

# CodecFake-Omni: A Large-Scale Codec-based Deepfake Speech Dataset

Jiawei Du<sup>1\*</sup>, Xuanjun Chen<sup>2\*</sup>, Haibin Wu<sup>2†</sup>, Lin Zhang<sup>4</sup>, I-Ming Lin<sup>1</sup>, I-Hsiang Chiu<sup>3</sup>, Wenzhe Ren<sup>2</sup>, Yuan Tseng<sup>2</sup>, Yu Tsao<sup>5</sup>, Jyh-Shing Roger Jang<sup>1</sup>, Hung-yi Lee<sup>2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Computer Science Information Engineering, National Taiwan University

<sup>2</sup>Graduate Institute of Communication Engineering, National Taiwan University

<sup>3</sup>Department of Electrical Engineering, National Taiwan University

<sup>4</sup>Speech@FIT, Brno University of Technology <sup>5</sup>Academia Sinica

**Abstract**—With the rapid advancement of codec-based speech generation (CoSG) systems, creating fake speech that mimics an individual’s identity and spreads misinformation has become remarkably easy. Addressing the risks posed by such deepfake speech has attracted significant attention. However, most existing studies focus on detecting fake data generated by traditional speech generation models. Research on detecting fake speech generated by CoSG systems remains limited and largely unexplored. In this paper, we introduce CodecFake-Omni, a large-scale dataset specifically designed to advance the study of neural codec-based deepfake speech (CodecFake) detection and promote progress within the anti-spoofing community. To the best of our knowledge, CodecFake-Omni is the largest dataset of its kind till writing this paper, encompassing the most diverse range of codec architectures. The training set is generated through re-synthesis using nearly all publicly available open-source 31 neural audio codec models across 21 different codec families (one codec family with different configurations will result in multiple different codec models). The evaluation set includes web-sourced data collected from websites generated by 17 advanced CoSG models with eight codec families. Using this large-scale dataset, we reaffirm our previous findings that anti-spoofing models trained on traditional spoofing datasets generated by vocoders struggle to detect synthesized speech from current CoSG systems. Additionally, we propose a comprehensive neural audio codec taxonomy, categorizing neural audio codecs by their root components: vector quantizer, auxiliary objectives, and decoder types, with detailed explanations and representative examples for each. Using this comprehensive taxonomy, we conduct stratified analysis to provide valuable insights for future CodecFake detection research. Overall, CodecFake-Omni serves as a valuable resource for both general and fine-grained exploration to develop anti-spoofing models against CodecFake.

**Index Terms**—Deepfake detection, speech synthesis, neural audio codec, speech-language model, anti-spoofing

## I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, speech generation technology has advanced significantly. However, these powerful techniques can be misused for malicious “deepfake” attacks, leading to risks such as misinformation, reputational damage, and the manipulation of public opinion [1]–[4]. To counter the growing threat of deepfake attacks, initiatives like the ASVspooft [5]–[8] and

Work in Progress. \*Equal first contribution. The first authorship order is alphabetically arranged by the first name. †Haibin Wu is the corresponding author. Most of the works were completed before Haibin Wu joined Microsoft.




Fig. 1. Illustration of CodecFake detection scenarios. CodecFake-Omni empowers models to perform both CodecFake detection and comprehensive attribute analysis.

ADD [9] challenges have been launched. These efforts are instrumental in driving the development of advanced algorithms to defend against deepfake speech [4]–[11].

Recently, a new type of speech generation system based on neural audio codecs has emerged [12]. The speech generated by this neural audio codec-based speech generation (CoSG) system differs significantly from the samples used in earlier deepfake detection challenges (e.g., ASVspooft and ADD),

most of which were generated using vocoder-related algorithms. Moreover, neural audio codec-based speech generation systems have advanced to the point where such models can reproduce any speaker’s voice using just a 3-second audio sample from that unseen speaker [12]–[20]. In addition, the deepfake speech produced by these systems is of increasingly high quality, often indistinguishable even to human listeners. [13] Addressing the risks posed by such attacks is crucial. However, as an emerging field, there are only limited studies and small-scale datasets [21], [22] dedicated to detecting deepfake audio generated by CoSG, highlighting the need for further research. We refer to deepfake speech generated by neural audio codec-based speech generation systems as **CodecFake**.

To defend against CodecFake speech, we built the first database in our previous study [21] and confirmed that countermeasures (CMs) trained on traditional anti-spoofing datasets failed to detect CodecFake speech (as shown in Figure 1: (a)). Moreover, our proposed codec-resynthesized speech [21] demonstrated improved performance in detecting CodecFake speech (as shown in Figure 1: (b)). The intuition is that codec-resynthesized speech and CoSG-generated speech share underlying similarities, which can contribute to detecting CodecFake. A similar strategy, known as copy-synthesis [23], has been widely utilized to enhance models’ ability for detecting vocoder-based deepfake speech. As time has passed, a great number of codecs and CoSG models have been developed after the release of the initial version of our dataset.

In this paper, we present **CodecFake-Omni**, which significantly scales up the initial collection to include as many neural audio codec models as possible as of January 2025 when this paper was written. CodecFake-Omni is the largest CodecFake corpus to the best of our knowledge, incorporating nearly all publicly available codec and CoSG models to date. Meanwhile, it is designed to reflect realistic scenarios, with training data generated using publicly available code and testing data sourced from unreleased models. In total, the training set consists of data re-synthesized using 31 different open-source codec models, while the testing set includes data collected from websites providing speech generated by 17 advanced CoSG models. Specifically, for the training data, we employed codec re-synthesis procedure, which encodes bona fide waveforms into discrete codes using codec encoders and then decodes them into re-synthesized waveforms using the corresponding codec decoders.

Compared to our previous study [21], in addition to scaling up the dataset size and diversifying the types of codecs as mentioned above, we also defined a systematic neural audio codec taxonomy (including vector quantizers, auxiliary objectives, and decoder types) to better understand and analyze these models. *Developing such a taxonomy is challenging, as no comprehensive overview of neural audio codecs existed before this work.* This makes the taxonomy proposed in this paper both novel and insightful. We leverage this taxonomy for stratified analysis, grouping codecs based on their core attributes as defined in the taxonomy (such as vector quantizers, auxiliary objectives, and decoder type). We then investigate how CMs perform across these different groups of core

attributes. Our experiments reveal several important patterns for CodecFake detection. For instance, our experiments reveal that CMs trained on spoofed data resynthesized by codecs with disentanglement auxiliary objective functions achieve relatively better performance in detecting CodecFake speech.

In summary, our key contributions and findings include:

- 1) CodecFake-Omni enhances the dataset scale compared to prior CodecFake research [21] with nearly all publicly available codec and CoSG models till January 2025. Specifically, it increases the number of distinct codecs used to create training data from 15 to 31 and expands the testing data from 3 to 17 CoSG models, representing a substantial extension. To the best of our knowledge, it is the largest CodecFake corpus to date.
- 2) We propose a systematic taxonomy for neural audio codecs, classifying codec models based on three core components: vector quantizers, auxiliary objectives, and decoder types. This taxonomy definition provides valuable insights for future research on source tracing, domain adaptation, and domain generalization for detecting unseen attacks.
- 3) Using the defined taxonomy, we conduct a stratified analysis to explore the relationship between codec attributes and CodecFake speech detection. This stratified analysis reveals several novel findings that can guide the development of advanced detection models. For instance, CMs trained on spoofed data resynthesized by codecs with multi-codebook vector quantization or disentanglement auxiliary objective functions achieve relatively better performance detecting CodecFake speech.

We will release all associated code and data to support the research community in mitigating the risks posed by advanced codec-based speech synthesis (CoSG) technologies.

## II. BACKGROUND

In this section, we provide a brief introduction to the background of codec-based speech generation systems [13], [15], [16], [18], [24]–[35] and neural audio codecs [12], [19], [20], [30], [36]–[79]. Figure 2 presents the timeline for neural audio codecs, codec-related benchmarks, and codec-based speech generation systems. For CoSG models, only the open-source ones used to construct the CodecFake-Omni dataset are shown.

### A. Neural Audio Codecs

Neural codecs play a crucial role in CoSG models by converting continuous audio into discrete tokens, enabling integration between audio processing and large language models. Most neural codecs follow a three-stage framework: the encoder compresses raw audio into frame-level features, the vector quantization (VQ) module converts these features into discrete tokens for efficient transmission and language modeling, and the decoder reconstructs audio from the tokens.

To drive progress in neural codec research and applications, several benchmarks have been introduced, including Codec-SUPERB [19], Codec-SUPERB @ SLT 2024 [20], DASB [78], and ESPnet-Codec [79]. However, these benchmarks




Fig. 2. Timeline of current different types of neural codec models and codec-based speech generation models.




Fig. 3. The background of neural audio codec and CoSG system.

currently cover only about six codec models in total. Although our proposed CodecFake-Omni dataset focuses on deepfake detection, it offers even more comprehensive codec coverage compared to the above-mentioned existing benchmarks as of the time of writing this paper.

### B. Neural Codec-based Speech Generation Systems (CoSG)

Most CoSG systems rely on neural audio codec speech language modeling, with only a few using diffusion models. CodecFake-Omni mainly focuses on fake speech generated through codec-based speech language modeling. As shown in Figure 3, the neural codec language model begins by encoding text information (e.g., instructions for expressiveness or target text content to be generated) into codes and the speaker prompt audio (used as the target speaker to mimic) into codec codes. These codes are then processed in the neural codec language model to generate the desired sequence of target codec codes, which are then decoded by the codec decoder to produce the generated speech.

## III. RELATED WORK

Deepfake detection aims to train a CM model to determine whether or not the given audio deepfake is correct.

TABLE I

COMPARISON WITH THE PREVIOUS CODECFAKE DATASETS. COLUMNS (A-B) SHOW THE NUMBER OF CODECS OR CoSg MODELS USED TO SYNTHESIZE CoRS AND CODECFAKE SPEECH, WHILE COLUMNS (C-D) SHOW THE NUMBER OF CODEC TYPES USED FOR EACH. NOTE THAT ONE CODEC TYPE CAN HAVE DIFFERENT TRAINING CONFIGURATIONS, RESULTING IN SEVERAL CODEC MODELS.

Dataset	# of codec models		# of codec types		Attribute analysis	
	(a) CoRS	(b) CoSg	(c) CoRS	(d) CoSg	Key factors	Stratified
(Wu et al.) [21]	15	3	6	1	✗	✗
(Lu et al.) [85]	7	10	7	4	✗	✗
(Xie et al.) [22]	7	9	7	4	✗	✗
CodecFake-Omni	31	17	21	9	✓	✓

Several challenges and databases emerge to encourage researchers working on this field. The ASVspooF 2015 [5] revealed vulnerabilities of ASV systems to speech synthesis and VC technique. The ASVspooF 2017 [6] introduced replay attacks in diverse acoustic settings, emphasizing the need for generalized defenses. Later, ASVspooF2019-LA [8] focused on clean TTS and VC attacks, while ASVspooF2021-LA and ASVspooF2021-DF [80] added real-world conditions like channel variations. Datasets like CFAD [81] and MLAAD [82] expanded language coverage, enabling cross-lingual evaluations. The recent ASVspooF 5 [83] dataset marks a milestone with multilingual data, adversarial attacks, newly defined task-agnostic metric a-DCF and merged with spoofing spoofing-robust automatic speaker verification. At the same time, with the rapid development of generative technologies, some databases keeps emerged, aiming to explore whether the most advanced CMs can handle speech generated by new synthesis techniques. For example, CodecFake [21], [22] and DFADD [84] address emerging challenges in detecting CodecFake speech, diffusion-based deepfake, and flow-matching based deepfake.

Our previous work, CodecFake [21], utilized a small number of mainstream neural codec models to re-synthesize speech to construct training data and three CoSG models to generate

evaluation data. However, the rapid development of codec and CoSG models since the release of the initial version has created an urgent need to scale up the dataset to keep pace with the emergence of new generative models. Building on this foundation, we have introduced several significant expansions in this work as follows:

- **Broader codec coverage:** For training data, our previous work [21] leverages six mainstream neural codec models. In this work, we expanded to 21 distinct advanced neural codecs with different configurations, resulting in a total of 31 different codecs for re-synthesizing speech.
- **Broader CodecFake Speech Coverage:** For evaluation data, previous work mainly focused on CodecFake speech generated by EnCodec-based speech systems. In contrast, this work broadens the scope by incorporating a wider variety of CoSG models with nine codec types. It provides a more comprehensive evaluation of CM model performance.
- **Key Factor Analysis:** We conducted a fine-grained comparison for CodecFake speech detection to identify the key factors affecting performance. Our previous work included only a baseline trained on traditional anti-spoofing datasets. In this study, we developed a stronger baseline trained on CodecFake data. With these two baselines, the effectiveness of our proposed datasets and the insights of the proposed taxonomy can be clearly revealed.
- **Stratified Analysis:** We defined a systematic neural codec taxonomy that could systematically group CodecFake speech according to different vector quantizers, different auxiliary objectives, and different decoders. Using this taxonomy, we analyzed the performance of CMs when trained on data grouped by these categories.

We compare CodecFake-Omni with both our previous work [21] and another contemporary work (with our previous work) [85], as shown in Table I. CodecFake-Omni demonstrates the most comprehensive codec coverage in terms of both the number of models and codec families. Additionally, it is the first work to introduce attribute analysis, including key factor analysis and stratified analysis, for a better understanding of the relationships between codec attributes and CodecFake detection.

#### IV. CODECFAKE-OMNI

Building on the assumption that codec-resynthesized data shares similarities with CodecFake data and that analyzing codec model attributes can provide valuable insights into understanding CodecFake detection models, we propose the CodecFake-Omni dataset alongside a comprehensive and novel taxonomy for classifying codec models. This taxonomy enables a detailed stratified analysis, allowing us to explore how different codec attributes contribute to CodecFake detection performance. The CodecFake-Omni dataset comprises training data and evaluation data. We use codec re-synthesized speech (CoRS) as training data, denoted as **CodecFake-Omni Train**. The evaluation dataset is divided into two subsets: (1). the codec re-synthesized speech evaluation set, denoted

as **CodecFake-Omni Eval CoRS**; (2). the fake speech generated by codec-based speech generation models, denoted as **CodecFake-Omni Eval CoSG**.

This section starts with the proposed taxonomy in Section IV-A, with detailed introductions for training data and evaluation data in Section IV-B1 and Section IV-B2, respectively. Finally, we show the quality assessment results of the CodecFake-Omni dataset in Section IV-D.

##### A. Neural Audio Codec Taxonomy

The taxonomy for conventional TTS/VC models is relatively well-defined, as previous works have extensively discussed these models, which are typically modular systems composed of distinct components like acoustic models and vocoders. In contrast, CodecFake speech is more complex than traditional TTS/VC models, making it challenging to identify clear attributes for classification. We use the codec as a breakthrough point, as codec models are a common component in codec-based speech generation systems. However, developing a taxonomy was challenging prior to this work due to lacking a comprehensive overview of neural audio codecs. As a result, the taxonomy presented in this paper is even more novel and insightful.

In this subsection, we propose a comprehensive Neural Audio Codec Taxonomy that categorizes neural audio codecs based on three core components: *vector quantizer*, *auxiliary objectives*, and *decoder types*, accompanied by detailed explanations and representative examples for each. This taxonomy lays the foundation for deeper stratified analysis, enabling a more fine-grained understanding of CodecFake detection models by examining how specific codec attributes influence detection performance and generalizability. And in turn, the analysis offers potential insights for improving generalization to spoofing attacks that are unseen during training but are composed of blocks (codec core attributes) encountered in training.

1) *Vector quantization*: Vector quantization methods aim to transform frame-wise audio features into discrete tokens. We categorize these methods into three types:

- **Multi-codebook vector quantization (MVQ)** compresses audio frames by sequentially applying a series of quantizers, each refining the residuals left by the previous one. Examples include EnCodec [59], which quantizes by a typical residual vector quantization; ESC [46], which uses cross-scale residual quantization and hierarchical transformers; and HiFi-Codec [58], which leverages group-residual vector quantization (GRVQ) for high performance with fewer codebooks.
- **Single-codebook vector quantization (SVQ)** refers to codecs designed to encode fewer tokens by utilizing a single utterance-level codebook during vector quantization. Examples of SVQ codecs include TiCodec [73] and Single-Codec [76], which reduce token usage by separating time-invariant global features into utterance-level vectors and encoding time-varying content into frame-level tokens.
- **Scalar vector quantization (SQ)** is to simplify and optimize audio representation by mapping complex speech

TABLE II

CODEC INFORMATION COMPARISON. “**A-W**” REPRESENTS DIFFERENT NEURAL CODEC MODELS. **QUANTIZER** REPRESENTS THE DIFFERENT VECTOR QUANTIZATIONS, INCLUDING **MVQ**, **SVQ**, AND **SQ**. **AUXILIARY** REFERS TO THE DIFFERENT AUXILIARY OBJECTIVE METHODS EMPLOYED, INCLUDING SEMANTIC-GUIDED QUANTIZATION (**SEM**), DISENTANGLEMENT QUANTIZATION (**DISSENT**), AND THE ABSENCE OF AUXILIARY OBJECTIVES (**NONE**). **DECODER** INDICATES WHETHER THE DECODER OPERATES IN THE TIME OR FREQUENCY DOMAIN. **RS-EER** REPRESENTS THE CM MODEL’S OVERALL PERFORMANCE IN CODEC RE-SYNTHESIS DETECTION, WHILE **SG-EER** INDICATES ITS OVERALL PERFORMANCE IN CODECFAKE SPEECH DETECTION.

	Codec	Config	Quantizer	Auxiliary	Decoder	RS-EER (#)	SG-EER (#)
A	SpeechTokenizer [56]	hubert_avg	MVQ	SEM	Time	9.54 (#4)	23.86
B	Descript Audio Codec (DAC) [57]	DAC24k	MVQ	None	Time	32.05	61.43
C	HiFi-Codec [58]	16k_320d_large_universal	MVQ	None	Time	16.15	15.78
D1	EnCodec [59]	6b24k	MVQ	None	Time	31.26	31.67
D2		24b24k	MVQ	None	Time	49.4	41.04
E1	SemantiCodec [60]	1.40kbps_16k	MVQ	SEM	Freq	29.54	24.71
E2		0.70kbps_16k	MVQ	SEM	Freq	28.48	25.55
E3		0.35kbps_16k	MVQ	SEM	Freq	32.45	25.04
F1	FunCodec [61]	en-libritts-16k-gr1nq32ds320	MVQ	None	Freq	40.1	31.67
F2		zh_en-general-16k-nq32ds320	MVQ	None	Time	38.01	32.00
G	FACodec [62]	encodec-decoder-v2_16k	MVQ	Disent	Time	18.81	13.31 (#2)
H	LLM-Codec [63]	llm_codec	MVQ	SEM	Time	38.3	25.04
I1	WavTokenizer [64]	small_320_24k_4096	SVQ	None	Freq	42.54	47.67
I2		medium_320_24k_4096	SVQ	None	Freq	36.43	40.71
J	Language-Codec [65]	language-codec	MVQ	None	Freq	6.38 (#3)	14.26 (#3)
K	HILCodec [66]	hilcodec_speech	MVQ	None	Time	35.89	44.81
L1	Vocos [67]	vocos_encodec_6	MVQ	None	Freq	6.19 (#2)	13.19 (#1)
L2		vocos_encodec_12	MVQ	None	Freq	4.64 (#1)	14.82 (#4)
M	SoCodec [68]	16384x4_120ms_16khz_chinese	MVQ	Disent	Freq	49.27	40.93
P1	SNAC [69]	24khz	MVQ	None	Time	11.23	16.34
P2		44khz	MVQ	None	Time	22.38	27.74
Q1	X-Codec [70]	hubert_librispeech	MVQ	SEM	Time	30.74	37.40
Q2		hubert_general_audio	MVQ	SEM	Time	38.53	39.19
R	AudioDec [71]	audiodec_24k_320d	MVQ	None	Freq	37.89	44.24
S	BigCodec [72]	BigCodec	SVQ	None	Time	19.87	19.99
T1	TiCodec [73]	ticodec_1g1r	SVQ	Disent	Time	27.95	31.05
T2		ticodec_1g2r	MVQ	Disent	Time	25.94	26.33
T3		ticodec_1g4r	MVQ	Disent	Time	19.23	26.84
U	Mimi [74]	mimi-codec	MVQ	SEM	Time	39.59	49.75
V	Spectral Codecs [75]	spectral codecs	SQ	None	Freq	15.23	43.29
W	SQ-Codec [30]	sqcodec50dim9	SQ	None	Time	29.78	45.54

signals into a finite, compact latent space, increasing the codebook utilization rate. SQ-Codec [30] achieves this by creating a scalar latent space, while Spectral Codecs [75] utilize finite scalar quantization to encode mel-spectrogram features into a flat codebook.

2) *Auxiliary objectives*: The auxiliary objectives are additional training objectives introduced in conjunction with the primary task objective to guide the training of a neural audio codec model. These objectives aim to provide supplementary supervision signals that improve the model’s ability to generalize, enhance specific capabilities, or encourage desirable properties in the learned representations. Two mainstream auxiliary objectives are as follows:

- **Disentanglement** in neural audio codecs separates complex speech attributes into distinct representations. TiCodec [60] separates time-invariant and time-varying features, reducing tokens. FACodec [62] factorizes waveforms into subspaces like content, prosody, and timbre. SoCodec [68] uses multi-stream semantic sequences and

ordered product quantization for efficient autoregressive generation.

- **Semantic distillation** refers to techniques that enhance codec representation with semantic information. This involves methods such as using pre-trained models for semantic guidance (SpeechTokenizer [56], X-Codec [70], Mimi Codec [74]), dual-encoder architectures for compressing and reconstructing audio (SemantiCodec [60]) and transforming audio into token spaces compatible with language models to bridge modality gaps (LLM-Codec [16]). These approaches ensure codec representations are better aligned with semantic information, which can boost audio generation and understanding tasks with codecs.

3) *Decoder type*: The primary function of the decoder in audio codecs is to reconstruct waveforms (usually 16k or 24k Hz) from discrete units (usually 50 Hz), with upsampling as a key operation. This can be achieved using two main methods based on the processing domain:

- **Time-domain decoder** utilizes transposed convolution






Fig. 4. The pipeline for CoRS and CoSG data set collection takes FAcCodec and its CoSG system as an example.

for upsampling the codec representation to raw audio waveforms, such as EnCodec [59], SpeechTokenizer [56], DAC [57], HiFiCodec [58], and so on.

- **Frequency-domain decoder** employs the Inverse Short-Time Fourier Transform (ISTFT) on the decoded features from the decoder (usually decoded features have similar frame rate with the codec tokens) for upsampling, commonly used in frequency-domain codecs such as SemantiCodec [60], WavTokenizer [64], LanguageCodec [65], Vocos [67], and Spectral Codecs [75] and so on.

The taxonomy described above, which considers three key components, provides a structured framework for understanding existing codecs and guides the development of CodecFake detection models. Using this taxonomy, we categorize various neural audio codecs and codecs leveraged in codec-based speech generation systems within CodecFake-Omni, as detailed in Table II and Table III, respectively.

## B. CodecFake-Omni Dataset

1) *CodecFake-Omni Train and CodecFake-Omni Eval CoRS*: The CodecFake-Omni Train and Eval CoRS datasets are generated through codec re-synthesis of speech (Figure 4.a). The CodecFake-Omni Train dataset comprises both training data and additional validation data used for model selection.

We adopt the dataset processing methodology described in CodecFake [21] to generate the CodecFake-Omni datasets using the Voice Cloning Toolkit (VCTK) corpus [86]. The 107 speakers in the corpus are divided into three disjoint sets for training, validation, and testing. Speakers p226 and p229 are allocated to the CodecFake-Omni validation set, while p227 and p228 are reserved for the CodecFake-Omni Eval CoRS dataset. The remaining speakers are used to create the CodecFake-Omni Train dataset. We utilize 31 open-source codec models to generate re-synthesized speech, which is treated as spoofed data in this context. By default, all datasets include both bonafide speech and spoofed speech.

As shown in Figure 4, in pre-trained codec models, the bonafide speech will be encoded and quantized as discrete units and reconstructed back to waveform by speech codec decoder. Each resynthesized audio is paired with its corresponding bonafide input, with both bonafide and spoofed data sharing the same dataset partitioning, forming a subset of

CodecFake-Omni for each codec. Note that the sampling rate of the resynthesized data follows the original setup of the pre-trained codecs, ranging from 16 kHz to 44.1 kHz. However, for consistency, fair training, and evaluation of the CM, we finally resampled the resynthesized data to 16 kHz.

2) *CodecFake-Omni Eval CoSG (Figure 4.b)*: Due to privacy concerns, most CoSG models lack publicly available pre-trained checkpoints, so our dataset primarily derives from their official demo pages. This scenario more closely resembles a realistic unseen case where the spoofed data is generated using unknown systems. This is more realistic than ASVspoof 2019, where the training and testing data shared the same source data conditions from the VCTK dataset. The speaker prompts, or ground truth audio serves as bonafide data, while audio generated by CoSG models is considered spoofed. For CoSG models supporting speech continuation and editing, we extract only the audio segments corresponding to the generated speech in these tasks. Detailed statistics for the CoSG model test set are provided in Table III. Note that this paper discusses CodecFake with a broader range of codec technologies rather than addressing multi-lingual conditions. Thus, our study focused on English audio and collected only English audio samples from their demo pages. Multi-lingual conditions are left for future work.

## C. Adopted Neural codec and CoSG models

1) *Neural codec in CodecFake*: To create the comprehensive CodecFake-Omni dataset, we collected a full range of open-source neural audio codecs, covering 21 distinct advanced neural codec families with varying configurations and training methodologies, resulting in a total of 31 codec models. These models were used to re-synthesize speech to get CodecFake-Omni Train and CodecFake-Omni Eval CoRS sets. Detailed statistics are provided in Table II.

**EnCodec (D)** [59] stands as one of the pioneering implementations of neural codec models, representing a foundational architecture that includes encoder, quantizer, and decoder. Its performance is enhanced through the addition of LSTM layers and the use of a Transformer-based language model, which effectively models residual vector-quantized codes, improving its sequence modeling capabilities.

**SpeechTokenizer (A)** [56] leverages HuBERT [87] for performing semantic distillation to facilitate an encoder-decoder architecture with RVQ. The first RVQ layer focuses on extracting semantic information, while subsequent layers capture acoustic details, including attributes like timbre and prosody.

**Descript Audio Codec (B)** [57] referred to as DAC, which is a high-fidelity, universal neural audio codec that achieves an exceptional compression rate by integrating enhanced VQ techniques from the image domain, complemented by improved adversarial and reconstruction losses. It compresses all kinds of audio, including speech, environment, and music, using a single universal model, making it highly versatile for generative audio modeling.

**HiFi-Codec (C)** [58] introduces a hybrid compression method using Group RVQ, achieving superior reconstruction quality with fewer codebooks and improving efficiency in both training and audio generation.

**SemantiCodec (E)** [60] employs a dual-encoder design consisting of a semantic encoder and an acoustic encoder. The semantic encoder leverages a self-supervised AudioMAE, with its outputs discretized using k-means clustering on large-scale audio datasets. The acoustic encoder complements this by capturing the finer details not represented in the semantic tokens.

**FunCodec (F)** [61] proposes time and frequency domain codecs with several configurations. The authors claim they can achieve comparable performance with fewer parameters and lower computation complexity. Meanwhile, they also found that incorporating semantic information in the codec tokens improves speech quality at low bit rates.

**FACodec (G)** [62] is a neural speech codec that factorizes speech waveforms into prosody, timbre, and acoustic subspaces for high-quality reconstruction. It comprises a speech encoder, Transformer-based timbre extractor, factorized vector quantizers, and a decoder, using techniques like information bottlenecking, auxiliary supervision, gradient reversal, and detail dropout to ensure effective information disentanglement.

**LLM-Codec (H)** [63] compresses the audio modality into the token space of LLMs, allowing LLMs to interpret audio as a “foreign language” that can be learned with minimal examples. The authors claim that, with LLM-Codec, LLMs can achieve expected performance without any parameter update in simple downstream audio tasks using only several prompts.

**WavTokenizer (I)** [64] is a frequency domain efficient acoustic codec. It employs single vector quantization to achieve extreme compression. Experiments show that WavTokenizer can compress 24kHz audio into as few as 40 or 75 tokens per second while maintaining high naturalness.

**Language-Codec (J)** [65] is a neural codec focusing on better compatibility with downstream speech language models. It first introduces Masked Channel Residual Vector Quantization to balance information distribution between different channels and achieve better audio restoration.

**HILCodec (K)** [66] is a high-fidelity, lightweight, and streaming-compatible codec. It adopts a Variance-Constrained Design to regulate output variance while normalizing input and output, ensuring stability during operation. Furthermore, it incorporates a Multi-Filter Bank Discriminator, effectively reducing aliasing and distortion to enhance audio quality.

**Vocos (L)** [67] is a vocoder built on a conditional GAN framework, drawing inspiration from EnCodec’s decoder implementation. It imitates EnCodec’s time-domain RVQ for multi-stage compression. By replacing bandwidth-specific discriminators with a projection discriminator, Vocos achieves efficient compression and high-fidelity reconstruction while enhancing performance through conditional GAN training.

**SoCodec (M)** [68] compresses speech into multi-stream semantic representations using Ordered Product Quantization (OPQ). Low streams capture primary speech information, while high streams retain supplementary details. OPQ’s ordered structure enhances stability in low streams and reduces error accumulation, making it ideal for multi-stream autoregressive (AR) generation.

**SNAC (P)** [69] enhances traditional RVQ by utilizing multi-scale quantizers that operate at varying temporal resolutions.

Compared to prior work, SNAC delivers superior audio quality at significantly lower bitrates for speech and music.

**X-Codec (Q)** [70] leverages a pre-trained semantic encoder and a semantic reconstruction loss to ensure that the generated tokens encapsulate rich semantic information. Furthermore, X-Codec adopts a unified tokenization framework that operates independently of specific large language model (LLM) architectures, enhancing its generalizability across diverse applications.

**AudioDec (R)** [71] enhances the EnCodec framework by employing a group convolution strategy to enable real-time processing in a streamable architecture. Moreover, it leverages HiFi-GAN [35] to produce high-fidelity audio with a sampling rate of 48 kHz.

**BigCodec (S)** [72] is a large-scale codec with a single codebook for enhancing performance at around one kbps bitrates. It has 10 times parameters compared to normal typical low-bitrate codecs. This large capacity enables pretty high speech quality for reconstructed speech under extremely low bitrates.

**TiCodec (T)** [73] is a neural codec compressing speech into fixed length time-invariant tokens, reducing frame-level counts via the time-invariant representation extraction module. In addition, it is trained with time-invariant encoding consistency loss to stabilize representations and excel in downstream tasks.

**Mimi (U)** [74] is one of the SOTA streaming neural audio codec-specific training for spoken dialogue framework Moshi [74]. It extends previous neural audio codec with a Transformer-based encoder/decoder, a 12.5 Hz frame rate, and semantic distillation loss aligning tokens with WavLM. It models semantic and acoustic features without delays, leveraging adversarial and feature-matching losses for improved quality at low bitrates.

**Spectral Codecs (V)** [75] compress the mel-spectrogram and reconstruct audio signals in the time domain. Specifically, it processes disjoint mel-bands independently, encoding and quantizing them using a finite scalar quantizer. The resulting codebook embeddings are concatenated and fed into a HiFi-GAN decoder to reconstruct the final waveform.

**SQ-Codec (W)** [30] utilizes scalar quantization to encode complex speech signals into a finite and compact latent space. This process leverages a hyperbolic tangent function for feature normalization, followed by rescaling to facilitate discretization. The approach stands out for its simplicity, low model complexity, and exceptional reconstruction quality, making it particularly effective in non-autoregressive (NAR) TTS systems.

2) *CoSG model adoption*: To evaluate the effectiveness of the CM model in detecting CodecFake speech, we collected CodecFake speech from 17 CoSG models. The CoSG model comparison is detailed in Table III.

**ELLA-V<sup>1</sup>** [24] is a zero-shot TTS framework based on EnCodec. It achieves phoneme-level control by interleaving phoneme and acoustic tokens and placing phonemes before acoustics.

**VALL-E<sup>2</sup>** [13] is based on EnCodec and AR language

<sup>1</sup><https://ereboas.github.io/ELLA/>

<sup>2</sup><https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/project/vall-e-x/vall-e/>

model to redefine TTS as a conditional language modeling task, trained on extensive semi-supervised data. It generates high-quality, personalized speech from a 3-second acoustic prompt, preserving the speaker’s emotions and acoustic environment while supporting diverse outputs without additional fine-tuning.

**GPST**<sup>3</sup> [25] is a hierarchical transformer for efficient speech modeling. It quantizes audio into discrete tokens via SSL (with k-means) and EnCodec, integrating them for unified one-stage generation and enhanced Hi-Res speech synthesis.

**UniAudio**<sup>4</sup> [16] utilizes LLM for unified audio generation. It tokenizes inputs and outputs, processing them as a single sequence to predict the next token by LLM. In addition, It employs a multi-scale Transformer to address some overly long sequences from EnCodec tokenization.

**TacoLM**<sup>5</sup> [26] stands as a new variant of the CoSG model, incorporating a gated attention mechanism to enhance efficiency, improve synthesis accuracy, and reduce model size. Pre-trained EnCodec is used as the audio tokenizer.

**SpeechX**<sup>6</sup> [18] is a unified CoSG model for diverse speech tasks, combining neural codec language modeling by EnCodec and multi-task learning with task-specific prompting. It excels in noisy and clean conditions, enabling zero-shot TTS, speaker extraction, noise removal, and speech editing.

**RALL-E**<sup>7</sup> [27] is an EnCodec-based CoSG model, which enhances the robustness of VALL-E by employing chain-of-thought (CoT) prompting to improve prosody and reduce word errors. It predicts pitches and duration as intermediate steps to predict speech tokens in CoT style and uses duration prompts to refine self-attention weights.

**CLaM-TTS**<sup>8</sup> [28] proposes a mel-based codec with an excel compression rate. It helps CoSG model generate multiple stacks of tokens at once to free the need for cascaded modeling when handling the number of token streams.

**VioLA**<sup>9</sup> [15] is a multilingual, multimodal AR transformer based on VALL-E. It specifically excels at speech recognition, audio synthesis, and speech translation. Using EnCodec for tokenizing speech, it treats speech as text, enabling efficient multimodal task optimization with a decoder-only model.

**NeuralSpeech 2**<sup>10</sup> [88] is a CoSG model designed for multi-style, multi-speaker, and multi-lingual scenarios. It employs latent diffusion models and SoundStream [36] representations with residual vector quantizers, enabling zero-shot synthesis and robust speech generation.

**NeuralSpeech 3**<sup>11</sup> [29] compress speech signal into discrete units sequence by FACodec. To simplify audio modeling, it can disentangle speech attributes into different subspaces (e.g., prosody, content, acoustic details, and timbre). Finally, tokens from subspaces combine with text tokens from the factorized diffusion model to decode high-quality audio.

TABLE III  
STATISTICS OF CODECFAKE SPEECH IN CODECFAKE-OMNI DATASET

CoSG Model	Codec	Quantizer	Auxiliary	Decoder	Source	Num
ELLA-V [24]	EnCodec [59]	MVQ	None	Time	Demo	16
VALL-E [13]	EnCodec [59]	MVQ	None	Time	Demo	110
GPST [25]	EnCodec [59]	MVQ	None	Time	Demo	40
UniAudio [16]	EnCodec [59]	MVQ	None	Time	Demo	22
TacoLM [26]	EnCodec [59]	MVQ	None	Time	Demo	16
SpeechX [18]	EnCodec [59]	MVQ	None	Time	Demo	16
RALL-E [27]	EnCodec [59]	MVQ	None	Time	Demo	10
CLaM-TTS [28]	EnCodec [59]	MVQ	None	Time	Demo	119
VioLA [15]	EnCodec [59]	MVQ	None	Time	Demo	14
NaturalSpeech 2 [33]	SoundStream [36]	MVQ	None	Time	Demo	46
NaturalSpeech 3 [29]	FA-Codec [62]	MVQ	Disent	Time	Demo	64
USLM [56]	SpeechTokenizer [56]	MVQ	SEM	Time	Demo	10
SimpleSpeech 1 [30]	SQ-Codec [30]	SQ	None	Time	Demo	66
SimpleSpeech 2 [31]	SQ-Codec [30]	SQ	None	Time	Demo	62
VALL-E-T [73]	TiCodec [73]	SVQ	Disent	Time	Demo	12
VALL-E-S [76]	Single-Codec [76]	SVQ	Disent	Freq	Demo	22
MaskGCT [32]	DAC-Vocos [32]	MVQ	None	Freq	E2TTS [34]	1152

**USLM**<sup>12</sup> [56] is a unified speech language model built upon SpeechTokenizer, designed to hierarchically model content and speech features (timbre, prosody). USLM can disentangle speech information through SpeechTokenizer during the training phase and leverage an AR model to capture content and a NAR model to complement paralinguistic features.

**SimpleSpeech 1**<sup>13</sup> [30] is a efficient diffusion-based NAR TTS model. It can effectively model speech within a finite and compact latent space, benefiting from the SQ-Codec. In addition, it can control the duration of the generated speech using the sentence length and train on speech-only datasets without alignment.

**SimpleSpeech 2**<sup>14</sup> [31] is the enhanced SimpleSpeech 1 based on SQ-Codec. Specifically, it introduces a flow-based scalar diffusion model to improve generation quality and speed. It also adds multilingual support, refines sentence duration prediction, and integrates advanced methods like a time mixture of experts for more efficient and robust TTS synthesis.

**VALL-E-T**<sup>15</sup> [73] is based on an unofficial implementation of VALL-E<sup>16</sup>, where the original EnCodec is replaced with TiCodec. Notably, using a single quantizer achieves significantly improved audio quality.

**VALL-E-S**<sup>17</sup> [76], also a variant of VALL-E, replaces EnCodec with Single-Codec [76] for improved performance with fewer quantizers.

**MaskGCT**<sup>18</sup> [32] is a two-stage NAR TTS system integrating semantic and acoustic codecs. Specifically, it extracts semantic features from Layer 17 of W2v-BERT 2.0 [89] and employs VQ-GAN [90] and DAC for factorized tokenization. Its T2S model utilizes a masked Llama-style transformer [91]

<sup>3</sup><https://youngsheen.github.io/GPST/demo/>

<sup>4</sup>[https://dongchaoyang.top/UniAudio\\_demo/](https://dongchaoyang.top/UniAudio_demo/)

<sup>5</sup><https://ereboas.github.io/TacoLM/>

<sup>6</sup><https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/project/speechx/>

<sup>7</sup><https://ralle-demo.github.io/RALL-E/>

<sup>8</sup><https://clam-tts.github.io/>

<sup>9</sup><https://violademo.github.io/>

<sup>10</sup><https://speechresearch.github.io/naturalspeech2/>

<sup>11</sup><https://speechresearch.github.io/naturalspeech3/>

<sup>12</sup><https://0nutation.github.io/SpeechTokenizer.github.io/>

<sup>13</sup><https://simplespeech.github.io/simplespeechDemo/>

<sup>14</sup>[https://dongchaoyang.top/SimpleSpeech2\\_demo/](https://dongchaoyang.top/SimpleSpeech2_demo/)

<sup>15</sup><https://y-ren16.github.io/TiCodec/>

<sup>16</sup><https://github.com/lifeiteng/vall-e>

<sup>17</sup><https://kkksuper.github.io/Single-Codec/>

<sup>18</sup><https://github.com/microsoft/e2tts-test-suite>






Fig. 5. The UTMOS scores of CodecFake-Omni dataset.

to leverage in-context learning, while the S2A model is based on SoundStorm to generate multi-layer acoustic tokens. In the speech acoustic codec, MaskGCT follows DAC training strategies but replaces the decoder with Vocos for improved efficiency. By listening to the audio samples, we found that the pre-trained MaskGCT model<sup>19</sup> from its official repository [92] consistently generates high-quality audio.

#### D. Quality Assessment for CodecFake-Omni

We use UTMOS [93], which is a neural network based mean opinion score (MOS) evaluation metric, to assess the naturalness. As shown in Figure 5, the bonafide speech achieves a UTMOS score of 4.027, which is treated as the reference line.

1) *CodecFake-Omni CoRS Evaluation Data*: Firstly, regarding the UTMOS scores of codec re-synthesized speech, DAC, FCodec, and BigCodec have the closest UTMOS scores to bonafide speech, with scores of 4.004, 4.020, and 4.028, respectively. This proves that the speech re-synthesized by neural codec maintains high quality, as we mentioned in section II.

2) *CodecFake-Omni CoSG Evaluation Data*: Secondly, analyzing the UTMOS scores of CodecFake speech reveals that over half of the bonafide speech achieves a UTMOS score above 4, with most CodecFake speech exhibiting quality very close to bonafide speech. Notably, several types of CodecFake speech, including VALL-E, GPST, UniAudio, NeuralSpeech 3, USLM, SimpleSpeech 1, and SimpleSpeech 2, even have higher UTMOS scores than bonafide speech. One possible reason is that some bonafide speech is collected from real-life audio recordings, often containing environmental noise. The CoSG models achieve great developments recently. When the CoSG model is very powerful and used to generate CodecFake speech, it focuses on content and speaker-related characteristics, without generating the noise. As a result, CodecFake speech can get higher UTMOS scores comparable to bonafide speech.

<sup>19</sup><https://huggingface.co/amphion/MaskGCT>

TABLE IV  
STATISTICS ON VARIOUS DATA SOURCES USED. NOTE THAT ALL DATASETS CONTAIN HALF BONAFIDE AND HALF SPOOFED UTTERANCES.

Data Source	Training	Validation	Testing	
	# utts. (including bonafide speech) / # spks.			
<b>Training Dataset</b>				
<i>Traditional Anti-spoofing Dataset</i>				
ASVspooF19	VCTK	85,504 / 103	1,470 / 2	N/A
<i>CoSS-generated Speech Baseline</i>				
MaskGCT-CF	VCTK	85,504 / 103	1,470 / 2	N/A
<i>CodecFake-Omni Training Set (A Certain Codec)</i>				
CoRS Speech	VCTK	85,504 / 103	1,470 / 2	N/A
<b>Evaluation Dataset</b>				
<i>CodecFake-Omni CoRS Evaluation Set (A Certain Codec)</i>				
CoRS Speech	VCTK	N/A	N/A	1510 / 2
<i>CodecFake-Omni CoSG Evaluation Set</i>				
CoSG Speech	Demo, E2TTS	N/A	N/A	1797 / -

## V. EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

### A. Training details

We conduct our CMs based on W2V2-AASIST [94]. To enhance generalization and reduce overfitting, we train the model for four epochs using RawBoost [95] for data augmentation. Other hyperparameters follow the default configurations in [94]: Adam optimizer with a weight decay of  $1 \times 10^{-4}$ , a batch size of 14, and a learning rate of  $1 \times 10^{-6}$ . During training, we mainly train CMs based on three different databases for comparison: 1) *Baseline 1: Traditional CM Model (ASVspooF19)*: We trained the W2V2-AASIST model on the ASVspooF19 dataset [96]. This is a reference baseline, representing for traditional spoof detection methods. 2) *Baseline 2: CodecFake CM Model (MaskGCT-CF)*: Using the SOTA CoSG model of MaskGCT pre-trained model, we generated CodecFake speech based on the VCTK dataset. This speech was then used to train a CM model to evaluate the effectiveness of CodecFake-specific training data in detecting spoofed audio. 3) *Our proposed method: Codec-Specific Re-Synthesized Models*: For each of the 31 codec models, we trained a CM model using the corresponding codec re-synthesized speech as training data. The respective codec re-synthesized validation subsets were used for model selection. This setting aims to assess the detection performance of models trained on codec resynthesised data. All training data and validation statistics data are shown in Table IV.

### B. Evaluation details

We evaluate our approach using two datasets: a codec re-synthesis speech evaluation set and a CodecFake speech evaluation set. Most of our CodecFake speech is from various CoSG model demo pages. We focus on collecting (zero-shot) TTS, voice conversion, speech continuation, and speech editing. Speaker prompts or ground-truth audio samples are labeled as bonafide, while CoSG-generated speech is labeled as spoofed. For speech editing and continuation tasks, only generated or edited segments are used. Beyond that, MaskGCT CodecFake speech, including 1152 audio, was synthesized

		Testing Subset																	
		ELLA-V	VALL-E	GPST	UniAudio	TacoLM	SpeechX	RALL-E	CLaM-TTS	ViOLA	NaturalSpeech 1	NaturalSpeech 2	NaturalSpeech 3	USLM	SimpleSpeech 1	SimpleSpeech 2	VALL-ET	VALL-E-S	MaskGCT
Training Subset	ASVspoof19	0.0	45.5	61.7	54.5	37.5	0.0	20.0	19.4	28.6	47.8	21.9	60.0	56.1	45.2	50.0	40.2	23.6	
	MaskGCT-CF	12.5	30.0	50.0	54.5	37.5	12.5	20.0	41.2	0.0	43.5	37.5	0.0	78.8	45.2	50.0	59.8	18.8	
	SpeechTokenizer (A)	0.0	49.1	61.7	36.4	0.0	12.5	0.0	43.8	0.0	21.7	21.9	0.0	90.9	54.8	16.7	50.0	16.3	
	DAC (B)	25.0	56.4	68.3	36.4	25.0	62.5	20.0	56.2	42.9	65.2	46.9	40.0	71.2	58.1	66.7	63.4	64.9	
	HiFi-Codec (C)	12.5	24.5	20.0	45.5	12.5	12.5	20.0	11.9	0.0	4.3	34.4	0.0	81.8	54.8	0.0	50.0	9.4	
	EnCodec (D1)	25.0	56.4	48.3	45.5	25.0	0.0	20.0	36.2	0.0	34.8	37.5	40.0	78.8	48.4	66.7	36.6	27.6	
	EnCodec (D2)	25.0	64.5	48.3	45.5	50.0	0.0	40.0	58.8	0.0	60.9	34.4	40.0	68.2	54.8	50.0	73.2	38.7	
	SemantiCodec (E1)	12.5	22.7	30.0	45.5	25.0	12.5	40.0	16.9	28.6	4.3	59.4	0.0	81.8	54.8	16.7	36.6	21.2	
	SemantiCodec (E2)	25.0	40.0	30.0	36.4	12.5	12.5	0.0	21.9	14.3	4.3	59.4	0.0	74.3	61.3	33.3	36.6	20.0	
	SemantiCodec (E3)	12.5	41.8	38.3	45.5	12.5	0.0	20.0	19.4	0.0	8.7	53.1	0.0	71.2	61.3	16.7	36.6	18.8	
	FunCodec (F1)	12.5	54.5	60.0	54.5	50.0	37.5	60.0	31.2	0.0	30.4	37.5	40.0	50.0	54.8	66.7	63.4	25.5	
	FunCodec (F2)	25.0	58.2	78.3	72.7	50.0	37.5	40.0	48.8	0.0	39.1	28.1	60.0	50.0	48.4	66.7	63.4	22.7	
	FACodec (G)	0.0	24.5	20.0	54.5	0.0	25.0	40.0	19.4	0.0	13.0	6.2	0.0	74.3	41.9	0.0	63.4	5.2	
	LLM-Codec (H)	12.5	49.1	50.0	36.4	25.0	12.5	20.0	19.4	42.9	26.1	40.6	40.0	75.7	64.5	50.0	63.4	15.6	
	WavTokenizer (I1)	12.5	60.0	71.7	36.4	25.0	37.5	40.0	55.6	14.3	60.9	53.1	60.0	75.7	64.5	50.0	59.8	42.9	
	WavTokenizer (I2)	0.0	54.5	70.0	54.5	37.5	25.0	40.0	58.8	42.9	56.5	34.4	60.0	71.2	64.5	66.7	63.4	34.7	
	Language-Codec (J)	0.0	35.5	40.0	54.5	0.0	12.5	0.0	7.5	0.0	0.0	15.6	0.0	90.9	54.8	16.7	36.6	8.0	
	HILCodec (K)	25.0	61.8	58.3	54.5	37.5	0.0	60.0	63.1	14.3	65.2	43.8	60.0	68.2	51.6	33.3	63.4	42.4	
	Vocos (L1)	0.0	28.2	41.7	36.4	0.0	12.5	0.0	7.5	0.0	0.0	18.8	0.0	78.8	45.2	0.0	26.8	7.6	
	Vocos (L2)	0.0	35.5	31.7	54.5	0.0	12.5	0.0	5.0	14.3	0.0	9.4	0.0	74.3	38.7	0.0	36.6	9.6	
	SoCodec (M)	12.5	58.2	60.0	63.6	62.5	12.5	80.0	39.4	57.1	43.5	62.5	80.0	47.0	61.3	50.0	76.8	35.4	
	SNAC (P1)	0.0	40.0	40.0	36.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	15.6	0.0	62.1	38.7	0.0	50.0	9.9	
	SNAC (P2)	12.5	47.3	78.3	45.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.0	0.0	0.0	37.5	20.0	78.8	45.2	16.7	26.8	25.9	
	X-Codec (Q1)	12.5	47.3	71.7	45.5	37.5	37.5	20.0	34.4	0.0	30.4	53.1	0.0	87.9	64.5	16.7	59.8	31.4	
	X-Codec (Q2)	50.0	52.7	41.7	45.5	25.0	25.0	60.0	17.5	14.3	34.8	59.4	40.0	62.1	61.3	33.3	36.6	37.3	
	AudioDec (R)	12.5	58.2	40.0	36.4	25.0	37.5	20.0	22.5	28.6	56.5	62.5	40.0	59.1	48.4	66.7	50.0	43.4	
	BigCodec (S)	37.5	24.5	20.0	54.5	12.5	50.0	40.0	14.4	14.3	17.4	21.9	0.0	78.8	41.9	50.0	50.0	12.0	
	TiCodec (T1)	12.5	45.5	48.3	36.4	25.0	12.5	20.0	16.9	14.3	13.0	43.8	0.0	87.9	67.7	0.0	26.8	27.8	
TiCodec (T2)	12.5	47.3	58.3	36.4	0.0	12.5	20.0	14.4	14.3	8.7	34.4	0.0	75.7	41.9	0.0	36.6	23.6		
TiCodec (T3)	0.0	38.2	50.0	45.5	0.0	12.5	0.0	9.4	14.3	4.3	40.6	0.0	68.2	41.9	16.7	26.8	24.6		
Mimi (U)	50.0	61.8	70.0	54.5	50.0	12.5	60.0	58.1	28.6	69.6	37.5	60.0	75.7	61.3	66.7	63.4	45.8		
Spectral Codes (V)	25.0	49.1	68.3	27.3	12.5	25.0	20.0	46.2	42.9	52.2	43.8	0.0	81.8	58.1	16.7	63.4	44.1		
SQ-Codec (W)	37.5	41.8	38.3	63.6	37.5	37.5	60.0	38.7	28.6	60.9	53.1	20.0	68.2	41.9	66.7	59.8	46.0		

Fig. 6. Comparison of CodecFake speech detection performance (EER) for models trained on the ASVspoof dataset (ASVspoof19), the CodecFake dataset (MaskGCT-CF), and the codec re-synthesized speech dataset (rows A–W). Each column represents a different type of CodecFake speech testing subset.

using open-source MaskGCT model with E2TTS<sup>20</sup> test suite [34]. For the details of CoSG models, including demo pages and number of samples, please refer to Table III.

We use the Equal Error Rate (EER) to evaluate the detection performance of the CM model. The EER represents the point at which the False Acceptance Rate (FAR) equals the False Rejection Rate (FRR). In other words, it is the rate at which the system makes false acceptances and false rejections at the same time. A lower EER indicates better detection performance.

## VI. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

We first conduct experiments on detecting CodecFake CoSG speech and evaluating the overall CodecFake speech detection performance, as presented in Sections VI-A and VI-B. Furthermore, we perform a fine-grained analysis based on our proposed taxonomy-level and codec-level categorizations in Sections VI-C and VI-D.

### A. Detecting Fake Speech Generated by CoSG

1) *Baseline comparison*: Figure 6 presents the Eval CoSG results for models trained on various types of CodecFake-Omni training datasets. Models trained on the ASVspoof

<sup>20</sup><https://github.com/microsoft/e2tts-test-suite>

dataset (row ASVspoof19) and the CodecFake speech dataset (row MaskGCT-CF) generally perform poorly on most CodecFake speech testing subsets. For the ASVspoof dataset, this is likely because it primarily consists of speech generated by traditional speech synthesis models, which attain different properties with codec-based speech synthesis systems. For the model trained by MaskGCT-CF dataset, the challenge arises from the diversity of CodecFake speech, which is generated by various CoSG models using different codecs, making one model trained on only one codecfake dataset difficult to detect all other codecfake attacks.

2) *The effectiveness of CodecFake-Omni*: To better visualize the results in Figure 6, we conduct a summarization in Table V. In the upper part of Table V-(a), BL1 and BL2 perform best for only 2 to 4 CodecFake speech types. Models trained on the CodecFake-Omni training data achieve Top-1 performance in all 17 settings, outperforming the BL1 and BL2.

3) *Challenges to detect CodecFake speech with human-level naturalness*: It can be observed that columns corresponding to VALL-E, GPST, UniAudio, NeuralSpeech 3, USLM, SimpleSpeech 1, and SimpleSpeech 2 in Figure 6 are particularly challenging for detection. Combined with the high UTMOs scores (which indicate high naturalness) observed in Figure 5-(b), we speculate that the above high-quality CodecFake speech, which in turn increases the difficulty of CodecFake detection, resulting in the bad CodecFake detection performance.

4) *Key factors analysis of CodecFake speech: a case study with MaskGCT*: The bottom part of Table V-(b) compares the detection performance on the MaskGCT testing set with models trained on different datasets. The results show that both EnCodec (D1) and DAC (B) perform worse than BL2, while Vocos (L1) achieves excellent performance among codecs. The codec in MaskGCT (BL2) and Vocos (L1) share a similar property by utilizing a frequency-domain decoder, which suggests that the frequency-domain decoder is likely a key factor in countering CodecFake speech generated by MaskGCT. In addition, FACodec (G) outperforms all others. It uses disentanglement auxiliary objective, which are different from other neural codec models in Table V-(b), indicating that disentangling information may further enhance the performance of CodecFake speech detection.

Furthermore, we use t-SNE visualization to analyze the embedding distributions of different CodecFake speech on CodecFake speech generated by MaskGCT. The embedding is extracted using different CM models based on corresponding CoRS speech datasets. We can observe an apparent overlap between bonafide and spoofed speech for BL1, DAC, and EnCodec. In contrast, BL2, Vocos, and FACodec progressively reduce the embedding overlap between bonafide speech and CodecFake speech, which aligns with its performance shown in Table V-(b).

### B. The CodecFake-Omni overall performance

To assess the generalizability of the codec re-synthesis training paradigm, we evaluate models trained on different codec

TABLE V  
CODECFAKE SPEECH DETECTION PERFORMANCE

(a) **Detecting CodecFake Speech. CoSG Model (Codec)** denotes CodecFake speech from various CoSG models and their codecs. **BL1 (ASVspoof19)** and **BL2 (MaskGCT-CF)** are baseline models trained on ASVspoof 2019 and MaskGCT-generated CodecFake speech, respectively. **Corr.** uses corresponding codec re-synthesized speech for training, while **Top-1** and **Top-2** indicate the best and second-best performances using other codec re-synthesized speech for training.

CoSG Model (Codec)	EER (%) ↓			
	BL1	BL2	Top-1	Top-2
ELLAV (EnCodec)	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
VALL-E (EnCodec)	45.5	30.0	<b>22.7</b>	24.5
GPST (EnCodec)	61.7	50.0	<b>20.0</b>	<b>20.0</b>
UniAudio (EnCodec)	54.5	<b>27.3</b>	<b>27.3</b>	<b>27.3</b>
TacoLM (EnCodec)	37.5	25.0	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
SpeechX (EnCodec)	<b>0.0</b>	25.0	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
RALL-E (EnCodec)	20.0	40.0	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
CLAMTTS (EnCodec)	19.4	31.9	<b>5.0</b>	7.5
VioLA (EnCodec)	28.6	28.6	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
NeuralSpeech 2 (SoundStream)	47.8	33.3	<b>0.0</b>	4.3
NaturalSpeech 3 (FACodec)	21.9	31.2	<b>6.2</b>	9.4
USLM (SpeechTokenizer)	60.0	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
SimpleSpeech 1 (SQCodec)	56.1	75.7	<b>47.0</b>	50.0
SimpleSpeech 2 (SQCodec)	45.2	41.9	<b>38.7</b>	<b>38.7</b>
VALL-E-T (TiCodec)	50.0	33.3	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
VALL-E-S (SingleCodec)	40.2	63.4	<b>26.8</b>	36.6
MaskGCT (DAC-Vocos)	23.6	24.3	<b>5.2</b>	7.6

(b) Detecting MaskGCT-generated CodecFake Speech

Model Training Source		Data Type	EER (%) ↓
BL1	ASVspoof 2019	Traditional	23.6
BL2	MaskGCT-CF	CoSG Speech	18.8
D1	EnCodec	CoRS Speech	27.6
D2	EnCodec	CoRS Speech	38.7
B	DAC	CoRS Speech	64.9
L1	Vocos	CoRS Speech	7.6
L2	Vocos	CoRS Speech	9.6
G	FACodec	CoRS Speech	5.2

re-synthesized speech for two kinds of evaluation sets, all codec re-synthesized speech and CodecFake speech evaluation sets, as summarized in the last columns of Table II. We can observe that the model trained using two variants of Vocos (L1-L2) re-synthesis speech achieved top-1 4.64% EER and top-2 6.19% EER performances in detecting codec re-synthesis speech, while Vocos (L1) re-synthesis speech also achieve top-1 13.19% EER performance in detecting CodecFake speech.

### C. Stratified analysis for CodecFake-Omni

In Table VI, we conduct a stratified analysis based on the neural audio codecs taxonomy we defined in Sec. IV-A for the CodecFake-Omni dataset. We first collect column-wise testing data based on the codec taxonomy shown in Figure 8 and Figure 6. Next, the EER is computed using a consistent threshold, and finally, the average row-wise EER is calculated based on the taxonomy.

1) *Different Quantizers*: We observe that CM models trained on SQ-related codec re-synthesized speech exhibit better generalizability in codec re-synthesis speech scenarios, while CM models trained on MVQ-related codec re-




Fig. 7. The t-SNE visualization of embedding distributions for different CodecFake speech samples in the CodecFake detection scenario. The CodecFake speech is generated by MaskGCT.

synthesized speech demonstrate better generalizability in CodecFake scenarios.

2) *Different Auxiliary Objectives*: We observe that under codec re-synthesis speech testing scenarios, the model derived on a specific codec family (with a specific auxiliary objective) has the best EER for testing data from that corresponding kind of codec family. The CM models trained on re-synthesized speech from the codec family with disentanglement auxiliary objects demonstrate better generalizability in detecting CodecFake speech.

3) *Different Decoders*: The CM model trained using the re-synthesized speech generated by codec with frequency-domain decoder has the best generalizability in both codec re-synthesis speech and CodecFake speech scenarios.

#### D. Detecting codec re-synthesis speech

We conduct a preliminary cross-evaluation across codecs to assess CM models trained on CoRS speech, focusing on their effectiveness in detecting codec resynthesis speech. The cross-evaluation is performed on the CodecFake-Omni Eval CoRS dataset, with the cross-testing results presented in Figure 8. The rows represent the training data subsets (ASVspoof, CodecFake speech, and codec re-synthesis data), while the columns correspond to the codec re-synthesis testing data subsets. The following observations can be made:

1) *Baseline comparison*: Models trained on the ASVspoof 2019 dataset and CodecFake speech (MaskGCT-CF) exhibit very high EER on most codec resynthesis test subsets, typically between 20% and 50%. This suggests that models trained on traditional vocoder-based TTS/VC data (ASVspoof 2019) or CodecFake speech also face the challenge of poor generalization in effectively detecting resynthesized speech from the codec model.

2) *In-distribution scenario*: Training on a specific codec re-synthesized speech subset generally yields the lowest Equal Error Rate (EER) for the corresponding testing subset (e.g., row A for training and column A for testing), as seen along the diagonal after excluding the first two rows. Furthermore,

TABLE VI  
STRATIFIED ANALYSIS OF CODECFAKE-OMNI

(a) Stratified Analysis with Different Quantization

CodecFake-Omni CoRS Evaluation (EER (%) ↓)						
Train	UTMOS 3.0+			UTMOS 3.5+		
	SVQ	MVQ	SQ	SVQ	MVQ	SQ
SVQ	27.58	31.79	42.70	27.78	35.24	40.92
MVQ	30.30	26.51	38.35	<b>24.47</b>	<b>24.95</b>	31.69
SQ	<b>25.91</b>	<b>22.39</b>	<b>23.64</b>	30.20	29.82	<b>23.65</b>

CodecFake-Omni CoSG Evaluation (EER (%) ↓)						
Train	UTMOS 3.0+			UTMOS 3.5+		
	SVQ	MVQ	SQ	SVQ	MVQ	SQ
SVQ	46.97	31.98	69.92	38.89	26.91	67.71
MVQ	<b>43.17</b>	<b>27.74</b>	62.50	<b>21.43</b>	<b>25.67</b>	63.45
SQ	50.00	42.81	<b>61.72</b>	41.67	43.18	<b>61.72</b>

(b) Stratified Analysis with Different Auxiliary Objectives

CodecFake-Omni CoRS Evaluation (EER (%) ↓)						
Train	UTMOS 3.0+			UTMOS 3.5+		
	None	SEM	Disent	None	SEM	Disent
None	<b>30.07</b>	19.36	23.09	<b>28.55</b>	19.83	21.74
SEM	37.40	<b>18.00</b>	24.28	34.05	19.65	26.84
Disent	33.84	18.49	<b>19.56</b>	33.42	<b>18.13</b>	<b>18.01</b>

CodecFake-Omni CoRG Evaluation (EER (%) ↓)						
Train	UTMOS 3.0+			UTMOS 3.5+		
	None	SEM	Disent	None	SEM	Disent
None	32.19	26.67	39.18	29.97	18.46	32.59
SEM	30.43	17.50	46.81	36.30	20.00	37.72
Disent	<b>27.16</b>	<b>16.00</b>	<b>38.17</b>	<b>22.33</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>26.31</b>

(c) Stratified Analysis with Different Decoders

CodecFake-Omni CoRS Evaluation (EER (%) ↓)					
Train	UTMOS 3.0+		UTMOS 3.5+		
	Time	Freq	Time	Freq	
Time	29.32	27.12	29.77	35.05	
Freq	<b>29.14</b>	<b>25.05</b>	<b>17.67</b>	<b>14.06</b>	

CodecFake-Omni CoSG Evaluation (EER (%) ↓)					
Train	UTMOS 3.0+		UTMOS 3.5+		
	Time	Freq	Time	Freq	
Time	39.89	28.10	39.85	28.60	
Freq	<b>39.71</b>	<b>26.31</b>	<b>34.21</b>	<b>20.80</b>	

within the same codec type but with different training configurations, codec re-synthesized data exhibits similar properties (e.g., row E1 for training corresponds well to columns E1, E2, and E3 for testing; row T1 for training aligns with columns T1, T2, and T3 for testing). This behavior can be attributed to improved performance under in-distribution testing conditions.

3) *Generalizability*: Models trained on subsets Language-Codec and Vocos (rows J, L1, and L2) exhibit superior generalizability across the majority of testing subsets (columns A–W). Stratified analysis further confirm that CM models trained on codec-generated re-synthesized speech, specifically Language-Codec (row J) and Vocos (rows L1 and L2), with frequency-domain decoders achieve enhanced performance, as illustrated in Table VI-(c).

		Testing Subset																														
		A	B	C	D1	D2	E1	E2	E3	F1	F2	G	H	I1	I2	J	K	L1	L2	M	P1	P2	Q1	Q2	R	S	T1	T2	T3	U	V	W
Training Subset	ASVspoof19	37.2	49.7	27.8	11.9	32.9	4.9	4.4	1.9	2.9	7.4	42.8	3.0	21.5	37.6	40.4	39.7	42.1	45.2	0.5	31.9	17.6	27.0	1.7	15.6	44.1	13.8	12.8	20.1	30.6	46.2	48.6
	MaskGCT-CF	22.6	49.5	18.4	9.3	32.0	5.2	4.2	2.9	15.4	21.7	40.3	3.3	4.5	40.4	34.8	35.2	38.1	42.5	0.5	33.1	24.5	2.2	1.1	12.8	28.5	4.9	7.5	23.8	14.4	32.3	43.6
	SpeechTokenizer (A)	0.0	44.9	0.0	1.7	15.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.6	18.5	12.2	0.0	0.8	20.5	4.0	9.4	6.0	11.4	0.3	1.3	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.3	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.8	1.2	1.3	27.0
	DAC (B)	29.4	3.3	33.9	39.7	47.8	24.9	21.2	17.4	26.9	35.9	26.4	38.4	29.5	37.5	35.0	38.7	33.9	36.3	38.4	23.4	31.8	44.4	20.9	38.7	37.5	31.7	34.6	29.4	30.7	30.5	29.5
	HiFi-Codec (C)	4.8	48.2	0.0	14.3	34.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	9.3	13.6	28.2	0.0	9.7	32.5	23.2	28.7	22.5	30.6	0.1	7.3	3.8	0.0	0.0	5.8	11.0	0.1	0.4	9.0	12.6	15.1	41.7
	EnCodec (D1)	39.3	50.9	35.4	0.0	0.7	1.5	2.6	1.7	5.3	36.6	47.1	0.4	34.2	48.5	42.1	47.8	45.0	46.4	1.7	41.3	25.0	28.1	0.3	11.0	48.0	16.4	14.0	24.8	27.1	45.7	47.8
	EnCodec (D2)	55.5	48.1	55.5	0.0	0.0	46.2	45.4	41.9	33.4	38.8	49.5	42.9	54.3	51.7	53.5	54.6	54.6	56.4	45.3	56.0	55.5	58.5	43.2	47.3	53.1	55.5	55.4	57.5	51.0	54.4	54.4
	SemantiCodec (E1)	38.5	51.0	31.9	14.6	43.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.1	16.3	49.9	0.0	28.9	47.4	45.3	46.5	43.8	47.1	0.0	37.5	17.6	5.8	0.0	8.9	46.4	11.1	6.5	16.3	35.4	40.5	49.3
	SemantiCodec (E2)	31.5	50.6	28.3	14.0	42.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	23.7	51.1	0.4	32.5	48.9	41.6	45.7	42.8	46.4	0.4	29.3	10.1	5.6	0.1	6.4	47.1	6.2	6.8	11.8	37.4	32.3	48.5
	SemantiCodec (E3)	42.9	50.1	36.3	24.2	47.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.8	20.8	49.0	0.4	38.3	47.5	47.1	45.4	46.6	47.4	0.4	40.8	24.6	11.0	0.0	10.9	48.7	11.0	7.7	20.7	44.1	42.8	49.1
	FunCodec (F1)	49.7	51.3	46.9	16.6	39.2	25.0	26.9	23.8	0.0	8.5	49.9	1.5	50.2	50.5	47.3	50.5	49.7	49.3	1.7	49.4	45.0	49.5	8.3	36.8	50.1	38.5	35.8	38.5	51.4	51.9	48.7
	FunCodec (F2)	42.9	48.2	38.5	31.0	39.9	27.4	31.0	23.8	0.5	0.0	42.8	32.0	33.9	43.6	45.7	39.7	46.0	46.8	41.1	45.7	40.8	44.5	29.8	36.6	43.0	33.9	37.5	38.9	36.7	44.6	48.7
	FACodec (G)	13.0	46.4	1.7	23.8	40.5	7.0	9.9	3.7	9.9	9.1	0.3	0.7	9.9	35.8	31.1	26.6	30.7	35.8	0.1	15.5	13.6	8.7	10.1	6.5	0.8	2.4	4.9	17.5	18.3	25.2	45.8
	LLM-Codec (H)	49.9	49.9	47.8	41.5	48.0	9.0	8.1	6.4	8.0	32.9	50.1	0.0	45.8	50.1	49.0	46.6	49.3	49.3	0.0	48.5	45.0	34.2	0.4	40.1	52.0	27.0	26.6	40.7	47.1	49.8	49.1
	WavTokenizer (I1)	46.2	49.7	44.8	47.1	48.6	34.6	33.9	29.5	34.3	36.0	49.3	36.7	0.0	48.9	48.6	48.6	49.4	49.9	36.7	46.6	47.8	43.7	31.8	37.2	48.0	34.8	37.5	44.1	44.0	47.5	48.1
	WavTokenizer (I2)	43.2	49.7	38.1	40.5	44.8	31.8	27.3	24.4	27.7	28.1	44.4	29.1	0.8	0.4	44.6	45.6	43.7	46.1	31.5	38.1	39.5	42.4	25.2	32.3	43.4	24.6	29.8	37.5	43.8	44.6	49.1
	Language-Codec (J)	0.1	45.2	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	9.4	13.6	0.0	0.1	10.2	0.3	3.2	2.1	4.5	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	2.0	18.8
	HiLCodec (K)	41.9	50.2	38.5	11.9	20.9	31.9	32.3	28.3	22.0	18.7	44.8	36.7	26.4	47.3	45.4	0.0	44.6	47.0	29.3	40.5	36.3	45.3	25.8	31.8	45.6	30.6	31.5	36.7	10.7	48.1	49.5
	Vocos (L1)	0.0	44.2	0.0	0.0	5.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	4.8	14.4	0.0	0.1	6.1	0.4	3.6	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	5.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	1.9	25.0
	Vocos (L2)	0.1	40.3	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	5.4	6.4	0.0	0.1	3.6	0.3	2.4	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.5	1.2	13.4
	SoCodec (M)	49.3	49.3	51.0	48.7	49.0	52.6	51.9	49.3	52.6	49.7	51.9	50.6	44.5	50.1	50.1	48.6	51.7	53.0	0.0	51.3	50.7	49.5	48.9	52.6	50.5	48.6	48.7	51.0	48.7	52.5	49.7
	SNAC (P1)	1.7	47.3	0.7	3.3	33.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.7	18.1	21.3	0.3	2.6	17.8	10.6	8.6	8.5	18.4	0.3	0.1	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.1	12.3	0.1	0.1	0.4	4.0	8.9	40.1
	SNAC (P2)	20.3	49.5	12.3	1.2	38.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.8	17.6	45.0	0.4	17.1	42.4	32.9	32.7	31.7	37.9	0.3	6.8	0.0	9.0	0.4	1.1	42.9	3.2	2.0	5.0	20.5	31.5	47.0
	X-Codec (Q1)	24.5	50.1	20.4	36.4	46.8	2.4	0.5	0.3	44.9	46.0	48.0	0.5	24.2	48.2	44.4	44.0	44.2	46.8	0.1	34.8	27.7	0.0	0.0	16.6	33.9	1.6	7.4	27.9	34.4	29.9	47.4
	X-Codec (Q2)	49.3	49.4	48.9	43.8	49.0	12.6	7.8	7.5	23.4	34.4	50.9	0.5	47.4	49.7	49.3	49.5	49.5	49.8	14.6	48.9	46.2	40.3	0.0	31.8	50.3	9.8	31.0	37.8	47.5	46.9	50.3
	AudioDec (R)	47.8	49.7	45.0	42.1	50.2	15.4	12.3	11.0	27.4	26.9	49.7	29.1	41.2	50.5	49.5	49.7	49.0	49.4	0.0	45.3	41.2	42.2	23.6	0.0	51.1	18.3	22.1	33.5	47.1	47.1	49.7
	BigCodec (S)	18.8	49.0	3.2	26.9	43.6	8.3	8.1	5.8	7.0	18.8	4.9	0.3	5.0	39.6	30.1	31.9	33.0	38.8	0.0	22.1	20.5	0.9	0.5	9.1	0.1	2.1	6.0	17.6	20.8	23.4	44.9
	TiCodec (T1)	31.3	48.9	22.1	22.5	45.7	0.7	0.3	0.1	21.1	25.7	46.6	0.5	18.9	47.1	43.6	43.3	42.9	45.7	0.1	31.7	16.0	3.0	0.0	0.4	41.5	0.0	0.5	8.0	36.6	31.7	47.4
	TiCodec (T2)	27.6	49.9	15.0	15.9	44.6	0.1	0.0	0.0	15.4	21.1	44.6	0.5	10.5	44.2	41.5	43.0	41.5	45.4	0.4	26.9	10.7	1.3	0.0	0.0	38.5	0.1	0.0	2.4	33.6	31.9	47.4
	TiCodec (T3)	12.2	48.7	9.3	3.4	35.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.0	13.6	41.2	0.1	4.4	38.9	28.1	32.0	30.6	35.6	0.1	13.6	2.6	1.7	0.0	0.0	31.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	19.6	13.4	42.9
	Mimi (U)	46.4	49.3	43.2	39.2	43.8	34.6	34.7	31.8	15.5	17.1	48.9	34.0	36.3	49.4	47.4	43.2	48.0	47.8	38.3	46.6	45.8	42.9	32.5	40.5	48.1	36.3	39.1	42.8	0.0	47.7	48.7
	Spectral Codecs (V)	4.5	44.1	3.7	12.1	33.8	0.5	0.0	0.1	26.0	16.9	25.3	0.7	2.2	33.0	17.6	18.1	18.0	24.9	0.4	9.0	1.9	0.3	0.1	0.0	14.3	0.4	0.1	1.6	9.1	0.0	38.4
	SQ-Codec (W)	38.4	48.2	36.3	19.3	32.5	8.0	8.2	9.5	6.6	22.2	51.5	10.3	14.6	45.7	42.1	51.3	43.0	43.7	10.1	40.9	36.7	36.3	12.1	15.5	44.8	25.8	17.2	29.4	43.3	32.6	0.0

Fig. 8. Cross-testing results of CM models on codec re-synthesis test subsets. All numbers in the figure are EER (%). The **ASVspoof19** row serves as a baseline, representing a CM trained on ASVspoof 2019 LA track. The **MaskGCT-CF** row is a baseline trained on CodecFake speech generated by MaskGCT model (using VCTK dataset as the source dataset). Rows **A-W** represent models trained on codec re-synthesis training data. Columns **A-W** indicate the specific codec re-synthesis test subsets. The average EER for models trained on each row can be found in the column “CR-EER” of Table II.

## VII. CONCLUSION

In this study, we compiled a diverse set of contemporary codec models and CoSS model to develop the comprehensive CodecFake-Omni dataset. Extensive experiments reveal that while CM models trained on the ASVspoof dataset and CodecFake speech dataset struggle to detect synthesized speech from modern CoSS systems, our CodecFake-Omni dataset significantly improves their detection capabilities. Specifically, models trained on Vocos (L1-L2) re-synthesis speech achieved

a top-1 EER of 4.64% and a top-2 EER of 6.19% in detecting 31 types of codec re-synthesis speech. Additionally, Vocos (L1) re-synthesis speech achieved a top-1 EER of 13.19% in detecting 17 types of CodecFake speech. To advance research in this area and combat malicious attacks from advanced codec-based speech synthesis systems, we will release all codes and datasets.



## REFERENCES

- [1] M. Li, Y. Ahmadiadi, and X.-P. Zhang, "Audio anti-spoofing detection: A survey," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.13914*, 2024.
- [2] A. Chinthha, B. Thai, S. J. Sohrawardi, K. Bhatt, A. Hickerson, M. Wright, and R. Ptucha, "Recurrent convolutional structures for audio spoof and video deepfake detection," *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, vol. 14, no. 5, pp. 1024–1037, 2020.
- [3] T. Zhang, L. Deng, L. Zhang, and X. Dang, "Deep learning in face synthesis: A survey on deepfakes," in *2020 IEEE 3rd International Conference on Computer and Communication Engineering Technology (CCET)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 67–70.
- [4] H. Wu, J. Kang, L. Meng, H. Meng, and H.-y. Lee, "The defender's perspective on automatic speaker verification: An overview," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.12804*, 2023.
- [5] Z. Wu, T. Kinnunen, N. Evans, J. Yamagishi, C. Haniçli, M. Sahidullah, and A. Sizov, "Asvspoof 2015: the first automatic speaker verification spoofing and countermeasures challenge," in *Interspeech 2015*, 2015, pp. 2037–2041.
- [6] T. Kinnunen, M. Sahidullah, H. Delgado, M. Todisco, N. Evans, J. Yamagishi, and K. A. Lee, "The asvspoof 2017 challenge: Assessing the limits of replay spoofing attack detection," in *Interspeech 2017*, 2017, pp. 2–6.
- [7] 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," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.05441*, 2019.
- [8] 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.
- [9] J. Yi, R. Fu, J. Tao, S. Nie, H. Ma, C. Wang, T. Wang, Z. Tian, Y. Bai, C. Fan *et al.*, "Add 2022: the first audio deep synthesis detection challenge," in *ICASSP 2022-2022 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 9216–9220.
- [10] J. Yi, J. Tao, R. Fu, X. Yan, C. Wang, T. Wang, C. Y. Zhang, X. Zhang, Y. Zhao, Y. Ren *et al.*, "Add 2023: the second audio deepfake detection challenge," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13774*, 2023.
- [11] R. K. Das, X. Tian, T. Kinnunen, and H. Li, "The attacker's perspective on automatic speaker verification: An overview," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.08849*, 2020.
- [12] H. Wu, X. Chen, Y.-C. Lin, K.-w. Chang, H.-L. Chung, A. H. Liu, and H.-y. Lee, "Towards audio language modeling-an overview," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.13236*, 2024.
- [13] C. Wang, S. Chen, Y. Wu, Z. Zhang, L. Zhou, S. Liu, Z. Chen, Y. Liu, H. Wang, J. Li *et al.*, "Neural codec language models are zero-shot text to speech synthesizers," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.02111*, 2023.
- [14] Z. Zhang, L. Zhou, C. Wang, S. Chen, Y. Wu, S. Liu, Z. Chen, Y. Liu, H. Wang, J. Li *et al.*, "Speak foreign languages with your own voice: Cross-lingual neural codec language modeling," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.03926*, 2023.
- [15] T. Wang, L. Zhou, Z. Zhang, Y. Wu, S. Liu, Y. Gaur, Z. Chen, J. Li, and F. Wei, "Viola: Unified codec language models for speech recognition, synthesis, and translation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16107*, 2023.
- [16] D. Yang, J. Tian, X. Tan, R. Huang, S. Liu, X. Chang, J. Shi, S. Zhao, J. Bian, X. Wu *et al.*, "Uniaudio: An audio foundation model toward universal audio generation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.00704*, 2023.
- [17] Z. Du, J. Wang, Q. Chen, Y. Chu, Z. Gao, Z. Li, K. Hu, X. Zhou, J. Xu, Z. Ma *et al.*, "Lauragpt: Listen, attend, understand, and regenerate audio with gpt," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.04673*, 2023.
- [18] X. Wang, M. Thakker, Z. Chen, N. Kanda, S. E. Eskimez, S. Chen, M. Tang, S. Liu, J. Li, and T. Yoshioka, "Speechx: Neural codec language model as a versatile speech transformer," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, 2024.
- [19] H. Wu, H.-L. Chung, Y.-C. Lin, Y.-K. Wu, X. Chen, Y.-C. Pai, H.-H. Wang, K.-W. Chang, A. H. Liu, and H.-y. Lee, "Codec-superb: An in-depth analysis of sound codec models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.13071*, 2024.
- [20] H. Wu, X. Chen, Y.-C. Lin, K. Chang, J. Du, K.-H. Lu, A. H. Liu, H.-L. Chung, Y.-K. Wu, D. Yang *et al.*, "Codec-superb@ slt 2024: A lightweight benchmark for neural audio codec models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.14085*, 2024.
- [21] H. Wu, Y. Tseng, and H. yi Lee, "Codecfake: Enhancing anti-spoofing models against deepfake audios from codec-based speech synthesis systems," in *Interspeech 2024*, 2024, pp. 1770–1774.
- [22] Y. Xie, Y. Lu, R. Fu, Z. Wen, Z. Wang, J. Tao, X. Qi, X. Wang, Y. Liu, H. Cheng *et al.*, "The codecfake dataset and countermeasures for the universally detection of deepfake audio," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.04880*, 2024.
- [23] X. Wang and J. Yamagishi, "Spoofed training data for speech spoofing countermeasure can be efficiently created using neural vocoders," in *ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1–5.
- [24] Y. Song, Z. Chen, X. Wang, Z. Ma, and X. Chen, "Ella-v: Stable neural codec language modeling with alignment-guided sequence reordering," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.07333*, 2024.
- [25] Y. Zhu, D. Su, L. He, L. Xu, and D. Yu, "Generative pre-trained speech language model with efficient hierarchical transformer," in *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, L.-W. Ku, A. Martins, and V. Srikumar, Eds. Bangkok, Thailand: Association for Computational Linguistics, Aug. 2024, pp. 1764–1775. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2024.acl-long.97>
- [26] Y. Song, Z. Chen, X. Wang, Z. Ma, G. Yang, and X. Chen, "Tacolm: Gated attention equipped codec language model are efficient zero-shot text to speech synthesizers," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.15752*, 2024.
- [27] D. Xin, X. Tan, K. Shen, Z. Ju, D. Yang, Y. Wang, S. Takamichi, H. Saruwatari, S. Liu, J. Li *et al.*, "Rall-e: Robust codec language modeling with chain-of-thought prompting for text-to-speech synthesis," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.03204*, 2024.
- [28] J. Kim, K. Lee, S. Chung, and J. Cho, "Clam-tts: Improving neural codec language model for zero-shot text-to-speech," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.02781*, 2024.
- [29] Z. Ju, Y. Wang, K. Shen, X. Tan, D. Xin, D. Yang, Y. Liu, Y. Leng, K. Song, S. Tang *et al.*, "Naturalspeech 3: Zero-shot speech synthesis with factorized codec and diffusion models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.03100*, 2024.
- [30] D. Yang, D. Wang, H. Guo, X. Chen, X. Wu, and H. Meng, "Simple-speech: Towards simple and efficient text-to-speech with scalar latent transformer diffusion models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.02328*, 2024.
- [31] D. Yang, R. Huang, Y. Wang, H. Guo, D. Chong, S. Liu, X. Wu, and H. Meng, "Simple-speech 2: Towards simple and efficient text-to-speech with flow-based scalar latent transformer diffusion models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.13893*, 2024.
- [32] Y. Wang, H. Zhan, L. Liu, R. Zeng, H. Guo, J. Zheng, Q. Zhang, S. Zhang, and Z. Wu, "Maskgct: Zero-shot text-to-speech with masked generative codec transformer," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.00750*, 2024.
- [33] K. Shen, Z. Ju, X. Tan, Y. Liu, Y. Leng, L. He, T. Qin, S. Zhao, and J. Bian, "Naturalspeech 2: Latent diffusion models are natural and zero-shot speech and singing synthesizers," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.09116*, 2023.
- [34] S. E. Eskimez, X. Wang, M. Thakker, C. Li, C.-H. Tsai, Z. Xiao, H. Yang, Z. Zhu, M. Tang, X. Tan, Y. Liu, S. Zhao, and N. Kanda, "E2 TTS: Embarrassingly easy fully non-autoregressive zero-shot TTS," 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.18009>
- [35] J. Kong, J. Kim, and J. Bae, "Hifi-gan: Generative adversarial networks for efficient and high fidelity speech synthesis," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 33, pp. 17022–17033, 2020.
- [36] N. Zeghidour, A. Luebs, A. Omran, J. Skoglund, and M. Tagliasacchi, "Soundstream: An end-to-end neural audio codec," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 30, pp. 495–507, 2021.
- [37] D. Petermann, S. Beack, and M. Kim, "Harp-net: Hyper-autoencoded reconstruction propagation for scalable neural audio coding," in *2021 IEEE Workshop on Applications of Signal Processing to Audio and Acoustics (WASPAA)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 316–320.
- [38] X. Jiang, X. Peng, C. Zheng, H. Xue, Y. Zhang, and Y. Lu, "End-to-end neural speech coding for real-time communications," in *ICASSP 2022-2022 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 866–870.
- [39] X. Jiang, X. Peng, H. Xue, Y. Zhang, and Y. Lu, "Cross-scale vector quantization for scalable neural speech coding," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.03067*, 2022.
- [40] X. Jiang, X. Peng, Y. Zhang, and Y. Lu, "Disentangled feature learning for real-time neural speech coding," in *ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1–5.
- [41] J. Betker, "Better speech synthesis through scaling," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.07243*, 2023.



- [42] Z. Borsos, M. Sharifi, D. Vincent, E. Kharitonov, N. Zeghidour, and M. Tagliasacchi, "Soundstorm: Efficient parallel audio generation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.09636*, 2023.
- [43] Z. Huang, C. Meng, and T. Ko, "Repecodec: A speech representation codec for speech tokenization," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.00169*, 2023.
- [44] M. Łajszczak, G. Cámara, Y. Li, F. Beyhan, A. van Korlaar, F. Yang, A. Joly, Á. Martín-Cortinas, A. Abbas, A. Michalski *et al.*, "Base tts: Lessons from building a billion-parameter text-to-speech model on 100k hours of data," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.08093*, 2024.
- [45] Y. Ai, X.-H. Jiang, Y.-X. Lu, H.-P. Du, and Z.-H. Ling, "Apecodec: A neural audio codec with parallel amplitude and phase spectrum encoding and decoding," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.10533*, 2024.
- [46] Y. Gu and E. Diao, "Esc: Efficient speech coding with cross-scale residual vector quantized transformers," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.19441*, 2024.
- [47] J. Kim, K. Lee, S. Chung, and J. Cho, "Clam-tts: Improving neural codec language model for zero-shot text-to-speech," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.02781*, 2024.
- [48] Y. Pan, L. Ma, and J. Zhao, "Promptcodec: High-fidelity neural speech codec using disentangled representation learning based adaptive feature-aware prompt encoders," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.02702*, 2024.
- [49] H. Guo, F. Xie, D. Yang, H. Lu, X. Wu, and H. Meng, "Addressing index collapse of large-codebook speech tokenizer with dual-decoding product-quantized variational auto-encoder," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.02940*, 2024.
- [50] Y. Zheng, W. Tu, L. Xiao, and X. Xu, "Supercodec: A neural speech codec with selective back-projection network," in *ICASSP 2024-2024 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 566–570.
- [51] K. An, Q. Chen, C. Deng, Z. Du, C. Gao, Z. Gao, Y. Gu, T. He, H. Hu, K. Hu *et al.*, "Funaudiollm: Voice understanding and generation foundation models for natural interaction between humans and llms," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.04051*, 2024.
- [52] X. Bie, X. Liu, and G. Richard, "Learning source disentanglement in neural audio codec," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.11228*, 2024.
- [53] J. Zhou, J. Yi, Y. Ren, J. Tao, T. Wang, and C. Y. Zhang, "Wmcodec: End-to-end neural speech codec with deep watermarking for authenticity verification," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12121*, 2024.
- [54] E. Casanova, R. Langman, P. Neekhar, S. Hussain, J. Li, S. Ghosh, A. Jukić, and S.-g. Lee, "Low frame-rate speech codec: a codec designed for fast high-quality speech llm training and inference," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12117*, 2024.
- [55] Z. Niu, S. Chen, L. Zhou, Z. Ma, X. Chen, and S. Liu, "Ndvq: Robust neural audio codec with normal distribution-based vector quantization," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12717*, 2024.
- [56] X. Zhang, D. Zhang, S. Li, Y. Zhou, and X. Qiu, "Speectokenizer: Unified speech tokenizer for speech large language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.16692*, 2023.
- [57] R. Kumar, P. Seetharaman, A. Luebs, I. Kumar, and K. Kumar, "High-fidelity audio compression with improved rvqgan," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 36, 2024.
- [58] D. Yang, S. Liu, R. Huang, J. Tian, C. Weng, and Y. Zou, "Hifi-codec: Group-residual vector quantization for high fidelity audio codec," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.02765*, 2023.
- [59] A. Défossez, J. Copet, G. Synnaeve, and Y. Adi, "High fidelity neural audio compression," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.13438*, 2022.
- [60] H. Liu, X. Xu, Y. Yuan, M. Wu, W. Wang, and M. D. Plumbley, "Semanticodec: An ultra low bitrate semantic audio codec for general sound," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.00233*, 2024.
- [61] Z. Du, S. Zhang, K. Hu, and S. Zheng, "Funcodec: A fundamental, reproducible and integrable open-source toolkit for neural speech codec," in *ICASSP 2024-2024 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 591–595.
- [62] Z. Ju, Y. Wang, K. Shen, X. Tan, D. Xin, D. Yang, Y. Liu, Y. Leng, K. Song, S. Tang *et al.*, "Naturalspeech 3: Zero-shot speech synthesis with factorized codec and diffusion models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.03100*, 2024.
- [63] D. Yang, H. Guo, Y. Wang, R. Huang, X. Li, X. Tan, X. Wu, and H. Meng, "Uniaudio 1.5: Large language model-driven audio codec is a few-shot audio task learner," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.10056*, 2024.
- [64] S. Ji, Z. Jiang, X. Cheng, Y. Chen, M. Fang, J. Zuo, Q. Yang, R. Li, Z. Zhang, X. Yang *et al.*, "Wavtokenizer: an efficient acoustic discrete codec tokenizer for audio language modeling," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.16532*, 2024.
- [65] S. Ji, M. Fang, Z. Jiang, S. Zheng, Q. Chen, R. Huang, J. Zuo, S. Wang, and Z. Zhao, "Language-codec: Reducing the gaps between discrete codec representation and speech language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.12208*, 2024.
- [66] S. Ahn, B. J. Woo, M. H. Han, C. Moon, and N. S. Kim, "Hilcodec: High fidelity and lightweight neural audio codec," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.04752*, 2024.
- [67] H. Siuzdak, "Vocos: Closing the gap between time-domain and fourier-based neural vocoders for high-quality audio synthesis," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.00814*, 2023.
- [68] H. Guo, F. Xie, K. Xie, D. Yang, D. Guo, X. Wu, and H. Meng, "Sococodec: A semantic-ordered multi-stream speech codec for efficient language model based text-to-speech synthesis," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.00933*, 2024.
- [69] H. Siuzdak, F. Grötschla, and L. A. Lanzendörfer, "Snac: Multi-scale neural audio codec," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.14411*, 2024.
- [70] Z. Ye, P. Sun, J. Lei, H. Lin, X. Tan, Z. Dai, Q. Kong, J. Chen, J. Pan, Q. Liu *et al.*, "Codec does matter: Exploring the semantic shortcoming of codec for audio language model," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.17175*, 2024.
- [71] Y.-C. Wu, I. D. Gebru, D. Marković, and A. Richard, "Audiodec: An open-source streaming high-fidelity neural audio codec," in *ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1–5.
- [72] D. Xin, X. Tan, S. Takamichi, and H. Saruwatari, "Bigcodec: Pushing the limits of low-bitrate neural speech codec," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.05377*, 2024.
- [73] Y. Ren, T. Wang, J. Yi, L. Xu, J. Tao, C. Y. Zhang, and J. Zhou, "Fewer-token neural speech codec with time-invariant codecs," in *ICASSP 2024-2024 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 12737–12741.
- [74] A. Défossez, L. Mazaré, M. Orsini, A. Royer, P. Pérez, H. Jégou, E. Grave, and N. Zeghidour, "Moshi: a speech-text foundation model for real-time dialogue," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.00037*, 2024.
- [75] R. Langman, A. Jukić, K. Dhawan, N. R. Koluguri, and B. Ginsburg, "Spectral codecs: Spectrogram-based audio codecs for high quality speech synthesis," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.05298*, 2024.
- [76] H. Li, L. Xue, H. Guo, X. Zhu, Y. Lv, L. Xie, Y. Chen, H. Yin, and Z. Li, "Single-codec: Single-codebook speech codec towards high-performance speech generation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.07422*, 2024.
- [77] H. Wu, N. Kanda, S. E. Eskimez, and J. Li, "Ts3-codec: Transformer-based simple streaming single codec," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.18803*, 2024.
- [78] P. Mousavi, L. Della Libera, J. Duret, A. Ploujnikov, C. Subakan, and M. Ravanelli, "Dasb-discrete audio and speech benchmark," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.14294*, 2024.
- [79] J. Shi, J. Tian, Y. Wu, J.-w. Jung, J. Q. Yip, Y. Masuyama, W. Chen, Y. Wu, Y. Tang, M. Baali *et al.*, "Espnet-codec: Comprehensive training and evaluation of neural codecs for audio, music, and speech," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.15897*, 2024.
- [80] X. Liu, X. Wang, M. Sahidullah, J. Patino, H. Delgado, T. Kinnunen, M. Todisco, J. Yamagishi, N. Evans, A. Nautsch *et al.*, "Asvspoof 2021: Towards spoofed and deepfake speech detection in the wild," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.02437*, 2022.
- [81] 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.
- [82] 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," in *2024 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*, 2024, pp. 1–7.
- [83] X. Wang, H. Delgado, H. Tak, J.-w. Jung, H.-j. Shim, M. Todisco, I. Kukanov, X. Liu, M. Sahidullah, T. Kinnunen, N. Evans, K. A. Lee, and J. Yamagishi, "ASVspoof 5: Crowdsourced speech data, deepfakes, and adversarial attacks at scale," in *Proc. ASVspoof Workshop 2024 (accepted)*.
- [84] J. Du *et al.*, "Dfadd: The diffusion and flow-matching based audio deepfake dataset," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.08731*, 2024.
- [85] Y. Lu, Y. Xie, R. Fu, Z. Wen, J. Tao, Z. Wang, X. Qi, X. Liu, Y. Li, Y. Liu, X. Wang, and S. Shi, "Codecfake: An initial dataset for detecting llm-based deepfake audio," in *Interspeech 2024*, 2024, pp. 1390–1394.
- [86] J. Yamagishi, C. Veaux, K. MacDonald *et al.*, "Cstr vctk corpus: English multi-speaker corpus for cstr voice cloning toolkit (version 0.92)," *University of Edinburgh. The Centre for Speech Technology Research (CSTR)*, pp. 271–350, 2019.
- [87] W.-N. Hsu, B. Bolte, Y.-H. H. Tsai, K. Lakhota, R. Salakhutdinov, and A. Mohamed, "Hubert: Self-supervised speech representation learning by masked prediction of hidden units," *IEEE/ACM transactions on audio, speech, and language processing*, vol. 29, pp. 3451–3460, 2021.

- [88] K. Shen, Z. Ju, X. Tan, E. Liu, Y. Leng, L. He, T. Qin, sheng zhao, and J. Bian, "Naturalspeech 2: Latent diffusion models are natural and zero-shot speech and singing synthesizers," in *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Rc7dAwVL3v>
- [89] Y.-A. Chung, Y. Zhang, W. Han, C.-C. Chiu, J. Qin, R. Pang, and Y. Wu, "W2v-bert: Combining contrastive learning and masked language modeling for self-supervised speech pre-training," in *2021 IEEE Automatic Speech Recognition and Understanding Workshop (ASRU)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 244–250.
- [90] J. Yu, X. Li, J. Y. Koh, H. Zhang, R. Pang, J. Qin, A. Ku, Y. Xu, J. Baldrige, and Y. Wu, "Vector-quantized image modeling with improved VQGAN," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=pfNyExj7z2>
- [91] H. Touvron, L. Martin, K. Stone, P. Albert, A. Almahairi, Y. Babaei, N. Bashlykov, S. Batra, P. Bhargava, S. Bhosale *et al.*, "Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- [92] X. Zhang, L. Xue, Y. Gu, Y. Wang, J. Li, H. He, C. Wang, T. Song, X. Chen, Z. Fang, H. Chen, J. Zhang, T. Y. Tang, L. Zou, M. Wang, J. Han, K. Chen, H. Li, and Z. Wu, "Amphion: An open-source audio, music and speech generation toolkit," in *IEEE Spoken Language Technology Workshop, SLT 2024*, 2024.
- [93] T. Saeki, D. Xin, W. Nakata, T. Koriyama, S. Takamichi, and H. Saruwatari, "Utmos: Utokyo-sarulab system for voicemos challenge 2022," in *Interspeech 2022*, 2022, pp. 4521–4525.
- [94] H. Tak, M. Todisco, X. Wang, J.-w. Jung, J. Yamagishi, and N. Evans, "Automatic speaker verification spoofing and deepfake detection using wav2vec 2.0 and data augmentation," in *The Speaker and Language Recognition Workshop*, 2022.
- [95] H. Tak, M. Kamble, J. Patino, M. Todisco, and N. Evans, "Rawboost: A raw data boosting and augmentation method applied to automatic speaker verification anti-spoofing," in *ICASSP 2022-2022 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 6382–6386.
- [96] 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.