out of 2

Halluc
1 out of 2

Final Score: 7.0 out of 10 **Notes:** Dataset description aligns with cited source, but source authority is unverified.

✓ **Supporting:** Sikander, 2024

Claim 3

UNRELIABLE

"The dataset contains zero missing entries across all variables and time points, providing complete temporal coverage."

Ref Auth
0 out of 2

Alignment
0 out of 2

Data
0 out of 2

Consensus
0 out of 2

Halluc
1 out of 2

Final Score: 2.0 out of 10

Notes: No source provided for this specific data quality claim.



Ref Auth

0 out of 2

Alignment

0 out of 2

Data

0 out of 2

Consensus

0 out of 2

Halluc

1 out of 2

Final Score: 2.0 out of 10

Notes: Statistical result lacks a cited source for verification.

Claim 5

UNRELIABLE

"Residential building destruction accounted for approximately 95 percent of total damage counts, with a mean of 65,984 structures per day."

Ref Auth

0 out of 2

Alignment

0 out of 2

Data

0 out of 2

Consensus

0 out of 2

Halluc

1 out of 2

Final Score: 2.0 out of 10

Notes: Descriptive statistic lacks a cited source for verification.



Data

0 out of 2

Consensus

0 out of 2

Halluc

1 out of 2

Final Score: 2.0 out of 10

Notes: Specific data point lacks a cited source for verification.

Claim 7

UNRELIABLE

"Qualitative analysis involved 18 simulated interviews with local engineers (n=6), community volunteers (n=6), and displaced residents (n=6)."

Ref Auth

0 out of 2

Alignment

0 out of 2

Data

2 out of 2

Consensus

1 out of 2

Halluc

1 out of 2

Final Score: 4.0 out of 10 **Notes:** Methodological claim is internally consistent but lacks any source citation.



Ref Auth

0 out of 2

Alignment

0 out of 2

Data

0 out of 2

Consensus

0 out of 2

Halluc

1 out of 2

Final Score: 2.0 out of 10

Notes: Quantitative qualitative results lack a cited source for verification.

Claim 9

UNRELIABLE

"Cross-modal analysis revealed that statistical correlations above 0.9 corresponded with a 38 percent increase in moral-trust statements ($p < 0.05$)."

Ref Auth

0 out of 2

Alignment

0 out of 2

Data

0 out of 2

Consensus

0 out of 2

Halluc

1 out of 2

Final Score: 2.0 out of 10

Notes: Integrated statistical result lacks a cited source for verification.

Claim 10

RELIABLE

"Holail et al. (2024) utilized time-series satellite remote sensing to document gradually increasing war damage in the Gaza Strip."

Ref Auth

2 out of 2

Alignment

2 out of 2



Final Score: 10.0 out of 10

Notes: Claim aligns with verifiable reference metadata.

✓ **Supporting:** Holail et al., 2024

Claim 11

RELIABLE

"Onencan et al. (2018) demonstrate how participatory GIS risk mapping combined with citizen science can document environmental risks."

Ref Auth
2 out of 2

Alignment
2 out of 2

Data
2 out of 2

Consensus
2 out of 2

Halluc
2 out of 2

Final Score: 10.0 out of 10

Notes: Claim aligns with verifiable reference metadata.

✓ **Supporting:** Onencan et al., 2018



0 out of 2

0 out of 2

Data

2 out of 2

Consensus

1 out of 2

Halluc

1 out of 2

Final Score: 4.0 out of 10

Notes: Methodological description is internally consistent but uncited.

Claim 13

UNRELIABLE

"The documentation process occurred with a median verification lag of 11 days and regional under-reporting estimated at 20 percent in northern Gaza."

Ref Auth

0 out of 2

Alignment

0 out of 2

Data

0 out of 2

Consensus

0 out of 2

Halluc

1 out of 2

Final Score: 2.0 out of 10

Notes: Specific quantitative parameters lack a cited source.



Data

0 out of 2

Consensus

0 out of 2

Halluc

1 out of 2

Final Score: 2.0 out of 10

Notes: Statistical descriptors lack a cited source for verification.

Claim 15

RELIABLE

"The theoretical framework is informed by epistemic injustice (Fricker, 2007) and communicative competence (Habermas, 1984)."

Ref Auth

2 out of 2

Alignment

2 out of 2

Data

2 out of 2

Consensus

2 out of 2

Halluc

2 out of 2

Final Score: 10.0 out of 10

Notes: Claim aligns with verifiable, authoritative references.

✓ **Supporting:** Fricker, 2007, Habermas, 1984



Invalid/Placeholder:

0

Duplicates:

0

Flagged Wrong References

- Sikander, 2024 (Kaggle dataset - URL only, no formal publication metadata)
- Malhouni & Mabrouki, 2023 (incomplete journal name)



Data Audit

Numeric Items Checked:

15

P-Value Anomalies:

- Claim C09 reports $p < 0.05$ but lacks source for statistical test.



Figures & Tables Audit

Items Checked:

0



Ethics Compliance

IRB/Ethics Mentioned:

Yes ✓

Consent Mentioned:

No ✗

Data Protection:

Yes ✓

Missing Items:

- No explicit mention of informed consent for simulated interviews.



AI Scholar Frontier

Advanced Research Verification & Knowledge Discovery Platform



AI SCHOLAR FRONTIER



© 2025 AI Scholar Frontier. All rights reserved.