Evidence based on Challenge Justification

This evidence is typed as words, which is due to the fact that a screenshot in this case would not help me. The contention is based on alleged manipulation of views, and unfortunately, Uptrennd does not give you a list of people that has read your work.

Pertaining to this evidence, The challenger is referred to as Disputant, and his/her challenge justification is marked in asterisks

1. Disputant: \*The assumed number of views is wrong. It was already verified that the views number can be tricked by refreshing the website\*

My Defence: The Uptrennd platform (the platform where the article was posted) incentivizes people to visit and post articles on the platform. Articles on the platform are viewed and read numerous times by different people from all over the world. Merely reading an article on the platform is considered an activity on the platform, and it increases your chances of having a greater rank. I don't need to manipulate views when there are readers always waiting to read new contents. You can try this out, by posting a short poem or article on the uptrennd platform, and see the numbers of reads/views you get in a short while.

Insisting that views number can be manipulated and that it was done in my article is an unfair accusation. There is no way to prove that the views on my article were manipulated, and there is also no way to be 100% sure that the assumed number of views at the time of submission is wrong.

1. Disputant:\* A similar case was already ruled denying the acceptance into the list\*

My Defense: There was no rule on the Kleros Story Telling Program that clearly forbids participants to post on the Uptrennd platform, and the fact that an item posted on the same platform was denied acceptance does not automatically make it the rule for all items submitted using that same platform, unless the rule changes in the future.

1. Disputant:\* If the submitter thinks that the post expands significantly the Kleros knowledge, he/she would have submitted earlier.\*

My Defense: The Kleros submission rules clearly states that content submitted before 12/08/2020 would be accepted into the storytelling program. The submission was done before the due date. There was no rule insisting that submissions were to be done at some certain specific time as long as it was within or before the deadline. In the context of a storytelling program, the date of submission of a work piece does not affect the lessons that are contained in the content submitted. If this was clearly a reason, it should be added to the rules. More so, if a submission is deemed late for a month, does that not make it an early submission for the next month of the storytelling program?

1. Disputant:\* Even more, the same submitter has an item in the same platform in the standard list\*

My Defense: The item the challenger was pointing to, was submitted for the standard impact during the first month of the Story Telling Program, of which I have been paid for. The content of the submission was purely about Kleros, and earned me 1000PNK tokens. See the story [Here](https://curate.kleros.io/tcr/0x7884a7ADf697e18357087FE8F994669042Af4ae9/0x60ae54d9088d80f742883db427df8b781f57188e9bc2480f44df0c7a65550e0a).

1. Disputant: \*Reinforcing the argument that the article do not comply with Kleros submission or significantly expand the Kleros knowledge.\*

My Defense: I was paid for the said article, which actually expands your knowledge on Kleros when you read it. The submission garnered total views/reads that was less than 500, and it was submitted for standard impact. The article was written to educate reader on common facts on Kleros, which is in line to the requirements of a standard impact submission.

My most recent article is based on Kleros practical use cases, which significantly educates you on Kleros, using the cases resolved on the kleros platform as examples.

1. Disputant: \*Submission is based on the viewers of the article which, as said before, can be manipulated.\*

My Defense: As earlier stated, the fact that a submission can be manipulated, does not mean that it was. Neither does it prove, in any way, that the article in contention garnered views solely based on manipulation.

Conclusively, it is well known that we live in a world of limitless possibilities. The fact that an event CAN happen DOES NOT guarantee, without a single doubt, that it actually happened. My challenger justification is purely based on a possible scenario which did not happen. I did not manipulate my views, and if it had garnered less than 500 views/reads, I would have submitted the said piece for Standard Impact, just like I did, the first time, as pointed out by my challenger.