IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

METHODS OF AI-BASED FAKE NEWS DETECTION: A REVIEW

[1]Rounak Ghosh, [2]Aadish Tamaskar, [3]Tanuja Kashyap

[1,2]Student , [3]Associate Professor

[1,2,3]Electronics and Telecommunication,

[1,2,3]Bhilai Institute of Technology, Durg, India

Abstract: In this age of ever-growing digital connection, fake news is prevalent and easier to spread more than ever. In the past, there have been some massive real-life implications of fake news, for example, the 2016 US elections. So in a day where almost everything we consume is digital and when fake news is very easy to spread, a way to separate real and fake news is very desirable. As such, this paper delves into the realm of Artificial Intelligence (AI) to look for a solution for this issue. This paper will focus on comparing and evaluating 4 different models of AI: Logistic Regression, Decision Tree, Gradient Booster and Random Forest classifiers. These 4 are the most common methods of AI-based fake news detection. Aside from comparing and evaluating these 4 algorithms against each other, the paper also aims to explain why traditional means of fact-checking often fail in this digital age and hence, why AI would be a more suitable option going forward.

I. Introduction

In the contemporary information landscape, characterized by incessant digital connectivity and an overwhelming influx of data, the proliferation of fake news and disinformation stands as a pressing challenge to the integrity of information ecosystems. The term "fake news" has evolved beyond mere misinformation, encapsulating intentionally fabricated or misleading content that masquerades as authentic news, with the potential to distort facts, manipulate public opinion, and erode the foundations of democratic societies[1]. This phenomenon has gained heightened significance, particularly in the wake of pivotal events such as the 2016 United States presidential election, where the rapid dissemination of deceptive narratives through social media platforms underscored the far-reaching impact of false information on public discourse and decision-making[2].

Beyond the political realm, the pervasive influence of fake news extends across diverse domains, including health, science, and finance, perpetuating misleading narratives that can significantly impact individuals and societies[3]. The inherent challenges in combating fake news lie in its dynamic and adaptive nature. Traditional fact-checking methodologies, despite their importance, struggle to keep pace with the sheer volume and velocity of information disseminated online, necessitating the exploration of innovative and efficient solutions[4].

Amid this landscape, artificial intelligence (AI) has emerged as a formidable ally in the quest for effective fake news detection. Leveraging machine learning algorithms, AI offers the promise of automated and adaptive solutions capable of discerning patterns indicative of deceptive content. This paper aims to contribute to the evolving discourse on fake news detection by undertaking a comparative analysis of four prominent AI-based methods—logistic regression, decision tree, gradient booster, and random forest.

1.1 The Pervasiveness of Fake News

The notoriety of fake news became particularly evident during the 2016 U.S. presidential election, where misinformation proliferated on social media platforms, influencing public perceptions and potentially impacting voting behaviours[2]. However, it is crucial to recognize that the issue of fake news transcends political contexts, permeating various sectors and domains, each with its unique set of challenges and consequences[3].

1.2 Challenges in Fake News Detection

Detecting fake news is a complex task due to the dynamic and evolving nature of deceptive content. Conventional fact-checking methodologies, while essential, struggle to keep up with the rapid dissemination of information online[4]. In response, there is a growing reliance on AI algorithms capable of automating the identification of deceptive patterns, harnessing the strengths inherent in machine learning models.[16]

1.3 The Focus of This Paper

This paper centers on the comparative evaluation of four distinguished AI-based methods—logistic regression, decision tree, gradient booster, and random forest—in the context of fake news detection. Through an in-depth exploration of the strengths and weaknesses of each approach, we aim to provide valuable insights into their performance metrics, computational efficiency, and adaptability to the ever-evolving tactics employed by purveyors of deceptive narratives.

In the ensuing sections, we will delve into the theoretical underpinnings of each method, articulate our methodology for evaluation, discuss the datasets employed, and ultimately present a comprehensive comparative analysis. By doing so, we aspire to contribute nuanced perspectives that can inform the ongoing development of sophisticated and accurate AI solutions, fortifying the collective effort against the insidious influence of fake news.

II. Literature Review

2.1 Overview

For the literature review of this project, we went over multiple publications that have been released over the years focusing on fake news detection through AI. As mentioned earlier, our research here is focused on 4 major algorithms: Logistic Regression, Decision Tree, Gradient Booster and Random Forest. The reason for selecting these 4 in particular is that they are the most commonly used algorithms for AI-based fake news detection. Additionally, in our research we also went over the nature of disinformation or fake news shedding light on why it can be difficult to judge especially in this digital age.

2.2 Fake News Detection Algorithms:

The literature reveals a wealth of research on various AI-based algorithms employed for fake news detection. Logistic regression, known for its simplicity and interpretability, has been explored as a viable method for binary classification tasks related to fake news[5]. Decision trees, characterized by their ability to create intricate decision boundaries, offer insights into feature importance within the context of fake news detection[6][7]. Gradient boosting techniques, emphasizing the sequential construction of weak learners, have demonstrated prowess in mitigating bias and variance, thereby enhancing predictive accuracy[8]. Random forest algorithms, leveraging ensemble learning, excel in handling high-dimensional data and exhibit resilience to noise[6].

2.3 Challenges in Fake News Detection:

The literature emphasizes the nuanced nature of disinformation, which spans intentional misinformation, misleading narratives, and the manipulation of emotional triggers[9]. This multifaceted aspect of disinformation poses a significant challenge to the development of effective detection strategies.

The dynamic nature of digital platforms presents unique challenges for fake news detection algorithms. The rapid dissemination of disinformation, coupled with the sheer volume of information on these platforms, hinders traditional fact-checking methods[10]. Algorithmic models must contend with the contextual intricacies of language, user behavior, and the adaptive nature of deceptive tactics, making accurate and timely detection a complex undertaking[3].

2.4 Algorithm:

2.4.1 Logistic Regression:

Logistic Regression is a statistical model widely utilized for binary classification tasks, making it a valuable tool in the realm of fake news detection. It operates by predicting the probability of an event occurring, with the outcome typically coded as 0 or 1, representing two possible categories.

Logistic Regression employs the logistic function, also known as the sigmoid function, to transform a linear combination of input features into probabilities. The logistic function is represented as:

$$P(Y = 1) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-(\beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 \ldots\ldots + \beta_n X_n)}}$$

Here Y represents the binary outcome, X are the input features and β are the model parameters.

The logistic regression model is trained by optimizing the parameters to maximize the likelihood of the observed outcomes. This is typically done using the Maximum Likelihood Estimation (MLE) method, aiming to find the set of parameters that maximizes the probability of observing the given data.[5].

Advantages of Logistic Regression:

- Interpretability: Logistic Regression provides interpretable results, as the coefficients associated with each input variable signify the impact of that variable on the log-odds of the predicted outcome. This makes it easier to comprehend the influence of individual features on the classification.
- Efficiency: Logistic Regression is computationally efficient and performs well with a large number of features, making it suitable for situations where computational resources are limited.
- Less Susceptible to Overfitting: Compared to more complex models, logistic regression is less prone to overfitting, especially in situations where the number of training samples is relatively small.[5][14]

Disadvantages of Logistic Regression:

- Linearity Assumption: Logistic Regression assumes a linear relationship between the independent variables and the log-odds of the dependent variable. This limitation may affect its performance when dealing with complex, non-linear relationships in the data.
- Limited Expressiveness: Logistic Regression may struggle with capturing intricate patterns in data, especially when the decision boundary is highly non-linear.
- Assumption of Independence: The model assumes that the observations are independent of each other. Violation of this assumption, as in the case of time-series or spatial data, can lead to inaccurate results.[5][14]

2.4.2 Decision Tree Classifier

The Decision Tree Classifier is a versatile and intuitive algorithm used for both classification and regression tasks. In the context of fake news detection, decision trees are adept at capturing complex decision boundaries, making them valuable tools for discerning patterns in data.

A Decision Tree is constructed through a recursive partitioning process. At each node of the tree, a feature is chosen to split the data based on a criterion such as Gini impurity or information gain. This process continues until a stopping criterion, often a predefined depth or a minimum number of samples per leaf, is met.

To make predictions, a new data point traverses the tree, following the path dictated by the feature values until it reaches a leaf node. The majority class in that leaf node becomes the predicted class for the input.[17]

Advantages of Decision Tree Classifier:

- Interpretability: Decision Trees offer a transparent representation of decision-making processes, making them easily interpretable. The branches of the tree represent a series of if-else conditions based on input features.
- Non-Linearity: Unlike logistic regression, decision trees can model complex, non-linear relationships in the data, making them suitable for scenarios where the decision boundaries are intricate.
- Feature Importance: Decision Trees provide a natural measure of feature importance. Features appearing closer to the root of the tree contribute more significantly to the overall decision-making process.[11]

Disadvantages of Decision Tree Classifier:

- Overfitting: Decision Trees have a propensity to overfit the training data, especially when the tree is deep and captures noise in the dataset. This can result in poor generalization to new, unseen data.
- Instability: Small variations in the data can lead to different tree structures, resulting in a lack of stability. Ensemble methods like Random Forests are often used to mitigate this instability.
- Biased to Dominant Classes: Decision Trees tend to be biased towards classes with a higher number of instances. This bias can impact their performance on imbalanced datasets.[11]

2.4.3 Gradient Boosting Classifier

The Gradient Boosting Classifier is an ensemble learning method that combines the predictive power of multiple weak learners, typically decision trees, to create a robust and accurate model. In the realm of fake news detection, Gradient Boosting has demonstrated efficacy in handling complex relationships and improving predictive performance.

Gradient Boosting builds an ensemble of weak learners sequentially, with each subsequent learner focusing on correcting the errors of the combined ensemble so far. It combines the predictions of multiple weak learners through a weighted sum, where each learner is assigned a weight based on its performance.

The boosting process involves iteratively fitting new weak learners to the residuals of the combined ensemble. The final prediction is the cumulative sum of the weighted predictions from all learners.[12]

Advantages of Gradient Boosting Classifier:

- High Predictive Accuracy: Gradient Boosting often achieves high predictive accuracy, making it a powerful algorithm for tasks with complex relationships and non-linear patterns.
- Handles Missing Data: Gradient Boosting can effectively handle missing data, providing robustness in scenarios where some features may be incomplete.
- Feature Importance: Similar to decision trees, Gradient Boosting naturally provides a measure of feature importance, aiding in the interpretation of the model.[8]

Disadvantages of Gradient Boosting Classifier:

- Computational Complexity: The sequential nature of training weak learners makes Gradient Boosting computationally expensive compared to other algorithms, particularly when the dataset is large.
- Prone to Overfitting: Gradient Boosting is susceptible to overfitting, especially when the model is overly complex or when weak learners are allowed to be too specialized.
- Sensitivity to Hyperparameters: The performance of Gradient Boosting is sensitive to hyperparameters, and tuning them effectively can be a time-consuming process.[8]

2.4.4 Random Forest

The Random Forest Classifier is an ensemble learning algorithm that builds a multitude of decision trees during training and merges their predictions to enhance overall accuracy and robustness. In the context of fake news detection, Random Forests offer versatility in handling diverse datasets and mitigating overfitting.
Random Forests construct an ensemble of decision trees, each trained on a randomly sampled subset of the training data and features. The predictions from individual trees are then combined through a voting mechanism for classification tasks.
Random Forests employ a technique known as bagging, where each tree is trained on a different bootstrap sample of the data. This ensures diversity among the trees, reducing the risk of overfitting to specific patterns present in the training data.[13][6]

Advantages of Random Forest Classifier:

- Robust to Overfitting: Random Forests mitigate overfitting by aggregating predictions from multiple trees, resulting in a more generalized model.
- High Predictive Accuracy: The ensemble nature of Random Forests often leads to high predictive accuracy, making them suitable for complex classification tasks.
- Feature Importance: Random Forests naturally provide a measure of feature importance, aiding in the identification of influential variables.[6]

Disadvantages of Random Forest Classifier:

- Complexity: The interpretability of Random Forests can be limited due to the complexity introduced by the ensemble of trees. Understanding the decision-making process might be challenging.
- Computational Intensity: Training multiple decision trees can be computationally intensive, especially with large datasets. However, this can be alleviated through parallel processing.
- Potential Bias: Random Forests may exhibit bias towards the majority class in imbalanced datasets. Techniques like balancing class weights can be applied to address this issue.[6]

Table 2.1: Comparison of various AI algorithms

Aspect	Logistic Regression	Decision Tree	Gradient Boosting	Random Forest
Model Type	Linear model	Non-linear model	Ensemble model	Ensemble model
Interpretability	High	Moderate	Low to Moderate	Moderate
Handling Non-Linearity	Limited	High	High	High
Computational Complexity	Low	Moderate	High	Moderate to High
Feature Importance	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Dealing with Missing Data	Not well-suited	Not well-suited	Not well-suited	Not well-suited
Resilience to Overfitting	Moderate	Prone	Can be Prone	Robust
Handling Imbalanced Datasets	Requires techniques	Requires techniques	Requires techniques	Can handle naturally
Suitability for Ensemble Learning	Not designed for ensemble	Single tree	Designed for ensemble	Designed for ensemble

III. CONCLUSION

In the face of escalating fake news and disinformation, this paper has navigated the landscape of AI-based detection, focusing on logistic regression, decision trees, gradient boosting, and random forests. Recognizing the harm and complexity of deceptive narratives, AI emerges as a vital tool. The algorithms discussed each bring unique strengths: logistic regression's interpretability, decision trees' non-linear capture, gradient boosting's predictive accuracy, and random forests' robustness. However, no single solution fits all, and the choice depends on dataset characteristics and application needs. As technology evolves, continuous refinement of AI methods is essential. Future research may explore hybrid models or novel advancements. Collaboration, ethical considerations, and interdisciplinary efforts will be pivotal in fortifying our information ecosystem. In essence, this exploration and evaluation contribute to the discourse, providing insights for the development of more effective fake news detection mechanisms and fostering a more trustworthy information landscape.

REFERENCES

[1] Allcott, H., & Gentzkow, M. (2017). Social media and fake news in the 2016 election. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 31(2), 211-236.

[2] Grinberg, N., Joseph, K., Friedland, L., Swire-Thompson, B., & Lazer, D. (2019). Fake news on Twitter during the 2016 U.S. presidential election. Science, 363(6425), 374-378.

[3] Vosoughi, S., Roy, D., & Aral, S. (2018). The spread of true and false news online. Science, 359(6380), 1146-1151.

[4] Zubiaga, A., Kochkina, E., Liakata, M., Procter, R., & Lukasik, M. (2018). Discourse-aware rumour stance classification in social media using sequential classifiers. Information Processing & Management, 54(2), 273-290.

[5] Hosmer Jr, D. W., Lemeshow, S., & Sturdivant, R. X. (2013). Applied Logistic Regression. John Wiley & Sons.

[6] Breiman, L. (2001). Random Forests. Machine learning, 45(1), 5-32.

[7] Loh, W. Y. (2011). Classification and regression trees. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery, 1(1), 14-23.

[8] Friedman, J. H. (2001). Greedy function approximation: A gradient boosting machine. Annals of Statistics, 1189-1232.

[9] Wardle, C., & Derakhshan, H. (2017). Information Disorder: Toward an interdisciplinary framework for research and policymaking. Council of Europe report.

[10] Guess, A., Nagler, J., & Tucker, J. (2019). Less than you think: Prevalence and predictors of fake news dissemination on Facebook. Science Advances, 5(1), eaau4586.

[11] Breiman, L., Friedman, J. H., Olshen, R. A., & Stone, C. J. (1984). Classification and regression trees. CRC press.

[12] Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R., & Friedman, J. (2009). The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference, and Prediction (2nd ed.). Springer.

[13] Ishwaran, H., & Kogalur, U. B. (2015). Random forests for survival, regression and classification (RF-SRC). R package version 2.5.1.

[14] Shah, K., Patel, H., Sanghvi, D., & Shah, M. (2020). A comparative analysis of logistic regression, random forest and KNN models for the text classification. Augmented Human Research, 5(1), 12.

[15] Ozbay, F. A., & Alatas, B. (2020). Fake news detection within online social media using supervised artificial intelligence algorithms. Physica A: statistical mechanics and its applications, 540, 123174.

[16] Iqbal, A., Shahzad, K., Khan, S. A., & Chaudhry, M. S. (2023). The relationship of artificial intelligence (AI) with fake news detection (FND): a systematic literature review. Global Knowledge, Memory and Communication.

[17] Priyanka, & Kumar, D. (2020). Decision tree classifier: a detailed survey. International Journal of Information and Decision Sciences, 12(3), 246-269.