



7ANALYTICA

METHODOLOGY WHITEPAPER · VERSION 1.0

How 7Analytica builds a score

Methodology whitepaper: what is measured, how each score is made, what it means and where it fails.

EXAMPLES USE SAMPLE DATA.

DOCUMENT

Whitepaper

Version 1.0

EDITION

1 October 2026

14:52 UTC

SECTIONS

14

numbered

THEME

Dark

A4, print or screen

7ANALYTICA.COM/METHODOLOGY/WHITEPAPER



What is in this paper.

Fourteen numbered sections. The readings come first, then how each is built, then a worked example, then the limits and how to challenge a score.

§ 01	Scope and status	3
	What this paper covers, and what 7Analytica is today.	
§ 02	What is measured	3
	Seven readings, each answering one question. None of them answers whether a claim is true.	
§ 03	Source reliability	4
	Four inputs describe a source. Three are properties of the outlet, and one depends on the claim.	
§ 04	Corroboration and origins	5
	Forty outlets repeating one briefing are one origin, not forty.	
§ 05	The trust score	6
	The average of four inputs with equal weight, rounded.	
§ 06	The bias score and alert tiers	6
	Four axes of wording, averaged, then compared with fixed cut-offs.	
§ 07	The six-axis audit	7
	Six questions asked of one record. Each gets its own confidence, and none is averaged into the others.	
§ 08	Zones, heat and anomalies	8
	Eight media zones, a heat reading for each, and a rule for when a reading becomes a flag.	
§ 09	A worked example	8
	Two profiles, every line of arithmetic, real numbers from the calculator.	
§ 10	What a score means, and what it does not	10
	A score says how much weight the record supports. It does not say what to conclude.	
§ 11	Limits and failure modes	10
	Where the method is weak, and what the record does when it is.	
§ 12	Provenance, custody and the seal	11
	How a record keeps its history and what a seal does and does not fix.	
§ 13	How to challenge a score	12
	Every score prints its inputs so that you can disagree with them in specific terms.	
§ 14	Version, date and changes	13
	This paper is dated and versioned so that a citation can name the edition.	

Read it in order for the argument, or jump to section 9 for the worked example and section 11 for the limits. Every figure in the worked example is produced by the same arithmetic as the calculator on the methodology page.



Scope and status

What this paper covers, and what 7Analytica is today.

This paper explains how 7Analytica turns news reports into readings that a person can check. It covers what is measured, how each score is built, what the scores mean, where they fail, and how to challenge one. It is written for analysts, editors, risk and compliance staff, researchers and anyone deciding whether to rely on a reading.

The status matters, so it comes first. 7Analytica today covers one sector, geopolitics and borders, and reads live data from real sources. The worked examples in this paper use invented sample inputs. The outlet profiles in them come from a sample source list. The corroboration and wording inputs in the worked example are set by hand to show the method. No score in this paper describes the real quality of a real outlet.

The live data service is in place. No outside party has validated the weights, and no error margin has been measured. Those are limits of the method as it stands, and section 11 lists them with the others.

Where this paper and a help article on the site differ, the difference is named in the section concerned. The calculator on the methodology page runs the same arithmetic as the worked example here, so you can reproduce every number.

What is measured

Seven readings, each answering one question. None of them answers whether a claim is true.

THE READINGS AND WHAT EACH ONE DESCRIBES

READING	RANGE	WHAT IT DESCRIBES
Trust score	0 to 100	How well the evidence stands behind a source's telling. Built from the source's record, its ownership and how far independent origins agree.
Bias score	0 to 100	How far the wording of a report leans in one direction. Built from four axes of wording.
Alert tier	0 to 3	How much attention a story demands. Set from the bias reading by stated cut-offs.
Six-axis confidence	0 to 100 per axis	How well each of who, what, when, where, why and how is supported, with a mark where sources disagree.
Provenance role	Primary, origin, repeat	Whether a report is the document itself, a report with its own sourcing, or a relay.
Zone heat	0 to 100	How much, and how unusually, one of eight media zones is being reported on.



READING	RANGE	WHAT IT DESCRIBES
Impact reading	0 to 100 per pillar	Where a claim would reach across nine pillars if it held. Not a forecast.

The objects the readings attach to

- A report is one published item from one outlet, captured with the time it was seen.
- A claim is one statement of fact extracted from reports. Many reports can carry the same claim.
- A source is an outlet or a document. It has a longevity, an ownership and a track record.
- A record is one story with its claims, sources, scores and audit. It has a permanent reference number.
- A dossier is a record exported in a fixed form, which can be sealed.

Two of these readings are about the teller and the telling. Trust is about who is saying it. Bias is about how it is said. Keeping them apart is deliberate: a careful outlet can word a story loudly, and a careless one can word it plainly.

§ 03 SOURCE RELIABILITY

Source reliability

Four inputs describe a source. Three are properties of the outlet, and one depends on the claim.

A source is scored on four inputs, each from 0 to 100. Three come from the source list: how long the outlet has published, how much its owner has at stake in the telling, and how often its earlier claims held up. The fourth, corroboration, depends on the claim in hand and is covered in section 4.

THE FOUR INPUTS TO A TRUST SCORE

INPUT	HOW IT BECOMES 0 TO 100	WHY IT IS BUILT THAT WAY
Source longevity	50 + years published / 4, rounded, held between 30 and 99	Age earns credit slowly. The cap is reached at 196 years, so a very old outlet gains nothing more, and a new one starts at 50 and not at zero.
Ownership conflict	100 minus the conflict weight as a percentage	The source list gives each outlet a conflict weight from 0 to 1, from its ownership type and known entanglements. A state owner or a parent with a financial stake weighs more.
Veracity record	As recorded, 0 to 100	How often the outlet's earlier claims held up when checked. The full design also keeps corrections made, the size of the sample and the date of last review. The demo holds one fixed value per outlet.
Corroboration	As set for the claim, 0 to 100	How far independent origins agree. It counts origins, not outlets.



The ownership input is a judgment. Someone has to decide that a state owner weighs 0.88 and a nonprofit cooperative weighs 0.12, and the number cannot be derived from a formula. The demo shows the weight beside the outlet so you can disagree with it, and the formula lets you see what a different weight would do.

S 04 CORROBORATION AND ORIGINS

Corroboration and origins

Forty outlets repeating one briefing are one origin, not forty.

A claim repeated by many outlets can still rest on one statement. Corroboration is only meaningful when the sources are independent, so 7Analytica follows each claim back to its first appearance and gives every report one of three roles.

- 01 Primary: the document or statement itself, when a reader can open it, such as a posted notice.
- 02 Origin: the first report of a claim, or a report with its own sourcing, such as a named witness or its own observation.
- 03 Repeat: a report that relays an earlier one without adding anything. A repeat is kept in the record and does not add to corroboration.

An example from the sample record

The sample record "One closed port, fourteen reports" ingests fourteen reports about a port closure in its first three hours. Counting origins moves the desk from fourteen voices to three: a port agency wire, a shippers' association statement and the harbour authority's own notice, which is the single primary document. The other eleven repeat.

SIX OF THE FOURTEEN REPORTS IN THE SAMPLE RECORD, WITH THE SAMPLE'S OWN SCORES

SOURCE	ROLE	SCORE
Harbour authority notice	Primary document	90
Port agency wire, own reporting	Origin	84
Shippers' association statement	Origin	71
Regional daily, relays wire	Repeat	60
Broadcaster, relays wire	Repeat	58
Aggregator, no sourcing	Repeat	34

The role counts matter more than the scores. A repeat can score 60 because its outlet has a long record. It still adds no new evidence about the port.

The limit: classification depends on what can be seen. A repeat that hides its source can look like an origin. When origin cannot be established, the record says so and does not guess.



The trust score

The average of four inputs with equal weight, rounded.

$$\text{trust} = \text{round}((\text{longevity} + \text{corroboration} + \text{ownership} + \text{veracity}) / 4)$$

Each input moves the score by a quarter of its own change. Raising ownership conflict from 30 to 40 percent lowers the ownership input by 10 and the trust score by 2.5, before rounding. No single input can sink or rescue a score alone, which is also the cost: a source with a poor record can still reach the middle of the range if it is old and well corroborated.

The printed score always carries the four inputs and each input's distance from the average, so a reader can see which one is holding the score up or pulling it down. In the state-owned profile in section 9, longevity sits 33 points above the average and ownership sits 35 below.

The help article "How a score is built" also lists recency and primary documents among the inputs. The methodology calculator uses the four above and does not include those two. Where they differ, the four-input arithmetic is what the calculator runs.

The bias score and alert tiers

Four axes of wording, averaged, then compared with fixed cut-offs.

The bias score reads the wording of a report. It does not say a report is false. Four axes are scored from 0 to 100 and averaged with equal weight.

THE FOUR AXES OF THE BIAS SCORE

AXIS	QUESTION	CONTRIBUTION TO THE BIAS SCORE
Accountability	Is the actor named, or does passive wording hide who did what?	100 minus the reading. Low accountability raises bias.
Intensity	How dense is loaded, high-arousal wording, against a neutral baseline?	The reading as it stands.
Framing	Whose voice anchors the telling, and who is cast as the actor?	The reading as it stands.
Veracity	How many attributed claims are unverified?	Not set by hand. Read from the trust score: 100 minus trust, held between 28 and 80.

$$\text{bias} = \text{round}(((100 - \text{accountability}) + \text{intensity} + \text{framing} + \text{veracity axis}) / 4)$$



Tiers and the Perspective Slider

- A bias reading above 48 raises tier 1, Elevated.
- Above 62, tier 2, Critical.
- Above 78, tier 3, Systemic.
- Above 65, the audit offers the Perspective Slider, which sets other outlets' accounts of the same event side by side.

Because the veracity axis is read from the trust score, a source with a poor record cannot read as neutral on bias even when its wording is plain. That is intended: unverified attribution is itself a lean. It is also a coupling between the two scores that you should know about, because it means they are not fully independent.

§ 07 THE SIX-AXIS AUDIT

The six-axis audit

Six questions asked of one record. Each gets its own confidence, and none is averaged into the others.

The audit breaks one record into who, what, when, where, why and how. Each answer carries a confidence reading from 0 to 100 and a mark if sources contest it. There is no overall audit score on purpose. A record can be solid on what and weak on why, and an average would hide that.

THE SIX AXES FOR THE SAMPLE RECORD "ONE CLOSED PORT, FOURTEEN REPORTS"

AXIS	ANSWER IN THE RECORD	CONFIDENCE	CONTESTED
Who	The harbour authority, per its own notice.	86	No
What	Port closed to inbound vessels.	90	No
When	From 06:00 local, no end time stated.	84	No
Where	Main container terminal. Secondary berths unclear.	58	Yes
Why	Weather, or an inspection. The two origins differ.	38	Yes
How	Notice posted, then enforced by traffic control.	72	No

In this record the desk can print the closure and the time as established. It must mark the berths as unconfirmed, and it must give both reasons with their origins. The audit says where the record is thin. It does not pick which reason is right.

Why is usually the lowest-confidence axis. Stated motive is shown as framing, not as fact.



Zones, heat and anomalies

Eight media zones, a heat reading for each, and a rule for when a reading becomes a flag.

Reporting is grouped into eight geographic media zones: North America, Europe, Asia, South America and the Caribbean, Africa, MENA and Gulf, Oceania and Polar, and a digital and gray zones strip. A country sits in one zone. Real framing sometimes straddles two, so the assignment is a simplification.

Each zone has a heat reading from 0 to 100. The help article describes it as a combination of the volume of reporting, how fast it is rising and how far it departs from the zone's own 30-day baseline. The calculator computes a simpler version from sample dispatches: the average alert tier of the zone's items times 26, plus 7 for each item at tier 2 or above, held at 100. Readings of 75 and above are High, 50 to 74 Elevated, and under 50 Low.

- An anomaly is flagged when a reading sits two or more spreads from its baseline. A flag is an invitation to look. It is confirmed only when independent physical telemetry, such as ship tracking or imagery, agrees with the reporting.
- Tier 3 is raised when two or more tier 2 alerts fall within 60 minutes. The rule that raised a tier is printed beside it.
- A silence sentinel alerts on an abnormal drop in coverage inside an active crisis zone, because a sudden quiet can be a signal.

A thin zone is not a quiet zone. Where the sample holds few outlets, a gap in the record is not evidence that nothing happened.

A worked example

Two profiles, every line of arithmetic, real numbers from the calculator.

Both profiles use outlet attributes from the sample source list: years published, ownership conflict weight and veracity record. The corroboration, accountability, intensity and framing inputs are set by hand to show the method. They are the presets of the methodology calculator, so you can load either and watch the lines build.

Established wire profile: trust 89, bias 25

WORKED EXAMPLE, ESTABLISHED WIRE PROFILE

LINE	STEP	WORKING	RESULT
01	Source longevity	$50 + 173 / 4$, held between 30 and 99	93



LINE	STEP	WORKING	RESULT
02	Corroboration	as set	88
03	Ownership conflict	100 - 18	82
04	Veracity record	as set	91
05	Trust score	$(93 + 88 + 82 + 91) / 4 = 88.5$, rounded	89
06	Accountability, inverted	100 - 78	22
07	Intensity	as set	22
08	Framing	as set	28
09	Veracity axis, read from trust	100 - 89, held between 28 and 80	28
10	Bias score	$(22 + 22 + 28 + 28) / 4 = 25$, rounded	25

State-owned outlet profile: trust 47, bias 66

WORKED EXAMPLE, STATE-OWNED OUTLET PROFILE

LINE	STEP	WORKING	RESULT
01	Source longevity	$50 + 121 / 4$, held between 30 and 99	80
02	Corroboration	as set	42
03	Ownership conflict	100 - 88	12
04	Veracity record	as set	54
05	Trust score	$(80 + 42 + 12 + 54) / 4 = 47$, rounded	47
06	Accountability, inverted	100 - 30	70
07	Intensity	as set	72
08	Framing	as set	70
09	Veracity axis, read from trust	100 - 47, held between 28 and 80	53
10	Bias score	$(70 + 72 + 70 + 53) / 4 = 66.25$, rounded	66

Reading the two side by side

- The first profile reads trust 89 and bias 25: no tier mark, and the audit would not ask for a second account by default.
- The second reads trust 47 and bias 66: tier 2, Critical, and because bias is above 65 the audit would offer the Perspective Slider.



- Longevity is not what separates them. The second profile's longevity input is 80, close to the first's 93. The gap comes from ownership (12 against 82) and corroboration (42 against 88).
- The distance of each trust input from the average for the second profile is +33 longevity, -5 corroboration, -35 ownership and +7 veracity.

These are sample inputs. Reading them as a verdict on any outlet that shares a profile's attributes would misuse them.

§ 10 WHAT A SCORE MEANS, AND WHAT IT DOES NOT

What a score means, and what it does not

A score says how much weight the record supports. It does not say what to conclude.

A score does mean

- An estimate of how well the evidence stands, printed with the inputs that produced it.
- A way to compare two accounts under the same method, and to see which input explains the difference.
- A prompt to look. A low trust score or a raised tier tells you where to spend your attention.
- A reading that moves when evidence moves, with the earlier value kept.

A score does not mean

- That a claim is true or false. A low score on a true claim is possible: it says the evidence held is thin.
- A judgment of an outlet's worth, honesty or intent, or of the people who work there.
- A forecast. The impact matrix shows exposure if a claim held. It predicts nothing.
- Advice. Nothing in 7Analytica is investment, legal or political advice.
- A difference between two numbers a few points apart. The weights are equal by choice, they have not been fitted to outside data, and no error margin has been measured.
- A comparable figure across other tools. Another product's score uses other inputs and other weights.



Limits and failure modes

Where the method is weak, and what the record does when it is.

KNOWN FAILURE MODES

FAILURE MODE	WHAT GOES WRONG	WHAT THE RECORD DOES
A hidden repeat	A relay that conceals its source looks like an origin and inflates corroboration.	Marks origin as unestablished when it cannot be traced. Does not guess.
Coordinated outlets	Outlets acting together while hiding the link look independent.	Cannot see a link that is hidden, so it treats such outlets as independent. This is a real gap.
Ownership weights are judgments	A conflict weight is set by a person, so two reasonable people could set it differently.	Shows the weight beside the outlet and prints the formula.
Equal weights	Four inputs counting the same is a choice for legibility, not a finding.	States the weights. They can be reweighed to see what changes.
Stale or thin track record	A veracity record from few checks, or an old review, can mislead.	In the full design, prints the sample size and review date. The demo holds one fixed value.
Model-made steps	Claim extraction and the reading of framing are done by models, which can misread.	Names which steps are model-made. Origin marking, score arithmetic, sealing and edit history are rules, not models.
Coupling of trust and bias	A poor record raises the bias reading even when the wording is plain.	Documented in section 6.
English only, one sector	The reporting read is English text on geopolitics and borders.	Native-language reading and other sectors are planned and not built.
Sample data in examples	The worked examples and the sample files use invented records.	Labels sample data on pages and on every page of the sample files.

A related limit sits outside the arithmetic. A score is a summary, and any summary invites the reader to stop at the number. 7Analytica prints inputs and keeps the working one click away for that reason. It cannot make a reader open it.



Provenance, custody and the seal

How a record keeps its history and what a seal does and does not fix.

- Every record has a permanent reference number. It is never reused, so a record can always be cited and found again.
- Reports are captured with the time they were seen, de-duplicated and linked to their sources.
- The chain of custody is the recorded path of a claim or document: who held it, when and what changed.
- Edits are entries. The earlier value stays visible, with the time of the change and what moved it.

A seal fixes a record's content and time. Any later change is recorded as a new entry rather than a rewrite, and the sealed version stays as it was. A seal says what the record held at that moment. It does not say the record was right.

In the sample files on the site, the seal block is a stand-in: nothing in them was sealed or signed. How a seal is implemented has not been published, and this paper makes no claim about it beyond the behaviour above.

How to challenge a score

Every score prints its inputs so that you can disagree with them in specific terms.

- 01 Reproduce it. Load the matching inputs in the methodology calculator and confirm the arithmetic. If the arithmetic differs from the printed score, that is an error to report.
- 02 Name the input. Say which of the four trust inputs or four bias axes you think is wrong, what you think it should be and how you know.
- 03 Send it. Write to the address below or use the contact form. Include the record or page, what it says, what you think is right, and a link or a screenshot.
- 04 Expect a person. We read every report and replies to the address it came from. We say what we found and, if we change something, what changed.

We do not state a reply time, because no service level is in place. A change to a score is logged in the changelog with the reason, and the earlier value is kept. A sealed dossier is not rewritten. A correction appears as a new, dated entry beside it.

If you disagree with a weight and not an input, say so. That is a fair challenge to the method itself, and it belongs in the next edition of this paper.



Version, date and changes

This paper is dated and versioned so that a citation can name the edition.

The version and date are on the cover and in the table below. Dates are in UTC. The paper is regenerated from the same source as the website, so the page and both PDFs always carry the same text.

To cite this edition: 7Analytica, "How 7Analytica builds a score", methodology whitepaper, version 1.0, 7analytica.com/methodology/whitepaper.

Changes to the arithmetic are written in the changelog. This paper is reissued with a new version number when the arithmetic or the inputs change, and not for wording alone.

DOCUMENT CONTROL

DOCUMENT CONTROL

ITEM	VALUE
Title	How 7Analytica builds a score
Version	1.0
Edition date	1 October 2026 (2026-10-01), 14:52 UTC
Status	Describes the method behind live data, with sample data in the worked examples
Theme	Dark
Web version	7analytica.com/methodology/whitepaper

End of the whitepaper. Prepared 1 October 2026 (2026-10-01), version 1.0. Examples use sample data and describe no real outlet. To challenge a score or report an error, write to the address on the contact page at 7analytica.com/contact.