Abstract

The rise of Internet has made it a major source of information. Unfortunately, not all information online is true, and thus a number of fact-checking initiatives have been launched, both manual and automatic. Here, we present our contribution in this regard: *WhatTheWikiFact*, a system for automatic claim verification using Wikipedia. The system predicts the veracity of an input claim, and it further shows the evidence it has retrieved as part of the verification process. It shows confidence scores and a list of relevant Wikipedia articles, together with detailed information about each article, including the phrase used to retrieve it, the most relevant sentences it contains, and their stances with respect to the input claim, with associated probabilities.

1 Introduction

The Internet is abundant in platforms that allow users to share information online such as social networks, blogs, and forums. Unfortunately, not all such information is true, and thus there is a need for tools that can help users check the veracity of questionable claims they come across online. As manual fact-checking is a complex and time-consuming task, it is important to develop tools that can help automate the process of fact-checking at all its stages.

Various task formulations have been proposed to automate fact-checking, e.g., RumourEval (Gorrell et al., 2019), the SemEval task on Fact Checking in Community Question Answering Forums (Mihaylova et al., 2019), the Fake News Challenge (Hanselowski et al., 2018a), and the FEVER task on Fact Extraction and VERification (Thorne et al., 2018b). Here, we focus on the FEVER task, as it offers a large-scale training dataset, and enables explainable systems.

Interestingly, despite the popularity of research using the FEVER task formulation and its dataset, to the best of our knowledge, there are no publicly available running systems based on it. Here we aim to bridge this gap with our *WhatTheWikiFact* system, which we describe in detail below.

*WhatTheWikiFact* allows users to check a claim, or a set of claims, against Wikipedia. The system searches for potentially relevant information, by first identifying relevant documents, and then the relevant sentences within them. Then, it analyzes each statement submitted as an input against all extracted text fragments and reports its final decision: *Truth*, *Lying*, or *No Enough Info*. *WhatTheWikiFact* further displays all the information it used to make its decision, together with intermediate results for each verified statement, which includes (i) a list of the titles of the most relevant documents with links to the corresponding Wikipedia pages, and (ii) detailed information about each document as a table of retrieved text fragments (position in the document | text fragment), and a bar chart showing the confidence of the classifier in each label (*Supports*, *Refutes* or *Not Enough Info*) for each text fragment. This allows the user to quickly analyze and to possibly correct the result.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 discusses related work. Section 3 describes the dataset we used for training. Section 4 offers an overview of the system and its components. Section 5 discusses the core implementation details. Section 6 presents some evaluation results. Section 7 describes the system interface and its functionality, with some examples. Finally, Section 8 concludes and discusses future work.
2 Related Work

Many task formulations have been proposed to address the spread of misinformation and disinformation online, and for each formulation, a number of approaches have been tried. Some good readings on the topic include surveys such as that by Shu et al. (2017), who adopted a data mining perspective on “fake news” and focused on social media. Another survey (Zubiaga et al., 2018) studied rumor detection in social media. The survey by Thorne and Vlachos (2018) took a fact-checking perspective on “fake news” and related problems. Li et al. (2016) covered truth discovery in general. Lazer et al. (2018) offered a general overview and discussion on the science of “fake news”, while Vosoughi et al. (2018) focused on the process of proliferation of true and false news online. Other recent surveys focused on stance detection (Kucuk and Can, 2020), on propaganda (da San Martin et al., 2020), on social bots (Ferrara et al., 2016), on false information (Zannettou et al., 2019) and on bias on the Web (Baeza-Yates, 2018). Some very recent surveys focused on stance for misinformation and disinformation detection (Hardalov et al., 2021), on automatic fact-checking to assist human fact-checkers (Nakov et al., 2021a), on predicting the factuality and the bias of entire news outlets (Nakov et al., 2021c), and on multimodal disinformation detection (Alam et al., 2021).

2.1 General Fact-checking

The primary focus of this paper is fact-checking of claims. Relevant research includes work on credibility assessment in Twitter, which has been addressed using user-based, message-based, topic-based, and propagation-based features (Castillo et al., 2011). Rashkin et al. (2017) studied veracity by analyzing the linguistic features used in the claims. Wang (2017) presented the LIAR dataset, which focuses on fact-checking using only the input claim (its text and metadata). Lee et al. (2020a) revealed that misinformation can be discovered using perplexity analysis of the input claim, as perplexity is higher for false statements (as scored by a language model trained on reliable information on the topic of the claim). A number of studies were also conducted on the feasibility of using language models for open-domain question answering and further as fact-checkers (Petroni et al., 2019; Roberts et al., 2020; Lee et al., 2020b). All this work was non-explainable.

An even more relevant research direction is on explainable, evidence-based fact-checking. Shaar et al. (2020) developed two datasets for detecting previously fact-checked claims, which were extended and used in CheckThat-2020 and CheckThat-2021 (Barron-Cedeno et al., 2020; Nakov et al., 2021b). Chen et al. (2020) proposed table-based fact verification, and Gad-Elrab et al. (2019) used knowledge graphs.

Yet another relevant research direction is on stance detection as an element of fact-checking. It was the objective of the Fake News Challenge shared task (Hanselowski et al., 2018a; Riedel et al., 2017), as well as of the RumorEval shared tasks at SemEval in 2017 and 2019 (Derczynski et al., 2017; Gorrell et al., 2019).

2.2 Fact-Checking Using Wikipedia

In our system, we use the FEVER dataset and task formulation, which enables Wikipedia-based explainable fact-checking Thorne et al. (2018a). The dataset was used in two shared tasks, FEVER and FEVER 2.0 (Thorne et al., 2019), where most participating systems had the following three components: (i) document retrieval, (ii) sentence retrieval, and (iii) natural language inference (NLI). Otto (2018); Chakrabarty et al. (2018); Hanselowski et al. (2018b); Alonso-Reina et al. (2019) used a search API to retrieve relevant documents, while Yoneda et al. (2018) used logistic regression. Word Mover’s Distance (Chakrabarty et al., 2018), TF.IDF (Malon, 2018), ESIM (Hanselowski et al., 2018b), logistic regression (Yoneda et al., 2018), BERT (Stammbach and Neumann, 2019) were used for sentence retrieval. DAM (Otto, 2018), ESIM (Hidey and Diab, 2018), Random Forest (Reddy et al., 2018), LSTM (Nie et al., 2019) and BERT (Stammbach and Neumann, 2019) were used for NLI. We use a similar overall architecture.

2.3 System Demonstrations

Several demos have addressed the task of fact-checking. This includes Hoaxy (Shao et al., 2016), for tracking misinformation from social networks and news sites, CredEye, (Popat et al., 2018) for credibility assessment, Tracy (Gad-Elrab et al., 2019), which uses rules and knowledge graphs, STANCY (Popat et al., 2019) for stance detection using BERT augmented with consistency constraints, and FAKTA (Nadeem et al., 2019), which was trained on the FEVER dataset, but focused on stance and on evidence extraction from the Web.
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4.4 Aggregation

We use CatBoost gradient boosting (Prokhorenkova et al., 2018) to aggregate the sentence-level predictions of the NLI component. We train the model on part of the validation set using the stacked label probabilities predicted by the NLI model. Thus, we use 60-dimensional (3 scores for 20 sentences) feature vectors, potentially padded by zeros in case of lack of sentences in the retrieval phase.

We further report the maximal probability of the Supports (Refutes) class among all sentences scaled by the percentage of such sentences among the possibly relevant ones, i.e., excluding Not Enough Info, as the confidence score for Truth(Lying) predictions and the minimal probability of the Not Enough Info, otherwise.

5 System Architecture

The WhatTheWikiFact system has a server and a client parts, which are connected via a REST API. The client part is implemented using the Streamlit framework3—it is the GUI part, that is, the interface in the browser. The server part is implemented using the Fast API4. We use Allen NLP library (Gardner et al., 2018) for the constituency and the dependency parsers, and the official repository for BERT.5 We preload these models on the server and we serve them using POST requests made by the client part. The parsers receive a piece of text as input, which is further tokenized and stemmed using the NLTK library (Bird and Loper, 2004). BERT receives a list of sentence pairs, which are further processed using the BERT tokenizer.

3http://streamlit.io/
4http://fastapi.tiangolo.com/
5http://github.com/google-research/bert

6 Evaluation

The approach we use in our WhatTheWikiFact system achieves an accuracy of 73.22 and a FEVER score of 67.44 on the test part of the FEVER dataset. These scores are better than those for the best system at the FEVER shared task (Thorne et al., 2018b), which had an accuracy of 68.21, and a FEVER score of 64.21. They are also on par with the best system from the builder phase of the FEVER2.0 shared task (Thorne et al., 2019), which had a FEVER score of 68.46. Of course, there have been some better results reported in the literature since then, and we also had stronger results in our offline experiments. Yet, we use this particular system, as we need real-time execution, which requires certain compromise in terms of accuracy for the sake of speed of execution.

Our analysis shows that the biggest fraction of the system classification errors are in distinguishing Not Enough Info sentences from the rest. At the same time, the quality of the retriever part is almost 91%, which means that in 91% of the cases, we do retrieve correct evidence for the final set of potentially relevant sentences. Therefore, such cases can be easily analyzed by the user in our system’s output.

7 User Interface

The system allows the user to enter a list of up to 5 claims to verify, separated by line breaks.

Figure 3 shows a snapshot of WhatTheWikiFact’s output for an input claim. We can see that the system offers an overview of the verification results, which includes a verdict, the system’s confidence in that verdict, and a list of possibly relevant documents: title and a link to the Wikipedia page.

This tool performs fact checking by comparing information with Wikipedia data.
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Figure 3: Screenshot of what our WhatTheWikiFact system outputs when verifying the claim: “Napoleon Bonaparte declared Joan of Arc a national symbol.”

Figure 3 shows that the system has retrieved three articles for the input claim “Napoleon Bonaparte declared Joan of Arc a national symbol.” However, this does not mean that the system considers all of these articles as relevant. It just means that they contain the top-20 most relevant sentences.

By clicking on the “show info” button, the user can expand the panel with details about each document. As a result, the following information will be shown (as illustrated in Figure 4):

- **The part of the input claim** that was used to retrieve the document.

- **A bar chart of the predicted stance labels for the input claim with respect to each retrieved sentence.** The stance is expressed as one of the classes Supports (SUP), Refutes (REF), or Not Enough Info (NEI). The chart further shows the class probability, which is also represented as the bar height, sentence number, and label, which is also indicated with the corresponding color. Note that there are three bars for each sentence, i.e., one for each label. Moreover, the bars are ordered (grouped) by labels.

- **A table of the most relevant sentences.** Each sentence in that table is supplemented with the position out of the length of the document, which is shown in lines for easy matching with the bar chart.

For example, Figure 4 shows that the article “Joan of Arc” is relevant for checking the input claim, as it includes a sentence that supports that claim. Other retrieved sentences in this document have almost 100% probability of a Not Enough Info label, and are thus irrelevant. The analysis of the remaining two documents—“Napoleon”, retrieved by the phrase “Napoleon Bonaparte”; “National symbol”, retrieved by the phrase “a national symbol”—will reveal that they are fully irrelevant. With these retrieval results, the user can manually investigate the boundary (doubtful) classification cases, especially for veracity prediction with low confidence or in case of Not Enough Info.

8 Conclusion and Future Work

We have presented WhatTheWikiFact, a system for automatic claim verification using Wikipedia. It reports the veracity for each input claim supplemented with evidence retrieved during the verification process. It also shows confidence scores and a set of relevant Wikipedia articles. Moreover, it allows users to get detailed information about each article, including the phrase used to retrieve it, a list of its most relevant sentences, and their stance probabilities regarding the input claim.

In future work, we plan to implement a more accurate model by distilling knowledge from a larger model. Another direction we want to explore is to add new languages for verification using local Wikipedias, which can be implemented without additional training, e.g., using multilingual BERT.
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Ethics and Broader Impact

We would like to point out that our demo could potentially be misused by malicious actors, e.g., to restrict freedom of speech. Yet, our actual intent is to promote media literacy and critical thinking by letting people check and explore evidence about claims of their interest. We believe that the benefit of this kind of research outweighs the potential downsides.

We would also like to warn that the use of large-scale Transformers requires a lot of computations and the use of GPUs/TPUs for training, which contributes to global warming. This is a bit less of an issue in our case, as we do not train such models from scratch; rather, we fine-tune them on relatively small datasets. Moreover, running on a CPU for inference, once the model has been fine-tuned (which is our case here), is perfectly feasible as CPUs contribute much less to global warming.
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