
MULTIMODAL FAKE NEWS VIDEO EXPLANATION GENERATION

Lizhi Chen

School of Computer Science and Technology
Soochow University
Suzhou, China 215000
20234027010@stu.suda.edu.cn

Zhong Qian

School of Computer Science and Technology
Soochow University
Suzhou, China 215000
qianzhongqz@163.com

Peifeng Li

School of Computer Science and Technology
Soochow University
Suzhou, China 215000
pfli@suda.edu.cn

Qiaoming Zhu

School of Computer Science and Technology
Soochow University
Suzhou, China 215000
qmzhu@suda.edu.cn

January 16, 2025

ABSTRACT


Multimodal explanation entails assessing the validity of varied content, reliant on the integration of multiple information modalities considering harmony and consistency between them. Most previous methods for detecting fake news videos emphasize precision while neglecting the significance of providing explanations. In this paper, we propose a novel task, i.e., MultiModal Fake News Video Explanation (MFNVE), where given a multimodal news item consist of video and title text, its aim is to generate natural language explanation revealing the prediction’s veracity. For this purpose, we develop FakeNVE, a supplementary dataset featuring explanations for 3614 multimodal news videos, each explaining a news lead attribution. We conduct a benchmark test on FakeNVE using a Transformer-based architecture, proposing a Multimodal Relation Graph Transformer (MRGT) to extract multimodal content (i.e., title, video frames, OCR text, and related news context) from input news videos. This model introduces a multimodal relation graph to capture inherent ties between vision and semantics for improved veracity reasoning. Empirical results demonstrate that our MRGT and diverse baselines (adopted to MFNVE) yield robust performance across various evaluation metrics. We also conduct human evaluations of explanation generation, securing high scores in both adequacy and fluency.

1 Introduction

The dissemination of fake news has evolved into a significant societal concern that poses real-world threats in domains including politics [39], finance [7], and public health [23]. Traditionally, tasks to detect such news largely revolved around judging potential falsehoods in text and visual elements [28, 42]. The rise of short video platforms has amplified the proliferation of fake news videos, displaying stronger persuasiveness and greater propagation velocity than text-based counterfeits [33]. Consequently, the detection of such videos becomes critical. Existing efforts [11, 2, 32, 27] harness multimodal signals in news videos for detection, employing the disparity across and within modalities by capturing multimodal signals. Most existing systems rely on the interplay between modality-specific latent representations for exploiting disparity. For instance, Ganti et al. [9] proposes a three-step approach for video misinformation detection, which includes reverse image search for Deepfake detection, semantic analysis to inspect metadata alterations, and sentiment comparison for veracity judgment.

The detection model should attribute its output to the extracted multimodal cues. Due to the complex features and fine-grained types of fake videos, one fake video may have multiple clues [1]. It is important to unravel the cue integration process to prove the final output of cue attribution, that is, whether the video is fake or real. In this case,

Title: Multiple vehicles involved in Pasadena accident, no injuries reported.



Speech: Police in Pasadena are investigating a fatal accident that resulted in the deaths of three individuals, aged between 17 and 22...

Explanation: The news title claims multiple vehicles were involved in the Pasadena accident, but video and speech clarify it was a single-vehicle incident resulting in three fatalities and critical injuries.

(a) Examples of video context modal errors.

Title: Laotian FM calls for multilateralism to tackle global challenges.



Speech: Individual actions that disregard the United Nations Charter and advocate utilitarianism rather than multilateralism...

Explanation: The news is false. From the speech suggested abandoning multilateralism, which contradicts the title highlighting the Lao Foreign minister's call for multilateralism to address global challenges.

(b) Examples of speech context modal errors.

Figure 1: Example scenarios of multimodal fake news video explanation task.

only detecting news videos without revealing hidden clues is not enough for many real scenes. For various applications, the spread of error information videos [36] may lead to reputation crisis and regulatory inspection. It is important to understand why news is fake or real and detect malicious public opinion in the form of explanation. Therefore, we propose a new task - multimodal false news video interpretation (MFNVE). This task takes multimodal (text and visual) news videos as input, and aims to generate natural language sentences to explain the veracity of predictions in news videos.

Figure 1 displays two instances of the MFNVE task. In Figure 1(a), the video shows the news screen of a car accident on Longquan Road in Tengzhou. By comparing with the news title, we can feel that the video content is consistent with the title. The video content directly shows the specific information related to the title, and there is no other relevant news to refute. As a result of the MFNVE task, we hope to generate corresponding explanations for similar video news. Figure 1(b) presents another instance of MFNVE. The video content describes the hot sales of this robot wife, while the news title claims that “the robot wife will be sold out after being online for an hour”. In the absence of other relevant information, it is difficult to judge whether the news video is true only based on the title and video content. However, by

obtaining other news descriptions of the same event, we found inconsistencies, which provided us with important clues to judge the veracity of the current news.

The task of MFNVE is different from the traditional explanation system. The output is no longer an abstract attention heat map [41] or data visualization mechanism [25, 26, 20], but a coherent and easy to understand explanation sentence. In fact, there are rich semantic and visual relationships between text sources and image sources that can be used for veracity reasoning and corresponding explanation generation. For example, the semantic correlation between the input title and the tokens in the OCR text can help to mine inconsistent explanations within the mode; The corresponding relationship between the tokens in video text and those in image visual data can facilitate the explanation of cross modal inconsistencies. In addition, the association of retrieved relevant news text tokens with video text and image visual tokens promotes the inconsistent explanation of multimodal input. These explanatory sentences can directly reflect the main content, key information and possible deep meaning of the video news, so that users can understand the video news more intuitively and enhance their trust in the decision-making process of the model.

To address the MFNVE task, we conceive FakeNVE, a complementary multimodal news video explanation dataset. It comprises 3,614 news videos featuring manually created natural language explanations. For benchmarking FakeNVE, we adopt the Multimodal Relational Graph Transformer (MRGT) that comprehensively embodies multimodal context relationships, encompassing title, video frames, OCR text, as well as related news context. This multimodal fusion approach considers multiple elements of news videos for more accurate deduction and explanation of video content. Finally, an equivalently Transformer-based decoder is incorporated into the pipeline for explanation generation. Empirical results demonstrate that our MRGT and diverse baselines (adopted to MFNVE) yield robust performance across various evaluation metrics. We also conduct human evaluations of explanation generation, securing high scores in both adequacy and fluency.

The main contributions of this paper are as follows:

- We introduce MFNVE, a novel task aiming to generate natural language explanations about video news, verifying its veracity. To our knowledge, it is the first attempt to explain the veracity of multimodal news video.
- We refine FakeNVE, a novel dataset comprising of 3614 quintuples (video frames, title, OCR text, related news context, and explanations) from the MFNVE.
- We employ the Multimodal Relational Graph Transformer (MRGT) model for benchmarking FakeNVE. MRGT unifies subtle visual and semantic information from both image and text modalities, forming an integrated, comprehensive representation.
- We conduct extensive qualitative and quantitative experiments on FakeNVE using the proposed model and existing SOTA methods to verify the advantages of the proposed method. At the same time, we perform human evaluations assessed the coherence and feasibility of explanations generated by our proposed model. Additionally, we make available our code and dataset to enrich this community’s research.

2 Related Work

2.1 Fake News Video Detection

News videos comprise a diverse range of information, with descriptive text and visual content being paramount. Past research primarily utilized statistical features in textual classification. For instance, Serrano et al. [31] applied corpus perceptive features. However, with the rise in deep learning technologies, researchers are increasingly adopting continuous representation approaches such as word embedding technology [12] to generate caption embeddings for more accurate semantics capture. Recent advancements in pre-trained language models (e.g., BERT [5]) have also provided robust context representation capabilities for multimodal detection models [37, 3, 22]. Visual content representation is accomplished through frame-level and clip-level methods. Frame-level focuses on static visual attributes, with Shang et al. [32] utilizing the Fast R-CNN network for target region feature extraction, title information assisting in generating frame visual expressions. Clip-level highlights temporal features, where Choi et al. [2] selects key frames based on their similarity to thumbnails, and employs VGG-19 for feature extraction. Liu et al. [18] have leveraged the pre-trained visual transformer from CLIP [29], ViT [6], which efficiently encodes video frames into features.

Modality correlation serves as a pivotal concept in video processing, analyzing interplay between distinct components of the video (such as video text and image). In certain scenarios, the original text or video title may mismatch with the new video content, leading to misleading information for viewers. This inconsistency not only impairs the integrity and consistency of the video but also potentially impacts audience perception and comprehension negatively. Liu et al. [18] trained a cross-modal transducer to study the coherent relationships among videos, speech, and text, identifying

erroneous information by aggregating agreement scores. McCrae et al. [22] utilized an integrated approach integrating various technologies like title analysis and automatic audio transcription for anomaly recognition. Wang et al. [37] proposed a joint representation learning method based on contrastive learning and masked language modeling to realize semantic inconsistency detection. However, existing works exhibit limitations, specifically concerning the differentiation of fine-grained erroneous information. The model needs further enhancement to predict specific types of error information and classifying datasets with novel classifications and fine-grained explanations.

2.2 Natural Language Explanations

Numerous studies have examined explaining models’ predictions via natural language generation (NLE). Hendricks et al. [10], pioneering for image classification tasks, introduced an interpretable model that elucidates the predicted label providing transparency of the decision. Kim et al. [14] further refined this concept, offering explanations for the model actions in autonomous vehicles boosting credibility and safety. Recently, Kayser et al. [13] presented e-ViL, a visual-language benchmark with an explainable evaluation framework, comparing existing NLE approaches for visual-language tasks. Although these studies have advanced use of NLE for model output explanations, their focus has been primarily on demonstrating model output validation. In our task, NLE is the model’s output and aims to validate the realness of multimodal news video content. To our knowledge, this is the first attempt to generate NLE for multimodal news videos, offering an innovative method for news content veracity verification, alongside establishing new pathways for model transparency and explainability.

3 FakeNVE Dataset

3.1 Task Formulation

Assuming we have a training dataset \mathcal{V} consisting of N sample, i.e. $\mathcal{V} = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_N\}$. Each sample $V_i = \{F_i, T_i, R_i, P_i, Y_i\}$, where F_i represents the input video frame, T_i is the title, R_i is the OCR text and related news text P_i , and $Y_i = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{N_{y_i}}\}$ represents the target explanatory text composed of N_{y_i} tokens. Based on these training samples, our goal is to learn a multimodal news video explanation model \mathcal{F} that can generate veracity explanations based on given multimodal inputs, as follows:

$$\hat{Y}_i = \mathcal{F}(F_i, T_i, R_i, P | \Theta) \tag{1}$$

where Θ is a set of to-be-learned parameters of the model \mathcal{F} . \hat{Y}_i is the generated explanation text by \mathcal{F} .

3.2 Dataset Construction

This section details our pursuit to enhance the Fake News Video Explanation (FakeNVE) dataset. Given the necessity in multimodal explanation of news videos via MFNVE, we utilise the quantitative annotation of the multimodal news video dataset FakeSV [27]. Constructed as the largest Chinese fake news short video database, FakeSV offers comprehensive news content and substantial social context. FakeSV categorized news videos into false, real and debunked categories, with a balanced sampling resulting in a total of 1,827 false news, 1,827 real news, and 738 event-based 1,884 debunked videos.

Subsequently, we employ the following detailed annotation guidelines for each news video explanation:

- **Real News Video Annotation:**
 - The video’s title, OCR text, and content are supportive and reflect consistent information.
 - Upon verification, the content of this news video corresponds to known facts without contradicting or inconsistent information in related events.
- **Fake News Video Annotation:**
 - There is a mismatch between the video’s title and OCR text, creating a significant divergence or contradiction.
 - The title misrepresents the video’s contents, conveying information inconsistent with visual content.
 - Analyzing the context of this video and other news reports under the same event reveals contradictions in news information.
- **Annotation Instruction:** Annotators were given the following instructions for generating the explanation.
 - The annotator is to scrutinize the image content, title, OCR recognized text and other news texts about the relevant event in the video holistically, ensuring these pieces are utilized as aids.

- If a video news’ Veracity can be interpreted through multiple approaches, the annotator should choose a succinct, straightforward method.
- The annotator should refute the inclusion of any themes or content irrelevant to judging the authenticity of the video news, ensuring the focus and accuracy of the explanation.

We engaged three expert annotators who meticulously examined each video news in our collection. Guided by our annotation guidelines, these individuals collectively generated corresponding explanations for 3,614 videos. Among these samples, the FakeNVE dataset incorporates 2,802 examples, featuring text entities both within images and as captions, we term these OCR samples. The remaining 812 samples have no shared overlap of image and text, we designate them as non-OCR samples. The summary statistics of this data set are succinctly presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Statistics of the FakeNVE dataset.

Split	# of News	Title (Avg. length)	Explanation (Avg. length)	Instances (Fake/Real)
Train	3070	32.69	49.12	1528/1542
Val	182	33.81	50.06	88/94
Test	362	31.86	41.03	186/176
Total	3614	32.64	48.33	1802/1812

4 Benchmark Model: MRGT

In order to benchmark FakeNVE, we propose MRGT, which is a multi-mode Transformer based encoder-decoder framework. Figure 2 shows the overall architecture of the proposed MRGT. First, we model different features of the input news video, and we extract features of multiple modes, including title, video frame, OCR text, and relevant news content. Next, we use multimodal graphs to model the correlation between semantics and vision. Finally, a BART based decoder is added to predict and explanation generation.




Figure 2: The proposed framework of MRGT consists of three key components: multimodal feature extraction for news videos, veracity reasoning for multimodal relational graphs, and veracity interpretation generation.

4.1 Multimodal Feature Extraction

News video post \mathcal{V} represents an instance of data set explanations via news videos. Each news video sample $V_i \in \mathcal{V}$ incorporates the following key components:

- Visual frame (F_i): The visual element of video posts F_i is defined as a sequence of video frames. Utilizing a pre-trained ViT [6], we extract static features $F_i = [f_1, f_2, \dots, f_K]$ from video, with $f_k \in F_i$ signifying the visual feature of each video frame and K indicating the number of frames.
- Title (T_i): We extract news video title text and extrude word embedding features $T_i = [t_1, t_2, \dots, t_M]$, where $t_m \in T_i$, M represents the title text length.
- OCR text (R_i): The OCR text within videos typically provides superior completeness compared to the restricted length of a mere title, encapsulating more video data. We extract the OCR text R_i from the video, further feeding it into a pretrained model to extract word embedding features $R_i = [r_1, r_2, \dots, r_C]$, where $r_C \in R_i$, C denotes the video OCR text length.
- Relevant news Content (P_i): Given the news video feature set V_L^E under identical event P^E , L denotes the number of news videos under event P^E . We amalgamate each OCR text and title text of relevant news videos under V_L^E , combining corresponding news text to extract word embedded features $P_i = [p_1, p_2, \dots, p_L]$.

4.2 Multimodal Relation Graph Reasoning

To date, we have four news video data sources: video frames F , input title T , OCR text R extracted from images, and relevant news context P . For fusion of these features, we employ a Transformer encoder, which has achieved outstanding success in various natural language processing tasks such as sentiment analysis [21] and multimodal summaries [40]. We initially form a labeled sequence X by connecting them together and then feed the X into the Transformer Encoder TE , as illustrated below:

Table 2: Performance comparison between MRGT and other baselines methods on FakeNVE datasets.

(a) Event Overlap											
Model	BLEU				ROUGE-L	METEOR	CIDEr	Performance			
	B1	B2	B3	B4				Rec	Prec	F1	Acc
BERT	49.89	44.89	44.89	38.31	51.84	54.66	72.94	89.23	89.27	89.16	89.20
Faster R-CNN	48.75	42.85	38.31	34.98	49.34	52.27	61.60	89.02	89.81	88.87	88.92
TikTec	51.84	46.79	42.83	39.82	53.57	56.78	77.80	89.79	89.87	89.75	89.75
SVFEND	53.16	47.31	43.53	41.66	55.00	58.92	74.87	90.88	90.90	90.84	90.86
MRGT	56.35	51.94	48.46	45.76	59.79	62.30	80.23	93.10	93.12	93.07	93.07

(b) Event Non-Overlap											
Model	BLEU				ROUGE-L	METEOR	CIDEr	Performance			
	B1	B2	B3	B4				Rec	Prec	F1	Acc
BERT	29.94	21.92	14.76	10.66	26.14	28.24	16.89	70.68	70.55	70.60	71.19
Faster R-CNN	28.32	21.42	14.13	10.21	25.46	27.76	16.71	69.90	70.52	70.10	71.19
TikTec	30.59	22.33	15.23	10.70	26.48	28.43	18.30	72.61	72.09	71.88	72.02
SVFEND	31.49	22.22	15.49	10.22	26.26	29.25	19.68	77.28	76.71	76.78	77.01
MRGT	32.98	23.24	16.17	11.98	27.95	30.28	21.22	78.59	77.94	77.94	78.12

(c) Video Non-OCR											
Model	BLEU				ROUGE-L	METEOR	CIDEr	Performance			
	B1	B2	B3	B4				Rec	Prec	F1	Acc
BERT	39.44	32.75	28.36	25.45	38.40	38.62	56.13	72.96	79.49	73.78	76.92
Faster R-CNN	37.30	30.57	25.95	22.94	36.96	37.26	55.28	72.81	72.26	73.08	72.42
TikTec	39.29	33.21	28.65	25.58	39.02	40.07	60.32	74.50	76.81	75.12	76.92
SVFEND	41.08	35.64	31.60	28.62	41.84	44.32	61.67	77.73	82.52	78.76	80.77
MRGT	44.62	38.77	34.36	31.12	45.63	47.50	66.44	90.40	89.85	90.09	90.38

$$\mathbf{H} = TE(X) \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times D}$ represents the encoded representation of the matrix, with each column corresponding to a token. S signifies the total number of tokens in X .

For each sample V_i , we construct a multimodal graph G to thoroughly encapsulate the aforementioned semantic and visual associations. Therefore, we make $\mathcal{H} = \{h_1, \dots, h_s\}$ represent a node set, corresponding to the S tokens in X , which can be divided into four categories: title nodes, OCR text nodes, image visual nodes, and related news context nodes.

Refer to Figure 2, the edges are defined according to the visual and semantic relationships between these nodes. Firstly, we establish a connection between nodes with semantic relevance in the input title and OCR text through an entailment tree relationship. Secondly, we link the visual nodes of video sequence via a connection between adjacent labels in the video frames. Thirdly, to comprehend the correlation between visual and title text, we connect all visual frame nodes through cosine similarity measurement, establishing an edge with the most similar title text label. Fourthly, to comprehend the correlation between visual and OCR text, we establish an edge between the sequentially input visual frame and its most similar OCR text label. Lastly, for related news retrieved under the same event, we append a connection after the text semantic label to connect related news text nodes. Formally, let $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times S}$ denote the adjacency matrix in the multimodal graph we constructed.

Subsequently, we employ our proven GCN for veracity reasoning. In particular, assume utilizing an L -layer GCN. The node representation is iteratively updated as follows:

$$\mathbf{G}_l = \text{ReLU} \left(\tilde{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{G}_{l-1} \mathbf{W}_l \right), l \in [1, L], \quad (3)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{A}} = (\mathbf{D})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{D})^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ is the normalized symmetric adjacency matrix, and \mathbf{D} is the degree matrix of \mathbf{A} . \mathbf{G}_l are the representations of nodes obtained in the l -th layer GCN, where $\mathbf{G}_0 = \mathbf{H}$ is the initial node representation.

The final node representation G_L obtained by GCN should absorb rich visual and semantic information from its related nodes and be used as the input generated by the following veracity explanation. We also introduce a residual connection [34] to generate the veracity explanation. Specifically, we first fuse the initial nodes, and the final nodes are represented as follows:

$$\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{H} + \mathbf{G}_L \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times D}$ denotes the fused node representation.

4.3 Classification and Explanation Generation

In the classification part, we use the full connection layer with softmax activation to project the multimodal fusion vector \mathbf{Z} into two types of target spaces: real news video and fake news video, and obtain the probability distribution:

$$p = \text{softmax}(\mathbf{W}_q \mathbf{Z} + \mathbf{b}_q) \quad (5)$$

where $p = [p_0, p_1]$ is the prediction probability vector, p_0 and p_1 indicate that the prediction probability of the label is 0 (real news video) and 1 (fake news video) respectively. \mathbf{W}_q is the weight matrix and \mathbf{b}_q is the deviation term. Therefore, for each news video post, the goal is to minimize the binary cross entropy loss function, as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_p = -[(1 - y) \log p_0 + y \log p_1] \quad (6)$$

where $y \in \{0, 1\}$ denotes the ground-truth label.

In the explanation generation part, we will feed \mathbf{Z} to the pretrained Transformer Decoder TD . The decoder works in an autoregressive manner, that is, it generates the next word by considering all the previously decoded outputs, as follows:

$$\hat{\mathbf{y}}_t = TD(\mathbf{Z}, \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_{<t}) \quad (7)$$

where $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times D}$, $t \in [1, N_y]$ and $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}|}$ represent the marginal probability distribution for t -th tag interpretation. $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_{<t}$ denotes the previously predicted $t - 1$ tokens.

To optimize the generation of MRGT, we also use the standard cross entropy loss function, as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{Gen} = -1/N_y \sum_{i=1}^{N_y} \log(\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i[t]) \quad (8)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i[t]$ is an element of $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i$ and corresponds to the i -th tag generating the explanations. N_y denotes the total number of tags utilized in generating veracity explanations Y .

Therefore, the overall loss function is as follows:

$$\mathcal{L} = \alpha_1 \mathcal{L}_p + \alpha_2 \mathcal{L}_{Gen} \quad (9)$$

where α_1, α_2 are two hyper-parameters.

Table 3: Ablation study on the architecture design of MRGT on FakeNVE.

Model	BLEU				ROUGE-L	METEOR	CIDEr	Performance			
	B1	B2	B3	B4				Rec	Prec	F1	Acc
w/o-Title	51.75	46.81	42.99	40.12	53.94	55.62	69.19	91.28	91.35	91.24	91.24
w/o-OCR	48.10	42.74	38.68	35.71	49.59	52.33	61.03	90.85	90.86	90.87	90.86
w/o-Related	52.59	45.90	43.27	38.48	52.22	56.08	72.27	90.32	90.35	90.39	90.41
w/o-Visual	54.32	49.70	46.03	43.22	57.34	60.20	78.33	92.03	92.30	91.93	91.97
w/o-Graph	55.07	50.40	46.78	44.02	57.91	61.85	78.76	92.02	91.96	92.01	91.97
MRGT	56.35	51.94	48.46	45.76	59.79	62.30	80.23	93.10	93.12	93.07	93.07

5 Experiments

5.1 Experimental Settings

We perform experiments on FakeNVE and use 85:5:10 split to create train (3070), validation (182), and test (362) sets. We employed BLEU (B1, B2, B3, B4) [24], ROUGE-L [4], METEOR [17], and CIDEr [35] as evaluation metrics for model explanation effectiveness. CIDEr assesses how well model generates concurrent text explanations considering the weights of each n-tuple in the descriptions. Simultaneously, we measured the model’s predictive power using accuracy (Acc.), macro precision (Prec.), macro recall (Rec.), and macro F1 scores (F1).

We utilized the BART-base-Chinese model [16] provided by huggingface as the backbone of ours. In practice, title text and OCR text were unified to 224 through either padding or truncation operations. The maximum number of video frames captured was 80, and each image was processed via pooling as image source information. The feature dimension was uniformed at 768. The training hyper-parameters are set as follows: $\alpha_1=0.2$, $\alpha_2=0.8$. We adopted AdamW [19] as the optimizer, with a learning rate of $1e-3$ for GCN layers and a learning rate of $1e-4$ for BART. The batch size was set to 10, and the maximum epoch number for model training was limited to 15.

5.2 Baselines

Given the multimodal nature of news videos, encompassing text, visual, and auditory information, this study compares both single and multimodal input methods. To ensure completeness and precision, we utilize various systems for comparison.

In single modality, we selected industry-standard baseline models specific to both text and vision modalities, as follows:

- For the text modality, we use BERT [5], a current predominant text encoder in natural language processing. We concatenate the title and OCR text into a sequence and fed it to BERT for classification.
- For the visual modality, we employ Faster RCNN [30], which is extensively used in object detection and can extract and fuse multiframe visual features for classification.

In multimodal, we compared two multimodal methods specifically designed to detect fake news, as follows:

- TikTec [32] employs speech text extraction to facilitate visual object feature learning, enhancing these features via MFCC, and a shared attention module integrates visual and auditory information for classification.
- SVFEND [27] uses two cross-modal transformers to model the mutual enhancement between text and other modalities (i.e., audio and key frames), then integrates them with social context features (such as comments and users) via self-attention mechanisms.


5.3 Experimental Results

Table 2 presents the MRGT performance comparison, evaluating three scenarios: (a) event overlap in the dataset (Table 2a), signifying similar news about the same event within both the training and test sets; (b) news event non-overlap [38] in the dataset (Table 2b), signifying no news event overlap between different datasets; and (c) evaluating on only news video samples with no OCR text (Table 2c).

From the data presented in Table 2a, the MRGT model exhibits significant advantages over other baseline models for interpreting and predicting multimedia false news videos. Firstly, in terms of BLEU scores, MRGT achieves the highest

marks across all four sub-metrics, B1, B2, B3, and B4. Especially, compared to its baseline SVFEND model, MRGT’s BLEU score improves by a remarkable 3.19 (+5.97%), 4.81 (+10.17%), 4.93 (+11.30%), and 4.10 (+9.84%). This indicates that MRGT’s generated interpretation sentences exhibit superior fluency and accuracy, hence accurately reflect video content. Secondly, the ROUGE-L score for MRGT improves by 4.79 (+8.71%) against SVFEND, indicating higher resemblance between MRGT’s generated explanations and reference explanations. Moreover, in METEOR and CIDEr scores, MRGT also performs remarkably, demonstrating its capability to produce accurate and descriptive interpretations accordingly. Lastly, from the perspective of predictive performance, MRGT achieves an Accuracy of 93.07%, outperforming all other models. This suggests high accuracy for predicting the veracity of news videos provided by MRGT, providing users with reliable assessment insights.

Title: Shen Wei, a top student in Fudan University, chooses to wander after a car accident takes away his wife and daughter.



Reference: The video shows a picture of a tramp with an article saying that the tramp is a top student of Fudan University, but there is a rumor refuting video saying that the tramp did not graduate from Fudan University and never married. Fake

Candidate: The video is an auditor from the Audit Bureau of Xuhui District, Shanghai. He is a tramp, but the related video shows the death of the husband and wife, which is inconsistent with the title and is false news. Fake

(a) Wrong explanation, correct prediction.

Title: This is the proof. The US intentionally spread the virus to China during the Military Games.



Reference: The video shows a foreign man wiping his saliva on the handrail of the subway, but this does not prove that Americans deliberately spread the virus to China. Fake

Candidate: The video shows a video of a man soaring in the subway, with an article saying that this is an American attempt to spread the virus to China. The title and content are consistent, and the video does not refute rumors. Real

(b) Wrong explanation, wrong prediction.

Title: Follow me in the accident at Datong Bridge in Tengzhou, don't get lost# Dithering assistant is popular on dou.



Reference: The video shows the news screen of a car accident on Longquan Road, Tengzhou, with the same title and content, and no refutation video. Real

Candidate: The video shows the scene of a car falling into a pit when the road collapses on the Datong Bridge in Tengzhou. The title and content are the same, and there is no refutation video. Real

(c) Correct explanation and prediction based on real news video.

Title: The face changing bird in Qinba Mountain, please come and have a look.



Reference: The video described that the photographer shot the rare nine headed bird "Face Changing" in Hubei Province, but the related video shot is the Anji hummingbird, mainly living in North America, which is inconsistent with the title. Fake

Candidate: The video is the face changing bird of Qinba Mountain, but the related video shows that the bird is the Anji hummingbird, which is common in North America, and is inconsistent with the title, which is false news. Fake

(d) Correct explanation and prediction based on fake news video.

Figure 3: Examples of four distinct types of explanation generation, with a comparison between model-generated candidate and reference with explanations.

Table 2b and Table 2c distinctly present the outcomes of experiments with no event overlap and without OCR samples. The objective is to further assess MRGT model performance under varying conditions; its generalization potential and robustness are examined. Firstly, for the experiment design devoid of event overlap, the objective was to prevent the model from discerning fake news videos by remembering information about events [38], ensuring generalization capability of the model on newly discovered news events. Table 2b presents that MRGT performed better under situations of event overlap or without. This suggests that MRGT excels in known as well as unknown events. Secondly, the experiment design without OCR samples was to investigate the influence of text in images on MRGT performance. Comparison between experimental results with and without OCR samples assesses if the model excessively relies on image text information for judgment. From Table 2c, it can be observed that MRGT did not exhibit any bias towards OCR or non-OCR samples. This indicates that MRGT’s performance is comparable, irrespective of the two conditions and more closely resembles the overall situation. It illustrates that MRGT does not depend on image text information for detecting fake news videos but considers multimodal information of the video to render a verdict.

5.4 Ablation Study

We designed models for ablation studies to assess contributing factors in veracity explanation. Firstly, we deactivated visual information (w/o-Visual), uncovering the significance of vision in the model. Secondly, we eliminated title data (wo/-Title) to scrutinize the impact on veracity explanation. Furthermore, we eradicated OCR text data (w/o-OCR) to

Table 4: Human Evaluation: A comparison between MRGT and SV-FEND.

(a) Adequacy and Fluency scores				
Model	Adequacy		Fluency	
SV-FEND	0.61		0.82	
MRGT	0.76		0.91	

(b) Adequacy rating distribution of SV-FEND and MRGT				
Model	Adequacy Rating			
	Justify	W. Justify	SRI	NRI
SV-FEND	35%	30%	20%	15%
MRGT	45%	35%	15%	5%

evaluate its role in veracity explanation. Simultaneously, we disposed related news text data from input (w/o-Related) to clarify its contributions. Finally, to validate the necessity of multi-source relationship graphs in actual reasoning, we eliminated graph construction (w/o-Graph), feeding only encoded information to the decoder.

As Table 3 illustrates, notable declines in performance were observed for variations that omitted OCR text (w/o-OCR) and titles (w/o-Title). These omissions, crucial sources of factual information in news videos, thus significantly impacted performance. Notably, models lacking visual features (w/o-Visual), despite possessing modest performance compared to MRGT, maintained a relatively consistent level, underscoring the efficacy of visual cues in enhancing BART’s realism explanation. More importantly, superior performance of MRGT compared to variations without related news context (w/o-Related) and graph (w/o-Graph) highlights the indispensability of other news content and structural graphs in capturing multimodal news video veracity reasoning.

5.5 Case Study

In order to intuitively understand how the model explains the authenticity of news videos, we show four examples in Figure 3. Through the candidate explanations generated by this model and the reference explanations of human annotations, we can deeply analyze the challenges of the model in understanding and explaining complex situations.

In case (a) and (b), the model shows relative anomalies. In case (a), although the model successfully predicted that the news video was fake, its explanation did not match the actual situation. The reference explanation was “the homeless man did not graduate from Fudan University and has never been married”, while the candidate explanation gave “the death of the couple” to infer that the news video was fake. This inconsistency indicates that the model may rely too much on certain specific clues that are not relevant to the actual situation in some cases, resulting in erroneous explanations. This reminds us that relying solely on the prediction results of the model is not enough, and careful review of its explanations is needed to ensure its rationality. In case (b), the model prediction was incorrect and gave an incorrect explanation. The reference explanation was “a single image cannot confirm the authenticity of the news”, while the candidate explanation made a direct judgment through reasoning. This may be due to the lack of sufficient context information when the model deals with complex situations. It also reflects the deficiency of the model in dealing with diversity and uncertainty, which needs further improvement.

In case (c) and (d), the model is relatively normal. The model not only successfully predicts the content of news videos, but also provides reasonable explanations. Even in some cases, the model can generate additional information to enhance the integrity of reasoning. This underscores its competence in understanding and leveraging multimodal information, a critical factor for news videos that integrate rich visual and text context. Particularly in (d), the model discerns issues with the current news video by analyzing other news related to the same event, further demonstrating its reasoning capabilities in complex contexts. Overall, the model’s interpretation generation and prediction performance in the context of multimodal news videos is commendable. It can deliver precise predictions and generate reasonable explanations, aiding human users in comprehending the strengths and weaknesses of the detection system.

5.6 Human Evaluation

We conduct an artificial evaluation to validate the explainability produced by our model. We randomly selected 40 samples from the testing set and enlisted 20 human evaluators to rate the explanations outputted by two distinct methods (MRGT and SV-FEND). The assessment was based on two key dimensions: adequacy and fluency. For adequacy, following Kayser et al. [13] study, the raters applied four rating options. Justify denoted high semantic similarity

between the generated explanation and the reference, effectively revealing the Veracity of the news; weakly justify signified that though some semantic irregularities [15] existed in the generated explanation, it could generally reveal the truth about the news; somewhat related to input (SRI) and not related to input (NRI), respectively, indicated that the generated explanation had a certain correlation to the input but was insufficient to prove the Veracity of the news, and the generated explanation was entirely unassociated or random with the input content.

Table 4 provides numerical results of the human evaluation, such as adequacy and fluency scores, along with perceived adequacy rating differences. The table 4a indicates that MRGT excels in both adequacy (0.76 vs. 0.61) and fluency (0.91 vs. 0.82) compared to SV-FEND, indicating that evaluators hold higher confidence in MRGT generated explanations. To understand distribution of adequacy ratings in depth, we utilized majority voting among evaluators for the selection of adequacy categories. Table 4b presents the outcome, where most samples fall into MRGT’s justify or weakly justify categories, signifying that MRGT explanations can effectively reveal news veracity. Conversely, SV-FEND samples are more commonly distributed in the SRI and NRI categories, suggesting weak or irrelevant association of their explanations to input content.

6 Conclusions

In this paper, we propose an innovative multimodal fake news video explanation task (MFNVE) to scrutinize the veracity of news videos by integrating title and video content. To address this problem, we developed a novel dataset—FakeNVE, which comprises 3,614 interpreted news videos along with reference explanations expressed in natural language sentences. Furthermore, we engineered a robust baseline model, MRGT, incorporating a multimodal relation graph for benchmarking on the FakeNVE dataset, promoting verification of news video veracity reasoning. Evaluations reveal that MRGT outperforms other baselines across diverse evaluation metrics. We affirm that MFNVE pioneers a novel approach in news video veracity and explicability analysis.

References

- [1] Yuyan Bu, Qiang Sheng, Juan Cao, Peng Qi, Danding Wang, and Jintao Li. Combating online misinformation videos: Characterization, detection, and future directions. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, pages 8770–8780, 2023.
- [2] Hyewon Choi and Youngjoong Ko. Using topic modeling and adversarial neural networks for fake news video detection. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM international conference on information & knowledge management*, pages 2950–2954, 2021.
- [3] Christos Christodoulou, Nikos Salamanos, Pantelitsa Leonidou, Michail Papadakis, and Michael Sirivianos. Identifying misinformation on youtube through transcript contextual analysis with transformer models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.12155*, 2023.
- [4] Michael Denkowski and Alon Lavie. Meteor universal: Language specific translation evaluation for any target language. In *Proceedings of the ninth workshop on statistical machine translation*, pages 376–380, 2014.
- [5] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- [6] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, et al. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929*, 2020.
- [7] Dina ElBoghdady. Market quavers after fake ap tweet says obama was hurt in white house explosions. *The Washington Post*, 23, 2013.
- [8] Joseph L Fleiss. Measuring nominal scale agreement among many raters. *Psychological bulletin*, 76(5):378, 1971.
- [9] Dhanvi Ganti. A novel method for detecting misinformation in videos, utilizing reverse image search, semantic analysis, and sentiment comparison of metadata. *Utilizing Reverse Image Search, Semantic Analysis, and Sentiment Comparison of Metadata (June 5, 2022)*, 2022.
- [10] Lisa Anne Hendricks, Zeynep Akata, Marcus Rohrbach, Jeff Donahue, Bernt Schiele, and Trevor Darrell. Generating visual explanations. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2016: 14th European Conference, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, October 11–14, 2016, Proceedings, Part IV 14*, pages 3–19. Springer, 2016.
- [11] Rui Hou, Verónica Pérez-Rosas, Stacy Loeb, and Rada Mihalcea. Towards automatic detection of misinformation in online medical videos. In *2019 International conference on multimodal interaction*, pages 235–243, 2019.

- [12] Raj Jagtap, Abhinav Kumar, Rahul Goel, Shakshi Sharma, Rajesh Sharma, and Clint P George. Misinformation detection on youtube using video captions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.00941*, 2021.
- [13] Maxime Kayser, Oana-Maria Camburu, Leonard Salewski, Cornelius Emde, Virginie Do, Zeynep Akata, and Thomas Lukasiewicz. e-vil: A dataset and benchmark for natural language explanations in vision-language tasks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 1244–1254, 2021.
- [14] Jinkyu Kim, Anna Rohrbach, Trevor Darrell, John Canny, and Zeynep Akata. Textual explanations for self-driving vehicles. In *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*, pages 563–578, 2018.
- [15] J. Richard Landis and Gary G. Koch. The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics*, page 159, Mar 1977.
- [16] Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Ves Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Bart: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.13461*, 2019.
- [17] Chin-Yew Lin. Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text summarization branches out*, pages 74–81, 2004.
- [18] Fuxiao Liu, Yaser Yacoob, and Abhinav Shrivastava. Covid-vts: Fact extraction and verification on short video platforms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.07919*, 2023.
- [19] Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Fixing weight decay regularization in adam. 2018.
- [20] Aditya Mahajan, Divyank Shah, and Gibraan Jafar. Explainable ai approach towards toxic comment classification. In *Emerging Technologies in Data Mining and Information Security: Proceedings of IEMIS 2020, Volume 2*, pages 849–858. Springer, 2021.
- [21] Abdelkader El Mahdaouy, Abdellah El Mekki, Kabil Essefar, Nabil El Mamoun, Ismail Berrada, and Ahmed Khoumsi. Deep multi-task model for sarcasm detection and sentiment analysis in arabic language. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.12488*, 2021.
- [22] Scott McCrae, Kehan Wang, and Avidah Zakhor. Multi-modal semantic inconsistency detection in social media news posts. In *International Conference on Multimedia Modeling*, pages 331–343. Springer, 2022.
- [23] Salman Bin Naeem and Rubina Bhatti. The covid-19 ‘infodemic’: a new front for information professionals. *Health Information & Libraries Journal*, 37(3):233–239, 2020.
- [24] Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 40th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 311–318, 2002.
- [25] Amir Bahador Parsa, Ali Movahedi, Homa Taghipour, Sybil Derrible, and Abolfazl Kouros Mohammadian. Toward safer highways, application of xgboost and shap for real-time accident detection and feature analysis. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, 136:105405, 2020.
- [26] Shraman Pramanick, Dimitar Dimitrov, Rituparna Mukherjee, Shivam Sharma, Md Shad Akhtar, Preslav Nakov, and Tanmoy Chakraborty. Detecting harmful memes and their targets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.00413*, 2021.
- [27] Peng Qi, Yuyan Bu, Juan Cao, Wei Ji, Ruihao Shui, Junbin Xiao, Danding Wang, and Tat-Seng Chua. Fakesv: A multimodal benchmark with rich social context for fake news detection on short video platforms. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 37, pages 14444–14452, 2023.
- [28] Shengsheng Qian, Jinguang Wang, Jun Hu, Quan Fang, and Changsheng Xu. Hierarchical multi-modal contextual attention network for fake news detection. In *Proceedings of the 44th international ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in information retrieval*, pages 153–162, 2021.
- [29] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR, 2021.
- [30] Shaoqing Ren, Kaiming He, Ross Girshick, and Jian Sun. Faster r-cnn: Towards real-time object detection with region proposal networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 28, 2015.
- [31] Juan Carlos Medina Serrano, Orestis Papakyriakopoulos, and Simon Hegelich. Nlp-based feature extraction for the detection of covid-19 misinformation videos on youtube. In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on NLP for COVID-19 at ACL 2020*, 2020.
- [32] Lanyu Shang, Ziyi Kou, Yang Zhang, and Dong Wang. A multimodal misinformation detector for covid-19 short videos on tiktok. In *2021 IEEE international conference on big data (big data)*, pages 899–908. IEEE, 2021.

- [33] S Shyam Sundar, Maria D Molina, and Eugene Cho. Seeing is believing: Is video modality more powerful in spreading fake news via online messaging apps? *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 26(6):301–319, 2021.
- [34] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [35] Ramakrishna Vedantam, C Lawrence Zitnick, and Devi Parikh. Cider: Consensus-based image description evaluation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 4566–4575, 2015.
- [36] Sukrit Venkatagiri, Joseph S Schafer, and Stephen Prochaska. The challenges of studying misinformation on video-sharing platforms during crises and mass-convergence events. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.14309*, 2023.
- [37] Kehan Wang, David Chan, Seth Z. Zhao, John Canny, and Avidah Zakhor. Misinformation detection in social media video posts, 2022.
- [38] 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.
- [39] Chloe Wittenberg, Ben M Tappin, Adam J Berinsky, and David G Rand. The (minimal) persuasive advantage of political video over text. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(47):e2114388118, 2021.
- [40] Yiran Xing, Zai Shi, Zhao Meng, Gerhard Lakemeyer, Yunpu Ma, and Roger Wattenhofer. Km-bart: Knowledge enhanced multimodal bart for visual commonsense generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00419*, 2021.
- [41] Shaowei Yao and Xiaojun Wan. Multimodal transformer for multimodal machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 58th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics*, pages 4346–4350, 2020.
- [42] Yangming Zhou, Yuzhou Yang, Qichao Ying, Zhenxing Qian, and Xinpeng Zhang. Multi-modal fake news detection on social media via multi-grained information fusion. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM International Conference on Multimedia Retrieval*, pages 343–352, 2023.