

A Multi-Agent Framework with Automated Decision Rule Optimization for Cross-Domain Misinformation Detection

Hui Li^{1*}, Ante Wang^{1*}, kunquan li¹, Zhihao Wang¹,
Liang Zhang¹, Delai Qiu², Qingsong Liu², Jinsong Su^{1†},

¹School of Informatics, Xiamen University, China, ²Unisound AI Technology, China
{huilinlp, jssu}@xmu.edu.cn

Abstract

Misinformation spans various domains, but detection methods trained on specific domains often perform poorly when applied to others. With the rapid development of Large Language Models (LLMs), researchers have begun to utilize LLMs for cross-domain misinformation detection. However, existing LLM-based methods often fail to adequately analyze news in the target domain, limiting their detection capabilities. More importantly, these methods typically rely on manually designed decision rules, which are limited by domain knowledge and expert experience, thus limiting the generalizability of decision rules to different domains. To address these issues, we propose a **Multi-Agent Framework** for cross-domain misinformation detection with **Automated Decision Rule Optimization (MARO)**. Under this framework, we first employ multiple expert agents to analyze target-domain news. Subsequently, we introduce a *question-reflection mechanism* that guides expert agents to facilitate higher-quality analysis. Furthermore, we propose a decision rule optimization approach based on carefully-designed cross-domain validation tasks to iteratively enhance the effectiveness of decision rules in different domains. Experimental results and in-depth analysis on commonly-used datasets demonstrate that MARO achieves significant improvements over existing methods.

1 Introduction

Nowadays, the Internet is flooded with misinformation spanning multiple domains such as politics, economics, and technology, significantly impacting people’s lives and societal stability (Della Giustina, 2023). However, due to the differences in background knowledge and linguistic features across domains, misinformation detection models trained on specific domains often perform poorly when applied to others (Ran and Jia, 2023; Liu et al., 2024c).

Thus, cross-domain misinformation detection offers substantial practical value, leading to increased research attention on this task. (Choudhry et al., 2022; Lin et al., 2022; Ran et al., 2023; Ran and Jia, 2023; Liu et al., 2024c; Karisani and Ji, 2024).

Generally, cross-domain misinformation detection methods are trained on the mixture of multiple source-domain datasets, and then evaluated on a unseen target-domain one (Hernández-Castañeda et al., 2017; Lin et al., 2022; Ran et al., 2023; Ran and Jia, 2023). Early studies primarily use machine learning methods with various classifiers (Pérez-Rosas and Mihalcea, 2014; Hernández-Castañeda et al., 2017). Subsequently, researchers resort to deep learning-based methods (Choudhry et al., 2022; Lin et al., 2022; Ran et al., 2023; Ran and Jia, 2023), which, however, suffer from limited training data. In recent years, with the emergence of Large Language Models (LLMs), researchers have shifted their attention to exploring the powerful capabilities of LLMs (Hang et al., 2024; Liu et al., 2024c). For example, Hang et al. (2024) explore the LLM incorporating graph knowledge for cross-domain misinformation detection. Very recently, Liu et al. (2024c) propose a Retrieval-Augmented Generation-based approach that achieves state-of-the-art performance. They extract labeled source domain examples based on emotional relevance and manually design a decision rule. Then, they incorporate these examples and the decision rule into the prompt, directly judging the veracity of target-domain.

In spite of their success, these methods still have two major drawbacks. First, they commonly overlook analyzing various dimensions of news, such as writing style and comments. Although Wan et al. (2024) propose using multiple proxy tasks to enhance news, their analysis remains inadequate¹. More importantly, these methods rely on manually

¹We validate this issue in Section 3.3 through experiments.




Figure 1: An illustration of MARO, where health news serves as the query news while finance, technology, and sports news act as demonstration news. The blue, green and orange dashed boxes represent a simplified linguistic feature report, fact-checking report and comment analysis report, respectively.

designed decision rules, which are typically developed based on domain-specific knowledge and experts’ experience. However, news from different domains often exhibit different background knowledge and linguistic features. As a result, these decision rules usually struggle to effectively detect misinformation across different domains, leading to poor adaptability.

In this paper, we propose a **Multi-Agent Framework for cross-domain misinformation detection with Automated Decision Rule Optimization**, MARO. As illustrated in Figure 1, MARO consists of two main modules: 1) Multi-Dimensional Analysis Module, which uses multi-agents to analyze target-domain news from different perspectives, such as linguistic features, external fact consistency, and comments, obtaining corresponding analysis reports. In particular, to improve the quality of these analyses, we introduce *question-reflection mechanism* which utilizing a Questioning Agent that generates corresponding reflection questions based on the analysis reports, helping the above agents produce refined analysis responses. 2) Decision Rule Optimization Module, which is designed to automatically optimize and generate more effective decision rules. For this purpose, we gather news from different domains within the source-domain dataset and construct a series of validation tasks designed to simulate cross-domain misinformation detection scenarios. This module iteratively optimizes the decision rules according to their per-

formance on the validation tasks.

We evaluate the performance of MARO using two commonly-used cross-domain misinformation detection datasets. Experimental results show that MARO outperforms existing state-of-the-art baselines across multiple LLMs. Further experiments demonstrate that both Multi-Dimensional Analysis Module and Decision Rule Optimization Module effectively improve the performance of MARO.

2 Our Method

2.1 Task Formulation

Given multiple source domain news datasets $D_s = \{D_s^i\}_{i=1}^{|D_s|}$ and a target domain news datasets D_t , each domain contains multiple news items represented as $(x_j, c_j, y_j)_{j=1}^{|D_s^*|}$, where x_j denotes the news content, $c_j = \{c_j^k\}_{k=1}^{|c_j|}$ represents the set of comments related to x_j , and $y_j \in \{0, 1\}$ is the corresponding ground-truth label. The goal of the cross-domain misinformation detection is to use source domain data to learn model parameters or decision rules with sufficient generalizability, and then effectively apply them to the target domain.

2.2 MARO

As shown in Figure 1, MARO consists of two main modules: the Multi-Dimensional Analysis Module and the Decision Rule Optimization Module, both of which employ LLM-based agents to perform various tasks. We provide details of these modules

in the following subsections.

2.2.1 Multi-Dimensional Analysis Module

This module aims to introduce analysis agents to analyze a news item from different perspectives, generating a multi-dimensional analysis report to support decision making. To this end, we design four kinds of agents: *Linguistic Feature Analysis Agent*, *Comment Analysis Agent*, *Fact-Checking Agent Group*, and *Questioning Agent*. Each agent (or agent group) focuses on a specific aspect of the news item, collectively providing a comprehensive analysis report.

Linguistic Feature Analysis Agent. This agent analyzes the linguistic features of the news content, such as emotional tone and writing style, to generate a *linguistic feature analysis report* R_l . Specifically, we design a system prompt P_l to guide the LLM in analyzing the linguistic features of the news content, producing the report R_l as $R_l = \text{LLM}(P_l, x)$. The blue dashed box in Figure 1 presents a simplified linguistic feature analysis report, which identifies an exaggerated tone in the news content.

Comment Analysis Agent. This agent analyzes comments to identify commenters’ stances, emotional attitudes, and evidence information. It generates a *comment analysis report* R_c that summarizes commenters’ reactions and factual evidence while counting their opinion distribution: $R_c = \text{LLM}(P_c, x, c)$, where P_c is the system prompt for Comment Analysis Agent. The orange dashed box in Figure 1 offers a simplified view of the generated comment analysis report, which quantifies the distribution of commenters’ opinions and presents fact evidence.

Fact-Checking-Agent Group. This agent group uses external facts to verify the authenticity of news. It primarily consists of two agents: a *Fact-Questioning Agent* and a *Fact-Checking Agent*.

The Fact-Questioning Agent generates yes/no questions based on claims in the news content. The fact question set Q_f is generated as $Q_f = \text{LLM}(P_{Q_f}, x)$, where P_{Q_f} is the system prompt for Fact-Questioning Agent. Then, Q_f serve as queries to retrieve relevant clues from the Google search engine.

The Fact-Checking Agent combines clues retrieved from Google and facts gathered via the Wikipedia tool to collect an evidence set e . Subsequently, it evaluates the consistency between claims

in news content and e . Based on this evaluation, it generates a fact-checking analysis report R_f to identify misleading claims: $R_f = \text{LLM}(P_f, x, e)$, where P_f is the system prompt for Fact-Checking Agent. The green dashed box in Figure 1 presents an example of the generated fact-checking analysis report, which highlights the inconsistency between claims in news content and the evidence.

Questioning Agent. To ensure sufficient analysis, we introduce a question-reflection mechanism. It uses a Questioning Agent to review the above-mentioned analysis reports, so as to identify any overlooked aspects. Then it generates specific questions to guide these analysis agents conducting more in-depth and comprehensive analysis. Formally, the generation processes of these question sets are described as

$$\begin{aligned} Q_r^l &= \text{LLM}(P_q, x, R_l), \\ Q_r^c &= \text{LLM}(P_q, x, c, R_c), \\ Q_r^f &= \text{LLM}(P_q, x, e, R_f), \end{aligned}$$

where Q_r^l, Q_r^c, Q_r^f represents the question sets for the linguistic feature analysis report, comment analysis report, and fact-checking analysis report, respectively. P_q is the system prompt for Questioning Agent.

The above question sets are respectively fed into the Linguistic Feature Analysis Agent, Comment Analysis Agent, and Fact-Checking Agent, enabling them to perform more comprehensive and in-depth analyses. Then, each agent produces its individual response. Finally, we integrate the three analysis reports and these responses into a unified multi-dimensional analysis report, which serves as a reliable basis for evaluating news authenticity. The system prompts for the Multi-Dimensional Analysis Module are provided in Appendix A.1.

2.2.2 Decision Rule Optimization Module

In this module, we design cross-domain verification tasks and use the module to perform them. Subsequently, we optimize the decision rules based on the feedback from executions on these tasks to improve the generalization of decision rules in different domains.

Cross-Domain Validation Tasks Construction. We construct cross-domain validation tasks using news from different source domains. As illustrated in Figure 2, we first sample a piece of source-domain news as the query news, and select other source-domain annotated news as the




Figure 2: An illustration of constructing cross-domain validation tasks.

demonstration news. The query news, along with its multi-dimensional analysis report and demonstration news, are then input into a Judge Agent in the form of in-context learning. Finally, the Judge Agent evaluates the query news and its analysis report, using the demonstration news and the decision rule to judge its truthfulness. To ensure the diversity of validation tasks, we sequentially sample query news from each source domain, thereby creating a set of cross-domain validation tasks $T = \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{N_{ct}}\}$, where N_{ct} denotes the total number of cross-domain validation tasks.

Decision Rule Optimization. To optimize the decision rules, we introduce a *Decision Rule Optimization Agent*, which refines decision rules based on the feedback obtained from the Judge Agent’s execution on the cross-domain validation task set. As illustrated in Algorithm 1, we first manually define a decision rule r_0 . Using r_0 , the Judge Agent executes cross-domain validation task set T to produce judgements. These judgements are compared with the ground-truth labels to obtain an accuracy score s_0 . Subsequently, we add $\langle r_0, s_0 \rangle$ to L_{RS} , a set designed to store \langle decision rule, accuracy \rangle pairs (Lines 1-2). Furthermore, $\langle r_0, s_0 \rangle$ also serves as a demonstration of the Decision Rule Optimization Agent’s prompt P_o (Lines 3), which is provided in Appendix A.2.

We design an iterative optimization process to progressively enhance the generalizability of the

Algorithm 1: Decision Rule Optimization

Input:

T : cross-domain validation task set
 r_0 : manually defined initial decision rule
 N_{iter} : the maximum number of iterations
 N_{att} : the maximum number of attempts
 K : the number of returned decision rules

- 1 The Judge Agent utilizes r_0 to execute T , obtaining the accuracy s_0
 - 2 $L_{RS} \leftarrow L_{RS} \cup \langle r_0, s_0 \rangle$
 - 3 Add $\langle r_0, s_0 \rangle$ as a demonstration into P_o
 - 4 $r_{best}, s_{max} \leftarrow r_0, s_0$
 - 5 $n_{iter}, n_{att} \leftarrow 0$
 - 6 **while** $n_{iter} < N_{iter}$ **and** $n_{att} < N_{att}$ **do**
 - 7 $n_{iter} = n_{iter} + 1$
 - 8 The Decision Rule Optimization Agent utilizes P_o to generate a new decision rule r_i
 - 9 The Judge Agent utilizes r_i to execute T , obtaining the accuracy s_i
 - 10 **if** $s_i > s_{max}$ **then**
 - 11 $L_{RS} \leftarrow L_{RS} \cup \langle r_i, s_i \rangle$
 - 12 $r_{best}, s_{max} \leftarrow r_i, s_i$
 - 13 $n_{att} \leftarrow 0$
 - 14 **else**
 - 15 $n_{att} = n_{att} + 1$
 - 16 **end**
 - 17 Use the top 10 \langle decision rule, accuracy \rangle pairs in L_{RS} as demonstrations for P_o
 - 18 **end**
 - 19 **return** top K decision rules
-

generated decision rules (Lines 6-16). During each iteration, the Decision Rule Optimization Agent first generates a new decision rule r_i , which is then applied by the Judge Agent to the cross-domain validation task set T (Lines 8-9). If s_i is greater than s_{max} , the pair $\langle r_i, s_i \rangle$ is added to L_{RS} , and we update the best decision rule r_{best} , the maximum accuracy s_{max} with r_i and s_i (Lines 11-12). Next, we select the top 10 \langle decision rule, accuracy \rangle pairs from L_{RS} to update the demonstrations of P_o (Line 17). This enables the Decision Rule Optimization Agent to iteratively refine its decision rules, ultimately achieving higher accuracy. Through the above process, we continuously expand L_{RS} until reaching the maximum iteration limit N_{iter} or failing to surpass s_{max} for N_{att} consecutive iterations (Line 6). Finally, the Decision Rule Optimization Module outputs the top K decision rules from L_{RS}

Method		Disasters		Entertain		Health		Politics		Society	
		Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1
NN-based	UCD-RD (Ran and Jia, 2023)	70.26	69.94	56.05	56.57	70.9	71.35	62.19	61.78	61.09	60.95
	CADA (Li et al., 2023)	73.26	72.75	58.24	58.05	70.3	70.05	64.33	65.07	59.82	58.62
	ADAF (Karisani and Ji, 2024)	73.54	72.39	57.19	56.95	70.5	69.91	62.82	61.94	61.19	61.88
LLM-based	GPT-3.5 w/ tools	72.35	72.19	60.26	59.91	68.8	68.05	63.42	62.94	61.69	60.27
	HiSS (Zhang and Gao, 2023)	72.79	72.06	57.56	56.87	72.7	72.37	67.96	66.34	62.64	61.07
	SAFE (Wei et al., 2024)	71.84	70.97	60.75	60.37	71.9	70.07	65.04	64.32	61.67	60.28
	SheepDog (Wu et al., 2024)	73.66	73.32	58.94	58.81	72.2	72.97	68.15	68.04	61.05	60.78
	TELLER (Liu et al., 2024a)	75.28	74.67	60.28	60.57	75.2	74.86	65.18	64.97	63.57	63.87
	DELL (Wan et al., 2024)	75.26	74.05	65.67	64.95	76.1	75.81	67.59	66.95	63.82	63.39
	RAEmo (Liu et al., 2024c)	78.29	77.84	61.51	60.37	77.3	76.87	68.74	67.87	60.78	61.06
	MARO (ours)	81.36	81.25	66.23	65.15	78.2	78.38	73.26	73.35	69.25	68.95
Method		Education		Finance		Military		Science		Avg.	
		Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1
NN-based	UCD-RD (Ran and Jia, 2023)	60.84	60.74	60.11	59.89	69.05	69.47	57.58	57.32	63.12	63.11
	CADA (Li et al., 2023)	64.31	63.82	61.15	60.83	69.37	70.14	59.31	59.14	64.45	64.27
	ADAF (Karisani and Ji, 2024)	65.54	64.32	62.05	61.16	66.28	65.16	59.16	58.49	64.25	63.58
LLM-based	GPT-3.5 w/ tools	65.96	65.79	62.15	61.61	67.41	66.27	60.16	59.65	64.69	64.08
	HiSS (Zhang and Gao, 2023)	64.84	64.15	63.95	62.89	68.63	67.84	55.91	55.37	65.22	64.33
	SAFE (Wei et al., 2024)	64.95	64.12	60.56	60.13	68.21	68.14	57.73	56.65	64.74	63.89
	SheepDog (Wu et al., 2024)	66.34	65.75	63.39	63.08	70.33	70.44	56.71	56.23	65.64	65.49
	TELLER (Liu et al., 2024a)	67.79	67.08	<u>65.06</u>	<u>65.27</u>	71.05	70.39	60.05	59.89	67.05	66.84
	DELL (Wan et al., 2024)	69.05	68.31	62.65	63.49	67.26	66.86	59.76	58.14	67.46	66.88
	RAEmo (Liu et al., 2024c)	<u>66.26</u>	<u>67.73</u>	64.25	63.53	72.86	71.49	60.63	60.17	67.85	67.44
	MARO (ours)	71.81	71.42	70.12	69.86	78.42	78.81	64.97	64.38	72.62	72.39

Table 1: Performance comparison between MARO and the baselines on Weibo21 using GPT-3.5-turbo-0125 as the underlying model. NN-based refers to conventional neural network-based methods. GPT-3.5 w/ tools means that we enable GPT-3.5-turbo-0125 to make independent judgments using the search engine and the Wikipedia tool. The best result in each column is marked in **bold** and the second best result is underlined. All results are reported as percentages.

(Line 19).

3 Experiments

3.1 Setup

Datasets. We conduct experiments on the Weibo21 (Nan et al., 2021) and AMTCele (Liu et al., 2024c) datasets. Weibo21 is a multi-domain rumor detection dataset covering 9 domains, where each news item includes a piece of news content and several comments. The AMTCele dataset, constructed by Liu et al. (2024c), contains fake news across 7 domains. In this dataset, each news item only contains a piece of news content. Further details are provided in Appendix B.

Baselines. We compare MARO with two kinds of baselines: 1) **conventional neural networks based methods:** UCD-RD (Ran and Jia, 2023), CADA (Li et al., 2023) and ADAF (Karisani and Ji, 2024); 2) **LLM-based methods:** HiSS (Zhang and Gao, 2023), SAFE (Wei et al., 2024), SheepDog (Wu et al., 2024), TELLER (Liu et al., 2024a), DELL

(Wan et al., 2024) and RAEmo (Liu et al., 2024c). Appendix C provides a detailed description of these baselines.

Settings and Evaluation. To ensure fair comparisons, we use the same underlying models to construct MARO and LLM-based baselines. Particularly, we set the temperature of the Decision Rule Optimization Agent to 1 to encourage greater diversity in outputs, and set the temperature of the Judge Agent to 0 for consistent outputs. In our experiments, we conduct 8-fold cross-validation on Weibo21 and 6-fold cross-validation on AMTCele, setting the cross-domain validation task number N_{vt} to 500 for Weibo21 and 400 for AMTCele, with the experimental results shown in Appendix D. For both datasets, we empirically set the number of samples for each source domain to 100 on Weibo21 and 80 on AMTCele, the maximum iteration number N_{iter} to 500 for Weibo21, the maximum attempt number N_{att} to 10, and the returned decision rule number K to 3. Finally, we use accu-

Method		Biz		Edu		Cele		Entmt	
		Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1
NN-based	UCD-RD (Ran and Jia, 2023)	73.52	73.29	64.21	63.85	62.2	61.93	61.57	60.21
	CADA (Li et al., 2023)	74.33	74.62	66.98	66.55	62	60.63	60.95	59.94
	ADAF (Karisani and Ji, 2024)	78.62	77.85	70.82	70.71	63.8	62.83	62.82	62.95
LLM-based	GPT-3.5 w/ tools	80.17	80.51	72.19	71.07	64.6	62.06	62.12	58.01
	HiSS (Zhang and Gao, 2023)	77.13	77.48	72.57	71.06	66.4	66.79	62.58	61.84
	SAFE (Wei et al., 2024)	79.26	78.64	72.51	72.27	63.8	62.11	63.56	63.13
	SheepDog (Wu et al., 2024)	79.26	78.51	70.06	70.11	65.2	65.77	60.16	59.35
	TELLER (Liu et al., 2024a)	82.21	81.38	73.27	73.85	67.6	65.28	63.91	63.64
	DELL (Wan et al., 2024)	83.57	82.94	74.13	73.72	65.2	64.35	62.54	61.49
	RAEmo (Liu et al., 2024c)	78.76	77.16	69.28	68.07	61	59.27	61.13	60.21
	MARO (ours)	85.46	84.83	77.62	77.24	68.8	67.95	66.81	65.97

Method		Polit		Sport		Tech		Avg.	
		Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1
NN-based	UCD-RD (Ran and Jia, 2023)	66.25	66.35	63.56	62.79	73.26	73.39	66.37	65.97
	CADA (Li et al., 2023)	68.41	68.92	63.82	62.91	72.19	73.05	66.95	66.66
	ADAF (Karisani and Ji, 2024)	71.72	71.45	71.72	71.24	72.73	72.42	70.32	69.92
LLM-based	GPT-3.5 w/ tools	71.07	73.71	72.72	70.51	74.45	75.28	71.05	70.16
	HiSS (Zhang and Gao, 2023)	71.66	70.95	74.32	73.43	72.54	71.21	71.03	70.39
	SAFE (Wei et al., 2024)	74.51	74.76	70.75	69.63	76.51	75.86	71.56	70.91
	SheepDog (Wu et al., 2024)	70.35	69.71	71.95	71.07	72.37	71.15	69.91	69.38
	TELLER (Liu et al., 2024a)	73.57	72.29	75.24	75.51	76.11	75.65	73.13	72.51
	DELL (Wan et al., 2024)	75.26	75.18	79.82	78.56	77.63	76.41	74.02	73.24
	RAEmo (Liu et al., 2024c)	73.55	72.58	71.15	70.09	70.89	69.05	69.39	68.06
	MARO (ours)	78.93	79.73	79.65	79.34	82.86	82.47	77.16	76.79

Table 2: Performance comparison between MARO and the baselines on AMTCele.

racy (Acc.) and F1-score (F1) as evaluation metrics.

3.2 Main Results

Tables 1 and 2 present experimental results on Weibo21 and AMTCele². Overall, MARO achieves the best performance across most domains on both datasets. Specifically, on Weibo21, MARO outperforms the second-best method, RAEmo, by 4.77 in average accuracy and 4.95 in average F1. Also, on AMTCele, MARO surpasses the second-best method, DELL, by 3.14 in average accuracy and 3.55 in average F1. These results demonstrate the effectiveness of MARO in cross-domain misinformation detection.

3.3 Further Analysis

Ablation Study. To verify the contributions of different components in MARO, we report the performance of MARO when these components are removed separately. Here, the components we considering include the Linguistic Feature Analysis

²We provide additional experimental results in the appendices, including those of MARO and baselines on other underlying models (Appendix E.1) as well as results on more datasets (Appendix E.2).

	Acc.	F1
MARO	72.63	72.39
w/o LFAA	70.11	69.76
w/o CAA	69.19	69.01
w/o FCAG	70.51	70.33
w/o QA	70.59	70.42
w/o CDVT	68.35	68.04
w/o DROA	66.88	66.79

Table 3: Ablation study on Weibo21.

Agent, the Comment Analysis Agent, the Fact-Checking-Agent Group, the Questioning Agent, the Cross-Domain Validation Tasks, and the Decision Rule Optimization Agent. To facilitate the subsequent descriptions, we name the variants of MARO removing different components as *w/o* LFAA, *w/o* CAA, *w/o* FCAG, *w/o* QA, *w/o* CDVT and *w/o* DROA, respectively.

From Table 3, we can clearly find that the removal of these components leads to a performance drop, indicating the effectiveness of these components. In particular, the performance of *w/o* QA shows a noticeable decline. This demonstrates that single-pass analysis is inadequate, while also proving that the question-reflection mechanism we pro-




Figure 3: F1 changes of MARO and RAEmo with different number of source domains on Weibo21.




Figure 4: F1 changes of MARO and RAEmo with different number of samples in each source domains on Weibo21.

posed helps in identifying misinformation.

Impact of Source Domain Number. In this experiment, we focus on how the number of source domains impacts the performance of MARO. Here, we also illustrate the performance of RAEmo, which is the most competitive baseline, as reported in Table 1.

As shown in Figure 3, increasing the number of source domains improves the performance of both methods. This result is reasonable, because more source domains not only provide more diverse feedback to optimize decision rules for MARO, but also enrich the demonstration database for RAEmo. We also observe that the F1 scores of MARO is always higher than RAEmo under different numbers of source domains, which further demonstrates the effectiveness of MARO.

Impact of Source Domain Sample Number.




Figure 5: F1 changes of MARO on the Politics, Science and Society domains with different source-target domain similarities.

Then, we investigate how the number of source domain samples affects MARO’s performance. To this end, we gradually vary from 10 to 100 with an increment of 10 in each step, and report the corresponding model performance.

As shown in Figure 4, we observe that as the number of source domain samples increases, both MARO and RAEmo show improvements in F1 scores. For this phenomena, we argue that more source-domain samples also provide more comprehensive feedback and similar demonstrations for MARO and RAEmo, respectively. Furthermore, MARO outperforms RAEmo across different numbers of source domain samples, especially in the scenarios of limited samples.

Impact of Domain Similarity. As mentioned previously, MARO is proposed to address cross-domain misinformation detection. Thus, one critical question arises regarding the impact of the similarity between source and target domains on the performance of MARO. To investigate this, we use TF-IDF to calculate the semantic similarity between news from different domains in Weibo21, as illustrated by the similarity matrix in Appendix F. We sample *Politics*, *Science*, and *Society* as target domains, and pair the remaining six domains into three groups as source domains. Figure 5 illustrates the relationship between source-target domain similarity and the performance of MARO.

It can be observed from Figure 5 that the performance of MARO reflects a positive correlation with domain similarity. This phenomena is reasonable since similar source domain can provide abundant shared features, which enable the Decision Rule

Optimization Agent to generate decision rules that are more effective for the target domain.

4 Case Study

We provide examples of the decision rule optimization process in Appendix G.

5 Related Work

Recently, LLMs have demonstrated impressive performance across a range of tasks (Minaee et al., 2024; Hadi et al., 2024; Chang et al., 2024; Xi et al., 2025) and have been extensively used for misinformation detection (Huang and Sun, 2023; Zhang and Gao, 2023; Wu et al., 2024; Yue Huang, 2024; Liu et al., 2024a; Wei et al., 2024; Liu et al., 2024b; Nan et al., 2024; Wan et al., 2024). For example, Huang and Sun (2023) design prompts tailored to the features of fake news, effectively guiding ChatGPT for misinformation detection. Along this line, Zhang and Gao (2023) and Wei et al. (2024) propose to deconstruct complex claims into simpler sub-statements, which are then verified step-by-step using external search engines. Unlike the above studies, Wu et al. (2024) leverage LLMs to disguise news styles and employ style-agnostic training, thereby improving the robustness of misinformation detection systems against style variations. Liu et al. (2024b) leverage LLMs to extract key information and integrate both the model’s internal knowledge and external real-time information to conduct a comprehensive multi-perspective evaluation. To address the problem of scarce comments in the early stages of misinformation spread, Nan et al. (2024) utilize LLMs to simulate users and generate diverse comments. Slightly similar to ours, Wan et al. (2024) propose DELL, which analyzes various aspects of news to assist in identifying misinformation. Despite their effectiveness, these studies mainly concentrate on in-domain misinformation detection and have yet to adequately address the challenges of cross-domain detection.

Early approaches to cross-domain misinformation detection (Pérez-Rosas and Mihalcea, 2014; Hernández-Castañeda et al., 2017) rely on hand-crafted features and traditional models, leading to limited performance. With the advent of deep learning, researchers explore this task by aligning feature representations across domains (Choudhry et al., 2022) or capturing invariant features (Ran et al., 2023; Ran and Jia, 2023) or reducing inter-domain discrepancies (Lin et al., 2022). Never-

theless, the lack of sufficient cross-domain labeled data limits the effectiveness of these methods. Very recently, Liu et al. (2024c) propose RAEmo, which leverages an emotion-aware LLM to encode source-domain samples and create in-context learning tasks for target-domain misinformation detection. However, RAEmo still relies on manually-designed decision rules for reasoning.

We introduce a multi-dimensional analysis approach within our framework to assist in news veracity evaluation, which has not been explored in previous studies. The one exception is DELL. However, unlike DELL, we introduce a Questioning Agent to facilitate more in-depth and comprehensive analysis. More importantly, compared with studies on LLM-based misinformation detection, such as DELL and RAEmo, we incorporate a decision rule optimization module to automatically optimize decision rules, inspired by the studies (Zhou et al., 2022; Pryzant et al., 2023; Xu et al., 2023; Yang et al., 2024).

6 Conclusion and Future Work

In this work, we have proposed MARO, a cross-domain misinformation detection framework which addresses two key shortcomings of existing LLM-based methods: inadequate analysis and relying on manually designed decision rules. First, MARO employs multiple expert agents to analyze news from various dimensions and generate initial analysis reports. Then, a Questioning Agent reviews each analysis report and poses specific questions to prompt the expert agents conducting a more in-depth and comprehensive analysis. Next, all the analysis reports and the expert agents’ responses to these questions are combined into a multi-dimensional analysis report to assist judgment. Besides, we design a decision rule optimization method, which automatically optimizes decision rules based on the feedback from cross-domain validation tasks. Compared to existing state-of-the-art methods, MARO yields significantly improved accuracy and F1 scores on the commonly used datasets. Ablation studies validate the effectiveness of each component.

As future work, we plan to extend our study by incorporating logical and knowledge graph reasoning to conduct a deeper analysis. Additionally, we intend to perform a more comprehensive evaluation of decision rules, thereby providing more valuable references for optimizing decision rules.

7 Limitations

Although MARO has demonstrated effectiveness in cross-domain misinformation detection, it may have two limitations. First, MARO's workflow is complex, requiring multiple rounds of iteration to generate effective decision rules, as well as multi-dimensional analysis conducted through multiple agents. Second, the clues gathered via search engines may include misinformation fabricated by malicious actors, which may introduce distortion into the process of judging the authenticity of target-domain news.

Acknowledgement

References

- Cody Buntain and Jennifer Golbeck. 2017. Automatically identifying fake news in popular twitter threads. In *SmartCloud*.
- Yupeng Chang, Xu Wang, Jindong Wang, Yuan Wu, Linyi Yang, Kaijie Zhu, Hao Chen, Xiaoyuan Yi, Cunxiang Wang, Yidong Wang, et al. 2024. A survey on evaluation of large language models. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology*.
- Arjun Choudhry, Inder Khatri, Arkajyoti Chakraborty, Dinesh Vishwakarma, and Mukesh Prasad. 2022. Emotion-guided cross-domain fake news detection using adversarial domain adaptation. In *ICNLP*.
- Nicholas Della Giustina. 2023. *Misinformation and Its Effects on Individuals and Society from 2015-2023: A Mixed Methods Review Study*. University of Washington.
- Muhammad Usman Hadi, Qasem Al Tashi, Abbas Shah, Rizwan Qureshi, Amgad Muneer, Muhammad Irfan, Anas Zafar, Muhammad Bilal Shaikh, Naveed Akhtar, Jia Wu, et al. 2024. Large language models: a comprehensive survey of its applications, challenges, limitations, and future prospects. *Authorea Preprints*.
- Ching Nam Hang, Pei-Duo Yu, and Chee Wei Tan. 2024. Trumorgpt: Query optimization and semantic reasoning over networks for automated fact-checking. In *CISS*.
- Ángel Hernández-Castañeda, Hiram Calvo, Alexander Gelbukh, and Jorge J García Flores. 2017. Cross-domain deception detection using support vector networks. *Soft Computing*.
- Yue Huang and Lichao Sun. 2023. Harnessing the power of chatgpt in fake news: An in-depth exploration in generation, detection and explanation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.05046*.
- Payam Karisani and Heng Ji. 2024. Fact checking beyond training set. In *NAACL*.
- Jingqiu Li, Lanjun Wang, Jianlin He, Yongdong Zhang, and Anan Liu. 2023. Improving rumor detection by class-based adversarial domain adaptation. In *ACM MM*.
- Hongzhan Lin, Jing Ma, Liangliang Chen, Zhiwei Yang, Mingfei Cheng, and Chen Guang. 2022. Detect rumors in microblog posts for low-resource domains via adversarial contrastive learning. In *NAACL*.
- Hui Liu, Wenya Wang, Haoru Li, and Haoliang Li. 2024a. TELLER: A trustworthy framework for explainable, generalizable and controllable fake news detection. In *ACL*.
- Ye Liu, Jiajun Zhu, Kai Zhang, Haoyu Tang, Yanghai Zhang, Xukai Liu, Qi Liu, and Enhong Chen. 2024b. Detect, investigate, judge and determine: A novel llm-based framework for few-shot fake news detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.08952*.
- Zhiwei Liu, Kailai Yang, Qianqian Xie, Christine de Kock, Sophia Ananiadou, and Eduard Hovy. 2024c. Raemollm: Retrieval augmented llms for cross-domain misinformation detection using in-context learning based on emotional information. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.11093*.
- Shervin Minaee, Tomas Mikolov, Narjes Nikzad, Meysam Chenaghlu, Richard Socher, Xavier Amatriain, and Jianfeng Gao. 2024. Large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.06196*.
- Qiong Nan, Juan Cao, Yongchun Zhu, Yanyan Wang, and Jintao Li. 2021. Mdfend: Multi-domain fake news detection. In *CIKM*.
- Qiong Nan, Qiang Sheng, Juan Cao, Beizhe Hu, Danding Wang, and Jintao Li. 2024. Let Silence Speak: Enhancing Fake News Detection with Generated Comments from Large Language Models. In *CIKM*.
- Verónica Pérez-Rosas and Rada Mihalcea. 2014. Cross-cultural deception detection. In *ACL*.
- Reid Pryzant, Dan Iter, Jerry Li, Yin Tat Lee, Chenguang Zhu, and Michael Zeng. 2023. Automatic prompt optimization with "gradient descent" and beam search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.03495*.
- Hongyan Ran and Caiyan Jia. 2023. Unsupervised cross-domain rumor detection with contrastive learning and cross-attention. In *AAAI*.
- Hongyan Ran, Caiyan Jia, and Jian Yu. 2023. A metric-learning method for few-shot cross-event rumor detection. *Neurocomputing*.
- Herun Wan, Shangbin Feng, Zhaoxuan Tan, Heng Wang, Yulia Tsvetkov, and Minnan Luo. 2024. DELL: Generating reactions and explanations for LLM-based misinformation detection. In *ACL*.
- Jerry Wei, Chengrun Yang, Xinying Song, Yifeng Lu, Nathan Hu, Dustin Tran, Daiyi Peng, Ruibo Liu, Da Huang, Cosmo Du, et al. 2024. Long-form factuality in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.18802*.

Jiaying Wu, Jiafeng Guo, and Bryan Hooi. 2024. Fake news in sheep’s clothing: Robust fake news detection against llm-empowered style attacks. In *ACM SIGKDD*.

Zhiheng Xi, Wenxiang Chen, Xin Guo, Wei He, Yiwen Ding, Boyang Hong, Ming Zhang, Junzhe Wang, Senjie Jin, Enyu Zhou, et al. 2025. The rise and potential of large language model based agents: A survey. *Science China Information Sciences*.

Can Xu, Qingfeng Sun, Kai Zheng, Xiubo Geng, Pu Zhao, Jiazhan Feng, Chongyang Tao, and Daxin Jiang. 2023. Wizardlm: Empowering large language models to follow complex instructions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.12244*.

Songhua Yang, Hanjie Zhao, Senbin Zhu, Guangyu Zhou, Hongfei Xu, Yuxiang Jia, and Hongying Zan. 2024. Zhongjing: Enhancing the chinese medical capabilities of large language model through expert feedback and real-world multi-turn dialogue. In *AAAI*.

Lichao Sun Yue Huang. 2024. Fakegpt: Fake news generation, explanation and detection of large language models. In *WWW*.

Xuan Zhang and Wei Gao. 2023. Towards llm-based fact verification on news claims with a hierarchical step-by-step prompting method. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.00305*.

Yongchao Zhou, Andrei Ioan Muresanu, Ziwen Han, Keiran Paster, Silviu Pitis, Harris Chan, and Jimmy Ba. 2022. Large language models are human-level prompt engineers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.01910*.

A Prompts

A.1 System Prompts for the Multi-Dimensional Analysis Module

We list the system prompts for the agents in Multi-Dimensional Analysis Module as follows:

Linguistic Feature Analysis Agent

In a multi-agent misinformation detection system, you act as the linguistic feature analysis agent, responsible for conducting an in-depth analysis of the emotional polarity and writing style of the news while generating a linguistic feature analysis report.

Comment Analysis Agent

In a multi-agent misinformation detection system, you act as the comment analysis agent, responsible for conducting an in-depth analysis of commenters’ stances and emotional polarity towards the news and identifying fact-checking information within the comments to generate a comment analysis report.

Fact-Questioning Agent

In a multi-agent misinformation detection system, you act as the fact questioning agent, responsible for generating specific yes/no questions based on the statements in the news to assist in determining its authenticity.

Fact-Checking Agent

In a multi-agent misinformation detection system, you act as the Fact-Questioning Agent, responsible for analyzing the consistency between statements in news and factual evidence. You need to invoke the Wikipedia tool and leverage clues from the search engine to retrieve relevant facts relevant to the statements. Then, you need assess the consistency between the statements and the facts, producing a fact-checking analysis report.

Questioning Agent

In a multi-agent misinformation detection system, you act as the Questioning Agent, responsible for reviewing the source content and the analysis report to identify aspects requiring further investigation. Then, you need to pose targeted questions, encouraging the report providers to perform more in-depth and comprehensive analysis.

A.2 Prompt for the Decision Rule Optimization Agent

Decision Rule Optimization Agent

You have been provided with a set of decision rules and their corresponding accuracy score. The decision rules are ordered by their accuracy in ascending order, where a higher accuracy represents higher generalizability.

<decision rule 1, accuracy 1>
<decision rule 2, accuracy 2>
(...more example pairs...)

Below are several examples demonstrating how to apply these decision rules. In each example, replace <DECISION RULE> with your decision rule, read the input carefully, and generate an accurate judgment. If the judgment matches the provided ground-truth label, it is considered correct; otherwise, it is wrong.

Input: [example news]
<DECISION RULE>
Output: fake
(...more examples...)

Now, design a new decision rule that differs from the existing ones and aim to maximize its accuracy.

B Datasets Details

We conduct experiments on the Weibo21 and AMTCele datasets, respectively. The statistical details of both datasets are summarized in Table 4,5.

C Baselines

The adopted baselines in our experiments are listed as follows:

- **UCD-RD** (Ran and Jia, 2023) This method leverages contrastive learning and cross-attention mechanisms to achieve cross-domain rumor detection through feature alignment and domain-invariant feature learning.
- **CADA** (Li et al., 2023) It utilizes category alignment and adversarial training to facilitate cross-domain misinformation detection.
- **HiSS** (Zhang and Gao, 2023) Typically, this approach breaks down complex news content

into multiple sub-statements and uses search engines to gather clues, progressively verifying each sub-statement to determine the authenticity of the news.

- **SheepDog** (Wu et al., 2024) By leveraging LLMs, it generates news data with diverse styles, enriching the style diversity of the training set and enhancing the robustness of misinformation detection against style-based attacks.
- **TELLER** (Liu et al., 2024a) It combines neural-symbolic reasoning with logic rules to enhance explainability and generalizability, providing transparent reasoning paths for misinformation detection.
- **ADAF** (Karisani and Ji, 2024) This approach enhances cross-domain fact-checking by adversarially training the retriever for robustness and optimizing the reader to be insensitive to evidence order, improving overall performance across domains.
- **SAFE** (Wei et al., 2024) The model decomposes news content into independent facts and verifies the authenticity of each fact through multi-step reasoning and search engine queries.
- **DELL** (Wan et al., 2024) It uses LLMs to generate diverse news reactions and interpretable agent tasks, aiming to enhance accuracy and calibration in misinformation detection by selectively integrating expert predictions.
- **RAEmo** (Liu et al., 2024c) It constructs a sentiment-embedded retrieval database, leveraging sentiment examples from the source domain for in-context learning to verify content authenticity in the target domain.

D Cross-Validation Experiments

To determine the cross-domain validation task number N_{vt} , we conduct 8-fold cross-validation experiments on Weibo21 and 6-fold cross-validation experiments on AMTCele. Through these experiments, we identify $N_{vt} = 500$ as the optimal value for Weibo21 and $N_{vt} = 400$ for AMTCele, with the validation results illustrated in Figure 6.

domain	Science	Military	Education	Disasters	Politics
real	143	121	243	185	306
fake	93	222	248	591	546
all	236	343	491	776	852

domain	Health	Finance	Entertain	Society	all
real	485	959	1000	1198	4640
fake	515	362	440	1471	4488
all	1000	1321	1440	2669	9128

Table 4: Data Statistics of Weibo21.

domain	Tech	Edu	Biz	Sport	Polit	Entmt	Cele	all
legit	40	40	40	40	40	40	250	490
fake	40	40	40	40	40	40	250	490
all	80	80	80	80	80	80	500	980

Table 5: Data Statistics of AMTCele.




Figure 6: Cross-validation experiments on Weibo21 and AMTCele.

E More Results

E.1 More Underlying Models

We replace the underlying models for MARO and the strong baselines with LLaMA-3.1-405B, LLaMA-3.1-8B, and Claude-3.5-Sonnet. As shown in Table 6-11, MARO’s performance remains superior to these competitive baselines across different underlying models, demonstrating its effectiveness.

E.2 More Datasets

We also conduct experiments on the PHEME (Buntain and Golbeck, 2017) dataset which contains posts and comments related to five breaking events. Table 12 shows the statistics of PHEME. We sam-

ple 100 samples from each event, totally 500 samples for the experiment. Similar to the above experiments, we conduct cross-event misinformation detection experiments on each event. As shown in Table 13-16, compared with the strong baselines, MARO still achieves the best performance on PHEME, demonstrating its effectiveness.

F Similarity Matrix

We compute the domain similarity of the Weibo21 dataset using TF-IDF, with the resulting domain similarity matrix visualized in Figure 7.




Figure 7: Domain similarity matrix of Weibo21.

G Case Study

Table 17 shows an example of the decision rule optimization process. The left side of the table

Method	Disasters		Entertain		Health		Politics		Society	
	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1
SheepDog (Wu et al., 2024)	78.02	77.96	80.59	79.85	80.6	79.85	81.06	81.26	74.68	76.25
TELLER (Liu et al., 2024a)	78.29	78.05	83.26	83.28	80.4	80.58	81.26	80.46	76.59	77.32
DELL (Wan et al., 2024)	81.05	81.26	82.06	81.89	83.1	82.97	84.18	83.89	78.56	77.19
RAEmo (Liu et al., 2024c)	84.26	84.49	83.11	82.84	83	82.85	84.75	84.55	77.65	77.49
MARO (ours)	87.92	88.11	85.03	84.85	89.4	89.52	87.05	87.11	81.05	81.24

Method	Education		Finance		Military		Science		Avg.	
	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1
SheepDog (Wu et al., 2024)	72.96	73.05	75.36	75.16	85.06	84.55	69.21	69.31	77.5	77.47
TELLER (Liu et al., 2024a)	72.11	72.12	74.76	75.25	88.19	87.89	72.21	71.19	78.56	78.46
DELL (Wan et al., 2024)	74.64	75.12	80.91	79.24	87.98	88.26	71.88	72.58	80.48	80.27
RAEmo (Liu et al., 2024c)	75.46	75.88	80.35	79.75	88.94	89.05	72.75	71.75	81.14	80.96
MARO (ours)	79.13	79.23	79.91	79.65	93.28	93.49	74.05	73.81	84.09	84.11

Table 6: Performance comparison between MARO and baselines on Weibo21 using LLaMA-3.1-405B as the underlying model.

Method	Biz		Edu		Cele		Entmt	
	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1
SheepDog (Wu et al., 2024)	81.98	82.05	81.69	81.75	77.2	76.51	76.48	76.59
TELLER (Liu et al., 2024a)	83.15	83.19	82.75	82.81	77.6	77.12	77.51	77.57
DELL (Wan et al., 2024)	83.07	83.75	84.18	84.35	77.2	76.82	77.94	78.06
RAEmo (Liu et al., 2024c)	82.51	82.53	84.09	84.15	79.4	79.11	75.15	75.26
MARO (ours)	86.25	86.54	86.25	86.11	81.2	80.84	78.75	78.81

Method	Polit		Sport		Tech		Avg.	
	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1
SheepDog (Wu et al., 2024)	82.95	83.06	81.19	81.34	83.34	83.36	80.69	80.67
TELLER (Liu et al., 2024a)	83.69	86.72	82.75	82.89	85.57	85.56	81.79	82.27
DELL (Wan et al., 2024)	84.06	83.91	84.13	84.24	86.41	86.32	82.43	82.49
RAEmo (Liu et al., 2024c)	84.31	84.34	85.11	85.16	87.02	86.91	82.47	82.49
MARO (ours)	87.52	87.51	87.35	87.42	91.25	90.87	85.49	85.44

Table 7: Performance comparison between MARO and baselines on AMTCele using LLaMA-3.1-405B as the underlying model.

shows the generated decision rules, while the right side shows the validation accuracy of these decision rules. We can observe that decision rules with higher accuracy generally have stronger applicability.

Method	Disasters		Entertain		Health		Politics		Society	
	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1
SheepDog (Wu et al., 2024)	84.13	84.66	83.27	83.38	83.4	83.31	76.85	76.69	72.66	72.79
TELLER (Liu et al., 2024a)	85.47	85.16	84.19	84.26	84.8	84.26	77.65	77.42	73.94	73.81
DELL (Wan et al., 2024)	86.51	86.19	86.93	86.89	86.4	86.27	79.29	79.34	75.27	75.19
RAEmo (Liu et al., 2024c)	87.65	86.27	87.49	85.06	87.2	87.45	80.85	81.06	76.26	75.84
MARO (ours)	89.97	90.15	90.35	90.32	90.1	90.19	83.94	84.05	77.06	76.59

Method	Education		Finance		Military		Science		Avg.	
	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1
SheepDog (Wu et al., 2024)	78.26	78.49	81.15	81.06	82.37	82.25	69.95	69.83	79.12	79.16
TELLER (Liu et al., 2024a)	79.55	78.94	82.97	82.84	83.19	83.13	70.38	70.54	80.24	80.04
DELL (Wan et al., 2024)	81.95	81.78	83.46	83.57	83.49	83.25	71.15	71.05	81.61	81.5
RAEmo (Liu et al., 2024c)	81.17	81.36	84.39	84.16	85.51	85.34	72.78	72.54	82.58	82.12
MARO (ours)	84.06	84.19	88.26	87.27	86.85	87.21	75.21	74.07	85.09	84.89

Table 8: Performance comparison between MARO and baselines on Weibo21 using Claude-3.5-Sonnet as the underlying model.

Method	Biz		Edu		Cele		Entmt	
	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1
SheepDog (Wu et al., 2024)	83.96	83.85	86.26	86.17	71.6	71.78	75.59	76.05
TELLER (Liu et al., 2024a)	86.55	86.27	88.54	88.69	73.2	73.51	79.28	79.62
DELL (Wan et al., 2024)	85.43	85.37	89.28	89.75	75.4	75.19	78.51	78.29
RAEmo (Liu et al., 2024c)	88.25	88.41	91.38	91.05	76.2	76.38	81.79	81.64
MARO (ours)	91.68	91.79	92.51	92.31	79.6	79.25	85.25	84.93

Method	Polit		Sport		Tech		Avg.	
	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1
SheepDog (Wu et al., 2024)	79.26	79.16	83.37	83.28	84.28	84.47	80.62	80.68
TELLER (Liu et al., 2024a)	80.26	80.11	84.51	84.63	85.59	85.26	82.56	82.58
DELL (Wan et al., 2024)	81.57	81.95	86.26	86.39	86.47	86.42	83.27	83.34
RAEmo (Liu et al., 2024c)	84.35	85.16	88.26	88.81	88.54	89.06	85.54	85.79
MARO (ours)	87.65	87.29	89.67	89.75	91.69	91.81	88.29	88.16

Table 9: Performance comparison between MARO and baselines on AMTCele using Claude-3.5-Sonnet as the underlying model.

Method	Disasters		Entertain		Health		Politics		Society	
	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1
SheepDog (Wu et al., 2024)	52.35	53.03	51.34	51.66	54.9	54.68	57.35	57.23	45.86	45.39
TELLER (Liu et al., 2024a)	52.98	53.31	51.26	51.54	56.4	56.51	59.52	59.46	41.05	41.18
DELL (Wan et al., 2024)	53.89	53.76	52.54	52.63	55.4	55.21	61.55	61.48	48.24	48.51
RAEmo (Liu et al., 2024c)	53.28	53.95	51.39	51.44	58.5	58.33	62.54	62.69	43.56	43.19
MARO (ours)	56.06	57.71	53.27	51.85	59.1	58.97	63.98	63.37	47.05	46.33

Method	Education		Finance		Military		Science		Avg.	
	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1
SheepDog (Wu et al., 2024)	41.42	41.51	56.21	56.57	48.54	48.49	51.47	51.52	51.05	51.12
TELLER (Liu et al., 2024a)	39.26	39.28	59.53	59.64	49.37	49.82	52.74	52.68	51.35	51.49
DELL (Wan et al., 2024)	41.24	41.39	60.25	60.17	52.51	52.55	53.69	53.57	53.25	53.26
RAEmo (Liu et al., 2024c)	40.92	40.79	62.17	62.28	50.52	50.73	53.25	53.37	52.9	52.97
MARO (ours)	42.75	42.18	65.28	65.31	53.11	52.63	54.85	53.91	55.05	54.7

Table 10: Performance comparison between MARO and baselines on Weibo21 using LLaMA-3.1-8B as the underlying model.

Method	Biz		Edu		Cele		Entmt	
	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1
SheepDog (Wu et al., 2024)	49.52	49.69	50.63	50.47	67.6	67.38	47.52	47.38
TELLER (Liu et al., 2024a)	51.29	51.42	54.52	54.39	71.4	71.42	50.69	50.73
DELL (Wan et al., 2024)	54.96	54.85	55.21	55.13	72.4	72.19	52.54	52.43
RAEmo (Liu et al., 2024c)	51.63	50.86	53.22	52.59	70.8	70.34	53.24	53.61
MARO (ours)	56.79	56.41	57.05	56.38	76.2	75.7	57.95	57.31

Method	Polit		Sport		Tech		Avg.	
	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1
SheepDog (Wu et al., 2024)	47.75	47.66	56.28	56.37	61.13	61.94	54.35	54.41
TELLER (Liu et al., 2024a)	49.56	49.79	57.54	57.36	63.27	63.18	56.9	56.9
DELL (Wan et al., 2024)	50.94	50.78	58.25	58.37	66.74	66.28	58.72	58.58
RAEmo (Liu et al., 2024c)	50.14	50.27	60.85	60.92	61.89	61.42	57.4	57.14
MARO (ours)	56.17	55.05	63.29	63.51	70.26	69.65	62.53	62

Table 11: Performance comparison between MARO and baselines on AMTCele using LLaMA-3.1-8B as the underlying model.

events	Charlie Hebdo	Sydney Siege	Ferguson	Ottawa Shooting	Germanwings Crash	all
rumors	458	522	284	470	238	1972
non-rumors	1621	699	859	420	231	3830
all	2079	1221	1143	890	469	5802

Table 12: Data Statistics of PHEME.

Method	Charlie Hebdo		Ferguson		Germanwings Crash	
	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1
SheepDog (Wu et al., 2024)	65	75.24	69	76.17	48	29.84
TELLER (Liu et al., 2024a)	65	75.24	68	75.26	51	31.82
DELL (Wan et al., 2024)	66	77.19	68	75.26	52	33.67
RAEmo (Liu et al., 2024c)	67	78.64	70	77.57	54	35.74
MARO (ours)	70	81.72	72	80.26	56	37.13

Method	Ottawa Shooting		Sydney Siege		Avg.	
	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1
SheepDog (Wu et al., 2024)	45	31.25	51	56.54	55.6	53.81
TELLER (Liu et al., 2024a)	48	33.76	53	59.24	57	55.06
DELL (Wan et al., 2024)	49	35.79	52	57.69	57.4	55.92
RAEmo (Liu et al., 2024c)	50	36.54	53	59.24	58.8	57.55
MARO (ours)	52	39.56	55	62.18	61	60.17

Table 13: Performance comparison between MARO and baselines on PHEME using GPT-3.5-turbo-0125 as the underlying model.

Method	Charlie Hebdo		Ferguson		Germanwings Crash	
	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1
SheepDog (Wu et al., 2024)	60	67.94	60	66.67	55	46.35
TELLER (Liu et al., 2024a)	61	70.55	63	68.37	57	50.21
DELL (Wan et al., 2024)	63	73.29	61	67.46	56	47.24
RAEmo (Liu et al., 2024c)	62	73.52	61	69.25	58	49.35
MARO (ours)	66	77.63	67	74.59	63	51.31

Method	Ottawa Shooting		Sydney Siege		Avg.	
	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1
SheepDog (Wu et al., 2024)	47	49.26	41	36.29	52.6	53.3
TELLER (Liu et al., 2024a)	49	55.73	43	37.05	54.6	56.38
DELL (Wan et al., 2024)	51	57.24	43	37.21	54.8	56.49
RAEmo (Liu et al., 2024c)	52	58.65	44	38.74	55.4	57.9
MARO (ours)	55	61.15	49	40.18	60	60.97

Table 14: Performance comparison between MARO and baselines on PHEME using Claude-3.5-Sonnet as the underlying model.

Method	Charlie Hebdo		Ferguson		Germanwings Crash	
	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1
SheepDog (Wu et al., 2024)	72	77.49	70	77.59	56	44.05
TELLER (Liu et al., 2024a)	73	79.86	71	78.64	56	43.27
DELL (Wan et al., 2024)	73	82.19	71	79.81	57	44.15
RAEmo (Liu et al., 2024c)	74	83.27	72	81.27	59	47.56
MARO (ours)	78	87.64	74	82.43	62	45.71

Method	Ottawa Shooting		Sydney Siege		Avg.	
	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1
SheepDog (Wu et al., 2024)	47	43.28	46	31.29	58.2	54.74
TELLER (Liu et al., 2024a)	48	46.18	48	31.54	59.2	55.49
DELL (Wan et al., 2024)	51	46.57	49	33.81	60.3	57.52
RAEmo (Liu et al., 2024c)	50	46.28	51	35.25	61.2	58.73
MARO (ours)	53	49.09	52	35.64	63.8	60.1

Table 15: Performance comparison between MARO and baselines on PHEME using LLaMA-3.1-405B as the underlying model.

Method	Charlie Hebdo		Ferguson		Germanwings Crash	
	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1
SheepDog (Wu et al., 2024)	80	66.59	73	71.05	51	41.86
TELLER (Liu et al., 2024a)	79	66.28	74	71.64	52	43.28
DELL (Wan et al., 2024)	81	66.79	76	73.85	54	45.64
RAEmo (Liu et al., 2024c)	82	67.56	77	74.29	54	45.64
MARO (ours)	85	70.67	80	76.92	57	49.41

Method	Ottawa Shooting		Sydney Siege		Avg.	
	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1	Acc.	F1
SheepDog (Wu et al., 2024)	48	43.75	47	42.56	59.8	53.29
TELLER (Liu et al., 2024a)	48	42.54	48	43.21	60.2	53.76
DELL (Wan et al., 2024)	48	44.37	50	46.39	61.8	55.41
RAEmo (Liu et al., 2024c)	50	47.24	51	47.68	62.8	56.48
MARO (ours)	52	49.09	54	50.26	65.6	59.27

Table 16: Performance comparison between MARO and baselines on PHEME using LLaMA-3.1-8B as the underlying model.

Decision Rule	Acc.
Analyze the credibility of the news outlet and its fact-checking history regarding the social media event. If the news outlet has a history of spreading misinformation, output "1" as fake news; if the news outlet is known for credible reporting, output "0" as real news. Output requirements: - Output format: judgment: <'1' represents fake-news, '0' represents real-news>	55.31
Evaluate the cross-referencing of multiple reliable sources to verify the accuracy and credibility of the information presented in the news item. If the information is corroborated by multiple reputable sources, output "0" as real news; if there are conflicting reports or lack of consensus among sources, output "1" as fake news. Output requirements: - Output format: judgment: <'1' represents fake-news, '0' represents real-news>	62.52
Utilize sentiment analysis and social media monitoring to assess public reactions and discussions surrounding the social media event. If a large portion of the online community expresses skepticism or disbelief in the news item, output "1" as fake news; if the overall sentiment is positive and supportive of the news, output "0" as real news. Output requirements: - Output format: judgment: <'1' represents fake-news, '0' represents real-news>	65.46
Evaluate the linguistic features and narrative structure of the news item to determine the level of bias and sensationalism in the reporting. If the article contains emotionally charged language, subjective opinions presented as facts, or sensationalized headlines, output "1" as fake news; if the article maintains a neutral tone, presents facts objectively, and avoids sensationalism, output "0" as real news. Output requirements: - Output format: judgment: <'1' represents fake-news, '0' represents real-news>	65.68
Examine the consistency of the news item with verified data and expert opinions related to the social media event. If the news item aligns with established facts and expert analysis, output "0" as real news; if the news item contradicts verified data or expert opinions, output "1" as fake news. Output requirements: - Output format: judgment: <'1' represents fake-news, '0' represents real-news>	68.39

Table 17: An example of the decision rule optimization process on Weibo21.