

# Targeted Augmented Data for Audio Deepfake Detection

Marcella Astrid\* Enjie Ghorbel\*<sup>†</sup> Djamila Aouada\*

\*Interdisciplinary Centre for Security, Reliability and Trust (SnT), University of Luxembourg, Luxembourg

<sup>†</sup>Cristal Laboratory, National School of Computer Sciences (ENSI), Manouba University, Tunisia

Email: marcella.astrid@uni.lu, enjie.ghorbel@isamm.uma.tn, djamila.aouada@uni.lu

**Abstract**—The availability of highly convincing audio deepfake generators highlights the need for designing robust audio deepfake detectors. Existing works often rely solely on real and fake data available in the training set, which may lead to overfitting, thereby reducing the robustness to unseen manipulations. To enhance the generalization capabilities of audio deepfake detectors, we propose a novel augmentation method for generating audio pseudo-fakes targeting the decision boundary of the model. Inspired by adversarial attacks, we perturb original real data to synthesize pseudo-fakes with ambiguous prediction probabilities. Comprehensive experiments on two well-known architectures demonstrate that the proposed augmentation contributes to improving the generalization capabilities of these architectures.

**Index Terms**—audio deepfake detection, anomaly detection, augmentation, adversarial attack

## I. INTRODUCTION

With the rapid advancement of generative deep learning, creating extremely convincing fake audio content, known as audio deepfakes, has become feasible. While such progress offers numerous advantages, it also opens avenues for malicious exploitation, such as spreading false information [1] or facilitating scams [2]. Consequently, introducing methods for detecting audio deepfakes is crucial.

Previous works on audio deepfake detectors have primarily focused on the architecture design, either through manual design [3]–[5] or neural architecture search [6], [7]. The training process typically involves the use of both real and fake data provided in the dataset. However, as for any deep learning-based method, such an approach tends to overfit the manipulation methods seen during the training phase, hence leading to poor performance when encountering unseen manipulations. Therefore, in this study, we propose a shift in focus from architecture to data augmentation. To enhance the robustness to unseen deepfakes, we aim to increase the diversity of fake data by augmenting the existing training dataset, as illustrated in Figure 1.

Specifically, we take inspiration from previous works on anomaly detection with a closely related objective, namely, generalizing to unseen anomalies. In fact, such an objective can be approached by generating pseudo-anomalies (i.e., augmented anomalous data, distinct from actual anomalous data) for covering more variability in anomalous data [8]–[12].

This work was supported by the Luxembourg National Research Fund (FNR) under the project BRIDGES2021/IS/16353350/FaKeDeTeR and POST Luxembourg.




Fig. 1. Overview of the proposed augmentation method for increasing the diversity of fake data. Both the original fake data and the augmented data are labeled as fake. The combined dataset is utilized during training. The x-axis denotes time, while the y-axis represents the audio signal magnitude.

However, different pseudo-anomalies do not contribute equally to the enhancement in performance. In particular, several research works [10]–[12] suggest that pseudo-anomalies located near the decision boundary separating normal data from fake ones can improve the model performance.

In this paper, we argue that following a similar boundary-driven data augmentation strategy in the context of audio deepfake detection can be a way to enhance the classification performance. To achieve this, we adopt a method from adversarial attacks [13] and utilize the model under training to perturb the input, resulting in augmented fake data. In adversarial attacks, the objective is to perturb the input in a way that induces the model to confidently make an incorrect prediction. For instance, in the context of deepfake detection, we might perturb a fake image so that the model confidently and inaccurately predicts it as real. In contrast, we perturb the input such that the model predicts it as a mixture of real and fake by minimizing the loss towards a prediction that is half real and half fake. This guides the perturbed input toward the decision boundary of the model. This strategy offers two key advantages: Firstly, it positions the augmented data near the boundary of real data, thereby encapsulating the genuine data more effectively (as depicted in Figure 2). Secondly, since we continuously generate the augmented data throughout the training, the augmented data also evolves throughout epochs, introducing further diversity due to shifts in the decision boundary of the model. Our method focuses solely on the training data and remains architecture-agnostic. We apply this augmentation technique to train two state-of-the-art audio deepfake architectures, namely, AASIST [3] and RawNet2 [5].




Fig. 2. Illustration of two different augmentation strategies: (a) augmentation of fake data in the neighborhood of the decision boundary (between real and fake data); and (b) augmentation in the neighborhood of fake data without considering the decision boundary. As compared to (b), the strategy employed in (a) can better enhance the generalization to unseen fake.

The reported experiments show that the proposed adversarial augmentation technique improves the performance of both architectures, thereby highlighting its relevance.

In summary, our contributions can be summarized as follows: 1) We are, to the best of our knowledge, the first in audio deepfake detection to focus on increasing the variety of fake data through augmentation; 2) We propose an adversarial-attack-like method to target the augmented data toward the decision boundary between real and fake; 3) Extensive experiments show the effectiveness of the targeted augmentation to improve the performance of audio deepfake detectors.

**Paper organization:** We discuss related work on deepfake detection in Section II. We detail our method in Section III. Section IV covers the experimental setup and results. Finally, our conclusions are presented in Section V.

## II. RELATED WORK

Audio deepfake detectors primarily focus on architectural designs, such as using smaller networks [14], [15], multiple feature scales [16], [17], fixed bandwidth filters [5], attention mechanisms [3], [5], [18], [19], and graph neural networks [3], [5], [18]. Another approach is to automatically search for optimal architectures through neural architecture search techniques [6], [7]. However, instead of focusing on the architectural design, we investigate the enrichment of training data by generating fake data from the original dataset.

While data synthesis strategies, to the best of our knowledge, have not been explored in the context of audio deepfake detection, generating pseudo-fake data from original dataset samples has been largely investigated in visual deepfake detection domain. Some methods [20]–[23] employ hand-crafted augmentation techniques, which are fully decoupled from the training phase, potentially leading to sub-optimal augmentations. Therefore, SLADD [24] suggests using a generator to determine the type of the generated pseudo-fake by maximizing the loss of the deepfake detector. In comparison, our method targets the boundary between real and fake to create fake data. Additionally, while SLADD trains its generator using reinforcement learning to approximate the gradient from the deepfake detector, potentially resulting in training convergence issues, we directly utilize the gradient from the deepfake detector.

## III. METHODOLOGY

An audio detection model, denoted as  $D(\cdot)$ , processes an input  $\mathbf{x}$  and generates the prediction denoted as  $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$ . Mathematically, this can be expressed as follows,

$$\hat{\mathbf{y}} = D(\mathbf{x}). \quad (1)$$

During the training phase, the model is optimized to minimize the classification loss  $\mathcal{L}(\hat{\mathbf{y}}, \mathbf{y})$  between the predictions  $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$  and the corresponding ground truth labels  $\mathbf{y}$ . Note that  $\mathbf{y}$  is one-hot encoded vector.

To enhance the diversity of fake data, we propose mixing the training batch with both the original and the augmented data. Let us denote by  $\mathbf{x}^o$  a given original input data and  $\mathbf{y}^o$  its corresponding label. In this approach, we introduce a perturbation denoted as  $\mathbf{p}$  to the original data for creating augmented data. In other words, given an original data  $\mathbf{x}^o$ , we obtain an augmented sample denoted as  $\mathbf{x}^a$  as follows,

$$\mathbf{x}^a = \mathbf{x}^o + \mathbf{p}. \quad (2)$$

Meanwhile, the corresponding label of  $\mathbf{x}^a$  denoted as  $\mathbf{y}^a$  is set to *fake* (i.e.,  $\mathbf{y}^a = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$ ) since the perturbed data is presumed to exhibit a different pattern compared to real data. From each data in the training batch, we randomly select a member from the augmented data or the original data with a probability of  $p \in [0, 1]$  and  $1 - p$ , respectively.

To target the decision boundary of the model, we propose an adaptive perturbation method inspired by adversarial attacks [13]. The perturbation of a data  $\mathbf{p}$  is computed using the gradient of the classification loss with respect to the input data  $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{L}(\hat{\mathbf{y}}^o, \tilde{\mathbf{y}})$  as follows,

$$\mathbf{p} = -\epsilon * \text{sign}(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{L}(\hat{\mathbf{y}}^o, \tilde{\mathbf{y}})), \quad (3)$$

where  $\hat{\mathbf{y}}^o = D(\mathbf{y}^o)$  represents the prediction probability of the original data,  $\epsilon$  denotes the perturbation magnitude which is randomly selected between the minimum and the maximum hyperparameter values  $\epsilon_{\min}$  and  $\epsilon_{\max}$  that are fixed empirically. The variable  $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}$  is set to be ambiguous with equal probability predictions for real and fake classes (i.e.,  $\tilde{\mathbf{y}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.5 \\ 0.5 \end{pmatrix}$ ). We assume that following such a strategy will be a way for targeting the decision boundary. The negative sign is utilized to move against the direction of the gradient

(i.e., gradient descent). As depicted in Figure 2(a), generating augmented data in the neighborhood of the decision boundary can enhance the model performance in detecting unseen fake samples as compared to targeting confident fake prediction (i.e.,  $\tilde{\mathbf{y}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$ ) illustrated in Figure 2(b). Additionally, it is worth noting that, unlike adversarial training that utilizes the perturbed input to increase the robustness of the model against attacks, we utilize the perturbed input as augmented fake data to increase the variety of fake data itself. Moreover, while we employ one of the simplest methods in adversarial attacks to illustrate this concept, the proposed idea can be adapted to any adversarial attack method.

#### IV. EXPERIMENTS

##### A. Dataset and metrics

In our experiments, the ASVspoof 2019 logical access (LA) dataset [25], [26] is considered. It comprises three subsets, namely, training, development, and evaluation subsets. The training and development sets contain different attacks denoted as A01-A06, while the evaluation set includes unseen attacks referred to as A07-A19. Additional information can be found in [26]. We employ the development and evaluation sets as validation and testing sets, respectively. We present the obtained results using the minimum normalized tandem detection cost function (min t-DCF) [27] and equal error rate (EER). A lower min t-DCF and EER value indicate a higher classification performance.

##### B. Experimental setup

We utilize open-sourced code for RawNet2<sup>1</sup> [5] and AASIST<sup>2</sup> [3] as our baseline models. However, we adjust the original batch size of AASIST from 24 to 16 to accommodate our hardware limitations, while we maintain a batch size of 32 for RawNet2 similar to the original source code. The training is conducted using the Adam optimizer [28], with a learning rate of 0.0001 and a weight decay of 0.0001. The validation set is used to select the most accurate model over 100 training epochs that is used for the final testing phase.

##### C. Ablation study

In this subsection, the impact of each proposed component is analyzed. Firstly, we report the obtained results using the two baselines without and with the proposed augmentation. As depicted in Table I, the proposed augmentation which targets samples with ambiguous probability predictions (half real and half fake) effectively enhances the performance of both AASIST and RawNet2 baselines. Additional details regarding the performance obtained for AASIST across different types of audio deepfakes can be found in Table II, demonstrating the improvement in performance across the majority of deepfake types. For AASIST, we set  $p = 0.5$ ,  $\epsilon_{\min} = 0.01$ , and  $\epsilon_{\max} = 0.5$ , while for RawNet2, we set  $p = 0.7$ ,  $\epsilon_{\min} = 0.01$ , and

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/asvspoof-challenge/2021/blob/main/LA/Baseline-RawNet2/model.py>

<sup>2</sup><https://github.com/clovaai/aasist/blob/main/models/AASIST.py>

TABLE I  
ABLATION STUDY OF OUR METHOD ON RAWNET2 [5] AND AASIST [3] BASELINE MODELS. AS OBSERVED, THE PROPOSED AUGMENTATION YIELDS SUPERIOR RESULTS. THE BEST PERFORMANCE IN EACH ARCHITECTURE IS MARKED IN BOLD.

Architecture	Augmentation (aug.)	Min t-DCF	EER (%)
RawNet2	No aug.	0.1003	3.79
	Untargeted aug.	0.0636	2.33
	Aug. targeting confident fake prediction	0.0688	2.41
	Aug. targeting ambiguous prediction (ours)	<b>0.0589</b>	<b>1.98</b>
AASIST	No aug.	0.0596	1.90
	Aug. targeting ambiguous prediction (ours)	<b>0.0403</b>	<b>1.39</b>

$\epsilon_{\max} = 0.7$ . We discuss the sensitivity to these hyperparameters in Section IV-E.

Secondly, to assess the importance of targeting ambiguous pseudo-fakes, we first compare it with untargeted augmentation by utilizing a Gaussian noise such that  $\mathbf{p}$  is defined as follows,

$$\mathbf{p} = \mathcal{G}(0, \sigma), \quad (4)$$

where  $\sigma$  represents the standard deviation sampled uniformly between two values predefined denoted as  $\sigma_{\min}$  and  $\sigma_{\max}$ . Note that, for a fair comparison, we also optimize the hyperparameters for untargeted augmentations, resulting in  $p = 0.7$ ,  $\sigma_{\min} = 0.01$ , and  $\sigma_{\max} = 1$ . As observed in Table I, untargeted augmented data can increase the diversity of fake data, leading to an improved performance as compared to the baseline. However, it is not as effective as the proposed targeted augmentation.

Thirdly, we explore the alternative of augmenting data by targeting to a confident fake prediction, as illustrated in Figure 2(b). To achieve this, we set  $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}$  in Eq. (3) to the fake category (i.e.,  $\tilde{\mathbf{y}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$ ). For a fair comparison, we optimize the hyperparameters for this setup and find  $p = 0.3$ ,  $\epsilon_{\min} = 0.01$ , and  $\epsilon_{\max} = 0.7$ . As observed in Table I, augmented data targeting standard pseudo-fakes can also increase the diversity of fake data, leading, hence improving the performance as compared to the baseline. However, it is not as effective as the proposed augmentation which targets ambiguous augmentation (with equivalent probability predictions for both real and fake classes).

In Figure 3, we show qualitative differences among the various augmentation strategies. Interestingly, despite no clear visual distinction can be made, the outcomes can still vary.

##### D. Comparison with SoA

The comparison with state-of-the-art (SoA) approaches are presented in Table III. Our method demonstrates competitiveness as compared to most SoA techniques, although it may not achieve the highest performance. Future improvements could involve selecting a more optimal baseline model, as theoretically our augmentation method can be applied with different baselines. Potential directions for future research include exploring this augmentation method with more optimal baselines, such as SENet [19] and RawGAT-ST [4]. Nevertheless, we have demonstrated that our method enhances the performance of AASIST [3] and RawNet2 [5].

TABLE II

EER (%) FOR EACH TYPE OF FAKE AUDIO IN THE EVALUATION SET USING THE AASIST [3] MODEL WITHOUT (BASELINE) AND WITH (OURS) THE PROPOSED AUGMENTATION. OUR AUGMENTED DATA ENHANCES THE PERFORMANCE OF THE BASELINE ACROSS THE MAJORITY OF TYPES. THE BEST PERFORMANCE IN EACH FAKE TYPE IS MARKED IN BOLD.

Method	A07	A08	A09	A10	A11	A12	A13	A14	A15	A16	A17	A18	A19
Baseline	0.4244	0.8556	<b>0.0170</b>	0.5704	0.3667	0.5466	0.3429	0.3090	0.4244	1.0831	2.4039	5.4122	<b>0.8964</b>
Ours	<b>0.1800</b>	<b>0.6112</b>	0.0238	<b>0.4074</b>	<b>0.1460</b>	<b>0.3429</b>	<b>0.1392</b>	<b>0.1630</b>	<b>0.2275</b>	<b>0.9371</b>	<b>2.2987</b>	<b>4.7026</b>	1.2393




Fig. 3. Visualization of an audio sample: (a) without augmentation, (b) with augmentation targeting ambiguous predictions (ours) (c) with augmentation targeting fake predictions, and (d) with untargeted augmentation. Perturbations with approximately similar magnitude are selected for visualization purposes:  $\epsilon = 0.1$  for (b) and (c), and  $\sigma = 0.05$  for (d).

TABLE III

COMPARISON OF VARIOUS STATE-OF-THE-ART (SoA) AUDIO DEEFAKE DETECTION METHODS ON THE ASVSPOOF 2019 DATASET. THE BEST, SECOND-BEST, AND THIRD-BEST PERFORMANCES ARE INDICATED BY BOLD, ITALIC, AND UNDERLINE, RESPECTIVELY. THE † MARK REPRESENTS OUR EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS. OUR METHOD DEMONSTRATES COMPETITIVE PERFORMANCE AS COMPARED TO THE SoA APPROACHES.

Method	min t-DCF	EER (%)
PC-DARTS [6]	0.0914	4.96
GMM [29]	0.0904	3.50
ResNet18-GAT-T [18]	0.0894	4.71
SE-Res2Net50 [16]	0.0743	2.50
Resnet18-OC-softmax [30]	0.0590	2.19
LCNN-Dual attention [15]	0.0777	2.76
ResNet18-LMCL-FM [31]	0.0520	1.81
MCG-Res2Net50 [17]	0.0520	1.78
Raw PC-DARTS [7]	0.0517	1.77
Res-TSSDNet [14]	0.0481	1.64
SENet [19]	<i>0.0368</i>	<i>1.14</i>
RawGAT-ST [4]	<b>0.0335</b>	<b>1.06</b>
RawNet2† [5]	0.1003	3.79
AASIST† [3]	0.0596	1.90
Ours (RawNet2)	0.0589	1.98
Ours (AASIST)	<u>0.0403</u>	<u>1.39</u>

### E. Hyperparameter robustness

Our method is based on three hyperparameters: the probability of using augmented data  $p$ , the maximum perturbation strength  $\epsilon_{\max}$ , and the minimum perturbation strength  $\epsilon_{\min}$ . In this subsection, we analyze the impact of these hyperparameters on the performance of the proposed approach.

The exploration of  $p$  values is depicted in Figure 4(a) and (d). It is evident that high values of  $p$ , such as  $p = 0.9$  in RawNet2 or  $p = 0.7$  in AASIST, can pose challenges to the model. With augmented data potentially converting real original data to fake data, there is a risk of aggravating the data imbalance between real and fake, which may result in decreased performance when excessively increasing  $p$ .

Different perturbation magnitudes can influence how much the augmented data pattern deviates from the original data, as observed qualitatively in Figure 5. As depicted in Figure 4(b), setting  $\epsilon_{\max}$  too small, for example,  $\epsilon_{\max} \leq 0.1$ , can be detrimental to the model. This is because there may be an excessive number of augmented data points that closely resemble the original data. This scenario is particularly problematic when the original data is real, as labeling similar data as fake can harm the performance of the model. Similar suited  $\epsilon_{\max}$  values can also be used for AASIST as depicted in Figure 4(e).

On the other hand, having a large  $\epsilon_{\min}$  is still acceptable for the model, as observed in Figure 4(c). The model exhibits robustness across a wide range of  $\epsilon_{\min}$  values. It is important to note that having a different pattern compared to the original data does not necessarily mean that the data lies/does not lie on the decision boundary. An augmented data point can be dissimilar to the original data while still residing in the neighborhood of decision boundary (where the model predicts half-real-half-fake), especially if the boundary is far from the original data.

## V. CONCLUSION

In this study, we introduce a novel data synthesis strategy for enhancing the performance of audio deepfake detection methods. Our approach generates fake data by focusing on ambiguous predictions, by taking inspiration from adversarial attack techniques. The proposed augmentation method has the advantage of being architecture-agnostic, hence can be coupled with any audio deepfake detection technique. Through extensive extensive, we demonstrate the relevance of targeting ambiguous augmentations in the context of audio deepfake detection, highlighting the need of further exploring this research area. In future works, we intend to explore more recent adversarial attack techniques.

## REFERENCES

- [1] J. Kelety, "Fake audio falsely claims to reveal private Biden comments," <https://apnews.com/article/fact-check-biden-audio-banking-fake-746021122607>, 2023, [Online; accessed 28-February-2024].
- [2] E. Flitter and S. Cowley, "Voice Deepfakes Are Coming for Your Bank Balance," <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/08/30/business/voice-deepfakes-bank-scams.html>, 2023, [Online; accessed 28-February-2024].
- [3] J.-w. Jung, H.-S. Heo, H. Tak, H.-j. Shim, J. S. Chung, B.-J. Lee, H.-J. Yu, and N. Evans, "Aasist: Audio anti-spoofing using integrated spectro-temporal graph attention networks," in *ICASSP 2022-2022 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 6367–6371.
- [4] H. Tak, J. weon Jung, J. Patino, M. Kamble, M. Todisco, and N. Evans, "End-to-end spectro-temporal graph attention networks for speaker verification anti-spoofing and speech deepfake detection," in *Proc. 2021 Edition of the Automatic Speaker Verification and Spoofing Countermeasures Challenge*, 2021, pp. 1–8.






Fig. 4. The EER (%) under different settings. The blue dotted line represents the baseline, i.e., the model trained without augmentation, while the red solid line depicts the model trained with our proposed augmentation technique. Various ranges of hyperparameter values are explored: (a) the probability of augmented data  $p$  on RawNet2 (with fixed  $\epsilon_{\min} = 0.01$  and  $\epsilon_{\max} = 0.5$ ), (b) the maximum perturbation strength  $\epsilon_{\max}$  on RawNet2 (with fixed  $p = 0.7$  and  $\epsilon_{\min} = 0.01$ ), (c) the minimum perturbation strength  $\epsilon_{\min}$  on RawNet2 (with fixed  $p = 0.7$  and  $\epsilon_{\max} = 0.5$ ), (d) the probability of augmented data  $p$  on AASIST (with fixed  $\epsilon_{\min} = 0.01$  and  $\epsilon_{\max} = 0.5$ ), and (e) the maximum perturbation strength  $\epsilon_{\max}$  on AASIST (with fixed  $p = 0.1$  and  $\epsilon_{\min} = 0.01$ ). Lower EER values indicate better performance.




Fig. 5. Samples of augmented data with varying perturbation magnitude. Augmentation with a higher magnitude results in augmented data that are more distinct from the original sample.

[5] H. Tak, J. Patino, M. Todisco, A. Nautsch, N. Evans, and A. Larcher, “End-to-end anti-spoofing with rawnet2,” in *ICASSP 2021-2021 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 6369–6373.

[6] W. Ge, M. Panariello, J. Patino, M. Todisco, and N. Evans, “Partially-connected differentiable architecture search for deepfake and spoofing detection,” in *Interspeech 2021*. ISCA, 2021, pp. 4319–4323.

[7] W. Ge, J. Patino, M. Todisco, and N. Evans, “Raw differentiable architecture search for speech deepfake and spoofing detection,” in *ASVSPOOF 2021, Automatic Speaker Verification and Spoofing Countermeasures Challenge*. ISCA, 2021, pp. 22–28.

[8] M. Z. Zaheer, J.-h. Lee, M. Astrid, and S.-I. Lee, “Old is gold: Redefining the adversarially learned one-class classifier training paradigm,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2020, pp. 14 183–14 193.

[9] M. Astrid, M. Z. Zaheer, J.-Y. Lee, and S.-I. Lee, “Learning not to reconstruct anomalies,” *British Machine Vision Conference*, 2021.

[10] P. C. Ngo, A. A. Winarto, C. K. L. Kou, S. Park, F. Akram, and H. K. Lee, “Fence gan: Towards better anomaly detection,” in *2019 IEEE 31st International Conference on tools with artificial intelligence (ICTAI)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 141–148.

[11] N. Dionelis, M. Yaghoobi, and S. A. Tsafaris, “Tail of distribution gan (tailgan): Generativeadversarial-network-based boundary formation,” in *2020 Sensor Signal Processing for Defence Conference (SSPD)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–5.

[12] —, “Boundary of distribution support generator (bdsg): sample generation on the boundary,” in *2020 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 803–807.

[13] I. Goodfellow, J. Shlens, and C. Szegedy, “Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2015. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1412.6572>

[14] G. Hua, A. B. J. Teoh, and H. Zhang, “Towards end-to-end synthetic speech detection,” *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 28, pp. 1265–1269, 2021.

[15] X. Ma, T. Liang, S. Zhang, S. Huang, and L. He, “Improved lightcnn with attention modules for asv spoofing detection,” in *2021 IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo (ICME)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1–6.

[16] X. Li, N. Li, C. Weng, X. Liu, D. Su, D. Yu, and H. Meng, “Replay and synthetic speech detection with res2net architecture,” in *ICASSP 2021-2021 IEEE international conference on acoustics, speech and signal processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 6354–6358.

[17] X. Li, X. Wu, H. Lu, X. Liu, and H. Meng, “Channel-wise gated res2net: Towards robust detection of synthetic speech attacks,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.08803*, 2021.

[18] H. Tak, J.-w. Jung, J. Patino, M. Todisco, and N. Evans, “Graph attention networks for anti-spoofing,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.03654*, 2021.

[19] Y. Zhang<sup>12</sup>, W. Wang<sup>12</sup>, and P. Zhang<sup>12</sup>, “The effect of silence and dual-band fusion in anti-spoofing system,” in *Proc. Interspeech*, 2021.

[20] L. Li, J. Bao, T. Zhang, H. Yang, D. Chen, F. Wen, and B. Guo, “Face x-ray for more general face forgery detection,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2020, pp. 5001–5010.

[21] K. Shiohara and T. Yamasaki, “Detecting deepfakes with self-blended images,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022, pp. 18 720–18 729.

[22] N. Mejri, E. Ghorbel, and D. Aouada, “Untag: Learning generic features for unsupervised type-agnostic deepfake detection,” in *ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1–5.

[23] D. Nguyen, N. Mejri, I. P. Singh, P. Kuleshova, M. Astrid, A. Kacem, E. Ghorbel, and D. Aouada, “Laa-net: Localized artifact attention network for high-quality deepfakes detection,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.13856*, 2024.

[24] L. Chen, Y. Zhang, Y. Song, L. Liu, and J. Wang, “Self-supervised learning of adversarial example: Towards good generalizations for deepfake detection,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2022, pp. 18 710–18 719.

[25] M. Todisco, X. Wang, V. Vestman, M. Sahidullah, H. Delgado, A. Nautsch, J. Yamagishi, N. Evans, T. Kinnunen, and K. A. Lee, “Asvspoof 2019: Future horizons in spoofed and fake audio detection,” in *INTERSPEECH 2019-20th Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association*, 2019.

[26] X. Wang, J. Yamagishi, M. Todisco, H. Delgado, A. Nautsch, N. Evans, M. Sahidullah, V. Vestman, T. Kinnunen, K. A. Lee *et al.*, “Asvspoof 2019: A large-scale public database of synthesized, converted and replayed speech,” *Computer Speech & Language*, vol. 64, p. 101114, 2020.

[27] T. Kinnunen, K. A. Lee, H. Delgado, N. Evans, M. Todisco, M. Sahidullah, J. Yamagishi, and D. A. Reynolds, “t-dcf: a detection cost function for the tandem assessment of spoofing countermeasures and automatic speaker verification,” in *The Speaker and Language Recognition Workshop (Odyssey 2018)*. ISCA, 2018.

[28] D. P. Kingma and J. Ba, “Adam: A method for stochastic optimization,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014.

[29] H. Tak, J. Patino, A. Nautsch, N. Evans, and M. Todisco, “Spoofing attack detection using the non-linear fusion of sub-band classifiers,” in *Interspeech 2020*. ISCA, 2020, pp. 1106–1110.

[30] Y. Zhang, F. Jiang, and Z. Duan, “One-class learning towards synthetic voice spoofing detection,” *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 28, pp. 937–941, 2021.

[31] T. Chen, A. Kumar, P. Nagarsheth, G. Sivaraman, and E. Khoury, “Generalization of audio deepfake detection,” in *Odyssey*, 2020, pp. 132–137.