

Deep Learning for Steganalysis of Diverse Data Types: A review of methods, taxonomy, challenges and future directions

Hamza Kheddar^{a,*}, Mustapha Hemis^b, Yassine Himeur^c, David Megías^d and Abbas Amira^{e,f}

^aLSEA Laboratory, Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Medea, 26000, Algeria

^bLCPTS Laboratory, University of Sciences and Technology Houari Boumediene (USTHB), P.O. Box 32, El-Alia, Bab-Ezzouar, Algiers 16111, Algeria.

^cCollege of Engineering and Information Technology, University of Dubai, Dubai, UAE

^dInternet Interdisciplinary Institute (IN3), Universitat Oberta de Catalunya (UOC), CYBERCAT-Center for Cybersecurity Research of Catalonia, Rambla del Poblenou, 154, 08018 Barcelona, Spain.

^eDepartment of Computer Science, University of Sharjah, UAE

^fInstitute of Artificial Intelligence, De Montfort University, Leicester, United Kingdom

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Image steganalysis
Speech steganalysis
Text steganalysis
Data hiding
Deep learning
OpenAI's model security

ABSTRACT

Steganography and steganalysis are two interrelated aspects of the field of information security. Steganography seeks to conceal communications, whereas steganalysis aims to discover or, if possible, recover the data they contain. These two areas have garnered significant interest, especially among law enforcement agencies. Cybercriminals and even terrorists often employ steganography to avoid detection while in possession of incriminating evidence, even when that evidence is encrypted, since cryptography is prohibited or restricted in many countries. Therefore, a deep understanding of cutting-edge techniques for uncovering concealed information is essential in exposing illegal activities. Over the last few years, a number of strong and reliable steganography and steganalysis techniques have been introduced in the literature. This review paper provides a comprehensive overview of deep learning-based steganalysis techniques used to detect hidden information within digital media. The paper covers all types of cover in steganalysis, including image, audio, and video, and discusses the most commonly used deep learning techniques. In addition, the paper explores the use of more advanced deep learning techniques, such as deep transfer learning (DTL) and deep reinforcement learning (DRL), to enhance the performance of steganalysis systems. The paper provides a systematic review of recent research in the field, including data sets and evaluation metrics used in recent studies. It also presents a detailed analysis of DTL-based steganalysis approaches and their performance on different data sets. The review concludes with a discussion on the current state of deep learning-based steganalysis, challenges, and future research directions.

1. Introduction

In recent years, technology has rapidly advanced, leading to the widespread use of multimedia for data transfer, particularly in the realm of the internet of things (IoT) [1]. However, the transfer of data often occurs over insecure network channels, with the Internet being a popular medium for the exchange of digital media among individuals, private companies, institutions, and governments [2]. While there are many benefits associated with this method of data exchange, one significant drawback is the risk to data privacy and security. The existence of readily available tools capable of exploiting vulnerabilities in data transfer channels has made malicious threats, eavesdropping, and other subversive activities a real possibility [3].

The primary solution to the security risks associated with data transfer is to use data encryption, including symmetric and asymmetric key cryptography, whereby the data is transformed into a cipher text using an encryption key [4, 5]. The receiver can then decrypt the message using a decryption key to obtain the original plain text. While data encryption is an effective way to protect sensitive information, the encrypted data is often unreadable and suspicious in appearance, which can lead to further scrutiny [6, 7]. As a result, another research topic called steganography emerged, which involves hiding data in a way that is statistically undetectable and, also, invisible to the human eye for image [8], video [9], and text carriers [10], and imperceptible to the human auditory system (HAS) for audio carriers, in low [11, 12], and high [13, 14] encoding rates. This approach allows for the secure transfer of data without arousing suspicions or attracting unwanted attention.

Steganalysis, on the other hand, is the art of detecting secret messages embedded in digital media using steganography. Steganalysis aims to identify suspicious information, determine the occurrence of the message, and, if possible, recover the message. Steganalysis and steganography advancements have increased standards for both. Steganalysis could be used to detect and extract hidden information in digital media to reduce the harm caused by those who use steganography tools for malicious purposes. Its primary objective is to estimate whether there is secret information in the media being tested by identifying the steganography type and, in a second phase, extracting the hidden information content. Image steganalysis is the most widely known technique, in which features are extracted through feature design, and different classifiers can be trained to make the technology more adaptable (Figure 1). Real-time communication requires examining information suspected of having hidden information in media such as images, audio, and video as quickly as possible, but detecting hidden information in real-time is a challenge due to various factors such as

*The first is the corresponding author.

✉ kheddar.hamza@univ-medea.dz (H. Kheddar); hemismustapha@yahoo.fr (M. Hemis); yhimeur@ud.ac.ae (Y. Himeur); dmegias@uoc.edu (D. Megías); aamira@sharjah.ac.ae, abbes.amira@dmu.ac.uk (A. Amira)

ORCID(s): 0000-0002-9532-2453 (H. Kheddar); 0000-0002-6353-0215 (M. Hemis); 0000-0001-8904-5587 (Y. Himeur); 0000-0002-0507-7731 (D. Megías); 0000-0003-1652-0492 (A. Amira)

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AAC	advanced audio coding	ECA	efficient channel Attention	NAS	neural architecture search
AE	auto encoder	EECS	equal length entropy codes substitution	NN	neural network
AMR	adaptive multi-rate	FAR	false alarm rate	NSGA-III	nondominated sorting genetic algorithm-III
AUC	area under the curve	FCB	fixed codebook	PSNR	peak signal-to-noise ratio
AWGN	additive white gaussian noise	FFT	fast Fourier transform	PU	prediction unit
BERT	bidirectional encoder representations from transformers	FLOP	floating-point operations	QIM	quantization index modulation
BN	batch normalization	FN	false negative	QMDCT	quantified modified discrete cosine transform
bpp	bit per pixel	FP	false positive	RBM	restricted Boltzmann machines
BPTT	back propagation through time	FPR	false positive rate	ReLU	rectified linear unit
CBAM	convolution block attention module	GMM	Gaussian mixture model	ResNet	residual neural network
CD	contrastive divergence	GNCNN	Gaussian-neuron convolutional neural network	RMSProp	root mean squared propagation
CMV	candidate motion vector	GNN	graph neural network	RNN	recurrent neural network
CNN	convolution neural network	GPU	graphics processing unit	ROC	receiver operating characteristic
CSA	channel-spatial attention	GRL	gradient reversal layer	SCA	selection-channel aware
CSM	cover source mismatch	GRU	gated recurrent unit	SDA	subdomain adaptation
DAE	denoising auto-encoder	HAS	human auditory system	SGD	stochastic gradient descent
DBN	deep belief network	HEVC	high efficiency video coding	SOTA	state-of-the-art
DCNN	densely connected convolutional neural network	HGD	high-level representation guided denoiser	SPP	spatial pyramid pooling
DCT/DST	discrete Cosine/Sine transform	HPF	high-pass filtering	SRM	spatial rich model
DCT	discrete cosine transform	IoT	internet of things	SRM-EC	spatial rich models with ensemble classifier
DER	detection error rate	JPEG	joint photographic experts group	SSIM	Structural similarity index
DL	deep learning	LSB	least significant bits	STC	syndrome-trellis code
DNA	deoxyribonucleic acid	LSTM	long short-term memory network	SVM	support vector machine
DNN	deep neural network	MAE	mean absolute error	TanH	hyperbolic tangent
DNNITS	deep neural network-based invisible text steganalysis	MFCC	mel-frequency cepstral coefficients	TLU	truncated linear unit
DR	detection rate	MFRNet	multi-frequency residual deep convolutional neural network	TN	true negative
DRL	deep reinforcement learning	ML	machine learning	TP	true positive
DRN	deep residual network	MLP	multilayer perceptron	TPR	true positive rate
DT	destruction rate	MP3	MPEG-1 audio layer 3	VoIP	voice over IP
DTL	deep transfer learning	MSE	mean squared error	VSOFD	video surveillance object forgery detection
EA	evolutionary algorithm	MV	Motion vector		

bandwidth, delay, and throughput. Combining deep learning with steganalysis can help achieve positive results by automatically extracting the complex and effective messages hidden in the data, which takes less time and resources and makes up for the shortcomings of traditional image steganalysis.

This review aims to help researchers achieve better outcomes in steganalysis by studying current methodologies and understanding future challenges in digital media steganalysis. The survey provides a summary of different types of algorithms for digital image, video, speech, and text steganalysis that have been developed using classical machine learning (ML) and deep learning (DL) technologies, with a focus on algorithms for temporal, spatial, and transform domains. Typically, the use of several DL algorithms in steganalysis is investigated, such as deep neural network (DNN), convolution neural network (CNN), recurrent neural network (RNN), long short-term memory network (LSTM), autoencoders, restricted Boltzmann machines (RBM), deep belief network (DBN) and graph neural network (GNN). The survey also begins by providing an overview of research methodology in Section 2, and Section 3 introduces a background for both steganalysis and deep learning algorithms. Section 4 summarizes most of the carrier-type-based deep steganalysis existing approaches. Section 5 discussed existing techniques-type-based deep steganalysis existing approaches. Research gaps and future directions are discussed in Section 6. Finally, Section 7 concludes this literature review paper.

1.1. Background

1.1.1. Definition

In contrast to steganography, which is used for hiding information within seemingly harmless media, steganalysis is the technology that attempts to defeat steganography—by detecting the hidden information and, in a second stage, if possible, extracting or destroying it. Figure 1 depicts the steganalysis process limited to the detection of the presence of a steganographic message.

Additionally, unlike cryptanalysis, which deals with encrypted data, steganalysis entails going through a collection of multimedia data (i.e., audio, image, video, etc.), frequently with no prior understanding of the data that contain a payload. Statistical analysis is employed by steganalysts to reduce the pool of suspect data.




Figure 1: Steganalysis process.

1.1.2. Mathematical formulation

The stego data S is often represented by an additive white gaussian noise (AWGN) model commonly used in information theory to mimic the effects of unpredictable natural processes. The “additive” term refers to the model being added to any noise that may naturally occur in information systems. The “white” term indicates that the model has uniform power across the frequency band. Finally, the “Gaussian” term refers to its normal distribution with zero mean value in the time domain. From a statistical point of view, the steganograms can be considered as random variables with the following probability density function [11]:

$$\text{pdf}(S) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \exp\left(-\frac{S^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \quad (1)$$

The assumption of an AWGN channel model, in which the signal sequence is corrupted by the addition of independent and identically distributed zero-mean Gaussian random variables with variance σ^2 , is the standard model for a communication channel. We assume that the channels from Alice to Bob and to Wendy are subject to AWGN with respective variances $\sigma_b^2 > 0$ and $\sigma_w^2 > 0$, as depicted in Figure 2. The steganograms ξ are random variables that follow a normal distribution with expectation $E(\xi) = 0$ and variance $D(\xi) = \sigma^2$.




Figure 2: Interpretation of steganograms in AWGN channel.

Table 1

Comparison of the planned study's contribution to prior steganalysis surveys. The cross mark (X) denotes missing the opportunity to address the particular fields, while the tick mark (✓) shows that the specific field has been treated.

Reference	Type	Year	Media content				Coverer DL-based steganalysis article	Eval. metrics	Databases review	Research gaps / Challenge / Open issues
			Image	Video	Audio	Text				
Muralidharan et al. [15]	Review	2022	✓	X	X	X	17 (CNN only)	X	✓	✓
Karapidis et al. [16]	Review	2018	✓	X	X	X	4	X	✓	X
Reinel et al. [17]	Sys. review	2019	✓	X	X	X	14 (CNN only)	X	X	X
Chaumont et al. [18]	Review	2019	✓	X	X	X	24 (CNN only)	X	X	X
Hussain et al. [19]	Survey	2020	✓	X	X	X	24 (CNN only)	X	X	✓
Ruan et al. [20]	Survey	2019	✓	X	X	X	15 (DNN & CNN)	X	X	✓
Eid et al. [21]	Survey	2022	✓	X	X	X	20	X	✓	✓
Selvaraj et al. [22]	Survey	2020	✓	X	X	X	30	X	X	X
Bao et al. [23]	Survey	2021	✓	X	X	X	12	X	X	X
This paper	Review	2023	✓	✓	✓	✓	155	✓	✓	✓

By using DL techniques, the steganalysis algorithms can identify the presence of hidden information in the stego signal (S), which differs from the statistical properties of the original signal (x). DL-based steganalysis techniques aim to detect the presence of hidden information with high accuracy while minimizing the false positive (FP) and the false negative (FN) rates.

1.2. Motivation and contribution

The field of steganalysis-based DL has seen significant advancements in recent years with the development of numerous schemes for image, video, text, and speech data. As the prevalence of steganography increases, there is a growing need for efficient and effective steganalysis techniques. DL plays a crucial role in steganalysis, the art of detecting hidden information in digital media. It offers numerous benefits, including improved detection accuracy due to its ability to learn complex patterns and features automatically. DL models can adapt to diverse data types like images, audio, and video, making them versatile. They reduce the need for manual feature engineering, can handle countermeasures, and scale effectively for large data sets. Some models are optimized for real-time processing, making them suitable for time-sensitive applications. Continuous advancements in DL contribute to the ongoing improvement of steganalysis systems. However, challenges such as computational requirements and adversarial techniques must be addressed to maintain effectiveness in this evolving field. A comprehensive survey of proposed schemes in this area is necessary to provide an overview of the state-of-the-art (SOTA) approaches and to identify areas for future research.

The contribution of this review paper is to provide an extensive survey of steganalysis-based DL techniques across various data types. According to the statistics gathered from the Scopus database, a comparison of existing reviews in the field is summarized in Table 1. To the best of our knowledge, our proposed survey is the only paper to review all data types and discuss more than 155 papers in the field for various types of DL algorithms, not only CNN and/or DNN techniques. By presenting a thorough analysis of the proposed techniques, the paper allows researchers and practitioners to compare and contrast different approaches, identify their strengths and weaknesses, and make informed decisions on which techniques to adopt for their specific use cases. Overall, the contribution in this review paper is as follows:

- Discuss the most used metrics and data sets for all data type steganalysis.
- Provide a strong taxonomy for DL algorithms used in steganalysis.
- Present a comprehensive coverage of existing classical steganalysis methods.
- Provide a comprehensive overview of the current SOTA and offer insights into potential avenues for future research and development. Not to mention, the research gaps, challenges and open issues.

2. Methodology

2.1. Objectives and Research Questions

This review aims to evaluate current DL techniques for steganalysis across diverse data types, assessing their effectiveness, resilience to adversarial attacks, and interpretability. It further explores the application of transfer learning, reinforcement learning, assesses data and hardware limitations, and investigates privacy concerns. The review also scrutinizes the role of DL in multi-modal steganalysis and real-time steganalysis, while identifying key areas for future research. Table 2 portrays the principal identified research questions to achieve the objectives outlined above.

2.2. Quality assessment

Our study conducted a quality assessment using a questionnaire, which included eight questions relevant to the research questions and objectives. These questions covered topics such as (i) the clarity and appropriateness of the research questions, (ii) the comprehensiveness of the literature review, (iii) the appropriateness and relevance of the datasets used, (iv) the effectiveness of the classification methods used, (v) the depth and comprehensiveness of the discussions on proposed solutions, (vi) the degree to which

Table 2
Research Questions.

RQ#	Question	Objective
RQ1	What is the primary motivation for employing DL in steganalysis, and what advantages it offers over traditional ML models?	Understand the rationale behind using DL in steganalysis and discern the unique benefits it brings as compared to traditional ML models.
RQ2	What are the current DL techniques used in steganalysis for different types of data? How effective are these techniques in detecting hidden messages?	Identify and understand the state-of-the-art DL techniques used in steganalysis for different types of data.
RQ3	How do DL-based steganalysis methods for different types of data compare to each other and to traditional methods?	Compare and contrast the performance of different DL-based steganalysis methods, and evaluate them against traditional techniques.
RQ4	How can we improve the interpretability of DL-based steganalysis models? What are the challenges and current research trends in making these models more explainable?	Assess the transparency of DL-based steganalysis models, highlight the challenges in interpretability, and review the current research efforts in enhancing their explainability.
RQ5	What is the impact of adversarial attacks on DL-based steganalysis models? How are researchers addressing the vulnerability of these models to adversarial attacks?	Investigate the susceptibility of DL-based steganalysis models to adversarial attacks and review strategies aimed at increasing their robustness.
RQ6	How is transfer learning being applied in steganalysis, and what benefits does it offer in improving the detection of steganography across different types of data?	Explore the implementation of transfer learning in steganalysis, and evaluate its effectiveness in improving steganographic detection across different types of data.
RQ7	What are the implications of the quantity and quality of training data on the effectiveness of DL-based steganalysis models? How can these issues be addressed?	Explore the impact of the quality and quantity of training data on the performance of DL-based steganalysis models, and discuss potential solutions.
RQ8	How do DL-based steganalysis techniques affect privacy? How can these techniques be modified to respect privacy while maintaining their effectiveness?	Investigate the potential privacy concerns associated with DL-based steganalysis techniques, and discuss possible modifications to these techniques to safeguard privacy.
RQ9	What are the key applications of steganalysis across different types of media?	Understand the different practical uses or implementations of steganalysis across diverse media forms.
RQ10	What are the key areas that require further research in DL-based steganalysis? What might be some potential future developments in this field?	Identify potential future developments and key areas requiring further research in the field of DL-based steganalysis.

experimental analysis supports the proposed solutions, and (vii) the clarity of the presentation of the results. By answering these questions, we evaluated the quality and identified the advantages and disadvantages of each work. The formulation of the quality assessment criteria in Table 3 was based on eight questions that assessed the quality of our research in relation to the research questions.

2.3. Study selection criteria

In order to create a comprehensive list of references for steganalysis based on DL, several well-known journals databases such as Scopus and Web of Science, including IEEE Xplore, ACM Digital Library, Science Direct, and SpringerLink, were searched. The selection criteria for these publications were based on four factors: (i) **modularity**, which kept only the most common methods and implementations; (ii) **coverage**, which is reported on a new or specific application domain; (iii) **influence**, which limited the selection to works published in high-quality journals, book chapters, or conference proceedings, but with a high number of citations; (iv) and **newness**, which only included papers published recently.

DL-related keywords were used to conduct the initial search for steganalysis. The papers were then divided into five groups based on "topic clustering" using the keywords associated with the application field. Figure 3, which has been generated using the biblioshiny analysis tool¹, illustrates the most frequent keywords used by steganalysist in their research papers. We can easily distinguish that image steganalysis is the most conducted field compared to other types of carriers. Also, CNN is the most frequently used technique in steganalysis.


2.4. Bibliometric statistics

Figure 4 displays the statistics obtained after applying the selection criteria, including the number of articles involved in this review each year, the top ten most cited papers with their authors and publication year, the top ten most relevant papers' sources, the top ten most active authors, the percentage of papers for DL-based steganalysis, steganalysis only, DL only, surveys, and others, and the percentage of discussed papers in each field of DL-based steganalysis.

¹<https://www.bibliometrix.org/home/index.php/layout/biblioshiny>

Table 3
Research Questions.

No.	Question	Objective	Mapping to the re- search question
Q1	Were the research questions appropriately presented and well-articulated?	The clarity and appropriateness of the research questions should be evaluated.	RQ1, RQ2
Q2	Was a comprehensive review of the state-of-the-art in the relevant areas provided by the authors?	The comprehensiveness of the literature review should be evaluated.	RQ2, RQ3, RQ4
Q3	Was the appropriateness and effectiveness of the methods used for classifying the studies, datasets, models, and attacks confirmed?	The appropriateness and effectiveness of the classification methods and taxonomy used should be reviewed.	RQ4, RQ5, RQ6
Q4	Was the appropriateness and relevance of the datasets discussed in the study confirmed?	The suitability and significance of the datasets used in the study should be evaluated.	RQ7
Q5	Has a detailed discussion on the potential benefits, challenges, and implications of the overviewed solutions been carried out?	Assess the depth and comprehensiveness of the overviewed solutions	RQ1, RQ2, RQ3, RQ4, RQ6
Q6	Has a discussion been carried out on the limitations of the overviewed solutions?	Assess the constraints of the overviewed solutions.	RQ7, RQ8
Q7	Were the potential applications of the overviewed solutions discussed in detail?	The thoroughness of the discussions on the potential applications of the proposed solutions should be reviewed.	RQ9
Q8	Were the study's conclusions and recommendations derived from the presented results and analysis?	Assess the extent to which the results and analysis substantiate the study's conclusions and recommendations.	RQ9, RQ10

**Figure 3:** Most frequently keywords used by steganalysis researchers.

3. Background in DL and steganalysis

3.1. Metrics

The metrics that are frequently used to evaluate steganalytic methods, and the functionalities they assess, are explained below (Table 4). In this table, True positive (TP) is the number of carriers that are correctly classified as stego (i.e., containing an embedded message) and FN is the number of carriers that are identified as cover (i.e., not embedded), but they actually contain a hidden message. Conversely, True negative (TN) and FP are, respectively, unembedded carriers that are identified as cover (correctly) and stego (incorrectly). By using these metrics, researchers can objectively evaluate the effectiveness and limitations of different steganalysis methods and identify areas for improvement.

3.2. Data sets

Steganalysis data set refers to a collection of data used for training and evaluating models that are designed to detect the presence of hidden messages or information within digital media, such as images, audio, or videos.

Table 5 presents a list of commonly used steganalysis datasets, all of which have been exclusively used in the context of deep learning-based steganalysis in at least one work or research article. It is important to note that these datasets have gained varying levels of popularity within the steganalysis field classified in table as "High," "Moderate," "Low," and "Minimal." In most cases, the datasets are primarily contain cover samples only, as indicated in the table by a cover/stego ratio of 1:0. Instead, Stego samples, which are essential for steganalysis, are generated using steganographic methods like HUGO, WOW, UNIWARD, and others applied to the




Figure 4: Bibliography analysis. (a) Annual production, (b) Top 10 production country, (c) Top 10 most global cited documents, (d) Top 10 most relevant sources, (e) Comparison based on data-type DL steganalysis, (f) Comparison based on research paper's type used in this review.

cover samples. It is worth pointing out that the steganographic methods used in the works are described in columns "Steganographic algorithm" of Tables 7, 8, and 9. Moreover, the labeling of these datasets encompasses both cover and stego classes, or multiple stego classes in cases where several steganographic algorithms are used to generate stego samples. Additionally, it is noteworthy that some datasets lack information about the division between training and test samples, as indicated by '-' in the table.

3.3. Taxonomy of DL

DNNs can automatically obtain feature representations for steganographic detection through sample training, eliminating the need for manually-defined features. The key challenge now is to design the structure of DNNs. Speech, text, video, and image steganalysis requires the extraction of subtle steganography information features hidden behind payload content and texture, which is quite different from traditional steganalysis tasks. Increasing the signal-to-noise ratio and maximizing the residual information are usually necessary to improve the performance of steganographic detection. For that reason, many DL techniques play a great role in successfully detecting or even uncovering the steganogram. The most used DL-based steganalysis techniques are overviewed in the next few sections. Table 6 compares various DL techniques for steganalysis in different data types. It assesses their suitability and effectiveness, with categories ranging from "Excellent" and "Good" to "Limited" and "Promising." The architectures include CNN, LSTM, DNN, RNN, DBN, RBN, and GNN, applied to text, speech, image, and video steganalysis. The table helps users understand the relative strengths and weaknesses of these architectures for specific tasks.

3.3.1. DNNs

DNN is a type of artificial neural network that has more hidden layers compared to shallow counterparts. While there may be variations in specific designs based on different problem requirements, the DNN model typically consists of an input layer, an output layer, and multiple hidden layers. This kind of architecture is suitable for solving classification and regression problems, but the size of the model parameters increases with the number of input features, which can affect the computational performance. To learn the DNN model, the back-propagation learning algorithm can be used to adjust the weights by propagating errors from the

Table 4

A summary of the evaluation metrics used to assess steganalysis techniques.

Metric	Formula	Description
False positive rate (FPR) and True positive rate (TPR)	$\frac{FP}{FP + TN}, \frac{TP}{TP + FN}$	The FPR, also known as false alarm rate (FAR), is the ratio (or percentage) of the non-steganographic bearers that are incorrectly identified as containing hidden information. The TPR, also known as detection rate (DR), is the ratio (or percentage) of the steganographic bearers that is correctly identified as containing hidden information.
Mean squared error (MSE)	$\frac{\sum_{M,N} [I_1(m,n) - I_2(m,n)]^2}{M \cdot N}$	The MSE is the cumulative squared error between the stego image and the original cover image. M and N are the rows and columns, respectively. $I_1(m,n)$ and $I_2(m,n)$ are the values of the pixel in the position (m,n) for the cover and the stego images. Mean absolute error (MAE) = $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N x_i - y_i $ used to gauge the precision of estimating the embedding rate.
Peak signal-to-noise ratio (PSNR)	$10 \log_{10} \left(\frac{R^2}{MSE} \right)$	R is the fluctuation in the input image, i.e., the maximum difference for the values of the pixels. The PSNR is commonly used to evaluate the quality of the stego-image (the image after the hidden information has been embedded). A lower PSNR indicates that the steganography technique has introduced more distortion to the image.
Structural index (SSIM)	$\frac{(2\mu_x\mu_y + c_1)(2\sigma_{xy} + c_2)}{(\mu_x^2 + \mu_y^2 + c_1)(\sigma_x^2 + \sigma_y^2 + c_2)}$	The SSIM is a measure of the similarity between two images. A lower SSIM indicates that the steganography technique has introduced more distortion to the image. The details of the parameters of the formulae can be found in [24].
Precision and recall	$\frac{TP}{TP + FP}, \frac{TP}{TP + FN}$	Precision is the ratio of correctly identified carriers of hidden information among the total number of instances identified as stego by the steganalysis algorithm. Recall is the ratio of correctly identified carriers of hidden information among the total number of hidden information instances present in the data. High precision and recall values indicate that the steganalysis algorithm effectively detects hidden information in the data.
Detection error rate (DER)	$\frac{1}{2}(P_{FA} + P_{MD})$	P_{FA} and P_{MD} are the false-alarm and missed-detection probabilities, respectively. The lower the DER, the more effective the steganalysis method. Note that DER can be expressed as $1 - \text{Accuracy}$.

output layer to the preceding layers. However, tuning the hyper-parameters of the model is crucial for optimal performance. Thus, determining the best model parameters is a significant challenge [92].

3.3.2. CNNs

CNN utilizes convolution layers that rely on the convolution operation to identify hidden patterns in images. This process was first introduced to detect low-level features before gradually detecting more complex features. Lower layers in the network are responsible for identifying basic features, while higher layers identify complex features [93]. The CNN model is most commonly used for image classification tasks. The CNN architecture consists of four different types of layers: convolution layers, max-pooling layers, dropout layers, and multilayer perceptron (MLP) layers. In CNN architecture, the MLP layer is fully connected. The basic convolution operation can be expressed using Equation 2, where p represents the input, t represents time, k represents the kernel, and $f(t, x, y)$ represents a feature map.

The variables u and v represent the spatial coordinates in the input signal, and $t - u$ and $x - v$ represent the relative displacement between the kernel and the input signal at each spatial position. The y coordinate is preserved throughout the convolution.

$$f(t, x, y) = f(p * k)(t, x, y) = \sum_{u=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{v=-\infty}^{\infty} p(u, v) \cdot k(t - u, x - v, y) \quad (2)$$

In this equation, represents the output signal at time $(t$ and spatial position (x, y) , $p(u, v)$ is the input signal in spatial position (u, v) and $k(t - u, x - v, y)$ is the 3D kernel. The summation is performed over all possible values of u and v , which can range from negative infinity to positive infinity. However, in practical applications, the signals are often discrete, so the summation is performed over a finite range determined by the size of the input signal and the kernel.

Equation 3 shows a neural network architecture where w represents weight, I represents input, b represents bias, and y represents the output of the neuron. Once the output of the neuron is obtained, the softmax function is applied to obtain the final output. Equation 4 given in [94].

Table 5

Analyzing current Internet datasets for the evaluation of DL-based steganalysis capabilities.

Data set	Year	Carrier type	Popularity	# Samples	# Training samples	# Test samples	Stego/Cover ratio	Data labelled?	DL-based works using the data set
BOSS	2011	Image	High	11,000	10,000 (BOSS-Base)	1000 (BOSS-Rank)	1:0	✗	[25–68]
BOWS2	2008	Image	High	10,000	–	–	1:0	✗	[26, 39, 44, 45, 50, 51, 57, 59, 65, 69]
IStego100K	2020	Image	Low	208,104	200,000	8,104	1:1	✓	[37, 70]
ALASKA2	2020	Image	Moderate	305,000	300,000	5000	1:4	✓	[42, 71, 72]
ImageNet	2009	Image	Moderate	14,197,122	–	–	1:0	✗	[34, 35, 51, 52, 73–76]
Cifar-10	2009	Image	Low	60,000	50,000	10,000	1:0	✗	[35, 74]
COCO	2015	Image	Low	330,000	–	–	1:0	✗	[77, 78]
LIRMMBase	2015	Image	Minimal	16,580	–	–	1:0	✗	[46]
Raise	2015	Image	Minimal	8,156	–	–	1:0	✗	[53]
LFW	2007	Image	Minimal	13,233	–	–	1:0	✗	[54]
UCID	2003	Image	Minimal	1338	–	–	1:0	✗	[60]
MIRFlickr25K	2008	Image	Minimal	25,000	–	–	1:0	✗	[60]
DIV2K	2017	Image	Minimal	1,000	800	100	1:0	✗	[60]
Xiph video test media	–	Video	Minimal	120	–	–	1:0	✗	[79]
TIMIT	1986	Speech	Low	6300	4620	1690	1:0	✗	[80, 81]
Noiseus	2007	Speech	Minimal	30	–	–	1:0	✗	[82]
Wall Street Journal	1992	Speech	Minimal	86000	–	–	1:0	✗	[83]
IMDB Movie Review	2011	Text	Moderate	50,000	25,000	25,000	1:0	✗	[84–89]
News	2022	Text	Low	210,294	–	–	1:0	✗	[84, 85]
Twitter	2009	Text	Moderate	1,600,365	1,600,000	365	1:0	✗	[84–88]
Gutenberg	2013	Text	Minimal	3,036	–	–	1:0	✗	[86]
Human UCSC-hg38	2013	DNA	Low	24,279 (genes)	–	–	1:0	✗	[90, 91]

Table 6

Comparison of DL techniques for diverse data-type steganalysis.

DL type	Text Steganalysis	Speech Steganalysis	Image Steganalysis	Video Steganalysis
CNN	Excellent for text steganalysis	Limited applications in speech	Excellent for image analysis	Promising for analyzing video
LSTM	Good for sequential data	Good for analyzing speech	Limited applications for images	Limited application for videos
DNN	Good for various data types	Good for various data types	Limited applications for images	Limited application for videos
RNN	Good for sequential data	Good for sequential data	Limited applications for images	Limited applications for videos
DBN	Limited applications for text analysis	Limited applications for speech analysis	Limited applications for image analysis	Limited applications for video analysis
RBN	Limited applications for text analysis	Limited applications for speech analysis	Limited applications for image analysis	Limited applications for video analysis
GNN	Limited applications for text analysis	Limited applications for speech analysis	Limited applications for image analysis	Limited applications for video analysis

$$y_{i,x,y} = \sum_{j=1}^N w_{i,j} \cdot I_{j,x,y} + b_i, \quad (3)$$

$$\text{softmax}(y_{i,x,y}) = \frac{e^{y_{i,x,y}}}{\sum_j e^{y_{j,x,y}}}. \quad (4)$$

The softmax function computes the exponential of the input value $y_{i,x,y}$ and normalizes it by the sum of the exponentials of all input values across the neurons (j) at the same spatial position (x, y). This normalization ensures that the resulting values lie in the range of $[0, 1]$ and sum up to 1, making them suitable for representing probabilities.

3.3.3. RNNs

RNN is a type of neural network (NN) that uses the output from the previous stage as input in the current stage [19]. Unlike conventional neural networks, where inputs and outputs are independent, RNNs are useful in scenarios where past inputs are needed

to predict future outputs, such as predicting the next word in a sentence. RNNs use a hidden layer to remember past inputs, making it different from the DNN model in terms of input processing, as shown in Figure 5.




Figure 5: The architecture of: (a) RNN and (b) RNN across a time step.

The hidden state is the essential component of the RNN model, which retains information about past input sequences. The RNN model comprises several layers and units, with the hidden layer unit containing information about the input history in the “state vector”. The back propagation through time (BPTT) algorithm can be used to learn the RNN model, and the stochastic gradient descent (SGD) and root mean squared propagation (RMSProp) algorithms can be used to optimize RNN parameters. However, RNN training is more challenging than other models due to its reliance on time, and its complexity increases with the learning period. The primary purpose of utilizing an RNN model is to learn long-term dependencies, although it has been found in the literature that learning RNNs can be challenging for long-term dependencies.

3.3.4. LSTMs

LSTM is an enhanced version of the RNN model that addresses the issue of RNNs failing in certain circumstances [95]. Unlike the RNN model, where the output of the previous stage is used as input in the current stage, the LSTM network is capable of storing past information for a longer period, making it suitable for applications requiring long-term dependencies [96]. The LSTM network consists of LSTM units that are combined to form an LSTM layer. Each LSTM unit is composed of cells that have input, output, and forget gates that control information flow within the network, allowing each cell to remember important information for an extended period. Equation 5 represents the forward pass of an LSTM unit [92].

$$\begin{aligned} A_f &= S_f(W_f * L_i + U_f * L_{j-1} + b_f), & A_i &= S_f(W_i * L_i + U_i * L_{j-1} + b_i), & L_j &= A_j * H_f(V_c) \\ A_j &= S_f(W_0 * L_i + U_0 * L_{j-1} + b_j), & V_c &= A_f * V_{c-1} + A_i * C_f(W_c * L_i + U_c * L_{j-1} + b_c) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

In this context, the symbols L_i and L_j stand for the input and output of the LSTM unit, respectively. A_f , A_i , and A_j denote the activation vectors for the forget, input, and output gates, respectively. Additionally, V_c is used to indicate the cell state vector, while S_f represents a *sigmoid* function. The hyperbolic tangent function is represented by H_f and C_f . The weight matrices are denoted by W and U , while the bias vector is represented by b [97].

3.3.5. Auto encoders

Auto encoders (AEs) is a type of neural network that consists of two components, an encoder, and a decoder. The encoder takes in input data, such as an image, and compresses it into a compact latent representation. This compression process helps to identify the important features of the input (also known as feature-map). The decoder then takes the latent representation and converts it back into the original data in an unsupervised manner (unlabeled target). Essentially, the auto-encoder performs a compression-decompression operation, it is also useful for denoising, and steganogram removal. Figure 6 illustrates a general architecture of an auto-encoder [13].




Figure 6: The general layout of an AE.

3.3.6. RBMs

RBMs are a category of unsupervised learning models used to determine the probability distribution of input data [98]. They are capable of discovering hidden patterns without supervision, but the training process can be challenging, which is a drawback. RBMs are composed of visible (denoted v_i) and hidden layers (denoted h_i^j) that form a bipartite and undirected graph, with no connections between layers. Each cell in the network processes input data and decides whether to transmit it or not, after multiplying it with weights and adding bias. The activation function is applied to the resulting input, generating an output that re-enters the network in the reconstruction phase. In Figure 7 (a), the neurons in both the visible and hidden layers form a bipartite graph, where each visible neuron is connected to all the hidden neurons, but the neurons within the same layer are not connected. The Gibbs sampler technique is used to train an RBM model to minimize the log-likelihood of both the data and the model [92].




Figure 7: Architecture of: (a) RBM and (b) DBN networks.

3.3.7. DBNs

A DBN is a generative artificial neural network that build upon the principles of RBMs. This kind of network consists of multiple layers of interconnected, undirected RBMs. These layers are usually divided into two primary types: the visible layer denoted as v_i and the hidden layers represented as h_i^j (as illustrated in Figure 7 (b)). DBNs are trained in an unsupervised manner using an algorithm called “layer-wise pre-training”. The output of each layer is used as input for the next layer, creating a deep network that can learn high-level representations of the input data. To train the DBN model, there are two steps involved. The first step is stacked RBM learning, which uses the iterative contrastive divergence (CD) algorithm, and the second step is back-propagation learning, which applies different optimization algorithms. In other words, the last layer of the DBN is usually trained using a supervised learning algorithm, such as back-propagation, to fine-tune the network for a specific task. DBNs have been used for various applications including image classification, speech recognition, and anomaly detection. Both the RBM and DBN models have the same hyper-parameters, which can be optimized using the CD algorithm. Like the RBM model, the DBN model has a disadvantage in that it first learns the input data in a probabilistic manner and then identifies independent features. After unsupervised learning, the classification is performed through supervised learning.

3.3.8. GNN

GNN is a type of neural network which directly operates on the graph structure. A typical application of GNN is node classification. Essentially, every node in the graph is associated with a label, and we want to predict the label of the nodes without ground truth. This section illustrates the algorithm described in the paper, the first proposal of GNN and thus is often regarded as the original GNN. In the node classification problem setup, each node v is characterized by its feature x_v and associated with a ground-truth label t_v . Given a partially labeled graph G , the goal is to leverage these labeled nodes to predict the labels of the unlabeled ones. This architecture learns to represent each node with a d dimensional vector (state) h_v which contains its neighborhood information. Specifically,

$$h_v = f(x_v, x_{co[v]}, h_{ne[v]}, x_{ne[v]}) \quad (6)$$

Where $x_{co[v]}$ denotes the features of the edges connecting with v , $h_{ne[v]}$ denotes the embedding of the neighbouring nodes of v , and $x_{ne[v]}$ denotes the features of the neighbouring nodes of v . The function f is the transition function that projects these inputs onto a d -dimensional space [99].

3.4. Taxonomy of steganalysis methods

Steganalysis methods can be categorized into two types: specific (or targeted) and universal steganalysis. Targeted steganalysis is effective in detecting specific steganography algorithms, with a low false alarm rate and accurate results, but its practical application is limited. Examples of specific steganalysis algorithms include regular-singular analysis [100], raw quick pair analysis [101], and blockiness artifacts analysis [102]. Universal steganalysis treats steganographic detection as a classification problem and uses ML to extract high-dimensional features for classification. Examples of universal steganalysis methods include subtractive pixel adjacency matrix feature analysis [103], steganalysis of JPEG images based on Markov features [104], and spatial rich model feature extraction [105]. Although these methods significantly improve detection performance, they require longer training times due to the use of

high-dimensional features. Feature design is a critical element in steganalysis, and the features used in the model are often obtained through manual design. This requires professional knowledge and substantial manual intervention, and the quality of the manually defined features directly affects the performance of the model.

There are different techniques for steganalysis, depending on the type of data being analyzed. A brief taxonomy of DL-based steganalysis techniques for image, video, speech, and text data is presented in Figure 8.




Figure 8: Taxonomy of existing steganalysis methods.

A brief overview of the different techniques depending on the type of the carrier is provided below:

- Image and video steganalysis:** There are several techniques for image steganalysis, including histogram analysis [106, 107], spatial domain analysis [108–110], and frequency domain analysis [111]. The researchers approach the video as a collection of images without taking into account the unique temporal characteristics of the video domain, thus many image steganalysis techniques are valid for video steganalysis. According to the review [112], video steganalysis techniques can be specific or targeted steganalysis, also known as passive steganalysis, which rely on prior knowledge of the steganography tool or embedding algorithm employed to conceal the confidential message [113]. Active steganalysis is the process of detecting or extracting a concealed message with limited or no prior information [114]. Video steganalysis techniques can be also temporal [115, 116], spatial like the methods surveyed in [117], or hybrid methods [116, 118]. Video steganalysis can rely on motion vector analysis, this method examines the motion vectors in the video to detect any changes or anomalies that may indicate the presence of hidden data [119, 120].
- Speech steganalysis:** As per the findings of [121], in the context of speech/audio steganalysis, there are non-targeted and non-compressed techniques that are classified as either spectral-like method-based fast Fourier transform (FFT) [122], method based mel-frequency cepstral coefficients (MFCC) [123] or temporal methods like least significant bits (LSB) method [124], pitch delay [125], pulse positions [126]. Alternatively, calibrated methods include denoising-based [127], constant referencing [128], and cover linear basis or re-sampling techniques [129]. For targeted approaches, speech/audio steganalysis can be based on phase, echo, or multiplications [128]. Additionally, speech/audio steganalysis can also be applied to compressed modes [129, 130].
- Text steganalysis:** Discovering secret information that is concealed within text documents is already summarized in [131] and it includes non-blind methods such as distribution of first letters of words analysis [132], context information analysis [133], analysis-based evolutionary algorithm [134], synonym frequency analysis [135]. Blind text steganalysis methods include techniques based on statistical language models [136, 137].

ML can be used as steganalysis method that involves training a model using a large data set of images, videos, speeches, or text documents, with the aim of recognizing patterns of hidden data in new images, videos, speeches, or text files. This approach is especially useful in steganalysis, as it enables the model to identify subtle changes or anomalies in the data that may indicate the presence of concealed information [138].

While various deep learning models, such as DNNs, CNNs, and LSTMs, are commonly applied in steganalysis across these diverse data types, it is essential to emphasize that, despite the shared core deep learning models, there exist significant distinctions in the methodologies and considerations associated with each data modality:

- **Data Preprocessing:** Each data modality requires unique preprocessing techniques tailored to its inherent characteristics. For instance, image steganalysis involves pixel-level analysis, whereas speech steganalysis necessitates audio feature extraction methods like MFCCs. These distinct preprocessing steps contribute to the diversity in steganalysis methodologies.
- **Network Architectures:** Generally, DNNs are versatile models used for various tasks in data analysis, such as classification. CNNs are primarily employed to process 1D data for tasks related to text and speech. They can handle also 2D and 3D data for images and videos. RNNs and LSTMs excel in retaining information from previous states, which is valuable for analyzing sequential data such as text and speech. Furthermore, GANs outperform in generating duplicate data, contributing to acquiring more information and addressing data scarcity issues. Similar to GANs, RBMs serve as fundamental components in constructing complex DL models, aiding in feature learning. DBNs are a variant of RBMs, functioning as generative models primarily used for feature learning. GNNs are designed for graph-structured data, empowering tasks like node classification and link prediction.
- **Datasets:** Diverse benchmark datasets are available for each data modality, with varying characteristics and complexities.

4. Cover-type-based deep steganalysis

DL techniques for steganalysis vary based on the cover type and data being analyzed, as different types of data have different statistical properties, and steganography methods use different techniques to embed secret information. For instance, image steganography may use LSB embedding or spatial domain techniques, while speech steganography may use spread spectrum or echo hiding. Therefore, DL techniques need to be adapted and optimized for each type of data and cover type to effectively detect hidden information. The upcoming subsections provide a summary of the SOTA methods proposed for each data type. Table 7 summarizes many of the detailed DL-based steganalysis schemes for both image and video data type.

4.1. Image steganalysis

This section provides an overview of the latest and most effective image steganalysis schemes that utilize DL techniques. To assist researchers who may want to replicate or build upon these models, Figure 9 presents a comprehensive summary of the architectures of the most commonly used models, including detailed information, such as kernels, max-pooling, batch normalization (BN) layer sizes, among others. Theoretical definitions of image-based steganalysis, including feature-based steganalysis, low probability modification, primary and secondary steganalytic classifiers, and more, can be found in [139]. Additionally, numerous proposed DL-based steganalysis frameworks benchmark their performance against the spatial rich model (SRM) method [140]. This framework is tailored for building steganography detectors by assembling a comprehensive noise model from various sub-models using image noise residuals. The model assembly is a key part of the training process, guided by samples from cover and stego sources. Ensemble ML classifiers are used due to their efficiency in handling high-dimensional feature spaces and large datasets, given their low computational complexity.

4.1.1. CNN-based methods

Since 2015, the use of CNN-based steganalysis methods has been increasing, gradually replacing the two-step machine-learning-based steganalysis approaches that involve feature extraction and classification. This shift in preference is largely due to the improved performance offered by CNN-based methods. The following summarizes and clusters proposed CNN SOTA methods that successfully identify stego images and clear cover images.

(a) Pre-processing-based methods: CNN based steganalysis is promising but suffers from degraded detection performance when an image is resized by the nearest-neighbor interpolation before steganography. To address this shortcoming, the preprocessing proposed in [25] involves the additional embedding of steganographic signals into both resized original images and resized steganographic ones with the same embedding key. This helps CNN learn features by making the difference of spatial frequencies between them obvious. In 2017, Ye et al. [26] proposed a novel approach that makes use of a set of high-pass filters in a SRM to identify the steganographic signal in an image. They found that initializing the parameters of the preprocessing layer significantly improved the results compared to random initialization. Additionally, they introduced the use of a truncated linear unit (TLU) for the first time and designed a TLU-CNN based on this activation function, as depicted in Figure 10. They also proposed the idea of selection-channel-aware steganalysis and developed a selection-channel-aware TLU-CNN network. The experimental results show that this network outperforms the traditional rich-model method in terms of detection performance. Yedroudj et al. [141] proposed a network called Yedroudj-Net that combines the successful features of Xu-Net [30] and Ye-Net [26] as depicted in Figure 9. They used 30 filters from SRM as initialization values for the preprocessing layer and added BN layers and TLU. Even without using selection-channel awareness, the network achieved good performance. Similarly, [27] proposes a study on the use of a TLU function in the pre-processing phase of a CNN-based steganalyzer. This function, combined with high-pass filters, can make the steganalyzer suitable for both spatial and JPEG domain steganalysis. This also allows the steganalysis method to perform detection in other domains, for instance, using Yedroudj-Net for JPEG steganalysis.

The performance of CNN-based steganalysis approaches is often linked to the size of the learning database. Increasing the size of the database can lead to better results, but obtaining a large database with controlled acquisition conditions can be difficult. Data augmentation can be an efficient approach to improve the efficiency of the steganalysis process. The proposed method in [143], is called “pixels-off”, which involves switching off a small proportion of pixels from the initial database of cover images to increase the data set. This technique is different from traditional noise addition methods, which alter the initial surface statistical regularities,




Figure 9: Commonly used CNNs schemes for the steganalysis of digital images. The information enclosed within the boxes contains the number of kernels multiplied by the height, width, and number of feature maps as input. On the other hand, the data outside the boxes is structured as the number of feature maps multiplied by height and width. If the values of Stride or Padding are not given, then the assumed values are 1 and 0, respectively [17, 142].

leading to a mismatch between the learning set and the test set. The pixels-off technique is applied directly to the spatial domain, keeping the average cover statistics. This technique can simulate dead pixels or faulty sensors that frequently occur in various application domains.

(b) Universal methods: DL has gained popularity in various fields and has also been applied to steganalysis by researchers, resulting in significant achievements. Steganalysis using DL has been proposed by several researchers. Qian et al. [28] proposed a CNNs model that can automatically learn feature representations and complex dependencies that are useful for steganalysis. Zeng et al. proposed a hybrid deep-learning framework for the steganalysis of JPEG images that incorporates domain knowledge from rich models [29]. Xu et al. [30] introduced a CNN structure with five convolutional layers and incorporated BN and global average pooling, which are widely used in image classification tasks. The network applies several activation functions, including absolute activation, hyperbolic tangent (TanH) activation function, and rectified linear unit (ReLU) to improve the experimental results. Their performance surpasses the SRM scheme [140], and the improved Xu-Net yields better outcomes for steganalysis in the joint photographic experts group (JPEG) domain [31]. One of the classical methods includes the Gaussian-neuron convolutional neural network (GNCNN) proposed by Qian et al. [32, 144], which uses a Gaussian activation function with CNNs. The network structure is comprised of three parts: a preprocessing layer that uses high-pass filters, a convolutional layer for feature extraction, and a fully connected layer for classification. This method is one of the earliest to use CNNs for steganalysis and has produced results that are similar to traditional methods that use manually designed features.

Li et al. [145] developed a CNN architecture, called ReSTNet, that consists of both linear and nonlinear filters arranged in a parallel subnet structure, leading to enhanced steganographic detection performance. Zhang et al. [146] proposed a CNN model that utilizes separable convolution, multilevel pooling, and spatial pyramid pooling techniques to achieve high detection accuracy for images of various sizes. Yang et al. [124] used maxCNN to integrate knowledge from the selection channel into a CNN for steganalysis. Zhang et al. [147] proposed an improved general CNN model called AG-Net for low-bit embedding steganalysis in the framework of DL. The model includes a confrontation module to extract and compare features from cover and stego parts, an association between adjacent confrontation modules to accumulate feature differences and a softmax layer for classification and detection of stego images. The work in [33] analyzes the impact of input data sequence on CNN training results based on the training mechanism. Differences in the data sequence can be caused by data correlation, data mini-batch processing, and high-pass filtering operations. The results show that the pairwise data, comprising cover and stego images generated using two separate steganography algorithms (S_UNIWARD and WOW) at distinct embedding rates (0.1 and 0.4), has a better network detection effect than the random data. Due to overfitting and hyper-parameter tuning problems, DL models encounter difficulties. Thus, in [148], an effective CNN model, denoted as θ nondominated sorting genetic algorithm-III (NSGA-III), is introduced. This model is built upon the densely connected convolutional neural network (DCNN) model and is employed to address these issues in image steganalysis by fine-tuning the initial model parameters. The universal method in [149] includes an ensemble classification strategy to allow any CNN-based steganalysis to train just one model, forming an ensemble that can enhance detection accuracy for both spatial and JPEG steganography. The proposed method constructs sub-spaces for training base learners, and a novel voting fusion structure automatically optimizes during the training process. Mustafa et al. [34] propose a new approach to blind image steganalysis that reduces the computational cost by discarding pre-processing, improves detection accuracy by modifying a recent CNN model, and uses a hybrid technique of model and data parallelism in both convolution and fully connected layers. The training workflow is based on forward and backward propagation. The study [150] compared CNN and the latest version of spatial rich models with ensemble classifier (SRM-EC), called maxSRMd2 method [151], and proposed an ensemble method that combined the two, yielding an improvement that surpassed the performance achieved by maxSRMd2. The proposed framework [35] aims to prevent the use of DL-based steganography in covert communications and transactions. The framework proposes a DL-based steganalysis technique that removes secret images by restoring the original image's distribution. The technique uses a DNN to exploit pixel and edge distributions and remove the hidden information, contrary to the attention-based schemes which use a whole region of interest during classification. The evaluation of the technique using three public benchmarks shows better performance compared to conventional steganalysis methods, considering that the decoding method of DL-based steganography is different from conventional steganography. Figure 11 illustrates an example of a pixel-level steganalysis scheme.

WISERNet is a highly regarded color image steganalysis algorithm proposed in 2019 [36]. The proposed method is based on using separate channel-wise convolution without summation in the bottom layer and united normal convolution in the upper layers. Thus, WISERNet widens the upper convolutional layer to increase the output involved in the summation and suppresses the image content in the lower layer, which improves network performance. The authors conducted extensive experiments and found that WISERNet outperformed other SOTA steganalytic models for color images with less complexity. Ren et al. [108] proposed an end-to-end steganalytic scheme that involves a selection channel network and a steganalysis network. The two networks, LSCA-XuNet and LSCA-YeNet, are trained together, with the selection channel network learning and outputting selection channels for the steganalysis network. Gomis et al. [152] focused on steganalysis of images with a cover-source mismatch problem. The study suggests using a combination of unsupervised and supervised ML algorithms to improve the classifier's performance. The unsupervised step involves using the k -means algorithm to group similar images. When the number of extracted features is large, the study recommends using a CNN to group similar images and an MLP neural network to estimate the hidden message length in different groups. Lai et al. [37] made significant contributions to steganalysis by creating a U-shaped symmetric architecture that preserves spatial distribution properties, developing a focus enhancement filter module to improve the learning of low-amplitude hidden signals, using feedback residual and pixel shuffle techniques for high-quality image reconstruction, and conducting experiments that show the effectiveness of their proposed FFR-Net method compared to state-of-the-art steganalysis models. You et al. in [38] proposed a new steganalytic network, called RestegNet, that uses a novel building block group consisting of sharpening




Figure 10: General outline for a steganalyzer that includes a preprocessing module besides a convolutional module for feature extraction, and a classification module.




Figure 11: An example of pixel-level steganalysis. The PixelSteganalysis P framework has two components, an analyzer, and an eraser. When given a stego image x as input, the framework applies the eraser function to produce a purified stego image \hat{x} , denoted as $P(x)$.

and smoothing blocks, named ShRC and SmRC, respectively, to widen the gap between cover and stego images in feature extraction layers. The network outperforms previous methods obtained for the BOSSbase 1.01 data set. RestegNet achieves better detection accuracy and faster convergence speed compared to XuNet and TLU-CNN, while using the same preprocessing layers as the previous methods.

(c) Attention layer-based methods: The attention mechanism is a technique that helps to prioritize important regions and generate feature weights efficiently. It was inspired by the human visual system, which selectively focuses on important information while ignoring less relevant details. By simulating this process, the attention mechanism can enhance the performance of classification networks by improving the focus on relevant information. The integration of attention and artificial intelligence tasks has become increasingly important for capturing global dependencies. Self-attention, which was developed later, allows for a response from a specific position in a sequence by focusing on all positions in that same sequence. This approach overcomes the limitations of convolution, which only operates on local neighborhoods and lacks global information. The SAANet network model proposed in [39] replaces traditional convolution with attention-augmented convolution, which enables the network to allocate more learning weights to the steganographic area. This approach guides the network to learn features that are more advantageous for steganalysis. Yang et al. [153] present a new image steganalysis model that uses a multilayer attention mechanism and a dual-residual structure network to enhance the transmission of steganographic signals. The proposed model is able to effectively capture steganographic data, as demonstrated by its performance on many data sets, achieving comparable results compared to current algorithms. The method proposed in [40] uses a CNN model with an efficient channel attention module by merging the efficient channel Attention (ECA) module with CNN, to focus on the steganographic region of the image and capture local cross-channel interaction information. DTL is applied to improve the steganalysis performance of low embedding rate images. Experimental results show that the proposed method outperforms the typical state-of-the-art models, demonstrating higher detection performance for steganalysis

of low embedding rate images. The performance of DL-based steganalysis can be enhanced by incorporating selection-channel aware (SCA) knowledge, but this is often unavailable in practical applications. To address this, the framework presented in [154] proposes a novel CNN model that includes extra non-linear kernels in the first network layer to enhance the stego signal and utilizes the residual channel-spatial attention (CSA) module along with a spatial pyramid pooling (SPP) to improve performance, similar to SCA.

(d) Noise-based methods: According to current literature, the steganalytic detector's accuracy improves if it is trained using the residual error (embedding noise) domain. However, to obtain an accurate noise residual, it is necessary to predict the cover image precisely from the corresponding stego image. In the scheme proposed in [155], a denoising kernel was used to obtain a more precise noise residual. Subsequently, a CNN-based steganalytic detector was developed, which was trained using the noise residual to improve detection accuracy. The results of the experiments indicate that the proposed approach outperforms current steganalysis schemes against current steganographic techniques. Boroumand et al. [41, 156] introduced SRNet, which does not use conventional high-pass filters but instead focuses on maximizing the noise residuals introduced by steganography methods, leading to one of the most accurate steganalysis methods to date. You et al. [42] designed an end-to-end DL solution for detecting steganography images from normal images, without retraining parameters, using a Ke-Net architecture based on the Siamese network with three phases: preprocessing, feature extraction, and fusion/classification. The algorithm is validated using data sets of steganography images of varying sizes and their corresponding normal images, sourced from BOSSbase 1.01 and ALASKA #2. The experimental results indicate that the proposed network is well-generalized and robust.

The scheme proposed in [157] constructs and applies models for removing document image hidden messages using DL, based on the concept of adversarial perturbation removal. These models include feed-forward denoising CNN and high-level representation guided denoiser (HGD). The method demonstrated better scalability and adaptability compared to SOTA methods. The method in [43] proposes a hybrid DL framework with a CNN that uses residual-based investigation for digital image steganalysis. The proposed framework extracts five types of handcrafted features to model the noise residuals, and a robust CNN with a new parallel architecture is used to classify the input features as cover or stego. The CNN is trained using stacked 1-dimensional residual features arranged in a 2-dimensional grid. The proposed architecture is evaluated using three spatial content-adaptive and four spatial non-content-adaptive algorithms, and the results show that it outperforms existing SOTA steganalytic methods. The approach presented in [158] proposes a multi-frequency residual deep convolutional neural network (MFRNet) for the steganalysis of color images. MFRNet uses DL techniques to analyze color images and detect steganographic noise. The network consists of two modules: a color image preprocessing module and a multi-frequency steganographic noise residual extraction to detect high-frequency information in the image texture, as well as low-frequency information that corresponds to the image content, and classification module. The MFRNet is more lightweight than other DL models used in steganalysis, making it more efficient for real-world applications. This research has potential applications in cybersecurity and digital forensics. MFRNet can suppress the interference of image content and better reduce the impact of the steganography algorithm and payload mismatch. The experimental results show that MFRNet outperforms the SOTA model, WISERNet [36], on the PPG-LIRMMCOLOR data set.

(e) Transform-based methods: Due to the widespread use of JPEG compression, several steganographic techniques have been developed to hide messages in JPEG format. Therefore, it is crucial to conduct steganalysis on JPEG images. Zeng et al. [73] were the first to use a DL approach in the transform domain steganalysis, in 2016, and they introduced a new model called hybrid CNN (HCNN) consisting of three CNN subnetworks for JPEG steganalysis. The experimental results showed that HCNN outperformed other existing SOTA models in terms of accuracy. However, compared to previous DL-based steganalysis models in the spatial domain, HCNN is more complex. This is due to two additional steps, namely quantitative and truncated, and three paths in the feature extraction module. Previous models only had one path, and, consequently, HCNN leads to an increase in network complexity and computational overhead. FractalNet [159, 160], a DL model, has recently demonstrated competitive performance similar to that of Resnet.

Reference [160] presents a new CNN-based steganalysis model for JPEG images called JPEGCNN. It calculates pixel residuals using a 3×3 kernel function, which solves problems with image content affecting direct analysis of discrete cosine transform (DCT) coefficients and larger kernel functions not effectively capturing neighborhood correlation changes. Compared to the HCNN model, JPEGCNN is a lightweight structure with fewer training parameters and maintains similar accuracy. The OneHot method in [44], for JPEG steganalysis, uses DCT coefficients as a preprocessing step, and demonstrated that a DNN may not be necessary to achieve desired accuracy levels. Only a small number of layers were found to be sufficient. The work proposed in [45] presents a method for adapting CNN-based detectors for detecting modern JPEG-domain steganography. The method involves introducing the concept of JPEG phase awareness into the network architecture through a new phase-split layer and two ways for incorporating phase awareness. The authors also enhance the key-value kernel, a kernel size traditionally used to pre-filter images for CNN detectors, with a second fixed kernel to enable the network to learn kernels that are better suited for detecting the stego noise introduced by JPEG-domain embedding techniques. The proposed design is tested using J-UNIWARD [161] and UED-JC [162] steganographic algorithms in experiments to show its effectiveness. The work presented in [163] proposed quantitative steganalysis that aims to estimate the size of the hidden message within an image that has been identified as containing confidential data. The features extracted from the activation of CNN detectors are used to perform payload estimation in the spatial and JPEG domains. The authors refer to this method as the "bucket regressor," which utilizes the MSE activation function for prediction instead of softmax for classification. Zhan et al. [164] proposed a JPEG steganalysis method based on FractalNet, called FRNet. This method involves introducing a residual unit with a shortcut connection into the fractal structure, which enables the network to effectively suppress image content and generate the residual image with stego noise. A deep feature extraction module is then used to downsample the feature map

and superimpose the weak stego signal between different channels of the convolution layer. The proposed approach achieved good detection performance when evaluated on two steganographic algorithms, namely, J-UNIWARD and UERD.

(f) Adversarial-based methods: CNN-based steganalysis has demonstrated superior performance compared to traditional ML methods. However, recent research in DL has revealed that CNNs are susceptible to adversarial examples, which are slight modifications of input data that can cause incorrect decisions. Adversarial examples have been used successfully in steganography to counter target CNN steganalyzers by adjusting the embedding costs based on back-propagated gradients [165]. Adversary-aware training can improve the performance of the steganalyzer, but this can lead to a dilemma where Eve, the adversary, does not know the exact parameters used by Alice, the steganographer, for adversarial embedding [166]. Similarly, Alice cannot tune the internal parameters of the steganographic scheme to maximize its deception capability because she does not know the exact images used by Eve to train the steganalyzer. This dilemma is illustrated in Figure 12. To overcome the apparent stalemate, Shi et al. [167] propose a game theoretical approach to address the problem of determining the parameters for the steganalyst and steganographer. They suggest two variations of the game, differing in how the steganalyzer-based CNN network output is thresholded to reach a final decision. In both games, the steganographer aims to increase the probability of missed detection, while the steganalyst aims to reduce the overall error probability in one game and missed detection probability for a given false alarm rate in the other. They conducted experiments using a modified version of the adversarial embedding scheme proposed by Tang et al. [165] and found equilibrium points and corresponding payoffs for both versions of the game. By comparing error probabilities at equilibrium to those obtained using alternative strategies, such as a worst-case assumption or Tang et al.'s adversarial embedding scheme, they demonstrate the advantages of using game theory to address the interaction between the steganographer and steganalyst.




Figure 12: The issue of embedding or detecting steganography in an adversary-aware context.

The purpose of the scheme proposed in [168] is to suggest a novel end-to-end network that can enhance steganalysis task performance by balancing detection accuracy and efficiency. The authors have incorporated separable convolution and an adversarial mechanism to isolate the steganographic from the content signals in spatial images. This separation enables better extraction of steganographic embedding features and enhances the performance of image steganographic detection by reducing interference from the image content. The gradient reversal layer (GRL) makes adversarial training between the feature extractor and the label classifier more straightforward. GRL optimizes the loss function in the opposite direction of the gradient, resulting in the extraction of more image content features to deceive the discriminator's classification. Figure 13 illustrates the scheme proposed in [168]. Zhang et al. [76] suggest a CNN model for detecting adversarial examples, which is based on end-to-end based-attention steganalysis. The work proposed in [77] presents evidence that training the YeNet architecture [26], which can undergo training using paired data sets of both cover images and corresponding stego images, with adversarially generated examples from the SteganoGAN method [169], can lead to improved performance on the blind steganalysis task.

4.1.2. DRN/GNN-based methods

Deep residual networks (DRNs), or ResNets, were proposed initially by He et al. [170] for image recognition. The success of DRN in tasks such as image classification, object detection, and semantic segmentation has led to its use in the field of steganalysis in numerous works [31, 41, 46–49, 79, 80, 156, 171–183]. Wu et al. were the first to apply a DRN in image steganalysis in their works [175, 181, 182]. Their proposed architecture includes three sub-networks: a high-pass filtering (HPF) sub-network, a DRL sub-network, and a classification sub-network. The HPF sub-network extracts noise components from cover and stego images. The DRL sub-network extracts relevant features to distinguish between cover and stego images. The classification sub-network, a fully connected neural network, maps the features obtained from the Residual Learning sub-network to binary labels. Tan et al. [173] and Li et al. [172] proposed incorporating channel pruning to shrink the size of the steganalyzer while preserving accuracy. They applied the pruning method to both the SRNet and XuNet2 architectures (Figure 9). The experimental results show that the proposed non-structured pruning method can significantly reduce the computational and storage cost of the original deep-learning frameworks without affecting their detection accuracy.




Figure 13: An example of adversarial steganography using GRL.

The SRNet model, illustrated in Figure 9, is a DRN-based steganalysis model that has been used as a foundation for multiple works, which have then been improved upon [47, 49, 60, 79, 80, 171, 174, 178, 179]. For example, Yousfi et al. [171] presented the design and training of detectors developed for the ALASKA steganalysis challenge. The detectors, based on SRNet, were trained on different combinations of three input channels: luminance and two chrominance channels, to handle varying image quality factors. This approach is based on the idea that the different channels in an image have distinct statistical properties that can be utilized to enhance steganalysis performance. On the other hand, Chen and Jiao [174] introduced a new neural network called “SRNet-CBAM” that incorporates a convolution block attention module (CBAM) to address the challenges of analyzing adaptive steganography and identifying picture regions that are favorable for modeling. This mechanism helps to identify and highlight important features of an image, such as high-frequency information while ignoring less relevant details like smooth background. As a result, the network can better represent the embedded signal. The experimental results show that the SRNet-CBAM model improves the accuracy of the original SRNet model by an average of 1.36%.

Li et al. [178] introduced a method for maximizing the accuracy of steganalysis through ensemble learning. This method is built on the SRNet model and incorporates multiple base learners that are derived from different training data and snapshots. The optimization is achieved through a combination of decision outputs and feature fusion. The results of their experiments demonstrate that this ensemble method improves classification accuracy compared to the SRNet model in both the spatial and JPEG domains. Wang et al. [47] applied DRN based on neural architecture search (NAS) to enhance the SRNet by discovering a combination of residual layer structures that is more appropriate for steganalysis. Additionally, they designed a long-span residual structure that preserves the signal of the hidden message without weakening it after passing through a multi-layer CNN. The findings demonstrate that this model outperforms manually designed models in most steganography processing. In [177], the authors present DRHNet, a model for the steganalysis of images that employs heterogeneous kernel residual learning. Rather than using the image directly as input to the network, they extract features and create a feature matrix with a rich model, which serves as the actual input. They also use a heterogeneous kernel called “HetConv”, leading to reduced computational complexity without sacrificing accuracy. In [48, 180], DRN has been used for multi-class blind image steganalysis. This approach identifies the stego image into the corresponding embedding algorithm class without any prior knowledge of the cover media or steganographic algorithm used. However, [48] employed hierarchical DRNs.

GNNs have been also exploited in image steganalysis. Liu and Wu [184] claim that altering an image for the purpose of steganography inevitably impacts the statistical properties of the graph-based features that are extracted from the cover image. To address this, they convert each image into a graph, where the patches of the image are represented as nodes and the relationships between the patches are represented as edges. The features of each node are derived from its corresponding patch using a shallow CNN structure. The graph is then processed through a graph attention network for feature representation, enabling the feature vector produced to be used for final classification. The results of their experiments show that the proposed architecture performs similarly to the commonly used CNN model.

4.1.3. AE/DNN-based methods

Chen et al. [179], suggested a DNN model with multiple scales based on the steganalysis residual network SRNet. They selected various local receptive fields within the same layer to produce distinctive channels of features. These channels were then recognized to identify different steganographic features of the image at different scales. Their experiments demonstrated that using a multi-scale residual network resulted in higher accuracy in detecting steganography compared to networks that only used a single-scale channel.

In 2014, Tan and Li [185] introduced an approach that incorporated AE for detecting steganography in images, which involved stacking multiple layers of convolutional auto-encoders. However, despite being able to detect steganography in various image formats and not just JPEG images, this method failed to surpass the performance of pre-existing steganalysis techniques. Cohen et al. [67] proposed an architecture that consists of two stages. In the first stage, a denoising auto-encoder (DAE) is applied to perform preprocessing on the input image. In the second stage, a Siamese neural network classifier is proposed. This latter network measures the distance between the DAE-processed image and the original input image to make this determination (Figure 14). The idea behind this architecture is that the DAE can learn the preprocessing steps for the image during training.




Figure 14: An example of using a Siamese architecture that relies on two sub-areas of an input image or composite steganography/non-steganography image that are separately processed by parallel subnetworks. Noise residuals are then extracted from each sub-area, and the outputs of the two subnetworks are combined to extract relationships that distinguish steganographic images from non-steganographic ones. The Siamese architecture has been used in [42].

Table 7: Cover-based image/video steganalysis. The type of cover could be identified from the data set used. (S), (T), and (S-Temp) stand for spatial, transform, and spatial-temporal domains, respectively. The well-known steganographic schemes: WOW, S-UNIWARD, HILL, and MiPOD belong to the S domain. UED, UERD, and J-UNIWARD, belong to the T domain. When many results are presented, only the maximum performance is mentioned. The improvement is calculated in percentage points.

Paper	DL model	Domain	Steganographic algorithm	Compared to	Data set	Metric used	Observations
[25]	CNN	S	WOW, S-UNIWARD, HUGO-BD	[156]	BOSSbase	Accuracy	Detection improved up to 34.8% when the same steganogram is embedded.
[26]	TLU-CNN	S	WOW, S-UNIWARD, HILL	[140, 151]	BOSS, BOWS2	DER	A novel activation function TLU used while integrating channel selection knowledge to enhance its performance. DER ranges from 11.82% to 28.08% depending on dataset preprocessing.
[27]	YedroudjNet,	S, T	WOW, J-UNIWARD	[51, 141]	BOSSBase	Accuracy	DenseNet is also investigated. In only 100 epoch, accuracy up to 90%.
[28]	GNCNN	S	HUGO, WOW, S-UNIWARD	[140]	BOSSbase, ImageNet	DER	Improvement from 2% to 5% higher DER than SRM method.
[29]	CNN	S	HUGO, WOW, S-UNIWARD	[28]	BOSSbase	DER	Achieving a 17% reduction in DER compared to the SRM-EC method.
[30]	CNN	S	S-UNIWARD, HILL	[140]	BOSSbase	Accuracy, ROC	Achieving accuracy and receiver operating characteristic (ROC) results comparable to that obtained using the SRM method.
[31]	CNN	S	S-UNIWARD	[140, 151]	BOSSbase	DER	Integrating the networks from [26] and [170]. Reduce DER by about 35%.
[32]	CNN	S	HUGO, WOW, S-UNIWARD, MiPOD, HILL-CMD	[140, 151]	BOSSbase	DER	Outperform SOTA methods in terms of DER with 16.55% for HOGO and 24.20% for S-UNIWARD methods.
[33]	CNN	S	WOW, S-UNIWARD	Random data	BOSSbase	Accuracy	The performance of in-pair data is better than that of shuffled data, with a maximum accuracy reaching 86%.
[34]	CNN	S	HILL, WOW, S-UNIWARD	[141, 146]	BOSSbase, ImageNet	Accuracy	Improvement reach 13.3%, LReLU activation function is used. Speedup 21.2 times than SOTA.
[35?]	CNN	S	LSB insertion, HUGO, WOW, S-UNIWARD	[24]	Cifar-10, BOSSbase, ImageNet	PSNR, SSIM, DT	Enhancements obtained in both the decoded rate and the destruction rate (DT), ranging from 10% to 20%.
[36]	WISERNet	S	HILL, SUNIWARD, SUNIWARD, CMD-C-HILL, CMD-C-	[26, 30, 186]	BOSSBase	Accuracy, FLOPs	Enhanced detection with <50% floating-point operations (FLOPs) complexity compared to advanced DL colored image steganalyzer.
[152]	DeepStego	T	Stegano	Universal	MNIST	Accuracy	MLP is used to estimate steganogram lengths with an accuracy reaching up to 99%.
[37]	FFR-Net	S, T	HILL, J-UNIWARD, WOW, UERD	[140, 151]	IStego100K, BOSSbase	MSE, PSNR, SSIM, DER, accuracy	Achieve cutting-edge results with accuracy of 97.04, 29.06, 0.88, and 229.38 for PSNR, mean SSIM, and MSE, respectively.
[38]	RestegNet	S	S-UNIWARD	[26, 30]	BOSSbase	Accuracy	RestegNet is improved by 3.07% to 7.45% compared to XuNet, and faster 8 times compared to TLU-CNN.
[39]	SAANet	T	J-UNIWARD, JC-UED	[31, 41, 45, 151]	BOSSbase, BOWS2	Accuracy	Achieved up to 96.68%. Model efficiency up to 28s.
[40]	Attention	S	S-UNIWARD, WOW, HUGO	[30, 141]	BOSSbase	Accuracy	At an embedding rate of 0.05 bit per pixel (bpp), the enhanced accuracy now spans from 5.03% to 37.83%.
[41]	CNN	T	Low-pass and High-pass filtering, Denoising, Tonal	ML detector	BOSSbase	Accuracy	Performance up to 97.91%. It can determine the processing history of JPEG images, it can be applied to both steganalysis and forensics.

Table 7 (Continue)

Paper	DL model	Domain	Steganographic algorithm	Compared to	Data set	Metric used	Comments
[42]	SiaStegNet	S	WOW, S-UNIWARD, HILL	[156]	BOSSbase, ALASKA #2	AUC	Achieved area under the curve (AUC) values exceeding 99% in less than 100 epochs, showcasing robust generalization abilities and can withstand variations.
[43]	CNN	S	HUGO-BD, S-UNIWARD, WOW	[140, 151]	BOSSbase	Accuracy, DER	Maximum accuracy of 83.6% and 47.3% in high and low volume payload bins, for content-adaptive and non-content-adaptive algorithms, respectively. DER decrease up to 13.4%.
[73]	CNN	T	J-UNIWARD, UERD, UED	[30, 31]	ImageNet	FLOP	Using quantization and truncation techniques in DL steganalyzers can enhance their performance in terms of FLOPs.
[44]	OneHot CNN	T	J-UNIWARD, UED-JC, EBS, nsF5	[31, 41]	BOSSbase, BOWS2 (Gray-scale)	DER	Able to learn relevant inter-block and intra-block connections using dilated convolutions and vanilla. 4.7% better than SRNet.
[45]	PNet, VNet	T	J-UNIWARD, UED-JC	SCA-GFR	BOSSbase, BOWS2	Accuracy	Improves detection by 7%, while SCA-GFR only enhances it by 1%.
[76]	ADNet	S	C&W, FGSM, BIM, DeepFool	[26, 187–189]	ImageNet (ILSVRC-2016)	Accuracy	Achieved 93.56% for adversarial examples detection.
[77]	YeNet	S	LSB, HiDDeN, SteganoGAN	—	COCO	AUC	Able to detect alteration with an AUC of 97.10%.
[46]	DRN	S	HUGO, S-UNIWARD, WOW	[26, 30, 144, 151]	BOSSbase, LIRMMBase	DER	When tested with a 0.4 payload, it showed a 1.2-3.5% decrease in detection error across three data sets.
[176]	DRN	S	PDM, FDM, DHSPT, PTHVS	PMMTM, LargeLTP	Created (IBB-Halftone)	Filter size	Approach developed for halftone images. Filter size 5×5 can capture more embedding trace.
[79]	VSRNet	S	Candidate motion vector (CMV)	Aly, and Xu methods	Xiph video test media	MAE	Videos are coded using HEVC. MAE can be greater than 0.05.
[47]	SNNet	S	SUNIWARD, WOW	Change embedding rate	BOSSbase	AUC	Achieved up to 98.25%, with an improvement of up to 1.5%.
[48]	ResNets	S	LSB, PVD, WOW, S-UNIWARD	—	BOSSbase	Accuracy	Attains a 79.71% accuracy rate in classifying the four steganographic algorithms.
[49]	GLSNet	S	S-UNIWARD, Baluja-Net [190]	Without RES, CNN, FC	BOSSbase	Accuracy	Achieves a high accuracy of 77.75% with only one pair of cover and stego images.
[50]	LWENet	S	WOW, S-UNIWARD, HILL	[41, 141, 145, 191, 192]	BOSSBase, BOSW2	Accuracy	Improving detection by using multi-view features, and achieved 92.59%.
[51]	Xu-Net	T	J-UNIWARD	[31]	BOSSbase, BOWS2, ImageNet	DER	The study found DER of 40.26% and 15.05% for 0.4 and 0.1 embedding rates, respectively.
[74]	CNN	S	CornerSearch, C&W- I_0 , SparseFool, DeepFool, C&W- I_2 , DDN, PGD, BIM	[140, 188]	ImageNet, CIFAR-10	Accuracy	Steganalysis for adversarial examples detection. Achieving a result of 100% for the CIFAR-10 dataset.
[193]	CNN	T	DCT/DST	SFE-AU, NRCNN	—	Accuracy	Based on the residual convolution layer for feature extraction, it achieved 91.81% in binary HEVC classification.
[194]	CNN	S-Temp	Object forgery in video	[195]	SYSU-OBJFORG	F1-score	Achieves up to 92.23% on SYSU-OBJFORG.
[196]	SSTNet	S-Temp	AE-based DeepFakes, Face2Face, FaceSwap	FF++	FaceForensics++	Accuracy	Achieved up to 98.57%. The generalization is proven on the GAN-based DeepFakes data set.
[52]	CNN	T	J-UNIWARD	[31]	BOSSbase, ImageNet	DER	Reduce DER by 4.33% and 6.55%, for XuNet and SCA-GFR methods, respectively.
[53]	CNN	S	HUGO, WOW, S-UNIWARD	—	BOSSbase, RAISE	Accuracy	Steganalysis over noisy channel can reach an accuracy of 97.5%.
[78]	FPNet	S	HiNet, WOW, S-UNIWARD, Mi-POD, HUGO	[26, 42, 156]	COCO	Accuracy	An ultra-lightweight network with just 0.16 million parameters, can achieve an accuracy of up to 91.75%.
[54]	DNN	S	StegHide	LSB, [197]	LFW, BOSSbase	Accuracy	Achieves an accuracy of 90.93% and 84.63% for LFW and BOSS data set respectively.
[55]	DNN/ Ensemble classifiers	T	UERD, J-UNIWARD, nsF5	[47]	BOSSbase	Accuracy	Achieves accuracy of 99.9% for NsF5 (at 0.4 bpnzac), whereas for J-UNIWARD, detection was challenging at 0.1 bpnzac density (max. 56.3%). Ensemble classifiers showed promise as an alternative to DL detection.
[75]	SRNet	S	HILL, MiPod	[140, 186]	ImageNet	TPR	Detection probability can reach 94.8%. The probability of fooling both EfficientNet-b0 and the detector SRNet is 5.9%.
[56]	J-Net	S	S-UNIWARD, WOW	Without JMMD	BOSSBase	Accuracy	Adapts JMMD into deep steganalysis. It can enhance the accuracy by 7%-10%.
[57]	CNN	S, T	S-UNIWARD, HILL, WOW, J-UNIWARD, UED-JC	SRNet, Cov-Net	BOSSBase, BOWS2	Accuracy	Attains a 0.56% improvement compared to SRNet in the specific domain.
[58]	CNN	T	J-UNIWARD, UED	Ensemble classifiers	BOSSBase	Accuracy	Outperforms traditional algorithms by 2%-3% under different embedding rates.
[59]	PC-DARTS	S	S-UNIWARD, HILL, WOW	[26, 156]	BOSSbase, BOWS2	Accuracy	Outperforms SRNet in detecting WOW at 0.4 bpp with 91.40% accuracy, but shows slightly lower performance in other cases with a difference of less than 0.57%.

4.2. Video steganalysis

Video steganalysis, unlike other data modalities such as images or text, has received comparatively less attention in the research community. This limited focus on video steganalysis can be attributed to several factors, including the complexity of video data, the increased computational demands of processing videos, and the challenges associated with developing steganalysis techniques specifically tailored to video content. Due to the constraints mentioned above, most steganalysis researchers opt to transform videos

into sequences of images, enabling them to create steganalysis techniques applicable to both image and video formats (as depicted in Figure 8). Additionally, numerous researchers have developed video steganalysis techniques and subsequently compared their outcomes with image steganalysis algorithms. The unequal distribution of research focus has led to a scarcity of well-established methodologies, benchmark datasets, and comprehensive studies in the field of video steganalysis. In this review, we have endeavored to present the available literature on video steganalysis to the best of our ability, considering the limitations in terms of the depth and breadth of research in this area.

To provide context, it's crucial to understand the pressing need for advancements in video steganalysis.

Advanced video encoding formats have become popular on the Internet, but this has led to increased video tampering and malicious video forgery. To address this issue, there is a growing need for passive video forensic techniques to verify the authenticity of pre-existing video content, which has become an important research topic. The researchers consider object-based forgery in video frames similar to image tampering in the corresponding motion residuals. They use feature extractors and algorithms that were initially designed for image steganalysis to extract forensic features from the motion residuals [198]. For example, reference [194] proposes a method for forgery detection that has two steps: video sequence preprocessing and network model training. In the first step, an absolute difference algorithm is used to convert the video sequence to image patches. These patches are labeled as positive and negative samples to create the training data set. In the second step, the data set is processed and used to train a five-layer CNN-based model. The proposed scheme can detect object-based steganographic methods in a video sequence [112].

The use of discrete Cosine/Sine transform (DCT/DST) based steganography is a common practice and therefore, the corresponding steganalysis methods have become a relevant research topic. However, there are only a limited number of high efficiency video coding (HEVC) video steganalysis methods that focus on the DCT/DST domain, particularly motion vector and inter-block partition type HEVC steganalysis. The scheme in [193] presents a new steganalysis method for detecting DCT/DST transform-based steganography in HEVC video. The proposed method analyzes the distortion caused by DCT/DST-based HEVC steganography and its impact on pixel values, and uses a CNN composed of residual convolution layers, steganalysis residual block modules, and a squeeze-and-excitation (SE) block for feature extraction and binary classification. Experimental results show that the proposed method outperforms existing steganalysis methods for detecting DCT/DST-based HEVC steganography. The work proposed in [79] focuses on quantitative steganalysis for videos, which is important for breaking secret codes in practical scenarios. Most video steganographical algorithms modify motion vector values in the compressed domain to embed secret messages. The work proposes a general framework for constructing video quantitative steganalyzers that use deep CNN to detect motion vector embedding based on learned features, and discusses the construction of input data matrices for CNN and the robustness of detection networks against different bitrates. Multiple models are used to extract features for constructing feature vectors. Experimental results show that the proposed method performs well, obtaining satisfactory estimation accuracy for testing HEVC videos at multiple embedding rates under different video bitrates.

Huang et al. [199] presents a new approach to video steganalysis using a selection-channel-aware DNN. Because videos have a different structure than images, the focus is on constructing an appropriate input data matrix for the deep CNN, defining probability for motion vector modification, and using selection channel knowledge in the network structure. The proposed approach is inspired by SRNet, one of the most powerful image steganalysis neural networks, and is adapted for video steganalysis using a selection-channel-aware CNN-based scheme. The experimental results show that the proposed method performs well and benefits from selection channel knowledge when applied to testing HEVC videos. Liu et al. [200] designed a universal steganalysis method that is capable of detecting both intra-prediction mode and motion vector-based steganography using DL. The proposed method, called noise residual CNN (NR-CNN), operates in the spatial domain and integrates feature extraction and classification modules into a single trainable network framework. NR-CNN outperforms that of IS-Net and led to better steganalysis performance. In [116], SSTNet framework is proposed for detecting manipulated faces incorporates three types of features: spatial, steganalysis, and temporal features. Spatial features are extracted by a DNN for finding visible tampering traces like unnatural color, shape, and texture. Steganalysis features are extracted by a proposed novel constraint for suppressing high-level image content and detecting hidden tampering artifacts like abnormal statistical characteristics of image pixels. Temporal features are extracted by a recurrent network for discovering inconsistency between consecutive frames.

Current steganalysis techniques for prediction unit (PU)-based steganography mainly rely on extracting video statistical features, which overlook the potential information within each frame and struggle to accurately identify different PU-based steganography methods. The study in [201] presents a novel video steganalysis approach utilizing PU maps and a multi-scale convolutional residual network. Initially, the impact of PU-based steganography on both spatial and compressed domains is analyzed. It is observed that steganography minimally affects the spatial domain but significantly disrupts connections between PU blocks in the compressed domain, creating distinct steganographic traces. Consequently, PU partition modes with local connections are introduced to generate PU maps for steganalysis. Subsequently, a video steganalysis network, termed prediction unit steganalysis network (PUSN) is developed. This network takes PU maps as input and comprises three components: feature extraction, feature representation, and binary classification. Additionally, a multi-scale module is introduced to enhance detection performance. Figure 15 illustrates the overall framework of PUSN. The experimental results demonstrate that, in comparison to existing methods, the proposed approach effectively detects multiple PU-based steganography methods and achieves superior detection accuracy across various embedding rates, with an accuracy of up to 99.02%. This accuracy is 3.07 percentage points higher than the method it is compared to.

Challenges are found in achieving desirable outcomes when dealing with video surveillance object forgery detection (VSOFD) because of the following constraints: (i) the absence of specialized features tailored for effective VSOFD processing, and (ii) the absence of a dedicated deep network architecture explicitly designed for VSOFD. To tackle the latter constraints, the work in [202] employed a residual-based steganalysis feature (RSF) to extract VSOFD-specific features from the spatial-temporal-frequent domain. The RSF feature is then used to form the residual-based steganography feature vector group (RSFVG), which serves as the




Figure 15: The overall framework of PUSN. For each block, $x_1 \rightarrow x_2$ indicates that the input channel is x_1 , and the output channel is x_2 [201].

input of the DL network, called parallel-DenseNet-concatenated-LSTM (PDCL). By extracting key clues of video frames from RSF, instead of raw frame images, the proposed approach can more effectively learn and identify forgery frames. Therefore, steganalysis plays a crucial role in detecting object forgery in video surveillance. The framework attains an exceptional F1 score of 90.33%, representing a substantial enhancement of nearly 8 percentage points compared to existing SOTA methods.

4.3. Audio/Speech steganalysis

Due to significant progress in DL methods, audio steganalysis has recently utilized these models and typically outperforms conventional techniques. This section introduces some recent studies on audio steganalysis using DL models. Table 8 summarizes many of the detailed DL-based steganalysis schemes for speech, text, and other data types.

4.3.1. RNN/LSTM-based methods

The RNN architecture is customized to identify and extract valuable insights from sequential or time-series data. One such application is analyzing audio files, such as speech recordings, to identify patterns of correlation. To address the need for high detection accuracy and quick response time in detecting hidden messages in voice over IP (VoIP) streams, Lin et al. [203] proposed an RNN model. Qiu et al. [204] tackle the issue of detecting quantization index modulation (QIM)-based steganography in short or low-embedding-rate speech streams. To accomplish this, they propose a steganalysis model that uses distributed representations. The model has a code-word embedding layer that captures distributed representations in a denser space. It also includes a bidirectional Bi-LSTM layer and a gated attention mechanism to provide contextual distribution features with superior generalization capabilities. Lastly, they designed a MLP classifier to differentiate between cover and steganographic objects. The results of their experiments indicate that their model can successfully detect QIM-based steganography in adaptive multi-rate (AMR) speech streams and surpasses previous SOTA models. Wang et al. [205] propose a steganalysis technique capable of identifying various types of steganography concurrently in compressed speech. Their approach involves a code-word-distributed embedding module that condenses compressed code words into a condensed feature representation. The technique then employs two correlation mining modules: a global-guided module (comprising Bi-LSTM and multi-head self-attention) and a local-guided module (consisting of convolution blocks and CBAM) to extract correlation changes before and after steganography at both the global and local levels. The detection outcome is then determined using fully connected layers.

4.3.2. CNN/DBN-based methods

Chen et al. introduce the first audio steganalysis method based on CNN in 2017 [83]. They propose a CNN architecture that operates in the time domain to identify audio steganography. The layers of the network are structured to eliminate audio content and flexibly detect the subtle alterations made by ± 1 LSB-based steganography. In addition, they apply a combination of convolutional layers and max pooling to perform sub-sampling, ensuring effective abstraction and avoiding over-fitting. Similarly, Lin et al. [81] also introduced a CNN-based audio steganalysis in the time domain. They use a HPF layer to extract the residual signal and generated hierarchical representations of the input through six sets of layers. The results show the potential and effectiveness of the proposed method in detecting LSB matching and syndrome-trellis code (STC) steganographic algorithms at various embedding rates. Wang et al. [206] introduced a new method for detecting hidden data in MPEG-1 audio layer 3 (MP3) files using a CNN-based approach. This technique shows excellent results when applied to the equal length entropy codes substitution (EECS) steganography algorithm. The authors in [207] aimed also to develop a CNN-based MP3 steganalysis technique. They focus on identifying messages that were embedded using the MP3Stego and EECS algorithms. Their approach involves classifying the files based on the algorithms used and the approximate length of the message. To accomplish this, they combine the quantified modified discrete cosine transform (QMDCT) audio feature with CNN architecture.

Yang et al. [208] developed a Hierarchical Representation Network for steganalysis of QIM steganography in low-bitrate speech signals. Their model uses a CNN and three levels of attention mechanisms to selectively focus on important content in speech frames. Results show their method outperforms existing approaches in steganalysis, particularly in detecting short and low-embedded speech samples, and is more time-efficient for real-time online services.

Paulin et al. [82] constructed a DBN by arranging multiple RBMs in a stacked manner where the initial visible layer takes in the input data, and the next RBM is trained with the preceding one's hidden layer. They use MFCCs as features and a DBN as a classifier to address two distinct objectives. The first task is to detect whether a signal had a concealed message, while the second task is to determine the steganographic algorithm used to embed the data. The authors compare their DBN architecture to support vector machine (SVM) and Gaussian mixture model (GMM) and show that, in general, SVM lead to the best outcomes for the first task, while DBN outperforms SVM and GMM in terms of accuracy in the second task. Later, an improvement of this technique using evolutionary algorithms (EAs) was presented in [209]. The EAs are exploited to train the RBM used to construct the DBNs.

4.3.3. Residual neural networks-based methods

Residual neural networks (ResNets) are specifically created to address the vanishing gradient problem that arises while training neural networks that are very deep. They solve this problem by incorporating skip connections or shortcuts between layers. These shortcuts modify the function $F(x)$ that maps data by adding the identity function x . Consequently, the mapping function becomes $F(x) + x$, which is simpler to optimize as it is related to the input data. Figure 16 shows a diagram of a residual block [142].




Figure 16: The diagram of a residual block, the shortcut is depicted by the arch encircling the layers.

In Ren et al. [210], a steganalysis scheme was designed using a ResNet architecture called S-ResNet. The authors use the spectrogram of an audio signal as input to the neural network. The spectrogram is a visual representation of the frequency components of a signal over time, and it can be seen as an image of size $n \times m$, where n is half the frame size, and m is the number of frames for a given window size. The S-ResNet architecture, shown in Figure 17, is composed of 31 convolutional layers, and the first layer has four fixed filters, while the other filters in the network are updated during training. All filters have a size of 3×3 , and after each convolutional layer, there is BN and a ReLU layer. The skip connection defines the residual blocks and allows the training a DNN and two average pooling layers reduce the data volume after every five residual blocks. There is a global average pooling layer at the end of the network to flatten the volume onto a 1-D vector of length 40, called the feature vector. The first four filters of the network are handcrafted to amplify the noise of the signal, which can be associated with hidden messages. Using this scheme, the authors achieve high levels of accuracy for both advanced audio coding (AAC) and MP3 audio formats. The testing is conducted using various window sizes to generate the spectrogram. The feature vector is then passed to an SVM to execute the final training and classification steps. Overall, this work demonstrates the benefit of using a ResNet architecture to extract complex and discriminative features from audio data for steganalysis purposes.

4.4. Text steganalysis

Generally, linguistic steganalysis methods involve the extraction of semantic features from texts, followed by an analysis of the differences in these features between cover and stego texts to determine if a sentence contains hidden information. As a result, some advanced linguistic steganalysis techniques have been proposed, which have yielded remarkable results. For instance, reference [84] used pre-trained bidirectional encoder representations from transformers (BERT) language mode to act as an embedder and generate initial word representations. It was then recognized that any local semantic changes before or after steganography could alter the overall semantics of a sentence. Consequently, a feature interaction module was developed to model the mutual effects between the extracted local and global semantic features.

4.4.1. DNN/CNN-based methods

According to Wen et al [211], a CNN-based model can be used for text steganalysis, which captures intricate dependencies and automatically learns text feature representations. To improve performance, a decision strategy is also suggested for detecting long texts. Firstly, the word embedding layer extracts both the semantic and syntactic features of words. Secondly, different-sized rectangular convolution kernels are used to learn sentence features. This method is effective not only for exploring various text steganography algorithms but also for analyzing texts of different lengths. On the other hand, Xiang et al. [212] proposes a two-stage




Figure 17: The S-ResNet design for speech steganalysis: It comprises of 31 convolutional layers and a non-trainable layer, divided into three groups, each containing ten layers. The initial group (Conv-1) utilizes ten filters per layer, the second group (Conv-2) uses 20 filters, and the third group (Conv-3) applies 40 filters. The layers in the first group have a stride of 1 in both dimensions, while those in the second and third groups have a stride of 2 in the vertical and horizontal axes, respectively [142].

CNN-based method for text steganalysis. The first stage is a sentence-level CNN that consists of a convolutional layer with multiple convolutional kernels of different window sizes, a pooling layer, a fully connected layer with Dropout, and a soft-max output. In this way, the layer can handle variable-length sentences and obtain two steganographic features per sentence. The second stage is a text-level CNN that utilizes the output of the first stage to determine whether the detected text is steganographic or not. The average accuracy of this method is 82.24%. Yang et al. [213] proposed a semantic-based text steganalysis technique called TS-CNN. This method employs CNN to extract high-level semantic features of texts and detects subtle variations in the semantic space before and after embedding hidden information to accurately identify steganographic texts. Experimental outcomes indicate that the proposed model attains almost 100% precision and recall.

Yuanfeng, et al. [214] employs an optimized DNN to uncover the connection between hidden business information and structured data, taking into account the effects of data generalization and hidden data optimization. The idea is based on two models for feature fusion and classification, referred to as deep neural network-based invisible text steganalysis (DNNITS) model, which involves concatenating each line of text message input, combining the entire message into a single sentence, and then utilizing the previously described model to conduct feature extraction.

4.4.2. RNN/LSTM-based methods

The embedding of hidden information causes distortion of the conditional probability distribution in stego text that is automatically generated. A text steganalysis algorithm presented in paper [215] suggests using RNN to identify these differences in feature distribution and classify them into cover text and steganographic text. The model’s experimental results indicate that it has high accuracy in detecting steganographic text and can estimate the amount of information embedded in the generated stego text using subtle differences in text feature distributions. In [85], a text steganalysis approach is proposed that aims to enhance low-level features in the feature vector and better associate them with steganographic information in the generated text. The approach includes two parts: dense connectivity and feature pyramid. The method is based on densely connected LSTM networks with a feature pyramid. First, the words in the text are mapped to a semantic space with hidden representations to better utilize semantic features. Then, stacked bidirectional LSTM networks are used to extract semantic features at different levels. Finally, the semantic features at all levels are fused, and a sigmoid layer is used to determine whether the text is steganographic or not. To capture the long-term semantic information of texts, the Bi-LSTM architecture is employed in [86]. Asymmetric convolution kernels with varying sizes are also applied to extract the local relationships between words. Yi et al. [87] proposed two methods to improve the performance of LSTM-based text steganalysis models. The first method involves pre-training a language model based on LSTMs, while the second method involves pre-training a sequence autoencoder. The parameters learned during pre-training are used to initialize the corresponding LSTM-based steganalysis model. The study shows that both methods result in improved performance compared to randomly initialized LSTMs, and the convergence speed is significantly faster.

4.4.3. GNN-based methods

Recently, there has been growing attention towards applying DL techniques to graph data, leading to the popularity of GNN. GNNs are DL-based methods that operate on the graph domain. These networks are designed to learn representations of graph data and can effectively handle both node-focused and graph-focused tasks. Unlike CNNs, GNNs captures the relationships within graphs by passing messages between nodes and maintaining a state that encodes information from any accessible neighborhood through edges [216]. Additionally, GNNs possess an enhanced ability to use global information. Due to their convincing performance, GNNs have been recently introduced for steganalysis in several works [88, 184, 217].

In [217], a GNN-based approach for text steganalysis was proposed. This approach differs from traditional methods that treat texts as sequences, as it models texts as graphs with associated information. For each text, a directed weighted graph is created, which is then used to train a graph convolutional network for feature extraction and text classification. To enhance the use of global information, the model adopts a globally-shared matrix that captures the correlation strengths between words. In [88], the graph channel attention module is used to extract the most notable distinguished text representation feature on the dimension level of a gated GNN’s node.




Figure 18: An example of a scheme that employs GNN and attention layer [88].

According to Figure 18, the Gated GNN is used as the primary means to update the node representations of the entire graph with contextual information at the graph level. Building on this coarse graph updater, a graph attention mechanism is introduced as a secondary means to extract detailed features and obtain the word-level representation. The graph channel attention module is then employed to identify the most significant dimension in the node embedding. Ultimately, the readout function is devised to merge the features from various levels and classify the text representation as either cover or stego.

4.5. Other cover-based steganalysis

Zhao and Wang [227] use CNN to identify network steganographic techniques used in the IPv6 network. They propose a unified steganalysis model based on CNN, named BNS-CNN, to detect multiple network storage steganographic algorithms. The model preprocesses network traffic and divides it by field to maintain the feature's integrity to the maximum extent, resulting in a matrix. The feature extraction is achieved through multiple convolution kernels and K-max pooling to hasten model convergence, while the fully connected layer is designed to improve feature integration and enhance the model's robustness. Research findings demonstrate that the BNS-CNN model achieves 99.98% detection accuracy with low time complexity and favorable generalization performance. In the field of steganalysis, they have been utilized for analyzing hidden information in DNA sequences [90, 91]. Bae et al. [90, 91] proposed using RNN to detect malicious DNA sequences. The concept involves utilizing RNN to learn intrinsic distributions and detect variation in distributions using a classification score to predict whether a sequence is coding or non-coding. The experimental results show that this approach provides better detection performance compared to common detection approaches, namely frequency analysis-based methods.

5. Advanced technique-based deep steganalysis

In this section, steganalysis schemes are categorized according to their utilized DL technique, rather than the type of cover. This includes methods that use advanced DL techniques such as DTL, DRL, and hybrid DL techniques.

5.1. Deep transfer learning-based methods

DTL is a method of improving generalization in a learning task by making use of knowledge gained from another, previously learned task [238–240]. In traditional ML, separate data sets and training processes are used for different tasks (source task \mathbb{T}_S and target task \mathbb{T}_T), and no knowledge is transferred or accumulated between models [241]. TL, on the other hand, makes use of knowledge such as features and weights gained from previously trained models in a source domain \mathbb{D}_S to train new models in a target domain \mathbb{D}_T . Additionally, DTL can be used even when there is less data or no label information available in the target domain. *Inductive* DTL refers to transfer knowledge learned from a \mathbb{D}_S to a \mathbb{D}_T that are not always equal, i.e. tasks and data sets are different. *Transductive* DTL refers to transfer knowledge learned from a \mathbb{D}_S to a \mathbb{D}_T that is totally different, and tasks are the same. Training DL models is a challenging task that requires significant processing time and data. As a result, pre-trained models have been used as feature extractors to reduce training time. Besides that, DTL is used to solve the problem of data and/or label scarcity, and computation cost [242].

In steganalysis, DTL plays a vital role in feature extraction and model adaptation. It allows transferring knowledge learned from one domain (e.g., image classification) to another domain (e.g., image steganalysis). Pre-trained models serve as effective feature extractors, and DTL addresses issues related to data and label scarcity. DTL is particularly valuable when dealing with data set mismatches.

For example, Taha et al. in [70] introduced an image steganalysis technique that applies the AlexNet CNN model. The method consists of three steps: (i) data collection and preparation, (ii) extraction of distinctive features using the AlexNet model, and (iii) training a random forest classifier with the feature vectors to detect binary classifications of cover and stego. Reference [51] use a pre-trained model, DenseNet, along with a conventional method to decrease detection error rates, resulting in ensemble approaches within the domain context. The research in [71] analyze approaches that are not commonly explored in the image steganalysis field. Specifically, it focused on DTL using recent ImageNet models such as EfficientNet, MobileNetV3, DenseNet, and MixNet, and try

Table 8

Cover-based steganalysis includes audio, text, and other cover types. The type of cover could be identified from the data set used. When compared to much SOTA work, only the two best methods are mentioned.

Paper	DL method	Steganographic algorithm	Compared to	Data set	Metric used	Observations
[80]	CNN	LSB, Steghide	Hide4PGP, [41, 81]	TIMIT	AUC, accuracy	SRNet, and BSNet architectures are employed. BSNet is the best, achieving 89.14% accuracy and 93.68% AUC.
[82]	DBN	StegHide, FreqSteg	Hide4PGP, SVM, GNN	Noizeus	Accuracy	Achieved higher accuracy (5% more) than SVM and GMM in identifying the steganographic method used.
[203]	RNN	CNV-QIM	IDC, QCCN	SS-Created	Accuracy	Achieved a detection accuracy of 90% even for a 0.1-second sample and a testing time that averaged 0.15% of the sample length.
[83]	CNN	LSB	Hand-crafted features	Wall Street Journal	Accuracy	Achieved an 88.3% classification accuracy for signals with a 0.5 bps embedding rate.
[81]	CNN	LSB matching, STC	[83]	TIMIT	Accuracy	HPF is used. The final output consisted of 215 features, which were then input into a binary classifier, resulting in an accuracy of 90.50%.
[206]	CNN	HCM-Gao, HCM-Yan, EECS	Hand-crafted features	Created	Accuracy	QMDCT coefficients matrix is selected as the input data. Accuracy can reach up to 95.35%.
[208]	CNN	QIM	[203, 218]	Created in [203]	Accuracy	The detection accuracy reached 87.14% of various models. Use nearly a quarter of the parameters used by the CSW method.
[210]	ResNet	LSB-EE, MIN, SIGN, MP3Stego	[206, 219]	Created	Accuracy	Accuracy reaches 94.98% for AAC format, and 99.93% on the MP3 format.
[84]	CNN	Tian-Fang, GLMA	[211, 215]	IMDB Movie Review, News, Twitter	Accuracy	Bidirectional gated recurrent unit (GRU) is used to extract global features from both directions. The detection depends on the specific scenario, and it can reach up to 97.4%.
[215]	RNN	Luo, Fang	Statistical methods, Genetic algo.	T-Steg	Precision, recall, accuracy	In some situations, it can achieve around 100% accuracy, precision, and recall.
[85]	Capsnet	RNN and variable-length coding	[215, 220]	IMDB Movie Review, News, Twitter	Accuracy	Achieves 92% accuracy at 1-3 bit/word, 7% better than other neural networks. At 4-5 bit/word, the detection accuracy was over 94%.
[86]	BILSTM-CNN	T-Lex, Tina-Fang	[211, 215]	IMDB Movie Review, Gutenberg	Accuracy, Recall, Precision.	A method called R-BILSTM-C, can achieve an accuracy of 100% in variable-length sentences.
[87]	LSTM	RNN-Steg, Bins	FCN, CNN, GNN, RNN	IMDB Movie Review, Twitter	Accuracy	Achieves a max accuracy of 91.75% for MOVIE data set and 96.43% for Twitter data set.
[88]	GNN	RNN, VAE	[84, 221]	IMDB Movie Review, Twitter	Accuracy, F1-score	It is a linguistic steganalysis method, called HGA. Detection can achieve an accuracy of 93.5% and an F1-score of 92.3%.
[222]	CNN	Geiser, Miao	[126, 223]	Created in [203]	Accuracy	The method called SepSteNet, is based on separable CNN. The dual-stream pyramid module enhances accuracy by up to 2.98% by mitigating the negative impact of sample content.
[224]	Adversarial Bi-GRU	Huang [225]	[125]	Created	Accuracy	For normal and adversarial samples, it achieves accuracy of 96.73% and 95.6%, respectively.
[90]	RNN	Developed in [226]	Adaptive boosting, SVM, Random forest	Human UCSC-hg38	Accuracy	Developed for unusual cover type (deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA)). The detection rate reaches 99.93% for both sides (Intron and Exon regions). Exceeds the BLAST method by 15.93%.
[91]	RNN+CNN	Developed in [226]	SVM, Adaptive boosting and Random forest classifiers	Human UCSC-hg38	Accuracy	Used DNA cover type. The model successfully identified all alteration rates in all DNA regions when tested with a sample length of 18,000. The accuracy difference between perturbed and non-perturbed sequences in the intron region is around 0.1.
[227]	CNN	Methods [228–230]	LeNet, AlexNet	Created	Accuracy	Developed for unusual cover type (IPv6 network). Exceptionally accurate at 99.98% while maintaining a low level of time complexity.

to develop ensemble models using these pre-trained architectures. Similarly, [72] explores the use of pre-trained deep architectures in computer vision, including EfficientNet, MixNet, and ResNet, for steganalysis. These models, which have been pre-trained on ImageNet, can be easily adapted for JPEG steganalysis and offer better performance than CNNs that are specifically designed for steganalysis, such as the SRNet that is trained from scratch. The work of Zhang et al. [60] introduces a technique for addressing the problem of data set mismatch in DL-based steganalysis. This is achieved through a feature-guided subdomain adaptation (SDA) framework (Transductive DTL), using the SRNet network as a baseline. To start with, both the source and target domains are split into subdomains based on class, and the relevant subdomains are aligned using SDA to address any distributional discrepancies. A guiding feature is then created to improve the accuracy and precision of the subdomain division. Ozcan and Mustacoglu [183] propose using DTL to perform image steganalysis in the spatial domain with aDRN. They train a ResNet50 model using the Keras DL framework on the ImageNet data set. Detailed experiments were conducted and showed improved results in detecting stego images across various payload data sets. However, the scheme has not been compared to any other steganalysis detectors, and it has not been evaluated using a standard data set. Two DTL are used in [62], namely parameter multiplexing and fine-tuning, to enhance the overall efficiency and reduce computation cost and time. Rabii El Beji et al. [63] propose a new technique that combines kernels

Table 9

Advanced technique-based deep steganalysis. In DTL-based steganalysis methods, any improvements achieved are in comparison to full training. When compared to much SOTA work, only the two best methods are mentioned.

Paper	DL Type	Steganographic algorithm	Compared to	Data set	Metric used	Observations
[60]	DTL (SDA)	S-UNIWARD, WOW, HUGO	[56, 156]	BOSSbase, UCID, MIR-Flickr25K, DIV2K	Accuracy	Accuracy boosted by 5.4%, 8.5%, and 8.0% at an ER! equal to 0.4, 0.2, and 0.1 bpp, respectively, in the presence of data set mismatch.
[71]	DTL	J-UNIWARD, JMIPOD, UERD	[58, 156]	ALASKA #2	F1-score	DTL employed the latest and triumphant ImageNet classification models such as EfficientNet, MobileNetV3, DenseNet, and MixNet. EfficientNet3 (3 classes) can reach an F1-score of 84%.
[72]	DTL	J-UNIWARD, JMIPOD, UERD	[156]	ALASKA #2	Weighted AUC	EfficientNet, MixNet, and ResNet pre-trained on ImageNet and adapted for JPEG steganalysis offered better performance, achieving a weighted AUC (wAUC) of 93.85%, compared to the SRNet model trained from scratch, which achieved a wAUC of 92.27%.
[70]	DTL	J-UNIWARD, nsF5, UERD	AlexNet, SRNet	IStego100K	Accuracy	This approach exploit pretrained AlexNet and achieves an accuracy of 99%.
[61]	DTL	BOW	Without DTL	BOSSbase	Precision	This method pertains to the field of image forensics. It has the ability to identify five distinct types of image alterations with an average precision of 97.36%.
[62]	DTL	WOW, S-UNIWARD	[26, 140]	BOSSbase	DER	The suggested technique demonstrates improved effectiveness in comparison to [26, 140] for certain types of payloads, achieving a low DER of around 45.30%, which is better to both parameter multiplexing, and fine-tuning, where the DER is around 47.31%.
[63]	DTL	WOW, S-UNIWARD, HUGO	Without DTL	BOSSbase	Accuracy	Exhibits faster convergence for low payloads and higher detection accuracy for high payloads, with a classification rate that can reach up to 96%, showing a 70% improvement when DTL is not adopted.
[89]	DTL	Block-based, VLC-based	[86, 231]	Twitter, IMDB Movie Review	Accuracy	Achieves superior performance compared to other tested DNN-based methods, with a maximum accuracy of 97.20%, regardless of the embedding capacity and steganographic algorithm used in both data sets.
[64]	DTL	S-UNIWARD, WOW	[140, 232]	BOSSbase	Accuracy	Surpasses the approach being compared to it, as it displays an average metric improvement of 7.4%, 5.3%, 4.1%, and 2.8%.
[65]	DRL	J-UNIWARD, UERD	[31, 156]	BOSSbase, BOWS2	Accuracy	Outperform SOTA methods by achieving an improvement in detection accuracy ranging from a minimum of 1.5% to a maximum of 16%.
[69]	DRL	J-UNIWARD	[31, 233]	BOSSbase	Accuracy	Achieves a classification with the lowest error rate of 0.0807 after the fifth iteration. For J-UNIWARD, it outperforms Xu's method by 0.5% to 1% in detection accuracy.
[66]	DRL	S-UNIWARD, J-UNIWARD	PEP [234]	BOSSbase	Accuracy	It can improve the performance of GFR, SRM, and maxSRMd2 at varying embedding payloads. The performance exceeds that of PEP by approximately 0.57% while utilizing the same features.
[67]	DAE+SNN	J-UNIWARD	[31, 156]	BOSSbase	Accuracy	Achieves detection accuracy between 80.3% and 99.3%.
[68]	CNN+DRN	WOW, PVD, LSB, S-UNIWARD	Single CNN	BOSSbase	Accuracy	Outperforms the single CNN approach. Accuracy increased by 17.71%
[235]	Bi-LSTM+CNN	Fixed codebook (FCB)	[126, 130]	Created [203]	in DR	Correct DR increases by 10% with 100 ms sample at 20% embedding rate.
[236]	CNN+LSTM	CNV-QIM	[203]	Created [203]	in Accuracy	Improves detection accuracy at low embedding rates and achieves an accuracy above 95% when the embedding rate is over 40%.
[237]	DTL	CNV-QIM, PMS, CNV-QIM+ PMS	[203]	Created [203]	in Accuracy	Achieves satisfactory accuracy in detecting CNV-QIM and performs the best among the compared methods in detecting PMS and CNV-QIM+PMS. After fine-tuning, the accuracy improved by 3.7% for English speeches at an embedding rate of 30%, compared to the accuracy without fine-tuning.

catalyst and DTL to guarantee quick convergence for small payloads through weight propagation. The results and findings of some of SOTA steganalysis schemes, which are based on DTL, are detailed in Table 9.

5.2. Deep reinforcement learning-based methods

Reinforcement learning (RL) is a type of ML where an agent learns to make decisions in an environment by receiving feedback in the form of rewards or punishments. The main goal is to maximize the total reward accumulated over time by choosing the best action based on the current state of the environment. DRL is a variation of RL that uses DNNs to represent the agent's decision-making process. By using DNNs, the agent can recognize patterns and make more complex decisions, leading to better performance in complex environments.

Figure 19 provides a clear illustration of the difference between RL, DL, and DRL [243]. In subfigure (A), the RL problem is shown, where the agent selects actions, receives observations and rewards from the environment, and tries to maximize the long-term reward. A tabular solution is also shown, where the agent learns the expected long-term reward associated with taking each action in each state. In subfigure (B), the supervised learning problem is depicted, where the agent receives unlabeled data samples and tries to guess the correct labels. A DL solution is also shown, where the features of a sample are passed through multiple layers of artificial neurons to predict the correct label. In subfigure (C), DRL is shown, where a neural network is used as an agent to solve an RL problem. This method has been found to perform well in complex environments by learning appropriate internal representations that generalize well to new states and actions.

DRL enhances steganalysis by training agents to autonomously scrutinize digital media, taking actions guided by environmental feedback based on detection accuracy. DRL's impressive ability to discern intricate patterns and relationships within media content adapt to diverse steganographic techniques, and continuously learn and improve, positions it as a vital asset for uncovering concealed information in complex and dynamic digital landscapes, transcending traditional steganalysis approaches.




Figure 19: RL, DL and DRL [243].

Various DTL-based steganalysis methods have been proposed in the existing literature [65, 66, 69]. Hu et al. [69] developed a steganalysis technique using DRL and visual attention to detect adaptive steganography in JPEG images. The method selects a region of interest using visual attention, then uses DRL to create a summary region, guiding the DL model to focus on favorable regions. The detection ability is enhanced by replacing misclassified training images with their corresponding summary regions. Ni et al. [66] introduced a deep Q-network-based ensemble technique for image steganalysis that utilizes DRL and CNN to enhance the model's generalization performance and decrease the ensemble's size. Their experimental findings indicate that this approach is effective for optimizing the ensemble classification of image steganalysis in both spatial and frequency domains.

5.3. Hybrid steganalysis methods

In the pursuit of advancing steganalysis accuracy, researchers have explored hybrid approaches that combine diverse DL models [68, 89, 235–237]. These innovative strategies are engineered to harness the distinct strengths of multiple models, resulting in a synergistic enhancement of the effectiveness of hidden message detection. The fundamental rationale behind hybrid steganalysis methods is to capitalize on the unique capabilities offered by different DL architectures and frameworks. Each DL model may excel in certain aspects of feature extraction, pattern recognition, or domain-specific knowledge, enabling steganalysis to benefit from a holistic analysis approach that considers a broader spectrum of features and characteristics within the data. This approach mitigates the limitations of relying solely on a single DL model, which may be specialized for specific tasks but may struggle with other types of steganography. Through integration, hybrid models can adapt to varying steganographic techniques and cover media, making them more versatile and robust.

For instance, Kang et al. [68] proposed an image steganalysis approach that can categorize images into five classes, which involves classifying between stego and cover images and identifying four spatial steganographic algorithms. This approach utilizes a combination of a hierarchical structure of CNN and DRN. Results from experiments indicate that the proposed technique outperforms the single CNN approach. Gong and Yi [235] suggest using a combination of Bi-LSTM and CNN for AMR audio steganalysis in their research paper. They use Bi-LSTM to extract contextual representations of AMR fixed codebook (FCB) at a higher level, and CNN to merge spatial-temporal features for steganalysis. According to the experiment results, this model has demonstrated an increase in the correct detection rate. Yang et al. [236] constructed a unified model CNN-LSTM network to detect QIM-based steganography in VoIP streams. The model employs Bi-LSTM to gather long-term contextual information from the carriers, while CNN captures both local and global features and temporal carrier features. Results from experiments demonstrate that this model can achieve superior detection of QIM-based steganography in VoIP streams. Hu et al. [237] proposed an approach for detecting multiple orthogonal steganographic methods (QIM and pitch modulation steganography) in low bit-rate VoIP speech streams. The proposed model combines three neural network structures, namely CNN, LSTM, and the fully connected network (FCN). The findings indicate that this model outperforms the existing steganalysis methods in detecting HPS and met the need for real-time detection, with a processing time of just 0.34 ms for a 10 ms speech frame. Peng et al. [89] developed a text steganalysis neural network based on multi-stage transfer learning. The model comprises three stages: fine-tuned BERT models the difference between normal and steganographic texts, steganography-specific knowledge is distilled to two tiny neural networks (a single-layer Bi-LSTM and a single-layer CNN) for fast inference, and different semantic features are integrated in a proposed network using the distilled tiny networks.

Xu et al. [84] proposed a linguistic steganalysis method for detecting hidden information in small-scale multi-concealed scenarios. The authors use a pre-trained BERT language model to address the lack of domain knowledge resulting from limited data

sets to provide an initial word-level representation, which is fine-tuned using training data. Local and global semantic features are extracted using CNN and GRU, respectively, in parallel to avoid deep model and gradient vanishing problems. A feature interaction module is then designed to explore the relationship between these features before a softmax classifier is used to identify sentences with hidden information. The experiments show that this method effectively detects hidden information and reduces the burden of intercepting large-scale data from network platforms. Reference [231] proposes a hybrid text steganalysis method (R-BiLSTM-C) by combining the advantages of Bi-LSTM and CNN. The method captures long-term semantic information of text using BiLSTM and extracts local relationships between words using asymmetric convolutional kernels of different sizes, leading to a significant increase in detection accuracy. Additionally, the paper visualizes the high-dimensional semantic feature space, demonstrating the approach's effectiveness for different text steganography algorithms. Reference [86] proposes an LSTM-CNN model for text steganalysis. First, the words are mapped to a semantic space for a better use of the semantic features of the text. Then, LSTM and CNN are combined to obtain local contextual information and long-range contextual information in stego text. Additionally, the model employs an attention mechanism to identify important cues in suspicious sentences. The model achieves outstanding results in steganalysis tasks.

6. Research challenges and future directions

6.1. Research challenges

It is true that modern DL-based detectors have shown significantly better performance in detecting steganographic signals compared to conventional detectors. However, these detectors face limitations when it comes to training on large images, due to hardware constraints. One of the challenges with steganographic signals is that they are often very subtle and difficult to detect. As a result, resizing or cropping the images prior to classification can compromise the accuracy of the detector. This occurs because such operations can distort the signal and make it even harder to detect. Steganalysis based on DL is a potential method for finding secret information in voice, text, and imaging signals. However, there are still a number of research gaps and potential future initiatives in this field of study:

- **Adversarial attacks:** To avoid being discovered by steganalysis algorithms based on DL, adversarial assaults might modify or distort the data. Additional research is required to create more reliable algorithms that can recognize adversarial threats.
- **Explainability:** Since DL-based models may be complex, it can be challenging to comprehend the features and workings of the algorithms that give them the ability to find hidden data. It is possible to increase the interpretability of the outcomes and contribute to the creation of more transparent and reliable systems by creating explainable models.
- **Lack of training data:** The effectiveness of DL-based steganalysis models is greatly influenced by the quantity and quality of the training data. The use and generalizability of these models may be constrained by a lack of extensive steganalysis data sets.
- **Transfer learning:** It refers to the process of transferring knowledge from one domain to another one that has either similarities or dissimilarities. The application of DL-based steganalysis models across various kinds of data may be made possible by developing transfer learning approaches.
- **Multimodal steganalysis:** It refers to the process of finding concealed information in several forms of data, such as voice, images, and text. The accuracy of detection may be increased, and false positives can be decreased, by using multimodal steganalysis approaches based on DL.
- **Motion vector (MV)-based video steganalysis:** Developing more effective convolutional neural networks to minimize embedding distortion in adaptive MV-based video steganalysis remains a challenging task.
- **Steganalysis that protects privacy:** The usage of DL-based steganalysis might cause privacy issues since sensitive data may be exposed during the analysis. Creating privacy-preserving methods may help to secure private information while still allowing efficient steganalysis.
- **Real-time steganalysis:** It is crucial in a variety of applications, including network security and real-time monitoring. One crucial area of study is the creation of real-time DL-based steganalysis methods that can deal with massive amounts of data quickly.
- **Steganalysis in real-world scenarios:** In real-world scenarios, steganalysis faces challenges when the collection of media used for steganography differs significantly from the training set used for the classifier. This discrepancy, known as cover source mismatch (CSM), can occur due to variations in image capture conditions, resolution, compression, filtering, and other factors. Additionally, stego source mismatch can lead to imprecise predictions when embedding parameters or stego-system used vary between the training and testing datasets.

In steganalysis, it is crucial to have feature extraction that can detect changes in embedding rates to accurately estimate payload. Additionally, a robust network structure is required since videos with the same embedding rate but different bit rates can have different steganalysis features, which needs to be reduced to address compression. Thus, the quantitative steganalyzer needs to learn steganalysis features that correspond to various embedding rates and have a robust network structure.

By addressing these issues, it may be possible to increase the security and privacy of different applications while also increasing the detection's accuracy and dependability. For example, to overcome these limitations of computation cost, researchers are exploring new techniques such as multi-scale processing, which involves analyzing the image at different scales to detect steganographic signals. Another approach is to use more advanced hardware, such as specialized graphics processing units (GPUs), which can handle larger images more efficiently.

To accomplish the task of enhancing feature representation, classifying images in spatial or frequency domains, processing arbitrary images, and obtaining noise generated by the steganographic process more efficiently, it is necessary to create novel DL models and design new computational components. It is important to ensure that this process is as automated as possible.

Regarding real-world scenarios, some authors suggest focusing in actor-based detection problems [244], in which a collection of users are examined to identify whether they are using or not steganography, for a large variety of embedding algorithms and bit rates.

6.2. Perspectives

There has been a significant surge in interest and focus among steganalysis researchers towards the development of DL-based techniques for image steganalysis, surpassing the attention given to other cover types. The realm of image steganalysis has witnessed comprehensive exploration, encompassing various facets such as steganalysis based on image pre-processing, the formulation of universal methods applicable across diverse image types, integration of attention layers, establishment of schemes based on noise, and more. For this reason, we propose extending this diversity beyond CNN-based image steganalysis. Given that speech and text can be transformed into 2D representations and later reverted to 1D, this versatility can be harnessed for these cover types as well. For instance, introducing DL-based preprocessing techniques like the TLU layer to 2D speech representations could pave the way for innovative audio steganalysis methods. This proposition not only broadens the scope but also creates opportunities to apply existing image-based steganalysis approaches, such as transform-based and adversarial-based methods, to the domains of speech and text. Furthermore, employing pretrained image models with 2D representations of speech or text has the potential to result in substantial enhancements. These models, having been trained on millions of images, have generated accurate weights that can be leveraged through DTL-based techniques for audio and text cover types steganalysis.

Recently, generative AI has emerged as a transformative technology that enables machines to generate creative and realistic content, such as text, images, and even audio, mimicking human-like creativity [245]. One remarkable example of generative AI is ChatGPT, a language model developed by OpenAI, based on the GPT (Generative Pre-trained Transformer) architecture. ChatGPT can understand and generate human-like text, engaging in conversations with users, answering questions, and even providing creative responses [246].

Text, speech, image, and video models can developed by OpenAI² can be secured against adversarial attacks by incorporating DL-based steganalysis techniques to detect any hidden perturbations or changes within the input data. Similarly, steganalysis can be used to enhance the security of OpenAI's speech models by detecting any hidden audio signals that may be used to inject malicious code or commands. By incorporating steganalysis into their security protocols, OpenAI can enhance the robustness and security of their systems, and help to prevent potential security breaches or attacks [247]. For instance, steganalysis can be used to prevent the ChatGPT model from being fooled by hidden messages that may be embedded within the input text. Adversarial attacks can be carried out by malicious actors who insert subtle changes or perturbations to the input text to deceive the ChatGPT model into generating incorrect or malicious output [248]. Steganalysis techniques can be used to detect any such hidden messages and enable the system to filter out any suspicious or adversarial inputs before they are processed by the ChatGPT model. This can help to prevent the model from being fooled by deceptive inputs, and ensure that the generated output is accurate and reliable. In essence, steganalysis can be used as an additional layer of security to detect and filter out any malicious or adversarial inputs, thereby enhancing the robustness and security of the ChatGPT model.

On the other hand, OpenAI can play a significant role in aiding the development of steganalysis schemes for image, text, and speech by leveraging its language generation capabilities and knowledge base. In the case of image steganalysis, for example, ChatGPT can assist researchers by providing insights into various steganographic techniques, common patterns, and potential vulnerabilities in image-hiding methods [249]. It can also help generate annotated image datasets for training steganalysis models and offer feedback on the effectiveness of different detection algorithms. For text steganalysis, ChatGPT can simulate conversations involving steganographic content, thereby helping researchers understand linguistic patterns, semantic inconsistencies, and statistical irregularities that can be indicative of hidden information [250]. It can generate steganographic texts and assist in evaluating the performance of detection algorithms. Regarding speech steganalysis, ChatGPT can provide guidance on the techniques used to embed information in audio signals, including frequency domain manipulation and phase coding. It can generate speech samples with hidden content, allowing researchers to develop detection methods and analyze audio features that may expose the presence of steganography [251].

7. Conclusion

The field of steganalysis is rapidly evolving, spurred by advancements in DL algorithms. DL-based detectors have shown remarkable performance in detecting steganographic signals, outpacing conventional detectors. However, numerous challenges still hinder the full potential of these detectors, including issues related to hardware constraints, adversarial attacks, interpretability, availability of training data, and privacy concerns, among others. This review highlights the increasing importance of steganalysis

²<https://openai.com/>

using DL in the field of information security. DL-based steganalysis has shown promising results in reducing detection error rates and addressing various issues related to random guessing situations. The survey provides a detailed description of the most famous DL models used in steganalysis and summarizes the findings of research for all cover types. The survey has provided a comprehensive overview of the topic by discussing the motivations for the research, presenting the background of DL and its concepts, and presenting a well-defined taxonomy. The taxonomy classifies existing DL-based steganalysis proposals based on different aspects, which can help researchers and practitioners to better understand the state-of-the-art in this field.

In addition, the review highlights the importance of using DTL and DRL in the steganalysis domain. DTL can help to transfer knowledge learned from one domain to another, which can improve the performance of steganalysis models. DRL, on the other hand, can be used to train steganalysis models that can adapt to different steganographic techniques and cover types, which can further enhance their detection capabilities. All in all, the review underscores the need for further research in DL-based steganalysis to enhance the security of digital communication and data storage systems.

Moreover, the relevance of steganalysis extends beyond the detection of steganographic signals. Notably, it has significant implications for enhancing the robustness and security of generative chatbots and generative AI models. By detecting hidden perturbations within the input data, steganalysis can safeguard these models against adversarial attacks, thereby improving their reliability.

Despite the aforementioned challenges discussed in this review, steganalysis holds immense potential, especially in light of the ubiquity of digital media. By addressing these issues, it is anticipated that steganalysis will play a critical role in enhancing the security, privacy, and accuracy of digital systems, extending from media to advanced ML models. The future of steganalysis thus promises to be exciting, provided the current research directions bear fruit and are further supported by new insights and technological advancements.

CRedit authorship contribution statement

Hamza Kheddar: Conceptualization; Methodology; Data Curation; Resources; Investigation; Visualization; Writing original draft; Writing, review, and editing. **Mustapha Hemis:** Conceptualization; Methodology; Resources; Investigation; Writing original draft; Writing, review, and editing. **Yassine Himeur:** Conceptualization; Methodology; Resources; Investigation; Writing original draft; Writing, review, and editing. **David Megías:** Conceptualization; Methodology; Resources; Visualization; Investigation; review, and editing. **Abbes Amira:** Methodology; Resources; Visualization; Investigation; Writing – review and editing, Supervision.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Data availability

No data was used for the research described in the article.

Acknowledgement

The first author acknowledges that the study was partially funded by the Algerian Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research (Grant No. PRFU–A25N01UN260120230001).

The fourth author acknowledges the funding obtained by the Detection of fake news on Social Media platforms (DISSIMILAR) project from the EIG CONCERT-Japan with grant PCI2020-120689-2 (Government of Spain), the PID2021-125962OB-C31 “SECURING” project funded by the Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación, la Agencia Estatal de Investigación and the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), as well as the ARTEMISA International Chair of Cybersecurity and the DANGER Strategic Project of Cybersecurity, both funded by the Spanish National Institute of Cybersecurity through the European Union – NextGenerationEU and the Recovery, Transformation and Resilience Plan.

We would like to express our sincere gratitude to the anonymous reviewers for their valuable feedback and suggestions that have improved the quality of this work.

References

1. A. Sayed, Y. Himeur, A. Alsalemi, F. Bensaali, A. Amira, Intelligent edge-based recommender system for internet of energy applications, *IEEE Systems Journal* 16 (3) (2021) 5001–5010.
2. Y. Himeur, S. S. Sohail, F. Bensaali, A. Amira, M. Alazab, Latest trends of security and privacy in recommender systems: a comprehensive review and future perspectives, *Computers & Security* 118 (2022) 102746.
3. Y. Himeur, A. Sayed, A. Alsalemi, F. Bensaali, A. Amira, I. Varlamis, M. Eirinaki, C. Sardanios, G. Dimitrakopoulos, Blockchain-based recommender systems: Applications, challenges and future opportunities (2022).
4. M. S. Rathore, M. Poongodi, P. Saurabh, U. K. Lilhore, S. Bourouis, W. Alhakami, J. Osamor, M. Hamdi, A novel trust-based security and privacy model for internet of vehicles using encryption and steganography, *Computers and Electrical Engineering* 102 (2022) 108205.
5. Y. Himeur, A. Boukabou, A robust and secure key-frames based video watermarking system using chaotic encryption, *Multimedia Tools and Applications* 77 (2018) 8603–8627.
6. S. Jing-yu, C. Hong, W. Gang, G. Zi-bo, H. Zhang, Fpga image encryption-steganography using a novel chaotic system with line equilibria, *Digital Signal Processing* 134 (2023) 103889.

7. Y. Himeur, A. Boukabou, A. Senouci, Performance of turbo-coded chaotic interleaving and frequency-domain equalization scheme for high speed ofdm-based plc systems, *Journal of the Franklin Institute* 353 (15) (2016) 3799–3817.
8. I. J. Kadhim, P. Premaratne, P. J. Vial, B. Halloran, Comprehensive survey of image steganography: Techniques, evaluations, and trends in future research, *Neurocomputing* 335 (2019) 299–326.
9. Y. Liu, S. Liu, Y. Wang, H. Zhao, S. Liu, Video steganography: A review, *Neurocomputing* 335 (2019) 238–250.
10. N. Alanazi, E. Khan, A. Gutub, Inclusion of unicode standard seamless characters to expand arabic text steganography for secure individual uses, *Journal of King Saud University-Computer and Information Sciences* 34 (4) (2022) 1343–1356.
11. H. Kheddar, M. Bouzid, D. Megías, Pitch and fourier magnitude based steganography for hiding 2.4 kbps MELP bitstream, *IET Signal Processing* 13 (3) (2019) 396–407.
12. H. Kheddar, D. Megías, M. Bouzid, Fourier magnitude-based steganography for hiding 2.4 kbps MELP secret speech, in: *2018 International Conference on Applied Smart Systems (ICASS)*, IEEE, 2018, pp. 1–5.
13. H. Kheddar, D. Megías, High capacity speech steganography for the g723. 1 coder based on quantised line spectral pairs interpolation and CNN auto-encoding, *Applied Intelligence* 52 (8) (2022) 9441–9459.
14. H. Kheddar, A. C. Mazari, G. H. Ilk, Speech steganography based on double approximation of lsf parameters in AMR coding, in: *2022 7th International Conference on Image and Signal Processing and their Applications (ISPA)*, IEEE, 2022, pp. 1–8.
15. T. Muralidharan, A. Cohen, A. Cohen, N. Nissim, The infinite race between steganography and steganalysis in images, *Signal Processing* (2022) 108711.
16. K. Karampidis, E. Kavallieratou, G. Papadourakis, A review of image steganalysis techniques for digital forensics, *Journal of information security and applications* 40 (2018) 217–235.
17. T.-S. Reinel, R.-P. Raul, I. Gustavo, Deep learning applied to steganalysis of digital images: A systematic review, *IEEE Access* 7 (2019) 68970–68990.
18. M. Chaumont, Deep learning in steganography and steganalysis, in: *Digital media steganography*, Elsevier, 2020, pp. 321–349.
19. I. Hussain, J. Zeng, X. Qin, S. Tan, A survey on deep convolutional neural networks for image steganography and steganalysis, *KSII Transactions on Internet and Information Systems (TIIS)* 14 (3) (2020) 1228–1248.
20. F. Ruan, X. Zhang, D. Zhu, Z. Xu, S. Wan, L. Qi, Deep learning for real-time image steganalysis: a survey, *Journal of Real-Time Image Processing* 17 (2020) 149–160.
21. W. M. Eid, S. S. Alotaibi, H. M. Alqahtani, S. Q. Saleh, Digital image steganalysis: Current methodologies and future challenges, *IEEE Access* 10 (2022) 92321–92336.
22. A. Selvaraj, A. Ezhilarasan, S. L. J. Wellington, A. R. Sam, Digital image steganalysis: A survey on paradigm shift from machine learning to deep learning based techniques, *IET Image Processing* 15 (2) (2021) 504–522.
23. Z. Bao, R. Xue, Survey on deep learning applications in digital image security, *Optical Engineering* 60 (12) (2021) 120901–120901.
24. Z. Wang, A. C. Bovik, H. R. Sheikh, E. P. Simoncelli, Image quality assessment: from error visibility to structural similarity, *IEEE transactions on image processing* 13 (4) (2004) 600–612.
25. H. Kato, K. Osuge, S. Haruta, I. Sasase, A preprocessing by using multiple steganography for intentional image downsampling on CNN-based steganalysis, *IEEE Access* 8 (2020) 195578–195593.
26. J. Ye, J. Ni, Y. Yi, Deep learning hierarchical representations for image steganalysis, *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security* 12 (11) (2017) 2545–2557.
27. Y. Y. Lu, Z. L. O. Yang, L. Zheng, Y. Zhang, Importance of truncation activation in pre-processing for spatial and JPEG image steganalysis, in: *2019 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*, IEEE, 2019, pp. 689–693.
28. Y. Qian, J. Dong, W. Wang, T. Tan, Deep learning for steganalysis via convolutional neural networks, in: *Media Watermarking, Security, and Forensics 2015*, Vol. 9409, SPIE, 2015, pp. 171–180.
29. L. Pibre, P. Jérôme, D. Ienco, M. Chaumont, Deep learning is a good steganalysis tool when embedding key is reused for different images, even if there is a cover source-mismatch, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.04855* (2015).
30. G. Xu, H.-Z. Wu, Y.-Q. Shi, Structural design of convolutional neural networks for steganalysis, *IEEE Signal Processing Letters* 23 (5) (2016) 708–712.
31. G. Xu, Deep convolutional neural network to detect j-uniward, in: *Proceedings of the 5th ACM workshop on information hiding and multimedia security*, 2017, pp. 67–73.
32. Y. Qian, J. Dong, W. Wang, T. Tan, Feature learning for steganalysis using convolutional neural networks, *Multimedia Tools and Applications* 77 (2018) 19633–19657.
33. S. Yang, Y. Sun, G. Tang, M. Jiang, Analysis for influence of training data sequence on CNN-based steganalysis, in: *2018 IEEE 4th International Conference on Computer and Communications (ICCC)*, IEEE, 2018, pp. 2110–2114.
34. E. M. Mustafa, M. A. Elshafey, M. M. Fouad, Enhancing CNN-based image steganalysis on GPUs., *J. Inf. Hiding Multim. Signal Process.* 11 (3) (2020) 138–150.
35. D. Jung, H. Bae, H.-S. Choi, S. Yoon, Pixelsteganalysis: Pixel-wise hidden information removal with low visual degradation, *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing* (2021).
36. J. Zeng, S. Tan, G. Liu, B. Li, J. Huang, Wisernet: Wider separate-then-reunion network for steganalysis of color images, *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security* 14 (10) (2019) 2735–2748.
37. Z. Lai, X. Zhu, J. Wu, Generative focused feedback residual networks for image steganalysis and hidden information reconstruction, *Applied Soft Computing* 129 (2022) 109550.
38. W. You, X. Zhao, S. Ma, Y. Liu, Restegnet: a residual steganalytic network, *Multimedia Tools and Applications* 78 (16) (2019) 22711–22725.
39. S. Huang, M. Zhang, Y. Ke, X. Bi, Y. Kong, Image steganalysis based on attention augmented convolution, *Multimedia Tools and Applications* 81 (14) (2022) 19471–19490.
40. S. Liu, C. Zhang, L. Wang, P. Yang, S. Hua, T. Zhang, Image steganalysis of low embedding rate based on the attention mechanism and transfer learning, *Electronics* 12 (4) (2023) 969.
41. M. Boroumand, J. Fridrich, Deep learning for detecting processing history of images, *Electronic Imaging* 2018 (7) (2018) 213–1.
42. W. You, H. Zhang, X. Zhao, A siamese CNN for image steganalysis, *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security* 16 (2020) 291–306.
43. S. Arivazhagan, E. Amrutha, W. Sylvia Lilly Jebarani, S. Veena, Hybrid convolutional neural network architecture driven by residual features for steganalysis of spatial steganographic algorithms, *Neural Computing and Applications* 33 (17) (2021) 11465–11485.
44. Y. Youfi, J. Fridrich, An intriguing struggle of CNNs in JPEG steganalysis and the onehot solution, *IEEE Signal Processing Letters* 27 (2020) 830–834.
45. M. Chen, V. Sedighi, M. Boroumand, J. Fridrich, JPEG-phase-aware convolutional neural network for steganalysis of JPEG images, in: *Proceedings of the 5th ACM workshop on information hiding and multimedia security*, 2017, pp. 75–84.
46. S. Zhang, H. Zhang, X. Zhao, H. Yu, A deep residual multi-scale convolutional network for spatial steganalysis, in: *International Workshop on Digital Watermarking*, Springer, 2019, pp. 40–52.
47. H. Wang, X. Pan, L. Fan, S. Zhao, Steganalysis of convolutional neural network based on neural architecture search, *Multimedia Systems* 27 (2021) 379–387.
48. S. Kang, H. Park, J.-I. Park, Identification of multiple image steganographic methods using hierarchical resnets, *IEICE Transactions on Information and Systems* 104 (2) (2021) 350–353.

49. H. Zhang, Z. Song, Q. Xing, B. Feng, X. Lin, A generative learning steganalysis network against the problem of training-images-shortage, *Electronics* 11 (20) (2022) 3331.
50. S. Weng, M. Chen, L. Yu, S. Sun, Lightweight and effective deep image steganalysis network, *IEEE Signal Processing Letters* 29 (2022) 1888–1892.
51. J. Yang, Y.-Q. Shi, E. K. Wong, X. Kang, JPEG steganalysis based on densenet, arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.09335 (2017).
52. J. Yang, X. Kang, E. K. Wong, Y.-Q. Shi, Deep learning with feature reuse for JPEG image steganalysis, in: 2018 Asia-Pacific Signal and Information Processing Association Annual Summit and Conference (APSIPA ASC), IEEE, 2018, pp. 533–538.
53. S. S. Prasad, O. Hadar, I. Polian, Detection of malicious spatial-domain steganography over noisy channels using convolutional neural networks, *Electronic Imaging* 2020 (4) (2020) 76–1.
54. B. R. Ghosh, S. Banerjee, A. Chakraborty, S. Saha, J. K. Mandal, A deep learning based image steganalysis using gray level co-occurrence matrix, in: 2022 Second International Conference on Advances in Electrical, Computing, Communication and Sustainable Technologies (ICAECT), IEEE, 2022, pp. 1–8.
55. M. Płachta, M. Krzemień, K. Szczypiorski, A. Janicki, Detection of image steganography using deep learning and ensemble classifiers, *Electronics* 11 (10) (2022) 1565.
56. X. Zhang, X. Kong, P. Wang, B. Wang, Cover-source mismatch in deep spatial steganalysis, in: International Workshop on Digital Watermarking, Springer, 2020, pp. 71–83.
57. X.-Q. Deng, B.-L. Chen, W.-Q. Luo, D. Luo, Universal image steganalysis based on convolutional neural network with global covariance pooling, *Journal of Computer Science and Technology* 37 (5) (2022) 1134–1145.
58. T. Zhang, H. Zhang, R. Wang, Y. Wu, A new JPEG image steganalysis technique combining rich model features and convolutional neural networks, *Mathematical Biosciences and Engineering* 16 (5) (2019) 4069–4081.
59. X. Deng, W. Luo, Y. Fang, Spatial steganalysis based on gradient-based neural architecture search, in: International Conference on Provable Security, Springer, 2021, pp. 365–375.
60. L. Zhang, S. M. Abdullahi, P. He, H. Wang, Dataset mismatched steganalysis using subdomain adaptation with guiding feature, *Telecommunication Systems* 80 (2) (2022) 263–276.
61. Y. Zhan, Y. Chen, Q. Zhang, X. Kang, Image forensics based on transfer learning and convolutional neural network, in: Proceedings of the 5th ACM workshop on information hiding and multimedia security, 2017, pp. 165–170.
62. Y. Dengpan, J. Shunzhi, L. Shiyu, L. ChangRui, Faster and transferable deep learning steganalysis on GPU, *Journal of Real-Time Image Processing* 16 (3) (2019) 623–633.
63. R. El Beji, M. Saidi, H. Hermassi, R. Rhouma, An improved CNN steganalysis architecture based on “catalyst kernels” and transfer learning, in: International conference on digital economy, Springer, 2018, pp. 119–128.
64. E. M. Mustafa, M. A. Elshafey, M. M. Fouad, Accuracy enhancement of a blind image steganalysis approach using dynamic learning rate-based CNN on GPUs, in: 2019 10th IEEE International Conference on Intelligent Data Acquisition and Advanced Computing Systems: Technology and Applications (IDAACS), Vol. 1, IEEE, 2019, pp. 28–33.
65. J. Yang, B. Lu, L. Xiao, X. Kang, Y.-Q. Shi, Reinforcement learning aided network architecture generation for JPEG image steganalysis, in: Proceedings of the 2020 ACM Workshop on Information Hiding and Multimedia Security, 2020, pp. 23–32.
66. D. Ni, G. Feng, L. Shen, X. Zhang, Selective ensemble classification of image steganalysis via deep Q network, *IEEE signal processing letters* 26 (7) (2019) 1065–1069.
67. A. Cohen, A. Cohen, N. Nissim, Assaf: Advanced and slim steganalysis detection framework for JPEG images based on deep convolutional denoising autoencoder and siamese networks, *Neural Networks* 131 (2020) 64–77.
68. S. Kang, H. Park, J.-I. Park, Classification of multiple steganographic algorithms using hierarchical CNNs and resnets, in: International conference on smart computing and cyber security: strategic foresight, security challenges and innovation, Springer, 2020, pp. 365–373.
69. D. Hu, S. Zhou, Q. Shen, S. Zheng, Z. Zhao, Y. Fan, Digital image steganalysis based on visual attention and deep reinforcement learning, *IEEE Access* 7 (2019) 25924–25935.
70. I. T. Ahmed, B. T. Hammad, N. Jamil, Image steganalysis based on pretrained convolutional neural networks, in: 2022 IEEE 18th International Colloquium on Signal Processing & Applications (CSPA), IEEE, 2022, pp. 283–286.
71. A. T. Padmasiri, S. Hettiarachchi, Impact on JPEG image steganalysis using transfer learning, in: 2021 10th International Conference on Information and Automation for Sustainability (ICIAfS), IEEE, 2021, pp. 234–239.
72. Y. Yousfi, J. Butora, E. Khvedchenya, J. Fridrich, Imagenet pre-trained CNNs for JPEG steganalysis, in: 2020 IEEE International Workshop on Information Forensics and Security (WIFS), IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–6.
73. J. Zeng, S. Tan, B. Li, J. Huang, Large-scale JPEG image steganalysis using hybrid deep-learning framework, *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security* 13 (5) (2017) 1200–1214.
74. C. Qin, Y. Chen, K. Chen, X. Dong, W. Zhang, X. Mao, Y. He, N. Yu, Feature fusion based adversarial example detection against second-round adversarial attacks, *IEEE Transactions on Artificial Intelligence* (2022).
75. B. Bonnet, T. Furon, P. Bas, Forensics through stega glasses: the case of adversarial images, in: International Conference on Pattern Recognition, Springer, 2021, pp. 453–469.
76. X. Zhang, Y. Wang, Adnet: A neural network model for adversarial example detection based on steganalysis and attention mechanism, in: 2022 3rd International Conference on Computer Vision, Image and Deep Learning & International Conference on Computer Engineering and Applications (CVIDL & ICCEA), IEEE, 2022, pp. 55–60.
77. K. A. Zhang, K. Veeramachaneni, Enhancing image steganalysis with adversarially generated examples, in: International Symposium on Cyber Security Cryptography and Machine Learning, Springer, 2019, pp. 169–177.
78. J. Liu, G. Jiao, X. Sun, Feature passing learning for image steganalysis, *IEEE Signal Processing Letters* 29 (2022) 2233–2237.
79. X. Huang, Y. Hu, Y. Wang, B. Liu, S. Liu, Deep learning-based quantitative steganalysis to detect motion vector embedding of hevc videos, in: 2020 IEEE Fifth International Conference on Data Science in Cyberspace (DSC), IEEE, 2020, pp. 150–155.
80. D. Lee, T.-W. Oh, K. Kim, Deep audio steganalysis in time domain, in: Proceedings of the 2020 ACM Workshop on Information Hiding and Multimedia Security, 2020, pp. 11–21.
81. Y. Lin, R. Wang, D. Yan, L. Dong, X. Zhang, Audio steganalysis with improved convolutional neural network, in: Proceedings of the ACM Workshop on Information Hiding and Multimedia Security, 2019, pp. 210–215.
82. C. Paulin, S.-A. Selouani, E. Hervet, Audio steganalysis using deep belief networks, *International Journal of Speech Technology* 19 (3) (2016) 585–591.
83. B. Chen, W. Luo, H. Li, Audio steganalysis with convolutional neural network, in: Proceedings of the 5th ACM Workshop on Information Hiding and Multimedia Security, 2017, pp. 85–90.
84. Y. Xu, T. Zhao, P. Zhong, Small-scale linguistic steganalysis for multi-concealed scenarios, *IEEE Signal Processing Letters* 29 (2021) 130–134.
85. H. Li, S. Jin, Text steganalysis based on capsule network with dynamic routing, *IETE Technical Review* 38 (1) (2021) 72–81.
86. Y. Niu, J. Wen, P. Zhong, Y. Xue, A hybrid R-BILSTM-C neural network based text steganalysis, *IEEE Signal Processing Letters* 26 (12) (2019) 1907–1911.
87. B. Yi, H. Wu, G. Feng, X. Zhang, Exploiting language model for efficient linguistic steganalysis, in: ICASSP 2022-2022 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), IEEE, 2022, pp. 3074–3078.

88. Z. Fu, Q. Yu, F. Wang, C. Ding, Hga: Hierarchical feature extraction with graph and attention mechanism for linguistic steganalysis, *IEEE Signal Processing Letters* 29 (2022) 1734–1738.
89. W. Peng, J. Zhang, Y. Xue, Z. Yang, Real-time text steganalysis based on multi-stage transfer learning, *IEEE Signal Processing Letters* 28 (2021) 1510–1514.
90. H. Bae, B. Lee, S. Kwon, S. Yoon, DNA steganalysis using deep recurrent neural networks, in: *BIOCOMPUTING 2019: Proceedings of the Pacific Symposium*, World Scientific, 2018, pp. 88–99.
91. H. Bae, S. Min, H.-S. Choi, S. Yoon, DNA privacy: analyzing malicious DNA sequences using deep neural networks, *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Computational Biology and Bioinformatics* 19 (2) (2020) 888–898.
92. C. Catal, G. Giray, B. Tekinerdogan, S. Kumar, S. Shukla, Applications of deep learning for phishing detection: a systematic literature review, *Knowledge and Information Systems* 64 (6) (2022) 1457–1500.
93. Y. Himeur, S. Al-Maadeed, I. Varlamis, N. Al-Maadeed, K. Abualsaud, A. Mohamed, Face mask detection in smart cities using deep and transfer learning: lessons learned from the covid-19 pandemic, *Systems* 11 (2) (2023) 107.
94. D. Zhu, S. Lu, M. Wang, J. Lin, Z. Wang, Efficient precision-adjustable architecture for softmax function in deep learning, *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems II: Express Briefs* 67 (12) (2020) 3382–3386.
95. S. Hochreiter, J. Schmidhuber, Long short-term memory, *Neural computation* 9 (8) (1997) 1735–1780.
96. Y. Wu, M. Schuster, Z. Chen, Q. V. Le, M. Norouzi, W. Macherey, M. Krikun, Y. Cao, Q. Gao, K. Macherey, et al., Google's neural machine translation system: Bridging the gap between human and machine translation, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.08144* (2016).
97. K. Greff, R. K. Srivastava, J. Koutník, B. R. Steunebrink, J. Schmidhuber, LSTM: A search space odyssey, *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems* 28 (10) (2016) 2222–2232.
98. X. Qiu, L. Zhang, Y. Ren, P. N. Suganthan, G. Amaratunga, Ensemble deep learning for regression and time series forecasting, in: *2014 IEEE symposium on computational intelligence in ensemble learning (CIEL)*, IEEE, 2014, pp. 1–6.
99. F. Scarselli, M. Gori, A. C. Tsoi, M. Hagenbuchner, G. Monfardini, The graph neural network model, *IEEE transactions on neural networks* 20 (1) (2008) 61–80.
100. D.-C. Lou, C.-L. Liu, C.-L. Lin, Message estimation for universal steganalysis using multi-classification support vector machine, *Computer Standards & Interfaces* 31 (2) (2009) 420–427.
101. J. Fridrich, M. Goljan, Practical steganalysis of digital images: state of the art, security and Watermarking of Multimedia Contents IV 4675 (2002) 1–13.
102. M. Baziyad, T. Rabie, I. Kamel, Achieving stronger compaction for DCT-based steganography: A region-growing approach, in: *Trends and Innovations in Information Systems and Technologies: Volume 2*, Springer, 2020, pp. 251–261.
103. A. K. Sahu, G. Swain, M. Sahu, J. Hemalatha, Multi-directional block based PVD and modulus function image steganography to avoid FOBP and IEP, *Journal of Information Security and Applications* 58 (2021) 102808.
104. Z. He, W. Lu, W. Sun, J. Huang, Digital image splicing detection based on markov features in DCT and DWT domain, *Pattern recognition* 45 (12) (2012) 4292–4299.
105. P. Wang, Z. Wei, L. Xiao, Pure spatial rich model features for digital image steganalysis, *Multimedia Tools and Applications* 75 (2016) 2897–2912.
106. W. Lu, R. Li, L. Zeng, J. Chen, J. Huang, Y.-Q. Shi, Binary image steganalysis based on histogram of structuring elements, *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology* 30 (9) (2019) 3081–3094.
107. N. M. Abdali, Z. M. Hussain, Reference-free detection of LSB steganography using histogram analysis, in: *2020 30th International Telecommunication Networks and Applications Conference (ITNAC)*, IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–7.
108. W. Ren, L. Zhai, J. Jia, L. Wang, L. Zhang, Learning selection channels for image steganalysis in spatial domain, *Neurocomputing* 401 (2020) 78–90.
109. K. Chubachi, An ensemble model using CNNs on different domains for ALASKA2 image steganalysis, in: *2020 IEEE International Workshop on Information Forensics and Security (WIFS)*, IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–6.
110. P. Wang, F. Liu, C. Yang, Towards feature representation for steganalysis of spatial steganography, *Signal Processing* 169 (2020) 107422.
111. I. A. Khalifa, S. R. Zeebaree, M. Atas, F. M. Khalifa, Image steganalysis in frequency domain using co-occurrence matrix and bpnn, *Science Journal of University of Zakho* 7 (1) (2019) 27–32.
112. M. Bouzegza, A. Belatrehche, A. Bouridane, M. Tounsi, A comprehensive review of video steganalysis, *IET Image Processing* 16 (13) (2022) 3407–3425.
113. H. Shi, T. Sun, X. Jiang, Y. Dong, K. Xu, A hevc video steganalysis against DCT/DST-based steganography, *International Journal of Digital Crime and Forensics (IJDCF)* 13 (3) (2021) 19–33.
114. N. Ghamsarian, K. Schoeffmann, M. Khademi, Blind mv-based video steganalysis based on joint inter-frame and intra-frame statistics, *Multimedia Tools and Applications* 80 (2021) 9137–9159.
115. X. Weng, Y. Li, L. Chi, Y. Mu, High-capacity convolutional video steganography with temporal residual modeling, in: *Proceedings of the 2019 on international conference on multimedia retrieval*, 2019, pp. 87–95.
116. X. Wu, Z. Xie, Y. Gao, Y. Xiao, Sstnet: Detecting manipulated faces through spatial, steganalysis and temporal features, in: *ICASSP 2020-2020 IEEE international conference on acoustics, speech and signal processing (ICASSP)*, IEEE, 2020, pp. 2952–2956.
117. M. Dalal, M. Juneja, Video steganography techniques in spatial domain—a survey, in: *Proceedings of the International Conference on Computing and Communication Systems: I3CS 2016*, NEHU, Shillong, India, Springer, 2018, pp. 705–711.
118. K. Tasdemir, F. Kurugollu, S. Sezer, Spatio-temporal rich model for motion vector steganalysis, in: *2015 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, IEEE, 2015, pp. 1717–1721.
119. L. Zhai, L. Wang, Y. Ren, Universal detection of video steganography in multiple domains based on the consistency of motion vectors, *IEEE transactions on information forensics and security* 15 (2019) 1762–1777.
120. K. Huang, T. Sun, X. Jiang, Y. Dong, Q. Fang, Combined features for steganalysis against pu partition mode-based steganography in hevc, *Multimedia Tools and Applications* 79 (2020) 31147–31164.
121. H. Ghasemzadeh, M. H. Kayvanrad, Comprehensive review of audio steganalysis methods, *IET Signal Processing* 12 (6) (2018) 673–687.
122. J. Peng, S. Tang, L. Jia, Fast fourier transform-based steganalysis of covert communications over streaming media, *International Journal of Computer and Information Engineering* 13 (7) (2019) 362–367.
123. H. Ghasemzadeh, M. T. Khass, M. K. Arjmandi, Audio steganalysis based on reversed psychoacoustic model of human hearing, *Digital signal processing* 51 (2016) 133–141.
124. W. Yang, S. Tang, M. Li, Y. Cheng, Z. Zhou, Steganalysis of low embedding rates lsb speech based on histogram moments in frequency domain, *Chinese Journal of Electronics* 26 (6) (2017) 1254–1260.
125. Y. Ren, J. Yang, J. Wang, L. Wang, Amr steganalysis based on second-order difference of pitch delay, *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security* 12 (6) (2016) 1345–1357.
126. Y. Ren, T. Cai, M. Tang, L. Wang, Amr steganalysis based on the probability of same pulse position, *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and security* 10 (9) (2015) 1801–1811.
127. H. Özer, B. Sankur, N. Memon, İ. Avcıbaş, Detection of audio covert channels using statistical footprints of hidden messages, *Digital Signal Processing* 16 (4) (2006) 389–401.
128. S. Yazdanpanah, S. S. Chaeikar, A. Jolfaei, Monitoring the security of audio biomedical signals communications in wearable iot healthcare, *Digital Communications and Networks* (2022).

129. M. Hassaballah, M. A. Hameed, A. I. Awad, K. Muhammad, A novel image steganography method for industrial internet of things security, *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics* 17 (11) (2021) 7743–7751.
130. H. Miao, L. Huang, Y. Shen, X. Lu, Z. Chen, Steganalysis of compressed speech based on markov and entropy, in: *Digital-Forensics and Watermarking: 12th International Workshop, IWDW 2013, Auckland, New Zealand, October 1-4, 2013. Revised Selected Papers 12*, Springer, 2014, pp. 63–76.
131. Y. Yang, L. Zha, Z. Zhang, J. Wen, An overview of text steganalysis, in: *The International Conference on Image, Vision and Intelligent Systems (ICIVIS 2021)*, Springer, 2022, pp. 933–943.
132. X.-g. Sui, H. Luo, Z.-l. Zhu, A steganalysis method based on the distribution of first letters of words, in: *2006 International Conference on Intelligent Information Hiding and Multimedia*, IEEE, 2006, pp. 369–372.
133. F. Wang, L. Huang, Z. Chen, W. Yang, H. Miao, A novel text steganography by context-based equivalent substitution, in: *2013 IEEE international conference on signal processing, communication and computing (ICSPCC 2013)*, IEEE, 2013, pp. 1–6.
134. R. Din, A. Samsudin, T. Z. T. Muda, P. Lertkrai, A. Amphawan, M. N. Omar, Fitness value based evolution algorithm approach for text steganalysis model, *International Journal of Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences* 7 (5) (2013) 551–558.
135. L. Xiang, X. Sun, G. Luo, B. Xia, Linguistic steganalysis using the features derived from synonym frequency, *Multimedia tools and applications* 71 (2014) 1893–1911.
136. S. Guo, J. Liu, Z. Yang, W. You, R. Zhang, Linguistic steganalysis merging semantic and statistical features, *IEEE Signal Processing Letters* 29 (2022) 2128–2132.
137. P. Meng, L. Hang, W. Yang, Z. Chen, H. Zheng, Linguistic steganography detection algorithm using statistical language model, in: *2009 international conference on information technology and computer science*, Vol. 2, IEEE, 2009, pp. 540–543.
138. D. D. Shankar, A. S. Azhakath, Random embedded calibrated statistical blind steganalysis using cross validated support vector machine and support vector machine with particle swarm optimization, *Scientific Reports* 13 (1) (2023) 2359.
139. D. Megías, D. Lerch-Hostalot, Subsequent embedding in targeted image steganalysis: Theoretical framework and practical applications, *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing* 20 (2) (2023) 1403–1421.
140. J. Fridrich, J. Kodovsky, Rich models for steganalysis of digital images, *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security* 7 (3) (2012) 868–882.
141. M. Yedroudj, F. Comby, M. Chaumont, Yedroudj-net: An efficient CNN for spatial steganalysis, in: *2018 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, IEEE, 2018, pp. 2092–2096.
142. R. Tabares-Soto, R. Ramos-Pollán, G. Isaza, S. Orozco-Arias, M. A. B. Ortíz, H. B. A. Arteaga, A. M. Rubio, J. A. A. Grisales, Digital media steganalysis, in: *Digital Media Steganography*, Elsevier, 2020, pp. 259–293.
143. M. Yedroudj, M. Chaumont, F. Comby, A. Oulad Amara, P. Bas, Pixels-off: data-augmentation complementary solution for deep-learning steganalysis, in: *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM workshop on information hiding and multimedia security*, 2020, pp. 39–48.
144. Y. Qian, J. Dong, W. Wang, T. Tan, Learning and transferring representations for image steganalysis using convolutional neural network, in: *2016 IEEE international conference on image processing (ICIP)*, Ieee, 2016, pp. 2752–2756.
145. B. Li, W. Wei, A. Ferreira, S. Tan, Rest-net: Diverse activation modules and parallel subnets-based CNN for spatial image steganalysis, *IEEE Signal Processing Letters* 25 (5) (2018) 650–654.
146. R. Zhang, F. Zhu, J. Liu, G. Liu, Efficient feature learning and multi-size image steganalysis based on CNN, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.11428* (2018).
147. H. Zhang, F. Liu, Z. Song, X. Zhang, Y. Zhao, Ag-net: An advanced general CNN model for steganalysis, *IEEE Access* 10 (2022) 44116–44122.
148. A. I. Iskanderani, I. M. Mehedi, A. J. Aljohani, M. Shorfuzzaman, F. Akther, T. Palaniswamy, S. A. Latif, A. Latif, Artificial intelligence-based digital image steganalysis, *Security and Communication Networks* 2021 (2021).
149. A. Su, X. Zhao, Boosting image steganalysis under universal deep learning architecture incorporating ensemble classification strategy, *IEEE signal processing letters* 26 (12) (2019) 1852–1856.
150. K. Liu, J. Yang, X. Kang, Ensemble of CNN and rich model for steganalysis, in: *2017 International Conference on Systems, Signals and Image Processing (TWSSIP)*, IEEE, 2017, pp. 1–5.
151. T. Denemark, V. Sedighi, V. Holub, R. Cogranne, J. Fridrich, Selection-channel-aware rich model for steganalysis of digital images, in: *2014 IEEE International Workshop on Information Forensics and Security (WIFS)*, IEEE, 2014, pp. 48–53.
152. F. K. Gomis, T. Bouwmans, M. S. Camara, I. Diop, Estimation of the hidden message length in steganography: A deep learning approach, in: *International Conference on Machine Learning for Networking*, Springer, 2020, pp. 333–341.
153. P. Yang, K. Qi, S. Yao, Multi-level attention network for image steganalysis, in: *2022 IEEE International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Computer Applications (ICAICA)*, IEEE, 2022, pp. 42–48.
154. Q. Liu, J. Ni, M. Jian, Effective JPEG steganalysis using non-linear pre-processing and residual channel-spatial attention, in: *2022 IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo (ICME)*, IEEE, 2022, pp. 1–6.
155. B. Singh, M. Chhajed, A. Sur, P. Mitra, Steganalysis using learned denoising kernels, *Multimedia Tools and Applications* 80 (4) (2021) 4903–4917.
156. M. Boroumand, M. Chen, J. Fridrich, Deep residual network for steganalysis of digital images, *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security* 14 (5) (2018) 1181–1193.
157. S. Zhong, W. Weng, K. Chen, J. Lai, Deep-learning steganalysis for removing document images on the basis of geometric median pruning, *Symmetry* 12 (9) (2020) 1426.
158. J. Lin, Y. Yang, Multi-frequency residual convolutional neural network for steganalysis of color images, *IEEE Access* 9 (2021) 141938–141950.
159. G. Larsson, M. Maire, G. Shakhnarovich, Fractalnet: Ultra-deep neural networks without residuals, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.07648* (2016).
160. L. Gan, Y. Cheng, Y. Yang, L. Shen, Z. Dong, An efficient JPEG steganalysis model based on deep learning, in: *International Conference on Security with Intelligent Computing and Big-data Services*, Springer, 2018, pp. 729–742.
161. A. Su, S. Ma, X. Zhao, Fast and secure steganography based on j-uniward, *IEEE Signal Processing Letters* 27 (2020) 221–225.
162. L. Guo, J. Ni, Y. Q. Shi, Uniform embedding for efficient jpeg steganography, *IEEE transactions on Information Forensics and Security* 9 (5) (2014) 814–825.
163. M. Chen, M. Boroumand, J. Fridrich, Deep learning regressors for quantitative steganalysis, *Electronic Imaging* 2018 (7) (2018) 160–1.
164. R. Zhan, Y. Ma, S. Yang, Y. Man, Y. Yang, An advanced JPEG steganalysis method with balanced depth and width based on fractal residual network, in: *2021 IEEE International Conference on Progress in Informatics and Computing (PIC)*, IEEE, 2021, pp. 345–351.
165. W. Tang, B. Li, S. Tan, M. Barni, J. Huang, CNN-based adversarial embedding for image steganography, *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security* 14 (8) (2019) 2074–2087.
166. M. Barni, M. C. Stamm, B. Tondi, Adversarial multimedia forensics: Overview and challenges ahead, in: *2018 26th European signal processing conference (EUSIPCO)*, IEEE, 2018, pp. 962–966.
167. X. Shi, B. Tondi, B. Li, M. Barni, CNN-based steganalysis and parametric adversarial embedding: a game-theoretic framework, *Signal Processing: Image Communication* 89 (2020) 115992.
168. Y. Ge, T. Zhang, H. Liang, Q. Jiang, D. Wang, A novel technique for image steganalysis based on separable convolution and adversarial mechanism, *Electronics* 10 (22) (2021) 2742.
169. K. A. Zhang, A. Cuesta-Infante, L. Xu, K. Veeramachaneni, Steganogan: High capacity image steganography with gans, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.03892* (2019).

170. K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, J. Sun, Deep residual learning for image recognition, in: Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, 2016, pp. 770–778.
171. Y. Yousfi, J. Butora, J. Fridrich, Q. Giboulot, Breaking ALASKA: Color separation for steganalysis in JPEG domain, in: Proceedings of the ACM Workshop on Information Hiding and Multimedia Security, 2019, pp. 138–149.
172. Q. Li, Z. Shao, S. Tan, J. Zeng, B. Li, Non-structured pruning for deep-learning based steganalytic frameworks, in: 2019 Asia-Pacific Signal and Information Processing Association Annual Summit and Conference (APSIPA ASC), IEEE, 2019, pp. 1735–1739.
173. S. Tan, W. Wu, Z. Shao, Q. Li, B. Li, J. Huang, Calpa-net: channel-pruning-assisted deep residual network for steganalysis of digital images, IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security 16 (2020) 131–146.
174. H. Chen, G. Jiao, Deep learning image steganalysis method fused with cbam, in: International Conference on Computer Engineering and Networks, Springer, 2022, pp. 1175–1184.
175. S. Wu, S. Zhong, Y. Liu, Deep residual learning for image steganalysis, Multimedia tools and applications 77 (9) (2018) 10437–10453.
176. L. Zeng, W. Lu, W. Liu, J. Chen, Deep residual network for halftone image steganalysis with stego-signal diffusion, Signal processing 172 (2020) 107576.
177. Y. Xu, Z. Fu, G. Xu, S. Zhang, X. Xie, Drhnet: A deep residual network based on heterogeneous kernel for steganalysis, Security and Communication Networks 2020 (2020).
178. Q. Li, G. Feng, H. Wu, X. Zhang, Ensemble steganalysis based on deep residual network, in: International Workshop on Digital Watermarking, Springer, 2020, pp. 84–95.
179. H. Chen, Q. Han, Q. Li, X. Tong, Image steganalysis with multi-scale residual network, Multimedia Tools and Applications (2022) 1–23.
180. A. Singhal, P. Bedi, Multi-class blind steganalysis using deep residual networks, Multimedia Tools and Applications 80 (9) (2021) 13931–13956.
181. S. Wu, S.-h. Zhong, Y. Liu, Residual convolution network based steganalysis with adaptive content suppression, in: 2017 IEEE international conference on multimedia and expo (ICME), IEEE, 2017, pp. 241–246.
182. S. Wu, S.-h. Zhong, Y. Liu, Steganalysis via deep residual network, in: 2016 IEEE 22nd International Conference on Parallel and Distributed Systems (ICPADS), IEEE, 2016, pp. 1233–1236.
183. S. Ozcan, A. F. Mustacoglu, Transfer learning effects on image steganalysis with pre-trained deep residual neural network model, in: 2018 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data), IEEE, 2018, pp. 2280–2287.
184. Q. Liu, L. Zhou, H. Wu, Graph representation learning for spatial image steganalysis, in: 2022 IEEE 24th International Workshop on Multimedia Signal Processing (MMSp), IEEE, 2022, pp. 1–5.
185. S. Tan, B. Li, Stacked convolutional auto-encoders for steganalysis of digital images, in: Signal and information processing association annual summit and conference (APSIPA), 2014 Asia-Pacific, IEEE, 2014, pp. 1–4.
186. M. Goljan, J. Fridrich, R. Cogranne, Rich model for steganalysis of color images, in: 2014 IEEE International workshop on information forensics and security (WIFS), IEEE, 2014, pp. 185–190.
187. J. Liu, W. Zhang, Y. Zhang, D. Hou, Y. Liu, H. Zha, N. Yu, Detection based defense against adversarial examples from the steganalysis point of view, in: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2019, pp. 4825–4834.
188. B. Liang, H. Li, M. Su, X. Li, W. Shi, X. Wang, Detecting adversarial image examples in deep neural networks with adaptive noise reduction, IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing 18 (1) (2018) 72–85.
189. W. Xu, D. Evans, Y. Qi, Feature squeezing: Detecting adversarial examples in deep neural networks, arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.01155 (2017).
190. S. Baluja, Hiding images in plain sight: Deep steganography, Advances in neural information processing systems 30 (2017).
191. X. Deng, B. Chen, W. Luo, D. Luo, Fast and effective global covariance pooling network for image steganalysis, in: Proceedings of the ACM Workshop on Information Hiding and Multimedia Security, 2019, pp. 230–234.
192. Q. Wang, M. Zhang, J. Li, Y. Kong, Lightweight end-to-end image steganalysis based on convolutional neural network, Journal of Electronic Imaging 30 (6) (2021) 063005–063005.
193. Z. Zhang, H. Shi, X. Jiang, Z. Li, J. Liu, A CNN-based hevc video steganalysis against DCT/DST-based steganography, in: Digital Forensics and Cyber Crime: 12th EAI International Conference, ICDF2C 2021, Virtual Event, Singapore, December 6–9, 2021, Proceedings, Springer, 2022, pp. 265–276.
194. Y. Yao, Y. Shi, S. Weng, B. Guan, Deep learning for detection of object-based forgery in advanced video, Symmetry 10 (1) (2017) 3.
195. S. Chen, S. Tan, B. Li, J. Huang, Automatic detection of object-based forgery in advanced video, IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology 26 (11) (2015) 2138–2151.
196. X. Wu, Z. Xie, Y. Gao, Y. Xiao, Sstnet: Detecting manipulated faces through spatial, steganalysis and temporal features, in: ICASSP 2020 - 2020 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), 2020, pp. 2952–2956.
197. A. Nissar, A. Mir, Texture based steganalysis of grayscale images using neural network, Signal processing research 2 (1) (2013) 17–24.
198. S. Tan, B. Chen, J. Zeng, B. Li, J. Huang, Hybrid deep-learning framework for object-based forgery detection in video, Signal Processing: Image Communication 105 (2022) 116695.
199. X. Huang, Y. Hu, Y. Wang, B. Liu, S. Liu, selection-channel-aware deep neural network to detect motion vector embedding of hevc videos, in: 2020 IEEE International Conference on Signal Processing, Communications and Computing (ICSPCC), IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–6.
200. P. Liu, S. Li, Steganalysis of intra prediction mode and motion vector-based steganography by noise residual convolutional neural network, in: IOP Conference series: materials science and engineering, Vol. 719, IOP Publishing, 2020, p. 012068.
201. H. Dai, R. Wang, D. Xu, S. He, L. Yang, Hecv video steganalysis based on pu maps and multi-scale convolutional residual network, IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology (2023).
202. Y.-F. Gan, J.-X. Yang, J.-L. Zhong, et al., Video surveillance object forgery detection using pdcl network with residual-based steganalysis feature, International Journal of Intelligent Systems 2023 (2023).
203. Z. Lin, Y. Huang, J. Wang, Rnn-sm: Fast steganalysis of voip streams using recurrent neural network, IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security 13 (7) (2018) 1854–1868.
204. Y. Qiu, H. Tian, L. Tang, W. Mazurczyk, C.-C. Chang, Steganalysis of adaptive multi-rate speech streams with distributed representations of codewords, Journal of Information Security and Applications 68 (2022) 103250.
205. J. Wang, J. Yang, F. Gao, P. Xu, Steganalysis of compressed speech based on global and local correlation mining, IEEE Access 10 (2022) 78472–78483.
206. Y. Wang, K. Yang, X. Yi, X. Zhao, Z. Xu, CNN-based steganalysis of mp3 steganography in the entropy code domain, in: Proceedings of the 6th ACM Workshop on Information Hiding and Multimedia Security, 2018, pp. 55–65.
207. M. R. Duwanto, R. Munir, Steganographic-algorithm and length estimation classification on mp3 steganalysis with convolutional neural network, in: 2019 4th International Conference on Information Technology, Information Systems and Electrical Engineering (ICITISEE), IEEE, 2019, pp. 210–215.
208. H. Yang, Z. Yang, Y. Bao, Y. Huang, Hierarchical representation network for steganalysis of qim steganography in low-bit-rate speech signals, in: International Conference on Information and Communications Security, Springer, 2020, pp. 783–798.
209. C. Paulin, S.-A. Selouani, É. Hervet, Speech steganalysis using evolutionary restricted boltzmann machines, in: 2016 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation (CEC), IEEE, 2016, pp. 4831–4838.
210. Y. Ren, D. Liu, Q. Xiong, J. Fu, L. Wang, Spec-resnet: a general audio steganalysis scheme based on deep residual network of spectrogram, arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.06838 (2019).
211. J. Wen, X. Zhou, P. Zhong, Y. Xue, Convolutional neural network based text steganalysis, IEEE Signal Processing Letters 26 (3) (2019) 460–464.

212. L. Xiang, G. Guo, J. Yu, V. S. Sheng, P. Yang, A convolutional neural network-based linguistic steganalysis for synonym substitution steganography, *Mathematical Biosciences and Engineering* 17 (2) (2020) 1041–1058.
213. Z. Yang, N. Wei, J. Sheng, Y. Huang, Y.-J. Zhang, Ts-CNN: text steganalysis from semantic space based on convolutional neural network, arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.08136 (2018).
214. Y. Luo, C. Yao, Y. Mo, B. Xie, G. Yang, H. Gui, A creative approach to understanding the hidden information within the business data using deep learning, *Information Processing & Management* 58 (5) (2021) 102615.
215. Z. Yang, K. Wang, J. Li, Y. Huang, Y.-J. Zhang, Ts-rnn: text steganalysis based on recurrent neural networks, *IEEE Signal Processing Letters* 26 (12) (2019) 1743–1747.
216. J. Zhou, G. Cui, S. Hu, Z. Zhang, C. Yang, Z. Liu, L. Wang, C. Li, M. Sun, Graph neural networks: A review of methods and applications, *AI open* 1 (2020) 57–81.
217. H. Wu, B. Yi, F. Ding, G. Feng, X. Zhang, Linguistic steganalysis with graph neural networks, *IEEE Signal Processing Letters* 28 (2021) 558–562.
218. Z. Yang, H. Yang, C.-C. Chang, Y. Huang, C.-C. Chang, Real-time steganalysis for streaming media based on multi-channel convolutional sliding windows, *Knowledge-Based Systems* 237 (2022) 107561.
219. C. Jin, R. Wang, D. Yan, Steganalysis of mp3stego with low embedding-rate using markov feature, *Multimedia Tools and Applications* 76 (2017) 6143–6158.
220. Z. Yang, Y. Huang, Y.-J. Zhang, A fast and efficient text steganalysis method, *IEEE Signal Processing Letters* 26 (4) (2019) 627–631.
221. Z. Yang, Y. Huang, Y.-J. Zhang, Ts-csw: text steganalysis and hidden capacity estimation based on convolutional sliding windows, *Multimedia Tools and Applications* 79 (2020) 18293–18316.
222. Y. Qiu, H. Tian, H. Li, C.-C. Chang, A. V. Vasilakos, Separable convolution network with dual-stream pyramid enhanced strategy for speech steganalysis, *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security* (2023).
223. H. Tian, J. Liu, C.-C. Chang, C.-C. Chen, Y. Huang, Steganalysis of amr speech based on multiple classifiers combination, *IEEE Access* 7 (2019) 140957–140968.
224. Z. Wu, J. Guo, Amr steganalysis based on adversarial bi-gru and data distillation, in: *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Workshop on Information Hiding and Multimedia Security, 2022*, pp. 141–146.
225. Y. Huang, C. Liu, S. Tang, S. Bai, Steganography integration into a low-bit rate speech codec, *IEEE transactions on information forensics and security* 7 (6) (2012) 1865–1875.
226. B. A. Mitras, A. Abo, Proposed steganography approach using DNA properties, *International Journal of Information Technology and Business Management* 14 (1) (2013) 96–102.
227. D. Zhao, K. Wang, Bns-CNN: A blind network steganalysis model based on convolutional neural network in ipv6 network, in: *International Workshop on Digital Watermarking, Springer, 2020*, pp. 365–373.
228. B. Miller, Steganography in ipv6 (2008).
229. N. B. Lucena, G. Lewandowski, S. J. Chapin, Covert channels in ipv6, in: *Privacy Enhancing Technologies: 5th International Workshop, PET 2005, Cavtat, Croatia, May 30-June 1, 2005, Revised Selected Papers 5, Springer, 2006*, pp. 147–166.
230. C. H. Rowland, Covert channels in the tcp/ip protocol suite (1997).
231. H. Yang, Y. Bao, Z. Yang, S. Liu, Y. Huang, S. Jiao, Linguistic steganalysis via densely connected LSTM with feature pyramid, in: *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM Workshop on Information Hiding and Multimedia Security, 2020*, pp. 5–10.
232. J. Kodovsky, J. Fridrich, V. Holub, Ensemble classifiers for steganalysis of digital media, *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security* 7 (2) (2011) 432–444.
233. T. D. Denemark, M. Boroumand, J. Fridrich, Steganalysis features for content-adaptive JPEG steganography, *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security* 11 (8) (2016) 1736–1746.
234. C. Qian, Y. Yu, Z.-H. Zhou, Pareto ensemble pruning, in: *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Vol. 29, 2015*.
235. C. Gong, X. Yi, X. Zhao, Y. Ma, Recurrent convolutional neural networks for amr steganalysis based on pulse position, in: *Proceedings of the ACM Workshop on Information Hiding and Multimedia Security, 2019*, pp. 2–13.
236. H. Yang, Z. Yang, Y. Huang, Steganalysis of voip streams with CNN-LSTM network, in: *Proceedings of the ACM Workshop on Information Hiding and Multimedia Security, 2019*, pp. 204–209.
237. Y. Hu, Y. Huang, Z. Yang, Y. Huang, Detection of heterogeneous parallel steganography for low bit-rate voip speech streams, *Neurocomputing* 419 (2021) 70–79.
238. Y. Himeur, S. Al-Maadeed, H. Kheddar, N. Al-Maadeed, K. Abualsaud, A. Mohamed, T. Khattab, Video surveillance using deep transfer learning and deep domain adaptation: Towards better generalization, *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence* 119 (2023) 105698.
239. H. Kheddar, Y. Himeur, A. I. Awad, Deep transfer learning for intrusion detection in industrial control networks: A comprehensive review, *Journal of Network and Computer Applications* 220 (2023) 103760.
240. H. Kheddar, Y. Himeur, S. Al-Maadeed, A. Amira, F. Bensaali, Deep transfer learning for automatic speech recognition: Towards better generalization, *Knowledge-Based Systems* 277 (2023) 110851. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.knosys.2023.110851.
241. A. N. Sayed, Y. Himeur, F. Bensaali, Deep and transfer learning for building occupancy detection: A review and comparative analysis, *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence* 115 (2022) 105254.
242. S. S. Sohail, Y. Himeur, A. Amira, F. Fadli, W. Mansoor, S. Atalla, A. Copiaco, Deep transfer learning for 3d point cloud understanding: A comprehensive survey, Available at SSRN 4348272.
243. M. Botvinick, J. X. Wang, W. Dabney, K. J. Miller, Z. Kurth-Nelson, Deep reinforcement learning and its neuroscientific implications, *Neuron* 107 (4) (2020) 603–616.
244. D. Lerch-Hostalot, D. Megías, Real-world actor-based image steganalysis via classifier inconsistency detection, in: *The 18th International Conference on Availability, Reliability and Security (ARES 2023)*, ACM, New York, NY, USA, 2023.
245. S. S. Sohail, D. Ø. Madsen, Y. Himeur, M. Ashraf, Using chatgpt to navigate ambivalent and contradictory research findings on artificial intelligence, *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence* 6 (2023). doi:10.3389/frai.2023.1195797.
246. S. S. Sohail, F. Farhat, Y. Himeur, M. Nadeem, D. Ø. Madsen, Y. Singh, S. Atalla, W. Mansoor, Decoding chatgpt: A taxonomy of existing research, current challenges, and possible future directions, arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.14107 (2023).
247. P. Wei, Q. Zhou, Z. Wang, Z. Qian, X. Zhang, S. Li, Generative steganography diffusion, arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.03472 (2023).
248. A. Qammar, H. Wang, J. Ding, A. Naouri, M. Daneshmand, H. Ning, Chatbots to chatgpt in a cybersecurity space: Evolution, vulnerabilities, attacks, challenges, and future recommendations, arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.09255 (2023).
249. B. Yi, H. Wu, G. Feng, X. Zhang, Alisa: Acrostic linguistic steganography based on bert and gibbs sampling, *IEEE Signal Processing Letters* 29 (2022) 687–691.
250. Y. Cao, Z. Zhou, C. Chakraborty, M. Wang, Q. J. Wu, X. Sun, K. Yu, Generative steganography based on long readable text generation, *IEEE Transactions on Computational Social Systems* (2022).
251. B. Sun, Y. Li, J. Zhang, H. Xu, X. Ma, P. Xia, Topic controlled steganography via graph-to-text generation., *CMES-Computer Modeling in Engineering & Sciences* 136 (1) (2023).



Dr. Hamza Kheddar is an Associate Professor at the University of Medea and a Researcher at LSEA Lab. Medea (Algeria). He was awarded a Ph.D. in Telecommunication from USTHB University (Algeria), a Magister degree in Electronics (Spoken Communication) from USTHB University, and an Engineer degree in Telecommunication from ENSTTIC (Oran-Algeria). He obtained the Habilitation to Direct Research, which granted him the official authorization to supervise research, in June 2021. His research interests include but are not limited to speech steganography, digital watermarking, data hiding, speech processing, intrusion detection, coding, and telecommunications. He is a reviewer for *Computers & Security*, *IET Information Security*, *IEEE Access*, *KFUPM journals*, *Applied Intelligence*, *e-prime*, and *Journal of image and graphic*.



Dr. Mustapha Hemis received the B.S. degree in Electrical Engineering and the M.Sc. degree in Telecommunication and Multimedia and the Ph.D. degree in Telecommunication and Information Processing from the University of Science and Technology Houari Boumediene (USTHB), Algiers, Algeria, in 2010, 2012 and 2017, respectively. He is currently an Associate Professor at the USTHB university and a researcher at LCPTS laboratory. His research interests include multimedia security, digital audio watermarking, steganography, steganalysis and data hiding.




Dr. Yassine Himeur is presently an Assistant Professor of Engineering & Information Technology at the University of Dubai. He completed both his M.Sc. and Ph.D. degrees in Electrical Engineering in 2011 and 2015, respectively. Following his doctoral studies, he obtained the Habilitation to Direct Research, which granted him the official authorization to supervise research, in July 2017. His academic journey led him to join the faculty at the University of Dubai after serving as a Postdoctoral Research Fellow at Qatar University from 2019 to 2022. Prior to that, he held the position of Senior Researcher from 2013 to 2019 at the Algerian Center for Development of Advanced Technologies (CDTA), where he also served as the Head of the TELECOM Division from 2018 to 2019. Throughout his career, he has been actively involved in conducting R&D projects and has played a significant role in proposing and co-leading several research proposals under the NPRP grant (QNRF, Qatar). With more than 100 research publications in high-impact venues, he has made valuable contributions to the field. He was honored to receive the Best Paper Award at the 11th IEEE SIGMAP in Austria in 2014. His current research interests

encompass Big Data and IoTs, AI/ML/DL, Healthcare Technologies, Digital Twins, Metaverse, Recommender Systems, Smart grid, Building Energy Management, Smart Buildings, NLP, Generative AI, and Cybersecurity.



Prof. David Megías is full Professor and the Principal Investigator of the KISON research group of the Internet Interdisciplinary Institute (IN3), at the Universitat Oberta de Catalunya (UOC). He received the Ph.D. degree in computer science from the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (UAB) in July 2000. Since October 2001, he has been at the UOC with a permanent position (currently as Professor). At the UOC, he has held several academic positions, until he was appointed director of the IN3 in April 2015. His current teaching is mostly related to computer networks, information security (watermarking and steganography), and research techniques and methodologies in the field of network and information technologies. His current research interests focus on information security and privacy, and include the security and privacy in multimedia content distribution (mainly in the watermarking and fingerprinting topics), steganography and steganalysis, and privacy concerns in different applications of decentralized networks. He has published more than 130 research papers in numerous international journals and conferences, 40 of them in journals indexed in JCR, and has participated in several national joint research projects

both as a contributor and as principal investigator. He has supervised four doctoral theses and is a member of the editorial board and programme committees of several journals and conferences in the area of security and privacy.



Prof. Abbas Amira received his Ph.D degree from Queen's University Belfast, United Kingdom and he has taken academic, leadership and consultancy positions in the United Kingdom including Queen's University Belfast, Brunel University and De Montfort University in Leicester, France, Malaysia, and the Middle East at Qatar University, Qatar. He is currently the Dean of the College of Computing and Informatics at the University of Sharjah, UAE. During his career to date, Prof. Amira has been successful in securing substantial funding from government agencies and industry; he has supervised more than 25 PhD students and has over 350 publications in top journals and conferences in the area of embedded systems, artificial intelligence, IoT, image and signal processing. He obtained many international awards, including the 2008 VARIAN prize offered by the Swiss Society of Radiobiology and Medical Physics, CAST award, DELL-EM Envision the future (2018), IET premium award (2017) and many best paper and recognition awards in IEEE international conferences and events.