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# Article summary:

1. Pictures of pipelines on fire circulating on social media claiming to be from Sudan are false.

2. The pictures were first used in India in 2015 and 2018, respectively, and are not related to the Sudan pipeline carrying South Sudan's oil.

3. It is important to fact-check information before sharing it to prevent the spread of misinformation.

# Article rating:

Appears moderately imbalanced: The article provides some useful information, but is missing several important points or pieces of evidence that would be required to present the discussed topics in a balanced and reliable way. You are encouraged to seek a more balanced perspective on the presented issues by exploring the provided research topics and looking at different information sources.

# Article analysis:

The article titled "Fact-check: These pictures don’t depict the Sudan pipeline transporting oil from South Sudan - 211CHECK" provides a detailed analysis of two pictures shared on Facebook claiming that locals in Port Sudan had set ablaze pipelines carrying South Sudan oil. The article concludes that the claim is false and the pictures are not from Sudan but were first used in India in 2015 and 2018.

The article appears to be well-researched, providing evidence from reverse image searches and links to various sources where the images were previously used. The author also provides a clear conclusion and encourages readers to refrain from sharing content they are unsure about.

However, there are some potential biases in the article. Firstly, it is unclear who runs 211 Check or what their agenda may be. This lack of transparency could lead readers to question the credibility of the fact-checking organization. Additionally, while the article does provide evidence that the pictures are not from Sudan, it does not explore why someone might have shared them with false information about their origin. It is possible that this was an innocent mistake, but it could also be an intentional attempt to spread misinformation.

Furthermore, while the article notes that the Facebook post received over 160 reactions, 60 comments, and 49 shares, it does not provide any examples of these reactions or comments. This omission makes it difficult for readers to understand how widespread this false information may have become or what people's reactions were.

Overall, while this article provides a useful fact-checking service by debunking false information about pipelines in Sudan, its potential biases and omissions suggest that readers should approach its conclusions with caution.

# Topics for further research:

* Who runs 211 Check and what is their agenda?
* What is the history of misinformation about pipelines in Sudan?
* Are there any political or economic factors that could be contributing to the spread of false information about Sudan?
* What are some other examples of false information being shared on social media in Sudan?
* How can individuals and organizations combat the spread of misinformation in Sudan?
* What are some best practices for fact-checking and verifying information on social media?
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