
FAD: A Chinese Dataset for Fake Audio Detection

Haoxin Ma^{1,2}, Jiangyan Yi¹, Chenglong Wang¹, Xinrui Yan¹, Jianhua Tao^{1,2,3}

Tao Wang^{1,2}, Shiming Wang¹, Le Xu¹, Ruibo Fu¹

¹NLPR, Institute of Automation, Chinese Academy of Sciences, China

²School of Artificial Intelligence, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, China

³CAS Center for Excellence in Brain Science and Intelligence Technology, China

{haoxin.ma, jiangyan.yi}@nlpr.ia.ac.cn

Abstract

Fake audio detection is a growing concern and some relevant datasets have been designed for research. But there is no standard public Chinese dataset under additive noise conditions. In this paper, we aim to fill in the gap and design a Chinese fake audio detection dataset (FAD) for studying more generalized detection methods. Twelve mainstream speech generation techniques are used to generate fake audios. To simulate the real-life scenarios, three noise datasets are selected for noisy adding at five different signal noise ratios. FAD dataset can be used not only for fake audio detection, but also for detecting the algorithms of fake utterances for audio forensics. Baseline results are presented with analysis. The results that show fake audio detection methods with generalization remain challenging. The FAD dataset is publicly available¹.

1 Introduction

Advanced speech synthesis technology brings a lot of convenience to our life, but it also brings a serious risks to our economic security, political security and social stability if used maliciously. For example, criminals can spoof automatic speaker verification (ASV) system by fake audios. Public opinion can be misled by the content of fake audios. Thus, fake audio detection is of great significance and has attracted widespread attention in recent years. To carry out the relevant research, the construction of the dataset is the first step.

Early researches focus on audio spoofing problem faced by ASV system, and perform on private dataset [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7]. Until 2015, some public datasets[8, 9, 10, 11] are released, represented by ASVspoof databases. ASVspoof databases are used for a series of automatic speaker verification spoofing and countermeasures (ASVspoof) challenge, which have been held for 4 sessions so far.

Recently, fake audio detection is not limited to ASV system, but also starts to focus on real-life scenarios. The first audio deep synthesis detection challenge [12] (ADD 2022) focuses on challenging situations, including low-quality fake audio and partially fake audio detection. More datasets are constructed by deep-learning speech techniques, such as: FoR [13], WaveFake [14], and HAD [15] datasets.

These above-mentioned datasets facilitate the progress of the fake audio detection research. However, in practical applications, audios on social media come in many languages with noisy background and the type of fake audio may be unknown to the model. Those various factors greatly influence the performance of the detection models. The generalization of the detection models is still an urgent need to address. Specifically, the generalization includes generalization to unknown types and robustness to noise and other factors. Most datasets focus on the evaluation of the former aspect,

¹<https://zenodo.org/record/6635521#.Ysjq4nZBw2x>

Table 1: Comparison between FAD dataset versus prior works.

Dataset	Language	Condition	Scenario	# Speaker	Fake	Real	Accessibility
SAS	English	Clean	ASV	Real: 106 Fake: 106	Types: VC, TTS Label: Yes	#Resource: 1 Label: Yes	Public
ASVspoof 2015	English	Clean	ASV	Real: 106 Fake: 106	Types: VC, TTS Label: Yes	#Resources: 1 Label: Yes	Public
Noisy Database	English	Noisy	ASV	Real: 106 Fake: 106	Types: VC, TTS Label: Yes	#Resources: 1 Label: Yes	Restricted
ASVspoof 2017	English	Clean	ASV	Real: 42 Fake: 42	Types: Replay Label: Yes	#Resources: 1 Label: Yes	Public
ASVspoof 2019	English	Clean	ASV	Real: 107 Fake: 107	Types: VC, TTS, Replay Label: Yes	#Resources: 2 Label: Yes	Public
FoR	English	Clean	Human	Real: 140 Fake: 33	Types: TTS Label: No	#Resource: 4 Label: No	Public
HAD	Chinese	Clean	Human	Real: 218 Fake: 218	Types: Partially fake Label: No	#Resource: 1 Label: No	Restricted
WaveFake	English, Japanese	Clean	Human	Real: 2 Fake: 2	Types: TTS Label: Yes	#Resource: 1 Label: Yes	Public
ASVspoof 2021	English	Clean, Noisy	ASV	Real: 149 Fake: 149	Types: VC, TTS, Replay Label: Yes	#Resource: 2 Label: Yes	Restricted
Our FAD	Chinese	Clean, Noisy	Human	Real: 1024 Fake: 279	Types: TTS, Partially fake Label: Yes	#Resource: 6 Label: Yes	Public

but ignoring noisy environments. Although noisy database [16] and part of ADD 2022 dataset [12] have considered that, they are inaccessible yet. Besides, for data collection, it's taken for granted to consider the diversity of fake audios. But in fact, there are also differences among real audios. So there cannot be only one resource of real audios. In addition, most datasets are in English and there is no public Chinese dataset. To better conduct the research on generalization of fake audio detection methods, noisy environments, other languages, and multiple data types (especially for real audio) need to be considered in the design of the dataset.

In this paper, we introduce a Chinese fake audio detection dataset named FAD. For the fake audios, they totally covers 12 types, 11 of which are generated by different speech synthesis techniques and the remaining one is partially fake type. For the real audios, they are collected from 6 different corpora. To better evaluate the robustness of detection methods under noisy conditions, we additionally add additive noise to all the audios, forming a noisy version dataset. FAD dataset provides not only basic labels (fake or real), but also detailed labels such as fake type, real source, noise type and signal noise ratio (SNR). In this way, a variety of studies on fake audio detection are supported. Relevant baseline experiments and analysis of results are also presented. We hope the publication of the FAD dataset can advance the progress in fake audio detection.

The main contributions of our work are as follows:

- This is the first public Chinese standard dataset for fake audio detection under noisy conditions. We provide the detailed label of each audio to enable flexible experimental settings for researchers.
- A variety of research related to fake audio detection are supported. FAD dataset can not only support the robustness studies under noisy conditions and generalization studies on unseen types for fake audio detection, but also support fake algorithm recognition studies for audio forensics. The corresponding baselines are provided to facilitate other researchers to compare against.

2 Related Work

In this section, we briefly introduce several other related fake audio detection datasets, and then compare them with our FAD dataset.

For the datasets used to spoof the ASV system, SAS [8] corpus comprises spoofing materials from 2 speech synthesis systems and 7 voice conversion systems. The real audio of SAS is from VCTK database [17]. SAS is also used for supporting the ASVspoof 2015 [9] but types of fake audio in ASVspoof 2015 database increase to 10. Then, a noisy database [16] is built based on ASVspoof 2015 to investigate of spoofing detection under additive noisy conditions. ASVspoof 2017 [10] focuses on replay attack . The real audios of it are from RedDots [18] corpus and fake audios are collected under more than 50 different configurations. Afterwards, ASVspoof 2019 [11] database collects more diverse spoofing sources, including replay, speech synthesis and voice conversion attacks.

For the datasets used to spoof the human auditory system, FoR dataset [13] contains fake audios from 7 open resources and real audios from 4 resources. HAD dataset [15] is designed for partially fake audio detection, generated by manipulated the original utterances with genuine or synthesized audio segments. WaveFake [14] collects ten sample sets from six different network architectures across two languages.

Table 1 highlights the differences. We can find that our FAD dataset has various fake types and more real audios resources with various speakers. It considers both clean and noisy conditions and is currently the only public Chinese dataset.

3 Dataset Design

In this section, we first introduce our dataset design policy. Then we demonstrate the construction process of the dataset, including the resources of the clean real audios, the generation of the clean fake audios, and the simulation process of the noisy audios. Finally, the overall statistics of FAD dataset are given.

3.1 Design Policy

The FAD dataset is designed to evaluate the methods of fake audio detection and fake algorithms recognition and other relevant studies. To better study the robustness of the methods under noisy conditions when applied in real life, we construct the corresponding noisy dataset. The total FAD dataset consists of two versions: clean version and noisy version. Both versions are divided into disjoint training, development and test sets in the same way. There is no speaker overlap across these three subsets. Each test sets is further divided into seen and unseen test sets. Unseen test sets can evaluate the generalization of the methods to unknown types. It is worth mentioning that both real audios and fake audios in the unseen test set are unknown to the model.

For the noisy speech part, we select three noise database for simulation. Additive noises are added to each audio in the clean dataset at 5 different SNRs. The additive noises of the unseen test set and the remaining subsets come from different noise databases. Figure 1 demonstrates the the construction process.

Overall, the generation procedure of FAD dataset consists of two steps:

- 1) **Building clean version.** Collecting clean real audios from different clean speech resources and generating clean fake audios by different techniques.
- 2) **Building noisy version based on clean version.** Adding the clean audios and noise signals together at various SNRs.

3.2 Clean Real Audios Collection

Most of the previous fake audio detection datasets only focus on the diversity of fake audios, ignoring the differences existing among real audios in real-life scenarios. If there in only one data resource, model may learn the irrelevant information. For example, if the real audio are recorded using the same microphones, the detection model may distinguish between real and fake audio based on microphone types rather than the essential difference. Besides, gender, accent, audio codecs, sample rate and other unrelated factors can also interfere with the training of the model. Collecting as diverse real audios as possible helps improve the generalization and robustness.




Figure 1: Partitions and construction of FAD dataset. Top part shows divisions of training, development, and test sets common to clean and noisy versions and numbers of speakers included in each set. Middle part shows data partitions for clean version and generation ways, and bottom part shows the process of noise adding to the clean data and corresponding noisy version.

From the point of eliminating the interference of irrelevant factors, we collect clean real audios from two aspects: open resources and self-recording data. Five speech resources from OpenSLR² platform are selected. We also recorded some audios by ourselves. They are:

- **R01: AISHELL1** [19]. This dataset contains more than 170 hours speech data from 400 speakers, recorded by high fidelity microphone in a quiet environment.
- **R02: AISHELL3** [20]. This dataset contains roughly 85 hours high-fidelity speech data from 218 speakers.
- **R03: THCHS-30** [21]. This dataset contains more than 30 hours speech data from 40 speakers, recorded by single carbon microphone at silent office.
- **R04: MAGICDATA Mandarin Chinese Read Speech Corpus**. This dataset contains 755 hours speech data from 1080 speakers, recorded by mobile phone in a quiet environment.
- **R05: MAGICDATA Mandarin Chinese Conversational Speech Corpus** [22]. This dataset contains 180 hours of conversational speech from 633 speakers, recorded by mobile phone in a quiet environment.
- **R06: Self-Recording Corpus**: This dataset contains about 60 hours speech data from 200 native Chinese speakers, recorded by mobile phone in a quiet indoor environment.

Among these 6 corpora, R01-R04 are used for the training, development and seen test sets, R05-R06 are used for unseen test set. For R01-R04, we sample 7900 utterances from each corpus, of which 3200 utterances are used for training set, 1200 utterances are used for development set, and the remaining 3500 utterances are used for seen test set. For R05 and R06, we sample 3500 utterances from each for unseen test set.

3.3 Clean Fake Audios Generation

We select 11 representative speech synthesis methods to generate the fake audios. They are all trained and generated using AISHELL3 corpus. Besides, we collected another type, partially fake, to better evaluate the generalization of the detection methods. The partially fake audios are generated based on AISHELL1. These 12 types of fake audios are as follows:

- **F01: STRAIGHT**³. This is a traditional-vocoder-based system which generates audios by STRAIGHT [23] vocoder from ground truth mel-spectrum. STRAIGHT is an extension

²<http://www.openslr.org/12/>

³https://github.com/HidekiKawahara/legacy_STRAIGHT.git

of the classical channel vocoder that exploits the advantages of progress in information processing technologies and a new conceptualization of the role of repetitive structures in speech sounds.

- **F02: Griffin-Lim**⁴. This is a traditional-vocoder-based system which generates audios by Griffin-Lim [24] from ground truth mel-spectrum. Griffin-Lim uses a phase reconstruction method based on the redundancy of the short-time Fourier transform and promotes the consistency of a spectrogram.
- **F03: LPCNet**⁵. This is a neural-vocoder-based system which generates audios by LPCNet [25] from ground truth mel-spectrum. LPCNet is used to reduce the complexity of neural synthesis by using linear prediction. It makes it easier to deploy neural synthesis applications on lower-power devices.
- **F04: WaveNet**⁶. This is a neural-vocoder-based system which generates audios by waveNet [26] from ground truth mel-spectrum. WaveNet models the conditional probability to generate the next sample in the audio waveform, given all previous samples and possibly additional parameters.
- **F05: PWG**⁷. This is a neural-vocoder-based system which generates audios by Parallel WaveGAN (PWG) [27] from ground truth mel-spectrum. PWG is a distillation-free, fast, and small-footprint waveform generation method using a generative adversarial network.
- **F06: HifiGan**⁷. This is a neural-vocoder-based system which generates audios by HifiGan [28] from ground truth mel-spectrum. HifiGan consists of one generator and two discriminators: multi-scale and multi-period discriminators, which are trained adversarially.
- **F07: Multiband-MelGan**⁷. This is a neural-vocoder-based system which generates audios by Multiband-MelGan [29] from ground truth mel-spectrum. The generator of Multiband-MelGan produces sub-band signals which are subsequently summed back to full-band signals as discriminator input.
- **F08: Style-MelGAN**⁷. This is a neural-vocoder-based system which generates audios by a light-weight vocoder, Style-MelGAN [30] from ground truth mel-spectrum. Style-MelGAN allows synthesis of high-fidelity speech with low computational complexity.
- **F09: World**⁸. This is a traditional-vocoder-based system which generates audios by world [31] from ground truth mel-spectrum. World can estimate fundamental frequency (F0), a periodicity and spectral envelope and also generate the speech like input speech with only estimated parameters.
- **F10: FastSpeech-HifiGan**⁹. This is an end-to-end system which generates audios from input text sequence. The acoustic model fastspeech [32] is used to generate mel-spectrum. The vocoder is hifiGan used for waveform reconstruction.
- **F11: Tacotron-HifiGan**⁹. This is an end-to-end system, similar to F10. But the acoustic model is Tacotron2 [33].
- **F12: Partially Fake**: Partially fake audios are obtained by clipping and splicing. We remove part of the original speech and replace it with a clipped segment from another speech. The replace part is semantically complete, guaranteed by text alignment techniques. This way is similar to the generation process of HAD dataset [15].

Among the 11 speech synthesis methods, F01-F02, and F09 are traditional-vocoder-based systems. F03-F08, and F10-F11 are neural-vocoder-based systems. Thus, for unseen test set, we select one of the traditional vocoders, two of neural vocoders, and partially fake type. They are F09-F12. In each type in F01-F08, 3200 utterances are used for training set, 1200 utterances are used for development set, and the 3500 utterances are used for seen test set. For each type in F09-F12, 3500 utterances are used for unseen test set. Since those speech synthesis systems are trained on AISHELL3 corpus (R2), the speakers of fake audios in each subset are consistent with R2 in the corresponding subset.

⁴<https://librosa.org/>

⁵<https://github.com/xiph/LPCNet.git>

⁶https://github.com/r9y9/wavenet_vocoder.git

⁷<https://github.com/kan-bayashi/ParallelWaveGAN.git>

⁸<https://github.com/mmorise/World.git>

⁹<https://github.com/espnet/espnet>

Table 2: The statistics of our FAD dataset. #Spk denotes the number of speakers. #Utt denotes the total utterance number. #dB denotes the number of utterance at different SNRs.

Subset	Clean		Noisy						
	#Spk	#Utt	#Spk	#0dB	#5dB	#10dB	#15dB	#20dB	#Utt
Train	407	38400	407	9294	6237	6237	6226	10406	38400
Dev	77	14400	77	2965	2475	2477	2385	4098	1440
Seen Test	92	42000	92	7126	7666	7674	7678	11856	42000
Unseen Test	636	21000	636	3506	3894	3890	3906	5804	21000

3.4 Noisy Audios Simulation

Noisy audios aim to quantify the robustness of the methods under noisy conditions. To simulate the real-life scenarios, we artificially sample the noise signals and add them to clean audios at 5 different SNRs, which are 0dB, 5dB, 10dB, 15dB and 20dB.

Additive noises are selected from three noise databases: PNL 100 Nonspeech Sounds [34], NOISEX-92 [35], and TAU Urban Acoustic Scenes [36]. There are 20 kinds of nonspeech, environmental sounds in PNL 100 Nonspeech Sounds and 15 kinds of noisy environments in NOISEX-92. TAU Urban Acoustic Scenes database supports for challenge on detection and classification of acoustic scenes and events (DCASE 2022) and contains 10 different acoustic scenes.

For the training, development and seen test sets in noisy version, we randomly select noise signals from PNL 100 Nonspeech Sounds and add them to the clean speech with a random SNR in [0dB, 5dB, 10dB, 15dB and 20dB]. For unseen test set in the noisy version, NOISEX-92 and TAU Urban Acoustic Scenes database are used for the same operations.

The generation of a noisy audio in our FAD dataset can be defined as 1:

$$y_{noisy}(t) = x_{clean}(t) + n_{noise}(t) \quad (1)$$

where t denotes the time index. y_{noisy} is referred as to our noisy audio after adding noise. x_{clean} is a utterance of clean dataset. $n_{noise}(t)$ denotes a noise signal of noise database.

3.5 Overall Statistics

In each version (clean and noisy versions) of FAD dataset, there are 138400 utterances in training set, 14400 utterances in development set, 42000 utterances in seen test set, and 21000 utterances in unseen test set. More detailed statistics are demonstrated in the Tabel 2.

4 Baselines

In this section, three baselines for fake audio detection and two baselines for fake algorithm recognition are provided and available on github¹⁰. All experiments are implemented on PyTorch [37] platform. Before experiments, the evaluation metrics for each task are briefly introduced. Then, experimental setup and results are presented. Based on these, we analyze the results.

4.1 Evaluation Metrics

For deepfake audio detection task, we use the equal error rate (EER) [9] as evaluation metric. The lower value of EER, the better performance of model. For fake algorithm recognition task, we use the F1-score [38] as our evaluation metric. The higher value of F1-score, the better performance of model.

4.2 Fake Audio Detection

Motivated by the baseline systems in ASVspooof challenges and ADD challenges, we choose three of them for fake audios detection task. They are:

1. **LFCC-GMM**: This is a Gaussian-mixture-model-based (GMM) systems operating on linear frequency cepstral coefficients (LFCCs) [39], which is the same as ASVspooof2021¹¹.
2. **LFCC-LCNN**: This system operates upon LFCC features with a light convolutional neural network (LCNN). Unlike LFCC-GMM, the frame length and shift of LFCC are set to 20ms and 10ms respectively. LCNN model refers to [40], but the 28th layer adopts AdaptiveMaxPool2d.
3. **RawNet2**: This is a fully end-to-end system [41] that operates directly upon raw audio waveforms. It consists of sinc filters, 6 residual blocks followed by a gated recurrent units (GRU) and a fully connected layer.

Table 3: The EERs (%) of the model trained with different training data sets on different fake types.

Train Set	Model	Clean Seen Test									Clean Unseen Test				
		F01	F02	F03	F04	F05	F06	F07	F08	Total	F09	F10	F11	F12	Total
Clean	LFCC-GMM	3.20	3.30	11.23	10.60	4.51	5.32	5.08	3.00	6.47	40.50	12.46	4.91	49.43	31.90
	LFCC-LCNN	2.04	2.34	1.56	0.50	0.398	0.67	0.74	0.32	1.26	16.54	7.73	2.74	70.63	26.56
	RawNet2	13.04	19.07	10.15	8.11	24.77	9.95	12.05	16.77	14.70	41.20	46.98	27.62	51.61	42.32
Noisy	LFCC-GMM	21.72	10.26	17.71	22.03	7.89	10.62	7.99	4.28	15.31	48.11	14.31	5.71	44.31	33.48
	LFCC-LCNN	5.46	4.63	3.56	2.66	1.96	2.11	2.90	0.64	3.43	15.97	3.18	4.91	59.11	24.01
	RawNet2	25.62	35.58	28.97	21.37	18.11	21.40	16.60	13.56	23.71	45.77	36.60	24.44	57.41	42.99
		Noisy Seen Test									Noisy Unseen Test				
		F01	F02	F03	F04	F05	F06	F07	F08	Total	F09	F10	F11	F12	Total
Clean	LFCC-GMM	28.51	21.08	42.55	29.13	28.10	22.71	28.38	33.91	29.79	36.62	23.52	13.35	36.25	30.31
	LFCC-LCNN	22.70	17.87	27.96	12.93	19.17	12.52	18.52	26.06	20.14	38.77	19.56	11.74	67.76	33.77
	RawNet2	39.54	40.34	25.85	24.50	35.21	21.33	20.01	29.35	30.25	43.55	41.77	29.46	42.66	39.82
Noisy	LFCC-GMM	35.79	38.10	39.10	10.98	5.05	5.03	5.25	4.87	19.80	39.96	20.65	15.73	43.29	31.71
	LFCC-LCNN	9.73	6.26	13.10	6.14	4.61	3.93	5.08	4.90	6.88	29.86	5.62	10.33	65.44	29.67
	RawNet2	20.67	25.93	28.15	18.35	14.86	17.56	13.44	11.02	19.68	45.65	33.34	24.29	49.94	40.01

Table 4: The EERs (%) of the model trained with different training data sets at different SNRs.

Train Set	Model	Noisy Seen Test						Noisy Unseen Test					
		0dB	5dB	10dB	15dB	20dB	Total	0dB	5dB	10dB	15dB	20dB	Total
Clean	LFCC-GMM	35.34	33.83	30.51	27.25	24.62	29.79	34.66	30.29	29.23	27.37	29.34	30.31
	LFCC-LCNN	32.06	27.00	20.96	15.59	10.82	20.14	40.18	39.12	35.13	33.33	30.29	33.77
	RawNet2	27.38	27.53	29.09	30.75	31.18	30.25	44.25	39.42	38.12	38.87	38.47	39.82
Noisy	LFCC-GMM	22.39	20.93	19.83	19.38	17.93	19.80	36.35	33.03	30.37	30.27	28.64	31.71
	LFCC-LCNN	10.59	9.49	6.63	5.21	4.41	6.88	32.39	33.65	30.84	29.67	27.05	29.67
	RawNet2	19.90	19.77	19.11	18.92	20.17	19.68	39.26	39.12	39.77	39.24	41.13	40.01

We conduct several groups of experiments to evaluate the performance of baseline systems on different test sets of our FAD dataset. For different dataset version, we only utilize the respective training data to train the models and use the respective development data to choose better models. For all the results, ‘Total’ denotes the results tested on complete seen or unseen test set.

Table 3 shows the EER of the model tested on different fake types. The test data of a certain type consists of the fake audios of this type and all the real audios of the subset (seen or unseen subset) to which the fake type belongs. LFCC-LCNN model achieves the best performance on seen test set. We find that all the models perform worse on unseen test set, compared to the results on seen test set. For the results on seen test set, the model trained with clean data gains higher EER on noisy seen test. These detection models degrade test performance on mismatched data and are not robust to noise.

We further compare the performance under different SNRs in Table 4. Most of the results show that EER goes lower as SNR increases, which means noisy audios with high SNR are easier to detect and noisy audios with low SNR are difficult to detect.

4.3 Fake Algorithm Recognition

Two baseline systems selected for fake algorithm recognition are:

1. **LFCC-x-vector**: This system operates upon LFCC features with a time delay neural networks (TDNN). X-vector [42] extracted from TDNN is robust embeddings for speaker recognition. The frame length and shift of LFCC are set to 25ms and 20ms respectively. The architecture of TDNN refers to [43].
2. **LFCC-LCNN**: The setting of LFCC feature is the same as in the LFCC-x-vector system. The LCNN model is the same as in fake audio detection task.

Each baseline model is trained under clean and noisy features separately and tested for its performance under clean and noisy seen test set.

From the F1-score in ‘Total’ column of Table 5, LCNN model can better identify the fake algorithm under clean condition in both case of trained with clean and noisy data, achieving F1-score of 97.26%

¹⁰<https://github.com/ADDchallenge/FAD>

¹¹<https://github.com/asvspoof-challenge/2021>

Table 5: The F_1 -score (%) of the model trained with different training data sets on different fake types.

Train Set	Model	Clean Test								
		F01	F02	F03	F04	F05	F06	F07	F08	Total
Clean	LFCC-X-vector	99.91	99.54	100.00	99.67	81.89	99.76	70.72	98.31	93.72
	LFCC-LCNN	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.96	92.02	98.16	88.09	99.86	97.26
Noisy	LFCC-X-vector	93.87	95.43	93.95	97.97	93.55	98.40	92.51	96.21	95.24
	LFCC-LCNN	98.84	99.63	99.73	98.46	89.81	98.88	90.14	98.44	96.74
		Noisy Test								
		F01	F02	F03	F04	F05	F06	F07	F08	Total
Clean	LFCC-X-vector	53.29	75.13	14.51	61.33	56.82	74.55	24.32	62.26	53.20
	LFCC-LCNN	40.09	76.18	19.04	43.15	57.25	64.05	32.25	54.66	48.86
Noisy	LFCC-X-vector	91.57	95.41	95.51	94.69	92.33	95.05	90.34	97.91	94.13
	LFCC-LCNN	97.80	99.02	99.32	96.12	85.70	96.98	81.30	91.99	93.63

Table 6: The F_1 -score (%) of the model trained with different training data sets at different SNRs.

Train Set	Model	0dB	5dB	10dB	15dB	20dB	Total
Clean	LFCC-X-vector	42.29	45.67	50.91	57.05	62.28	53.20
	LFCC-LCNN	33.99	36.03	45.98	53.90	61.96	48.86
Noisy	LFCC-X-vector	90.11	93.71	94.33	95.54	95.91	94.13
	LFCC-LCNN	90.85	92.58	93.68	94.57	95.25	93.63

and 96.74%, respectively. While, the X-vector model performs better under noisy condition, with the F1-score of 53.20% when trained with clean data and 94.13% when trained with noisy data. The model trained with clean data is not robust to noisy audios. In contrast, the model trained with noisy data performs well under both clean and noisy conditions.

We further compare the recognition performance under different SNRs in Table 6. The results show that the F1-score value of each model increases gradually with the increase of SNR. In the case of SNR20, both X-vector and LCNN models achieve the best performance. Recognizing the fake algorithm is more difficult under lower SNR than under higher SNR, which is consistent with fake audio detection task.

5 Discussions

We plot t-SNE visualization of the embeddings of audios in clean test set extracted by LFCC-LCNN system. LCNN is trained for fake audio detection task. In Figure 2(a), fake audios (blue) and real audios (red) are divided into two parts. The audios near the class boundary are easily misclassified. Further, fake and real categories are divided into several sub-categories. Each sub-category represent a generation method or resource and is shown in different colors in the Figure 2(b). We find that audios of the same sub-category have a relative similar distributions, and audios of different sub-categories are different.

6 Future Directions

We have designed an initial Chinese public dataset under additive noise conditions for fake audio detection and fake algorithm recognition. There are still some limitations which are suggested to be potential research directions in the future.

Simulating utterance under more acoustic conditions: The simulated noisy genuine and fake utterances of the current FAD dataset are under additive noise conditions. However, there are more complex noise scenarios in real life. More noises are utilized to generate noisy utterances, such as convolutional noises.

Generating noisy audios with matched linguistic content: The noisy utterances of our FAD dataset are simulated by randomly adding noise signals to clean utterances. The linguistic content and the noise of the audio may exist mismatch. In order to make noisy data more reasonable in practical applications, we need to consider the match between the linguistic content and the noise.

Collecting noisy audios under realistic conditions: The noisy utterances of the FAD dataset are simulated data. Such simulations do not quite match with the real and fake utterances collected in




Figure 2: Visualization of real and fake audio data of FAD clean test set. Color blue in Fig(a) represents fake audios. Color red in Fig(a) represents real audios. Different colors in Fig(b) represent different real or fake types.

real conditions. In order to evaluate the robustness and generation of fake audio detection methods in practical applications, the noisy genuine and fake utterances are suggested to collect under realistic environment conditions.

More diverse real and fake audio types: The FAD dataset contains 6 kinds of real utterances and 12 sorts of fake attacks. But the audios are more diverse and complex in real-life scenarios. It is crucial to take more diverse types of real and fake audios into consideration so that make the dataset be more appropriate for real scenarios.

Generalization of detection methods: The work here aims to provide benchmark results on the FAD dataset for future research. More better methods would be proposed to make the detection models generalize well to unknown fake utterances, mismatch noisy conditons, and mismatched languages, such as continual learning etc.

Detecting unknown fake algorithms: The current work here only provides benchmark results for recognizing known fake algorithms. In fact, there are many new types of fake utterances in real applications. So, it is important for the models to detect the unknown fake attacks.

7 Conclusions

The generalization of the model is the challenge faced by the current fake audio detection methods. There are some datasets that consider the generalization to unknown types in their design, but there is no public dataset that can evaluate the robustness under noisy conditions. Besides, there is currently a lack of available Chinese datasets. To facilitate the robustness studies and relevant reproducible research, this paper presents the first public Chinese standard dataset for fake audio detection under noisy conditions. It meets the need to detect fake audios accompanied by a variety of background noises in real-life scenarios and further recognize the exact types of fake audios. Design process and several baseline results for fake audio detection and fake algorithm recognition are reported. Future work has been mentioned in the previous section.

References

- [1] Yee Wah Lau, Michael Wagner, and Dat Tran. Vulnerability of speaker verification to voice mimicking. In *Proceedings of 2004 International Symposium on Intelligent Multimedia, Video and Speech Processing, 2004.*, pages 145–148. IEEE, 2004.
- [2] Yee W Lau, Dat Tran, and Michael Wagner. Testing voice mimicry with the yoho speaker verification corpus. In *International conference on knowledge-based and intelligent information and engineering systems*, pages 15–21. Springer, 2005.
- [3] Johnny Mariéthoz and Samy Bengio. Can a professional imitator fool a gmm-based speaker verification system? Technical report, IDIAP, 2005.
- [4] Elisabeth Zetterholm. Detection of speaker characteristics using voice imitation. In *Speaker Classification II*, pages 192–205. Springer, 2007.
- [5] Rosa González Hautamäki, Tomi Kinnunen, Ville Hautamäki, Timo Leino, and Anne-Maria Laukkanen. I-vectors meet imitators: on vulnerability of speaker verification systems against voice mimicry. In *Interspeech*, pages 930–934. Citeseer, 2013.

- [6] Phillip L De Leon, Bryan Stewart, and Junichi Yamagishi. Synthetic speech discrimination using pitch pattern statistics derived from image analysis. In *Interspeech*, pages 370–373, 2012.
- [7] Zhizheng Wu, Anthony Larcher, Kong Aik Lee, Eng Siong Chng, Tomi Kinnunen, and Haizhou Li. Vulnerability evaluation of speaker verification under voice conversion spoofing: the effect of text constraints. In *Proc. Interspeech 2013*, pages 950–954, 2013.
- [8] Zhizheng Wu, Ali Khodabakhsh, Cenk Demiroglu, Junichi Yamagishi, Daisuke Saito, Tomoki Toda, and Simon King. Sas: A speaker verification spoofing database containing diverse attacks. In *2015 IEEE international conference on acoustics, speech and signal processing (ICASSP)*, pages 4440–4444. IEEE, 2015.
- [9] Zhizheng Wu, Tomi Kinnunen, Nicholas Evans, Junichi Yamagishi, Cemal Hanilçi, Md Sahidullah, and Aleksandr Sizov. Asvspoof 2015: the first automatic speaker verification spoofing and countermeasures challenge. In *Sixteenth annual conference of the international speech communication association*, 2015.
- [10] Tomi Kinnunen, Md Sahidullah, Héctor Delgado, Massimiliano Todisco, Nicholas Evans, Junichi Yamagishi, and Kong Aik Lee. The asvspoof 2017 challenge: Assessing the limits of replay spoofing attack detection. 2017.
- [11] Xin Wang, Junichi Yamagishi, Massimiliano Todisco, Héctor Delgado, Andreas Nautsch, Nicholas Evans, Md Sahidullah, Ville Vestman, Tomi Kinnunen, Kong Aik Lee, et al. Asvspoof 2019: A large-scale public database of synthesized, converted and replayed speech. *Computer Speech & Language*, 64:101114, 2020.
- [12] Jiangyan Yi, Ruibo Fu, Jianhua Tao, Shuai Nie, Haoxin Ma, Chenglong Wang, Tao Wang, Zhengkun Tian, Ye Bai, Cunhang Fan, et al. Add 2022: the first audio deep synthesis detection challenge. In *ICASSP 2022-2022 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 9216–9220. IEEE, 2022.
- [13] Ricardo Reimao and Vassilios Tzerpos. For: A dataset for synthetic speech detection. In *2019 International Conference on Speech Technology and Human-Computer Dialogue (SpeD)*, pages 1–10. IEEE, 2019.
- [14] Joel Frank and Lea Schönherr. Wavefake: A data set to facilitate audio deepfake detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.02813*, 2021.
- [15] Jiangyan Yi, Ye Bai, Jianhua Tao, Zhengkun Tian, Chenglong Wang, Tao Wang, and Ruibo Fu. Half-truth: A partially fake audio detection dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.03617*, 2021.
- [16] Xiaohai Tian, Zhizheng Wu, Xiong Xiao, Eng Siong Chng, and Haizhou Li. Spoofing detection under noisy conditions: a preliminary investigation and an initial database. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1602.02950*, 2016.
- [17] Christophe Veaux, Junichi Yamagishi, Kirsten MacDonald, et al. Superseded-cstr vctk corpus: English multi-speaker corpus for cstr voice cloning toolkit. 2017.
- [18] Kong Aik Lee, Anthony Larcher, Guangsen Wang, Patrick Kenny, Niko Brümmer, David Van Leeuwen, Hagai Aronowitz, Marcel Kockmann, Carlos Vaquero, Bin Ma, et al. The reddots data collection for speaker recognition. In *Interspeech 2015*, 2015.
- [19] Hui Bu, Jiayu Du, Xingyu Na, Bengu Wu, and Hao Zheng. Aishell-1: An open-source mandarin speech corpus and a speech recognition baseline. In *2017 20th Conference of the Oriental Chapter of the International Coordinating Committee on Speech Databases and Speech I/O Systems and Assessment (O-COCOSDA)*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2017.
- [20] Yao Shi, Hui Bu, Xin Xu, Shaoji Zhang, and Ming Li. Aishell-3: A multi-speaker mandarin tts corpus and the baselines. 2015.
- [21] Zhiyong Zhang Dong Wang, Xuwei Zhang. Thchs-30 : A free chinese speech corpus, 2015.
- [22] Zehui Yang, Yifan Chen, Lei Luo, Runyan Yang, Lingxuan Ye, Gaofeng Cheng, Ji Xu, Yaohui Jin, Qingqing Zhang, Pengyuan Zhang, et al. Open source magicdata-ramc: A rich annotated mandarin conversational (ramc) speech dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.16844*, 2022.
- [23] Hideki Kawahara. Straight, exploitation of the other aspect of vocoder: Perceptually isomorphic decomposition of speech sounds. *Acoustical science and technology*, 27(6):349–353, 2006.
- [24] Nathanaël Perraudin, Peter Balazs, and Peter L Søndergaard. A fast griffin-lim algorithm. In *2013 IEEE Workshop on Applications of Signal Processing to Audio and Acoustics*, pages 1–4. IEEE, 2013.

- [25] Jean-Marc Valin and Jan Skoglund. Lpcnet: Improving neural speech synthesis through linear prediction. In *ICASSP 2019-2019 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 5891–5895. IEEE, 2019.
- [26] 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.
- [27] 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)*, pages 6199–6203. IEEE, 2020.
- [28] Jungil Kong, Jaehyeon Kim, and Jaekyoung Bae. Hifi-gan: Generative adversarial networks for efficient and high fidelity speech synthesis. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:17022–17033, 2020.
- [29] Geng Yang, Shan Yang, Kai Liu, Peng Fang, Wei Chen, and Lei Xie. Multi-band melgan: Faster waveform generation for high-quality text-to-speech. In *2021 IEEE Spoken Language Technology Workshop (SLT)*, pages 492–498. IEEE, 2021.
- [30] Ahmed Mustafa, Nicola Pia, and Guillaume Fuchs. Stylemelgan: An efficient high-fidelity adversarial vocoder with temporal adaptive normalization. In *ICASSP 2021-2021 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 6034–6038. IEEE, 2021.
- [31] Masanori Morise, Fumiya Yokomori, and Kenji Ozawa. World: a vocoder-based high-quality speech synthesis system for real-time applications. *IEICE TRANSACTIONS on Information and Systems*, 99(7):1877–1884, 2016.
- [32] Yi Ren, Chenxu Hu, Xu Tan, Tao Qin, Sheng Zhao, Zhou Zhao, and Tie-Yan Liu. FastSpeech 2: Fast and high-quality end-to-end text to speech. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.04558*, 2020.
- [33] Yuxuan Wang, RJ Skerry-Ryan, Daisy Stanton, Yonghui Wu, Ron J Weiss, Navdeep Jaitly, Zongheng Yang, Ying Xiao, Zhifeng Chen, Samy Bengio, et al. Tacotron: Towards end-to-end speech synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.10135*, 2017.
- [34] Guoning Hu and DeLiang Wang. A tandem algorithm for pitch estimation and voiced speech segregation. *IEEE Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, 18(8):2067–2079, 2010.
- [35] Andrew Varga and Herman JM Steeneken. Assessment for automatic speech recognition: Ii. noisex-92: A database and an experiment to study the effect of additive noise on speech recognition systems. *Speech communication*, 12(3):247–251, 1993.
- [36] Annamaria Mesaros, Toni Heittola, and Tuomas Virtanen. A multi-device dataset for urban acoustic scene classification. In *Proceedings of the Detection and Classification of Acoustic Scenes and Events 2018 Workshop (DCASE2018)*, pages 9–13, November 2018.
- [37] Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, et al. Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- [38] Yiming Yang. An evaluation of statistical approaches to text categorization. *Information retrieval*, 1(1):69–90, 1999.
- [39] Howard Lei and Eduardo Lopez. Mel, linear, and antmel frequency cepstral coefficients in broad phonetic regions for telephone speaker recognition. In *Tenth Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association*, 2009.
- [40] Galina Lavrentyeva, Sergey Novoselov, Andzhukaev Tseren, Marina Volkova, Artem Gorlanov, and Alexandr Kozlov. Stc antispoofing systems for the asvspoof2019 challenge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.05576*, 2019.
- [41] Jee-weon Jung, Seung-bin Kim, Hye-jin Shim, Ju-ho Kim, and Ha-Jin Yu. Improved rawnet with feature map scaling for text-independent speaker verification using raw waveforms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.00526*, 2020.

- [42] 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)*, pages 5329–5333. IEEE, 2018.
- [43] Vijayaditya Peddinti, Daniel Povey, and Sanjeev Khudanpur. A time delay neural network architecture for efficient modeling of long temporal contexts. In *Sixteenth annual conference of the international speech communication association*, 2015.