



## HIKMA Fact-Check Report

Comprehensive authenticity analysis and verification

Paper Verified

**"Counting Stones, Silencing Voices": Epistemic Injustice and Witnessing under Occupation in the Documentation of Palestinian Structure Demolitions (2004–2023)**

**7.4 out of 10**

OVERALL FACT SCORE



**MANUAL CHECK**

RECOMMENDATION

**20**

CLAIMS VERIFIED



areas may benefit from additional verification or clarification of references. The majority of the content demonstrates solid alignment with established research. Minor improvements to reference documentation or claim substantiation would strengthen the paper further before final submission.

Overall Assessment:


**7 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





*authorities."*

Ref Auth  
**1 out of 2**

Alignment  
**2 out of 2**

Data  
**2 out of 2**

Consensus  
**1 out of 2**

Halluc  
**2 out of 2**

**Final Score:** 8.0 out of 10

**Notes:** Dataset cited, number aligns with dataset description.

✓ **Supporting:** Asaniczka (2023)

## Claim 2

RELIABLE

*"The primary dataset comprises 9,473 demolition records from the 'Data on Palestinian Structures Israel Demolished (2004–2023)' collection."*

Ref Auth  
**1 out of 2**

Alignment  
**2 out of 2**

Data  
**2 out of 2**

Consensus  
**1 out of 2**

Halluc  
**2 out of 2**

**Final Score:** 8.0 out of 10

**Notes:** Dataset cited, specific count provided.

✓ **Supporting:** Asaniczka (2023)



1 out of 2

2 out of 2

Data

2 out of 2

Consensus

1 out of 2

Halluc

2 out of 2

**Final Score:** 8.0 out of 10

**Notes:** Geographic scope defined, aligns with dataset.

✓ **Supporting:** Asaniczka (2023)

## Claim 4

UNRELIABLE

*"In 2004, there were 152 demolition events with a mean of 1.7 structures demolished."*

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:** Data from Table 1, but no source cited for table.



0 out of 2

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:** Data from Table 1, but no source cited for table.

## Claim 6

UNRELIABLE

*"Jerusalem, Hebron, and Tubas account for over 50% of all recorded demolition cases."*

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:** Claim from Table 2, but table source not cited.



Data

**0 out of 2**

Consensus

**0 out of 2**

Halluc

**1 out of 2**

**Final Score:** 2.0 out of 10

**Notes:** Data from Table 3, but table source not cited.

## Claim 8

**UNRELIABLE**

*"Private ownership accounts for 80% of demolished structures."*

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:** Data from Table 4, but table source not cited.





0 out of 2

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:** Data from Table 5, but table source not cited.

## Claim 10

RELIABLE

*"The study employs a mixed-methods concurrent triangulation design."*

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:** Methodology clearly described and referenced.

✓ **Supporting:** Creswell & Creswell (2018)

## Claim 11

RELIABLE

*"The theoretical foundation draws from Miranda Fricker's conceptualization of testimonial injustice."*

Ref Auth

2 out of 2

Alignment

2 out of 2



Final Score: 10.0 out of 10

Notes: Core theory correctly attributed to standard source.

✓ **Supporting:** Fricker (2007)

## Claim 12

RELIABLE

*"The concept of moral witnessing is drawn from Avishai Margalit."*

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: Concept correctly attributed to standard source.

✓ **Supporting:** Margalit (2002)

## Claim 13

RELIABLE

*"Qualitative analysis employed thematic analysis following procedures by Flick (2014)."*

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**



*"Methodological triangulation used multiple data sources and analytic approaches."*

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:** Trustworthiness procedure correctly referenced.

✓ **Supporting:** Lee & Lee (2022)

## Claim 15

RELIABLE

*"The quantitative analysis employs geospatial and temporal techniques building on methodologies from Obukhov & Brovelli (2022) and Hammond & Weidmann (2014)."*

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:** Analytic techniques correctly attributed.

✓ **Supporting:** Obukhov & Brovelli (2022), Hammond & Weidmann (2014)



0 out of 2

0 out of 2

Data

2 out of 2

Consensus

1 out of 2

Halluc

2 out of 2

**Final Score:** 5.0 out of 10

**Notes:** Themes are interpretive results, not directly sourced.

## Claim 17

RELIABLE

*"Documentation practices serve as epistemic resistance against structural silencing mechanisms."*

Ref Auth

2 out of 2

Alignment

2 out of 2

Data

2 out of 2

Consensus

1 out of 2

Halluc

2 out of 2

**Final Score:** 9.0 out of 10

**Notes:** Theoretical claim well-supported by references.

✓ **Supporting:** Causevic et al. (2020), Medina (2013)

## Claim 18

RELIABLE

*"Digital documentation and witnessing practices can address testimonial injustice by creating alternative archives."*



Halluc

**2 out of 2**

**Final Score:** 9.0 out of 10

**Notes:** Claim aligned with cited reference.

✓ **Supporting:** Ghosh (2019)

## Claim 19

RELIABLE

*"The study's approach builds on work treating documentation as both technical process and social practice."*

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:** Methodological positioning correctly referenced.

✓ **Supporting:** Creswell & Creswell (2018)

## Claim 20

RELIABLE

*"The dataset compilation involved systematic recording by NGOs using standardized protocols with geographical coordinates and photographic evidence."*

Ref Auth

**1 out of 2**

Alignment

**2 out of 2**



Final Score: 8.0 out of 10

Notes: Dataset methodology described, aligns with citation.

✓ **Supporting:** Asaniczka (2023)



## Reference Audit

Show Details ▼

Total References:

20



## Data Audit

Numeric Items Checked:

9

### ⚠ Mismatches:

- Table data (C04-C09) presented without citation to source dataset or calculation method.



## Figures & Tables Audit

Items Checked:

5

### ⚠ Caption-Data Mismatches:

- Tables 1-5 presented in text but source for table data not cited.



## Missing Items:

- No ethics statement for analysis of sensitive human rights/conflict data.

### Fact-Check Metadata

Model: deepseek-chat

Max Claims: 20

Domain: Genocide Studies

Paper ID: review\_20251127\_215630