

A Practical Synthesis of Detecting AI-Generated Textual, Visual, and Audio Content

Lele Cao

Abstract—Advances in AI-generated content have led to wide adoption of large language models, diffusion-based visual generators, and synthetic audio tools. However, these developments raise critical concerns about misinformation, copyright infringement, security threats, and the erosion of public trust. In this paper, we explore an extensive range of methods designed to detect and mitigate AI-generated textual, visual, and audio content. We begin by discussing motivations and potential impacts associated with AI-based content generation, including real-world risks and ethical dilemmas. We then outline detection techniques spanning observation-based strategies, linguistic and statistical analysis, model-based pipelines, watermarking and fingerprinting, as well as emergent ensemble approaches. We also present new perspectives on robustness, adaptation to rapidly improving generative architectures, and the critical role of human-in-the-loop verification. By surveying state-of-the-art research and highlighting case studies in academic, journalistic, legal, and industrial contexts, this paper aims to inform robust solutions and policymaking. We conclude by discussing open challenges, including adversarial transformations, domain generalization, and ethical concerns, thereby offering a holistic guide for researchers, practitioners, and regulators to preserve content authenticity in the face of increasingly sophisticated AI-generated media.

I. INTRODUCTION

Generative AI technologies have drastically changed how digital content is created, consumed, and transmitted worldwide [1], [2]. Large language models (LLMs) now consistently produce text that emulates human writing style [3], [4], diffusion and GAN (Generative Adversarial Networks) based frameworks yield photorealistic images and videos [5], [6], and advanced text-to-speech (TTS) systems synthesize voices that rival real speakers [7], [8]. While these breakthroughs offer profound benefits to creative industries, data augmentation, and accessibility solutions, they also open the floodgates for significant societal challenges.

Unlike previous surveys that have largely focused on single modalities or isolated detection strategies, our work uniquely integrates detection approaches across textual, visual, and audio domains. We provide a comprehensive analysis of state-of-the-art techniques while also highlighting emerging trends such as watermarking, self-supervised learning, generative model fingerprinting, and human-in-the-loop verification. This holistic perspective, reinforced by practical case studies, differentiates our survey and underscores its relevance for both research and industrial applications.

Maliciously generated or manipulated content can propagate disinformation, orchestrate social engineering attacks,

breach security protocols, undermine academic integrity, and violate intellectual property rights [9], [10]. From deceptively plausible news articles to convincing audio recordings impersonating public figures, adversaries increasingly create forgeries that elude basic detection.

Under increasing global concerns, the quest for robust detection of AI-generated textual, visual and audio content has intensified [3], [11]. Governments, academic institutions, technology platforms, and industries alike seek solutions to discern authentic content from synthetic. Addressing this need has led to the proliferation of detection strategies, ranging from visual artifact analysis to linguistic fingerprinting, watermark verification, and classification approaches.

The paper is organized as follows. Section II outlines the conceptual foundations of AI-generated content, including key generation approaches and threat models. Section III focuses on text-based detection strategies, from prompting-based classification to watermarking-based schemes. Section IV covers visual detection methods for AI-generated images and videos, emphasizing artifact analysis, watermarking, and advanced video forensics. Section V addresses synthetic audio detection, highlighting speech deepfake risks and music plagiarism. Section VI provides real-world case studies in academia, journalism, and creative industries. Section VII surveys cross-modal insights, challenges, and future directions, including emerging self-supervised and generative model fingerprinting techniques. Finally, we conclude by underscoring the need for a multi-stakeholder and adaptive approach to preserve digital authenticity in the rapidly evolving generative AI landscape.

II. BACKGROUND ON AI-GENERATED CONTENT

To contextualize the approaches for detection, we provide a brief overview of the primary mechanisms behind AI-generated content and typical threat models.

A. Generative Modeling Paradigms

Three major paradigms underlie most modern AI-based content generation:

- Autoregressive models: Exemplified by GPT-type architectures, these models predict tokens sequentially to generate coherent text, code snippets, lyrics, or even image patches (by ViT - Vision Transformer) [4], [12]. Because large parameter counts are typically needed for strong performance, they are often referred to as LLMs in NLP (natural language processing) domain.

- GANs: Operate on the principle of a generator and discriminator in competition, widely used for producing images, style transfer, and deepfake videos [6].
- Diffusion models: Gradually denoise random noise into highly realistic images or audio. Known for generating crisp visuals (e.g., Stable Diffusion [5] and DALL-E¹) and increasingly refined speech and music [13].

These architectures have been refined to handle specialized tasks: style-based face generation, voice cloning, text-to-music composition, etc. They can also be composited, e.g., LLM-driven prompts controlling diffusion image generation, to produce multi-modal AI outputs.

B. Threat Models and Malicious Use Cases

Disinformation campaigns involve automated text production at scale, which can flood social media with politically motivated messages, conspiracy theories, or phony press releases, effectively shaping public opinion [2], [10]. **Identity theft and fraud** can be facilitated by synthetic voice or video mimicking a corporate executive or family member, enabling financial scams, social engineering, or blackmail [7], [14]. **Academic dishonesty** arises when students or researchers generate entire essays, lab reports, or dissertations using LLMs [9], undermining educational integrity. **Plagiarism and copyright infringement** may occur as AI composition tools create music or artwork that partially copies existing works or inadvertently violates intellectual property, posing a serious challenge [15], [16]. **Manipulation in e-commerce or branding** is also a concern, as product images or videos might be faked to damage a competitor’s brand or mislead customers about product quality [17].

The overall challenge is that as AI-based generation quality improves, naive or conventional authenticity checks fail. In response, a vibrant research ecosystem focuses on robust detection measures, as discussed next.

III. DETECTING AI-GENERATED TEXT

A. Key Motivations and Constraints in Textual Detection

The written word remains a cornerstone of communication in academia, journalism, business, and everyday conversations. LLM-generated content can be harnessed productively, but the ease of generating vast, coherent text also creates new vulnerabilities, including misinformation spread, spam, impersonation, and academic plagiarism [1], [3].

Several major constraints hinder effective textual detection. **Language diversity** poses a significant challenge, as tools must function across different languages, dialects, and text domains (technical, legal, creative). **Model evolution** further complicates detection – systems trained on older text generators such as GPT-2 [18] often underperform when confronted with more advanced models like GPT-4 [19] or Bard [20]. Additionally, **paraphrasing attacks** exploit simple rephrasings to mask many stylistic signals of machine-generated text [21].

¹<https://openai.com/index/dall-e-3>

B. Approaches

1) *LLM prompting and zero-shot methods*: One popular approach leverages an external LLM to classify whether a piece of text is AI-generated or not [12]. With carefully crafted prompts, these zero-shot methods can achieve moderate accuracy quickly. However, sensitivity to prompt design and the adversarial gap between the LLM detector and the text generator are common issues [22].

2) *Linguistic and statistical signatures*: Traditional stylistometric features (e.g., function words, syntax complexity, average phrase length) have long been used in authorship attribution [23], [24]. More modern detection focuses on computing perplexity or log-likelihood using reference language models, observing that LLM-generated text tends to show distinctive probability distributions. Additionally, specialized white-box methods can measure rank ordering of tokens if the generating model is partially known [25].

3) *Supervised classification (training-based)*: Labeled corpora of AI versus human text enable fine-tuning of large pre-trained transformers like RoBERTa or T5 to discriminate synthetic text [26], [27]. Researchers improve robustness with adversarial training sets that contain paraphrased or AI-generated passages shifted in style. Tools like GPTZero [28] and RADAR [29] exemplify advanced supervised detectors. However, assembling high-quality, representative training data remains a challenge, especially as new generator architectures emerge frequently.

4) *Watermarking for AI text*: Cooperative watermarking modifies text generation at token selection time, embedding an imperceptible pattern in the distribution of words or punctuation [30], [31]. A verifier can detect such patterns after the fact. While promising for major industrial LLMs that adopt the standard, watermarking fails if malicious or open-source models do not embed it, or if paraphrasing disrupts the signal [32], [33].

5) *Ensemble and multi-feature systems*: To mitigate single-method vulnerabilities, some frameworks combine perplexity-based signals, style analysis, embedding-based classification, and watermark checks [34], [35]. By fusing different perspectives, these ensembles often achieve higher accuracy. The trade-off is system complexity and the need for sufficiently large training resources.

IV. DETECTING AI-GENERATED VISUAL CONTENT

A. Motivations and Real-World Impact

AI-generated images and videos, often created via GANs or diffusion models, enable powerful visual illusions [6], [17]. Notable concerns include **political misinformation**, where fabricated news images depict fictional events; **financial fraud**, involving misleading product visuals or manipulation of stock markets; **harassment and defamation**, as seen in deepfake pornography or face swaps designed to humiliate victims; and **intellectual property theft**, such as art or design forgery that undermines artists’ livelihoods.

B. Detection Methodologies

1) *Observation and manual inspection*: Human experts can sometimes detect unnatural artifacts in lighting, shadows, perspective, or anatomical features [36]. Context-based checks (e.g., unrealistic historical detail) also help. However, manual inspection is subjective, time-consuming, and not scalable for large volumes of online images.

2) *Model-based artifact analysis*: Algorithms analyze pixel-level statistics or frequency-domain features. For instance, Fourier transform reveals periodic textures characteristic of upsampling procedures in GANs or consistent small-scale noise from diffusion [37], [38]. White-box strategies exploit knowledge of the generator’s pipeline (e.g., measuring the likelihood under the reverse diffusion process).

3) *Black-box deep learning classifiers*: With large amount of labeled real/fake data, CNN (convolutional neural network) based classifiers (ResNet, EfficientNet) learn discriminative cues [39]. Ensemble approaches combine multiple model outputs or domain-specific sub-networks (e.g., focusing on faces vs. backgrounds) to bolster accuracy.

4) *Watermarking for visual media*: When the generative pipeline is compliant, watermarks are embedded. These vary from invisible spatial pixel encodings to frequency manipulations [30], [40]. However, simple image transformations, such as crop or rotation, can weaken naive watermarks [32], [41] unless specifically designed for robustness.

5) *Video deepfake detection*: Beyond static artifacts in frames, deepfake videos exhibit temporal inconsistencies in facial expressions, motion, or geometry [42]–[44]. Optical flow analysis or 3D geometry can spot unnatural transitions [45], [46]. Some methods track facial micro-expressions (e.g., eye blinking [47]), aligning them with known patterns of real human physiology.

C. Datasets and Benchmarks

Well-known datasets include CelebA-HQ [48] for facial images and LAION [49] for broad image domains. Large-scale synthetic benchmarks like StyleGAN or Stable Diffusion outputs help train classifiers [17]. For video, FaceForensics++ [50], DFDC [51], and Celeb-DF are commonly used [44]. However, frequent advancement of the generative model requires continuous expansion of the detection dataset.

D. Limitations and Outlook

Compression sensitivity is a major challenge, as down-sampling, scaling, or re-encoding can obscure forensic traces [38], [52]. **Generalization to new architectures** remains difficult since tools often lag behind novel generator types, such as next-generation diffusion or hybrid models. **Ethical implications** also complicate detection efforts: large-scale scanning of user images for potential deepfakes raises privacy concerns, while overly aggressive detection can flag benign content as suspicious, ultimately hurting user trust.

V. DETECTING AI-GENERATED AUDIO CONTENT

A. Risks and Use Cases

Synthetic audio has rapidly evolved thanks to neural TTS, voice conversion (VC), and audio diffusion. High-fidelity

speech generation from minimal samples can facilitate voice impersonation [7], [14] or mislead detection systems in telephony security. Meanwhile, AI-composed music raises legal problems on originality, licensing, and plagiarism [13].

Use cases of audio detection span several domains. **Voice deepfake forensics** is essential in contexts such as law enforcement, banking, or enterprise authentication systems, where verifying speaker identity is critical [53], [54]. **Music authenticity** matters for streaming services or record labels that aim to detect GenAI music to safeguard artists’ rights [16]. **Real-time moderation** is crucial for conference platforms that filter suspicious speech to prevent social engineering attacks.

B. Detection Techniques

1) *Pipeline classifiers*: Features such as Mel frequency cepstral coefficients (MFCC), Linear frequency cepstral coefficients (LFCC) spectrogram-based descriptors are extracted and then fed into machine learning models (SVM, XGBoost, or CNN) [8], [14]. They typically rely on analyzing subtle cues in pitch, timbre, and vocal fold dynamics.

2) *End-to-end neural approaches*: Powerful audio deepfake detectors ingest raw waveforms or full spectrograms using deep architectures like SincNet, Wav2Vec2.0 [55], or CRNN [56], [57]. These systems can learn complex patterns indicative of synthetic audio, such as unnatural transitions or missing microprosody. However, performance can degrade with domain shifts (e.g., new TTS pipelines, different languages) or background noise.

3) *Music detection specifics*: Music detection often analyzes melodic structure, chord progressions, or repetitive patterns [13], [58]. Large neural networks trained on real vs. AI-generated music can spot overly mechanical or simplistic progressions [15], [59].

4) *Audio watermarking*: Similar to the textual and visual domain, watermarking can be inserted into the synthetic audio during generation, using imperceptible frequency modulations or phase shifts [40], [60]. The watermark reveals the audio’s origin; however, many transformation (tempo shift, reverb, denoising) can weaken naive watermarking signals.

C. Robustness and Challenges

Generalization across accents and languages is a key challenge, as a universal voice deepfake detector must handle wide linguistic and accent diversity [61]. Another major constraint is **time constraints and real-time detection**, since fraud scenarios may require near-instant detection in phone calls or chat streams, while many advanced models remain too slow for real-time deployment. Furthermore, **music complexity** adds another layer of difficulty—music contains higher dimensionality involving harmonies, instrumentation, and lyrics, which demands specialized features and large labeled datasets [16].

VI. CASE STUDIES IN PRACTICE

To illustrate how detection strategies apply in different domains, we highlight several real-world contexts where AI-generated content is already a pressing concern.

A. Academic Integrity and Higher Education

Universities face surging usage of LLM tools for assignments and research papers. In many cases, naive plagiarism checks fail to detect newly generated text. Some institutions adopt specialized systems (e.g., GPTZero², Turnitin’s AI detection³) that combine perplexity measures, stylometric analysis, and partial reference matching [3], [9]. However, concerns about privacy (scanning entire student submissions) and false positives remain. Many universities are establishing policies requiring students to label or disclaim AI assistance.

B. Newsrooms and Journalistic Fact-Checking

Misinformation campaigns are increasingly complex due to auto-generated text, manipulated images (e.g., fabricated protest scenes), and deepfake videos of political leaders. Journalists use hybrid detection pipelines: a first-level automated classifier flags suspicious content, which is then reviewed by human fact-checkers [10]. They also rely on watermark or metadata checks if major AI model providers tag their outputs. Major media platforms and social networks have begun integrating these systems into their content moderation workflows, combining automated screening with expert review to minimize false positives.

C. Law Enforcement and Legal Proceedings

Synthetic audio or video can compromise evidence authenticity. Forensic experts apply advanced image, audio forensics, and motion analysis tools to verify recordings [44], [54]. They may also cross-reference biometric cues, such as lip movement, voice biometrics, or EKG-like signals from speech waveforms. Courts increasingly grapple with how to interpret detection tool outputs, calling for transparent and explainable detection methods.

D. Creative Industries and Content Platforms

Content creators worry about plagiarism from AI tools that replicate their style or incorporate copyrighted material [15]. Music streaming platforms experiment with classifier-based scanning of newly uploaded tracks for suspicious patterns. Some are exploring watermark enforcement with partial success [60]. Visual artists are also advocating for improved detection of unauthorized use of their work, prompting platforms to implement hybrid approaches that combine automated and manual review processes.

For researchers interested in experimental validation and reproducibility, numerous open-source frameworks and benchmark leaderboards (e.g., DFDC, FaceForensics++, Audio Deepfake datasets) are available. We reference these resources to facilitate further exploration of state-of-the-art methods, and encourage readers to consult [62] for a more practical and comprehensive guide.

²<https://gptzero.me>

³<https://www.turnitin.com>

VII. CROSS-MODAL INSIGHTS, CHALLENGES, AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

A. Unified Themes Across Modalities

Despite modality differences, several consistent themes arise. (1) *Arms race with generators*: As generative models advance, older detection strategies degrade, requiring frequent retraining or adaptation [4], [63]. (2) *Vulnerability to perturbations*: Slight paraphrasing in text, minor image edits (e.g., crop and color shift), or audio pitch/time adjustments can bypass naive methods [21], [38]. (3) *Watermarking as partial solution*: Watermarking is useful if widely adopted by model providers, but it’s easily circumvented by uncooperative or malicious providers [33]. (4) *Ensemble or multimodal methods*: Combining multiple cues (statistical, watermark, contextual) and bridging text–image–audio modalities yields more robust detection [34], [35]. (5) *Ethical pitfalls*: Systemic large-scale scanning can infringe on user privacy, and erroneous misclassifications can harm reputations.

B. Emerging Approaches: Self-Supervised Learning and Generative Model Fingerprinting

Recent research has begun exploring self-supervised learning techniques to enhance detection robustness. Approaches leveraging pretext tasks (e.g., contrastive learning) enable detectors to learn robust feature representations from unlabeled data, capturing subtle discrepancies in AI-generated content. Similarly, generative model fingerprinting techniques aim to extract unique signatures inherent to specific generator architectures or training pipelines. These methods hold promise for improved performance, particularly in cross-domain and evolving generative scenarios.

C. Open Problems and Research Gaps

1) *Adversarially robustness*: Most detection tools remain sensitive to small input perturbations or domain shifts. Research on adversarial training or specialized defenses in text or multimedia deepfake detection is nascent [29], [38].

2) *Domain generalization*: Detectors generally excel on known generator architectures or stable distributions. But in real deployment, content can come from newly released models. Future solutions may rely on generative model fingerprinting or dynamic unsupervised adaptation [64].

3) *Explainability and calibration*: High-stakes contexts (legal, academic) demand interpretable detection. Visualizing suspicious words, image regions, or spectral frames fosters trust. Score calibration ensures confidence estimates are meaningful, limiting false accusations.

4) *Lack of diversity in benchmark datasets*: For text, English is overrepresented; for images, faces dominate available data. Audio datasets often focus on one or two languages. This scarcity undermines generalization to real global use cases [3], [8].

5) *Regulatory and policy dimensions*: Debates abound regarding mandated watermarking or content labeling, standardizing detection APIs, or clarifying liability for generative misuse. Government bodies and industry coalitions may adopt guidelines influencing detection approach design.

D. Future Directions

Future research in AI content detection is exploring several promising directions. (1) *Retrieval-augmented schemes*: Pairing a suspicious sample (text, image, audio) with a large database of known AI or human samples can reveal nearest neighbors, significantly enhancing detection of paraphrased or style-shifted outputs [21], [64]. (2) *Cross-modal verification*: Advanced generative systems produce text, images, and audio in tandem (e.g., a news article plus a purported video). Checking cross-modal consistency (lip sync, textual references to images, etc.) can reveal mismatches [54]. (3) *Human-in-the-loop collaboration*: No fully automated solution is perfect. Incorporating expert or crowd-sourced human checks for borderline cases, along with user feedback loops, is likely essential in high-consequence scenarios (e.g., journalism, law enforcement) [47]. (4) *Private and federated learning approaches*: As privacy restrictions tighten, training robust detectors on distributed user data may rely on federated or privacy-preserving methods that do not require centralizing sensitive content [10]. (5) *Neurosymbolic and knowledge-enhanced detection*: Fusing symbolic reasoning or domain knowledge with deep neural detection may help catch subtle anomalies overlooked by purely data-driven methods. This might be particularly relevant for domain-specific content such as medical, legal, or scientific articles.

VIII. CONCLUSION AND BROADER REFLECTIONS

As AI generation systems become more sophisticated and widespread, detection is a critical fortress to uphold authenticity, trust, and accountability in the digital ecosystem. This paper has surveyed leading techniques for distinguishing AI-generated text, images, video, voice, and music, with attention to the motivations, current approaches, challenges, and ethical underpinnings across each domain. Our investigation underscores the following overarching lessons:

- No silver bullet: Each detection category, text, visual, or audio, relies on complementary signals (statistical, watermark-based, manual observation), yet none are foolproof against adaptive adversaries.
- Continual adaptation: Generative models evolve quickly. Detectors must be regularly updated, often requiring new training data from newly released generation architectures.
- Watermarking potential and pitfalls: Watermarks show promise if major platforms adopt them systematically, but they are easily circumvented by malicious or open-source models.
- Contextual and human-AI collaboration: Real-world detection extends beyond pure algorithmic classification. Human oversight, context checks, retrieval-based cross-referencing, and specialized domain knowledge remain pivotal, especially in high-stakes use cases.
- Ethical complexity: Overly invasive or inaccurate detection can harm user privacy and trust, while under-detection fuels misinformation and fraud. Balancing these risks requires responsible governance.

Looking forward, deeper integration across modalities, advanced retrieval-based or self-supervised approaches, improved adversarial robustness, and generative model fingerprinting will define the next generation of AI-content detectors. Collaboration among academia, industry, policymakers,

and civil society is paramount to develop globally recognized standards and frameworks ensuring that generative AI can flourish as a positive force, while preserving integrity and truthfulness in digital media.

For further learning, we suggest to explore open-source tools, benchmark datasets, and books like [62] to accelerate progress in this fast-moving field.

REFERENCES

- [1] Chaka Chaka, "Reviewing the performance of ai detection tools in differentiating between ai-generated and human-written texts: A literature and integrative hybrid review," *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, vol. 7, no. 1, 2024.
- [2] Lili Li, Pengcheng Wang, Kai Ren, Tianxiang Sun, and Xipeng Qiu, "Origin tracing and detecting of llms," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.14072*, 2023.
- [3] J. Wu, S. Yang, R. Zhan, Y. Yuan, D. F. Wong, and L. S. Chao, "A survey on llm-generated text detection: Necessity, methods, and future directions," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.14724*, 2024.
- [4] Ruochen Tang, Yun-Nung Chuang, and X. Hu, "The science of detecting llm-generated text," *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 67, no. 4, pp. 50–59, 2024.
- [5] Jonathan Ho, Ajay Jain, and Pieter Abbeel, "Denosing diffusion probabilistic models," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 6840–6851, 2020.
- [6] Ali Borji, "Qualitative failures of image generation models and their application in detecting deepfakes," *Image and Vision Computing*, vol. 136, pp. 104771, 2023.
- [7] Xin Wang, Junichi Yamagishi, Massimiliano Todisco, Héctor Delgado, Andreas Nautsch, Nicholas Evans, Md Sahidullah, Ville Vestman, Tomi Kinnunen, Kong-Aik Lee, et al., "ASVspoof 2019: A large-scale public database of synthesized, converted and replayed speech," in *Computer Speech & Language*. Elsevier, 2020, vol. 64, p. 101114.
- [8] Min Li, Yasser Ahmadiadi, and X.-P. Zhang, "Audio anti-spoofing detection: A survey," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.13914*, 2024.
- [9] Dmytro Valiaiev, "Detection of machine-generated text: Literature survey," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01642*, 2024.
- [10] Evan N Crothers, Nathalie Japkowicz, and Herna L Viktor, "Machine-generated text: A comprehensive survey of threat models and detection methods," *IEEE Access*, vol. 11, pp. 70977–71002, 2023.
- [11] X. Yang, L. Pan, X. Zhao, H. Chen, L. Petzold, W. Y. Wang, and W. Cheng, "A survey on detection of llms-generated content," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.15654*, 2023.
- [12] Abhradeep Bhattacharjee and Huan Liu, "Fighting fire with fire: Can chatgpt detect ai-generated text?," *ACM SIGKDD Explorations Newsletter*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 14–21, 2024.
- [13] Y. Li, M. Milling, L. Specia, and B. W. Schuller, "to ai-generated music detection: A pathway and overview," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.00571*, 2024.
- [14] Jiahao Yi, Chao Wang, Jun Tao, Xueyan Zhang, ChengYu Zhang, and Yuxuan Zhao, "Audio deepfake detection: A survey," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.14970*, 2023.
- [15] Y. Li, Q. Sun, H. Li, L. Specia, and B. W. Schuller, "Detecting machine-generated music with explainability: A challenge and early benchmarks," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.13421*, 2024.
- [16] Y. Li, H. Li, L. Specia, and B. W. Schuller, "M6: Multi-generator, multi-domain, multi-lingual and cultural, multi-genres, multi-instrument machine-generated music detection databases," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.06001*, 2024.
- [17] Lei Lin, Niyati Gupta, Y. Zhang, H. Ren, C. H. Liu, F. Ding, X. Wang, X. Li, L. Verdoliva, and S. Hu, "Detecting multimedia generated by large AI models: A survey," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.00045*, 2024.
- [18] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al., "Language models are unsupervised multitask learners," *OpenAI blog*, vol. 1, no. 8, pp. 9, 2019.
- [19] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al., "Gpt-4 technical report," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.

- [20] Erik P Nyberg, Ann E Nicholson, Kevin B Korb, Michael Wybrow, Ingrid Zukerman, Steven Mascaró, Shreshth Thakur, Abraham Oshni Alvandi, Jeff Riley, Ross Pearson, et al., “Bard: A structured technique for group elicitation of bayesian networks to support analytic reasoning,” *Risk Analysis*, vol. 42, no. 6, pp. 1155–1178, 2022.
- [21] Kalpesh Krishna, Y. Song, Magdalena Karpinska, John Wieting, and Mohit Iyyer, “Paraphrasing evades detectors of ai-generated text, but retrieval is an effective defense,” in *NeurIPS*, 2024.
- [22] K. Taguchi, Yu. Gu, and Kouichi Sakurai, “The impact of prompts on zero-shot detection of ai-generated text,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.20127*, 2024.
- [23] Eric Mitchell, Yoonho Lee, Andrey Khazatsky, Chris Manning, and Chelsea Finn, “DetectGPT: Zero-shot machine-generated text detection using probability curvature,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2023, pp. 24950–24962.
- [24] Andrew Hans, Avi Schwarzschild, Valeriia Cherepanova, Hossein Kazemi, et al., “Spotting llms with binoculars: zero-shot detection of machine-generated text,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2024.
- [25] Jiayi Su, Taotao Zhuo, Diyi Wang, and Preslav Nakov, “DetectLLM: Leveraging log rank information for zero-shot detection of machine-generated text,” *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP*, pp. 12395–12412, 2023.
- [26] Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov, “RoBERTa: A robustly optimized BERT pretraining approach,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*, 2019.
- [27] Yangyang Chen, Hongchang Kang, Vicky Zhai, Lele Li, Rishabh Singh, and Bhiksha Raj, “GPT-sentinel: Distinguishing human and chatgpt generated content,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.07969*, 2023.
- [28] Yuxin Tian, Hongru Chen, Xinting Wang, et al., “Multiscale positive-unlabeled detection of ai-generated texts,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2024.
- [29] X. Hu, Pin-Yu Chen, and T. Y. Ho, “RADAR: Robust ai-text detection via adversarial learning,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023, pp. 15077–15095.
- [30] Jacob Kirchenbauer, Jonas Geiping, Yuxin Wen, Jonathan Katz, Ian Miers, and Tom Goldstein, “A watermark for large language models,” *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pp. 17061–17084, 2023.
- [31] V. S. Sadasivan, A. Kumar, S. Balasubramanian, W. Wang, and S. Feizi, “Can AI-generated text be reliably detected?,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.11156*, 2023.
- [32] Ailing Hou, Jiawei Zhang, T. He, Y. Wang, Y. S. Chuang, H. Wang, and Y. Tsvetkov, “SemStamp: A semantic watermark with paraphrastic robustness for text generation,” *Proceedings of NAACL*, 2023.
- [33] R. Kuditipudi, J. Thickstun, T. Hashimoto, and P. Liang, “Robust distortion-free watermarks for language models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.15593*, 2023.
- [34] Ivan Ong and Boon Kiat Quek, “Applying ensemble methods to model-agnostic machine-generated text detection,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.12570*, 2023.
- [35] Z. Zeng, S. Liu, L. Sha, Z. Li, K. Yang, S. Liu, and G. Chen, “Detecting ai-generated sentences in realistic human-ai collaborative hybrid texts: Challenges, strategies, and insights,” in *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.03506*, 2024.
- [36] Negar Kamali, Koji Nakamura, Angelos Chatzimparmpas, Jessica Hullman, and Michael Groh, “How to distinguish ai-generated images from authentic photographs,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.08651*, 2024.
- [37] S. Mavali, J. Ricker, D. Pape, Y. Sharma, A. Fischer, and L. Schönherr, “Fake it until you break it: on the adversarial robustness of ai-generated image detectors,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.01574*, 2024.
- [38] Mohammad Saberi, Vivek Sadasivan, Kourosh Rezaei, Animesh Kumar, Amin Chegini, Wenchao Wang, and Soheil Feizi, “Robustness of ai-image detectors: fundamental limits and practical attacks,” *ICLR*, 2024.
- [39] R. A. F. Saskoro, N. Yudistira, and T. N. Fatyanosa, “Detection of ai-generated images from various generators using gated expert convolutional neural network,” *IEEE Access*, 2024.
- [40] Aohan Liu, Linqing Pan, Xinyang Hu, Shukai Meng, and Liang Wen, “A semantic invariant robust watermark for large language models,” *ICLR*, 2024.
- [41] S. Sharma, J. J. Zou, G. Fang, P. Shukla, and W. Cai, “A review of image watermarking for identity protection and verification,” *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, vol. 83, no. 11, pp. 31829–31891, 2024.
- [42] Cheng Chang, Zihan Liu, Xiaoming Lyu, and Xin Qi, “What matters in detecting ai-generated videos like sora?,” in *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.19568*, 2024.
- [43] Dariush Seifabad Vahdati, Tien Dat Nguyen, Hossein Azizpour, and Matthew C. Stamm, “Beyond deepfake images: detecting ai-generated videos,” in *CVPR*, 2024.
- [44] A. K. Tiwari, A. Sharma, P. Rayakar, and M. K. Bhavriya, “AI-generated video forgery detection and authentication,” in *IEEE I2CT*, 2024, pp. 1–8.
- [45] T. D. Nguyen, S. Fang, and M. C. Stamm, “Videofact: Detecting video forgeries using attention, scene context, and forensic traces,” in *WACV*, 2024, pp. 8563–8573.
- [46] Jianwei Bai, Ming Lin, Gang Cao, and Zhong Lou, “AI-generated video detection via spatial-temporal anomaly learning,” in *Chinese Conference on Pattern Recognition and Computer Vision (PRCV)*, 2024.
- [47] Yuezun Li, Ming-Ching Chang, and Siwei Lyu, “In ictu oculi: Exposing ai-created fake videos by detecting eye blinking,” in *2018 IEEE International Workshop on Information Forensics and Security (WIFS)*, 2018, pp. 1–7.
- [48] Tero Karras, Timo Aila, Samuli Laine, and Jaakko Lehtinen, “Progressive growing of GANs for improved quality, stability, and variation,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [49] Christoph Schuhmann, Romain Beaumont, Richard Vencu, Cade Gordon, Ross Wightman, Mehdi Cherti, Theo Coombes, Aarush Katta, Clayton Mullis, Mitchell Wortsman, et al., “Laion-5b: An open large-scale dataset for training next generation image-text models,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 35, pp. 25278–25294, 2022.
- [50] Andreas Rossler, Davide Cozzolino, Luisa Verdoliva, Christian Riess, Justus Thies, and Matthias Nießner, “Faceforensics++: Learning to detect manipulated facial images,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, 2019, pp. 1–11.
- [51] Brian Dolhansky, Joanna Bitton, Ben Pfau, Jikuo Lu, Russ Howes, Menglin Wang, and Cristian Canton Ferrer, “The deepfake detection challenge (dfdc) dataset,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.07397*, 2020.
- [52] “A sanity check for ai-generated image detection,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.19435*, 2024, Accessed: November 29, 2024.
- [53] “Does audio deepfake detection generalize?,” Interspeech 2022, ISCA, 2022, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2202.01167>.
- [54] M. Hussain et al., “Forensic audio authentication in law enforcement and court proceedings,” *ArXiv e-prints*, 2022, arXiv:2210.11273.
- [55] Alexei Baevski, Yuhao Zhou, Abdelrahman Mohamed, and Michael Auli, “wav2vec 2.0: A framework for self-supervised learning of speech representations,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 33, pp. 12449–12460, 2020.
- [56] Mirco Ravanelli and Yoshua Bengio, “Speaker recognition from raw waveform with sincnet,” in *2018 IEEE Spoken Language Technology Workshop (SLT)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 1021–1028.
- [57] Octave Pascu, Andrei Stan, Dan Oneata, Emil Oneata, and Horia Cucu, “Towards generalisable and calibrated audio deepfake detection with self-supervised representations,” in *Interspeech*, 2024, pp. 4828–4832.
- [58] K. S. Rao and P. P. Das, “Melody extraction from polyphonic music by deep learning approaches: a review,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.01078*, 2022.
- [59] Luca Comanducci, Paolo Bestagini, and Stefano Tubaro, “FakeMusicCaps: A dataset for detection and attribution of synthetic music generated via text-to-music models,” in *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.10684*, 2024.
- [60] “Synthid by deepmind,” deepmind.google/technologies/synthid, Accessed: December 24, 2024.
- [61] Wei-Ning Hsu, Benjamin Bolte, Yao-Hung Hubert Tsai, Kushal Lakhota, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Abdelrahman 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.
- [62] Lele Cao, *A Practical Guide to Detect GenAI Content*, Amazon, first edition, 2025, Kindle Direct Publishing (KDP).
- [63] Nafise Sadat Mireshghallah, John Mattern, Songwei Gao, Reza Shokri, and Taylor Berg-Kirkpatrick, “Smaller language models are better zero-shot machine-generated text detectors,” *Proceedings of the EACL*, pp. 278–293, 2024.
- [64] Z. Kang, Y. He, B. Zhao, X. Qu, J. Peng, J. Xiao, and J. Wang, “Retrieval-augmented audio deepfake detection,” in *2024 International Conference on Multimedia Retrieval*, 2024, pp. 376–384.