

CroMe: Multimodal Fake News Detection using Cross-Modal Tri-Transformer and Metric Learning

Eunjee Choi, Junhyun Ahn, XinYu Piao and Jong-Kook Kim

Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Korea University, Republic of Korea
 {eun09ji, ajoonh1, xypiao97, jongkook}@korea.ac.kr

Abstract

Multimodal Fake News Detection has received increasing attention recently. Existing methods rely on independently encoded unimodal data and overlook the advantages of capturing intra-modality relationships and integrating inter-modality similarities using advanced techniques. To address these issues, Cross-Modal Tri-Transformer and Metric Learning for Multimodal Fake News Detection (CroMe) is proposed. CroMe utilizes Bootstrapping Language-Image Pre-training with Frozen Image Encoders and Large Language Models (BLIP2) as encoders to capture detailed text, image and combined image-text representations. The metric learning module employs a proxy anchor method to capture intra-modality relationships while the feature fusion module uses a Cross-Modal and Tri-Transformer for effective integration. The final fake news detector processes the fused features through a classifier to predict the authenticity of the content. Experiments on datasets show that CroMe excels in multimodal fake news detection.

1 Introduction

Advances in information technology and the growing use of social media have made these platforms central to information exchange [Mitra *et al.*, 2017]. However, this has also led to a rise in fake news, which harms public opinion, disrupts political stability [Shu *et al.*, 2017], and affects social and economic activities [Xia *et al.*, 2023]. Detecting false information is essential to prevent its spread. The shift to digital platforms has changed how people consume news, increasing exposure to misinformation. Traditional methods, such as identifying logical flaws or obvious signs like spelling errors and image alterations, were effective for text or image content. However, the rise of multimedia formats like images and videos has accelerated the spread of fake news [Jin *et al.*, 2017], making multimedia-focused detection methods necessary.

Figure 1 shows four examples from the Weibo and Weibo-21 datasets. (a) A group of Quora users listed historically ingenious but unreasonable weapons which are semantically contradictory. (b) In Marco Island, dolphins rescued a dog and firefighters reunited it with its owner



(a) A group of Quora users listed historically ingenious but unreasonable weapons.



(b) In Marco Island, dolphins rescued a dog and firefighters reunited it with its owner.



(c) Yichang police seized 7 macaques and arrested 2 suspects.



(d) Photographer captured an abandoned Douglas DC 3 under Aurora's light.

Figure 1: Some fake examples from the Weibo and Weibo-21 datasets include: (a) The image shows intra-modality inconsistency. (b) Both the image and text contain intra-modality inconsistencies. (c) The image and text are unrelated. (d) The image does not match the text.

from a canal and firefighters reunited it with its owner which are semantically conflicting. (c) Yichang police seized 7 macaques and arrested 2 suspects which is unrelated to the tiger in the image. (d) The text mentions abandoned Douglas DC 3 of the Aurora's light but the image shows only the Aurora's light. The main challenge in multimodal fake news detection is effectively identifying incongruent semantic features in both intra-modality and inter-modality contexts.

Fake news detection has progressed from text-based methods to advanced deep learning techniques. Early work focused on text analysis [Castillo *et al.*, 2011], while later studies utilized deep neural networks for linguistic and temporal patterns [Ma *et al.*, 2016], and attention mechanisms with RNNs [Chen *et al.*, 2018]. Jin *et al.* [Jin *et al.*, 2016] in-

roduced multimodal approaches by combining image, text, and social context features. Choi et al. [Choi and Kim, 2024] developed TT-BLIP, integrating text, image, and multimodal features using BLIP [Li et al., 2022] encoders and a Multi-Modal Tri-Transformer for feature fusion. However, it primarily focuses on modality combination without addressing inter-modal and intra-modal relationships.

This paper introduces a Multimodal Fake News Detection approach using the Cross-Modal Tri-Transformer and Metric Learning (CroMe) network, a motivated framework inspired by the TT-BLIP model. Text is processed using pre-trained BERT [Devlin et al., 2019], and images are analyzed with Masked Autoencoders (MAE) [He et al., 2022]. The BLIP2 [Li et al., 2023] model captures semantic features across modalities. Additionally, CroMe introduces Cross-Modal fusion [Chen et al., 2022] to compute and integrate cross-modal similarities, addressing the limitations of existing methods in capturing complex inter-modal interactions. For intra-modal relationships, a type of metric learning [Schroff et al., 2015; Movshovitz-Attias et al., 2017] called the Proxy Anchor Loss method [Kim et al., 2020] is used. This method captures fine-grained similarities while maintaining the efficiency of proxy-based methods through dynamic gradients. Thus, CroMe ensures that features within the same modality are more closely aligned while capturing and integrating cross-modal correlations, enhancing the overall feature representation for more accurate fake news detection. Experiments performed using the Weibo and Weibo-21 datasets demonstrate that CroMe outperforms state-of-the-art models, highlighting its effectiveness in Multimodal Fake News Detection. For the Politifact dataset, CroMe achieved results comparable to state-of-the-art models due to its smaller size.

This paper offers four key contributions:

- The proposed multimodal fake news detection model, called CroMe, utilizes the advanced BLIP2 model for feature extraction to capture detailed text, image, and combined image-text features.
- The model uses a proxy anchor method in the metric learning module to capture intra-modality relationships ensuring effective representation learning within the same modality.
- The Cross-Modal Tri-Transformer Fusion, a new fusion technique, is introduced to calculate and merge similarities between text, image and image-text embeddings enhancing the model’s ability to handle interactions among different modalities.
- CroMe is evaluated using the Weibo and Weibo-21 datasets, demonstrating that it outperforms state-of-the-art models and highlights its effectiveness in multimodal fake news detection. For the Politifact dataset, CroMe achieved comparable results to state-of-the-art models, likely due to the dataset’s smaller size.

2 Related work

Several methods for multimodal fake news detection focus on extracting features from text and images. EANN [Wang

et al., 2018] uses an event discriminator, and MCAN [Wu et al., 2021] integrates textual and visual features through co-attention layers. MVAE [Khattar et al., 2019] employs a multimodal variational autoencoder to reconstruct text and image features. Spotfake [Singhal et al., 2019] applies BERT [Devlin et al., 2019] for text and VGG19 [Simonyan and Zisserman, 2014] for images, with Spotfake+ [Singhal et al., 2020] extending this to full articles. SAFE [Zhou et al., 2020] detects fake news by analyzing text and visual similarities, while CAFE [Chen et al., 2022] measures cross-modal ambiguity using KL divergence [Kullback and Leibler, 1951]. LIIMR [Singhal et al., 2022] emphasizes primary modalities and minimizes less significant ones. DistilBert [Allein et al., 2021] detects disinformation by analyzing user preferences and sharing behaviors. BDANN [Zhang et al., 2020] combines multimodal features to reduce event-specific biases. FND-CLIP [Zhou et al., 2023] uses the CLIP model to measure image-text correlations and aggregate features through modality-wise attention. TT-BLIP [Choi and Kim, 2024] employs BLIP [Li et al., 2022] encoders for text, image, and multimodal data, with the Multimodal Tri-Transformer fusing features using multi-head attention mechanisms.

Unlike previous models, the proposed model integrates uni-modal features and cross-modal correlations. The metric learning module aligns features within the same modality, while cross-modal similarities capture inter-modality interactions. By focusing on both intra-modality alignment and inter-modality integration, this approach improves fake news detection in social media.

3 Methodology

3.1 Overview

CroMe, introduced in this paper, as illustrated in Figure 2, comprises four modules: the encoder, metric learning, Cross-Modal Tri-Transformer Fusion (CMTTF), and fake news detection. The encoder extracts image, text, and integrated encodings. Metric learning enhances intra-modality relationships using the Proxy Anchor method. The CMTTF module fuses these encodings, and the detection module determines whether the content is real or fake.

3.2 Encoder Module

The encoder layer consists of components for encoding text, images and their combination. These components process input data denoted as x_{img} for images and x_{txt} for text.

The image encoder utilizes two parallel methods: Masked Autoencoders (MAE) [He et al., 2022] and BLIP2 Image. The pretrained MAE functions as the primary image encoder, producing encodings $Z_{i1} = f_{MAE}(x_{img})$, capturing both global and local features by reconstructing missing data parts. In parallel, BLIP2 Image provides an alternative encoding $Z_{i2} = f_{BLIP2.i}(x_{img}, x_{txt})$, ensuring that image-specific encodings are derived without textual influence by utilizing a “dummy text” input.

For textual data, BERT and BLIP2 Text encoders are utilized. The pretrained BERT [Devlin et al., 2019] generates encodings $Z_{t1} = f_{BERT}(x_{txt})$ by using its bidirectional understanding of text context. Additionally, BLIP2 Text [Li et al.,




Figure 2: Overview of the CroMe architecture. Masked Autoencoders (MAE), BERT, and BLIP2 encode multimodal features. Metric Learning extracts intra-modal relationships by representing class data points with proxies, where arrow thickness indicates the gradient scale. The CMTTF and Fake News Detector modules use cross-modal fusion and fake news detection.




Figure 3: Comparison of two different metric learning methods; (a) Proxy as an anchor, and (b) Data point as an anchor. The thickness of arrows in proxy anchor loss indicates the gradient scale determined by the scaling factor α .

2023] produces encodings $Z_{i2} = f_{\text{BLIP2},t}(x_{\text{img}}, x_{\text{txt}})$ by focusing on text data alone, using a zero-filled image tensor to isolate the textual encoding process. The outputs from these encoding processes are concatenated to form integrated image and text encodings, denoted as Z_i and Z_t , respectively, for use in subsequent model components.

The BLIP2 model generates combined Image-Text encodings, capturing the cross-modal information between these modalities. This is represented as $Z_b = f_{\text{BLIP2}}(x_{\text{img}}, x_{\text{txt}})$, incorporating the integrated features from both image and text inputs.

3.3 Metric Learning

Proxy anchor loss [Kim *et al.*, 2020] effectively learns data representations by utilizing distance relationships between data points and proxies. In this work, it captures intra-modal relationships across different modalities, improving the distinction between rumors and non-rumors. The loss function $L(X)$ uses static proxy assignment [Movshovitz-Attias *et al.*, 2017], selecting a data point from each class as a proxy. It minimizes the distance between the proxy and same-class data points while maximizing the distance to those from different classes. Modality embeddings X are split into positive (X_p^+) and negative (X_p^-) sets relative to their proxies. The

loss is defined as:

$$L(X) = \frac{1}{|P^+|} \sum_{p \in P^+} \log \left(1 + \sum_{x \in X_p^+} e^{-\alpha(s(x,p)-\delta)} \right) + \frac{1}{|P^-|} \sum_{p \in P^-} \log \left(1 + \sum_{x \in X_p^-} e^{\alpha(s(x,p)+\delta)} \right),$$

where $\delta > 0$ is the margin parameter (margin) and $\alpha > 0$ (alpha) is the scaling parameter.

As shown in Figure 2, the model iteratively trains each modality Z_* by fixing the parameters of other modalities, allowing it to refine intra-modal relationships without interference. This process is applied to each $Z_* \in \{Z_{i1}, Z_{i2}, Z_{t1}, Z_{t2}, Z_b\}$. Proxy Anchor Loss, illustrated in Figure 3a, adjusts pull and push forces based on data point proximity, unlike traditional triplet loss [Schroff *et al.*, 2015; Peng *et al.*, 2023]. Proxy Anchor Loss is computationally efficient as it calculates distances between proxies and data points rather than between individual points, reducing computational load. Applied to text, image, and image-text features, it clusters data points of the same class while separating those of different classes, enhancing fake news detection.

3.4 Cross-Modal Tri-Transformer Fusion

This section introduces Cross-Modal Tri-Transformer Fusion (CMTTF) for integrating and processing image, text, and image-text data. CMTTF combines Cross-Modal Fusion [Chen *et al.*, 2022] and Tri-Transformer [Choi and Kim,




Figure 4: Overview of the CMTTF architecture, integrating Cross-Modal Fusion and Tri-Transformer modules to process and combine information from text, image, and image-text data. The architecture captures cross-modal correlations and fuses them to enhance feature representation.

2024], as illustrated in Figure 4a, with details on each component provided below.

Cross-Modal Fusion To capture semantic interactions between modalities, the Cross-Modal Fusion module integrates text-image similarities using dot product with softmax normalization and cosine similarity [Luo *et al.*, 2018]. Given unimodal representations Z_{i1} , Z_{t1} , and additional representations Z_{i2} , Z_{t2} , Z_b , the process follows these steps: 1) *Inter-modal Fusion* and 2) *Cosine Similarity*.

Inter-modal Fusion integrates semantic interactions between text and image modalities (is illustrated in Figure 4b). Correlations between text features \mathbf{t} and image features \mathbf{i} are computed, normalized, and combined into a unified representation \mathbf{C}_1 , as shown:

$$\mathbf{f}_{t \rightarrow i} = \text{Softmax} \left(\frac{\mathbf{t} \cdot \mathbf{i}^T}{\sqrt{d}} \right), \mathbf{f}_{i \rightarrow t} = \text{Softmax} \left(\frac{\mathbf{i} \cdot \mathbf{t}^T}{\sqrt{d}} \right),$$

$$\mathbf{C}_1 = \mathbf{f}_{t \rightarrow i} \oplus \mathbf{f}_{i \rightarrow t}.$$

This inter-modal fusion approach suits models like BERT and MAE, processing unimodal data without embedding normalization. The dot product operation captures direct text-image interactions while preserving scale information, enabling effective multimodal representation.

Cosine Similarity is computed between different combinations of the inputs Z_{i2} , Z_{t2} , and Z_b to measure the relationships between the modalities. The similarities $\mathcal{S}_i(Z_{i2}, Z_{i2})$, $\mathcal{S}_b(Z_{i2}, Z_b)$, and $\mathcal{S}_{ib}(Z_{i2}, Z_b)$ are computed using cosine similarity, defined for two vectors \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{b} as:

$$\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = \frac{\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{b}}{\|\mathbf{a}\| \times \|\mathbf{b}\|}.$$

The combined similarity is computed by weighting individual similarity scores with learnable parameters w_{i2} , w_b , w_{t2} , and adding a bias term b to account for modality differences. This similarity is processed through linear layers, ReLU activations, and batch normalization, producing \mathbf{C}_2 . BLIP2 components use cosine similarity as it effectively captures directional alignment, simplifies the fusion process, and maintains key correlations between modalities [Li *et al.*, 2023].

The outputs \mathbf{C}_1 and \mathbf{C}_2 are combined into Z_c then processed through fully connected layers with batch normalization, ReLU activations, and dropout, resulting in the final correlation output used in the subsequent Tri-Transformer.

Tri-Transformer The text and image embeddings (Z_i and Z_t) are passed through their respective projection networks and, along with correlation outputs (Z_c), are fed into the Tri-Transformer (Figure 4c). This framework is based on the Multi-Modal Tri-Transformer in [Choi and Kim, 2024]. Unlike TT-BLIP’s text-focused cross-modal attention, this method processes text, image, and correlation independently.

$$f_* = \text{MultiHead} \left(\text{Softmax} \left(\frac{Q_* K_*^T}{\sqrt{d_h}} \right) \times V_*; \theta_{\text{att}}^* \right),$$

where Q_* , K_* , V_* are query, key, and value matrices, and θ_{att}^* are attention parameters. The outputs processed through Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP) layers and combined into a unified tensor.

3.5 Fake News Detector

The fake news detector uses the fusion representation to predict whether news articles are fake or real. This fused representation is processed by a classifier composed of three fully connected layers, ReLU activations, and batch normalization, resulting in a binary classification. The classifier assigns labels of ‘real’ (0) or ‘fake’ (1) to the news content, where $\hat{y} = [\hat{y}_0, \hat{y}_1]$ denotes the probabilities of the news being ‘real’ (0) or ‘fake’ (1). Cross-entropy is used to define the loss function $L(\theta)$, where θ represents the model parameters.

$$L(\theta) = -y \log(\hat{y}_1) - (1 - y) \log(\hat{y}_0)$$

The total loss L_{total} is defined, where α controls the weight of this metric loss. The optimal value of β determined through a grid search over the range [0.1, 1] using a step 0.1. The model aims to minimize the total loss L_{total} for each news data by learning θ through back propagation.

$$L_{\text{total}} = L(\theta) + \beta \cdot L(X)$$

Table 1: Experimental Results for Weibo, Weibo-21 and Politifact Datasets. A dash (‘-’) signifies that results are not provided in their corresponding research paper.

Datasets	Methods	Accuracy	Fake News			Real News		
			Precision	Recall	F1 Score	Precision	Recall	F1 Score
Weibo	EANN [Wang <i>et al.</i> , 2018]	0.827	0.847	0.812	0.829	0.807	0.843	0.825
	MVAE [Khattar <i>et al.</i> , 2019]	0.824	0.854	0.769	0.809	0.802	0.875	0.837
	MPFN [Jing <i>et al.</i> , 2023]	0.838	0.857	0.894	0.889	0.873	0.863	0.876
	Spotfake [Singhal <i>et al.</i> , 2019]	0.892	0.902	0.964	0.932	0.847	0.656	0.739
	SAFE [Zhou <i>et al.</i> , 2020]	0.762	0.831	0.724	0.774	0.695	0.811	0.748
	BDANN [Zhang <i>et al.</i> , 2020]	0.821	0.790	0.610	0.690	0.830	0.920	0.870
	LIIMR [Singhal <i>et al.</i> , 2022]	0.900	0.882	0.823	0.847	0.908	0.941	0.925
	MCAN [Wu <i>et al.</i> , 2021]	0.899	0.913	0.889	0.901	0.884	0.909	0.897
	CAFE [Chen <i>et al.</i> , 2022]	0.840	0.855	0.830	0.842	0.825	0.851	0.837
	FND-CLIP [Zhou <i>et al.</i> , 2023]	0.907	0.914	0.901	0.908	0.914	0.901	0.907
	TT-BLIP [Choi and Kim, 2024]	0.961	0.979	0.944	0.961	0.944	0.980	0.962
CroMe (Ours)	0.974	0.964	0.984	0.974	0.985	0.966	0.975	
Weibo-21	HAN [Yang <i>et al.</i> , 2016]	0.792	-	-	0.792	-	-	-
	Vaibhav(2019) [Vaibhav <i>et al.</i> , 2019]	0.771	-	-	0.771	-	-	-
	FakeFlow [Ghanem <i>et al.</i> , 2021]	0.781	-	-	0.780	-	-	-
	EANN [Wang <i>et al.</i> , 2018]	0.870	0.902	0.825	0.862	0.841	0.912	0.875
	SpotFake [Singhal <i>et al.</i> , 2019]	0.851	0.953	0.733	0.828	0.786	0.964	0.866
	CAFE [Chen <i>et al.</i> , 2022]	0.882	0.857	0.915	0.885	0.907	0.844	0.876
	CroMe (Ours)	0.917	0.944	0.917	0.930	0.880	0.918	0.930
Politifact	RoBERTa-MWSS [Shu <i>et al.</i> , 2004]	0.820	-	-	0.820	-	-	-
	SAFE [Zhou <i>et al.</i> , 2020]	0.874	0.851	0.830	0.840	0.889	0.903	0.896
	Spotfake+ [Singhal <i>et al.</i> , 2020]	0.846	-	-	-	-	-	-
	TM [Bhattacharai <i>et al.</i> , 2022]	0.871	-	-	-	0.901	-	-
	LSTM-ATT [Lin <i>et al.</i> , 2019]	0.832	0.828	0.832	0.830	0.836	0.832	0.829
	DistilBert [Allein <i>et al.</i> , 2021]	0.741	0.875	0.636	0.737	0.647	0.880	0.746
	CAFE [Chen <i>et al.</i> , 2022]	0.864	0.724	0.778	0.750	0.895	0.919	0.907
	FND-CLIP [Zhou <i>et al.</i> , 2023]	0.942	0.897	0.897	0.897	0.960	0.960	0.960
	TT-BLIP [Choi and Kim, 2024]	0.904	0.913	0.724	0.808	0.901	0.973	0.936
CroMe (Ours)	0.933	0.987	0.925	0.955	0.793	0.958	0.868	

4 Experiments

4.1 Experimental Setup

Datasets To evaluate the performance of CroMe, three datasets are used: Weibo [Jin *et al.*, 2017], Weibo-21 [Nan *et al.*, 2021], and Politifact [Shu *et al.*, 2020]. The Weibo dataset contains 6,137 training articles (2,802 fake and 3,335 real) and 1,685 test articles (833 fake and 852 real). The Weibo-21 dataset includes 4,640 real and 4,487 fake articles, split into training and testing sets with an 8:2 ratio. The Politifact dataset consists of 381 training articles (246 fake and 135 real) and 104 test articles (74 fake and 30 real).

Training Settings Text encoding utilized the pretrained BERT model [Devlin *et al.*, 2019] for Chinese in the Weibo and Weibo-21 datasets and the “bert-base-uncased” model for the Politifact dataset. Images were resized to 224×224 pixels and encoded using Masked Autoencoders (MAE) [He *et al.*, 2022]. Image-text pairs were encoded with the pretrained BLIP2 model [Li *et al.*, 2023], translating Chinese texts to English via the Google Translation API [Johnson, 2012]. The model employed five Adam optimizers for $Z_* \in \{Z_{i1}, Z_{i2}, Z_{t1}, Z_{t2}, Z_b\}$, with a learning rate of 1×10^{-3} , a batch size of 64, and was trained for 50 epochs. Metric Learning parameters were set as follows: an iterative frequency of

5 epochs per modality, $\alpha = 16$, $\delta = 0.1$, and $\beta = 0.1$, balancing classification and metric losses. These values were determined through preliminary experiments to optimize performance.

4.2 Results and Analysis

CroMe’s performance is evaluated against state-of-the-art models shown in Table 1. The evaluation metrics used include accuracy and precision, recall, and F1 scores for both real and fake news. CroMe achieved the highest accuracy of 0.974 in the experiments using Weibo, surpassing TT-BLIP by 1.3% and FND-CLIP by 6.7%. Similarly, when using Weibo-21, CroMe reached an accuracy of 0.917, outperforming CAFE by 3.5% and EANN by 4.7%. For both datasets, CroMe ranked 1st or 2nd in precision, recall, and F1 scores for both fake and real news. CroMe achieves 0.933 accuracy that closely matches FND-CLIP’s 0.942. The reason may be that the dataset size is too small.

CroMe excelled in fake news detection due to three key factors: 1) Advanced multimodal feature extraction through the BLIP2 model enhances CroMe’s capabilities by capturing detailed features from both text and images, allowing for more precise feature extraction. This precision improves the model’s ability to distinguish between real and fake




Figure 5: Parameter Analysis for Weibo, Weibo-21 and Politifact dataset using the heatmap.




Figure 6: T-SNE visualizations of the features by CroMe and its variants using the Weibo test dataset, with each color representing a distinct label grouping.

news. 2) The Cross-Modal Tri-Transformer Fusion (CMTTF) computes and integrates cross-modal similarities, enhancing the model’s ability to utilize interactions between different modalities which is crucial for accurate fake news detection. 3) CroMe incorporates a Metric Learning module using the Proxy Anchor method, which focuses on intra-modality relationships. This ensures that features within the same modality are more closely aligned, leading to better representation learning and overall improved performance in detecting fake news. For smaller datasets, future research could explore data augmentation or transfer learning to improve performance.

Proxy Anchor Loss Parameter Analysis

The analysis of the Weibo, Weibo-21, and Politifact datasets under different Proxy Anchor Loss hyperparameters, δ (margin) and α (alpha), is shown in Figure 5. As the margin increases, performance declines, with larger margins causing greater drops. Performance improves as alpha approaches 16, with the best results at alpha 16. Performance is more sensitive to margin variations than alpha. Alpha was tested at 4, 8, 16, 32, and margin at 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4. The best performance was achieved with alpha 16 and margin 0.1.

4.3 Ablation

Ablation experiments evaluated the impact of each component in the CroMe model. Table 2 shows the results for the Weibo, Weibo-21, and Politifact datasets. The CroMe variants compared are:

1. Without Image (BLIP2_{Img} + MAE): Removing the im-

age encoders and using only text encoders and other components.

2. Without Text (BLIP2_{Txt} + BERT): Removing the text encoders and using only image encoders and other components.
3. Without BLIP2 (BLIP2_{Img} + BLIP2_{Txt} + BLIP2_{Img-Txt}): Removing all BLIP2 components (text, image and image-text) and using only other encoders.
4. Without BLIP2_{Img-Txt}: Removing the image-text feature component of BLIP2, retaining the individual text and image BLIP2 encoders.
5. Without CM (Cross-Modal): Removing the Cross-Modal Fusion responsible for integrating cross-modal similarities.
6. Without MT (Metric Learning): Removing the Metric Learning module.
7. Without TT (Tri-Transformer): Removing the Tri-Transformer component.

The ablation study highlights three components that most significantly impact accuracy when removed. First, excluding the BLIP2 text components causes a substantial drop in accuracy across all datasets, as they are critical for understanding textual context necessary for identifying fake news. Second, removing the Cross-Modal Fusion (CM) component weakens performance by preventing effective integration of inter-modal fusion and cosine similarity features from text and images. Lastly, the Metric Learning module (MT) is essential

Table 2: Ablation experimental results of CroMe.

Datasets	Modules								Accuracy	F1 Score	
	MAE	BLIP2 _{img}	BERT	BLIP2 _{Txt}	BLIP2 _{img,Txt}	CM	MT	TT		Fake News	Real News
Weibo			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	0.961	0.919	0.975
	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	0.950	0.852	0.961
	✓		✓			✓	✓	✓	0.949	0.854	0.961
	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	0.971	0.912	0.976
	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	0.971	0.935	0.971
	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	0.959	0.915	0.962
	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		0.906	0.900	0.910
	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	0.890	0.803	0.934
								0.974	0.974	0.975	
Weibo21			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	0.903	0.890	0.959
	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	0.882	0.858	0.957
	✓		✓			✓	✓	✓	0.890	0.876	0.957
	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	0.897	0.870	0.916
	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	0.899	0.893	0.961
	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	0.899	0.891	0.961
	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		0.895	0.875	0.958
	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	0.888	0.860	0.910
								0.917	0.930	0.930	
Politifact			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	0.913	0.927	0.972
	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	0.865	0.891	0.968
	✓		✓			✓	✓	✓	0.846	0.839	0.940
	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	0.923	0.933	0.976
	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	0.923	0.942	0.978
	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	0.913	0.915	0.972
	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		0.875	0.790	0.910
	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	0.865	0.877	0.967
								0.933	0.955	0.868	

for learning distinct features that differentiate fake and real news; its removal reduces accuracy. Overall, uni-modal and cross-modal features, along with CMTTF and Metric Learning, are crucial for the model’s effectiveness in detecting fake news.

T-SNE visualizations

Figure 6 provides a T-SNE [Van der Maaten and Hinton, 2008] visualization of features before classification, comparing various CroMe settings: CroMe w/o image, CroMe w/o text, CroMe w/o BLIP, CroMe w/o fusion, CroMe w/o metric and the full CroMe model on the Weibo test dataset. Dots of the same color indicate the same label. Figure 6d shows that without the Cross-Modal Tri-Transformer Fusion (CMTTF) module, fake and real news instances are not well-separated. Including it improves clustering and distinction between classes. Comparisons of Figures 6a, 6b, 6c, and 6f shows that removing BLIP2 feature extraction results in less clear clustering, highlighting its importance for integrating image, text, and image-text data. Excluding text features also reduces separation in t-SNE plots, showing that image and image-text features alone are less effective. Comparing CroMe w/o MT (Metric Learning, Figure 6e) and CroMe (Figure 6f), the degree of separation of the sample dots in Figure 6f is higher. This indicates that capturing intra-modality relationships ensures effective representation learning within the same modality.

5 Conclusion

This study introduces Cross-Modal Tri-Transformer and Metric Learning (CroMe), a Multimodal Fake News Detection model. CroMe uses Bootstrapping Language-Image Pre-training with Frozen Image Encoders and Large Language Models (BLIP2) to capture intra-modality and inter-modality relationships. The model includes four main modules: encoders (BERT, BLIP2-text, Masked Autoencoders (MAE), and BLIP2-image), a metric learning module (proxy anchor method), a feature fusion module (Cross-Modal Tri-Transformer Fusion, CMTTF), and a fake news detection module. CroMe uses BLIP2 for semantic information extraction, CMTTF for feature fusion, and the proxy anchor method for metric learning. It improves accuracy by 1.3% on the Weibo dataset and 3.5% on the Weibo-21 dataset compared to previous models. CroMe performed slightly below the state-of-the-art model by 0.9% in the case of Politifact, due to the smaller dataset size.

References

- [Allein *et al.*, 2021] Liesbeth Allein, Marie-Francine Moens, and Domenico Perrotta. Like article, like audience: Enforcing multimodal correlations for disinformation detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.13892*, 2021.
- [Bhattarai *et al.*, 2022] Bimal Bhattarai, Ole-Christoffer Granmo, and Lei Jiao. Explainable tsetlin machine

- framework for fake news detection with credibility score assessment. In Nicoletta Calzolari, Frédéric Béchet, Philippe Blache, Khalid Choukri, Christopher Cieri, Thierry Declerck, Sara Goggi, Hitoshi Isahara, Bente Maegaard, Joseph Mariani, Hélène Mazo, Jan Odijk, and Stelios Piperidis, editors, *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 4894–4903, Marseille, France, June 2022. European Language Resources Association.
- [Castillo *et al.*, 2011] Carlos Castillo, Marcelo Mendoza, and Barbara Poblete. Information credibility on twitter. In *Proceedings of the 20th international conference on World wide web*, pages 675–684, 2011.
- [Chen *et al.*, 2018] Tong Chen, Xue Li, Hongzhi Yin, and Jun Zhang. Call attention to rumors: Deep attention based recurrent neural networks for early rumor detection. In *Trends and Applications in Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining: PAKDD 2018 Workshops, BDASC, BDM, ML4Cyber, PAISI, DaMEMO, Melbourne, VIC, Australia, June 3, 2018, Revised Selected Papers 22*, pages 40–52. Springer, 2018.
- [Chen *et al.*, 2022] Yixuan Chen, Dongsheng Li, Peng Zhang, Jie Sui, Qin Lv, Lu Tun, and Li Shang. Cross-modal ambiguity learning for multimodal fake news detection. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022*, pages 2897–2905, 2022.
- [Choi and Kim, 2024] Eunjee Choi and Jong-Kook Kim. Tt-blip: Enhancing fake news detection using blip and tri-transformer. In *2024 27th International Conference on Information Fusion (FUSION)*, pages 1–8, 2024.
- [Devlin *et al.*, 2019] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In Jill Burstein, Christy Doran, and Thamar Solorio, editors, *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota, June 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [Ghanem *et al.*, 2021] Bilal Ghanem, Simone Paolo Ponzetto, Paolo Rosso, and Francisco Rangel. Fakeflow: Fake news detection by modeling the flow of affective information. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.09810*, 2021.
- [He *et al.*, 2022] Kaiming He, Xinlei Chen, Saining Xie, Yanghao Li, Piotr Dollár, and Ross Girshick. Masked autoencoders are scalable vision learners. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 16000–16009, 2022.
- [Jin *et al.*, 2016] Zhiwei Jin, Juan Cao, Yongdong Zhang, Jianshe Zhou, and Qi Tian. Novel visual and statistical image features for microblogs news verification. *IEEE transactions on multimedia*, 19(3):598–608, 2016.
- [Jin *et al.*, 2017] Zhiwei Jin, Juan Cao, Han Guo, Yongdong Zhang, and Jiebo Luo. Multimodal fusion with recurrent neural networks for rumor detection on microblogs. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM international conference on Multimedia*, pages 795–816, 2017.
- [Jing *et al.*, 2023] Jing Jing, Hongchen Wu, Jie Sun, Xiaochang Fang, and Huaxiang Zhang. Multimodal fake news detection via progressive fusion networks. *Information processing & management*, 60(1):103120, 2023.
- [Johnson, 2012] Gregory Johnson. Google translate <http://translate.google.com/>. *Technical Services Quarterly*, 29(2):165–165, 2012.
- [Khattar *et al.*, 2019] Dhruv Khattar, Jaipal Singh Goud, Manish Gupta, and Vasudeva Varma. Mvae: Multimodal variational autoencoder for fake news detection. In *The world wide web conference*, pages 2915–2921, 2019.
- [Kim *et al.*, 2020] Sungyeon Kim, Dongwon Kim, Minsu Cho, and Suha Kwak. Proxy anchor loss for deep metric learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 3238–3247, 2020.
- [Kullback and Leibler, 1951] Solomon Kullback and Richard A Leibler. On information and sufficiency. *The annals of mathematical statistics*, 22(1):79–86, 1951.
- [Li *et al.*, 2022] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Caiming Xiong, and Steven Hoi. Blip: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training for unified vision-language understanding and generation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 12888–12900. PMLR, 2022.
- [Li *et al.*, 2023] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Hoi. Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 19730–19742. PMLR, 2023.
- [Lin *et al.*, 2019] Jun Lin, Glenna Tremblay-Taylor, Guanyu Mou, Di You, and Kyumin Lee. Detecting fake news articles. In *2019 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*, pages 3021–3025. IEEE, 2019.
- [Luo *et al.*, 2018] Chunjie Luo, Jianfeng Zhan, Xiaohe Xue, Lei Wang, Rui Ren, and Qiang Yang. Cosine normalization: Using cosine similarity instead of dot product in neural networks. In *Artificial Neural Networks and Machine Learning—ICANN 2018: 27th International Conference on Artificial Neural Networks, Rhodes, Greece, October 4-7, 2018, Proceedings, Part I 27*, pages 382–391. Springer, 2018.
- [Ma *et al.*, 2016] Jing Ma, Wei Gao, Prasenjit Mitra, Sejeong Kwon, Bernard J Jansen, Kam-Fai Wong, and Meeyoung Cha. Detecting rumors from microblogs with recurrent neural networks. 2016.
- [Mitra *et al.*, 2017] Tanushree Mitra, Graham P Wright, and Eric Gilbert. A parsimonious language model of social media credibility across disparate events. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM conference on computer supported cooperative work and social computing*, pages 126–145, 2017.
- [Movshovitz-Attias *et al.*, 2017] Yair Movshovitz-Attias, Alexander Toshev, Thomas K Leung, Sergey Ioffe, and Saurabh Singh. No fuss distance metric learning

- using proxies. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 360–368, 2017.
- [Nan *et al.*, 2021] Qiong Nan, Juan Cao, Yongchun Zhu, Yanyan Wang, and Jintao Li. Mdfend: Multi-domain fake news detection. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*, pages 3343–3347, 2021.
- [Peng *et al.*, 2023] Liwen Peng, Songlei Jian, Dongsheng Li, and Siqi Shen. Mrml: Multimodal rumor detection by deep metric learning. In *ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2023.
- [Schroff *et al.*, 2015] Florian Schroff, Dmitry Kalenichenko, and James Philbin. Facenet: A unified embedding for face recognition and clustering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 815–823, 2015.
- [Shu *et al.*, 2004] Kai Shu, Guoqing Zheng, Yichuan Li, Subhabrata Mukherjee, Ahmed Hassan Awadallah, Scott Ruston, and Huan Liu. Leveraging multi-source weak social supervision for early detection of fake news (2020). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.01732*, 2004.
- [Shu *et al.*, 2017] Kai Shu, Amy Sliva, Suhang Wang, Jiliang Tang, and Huan Liu. Fake news detection on social media: A data mining perspective. *ACM SIGKDD explorations newsletter*, 19(1):22–36, 2017.
- [Shu *et al.*, 2020] Kai Shu, Deepak Mahudeswaran, Suhang Wang, Dongwon Lee, and Huan Liu. Fakenewsnet: A data repository with news content, social context, and spatiotemporal information for studying fake news on social media. *Big data*, 8(3):171–188, 2020.
- [Simonyan and Zisserman, 2014] Karen Simonyan and Andrew Zisserman. Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.1556*, 2014.
- [Singhal *et al.*, 2019] Shivangi Singhal, Rajiv Ratn Shah, Tanmoy Chakraborty, Ponnurangam Kumaraguru, and Shin’ichi Satoh. Spofake: A multi-modal framework for fake news detection. In *2019 IEEE fifth international conference on multimedia big data (BigMM)*, pages 39–47. IEEE, 2019.
- [Singhal *et al.*, 2020] Shivangi Singhal, Anubha Kabra, Mohit Sharma, Rajiv Ratn Shah, Tanmoy Chakraborty, and Ponnurangam Kumaraguru. Spofake+: A multimodal framework for fake news detection via transfer learning (student abstract). In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 34, pages 13915–13916, 2020.
- [Singhal *et al.*, 2022] Shivangi Singhal, Tanisha Pandey, Saksham Mrig, Rajiv Ratn Shah, and Ponnurangam Kumaraguru. Leveraging intra and inter modality relationship for multimodal fake news detection. In *Companion Proceedings of the Web Conference 2022*, pages 726–734, 2022.
- [Vaibhav *et al.*, 2019] Vaibhav Vaibhav, Raghuram Mandyam, and Eduard Hovy. Do sentence interactions matter? leveraging sentence level representations for fake news classification. In Dmitry Ustalov, Swapna Somasundaran, Peter Jansen, Goran Glavaš, Martin Riedl, Mihai Surdeanu, and Michalis Vazirgiannis, editors, *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Workshop on Graph-Based Methods for Natural Language Processing (TextGraphs-13)*, pages 134–139, Hong Kong, November 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [Van der Maaten and Hinton, 2008] Laurens Van der Maaten and Geoffrey Hinton. Visualizing data using t-sne. *Journal of machine learning research*, 9(11), 2008.
- [Wang *et al.*, 2018] Yaqing Wang, Fenglong Ma, Zhiwei Jin, Ye Yuan, Guangxu Xun, Kishlay Jha, Lu Su, and Jing Gao. Eann: Event adversarial neural networks for multimodal fake news detection. In *Proceedings of the 24th acm sigkdd international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*, pages 849–857, 2018.
- [Wu *et al.*, 2021] Yang Wu, Pengwei Zhan, Yunjian Zhang, Liming Wang, and Zhen Xu. Multimodal fusion with co-attention networks for fake news detection. In *Findings of the association for computational linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, pages 2560–2569, 2021.
- [Xia *et al.*, 2023] Huosong Xia, Yuan Wang, Justin Zuopeng Zhang, Leven J Zheng, Muhammad Mustafa Kamal, and Varsha Arya. Covid-19 fake news detection: A hybrid cnn-bilstm-am model. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 195:122746, 2023.
- [Yang *et al.*, 2016] Zichao Yang, Diyi Yang, Chris Dyer, Xiaodong He, Alex Smola, and Eduard Hovy. Hierarchical attention networks for document classification. In *Proceedings of the 2016 conference of the North American chapter of the association for computational linguistics: human language technologies*, pages 1480–1489, 2016.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2020] Tong Zhang, Di Wang, Huanhuan Chen, Zhiwei Zeng, Wei Guo, Chunyan Miao, and Lizhen Cui. Bdann: Bert-based domain adaptation neural network for multi-modal fake news detection. In *2020 international joint conference on neural networks (IJCNN)*, pages 1–8. IEEE, 2020.
- [Zhou *et al.*, 2020] Xinyi Zhou, Jindi Wu, and Reza Zafarani. : Similarity-aware multi-modal fake news detection. In *Pacific-Asia Conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 354–367. Springer, 2020.
- [Zhou *et al.*, 2023] Yangming Zhou, Yuzhou Yang, Qichao Ying, Zhenxing Qian, and Xinpeng Zhang. Multimodal fake news detection via clip-guided learning. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo (ICME)*, pages 2825–2830. IEEE, 2023.