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What do fact-checkers do?

The United Kingdom has ten times Italy’s number of immigrants.

FALSE: We find no data to support this claim. The UK does not have "ten times Italy’s number of immigrants".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/Immigration</th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>4.92M</td>
<td>5.05M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>5.01M</td>
<td>5.42M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>5.03M</td>
<td>5.64M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Automated fact-checking

The United Kingdom has ten times Italy’s number of immigrants.

FALSE: We find no data to support this claim. The UK does not have "ten times Italy’s number of immigrants".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/Immigration</th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>4.92M</td>
<td>5.05M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>5.01M</td>
<td>5.42M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>5.03M</td>
<td>5.64M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What do we want from automated fact-checking?

- Verdict justification, a.k.a. algorithmic transparency
  - Can’t convince otherwise
  - Need to check their correctness

- Generalization to different domains (economy, health, etc.)

- Learn with (relatively) little data

*(Vlachos and Riedel, 2014)*
Fact-checking framework (for NLP)

For more details see our surveys (Thorne and Vlachos, 2018; Guo et al., 2022)
New datasets needed

AI successes follow dataset availability *(Wissner-Gross, 2016)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Breakthroughs in AI</th>
<th>Datasets (First Available)</th>
<th>Algorithms (First Proposed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Average No. of Years to Breakthrough:** 3 years 18 years
Fact Extraction and VERification (FEVER)

Claim:
The Rodney King riots took place in the most populous county in the USA.

Evidence:
[wiki/Los Angeles Riots]: The 1992 Los Angeles riots, also known as the Rodney King riots were a series of riots, lootings, arsons, and civil disturbances that occurred in Los Angeles County, California in April and May 1992.
[wiki/Los Angeles County]: Los Angeles County, officially the County of Los Angeles, is the most populous county in the United States.

- 185K claims verified on Wikipedia (Thorne et al., NAACL 2018)
- Enabled progress in system development, still far from solved
Annotation process

1. Pick a random page and sentence from Wikipedia
2. Extract a set of claims (typically shorter/simpler than the sentence)
3. For each claim:
   a. Generate mutated claims by paraphrasing, substituting words, negations, etc.
   b. Verify each mutated claim selecting the evidence sentence(s):
      ■ The claim is SUPPORTED by the evidence
      ■ The claim is REFUTED by the evidence
      ■ NOT ENOUGH INFORMATION in Wikipedia to verify it
Annotation process details

- 50 annotators, all native speakers, trained by the authors or more experienced annotators
- Fixed Wikipedia dump to avoid changes in labels
- One annotator constructs the claim, different annotator verifies it
- Dedicated user interfaces were developed for the task
- Guidelines were refined through pilot studies
- Advised to spend 2-3 minutes per claim
- Instructed to avoid using their own world knowledge: "Shakira is Canadian" is NOT ENOUGH INFORMATION
Annotation findings

- 0.68 in Fleiss Kappa inter-annotator agreement on 3.4K claims
- 96.12% precision and 74.84% recall in evidence retrieval: measured against annotators who were not time-constrained
- Claims were 7.9 tokens long
- Multi-sentence evidence was chosen for 28.04% of the claims
- Evidence from different pages was chosen for 11.47%
- 7.6% of the mutated claims were excluded due to being too vague/ambiguous
- Final verification by the authors: 91.2% correct on 227 claims.
Results

Unlike previous tasks and datasets, evidence matters:

- A correct label with incorrect supporting evidence is wrong
- A simple approach using TF-IDF-based similarity for evidence selection and DecAtt for labeling the claim given the evidence achieved 31.87% acc. (50.91% ignoring evidence)

Fact Extraction and Verification (FEVER) shared task

- EMNLP 2018 workshop with Amazon and Imperial College
- 23 participants, best performance at 64.21%, a year later 68%, now at 76.89%
Fact checking tested by BBC(Miranda et al. 2018)

Claim: Russia meddled with US elections

Supports

- Not climate change or trade, but why didn’t John Podesta give a server that wasn’t his to the CIA.” Several American intelligence agencies have concluded Russia meddled in last year’s US elections, but Mr Trump has as recently as this week said he thinks other countries could have been responsible. [2017-07-07]

- Kosachev: "No evidence" Russia meddled in US election [2017-09-26]

- Trump had come under fire for defending Russia against claims that they meddled in the 2016 US presidential elections. [2018-07-19]

Refutes

- Vice-presidential nominee Mike Pence quickly stated there will be "serious consequences" if Russia attempts to influence US elections. [2016-07-27]

- The new US ambassador to the UK, Woody Johnson, has said Theresa May was right to air her grievances about Russia’s potential influence in the US elections. [2017-11-14]

- The arrest also came days after the justice department charged 12 Russian intelligence officers with hacking Democratic officials in the 2016 US elections. [2018-07-16]
Crimea was part of Russia until 1954, when it was given to the Soviet Republic of Ukraine.

MONITIO: Question generation

- Learn to ask questions for different parts of the claim
- Better able to retrieve refuting evidence
- Recent paper (Fan et al., 2020) explored crowd-sourced fact-checking questions; adapt for journalists?
- EU H2020 with Priberam, Deutsche-Welle and Scandinavian Communications

When was Crimea part of Russia?
When did Crimea become part of Ukraine?
FEVER2

Build it, Break it, Fix it for fact checking:

- **Building**: many systems with source code to help
- **Breaking**: participants create adversarial instances (manually or automatically): half given to fixers, half reserved for evaluation
- **Fixers**: fix the systems using the adversarial instances

Workshop at EMNLP in Hong Kong in November 2019
- Best breaking method was a human/machine hybrid
- See more in Thorne et al. (2019) shared task overview
SOTA architectures for FEVER

Task decomposition remains the same:

- **Document retrieval**: TFIDF/BM25, Wikipedia entity linking, deep passage retrieval
- **Evidence selection**: TFIDF/BM25, claim-sentence classification, multihop approaches
- **Veracity prediction**: Claim-evidence classification (Natural Language Inference/Textual Entailment)

Recent advances:

- Pre-training specialized to handle coreference (Ye et al., 2020)
- Graph attention over the evidence retrieved (Liu et al., 2020)
Retrieved evidence is a baseline. However, we also want to know:

- *How* was the evidence used in the reaching the verdict?
- What were the assumptions/commonsense used?
- What was the reasoning process?

Current approaches:

- Highlight(attention)-based, e.g. Popat et al. (2018), but not clear if attention is an explanation indeed
- (Evidence) Summarization, e.g. Kotonya and Toni (2020), Atanasova et al. (2020), but does not correspond to reasoning
- *Faithfulness* is lacking in both
Proof System for Fact Verification (ProoFVer)

When comparing the claim with the evidence, we generate the proof directly and infer the verdict from it \((Krishna \ et \ al., \ 2022)\)

The six operators are from Natural Logic (Angeli and Manning, 2014) indicating negation, equivalence, alternation, etc.
Inference

Inference is a two-stage process (given evidence):
1. Generate the sequence of lexically aligned spans in claim and evidence labeled with NatLog operators (constrained seq2seq):

   ![Diagram](image.png)

2. A deterministic finite state automaton for the verdict (fixed)

Training data for step 1 was obtained from FEVER, PPDB, Wikidata, WordNet and manual annotation (2.5% of the cases)
## Results (FEVER blind test)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Label accuracy</th>
<th>Evidence+Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ProofFVer</td>
<td>79.25</td>
<td>74.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KGAT (Liu et al. 2020)</td>
<td>74.07</td>
<td>70.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CorefBERT (Ye et al. 2020)</td>
<td>75.96</td>
<td>72.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DREAM (Zhong et al. 2020)</td>
<td>76.85</td>
<td>70.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Testing robustness

Use paired symmetric counterfactual data from Schuster et al. (2019) to validate dependence on claim’s text alone

**Claim:** Damon Albarn’s debut album was released in 2014.

**Positive Evidence:**
His debut solo album Everyday Robots was released in 2014

**Negative Evidence:**
His debut solo album Everyday Robots was released in 2011
## Results on symmetric FEVER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Trained on FEVER</th>
<th>After Fine-Tuning</th>
<th>After Fine-Tuning tested on FEVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ProoFVer</td>
<td>81.70</td>
<td>85.88</td>
<td>86.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KGAT (Liu et al. 2020)</td>
<td>65.73</td>
<td>84.94</td>
<td>76.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CorefBERT (Ye et al. 2020)</td>
<td>68.49</td>
<td>85.45</td>
<td>78.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Robustness of ProoFVer also when faced with additional evidence
- Improvements on FEVER2 dataset
Beyond text-based verification

FEVEROUS: Fact Extraction and VERification Over Unstructured and Structured information (Aly et al., NeurIPS datasets 2021)

- 87K claims with evidence (text and tables)
- All of Wikipedia, not just the introductory sections
- Evidence + veracity needs to be correct
- Not Enough Information must be accompanied by evidence
- Shared task outcomes:
  - 12 teams, accuracies from 2% to 27% (our baseline: 18%)
  - Results are on our website: [http://fever.ai/task.html](http://fever.ai/task.html)
FEVEROUS examples

**Claim:** In the 2018 Naples general election, Roberto Fico, an Italian politician and member of the Five Star Movement, received 57,119 votes with 57.6 percent of the total votes.

**Evidence:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roberto Fico</td>
<td>Five Star</td>
<td>61,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marta Schifone</td>
<td>Centre-right</td>
<td>21,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniela Iaconis</td>
<td>Centre-left</td>
<td>15,779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Verdict:** Refuted

**Claim:** Red Sundown screenplay was written by Martin Berkeley; based on a story by Lewis B. Patten, who often published under the names Lewis Ford, Lee Leighton and Joseph Wayne.

**Evidence:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directed by</th>
<th>Jack Arnold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Produced by</td>
<td>Albert Zugsmith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screenplay by</td>
<td>Martin Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on</td>
<td>Lewis B. Patten</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Page:** wiki/Red_Sundown

**e₁ (Introduction):**

**Page:** wiki/Lewis_B._Patten

**e₂ (Introduction):** He often published under the names Lewis Ford, Lee Leighton and Joseph Wayne.

**Verdict:** Supported
FEVEROUS baseline

- Wikipedia pages retrieved by entity matching and TF-IDF
- Sentences and tables are retrieved with TF-IDF
- Cells are picked with a fine-tuned RoBERTa sequence labeler
- Veracity is predicted with fine-tuned RoBERTa on concatenated claim and all evidence
Next steps

- Neurosymbolic evidence retrieval
- Neurosymbolic inference for tables and text
- Fact-checking real-world claims
- Multilingual fact-checking
Misinformation and fact-checking are social

- Online social media helps us see outside the bubble but also increase polarisation (Bail et al., 2018)
- What correlates with more constructive conversations?
- How can we intervene to make them happen?
Fact checking as a conversation

- Wikipedia: most successful large-scale online conversation
- Success not straightforward to replicate
- How can we make it happen again?
Let’s take a look at reasoning

- Dual system
  - System 1: Fast, biased
  - System 2: Slow, rational
- Various cognitive biases:
  - Recency bias
  - Confirmation bias
  - etc.
What do you think?

Individuals’ success rate: 10-20%

Small groups success rate?

80%! What makes groups work?

Wason (1968) selection task

Each of the 4 cards below has letter on one side and a number on the other. Which card(s) do you need to turn to test the rule:

All cards with vowels on one side, have an even number on the other.

A 9 N 8
With a little help from my friends

Reasoning has evolved in the context of communication, not in isolation:

- arguments are made to help us justify ourselves and convince each other
- we are bad judges of our own arguments but good for the others
- Scientists are no different!

Can we help groups work better?
Deliberation Enhancing Bots (DEliBots)

- Develop conversational agents that make conversations better!
- A different kind of dialogue agent:
  - Unlike chatbots, they help users accomplish a task
  - Unlike task-oriented bots (e.g. restaurant booking), they don’t know or give the answer
Let’s look at some data

Each of the 4 cards below has a letter on one side and a number on the other. Which card(s) do you need to turn to test the rule: All cards with vowels on one side, have an even number on the other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Beaver:** What do you think?

**Cat:** I think A and 8

**Duck:** I thought A and 8 too, but we may be wrong

**Cat:** @Duck, well we need A for sure

**Beaver:** What if we don't turn 8 at all?

**Duck:** Yes! We don't care what is behind the even numbers

**Cat:** This may be right, but we may need to check the odds

**Duck:** So, A and 9?

**Beaver:** Yes
Data collection

Initial experiments with local volunteers, once stable used MTurk

- 500 groups, 2-5 persons (avg 3.16) (smaller group, fewer ideas)
- each group member submits responses at onboarding
- the group deliberates and members submit again
- no need for the group consensus but bonus for correct response

Onboarding success rate: 11%

Success rate after deliberation: 33%

In 43.8% of the groups with the correct solution, no participant had chosen it initially!
Annotating deliberation

How do we improve deliberation?

Ask questions/probes for:

- moderation
- solutions
- reasons

Hypothesis: **probing for reasoning** makes a difference
Annotation findings

- Three annotators (two NLPers, one psychologist)
- Inter-annotator agreement (Kappa): 75% on annotating probes, 71% on determining probing type
- Key correlations:
  - **Probing for reasoning** correlates positively but weakly; how we probe (choice of language) is likely to matter.
  - **Conversation length** correlates positively but weakly
  - Strongest correlation is with **group consensus**; agrees with previous work that small group discussion is better than wisdom of crowds (Navajas et al., 2018)
What makes you change your mind?

- Identify utterances that cause changes to proposed solutions
- Experiments with methods relying on both language and dialogue statistics, e.g. utterances since the previous change point
Next steps

- Build DeliBots!

- Evaluation with humans in the loop

- Data and more here: https://www.delibot.xyz/delidata/
Getting real: Wikipedia vs much of the web
WikiDisputes (De Kock and Vlachos, EACL2021)

- A corpus of 7,425 disagreements on Wikipedia Talk pages

Climate change denial

WikiConv: A Corpus of the Complete Conversational History of a Large Online Collaborative Community  
Hua et al., 2018

Terra Novus at 2010-10-14 07:25: The title of this article is unnecessarily and should be revised to something like Criticism of Climate Change.

Terra Novus at 2010-10-14 07:29
<<EDIT>> moved [[Climate change denial]] to [[Criticism of Climate Change]]: Climate Change denial is the term used by proponents of climate change and not those who disagree with some or all of its implications. Changing it to Criticism of Climate Change.

TALK PAGE

Hans Adler at 2010-10-14 21:32: Neutrality isn't about "balancing" in the way incompetent or lazy journalists do. (Typical example: "Most people find torture morally repugnant. However, according to Professor John Doe [...] properly conducted torture does not pose a serious threat to the subject’s physical constitution and is often necessary to...") One thing that Wikipedia doesn't do is misrepresent fringe claims as if they had more credibility than they do.

TALK PAGE

Dgaw at 2010-10-21 14:25: With all due respect, it does appear to me that this article is written from a particular point of view specifically one that is critical of [denialists]. Are there others here who disagree?
Predicting escalation

Welcome to the dispute resolution noticeboard (DRN)

This is an informal place to resolve small content disputes as part of dispute resolution. It may also be used as a tool to direct certain discussions to more appropriate forums, such as requests for comment, or other noticeboards. You can ask a question on the talk page. This is an early stop for most disputes on Wikipedia. You are not required to participate, however, the case filer must participate in all aspects of the dispute or the matter will be considered failed. Any editor may volunteer! Click this button 📚 to add your name! You don’t need to volunteer to help. Please feel free to comment below on any case. Be civil and remember; Maintain Wikipedia policy: it is usually a misuse of a talk page to continue to argue any point that has not met policy requirements. *Editors must take particular care adding information about living persons to any Wikipedia page. This may also apply to some groups.

Noticeboards should not be a substitute for talk pages. Editors are expected to have had extensive discussion on a talk page (not just through edit summaries) to work out the issues before coming to DRN.

Do you need assistance?  Would you like to help?

Request dispute resolution  Become a volunteer

Escalation labels:
- 201 Escalated
- 7224 Not escalated*

*sub-sampled to correct for length imbalance
Predicting escalation

Feature-based models

- **Toxicity**: Wulczyn et al. (2017)
- **Sentiment**: Liu et al. (2005)
- **Politeness**: Zhang et al. (2018)
- **Collaboration**: Niculae and Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil (2016)

+ **Gradients** to consider how feature values change throughout conversation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>PR-AUC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Random</td>
<td>0.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bag-of-words</td>
<td>0.213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baselines</th>
<th>PR-AUC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toxicity</td>
<td>0.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentiment</td>
<td>0.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politeness</td>
<td>0.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>0.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>+ gradients</strong></td>
<td>0.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>0.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>+ gradients</strong></td>
<td>0.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politeness and collaboration</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>+ gradients</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Predicting escalation

Neural networks

- **GloVe embeddings**: Pennington et al. (2014)
- **LSTM-based**: Hochreiter and Schmidhuber (1997)
- **Hierarchical attention network**: Yang et al. (2016)

➔ Representing structure helps
➔ Edit summaries help
A cherry picked example from our model

Ggugvunt at 2006-08-25 15:09: The rest of this article is quite well written and reasonably NPOV, but the caption to the Canada picture reads like polemic to me.

Frogsprog at 2006-08-25 15:12: I would start by saying I am “very” annoyed by american editors refusing to accept information that makes their country look unpopular.

Ggugvunt at 2006-08-25 15:20: First of all, you need to calm down a bit. Secondly, if you think the picture is so violent and strong, let it speak for itself.

Ggugvunt at 2006-08-25 15:33: Listen - my only issue is this: the caption sounded out of place with the reasonable tone of the rest of the article. Don't jump to conclusions - please. Can I revert it back to the non-adverbs version and remove the NPOV marker now?

Frogsprog at 2006-08-25 18:11: OK, a compromise, I will re-add the adverb "violently" but leave out strong.

Ggugvunt at 2006-08-25 18:39: Much better! Thank you!
How do we encourage them? Opening Minds Up

- Joint project with Open University, Sheffield and Toshiba
- Develop bots that help users engage with the “other side”
Deliberation4Good

Theme: “How can people with diverging views be supported to successfully communicate and negotiate?”

- 14th of October in Cambridge
- Registration until the 28th of September
- More information: https://www.delibot.xyz/deliberation4good/
Thanks to my collaborators


Elsewhere: Christos Christodoulopoulos (Amazon), Oana Cocarascu (Imperial College, King's College), Arpit Mittal (Amazon, Meta), Sebastian Riedel (UCL, Meta), Tom Stafford (Sheffield)
Thanks to the funding agencies
Questions?

andreas.vlachos@cst.cam.ac.uk
Claim Verification Correction

Make meaning altering changes to claims so that they are better supported by evidence

Sub-tasks:

- Find evidence
- Identify falsehoods
- Incorporate information from the evidence into the claim to correct them

“Bullitt was directed by D’Antoni”

Refuted

“Bullitt was produced by D’Antoni”

Supported
Requirements for generating corrections

1. **Intelligible:** Is the generated correction grammatical and can the meaning be understood? Considers the correction in isolation.

2. **Supported by Evidence:** Same definition as in claim verification. Considers the relation between correction and evidence.

3. **Correcting the Error:** Is the correction addressing an error in the claim? Considers the relation between correction and claim.
Supervised encoder-decoder model?

Yes, but we don’t have the data!
Datasets typically have claim and evidence, not corrections.
Generating corrections

**Step 1:** Mask out tokens from claim using retrieved evidence.

**Step 2:** Use evidence to rewrite the masked sentence into a correction.
Incorporating evidence into masked claims

**Seq2seq model**
Trained to recover missing tokens, conditioned on evidence

**Training:** reproduce the (unmasked) claim, only possible if claim was supported by the evidence, otherwise partly

**Masker:** random in training, heuristic in testing
# Human Evaluation on FEVER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Intelligible</th>
<th>Supported</th>
<th>Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervised (oracle)</td>
<td>Retrieved</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ours</strong></td>
<td>Retrieved</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Shah et al 2020]</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(tokens from NLI interpretation for masking)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERT (no evidence)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For more details see our paper *(Thorne and Vlachos, 2021)*