

# MMSys'21 Grand Challenge on Detecting Cheapfakes

Shivangi Aneja  
Technical University of Munich,  
Germany

Cise Midoglu  
SimulaMet, Norway

Duc-Tien Dang-Nguyen  
University of Bergen, Norway  
Kristiania University College, Norway


Michael Alexander Riegler  
SimulaMet, Norway

Pål Halvorsen  
SimulaMet, Norway

Matthias Nießner  
Technical University of Munich,  
Germany

Balu Adsumilli  
YouTube

Chris Bregler  
Google AI



**Figure 1: Multimedia manipulation can be broadly grouped into two categories. Deepfakes (left):** These are falsified media created using sophisticated AI-based media manipulation tools and techniques. Deepfake videos include re-enactment based techniques where head-pose/expressions are transferred from one video to the other, and swapping methods where facial region is swapped from one video to the other. Cheapfakes (right): These include falsified media created with/without contemporary non-AI based editing tools which are easily accessible. Photoshopping tools can be used to tamper with images. Videos can be sped up or slowed down to change the intent or misrepresent the person in the video. Re-contextualizing includes associating falsified or unrelated claims with a genuine image to misrepresent events or persons. This challenge is focused on detecting re-contextualized cheapfakes. Image sources: [1, 7, 13, 26, 29]

## ABSTRACT

*Cheapfake* is a recently coined term that encompasses non-AI (“cheap”) manipulations of multimedia content. Cheapfakes are known to be more prevalent than deepfakes. Cheapfake media can be created using editing software for image/video manipulations, or even without using any software, by simply altering the context of an image/video by sharing the media alongside misleading claims.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from [permissions@acm.org](mailto:permissions@acm.org).

MMSys'21, Sept. 28-Oct. 1, 2021, Istanbul, Turkey  
© 2021 Association for Computing Machinery.

This alteration of context is referred to as *out-of-context (OOC) misuse* of media. OOC media is much harder to detect than fake media, since the images and videos are not tampered. In this challenge, we focus on detecting OOC images, and more specifically the misuse of real photographs with conflicting image captions in news items. The aim of this challenge is to develop and benchmark models that can be used to detect whether given samples (news image and associated captions) are OOC, based on the recently compiled COSMOS dataset.

## KEYWORDS

Cheapfakes, Misinformation, News, Out-of-context misuse, Re-contextualized media

**ACM Reference Format:**

Shivangi Aneja, Cise Midoglu, Duc-Tien Dang-Nguyen, Michael Alexander Riegler, Pål Halvorsen, Matthias Nießner, Balu Adsumilli, and Chris Bregler. 2021. MMSys'21 Grand Challenge on Detecting Cheapfakes. In *12th ACM Multimedia Systems Conference (MMSys'21)*, Sept. 28-Oct. 1, 2021, Istanbul, Turkey. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 7 pages.

**1 INTRODUCTION**

The last decade has seen a surge in the use of social media platforms as a means of consuming news. In a recent study [31], Forbes reports that social media giant Facebook leads this trend with 36% of its customers using the platform for consuming news. Social media platforms come with a freedom for users to upload and share posts, which has led to the proliferation of fake media on these platforms.

Fake media (including audio, images, videos, and text) circulated on social media platforms can be broadly grouped into two major categories: *deepfakes* and *cheapfakes*, as shown in Figure 1. Deepfakes are falsified media, most commonly facial videos created using sophisticated AI-based media manipulation tools and techniques. Several deepfake detection methods [2, 3, 6, 11, 12, 19, 20, 23, 26, 30, 36] are in place to monitor and regulate the spread of deepfake videos.

Cheapfake is a general term that encompasses many non-AI (“cheap”) manipulations of multimedia content, created without using deep learning methods. Cheapfakes are created with or without contemporary editing tools which are non-AI based and are easily accessible. As shown in Figure 1, cheapfake generation methods can include the use of editing software such as Adobe Photoshop or PremierePro for image manipulations, deliberate alteration of context in news captions, and speeding/slowing of videos. We refer readers to the report by Paris *et al.* [24] for an overview of different types of cheapfakes surfacing the Internet. In fact, certain studies have found cheapfakes to be more prevalent than deepfakes [8, 27].

Depending on the type of cheapfake media, different detection tools need to be developed. For instance, methods to detect image manipulations such as photoshopping and image splicing have been investigated [9, 10, 16, 32]. Re-contextualization or out-of-context (OOC) misuse, which include associating falsified or unrelated claims with a genuine image in order to misrepresent events or persons is, however, relatively niche and unexplored. Very recently, Aneja *et al.* [5] introduced this task, provided a dataset of real-world news posts called COSMOS, and proposed a method for detecting cheapfakes which was benchmarked using this dataset.

Note that OOC misuse of images should not be confused with multi-modal (image, caption) fake news detection methods [17, 18, 28, 33, 37, 38], which aim to identify fake news where images could be photoshopped and the real counterpart does not even exist. In the case of OOC misuse, the images are genuine and the real counterpart always exists. This is illustrated in Figure 2.

It is difficult to construct large-scale supervised dataset for the task of detecting OOC misuse, due to the relatively small number of images used to spread misinformation compared to the overall number of images shared on the Internet every day. To foster research in this direction, automatic methods to create synthetic OOC media can be used [21].

In this challenge, we focus on detecting a specific type of cheapfake – the alteration of context for news captions, where the key



**Figure 2: Fauxtography on social media: Green denotes real image/true claim and Red denotes fake image/false claim. Different real/fake image and true/false claim combinations used in news posts to spread misleading content can be considered under the umbrella term of *fake news*. Note that here we refer to the misuse of genuine images as out-of-context (OOC) cheapfakes, such as the use of contextually similar but irrelevant photographs (e.g., different time, different location, different event) with true/false claims, as shown in the top row. Image sources: [4, 13–15, 25]**

idea is to take an existing genuine image and create a highly convincing but potentially misleading message in order to spread misinformation. The challenge is based on the recently compiled COSMOS dataset [5], tailored specifically to the detection of OOC misuse of images. The algorithms developed by participants for this challenge should be able to detect OOC <Image, Caption1, Caption2> triplets in news items. The task is further explained in Section 3 and illustrated in Figure 4.


This article provides basic information about the dataset (Section 2), the task (Section 3), the evaluation criteria (Section 4), and the administrative details (Section 5) for the challenge. A challenge webpage <sup>1</sup> has also been setup for information and official announcements.

**2 DATASET**

Aneja *et al.* [5] have created COSMOS, a large-scale dataset of around 200K images which have been matched with 450K textual captions from different news websites, blogs, and social media posts. Figure 3 presents the category distribution of the images in the dataset, which were collected from a wide-variety of articles with special focus on topics where misinformation spread is prominent.

Overall, the dataset was gathered from two primary sources: news outlets and fact-checking websites. First, using publicly available news channel APIs, the authors scraped images along with the corresponding captions. Then, reverse-searching these images using Google’s Cloud Vision API, the authors found different contexts across the web in which the same images were shared. Thus, they

<sup>1</sup>[https://2021.acmmsys.org/cheapfake\\_challenge.php](https://2021.acmmsys.org/cheapfake_challenge.php)



**Figure 3: Distribution of the images in the COSMOS dataset per category.**

have obtained several captions per image with varying context (2-4 captions per image).

Split	#Images	#Captions	Context Annotation
Training	161752	360749	No
Validation	41006	90036	No
Public Test	1000	2000	Yes
Hidden Test	N/A	N/A	Yes

**Table 1: Challenge dataset statistics.**

For this challenge, a part of the COSMOS dataset is sampled and assigned as the public dataset. The public dataset, consisting of the *training*, *validation* and *public test* splits, is provided openly to participants for training and testing their algorithms<sup>2</sup>. The remaining part of the COSMOS dataset is augmented with new samples and modified to create the *hidden test* split, which is not made publicly available, and will be used by the challenge organizers to evaluate the submissions. Table 1 provides statistics about the overall challenge dataset.

## 2.1 Training and Validation Splits

The training and validation splits are provided as JavaScript Object Notation (JSON) formatted text files called `train.json` and `val.json`, where each data sample is stored as a dictionary (see Listing 1). The attributes in `train.json` and `val.json` are as follows.

- `img_local_path`: Source path for the image in the dataset directory.
- `articles`: List of dictionaries containing metadata for every caption associated with the image.
- `caption`: Original caption scraped from the news website.
- `article_url`: Link to the website from where the image and caption were scraped.
- `caption_modified`: Modified caption after applying Spacy NER<sup>3</sup>. Authors in [5] use this caption as an input to their model during experiments.
- `entity_list`: List of mappings between the modified named entities in `caption` with the corresponding hypernyms.

<sup>2</sup>Prospective participants are able to get access to the dataset by filling out a Google Form indicated on the challenge webpage.

<sup>3</sup><https://spacy.io/api/entityrecognizer>

## Listing 1: File structure for `train.json` and `val.json`

```
{
  "img_local_path": <img_path >,
  "articles": [
    {
      "caption": <caption1 >,
      "article_url": <url1 >,
      "caption_modified": <caption_mod1 >,
      "entity_list": <entity_list1 >,
    },
    {
      "caption": <caption2 >,
      "article_url": <url2 >,
      "caption_modified": <caption_mod2 >,
      "entity_list": <entity_list2 >,
    },
    {
      "caption": <caption3 >,
      "article_url": <url3 >,
      "caption_modified": <caption_mod3 >,
      "entity_list": <entity_list3 >,
    },
    ... ] ,
  "maskrcnn_bboxes": [
    [x1, y1, x2, y2],
    [x1, y1, x2, y2],
    ... ]
}
```

- `maskrcnn_bboxes`: List of detected bounding boxes corresponding to the image. (x1,y1) refers to the start vertex of the rectangle and (x2, y2) refers to end vertex of the rectangle. Note that for detecting bounding boxes, the authors in [5] use the Detectron2 pretrained model<sup>4</sup> available under<sup>5</sup>. They detect up to 10 bounding boxes per image.

## 2.2 Test Splits

The public test split is provided as a JSON formatted text file called `test.json`, and has the structure shown in Listing 2. The hidden test split is structurally identical to the public test split. The attributes in `test.json` are as follows.

- `img_local_path`: Source path for the image in the dataset directory.
- `caption1`: First caption associated with the image.
- `caption1_modified`: Modified `caption1` after applying Spacy NER.
- `caption1_entities`: List of mappings between the modified named entities in `caption1` with the corresponding hypernyms.
- `caption2`: Second caption associated with the image.
- `caption2_modified`: Modified `caption2` after applying Spacy NER.
- `caption2_entities`: List of mappings between the modified named entities in `caption2` with the corresponding hypernyms.

<sup>4</sup>[https://github.com/facebookresearch/detectron2/blob/master/MODEL\\_ZOO.md](https://github.com/facebookresearch/detectron2/blob/master/MODEL_ZOO.md)

<sup>5</sup>[https://github.com/facebookresearch/detectron2/blob/master/configs/COCO-Keypoints/keypoint\\_rcnn\\_X\\_101\\_32x8d\\_FPN\\_3x.yaml](https://github.com/facebookresearch/detectron2/blob/master/configs/COCO-Keypoints/keypoint_rcnn_X_101_32x8d_FPN_3x.yaml)

### Listing 2: File structure for test.json

```
{
  "img_local_path": <img_path >,
  "caption1": <caption1 >,
  "caption1_modified": <caption1_modified >,
  "caption1_entities": <caption1_entities >,
  "caption2": <caption2 >,
  "caption2_modified": <caption2_modified >,
  "caption2_entities": <caption2_entities >,
  "article_url": <article_url >,
  "label": "ooc/not-ooc",
  "maskrcnn_bboxes": [
    [x1, y1, x2, y2],
    [x1, y1, x2, y2],
    ... ]
}
```

- `article_url`: Link to the website from where the image and caption were scraped.
- `label`: Class label indicating whether the two captions are out-of-context with respect to the image (1=out-of-context (OOC), 0=not-out-of-context (NOOC))
- `maskrcnn_bboxes`: List of detected bounding boxes corresponding to the image. (x1,y1) refers to the start vertex of the rectangle and (x2, y2) refers to the end vertex of the rectangle.

## 3 TASK DESCRIPTION

This challenge invites participants to develop a model using the dataset provided by the organizers, for the detection of OOC image captions that might be accompanying news images. For each sample in a given test split described above, their model must detect whether the <Image, Caption1, Caption2> triplet is OOC or NOOC, and output the corresponding class label: 1=OOC or 0=NOOC.

### 3.1 Considerations

There are two considerations in the fulfilment of the above described task.

- **Binary detection performance:** The first goal of the task is to achieve high detection performance, i.e., to be able to detect whether <Image, Caption1, Caption2> triplets are OOC or NOOC, successfully. This speaks to *effectiveness*. Participant models are evaluated based on the Effectiveness Score (E1) described in Section 4.
- **Latency and complexity:** In certain scenarios, having an idea about the potential misuse of images in real-time and with minimal resources can be more important than the detection performance itself. This speaks to *efficiency*. We take this aspect into consideration by introducing an additional goal: having low latency and low complexity. Participant models are evaluated based on the Efficiency Score (E2) described in Section 4.




Figure 4: Task description: Each image is accompanied by two captions it was shared together with on the Internet. On the left, one of the two captions is misleading with an alteration of context, hence out-of-context (OOC). On the right, none of the two captions are misleading, hence not-out-of-context (NOOC). Given <Image, Caption1, Caption2> triplets as input, the model should predict corresponding class labels. Image source: [5]

### 3.2 Baseline Model

Prospective participants are provided with the pre-trained model from [5] upon request. This model is provided only as a reference, where interested participants are encouraged to use the model for reproducing the results from the original paper, and/or as a baseline for developing their own models for this challenge.

The core idea of [5] is a self-supervised training strategy where only captioned images are needed: no explicit OOC annotations are required during training, which could be potentially difficult to acquire in large numbers. The image captions from the dataset are established as matches, and random captions from other images as non-matches. Using these matches vs. non-matches as a loss function, the authors are able to learn the co-occurrence patterns of images with textual descriptions in order to determine whether an image appears to be OOC with respect to textual claims. During training, their method only learns to selectively align individual objects in an image with textual claims, without explicit OOC supervision. At test time, they correlate these alignment predictions between the two captions for the input image. If both texts correspond to the same object but their meaning is semantically different, they infer that the image is used OOC.

### 3.3 Test Environment

Participants are free to develop their models in any language or platform they prefer. However, a submission in the form of a Docker image is required for evaluation. This image should include all the required dependencies and should be possible to run using the latest version of Docker (releases for Linux/Mac/Windows are available under <sup>6</sup>). Note that data should not be included within the Docker image itself, as it will be injected during evaluation. Participants can assume that the test dataset will be located at /mmsys21/cheapfakes. Sample Docker file instructions can be found in the official GitHub repository for the challenge [22].

<sup>6</sup><https://docs.docker.com/get-docker/>



Figure 5: Timeline for the MMSys'21 Grand Challenge on Detecting Cheapfakes.

## 4 EVALUATION CRITERIA

In order to rank participant models, two aggregate scores will be used: E1 and E2.

### 4.1 Effectiveness Score (E1)

Given the following definitions

- **True Positives (TP)**: Number of samples correctly identified as OOC
- **True Negatives (TN)**: Number of samples correctly identified as NOOC
- **False Positives (FP)**: Number of samples incorrectly identified as OOC
- **False Negatives (FN)**: Number of samples incorrectly identified as NOOC

The *effectiveness* of participant models will be evaluated according to the following 5 metrics: accuracy, precision, recall, F1-score [34], and Matthews Correlation Coefficient (MCC) [35]. Authors are asked to calculate the 5 metrics for their model and include these values in their manuscript. E1 will be a function of accuracy, F1-score and MCC, to be calculated by the organizers.

$$Accuracy = \frac{TP + TN}{TP + FP + TN + FN} \quad (1)$$

$$Precision = \frac{TP}{TP + FP} \quad (2)$$

$$Recall = \frac{TP}{TP + FN} \quad (3)$$

$$F1 = 2 \frac{(Recall \times Precision)}{(Recall + Precision)} \quad (4)$$

$$= \frac{TP}{TP + \frac{1}{2}(FP + FN)}$$

$$MCC = \frac{(TP \times TN) - (FP \times FN)}{\sqrt{(TP + FP)(TP + FN)(TN + FP)(TN + FN)}} \quad (5)$$

### 4.2 Efficiency Score (E2)

The *efficiency* of participant models will be evaluated according to the following 3 metrics: latency, number of parameters, and model size. Participants are asked to calculate the 3 metrics for their model and include these values in their manuscript. E2 will be a function of latency, complexity-1 and complexity-2, to be calculated by the organizers.

- Latency: Average runtime per sample<sup>7</sup> (ms)
- Complexity-1: Number of trainable parameters in the model (million)
- Complexity-2: Model size (MB)

### 4.3 Baseline Model Scores

As a reference, we run the baseline model described in Section 3.2 on the public test split described in Section 2. Results can be found in Table 2.

	Metric	Value
E1	Accuracy (Eq. 1)	0.82
	Precision (Eq. 2)	0.85
	Recall (Eq. 3)	0.77
	F1-score (Eq. 4)	0.81
	MCC (Eq. 5)	0.64
E2	Latency: runtime for one data sample (ms)	35
	Complexity-1: # trainable parameters (million)	2.5
	Complexity-2: model size (MB)	10.2

Table 2: Baseline model results on the public test split.

This model achieves 82% accuracy when run on the public test split. Note that the accuracy value is different from the original paper [5], where the model is run on a slightly different dataset.

## 5 ADMINISTRATIVE DETAILS

### 5.1 Timeline and Awards

The timeline for the grand challenge is indicated in Figure 5. The challenge was announced on April 9, and the dataset was released<sup>2</sup> on May 5. The registration/submission site<sup>8</sup> was opened on May 31. The registration and submission deadlines are June 25 and July 19, respectively. The authors will be notified after a review process (acceptance notifications are due July 26). Authors of accepted papers need to prepare a camera-ready version according to the instructions provided below in Section 5.2, in order for their papers to be published in the ACM Digital Library. Camera-ready manuscripts are due August 6.

The challenge is open to any individual, commercial or academic institution. Winners will be chosen by a committee appointed by the challenge organizers and the decision will be final. The results will be announced during the ACM Multimedia Systems Conference

<sup>7</sup>Arithmetic mean of the runtime per sample, calculated over all samples in the public test split.

<sup>8</sup><https://mmsys2021challenges.hotcrp.com/>

(MMSys'21)<sup>9</sup> which will take place between September 28 and October 1. The winner will be awarded 5,000 USD and the runner-up will be awarded 2,500 USD. If contributions of sufficient quality are not received, then some or all of the awards may not be granted.

## 5.2 Submission Instructions

Submissions should be prepared according to the guidelines provided below.

- The manuscript should provide enough details for the implemented algorithm in a short technical paper, and include references to the public repository for the source code and the Docker image.
- Page count: Up to 6 pages plus an optional page for references only.
- Style: Single blind using the ACM proceedings template<sup>10</sup>.
- ACM header: "MMSys'21, Sept. 28-Oct. 1, 2021, Istanbul, Turkey" on the left, and author names (on even pages) / title (on odd pages, except the first page) on the right.
- Format: Portable Document Format (PDF)
- Online submission: <https://mmsys2021challenges.hotcrp.com/>

## 5.3 Participant Support

Along with the official webpage for the challenge<sup>1</sup>, a Google Group<sup>11</sup> and a Slack channel<sup>12</sup> have been established to support prospective participants. Interested participants can find the previously asked questions and join interactive discussions on these platforms.

## 6 CONCLUSION AND OUTLOOK

The MMSys'21 Grand Challenge on Detecting Cheapfakes addresses the relatively new but prominent problem of *cheapfake* multimedia content in news. More specifically, it focuses on the OOC misuse of images in news items. As emphasized in the Section 1, this is a relatively novel area of research, in comparison to deepfakes, and is distinguishable from the wider field of fake news in the following way: the term "fake news" traditionally refers to the use of either *fake* multimedia content or *false* captions, whereas OOC misuse refers to the scenario where the multimedia content in the news item (images in this case) is decidedly not fake, and the captions may or may not be false. Rather, the misinformation results from the OOC combination of the two.

With this challenge, we firstly aim to motivate researchers to develop different methods for addressing this particular problem, and to benchmark a number of proposed models for detecting the OOC misuse of photographs in news items. Secondly, through the dissection and analysis of the COSMOS dataset, we aim to encourage the in-depth understanding and later generation of (further) supervised datasets for this task. Algorithmic benchmarking is an efficient approach to analyze the results from different detection

methods, but on top of evaluating the models themselves, the comparison of different approaches can help identify the potentials as well as the shortcomings of existing open datasets.

There is a growing interest from the scientific community towards addressing the problem of misinformation in general, and towards the detection of deepfakes in particular. We hope that this challenge can increase awareness regarding the prominence of cheapfakes as well, and that in the future, the methods presented within this context can evolve into systems that support researchers, regulatory bodies, news consumers, and the general public in their search for a safe and truthful information ecosystem.

## REFERENCES

- [1] 2019. *Real vs fake: debunking the 'drunk' Nancy Pelosi footage*. <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2019/may/24/facebook-leaves-fake-nancy-pelosi-video-on-site>
- [2] Darius Afchar, Vincent Nozick, Junichi Yamagishi, and Isao Echizen. 2018. MesoNet: a Compact Facial Video Forgery Detection Network. <https://doi.org/10.1109/wifs.2018.8630761>
- [3] S. Agarwal, H. Farid, Yuming Gu, Mingming He, Koki Nagano, and H. Li. 2019. Protecting World Leaders Against Deep Fakes. In *CVPR Workshops*.
- [4] Aljazeera. 2021. *What led to the most recent Israel-Palestine escalation?* Retrieved May 12, 2021 from <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2021/5/12/what-lead-up-to-most-recent-israel-palestine-escalation>
- [5] Shivangi Aneja, Chris Bregler, and Matthias Nießner. 2021. COSMOS: Catching Out-of-Context Misinformation with Self-Supervised Learning. arXiv:2101.06278 [cs.CV]
- [6] Shivangi Aneja and Matthias Nießner. 2020. Generalized Zero and Few-Shot Transfer for Facial Forgery Detection. arXiv:2006.11863 [cs.CV]
- [7] Boredpanda. 2019. *30 Fake Viral Photos People Believed Were Real*. <https://www.boredpanda.com/fake-news-photos-viral-photoshop/>
- [8] J. Scott Brennen, Felix M. Simon, Philip N. Howard, and Rasmus Kleis Nielsen. 2020. *Types, Sources, and Claims of COVID-19 Misinformation*. [http://www.primaonline.it/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/COVID-19\\_reuters.pdf](http://www.primaonline.it/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/COVID-19_reuters.pdf)
- [9] Can Chen, Scott McCloskey, and J. Yu. 2017. Image Splicing Detection via Camera Response Function Analysis. *2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR) (2017)*, 1876–1885.
- [10] D. Cozzolino, G. Poggi, and L. Verdoliva. 2015. Splicebuster: A new blind image splicing detector. *2015 IEEE International Workshop on Information Forensics and Security (WIFS) (2015)*, 1–6.
- [11] Davide Cozzolino, Andreas Rössler, Justus Thies, Matthias Nießner, and Luisa Verdoliva. 2020. ID-Reveal: Identity-aware DeepFake Video Detection. arXiv:2012.02512 [cs.CV]
- [12] Davide Cozzolino, Justus Thies, Andreas Rössler, Christian Riess, Matthias Nießner, and Luisa Verdoliva. 2018. Forensictransfer: Weakly-supervised domain adaptation for forgery detection. arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.02510 (2018).
- [13] Dan Evon. 2020. *Is This Obama, Fauci, and Gates at a Wuhan Lab in 2015?* Retrieved July 13, 2020 from <https://www.snopes.com/fact-check/obama-fauci-gates-wuhan-lab/>
- [14] Dan Evon. 2021. *Mike Tyson's Anti-Vaccine Shirt Photo Is Fake*. Retrieved July 1, 2021 from <https://www.snopes.com/fact-check/mike-tyson-anti-vaccine-shirt/>
- [15] Dan Haverty. 2020. *Thousands Injured in Giant Beirut Blast*. Retrieved Aug 4, 2020 from <https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/08/04/thousands-injured-in-giant-beirut-blast/>
- [16] Minyoung Huh, Andrew Liu, Andrew Owens, and Alexei A. Efros. 2018. Fighting Fake News: Image Splice Detection via Learned Self-Consistency. arXiv:1805.04096 [cs.CV]
- [17] Zhiwei Jin, Juan Cao, Han Guo, Yongdong Zhang, and Jiebo Luo. 2017. Multimodal Fusion with Recurrent Neural Networks for Rumor Detection on Microblogs. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM International Conference on Multimedia (Mountain View, California, USA) (MM '17)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 795–816. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3123266.3123454>
- [18] Dhruv Khattar, Jaipal Singh Goud, Manish Gupta, and Vasudeva Varma. 2019. MVAE: Multimodal Variational Autoencoder for Fake News Detection. *The World Wide Web Conference (2019)*.
- [19] Lingzhi Li, Jianmin Bao, Ting Zhang, Hao Yang, Dong Chen, Fang Wen, and Baining Guo. 2020. Face x-ray for more general face forgery detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 5001–5010.
- [20] Yuezun Li and Siwei Lyu. 2018. Exposing DeepFake Videos By Detecting Face Warping Artifacts. arXiv:1811.00656 [cs.CV]
- [21] Grace Luo, Trevor Darrell, and Anna Rohrbach. 2021. NewsCLIPpings: Automatic Generation of Out-of-Context Multimodal Media. arXiv:2104.05893 [cs.CV]

<sup>9</sup><https://2021.acmmmsys.org/>

<sup>10</sup><https://www.acm.org/publications/proceedings-template>

<sup>11</sup>"MMSys'21 Grand Challenge on Detecting Cheapfakes" group homepage: <https://groups.google.com/g/mmsys21-grandchallenge-cheapfakes/>, e-mail: [mmsys21-grandchallenge-cheapfakes@googlegroups.com](mailto:mmsys21-grandchallenge-cheapfakes@googlegroups.com).

<sup>12</sup>ACM MMSys Slack workspace: <https://tinyurl.com/mmsys-slack/>, channel for grand challenge: #2021-gc-cheapfakes

- [22] Cise Midoglu and Shivangi Aneja. 2021. *2021 Grand Challenge Cheapfakes*. <https://github.com/acmmmsys/2021-grandchallenge-cheapfakes>
- [23] Huy H. Nguyen, Junichi Yamagishi, and Isao Echizen. 2019. Capsule-forensics: Using Capsule Networks to Detect Forged Images and Videos. <https://doi.org/10.1109/icassp.2019.8682602>
- [24] Britt Paris and Joan Donovan. 2019. *Deepfakes and cheapfakes: The manipulation of audio and visual evidence*. [https://datasociety.net/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/DataSociety\\_Deepfakes\\_Cheap\\_Fakes.pdf](https://datasociety.net/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/DataSociety_Deepfakes_Cheap_Fakes.pdf)
- [25] Georgina Rannard. 2020. *Australia fires: Misleading maps and pictures go viral*. Retrieved January 7, 2020 from <https://www.bbc.com/news/blogs-trending-51020564>
- [26] Andreas Rössler, Davide Cozzolino, Luisa Verdoliva, Christian Riess, Justus Thies, and Matthias Nießner. 2019. FaceForensics++: Learning to Detect Manipulated Facial Images. arXiv:1901.08971 [cs.CV]
- [27] Nina Schick. 2020. *Don't underestimate the cheapfake*. Retrieved Dec 22, 2020 from <https://www.technologyreview.com/2020/12/22/1015442/cheapfakes-more-political-damage-2020-election-than-deepfakes/>
- [28] Lanyu Shang, Yang Zhang, Daniel Zhang, and D. Wang. 2020. FauxWard: a graph neural network approach to fauxtography detection using social media comments. *Social Network Analysis and Mining* 10 (2020), 1–16.
- [29] President Obama The White House. 2014. *President Obama tours a lab at the Vaccine Research Center at the National Institutes of Health*. <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/photos-and-video/photo/2014/12/president-obama-tours-lab-vaccine-research-center-national-institutes>
- [30] L. Verdoliva. 2020. Media Forensics and DeepFakes: An Overview. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing* 14, 5 (2020), 910–932. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JSTSP.2020.3002101>
- [31] Mike Vorhaus. 2020. *People Increasingly Turn To Social Media For News*. Retrieved June 24, 2020 from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/mikevorhaus/2020/06/24/people-increasingly-turn-to-social-media-for-news/>
- [32] Sheng-Yu Wang, Oliver Wang, Andrew Owens, Richard Zhang, and Alexei A Efros. 2019. Detecting Photoshopped Faces by Scripting Photoshop. In *ICCV*.
- [33] Yaqing Wang, Fenglong Ma, Zhiwei Jin, Ye Yuan, Guangxu Xun, Kishlay Jha, Lu Su, and Jing Gao. 2018. EANN: Event Adversarial Neural Networks for Multi-Modal Fake News Detection. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery* (London, United Kingdom) (KDD '18). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 849–857. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3219819.3219903>
- [34] Wikipedia. 2021. *F1-score*. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/F-score>
- [35] Wikipedia. 2021. *Matthews correlation coefficient*. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Matthews\\_correlation\\_coefficient](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Matthews_correlation_coefficient)
- [36] Xin Yang, Yuezun Li, and Siwei Lyu. 2019. Exposing Deep Fakes Using Inconsistent Head Poses. *ICASSP 2019 - 2019 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)* (May 2019). <https://doi.org/10.1109/icassp.2019.8683164>
- [37] Daniel Zhang, Lanyu Shang, Biao Geng, Shuyue Lai, Ke Li, Hongmin Zhu, Tanvir Amin, and Dong Wang. 2018. FauxBuster: A Content-free Fauxtography Detector Using Social Media Comments. In *Proceedings of IEEE BigData 2018*.
- [38] Dimitrina Zlatkova, Preslav Nakov, and Ivan Koychev. 2019. Fact-Checking Meets Fauxtography: Verifying Claims About Images. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Hong Kong, China, 2099–2108. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/D19-1216>