

DEFAME: Dynamic Evidence-based FAct-checking with Multimodal Experts

Tobias Braun* Mark Rothermel* Marcus Rohrbach Anna Rohrbach
 Technical University of Darmstadt & hessian.AI, Germany

tobias.braun@mai.tu-darmstadt.de, {mark.rothermel, marcus.rohrbach, anna.rohrbach}@tu-darmstadt.de

Abstract

The proliferation of disinformation presents a growing threat to societal trust and democracy, necessitating robust and scalable Fact-Checking systems. In this work, we present *Dynamic Evidence-based FAct-checking with Multimodal Experts (DEFAME)*, a modular, zero-shot MLLM pipeline for open-domain, text-image claim verification. DEFAME frames the problem of fact-checking as a six-stage process, dynamically deciding about the usage of external tools for the retrieval of textual and visual evidence. In addition to the claim’s veracity, DEFAME returns a justification accompanied by a comprehensive, multimodal fact-checking report. While most alternatives either focus on sub-tasks of fact-checking, lack explainability or are limited to text-only inputs, DEFAME solves the problem of fact-checking “end-to-end”, including claims with images or those that require visual evidence. Evaluation on the popular benchmarks VERITE, AVeriTeC, and MOCHEG shows that DEFAME surpasses all previous methods, establishing it as the new state-of-the-art fact-checking system. We released the implementation on GitHub¹.

1. Introduction

In recent years, misinformation has been growing in scale and quality beyond human capacity to fact-check. Increasing global interconnectedness accelerates the spread of misinformation, while advances in AI make its generation easier and more convincing. Greater time spent on social networks heightens exposure, and a growing number of conflicts present opportunities for bad actors to exploit these new avenues. “Fake news” has evolved from a lighthearted term into a serious global threat [12, 68]. Humans alone cannot meet this challenge; scientific and technological advancements are essential.

Importantly, humans perceive multimodal information to be more credible than pure text [24, 43], interpreting

*Equal contribution.

¹<https://github.com/multimodal-ai-lab/DEFAME>




Figure 1. DEFAME in a nutshell: It processes a claim consisting of text and images and returns a fact-check report. This human-friendly multimodal document includes a verdict and all the necessary evidence to support it.

visuals as “evidence” [22], making such content particularly persuasive. Driven by higher engagement rates on social media, multimodal misinformation also spreads faster and reaches a broader audience than text-only misinformation [35, 62]. This is especially critical given that approximately 80% of misinformation is multimodal [18]. Unfortunately, Automated Fact-Checking (AFC) systems still lag in several crucial areas, sometimes hindering rather than advancing trust in fact-checking processes. Incorrect flagging or unwarranted censorship can quickly erode public confidence, especially given the sensitivity and emotional weight surrounding these issues.

But there is hope. While only a few years ago, most AFC systems were limited to text analysis [17, 63], the field has since advanced toward multimodal misinformation detection, aligning with technological and societal shifts. Early datasets like the Multimodal Information Manipulation (MAIM) [26] and Multimodal Entity Image Repurpos-

ing (MEIR) [50] represented initial steps to capture these multimodal threats. However, these datasets rely on simplistic manipulations, such as randomly mismatched images (MAIM) or entity swaps (MEIR), which fail to capture the sophisticated misinformation techniques observed today. To address this, more recent datasets like TAMPERED-NEWS [41] and NEWSCLIPPINGS [37] have focused on challenging out-of-context data and more realistic misinformation scenarios. These contributions have enhanced data authenticity; however, they have also gone hand in hand with increasing fragmentation of the field into distinct sub-fields, including: Text-Only Fact-Checking [25, 53, 58], Image Manipulation Detection [23, 72, 76], Justification Analysis [7], Synthetic Misinformation Detection [12, 74], and Evidence Retrieval and Verification [51]. This growing specialization, while beneficial, has created a scattered landscape where individual approaches address only isolated aspects of a complex problem.

As benchmarks evolve to mirror the complexity of misinformation, we introduce *Dynamic Evidence-based Fact-checking with Multimodal Experts (DEFAME)* to address the same gap from a solution-oriented perspective. DEFAME is a task-agnostic, end-to-end framework capable of handling diverse misinformation types—including manipulated images, altered text, and out-of-context pairings. It strategically incorporates Multimodal Large Language Models (MLLMs) in a modular design, deploying them selectively for tasks that leverage their commonsense reasoning, summarization, retrieval-augmented generation (RAG), and high-level planning capabilities. Recognizing the potential and limitations of MLLMs, we reinforce MLLM inferences with external tools that allow us to dynamically collect the necessary evidence, thereby reducing hallucination risks and enhancing reliability.

Significantly, our model incorporates visual information from claims *and* evidence into its justification process. DEFAME produces a comprehensive explanatory fact-checking report that includes retrieved evidence images (cf. Figure 1). To the best of our knowledge, this is the first framework to iteratively incorporate both types of images within the same analytical cycle.

We demonstrate DEFAME’s effectiveness by establishing new state-of-the-art results on three diverse and widely used benchmarks. On AVERITEC [53], we improve accuracy from 72.4% to 74%. For MOCHEG [71], we achieve a +4.7% improvement in average F1 score, and on VERITE [48], we enhance True/False accuracy by +26.5%. Additionally, we demonstrate that the fact-checking reports generated by DEFAME are well-received by human evaluators.

2. Related Work

Automating the task of fact-checking is a difficult problem, far from being solved [3, 17, 52, 71]. AFC covers various sub-problems such as evidence retrieval, claim extraction, and veracity prediction. Most approaches narrow down their scope, either by focusing on a sub-task like summarization [13], deepfake detection [27], or out-of-context detection [61, 69], or by addressing only a specific domain, e.g., charts [2, 4], social media [65], politics [28], or news [54, 69]. Others investigate the incorporation of new architectures like a knowledge graph [10] or address the problem of evidence ambiguity [21]. In contrast to all these methods, DEFAME combines the fragmented landscape of AFC work into one end-to-end system—not restricted to only one modality, domain, or sub-task.

Text-only fact-checking. The vast majority of proposed AFC systems is purely text-based [14, 17, 32, 45, 52, 63, 67, 70, 75]. The most popular benchmarks to evaluate these methods are LIAR [64], FEVER [59], and AVERITEC [53], the latter of which mitigates important weaknesses of the previous ones, including temporal leaks and evidence insufficiency. Most recently, FACTCHECK-BENCH [66] was introduced to evaluate the factuality of LLM responses. We use AVERITEC in our evaluation.

Multimodal fact-checking. Popular multimodal AFC benchmarks include [6, 42, 44, 69, 71, 78], most notably MOCHEG [71] which builds on real-world claims, requiring multimodal evidence retrieval, additionally incorporating the task of justification generation. Given these features, we use MOCHEG in our evaluation. Previous approaches utilize multimodal fusion [46, 47, 54], leverage inter-, and cross-modal consistency [1, 19], or apply conventional machine learning models [47, 65]. A strong disadvantage of these systems is the inability to produce human-understandable explanations of the predictions. Furthermore, in stark contrast to DEFAME, they often rely on superficial pattern matching or lexical/visual similarity, ignoring factuality and logic, raising questions about their robustness.

A strong emphasis of multimodal AFC has been on Out-Of-Context (OOC) image detection, sometimes referred to as “cheapfake” detection. Popular evaluation benchmarks include NEWSCLIPPINGS [38] and, more recently, VERITE [48]. In our experiments, we use VERITE because it improves over previous benchmarks by reducing unimodal bias and incorporating real-world samples.

(M)LLM-based fact-checking. Since the rise of LLMs, the AFC community increasingly began to incorporate LLMs (or their multimodal counterpart, MLLMs) into their proposed solutions [13, 14, 28, 45, 57, 70]. One of the multimodal AFC systems closest related to DEFAME is RAGAR [28]. Although it is able to process textual and visual claims, RAGAR does not retrieve any other evidence

besides text. Additionally, instead of including the claim image directly in its context, as DEFAME does, RAGAR uses a mere MLLM-generated textual description of it.

Several multimodal AFC approaches mostly or entirely rely on the parametric knowledge of the MLLM [8, 20, 34, 54], avoiding the retrieval of evidence from external sources. This kind of approach has three major disadvantages: First, the MLLM knowledge may not be up-to-date, i.e., it cannot be used to retrieve evidence about recent events. Second, the absence of links to external, credible sources makes the predictions less trustworthy and harder to “trace” and verify. Third, it is subject to more hallucinations than Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG)-based methods, worsening the reliability. In contrast, DEFAME uses its internal knowledge only for commonsense reasoning. All the evidence comes via external tools invoked by DEFAME. In particular, and unlike some other work [70], DEFAME does not use benchmark-provided gold evidence.

3. DEFAME Approach

(M)LLM agents have become powerful tools across complex domains, even independently conducting scientific research [36]. Their strengths include commonsense reasoning, summarization, basic planning, and tool use [16, 33, 56, 73], making LLMs ideal for targeted deployment on selective sub-tasks within a structured framework. Nonetheless, their limitations like hallucinations, reliance on static data, and stochastic outputs [31, 39] necessitate careful management. Accordingly, we decompose the fact-checking process into discrete sub-tasks, linking the outputs of rigorous tools to form a logical chain using MLLMs. This framework effectively operates as a dynamic, multi-step RAG system [29], inspired by established fact-checking workflows [40]. DEFAME (see Figure 2) comprises an MLLM, central to five of the six stages, a suite of multimodal tools, and a structured fact-check report, creating a comprehensive system designed to navigate and verify complex multimodal claims.

By default, each call to the Multimodal Large Language Model (MLLM) includes the current state of the fact-checking report as contextual input, along with a task-specific description and, where applicable, relevant in-context examples. This approach emulates a form of context awareness, guiding the MLLM to focus on pertinent information at each stage of the fact-checking process.

3.1. Stage 1: Plan Actions

Upon receiving a claim, the planner suggests a targeted action sequence designed to identify missing information and gather the necessary evidence. It keeps track of previously executed actions, ensuring it avoids repetitive loops and can adjust course if it encounters a “dead end.” The instructions for the planner are built on the basis of in-context




Figure 2. Overview of DEFAME: The three main components are the MLLM, the fact-checking report, and the external tools. They interact with each other in a dynamic six-stage pipeline.

examples that demonstrate the use of the four specialized tools, namely Web Search, Reverse Image Search (RIS), Image Search, and Geolocation. While RIS and Geolocation are specific to image-based inputs, Web Search and Image Search operate with text queries, which are dynamically generated as part of the action planning.

3.2. Stage 2: Execute Actions

Given a set of actions, DEFAME invokes the corresponding tools from the following list:

1. Web Search: Web Search serves as the foundational tool in our fact-checking framework, like a hammer for a handyman—it’s essential for grounding MLLM predictions with external sources. Given a textual search query, this tool conducts an open web search via Google Search using the Serper API². It provides the top 3 relevant web pages.

2. Reverse Image Search (RIS): RIS serves as a flexible, real-time knowledge base, providing contextual data—such as an image’s sources, authors, prior uses, and approximate dates—that a statically trained MLLM, with fixed parametric knowledge, cannot offer. For each image, RIS retrieves up to 3 URLs of web pages containing the same

²<https://serper.dev>

image, using the Google Vision API³.

3. Image Search: LLMs have no(t yet) access to the open web. Moreover, even Multimodal LLMs are not suited to authentically recreate photos or graphics in a way that supports legitimate fact-checking. To bridge this gap, we integrate an open web image search, retrieving up to three URLs for the most relevant images, diagrams, and infographics. These retrieved visuals can then serve as inputs for our Geolocation and RIS tools, providing real-world context that MLLMs alone cannot supply.

4. Geolocator: Geolocation is another critical capability for any multimodal fact-checking system. MLLMs lack the spatial reasoning and domain-specific training required for precise geolocation [49]. Therefore, we integrated GEOCLIP [11]—a specialized geolocation tool designed to estimate the most probable countries from which an image could originate. This tool serves as a plausibility check, further grounding the reasoning process of the MLLM.

To prevent temporal leakage, all web-based tools restrict search results to sources published before the claim’s release date (if known). Additionally, we exclude major fact-checking websites and any sites that disallow automated bot access. A list of excluded domains can be found in Section A. For each retrieved URL, we scrape the corresponding page using Firecrawl⁴, converting it into an MLLM-friendly Markdown format. This process also identifies and downloads any referenced images within the Markdown, ensuring a complete context for the fact-check.

3.3. Stage 3: Summarize Results




Now begins the process of integrating external evidence into the system. The MLLM performs all summarizations. For each tool output, DEFAME instructs the MLLM to produce a natural language summary of the key findings. Relevant images are retrieved and incorporated into the summary. To avoid clutter, the MLLM is instructed to return NONE if the result is deemed irrelevant.


3.4. Stage 4: Develop the Fact-Check

In this stage, corresponding to stage 4 in [40], the claim is situated in a broader context by establishing relationships between evidence and the claim. DEFAME directs the MLLM to assess the claim’s veracity step-by-step based on the available evidence, flagging any gaps as “incomplete” if the information is missing. This stage aids in complex fact-checks that require detailed reasoning and prepares for the next stage by consolidating evidence.

3.5. Stage 5: Predict a Verdict

At this stage, DEFAME assesses the claim’s veracity, classifying it into one of the benchmark-specific cate-

gories—typically  **Supported** or  **Refuted**. The MLLM is prompted to summarize key findings and select a verdict. If there is insufficient information, it may return  **NEI** (Not Enough Information).

When  **NEI** is returned, the fact-checking process initiates a new iteration, returning to Stage 1 to gather further evidence. This iterative process provides an opportunity for DEFAME to dive deeper into unresolved questions, allowing for a more thorough exploration of relevant sub-branches and a more extensive analysis of existing evidence. By revisiting earlier stages, DEFAME can expand its investigation, uncover new connections, and refine its conclusions, ultimately enhancing the robustness of the fact-check. However, if this is the third iteration or a definitive verdict is reached, the fact-checking process concludes, moving on to the final stage.

3.6. Stage 6: Justify the Verdict

Human readability and explainability are core focuses in this final stage. Given the entire fact-checking report, DEFAME tasks the MLLM with generating a one-paragraph summary. It highlights noteworthy findings and includes the most critical evidence—including key images—that influenced the decision.

3.7. To Sum Up

DEFAME only predicts a claim’s veracity when it deems its knowledge sufficient, mirroring the systematic approach of human fact-checkers. This process enables us to generate a comprehensive natural language report that could further assist a human in determining the truthfulness of a claim.

While DEFAME is designed to be agnostic to the specific MLLM, the chosen model’s capabilities directly influence the quality and accuracy of the resulting fact-check. As MLLMs continue to evolve and demonstrate proficiency in tasks ranging from scientific literature review to legal analysis, DEFAME’s performance in producing reliable verification outcomes is expected to improve correspondingly. This synergy between advanced MLLM capabilities and our DEFAME framework positions it at the forefront of automated fact-checking technology, capable of addressing the complex demands of modern claim verification. Moreover, its modular design enables DEFAME to incorporate further multimodal tools beyond those demonstrated here.

4. Experiments

4.1. Datasets

We evaluate DEFAME on three fact-checking datasets: AVERITEC [53], MOCHEG [71], and VERITE [48], representative of three distinct areas in fact-checking literature.

³<https://cloud.google.com/vision/>

⁴<https://github.com/mendableai/firecrawl>

AVeriTeC AVeriTeC [53] is a popular text-only real-world-based benchmark. We include it in our experiments to showcase the breadth of our approach. The development set consists of 500 claims: 305 ✖ **Refuted**, 122 ✔ **Supported**, 35 ? **NEI** (Not Enough Information), and 38 claims with the ⚡ **C/CP** (Conflicting/Cherrypicking) label that designates claims with conflicting evidence or claims that are technically true but taken out of context. We retrieve evidence from the benchmark-complementary Knowledge Base (KB), which contains the necessary evidence along with approximately 1,000 unrelated resources to simulate open web search. Thus, for AVeriTeC, the Web Search Tool does not utilize the Serper API but searches for documents via a semantic search. Each query to the KB is encoded using `gte-base-en-v1.5` [5]; the closest documents to the search query are retrieved via k -nearest neighbor. We evaluate DEFAME’s performance by computing accuracy overall 4 classes.

MOCHEG MOCHEG [71] is a recent multimodal dataset. Its textual claims are paired with multimodal text-image evidence and sourced from PolitiFact⁵ and Snopes⁶. The test set contains 2,001 unique claims, out of which 1,689 contain a final ruling. The ruling is used to assess the quality of generated justifications. Thus, we choose this subset as our test set. It includes 667 ✖ **Refuted**, 522 ? **NEI**, and 500 ✔ **Supported** claims. We evaluate our performance using the $F1$ -score for comparability with prior work while also reporting the 3-class accuracy in Sec. 4.3 and various metrics to assess justification quality in Sec. 4.5.

VERITE The VERITE [48] benchmark is designed for image-text claim verification focusing on the Out-Of-Context (OOC) scenario. It features claims with textual and image components, with some samples originating from fact-checking platforms and others obtained by swapping either an image or parts of a caption. We use the entire VERITE dataset totaling 1,001 samples for evaluation.⁷ The samples are categorized into 338 ✔ **True**, 325 ✖ **OOC**, and 338 ✖ **Miscaptioned** claims⁸. We take inspiration from [47] and report “✔ **True** vs. ✖ **Miscaptioned**” and “✔ **True** vs. ✖ **OOC**” accuracy. We further merge the ✖ **Miscaptioned** and ✖ **OOC** into a new “✖ **False**” category and report the “✔ **True** vs. ✖ **False**” accuracy.

⁵<https://www.politifact.com/>

⁶<https://www.snopes.com/>

⁷A small number of claims were excluded due to issues in the original web-crawling process, reducing the dataset from 1014 to 1001 samples.

⁸These differ in the way they were constructed, but both are out-of-context images, making it odd to distinguish between them.

4.2. Model and Configuration

As our MLLMs of choice, we use GPT-4O, GPT-4O MINI, and LLAVA-ONEVISION [30]. We compare these on all three datasets and choose GPT-4O as the main backbone in our framework due to its superior performance on all benchmarks (see Table 1). DEFAME includes GPT-4O without any fine-tuning, with temperature set to 0.01 and top- p to 0.9 to control response diversity. We postprocess each scraped web page returned by FireCrawl to contain the referenced images with a maximum of 32 images per result. DEFAME processes interleaved text-image inputs, preserving the original position of images within the text context, but any input exceeding the maximum context window of 128 k tokens is truncated.

Dataset	GPT-4O	GPT-4O MINI	LLAVA-ONEVISION
VERITE	84.5	67.1	59.3
MOCHEG	58.9	55.5	42.1
AVerITEC	74.0	59.2	40.0

Table 1. Accuracy comparison of three backbone models (GPT-4O, GPT-4O MINI, LLAVA-ONEVISION) on VERITE, MOCHEG, AVerITEC.

4.3. Ablation Study

We conduct an ablation study to investigate the contributions of various components and capabilities of DEFAME to its overall performance. First, to assess the importance of DEFAME’s dynamic design, we compare several variants: **Static Variant:** This version performs only a single pass through stages one to six, i.e., no ability to iterate or delve deeper into findings.

W/o Develop Stage: To understand the role of intermediate reasoning in the Develop Stage, we test a variant that excludes this stage from the framework. This variant jumps from the evidence retrieval immediately to the judgment.

Unimodal Develop Stage: Does it help to carry images through the stages and iterations, or is textual reasoning sufficient for comprehensive fact-checking? To test this, we construct this part-unimodal variant that can retrieve evidence images but cannot pass them on to the judgment stage or future iterations. Here, the MLLM must extract all the relevant details at first sight.

Tool Ablations: Next, we examine the contribution of each tool by individually removing them for the VERITE and MOCHEG datasets. The tools ablated include Web Search, Image Search, Reverse Image Search, and Geolocation. Since the AVerITEC dataset is purely textual, we did not ablate the use of multimodal tools for it.

Additionally, we compare our method to two baselines: **Pure GPT-4O:** This baseline instructs GPT-4O to generate a verdict in the most direct manner: “Determine the claim’s

Model Variant	MOCHEG		VERITE
	Acc	F1	T/F (Acc.)
DEFAME	59.5	<u>53.3</u>	84.5
w/o Geolocation	58.3	53.8	80.6
w/o Reverse Search	58.2	53.2	73.7
w/o Image Search	57.8	53.0	81.4
w/o Web Search	42.0	40.0	81.8
Static	47.7	47.7	82.8
w/o Develop	57.4	51.5	<u>83.8</u>
Unimodal Develop	56.1	52.9	82.0
Pure GPT-4o	53.5	53.0	78.0
Chain-of-Thought	49.6	37.2	79.7

Table 2. Ablation study results for different model variants on the MOCHEG and VERITE datasets. “True vs. False(= MC + OOC)” accuracy is reported for VERITE. Best scores are marked in bold, second best are underlined.

veracity by picking one of the following decision options...”
Chain-of-Thought: Similarly, this baseline relies solely on GPT-4O’s parametric knowledge. However, it is instructed to perform reasoning before generating the verdict.

The results of the ablation study are displayed in Table 2.

Analyzing the contribution of each tool, we see that DEFAME benefits from all four tools. While Web Search and Image Search are important for both datasets, Geolocation and Reverse Image Search yield little gain on MOCHEG. This is likely caused by the benchmark’s focus on textual claims, which often allows the model to generate a verdict in the first iteration. This avoids the need for further analysis of the retrieved images with other tools. On the other hand, the images included in the VERITE claims can be immediately scrutinized with Geolocation and Reverse Image Search tools, thereby increasing these tools’ relevance for text-image claims.

We see that the static variant of DEFAME lags behind the full dynamic version, especially on the MOCHEG benchmark. This suggests that for MOCHEG dynamic “chaining” of steps is very important. We also observe a consistent advantage from the Develop Stage and the integration of visual content into the fact-check report.

Surprisingly, the ablation study reveals that incorporating Chain-of-Thought prompting only slightly improves results on VERITE while hurting the performance on MOCHEG (bottom two rows). A look at the confusion matrices (Fig. 3) shows that the introduction of Chain-of-Thought makes the model more unsure, leaning towards ?NEI compared to the *Pure* GPT-4O. In contrast, DEFAME predicts too confidently even when the ground truth implies insufficient information. A qualitative analysis of the failure cases reveals that, in several cases, the ground truth explanation is no longer up-to-date (see Sections 4.7




Figure 3. Confusion matrices for the Pure GPT-4O, Chain-of-Thought, and DEFAME versions on the MOCHEG dataset.

and Supplemental E).

4.4. Comparison to the State-of-the-Art

Model	AVERTeC	MOCHEG	VERITE		
	Acc	F1	T/OOC	T/MC	T/F
CFR [55]	60.0	-	-	-	-
GPT-CoT [9]	<u>72.4</u>	-	-	-	-
MOCHEG [71]	-	44.1	-	-	-
MetaSum [13]	-	<u>48.6</u>	-	-	-
CHASMA [48]	-	-	74.4*	59.3*	52.1
AITR [47]	-	-	82.7	51.8	<u>58.0*</u>
DEFAME	74.0	53.3	<u>79.8</u>	84.5	84.5

Table 3. Comparison of our method with prior works across datasets. Best scores are in bold, second best are underlined. Values marked with * had to be derived from the reported numbers.

In Table 3, we display the results of our evaluation as compared to the state-of-the-art methods on the respective tasks. DEFAME achieves an accuracy of 74.0% on the AVERTeC benchmark and surpasses the previous previous state of the art [9] that deploys a Chain-of-Thought LLM approach (it is an unpublished work). With an overall accuracy of 84.5% on VERITE, DEFAME ranks 32.7 percentage points above prior best result [47] in terms of “✔True vs. ✖Miscaptioned” accuracy. It per-

forms competitively on the “ True vs. 00C” accuracy, leading to an overall accuracy gain of 26.5 percentage points. On MOCHEG, our framework achieves an accuracy of 59.5% and an average $F1$ -score of 53.3% replacing the METASUMPERCEIVER [13] as the new state-of-the-art fact-checking model. Importantly, no prior work has demonstrated the ability to *simultaneously* address such diverse tasks as we do here.

4.4.1 Adaptation to the AVERITEC Challenge

The AVERITEC dataset has recently run a challenge, where methods compete in terms of a new metric, AVERITEC Score, aimed to capture evidence correctness (see [53] for details). To compute this metric, we need to adapt our approach to include question-answer (QA) pairs in the fact-checking document since the score measures the similarity between generated and gold QA pairs. Our adapted approach (titled DEFAME-QA) achieves outstanding results in the AVERITEC Challenge (see Table 4)⁹. Notably, both the original DEFAME and the adapted DEFAME-QA achieve the same accuracy on the development set. This further demonstrates the versatility of our approach, effortlessly allowing us to “shape” the evidence the required way.

System	AVERITEC Score
1. DEFAME-QA	63
2. HERO	57
3. AIC	50
4. DUN-FACTCHECKER	50
5. PAPELO-TEN	48

Table 4. Top-5 systems on the AVERITEC challenge test set, ranked by AVERITEC score (in %).

4.5. Justification Evaluation

We also compare the generated justifications on the MOCHEG dataset to the gold rulings in Table 5. Note that our competitors here are fine-tuned on the gold rulings (except the top row and CoT). The vanilla zero-shot performance of DEFAME trails behind the other methods. We experimented by providing a single in-context example to convey the expected style of the rulings. It leads to a significant improvement in all metrics, even compared to the state-of-the-art fine-tuned models. Nonetheless, rather than speaking for much improved explanatory power, this shows the shortcomings of the automatic metrics, e.g., their sensitivity to specific n-grams and wording.

⁹See Section C for more details on the method adaptation.

Model	ROUGE L	BLEU	BERTScore
Best w/o FT [71]	17.18	7.38	83.95
FT [13]	24.60	11.40	88.10
FT [71]	<u>24.83</u>	<u>10.08</u>	86.95
DEFAME	18.72	3.20	85.89
DEFAME 1-shot	25.37	7.31	<u>87.42</u>

Table 5. Performance Comparison of Explanation Generation (in %). Best scores are marked in bold, second best are underlined.

4.6. Explainability Quality and Human Evaluation

This motivates us to explore human evaluation instead. One of the key features of DEFAME is its ability to produce comprehensible outputs in natural language, enhancing transparency for human readers. We conduct a small human evaluation to assess the explanatory quality of DEFAME’s output. We focus on two aspects.

Coherence: The fact-check maintains a logical and meaningful flow. There are no contradictions or gaps that disrupt the overall coherence of the document.

Completeness: The verdict is sufficiently justified. That is, based on the provided evidence, it is possible to derive the verdict.





Figure 4. Human assessment of Coherence and Completeness of DEFAME’s fact-checking reports vs. justifications produced by GPT-4O with Chain-of-Thought.

Participants are asked to rate the fact-checking reports w.r.t. the above criteria on a Likert scale from 1 to 5. In total, we collect 185 ratings over 36 claims sampled randomly but balanced from all three datasets. We ensure a minimum number of 5 evaluations per claim and include random samples from the Chain-of-Thought baseline for comparison. (We post-process the baseline outputs to match the format of DEFAME’s output to “disguise” it.) In total, 154 of the submissions assess the outputs from DEFAME while 31 assess the baseline. An example of the report format is included in Section G.

The results for coherence and completeness are shown in Fig. 4. The Chain-of-Thought baseline and DEFAME show no significant difference in output coherence, i.e., both produce mostly logical reports. This is expected, considering the current state of zero-shot LLMs in text generation. However, the two differ significantly in the justification of their verdicts. We assess the difference in Completeness scores between the DEFAME and CoT LLM groups using the Mann-Whitney U Test. This non-parametric test was chosen due to the non-normal distribution of completeness scores. The Mann-Whitney U Test yields a p -value of approximately 9.1×10^{-9} , deeming the findings statistically significant. Thus, we conclude that DEFAME consistently provides better justifications compared to Multimodal Large Language Models (MLLMs) with Chain-of-Thought prompting. This finding challenges recent studies [8, 20, 34, 54] that suggest MLLMs can perform fact-checking without relying on external evidence.

4.7. Qualitative Analysis and Failure Modes

We analyzed 20 VERITE cases in which DEFAME mislabeled a sample, and we identified three common failure modes. (1) **Premature Judgment** is the most common, appearing in half of the failures. It covers all instances where DEFAME committed to a definite verdict before having all the necessary evidence at hand, yet not having used up all three available retrieval iterations. We often observed that DEFAME felt confident to predict  **Supported** as soon as there was supporting evidence confirming that there is *any* image matching the claim text, not necessarily *the one* image given in the claim. (2) **Failed Evidence Retrieval**: In a quarter of the cases, DEFAME used up all three iterations and still did not find enough or any evidence. We found that this is due to two main reasons: Either the needed evidence was present only on inaccessible web pages (particularly social media), or the evidence was hidden in a video. (3) **Wrong Ground Truth**: In three out of 20 cases, after closer manual inspection, we found the annotation to be wrong, i.e., the prediction of DEFAME was actually correct. Finally, in one case, DEFAME “over-summarized” the evidence, losing the necessary information.

5. Discussion

5.1. Limitations

Despite promising results, our approach has limitations. **Credibility of External Evidence**: Our reliance on search engines for evidence retrieval introduces the risk of incorporating unreliable information, as search results may include leaked or biased content [15]. While some approaches assess source credibility using third-party ratings (e.g., Media Bias/Fact Check) [77], our framework currently lacks this feature, which could strengthen verification rigor.

Data Leakage: Data leakage is a concern, especially when fact-checking benchmarks use real-world claims. In the MOCHEG dataset, evidence-free model-generated justifications often closely match ground truth text, possibly due to exposure to the sources during training. This issue underscores the need for grounding models in external evidence to reduce reliance on potentially leaked information.

System Stability and Sensitivity: Our framework’s web scraping process, while central to evidence retrieval, is prone to instability due to restricted access and large document size. Additionally, open-source models like LLAVA exhibit formatting sensitivity, where minor prompt variations impact response quality. Ensuring robust scraping and prompt formatting stability is crucial for reliable outputs.

Hallucination: Despite efforts to mitigate the weaknesses of LLMs, our system remains vulnerable to hallucination. While we have implemented measures to ground responses in external evidence, the risk of hallucination remains.

5.2. Future Work

Enhanced Dataset Complexity and Multimodal Benchmarking. Current datasets offer limited opportunities for complex, multi-step reasoning. Additionally, existing benchmarks often lack depth in assessing multimodal justifications, focusing primarily on simple veracity checks or text-only justifications. Future work should prioritize curating more challenging datasets and developing benchmarks that evaluate the quality of justifications semantically.

Expanded Toolset for Verification. Adding tools such as image manipulation detection, chronology estimation, and metadata verification [60] could improve the robustness of verification against sophisticated misinformation tactics.

Efficiency Improvement. Our method is resource-intensive, requiring multiple web searches, high token usage, and numerous API calls. Optimizing dynamic planning to reduce prompt frequency and minimize searches could improve efficiency without sacrificing accuracy.

6. Conclusion

We presented DEFAME, a comprehensive framework for multimodal fact-checking that integrates MLLMs with external tools to address the limitations of traditional automated fact-checking approaches. Our framework effectively grounds its analysis in verifiable data by combining MLLM-driven reasoning with external evidence sources, geolocation, reverse image search, and dynamic web searches. We demonstrated that DEFAME achieves new state-of-the-art results across multiple diverse benchmarks, highlighting its capability to navigate complex, real-world claims. While limitations remain, our system represents a significant advancement in the field, providing a versatile foundation for future developments in automated multimodal fact-checking.

7. Acknowledgments

The research was partially funded by a LOEWE-Start-Professor (LOEWE/4b//519/05.01.002-(0006)/94), LOEWE-Spitzen-Professor (LOEWE/ 4a//519/05.00.002-(0010)/93) and an Alexander von Humboldt Professorship in Multimodal Reliable AI, sponsored by Germany's Federal Ministry for Education and Research.

References

- [1] Sahar Abdelnabi, Rakibul Hasan, and Mario Fritz. Open-domain, content-based, multi-modal fact-checking of out-of-context images via online resources. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 14940–14949, 2022. 2
- [2] Mubashara Akhtar, Oana Cocarascu, and Elena Simperl. Reading and reasoning over chart images for evidence-based automated fact-checking. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EACL 2023*, pages 399–414, Dubrovnik, Croatia, 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. 2
- [3] Mubashara Akhtar, Michael Schlichtkrull, Zhijiang Guo, Oana Cocarascu, Elena Simperl, and Andreas Vlachos. Multimodal Automated Fact-Checking: A Survey. In *The 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP): Findings*, 2023. 2
- [4] Mubashara Akhtar, Nikesh Subedi, Vivek Gupta, Sahar Tahmasebi, Oana Cocarascu, and Elena Simperl. Chartcheck: Explainable fact-checking over real-world chart images. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics ACL 2024*, pages 13921–13937, 2024. 2
- [5] Alibaba-NLP. Gte base en v1.5, 2024. Accessed: 2024-08-14. 5
- [6] Shivangi Aneja, Chris Bregler, and Matthias Nießner. Cosmos: Catching out-of-context misinformation with self-supervised learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.06278*, 2021. 2
- [7] Pepa Atanasova, Jakob Grue Simonsen, Christina Lioma, and Isabelle Augenstein. Generating fact checking explanations. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7352–7364, Online, 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics. 2
- [8] Alimohammad Beigi, Bohan Jiang, Dawei Li, Tharindu Kumarage, Zhen Tan, Pouya Shaeri, and Huan Liu. Lrq-fact: Llm-generated relevant questions for multimodal fact-checking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.04616*, 2024. 3, 8
- [9] Han Cao, Lingwei Wei, Mengyang Chen, Wei Zhou, and Songlin Hu. Are large language models good fact checkers: A preliminary study. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.17355*, 2023. 6
- [10] Han Cao, Lingwei Wei, Wei Zhou, and Songlin Hu. Multi-source knowledge enhanced graph attention networks for multimodal fact verification. In *2024 IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo (ICME)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2024. 2
- [11] Vicente Vivanco Cepeda, Gaurav Kumar Nayak, and Mubarak Shah. GeoCLIP: Clip-inspired alignment between locations and images for effective worldwide geolocalization. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. 4
- [12] Canyu Chen and Kai Shu. Can LLM-generated misinformation be detected? In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. 1, 2
- [13] Ting-Chih Chen, Chia-Wei Tang, and Chris Thomas. MetaSumPerceiver: Multimodal multi-document evidence summarization for fact-checking. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 8742–8757, Bangkok, Thailand, 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. 2, 6, 7
- [14] Tsun-Hin Cheung and Kin-Man Lam. Factllama: Optimizing instruction-following language models with external knowledge for automated fact-checking. In *2023 Asia Pacific Signal and Information Processing Association Annual Summit and Conference (APSIPA ASC)*, pages 846–853. IEEE, 2023. 2
- [15] Zacharias Chrysidis, Stefanos-Iordanis Papadopoulos, Symeon Papadopoulos, and Panagiotis Petrantonakis. Credible, unreliable or leaked?: Evidence verification for enhanced automated fact-checking. In *Proceedings of the 3rd ACM International Workshop on Multimedia AI against Disinformation*, pages 73–81, 2024. 8
- [16] Ernest Davis. Benchmarks for automated commonsense reasoning: A survey. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 56(4), 2023. 3
- [17] Alphaeus Dmonte, Roland Oruche, Marcos Zampieri, Prasad Callyam, and Isabelle Augenstein. Claim verification in the age of large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.14317*, 2024. 1, 2
- [18] Nicholas Dufour, Arkanath Pathak, Pouya Samangouei, Nikki Hariri, Shashi Deshetti, Andrew Dudfield, Christopher Guess, Pablo Hernández Escayola, Bobby Tran, Mevan Babakar, et al. Ammeba: A large-scale survey and dataset of media-based misinformation in-the-wild. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.11697*, 2024. 1
- [19] Zhe Fu, Kanlun Wang, Wangjiaxuan Xin, Lina Zhou, Shi Chen, Yaorong Ge, Daniel Janies, and Dongsong Zhang. Detecting misinformation in multimedia content through cross-modal entity consistency: A dual learning approach. *arXiv:2409.0002*, 2024. 2
- [20] Jiahui Geng, Yova Kementchedjhieva, Preslav Nakov, and Iryna Gurevych. Multimodal large language models to support real-world fact-checking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.03627*, 2024. 3, 8
- [21] Max Glockner, Ieva Staliūnaitė, James Thorne, Gisela Vallejo, Andreas Vlachos, and Iryna Gurevych. AmbiFC: Fact-checking ambiguous claims with evidence. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 12: 1–18, 2024. 2
- [22] Rainer Greifeneder, Mariela Jaffe, Eryn Newman, and Norbert Schwarz. *The Psychology of Fake News: Accepting, Sharing, and Correcting Misinformation*. Routledge, 1 edition, 2021. 1

- [23] Fabrizio Guillaro, Davide Cozzolino, Avneesh Sud, Nicholas Dufour, and Luisa Verdoliva. Trufor: Leveraging all-round clues for trustworthy image forgery detection and localization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 20606–20615, 2023. 2
- [24] M. Hameleers, T. E. Powell, T. G. L. A. Van Der Meer, and L. Bos. A picture paints a thousand lies? The effects and mechanisms of multimodal disinformation and rebuttals disseminated via social media. *Political Communication*, 37, 2020. 1
- [25] Naemul Hassan, Gensheng Zhang, Fatma Arslan, Josue Caraballo, Damian Jimenez, Siddhant Gawsane, Shohedul Hasan, Minumol Joseph, Aaditya Kulkarni, Anil Kumar Nayak, Vikas Sable, Chengkai Li, and Mark Tremayne. Claimbuster: the first-ever end-to-end fact-checking system. *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, 10(12):1945–1948, 2017. 2
- [26] Ayush Jaiswal, Ekraam Sabir, Wael AbdAlmageed, and Premkumar Natarajan. Multimedia semantic integrity assessment using joint embedding of images and text. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, page 1465–1471, New York, NY, USA, 2017. Association for Computing Machinery. 1
- [27] Shan Jia, Reilin Lyu, Kangran Zhao, Yize Chen, Zhiyuan Yan, Yan Ju, Chuanbo Hu, Xin Li, Baoyuan Wu, and Siwei Lyu. Can chatgpt detect deepfakes? a study of using multimodal large language models for media forensics. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 4324–4333, 2024. 2
- [28] Mohammed Abdul Khaliq, Paul Yu-Chun Chang, Mingyang Ma, Bernhard Pflugfelder, and Filip Miletic. RAGAR, your falsehood radar: RAG-augmented reasoning for political fact-checking using multimodal large language models. In *Proceedings of the Seventh Fact Extraction and VERification Workshop (FEVER)*, pages 280–296, Miami, Florida, USA, 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. 2
- [29] Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Kuttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, Sebastian Riedel, and Douwe Kiela. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, Red Hook, NY, USA, 2020. Curran Associates Inc. 3
- [30] Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Dong Guo, Renrui Zhang, Feng Li, Hao Zhang, Kaichen Zhang, Yanwei Li, Ziwei Liu, and Chunyuan Li. Llava-onevision: Easy visual task transfer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.03326*, 2024. 5
- [31] Changmao Li and Jeffrey Flanigan. Task contamination: Language models may not be few-shot anymore. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 38(16):18471–18480, 2024. 3
- [32] Guanghua Li, Wensheng Lu, Wei Zhang, Defu Lian, Kezhong Lu, Rui Mao, Kai Shu, and Hao Liao. Re-search for the truth: Multi-round retrieval-augmented large language models are strong fake news detectors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.09747*, 2024. 2
- [33] Taiji Li, Zhi Li, and Yin Zhang. Improving faithfulness of large language models in summarization via sliding generation and self-consistency. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024)*, pages 8804–8817, Torino, Italia, 2024. ELRA and ICCL. 3
- [34] Xinyi Li, Yongfeng Zhang, and Edward C Malthouse. Large language model agent for fake news detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.01593*, 2024. 3, 8
- [35] Yiyi Li and Ying Xie. Is a Picture Worth a Thousand Words? An Empirical Study of Image Content and Social Media Engagement. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 57(1):1–19, 2020. 1
- [36] Chris Lu, Cong Lu, Robert Tjarko Lange, Jakob Foerster, Jeff Clune, and David Ha. The ai scientist: Towards fully automated open-ended scientific discovery. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.06292*, 2024. 3
- [37] Grace Luo, Trevor Darrell, and Anna Rohrbach. NewsCLIPpings: Automatic Generation of Out-of-Context Multimodal Media. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 6801–6817, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. 2
- [38] Grace Luo, Trevor Darrell, and Anna Rohrbach. NewsCLIPpings: Automatic Generation of Out-of-Context Multimodal Media. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 6801–6817, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. 2
- [39] Joshua Maynez, Shashi Narayan, Bernd Bohnet, and Ryan McDonald. On faithfulness and factuality in abstractive summarization. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1906–1919, Online, 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics. 3
- [40] Victoria Moreno Gil, Xavier Ramon, and Ruth rodriguez martinez. Fact-checking interventions as counteroffensives to disinformation growth: Standards, values, and practices in latin america and spain. *Media and Communication*, 9: 251–263, 2021. 3, 4
- [41] Eric Müller-Budack, Jonas Theiner, Sebastian Diering, Maximilian Idahl, and Ralph Ewerth. Multimodal analytics for real-world news using measures of cross-modal entity consistency. In *Proceedings of the 2020 International Conference on Multimedia Retrieval*, page 16–25, New York, NY, USA, 2020. Association for Computing Machinery. 2
- [42] Kai Nakamura, Sharon Levy, and William Yang Wang. Fakeddit: A new multimodal benchmark dataset for fine-grained fake news detection. In *Proceedings of the Twelfth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 6149–6157, Marseille, France, 2020. European Language Resources Association. 2
- [43] Eryn J. Newman, Maryanne Garry, Daniel M. Bernstein, Justin Kantner, and D. Stephen Lindsay. Nonprobative photographs (or words) inflate truthiness. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 19(5):969–974, 2012. 1

- [44] Dan S Nielsen and Ryan McConville. Mumin: A large-scale multilingual multimodal fact-checked misinformation social network dataset. In *Proceedings of the 45th international ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in information retrieval*, pages 3141–3153, 2022. [2](#)
- [45] Liangming Pan, Xiaobao Wu, Xinyuan Lu, Anh Tuan Luu, William Yang Wang, Min-Yen Kan, and Preslav Nakov. Fact-checking complex claims with program-guided reasoning. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6981–7004, Toronto, Canada, 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. [2](#)
- [46] Stefanos-Iordanis Papadopoulos, Christos Koutlis, Symeon Papadopoulos, and Panagiotis C Petrantonakis. Red-dot: Multimodal fact-checking via relevant evidence detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.09939*, 2023. [2](#)
- [47] Stefanos-Iordanis Papadopoulos, Christos Koutlis, Symeon Papadopoulos, and Panagiotis C Petrantonakis. Similarity over factuality: Are we making progress on multimodal out-of-context misinformation detection? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.13488*, 2024. [2](#), [5](#), [6](#)
- [48] Stefanos-Iordanis Papadopoulos, Christos Koutlis, Symeon Papadopoulos, and Panagiotis C Petrantonakis. Verite: a robust benchmark for multimodal misinformation detection accounting for unimodal bias. *International Journal of Multimedia Information Retrieval*, 13(1):4, 2024. [2](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#)
- [49] Jonathan Roberts, Timo Lüddecke, Rehan Sheikh, Kai Han, and Samuel Albanie. Charting new territories: Exploring the geographic and geospatial capabilities of multimodal llms. In *2024 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops (CVPRW)*, pages 554–563, 2024. [4](#)
- [50] Ekraam Sabir, Wael AbdAlmageed, Yue Wu, and Prem Natarajan. Deep multimodal image-repurposing detection. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, page 1337–1345, New York, NY, USA, 2018. Association for Computing Machinery. [2](#)
- [51] Chris Samarinas, Wynne Hsu, and Mong Li Lee. Improving evidence retrieval for automated explainable fact-checking. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies: Demonstrations*, pages 84–91, Online, 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. [2](#)
- [52] Michael Schlichtkrull, Yulong Chen, Chenxi Whitehouse, Zhenyun Deng, Mubashara Akhtar, Rami Aly, Zhijiang Guo, Christos Christodoulopoulos, Oana Cocarascu, Arpit Mittal, James Thorne, and Andreas Vlachos. The automated verification of textual claims (AVeriTeC) shared task. In *Proceedings of the Seventh Fact Extraction and VERification Workshop (FEVER)*, pages 1–26, Miami, Florida, USA, 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. [2](#)
- [53] Michael Schlichtkrull, Zhijiang Guo, and Andreas Vlachos. Averitec: A dataset for real-world claim verification with evidence from the web. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024. [2](#), [4](#), [5](#), [7](#), [14](#)
- [54] Rui Shao, Tianxing Wu, and Ziwei Liu. Detecting and grounding multi-modal media manipulation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 6904–6913, 2023. [2](#), [3](#), [8](#)
- [55] Aniruddh Sriram, Fangyuan Xu, Eunsol Choi, and Greg Durrett. Contrastive learning to improve retrieval for real-world fact checking. In *Proceedings of the Seventh Fact Extraction and VERification Workshop (FEVER)*, pages 264–279, Miami, Florida, USA, 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. [6](#)
- [56] Dídac Surís, Sachit Menon, and Carl Vondrick. Vipergpt: Visual inference via python execution for reasoning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 11888–11898, 2023. [3](#)
- [57] Sahar Tahmasebi, Eric Müller-Budack, and Ralph Ewerth. Multimodal misinformation detection using large vision-language models. In *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, page 2189–2199, New York, NY, USA, 2024. Association for Computing Machinery. [2](#)
- [58] James Thorne, Andreas Vlachos, Christos Christodoulopoulos, and Arpit Mittal. FEVER: a large-scale dataset for fact extraction and VERification. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, pages 809–819, New Orleans, Louisiana, 2018. Association for Computational Linguistics. [2](#)
- [59] James Thorne, Andreas Vlachos, Christos Christodoulopoulos, and Arpit Mittal. FEVER: a large-scale dataset for fact extraction and VERification. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, pages 809–819, New Orleans, Louisiana, 2018. Association for Computational Linguistics. [2](#)
- [60] Jonathan Tonglet, Marie-Francine Moens, and Iryna Gurevych. “image, tell me your story!” predicting the original meta-context of visual misinformation. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 7845–7864, Miami, Florida, USA, 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. [8](#)
- [61] Hoa-Vien Vo-Hoang, Long-Khanh Pham, and Minh-Son Dao. Detecting out-of-context media with llama-adapter v2 and roberta: An effective method for cheapfakes detection. In *Proceedings of the 2024 International Conference on Multimedia Retrieval*, pages 1282–1287, 2024. [2](#)
- [62] Soroush Vosoughi, Deb Roy, and Sinan Aral. The spread of true and false news online. *Science*, 359(6380):1146–1151, 2018. [1](#)
- [63] Ivan Vykopal, Matúš Pikuliak, Simon Ostermann, and Marián Šimko. Generative large language models in automated fact-checking: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.02351*, 2024. [1](#), [2](#)
- [64] William Yang Wang. “liar, liar pants on fire”: A new benchmark dataset for fake news detection. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 422–426, Vancouver, Canada, 2017. Association for Computational Linguistics. [2](#)

- [65] Yaqing Wang, Fenglong Ma, Zhiwei Jin, Ye Yuan, Guangxu Xun, Kishlay Jha, Lu Su, and Jing Gao. Eann: Event adversarial neural networks for multi-modal fake news detection. In *Proceedings of the 24th acm sigkdd international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*, pages 849–857, 2018. 2
- [66] Yuxia Wang, Revanth Gangi Reddy, Zain Muhammad Mujahid, Arnav Arora, Aleksandr Rubashevskii, Jiahui Geng, Osama Mohammed Afzal, Liangming Pan, Nadav Borenstein, Aditya Pillai, Isabelle Augenstein, Iryna Gurevych, and Preslav Nakov. Factcheck-bench: Fine-grained evaluation benchmark for automatic fact-checkers. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, pages 14199–14230, Miami, Florida, USA, 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. 2
- [67] Yuxia Wang, Minghan Wang, Hasan Iqbal, Georgi Georgiev, Jiahui Geng, and Preslav Nakov. Openfactcheck: A unified framework for factuality evaluation of llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.05583*, 2024. 2
- [68] World Economic Forum. The global risks report 2024, 2024. Page 18. 1
- [69] Qingzheng Xu, Heming Du, Huiqiang Chen, Bo Liu, and Xin Yu. Mmooc: A multimodal misinformation dataset for out-of-context news analysis. In *Australasian Conference on Information Security and Privacy*, pages 444–459. Springer, 2024. 2
- [70] Jing Yang and Anderson Rocha. Take it easy: Label-adaptive self-rationalization for fact verification and explanation generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.04002*, 2024. 2, 3
- [71] Barry Menglong Yao, Aditya Shah, Lichao Sun, Jin-Hee Cho, and Lifu Huang. End-to-end multimodal fact-checking and explanation generation: A challenging dataset and models. In *Proceedings of the 46th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, page 2733–2743, New York, NY, USA, 2023. Association for Computing Machinery. 2, 4, 5, 6, 7
- [72] Zeqin Yu, Jiangqun Ni, Yuzhen Lin, Haoyi Deng, and Bin Li. Diffforensics: Leveraging diffusion prior to image forgery detection and localization. *2024 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 12765–12774, 2024. 2
- [73] Andy Zeng, Maria Attarian, brian ichter, Krzysztof Marcin Choromanski, Adrian Wong, Stefan Welker, Federico Tombari, Aveek Purohit, Michael S Ryoo, Vikas Sindhwani, Johnny Lee, Vincent Vanhoucke, and Pete Florence. Socratic models: Composing zero-shot multimodal reasoning with language. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. 3
- [74] Fengzhu Zeng, Wenqian Li, Wei Gao, and Yan Pang. Multimodal misinformation detection by learning from synthetic data with multimodal LLMs. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, pages 10467–10484, Miami, Florida, USA, 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. 2
- [75] Xiaoyan Zhao, Lingzhi Wang, Zhanghao Wang, Hong Cheng, Rui Zhang, and Kam-Fai Wong. PACAR: Automated fact-checking with planning and customized action reasoning using large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024)*, pages 12564–12573, Torino, Italia, 2024. ELRA and ICCL. 2
- [76] Yuan Zhao, Bo Liu, Tianqing Zhu, Ming Ding, Xin Yu, and Wanlei Zhou. Proactive image manipulation detection via deep semi-fragile watermark. *Neurocomputing*, 585:127593, 2024. 2
- [77] Xinyi Zhou, Ashish Sharma, Amy X Zhang, and Tim Althoff. Correcting misinformation on social media with a large language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.11169*, 2024. 8
- [78] Dimitrina Zlatkova, Preslav Nakov, and Ivan Koychev. Fact-checking meets fauxtography: Verifying claims about images. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 2099–2108, Hong Kong, China, 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. 2

DEFAME: Dynamic Evidence-based FAct-checking with Multimodal Experts

Supplementary Material

The supplementary materials provide an in-depth extension of the main paper, showcasing additional examples, analyses, and details that complement the findings discussed. Section A outlines excluded domains to ensure a fair and realistic evaluation setting. We include information on compute and cost in Section B. Details about our adaptations for the AVERITEC challenge are given in Section C. Section D includes the prompts used in DEFAME. Section E identifies wrongly annotated samples in the VERITE dataset. Section F discusses cases with outdated ground truth in the MOCHEG dataset and their implications. Section G illustrates an example fact-checking report produced by DEFAME. Section H delves into failure cases, highlighting common pitfalls and their underlying causes. Section I contrasts our fact-checking report with that of a baseline, as used in the human evaluation.

A. Excluded Domains

To maintain a realistic and fair setting, we exclude all major fact-checking organizations we know from all web search results. Table 6 shows the corresponding list of domains. Additionally, several platforms forbid (direct) automatic access to their web pages, cf. Table 7. Any URL with a substring matching the domains and URLs in the Tables mentioned earlier is removed from the search results and, hence, ignored by the fact-check.

B. Details on Compute and Cost

As the GPT models are available only via OpenAI’s API, most of our computation happened externally. On our end, we employed four NVIDIA A100-80GB GPUs in order to execute LLAVA-ONEVISION and GEOCLIP. All other processing was performed on 32 AMD EPYC 7313 16-core CPUs. Since fact-checks on VERITE claims are multimodal from the start, we chose VERITE as a representative surrogate for the setting of multimodal AFC. We thus report usage statistics on VERITE in Table 8. Time values are rough estimates and object to high variance due to hardware usage by other processes.

As expected, the naive baselines (Pure GPT-4o and CoT) require the least amount of resources. But, as discussed in Section 4, this is due to the absence of any external evidence and comes at the cost of lower accuracy. DEFAME with GPT-4o MINI and LLAVA-ONEVISION as the backbone MLLM runs faster and cheaper than DEFAME with GPT-4o, but yields decreased accuracy as well. Surprisingly, LLAVA-ONEVISION fact-checks faster than the GPT models. We found the reason to lie in

Excluded Fact-Checking URLs

snopes.com
politifact.com
factcheck.org
truthorfiction.com
fullfact.org
leadstories.com
hoax-slayer.net
checkyourfact.com
reuters.com/fact-check
reuters.com/article/fact-check
apnews.com/APFactCheck
factcheck.afp.com
poynter.org
factcheck.ge
vishvasnews.com
boomlive.in
altnews.in
thequint.com/news/webqoof
factcheck.kz

Table 6. List of excluded URLs to maintain a fair and realistic fact-checking setting.

Unsupported Domains

facebook.com
twitter.com
x.com
instagram.com
youtube.com
tiktok.com
reddit.com
ebay.com
microsoft.com
researchhub.com
pinterest.com
irs.gov

Table 7. List of excluded domains due to bot traffic restrictions.

LLAVA-ONEVISION’s inability to correctly format the proposed actions, yielding a smaller number of executed actions and, thus, shorter fact-checks overall.

Compared to human fact-checking experts—who invest about an entire working day to debunk a claim and write a corresponding article¹⁰—DEFAME’s fee of \$0.13 per

¹⁰Naemul Hassan, Chengkai Li, and Mark Tremayne. Detecting Check-worthy Factual Claims in Presidential Debates. *Proceedings of the 24th ACM International on Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, pages 1835–1838, 2015

Model Variant	Time min / Claim	LLM API Cost ¢ / Claim	Search API Cost ¢ / Claim	# Search Queries	# Input Tokens Processed	# Output Tokens Generated
DEFAME:						
- GPT-4o	4:14	13	<1	2.2	48K	921
- GPT-4o MINI	3:13	<1	<1	3.1	54K	1300
- LLAVA-ONEVISION	1:23	-	<1	0.9	14K	794
w/o Geolocation	3:12	11	<1	2.3	40K	910
w/o Reverse Search	2:37	8	<1	2.3	28K	828
w/o Image Search	2:57	11	<1	2.2	40K	909
w/o Web Search	2:30	10	<1	2.2	37K	761
Static	2:47	10	<1	2.0	38K	858
w/o Develop	1:56	10	<1	2.1	42K	710
Unimodal Develop	3:15	10	<1	2.3	41K	865
Pure GPT-4o	0:06	<1	0	0.0	2.2K	67
Chain-of-Thought	0:09	<1	0	0.0	2.3K	177

Table 8. Usage and computational cost statistics of DEFAME and all considered variants on VERITE.

claim is cheap. However, DEFAME’s output quality does not match human fact-checkers yet. Thus, DEFAME could serve as a cost-effective assistant to aid human fact-checkers. Theoretically, social media platforms could also use DEFAME to cheaply mass-check larger amounts of claims posted online. However, depending on the number of claims—which, on social media, arguably exceed millions per day—DEFAME could become expensive. Claim filtering approaches would be needed to narrow down the claims to the most check-worthy ones in order scale DEFAME up to larger scales.

C. Adaptation to the AVERITEC Challenge

The AVERITEC challenge evaluates fact-checking quality using the AVERITEC Score that compares model-generated question-answer (QA) pairs with gold QA pairs provided in the benchmark [53]. To perform well, a method must effectively identify and address *the same (or very similar) questions and answers posed by the benchmark annotators*.

To align with this evaluation, we introduce an extension called DEFAME-QA. This adaptation begins by generating 10 key questions designed to probe the claim’s veracity. The Planner then proposes targeted search queries for each question and applies the Web-Search tool to retrieve up to 5 relevant search results. Using the retrieved evidence, the LLM backbone attempts to answer the questions systematically. Finally, the system synthesizes the answers into a coherent verdict, ensuring the reasoning is grounded in the collected evidence. The resulting QA pairs are evaluated using the

AVERITEC Score, showcasing DEFAME-QA’s alignment with the benchmark’s evaluation criteria while maintaining its structured, evidence-driven methodology.

D. LLM Prompts

Each stage of the DEFAME framework is guided by a tailored prompt. These prompts are constructed from prompt templates, where values enclosed in `[]` serve as placeholders. During execution, these placeholders are dynamically replaced with the corresponding variables. This process ensures that the prompt is specific to the current task and context, as illustrated in D.1 and D.2.

In subsequent sections, we present the templates for the remaining four stages of the DEFAME framework. Each template includes detailed explanations of its placeholders. A key placeholder is `[Record]`, which is present in every prompt. This generic placeholder provides the current state of the fact-checking report, consolidating the claim, evidence, and findings gathered so far, ensuring that the LLM operates within the relevant context.

Some prompts require specific values to be returned by the LLM, such as the verdict in the Judge Prompt or the proposed actions in the Plan Prompt. In these cases, both the expected value and its format are explicitly defined within the prompt to guide the LLM’s response. Value-specific fallback mechanisms are employed to enhance robustness. These mechanisms, primarily based on regular expressions tailored to observed failure modes, ensure that the required values can still be reliably extracted, even if the LLM devi-

ates from the expected format or introduces minor inconsistencies.

For multimodal LLM inputs and outputs, images are integrated into prompts through a referencing system. When an image reference (e.g., `image:k`) is encountered, the system inserts a corresponding image block, including the Base64-encoded representation of the image. The LLM references these images using the same identifier, maintaining a consistent link between visual and textual elements.

The prompt templates in DEFAME are dataset-agnostic, enabling use across benchmarks with minimal adaptations. Dataset-specific changes are limited to `[Extra Rules]` in the Plan and Judge Prompts. MOCHEG requires no additional rules, while AVERITEC includes a guideline to avoid the "argument from ignorance" fallacy, ensuring unsupported claims are labeled as `Not Enough Information`. In VERITE, detailed instructions are needed for the `✖ 00C` class, which includes samples generated in two ways: true images with altered captions (formerly `✖ Miscaptioned`) and true captions with unrelated images. These rules address dataset-specific nuances while maintaining a consistent framework.

D.1. Plan Prompt Template

Instructions

The available knowledge is insufficient to assess the Claim. Therefore, **propose a set of actions** to retrieve new and helpful evidence. Adhere to the following rules:

- The actions available are listed under **Valid Actions**, including a short description for each action. No other actions are possible at this moment.
- For each action, use the formatting as specified in **Valid Actions**.
- Include all actions in a single Markdown code block at the end of your answer.
- Propose as few actions as possible but as many as needed. Do not propose similar or previously used actions.

[Extra Rules]

[Valid Actions]

[Examples]

[Record]

Your Actions:

- `[Extra Rules]`: Contains benchmark-specific planning guidelines that the Planner must follow when selecting actions. These rules are tailored to the requirements of individual datasets or evaluation scenarios, ensuring that the Planner adheres to task-specific constraints or priori-

ties.

- `[Valid Actions]`: Represents the set of actions available to the Planner at a given stage. The list of valid actions is dynamically adapted to avoid reusing the same action unnecessarily.
- `[Examples]`: Provides in-context examples that demonstrate how to use actions with the correct format. These examples illustrate the structure and logic behind action proposals to guide the Planner.

D.2. Finalized Plan Prompt

Instructions

The available knowledge is insufficient to assess the Claim. Therefore, **propose a set of actions** to retrieve new and helpful evidence. Adhere to the following rules:

- The actions available are listed under **Valid Actions**, including a short description for each action. No other actions are possible at this moment.
- For each action, use the formatting as specified in **Valid Actions**.
- Include all actions in a single Markdown code block at the end of your answer.
- Propose as few actions as possible but as much as needed. Do not propose similar or previously used actions.
- **Consider Both Modalities Equally**: Avoid focusing too much on one modality at the expense of the other, but always check whether the text claim is true or false.
- **Compare Image and Caption**: Verify the context of the image and caption.

Valid Actions:

- `geolocate`: Determine the country where an image was taken by providing an image ID.
- `reverse_search`: Perform a reverse image search on the web for similar images.
- `web_search`: Run an open web search for related webpages.
- `image_search`: Retrieve related images for a given query.

Examples:

- `geolocate(<image:k>)`
- `reverse_search(<image:k>)`
- `web_search("New Zealand Food Bill 2020")`
- `image_search("China officials white suits carry people")`

Record:

Claim: "`<image:1232>`Image of a bus powered by compressed natural gas, bursting into flames in Italy."

Your Actions:

D.3. Summarize Prompt Template

Instructions

In order to find evidence that helps your fact-check, you just ran a web search, which yielded a **Search Result**. **Your task right now is to summarize the Search Result.**

What to include:

- Information that might be useful for the fact-check (see **Record**).
- Relevant images (refer to images by inserting their reference in the format <image:k>).
- If available: the release date as well as the author or the publisher (e.g., the media company) of the search result.

Do **NOT** include:

- Advertisements.
- Any other information unrelated to the **Record** or the Claim.

Additional Rules:

- Do not add any additional information besides the information in the **Search Result**.
- If the **Search Result** doesn't contain any relevant information for the fact-checking work, simply print one word in capital letters: NONE.
- Keep your writing style consistent with the provided Examples.
- Try to filter out relevant information even if the **Search Result** is in a different language.

[Examples]

[Record]

[Search_Result]

Your Summary:

- [Examples]: Provides 3 in-context examples that demonstrate how to write concise summaries, incorporating relevant images, key insights, and links to sources using Markdown notation. One of the examples shows a case where the search result is irrelevant, guiding the model to return NONE instead of a summary when no useful information is found.
- [Search_Result]: Refers to the search result retrieved by a Search tool. This includes the text content scraped from the webpage using the Firecrawl web scraper, the title of the page, any hyperlinks found within the content, images included on the page, and the source URL.

D.4. Develop Prompt Template

Instructions

You just retrieved new Evidence. Now, **analyze the Claim's veracity using the evidence**. Always adhere to the following rules:

- Focus on developing new insights. Do not repeat larger parts from the **Record**. Do not restate the Claim.
- Write down your thoughts step-by-step. Whenever necessary, you may elaborate in more detail.
- Depending on the topic's complexity, invest one to three paragraphs. The fewer, the better.
- If you find that there is insufficient information to verify the Claim, explicitly state what information is missing.
- If you cite web sources, always refer to them by including their URL as a Markdown hyperlink.
- **Use information only from the recorded evidence:** Avoid inserting information that is not implied by the evidence. You may use commonsense knowledge, though.

[Record]

Your Analysis:

D.5. Judge Prompt Template

Instructions

Determine the Claim's veracity by following these steps:

1. Briefly summarize the key insights from the fact-check (see **Record**) in at most one paragraph.
2. Write one paragraph about which one of the **Decision Options** applies best. Include the most appropriate decision option at the end and enclose it in backticks like 'this'.

[Extra Rules]

[Decision Options]

[Record]

Your Judgement:

- [Extra Rules]: Contains benchmark-specific rules or additional constraints that guide the judgment process. These rules are designed to increase the model's understanding of the different classes present in the corresponding benchmark, ensuring consistent verdicts.
- [Decision Options]: Lists the possible labels or verdicts that can be assigned to the claim, along with a short description of each label. These descriptions provide additional context to help the model accurately differentiate between the available options.

D.6. Justify Prompt Template

Instructions

You are provided with the record of a fact-check. It contains the Claim to be verified and documentation of all the fact-checking work along with the gathered evidence. Your task is to **summarize the fact-check**. That is, you provide a concise, one-paragraph justification for the final **VERDICT** based on the knowledge from the **Record**. Note:

- Be truthful, brief, and do not add any additional information besides the information given in the **Record**.
- Link key sources in your summary. Use Markdown notation for that. You may link them in-line.
- Don't state the Claim again. Rather focus on the key insights of the fact-check.
- Simply print just the summary.

[Record]

Summary:

E. Wrongly Annotated VERITE Samples

During the qualitative analysis of 20 mispredicted VERITE instances, we encountered 3 cases we argue to be wrongly annotated. Figure 5 shows the corresponding claims and (wrong) annotations. The VERITE annotation classifies the first claim (753) as ✔ Supported. However, DEFAME found the image to be captured not in September but in July 2018, citing a fact-check by USA Today¹¹ from May 2022. Manually investigating this case further, we find that USA Today refers to an article on Mediaite¹² from Sept 6th, 2018, indeed stating that “in July, Clanton shared a photo on Instagram of herself, Thomas, and Ginni Thomas having a ‘great weekend’ together,” showing the screenshot of the respective Instagram post. Hence, the actual correct label for this claim should be ✘ OOC.

The wrong annotation can be seen even more clearly for the claims 249 and 250. DEFAME’s reverse search yielded multiple credible sources, including an article by CBS News¹³, consistently reporting about a gathering of 75 people at the “Area 51” military airbase in Sept 2019. The sources use the claim’s photo along with other similar images showing the apparently same event. According to the VERITE annotation, the photo shows a completely different


¹¹<https://web.archive.org/web/20220526225427/https://eu.usatoday.com/story/news/factcheck/2022/05/26/fact-check-photo-ginni-thomas-expensive-wine-2018/9910097002/>

¹²<https://web.archive.org/web/20180906222511/https://www.mediaite.com/online/exclusive-clarence-thomas-wife-hired-ex-tpusa-staffer-known-for-saying-i-hate-blacks/>

¹³<https://www.cbsnews.com/news/storm-area-51-hoax-draws-hundreds-events-outside-secretive-us-base-today-2019-09-20-live-updates/>

Claim # 753

“An image of Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas with his wife, Ginni Thomas, holding a bottle of wine was captured **in September 2018** after hiring Crystal Clanton to assist her media ventures.”




Annotation
✔ Supported

Actually
✘ OOC

Claim # 250

“Image shows a crowd of people at the ‘Area 51 Raid’ in September 2019.”



Annotation
✘ OOC

Actually
✔ Supported

Claim # 249

“Image shows a crowd of people during a ‘crusade’ by the religious group ‘In His Name Ministries’ in November 2014 in Nikomazi, South Africa.”



Annotation
✔ Supported

Actually
✘ OOC

Figure 5. Three faulty VERITE instances identified during qualitative analysis.

event, contradicting the evidence. Consequently, the provided labels for both claims are clearly “switched.” Since we analyzed only 20 samples, there are likely more such wrongly annotated samples, penalizing DEFAME’s accuracy where it should not be. Hence, the actual accuracy of DEFAME is slightly higher than measured.

F. Outdated Ground Truths and Temporal Dependence in MOCHEG

A qualitative analysis of failure cases in the MOCHEG dataset reveals that some ground truth explanations are no longer accurate or up-to-date, potentially affecting model evaluations (see Section 4.7). This issue arises when real-world developments render previously valid ground truths obsolete.

For instance, consider the claim:

“A company is developing a lab-grown chicken nugget made from feathers.”

This was classified as *Not Enough Information* by Snopes, with the explanation that it is undetermined when these lab-grown nuggets will hit store shelves.¹⁴ However, since the creation of the benchmark, lab-grown meat has become commercially available in parts of the world.¹⁵

Other examples of claims with temporal dependence include:

- **Claim:** “Al Gore’s residence uses considerably more energy than the average American home.”
- **Claim:** “Oreos have a new Lady Gaga-themed cookie.”
- **Claim:** “Says Anthony Fauci will make millions off new book.”

Such claims rely on a specific temporal context that may no longer be accurate as time progresses. Including such claims without temporal markers risks introducing inaccuracies into evaluation. To address the challenge of temporal dependence in fact-checking benchmarks, we propose the following alternatives:

1. **Include Timestamps:** Ensure that datasets include clear timestamps for both the claim and the associated ground truth explanation, allowing systems to account for the temporal context.
2. **Filter Out Time-Sensitive Claims:** Exclude claims with high temporal sensitivity from the dataset to avoid potential inconsistencies over time.
3. **Periodic Updates:** Regularly update benchmarks to reflect evolving ground truths, ensuring their continued relevance.
4. **Temporal Validity Check:** Integrate a pre-processing step to verify whether the ground truth explanations remain consistent with current knowledge before evaluation.

G. Example Fact-Checking Report

Figures 6 and 7 display a 2-page fact-checking report as returned by DEFAME, including a correct veracity predic-

¹⁴<https://www.snopes.com/fact-check/chicken-nuggets-feather-cells>

¹⁵<https://www.theguardian.com/food/2020/dec/07/lab-grown-chicken-tastes-like-chicken-but-the-feeling-when-eating-it-is-more-complicated>

tion. We rendered the Markdown output into a PDF, including the referenced images. This and the following reports also include hyperlinks¹⁶, referencing the used resources.

H. Examples of Failure Cases

The qualitative analysis of mispredicted VERITE instances uncovered two common failure modes attributed to DEFAME: *premature judgment* and *failed evidence retrieval*. See Figure 8 for an example of a premature judgment. While it is true that there exists a photo showing the “Air Force Officers’ Spouses’ Club” taken on April 24, 2018¹⁷, it is not the photo depicted in the claim. DEFAME missed comparing the claim photo with evidence photos before judging the veracity.

Additionally, Figures 9 and 10 show a case where the retrieval of evidence (from either (reverse) image search or web search) was unsuccessful, resulting in a wrong prediction. Manual inspection reveals that according to Snopes¹⁸, the origin is a news video accessible on YouTube. However, both Snopes and YouTube are excluded from DEFAME’s search results. Apart from that, manually using all three web search tools yields only more excluded or unrelated results.

I. Examples from the Human Evaluation

To provide further insights, we include a direct comparison of a fact-checking report generated by DEFAME and one from the Chain-of-Thought baseline for the same claim (see Figures 11 and 12). This example illustrates the key differences observed during the evaluation, particularly in the Completeness dimension. While both reports maintain coherence in structure and logical flow, the DEFAME report explicitly links its verdict to multiple pieces of evidence, providing a clear justification. In contrast, the CoT report relies heavily on parametric reasoning, lacking grounded evidence to support its conclusions.

While our human evaluation highlights DEFAME’s strengths, we acknowledge certain limitations, such as the relatively small number of claims evaluated.


¹⁶For technical reasons, the hyperlinks are not preserved in this PDF.

¹⁷<https://web.archive.org/web/20241116170848/https://taskandpurpose.com/military-life/viral-military-spouse-tweet-photo/>

¹⁸<https://www.snopes.com/fact-check/sharks-on-power-lines-hurricane/>

Claim

"Image of Joe Biden kissing his 19-year-old granddaughter, Finnegan Biden."



Actions




```
reverse_search(<image:1328>)  
web_search("Joe Biden kissing granddaughter Finnegan Biden")
```

Evidence

Evidence from reverse_search

From [Source](#): Found exact image on website with title: Joe Biden kisses granddaughter on lips during Iowa rally Content: The New York Post reports that Joe Biden kissed his 19-year-old granddaughter, Finnegan Biden, on the lips during a campaign rally in Iowa. The event took place at Clarke University in Dubuque. The article includes images of the kiss:



The incident prompted mixed reactions on social media. The article also mentions past criticisms of Biden's behavior with women.

Figure 6. Exemplary fact-check report with a correct prediction, page 1 of 2.

Evidence from `web_search`

The photo in question shows Joe Biden kissing his 19-year-old granddaughter, Finnegan Biden, during a campaign stop in Iowa. This event took place in February at Clarke University in Dubuque. The claim that he was kissing a 15-year-old is false. The gesture sparked mixed reactions, with some finding it unsettling and others viewing it as a normal display of affection.

For more details, you can refer to the articles from [AP News](#) and [NZ Herald](#).

Elaboration

The evidence confirms that the image shows Joe Biden kissing his granddaughter, Finnegan Biden, during a campaign rally in Iowa. The event took place at Clarke University in Dubuque. The New York Post and other sources, such as [AP News](#) and [NZ Herald](#), corroborate this information. The claim that she is 19 years old is also supported by these sources. Therefore, the claim is verified as true.

Final Judgement

The fact-check confirms that the image shows Joe Biden kissing his granddaughter, Finnegan Biden, during a campaign rally in Iowa. The event took place at Clarke University in Dubuque, and multiple sources, including the New York Post, AP News, and NZ Herald, verify this information. The claim that she is 19 years old is also supported by these sources, confirming the accuracy of the claim.

The caption is factually correct, and the image aligns with the claim. There is no indication that the image is used out of context, as it accurately represents the described event. Therefore, the claim is supported by the evidence provided.

supported

Verdict: SUPPORTED

Justification

The fact-check confirms that the image shows Joe Biden kissing his granddaughter, Finnegan Biden, during a campaign rally at Clarke University in Dubuque, Iowa. Multiple sources, including the [New York Post](#), [AP News](#), and [NZ Herald](#), verify this information and confirm that she is 19 years old. The claim is accurate and supported by the evidence.

Figure 7. Exemplary fact-check report with a correct prediction, page 2 of 2.

Claim

"Image depicts members of the Air Force Officers' Spouses' Club taken at the annual Joint Armed Forces of Washington Luncheon (JAFOWL) on April 24."



Actions

```
reverse_search(<image:1551>)  
web_search("Air Force Officers' Spouses' Club annual Joint Armed Forces  
of Washington Luncheon April 24")
```

Evidence

Evidence from web_search

From [Source](#): Content: The photo in question was taken at the annual Joint Armed Forces of Washington Luncheon (JAFOWL) on April 24, not at the White House. It depicts members of the Air Force Officers' Spouses' Club. The event is criticized for potentially reinforcing a hierarchy among military spouses. The image was mistakenly associated with a White House event by Ronald Klain in a viral tweet.

Elaboration

The evidence confirms that the image was taken at the annual Joint Armed Forces of Washington Luncheon (JAFOWL) on April 24 and depicts members of the Air Force Officers' Spouses' Club. This aligns with the claim, verifying its accuracy. The image was mistakenly associated with a White House event in a viral tweet, but this does not affect the claim's validity regarding the event and group depicted. Therefore, the claim is true based on the provided evidence.

Final Judgement

The fact-check confirms that the image was taken at the annual Joint Armed Forces of Washington Luncheon (JAFOWL) on April 24 and depicts members of the Air Force Officers' Spouses' Club. This aligns with the claim, verifying its accuracy. Although the image was mistakenly associated with a White House event in a viral tweet, this does not affect the claim's validity regarding the event and group depicted.

The claim accurately describes the origin, content, and context of the image. Therefore, the most appropriate decision option is supported.

Verdict: SUPPORTED

Justification

The fact-check confirms that the image was taken at the annual Joint Armed Forces of Washington Luncheon (JAFOWL) on April 24 and depicts members of the Air Force Officers' Spouses' Club, as claimed. Despite a viral tweet mistakenly associating the image with a White House event, the evidence from [Task & Purpose](#) supports the claim's accuracy regarding the event and group depicted. Therefore, the claim is supported.

Figure 8. Report of a fact-check which ended in a wrong prediction due to a premature judgment.

Claim

"Image shows portions of a fishnet as well as several fish being stuck up on power lines after traffic accident with a fisherman boat, in August 2020."



Actions

```
reverse_search(<image:1312>)  
web_search("fishnet power lines traffic accident fisherman boat August 2020")
```

Evidence

No new evidence found.

Elaboration

The claim suggests that a traffic accident involving a fisherman's boat resulted in a fishnet and several fish being stuck on power lines. However, there is no new evidence to support or refute this claim. The image alone does not provide enough context or details to verify the incident or its cause.

To assess the claim's veracity, additional information is needed, such as news reports or eyewitness accounts from August 2020 that describe a similar incident. Without such evidence, the claim remains unverified.

Actions

```
image_search("fishnet power lines traffic accident August 2020")  
web_search("fishnet power lines accident fisherman boat August 2020")
```

Evidence

No new evidence found.

Elaboration

The claim remains unverified due to a lack of supporting evidence. The image alone does not provide sufficient context to confirm the incident described. No additional information, such as news reports or eyewitness accounts from August 2020, has been found to substantiate the claim. Therefore, without further evidence, the claim cannot be confirmed or refuted.

Figure 9. Report of a fact-check (page 1 of 2), which ended in a wrong prediction due to the failed retrieval of evidence.

Actions

```
image_search("fishnet power lines accident August 2020")  
web_search("fishnet power lines traffic accident August  
2020")
```

Evidence

No new evidence found.

Elaboration

The claim remains unverified due to insufficient evidence. Despite multiple searches, no supporting information such as news articles or eyewitness accounts from August 2020 has been found to confirm the incident described. The image alone lacks context and details necessary to substantiate the claim. Without additional evidence, the claim cannot be confirmed or refuted. Further investigation or credible sources are needed to verify the event.

Final Judgement

The claim suggests that a traffic accident involving a fisherman's boat resulted in a fishnet and several fish being stuck on power lines. Despite multiple searches, no supporting evidence such as news reports or eyewitness accounts from August 2020 has been found to confirm this incident. The image alone does not provide enough context or details to verify the claim.

Given the lack of evidence and context, the claim appears to construct a narrative around the image without substantiation. Therefore, the claim is best categorized as out of context.

Verdict: OUT_OF_CONTEXT

Justification

The claim that a traffic accident involving a fisherman's boat resulted in a fishnet and several fish being stuck on power lines remains unverified due to a lack of supporting evidence. Despite multiple searches, no news reports or eyewitness accounts from August 2020 have been found to confirm the incident. The image alone lacks sufficient context to substantiate the claim, leading to the conclusion that the claim is out of context.

Figure 10. Report of a fact-check (page 2 of 2), which ended in a wrong prediction due to the failed retrieval of evidence.

Claim

“A photograph of a riot police officer with his boot on the shoulder of a protester in 2010 during protests over a G20 summit in Toronto.”



Actions

reverse_search(<image:1732>)

web_search("G20 summit Toronto 2010 police protest image")

Evidence

Evidence from reverse_search

From [Source](#): The image in question is confirmed to be from the 2010 G20 summit protests in Toronto, where police clashed with protesters. The Toronto Star reports on a \$16.5 million settlement between the Toronto police board and over a thousand individuals arrested during the event, highlighting the image of police and protesters. [Socialist Action](#) discusses the settlement and criticizes ongoing police misconduct, using the same image. [Analysis News](#) also confirms the image's origin, discussing the aggressive police tactics and civil rights violations during the protests

Evidence from web_search

From [Source](#): Content: The Getty Images page contains multiple images related to the G20 summit protests in Toronto in 2010, showing police and protesters clashing. There are no specific details about the image in question, but the context aligns with the claim of police-protester interactions during the summit.

Elaboration

The evidence confirms that the image is from the 2010 G20 summit protests in Toronto. Multiple sources, including the Toronto Star, Socialist Action, and The Analysis News, verify the context of the image, showing police clashing with protesters. The Toronto Star article mentions a settlement related to mass arrests during the event, further supporting the claim's context. Additionally, Getty Images provides a collection of similar images from the protests, reinforcing the setting and time frame.

Therefore, the claim about the photograph depicting a riot police officer with his boot on the shoulder of a protester during the 2010 G20 summit in Toronto is verified as accurate.

Final Judgement

The fact-check confirms that the image is indeed from the 2010 G20 summit protests in Toronto. Multiple sources, including the Toronto Star and Socialist Action, verify the context of the image, showing police clashing with protesters. The Toronto Star article mentions a settlement related to mass arrests during the event, further supporting the claim's context. Getty Images also provides a collection of similar images from the protests, reinforcing the setting and time frame. The claim accurately describes the origin, content, and context of the image, as verified by multiple sources. Therefore, the most appropriate decision option is supported.

Verdict: SUPPORTED

Justification

The image is confirmed to be from the 2010 G20 summit protests in Toronto, depicting police clashing with protesters. Multiple sources, including the [Toronto Star](#), [Socialist Action](#) and [The Analysis News](#) verify the context and authenticity of the image. The Toronto Star article also mentions a settlement related to mass arrests during the event, supporting the claim's context. Getty Images provides additional images from the protests, reinforcing the setting and time frame. The claim is thus supported.

Figure 11. Fact-checking report by DEFAME, presented in the Human Evaluation.

Claim

“A photograph of a riot police officer with his boot on the shoulder of a protester in 2010 during protests over a G20 summit in Toronto.”



Final Judgement

The image shows a police officer with his boot on the shoulder of a protester, which aligns with the claim that it was taken during protests over a G20 summit in Toronto in 2010.

This event was marked by significant clashes between police and protesters, and the image accurately reflects the tense and confrontational atmosphere of those protests.

Therefore, the claim accurately describes the origin, content, and context of the image. The decision option that applies best is `supported`.

Verdict: SUPPORTED

Justification

The claim that the image depicts a police officer with his boot on a protester's shoulder during the 2010 G20 summit protests in Toronto is supported. The image accurately reflects the confrontational atmosphere of the event, aligning with the described context and content.

Figure 12. Fact-checking report by the Chain-of-Thought baseline, presented in the Human Evaluation.