

# Deepfake Detection of Singing Voices With Whisper Encodings

Falguni Sharma

Centre for Artificial Intelligence

Banasthali Vidyapith

Jaipur, India

fsharma0207@gmail.com

Priyanka Gupta

Dept. of Communication and Computer Engineering

The LNM Institute of Information Technology

Jaipur, India

priyanka.gupta@lnmiit.ac.in

**Abstract**—The deepfake generation of singing vocals is a concerning issue for artists in the music industry. In this work, we propose a singing voice deepfake detection (SVDD) system, which uses noise-variant encodings of open-AI’s Whisper model. As counter-intuitive as it may sound, even though the Whisper model is known to be noise-robust, the encodings are rich in non-speech information, and are noise-variant. This leads us to evaluate Whisper encodings as feature representations for the SVDD task. Therefore, in this work, the SVDD task is performed on vocals and mixtures, and the performance is evaluated in %EER over varying Whisper model sizes and two classifiers—CNN and ResNet34, under different testing conditions.

**Index Terms**—Deepfake Detection, Singing voice deepfake detection, anti-spoofing, Whisper, Transfer Learning

## I. INTRODUCTION

The growing improvements in generative models have considerably enhanced automatic human voice generation, with nearly natural-parity performances. However, such an artificial audio data generation has paved the way for forgeries, popularly known as *deepfakes* [1], [2]. Particularly in the music industry, unauthorized deepfake copies that closely resemble well-known vocalists are a growing source of concern for musicians. These reproductions pose a direct threat to the commercial worth and intellectual property rights of the original artists. Some of the singing voice synthesis models such as VISinger [3], DiffSinger [4], MidiVoices [5], and SinTechSVS [6] have the capability to synthesize convincing levels of natural sounding vocals, thereby mimicking vocalists well. Therefore, the effective detection of deepfake-generated music calls for attention.

As opposed to speech spoof detection, singing voice deepfake detection (SVDD), presents a unique set of issues that are not observed in speech. For example, the pitch and duration of phonemes in a singing voice are significantly affected by the melody. Moreover, the wider range of timbre and voicing by artists in a musical context is not observed in speech. Additionally, extensive editing in singing voices is done to mix with musical instrumental accompaniments. These contrasts with speech pose the question of whether the countermeasures designed for speech can be directly applied to SVDD. In this context, research in Singing Voice Deepfake Detection (SVDD) has come up recently, with the proposition of the *Singfake* dataset [7]. This was followed by the SVDD 2024

challenge, having CtrSVDD and WildSVDD tracks, with its evaluation labels yet to be released. Recently, SingGraph has been proposed as a state-of-the-art model for singing voice deepfake detection, integrating music and linguistic analysis with domain-specific augmentation techniques. Our work proposes a different approach, focusing on non-invariant features without using data augmentation techniques, to address the challenges in this domain.

We propose an end-to-end model for SVDD which utilizes the encoder representations from the pre-trained Web-scale Supervised Pretraining for Speech Recognition (WSPR) model also referred to as *Whisper* [8]. Whisper is incredibly resilient to real-world background sounds, like music. However counter-intuitively, unlike the other Automatic Speech Recognition (ASR) systems, its audio representation is not noise-invariant [9]. Therefore, we use these noise-variant encodings from the encoder output of the Whisper model, for the SVDD task. In particular, this paper has the following contributions:

- End-to-end Whisper encoding-based SVDD system is proposed.
- Noise-variance in encodings is used as a discriminative cue to classify the bonafide and deepfake voices, in pure vocals, as well as in the case of mixtures.
- Performance evaluation is done on four variants (W(Tiny), W(Small), W(Base), and W(Medium)) of Whisper.
- Experiments on vocals and mixtures are also done to investigate the effect of instrumental accompaniments in the songs.
- Experimental analysis w.r.t. various testing conditions is done to observe the effect of seen/unseen singers, different communication codecs, languages, and musical contexts.

## II. PROPOSED WORK

### A. Whisper Encoder

Whisper is an extensively trained ASR model, with training done on 680K hours of data collected from the Internet with diverse environments and recording setups. It is based on encoder-decoder Transformer architecture, primarily given by [10] and it is trained on a substantial and varied supervised dataset and focuses on zero-shot transfer. In this work, we




Fig. 1. The proposed end-to-end SVDD system using Whisper Encoder with ResNet34

propose a SVDD system, which uses Whisper encodings along with ResNet34 in the pipeline, as shown in Figure 1.

The encoder of the Whisper model from which the encodings are extracted takes input audio, which is pre-processed to mel-spectrogram. The corresponding mel-spectrogram is processed through two 1-D convolutional layers to extract features. Additionally, sinusoidal positional embeddings are then added for temporal context. The variant of the Whisper models are with respect to the size of its encoder. In particular, tiny model incorporates 4 blocks, the base model uses 6, the small model employs 12, and the medium model utilizes 24 blocks and according to that it gives a vector output of fixed dimensions in its last hidden state. Each block consists of a multi-head self-attention mechanism,

$$\text{Attention}(Q, K, V) = \text{softmax}\left(\frac{QK^T}{\sqrt{d_k}}\right)V \quad (1)$$

where  $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times d_k}$ , keys  $K \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times d_k}$ , and values  $V \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times d_v}$ , where  $T$  is the sequence length, and  $d_k$  and  $d_v$  are the hidden dimensionality for queries/keys and values respectively. Following this is a position-wise fully connected feed-forward network. The output of each sub-layer is  $\text{LayerNorm}(x + \text{Sublayer}(x))$ , where  $\text{Sublayer}(x)$  is the function implemented by the sub-layer itself.

### B. Noise-Variant Encodings from Noise Robust Whisper

There have been various studies that focus on noise-invariant representations of ASR [11]–[13]. Researchers often specify noise invariance as an explicit inductive bias for robust ASR since it is widely accepted that a robust ASR model’s representation should be noise-invariant [11]–[14]. For Whisper however, a counter-intuitive finding is that Whisper’s audio representation is *not noise-invariant*; rather, it encodes rich information about non-speech background sounds. This indicates that the Whisper model encodes the type of noise and subsequently detects speech conditioned on it, instead of learning a noise-invariant representation [9]. Since the training data of Whisper is very large (680K hours), it consists of diverse settings of environments, languages, and speakers, and has noisy labels. This differentiates the Whisper model from the other ASR models. As opposed to learning a representation that is independent of noise, it *encodes* the background sound first and then transcribes text based on the type of noise [9].

We leverage Whisper’s *noise-conditioned* encodings to capture the noise introduced in deepfakes and use it as the

discriminative feature/cue to distinguish between bonafide and deepfake singing voices. In this work, the Singfake dataset has been used which is divided into two scenarios - vocals (containing only the singer’s voice), and mixtures (the singer’s voice is accompanied by background music). In context with this, Figure 2 shows the spectrographic comparison of bonafide vs. deepfake singing voices for both vocals and mixtures. In




Fig. 2. Bonafide vs. Deepfake Singing Voices

particular, as indicated by the regions marked in green circles in Figure 2, in the case of vocals, the end of a non-vocal region (silent region), has a gradual fading in bonafide utterance (Figure 2 (i)). However, in the deepfaked singing voice, a very distinct and sharp transition from the silence region to the singing region can be observed (Figure 2 (ii)). Furthermore, in the case of mixtures, the formants of the singer’s voice dissolve into the background instrument frequencies, as observed by the region marked in green in Figure 2 (iii). However, in the case of deepfaked mixture, the formants appear very distinct from the background instrumentals, as observed by the region marked in Figure 2 (iv).

## III. EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

### A. Dataset

For this study, the Singfake dataset [7] is used. It offers 28.93 hours of bonafide (real songs) and 29.40 hours of deepfake generated songs, with partitioning details as shown in Table I. Furthermore, the Singfake dataset has two subsets - vocals, and mixtures. The vocals subset consists of separated singing vocals from the background instrument accompaniments. For vocal separation, Demucs [15] was used, and each song was separated into 6 – 8 clips of an average of

TABLE I  
SINGFAKE DATA PARTITIONS

Partition	Description	Bonafide/Deepfake
Train	General Training Set	5251 / 4519
Validation	General Validation Set	1089 / 543
T01	Seen Singers, Unseen Songs	370 / 1208
T02	Unseen Singers, Unseen Songs	1685 / 1006
T03	T02 over 4 communication codecs	6740 / 4024
T04	Unseen Languages/musical Contexts	353 / 166

13.75 seconds duration, using Voice Activity Detection (VAD) from the Pyannote library [16], [17]. Furthermore, the mixture subset consists of songs with instrumental accompaniments. Similar to the vocals, the songs were clipped into segments based on the timestamps obtained by VAD. This resulted in the mixture clips similar to vocal clips with background accommodations.

### B. Classifier and Performance Metrics

Two classifiers are utilized in this study: Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) and ResNet34. The CNN architecture in this work consists of two convolutional layers, followed by two max-pooling layers and a fully connected layer. The kernel size is kept as 5 and the activation function used is ReLU. The ResNet34 model consists of 34 residual networks comprising a  $7 \times 7$  convolution layer, subsequently one max pooling layer and four stages of residual blocks with  $3 \times 3$  convolutional filters and identity shortcuts, and a final global average pooling and fully connected layer. Both the classifiers use the Adam optimizer with a learning rate of 0.001 and a batch size of 32. Furthermore, the Equal Error Rate (EER) is used as the performance metric.

### C. Baseline

We have considered Wav2vec2+AASIST as the baseline in this work [7]. It is the best-performing system on the Singfake dataset so far. It should be noted that in this baseline work [7], the RawBoost data augmentation module has been removed for fair comparisons between methods.

## IV. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

### A. Whisper Encodings vs. Standard Representations

This subsection shows the experimental results of the proposed Whisper-encodings-based-SVDD system, of varying sizes- tiny, base, small, and medium, denoted as W(Tiny), W(Base), W(Small) and W(Med.), respectively. To observe the effectiveness of the proposed method, additional experiments w.r.t. *non-Whisper* standard feature sets MFCC, and CQCC were performed. The experimental results corresponding to LFCC are taken from [7].

1) *Vocals*: Figure 3 and Figure 4 show the training, testing (average of the performances of all the 4 test cases), and validation performances on classifiers ResNet34 and CNN, respectively, for the case when only vocals from the dataset are considered. It can be observed that for *both* the classifiers, the proposed approach of extracting Whisper encodings significantly outperforms *all* the standard feature sets. In particular, with ResNet34 (as shown in Figure 3), encodings from the medium-sized Whisper model (denoted as W (Med.)) achieve an average EER of 4.86%.




Fig. 3. %EER for various splits on Singfake vocals across different representations, with ResNet34 as the classifier




Fig. 4. %EER for various splits on Singfake vocals across different representations, with CNN as the classifier

2) *Mixtures*: For the case of mixtures (i.e., singing voices that have background instrumental accompaniments), Figure 5 and Figure 6, show the comparative performances on the training, average testing, and validation sets, using classifiers ResNet34 and CNN, respectively. It can be observed that for




Fig. 5. %EER for various splits on Singfake mixtures across different representations, with ResNet34 as the classifier

mixtures as well, for *both* the classifiers, the encoding from the Whisper-medium model significantly outperforms *all* the




Fig. 6. %EER for various splits on Singfake mixtures across different representations, with CNN as the classifier

standard feature sets, with an average EER of 9.45%. It should also be noted that all the Whisper encoding-based systems *significantly outperform* the non-Whisper representation-based SVDD systems.

### B. Analysis on Testing Conditions

We now analyze our findings for different test cases (T01 to T04). Given that in the previous subsection IV-A, the ResNet34 classifier showed the best performance on both vocals and mixtures, we now consider ResNet34 at the classifier end for the rest of the experiments in this paper.

1) *Vocals*: Figure 7 shows the experimental results obtained on various testing conditions (T01 to T04) such as seen/unseen singers & languages, communication codecs, and musical contexts. It is observed that for *all* the systems, T01 is the easiest, and T04 is the hardest to detect. In particular, on the T01 case (seen singers, but unseen songs), the best performance of 1.09% EER is achieved by the proposed system based on W(Med.) with ResNet34 as the classifier.




Fig. 7. Testing Conditions Comparison on Vocals

2) *Mixtures*: It can be observed from Figure 8, that the performances on mixtures follow the same trend as for the case of vocals. Additionally, for all the values of the EERs for all the representations, the vocals are found to be easier to detect than deepfakes in the mixture. Overall, the proposed Whisper encodings-based system is observed to outperform *all* the remaining systems, with remarkable differences in EER values, for *both* vocals and mixtures. However, with unseen

language and musical style, T04 is the most difficult to detect, indicating the limitation of the models.




Fig. 8. Testing Conditions Comparison on Mixtures

### C. Comparison with Existing Systems

We compare the performance of our proposed model-Whisper(Med.) with ResNet34, against the best-performing model (Wave2vec2 + AASIST) on Singfake [7]. It is to be mentioned that the Singfake paper did not provide results for the validation dataset. The comparison of both the vocals and the mixture highlights that the Whisper(medium) based model consistently performed better across all training and testing conditions, especially in T04, with an absolute difference of 28.94% and 24.52, in vocals and mixtures, respectively.




Fig. 9. Comparison of the proposed system with the baseline

## V. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORKS

This work proposed noise-variant encodings from the Whisper model as representations to be used for SVDD. It was observed that the encodings from the Whisper (medium) model with ResNet34 classifier achieved the best performances throughout all the testing scenarios of the Singfake dataset. Our findings showed that amongst the *non-whisper* representations, LFCC showed the best performance.

However, our system's robustness under T04 conditions, which involve unseen languages, remains a limitation. Although our results surpass those of the baseline paper, there is room for improvement in handling such diverse linguistic conditions. In the future, the effectiveness of the proposed SVDD system can also be improved by incorporating data augmentation.

## REFERENCES

- [1] X. Wang, H. Delgado, H. Tak, J.-w. Jung, H.-j. Shim, M. Todisco, I. Kukanov, X. Liu, M. Sahidullah, T. Kinnunen *et al.*, “Asvspoof 5: Crowdsourced speech data, deepfakes, and adversarial attacks at scale,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.08739*, 2024.
- [2] P. Gupta, H. A. Patil, and R. C. Guido, “Vulnerability issues in automatic speaker verification (ASV) systems,” *EURASIP Journal on Audio, Speech, and Music Processing*, vol. 2024, no. 1, p. 10, 2024.
- [3] Y. Zhang, J. Cong, H. Xue, L. Xie, P. Zhu, and M. Bi, “Visinger: Variational inference with adversarial learning for end-to-end singing voice synthesis,” in *ICASSP 2022-2022 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 7237–7241.
- [4] J. Liu, C. Li, Y. Ren, F. Chen, and Z. Zhao, “Diffsinger: Singing voice synthesis via shallow diffusion mechanism,” in *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, vol. 36, no. 10, 2022, pp. 11 020–11 028.
- [5] D.-M. Byun, S.-H. Lee, J.-S. Hwang, and S.-W. Lee, “Midi-voice: Expressive zero-shot singing voice synthesis via midi-driven priors,” in *ICASSP 2024-2024 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 12 622–12 626.
- [6] J. Zhao, L. Q. H. Chetwin, and Y. Wang, “Sintechsvs: A singing technique controllable singing voice synthesis system,” *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, 2024.
- [7] Y. Zang, Y. Zhang, M. Heydari, and Z. Duan, “Singfake: Singing voice deepfake detection,” 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.07525>
- [8] A. Radford, J. W. Kim, T. Xu, G. Brockman, C. McLeavey, and I. Sutskever, “Robust speech recognition via large-scale weak supervision,” in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 28 492–28 518.
- [9] Y. Gong, S. Khurana, L. Karlinsky, and J. Glass, “Whisper-AT: Noise-robust automatic speech recognizers are also strong general audio event taggers,” in *INTERSPEECH*, 2023, pp. 2798–2802.
- [10] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, L. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin, “Attention is all you need,” 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1706.03762>
- [11] D. Serdyuk, K. Audhkhasi, P. Brakel, B. Ramabhadran, S. Thomas, and Y. Bengio, “Invariant representations for noisy speech recognition,” *NIPS End-to-end Learning for Speech and Audio Processing Workshop*, 2016.
- [12] D. Liang, Z. Huang, and Z. C. Lipton, “Learning noise-invariant representations for robust speech recognition,” in *2018 IEEE Spoken Language Technology Workshop (SLT)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 56–63.
- [13] Q.-S. Zhu, J. Zhang, Z.-Q. Zhang, M.-H. Wu, X. Fang, and L.-R. Dai, “A noise-robust self-supervised pre-training model based speech representation learning for automatic speech recognition,” in *ICASSP 2022-2022 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 3174–3178.
- [14] M. Van Segbroeck *et al.*, “Unsupervised learning of time–frequency patches as a noise-robust representation of speech,” *Speech Communication*, vol. 51, no. 11, pp. 1124–1138, 2009.
- [15] A. Défossez, N. Usunier, L. Bottou, and F. Bach, “Demucs: Deep extractor for music sources with extra unlabeled data remixed,” 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1909.01174>
- [16] Y. Xiong, V. Berisha, and C. Chakrabarti, “Computationally-efficient voice activity detection based on deep neural networks,” in *2021 IEEE Workshop on Signal Processing Systems (SiPS)*, 2021, pp. 64–69.
- [17] H. Bredin, R. Yin, J. M. Coria, G. Gelly, P. Korshunov, M. Lavechin, D. Fustes, H. Titeux, W. Bouaziz, and M.-P. Gill, “Pyannote. audio: neural building blocks for speaker diarization,” in *ICASSP 2020-2020 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 7124–7128.