

Improving Model’s Focus Improves Performance of Deep Learning-Based Synthetic Face Detectors

Jacob Piland¹, Adam Czajka², and Christopher Sweet³

¹Department of Computer Science and Engineering, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46556, USA (e-mail: jpiland@nd.edu), Corresponding Author

²Department of Computer Science and Engineering, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46556, USA (e-mail: aczajka@nd.edu)

³Center for Research Computing, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46556, USA (e-mail: csweet1@nd.edu)

March 3, 2023

Abstract

Deep learning-based models generalize better to unknown data samples after being guided “where to look” by incorporating human perception into training strategies. We made an observation that the entropy of the model’s salience trained in that way is lower when compared to salience entropy computed for models training without human perceptual intelligence. Thus the question: does further increase of model’s focus, by lowering the entropy of model’s class activation map, help in further increasing the performance? In this paper we propose and evaluate several entropy-based new loss function components controlling the model’s focus, covering the full range of the level of such control, from none to its “aggressive” minimization. We show, using a problem of synthetic face detection, that improving the model’s focus, through lowering entropy, leads to models that perform better in an open-set scenario, in which the test samples are synthesized by unknown generative models. We also show that optimal performance is obtained when the model’s loss function blends three aspects: regular classification, low-entropy of

the model’s focus, and human-guided saliency. ¹

1 Introduction

Modern generative models are able to synthesize non-existing² objects, including human faces, with a high (and constantly increasing) degree of realism. Examples of real and synthetic faces, are shown in Fig. 4. This makes the fully data-driven discovery of which features are fundamental for automatic synthetic face detection an unfathomable task. Human beings, in turn, are naturally adept at finding and recognizing faces, and exceptionally sensitive to minuscule aberrations in face appearance. Thus, using human salience to guide the process of training of deep learning-based synthetic face detectors has proved to increase the generalization of such models

¹This work was supported by the U.S. Department of Defense (Contract No. W52P1J2093009). The views and conclusions contained in this document are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as representing the official policies, either expressed or implied, of the U.S. Department of Defense or the U.S. Government.

²With exception, notably when the models “leak” identity information found in the training set to the generated samples [33, 32]




Figure 1: Various approaches to build loss functions for models detecting synthetic samples, and example model’s saliency (pictures as class activation maps). The most common penalizes the classification cross-entropy (CE). Recent approaches suggest penalizing deviations of the model saliency from the human saliency (CYBORG [3]). In this paper we investigate how shaping the entropy of the model saliency, independently of the human saliency, performs in the task of synthetic face detection, and propose DROID: the method of directed diminution of model saliency’s entropy. To get a full picture on possible variants of model and human saliency combinations in a single loss function, we explore losses that only match the average entropy of the human annotations and model saliency (HSEB), and investigate if aggressive minimization of model saliency’s entropy (FMMMSE) may be sufficient to solve the synthetic face detection task. Finally, we combine all three types of losses (classification cross-entropy, human saliency-based, and model saliency-based (DROID+CYBORG))

(to unknown data) [3]. This is achieved by focusing the model on features identified by humans as being prominent, instead of on features accidentally correlated with class labels.

An interesting observation we made about human saliency-trained models is that the average entropy of a model’s saliency (estimated by Class Activation Map [CAM] [38]) is lower than entropy of saliency of models trained by a standard minimization of classification cross-entropy loss. Hence, an immediate question: how does the entropy of a model’s saliency (regulated through *e.g.*, a loss function) relate to the model’s generalization, and – as a consequence – to its strength of detecting synthetic face images? This paper answers this question by exploring several variants of shaping the entropy of the model’s saliency with and without human guidance embed-

ded into training. We show that appropriate entropy of the model’s saliency (not “too large” to keep the model’s focus, and not “too small” to prevent overfitting to specific features) allows to build an effective synthetic face detector, generalizing to samples generated by unknown Generative Adversarial Networks (GAN) much better than state of the art solutions. In particular, we explore the loss functions incorporating the entropy with different mixtures of both human saliency [3] and model’s saliency.

We define the following **research questions** (RQ), and organize the paper in a way to answer these questions. All questions relate to models trained to detect synthetically generated faces by a GAN model held out for testing (hence, unknown during training). When we speak about human saliency, we assume it’s available in a form of regions that humans

annotated, as in previous experiments by Boyd *et al.*, who introduced the human perception-based guidance into the loss function called CYBORG [3].

- RQ1:** Let’s assume that human saliency information is not available, but we can estimate the average entropy of human salience. Does requesting the average entropy of the model’s and human’s saliencies to match increase the performance, compared to a performance of a model trained traditionally with just cross-entropy loss? (see **HSEB** variant in Fig. 1)
- RQ2:** If the answer to RQ1 is affirmative, what if we aggressively request the minimum possible entropy of the model’s saliency? The intuition behind this approach is that there are perhaps single or well-localized and strong-enough features that are sufficient to solve the synthetic face detection task. (see **FMMMSE** variant in Fig. 1)
- RQ3:** Is there a better strategy to control the entropy of the model’s saliency than requesting a specific entropy (as in RQ1) or aggressively minimizing such entropy (as in RQ2)? (see **DROID** variant in Fig. 1)
- RQ4:** Finally, does the model benefit from combining the human saliency-guided training with non-human-guided control of the model salience’s entropy? (see **DROID+CYBORG** variant in Fig. 1)

2 Related Work

Image manipulation and the creation of fake images poses a serious threat in terms of security [35, 2, 4]. A particularly well known and socially relevant example is that of creating facial data [7]. The wholesale generation of synthetic faces using GANs was first demonstrated in 2014 [9] and there have been numerous examples since [21, 23, 17, 19, 18].

There have been many efforts to detect fake faces [30, 15, 36, 10, 24, 35] and frequency domain analysis has had success in detecting synthetic faces [27, 11].

However, deep neural networks can achieve a recall of synthetic faces of 99% due to the effectively endless supply of generated fake face samples [31] even if the overall accuracy is not perfect. One of these deep neural networks is DenseNet [13], which we use as the backbone (pre-trained framework and starting point) for the models tested in this paper.

However, there remains a level of inexplicability to these deep learning methods that can be alleviated by comparison to observed, human experts detecting synthetic faces [28]. Furthermore, while machine learning accuracy is essentially always at least as good as human accuracy [26], human psychophysics has aided in deep learning tasks such as handwriting [11], natural language processing [37], and scene description [12, 14]. Specifically in biometrics (including synthetic face detection), human saliency has been shown to compliment machine saliency [34, 6, 25, 3]. Of particular importance to this study is the CYBORG study [3] which is covered in detail in Sec. 3.

Finally, the idea of measuring CAM entropy as a meaningful way to improve model explainability is a relatively new idea, but established in [29].

3 Human saliency-guided training reduces entropy of model’s salience

The human perception-guided training aims at minimizing the distance between the model’s saliency maps and their respective human saliency maps. For instance, in the example CYBORG approach [3], the loss function is composed of two terms: the human perception loss component (the Mean Squared Error between the human salience and the model’s salience), and the classification loss component (reg-




Figure 2: **(Entropy of the probability density map)** Example CAMs for a 7-by-7 grid that have been normalized to sum to 1. Underneath each CAM is its corresponding entropy value. In each CAM focus is mapped to a yellow-to-blue color scale with yellow corresponding to its highest value (i.e., focus) and blue to its lowest. This demonstrates how Shannon entropy shrinks as the number of pixels focused on shrinks.

ular cross-entropy):

$$\mathcal{L}_{CYBORG} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{c=1}^C \mathbf{1}_{y_k \in C_c} \left[(1 - \alpha) \underbrace{MSE(\mathbf{s}_k^{(h)}, \mathbf{s}_k^{(m)})}_{\text{human perception component}} - \alpha \underbrace{\log p^{(m)}(y_k \in C_c)}_{\text{classification component}} \right] \quad (1)$$

where K is the number of samples in a batch, C is the number of classes, y_k is a class label for the k -th sample, $\mathbf{1}$ is a class indicator function equal to 1 when $y_k \in C_c$ and 0 otherwise, $\mathbf{s}_k^{(h)}$ is the human saliency map, $\mathbf{s}_k^{(m)}$ is the model’s saliency map calculated for the k -th sample, and α is the parameter weighting human-based and cross-entropy-based loss components. Boyd *et al.* [3] selected Class Activation Mechanism (CAM) [38] to approximate model’s saliency $\mathbf{s}^{(m)}$, and normalized both the human and model saliency maps to $[0,1]$. We follow the same strategy in this work.

The entropy H of the CAM (or saliency map) \mathbf{s} is:

$$H = \sum_{i=1}^h \sum_{j=1}^w -\mathbf{s}(i, j) \log \mathbf{s}(i, j), \quad (2)$$

where h, w are height and width of the saliency map \mathbf{s} , respectively, and \mathbf{s} is normalized to formally express the probability distribution related to the concept of “focus”:

$$\sum_{i=1}^h \sum_{j=1}^w \mathbf{s}(i, j) = 1, \quad 0 \leq \mathbf{s}(i, j) \leq 1 \quad \forall i, j. \quad (3)$$

Fig. 2 illustrates a few example 7×7 saliency maps \mathbf{s} and their corresponding entropy. For instance, an entropy of 3.89 would correspond to all 49 locations of equal probability of ≈ 0.02 (i.e., the model is focusing on all pixels equally, Fig. 2(a)). An entropy of ≈ 0.02 would correspond to a single location of probability 1.0.




Figure 3: Comparison of entropy of the model’s saliency \mathbf{s} (estimated via Class Activation Map) over training epochs for a DenseNet model trained using classical cross-entropy and human-guided (CYBORG) approaches. Maximum entropy for a 7×7 -element saliency and the human entropy (measured in synthetic face recognition tasks) are also shown for reference. It can be seen that human guidance during training (CYBORG) ends up with lower model’s saliency entropy, compared to cross-entropy.

Fig. 2 is certainly a toy example, and it is more interesting to observe how the entropy H of actual saliency \mathbf{s} estimated for models trained in various ways changes during training. We trained DenseNet [13] with both regular cross-entropy loss, and CYBORG human saliency-guided loss, and compared

the entropy of the resulting model saliency maps with entropy of human saliency (computed directly from human annotations). As we see in Figure 3, an average saliency entropy for a model trained with cross-entropy loss is around 3.65. That corresponds to approx. 38-element (out of 49 for a 7×7 Class Activation Map) focus area. For model trained with CYBORG loss, however, the model’s saliency entropy goes down to 3.30 (what corresponds to a 27-element focus). For comparison, human-annotated saliency maps have an average entropy of 3.0. Looking at the saliency maps in Fig. 1 we see a reasonable correlation with these figures. This experiment, serving as a segue to Sec. 4, suggests that (a) human-guided training decreases the model’s saliency entropy, and (b) there is a negative correlation between the saliency entropy and the model’s performance.

4 Proposed low entropy models

Section 3 demonstrated that Shannon’s entropy of the model’s saliency is reduced when the network is guided towards important features during training. Extending this insight, we propose to examine several methods of minimizing entropy of the class activation maps (serving as an estimator of the model saliency) and analyze which methods increase the generalization capabilities of the model in the task of synthetic face detection. An important note is that the proposed approaches are not limited to synthetic face detection task, and can be applied to problems, in which human perceptual capabilities may be utilized in model’s training.

The proposed overall approach can be seen as a generalization of the human-guided CYBORG training introduced by Boyd *et al.*[3]. We do this by replacing the human perception component in Eq. (1) with a more generic *saliency entropy control component* $\mathcal{L}^{(sec)}$, namely:

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{c=1}^C \mathbf{1}_{y_k \in C_c} \left[(1 - \alpha) \mathcal{L}_k^{(sec)} - \alpha \underbrace{\log p^{(m)}(y_k \in C_c)}_{\text{classification component}} \right] \quad (4)$$

where all variables have the same meaning as in Eq. (1). Further in this Section we investigate three different approaches to building $\mathcal{L}^{(sec)}$

The first approach, Human Saliency Entropy Bound (**HSEB**), which is directly related to research question **RQ1** aims at matching the Shannon’s entropy of the model’s and human’s saliency maps:

$$\mathcal{L}_k^{(sec)} = MSE(H_k^{(m)}, H_k^{(h)}) \quad (5)$$

where $H_i^{(m)}$ and $H_i^{(h)}$ are the entropies of the CAMs and human saliency maps, as defined in Eq. 2, respectively, and averaged over all samples within the i -th batch. Note that in this approach we do not guide the model “where to look” and only request the model to achieve a similar saliency’s entropy as observed for humans who annotated the same training samples. The motivation for this is to give the model more flexibility in choosing salient features and exploring an approach in which the exact human saliency maps are not available, but instead we know the estimated value of their entropy. If the generalization capabilities of such approach is competitive, we could potentially replace the need of collecting human saliency maps with an estimated scalar entropy value of such maps.

The observed results obtained for the HSEB approach (discussed in details in Sec. 7) suggest that this way of limiting the model saliency’s entropy allows to further improve the performance. Following this, in some sense naïve approach, we explored the way to aggressively minimize the model’s saliency, called Forcibly Minimizing the Mean Model Saliency Entropy (**FMMMSE**), directly addressing the research question **RQ2**:

$$\mathcal{L}_k^{(sec)} = H_k^{(m)} \quad (6)$$

with $H_k^{(m)}$ defined in Eq. 2. This method, as we will see later, not surprisingly overfits to the training

data, suggesting that the model saliency’s entropy cannot be minimized too aggressively as it promotes searching for spurious features correlated with the class category (that is, what we want to avoid. This takes us to the last, and the most effective approach to select $L^{(sec)}$, which investigates a middle ground between being close to human entropy and minimum entropy of model’s saliency: Directed Region Of Interest Diminution (**DROID**). DROID minimizes the log CAM entropy, which is similar to the FMMSSE approach, but with less of a penalty on higher entropy to avoid over-focusing:

$$\mathcal{L}_k^{(sec)} = \log(H_k^{(m)}) \quad (7)$$

for each sample k in a batch.

5 Proposed combination of human-saliency and low entropy

In Section 4 we saw that low entropy models force a model’s focus on few features. However, there is no guarantee that these will be the most important, or even useful features. CYBORG approach, as we saw in Sec. 3, uses human saliency to guide a model to important features, but the features to focus on are desired to be matched with those with humans, including their number. We hypothesise that if put together, human saliency should guide the model to important features while low entropy should force the model to focus on only the most important features. We thus propose a combination of these two approaches (called **CYBORG+DROID**) as an exploratory test, by using DROID as the low entropy component and CYBORG as the human-saliency component, addressing research question **RQ4**:

$$\mathcal{L}_{CYBORG+DROID} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{c=1}^C \mathbf{1}_{y_k \in C_c} \left[\alpha \underbrace{MSE(\mathbf{s}_k^{(h)}, \mathbf{s}_k^{(m)})}_{\text{human perception component}} + \beta \underbrace{\log(H_k^{(m)})}_{\text{low entropy component}} - \gamma \underbrace{\log p_{model}(y_k \in C_c)}_{\text{classification component}} \right] \quad (8)$$

for each sample k in a batch of size K .

As we see, CYBORG+DROID follows a similar loss function format as the other low entropy models, excepting that there is both a saliency entropy control component (specifically, DROID, defined by (7)) and a CYBORG loss component (defined by (1)), each with their own weights.

In the original CYBORG study it was determined that CYBORG is largely unaffected by changes to the coefficients in front of the loss components (α and γ in (8)). In this study, we did explore using various weight values for the components of our proposed low entropy models, and they too were largely unaffected. However, the combination model, CYBORG+DROID, is affected by changes in component weights in terms of final average CAM entropy, performance score, and over focusing. We found that $\alpha = 0.5$, $\beta = 0.3$, and $\gamma = 0.5$ in Eq. 8 are optimal for the CYBORG+DROID approach.

6 Experimental Setup

6.1 Experiment descriptions


We conduct four experiments, one to address each of the four research questions: explicitly requesting the model and human saliency match in terms of CAM entropy value (HSEB approach, addressing **RQ1**), aggressively requesting the minimum CAM entropy possible (FMMSSE approach, addressing **RQ2**), less aggressively requesting the minimum CAM entropy with a log-loss function (DROID approach, addressing **RQ3**), and the combination of low model’s en-



(a) Training set samples



(b) Validation set samples



(c) Test set samples

Figure 4: Examples of real and fake faces from each of the datasets or generators used in the a) training set, b) validation set, and c) testing set.

tropy request and human saliency-based guidance (DROID + CYBORG, addressing **RQ4**).

The same experimental format is used in all four experiments. In each experiment we compare the performance of one of the low entropy models, or the CYBORG+DROID model, to baseline cross-entropy and state-of-the-art CYBORG in the task of synthetic face detection. While synthetic face detection was chosen as an example domain, all the considerations remain valid for other visual tasks in which humans are competent. An increase in performance from the baseline or state-of-the-art compared to the low entropy model, where only the loss functions distinguish between the models, will indicate that training a model with a constraint put on its CAM entropy is beneficial. The performance of each model is measured using area under the Receiver Operating Characteristic (AUROC) based on sigmoid scoring. In all cases, cross-entropy-based models serve as our baseline for comparisons, and CYBORG models as the state-of-the-art for comparisons.

6.2 Experiment parameters

For training, we follow the experimental procedure established in [3], excepting learning rate and number of epochs. Both of these changes were done to more thoroughly explore the behavior of our low entropy models. Specifically, all models are trained with a constant learning rate of 0.002 for a period of 150 epochs using Stochastic Gradient Descent and the weights chosen for the final model are those offering the highest validation accuracy. All samples are instantiated from the DenseNet-121 model pre-trained on ImageNet dataset [13]. The training and validation sets are constant for all models as described in Sec. 5. To assess the uncertainty associated with randomness of the training process, we train ten instances of each model with the same training data but with different seeds, and use an average AUROC with standard deviation margins in comparisons.

The weighting for loss components is as follows. For the cross-entropy baseline, classification loss is $\alpha = 1.0$. For CYBORG, HSEB, FMMMSE, and DROID, the weighting for all loss components is equal: $alpha = 0.5$. For CYBORG+DROID, the

weighting for the classification loss is $\gamma = 0.5$, the low entropy DROID component is $\beta = 0.3$, and the CYBORG human component is $\alpha = 0.5$.

6.3 Datasets

For training each model we use the established face image datasets, split into disjoint training, validation, and testing datasets, in the same way as proposed in [3]. Figure 4 shows synthetic and real face image examples from each dataset.

The **training set** consists of 1821 training samples (919 real and 902 synthetic). Real samples originate from the Face Recognition Grand Challenge (FRGC) dataset, and synthetic samples are generated for this dataset using the “synthesis of realistic face images” (SREFI) method [1] and StyleGAN2 [19].

The **validation set** consists of 20,000 samples (10,000 real and 10,000 synthetic). As with the training set, real validation samples are taken from FRGC, and synthetic validation samples are generated with SREFI and StyleGAN2. Note that separate images were generated from SREFI and StyleGAN2 for the training and validation datasets.

Finally, the **test set**, kept the same for all experiments, consists of 700,000 samples. There are 600,000 synthetic samples, 100,000 from each of the following GANs: ProGAN [8], StarGANv2 [5], StyleGAN [17], StyleGAN2 [19], StyleGAN3 [18], and StyleGAN2-ADA [23]. The images from three of these sources were pre-generated: the ProGAN images are from [22] and then the StyleGAN and StyleGAN2 images are from their GitHub repositories. Samples from the remaining three sources, StyleGAN3, StyleGAN2-ADA, and StarGAN were generated for this dataset [3]. There are 100,000 real samples: 30,000 images from CelebA-HQ [20], and 70,000 images from Flickr-Faces-HQ (FFHQ) [16].

7 Results

7.1 Model Entropy vs Performance

Motivated by [29], we observed in Section 3 that the CAM entropy for models trained with Cyborg was

BORG+DROID. For each model we use the weights from the epoch with the highest validation accuracy during training, and then do all analyses described later on the sequestered test subset.

Fig. 5 shows the results for ten training runs for each model type. We observe good correlation between lower CAM entropy and increasing AUROC for CAM entropy values above 2.0 with a “Sweet Spot” between 2.0 and 2.5. The only method that can achieve CAM entropy values lower than 2 is FM-MMSE but AUROC is generally lower, giving credence to the idea that there may be a point where too focused a CAM may detract from the AUROC scores. For the various methods, their highest singular AUROC score increases in the following order: baseline cross-entropy, state-of-the-art CYBORG, HSEB, DROID, CYBORG+DROID, and FM-MMSE. We note that although FM-MMSE achieved the highest AUROC score, it did so with a moderate CAM entropy value around 2.0, its other results were not as good as CAM entropy was forced lower.

Summarizing, we can make a number of important conclusions based on Fig. 5. First, reducing CAM entropy, even without the guidance of human salience, gives significant improvement in AUROC scores. Second, training approaches that aggressively minimizing a model’s CAM entropy (like FM-MMSE) do not end up with models offering the best performance capabilities, and their performance varies greatly across different training runs. Finally, adding complementary human guidance, as in DROID+CYBORG approach, stabilizes the model in terms of CAM entropy across training runs, and offers the best performance capabilities, translating to the highest average AUROC for DROID+CYBORG in Fig. 5.

7.2 Addressing research questions

The AUROC results supporting the answers to research questions **RQ1-4**, along with their baseline and state-of-the-art comparisons, are shown in Fig. 6. Actual ROC curves are shown in Fig. 7.




Figure 6: Boxplots representing the sigmoid AUROC scores over 10 training runs for each of the approaches considered in this paper. Thick central bars represent median values, height of each box corresponds to an inter-quartile range (IQR) spanning from the first (Q1) to the third (Q3) quartile, whiskers span from $Q1-1.5 \times IQR$ to $Q3+1.5 \times IQR$, and outliers are shown as circles. Notches represent 95% confidence intervals of the median. Note that for the y-axis we show only that range for which we have data, 0.45 to 0.85.

7.2.1 Answering RQ1: Does matching the model and average human saliency entropies increase the performance?

In CYBORG-trained models, human saliency-guided model learns by focusing on important features. In HSEB-trained models, human saliency provides a target entropy score. Our experiments show that HSEB is able to achieve this mean entropy and it outperforms the baseline cross-entropy. Hence, **the answer to RQ1 is affirmative: requesting the model CAM entropy match human saliency entropy increases the performance**, compared to traditional cross-entropy trained models. HSEB achieves an AUROC of 0.7100.02. It outperforms baseline cross-entropy (0.5610.05) and CYBORG (0.6360.02) with a mean AUROC score increase of +0.149 and +0.074 (26.6 and 11.6 percent increase), respectively.

7.2.2 Answering RQ2: Does unconstrained minimization of model’s saliency help in achieving even better performance?

As the answer to **RQ1** is affirmative, in FMMMSE-trained models, we aggressively request the minimum possible CAM entropy. This results in the lowest mean CAM entropy models and further increases the performance, allowing us to answer the RQ2 affirmatively as well: **there well-localized and strong-enough image features that are sufficient to solve the synthetic face detection task**. The FMMMSE approach achieves an AUROC of 0.7580.03. It outperforms baseline cross-entropy and CYBORG with a mean AUROC score increase of +0.197 and +0.122 (35.1 and 19.2 percent increase), respectively.

7.2.3 Answering RQ3: Is there a better strategy to control the entropy of the model’s saliency?

As **RQ2** is affirmative, and the concern for over-focusing using the FMMMSE approach is high (due to the low percent of image focused on, and apparent high variance of the performance seen in different training runs, depicted in Fig. 5), what if we request a middle-of-the-road CAM entropy in model training

using log-entropy? DROID fills this middle-of-the-road position, having final mean CAM entropy scores ranging generally between FMMMSE and HSEB entropy scores. DROID also outperforms the baseline indicating that **a softer request of minimizing mean CAM entropy improves performance in the task of synthetic face detection**. DROID achieves an AUROC of 0.7310.05. It outperforms baseline cross-entropy and CYBORG with a mean AUROC score increase of +0.170 and +0.095 (a 30.3 and 14.9 percent increase), respectively.

7.2.4 Answering RQ4: Does the model benefit from combining the human saliency-guided training with non-human-guided control of the model saliency’s entropy?

As the results are affirmative for **RQ1-3**, and due to concerns with over-focusing in FMMMSE, we investigate the performance of a model using the combination of human saliency-guided training (CYBORG) with low entropy-based training (DROID). The increase in performance of the CYBORG+DROID approach over baseline cross-entropy indicates that **the model benefits from combining human-guided saliency training with non-human-guided control of the model’s CAM entropy**. CYBORG+DROID achieves our highest AUROC performance, 0.7750.02. It outperforms baseline cross-entropy and CYBORG by a mean AUROC score increase of +0.216 and +0.141 (a 38.5 and 22.2 percent increase) respectively.

8 Conclusions

High Shannon entropy of model saliency (CAM entropy) corresponds to a low focus as the model considers all pixels, including the irrelevant ones, with equal probability. Thus models with high entropy are indiscriminate and low-information. This is seen with models trained with the classical cross-entropy loss function. As CYBORG introduces human saliency to the model we can expect that the entropy decreases with the increased information. We make the obser-




Figure 7: Graphs showing the average Receiver Operating Characteristic curves of each of the six models tested in this paper along with the standard error of the true positive rates. It can be clearly seen that the combination of human saliency-based guidance (CYBORG) with a non-aggressive, and proposed in this paper minimization of the model salience’s entropy, offers the best performance and low variability over 10 training runs.

vation that this is so, leading to the natural question “is low entropy merely an effect or can it be a cause of increased information and performance?”

This paper is an attempt to answer that question by introducing new loss functions that modify CAM entropy directly. HSEB matches the average human-saliency entropy, FMMSSE forcibly minimizes CAM entropy, and DROID seeks a reasonable middle ground by minimizing log entropy. Indeed we see AUROC improvements in all three methods as we reduce CAM entropy.

The next question raised is “how far can we reduce CAM entropy before the information gain becomes a hindrance to the model?” In Fig. 5 we see that no model achieves its highest AUROC performance with a CAM entropy below 1.0. Instead, the best performances are generally in the entropy range of 2.0-2.5. This leads us to consider the middle-of-the-road DROID method as the most optimal.

Finally, as the incorporation of human-saliency has proven useful in the past, it stands to reason that human direction could help guide the more focused, low-entropy DROID method. This leads us to the final question of this paper, “does incorporating human-saliency into an optimal low-entropy model improve performance?”

The answer is yes. CYBORG+DROID achieves the highest average AUROC of all the methods in this paper, improving over DROID by +0.024. While this difference appears significant (Fig. 6), it is ultimately quite small (a 0.03 percent increase) indicating that there is a need for further work in combining model-saliency entropy and human-saliency.

References

- [1] Sandipan Banerjee et al. “Srefi: Synthesis of realistic example face images”. In: *2017 IEEE International Joint Conference on Biometrics (IJCB)*. IEEE. 2017, pp. 37–45.
- [2] Johnny Botha and Heloise Pieterse. “Fake news and deepfakes: A dangerous threat for 21st century information security”. In: *International conference on cyber warfare and security*. 2020, pp. 57–66.
- [3] Aidan Boyd et al. “CYBORG: Blending Human Saliency Into the Loss Improves Deep Learning”. In: *2023 IEEE Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV), Waikoloa, Hawaii*. pre-print: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.00686>. 2023, pp. 1–8.
- [4] Robert Chesney and Danielle Citron. “Deepfakes and the new disinformation war: The coming age of post-truth geopolitics”. In: *Foreign Aff.* 98 (2019), p. 147.
- [5] Yunjey Choi et al. “StarGAN: Unified Generative Adversarial Networks for Multi-Domain Image-to-Image Translation”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. June 2018.
- [6] Adam Czajka et al. “Domain-specific human-inspired binarized statistical image features for iris recognition”. In: *2019 IEEE Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV)*. IEEE. 2019, pp. 959–967.
- [7] Deepfakes. *Faceswap*. 2021. URL: <https://github.com/deepfakes/faceswap>.
- [8] Hongchang Gao, Jian Pei, and Heng Huang. “ProGAN: Network Embedding via Proximity Generative Adversarial Network”. In: *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*. KDD ’19. Anchorage, AK, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2019, pp. 1308–1316. ISBN: 9781450362016. DOI: 10.1145/3292500.3330866. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3292500.3330866>.
- [9] Ian J Goodfellow et al. “Generative adversarial nets (Advances in neural information processing systems)(pp. 2672–2680)”. In: *Red Hook, NY Curran* (2014).
- [10] Diego Gagnaniello et al. *GANimageDetection*. 2021. URL: <https://github.com/grip-unina/GANimageDetection>.

- [11] Samuel Grieggs et al. “Measuring human perception to improve handwritten document transcription”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 44.10 (2021), pp. 6594–6601.
- [12] Sen He et al. “Human attention in image captioning: Dataset and analysis”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*. 2019, pp. 8529–8538.
- [13] Gao Huang et al. “Densely Connected Convolutional Networks”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. July 2017.
- [14] Yupan Huang, Zhaoyang Zeng, and Yutong Lu. “Be Specific, Be Clear: Bridging Machine and Human Captions by Scene-Guided Transformer”. In: *Proceedings of the 2021 Workshop on Multi-Modal Pre-Training for Multimedia Understanding*. 2021, pp. 4–13.
- [15] Yan Ju. *GAN-generated-image-detector*. 2021. URL: <https://gitlab.com/littlejuyan/GAN-generated-image-detector>.
- [16] Tero Karras, Samuli Laine, and Timo Aila. *A Style-Based Generator Architecture for Generative Adversarial Networks*. 2018. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1812.04948. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1812.04948>.
- [17] Tero Karras, Samuli Laine, and Timo Aila. “A Style-Based Generator Architecture for Generative Adversarial Networks”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. June 2019.
- [18] Tero Karras et al. “Alias-Free Generative Adversarial Networks”. In: *Proc. NeurIPS*. 2021.
- [19] Tero Karras et al. “Analyzing and Improving the Image Quality of StyleGAN”. In: *CoRR* abs/1912.04958 (2019). arXiv: 1912.04958. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1912.04958>.
- [20] Tero Karras et al. *Progressive Growing of GANs for Improved Quality, Stability, and Variation*. 2017. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1710.10196. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1710.10196>.
- [21] Tero Karras et al. “Progressive growing of gans for improved quality, stability, and variation”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.10196* (2017).
- [22] Tero Karras et al. *Progressive Growing of GANs for Improved Quality, Stability, and Variation: Official TensorFlow Implementation*. 2021. URL: https://github.com/tkarras/progressive_growing_of_gans.
- [23] Tero Karras et al. “Training Generative Adversarial Networks with Limited Data”. In: *Proc. NeurIPS*. 2020.
- [24] Sara Mandelli et al. “Training CNNs in presence of JPEG compression: Multimedia forensics vs computer vision”. In: *2020 IEEE International Workshop on Information Forensics and Security (WIFS)*. IEEE. 2020, pp. 1–6.
- [25] Daniel Moreira et al. “Performance of humans in iris recognition: The impact of iris condition and annotation-driven verification”. In: *2019 IEEE Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV)*. IEEE. 2019, pp. 941–949.
- [26] Alice J O’Toole et al. “Comparing face recognition algorithms to humans on challenging tasks”. In: *ACM Transactions on Applied Perception (TAP)* 9.4 (2012), pp. 1–13.
- [27] Yuyang Qian et al. “Thinking in frequency: Face forgery detection by mining frequency-aware clues”. In: *European conference on computer vision*. Springer. 2020, pp. 86–103.
- [28] Brandon RichardWebster et al. “Visual psychophysics for making face recognition algorithms more explainable”. In: *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*. 2018, pp. 252–270.

- [29] Alfred Schöttl. “Improving the Interpretability of GradCAMs in Deep Classification Networks”. In: *Procedia Computer Science* 200 (2022). 3rd International Conference on Industry 4.0 and Smart Manufacturing, pp. 620–628. ISSN: 1877-0509. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2022.01.260>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877050922002691>.
- [30] Harry Sun. *Kitware Generated Image Detector*. 2021. URL: <https://github.com/Kitware/generated-image-detection>.
- [31] Shahroz Tariq et al. “Gan is a friend or foe? a framework to detect various fake face images”. In: *Proceedings of the 34th ACM/SIGAPP Symposium on Applied Computing*. 2019, pp. 1296–1303.
- [32] Patrick Tinsley, Adam Czajka, and Patrick Flynn. “Haven’t I Seen You Before? Assessing Identity Leakage in Synthetic Irises”. In: *IEEE/IAPR International Joint Conference on Biometrics (IJCB) – Special Session on Synthetic Data in Biometrics, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates*. 2022, pp. 1–6.
- [33] Patrick Tinsley, Adam Czajka, and Patrick Flynn. “This Face Does Not Exist... But It Might Be Yours! Identity Leakage in Generative Models”. In: *2021 IEEE Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV), Waikoloa, Hawaii*. 2021, pp. 1319–1327. DOI: 10.1109/WACV48630.2021.00136.
- [34] Mateusz Trokielewicz, Adam Czajka, and Piotr Maciejewicz. “Perception of image features in post-mortem iris recognition: Humans vs machines”. In: *2019 IEEE 10th International Conference on Biometrics Theory, Applications and Systems (BTAS)*. IEEE. 2019, pp. 1–8.
- [35] Sheng-Yu Wang et al. “CNN-generated images are surprisingly easy to spot... for now”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2020, pp. 8695–8704.
- [36] Yaser Yacoob. *GAN-Scanner*. 2021. URL: <https://github.com/yaseryacoob/GAN-Scanner>.
- [37] Ruohan Zhang et al. “Human gaze assisted artificial intelligence: A review”. In: *IJCAI: Proceedings of the Conference*. Vol. 2020. NIH Public Access. 2020, p. 4951.
- [38] Bolei Zhou et al. “Learning Deep Features for Discriminative Localization”. In: *2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 2016, pp. 2921–2929. DOI: 10.1109/CVPR.2016.319.