



HIKMA Fact-Check Report

Comprehensive authenticity analysis and verification

Paper Verified

**Empirical Communication and Trust Construction in
ACLED Data of the 2023-2024 Palestine–Israel Conflict**

2.0 out of 10

OVERALL FACT SCORE

X REJECT

RECOMMENDATION

20

CLAIMS VERIFIED



be problematic, and substantial revisions are recommended before acceptance. There are critical issues with reference authenticity, claim verification, or data integrity. A thorough revision addressing these fundamental concerns is essential before the paper can be considered for publication.

Overall Assessment:

2 out of 10


Reference Authenticity

Verifies that cited references exist and are correctly attributed

0.0

out of 10

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

0.0

out of 10

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

0.0

out of 10

Score Distribution

0: Claims contradict established scientific consensus

10: Claims fully align with scientific consensus

Hallucination Check

Detects fabricated or unsupported statements

5.0

out of 10

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





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. Data extends beyond current date (July 2025).

Claim 2

UNRELIABLE

"Total documented fatalities are 25,930."

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. Unverifiable.



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: No source provided. Unverifiable.

Claim 4

UNRELIABLE

"Air and artillery strikes accounted for 2,480 events (33.4%) with highest mean fatalities at 6.1 per event."

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. Unverifiable.



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: No source provided. Unverifiable.

Claim 6

UNRELIABLE

"Children (0-14 years) constitute approximately 42% of documented civilian fatalities."

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: Placeholder reference. No source for demographic estimate.

✓ Supporting: ?



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. Unverifiable.

Claim 8

UNRELIABLE

"Hospital mentions occur in 1,782 entries (24.0%)."

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: Placeholder reference. No source for keyword frequency.

✓ **Supporting:** ?



Data

0 out of 2

Consensus

0 out of 2

Halluc

1 out of 2

Final Score: 2.0 out of 10

Notes: Placeholder references. No verifiable methodology sources.

✓ **Supporting:** ???, ?

Claim 10

UNRELIABLE

"The theoretical framework draws from concepts of epistemic trust and moral witnessing."

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: Placeholder references. No verifiable theoretical sources.

✓ **Supporting:** ?, ?



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: Placeholder reference. No verifiable source for ACLED methodology.

✓ Supporting: ?

Claim 12

UNRELIABLE

"The qualitative analysis employs thematic analysis procedures following guidelines for integration in mixed methods studies."

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: Placeholder references. No verifiable methodological sources.

✓ Supporting: ?, ?



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: Placeholder reference. No verifiable integration framework.

✓ **Supporting:** ?

Claim 14

UNRELIABLE

"The trustworthiness procedures align with qualitative research standards for credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability."

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. Unverifiable methodological claim.



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: Placeholder reference. No verifiable theoretical framework.

✓ Supporting: ?

Claim 16

UNRELIABLE

"The evidence of disproportionate impacts on children suggests priorities for humanitarian assistance and protection efforts."

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: Placeholder reference. No verifiable source for policy implications.

✓ Supporting: ?



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: Placeholder reference. No verifiable methodological contribution.

✓ Supporting: ??

Claim 18

UNRELIABLE

"The study underscores the importance of community-based documentation in challenging epistemic injustice and preserving historical records."

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: Placeholder reference. No verifiable conclusion source.

✓ Supporting: ?



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: Placeholder reference. No verifiable future research direction.

✓ Supporting: ?

Claim 20

UNRELIABLE

"The evidence demonstrates that local knowledge production can provide credible accounts of violence despite structural constraints."

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: Placeholder reference. No verifiable conclusion evidence.

✓ Supporting: ?



Invalid/Placeholder:

0

Duplicates:

0

Flagged Wrong References

- All references are placeholders (? or ??)



Data Audit

Numeric Items Checked:

20

Mismatches:

- Data extends to July 2025 (future date)
- Percentages in tables sum to >100% when combined (e.g., Table 3: $33.4+24.8+16.0+25.8=100.0$ but categories may overlap)



Figures & Tables Audit

Items Checked:

6

Caption-Data Mismatches:

- All table data lacks source verification



⚠ Missing Items:

- No ethics statement for conflict data analysis
- No consent mention for quoted material
- No data protection statement

Fact-Check Metadata

Model: deepseek-chat

Max Claims: 20

Domain: Genocide Studies

Paper ID: review_20251127_213918