



## HIKMA Novelty Check Report

Real Knowledge Value (RKV) Framework Analysis

Paper Analyzed

**“Numbers Don’t Speak, People Do”: Trustworthiness in Humanitarian Casualty Reporting during the Gaza War (2024–2025)**

**4.4 out of 10**

RKV CONTRIBUTION SCORE

**X DERIVATIVE**

NOVELTY CLASSIFICATION

**4**

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**



4.38

Out of 10.0

Gap Identification

Avg. Score

Contribution Delta

Measured Impact


Idea Provenance

Originality

Sub-Dimensions

4 Metrics

## Overall Dimension Scores








C01	contributes a two-path triangulation model for humanitarian data credibility that emphasizes independent verification.	0	0	1	MEDIUM	No gap identified; no baseline comparison; recombines known concepts.
C02	The study contributes range-plus-change-log publication standards that explicitly acknowledge uncertainty in reporting.	0	0	1	MEDIUM	No gap or baseline; adapts existing transparency concepts.
C03	The study contributes integration of micro-narratives with aggregate counts to maintain human connection in data presentation.	0	0	1	MEDIUM	No gap or baseline; qualitative-quantitative integration is established.
C04	The study contributes methodological explainers for public literacy in data ethics during humanitarian crises.	0	0	1	MEDIUM	No gap or baseline; applies public literacy concepts to crisis context.



⚠️ Gap not grounded in literature

⚠️ All novelty comes from recombination only

## 📈 Derivative Risk Distribution



Low Risk



Medium Risk



High Risk



✓ Idea Provenance

✓ Method Novelty

✓ Question Novelty

✓ Result Theory Novelty

✓ Data Context Novelty