

Are audio DeepFake detection models polyglots?

Bartłomiej Marek^{1,2}, Piotr Kawa¹, Piotr Syga¹

¹Wrocław University of Science and Technology, Poland
²CISPA – Helmholtz Center for Information Security, Germany
{bartlomiej.marek, piotr.kawa, piotr.syga}@pwr.edu.pl

Abstract

Since the majority of audio DeepFake (DF) detection methods are trained on English-centric datasets, their applicability to non-English languages remains largely unexplored. In this work, we present a benchmark for the multilingual audio DF detection challenge by evaluating various adaptation strategies. Our experiments focus on analyzing models trained on English benchmark datasets, as well as intra-linguistic (same-language) and cross-linguistic adaptation approaches. Our results indicate considerable variations in detection efficacy, highlighting the difficulties of multilingual settings. We show that limiting the dataset to English negatively impacts the efficacy, while stressing the importance of the data in the target language.

Index Terms: Audio DeepFakes, DeepFake detection, multilingual audio DeepFakes

1. Introduction

The exponential advancement of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI), particularly in voice synthesis, has significantly lowered the barrier of entry for creating personalized voices. Technologies such as text-to-speech (TTS) and voice cloning (VC) require minimal input, even just seconds of voice recording, to produce convincing replicas [1], which, aside from helpful applications like personal assistants, may be used in a malicious way as so-called audio DeepFakes (DF). Malicious ones may challenge the existing understanding of the media by questioning their authenticity and credibility, thus posing significant social threats and allowing manipulation to discredit individuals, e.g., AI-generated campaign ads in Poland [2] or sophisticated scams, e.g. a Hong Kong incident where DFs were used to fraud \$25.6M by impersonating company executives [3].

Even though research on DF detection, a problem similar to spoofing countermeasures [4], is widely conducted, the main problem has been shown to lie in a low amount of diversified data and the difficulty of generalization of the detection model (cf. [5]). Additionally, we note significant progress in personalized, also in terms of language, voice assistants, and even multilingual TTS, e.g., [6], that enable the creation of high-quality and high-fidelity utterances across various languages. As shown in a report by Recorded Future Inc.¹, between July 2023 and July 2024, over 82 DeepFakes of public figures (e.g., Prime Ministers of Senegal, Canada, and UK) were found in 38 countries. From that group, 30 countries held elections between July 2023 and the end of 2024. This shows that the DF problem is global in reach yet may require localized focus and tuning for the language. However, due to the availability of the datasets and

the global prevalence, most cutting-edge models remain focused on English and Chinese in training and evaluation.

With a recent publication of a multilingual dataset [7], a new branch of investigating the generalization of DF detection models was made possible. Hence, in this work, we evaluate the generalization of cutting-edge models trained on benchmark English datasets to new (i.e., non-English) languages, comparing the efficacy of those models with ones explicitly trained on the target language with severely limited data available and fine-tuned English-trained models. To the best of the authors' knowledge, this is the first study to specifically investigate the performance of audio DF detection methods across multiple languages from different language families, taking a broader perspective by considering languages available in both the M-AILABS Speech Dataset [8] and the Multi-Language Audio Anti-Spoofing Dataset (MLAAD) [7]. We include languages from the Germanic (English, German), Romance (French, Italian, Spanish), and Slavic (Polish, Russian, Ukrainian) families to find the best adaptation strategy while having additional language-specific data in cases where data availability is limited, and to initiate discourse and draw attention to the challenges posed by multilingual approaches to audio DF detection, as the lack of publicly available datasets and generators in this area significantly limits research progress.

The main goal of this work is to determine the most effective approach for adapting detection models to non-English languages. Specifically, it seeks to answer two questions: first, whether language-specific models are necessary for accurate detection across various languages, thereby necessitating linguistically diverse datasets; and second, which adaptation strategy is most effective when only a small dataset in the target language is available to tune an English-trained detection model.

In this study, we introduce a benchmark for advancing audio DF detection in multilingual settings and empirically explore three essential research questions (RQ) in this area. Specifically, we aim to check the extent to which detection efficacy varies by language, whether English benchmark-trained models are sufficient for effective cross-linguistic detection, and which targeted strategies best support DF detection in specific languages, precisely intra- or cross-lingual adaptations, **even assuming access to very limited non-English resources.**

RQ1: Are detection models trained on English benchmark datasets sufficient for multilingual application?

Current, publicly available benchmarks are English-centric, potentially leaving detection models underprepared for real-world scenarios involving non-English audio. This research question explores the challenges of relying solely on benchmark-trained models for diverse linguistic contexts, focusing on their performance in specific non-English languages evaluated both individually or collectively.

¹<https://go.recordedfuture.com/hubfs/reports/ta-2024-0924.pdf>

RQ2: To what extent does the DF detection vary by language?

Despite advances in audio DF detection, there is a limited understanding of how language influences detection efficacy. This question is essential for understanding whether a linguistic adaptation is necessary to ensure robust detection for specific languages. Given the constrained data regime for most languages, is it more effective to train the language-specific model or use an English-trained one. Moreover, if adding other languages to the training set helps or hinders the detection. This may prove particularly important if language-specific adaptation indicates a negative impact, suggesting that simply increasing data volume may improve performance in audio DF detection.

RQ3: Which language-specific audio DeepFake detection strategies are most effective?

Observing variations in model performance across different languages could reveal valuable insights for developing language-specific improvements in audio DF detection systems. We investigate the difference between training a language-specific model in a low-data availability, using an English-trained model, and fine-tuning an English-trained model with non-English data. Moreover, we aim to determine whether a more targeted or more diverse language dataset would be more effective for our strategy. In the latter case, it would be necessary to determine which languages would be most suitable for adaptation.

The codebase related to our research can be found at ².

2. Related works

DF detection has garnered significant attention due to the increasing sophistication of TTS and VS algorithms capable of producing highly realistic audio fakes. A substantial portion of the research in this domain has utilized the ASVspoof datasets [9, 10, 11, 12] using all of the subsets for training. ASVspoof 2019 is one of the most prominently used training sets as it concentrates on presentation attacks, including synthesized, converted, and replayed speech. It has significantly improved defense against sophisticated spoofing attempts targeting automatic speaker verification systems [13]. However, the pristine nature of the dataset, free from noise and other perturbations, may not accurately represent real-world scenarios. Moreover, this set consists exclusively of English samples. Using other datasets, e.g., [14, 15] showed that the detection of fakes taken from a different distribution results in lower efficacy. While [16] proposed a method for coping with unseen methods of DF generation, [5] showed that detection models have even greater difficulty in correct classification of real-world samples, publishing their 'In the Wild' dataset. The lack of differentiated datasets amplified the generalization problem. Furthermore, most published datasets comprise solely English samples, with [14] including some Japanese utterances and [17, 18, 19, 20] provided Chinese. A recent Multi-Language Audio Anti-spoofing Dataset (MLAAD) [7] attempts to address the gap, providing 76,000 utterances in 23 languages, with DF generated using 54 systems to present samples with varied distributions. This publicly available, large-scale audio fake corpus spans over 160 hours and forms a complete dataset with the M-AILABS Speech Dataset, consisting of authentic audio recordings from public domain books (mostly LibriVox) and corresponding text transcripts. For this research, we used the third version of the MLAAD dataset. ³ In particular, due to the large number of languages in the dataset, the number of samples in each language is limited. Given the

problem with the generalization of the models, we cannot be sure if the efficacies of the detection models rely on the target language, i.e., the language in which the utterance is spoken. This motivated this paper so that further research could focus on the most promising way to detect non-English DFs.

3. Experimental setup

Throughout the article, we investigate the efficacy of English-trained detection models in detecting DFs for various languages and provide a strategy to improve the detection efficacy for DF utterances in languages with severely limited datasets that might be used to train or fine-tune the detection model. In this study, we concentrate on the languages represented in the M-AILABS Speech Dataset, which provides a comprehensive sample of authentic language data in these languages. We have selected English (en) and German (de) from the Germanic family, French (fr), Italian (it), and Spanish (es), which represent the Romance languages, and Polish (pl), Russian (ru), and Ukrainian (uk), which represent the Slavic languages.

Models. In the audio DF detection domain, methodologies diverge between direct waveform analysis via end-to-end models and feature-based methods employing front-end extractors, which extract acoustic properties from raw audio for subsequent deep learning (DL) classification. Although methods like [21, 22, 23] show improved generalization capabilities, they rely on a large training set, which is infeasible in the scenario of utterances in a new language. In our research, we investigate the behavior of top-performing models [22, 24, 25, 26], following the intuition that smaller models may be better suited for the limited data availability in the following evaluation scenarios: i) English-trained detection model on the target language, ii) training from scratch directly on the target language, iii) fine-tuning pre-trained English models on target languages, iv) fine-tuning with related or unrelated language. For all the experiments, we assume that non-English resources are severely limited.

Datasets. In this research, we establish a baseline by utilizing models trained on the entire English benchmark dataset ASVspoof2019 LA, consisting of the training set, development set, and evaluation set, and treat them as a reference point for language-specific fine-tuning, as most researched audio DFs detection solutions used English or Chinese for training (the latter's challenge sets were not publicly available during this research).

Dataset partitioning. Given the characteristics of MLAAD, where several languages use only four architectures (*XTTS v1.1*, *XTTS v2*, *Griffin-Lim*, *VITS*), we utilize a conditional sampling approach with explicit architectural constraints [7]. Hence, we initially perform fine-tuning with single-language audio samples generated using *VITS* and *Griffin-Lim*, and evaluate on spoof samples synthesized with *XTTS v1.1* and *XTTS v2*, thus guaranteeing no overlap between the fine-tuning and test datasets. To ensure fair evaluation, we reverse the roles of these datasets—using the fine-tuning dataset for testing and the original test set for fine-tuning. Our dataset partitioning strategy dictates that once an architecture (e.g., *VITS*) is assigned to either the fine-tuning or evaluation subset, any sample generated using this architecture cannot occur in the other dataset, even in another language. Such overlap could lead to incorrect conclusions, especially regarding language transferability. This separation across samples is essential to maintain the integrity of our comparisons. We fully acknowledge the limitations imposed by the lack of a more comprehensive dataset. However, our methodology represents a best-effort attempt to conduct fair comparisons within these

²https://github.com/bartlomiejmarek/are_audio_df_polyglots

³<https://owncloud.fraunhofer.de/index.php/s/tL2Y1FKrWiX4ZtP>

constraints. The experimental design faced inherent limitations due to the (un)availability of the datasets.

Even for this limited number of languages and architectures, we took proactive steps to generate missing data to avoid potential bias. Specifically, we synthesized samples using *XTTS v1.1* and *XTTS v2* for English and *VITS* samples for Russian, which were not included in the original MLAAD. Moreover, it is important to note that the original MLAAD dataset does not contain Ukrainian samples generated using *XTTS v1.1* and *XTTS v2* due to the limitations of these generators. This led us to use *GlowTTS* and *Facebook Massively Multilingual Speech* (MMS) instead of excluding this language from our study.

4. Results

In this section, we present the evaluation results of the scenario defined in Section 3 to determine model efficacies in limited data availability across various languages and adaptation strategies. Firstly, we evaluate English pre-trained models without any additional linguistic adaptation, thus providing an initial measure of cross-linguistic performance. Secondly, we train the same models from scratch using small language-specific datasets (~4,000 samples). While performance remains limited by dataset size, this approach provides insight into whether and, if so, how an insufficient amount of data may still support language-centered detection. Finally, we explore intra- and cross-linguistic adaptations. Intra-linguistic strategy, focusing on within-language fine-tuning, demonstrates that even a limited amount of data can meaningfully improve detection accuracy in the target language. Cross-linguistic adaptations, that is strategy that uses any other language(s) than the target one, offer a promising path for enhancing low-resource language performance through transfer from potential similarities between languages or similar models' interpretations, but the results point out the challenges and limitations, thus leading to using unusual combinations of languages that are not related to each other.

4.1. Base line

Tables 1-3 show the performance of models trained with the entire ASVspoof2019 LA. W2V+AASIST, pre-trained on an English benchmark dataset, achieves the highest performance across nearly all tested languages, thus substantially outperforming the lowest EERs of other models for each language, presenting superior generalization capabilities across languages. The only exception is the Ukrainian language, for which the most effective is LFCC+MesoNet, slightly overperforming LFCC+MesoNet and W2V+AASIST. While the best LFCC-based model varies across languages, these models trailed behind W2V+AASIST overall and far outperformed alternatives like Whisper+AASIST and RawGAT-ST, demonstrating insufficient cross-lingual generalization capabilities.

Table 1: *The mean EER scores (in %) for the Germanic languages tested on ASV-trained models.*

Model	Dataset	Languages	
		en	de
LFCC+AASIST	ASVspoof2019	5.53 ± 0.13	6.30 ± 0.24
LFCC+MesoNet		9.35 ± 0.30	6.79 ± 0.14
RawGAT-ST		43.28 ± 0.13	51.68 ± 0.13
W2V+AASIST		1.57 ± 0.14	2.88 ± 0.03
Whisper+AASIST		41.15 ± 0.27	44.93 ± 0.39

The results exhibit widely differing efficacies of audio DF detection according to model and language. Notably, specific lan-

Table 2: *The mean EER scores (in %) for the Romance languages tested on ASV-trained models.*

Model	Dataset	Languages		
		fr	es	it
LFCC+AASIST	ASVspoof2019	1.68 ± 0.08	27.36 ± 0.20	5.48 ± 0.11
LFCC+MesoNet		4.31 ± 0.21	10.20 ± 0.13	5.62 ± 0.21
RawGAT-ST		56.45 ± 0.21	46.01 ± 0.48	56.72 ± 0.22
W2V+AASIST		0.35 ± 0.05	2.68 ± 0.07	0.26 ± 0.03
Whisper+AASIST		46.22 ± 0.24	48.87 ± 0.13	48.40 ± 0.10

Table 3: *The mean EER scores (in %) for the Slavic languages tested on ASV-trained models.*

Model	Dataset	Languages		
		pl	ru	uk
LFCC+AASIST	ASVspoof2019	0.99 ± 0.04	17.44 ± 0.17	0.28 ± 0.04
LFCC+MesoNet		1.27 ± 0.05	8.72 ± 0.11	0.09 ± 0.03
RawGAT-ST		49.89 ± 0.23	42.53 ± 0.24	29.26 ± 0.25
W2V+AASIST		0.37 ± 0.03	7.25 ± 0.11	0.23 ± 0.03
Whisper+AASIST		48.55 ± 0.31	45.32 ± 0.26	25.86 ± 0.16

guages revealed more significant challenges for the pre-trained models. In particular, the Russian language exhibits the highest challenge, achieving an EER of 7.25±0.11% for W2V+AASIST and 8.72±0.11% for LFCC+MesoNet. Analyzing the best-performing models trained on the English benchmark dataset, our findings indicate that models are more effective in detecting audio DF in Polish, French, and Ukrainian than in English, which is the only language used for training these models. Specifically, LFCC+AASIST, LFCC+MesoNet, and W2V+AASIST detect DFs better in French, Polish, Italian, and Ukrainian. This trend may also be caused by lower sample quality in these languages.

4.2. Language training

To fairly answer RQ3 in a sparse data regime, we train models from scratch on limited (4,000) samples. The aim is to assess whether even a small number of samples for a particular language and training the model from scratch would be an alternative to long training on a large dataset. The detailed results presented in Section 7.1 (Tables 4-6) indicated reduced efficacy compared to English pre-trained models, which exceed in every scenario. These results confirm that having a large language-independent amount of data boosts the detection more than language-specific small datasets, thus highlighting and reinforcing the value of extensive, even language-independent data for DF detection.

4.3. Language fine-tuning

Fine-tuning pre-trained models with English benchmark datasets allows us to assess the necessity of fine-tuning for improving models' detectability and potential cross-language generalization capabilities. Figures Figure 1- 2 present the EER heatmaps for fine-tuned the pre-trained model with the specific language (marked on the y-axis), while the x-axis represents the evaluated languages. The red rectangles highlight the best-performing models. The first row depicts the performance of a pre-trained baseline model for each language. The heatmap illustrates the generalizability of intra- and cross-language adaptations for specific models.

Fine-tuning models with language-specific data improves audio DF detection, thereby adding linguistic context, and shows noteworthy gains in audio DF detection compared to the performance of English pre-trained models. Detailed tables presenting results for all tested models can be found in Section 7.2.

Similarly to the baseline, W2V+AASIST, in most cases, con-




Figure 1: Heatmap of EER values (in %) for W2V+AASIST pre-trained on large English dataset and fine-tuned using language-specific small dataset

sistently emerges as the overall best-performing model among the evaluated architectures. Figure 1 shows this model achieving low EER in various scenarios, especially intra-, but also cross-linguistic evaluations. The first of these is evident from the low EER values along the diagonal of the Figure 1.

Cross-lingual adaptation is one of the key aspects of evaluating the multilingual model, and W2V+AASIST seems to provide competitive results, but mainly if the base model performs well. Conversely, for example, for Russian or even Germanic languages, the performance of W2V+AASIST remains comparable to or even worse than the baseline.

Results for LFCC+AASIST shown in Figure 2 indicate similar trends with the best results on the diagonal, thus indicating that intra-language adaptations are more effective. Notably, cross-linguistic fine-tuning of the LFCC+AASIST is effective in two scenarios: improving a well-performing base model (e.g., in the case of French or Polish languages) or fine-tuning with the Italian language, which indicates overperforming other even intra-linguistic adaptations.

On the other hand, despite improvement in comparison to the pre-trained models, LFCC+MesoNet, RawGAT-ST, and Whisper+AASIST face considerable challenges in achieving effective adaptation, with both intra- and cross-linguistic fine-tuning yielding high EER values across most languages.

Additional experiments explore the impact of grouping languages during tuning. Interestingly, sometimes fine-tuning on multiple languages without a specific language in the mix, such as combining datasets from unrelated languages, proves less effective than fine-tuning on a single-language dataset. For instance, using just Russian or Spanish outperforms using a larger combined dataset that lacks Russian and Spanish when explicitly evaluated in these 2 languages, reinforcing that linguistic specificity can outweigh the raw data volume.

Noteworthy, all experiments suggest that simply increasing data volume without linguistic relevance may not improve, and even dilute, the performance performance.

Answer to RQ1: The detection of audio DF shows significant variability across different languages. The evaluation of En-




Figure 2: Heatmap of EER values (in %) for LFCC+AASIST pre-trained on large English dataset and fine-tuned using language-specific small dataset

glish pre-trained models without additional linguistic adaptation reveals that models like W2V+AASIST show cross-lingual generalization capabilities, yet their performance varied significantly across languages. The efficacy of some languages is even better than that of the only language *known to the model*, English.

Answer to RQ2: Evaluation using English pre-trained models without additional adaptation reveals notable differences in performance when applied to other languages. Languages such as French, Polish, Italian, and Ukrainian show better detection performance than English, even though the models are trained exclusively on English datasets. Conversely, Russian or Spanish seems more challenging, with pre-trained models yielding higher EERs. Nevertheless, for these languages, the intra-linguistic adaptations significantly improve audio DF detection.

Answer to RQ3: The experiments indicate that the most effective targeted strategy for improving audio DF detection within specific languages is intra-linguistic adaptation. Fine-tuning models, like W2V+AASIST and LFCC+AASIST, with limited data from the target language significantly enhance detection accuracy. Cross-linguistic adaptation, where models are fine-tuned with data from languages other than the target language, indicates mixed results. Fine-tuning with unrelated languages or combining datasets from multiple languages, ignoring the target language, often does not improve and can degrade performance.

5. Conclusion

This research aims to introduce a benchmark and to answer the question of the effectiveness of pre-trained and adapted audio DF detection models in multilingual settings. Up to now, the influence of the utterances' language on audio DF detection has not been examined. The experiments, especially for best-performed W2V+AASIST and LFCC+AASIST, confirm that overall intra-linguistic adaptations are a reliable approach. Although our study is limited to eight languages, samples were generated using a paucity of methods, which affected the confi-




Figure 3: Heatmap of EER values (in %) for W2V+AASIST pre-trained on a large English dataset and fine-tuned using combined language-specific small datasets.

dence of the result. Despite these limitations, we believe that it is an important starting point for tackling the problems and challenges posed by multilingual DFs. Future research should aim to expand the scope to include a wider spectrum of languages, generators, and models to understand the impact of fine-tuning and transferability across languages comprehensively.

6. References

- [1] C. Zhang, C. Zhang, S. Zheng, M. Zhang, M. Qamar, S.-H. Bae, and I. S. Kweon, "A Survey on Audio Diffusion Models: Text To Speech Synthesis and Enhancement in Generative AI," 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.13336>
- [2] Notes from Poland, "Opposition criticised for using AI-generated deepfake voice of PM in Polish election ad," 08 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://notesfrompoland.com/2023/08/25/opposition-criticised-for-using-ai-generated-deepfake-voice-of-pm-in-polish-election-ad/>
- [3] CNN World, "Finance worker pays out \$25 million after video call with deepfake 'chief financial officer'," 02 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://edition.cnn.com/2024/02/04/asia/deepfake-cfo-scam-hong-kong-intl-hnk/index.html>
- [4] X. Wang and J. Yamagishi, "Investigating self-supervised front ends for speech spoofing countermeasures," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2111.07725, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.07725>
- [5] N. Müller, P. Czempin, F. Diekmann, A. Froghyar, and K. Böttinger, "Does Audio Deepfake Detection Generalize?" in *Interspeech 2022*, 2022, pp. 2783–2787.
- [6] E. Casanova, K. Davis, E. Gölge, G. Gökmar, I. Gulea, L. Hart, A. Aljafari, J. Meyer, R. Morais, S. Olayemi, and J. Weber, "Xtts: a massively multilingual zero-shot text-to-speech model," in *Interspeech 2024*, 2024, pp. 4978–4982.
- [7] N. M. Müller, P. Kawa, W. H. Choong, E. Casanova, E. Gölge, T. Müller, P. Syga, P. Sperl, and K. Böttinger, "Mlaad: The multi-language audio anti-spoofing dataset," *International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*, 2024.
- [8] I. Solak. (2019) The M-AILABS Speech Dataset. [Accessed: Aug. 22, 2024]. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/imdatcelest/m-ailabs-dataset>
- [9] Z. Wu, T. Kinnunen, N. Evans, J. Yamagishi, C. Hanilçi, M. Sahidullah, and A. Sizov, "Asvspoof 2015: the first automatic speaker verification spoofing and countermeasures challenge," in *Interspeech 2015*, 2015, pp. 2037–2041.
- [10] A. Nautsch, X. Wang, N. Evans, T. H. Kinnunen, V. Vestman, M. Todisco, H. Delgado, M. Sahidullah, J. Yamagishi, and K. A. Lee, "ASVspoof 2019: Spoofing Countermeasures for the Detection of Synthesized, Converted and Replayed Speech," *IEEE Transactions on Biometrics, Behavior, and Identity Science*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 252–265, 2021.
- [11] J. Yamagishi, X. Wang, M. Todisco, M. Sahidullah, J. Patino, A. Nautsch, X. Liu, K. A. Lee, T. Kinnunen, N. Evans, and H. Delgado, "ASVspoof 2021: accelerating progress in spoofed and deepfake speech detection," in *Proc. 2021 Edition of the Automatic Speaker Verification and Spoofing Countermeasures Challenge*, 2021, pp. 47–54.
- [12] X. Wang, H. Delgado, H. Tak, J. weon Jung, H. jin Shim, M. Todisco, I. Kukanov, X. Liu, M. Sahidullah, T. H. Kinnunen, N. Evans, K. A. Lee, and J. Yamagishi, "ASVspoof 5: crowd-sourced speech data, deepfakes, and adversarial attacks at scale," in *The Automatic Speaker Verification Spoofing Countermeasures Workshop (ASVspoof 2024)*, 2024, pp. 1–8.
- [13] X. Wang, J. Yamagishi, M. Todisco, H. Delgado, A. Nautsch, N. Evans, M. Sahidullah, V. Vestman, T. Kinnunen, K. A. Lee, L. Juvela, P. Alku, Y.-H. Peng, H.-T. Hwang, Y. Tsao, H.-M. Wang, S. L. Maguer, M. Becker, F. Henderson, R. Clark, Y. Zhang, Q. Wang, Y. Jia, K. Onuma, K. Mushika, T. Kaneda, Y. Jiang, L.-J. Liu, Y.-C. Wu, W.-C. Huang, T. Toda, K. Tanaka, H. Kameoka, I. Steiner, D. Matrouf, J.-F. Bonastre, A. Govender, S. Ronanki, J.-X. Zhang, and Z.-H. Ling, "ASVspoof 2019: A large-scale public database of synthesized, converted and replayed speech."
- [14] J. Frank and L. Schönherr, "WaveFake: A Data Set to Facilitate Audio Deepfake Detection," in *Thirty-fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*, 2021.
- [15] H. Khalid, S. Tariq, and S. S. Woo, "FakeAVCeleb: A Novel Audio-Video Multimodal Deepfake Dataset," 2021.
- [16] P. Kawa, M. Plata, and P. Syga, "Attack agnostic dataset: Towards generalization and stabilization of audio deepfake detection," in *INTERSPEECH*, 2022, pp. 4023–4027. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.21437/Interspeech.2022-10078>
- [17] J. Yi, J. Tao, R. Fu, X. Yan, C. Wang, T. Wang, C. Y. Zhang, X. Zhang, Y. Zhao, Y. Ren, L. Xu, J. Zhou, H. Gu, Z. Wen, S. Liang, Z. Lian, S. Nie, and H. Li, "ADD 2023: the Second Audio Deepfake Detection Challenge," 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.13774>
- [18] Z. Zhang, Y. Gu, X. Yi, and X. Zhao, "FMFCC-A: A Challenging Mandarin Dataset for Synthetic Speech Detection," in *Digital Forensics and Watermarking*, X. Zhao, A. Piva, and P. Comesaña-Alfaro, Eds. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2022, pp. 117–131.
- [19] J. Yi, Y. Bai, J. Tao, H. Ma, Z. Tian, C. Wang, T. Wang, and R. Fu, "Half-Truth: A Partially Fake Audio Detection Dataset," in *Proc. Interspeech 2021*, 2021, pp. 1654–1658.
- [20] H. Ma, J. Yi, C. Wang, X. Yan, J. Tao, T. Wang, S. Wang, and R. Fu, "CFAD: A Chinese dataset for fake audio detection," *Speech Communication*, vol. 164, p. 103122, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167639324000931>
- [21] X. Wang and J. Yamagishi, "Spoofed training data for speech spoofing countermeasure can be efficiently created using neural vocoders," in *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing ICASSP 2023, Rhodes Island, Greece, June 4-10, 2023*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1–5. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICASSP49357.2023.10094779>
- [22] H. Tak, M. Todisco, X. Wang, J. Jung, J. Yamagishi, and N. W. D. Evans, "Automatic speaker verification spoofing and deepfake detection using wav2vec 2.0 and data augmentation," in *Odyssey 2022: The Speaker and Language Recognition Workshop, 28 June - 1 July 2022, Beijing, China*, T. F. Zheng, Ed. ISCA, 2022, pp. 112–119. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.21437/Odyssey.2022-16>

- [23] T.-P. Doan, H. Dinh-Xuan, T. Ryu, I. Kim, W. Lee, K. Hong, and S. Jung, "Trident of poseidon: A generalized approach for detecting deepfake voices," in *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS '24)*, 2024.
- [24] J. Jung, H. Heo, H. Tak, H. Shim, J. S. Chung, B. Lee, H. Yu, and N. W. D. Evans, "AASIST: audio anti-spoofing using integrated spectro-temporal graph attention networks," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2110.01200, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.01200>
- [25] D. Afchar, V. Nozick, J. Yamagishi, and I. Echizen, "Mesonet: a compact facial video forgery detection network," in *2018 IEEE International Workshop on Information Forensics and Security, WIFS 2018, Hong Kong, China, December 11-13, 2018*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 1–7. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/WIFS.2018.8630761>
- [26] 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 *2021 Edition of the Automatic Speaker Verification and Spoofing Countermeasures Challenge*, 2021, pp. 1–8.

7. Appendix

7.1. MLAAD training

The results presented in Tables 4-6 indicate that models trained from scratch generally perform poorly, especially compared to the pre-trained models. However, an interesting pattern emerges: Polish and French provide the best training data for W2V+AASIST and LFCC+MesoNet, and Spanish provides better results for LFCC+AASIST. Notably, LFCC+MesoNet achieves relatively acceptable results for the Ukrainian language when trained with Italian or French, with EER still higher than the pre-trained baseline, but significantly better than other models.

7.2. MLAAD fine-tuning

We fine-tune the pre-trained models using specific languages to verify the models' intra- and cross-linguistic adaptation abilities. Generally, every fine-tuned model achieves lower EER than pre-trained models. Thus, fine-tuning positively impacts audio DeepFake detection in almost every language. Similar to evaluating the pre-trained models, the W2V+AASIST and LFCC-based models outperformed the others. Based on results in Tables 7-9, we can distinguish two trends. In the first one, intra-linguistic adaptation is more efficient and thus reduces the EER compared to pre-trained and cross-adaptation models. This group includes better-performed models: LFCC+AASIST and W2V+AASIST. On the other hand, the second group shows a trend that fine-tuning with a specific language is most effective. Specifically, RAWGAT ST, fine-tuned with Polish, and Whisper+AASIST, as well as LFCC+MesoNet, fine-tuned with English, achieve the lowest EER across most languages for this specific model.

7.3. MLAAD multi-lingual fine-tuning

During these experiments, we assess whether combining two or three languages for training might provide comparable results, especially in the context of cross-language adaptations. We use the same approaches and datasets as in our previous fine-tuning experiments (Section 4.3), but we now group languages to identify whether specific combinations offer improved efficiency, especially in cross-lingual scenarios. However, results for W2V+AASIST indicate that cross-language adaptation still struggles, especially with base models that initially perform

Table 4: *The mean EER scores tested on ASV-trained models trained with samples generated using D_{ft} subset for the specific language.*

Model	Fine-tuned on	Languages	
		en	de
LFCC+AASIST	de	49.94 ± 0.17	48.74 ± 0.17
	en	33.50 ± 0.37	53.25 ± 0.15
	es	25.74 ± 0.35	36.52 ± 0.27
	fr	46.92 ± 0.49	43.69 ± 0.45
	it	42.46 ± 0.45	66.43 ± 0.39
	pl	45.87 ± 0.21	46.27 ± 0.12
	ru	62.53 ± 0.28	58.84 ± 0.24
LFCC+MesoNet	de	49.87 ± 0.27	51.16 ± 0.13
	en	57.49 ± 0.24	53.44 ± 0.18
	es	38.49 ± 0.15	42.68 ± 0.38
	fr	33.11 ± 0.23	36.52 ± 0.15
	it	38.30 ± 0.38	37.52 ± 0.25
	pl	20.40 ± 0.11	37.96 ± 0.10
	ru	66.58 ± 0.24	59.56 ± 0.06
RawGAT ST	de	59.82 ± 0.26	56.35 ± 0.18
	en	69.71 ± 0.25	55.07 ± 0.21
	es	38.37 ± 0.33	42.28 ± 0.13
	fr	41.42 ± 0.27	40.52 ± 0.28
	it	58.66 ± 0.17	54.78 ± 0.18
	pl	33.47 ± 0.26	45.25 ± 0.23
	ru	57.74 ± 0.15	44.28 ± 0.15
W2V+AASIST	de	48.66 ± 0.17	34.89 ± 0.09
	en	48.53 ± 0.18	46.27 ± 0.17
	es	47.90 ± 0.18	26.07 ± 0.05
	fr	43.98 ± 0.19	30.70 ± 0.21
	it	47.90 ± 0.18	37.56 ± 0.12
	pl	47.90 ± 0.18	22.42 ± 0.37
	ru	47.90 ± 0.18	49.98 ± 0.06
Whisper+AASIST	de	48.78 ± 0.27	53.15 ± 0.18
	en	41.93 ± 0.11	38.09 ± 0.25
	es	49.21 ± 0.19	56.39 ± 0.34
	fr	47.13 ± 0.12	43.48 ± 0.18
	it	44.83 ± 0.34	52.90 ± 0.14
	pl	44.83 ± 0.34	53.17 ± 0.23
	ru	44.83 ± 0.34	53.17 ± 0.23
Whisper+AASIST	de	48.78 ± 0.27	53.15 ± 0.18
	en	41.93 ± 0.11	38.09 ± 0.25
	es	49.21 ± 0.19	56.39 ± 0.34
	fr	47.13 ± 0.12	43.48 ± 0.18
	it	44.83 ± 0.34	52.90 ± 0.14
	pl	44.83 ± 0.34	53.17 ± 0.23
	ru	44.83 ± 0.34	53.17 ± 0.23

poorly, such as Russian and German. Conversely, Figure 5 shows that for LFCC+AASIST, although intra-linguistic adaptation is the optimal path for most cases, cross-linguistic adaptation significantly improves audio DF detection in Russian compared to the poorly performed baseline model. The EER drops from 17.7 to below 3.82 when we fine-tune using Ukrainian, Spanish, and English or Spanish and Italian. Similarly, results for LFCC+MesoNet shown in Figure 4 indicate promising cross-lingual capabilities, using Italian and Spanish, but also Polish, German, and Italian.

7.4. Hyperparameters

We train and fine-tune the models utilizing distinct hyperparameter configurations depending on the model architecture. For the lightweight architectures (LFCC+AASIST, LFCC+MesoNet, RawGAT ST), we utilize a learning rate (lr) of 5e-03 and a weight decay of 2.5e-05. In contrast, for the larger models, W2V+AASIST and Whisper+AASIST, we utilize an lr of 5.0e-06 and a weight decay of 5e-07. Due to limited data resources, we use unchanged hyperparameters configuration, as well as a more traditional, lower learning rate and weight decay typically applied during fine-tuning. Thus, for fine-tuning lightweight models, we use a lr of 1e-04, a weight decay of 5e-6, an lr of 5.0e-06, and a weight decay of 5e-07. Similarly, we fine-tune W2V+AASIST and Whisper+AASIST using either a learning rate of 2.5e-6 or 5e-6, both with a weight decay of 2.5e-7. Fur-

Table 5: The mean EER scores for the Romance languages tested on ASV-trained models fine-tuned with samples generated using D_{ft} subset for the specific language.

Model	Fine-tuned on	Languages		
		fr	es	it
LFCC+AASIST	de	52.25 ± 0.23	58.55 ± 0.21	49.32 ± 0.28
	en	53.94 ± 0.22	71.54 ± 0.29	48.29 ± 0.25
	es	38.22 ± 0.23	56.25 ± 0.18	32.59 ± 0.28
	fr	44.41 ± 0.56	62.60 ± 0.32	39.46 ± 0.20
	it	73.90 ± 0.12	72.65 ± 0.17	44.68 ± 0.27
	pl	49.57 ± 0.15	63.69 ± 0.22	41.02 ± 0.31
	ru	62.64 ± 0.27	70.97 ± 0.27	50.90 ± 0.22
LFCC+MesoNet	de	53.75 ± 0.07	64.70 ± 0.28	48.94 ± 0.24
	en	54.06 ± 0.14	69.72 ± 0.23	52.54 ± 0.17
	es	46.54 ± 0.12	56.38 ± 0.27	40.12 ± 0.26
	fr	43.30 ± 0.12	55.81 ± 0.20	35.55 ± 0.30
	it	41.88 ± 0.13	63.55 ± 0.31	41.56 ± 0.23
	pl	31.12 ± 0.09	57.07 ± 0.23	27.46 ± 0.30
	ru	68.46 ± 0.21	69.15 ± 0.20	63.46 ± 0.12
RawGAT ST	de	58.29 ± 0.17	52.29 ± 0.14	60.56 ± 0.19
	en	63.31 ± 0.15	49.08 ± 0.21	60.79 ± 0.07
	es	48.05 ± 0.27	46.41 ± 0.27	51.41 ± 0.21
	fr	34.00 ± 0.11	63.45 ± 0.10	38.10 ± 0.27
	it	51.63 ± 0.15	42.16 ± 0.14	58.06 ± 0.07
	pl	41.85 ± 0.16	36.62 ± 0.25	43.12 ± 0.42
	ru	45.88 ± 0.15	57.09 ± 0.15	53.33 ± 0.22
W2V+AASIST	de	31.49 ± 0.14	38.38 ± 0.33	37.34 ± 0.22
	en	47.49 ± 0.20	40.47 ± 0.13	42.27 ± 0.08
	es	21.11 ± 0.22	22.05 ± 0.22	18.68 ± 0.25
	fr	22.81 ± 0.31	20.09 ± 0.18	19.80 ± 0.27
	it	37.70 ± 0.37	31.22 ± 0.35	32.79 ± 0.27
	pl	16.59 ± 0.11	20.88 ± 0.26	16.20 ± 0.21
	ru	48.90 ± 0.25	49.05 ± 0.31	48.53 ± 0.20
Whisper+AASIST	de	55.18 ± 0.19	55.81 ± 0.08	53.76 ± 0.23
	en	41.83 ± 0.13	39.26 ± 0.22	37.41 ± 0.28
	es	55.27 ± 0.32	56.42 ± 0.10	55.90 ± 0.13
	fr	41.75 ± 0.17	44.08 ± 0.19	39.84 ± 0.16
	it	50.75 ± 0.31	52.54 ± 0.36	51.32 ± 0.20
	pl	52.20 ± 0.29	52.29 ± 0.30	50.51 ± 0.41
	ru	52.20 ± 0.29	52.29 ± 0.30	50.51 ± 0.41

therefore, the SSL front-ends (W2V and Whisper) remain fully trainable during both training and fine-tuning, with all weights unfrozen. We do not apply any data augmentation techniques. The evaluation results presented in Tables 1- 9 are the mean of 10 runs of 90% of the test dataset.

Table 6: The mean EER scores with standard deviation for the Slavic languages tested on ASV-trained models trained with samples generated using D_{ft} subset for the specific language.

Model	Trained on	Languages		
		pl	ru	uk
LFCC+AASIST	de	42.95 ± 0.13	51.10 ± 0.36	40.13 ± 0.18
	en	39.34 ± 0.13	54.31 ± 0.15	20.43 ± 0.18
	es	24.89 ± 0.31	47.35 ± 0.41	29.41 ± 0.36
	fr	37.59 ± 0.29	46.76 ± 0.47	35.93 ± 0.23
	it	73.43 ± 0.11	54.98 ± 0.31	45.97 ± 0.26
	pl	37.52 ± 0.17	51.13 ± 0.23	33.42 ± 0.14
	ru	52.67 ± 0.38	54.89 ± 0.32	50.31 ± 0.32
LFCC+MesoNet	de	44.95 ± 0.10	47.50 ± 0.50	24.48 ± 0.13
	en	60.61 ± 0.18	50.02 ± 0.32	37.45 ± 0.47
	es	39.81 ± 0.12	44.59 ± 0.49	9.24 ± 0.30
	fr	34.73 ± 0.28	43.01 ± 0.55	3.70 ± 0.10
	it	36.57 ± 0.11	43.13 ± 0.26	3.28 ± 0.09
	pl	22.98 ± 0.20	42.99 ± 0.33	9.04 ± 0.10
	ru	69.23 ± 0.10	48.17 ± 0.22	47.14 ± 0.24
RawGAT ST	de	54.82 ± 0.13	46.06 ± 0.19	43.72 ± 0.29
	en	57.06 ± 0.18	55.62 ± 0.10	35.50 ± 0.11
	es	54.44 ± 0.18	41.90 ± 0.18	32.88 ± 0.17
	fr	37.53 ± 0.22	43.70 ± 0.55	4.65 ± 0.15
	it	45.41 ± 0.11	42.19 ± 0.15	20.69 ± 0.17
	pl	21.11 ± 0.07	42.43 ± 0.31	50.31 ± 0.29
	ru	40.47 ± 0.09	40.45 ± 0.21	21.21 ± 0.18
W2V+AASIST	de	20.06 ± 0.18	31.12 ± 0.09	34.49 ± 0.18
	en	33.50 ± 0.15	39.61 ± 0.15	16.70 ± 0.18
	es	15.06 ± 0.24	28.36 ± 0.35	12.11 ± 0.29
	fr	17.01 ± 0.15	24.34 ± 0.33	10.91 ± 0.10
	it	28.58 ± 0.31	23.77 ± 0.11	16.44 ± 0.08
	pl	5.17 ± 0.11	19.01 ± 0.20	34.94 ± 0.33
	ru	48.77 ± 0.23	52.18 ± 0.17	44.06 ± 0.27
Whisper+AASIST	de	53.84 ± 0.31	55.34 ± 0.16	34.39 ± 0.17
	en	38.70 ± 0.22	39.88 ± 0.21	43.30 ± 0.21
	es	54.75 ± 0.10	54.77 ± 0.16	34.61 ± 0.18
	fr	46.58 ± 0.24	39.95 ± 0.20	34.92 ± 0.09
	it	49.14 ± 0.26	47.33 ± 0.26	21.69 ± 0.22
	pl	45.41 ± 0.21	50.16 ± 0.12	41.85 ± 0.15
	ru	45.41 ± 0.21	50.16 ± 0.12	41.85 ± 0.15




Figure 4: Heatmap of EER values (in %) for LFCC+MesoNet pre-trained on a large English dataset and fine-tuned using combined language-specific small datasets.

Table 7: The mean EER scores tested on ASV-trained models fine-tuned with samples generated using D_{ft} subset for the specific language.

Model	Fine-tuned on	Languages	
		en	de
LFCC+AASIST	de	4.30 ± 0.05	5.81 ± 0.07
	en	1.25 ± 0.04	7.03 ± 0.08
	es	4.30 ± 0.07	7.98 ± 0.21
	fr	1.64 ± 0.05	7.28 ± 0.15
	it	1.33 ± 0.06	7.12 ± 0.10
	pl	2.78 ± 0.06	7.61 ± 0.06
	ru	4.62 ± 0.12	7.60 ± 0.14
	uk	5.36 ± 0.04	7.99 ± 0.22
LFCC+MesoNet	de	21.99 ± 0.09	21.61 ± 0.15
	en	6.94 ± 0.08	5.48 ± 0.04
	es	33.00 ± 0.48	31.15 ± 0.10
	fr	13.12 ± 0.06	9.00 ± 0.10
	it	24.65 ± 0.33	21.05 ± 0.07
	pl	24.48 ± 0.27	20.37 ± 0.07
	ru	23.45 ± 0.26	18.23 ± 0.08
	uk	9.04 ± 0.11	7.06 ± 0.09
RawGAT ST	de	51.43 ± 0.17	50.22 ± 0.11
	en	53.66 ± 0.24	48.64 ± 0.28
	es	52.71 ± 0.31	52.68 ± 0.09
	fr	41.82 ± 0.19	45.87 ± 0.09
	it	48.56 ± 0.17	43.12 ± 0.18
	pl	28.36 ± 0.18	40.36 ± 0.20
	ru	50.43 ± 0.11	50.93 ± 0.10
	uk	54.74 ± 0.13	45.34 ± 0.11
W2V+AASIST	de	3.72 ± 0.04	1.68 ± 0.06
	en	1.01 ± 0.03	3.88 ± 0.07
	es	2.79 ± 0.05	4.56 ± 0.03
	fr	3.58 ± 0.20	3.74 ± 0.20
	it	3.91 ± 0.04	4.41 ± 0.05
	pl	7.95 ± 0.11	2.59 ± 0.03
	ru	4.60 ± 0.07	4.89 ± 0.06
	uk	4.63 ± 0.07	3.10 ± 0.09
Whisper+AASIST	de	39.47 ± 0.15	47.03 ± 0.13
	en	32.18 ± 0.20	42.68 ± 0.21
	es	43.08 ± 0.20	46.78 ± 0.03
	fr	41.05 ± 0.18	44.69 ± 0.17
	it	41.90 ± 0.14	46.10 ± 0.13
	pl	41.30 ± 0.08	47.76 ± 0.12
	ru	40.34 ± 0.17	45.09 ± 0.18
	uk	44.84 ± 0.23	44.98 ± 0.16

Table 8: The mean EER scores for the Romance languages tested on ASV-trained models trained with samples generated using D_{ft} subset for the specific language.

Model	Fine-tuned on	Languages		
		fr	es	it
LFCC+AASIST	de	1.02 ± 0.03	16.77 ± 0.14	2.75 ± 0.10
	en	0.48 ± 0.02	20.22 ± 0.16	2.62 ± 0.07
	es	0.51 ± 0.01	14.28 ± 0.03	2.44 ± 0.05
	fr	0.34 ± 0.03	21.82 ± 0.17	2.50 ± 0.08
	it	0.39 ± 0.02	12.15 ± 0.17	0.92 ± 0.05
	pl	0.53 ± 0.02	20.65 ± 0.20	2.81 ± 0.05
	ru	0.54 ± 0.03	13.22 ± 0.15	2.06 ± 0.05
	uk	0.48 ± 0.05	18.94 ± 0.22	3.11 ± 0.13
LFCC+MesoNet	de	15.60 ± 0.08	21.47 ± 0.27	18.14 ± 0.11
	en	0.68 ± 0.04	15.54 ± 0.10	3.34 ± 0.13
	es	28.26 ± 0.14	38.38 ± 0.19	33.81 ± 0.12
	fr	5.58 ± 0.07	13.92 ± 0.12	7.58 ± 0.04
	it	15.75 ± 0.09	29.82 ± 0.19	21.65 ± 0.16
	pl	12.83 ± 0.07	27.46 ± 0.20	19.80 ± 0.19
	ru	13.97 ± 0.07	27.14 ± 0.23	17.12 ± 0.11
	uk	1.73 ± 0.06	14.68 ± 0.15	5.62 ± 0.13
RawGAT ST	de	45.58 ± 0.15	49.34 ± 0.21	49.35 ± 0.32
	en	47.44 ± 0.28	47.00 ± 0.23	44.79 ± 0.16
	es	51.23 ± 0.18	45.36 ± 0.11	50.76 ± 0.28
	fr	44.64 ± 0.20	48.66 ± 0.34	45.10 ± 0.23
	it	44.99 ± 0.29	43.10 ± 0.17	44.39 ± 0.14
	pl	40.05 ± 0.22	42.58 ± 0.28	40.45 ± 0.09
	ru	44.16 ± 0.20	42.30 ± 0.23	44.34 ± 0.22
	uk	43.46 ± 0.16	37.52 ± 0.24	43.85 ± 0.25
W2V+AASIST	de	0.64 ± 0.02	6.49 ± 0.11	1.91 ± 0.06
	en	0.44 ± 0.01	2.33 ± 0.06	0.75 ± 0.02
	es	0.28 ± 0.04	1.23 ± 0.02	0.69 ± 0.06
	fr	0.08 ± 0.01	7.60 ± 0.08	0.77 ± 0.06
	it	0.81 ± 0.04	6.16 ± 0.06	0.45 ± 0.02
	pl	0.46 ± 0.03	4.25 ± 0.06	0.45 ± 0.03
	ru	0.96 ± 0.04	2.61 ± 0.10	1.63 ± 0.03
	uk	0.51 ± 0.02	3.31 ± 0.08	0.52 ± 0.04
Whisper+AASIST	de	41.57 ± 0.18	45.39 ± 0.15	37.98 ± 0.16
	en	41.17 ± 0.22	43.67 ± 0.21	36.40 ± 0.21
	es	43.04 ± 0.15	46.64 ± 0.08	40.46 ± 0.19
	fr	39.81 ± 0.22	44.94 ± 0.21	40.67 ± 0.19
	it	44.26 ± 0.18	46.41 ± 0.21	40.07 ± 0.14
	pl	43.48 ± 0.20	48.46 ± 0.25	42.03 ± 0.16
	ru	39.86 ± 0.23	44.59 ± 0.13	36.09 ± 0.15
	uk	40.51 ± 0.28	44.94 ± 0.16	36.41 ± 0.22




Figure 5: Heatmap of EER values (in %) for LFCC+AASIST pre-trained on a large English dataset and fine-tuned using combined language-specific small datasets.

Table 9: The mean EER scores with standard deviation for the Slavic languages tested on ASV-trained models fine-tuned with samples generated using D_{ft} subset for the specific language.

Model	Trained on	Languages		
		pl	ru	uk
LFCC+AASIST	de	2.00 ± 0.07	9.28 ± 0.23	1.51 ± 0.05
	en	0.89 ± 0.03	20.18 ± 0.12	1.67 ± 0.07
	es	0.81 ± 0.04	14.08 ± 0.14	1.71 ± 0.12
	fr	1.05 ± 0.04	20.91 ± 0.12	0.23 ± 0.06
	it	0.37 ± 0.03	7.34 ± 0.12	0.70 ± 0.05
	pl	0.37 ± 0.05	13.76 ± 0.28	2.23 ± 0.05
	ru	0.65 ± 0.04	7.56 ± 0.18	0.70 ± 0.04
	uk	1.13 ± 0.03	20.57 ± 0.21	0.54 ± 0.04
LFCC+MesoNet	de	12.71 ± 0.12	15.73 ± 0.20	24.22 ± 0.30
	en	0.70 ± 0.04	10.44 ± 0.18	6.13 ± 0.13
	es	35.59 ± 0.23	27.91 ± 0.19	20.71 ± 0.29
	fr	2.14 ± 0.03	11.87 ± 0.23	6.41 ± 0.09
	it	16.84 ± 0.13	17.50 ± 0.14	9.04 ± 0.13
	pl	15.76 ± 0.11	13.73 ± 0.12	18.47 ± 0.27
	ru	11.12 ± 0.15	15.86 ± 0.16	7.21 ± 0.10
	uk	2.94 ± 0.08	13.94 ± 0.24	9.87 ± 0.11
RawGAT ST	de	53.63 ± 0.22	42.25 ± 0.20	52.50 ± 0.26
	en	53.27 ± 0.30	45.70 ± 0.17	44.88 ± 0.17
	es	50.42 ± 0.23	43.61 ± 0.06	38.24 ± 0.18
	fr	43.96 ± 0.16	38.65 ± 0.18	34.28 ± 0.17
	it	49.44 ± 0.17	37.22 ± 0.08	35.24 ± 0.10
	pl	39.44 ± 0.14	43.36 ± 0.17	54.04 ± 0.11
	ru	53.94 ± 0.19	31.39 ± 0.20	31.04 ± 0.14
	uk	45.45 ± 0.12	39.47 ± 0.19	36.66 ± 0.16
W2V+AASIST	de	0.67 ± 0.04	11.73 ± 0.17	0.21 ± 0.05
	en	0.29 ± 0.02	14.53 ± 0.35	0.12 ± 0.02
	es	0.65 ± 0.04	7.57 ± 0.13	0.15 ± 0.03
	fr	0.24 ± 0.04	20.97 ± 0.19	0.03 ± 0.00
	it	0.51 ± 0.04	14.75 ± 0.17	0.18 ± 0.03
	pl	0.21 ± 0.02	10.25 ± 0.12	0.33 ± 0.04
	ru	0.92 ± 0.04	2.09 ± 0.13	0.65 ± 0.04
	uk	0.78 ± 0.01	8.54 ± 0.19	1.36 ± 0.05
Whisper+AASIST	de	45.43 ± 0.29	43.09 ± 0.15	35.15 ± 0.24
	en	43.47 ± 0.36	39.82 ± 0.23	35.96 ± 0.28
	es	46.34 ± 0.25	44.79 ± 0.17	35.93 ± 0.26
	fr	43.58 ± 0.31	42.53 ± 0.40	33.15 ± 0.19
	it	45.21 ± 0.34	44.39 ± 0.32	34.08 ± 0.24
	pl	46.83 ± 0.23	45.96 ± 0.20	36.76 ± 0.27
	ru	45.48 ± 0.15	40.42 ± 0.27	35.85 ± 0.25
	uk	46.20 ± 0.19	43.25 ± 0.15	33.83 ± 0.25