



HIKMA Novelty Check Report

Real Knowledge Value (RKV) Framework Analysis

Paper Analyzed

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

3.8 out of 10

RKV CONTRIBUTION SCORE

X DERIVATIVE

NOVELTY CLASSIFICATION

3

CLAIMS ANALYZED



novel contributions. The research may largely recombine or restate known ideas without adequate differentiation. Significant revision is needed to establish clearer novelty, identify genuine research gaps, and demonstrate measurable advances beyond the current state of the art.

Domain:

Genocide Studies

Analysis Model:

deepseek-chat



3.75

Out of 10.0

Gap Identification

Avg. Score

Contribution Delta

Measured Impact


Idea Provenance

Originality

Sub-Dimensions

4 Metrics

Overall Dimension Scores










C01	quantitative validation of community-reported infrastructure damage data.	0	0	0	HIGH	Generic validation claim with no baseline comparison.
C02	Second, it offers qualitative insights into the challenges of establishing epistemic trust in conflict documentation.	0	0	0	HIGH	Qualitative insights claim lacks specific gap and delta.
C03	Third, it proposes an integrated framework for assessing trustworthiness that combines statistical indicators with ethical principles of epistemic justice.	0	0	1	MEDIUM	Framework combines known concepts without measurable improvement.




 No measurable delta

 Gap not grounded in literature

 All novelty comes from recombination only

Derivative Risk Distribution





✓ Idea Provenance

✓ Method Novelty

✓ Question Novelty

✓ Result Theory Novelty

✓ Data Context Novelty