Fake News Detection in Social Media: A Systematic Research Review

Mr. Parshwa R. Shah[a]*, Mr. Devam M. Sheth[b]

[a, b]*Student, Arizona State University, Tempe,AZ*

Abstract

With the expanding fame of social media and electronic discussions, the dissemination of phony news has become a significant danger to different areas and offices. This has reduced trust in the media, leaving users in a condition of perplexity. The spread of this kind of information represents a genuine threat to union and social prosperity since it cultivates political polarization and doubt of individuals regarding their politicians. The large measure of information that is spread through social media makes manual confirmation unworkable, which has advanced the plan and execution of different techniques for fake news detection. The makers of phony news utilize different complex stunts to advance the accomplishment of their manifestations, with one of them being triggering people's thought processes. Due to this sentiment analysis is accountable for deciding the extremity and strength of opinions commuted in content. So, Sentiment analysis can be used either as a premise of the framework or as a feature inside the database. In this article, we study the unique employments of detection of fake news using sentiment analysis with a conversation of the most pertinent benefits and shortcomings, and the necessities that should be met sooner rather than later, for example, multilingualism, fairness, the balance of inclinations, or treatment of negative media components.

Keywords: Phony News, Social Media, Linguistics, Semantics, Machine learning

---

1. Introduction

In the past, if anybody required any news, the individual would hang tight for the following day's paper [9]. In any case, with the development of online papers and the measure of time spent via social media stages individuals have discovered a superior and quicker approach to being educated regarding the matter of his/her advantage. It has become a main source for news reading, for instance, according to the Pew Research Centre's Journalism Project [2], in 2020, 53% of US grown-ups say they acquired news from web-based media "frequently" or "now and again", with 59% of Twitter clients and 54% of Facebook clients burning-through news on the website routinely. Bogus data can be proliferated by bots, criminal/fear-monger associations, extremist or political associations, governments, covered-up paid banners, state-supported savages, writers, helpful numbskulls, scheme scholars, people that profit from bogus data, and savages [3]. The aim of these entertainers can be to harm or hurt, to get monetary benefit by expanding site sees, to control general assessment, to make problems and disarray, to advance philosophical inclinations, or even as individual amusement [4].

1.1 Need and Motivation: -

The motivation behind fake news detection is to combat the negative impact of fake news on society. Fake news can have serious consequences, including spreading misinformation, influencing public opinion, and damaging trust in traditional news sources. By detecting and flagging fake news, researchers and journalists can help prevent the spread of misinformation, reduce the impact of propaganda and biased information, and increase the credibility of news sources. Additionally, developing effective techniques for fake news detection can also help in the fight against disinformation campaigns, online scams, and other malicious activities that exploit the vulnerabilities of online platforms. Ultimately, the motivation for fake news detection research is to promote the integrity and accuracy of the information in the digital age.

1.2 Challenges: -

- Volume of information: The vast amount of information available on the internet makes it challenging to identify fake news from authentic news sources. Moreover, fake news can spread rapidly through social media, making it even more difficult to track and monitor.
- Lack of labeled data: To train machine learning models to detect fake news, large amounts of labeled data are required. However, such data is scarce, making it difficult to train and evaluate models accurately.
- Diverse forms of fake news: Fake news can take many different forms, including misleading headlines, manipulated images or videos, and completely fabricated stories. As a result, it is challenging to develop a single model or approach that can detect all forms of fake news effectively.

* Mr. Parshwa R. Shah
E-mail address: parshwas09@gmail.com

- Human biases: Humans have inherent biases that can affect their ability to detect fake news. For example, people may be more likely to believe the fake news that aligns with their preconceived beliefs or biases.
- Evolving tactics: As technology and social media continue to evolve, the tactics used to spread fake news are also changing. Attackers are becoming more sophisticated and are constantly developing new ways to spread fake news and evade detection.
- Legal and ethical challenges: There may be legal and ethical challenges in detecting and flagging fake news, such as concerns around censorship and freedom of speech.

An intentionally tricky story is "fake news" Any way of late babbling on the web media's discussion is changing its definition. Some of them at present use the term to pardon the real factors counter to their supported perspectives [5]. An exceptional trait of information via web-based media is that anybody can enroll as a news distributor with no forthright expense (e.g., anybody can make a Facebook page professing to be a paper or news media association). Thusly, not just customary news, companies are progressively moving to web-based media. (https://www.comscore.com/Insights/Blog/TraditionalNews-Publishers-Take-Non-Traditional-Path-toDigital-Growth). Alongside this progress, as anyone might expect, there are developing worries about counterfeit news distributors posting "counterfeit" reports, and regularly spreading those broadly utilizing "counterfeit" supporters [6].

Here is a list of some fake news that had a very huge (negative) impact:

- Before the finish of the 2016 official political decision, a report assessed that more than 1 million tweets were found connected to the phony news story "Pizza Gate" [7]. With the most recent three months of 2016's U.S. official political decision, numerous individuals accepted that the phony news favored the result in either of the two competitors was more than 37 million times shared on Facebook and Twitter [7] Thus, the spread of phony news might cause enormous scope adverse consequences, frequently affecting or in any event, abusing public occasions.
- A picture on Facebook shows a man's skull hacked open that was seen more than multiple times. The Facebook clients who posted the pictures asserted they showed a slaughter in progress in the Gashish area of Plateau State, Nigeria by Fulani Muslims who were killing Christians from the locale Berom ethnic minority. As an outcome, a slaughter occurred in Gashish that weekend, and somewhere close to 86 and 238 Berom individuals were killed, as per estimates made by the police and by nearby local area pioneers. However, the images and videos of a man's skull were not even from Gashish. The video showing a man's head was cut, didn't occur in Nigeria and it was recorded in Congo, in 2012. [8]
- An investigation by Silverman [9] shows that for the main 20 political race stories in 2016, the best 20 fake reports had 8,711,000 shares, comments, and likes on Facebook. These client commitment numbers were essentially higher than those for the main 20 genuine stories, with 7,367,000 shares, comments, and likes on Facebook during a similar time frame. These worries rouse evaluating news validity and recognizing counterfeit word before it gets out on the web.
- In the financial field, a piece of phony news guaranteeing that Barack Obama was injured in a blast cleared out $130 billion in stock value [10].
- In the social field, many guiltless individuals were pounded into the ground by local people in India give a piece of fake news about child trafficking that was broadly spread on social media [11].

Since individuals are frequently incapable to invest sufficient energy to cross-check references and make certain of the validity of information, automatic detection of fake news is crucial. Along these lines, it is getting incredible consideration from the research community. A few techniques have been pointed out in the new past to recognize and handle the issue of phony news. These could be extensively sorted into (a) Content-based: Text (semantics [12]); Media (pictures [13], GIFs, and video) and URLs, (b) User-based: movement following (bots and spam [14]); bio-data (registration age [15]); restricting perspectives on other online clients [16] and (c) Metadata-based: GPS, gadget source, Followers and Friends Network [17].

1.3 Introduction to Sentiment Analysis: -

Sentiment Analysis (SA) is the part of Natural Language Processing (NLP) responsible for the planning and execution of models, strategies, and procedures to decide if a book manages unbiased or emotional data and, in the last case, to decide whether such data is communicated in a good, nonpartisan, or negative way just as in case it is communicated in a solid or frail manner. Since a huge piece of the abstract substance communicated by clients on social networks is about suppositions (on survey locales, discussions, message sheets, visits, and so forth), SA is otherwise called Opinion Mining (OM) [18]. Sentiment analysis can help identify biased language that is used in fake news articles. For example, an article that uses strong emotional language, such as "outrageous" or "shocking", may indicate a biased perspective. By analyzing the sentiment of the language used in the article, sentiment analysis can help identify the such biased language. Fake news often targets people's emotions to influence their opinions. Sentiment analysis can help identify the emotions that are being targeted, such as anger, fear, or sadness, and determine whether the news is trying to manipulate the emotions of the reader. Sentiment analysis can also help identify inconsistencies within an article. For example, an article that claims to report on a factual event, but uses language that evokes strong emotions or biases, may indicate that the article is fake news. By analyzing the sentiment of the language used in the article, sentiment analysis can help identify such inconsistencies.

Past work has shown that misdirection and bogus proclamations can be identified from the composing style of the creators or semantics and now and then be utilized to infer their characters [19]. A few creators have shown that liars can even be recognized as they recount complex stories, make fewer self-references to disassociate themselves from the story, and will in general have more continuous utilization of negative feeling words – as an indication of blame [20]. Along these lines, it is intelligent to think about feelings inside the posted writings as a prompt comparable to getting out counterfeit news/gossip.

Sentiment analysis is typically approached as a machine learning problem, where the goal is to automatically classify the sentiment of a piece of text as positive, negative, or neutral. It can also perform contextual analysis, which involves analyzing the surrounding words and phrases in addition to the words directly associated with the sentiment. This allows sentiment analysis to identify subtle nuances in language that may indicate bias or manipulation. Sentiment analysis is a flexible technique that can be applied to a wide range of data sources, including social media, news articles, and online forums. This makes it a versatile tool for detecting fake news across different platforms and channels

2. Related Work

The majority of previous studies have focused on categorizing online news and social media articles. Various researchers have presented various ways of detecting deceit. Hai et al. [21] have planned a semi-supervised learning method by utilizing Laplacian regularized logistic regression to further develop the survey spam identification execution. In the writing, a few methodologies use PC vision for counterfeit news identification. An intriguing strategy, falling into that class, for picture-based phony photograph identification, has been introduced in [24].

Zang [22] has proposed a profound repetitive diffusive neural organization to resolve the issue of phony news identification. Then again, rather than the customary RNN model, in [70] creators adjusted a pre-prepared BERT model (Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers), that comprises a few stacked transformer-encoder blocks.

Conroy et al. [11] looked at two significant types of techniques for detecting counterfeit news. The first was syntactic methods in which the text of deceitful communications is collected and examined to identify language trends. The subsequent one tries to get duplicity by measuring message data or network queries. In the particular instance of the location of phony surveys, Sentiment Analysis can be viewed as a helpful strategy not explicitly to recognize counterfeit messages but to identify counterfeit negative commentators as they overproduced negative passionate terms when contrasted with honest audits because of embellishments of the feeling they were attempting to pass on.

While Julia et al. [24] are of the opinion that Fake news deception detection can be more accurate when the features are selected properly. They classified features as follows: Language Features(They carried out 31 highlights which included no. of words and syllables per sentence), Lexical Features: Typical lexical highlights incorporate word-level signals like a measure of extraordinary words and their frequency in the content, Psycholinguistic Features(Used to catch extra signals of influential and one-sided language), Lexicon Features (Highlights that catch the lexicon parts of a book using Google API), Subjectivity (Figure subjectivity and polarity scores of a text).

Hussein [25] grouped 41 articles on SA as per the test they tended to. They tracked down that eight articles tended to refutation, seven managed domain dependence, 6 were committed to fake and phony recognition, 2 tended to global information, 8 managed Natural Language Processing overheads (mockery was remembered for this test), 3 chipped away at feature extraction, 3 contemplated polarity (words having extremity relies upon the setting where they are utilized [26]), and four managed gigantic dictionaries. As can be seen, counterfeit location is one of the primary difficulties, although the vast majority of the articles investigated in [25] didn't manage counterfeit news yet rather with the identification of phony sites or phony audits.

Thorne and Vlachos [27] inspected truth checking in reporting and recorded the assets and strategies accessible to computerize such an undertaking just as the connected works that could profit them. Elhadad [28] separated phony news from different types of dispersing false news, deception, and abnormality, for example, fabrications, fake announcement, parody/spoofs, reports, misleading content, and garbage news. They further augmented falsehood to the traditional classifications of false news and deception. Falsehood was characterized as the passing of veritable doom to hurt someone. Notwithstanding, created or garbage news, which can't be thought of as containing authentic data, was taken into account as a potential falsehood acknowledgment, which appears to be conflicting. Sentiment Analysis was not referenced in either [27] or [28].

Da Silva et al. [29] examined ML approaches and strategies to distinguish counterfeit news, tracking down that the favored techniques included neural networks made out of old-style grouping calculations that vigorously center on the lexical examination of the sections as a fundamental feature for prediction. SA was regularly utilized as a substance highlight as words having a place with assumption vocabularies or as the aftereffect of an ML-based opinion mining framework. Klyuev [30] likewise examined various ways to deal with battle counterfeit news and the significance of deciding content highlights through natural language processing (NLP) strategies to make a profile of the content report. Even though he showed the significance of utilizing word references that contain, among other data, the feeling of the extremity of words, he didn't unequivocally specify the assignment of opinion mining.

Meel and Vishwakarma [31] overviewed how the substance on the web is stained purposefully or some of the time inadvertently by counterfeit audits, counterfeit news, and parody, among different wellsprings of data contamination. For this reason, they examined the bogus data environment, from the order of bogus data and the inspirations to scatter it to the social effect and client discernment. They additionally talked about the present status of reality checking, which includes an origin location, strategies for identification, and techniques for control and intercession. They hypothesized SA as the basic wellsprings of data expected to identify bogus data.

Niraj and Chilukuri [32] mentioned the believability of news, underlining features identified with the source articles. Their outcomes dependent on the well-spring of the news show that number of creators of the news is a solid pointer of validity. We found that when the news story has no creators, it is bound to be phony information. Our discoveries on the cooperation of creators recommend that creators who are occupied with valid trustworthy news are less likely to team up with creators who are related to counterfeit news. This demonstrates that for a news story with various creators, by knowing the believability of one creator, we can construe the validity of the news just as other co-authors. Besides, we came to know that creators' affiliations with very much perceived associations can be a sign of credibility. The outcomes additionally recommend that the credit history of writers can give bits of knowledge on the believability of different articles from the same creator.

Oshikaw in [33] examined the specialized difficulties in counterfeit news location and how analysts characterize various assignments and figure ML answers to handle this undertaking, concentrating on how counterfeit news discovery was lined up with ongoing NLP tasks.

Zhang and Ghorbani in [34] described the adverse consequence of online phony news and fake news recognition techniques for this kind of data, tracking down that a large number of them depend on recognizing highlights of the clients, context, and content that demonstrate deception. They additionally claimed that developing effective and understandable false news detection algorithms will necessitate collaboration between specialists in social sciences, journalism, computer and information science, and political science. Accordingly, they thought that Sentiment investigation is a valuable strategy to show the feelings, mentalities, and suppositions that are passed on by online web-based media and those Sentiment related components are key ascribes for dubious record recognizable proof.

Zhou and Zafarini in their paper [35] studied phony news identification according to the viewpoint of information-based techniques that recognize counterfeit news by checking if the information inside is provided with facts or not. They considered opinion as a significant lexicon component of information. They likewise expressed that the execution of proficient and reasonable phony articles location frameworks needs community-oriented endeavors including specialists in PC and data sciences, sociologies, political theory, and news coverage.

De Souza et al. [36] audited the various kinds of highlights identified with counterfeit news discovery strategies and informational collections, and they thought that SA was a valuable element to rapidly confirm the exactness of data via online media. At last, Antonakaki et al. [37] introduced an overview on present research subjects in Twitter, discovering that feeling investigation was one of the four fundamental parts of examination including Twitter, and that one of the significant dangers for this informal organization is the spread of phony news through it. In any case, they broke down the two points independently, without making an association between the two which shows the handiness of assessment investigation in distinguishing counterfeit news.

Ajao et al. [12] have shown that phony news can be distinguished by utilizing the content-based just methodology without earlier information on the subject area. It is significant that phony and bogus data spreads a lot speedier and more profoundly than genuine data. S. Kumar et al. [38] have so far made the biggest talk data of 126k messages spread by very nearly 300K individuals and tracked down that phony news diffused up to 100K individuals while reality just contacted 1,000 individuals. C. Guo et al.[39] recognized that ‘lone wolves’ scatter their message quicker by making counterfeit records that state a similar viewpoint in numerous manners to assist with propagating their message quicker.

Y. Kim et al. [40], proposed another double feeling-based way to deal with identifying counterfeit news where it can gain from the substance, client remark, and portrayal of feelings from the two distributors and clients. Kim et al. [40] recognize diverse granularity of text highlights with convolution channels for detecting phony news by using a convolutions neural network model.

Notwithstanding highlights straightforwardly identified with the news stories' substance, helper data can be separated from the client-driven social commitment to information via web-based media. In [42], they proposed an original way to deal with recognizing counterfeit news dependent on news content utilizing an information chart.

Mathieu Cliche presented the discovery of mockery on Twitter using n-grams, terms derived from tweets expressly labeled as wry, on his mockery detection site. His study additionally incorporates the utilization of opinion mining and the detection of themes (words that are frequently assembled in tweets) further develop expectation exactness. [43]

Hannah Rashkin in his paper [44] has played out a broad examination of etymological highlights to demonstrate the aftereffect of LSTM. Singhania in his paper [45] developed a 3-structured hierarchical consideration network, one containing a word, another a sentence, and a news article element. Ruchansky et al. [46] developed the CSI model, which captures text, article reaction, and source quality as a function of client behavior.

3. Datasets used in Different research works:

One of the most important factors in detecting fake news is a bipolar dataset. Our Dataset should contain both reliable and fake news examples in equivalent proportion. The fundamental issues in building such informational datasets are that the measure of bogus data in the online content created each day, regardless of whether we limit our focus on news stories and posts examining breaking news, and that web-based media organizations these days have severe policies concerning the examination of data delivered by their users [47]. Beneath, we list the informational indexes that have been worked by established researchers to survey the presentation of phony news recognition calculations, procedures, and frameworks.

- LIAR dataset with 12,800 human-named short explanations from PolitiFact.com assessed for its honesty utilizing six features like ‘true’, ‘mostly true’, ‘half true’, ‘barely true’, ‘false’, and pants fire’. A rich arrangement of meta-information for the creator of every assertion is likewise given. The assertions are examined from news deliveries, Twitter messages, Television and radio interviews, campaign discourses, TV promotions, discussions, and Facebook posts. The vast examined subjects are medical services, taxes, government spending plans, schooling, occupations, state-financial plan, economy, election decisions, and migration. [48] ((https://www.cs.ucsb.edu/william/data/liar_dataset.zip)

- Buzz Face (https://github.com/gsantia/BuzzFace) [49] is a supplement to the previous corpus that includes 16 lahks Facebook remark responses as well as additional data from Twitter and Reddit.

- The BS Detector informative data, at times referred to as Kaggle FakeNews, consist of text/strings and data from 244 sites and covers 12,999 postings from the past 30 days, obtained using a program expansion named BS detector. This expansion scans each and every connection on a particular website page for references to problematic origins/source by comparing with physically gathered rundown spaces. In this way, the records in the informational index were named by programming, not by human annotators.

- Fact-checking data set Reality, an assortment of appraised proclamations from PolitiFact.com with extra problematic news stories from various kinds of untrustworthy sources including parody, publicity, and deceptions. [50]

- Craig Silverman which is also called Buzz feed Political News’ Data includes genuine reports and malignant phony reports from buzzfeednews.com. A different information set called Random Political News Data includes genuine news from many different USA newspapers and journals.

- BuzzFeed-Webis Fake News Corpus 2016. This dataset includes 1627 posts from Facebook coming from nine distributors on seven workdays near the US Political Elections of 2016 official political race. It includes 256 posts from 3 remaining wing distributors, 826 posts from three standard distributors, and 545 posts from three conservative ones. All distributors acquired Facebook's official checkmark, demonstrating validness and raising status inside the organization. [51]

4. Assessment Measures

Accuracy (Acc.), Precision (P), Recall (R), F1, and Area under the Curve (AUC) are the most broadly used measurements to decide the presentation of false news identification frameworks. We should consider the number of true positives (|TP|), true negatives (|TN|), false positives (|FP|), and false negatives (|FN|) while processing the measurements where,

• A true positive is actually fake news which is predicted as fake news by our test results.
• A false positive is actually genuine news which is predicted as fake news by our test results.

• A true negative is actually genuine news that is predicted as genuine by our test results.
• A false negative is actually fake news which is predicted as genuine news by our test results.

Accuracy: The percentage obtained by dividing the number of articles correctly identified by the framework, as either phony or genuine news, by the number of articles named accurately recognized by the framework, and is processed as shown in Equation below (1).

Precision: The percentage resulting by dividing of articles that have been actual fake news by the number of articles that have been predicted as fake news as shown in equation (2). The recall is the percentage resulting by dividing the number of articles that have been actual fake news by the totally fake news articles as shown in equation(3). F1 is the harmonic mean of Precision and recall as shown in the equation. (4)

$$\text{Accuracy} = \frac{\text{TP} + \text{TN}}{\text{TP} + \text{TN} + \text{FP} + \text{FN}} \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Precision} = \frac{\text{TP} + \text{TN}}{\text{TP} + \text{TN} + \text{FP} + \text{FN}} \quad (2)$$

$$\text{Recall} = \frac{\text{TP}}{\text{TP} + \text{FN}} \quad (3)$$

$$\text{F1 Score} = \frac{\text{Precision} \times \text{Recall}}{\text{Precision} + \text{Recall}} \quad (4)$$

Another important term is False Positive Rate (FPR) which can also be defined as(in the context of fake news) the number of genuine news wrongly identified as fake to the total number of genuine articles(5). The Receiving Operating Curve is recognized as a curve between False Positive Rate and True Positive Rate (which is also known as Recall). A best model has AUC (Area under Curve) close to 1 while it is close to 0 in a poor/worst model.

$$\text{FPR} = \frac{\text{FP}}{\text{FP} + \text{TN}} \quad (5)$$

5. Automatic fake/phony news detection with help of sentiment analysis:

As previously said, the intensity with which an opinion is presented establishes a crucial component in determining the amount of authenticity of the news. In light of recent advancements, we can differentiate two types of methodologies for identifying phony news, both of which take into account SA. From one viewpoint, a bunch of methods accept Sentiment Analysis as the crucial premise for phony news recognition methodology and is generally supplemented by the utilization of other data separated from both news substance and the setting of information propagating on interpersonal organizations. Our next section is based on this and the section after that reviews papers that have taken SA into their feature column.

5.1 Phony News Identification Dependent on Sentiment Analysis

Diakopoulos et al. [52] proposed an insightful mechanism to assist columnists and journal editors in extracting news value from vast collections of web-based media content around televised events and, specifically, to encourage investigators to collect data from reputable sources. As a result, they utilized 4 different sorts of programmed text importance: importance, originality, emotion, and word retrieval. They followed a 2-venture method for assessment examination. They started with a classifier dependent on a vocabulary of terms that classified messages based on whether they were sending abstract data or not. As a subsequent advance, they tried applying a Machine-Learning Classifier[69] which is dependent on n-grams upto a size of 4. This brought about a 5-overlap CV exactness (62.4%) that was adequate to give a general image of a supposition yet fizzled on troublesome cases including mockery or slang. But they found that notion investigation related to the extent of the social media reaction to various statements, points, or issues were the most valuable logical markers for editorial requests.

Even when viral dissemination is powered by the evocation of intense emotions[68], Zhang in his paper [53] believed that most previous study on phony news was based on the feelings and sentiment of material given by publishers but hardly focused on the emotions of comments provoked in the public. Yes, they looked at whether feelings expressed in comment sections and their correlation to those expressed in the actual substance could aid in the detection of counterfeit news. They utilized different DL classifiers with respect to information in Chinese and English. Conclusively the outcomes on the Chinese phony articles' informational index were acceptable however; the outcomes on the English informational collection have been very less, presumably on the grounds that the informational collection was initially intended for the discovery of rumors, not phony news.

Dey in his paper [54] tried applying a few NLP strategies (named-element recognition, opinion mining) on a bunch of two hundred tweets alluding to the USA 2016 Election. They tracked down that trustworthy tweets in the most part contained sure or impartial extremity, while tweets with counterfeit substance had a solid propensity towards negative assumption. In any case, their data was too little to even think about getting definitive outcomes. Bhutani in his paper [55] proposed the theory that to find if the news is genuine or phony, the polarity of the words in an article plays a crucial role. For deciding the polarity of writings they used Naive Bayes and afterward applied random forest and Multinomial Naive Bayes. Multinomial Naive Bayes was proved to be giving the best results.

Cui in his paper [56] discovered factual proof on a dataset called Fake News Net, that the polarity or extremity of remarks below counterfeit articles was more noteworthy than below genuine news. For identifying counterfeit news, clients' latent semantics were chosen in a start-to-finish embedding structure. For managing clients' profiles, text in the news, and pictures in the news; they utilized 3 neural organizations for safeguarding lexicon likeness and to uphold the representing stability between a picture and content they used an adversarial mechanism. At long last, they displayed clients' polarity for consolidating it into a proposed structure. Utilizing adversarial learning for lexicon relationships was a curiosity of this work. Other traditional and deep learning-based classifiers were defeated by the following phony news discovery approach.

5.2 Phony News Identification Using Sentiment Analysis as a Feature Column:

Hassan in his paper [57] interpreted real cases into questions against a repository of truth checks using online media, news and live talks. The framework was prepared on a bunch of US general political decision official discussions in which each and every sentence was commented as either "Non-Factual", "Irrelevant Factual", or "Factual". They extricated as many highlights as possible like no. of events, no. of sack words, sentiment, etc. Sentiment was considered as the third most significant feature among the 6615 collected.

Before counterfeit news turned into a first-order issue, there was at that point some work in the writing that focused on deciding the validity of data flowing on social media. In this line, Castillo et al. [59] focused on programmed techniques for evaluating the validity of sets of tweets that spread data about a news occasion. They considered data from official and respectable sources as important data that different clients integrate and elaborate to deliver inferred translations in a nonstop cycle. For their trials, they gathered 747 arrangements of tweets getting out the word, and every one of them was physically labeled as "in all likelihood obvious", "liable to be fake", "in all likelihood fake", and "I can't choose". They noticed that features dependent on SA were exceptionally significant for evaluating the validity, as 3 out of the 10 best-performing highlights were sentiment-related ones: average slant score, number of positive estimation words, and number of negative assumption words. They likewise saw that tweets showing positive supposition were more identified with non-trustworthy data while those with negative notions would in general be more identified with tenable data.

Ross in [60] contrasted with the above explanation stated in [59] that, a bunch of tweets should be ranked by their validity and importance rather than deciding their believability. In their base arrangement of features. There were opinion highlights such as, “has a cheerful emoji", "has a tragic emoji", and an assessment result in their basic arrangement. They implied that tweets with similar notion are dependable and tweets which had assumptions are invalid; this implication was done with the help of 2 highlights/features. The depiction of creator and content of tweets were used to get the highlights/features of various tweets.

Shu in his paper [61] investigated data called Fake News Net, discovering that individuals state their feelings/ viewpoints to counterfeit articles with the help of web-based media pictures by showing distrustful assessments and sensational responses, with genuine news having a bigger extent of unbiased answers over good and regrettable answers, while counterfeit news consisting a greater proportion of negative supposition. While starting their investigations to detect counterfeit news, they tried utilizing basic features from text and so they didn't give details about the effect that SA has on the discovery of phony news in this dataset.

Vosoughi et al. [62] examined valid and counterfeit reports spread on social media platforms (Twitter). They tracked down that phony articles propelled the feelings of dread, disdain, and shock in answers, while genuine articles roused expectation, trouble, bliss, and trust. They infer that the feelings communicated in comments to counterfeit news might enlighten extra factors that rouse individuals to share bogus news. Despite the fact that emotional feeling isn't equivalent to SA, they are closely related in light of the fact that both analyze the emotional substance communicated in content, and the classification models utilized are practically the same in the two cases, with the greatest distinction being in the arrangement of classes with which the writings to be handled are commented on. Thus, we have remembered this article for the investigation.

Bhavika and Neha in [63] made their own vocabulary to train and predict the polarity of a particular sentence. They added the predicted results in feature columns along with TF-idf scores and cosine similarity. They also used Count vectorizers along with n-grams and also without n-grams. They got different accuracies on 3 different datasets, but they found that Tf-idf Vectorizer with Cosine similarity was the best when using Naïve Bayes and Random Forest Classifier in either of the 3 datasets.

Reis et al. [64] separated an enormous number of features by utilizing linguistic strategies, for example polarity, validity and dependability, and area from news content. Subjectivity and Polarity were among the setting feature for this news. XGBoost and Random forest acquired the best presentation among a number of classifiers while using a dataset called Buzz Face. By watching subsequent outcomes, creators picked a threshold for classifying each and every phony article whose True Positive Rate is near 1, and thought that this will be helpful in truth checking.

6. Discussion

In the previous section, we saw how Sentiment Analysis can be utilized in a variety of ways to improve the performance of false news detection systems. In the below table comparative analysis has been shown which includes the accuracy of different algorithms along with different opinion mining methods applied on various datasets.

Table 1. Comparative analysis of fake news detection systems

Author and Reference	DataSet	Opinion Mining Method	Algorithm Used	Results
Horne [65]	Silverman Buzzfeed News	Semantics based	Support Vector Machine	Acc. =0.77
Zhang [66]	Politifact Fakenews	Semantics based	Deep Neural Network	F1 score = 0.7724
	Gossip Cop FakeNews			F1 score = 0.8042
Popat [67]	SNOPES	Semantics Based	Logistic Regression	Acc. =71.96; AUC =0.80
			Conditional Random Field	Acc. = 84.02; AUC = 0.86
Bhavika and Neha [63]	George McIntire	TF-IDF Vectorizer with Cosine Similarity	Naïve Bayes	Acc. = 0.843
			Random Forest	Acc.= 0.839
Rashkin [50]	Fact Checking	Semantics Based	LSTM	F1 =0.55
Dey [54]	Twitter dataset named Ad-hoc	Semantics Based	K-Nearest Neighbor	Acc. =0.66
Reis[64]	BuzzFace		Support vector Machine	AUC = 0.79 ; F1 = 0.76
			K-Nearest Neighbor	AUC = 0.80; F1 = 0.75
			XG Boost	AUC = 0.86 ; F1 = 0.81
			Random Forest	AUC = 0.86 ; F1 = 0.81

7. Conclusion and Future Scope

With the growing popularity of social media, an increasing number of people are absorbing news through social media on a regular basis. The growth of fake news, on the other hand, is a rising source of concern for us today, since it has significant negative consequences for both individual users and society as a whole. We looked at the field of fake news identification from the perspective of how sentiment analysis is being used to combat the problem in this paper. We may claim that the field of false news detection research is moving from the initial stages to the development stage. The need to ensure system fairness, accountability, and transparency (ensuring that results are explainable and free of harmful biases); support for multilingualism and multimedia content; and detection of fake news generated by subtly altering authentic stories or using text-generation algorithms are among the most pressing challenges, in our opinion.

These are some of the future recommendations which can be implemented in this domain.

- Developing more sophisticated algorithms: While machine learning algorithms have shown promise in detecting fake news, there is still room for improvement. Future research could focus on developing more sophisticated algorithms that can identify more subtle patterns and features in social media data.

- Incorporating more data sources: While social media is a rich source of data for fake news detection, there are other data sources that could be incorporated into the analysis. For example, news articles, blogs, and online forums could be used to provide additional context and information for fake news detection.

- Addressing the challenge of deep fakes: Deepfakes are synthetic media that are created using artificial intelligence and are designed to look and sound like real people. Detecting deep fakes can be challenging, and future research could focus on developing techniques for identifying deep fakes in social media.

- Evaluating the effectiveness of interventions: While there are many techniques for detecting fake news, it is unclear which techniques are most effective in practice. Future research could focus on evaluating the effectiveness of different interventions, such as fact-checking or social media platform policies, for reducing the spread of fake news.

- Examining the impact of fake news on society: While fake news has been widely studied from a technical perspective, there is less research on the impact of fake news on society. Future research could focus on examining the social, political, and economic consequences of fake news and developing strategies for mitigating its impact.

- Overall, there are many exciting areas for future research in fake news detection in social media. By developing more sophisticated algorithms, incorporating additional data sources, addressing the challenge of deep fakes, evaluating the effectiveness of interventions, and examining the impact of fake news on society, researchers can make significant contributions to the field and ultimately help prevent the spread of misinformation.

References

1. Khan, Junaed Younus, et al. "A benchmark study on machine learning methods for fake news detection." arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.04749 2 (2019).
2. Shearer, E.; Mitchell, A. News Use Across Social Media Platforms in 2020. 2021. Available online: https://www.journalism.org/2021/01/12/news-use-across-social-media-platforms-in-2020/ .
3. Zannettou, S.; Sirivianos, M.; Blackburn, J.; Kourtellis, . "The Web of False Information: Rumors, Fake News, Hoaxes, Clickbait, and Various Other Shenanigans". ACM J. Data Inf. Qual. 2019, 11, 10:1–10:37. [CrossRef]
4. Sharma; Qian; Jiang; Ruchansky,; Zhang; Liu. "Combating Fake News: A Survey on Identification and Mitigation Techniques". ACM Trans. Intell. Syst. Technol. 2019, 10, 21:1–21:42. [CrossRef]
5. Dubey, S.; Kohok, P.; Thakre, D., "Fake News Detection using Sentiment Analysis", Spvryan's International Journal of Engineering Sciences & Technology (SEST) Volume 7, Issue 1, Paper 4
6. Reis, J.C.S.; Correia, A.; Murai, F.; Veloso, A.; Benevenuto, F.; Cambria, E. Supervised Learning for Fake News Detection. IEEE Intell. Syst. 2019, 34, 76–81
7. H. Allcott and M. Gentzkow, "Social media and fake news in the 2016 election," Journal of economic perspectives, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 211–36, 2017.
8. Khan, J.; Khondaker, T.; Iqbal, A., "A Benchmark Study on Machine Learning Methods for Fake News Detection" arXiv:1905.04749v1 May 2019
9. Silverman, C.: This analysis shows how viral fake election news stories outperformed real news on facebook (2016). https://www.buzzfeednews.com/article/craigsilverman/viral-fakeelection-news-outperformed-real-news-on-facebook#.vtQpz9DKd
10. Boididou, C., Papadopoulos, S., Dang-Nguyen, D.T., Boato, G., Riegler, M., Middleton, S.E., Petlund, A., Kompatsiaris, Y., et al.: "Verifying multimedia use at mediaeval 2016". In: MediaEval (2016).
11. Boididou, C., Papadopoulos, S., Zampoglou, M., Apostolidis, L., Papadopoulou, O., Kompatsiaris, Y.: "Detection and visualization of misleading content on twitter. Int. J. Multimed". Inf. Retr. 7(1), 71–86 (2018)

12. O. Ajao, D. Bhowmik, and S. Zargari, “Fake news identification on twitter with hybrid cnn and rnn models,” in 9th Int’l Conference on Social Media & Society. Copenhagen (July 18), no. Jul 2018, 2018.
13. A. Gupta, H. Lamba, P. Kumaraguru, and A. Joshi, “Faking sandy: characterizing and identifying fake images on twitter during hurricane sandy,” in Proceedings of the 22nd international conference on World Wide Web. ACM, 2013, pp. 729–736.
14. E. Ferrara, O. Varol, C. Davis, F. Menczer, and A. Flammini, “The rise of social bots,” Communications of the ACM, vol. 59, no. 7, pp. 96–104, 2016.
15. C. Castillo, M. Mendoza, and B. Poblete, “Information credibility on twitter,” in Proceedings of the 20th international conference on World wide web. ACM, 2011, pp. 675–684.
16. Z. Jin, J. Cao, Y. Zhang, and J. Luo, “News verification by exploiting conflicting social viewpoints in microblogs.” in AAAI, 2016, pp. 2972–2978.
17. E. Tacchini, G. Ballarin, M. L. Della Vedova, S. Moret, and L. de Alfaro, “Some like it hoax: Automated fake news detection in social networks,” arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.07506, 2017.)
18. Alonso, M; Vilares, D; Gómez-Rodríguez, C; Vilares, J, MDPI, Basel, Switzerland; Electronics 2021, 10, 1348. https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics10111348
19. J. W. Pennebaker and L. A. King, “Linguistic styles: Language use as an individual difference.” vol. 77, no. 6, p. 1296, 1999.
20. M. L. Newman, J. W. Pennebaker, D. S. Berry, and J. M. Richards, “Lying words: Predicting deception from linguistic styles,” Personality and social psychology bulletin, vol. 29, no. 5, pp. 665–675, 2003.
21. H. Zhen, et al. ”Deceptive review spam detection via exploiting task relatedness and unlabeled data.” Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, 2016
22. Zhang, J., Cui, L., Fu, Y., Gouza, F.B.: Fake news detection with deep diffusive network model. CoRR, abs/1805.08751 (2018)
23. Conroy, N.J.; Rubin, V.L.; Chen, Y. Automatic deception detection: Methods for finding fake news. In Information Science with Impact: Research in and for the Community—Proceedings of the 78th ASIS&T Annual Meeting, ASIST 2015, St. Louis, MO, USA, 6–10 October 2015; Wiley: Hoboken, NJ, USA, 2015; Volume 52, pp. 1–4. [CrossRef]
24. Hussein, D.M.E.D.M. A survey on sentiment analysis challenges. J. King Saud Univ. Eng. Sci. 2018, 30, 330–338. [CrossRef]
25. 16. Flekova, L.; Preotiuc-Pietro, D.; Ruppert, E. Analysing domain suitability of a sentiment lexicon by identifying distributionally bipolar words. In Proceedings of the 6th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment and Social Media Analysis, WASSA@EMNLP 2015, Lisbon, Portugal,
26. 17 September 2015; Balahur, A., der Goot, E.V., Vossen, P., Montoyo, A., Eds.; The Association for Computer Linguistics: Stroudsburg, PA, USA, 2015; pp. 77–84. [CrossRef] 17. Thorne, J.; Vlachos, A. Automated Fact Checking: Task Formulations, Methods and Future Directions. In Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Computational Linguistics, COLING 2018, Santa Fe, NM, USA, 20–26 August 2018; Bender, E.M., Derczynski, L., Isabelle, P., Eds.; Association for Computational Linguistics: Stroudsburg, PA, USA, 2018; pp. 3346–3359.
27. 18. Elhadad, M.K.; Li, K.F.; Gebali, F. Fake News Detection on Social Media: A Systematic Survey. In Proceedings of the IEEE Pacific Rim Conference on Communications, Computers and Signal Processing, PACRIM 2019, Victoria, BC, Canada, 21–23 August 2019; IEEE: Piscataway, NJ, USA, 2019; pp. 1–8. [CrossRef]
28. da Silva, F.C.D.; Vieira, R.; Garcia, A.C. Can Machines Learn to Detect Fake News? A Survey Focused on Social Media. In Proceedings of the 52nd Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, HICSS 2019, Grand Wailea, Maui, HI, USA, 8–11 January 2019; Bui, T., Ed.; ScholarSpace: Honolulu, HI, USA, 2019; pp. 1–8.
29. Klyuev, V. Fake News Filtering: Semantic Approaches. In Proceedings of the 2018 7th International Conference on Reliability, Infocom Technologies and Optimization (Trends and Future Directions) (ICRITO), Noida, India, 29–31 August 2018; pp. 9–15. [CrossRef]
30. Meel, P.; Vishwakarma, D.K. Fake news, rumor, information pollution in social media and web: A contemporary survey of state-of-the-arts, challenges and opportunities. Expert Syst. Appl. 2020, 153, 112986. [CrossRef]
31. Sitaula, N.; Chilukuri, M.; Jennifer, G.; Zhou, X.; Zafarni, R., “Credibility-Based Fake News Detection”, Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2020 K. Shu et al. (eds.), Disinformation, Misinformation, and Fake News in Social, pp. 163-188.
32. Oshikawa, R.; Qian, J.; Wang, W.Y. A Survey on Natural Language Processing for Fake News Detection. In Proceedings of the 12th Language Resources and Evaluation Conference, LREC 2020, Marseille, France, 11–16 May 2020; Calzolari, N., Béchet, F., Blache, P., Choukri, K., Cieri, C., Declerck, T., Goggi, S., Isahara, H., Maegaard, B., Mariani, J., et al., Eds.; European Language Resources Association: Paris, France, 2020; pp. 6086–6093.
33. Zhang, X.; Ghorbani, A.A. An overview of online fake news: Characterization, detection, and discussion. Inf. Process. Manag. 2020, 57, 102025. [CrossRef]
34. Zhou, X.; Zafarani, R. A Survey of Fake News: Fundamental Theories, Detection Methods, and Opportunities. ACM Comput. Surv. 2020, 53, 109:1–109:40. [CrossRef]
35. de Souza, J.V.; Gomes, J., Jr.; de Souza Filho, F.M.; de Oliveira Julio, A.M.; de Souza, J.F. A systematic mapping on automatic classification of fake news in social media. Soc. Netw. Anal. Min. 2020, 10, 48. [CrossRef]
36. Antonakaki, D.; Fragopoulou, P.; Ioannidis, S. A survey of Twitter research: Data model, graph structure, sentiment analysis and attacks. Expert Syst. Appl. 2021, 164, 114006. [CrossRef]
37. S. Vosoughi, D. Roy, and S. Aral, “The spread of true and false news online,” Science, vol. 359, no. 6380, pp. 1146–1151, 2018.
38. S. Kumar, M. Jiang, T. Jung, R. J. Luo, and J. Leskovec, “Mis2: Misinformation and misbehavior mining on the web,” in Proceedings of the Eleventh ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining. ACM, 2018, pp. 799–800
39. C. Guo, J. Cao, X. Zhang, K. Shu, and M. Yu, “Exploiting emotions for fake news detection on social media,” arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.01728, 2019.
40. Y. Kim, “Convolutional neural networks for sentence classification,” arXiv preprint arXiv:1408.5882, 2014.

41. F. Marra, D. Gragnaniello, D. Cozzolino, and L. Verdoliva, “Detection of gan-generated fake images over social networks,” in 2018 IEEE Conference on Multimedia Information Processing and Retrieval (MIPR). IEEE, 2018, pp. 384–389
42. Mathieu Cliche. The sarcasm detector, 2014
43. Hannah Rashkin, Eunsol Choi, Jin Yea Jang, Svitlana Volkova, and Yejin Choi. Truth of varying shades: Analyzing language in fake news and political fact-checking. In Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, pages 2931–2937, 2017.
44. Sneha Singhania, Nigel Fernandez, and Shrisha Rao. 3han: A deep neural network for fake news detection. In International Conference on Neural Information Processing, pages 572–581. Springer, 2017.
45. Natali Ruchansky, Sungyong Seo, and Yan Liu. Csi: A hybrid deep model for fake news detection. In Proceedings of the 2017 ACM on Conference on Information and Knowledge Management, pages 797–806. ACM, 2017
46. Bondielli, A.; Marcelloni, F. A survey on fake news and rumour detection techniques. Inf. Sci. 2019, 497, 38–55. [CrossRef]
47. Wang, W.Y. “Liar, Liar Pants on Fire”: A New Benchmark Dataset for Fake News Detection. In Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2017, Vancouver, BC, Canada, 30 July–4 August 2017; Volume 2: Short Papers; Barzilay, R., Kan, M., Eds.; Association for Computational Linguistics: Stroudsburg, PA, USA, 2017; pp. 422–426. [CrossRef]
48. Santia, G.C.; Williams, J.R. BuzzFace: A News Veracity Dataset with Facebook User Commentary and Egos. In Proceedings of the Twelfth International Conference on Web and Social Media, ICWSM 2018, Stanford, CA, USA, 25–28 June 2018; AAAI Press: Palo Alto, CA, USA, 2018; pp. 531–540.
49. Wang, W.Y. “Liar, Liar Pants on Fire”: A New Benchmark Dataset for Fake News Detection. In Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2017, Vancouver, BC, Canada, 30 July–4 August 2017; Volume 2: Short Papers; Barzilay, R., Kan, M., Eds.; Association for Computational Linguistics: Stroudsburg, PA, USA, 2017; pp. 422–426. [CrossRef]
50. Potthast, M.; Kiesel, J.; Reinartz, K.; Bevendorff, J.; Stein, B. A Stylometric Inquiry into Hyperpartisan and Fake News. In Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2018, Melbourne, Australia, 15–20 July 2018; Volume 1: Long Papers; Gurevych, I., Miyao, Y., Eds.; Association for Computational Linguistics: Stroudsburg, PA, USA, 2018; pp. 231–240. [CrossRef]
51. Diakopoulos, N.; Naaman, M.; Kivran-Swaine, F. Diamonds in the rough: Social media visual analytics for journalistic inquiry. In Proceedings of the 5th IEEE Conference on Visual Analytics Science and Technology, IEEE VAST 2010, Salt Lake City, UT, USA, 24–29 October 2010; Part of VisWeek 2010; IEEE Computer Society: Washington, DC, USA, 2010; pp. 115–122. [CrossRef]
52. Zhang, X.; Cao, J.; Li, X.; Sheng, Q.; Zhong, L.; Shu, K. Mining Dual Emotion for Fake News Detection. In The Web Conference 2021, Proceedings of The World Wide Web Conference WWW 2021; ACM: New York, NY, USA, 2021. [CrossRef]
53. Dey, A.; Rafi, R.Z.; Hasan Parash, S.; Arko, S.K.; Chakrabarty, A. Fake News Pattern Recognition using Linguistic Analysis. In Proceedings of the 2018 Joint 7th International Conference on Informatics, Electronics Vision (ICIEV) and 2018 2nd International Conference on Imaging, Vision Pattern Recognition (icIVPR), Kitakyushu, Japan, 25–29 June 2018; pp. 305–309. [CrossRef]
54. Bhutani, B.; Rastogi, N.; Sehgal, P.; Purwar, A. Fake News Detection Using Sentiment Analysis. In Proceedings of the 2019 Twelfth International Conference on Contemporary Computing, IC3 2019, Noida, India, 8–10 August 2019; IEEE: Piscataway, NJ, USA, 2019; pp. 1–5. [CrossRef]
55. Cui, L.; Wang, S.; Lee, D. SAME: Sentiment-aware multi-modal embedding for detecting fake news. In Proceedings of the ASONAM ’19: International Conference on Advances in Social Networks Analysis and Mining, Vancouver, BC, Canada, 27–30 August 2019; Spezzano, F., Chen, W., Xiao, X., Eds.; ACM: New York, NY, USA, 2019; pp. 41–48. [CrossRef]
56. Hassan, N.; Arslan, F.; Li, C.; Tremayne, M. Toward Automated Fact-Checking: Detecting Check-worthy Factual Claims by ClaimBuster. In Proceedings of the 23rd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, Halifax, NS, Canada, 13–17 August 2017; ACM: New York, NY, USA, 2017; pp. 1803–1812. [CrossRef]
57. 181. Alonso, M.A.; Gómez-Rodríguez, C.; Vilares, J. On the Use of Parsing for Named Entity Recognition. Appl. Sci. 2021, 11, 1090. [CrossRef]
58. Castillo, C.; Mendoza, M.; Poblete, B. Information credibility on twitter. In Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on World Wide Web, WWW 2011, Hyderabad, India, 28 March–1 April 2011; Srinivasan, S., Ramamritham, K., Kumar, A., Ravindra, M.P., Bertino, E., Kumar, R., Eds.; ACM: New York, NY, USA, 2011; pp. 675–684. [CrossRef]
59. Ross, J.; Thirunarayan, K. Features for Ranking Tweets Based on Credibility and Newsworthiness. In Proceedings of the 2016 International Conference on Collaboration Technologies and Systems, CTS 2016, Orlando, FL, USA, 31 October–4 November 2016; Smari, W.W., Natarian, J., Eds.; IEEE Computer Society: Washington, DC, USA, 2016; pp. 18–25. [CrossRef]
60. Shu, K.; Mahudeswaran, D.; Wang, S.; Lee, D.; Liu, H. FakeNewsNet: A Data Repository with News Content, Social Context, and Spatiotemporal Information for Studying Fake News on Social Media. Big Data 2020, 8, 171–188
61. Vosoughi, S.; Roy, D.; Aral, S. The spread of true and false news online. Science 2018, 359, 1146–1151.
62. Bhutani, B.; Rastogi, N.; Sehgal, P.; Purwar, A., “Fake News Detection Using Sentiment Analysis”, 978-1-7281-3591-5/19/$31.00 , IEEE Conference 2019
63. Horne, B.D.; Adali, S. This Just In: Fake News Packs a Lot in Title, Uses Simpler, Repetitive Content in Text Body, More Similar to Satire than Real News. In Proceedings of the Workshops of the Eleventh International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media (ICWSM 2017), Montreal, QC, Canada, 15–18 May 2017; An, J., Kwak, H., Benevenuto, F., Eds.; AAAI Press: Palo Alto, CA, USA, 2017; Volume AAAI Technical Report WS-17-17: News and Public Opinion, pp. 759–766.
64. Ajao, O.; Bhowmik, D.; Zargari, S. Sentiment Aware Fake News Detection on Online Social Networks. In Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing, ICASSP 2019, Brighton, UK, 12–17 May 2019; IEEE: Piscataway, NJ, USA, 2019; pp. 2507–2511. [CrossRef]
65. Popat, K.; Mukherjee, S.; Strötgen, J.; Weikum, G. Credibility Assessment of Textual Claims on the Web. In Proceedings of the 25th ACM International on Conference on Information

66. Zhang, Jiawei, Limeng Cui, Yanjie Fu, and Fisher B. Gouza. "Fake news detection with deep diffusive network model." arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.08751 (2018).
67. Popat, K. K. (2019). Credibility analysis of textual claims with explainable evidence.
68. Shah, A., Chopade, M., Patel, P., Patel, P. (2022). Survey: Emotion Recognition from Text Using Different Approaches.Futuristic Trends in Networks and Computing Technologies . Lecture Notes in Electrical Engineering, vol 936. Springer, Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-5037-7_31
69. Kanal Bhadresh Soni, Madhuri Chopade, Rahul Vaghela. “Credit Card Fraud Detection Using Machine Learning Approach”. Applied Information Systems and Management (AISM) Volume 4, (2) 2021, hal 71-76 P-ISSN: 2621-2536 ;E-ISSN: 2621-2544; DOI: https://doi.org/10.15408/aism.v4i2.20570
70. Devlin, J., Chang, M.-W., Lee, K., Toutanova, K.: BERT: pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805 (2018)