

Let Real Images be as a Judge, Spotting Fake Images Synthesized with Generative Models

Liang Ziyou¹, Wang Run¹, Liu Weifeng¹, Yuyang Zhang¹, Wenyuan Yang²,
Lina Wang¹ and Xingkai Wang³

¹Wuhan University, China

²Sun Yat-Sen University, China

³NSFOCUS, China

E-mail: wangrun@whu.edu.cn

Abstract

In the last few years, generative models have shown their powerful capabilities in synthesizing realistic images in both quality and diversity (*i.e.*, facial images, and natural subjects). Unfortunately, the artifact patterns in fake images synthesized by different generative models are inconsistent, leading to the failure of previous research that relied on spotting subtle differences between real and fake. In our preliminary experiments, we find that the artifacts in fake images always change with the development of the generative model, while natural images exhibit stable statistical properties. In this paper, we employ natural traces shared only by real images as an additional predictive target in the detector. Specifically, the natural traces are learned from the wild real images and we introduce extended supervised contrastive learning to bring them closer to real images and further away from fake ones. This motivates the detector to make decisions based on the proximity of images to the natural traces. To conduct a comprehensive experiment, we built a high-quality and diverse dataset that includes generative models comprising 6 GAN and 6 diffusion models, to evaluate the effectiveness in generalizing unknown forgery techniques and robustness in surviving different transformations. Experimental results show that our proposed method gives **96.1%** mAP significantly outperforms the baselines. Extensive experiments conducted on the widely recognized platform **Midjourney** reveal that our proposed method achieves an accuracy exceeding **78.4%**, underscoring its practicality for real-world application deployment. The source code and partial self-built dataset are available in supplementary material.

1 Introduction

With the rapid development and maturity of generative models, the increasing proliferation of fake images has attracted widespread attention. Compared to Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs), diffusion models (DMs), as today’s SOTA generative models, exhibit better generation quality [Dhari-




Figure 1: As the specific artifacts disappear, can fake detectors still work? For example, the detector trained on dog images generated by GANs is unable to detect ones generated by diffusion models.

wal and Nichol, 2021] and even support powerful text-to-image models such as DALL-E2 [Ramesh *et al.*, 2022], Stable Diffusion [Rombach *et al.*, 2022]. Currently, one can use different types of generative models to create realistic faces or complex scene images and it is foreseeable that more generative models for image synthesis will emerge in the future. Therefore, it is the goal for the community to develop a more practical method to distinguish fake images that are synthesized with unknown forgery techniques as the unseen generative models will emerge inadvertently.

The prior paradigm for fake image detection is to learn artifacts of fake images by capturing the subtle differences between real and fake images [Zhang *et al.*, 2019; Wang *et al.*, 2020]. As shown in Figure 1, the detector distinguishes images as real or fake based on the presence of specific artifacts in the image. It is challenging to generalize to other unknown generative models, which may carry unseen or even imperceptible artifacts. Thus, a practical fake image detector should have strong capabilities in tackling fake images manipulated by unknown generative models. Unfortunately, the existing studies are trapped in the endless efforts to spot the artifacts by investigating the subtle differences between real and fake [Corvi *et al.*, 2023]. The artifacts commonly explored are ad hoc to generative models and not applicable to diverse forgery techniques. As a defender, fake image detection seems to be perpetually behind the generation, only able to regulate obsolete fake images and helpless against the rapidly updating ones. Such a mouse-and-cat game reminds us whether the paradigm is trapped by exploring the subtle differences between real and fake, which is an endless effort as new forgery methods appear rapidly and the exploited artifacts for forensics will be invalid soon.

We argue that the challenges in the traditional paradigm arise from classifiers’ tendency to easily capture perceptible artifacts in training data. As these artifacts evolve or even vanish with generative model iterations, classifiers fail to detect new fake images. Merely investigating the flaws in fake images proves insufficient, given the constant emergence of unknown fake images that defenders have not seen. Instead, we consider a novel insight that *the focus for fake image detection should be on the inherent similarities within real images, as opposed to the differences between real and fake*. Our novel insight is motivated by the premise that real-world images possess an intrinsic naturalness that remains stable, whereas fake images continually evolve with technological innovation. We conjecture that there should be some shared features in real images, akin to that in fake images, which we term the natural trace.

Despite the stable statistical properties of natural images, precisely defining and capturing the shared feature of natural traces remains a significant challenge. In this work, we introduce Natural Trace Forensics (NTF) and adopt an alternative strategy, substituting the shared feature with homogeneous features, which are universally present in natural images. We develop a self-supervised feature mapping process to decouple real image representations, capturing stable homogeneous features accurately. Then, we integrate these features as an extra predictive target in parallel with binary classification, prompting the detector to aggregate these features closer to real images and separate them from fake ones. Guided by this strategy, the detector reduces its reliance on specific artifact patterns and gains the capability to detect images synthesized by unknown generative models.

To better evaluate whether our proposed method can be well generalized to other unknown generative models, we build a generated image dataset consisting of 12 SOTA generative models, including 6 GANs and 6 DMs. Our dataset covers a variety of categories, such as faces and scenes, to evaluate detectors’ capability across various types of fake images. In addition, we also evaluate the performance of our method in identifying images generated by **Midjourney**, which is currently a popular commercial tool for text-to-image generation. Experimental results show that our proposed method could discriminate GAN-based, DM-based, and Multi-step fake images (synthesized with at least two different generated models) in high confidence with an average accuracy of more than **96.1%** and is sufficiently robust to various image perturbation transformations.

Our main contributions are summarized as follows:

- We are the first to propose training fake image detection with natural traces, rather than merely a mix of real and fake images; our results also confirm its ability to detect different generative models and its potential as a universal judge for distinguishing fake images.
- To conduct a comprehensive evaluation, we build a dataset including GAN-based, DM-based, and Multi-step manipulation for generating fake images. For the first time, we generate Multi-step fake images by employing multiple synthesis methods. This self-built dataset will be released to the community to advance

the community to develop more effective and practical methods for distinguishing unseen forgery techniques.

- Experimental results show the effectiveness of our proposed method in tackling fake images generated by SOTA GANs and diffusion models, giving an average precision of more than 96.18%, significantly outperforming the baselines. Additionally, our method is robust against the common image transformations and identifies the undistinguishable Midjourney in high confidence.

2 Related Work

2.1 Fake Images Synthesis

In recent years, generative models represented by GANs and diffusion models have been evolving towards maturity. GANs train a generator and a discriminator to compete with each other until the generator can produce realistic images, while DMs utilize diffusion and denoising Markov chains for training, surpassing GANs in training stability, diversity, and quality of generation [Mazé and Ahmed, 2023; Stypułkowski *et al.*, 2024]. This marks an evolution from producing or manipulating facial appearances, commonly termed DeepFakes [Juefei-Xu *et al.*, 2022], to generating contextually relevant text or image prompts. What’s more, with the emergence of new generative models, the artifacts of fake images are varied and more imperceptible, which also leads to the inability to detect fake images with low-level artifacts. It is foreseeable that the vast majority of artifact-based detection will fail when the fake image artifacts vanish. This progression has escalated public apprehension regarding the challenges in identifying fake images. In this paper, we are dedicated to developing a practical method for detecting fake images that are manipulated by unknown generative models.

2.2 Fake Images Detection

Existing research focuses on exploring subtle differences between real and fake images, and these can be categorized into explicit and implicit artifact-based methods.

Explicit-based. Some researchers noticed that they often contained specific artifacts or unnatural patterns [Zhang *et al.*, 2019; Liu *et al.*, 2023]. Additionally, several studies focused on exploring GAN-based artifacts in the frequency domain [Frank *et al.*, 2020] and the failure to accurately re-enact certain biological features when generating fake faces [Hu *et al.*, 2021; Tan *et al.*, 2023b]. These findings have motivated researchers to use explicit artifacts to detect fake images through simple classifiers. However, as generative models are continuously updated and iterated, these artifacts become imperceptible or even disappear, making detection methods reliant on explicit artifacts less effective.

Implicit-based. Wang *et al.* [Wang *et al.*, 2020] demonstrated that with appropriate training data and data augmentation, neural networks could detect other GAN-based images, while [Tan *et al.*, 2023a] used CNNs to transform images into gradient form to present a broader range of artifacts. These studies indicate that images generated by both GAN and diffusion models possess distinct “fingerprints” different from the real images [Yu *et al.*, 2019; Sha *et al.*, 2023]. Nevertheless, there

Family	Type	Method	Year	Image Source	# Images
GAN-based	Unconditional	ProGAN	2017	CelebA-HQ	4.0k
		StyleGAN2	2019	CelebA-HQ/FFHQ/LSUN	12.0k
		ProjectedGAN	2021	FFHQ/LSUN/Landscape	12.0k
		VQGAN	2020	CelebA-HQ	4.0k
		Diff-StyleGAN2	2022	FFHQ/LSUN	8.0k
	Image-to-Image	SimSwap	2020	CelebA-HQ	4.0k
DM-based	Unconditional	DDPM	2020	CelebA-HQ/LSUN	8.0k
		DDIM	2021	CelebA-HQ	4.0k
		PNDM	2022	CelebA-HQ/LSUN	12.0k
	Image-to-Image	DiffFace	2022	CelebA-HQ	2.0k
Prompt-guided	LDM	2022	CelebA-HQ/LAION	8.0k	
	StableDM	2022	LAION	4.0k	
GAN-GAN	SimSwap_Style2	2024	CelebA-HQ	2.0k	
	SimSwap_VQ	2024	CelebA-HQ	2.0k	
Multi-step	GAN-DM	SimSwap_LDM	2024	CelebA-HQ	2.0k
		DiffFace_Style2	2024	CelebA-HQ	2.0k
	DM-DM	DiffFace_Proj	2024	FFHQ	2.0k
		DiffFace_LDM	2024	CelebA-HQ	2.0k

Table 1: Statistics of the self-built dataset, including GAN-based, DM-based, and Multi-step synthesis.

is still insufficient evidence to prove that generative models from different families have the same fingerprints that can be used for universal detection.

In this work, we propose an innovative method: training with real images for fake detection. It’s noteworthy that [Liu *et al.*, 2022a] has similarities with ours, where they detect fake by analyzing noise patterns in real images. However, their method relies on the noise patterns of various devices. Our method uses natural traces extracted from real images for training. Compared to noise patterns, which may vary with different devices, can be complex to analyze, and are susceptible to intentional modification for evasion, natural traces consistently present in real images offer greater robustness.

3 A Diverse Generated Image Dataset

Due to the lack of DM-based generated images in current datasets, we create a dataset with a wide range of generative models. This dataset aims to enhance the evaluation of fake detection methods’ capability. It includes fake images generated by various models, alongside an equal number of real images from corresponding training sets for each method.

Our dataset covers two major families: GAN and Diffusion Models, with each fake image synthesized using a single generative model. Particularly, we have developed a novel multi-step fake image generation method, involving collaboration between two or more generative models, to achieve identity swapping or attribute editing between real and fake faces. To ensure diversity, the dataset comprises various categories of generation methods: unconditional generation, image-to-image generation, and prompt-guided generation, as shown in Table 1. Moreover, our carefully selected generative models exhibit fundamental differences in their generations, ensuring extensive representation of the dataset.

GAN-based forgery: We select six representative GANs to generate forgery images including unconditional and image-to-image. The innovation of ProGAN [Karras *et al.*, 2017] in introducing progressive training has a significant impact on subsequent research, while StyleGAN2 [Karras *et al.*,

2020] refines style control through decoupling image features and generates more realistic images. In terms of architectural improvements, ProjectedGAN [Sauer *et al.*, 2021] enhances generator feedback using pre-trained weights, while VQGAN [Esser *et al.*, 2021] and Diff-StyleGAN2 [Wang *et al.*, 2022] innovatively replace the backbone network with transformer and diffusion processes, respectively, resulting in higher image quality and more stable training processes. SimSwap’s [Chen *et al.*, 2020] ID injection module achieves breakthroughs in arbitrary face swapping.

DM-based forgery: DM-based forgery surpasses GAN-based in terms of image quality and diversity. Here, we select six different DMs for creating fake images including unconditional, image-to-image, and prompt-guided. DDPM [Ho *et al.*, 2020], as the initial diffusion model, lays the groundwork, with DDIM [Song *et al.*, 2020] and PNDM [Liu *et al.*, 2022b] enhancing execution speed and quality. DiffFace [Kim *et al.*, 2022] is the first identity-conditioned DDPM that uses diffusion models for face swapping. And LDM [Rombach *et al.*, 2022], which employs pre-trained self-encoders to map pixels to latent space, combined with context learning in cross-attention layers for prompt-guided image generation, along with Stable Diffusion (StableDM), a popular LDM-based prompt-guided model, represent further advancements. **Multi-step:** In the real scenario, the creator tends to employ multiple forgery techniques to achieve better forgery. We create a Multi-step face synthesis dataset where two face-swapping methods (SimSwap and DiffFace) based on GAN or diffusion models swap real faces onto synthetic ones, including three hybrid modes: GAN-GAN, GAN-DM, and DM-DM. This generation method provides simulated threats of artifact disappearance or blending in real-world scenarios.

In summary, our dataset includes high-resolution images ranging from 256×256 to 1024×1024 resolution. What’s more, diverse image categories support a more comprehensive evaluation of fake detection generalization. The dataset will be released to the community to advance this interesting research field.

4 Our Method

In this work, to achieve a universal fake image detection and avoid the classifier’s reliance on specific artifact patterns, we propose a novel method, named Natural Trace Forensics (NTF), which involves training the classifier using the natural traces shared merely by real images as an additional predictive target. Figure 2 overviews the pipeline of NTF. We start by learning natural trace representations from real datasets. Then, under an extended supervised contrastive learning framework, the network is trained to align natural traces closer to real images and further from fake ones. With such constraints, the network is motivated to detect fakes based on the distance between images and natural traces. Next, we elaborate on how to learn the natural traces and apply the extracted traces for detection.

4.1 Natural Trace Representation Learning

We first explore the natural traces in real images to provide learnable features for the next fake image identification.




Figure 2: NTF architecture. We first decouple the feature representation of real images into homogeneous and heterogeneous features. Next, the homogeneous features z_i^{hom} participate in extended supervised contrastive training with the real and fake image features. Detector classifies real and fake images guided by the target of intra-class aggregation and inter-class separation. Better view in color.

Method	ProGAN				StyleGAN2				VQGAN				ProjectedGAN				Diff-StyleGAN2				SimSwap				Average			
	AP ↑	ACC ↑	FPR ↓	FNR ↓	AP	ACC	FPR	FNR	AP	ACC	FPR	FNR	AP	ACC	FPR	FNR	AP	ACC	FPR	FNR	AP	ACC	FPR	FNR	AP	ACC	FPR	FNR
XceptionNet	99.31	84.47	0	31.05	100	<u>99.95</u>	<u>0.10</u>	0	100	<u>99.92</u>	<u>0.15</u>	0	100	<u>99.10</u>	<u>1.80</u>	0	97.89	84.03	<u>0.20</u>	31.75	99.85	<u>90.13</u>	<u>19.74</u>	0	<u>99.51</u>	92.93	<u>3.66</u>	10.47
Wang2020	97.88	85.33	27.05	2.00	86.15	56.33	87.30	<u>0.05</u>	61.21	50.52	98.90	<u>0.05</u>	62.18	50.35	99.20	<u>0.10</u>	87.79	68.45	61.30	<u>1.80</u>	98.36	65.04	69.78	<u>0.05</u>	82.26	62.67	73.92	0.68
Grag2021	100	99.98	0	0.05	100	100	0	0	<u>99.88</u>	91.62	16.75	<u>0.05</u>	99.72	<u>94.62</u>	10.75	0	<u>99.82</u>	94.47	11.05	0	94.12	50.49	98.90	0	98.92	88.53	22.91	0.02
Ojha2023	98.83	<u>99.05</u>	<u>1.45</u>	<u>0.45</u>	83.05	87.00	15.95	10.05	83.56	87.30	16.05	9.35	75.20	78.72	33.20	9.35	64.57	64.95	69.30	0.80	80.30	83.83	23.45	8.90	80.92	83.48	26.57	6.48
Self-Blended*	68.65	66.02	39.81	28.16	65.45	60.19	41.75	37.86	56.88	46.15	76.92	30.77	59.87	50.00	53.85	46.15	58.49	54.85	58.25	32.04	55.33	53.88	33.10	59.14	60.78	55.18	41.78	41.95
CADDM*	51.51	53.36	40.63	52.58	52.29	54.41	46.84	44.34	52.62	54.52	50.65	40.28	54.29	57.63	43.00	41.74	51.26	52.90	44.15	50.03	46.64	36.58	82.90	43.63	52.09	53.31	48.36	44.98
NTF	100	92.53	0	14.85	100	92.53	0	14.95	100	<u>92.55</u>	0	14.90	<u>99.77</u>	92.20	0.65	14.95	99.94	<u>92.65</u>	0.15	14.55	<u>99.77</u>	92.16	0.60	15.10	99.91	<u>92.44</u>	0.23	14.88

Table 2: Intra-family generalization on GANs. Performance of NTF and baselines in spotting 6 GAN-based generated images. These baselines include the classic approach, XceptionNet, Wang2020, and Grag2021, as well as the latest methods, Ojha2023, and CADDM. The method with * means that the baseline is only evaluated on non-face images. The *Average* column represents the weighted average of the corresponding metrics. Among those, the best and second-best performances are highlighted in **bold** and underlined, respectively.

However, it is impossible to analyze every real image in existence to identify shared features. To address this, we employ an innovative strategy using the same intrinsic features found in real images as a substitute for shared features. These intrinsic features, known as homogeneous features, are derived from the inherent properties and statistical regularities of images, which are commonly present in real images. We develop a self-supervised feature mapping mechanism to extract the homogeneous features. This mechanism decouples the natural image features into homogeneous features and heterogeneous features, where the latter are associated with specific images. As opposed to direct embedding features, feature decoupling not only enhances generalization by ensuring homogeneous features more accurately capture commonalities across images, but also improves feature quality by eliminating noise and redundant information. Additionally, the network should access a large variety of natural images. This exposure enables the network to learn the patterns of feature coupling in various types of real images so that it can decouple features for unseen images.

Formulation. We assume access to a large-scale dataset of real images D_r . Sample $x \in D_r$ is a augmented sample from a image $x_r \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times W \times 3}$ (of height H , and width W). As shown in Figure 2(a), our architecture consists of a feature encoder followed by two projection heads that map real image embeddings into homogeneous features and heterogeneous features.

Specifically, feature encoder, E , producing feature embedding $e = E(x_r)$ from the inputs, then decouples the e into homogeneous and heterogeneous features, $z_i^{hom} = f^{hom}(e) \in \mathbb{R}^C$

and $z_i^{het} = f^{het}(e) \in \mathbb{R}^C$ through two projection heads, f^{hom} and f^{het} , respectively, where C is the dimensionality of the features. Let $i \in I \equiv \{1 \dots 2N\}$ be the index of an arbitrary augmented sample, where there are a total of N samples in a batch, each with two random augmentations ($2N$). The self-supervised contrastive loss of heterogeneous feature representations in real images can be formulated as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{het} = - \sum_{i \in I} \log \frac{\exp(z_i^{het} \cdot z_p^{het} / \tau)}{\sum_{k \in K(i)} \exp(z_i^{het} \cdot z_k^{het} / \tau)}, \quad (1)$$

where the index i is called the anchor, the index p is called the *positive*, τ is a temperature hyperparameter and $K(i) \equiv I \setminus \{i\}$, which contains all the augmented samples except i in a batch. Furthermore, the loss of homogeneous feature representations in real images can be formulated as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{hom} = \max \arg_{i \in I, k \in K'(i)} \|z_k^{hom} - z_i^{hom}\|_F^2, \quad (2)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_F$ denotes the Frobenius norm, K' contains $2N - 2$ augmented samples, *i.e.*, target i is compared only with samples from different sources.

Considering the potential issues of high feature coupling in the embedding space, we further exploit soft orthogonality to reduce information redundancy and dependencies between these homogeneous and heterogeneous features:

$$\mathcal{L}_{ort} = \sum_{i \in I} \cos(z_i^{hom}, z_i^{het}), \quad (3)$$

Finally, we combine these constraints to form the natural trace representation learning loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_{tra} = \mathcal{L}_{hom} + \mathcal{L}_{het} + \lambda \mathcal{L}_{ort}, \quad (4)$$

Method	DDPM				DDIM				PNDM				LDM				StableDM				DiffFace				Average			
	AP ↑	ACC ↑	FPR ↓	FNR ↓	AP	ACC	FPR	FNR	AP	ACC	FPR	FNR	AP	ACC	FPR	FNR	AP	ACC	FPR	FNR	AP	ACC	FPR	FNR	AP	ACC	FPR	FNR
XceptionNet	74.69	72.37	5.07	50.19	75.78	73.89	12.36	39.86	89.61	49.75	99.95	0.61	65.75	65.02	8.80	61.16	41.07	40.25	28.47	91.03	59.23	40.77	99.45	19.01	66.21	57.01	14.04	59.03
Wang2020	58.15	50.15	99.65	0.05	60.90	50.15	99.60	0.10	66.35	49.95	99.55	0.05	67.87	50.40	99.20	0	39.81	49.48	99.55	1.50	34.75	49.75	99.79	2.40	54.64	49.98	99.56	0.68
Grag2021	79.92	50.12	99.75	0	83.70	50.25	99.45	0.05	86.46	50.10	99.31	0	99.98	98.78	2.45	0	98.17	63.55	72.90	0	63.19	54.35	91.29	0	85.24	61.19	77.53	0.01
Ojha2023	64.18	67.03	57.40	8.55	71.78	75.30	39.65	9.75	61.66	64.42	62.20	8.95	80.20	83.88	22.85	9.40	55.60	55.95	87.30	0.80	88.41	88.72	21.95	0.62	70.31	72.55	48.58	6.34
Self-Blended*	63.12	64.00	37.50	34.50	71.10	69.45	15.53	47.57	64.15	59.22	48.54	33.01	83.75	75.73	14.56	33.98	56.97	55.83	59.22	29.13	70.59	56.91	27.98	28.42	68.28	63.52	33.89	34.44
CADDM*	53.04	55.15	46.47	43.21	55.76	59.77	35.84	44.62	51.75	52.45	51.92	43.10	52.30	53.92	48.28	43.85	51.58	54.51	38.25	52.46	53.02	52.62	43.92	44.15	52.91	54.74	44.11	45.23
NTF	76.93	68.77	47.15	15.30	91.79	84.05	16.40	15.50	79.40	71.02	42.72	15.10	99.98	92.65	0.05	14.65	99.54	92.10	1.05	14.75	99.31	87.43	0.62	15.45	91.16	82.67	18.00	15.13

Table 3: Cross-family generalization on diffusion models. Performance of NTF and baselines in spotting 6 DM-based generated images.

Method	SimSwap_Style2				SimSwap_VQ				SimSwap_LDM				DiffFace_Style2				DiffFace_Proj				DiffFace_LDM				Average			
	AP ↑	ACC ↑	FPR ↓	FNR ↓	AP	ACC	FPR	FNR	AP	ACC	FPR	FNR	AP	ACC	FPR	FNR	AP	ACC	FPR	FNR	AP	ACC	FPR	FNR	AP	ACC	FPR	FNR
XceptionNet	44.60	50.00	100	0	46.56	50.00	100	0	48.51	50.00	100	0	100	100	0	0	100	100	0	0	37.97	50.00	100	0	62.94	66.67	66.67	0
Wang2020	89.32	55.7	88.60	0	76.07	50.80	98.20	0.20	79.38	50.00	98.4	0	69.89	78.91	90.88	0.05	65.19	50.10	99.40	0.40	54.68	50.00	100	0	72.42	55.92	95.91	0.11
Grag2021	99.76	85.70	28.60	0	97.07	61.90	76.00	0	95.24	55.40	89.20	0	100	99.85	0.66	0	80.78	79.40	41.20	0	53.03	50.00	100	0	87.65	72.04	55.94	0
Ojha2023	88.92	91.60	6.60	10.20	90.29	94.10	2.60	9.20	89.27	93.40	3.00	10.20	88.21	92.12	6.14	9.62	87.21	92.00	3.60	12.40	80.96	83.59	26.56	6.25	87.48	91.14	8.08	9.65
Self-Blended*	62.74	69.23	38.46	23.08	74.53	65.49	30.97	38.05	47.38	48.23	74.34	28.20	74.59	69.91	24.78	35.40	65.24	58.33	43.97	45.15	63.04	58.15	54.11	28.80	64.59	61.56	44.44	33.11
CADDM*	46.84	37.30	83.60	41.46	44.56	50.28	60.25	41.14	48.12	44.66	65.80	44.72	18.38	51.11	81.16	40.71	23.48	50.55	67.22	42.71	53.30	55.56	53.74	41.60	39.11	48.24	68.63	42.06
NTF	99.80	91.80	0.40	16.00	99.99	92.20	3.32	15.40	99.87	92.00	0.20	15.80	99.98	87.82	0	15.68	99.66	91.80	0.80	15.60	84.61	74.30	35.60	15.80	97.32	88.32	6.72	15.74

Table 4: Cross-family generalization on multi-step methods. Performance of NTF and baselines in spotting 6 multi-step generated images.

where λ is a scaling factor.

4.2 Fake Image Detection

To capture the homogeneous features as an additional predictive target, we employ an extended supervised contrastive learning to simultaneously encode real and fake images further for fake image detection. Specifically, we incorporate these homogeneous features into extended supervised contrastive learning and constrain their distance from positive and negative samples. This will motivate the detector to identify fake images based on distance. Note that the feature encoder is frozen during this stage.

Formulation. We now assume access a full dataset, $D = D_r \cup D_f$, where D_r is used in the previous stage, D_f is a dataset of fake images. Our architecture consists of a feature encoder, an auxiliary projection head for extended supervised contrastive learning, and another classification head for supervised classification (shown in Figure 2(b)). With the auxiliary projection head, the real and fake feature embeddings are mapped to z_i^r and z_i^f , respectively. To motivate the network to focus on the intra-class aggregation of real images more than the inter-class differences between real and fake images, we adopt the homogeneous features from the previous stage as extra positive instances for real anchors and additional negative instances for fake anchors. Formally, the extended supervised contrastive loss is as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{ext} = \sum_{i \in I} \frac{-1}{|P(i)|} \sum_{p \in P(i)} \frac{\exp(z_i \cdot z_p / \tau)}{\sum_{k \in K(i)} \exp(z_i \cdot z_k / \tau)}, \quad (5)$$

where $P(i)$ is the set of all positive samples for the anchor i , $|P(i)|$ is its cardinality. Note that for real anchor, the auxiliary homogeneous feature $z^{hom} \in P(i)$, and vice versa, $z^{hom} \in K(i)$. To achieve fake image detection, for a given sample and label, the classifier D is optimized on the binary cross entropy loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_{ce} = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_i y_i \cdot \log(\hat{y}_i) + (1 - y_i) \cdot \log(1 - \hat{y}_i), \quad (6)$$

Finally, the discriminative loss is given by:

$$\mathcal{L}_d = \mathcal{L}_{ext} + \gamma \mathcal{L}_{ce}, \quad (7)$$

Method	Wang2020	Grag2021	Ojha2023	NTF
Midjourney/Acc(%) ↑	63.02	57.88	56.82	78.41

Table 5: Evaluation on commercial generative models. NTF shows 78.41% Acc on Midjourney, outperforming other baselines.

where γ is a balance factor. Please refer to the technical appendix for more implementation details.

5 Experiments

5.1 Experiments Setup

Dataset. We use the dataset provided by [Wang *et al.*, 2020], which consists of 720K images for training and 4K images for validation. The fake images were generated by ProGAN[Karras *et al.*, 2017], while an equal number of real images were sourced from the LSUN[Yu *et al.*, 2015]. We also conducted evaluation experiments on the self-built dataset, which covered GAN-based, DM-based, and multi-step fake images.

Evaluation Metrics. In evaluating the performance in spotting fake images synthesized with diverse generative models, we adopt four popular metrics to get a comprehensive result of our proposed method. Specifically, we report ACC (accuracy), AP (average precision), FPR (false positive rate), and FNR (false negative rate), respectively.

Baselines. For better evaluation, we compare with six baselines, including fake detection methods based on explicit artifacts and implicit artifacts. In experiments, we compare with the following six baselines: 1) XceptionNet [Rossler *et al.*, 2019] is widely employed as the baseline in the studies of DeepFake forensics; 2) Wang2020[Wang *et al.*, 2020] focuses on the artifacts exposed by CNN-generated images; 3) Grag2021[Gragnaniello *et al.*, 2021] uses spectral super-resolution to reconstruct visual cues for detection. 4) Ojha2023[Ojha *et al.*, 2023] uses a feature space not explicitly trained to distinguish real from fake images. 5) Self-Blended[Shiohara and Yamasaki, 2022] mixes image pairs with various masks to generate training data. 6) CADDM[Dong *et al.*, 2023] focuses on local information so that the network ignores identity information leakage caused by irregular face changes. Except that Self-Blended and CADDM are trained on FaceForensics++ [Rossler *et al.*, 2019], the training set for the other comparison methods is




Figure 3: Ablation study on NTF architecture. All detectors were trained using the ProGAN and tested on other generative models. The designs of NTF architecture improve generalization ability. The red dotted line depicts chance performance.




Figure 4: Ablation study on training data. All detectors trained on different data sources (ProGAN or LDM) or different numbers of classes of the ProGAN data source (20 classes, 12 classes, and 4 classes). The diversity of training data improves generalization ability.

consistent with ours. Note that Self-Blended and CADDM are limited to DeepFake datasets, and for the sake of fairness, they are not included in the test of non-face data.

Implementation Details. We use ResNet50 pre-trained on ImageNet as the feature encoder. All the projection heads contain two layers of MLPs with an output dimension of 128. For all datasets, we use a 224×224 crop for both training and testing (random crop for training and center crop for testing). For extended supervised contrastive learning, we perform a random crop of the input image to 32 px. The optimizer is an SGD with a momentum of 0.9, an initial learning rate of 0.1, and an attenuation of 0.001. In the first stage, training is conducted for 200 epochs, followed by 10 epochs in the second stage. The empirical setting for λ, γ is set at 0.1, 0.5.

5.2 Effectiveness Evaluation

We explore the capability of NTF in detecting fake images from different generative models under the aforementioned experimental setup. Table 2-4 highlights its advanced performance through comparison with baselines.

Performance on GAN-based fake images. Experimental results in Table 2 demonstrate that NTF shows its capability in tackling unknown GAN-based fake images with the highest AP **99.91%** and the lowest FPR **0.23%** on average. In particular, NTF attains optimal detection performance on GAN-based fake images, which could be attributed to the similarity in the image generation principle of these models to that of ProGAN. That is precisely why certain baselines, such as XceptionNet[Rossler *et al.*, 2019] and Grag2021[Graganiello *et al.*, 2021], have achieved high-performance generalization on GAN-based generative models. This indicates that existing fake image detection methods are adept at handling generalization scenarios within the same model family.

Performance on DM-based fake images. As illustrated in Table 3, NTF exhibits superior cross-family generalization capability on the DMs with the highest AP **91.16%** and ACC **82.67%** on average. Specifically, NTF improves the AP and ACC by nearly **5.92%** and **10.12%** compared to the best baseline. The detection accuracy of NTF surpasses all baselines across four DMs. However, it remains comparable to Grag2021[Graganiello *et al.*, 2021] on LDM and to

XceptionNet[Rossler *et al.*, 2019] on DDPM. Overall, NTF detects different DM-base generation models in a more balanced way, although it is slightly inferior to some baselines on certain models.

Performance on multi-step fake images. As shown in Table 4, NTF detects fake images synthesized by six multi-step methods with the highest mAP of **97.32%**. It is noteworthy that the method from Ojha2023[Ojha *et al.*, 2023] demonstrated an average ACC of 91.14%, slightly outperforming NTF. This can be attributed to their use of the ViT-L/14[Dosovitskiy *et al.*, 2020], a vision transformer variant pre-trained on CLIP[Radford *et al.*, 2021] for the backbone, aiding in effectively modeling details for real and fake image classification.

Performance on Challenging Midjourney. To better evaluate the performance in tackling commercial generative models, we assess the detection capability of NTF on fake images generated by *Midjourney* in Table 5. Experimental results show that our proposed method NTF gives an accuracy more than **78%** which significantly outperforms the baselines.

In summary, NTF effectively detects GAN-based unknown generative models with a mAP **99.91%**. It also demonstrates the capability to detect DM-based and multi-step generation methods with mAPs of **91.16%** and **97.32%** respectively, achieving an overall mAP of **96.18%** across all datasets. Additionally, NTF shows a slightly higher FNR, which can be attributed to the inadequate coverage of real-world images in the training dataset.

5.3 Ablation Studies

We evaluated the effect of architecture and training data on the generalization ability of NTF. It initially employed homogeneous, heterogeneous, and soft orthogonality losses with Eq (4) for learning natural trace representations and it trains with the ProGAN/LSUN dataset consisting of 20 classes.

Effect of network architecture. We conducted experiments with different variants of NTF, exploring the following configurations: 1) without *orthogonality* loss, and 2) without *heterogeneity* and *orthogonality* loss. For each, We maintain ProGAN real/fake image data as training data. Figure 3 shows the performance of these variants on the same mod-




Figure 5: Robustness to four image processing operations, *i.e.*, Gaussian blur (a), JPEG compression (b), Gaussian Noise (c), Scaling (d).



Figure 6: The Grad-CAM++ visualization of the self-built dataset.

els. We find that the architectural design of NTF has an important role in generalization, improving performance on conditional generative models such as LDM, StableDM, and multi-step synthesis methods. This improvement is likely attributed to the implementation of soft orthogonality and heterogeneous constraints on upper bounds, which enables the NTF to learn homogeneous features capable of effectively separating traces of conditional generative models from natural traces. Moreover, this design also improves performance on unconditional generative models, particularly more significant in models like Diff-StyleGAN and PNLM.

Effect of training data Next, we investigate how the source and diversity of the training data influence a detector’s generalization ability. Our approach involves altering either the data source or the number of classes in the training set. Specifically, we train multiple detectors by 1) employing a pre-trained LDM, substituting the ProGAN, and 2) utilizing a subset of the full ProGAN dataset, excluding real and fake images from certain LSUN classes, as shown in Figure 4. With access only to the LDM dataset, the model displays impressive generalization capabilities, even though the dataset consists of 200k reals from LAION[Schuhmann *et al.*, 2022] and 200k fakes generated by LDM. As expected, diversifying the training set does enhance generalization to some extent, but the benefits diminish with increasing diversity. This suggests the potential existence of a real image dataset capable of extracting universally present natural traces.

5.4 Robustness Evaluation

In this section, we mainly explore the robustness of our proposed method in surviving diverse input transformations, such as blur, compression, noise, and scaling.

As shown in Figure 5, NTF is typically robust to blur, compression, and noise operations. The performance of Wang2020[Wang *et al.*, 2020] is more consistent under different levels of blur/compression/noise. This is reasonable, as it employs random compression and blur for data augmentation during training. Although Ojha2023[Ojha *et al.*, 2023]

also employs data augmentation, it also performs in addition to being less robust in blur operations. In addition, both NTF and other baselines show significant performance degradation in image scaling operations. When the image scaling factor is 0.2, the image content becomes imperceptible, making robustness in such extreme scenarios less critical. Please refer to the technical appendix for more details.

5.5 Qualitative Analysis

To understand how the network generalizes to different synthesis methods, we visualize the model saliency map. We apply GradCAM++ [Chattopadhyay *et al.*, 2018] to NTF on the self-built dataset to visualize where models are paying their attention to images, as shown in Figure 6. This demonstrates how the network captures artifacts from different generative models; for example, with the StyleGAN2-generated image of a dog, the network focuses on the inconsistency in shadow.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we escape the trap of exploring subtle differences between real and fake for fake image detection. Motivated by the presence of common shared features in real images, We propose a novel framework named NTF, pre-trained by natural trace representation learning and extended supervised contrastive learning, to significantly improve the generalization ability of fake image detection. Extensive experiments on the self-built dataset demonstrate that our method exhibits state-of-the-art generalization capability for unknown generative models. Our research also offers a fresh perspective on fake image detection, focusing on exploring stable detectable features rather than those that continuously change, thereby paving the way for future studies in this field.

7 Technical Appendix

In the technical appendix, we present the details of the self-built dataset, evaluation of the test set from [Wang *et al.*, 2020], some visualizations, and additional experiments.

References

- [Chattopadhyay *et al.*, 2018] Aditya Chattopadhyay, Anirban Sarkar, Prantik Howlader, and Vineeth N Balasubramanian. Grad-cam++: Generalized gradient-based visual explanations for deep convolutional networks. In *2018 IEEE Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV)*, pages 839–847, 2018.
- [Chen *et al.*, 2020] Renwang Chen, Xuanhong Chen, Bingbing Ni, and Yanhao Ge. Simswap: An efficient framework for high fidelity face swapping. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, pages 2003–2011, 2020.
- [Corvi *et al.*, 2023] Riccardo Corvi, Davide Cozzolino, Giada Zingarini, Giovanni Poggi, Koki Nagano, and Luisa Verdoliva. On the detection of synthetic images generated by diffusion models. In *ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2023.
- [Dhariwal and Nichol, 2021] Prafulla Dhariwal and Alexander Nichol. Diffusion models beat gans on image synthesis. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:8780–8794, 2021.
- [Dong *et al.*, 2023] Shichao Dong, Jin Wang, Renhe Ji, Jiajun Liang, Haoqiang Fan, and Zheng Ge. Implicit identity leakage: The stumbling block to improving deepfake detection generalization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3994–4004, 2023.
- [Dosovitskiy *et al.*, 2020] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, et al. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929*, 2020.
- [Esser *et al.*, 2021] Patrick Esser, Robin Rombach, and Bjorn Ommer. Taming transformers for high-resolution image synthesis. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 12873–12883, 2021.
- [Frank *et al.*, 2020] Joel Frank, Thorsten Eisenhofer, Lea Schönherr, Asja Fischer, Dorothea Kolossa, and Thorsten Holz. Leveraging frequency analysis for deep fake image recognition. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 3247–3258. PMLR, 2020.
- [Gagnaniello *et al.*, 2021] Diego Gagnaniello, Davide Cozzolino, Francesco Marra, Giovanni Poggi, and Luisa Verdoliva. Are gan generated images easy to detect? a critical analysis of the state-of-the-art. In *2021 IEEE international conference on multimedia and expo (ICME)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2021.
- [Ho *et al.*, 2020] Jonathan Ho, Ajay Jain, and Pieter Abbeel. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:6840–6851, 2020.
- [Hu *et al.*, 2021] Shu Hu, Yuezun Li, and Siwei Lyu. Exposing gan-generated faces using inconsistent corneal specular highlights. In *ICASSP 2021-2021 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 2500–2504. IEEE, 2021.
- [Juefei-Xu *et al.*, 2022] Felix Juefei-Xu, Run Wang, Yihao Huang, Qing Guo, Lei Ma, and Yang Liu. Countering malicious deepfakes: Survey, battleground, and horizon. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 130(7):1678–1734, 2022.
- [Karras *et al.*, 2017] Tero Karras, Timo Aila, Samuli Laine, and Jaakko Lehtinen. Progressive growing of gans for improved quality, stability, and variation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.10196*, 2017.
- [Karras *et al.*, 2020] Tero Karras, Samuli Laine, Miika Aittala, Janne Hellsten, Jaakko Lehtinen, and Timo Aila. Analyzing and improving the image quality of stylegan. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 8110–8119, 2020.
- [Kim *et al.*, 2022] Kihong Kim, Yunho Kim, Seokju Cho, Junyoung Seo, Jisu Nam, Kychul Lee, Seungryong Kim, and KwangHee Lee. Diffface: Diffusion-based face swapping with facial guidance. 2022.
- [Liu *et al.*, 2022a] Bo Liu, Fan Yang, Xiuli Bi, Bin Xiao, Weisheng Li, and Xinbo Gao. Detecting generated images by real images. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 95–110. Springer, 2022.
- [Liu *et al.*, 2022b] Luping Liu, Yi Ren, Zhijie Lin, and Zhou Zhao. Pseudo numerical methods for diffusion models on manifolds. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.09778*, 2022.
- [Liu *et al.*, 2023] Chi Liu, Tianqing Zhu, Sheng Shen, and Wanlei Zhou. Towards robust gan-generated image detection: a multi-view completion representation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.01364*, 2023.
- [Mazé and Ahmed, 2023] François Mazé and Faez Ahmed. Diffusion models beat gans on topology optimization. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI), Washington, DC*, 2023.
- [Ojha *et al.*, 2023] Utkarsh Ojha, Yuheng Li, and Yong Jae Lee. Towards universal fake image detectors that generalize across generative models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 24480–24489, 2023.
- [Radford *et al.*, 2021] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR, 2021.
- [Ramesh *et al.*, 2022] Aditya Ramesh, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alex Nichol, Casey Chu, and Mark Chen. Hierarchical text-conditional image generation with clip latents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.06125*, 2022.
- [Rombach *et al.*, 2022] Robin Rombach, Andreas Blattmann, Dominik Lorenz, Patrick Esser, and Björn

- Ommer. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 10684–10695, 2022.
- [Rossler *et al.*, 2019] Andreas Rossler, Davide Cozzolino, Luisa Verdoliva, Christian Riess, Justus Thies, and Matthias Nießner. Faceforensics++: Learning to detect manipulated facial images. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 1–11, 2019.
- [Sauer *et al.*, 2021] Axel Sauer, Kashyap Chitta, Jens Müller, and Andreas Geiger. Projected gans converge faster. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2021.
- [Schuhmann *et al.*, 2022] Christoph Schuhmann, Romain Beaumont, Richard Vencu, Cade Gordon, Ross Wightman, Mehdi Cherti, Theo Coombes, Aarush Katta, Clayton Mullis, Mitchell Wortsman, et al. Laion-5b: An open large-scale dataset for training next generation image-text models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:25278–25294, 2022.
- [Sha *et al.*, 2023] Zeyang Sha, Zheng Li, Ning Yu, and Yang Zhang. De-fake: Detection and attribution of fake images generated by text-to-image generation models. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 3418–3432, 2023.
- [Shiohara and Yamasaki, 2022] Kaede Shiohara and Toshihiko Yamasaki. Detecting deepfakes with self-blended images. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 18720–18729, 2022.
- [Song *et al.*, 2020] Jiaming Song, Chenlin Meng, and Stefano Ermon. Denoising diffusion implicit models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.02502*, 2020.
- [Stypułkowski *et al.*, 2024] Michał Stypułkowski, Konstantinos Vougioukas, Sen He, Maciej Zięba, Stavros Petridis, and Maja Pantic. Diffused heads: Diffusion models beat gans on talking-face generation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pages 5091–5100, 2024.
- [Tan *et al.*, 2023a] Chuangchuang Tan, Yao Zhao, Shikui Wei, Guanghua Gu, and Yunchao Wei. Learning on gradients: Generalized artifacts representation for gan-generated images detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 12105–12114, June 2023.
- [Tan *et al.*, 2023b] Lingfeng Tan, Yunhong Wang, Junfu Wang, Liang Yang, Xunxun Chen, and Yuanfang Guo. Deepfake video detection via facial action dependencies estimation. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 37, pages 5276–5284, 2023.
- [Wang *et al.*, 2020] Sheng-Yu Wang, Oliver Wang, Richard Zhang, Andrew Owens, and Alexei A Efros. Cnn-generated images are surprisingly easy to spot...for now. In *CVPR*, 2020.
- [Wang *et al.*, 2022] Zhendong Wang, Huangjie Zheng, Pengcheng He, Weizhu Chen, and Mingyuan Zhou. Diffusion-gan: Training gans with diffusion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.02262*, 2022.
- [Yu *et al.*, 2015] Fisher Yu, Ari Seff, Yinda Zhang, Shuran Song, Thomas Funkhouser, and Jianxiong Xiao. Lsun: Construction of a large-scale image dataset using deep learning with humans in the loop. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.03365*, 2015.
- [Yu *et al.*, 2019] Ning Yu, Larry S. Davis, and Mario Fritz. Attributing fake images to gans: Learning and analyzing gan fingerprints. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, October 2019.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2019] Xu Zhang, Svebor Karaman, and Shih-Fu Chang. Detecting and simulating artifacts in gan fake images. In *2019 IEEE international workshop on information forensics and security (WIFS)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2019.