



## HIKMA Novelty Check Report

Real Knowledge Value (RKV) Framework Analysis

Paper Analyzed

**Unequal Modernities, Unequal Measures of Trust**

**0.0 out of 10**

RKV CONTRIBUTION SCORE

**X DERIVATIVE**

NOVELTY CLASSIFICATION

**10**

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**



0.0

out of 10

0.00

Out of 10.0

Gap Identification

Avg. Score

Contribution Delta

Measured Impact


Idea Provenance

Originality

Sub-Dimensions

4 Metrics

## Overall Dimension Scores









|     |   |   |   |   |      |  |
|-----|---|---|---|---|------|--|
| C01 | Palestine shape credibility construction in conflict reporting and policy discourse through analysis of a panel dataset (2000–2021) comprising 16 development, health, and defense indicators.  | 0 | 0 | 0 | HIGH | No gap identification or baseline comparison provided.                       |
| C02 | Our findings reveal that credibility emerges through dueling warrants: statistical authority versus moral witnessing.   | 0 | 0 | 0 | HIGH | Concept appears derived from existing literature without novel contribution. |
| C03 | The analysis demonstrates that indicator coherence (GDP-IT-literacy cluster) and narrative coherence (vulnerability-risk cluster) independently foster trust while appealing to different audience logics—technocratic versus humanitarian. | 0 | 0 | 0 | HIGH | No measurable delta or novel conceptual relations demonstrated.              |
| C04 | Epistemic justice thus necessitates the inclusion of testimony alongside contextualized   | 0 | 0 | 0 | HIGH | Paraphrase of existing epistemic justice concepts.                           |



|     |  |   |   |   |      |  |
|-----|--|---|---|---|------|--|
| C05 | This research contributes to understanding how measurable disparities influence perceptions of authority and empathy in conflict communication, with implications for media ethics and policy discourse. | 0 | 0 | 0 | HIGH | Generic contribution statement without specific advancement. |
| C06 | It demonstrates a mixed-methods bridge between macro-structural asymmetries and trust/witness dynamics.  | 0 | 0 | 0 | HIGH | Method combination is standard in social sciences.           |
| C07 | It reveals how indicator coherence and narrative coherence foster trust through different audience logics.   | 0 | 0 | 0 | HIGH | No gap identification or novel findings demonstrated.        |
| C08 | It identifies institutional practices that valorize quantification while potentially marginalizing testimony.  | 0 | 0 | 0 | HIGH | Well-established critique in media studies literature.       |
| C09 | It provides empirical grounding for  | 0 | 0 | 0 | HIGH | No empirical results or                                      |



C10

This research employs a mixed-methods concurrent triangulation design to bridge quantitative analysis of macro-indicators with qualitative interpretation of credibility dynamics.

0


0


0


HIGH


Standard methodological approach without novelty.

## Novelty Flags


 High idea overlap detected

 No measurable delta

 Gap not grounded in literature

 All novelty comes from recombination only





## Novelty Dimensions Checked

✓ Gap Identification

✓ Contribution Delta

✓ Idea Provenance

✓ Method Novelty

✓ Question Novelty

✓ Result Theory Novelty

✓ Data Context Novelty



# AI Scholar Frontier

Advanced Research Verification & Knowledge Discovery Platform



AI SCHOLAR FRONTIER

