

# SPOTTING ADVERSARIAL SAMPLES FOR SPEAKER VERIFICATION BY NEURAL VOCODERS

Haibin Wu<sup>1</sup>, Po-chun Hsu<sup>1</sup>, Ji Gao<sup>2</sup>, Shanshan Zhang<sup>2</sup>, Shen Huang<sup>2</sup>, Jian Kang<sup>2</sup>,  
Zhiyong Wu<sup>3</sup>, Helen Meng<sup>4</sup>, Hung-yi Lee<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Graduate Institute of Communication Engineering, National Taiwan University

<sup>4</sup> Human-Computer Communications Laboratory, The Chinese University of Hong Kong

<sup>3</sup> Shenzhen International Graduate School, Tsinghua University

<sup>2</sup> Tencent Research, Beijing, China

## ABSTRACT

Automatic speaker verification (ASV), one of the most important technology for biometric identification, has been widely adopted in security-critic applications, including transaction authentication and access control. However, previous works have shown ASV is seriously vulnerable to recently emerged adversarial attacks, yet effective countermeasures against them are limited. In this paper, we adopt neural vocoders to spot adversarial samples for ASV. We use neural vocoder to re-synthesize audio and find that the difference between the ASV scores for the original and re-synthesized audio is a good indicator to distinguish genuine and adversarial samples. As the very beginning work in this direction of detecting adversarial samples for ASV, there is no reliable baseline for comparison. So we first implement Griffin-Lim for detection and set it as our baseline. The proposed method accomplishes effective detection performance and outperforms all the baselines in all the settings. We also show the neural vocoder adopted in the detection framework is dataset independent. Our codes will be made open-source for future works to do fair comparison<sup>1</sup>.

**Index Terms**— adversarial attack, automatic speaker verification, vocoder

## 1. INTRODUCTION

ASV refers to verifying whether a piece of given speech is uttered by a certain person. ASV is one of the essential biometric identification methods, as a particular person’s voice represents the inherent characteristics of himself/herself and is stable and non-reproducible. Recently, deep learning has dramatically boosted ASV advances [1], resulting in a variety of high-performance ASV models [2–4]. So ASV has been adopted in a wide range of security-sensitive applications, including transaction authentication and access control. However, previous works have shown that ASV is under the radar

of spoofing audios [5], backdoor attacks [6], and recently emerged adversarial attacks [7, 8]. Given that ASV systems have gained wide usage in safety-critical environments, their security is of high priority. The adversarial attacks against ASV emerge very late, the defense methods countering them are limited. And in this paper, we mainly focus on mitigating adversarial attacks for ASV.

[9] firstly propose the concept of adversarial attack. The authors show adversarial attack disastrously jeopardizes the performance of well-trained image classification models. Elaborating adversarial samples and adopting them for attacking machine learning models is called adversarial attack [9]. Adversarial samples are very similar to their genuine counterparts from human perception but will surprisingly hallucinate the high-performance models. The models for speech processing tasks, including automatic speech recognition (ASR) [10–14], anti-spoofing for ASV [15–18] and sound event classification [19], are also under the radar of adversarial attacks. What’s more, the security-sensitive ASV models are subject to adversarial attacks [7, 8, 20–25]. [7] is the first to illustrate the vulnerability of ASV models to adversarial attacks. [20] and [21] respectively illustrate state-of-the-art (SOTA) ASV models, including i-vector and x-vector models, can be manipulated by adversarial samples. To realize the adversarial attack against ASV into real-world, further works investigate the more malicious adversarial attacks from the perspective of universality [22, 23], in-the-air transferability [22, 24], and imperceptibility [25]. Addressing adversarial attacks for ASV is of high priority, as ASV is widely used in safety-sensitive environments.

However, due to limited works [26–32] for adversarial defense on ASV, how to effectively mitigate adversarial attacks for ASV remains an open question. Wang et al. [26] adopt adversarial training to mitigate adversarial attack for ASV by injecting the adversarial data into the training set. Li et al. [27] propose to train a detection model by the mixture of adversarial samples and genuine samples and implement it to detect the adversarial samples. Zhang et al. [28] harness an inde-

<sup>1</sup>Code

pendent DNN filter trained by adversarial samples and apply it as a deep filter to purify the adversarial samples. However, the above methods [26–28] require the knowledge of the attack algorithms used by attackers. It is impractical that the ASV system designers know which attack algorithms will be implemented by in-the-wild attackers in advance, not to mention such methods [26–28] may overfit to a specific adversarial attack algorithm. [29, 30] use self-supervised learning models as a filter to purify the adversarial noise. [31] proposes four pre-processing defenses and [32] introduces the idea of voting to prevent risky decisions of ASV when encountering adversarial samples.

In this work, we propose to adopt neural vocoders, which attains the capacity of purifying the adversarial noise while introducing less distortion when generating genuine waveform, and set Parallel WaveGAN [33] as a case study, for spotting adversarial samples. As is known to all, vocoders are usually adopted as weapons to generate spoofing audios to fool ASV [5]. However, we harness them as shields for defending the ASV systems. As the old saying goes, "technology is a double-edged sword", whether it is a weapon or a shield depends on the holder. Contrary to [26–28], which need to know the adversarial attack method adopted by the attackers, our method is attack-agnostic. Compared to [29, 30], which defend the ASV in the frequency domain, our detection method directly spots the adversarial samples in the time domain, so they are orthogonal. Compared with [31] which aims at improving the robustness of speaker identification, our work aims to alleviate the vulnerability of speaker verification. The vocoder in [31] is for defense use, yet we adopt vocoder for detection. [32] focused on defense, our method aims at spotting adversarial samples and filtering them away.

Our contributions of this paper are as follows. This is the first paper to adopt neural vocoders as shields to spot adversarial samples for ASV. We also first implement the traditional vocoder, Griffin-Lim, to detect adversarial samples for ASV, and set it as our baseline. The proposed detection method accomplishes effective detection performance and outperforms all the baselines under all settings in Table 3.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the background of automatic speaker verification, adversarial attacks and the Parallel WaveGAN. Section 3 presents the proposed method. Section 4 reports the experimental setups. Experimental results, and analysis is presented in Section 6. Section 6 shows the conclusion.

## 2. BACKGROUND

### 2.1. Automatic speaker verification

The objective of ASV is to authenticate the claimed identity of a speaker by a piece of his/her speech and some enrolled speaker records. The procedure of ASV can be divided into feature engineering, speaker embedding extraction, and similarity scoring. Feature engineering aims at trans-

forming a piece of utterance in waveform representation, into acoustic features, such as Mel-frequency cepstral coefficients (MFCCs), filter-banks, and spectrograms. The speaker embedding extraction procedure of recently ASV models [2–4] usually extracts utterance-level speaker embedding from acoustic features. Then the similarity scoring will measure the similarity between the testing speaker embedding and the enroll speaker embedding. The higher the score is, the more likely the testing utterance and the enroll utterance belong to the same speaker, and vice versa. Denote the testing utterance and the enroll utterance as  $x_t$  and  $x_e$  respectively. For simplicity, we combine the above three procedures and view ASV as an end-to-end function  $f$ :

$$s = f(x_t, x_e), \quad (1)$$

where  $s$  is the similarity score between  $x_t$  and  $x_e$ .

### 2.2. Adversarial attack

Attackers deliberately elaborate a tiny perturbation, which is indistinguishable from human perception, and combine it with the original sample to generate the new sample, which will manipulate the model give wrong prediction. The new sample and the tiny perturbation are denoted as the adversarial sample and adversarial noise respectively. Suppose the in-the-wild attackers have access to the internals of the ASV system, including structures, parameters and gradients, and have the access to the testing utterance  $x_t$ . They aim at crafting such an adversarial utterance by finding an adversarial perturbation. Different searching strategies for elaborating adversarial noise result in different attack algorithms, and in this work, we adopt a powerful attack method, basic iterative method (BIM) [34]. During BIM attack, attackers will start from  $x_t^0 = x_t$ , then iteratively update it to find the adversarial sample:

$$x_t^{k+1} = clip \left( x_t^k + \alpha \cdot (-1)^{is.tgt} \cdot sign \left( \nabla_{x_t^k} f(x_t^k, x_e) \right) \right), \quad \text{for } k = 0, 1, \dots, K - 1, \quad (2)$$

where  $clip(\cdot)$  is the clipping function which make sure that  $\|x_t^{k+1} - x_t\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$ ,  $\epsilon$ , denotes the attack budget or intensity predefined by the attackers,  $\epsilon \geq 0 \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\alpha$  is the step size,  $is.tgt = 1$  and  $is.tgt = 0$  for the target trial and the non-target trial respectively,  $K$  is the total iteration number and we define  $K = \lceil \epsilon/\alpha \rceil$ , where  $\lceil \cdot \rceil$  denotes the ceiling function. In the target trial, the testing and enroll utterance are pronounced by the same speaker, yet they belong to different speakers in the non-target trial. Take the non-target trial for example, after BIM attack, the similarity score between the testing and enroll utterance will be high, which will lead the ASV system false accept the imposter. We recommend the readers listen to the demo of the deliberately crafted adversarial samples<sup>2</sup>, which are indistinguishable from their genuine counterparts.

<sup>2</sup>Audio demo

### 2.3. Vocoder

Due to the lack of phase information, speech waveform cannot be restored directly from acoustic features, such as linear spectrograms and mel-spectrograms. Traditional vocoder, Griffin-Lim, [35] is usually used to reconstruct phase information. However, it inevitably introduces distortion during reconstructing, resulting in limited speech quality. We argued that the introduced distortion might also degrade the effect of the attack. Another approach, neural vocoder, takes acoustic features as conditions and uses a neural network to generate speech signals. Since a neural vocoder is trained to maximize the likelihood of real speech in training data, given distorted or attacked acoustic features, it can generate their genuine counterparts. In contrast to Griffin-Lim, a neural vocoder is a data-driven method, which can model the manifolds of genuine data, thus can generate waveform with less distortion.

Common neural vocoders, such as WaveNet [36] and WaveRNN [37], can restore high-quality speech but with slow inference speed due to the autoregressive architecture. Parallel WaveGAN [33] adopted a model based on dilated CNN, which can generate audio samples in parallel. They jointly trained the model using the adversarial loss in GAN and the proposed loss on the frequency domain. Parallel synthesis improves the efficiency of speech generation, while the GAN architecture can make the Parallel WaveGAN effectively model the distribution of real speech. Thus in this work, we adopt Parallel WaveGAN for spotting adversarial samples.

## 3. NEURAL VOCODER IS ALL YOU NEED

### 3.1. The detection procedure

We first detail the detection procedure, followed by the reason why it works. The vocoder<sup>1</sup>-based detection framework is shown in Fig. 1. For brevity, we omit the enroll utterance  $x_e$ . The subscript of  $x_t$  is also omitted, and we use  $x$  to denote the testing utterance. We use  $x'$  to denote the testing utterance after feature extraction and vocoder preprocessing (yellow block and gray block in Fig. 1). We follow the procedure in Fig. 1, and get  $|s - s'|$  for a piece of testing utterance  $x$ . Denote the score variation  $d = |s - s'|$ . Denote  $\mathbb{T}_{gen} = \{x_{gen}^1, x_{gen}^2, \dots, x_{gen}^I\}$  is the set of genuine testing utterances, and  $|\mathbb{T}_{gen}|$  denotes the number of elements in set  $\mathbb{T}_{gen}$ . Then we derive  $\{d_{gen}^1 = |s_{gen}^1 - s_{gen}^1{}'|, d_{gen}^2 = |s_{gen}^2 - s_{gen}^2{}'|, \dots, d_{gen}^I = |s_{gen}^I - s_{gen}^I{}'| \}$  for  $\mathbb{T}_{gen}$  as shown in Fig. 1, where  $s_{gen}^i$  and  $s_{gen}^i{}'$  are the ASV scores for  $x_{gen}^i$  before and after vocoder preprocessing respectively. Given a false positive rate for detection ( $FPR_{given}$ , a real number), such that  $FPR_{given} \in [0, 1]$ , for genuine samples, we derive

<sup>1</sup>If not specified in the following sections, we use vocoder to denote neural vocoder for simplicity.

a detection threshold  $\tau_{det}$ :

$$FPR_{det}(\tau) = \frac{|\{d_{gen}^i > \tau : x_{gen}^i \in \mathbb{T}_{gen}\}|}{|\mathbb{T}_{gen}|} \quad (3)$$

$$\tau_{det} = \{\tau \in \mathbb{R} : FPR_{det}(\tau) = FPR_{given}\} \quad (4)$$

where  $FPR_{det}(\tau)$  is the false positive rate for genuine samples given a threshold  $\tau$ ,  $d_{gen}^i$  is derived by  $x_{gen}^i$  as shown in Fig. 1. In realistic condition, the ASV system designer is not aware of the adversarial samples, not to mention which exact adversarial attack algorithm will be adopted for generating adversarial samples. So the detection threshold  $\tau_{det}$  is determined based on the genuine samples. Thus the detection method doesn't require the knowledge of adversarial sample generation and is kind of attack-agnostic.

Then, given a piece of testing utterance, whether adversarial or genuine,  $|s - s'|$  will be derived, and the system will label it adversarial if  $|s - s'| > \tau_{det}$ , and vice versa. And the detection rate ( $DR_{\tau_{det}}$ ) under  $\tau_{det}$ , which is determined by Eq. 4, for adversarial data can be derived as:

$$DR_{\tau_{det}} = \frac{|\{d_{adv}^i > \tau_{det} : x_{adv}^i \in \mathbb{T}_{adv}\}|}{|\mathbb{T}_{adv}|} \quad (5)$$

where  $\mathbb{T}_{adv}$  denotes the set of adversarial testing utterances, and  $d_{adv}^i$  is derived by  $x_{adv}^i$  as the procedure illustrated in Fig. 1.

### 3.2. Why the detection framework works

As the vocoder is data-driven and trained by genuine data during training, it attains the capacity of modeling the distribution of genuine data, resulting in less distortion when generating genuine waveform. Thus during inference time, the vocoder preprocessing won't affect the ASV scores of genuine samples too much, as shown by the EER in the second row and last column of Table 1. However, suppose the inputs are adversarial samples. In that case, the vocoder will try to pull it back towards the manifold of their genuine counterparts to some extent, resulting in the effect of purifying the adversarial noise.

Take a non-target trial as an example, in which an ASV system should give the genuine sample a score below the threshold. And after the nearly lossless reconstruction procedure (yellow block and gray block in Fig. 1), the genuine sample won't change too much, and the ASV score changes little. In contrast to the genuine sample, the ASV score for the adversarial one is higher than the threshold. And the reconstruction procedure will try to counter adversarial noise, purify the adversarial sample, and decrease the ASV score for the adversarial sample. Then we can adopt the discrepancy of the score variations,  $d_{adv}$  and  $d_{gen}$ , to discriminate them as shown in Fig. 2. The transform, which makes  $d_{gen}$  as small as possible while makes  $d_{adv}$  as large as possible, is suitable for adversarial detection.




Fig. 1. Proposed detection framework.  $s$  and  $s'$  are the ASV scores for  $x$  and  $x'$ .  $|s - s'|$  is the absolute value between  $s$  and  $s'$ .

Table 1. EER with different  $\epsilon$

Method	EER with different $\epsilon$ (%)				
	20	15	10	5	0 (no attack)
None	99.33	95.66	90.57	74.04	2.88
Vocoder	87.58	65.75	52.20	30.37	3.39
GL-lin	95.23	80.83	66.73	39.49	3.93
GL-mel	88.41	65.39	49.76	26.67	3.81

Also, the Griffin-Lim can be regarded as a not perfect transform as well, and it will also introduce distortion to affect the adversarial noise. However, for genuine data, the distortion introduced by the Griffin-Lim is more significant than the vocoder, as it is not a data-driven method and can't be customized for a specific dataset, resulting in larger  $d_{gen}$  and inferior detection performance.

## 4. EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

### 4.1. ASV setup

Our ASV system, a variation of X-vector system, is modified from [38]. We adopt the dev sets of Voxceleb1 [39] and Voxceleb2 [40] for training. Spectrograms are extracted with a hamming window of width 25ms and step 10ms, and 64-dimensional Fbanks are extracted as input features. No further data augmentation and voice activity detection are adopted during training. The model is trained for only 50 epochs, rather than 500 epochs in [40], as our focus is to evaluate the performance of detection method rather than to accomplish SOTA performance of ASV. Cosine similarity is used for back-end scoring. We adopt the trials provided in VoxCeleb1 test set for generating adversarial samples, evaluating the ASV performance and detection performance.

### 4.2. Griffin-Lim and Parallel WaveGAN

We use Griffin-Lim and Parallel WaveGAN in our experiments. The Griffin-Lim method, denoted as GL-lin, uses 100 iterations to reconstruct speech from linear spectrograms. GL-mel denotes that linear spectrograms are first estimated

from Mel-spectrograms using the pseudo inverse. Our Parallel WaveGAN method, denoted as Vocoder, is modified from the public implementation<sup>3</sup>. We use 80-dimension, band-limited (80-7600 kHz), and normalized log-mel spectrograms as conditional features. The window and hop sizes are set to 50 ms and 12.5 ms. The architectures of the generator and discriminator follow [33]. We trained the model on the dev set of VoxCeleb1 [39] for 1000k iterations, which takes around 5 days. Note that there is no overlap between the training data of Voxceleb1 for neural vocoder and the evaluation data of speaker verification. To further show that the vocoder adopted in the proposed method is dataset independent, we also trained an universal vocoder [41, 42] with the same structure as Vocoder, but on Lrg dataset from [42], which is a large speech dataset containing 6 languages and more than 600 speakers. The vocoder trained on Lrg is denoted as Vocoder-L.

### 4.3. ASV performance with genuine and adversarial inputs

To evaluate the performance, we use the trials provide in VoxCeleb1 test set, which contains 37,720 enrollment-testing pairs. During adversarial samples generation,  $\alpha$  is set as 1, attack budget  $\epsilon$  is set as 5, 10, 15, 20. The adversarial attack is conducted in the time domain. Also, note that it is really time-consuming to generate adversarial samples. We first evaluate the performance of our ASV system on genuine and adversarial samples. The results are shown in the first row and the last column of Table 1. "None" denotes that utterances are passed directly to the ASV system. We find that: (1) When testing on genuine samples, the ASV system achieved an EER of 2.88%, which is comparable to recent ASV models. When using generated speech as input, we found that the EER slightly increased. (2) While introducing the adversarial attack, the EER increased from 2.88% to over 70%, which shows the effectiveness of the attack method. The larger the attack budget  $\epsilon$  is, the higher the attack intensity is.

<sup>3</sup>Parallel WaveGAN

**Table 2.** AUC with different  $\epsilon$ 

Method	AUC with different $\epsilon$ (%)			
	20	15	10	5
Vocoder	<b>99.94</b>	<b>99.62</b>	<b>99.12</b>	<b>96.52</b>
GL-lin	97.89	97.39	95.87	89.86
GL-mel	99.01	97.64	95.41	87.52

## 5. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS AND ANALYSIS


### 5.1. Defence performance

We firstly show the defense performance when using vocoder, GL-mel, or GL-lin to re-synthesis audio samples. The results are shown in Table 1. The EER decrease after audio re-synthesis illustrates all the three methods alleviate the adversarial noise a little bit. In contrast to [31], which effectively purifies the adversarial noise for speaker identification by vocoders, directly applying vocoders for defense for speaker verification doesn’t work. Note that the re-synthesis process won’t affect the genuine EER too much. Thus, we will adopt the difference between the ASV scores for the original and re-synthesized audio as a good indicator to distinguish genuine and adversarial samples.

### 5.2. AUC evaluation

As mentioned in Sec 3.1, we use the discrepancy  $|s - s'|$  to distinguish genuine and adversarial samples. The distributions of the discrepancy are in Fig. 2. It is clear that a threshold  $\tau_{det}$  can be determined by genuine samples as shown in Eq. 4 to separate genuine and adversarial samples. And we claim the detection framework based on vocoder in Fig. 1 is effective, where the discrepancy  $|s - s'|$  for genuine samples is small, while  $|s - s'|$  for adversarial samples is large. Notice that the distribution overlap between the GL-mel genuine samples and adversarial samples is more considerable than that of Vocoder, as shown in Fig. 2. As Vocoder is trained from genuine data, it attains the capacity of making  $|s - s'|$  for genuine samples small enough. On the other hand, Griffin-Lim can only enlarge  $|s - s'|$  for adversarial samples.

Fig. 3 shows the receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves of different methods. Points on the curves show the true positive rate for adversarial samples and false positive rate for genuine samples when using different thresholds for detection. The larger the area under the curve (AUC) is, the better the detection performance is. Both GL-lin and GL-mel achieve effective detection performance, and Vocoder performs better than them. Table 2 shows the AUC of different methods. Results in Table 2 indicate that the proposed method is powerful for adversarial samples detection as all AUCs are approaching or greater than 90%. And also Vocoder outperforms GL-lin and GL-mel in all the settings.

**Fig. 2.**  $|s - s'|$  distribution with  $\epsilon = 10$ **Table 3.** Detection rate with different  $\epsilon$ 

$FPR_{given}$	Method	Detection rate with different $\epsilon$ (%)			
		20	15	10	5
0.05	Vocoder	<b>99.76</b>	<b>98.82</b>	<b>97.30</b>	<b>89.33</b>
	Vocoder-L	99.38	97.23	94.07	81.21
	GL-lin	89.12	88.30	84.64	71.29
	GL-mel	95.39	91.33	85.37	68.07
	Gaussian	34.54	51.29	61.56	68.57
0.01	Vocoder	<b>98.92</b>	<b>97.56</b>	<b>94.76</b>	<b>81.60</b>
	Vocoder-L	97.96	94.37	88.77	70.15
	GL-lin	73.62	73.63	70.62	56.37
0.005	Vocoder	<b>98.30</b>	<b>96.78</b>	<b>93.25</b>	<b>78.21</b>
	Vocoder-L	96.78	92.58	85.81	64.65
	GL-lin	64.76	64.97	62.85	49.32
0.001	Vocoder	<b>96.04</b>	<b>93.89</b>	<b>88.60</b>	<b>68.58</b>
	Vocoder-L	93.36	87.34	78.24	53.18
	GL-lin	45.10	45.27	44.72	34.28
	GL-mel	72.53	65.98	59.66	40.98

### 5.3. Detection performance

Table 3 shows the detection results on adversarial samples with different  $\epsilon$ .  $FPR_{given}$  column lists different false acceptable rates. The threshold  $\tau_{det}$  was determined according to  $FPR_{given}$  as shown in Eq. 4. Gaussian denotes that we use Gaussian filter to replace feature extraction and vocoder (yellow block and gray block in Fig. 1). Gaussian filter [18, 29] is usually adopted as an attack-agnostic method to counter adversarial samples, so we also set it as our baseline. The observations and analysis are concluded as follows: (1) We find that using Vocoder performs best among all methods. In most cases, more than 90% of the adversarial samples could be detected. While with a large  $\epsilon$  or  $FPR_{given}$ , all the detection rates are even over 95%. Even with a small  $\epsilon$  of 5, the detec-




Fig. 3. ROC curve under different epsilon ( $\epsilon$ )

tion rates can still approach or exceed 80%. The results indicate that the proposed method can effectively detect adversarial samples. (2) Gaussian based detection performs the worst, and even with  $FPR_{given} = 0.05$ , the detection rates are still lower than vocoder based detection with  $FPR_{given} = 0.001$ . As it is not a comparable baseline, we do not show its results in other settings due to space limitation. (3) For Griffin-Lim based methods, we find that they might be good approaches for detection with a large  $\epsilon$  or  $FPR_{given}$ . However, in stricter cases (smaller  $\epsilon$  or  $FPR_{given}$ ), the detection rates of GL-lin and GL-mel decrease drastically. We argue that Griffin-Lim is a pseudo nearly lossless transform, so we can, to some extent, adopt it to replace the vocoders in the adversarial detection framework in Fig. 1. While Griffin-Lim is not a data-driven method and can't model the genuine data manifold well, it results in higher  $|s' - s|$  for genuine samples as shown in Fig. 2, and thus the detection performance is not comparable to Parallel WaveGAN. (4) As shown in Table 3, the detection rate for the Vocoder-L is very close to Vocoder, which indi-

cates the vocoder adopted for the proposed detection method is kind of dataset independent.

## 6. CONCLUSION

In this work, we adopt the neural vocoder, which is a nearly lossless reconstruction transform from mel spectrograms to waveform, as shields for spotting adversarial samples for ASV. The proposed method accomplishes effective detection performance and outperforms the Griffin-Lim baseline and other typical approaches in all the settings. We will compare the performance of different neural vocoders on detecting adversarial samples for ASV in future works. We will also refer to [43], and characterize the adversarial robustness of our method under powerful adaptive attacks [44].

## References

- [1] Man-Wai Mak and Jen-Tzung Chien, *Machine learning for speaker recognition*, Cambridge University Press,

- 2020.
- [2] N. Dehak, P. Kenny, R. Dehak, P. Dumouchel, and P. Ouellet, "Front-end factor analysis for speaker verification," *IEEE Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 788–798, 2010.
  - [3] Patrick Kenny, "A small footprint i-vector extractor," in *Odyssey 2012-The Speaker and Language Recognition Workshop*, 2012.
  - [4] David Snyder, Daniel Garcia-Romero, Gregory Sell, Daniel Povey, and Sanjeev Khudanpur, "X-vectors: Robust dnn embeddings for speaker recognition," in *2018 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 5329–5333.
  - [5] Massimiliano Todisco, Xin Wang, Ville Vestman, Md Sahidullah, Hector Delgado, Andreas Nautsch, Junichi Yamagishi, Nicholas Evans, Tomi Kinnunen, and Kong Aik Lee, "Asvspoof 2019: Future horizons in spoofed and fake audio detection," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.05441*, 2019.
  - [6] Tongqing Zhai, Yiming Li, Ziqi Zhang, Baoyuan Wu, Yong Jiang, and Shu-Tao Xia, "Backdoor attack against speaker verification," in *ICASSP 2021-2021 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 2560–2564.
  - [7] Felix Kreuk, Yossi Adi, Moustapha Cisse, and Joseph Keshet, "Fooling end-to-end speaker verification with adversarial examples," in *2018 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 1962–1966.
  - [8] Rohan Kumar Das, Xiaohai Tian, Tomi Kinnunen, and Haizhou Li, "The attacker's perspective on automatic speaker verification: An overview," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.08849*, 2020.
  - [9] Christian Szegedy, Wojciech Zaremba, Ilya Sutskever, Joan Bruna, Dumitru Erhan, Ian Goodfellow, and Rob Fergus, "Intriguing properties of neural networks," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6199*, 2013.
  - [10] Nicholas Carlini and David Wagner, "Audio adversarial examples: Targeted attacks on speech-to-text," in *2018 IEEE Security and Privacy Workshops (SPW)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 1–7.
  - [11] Xuejing Yuan, Yuxuan Chen, Yue Zhao, Yunhui Long, Xiaokang Liu, Kai Chen, Shengzhi Zhang, Heqing Huang, XiaoFeng Wang, and Carl A Gunter, "Commandersong: A systematic approach for practical adversarial voice recognition," in *27th {USENIX} Security Symposium ({USENIX} Security 18)*, 2018, pp. 49–64.
  - [12] Hiromu Yakura and Jun Sakuma, "Robust audio adversarial example for a physical attack," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.11793*, 2018.
  - [13] Rohan Taori, Amog Kamsetty, Brenton Chu, and Nikita Vemuri, "Targeted adversarial examples for black box audio systems," in *2019 IEEE Security and Privacy Workshops (SPW)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 15–20.
  - [14] Yao Qin, Nicholas Carlini, Garrison Cottrell, Ian Goodfellow, and Colin Raffel, "Imperceptible, robust, and targeted adversarial examples for automatic speech recognition," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2019, pp. 5231–5240.
  - [15] Songxiang Liu, Haibin Wu, Hung-yi Lee, and Helen Meng, "Adversarial attacks on spoofing countermeasures of automatic speaker verification," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.08716*, 2019.
  - [16] Haibin Wu, Andy T Liu, and Hung-yi Lee, "Defense for black-box attacks on anti-spoofing models by self-supervised learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.03214*, 2020.
  - [17] Yuekai Zhang, Ziyang Jiang, Jesús Villalba, and Najim Dehak, "Black-box attacks on spoofing countermeasures using transferability of adversarial examples," *Proc. Interspeech 2020*, pp. 4238–4242, 2020.
  - [18] Haibin Wu, Songxiang Liu, Helen Meng, and Hung-yi Lee, "Defense against adversarial attacks on spoofing countermeasures of asv," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.03065*, 2020.
  - [19] Vinod Subramanian, Emmanouil Benetos, and Mark B Sandler, "Robustness of adversarial attacks in sound event classification," 2019.
  - [20] Jesús Villalba, Yuekai Zhang, and Najim Dehak, "x-vectors meet adversarial attacks: Benchmarking adversarial robustness in speaker verification," *Proc. Interspeech 2020*, pp. 4233–4237, 2020.
  - [21] Xu Li, Jinghua Zhong, Xixin Wu, Jianwei Yu, Xunying Liu, and Helen Meng, "Adversarial attacks on gmm i-vector based speaker verification systems," in *ICASSP 2020-2020 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 6579–6583.
  - [22] Yi Xie, Cong Shi, Zhuohang Li, Jian Liu, Yingying Chen, and Bo Yuan, "Real-time, universal, and robust adversarial attacks against speaker recognition systems," in *ICASSP 2020-2020 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1738–1742.

- [23] Mirko Marras, Pawel Korus, Nasir D Memon, and Gianni Fenu, “Adversarial optimization for dictionary attacks on speaker verification.,” in *Interspeech*, 2019, pp. 2913–2917.
- [24] Zhuohang Li, Cong Shi, Yi Xie, Jian Liu, Bo Yuan, and Yingying Chen, “Practical adversarial attacks against speaker recognition systems,” in *Proceedings of the 21st International Workshop on Mobile Computing Systems and Applications*, 2020, pp. 9–14.
- [25] Qing Wang, Pengcheng Guo, and Lei Xie, “Inaudible adversarial perturbations for targeted attack in speaker recognition,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.10637*, 2020.
- [26] Qing Wang, Pengcheng Guo, Sining Sun, Lei Xie, and John HL Hansen, “Adversarial regularization for end-to-end robust speaker verification.,” in *Interspeech*, 2019, pp. 4010–4014.
- [27] Xu Li, Na Li, Jinghua Zhong, Xixin Wu, Xunying Liu, Dan Su, Dong Yu, and Helen Meng, “Investigating robustness of adversarial samples detection for automatic speaker verification,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.06186*, 2020.
- [28] Hanyi Zhang, Longbiao Wang, Yunchun Zhang, Meng Liu, Kong Aik Lee, and Jianguo Wei, “Adversarial separation network for speaker recognition,” *Proc. Interspeech 2020*, pp. 951–955, 2020.
- [29] Haibin Wu, Xu Li, Andy T Liu, Zhiyong Wu, Helen Meng, and Hung-yi Lee, “Adversarial defense for automatic speaker verification by cascaded self-supervised learning models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.07047*, 2021.
- [30] Haibin Wu, Xu Li, Andy T Liu, Zhiyong Wu, Helen Meng, and Hung-yi Lee, “Improving the adversarial robustness for speaker verification by self-supervised learning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.00273*, 2021.
- [31] Sonal Joshi, Jesús Villalba, Piotr Żelasko, Laureano Moro-Velázquez, and Najim Dehak, “Adversarial attacks and defenses for speaker identification systems,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.08909*, 2021.
- [32] Haibin Wu, Yang Zhang, Zhiyong Wu, Dong Wang, and Hung-yi Lee, “Voting for the right answer: Adversarial defense for speaker verification,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.07868*, 2021.
- [33] Ryuichi Yamamoto, Eunwoo Song, and Jae-Min Kim, “Parallel wavegan: A fast waveform generation model based on generative adversarial networks with multi-resolution spectrogram,” in *ICASSP 2020-2020 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 6199–6203.
- [34] Alexey Kurakin, Ian Goodfellow, and Samy Bengio, “Adversarial machine learning at scale,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.01236*, 2016.
- [35] Daniel Griffin and Jae Lim, “Signal estimation from modified short-time fourier transform,” *IEEE Transactions on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 236–243, 1984.
- [36] Aaron van den Oord, Sander Dieleman, Heiga Zen, Karen Simonyan, Oriol Vinyals, Alex Graves, Nal Kalchbrenner, Andrew Senior, and Koray Kavukcuoglu, “Wavenet: A generative model for raw audio,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.03499*, 2016.
- [37] Nal Kalchbrenner, Erich Elsen, Karen Simonyan, Seb Noury, Norman Casagrande, Edward Lockhart, Florian Stimberg, Aaron Oord, Sander Dieleman, and Koray Kavukcuoglu, “Efficient neural audio synthesis,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2018, pp. 2410–2419.
- [38] Joon Son Chung, Jaesung Huh, Seongkyu Mun, Minjae Lee, Hee Soo Heo, Soyeon Choe, Chiheon Ham, Sunghwan Jung, Bong-Jin Lee, and Icksang Han, “In defence of metric learning for speaker recognition,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.11982*, 2020.
- [39] Arsha Nagrani, Joon Son Chung, and Andrew Zisserman, “Voxceleb: a large-scale speaker identification dataset,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.08612*, 2017.
- [40] Joon Son Chung, Arsha Nagrani, and Andrew Zisserman, “Voxceleb2: Deep speaker recognition,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.05622*, 2018.
- [41] Jaime Lorenzo-Trueba, Thomas Drugman, Javier Latorre, Thomas Merritt, Bartosz Putrycz, Roberto Barra-Chicote, Alexis Moinet, and Vatsal Aggarwal, “Towards achieving robust universal neural vocoding,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.06292*, 2018.
- [42] Po-chun Hsu, Chun-hsuan Wang, Andy T Liu, and Hung-yi Lee, “Towards robust neural vocoding for speech generation: A survey,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.02461*, 2019.
- [43] Chao-Han Yang, Jun Qi, Pin-Yu Chen, Xiaoli Ma, and Chin-Hui Lee, “Characterizing speech adversarial examples using self-attention u-net enhancement,” in *ICASSP 2020-2020 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 3107–3111.
- [44] Florian Tramer, Nicholas Carlini, Wieland Brendel, and Aleksander Madry, “On adaptive attacks to adversarial example defenses,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.08347*, 2020.