Tuijin Jishu/Journal of Propulsion Technology
ISSN: 1001-4055
Vol.44 No. 6 (2023)

A Study on Identification of Fake News Using Real-time Analytics

Yashaswini N[1], Srinath G S[1], Nagaraj A[1], Sudharshan S[1], Sayed Faizal[1], Rajkumar N[2*]

[1]*Department of Computer Applications, Krupanidhi Degree College, Bengaluru, Karnataka, India*

[2]*Department of Computer Applications, Krupanidhi College of Management, Bengaluru, Karnataka, India*

Abstract

Consistent with the expansion of the internet entertainment sector, false information is proliferating. It is progressively emerging as one of the most pressing issues of our time. Those who seek to tarnish the reputation of an organization will spread false information about it. The principal aim of this research is to develop a methodology utilizing Machine Learning to contrast the linguistic attributes of authentic and fabricated news. The primary objective of this paper is to develop a machine learning-based system capable of differentiating between accurate and inaccurate news language plans. We present a compilation of Machine Learning models designed to identify deception in this study. These algorithms possess the capability to discern genuine news articles from fabricated ones, despite operating in an environment that is perpetually evolving. Prominent techniques investigated in this study include logistic regression, a TFIDF vectorizer (term frequency-inverse document frequency), and a random forest classifier. As machine learning models apply to a vast array of unstructured data, they are an excellent option for conducting realistic sentiment analysis. Fake news is a difficult issue currently. Detecting fake news is significant on the grounds it assists us in safeguarding ourselves from being misdirected. This paper lets us know how to deduct fake news, where we can assist with making the world more educated and secure spot. Today, fake news is a problematic issue to address. Identifying false news is crucial because it helps us avoid being misinformed. This paper helps us to identify false news so that we can contribute to making the world a more educated and secure place. This paper aimed to enhance a fake news deduction. By utilizing modern technology, the study explored innovative approaches towards deducting fake news.

Keywords: *fake news, logistic regression, random forest classifier, TFIDF, vectorizer.*

Introduction

Contrary to popular belief, fake news has been spreading since before the birth of Christ (BC) [1]. Newspapers, television, and other conventional forms of media are progressively incorporating coverage of this topic. The World Wide Web's prominence expanded in the years following its inception. A recent survey of internet consumers revealed that 92% of respondents obtain most of their news and information from social media websites [2]. Numerous internet fact-checking services, such as FactCheck.org and PoltiFact.com, and more manual identification procedures by professionals are available [3]. The diversity of news topics and trends also constrain these approaches. Misinformation is often disseminated through social media by revising or fabricating entire stories. In an interview with Swartz [4], Tim Berners-Lee, the inventor of the World Wide Web, expressed concern about the growth of false news. 62 percent of American adults say they get their news from social media, up from 49 percent in 2012. False information has adverse effects on both individuals and groups when it expands. In addition, the purpose of fake news is to mislead readers into holding a particular viewpoint. However, the confusion caused by false news will affect how people react to genuine news.

The expression "fake news" refers to disseminating inaccurate information via conventional media. Consider the "Indian 2000 Rupee currency" as an illustration. Bill had brought surveillance equipment that could locate him to a depth of 120 meters [5]. False information may be found on popular social media platforms like Facebook, WhatsApp, Twitter, Instagram, etc. [6]. WhatsApp now has 400 million monthly active users, per TechCrunch [7].

India now has more than 200 million Facebook users. The daily production of data, which is currently 2.5 quintillion bytes [8], will not decrease. As a result, it is not a straightforward task to sift through all of this data and eliminate false information.

Besides health and economic concerns, the COVID-19 contagion generated pervasive misinformation and confusion, particularly on social media platforms like Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube. This indicates that social media has become a breeding ground for disseminating false information. Fraudsters use social networks to spread fraudulent information and persuade users to support their political or social objectives [9].

Consumers believe in user opinions and other user-generated content when making purchase decisions [10]. Customers express their positive or negative opinions regarding the service they experience. Businesses feel both the positive and negative effects of their actions. This naturally permits false ratings and comment propagation, which can mislead customers [11, 12]. Among the most prolific propagators of false information and falsehoods, are social media websites11 such as Google Plus, Facebook, Twitter, etc [13]. Rapid dissemination of false information throughout a population is a significant issue. False information would be disseminated to advance individuals' or institutions' financial or political objectives [14]. Fake news is created using sentiment analysis [15], a subfield of information retrieval and extraction. Due to the efforts of academicians, there is now an abundance of viable solutions in the disciplines of deep learning, neural networks, etc. In 2016, ten percent more Americans than in 2012 used social media to obtain news (62% vs. 49%). Additionally, social media has surpassed television as the most prominent news source [16]. It was estimated that until the conclusion of the presidential election, "Pizzagate"-related fake news would generate over one million tweets. Fake news attempts to obfuscate the truth by parodying real news, covering various topics, and employing various writing styles and distribution methods. False news frequently cites credible sources to support a false claim [17]. Consumers' social interactions with false news generate vast quantities of fragmentary, unstructured, and noisy data [18]. A recent study [19] found that Facebook users were more likely to share widely disseminated false news than widely disseminated mainstream news. Buzzfeed discovered that the most widely shared pieces of fake news generated more Facebook likes, remarks, and shares than the most widely shared pieces of genuine news [20].

Despite significant efforts to solve these problems, such as developing algorithms to block access to harmful content and user education campaigns [21], these problems persist. Platforms that attempt to remove detrimental content are often accused of restricting free speech [22]. Despite efforts to identify false news,

Literature Review

Before the advent of the Internet, yellow journalism was a popular means of disseminating sensational news [23]. Sometimes, comments on false news can enhance its ‘reliability,' leading to the spread of additional false news and doubling the original rate of dissemination [24]. Feldman, et al. [25], the effects of fake news can range from moderate irritation to the manipulation of entire communities or even governments. Various methods are currently available for detecting false news, such as knowledge-based strategies, linguistic approaches, machine learning approaches, hybrid approaches, and topic-agnostic approaches [26]. These characteristics are central to the authors' method for identifying false news [27, 28]. Conventional machine learning models typically employ unsupervised factorization strategies to detect fake news. The authors use optimization methods to describe a novel approach to detecting fraudulent news [29].

Fake news exacerbates anxiety and uncertainty, resulting in a more critical and severe outlook. Even when they know that the "news" is fraudulent, most listeners accept it at face value [30]. There are prospective advantages and disadvantages to obtaining news via social media. In recent years, due to its low barrier to entry and vast reach, social media has become the platform of choice for disseminating false information [31]. There is a developing trend of social media misinformation [32]. PolitiFact [3] and GossipCop [33] are trustworthy sources contributing to the FakeNewsNet database. Using Twitter's Advanced Search API, it is possible to determine the social impact of users' interactions with false and authentic news.

Jindal et al. [34] raised the problem of identifying opinion spam for the first time in 2008. Three categories of evaluations were identified: promotional, false, and brand-specific. The n-gram word frequency detection model devised by Ott et al. is one of the most significant review content-based identification techniques. Mukherjee et al. [35] developed a content-based detection method to identify phony reviews utilizing examples from Ott et al.16's gold-standard dataset. Ott et al. [36] 67.8 percent success rate was impressive by all parties involved. Therefore, n-gram is still helpful in identifying false testimonials. In addition, they demonstrated a method for categorizing review data into two groups. Mukherjee et al. [37] conducted a follow-up study. Several content-based detection strategies, such as the one devised by Shojaee et al. [38], employ stylometry analysis. Lau et al. [39] are examples of content-based detection algorithms that employ semantic similarity metrics.

Ahmed et al. [40] extracted inaccurate data using a 4-g model of word frequency with TF-IDF. Predictions generated by nonlinear machine learning algorithms for genuine and fabricated news were identical. Conroy et al. [41] delineated the two prevailing methodologies utilized for identifying misinformation. Our discourse commenced with an examination of linguistic methodologies, encompassing activities such as dissecting potentially deceptive messages and discerning patterns within them. Hussein [42] concerning the application of natural language processing to sentiment analysis. Although the datasets were restricted, Shaikh and Patil's [43] research did identify features from the TF-IDF of news datasets that could potentially be used to identify fake news sources. Ahmad et al. [44] have examined a variety of linguistic components to determine how to differentiate between false and authentic content. Numerous automated detection methods utilizing deep learning and machine learning were investigated, as demonstrated by the research presented by Nasir et al. [45]. An innovative hybrid deep-learning model for detecting fake news was recently unveiled in research.

Table 1. Approaches used for identification of fake news using real-time analytics

Ref. No.	Approaches used	Dataset collected from	Accuracy (%)	F1 Score (%)
46	Logistic Regression, Random Forest, K-Nearest Neighbor, Linear Support Vector Classifier, Gaussian Naive Bayes	Random Political news (Horne2017 Fake news data1 repository),Buzz Feed	90	
47	Mixed Graphical neural network	LIAR	71.8	
48	LSTM	FNC-1	92.36	
49	DenseNet 201, NasNet mobile, ResNet101V2, ELECTRA (Textual), BERT,	Twitter, Weibo	85.8	
50	Bidirectional LSTM	LIAR	33.8	
51	FDML	LIAR	50.8	
52	CNN-LSTM	FNC-1	97.8	
53	EMAF	Twitter, Weibo	97.4	
54	Graph-aware Co-Attention Networks	Twitter	87.67, 90.84	
55	MVAN	Twitter	92.34, 93.65	
56	FakeBERT	BS detector	98.90	
57	DNN		92.30	
58	optimization algorithms		99.50	
59	ConvNet		93.56	
60	RF	FEVER		42.77

61	NN	FNC-1		59.60
62	RNN and CNN	PHEME dataset of rumors and non-rumors	82	
63	Logistic Regression, Decision Tree Classifier, Random Forest Classifier, TF-IDF-Vectorizer	Set of features extracted from the headlines and contents.	99.45	
64	Perez-LSVM, Random forest algorithm, bagging classifiers, Linear SVM, multilayer perceptron, boosting classifiers, KNN.	bogus sample in the training dataset (OCC) model.	99 99 98 98 98 88	
65	TF-IDF and SVM	phony dataset from the public	95.05	
66	SVM	PolitiFact - GossipCop -	0.580 0.497	0.659 0.595
	LR	PolitiFact - GossipCop -	0.642 0.648	0.633 0.646
	NB	PolitiFact - GossipCop -	0.617 0.624	0.651 0.649
	CNN	PolitiFact - GossipCop -	0.629 0.723	0.583 0.725
	SAF/S	PolitiFact - GossipCop -	0.654 0.689	0.681 0.703
	SAF/A	PolitiFact - GossipCop -	0.667 0.635	0.619 0.706
	SAF	PolitiFact - GossipCop -	0.691 0.689	0.706 0.717

Discussion

The information offered appears to be a compilation of numerous study articles and studies on spotting fake news. It contains details about the authors, their study methods, the datasets they gathered or used, and the accuracy or performance metrics they attained—some significant ideas were drawn from this data as shown in Table 1.

The data shows a variety of strategies scholars have used to combat the problem of identifying fake news [67]. These methods incorporate deep learning methods (such as BERT-based models, LSTM), classic machine learning approaches (such as SVM, Naive Bayes, and Random Forest), and even optimization algorithms. Researchers have employed a range of datasets for their investigations, including well-known ones like LIAR and FNC-1 and datasets gathered from social media sites like Twitter. The variety of datasets reflects the requirement for thoroughly comprehending false information in varied circumstances. Varying between research are the reported accuracy and F1 ratings. While other studies have produced more modest results, some have reached astoundingly high accuracy rates. These variations can be related to the difficulty of the work involved in identifying fake news, the caliber of the datasets, and the potency of the selected algorithms. Numerous studies discuss possible directions for the future or possible areas for improvement. Some suggested directions include expanding parameter sizes, investigating entity-based identification, and improving trustworthiness and expertise graphs.

These potential horizons demonstrate how fake news detection research is a dynamic field. Some research recommends using ensemble models or integrating other machine learning algorithms to increase the accuracy of false news identification. This reflects the constant search for more robust, more trustworthy detection techniques. A few research make mention of restrictions, like feature restrictions or the need to modify their methods to lower false negatives. It is essential to recognize and address these issues if we want to make false news detection systems more effective.

The provided data contains information about the accuracy rates achieved in various studies and research papers related to fake news detection.

According to the provided accuracy rates, the algorithm that produced the highest accuracy is "TF-IDF-Vectorizer, LR, RF Classifier, DT Classifier," with a 99.45% accuracy rate. Among the research presented, this method had the best reported accuracy.

Remembering that the ideal method selection will rely on the particular dataset and the circumstances surrounding the challenge is crucial. Researchers frequently experiment with various algorithms and strategies to determine the best course of action for false news identification in various contexts.

Conclusion

The information provided in this collection of study findings and insights provides insight into the intricate and dynamic field of false news identification. Although fake news has been around for centuries, its influence and reach have substantially increased with the internet and social media development. It is becoming a crucial societal issue since it is prevalent in traditional media, online platforms, and social networks. To address the problem of detecting false news, researchers have used a wide range of methods and algorithms. Each method, which varies from conventional machine learning models to deep learning techniques, has pros and weaknesses. The reported accuracy rates differ amongst studies, highlighting the difficulty of the task and the significance of suitable datasets and efficient algorithms. Fake news has the potential to sway public opinion, cause confusion, and even impact political and social agendas as the world struggles with the spread of it, especially on social media platforms. A serious threat is posed by quickly disseminating misleading information on social media, led by bad actors looking to obtain power or money. Despite significant advancements in fake news detection, difficulties still exist. Expanding datasets, enhancing algorithm performance, and tackling the variety and evolution of fake news should be the main areas of future research. Cooperation between scholars, social media platforms, and politicians is essential to address this issue adequately.

The fight against false news is still ongoing, and to win it, we need a multifaceted strategy incorporating user education, technology developments, and regulatory measures. Our methods for recognizing fake news and lessening its adverse effects on society must develop along with technology. Therefore, we have studied that there are various machine learning techniques and deep learning techniques to detect fake news in the format of text. In the case of other media like audio and videos, further research must be done.

References

[1] Mason, L.E., Krutka, D., Stoddard, J., 2018. Media literacy, democracy, and the challenge of fake news. J. Media Literacy Educ. 10, 1–10.

[2] Shu, K., Wang, S., Tang, J., Zafarani, R., Liu, H., 2017b. User identity linkage across online social networks: A review. Acm Sigkdd Explorations Newsletter 18, 5–17.

[3] Zhang, Xichen, G., Ali, A., 2020. An overview of online fake news: Characterization, detection, and discussion. Information. Process. Manage. 57, 102025

[4] Swartz, J. (2017). The world wide web's inventor warns it's in peril on 28th anniversary. *USA Today* . www.usatoday.com/story/tech/news/2017/03/11/

[5] Chiluwa I. E., Samoilenko S. A, *Handbook of Research on Deception, Fake News and Misinformation Online*, IGI Global, Information Science Reference [eBook], Hershey PA, USA, June, 2019.

[6] Tandoc Jr. E. C., Zheng Wei Lim, Ling R., "DEFINING "FAKE NEWS" A typology of scholarly definitions", *Digital Journalism*, Vol. 2, Issue 2, pp. 137-153, 2017.

[7] Tech2 News Staff, *Whatsapp Hits 400 Active Million Monthly Active Users in India out of 1.5 Billion Users*, JUL 26, 2019, Tech2, Retrieved (August 17, 2019) from: https://www.firstpost.com/tech/news-analysis/whatsapp-hits-400-million-monthly-active-users-in-india-out-of-1-5-billion-users-7063351.html.

[8] Marr B., *How Much Data Do We Create Every Day? The Mind-Blowing Stats Everyone Should Read*, May 21, 2018, Forbes, Retrieved (August 17, 2019) from: https://www.forbes.com/sites/bernardmarr/2018/05/21/how-muchdata-do-we-create-every-day-the-mind-blowing-stats-everyoneshould-read/#141aca0660ba.

[9] Vogel, I. and Meghana, M., 2020, October. Detecting fake news spreaders on twitter from a multilingual perspective. In *2020 IEEE 7th International Conference on Data Science and Advanced Analytics (DSAA)* (pp. 599-606). IEEE.

[10] Anderson M, Anderson M. 88% of consumers trust online reviews as much as personal recommendations. *Search Engine Land* 2017. http://searchengineland.com/88-consumers-trust-online-reviews-much-personal-recommendations-195803. Accessed June 15, 2016.

[11] BBC News. Samsung probed in Taiwan over 'fake web reviews'. *BBC News* 2017. http://www.bbc.com/news/technology-22166606. Accessed June 15, 2016.

[12] Helft M. Reverb P.R. firm settles case on fake reviews. *Nytimes.com*. 2017. http://www.nytimes.com/2010/08/27/technology/27ftc.html. Accessed June 15, 2016.

[13] Jindal N, Liu B. *Opinion spam and analysis*. *Proceedings of the 2008 International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*. New York, NY: ACM; 2008:219-230. https://doi.org/10.1145/1341531.1341560.

[14] Alonso, M.; Vilares, D.; Gómez-Rodríguez, C.; Vilares, J. Sentiment Analysis for Fake News Detection. Electronics **2021**, 10, 1348.

[15] Rehma, A.A.; Awan, M.J.; Butt, I. Comparison and Evaluation of Information Retrieval Models. VFAST Trans. Softw. Eng. **2018**, 13, 7–14.

[16] Hunt Allcott and Matthew Gentzkow. Social media and fake news in the 2016 election. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2017.

[17] Song Feng, Ritwik Banerjee, and Yejin Choi. Syntactic stylometry for deception detection. In ACL'12.

[18] Jiliang Tang, Yi Chang, and Huan Liu. Mining social media with social theories: a survey. ACM SIGKDD Explorations Newsletter, 15(2):20{29, 2014.

[19] Allcott, Hunt, and Matthew Gentzkow. 2017. "Social Media and Fake News in the 2016 Election." The Journal of Economic Perspectives 31 (2): 211–235.

[20] Silverman, Craig, Lauren Strapagiel, Hamza Shaban, Ellie Hall, and Jeremy Singer-Vine. 2016.

[21] Oakes, O. (2020). Facebook launches campaign to help people spot fake news. Campaign.

[22] Westfall, C. (2020). The free speech face-off between Facebook and Twitter: Are warnings justified? Retrieved from https://www.forbes.com/sites/chriswestfall/2020/05/30/free-speech-facebook-twitter-georgefloyd-demonstrations-censorship/#1620affe6e90.

[23] Stein-Smith, K. (2017). Librarians, information literacy, and fake news. *Strategic Library, 37* .

[24] Albright, J. (2017). Welcome to the era of fake news. *Media and Communication, 5* (2), 87–89 .

[25] Feldman, P. , Papanastasiou, Y. , & Segev, E. (2019). Social learning and the design of new experience goods. *Management Science, 65* (4), 1502–1519 .

[26] De Beer, D. , & Matthee, M. (2020). Approaches to identify fake news: A systematic literature review. In *Proceedings of the international conference on integrated science* (pp. 13–22). Springer .

[27] Singh, V. K. , Ghosh, I. , & Sonagara, D. (2021). Detecting fake news stories via multimodal analysis. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 72* (1), 3–17 .

[28] Kaliyar, R. K. , Goswami, A. , & Narang, P. (2021b). Echofaked: Improving fake news de- tection in social media with an efficient deep neural network. *Neural Computing and Applications* , 1–17 .

[29] Ozbay, F. A. , & Alatas, B. (2021). Adaptive salp swarm optimization algorithms with in- ertia weights for novel fake news detection model in online social media. *Multimedia Tools and Applications* , 1–25 .

[30] Fiske, W., Ramos, J. T., Specht, P., Nichols, C., & Kertscher, T. (2019). Fact-checking US politics. *PolitiFact*. Available at: https://www.politifact.com/ [Accessed: 10/07/2023].

[31] Gottfried, J. and Shearer, E., 2016. News use across social media platforms 2016.

[32] Ponniah, K. (2019). WhatsApp: The'black hole'of fake news in India's election. *BBC News*, *6*.

[33] Nyow, N. X., & Chua, H. N. (2019, November). Detecting fake news with tweets' properties. In *2019 IEEE conference on application, information and network security (AINS)* (pp. 24-29). IEEE.

[34] Jindal, N., & Liu, B. (2008, February). Opinion spam and analysis. In *Proceedings of the 2008 international conference on web search and data mining* (pp. 219-230).

[35] Mukherjee, A., Venkataraman, V., Liu, B., & Glance, N. (2013). Fake review detection: Classification and analysis of real and pseudo reviews. *UIC-CS-03-2013. Technical Report*.

[36] Ott, M., Choi, Y., Cardie, C., & Hancock, J. T. (2011). Finding deceptive opinion spam by any stretch of the imagination. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1107.4557*.

[37] Mukherjee, A., Venkataraman, V., Liu, B., & Glance, N. (2013). What yelp fake review filter might be doing?. In *Proceedings of the international AAAI conference on web and social media* (Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 409-418).

[38] Shojaee, S., Murad, M. A. A., Azman, A. B., Sharef, N. M., & Nadali, S. (2013, December). Detecting deceptive reviews using lexical and syntactic features. In *2013 13th International Conference on Intellient Systems Design and Applications* (pp. 53-58). IEEE.

[39] Lau, R. Y., Liao, S. Y., Kwok, R. C. W., Xu, K., Xia, Y., & Li, Y. (2012). Text mining and probabilistic language modeling for online review spam detection. *ACM Transactions on Management Information Systems (TMIS)*, *2*(4), 1-30.

[40] Ahmed, H., Traore, I., & Saad, S. (2018). Detecting opinion spams and fake news using text classification. *Security and Privacy*, *1*(1), e9.

[41] Conroy, N. K., Rubin, V. L., & Chen, Y. (2015). Automatic deception detection: Methods for finding fake news. *Proceedings of the association for information science and technology*, *52*(1), 1-4.

[42] Hussein, D. M. E. D. M. (2018). A survey on sentiment analysis challenges. *Journal of King Saud University-Engineering Sciences*, *30*(4), 330-338.

[43] Shaikh, J., & Patil, R. (2020, December). Fake news detection using machine learning. In *2020 IEEE International Symposium on Sustainable Energy, Signal Processing and Cyber Security (iSSSC)* (pp. 1-5). IEEE.

[44] Ahmad, I., Yousaf, M., Yousaf, S., & Ahmad, M. O. (2020). Fake news detection using machine learning ensemble methods. *Complexity*, *2020*, 1-11.

[45] Nasir, J. A., Khan, O. S., & Varlamis, I. (2021). Fake news detection: A hybrid CNN-RNN based deep learning approach. *International Journal of Information Management Data Insights*, *1*(1), 100007.

[46] Garg, S., & Sharma, D. K. (2022). Linguistic features based framework for automatic fake news detection. *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, *172*, 108432.

[47] Guo, Z., Yu, K., Jolfaei, A., Li, G., Ding, F., & Beheshti, A. (2022). Mixed graph neural network-based fake news detection for sustainable vehicular social networks. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*.

[48] Kumar, S., & Singh, T. D. (2022). Fake news detection on Hindi news dataset. *Global Transitions Proceedings*, *3*(1), 289-297.

[49] Singh, P., Srivastava, R., Rana, K. P. S., & Kumar, V. (2023). SEMI-FND: stacked ensemble based multimodal inferencing framework for faster fake news detection. *Expert systems with applications*, *215*, 119302.

[50] Trueman, T. E., Kumar, A., Narayanasamy, P., & Vidya, J. (2021). Attention-based C-BiLSTM for fake news detection. *Applied Soft Computing*, *110*, 107600.

[51] Liao, Q., Chai, H., Han, H., Zhang, X., Wang, X., Xia, W., & Ding, Y. (2021). An integrated multi-task model for fake news detection. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, *34*(11), 5154-5165.

[52] Umer, M., Imtiaz, Z., Ullah, S., Mehmood, A., Choi, G. S., & On, B. W. (2020). Fake news stance detection using deep learning architecture (CNN-LSTM). *IEEE Access*, *8*, 156695-156706.

[53] Li, P., Sun, X., Yu, H., Tian, Y., Yao, F., & Xu, G. (2021). Entity-oriented multi-modal alignment and fusion network for fake news detection. *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, *24*, 3455-3468.

[54] Lu, Y. J., & Li, C. T. (2020). GCAN: Graph-aware co-attention networks for explainable fake news detection on social media. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.11648*.

[55] Ni, S., Li, J., & Kao, H. Y. (2021). MVAN: Multi-view attention networks for fake news detection on social media. *IEEE Access*, *9*, 106907-106917.

[56] Kaliyar, R. K., Goswami, A., & Narang, P. (2021). FakeBERT: Fake news detection in social media with a BERT-based deep learning approach. *Multimedia tools and applications*, *80*(8), 11765-11788.

[57] Kaliyar, R. K., Goswami, A., & Narang, P. (2021). EchoFakeD: improving fake news detection in social media with an efficient deep neural network. *Neural computing and applications*, *33*, 8597-8613.

[58] Ozbay, F. A., & Alatas, B. (2021). Adaptive Salp swarm optimization algorithms with inertia weights for novel fake news detection model in online social media. *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, *80*(26-27), 34333-34357.

[59] Raj, C., & Meel, P. (2021). ConvNet frameworks for multi-modal fake news detection. *Applied Intelligence*, 1-17.

[60] Reddy, A. J., Rocha, G., & Esteves, D. (2018). Defactonlp: Fact verification using entity recognition, TFIDF vector comparison and decomposable attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.00509*.

[61] Ghanem, B., Rosso, P., & Rangel, F. (2018, November). Stance detection in fake news a combined feature representation. In *Proceedings of the first workshop on fact extraction and VERification (FEVER)* (pp. 66-71).

[62] Ajao, O., Bhowmik, D., & Zargari, S. (2018, July). Fake news identification on twitter with hybrid cnn and rnn models. In *Proceedings of the 9th international conference on social media and society* (pp. 226-230).

[63] Alonso, M. A., Vilares, D., Gómez-Rodríguez, C., & Vilares, J. (2021). Sentiment analysis for fake news detection. *Electronics*, *10*(11), 1348.

[64] Alam, T. M., & Awan, M. J. (2018). Domain analysis of information extraction techniques. *Int. J. Multidiscip. Sci. Eng*, *9*(6).

[65] Pulido, C. M., Ruiz-Eugenio, L., Redondo-Sama, G., & Villarejo-Carballido, B. (2020). A new application of social impact in social media for overcoming fake news in health. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *17*(7), 2430.

[66] Shu, K., Mahudeswaran, D., Wang, S., Lee, D., & Liu, H. (2020). Fakenewsnet: A data repository with news content, social context, and spatiotemporal information for studying fake news on social media. *Big data*, *8*(3), 171-188.

[67] Ramalakshmi, V., Swathi, B.V., & Renu Priya, V. (2019). Behavioural biases of investors and its impact, *Journal of Advanced Research in Dynamical & Control Systems*, 271