

# A Survey of Defenses against AI-generated Visual Media: Detection, Disruption, and Authentication

Jingyi Deng, *Graduate Student Member, IEEE*, Chenhao Lin\*, *Member, IEEE*, Zhengyu Zhao, *Member, IEEE*, Shuai Liu, *Member, IEEE*, Qian Wang, *Fellow, IEEE*, Chao Shen, *Senior Member, IEEE*

**Abstract**—Deep generative models have demonstrated impressive performance in various computer vision applications, including image synthesis, video generation, and medical analysis. Despite their significant advancements, these models may be used for malicious purposes, such as misinformation, deception, and copyright violation. In this paper, we provide a systematic and timely review of research efforts on defenses against AI-generated visual media, covering detection, disruption, and authentication. We review existing methods and summarize the mainstream defense-related tasks within a unified passive and proactive framework. Moreover, we survey the derivative tasks concerning the trustworthiness of defenses, such as their robustness and fairness. For each task, we formulate its general pipeline and propose a taxonomy based on methodological strategies that are uniformly applicable to the primary subtasks. Additionally, we summarize the commonly used evaluation datasets, criteria, and metrics. Finally, by analyzing the reviewed studies, we provide insights into current research challenges and suggest possible directions for future research.

**Index Terms**—Visual Media Forensics, Detection, Disruption, Authentication, Deepfake, Diffusion Models, GANs.

## I. INTRODUCTION

THE authenticity of digital vision media has become increasingly challenging due to advancements in deep generative models, given their remarkable capabilities in image and video synthesis and editing. These deep generative models primarily include variational autoencoders (VAEs) [1], [2], generative adversarial networks (GANs) [3], flow models [4], autoregressive models [5], and diffusion models (DMs) [6]–[8]. Initially, constrained by their limited generative ability to generate diverse content [9], [10], most generative models focused on single-class generation. This leads to the development of a manipulation technique known as Deepfake [11]–[14], which particularly generates visual content containing human faces. More recently, impressive advancements, particularly in DMs, have enabled the generation of visual media depicting complex objects and scenes with high fidelity and diversity [15]–[17]. These breakthroughs have been applied to various computer vision tasks, including image and video generation [17], [18], image super-resolution [19], [20], and anomaly detection [21], [22].

J. Deng, C. Lin, Z. Zhao, S. Liu, and C. Shen are with the Faculty of Electronic and Information Engineering, Xi’an Jiaotong University, Xi’an, 710049 China. E-mail: misscc320@stu.xjtu.edu.cn, linchenhao@xjtu.edu.cn, zhengyu.zhao@xjtu.edu.cn, sh\_liu@mail.xjtu.edu.cn, chaoshen@mail.xjtu.edu.cn.

Q. Wang is with the School of Cyber Science and Engineering, Wuhan University, Wuhan, 430072 China. E-mail: qianwang@whu.edu.cn.

While generative content offers positive impacts, it also poses risks of technology abuse [23], such as misinformation [24], deception [25], and copyright violations [26], raising ethical concerns to society [25], [27]–[29]. Additionally, the proliferation of generative media on the Internet leads to data contamination [30], [31], posing new challenges for the research community. Consequently, ensuring media authenticity and identity traceability is crucial to mitigate the potential misuse, prompting numerous explorations.

One popular way to mitigate the threat of generative media is to (passively) detect the authenticity of a given visual media. Early approaches primarily aimed at identifying Deepfake [32]–[36] and GAN-generated [37]–[40] media, commonly relying on hand-crafted artifact features for detection [32], [33], [35]–[38]. However, due to the lack of acknowledged benchmarking datasets, these methods were difficult to compare directly. Since 2019, various large-scale datasets have been gradually proposed [41]–[44], offering larger scale, better manipulation quality, and greater diversity. Accordingly, hand-crafted artifact features have been circumvented, and deep learning-based discriminative representations have been exploited [44]–[46]. During this development, most detection approaches have achieved superior in-domain but relatively poor cross-domain detection performance. This has led to the generalization ability becoming a significant evaluation criterion for detection. Particularly, with the advances in generative models, detection methods now require to generalize to a broader range of generative media types. Except for generalizability, detection robustness has become another critical evaluation criterion, given that media encountered in real-world social networks often suffer from lossy quality. Throughout these developments, fine-grained detection tasks (e.g., forgery localization, forgery attribution) and trustworthiness of detection have also been explored, collaboratively contributing to the advancement of detection technologies.

Another effective way to prevent the malicious use of generative media is to (proactively) modify the generative media before they are released. On the one hand, one can directly disrupt the potentially generated outputs by adversarially perturbing the inputs to generative models [47], [48], thereby preventing their generation and potential misuse. On the other hand, digital watermarks can be injected into the inputs, generative models, and generative media to embed identification information or highlight forgery traces for further media verification [49], [50]. This provides traceability of generative media and mitigates misuse. Additionally, the trustworthiness of proactive defense is also explored [51], [52].

TABLE I

COMPARISONS BETWEEN EXISTING RELATED SURVEYS AND OURS. OURS DISCUSSES THE DISRUPTION AND AUTHENTICATION TASKS IN ADDITION TO THE DETECTION. OURS ALSO COVERS A MORE COMPLETE REVIEW OF DATA DOMAINS AND EVALUATION METHODOLOGY.

Surveys	Year	Detection		Disruption		Authentication		Method Taxonomy		Evaluation Methodology			
		Subtask	Trust	Subtask	Trust	Subtask	Trust	Perspective	Uniform	Methods	Datasets	Criteria	Metrics
Tolosana et al. [53]	2020	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	✓	✓	–	✓
Misky et al. [54]	2021	1	1	–	–	–	–	1	–	✓	–	–	–
Xu et al. [56]	2022	2	1	–	–	–	–	1	–	✓	✓	–	✓
Seow et al. [57]	2022	1	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	✓	✓	–	✓
Cardenuto et al. [59]	2023	1	1	–	–	–	–	1	–	✓	–	–	–
Chen et al. [63]	2023	–	–	1	–	1	–	1	–	✓	–	–	–
Wang et al. [62]	2023	2	–	2	–	1	–	1	–	✓	–	–	–
Lin et al. [60]	2024	3	1	–	–	–	–	1	–	✓	–	–	–
Tariang et al. [61]	2024	2	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	✓	✓	✓	–
Ours	2024	4	3	2	1	3	1	2	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

\* Detection subtasks include forgery detection, passive forgery localization, forgery attribution, and sequential manipulation prediction. Trustworthiness of detection includes robustness and fairness.

\* Disruption subtasks include distorting disruption and nullifying disruption. Trustworthiness of disruption includes robustness.

\* Authentication subtasks include copyright protection, forgery authentication, and proactive forgery localization. Trustworthiness of authentication includes robustness.

\* The method taxonomy perspective indicates the number of methodological strategies on which the taxonomy based. Uniform method taxonomy indicates it is uniformly applicable for all subtasks.

With the growing interest in the passive and proactive defenses against AI-generated visual media, several existing surveys [53]–[62] aim to analyze and categorize existing works. Nevertheless, these surveys have several limitations that prevent them from providing systematic and comprehensive summaries. First, they either lack coverage of proactive defense tasks [53]–[63], such as authentication and disruption, or consider a limited set of detection subtasks [62], [63]. Second, for each defense task, they lack a multidimensional taxonomy uniformly applicable to all defense subtasks. For instance, while Lin et al. [60] and Xu et al. [56] propose a taxonomy on detection, their taxonomy is only based on a single perspective and does not apply to detection subtasks. Third, they do not discuss the trustworthiness and evaluation methodologies of various defenses from a systematic perspective. Specifically, although Xu et al. [56] and Lin et al. [60] have discussed the evasion of detection, they lack a comprehensive discussion of trustworthiness concerns. Detailed comparisons between existing surveys and ours are summarized in Table I.

This paper aims to address these limitations by providing a systematic and comprehensive review of the up-to-date literature. Our main contributions are summarized as follows:

- We provide the first systematic and comprehensive review of various defenses against diverse AI-generated media in computer vision. It covers both passive and proactive defenses (i.e., detection, disruption, authentication) and their trustworthiness, within a unified framework following the generation pipeline.
- For each defense task, we construct a common methodological pipeline to illustrate its involved subtasks and trustworthiness. Moreover, we develop a novel taxonomy for each defense task based on methodological strategies and categorize the reviewed methods.
- We provide an overview of common evaluation methodology for detection, disruption, and authentication, including datasets, criteria, and metrics.

- We summarize the ongoing challenges in current research and present our outlook on potential areas and directions for future research.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: Section II provides a brief background on defenses against AI-generated visual media, including the targeted generation techniques and definition/formulation of involved defense tasks; Section III summarizes detection and its trustworthiness; Section IV summarizes disruption and its trustworthiness; Section V summarizes authentication and its trustworthiness; Section VI reviews the evaluation methodology, covering datasets, criteria, and metrics; Section VII discusses the recommendations for future work; and Section VIII concludes with a discussion.

## II. BACKGROUND

This section presents background on defenses against AI-generated visual media. We first briefly introduce the generation techniques that most defense approaches against. Then we define and formulate detection, disruption, authentication, and their trustworthiness within a passive and proactive unified framework following the common generation pipeline, as shown in Fig. 1.

### A. Generation of AI-generated Visual Media

Deep generative models aim to capture the probability distribution of given data and generate new, similar samples. These models include variational autoencoders (VAEs) [1], [2], generative adversarial networks (GANs) [3], flow models [4], autoregressive models [5], and diffusion models (DMs) [6]–[8].

Early applications of VAEs [13], [64] and GANs [65], [66] families mainly focus on single-class generation [67], particularly face content manipulation, leading to the prevalence of *deepfake*. Specifically, most deepfake defense methods target




Fig. 1. Framework of proactive and passive defenses against AI-generated visual media, which consists of three defense strategies: **disruption**, **authentication**, and **detection**. Within each task, we review related mainstream subtasks and also discuss the trustworthiness of defenses.

fake face content generated by four main deepfake generation techniques: entire face synthesis, attribute manipulation, identity swap, and expression swap. With the rise and maturity of various deep generative models, *universal generative visual media* with complex scenes can be synthesized and edited with high quality and diversity [19], [68]. Deep generative models such as GANs, flow models, autoregressive models, and DMs can generate such visual media. Consequently, early defense methods mostly focus on deepfake content [44], [69], [70] and recent methods required to deal with universal generative contents [67], [71].

In this paper, we model a general generation pipeline that most defense methods target, as shown in Fig. 1. This pipeline includes an optional encoding process performed by encoders  $E$  to encode inputs and conditions into embeddings in the latent space, a generation process achieved by specific generators  $G$ , such as VAEs, GANs, and DMs, an optional decoding process implemented by decoders  $D$  to decode the generative embeddings into generative media.

### B. Definition and Formulation

Preventing the misuse of AI-generated visual media can be achieved by proactive and passive defenses through detection, disruption, and authentication, as shown in Fig. 1. Detection is a passive defense strategy that identifies forgeries after the generated media are released, while disruption and authentication are proactive defense strategies that either disrupt or watermark generated media before they are released. The literature distribution of these defenses, their involved mainstream subtasks, and their trustworthiness are illustrated in Fig. 2.

1) *Detection*: Detection identifies whether a visual media is generated by generative models, i.e., forgery detection, alternatively along with fine-grained forgery detection if the media is fake (e.g., passive forgery localization, forgery attribution, sequential manipulation prediction). Forgery detection is a coarse-grained binary classification task that predicts media-level fakeness score using the detection head  $H_D$ . Fine-grained forgery detection predicts detailed forgery information with different detection heads.

Beyond detection, the mostly focused detection trustworthiness issues include detection robustness and detection fairness.




Fig. 2. Literature distribution of three defenses, their involved subtasks, and their trustworthiness: **disruption** (23 papers), **authentication** (26 papers), and **detection** (115 papers).

2) *Disruption*: Disruption disrupts the generation process by guiding the generative models to generate perceptually abnormal media. This is achieved by adding small perturbations  $\eta$  to the inputs and conditions of generative models, resulting in adversarial inputs  $I_{adv}$  and conditions  $C_{adv}$ . Then the generative media  $O_{adv} = G(I_{adv}, C_{adv})$  would be perceived as distorted or nullified by human eyes  $H_E$ .

Beyond disruption, its trustworthiness of robustness is threatened by adversarial purification, eliminating disrupted perturbations and leading to ineffective disruption.

3) *Authentication*: Authentication involves injecting watermarks into AI-generated visual media before they are released, followed by decoders and detectors to verify the watermarks for specific purposes, such as copyright protection, forgery authentication, and forgery localization. Specifically, a watermark  $w$  can be embedded before, during, or after generation to obtain a watermarked generative media  $O_w$ . When performing verification, a decoder  $D_W$  decodes the estimated watermark  $\hat{w}$  from  $O_w$ , denoted as  $\hat{w} = D_W(O_w)$ . Then based on  $w$  and  $\hat{w}$ , different authentication subtasks can be performed with various detection heads.

Beyond authentication, the trustworthiness issue of robustness is focused, as watermarks are vulnerable to attacks to evade authentication.

## III. DETECTION

Detection includes subtasks of forgery detection and fine-grained forgery detection. In this section, we first introduce the taxonomy of detection methods, then we overview methods in each subtask based on the proposed taxonomy. Finally, we review the trustworthiness of detection. The structure of this section is shown in Fig. 3 and we summarize an overview of detection subtasks and their trustworthiness in Fig. 4.

### A. Taxonomy of Detection

Detection methods identify various generative artifacts based on discriminative features learned by different representation learning strategies. Therefore, we divide the existing detection methods from two perspectives: detected generative artifacts and adopted discriminative representation learning strategies.




Fig. 3. Structure of our paper on detection.

1) *Generative Artifacts*: Based on the modality of explored generative artifacts, generation artifacts can be divided into image-level and video-level artifacts, along with subdivided specific artifacts that can be explored exclusively or jointly for detection.

a) *Image-level Generative Artifacts*: Image-level artifacts are static forgery traces contained in a generative image or a frame image extracted from generative videos. This section summarizes the most commonly detected image-level generative artifacts.

- **Physical Characteristics-based Artifacts.** Physical characteristics, such as facial features, fingerprints, and iris, are commonly used in biometrics to identify individuals [72]. Generated media contain anomalous artifacts due to the difficulty of generating natural physical characteristics.
- **Generation Pipeline-based Artifacts.** Deep generative models and generation processes often share common operations, such as the image blending operation in identity swap deepfake generation [45], [46] and up-sampling, convolution, and batch normalization operations generally employed in generative models [73]–[75]. These common operations usually leave artifacts that generalize across multiple types of synthesized data.
- **Semantic Artifacts.** Universal generative media contains complex semantic contents, which can introduce anomalous semantic artifacts [76], [77] that can be used for detection.
- **Spatial Artifacts.** Multi-scale spatial artifacts generally exist in generative images, from low-level features (e.g., corners, edges, and textures) [78], [79] to high-level features (e.g., objects, scenes, and their parts) [79]. We indicate artifacts other than the physical characteristics-based, generation pipeline-based, and semantic artifacts in the spatial domain as spatial artifacts, which can be explored in RGB images.
- **Frequency Artifacts.** The spectra patterns of high-pass filtered images differ between real and fake images, as well as among different types of fake images [80]–[82], as evidenced by the observation that fake spectra usually contain various periodic patterns while real spec-




Fig. 4. Overview of detection. Mainstream detection subtasks include (a) forgery detection (Section III-B) and fine-grained forgery detection (e.g., (b) passive forgery localization (Section III-D1), (c) forgery attribution (Section III-D2), (d) sequential manipulation prediction (Section III-D3)). Mainstream trustworthiness issues of detection include (e) detection robustness (Section III-E1) and (f) detection fairness (Section III-E2)). This figure merely depicts the key generation components for detection.




Fig. 5. Illustration of global and/or local spatial-temporal artifacts in video-level detection.

tra decay gradually from high to low frequency bands. This suggests the existence of frequency artifacts. While high-frequency artifacts are prone to be easily degraded by common data augmentation techniques (e.g. JPEG compression, Gaussian blur) [80] and spectral correction operations [81], [83], which should be carefully considered when incorporating frequency artifacts.

b) *Video-level Generative Artifacts*: Cross-frame consistency issues generally exist in AI-generated videos [84]. Therefore, video-level generative artifacts, indicating temporal discontinuity between frames, are extensively explored. These artifacts consist of spatial-temporal artifacts in specific settings, including global-spatial, local-spatial, and global-and-local temporal artifacts, and multimodality artifacts, including physical characteristics-based, frequency, audio-visual, and optical flow-based artifacts. This section introduces the video-level specific artifacts that can be leveraged individually or jointly to guide detection.

- **Spatial-temporal artifacts.** Depending on the differences in the receptive fields of the spatial/temporal dimensions, spatial-temporal artifacts can be explored based on local or global spatial/temporal receptive fields. In this line, as shown in Fig. 5, the commonly explored artifacts in methods are (a) global-spatial artifacts, (b) local-spatial artifacts, and (c) global-and-local-temporal artifacts, where (c) defines a unit of sampling sequential frames as a snippet and explores intra-snippet and inter-

TABLE II

A LOOKUP TABLE FOR OUR SURVEYED PAPERS ON DETECTION. THESE PAPERS ARE CATEGORIZED BY THEIR USED ARTIFACTS FOR DETECTION AND ADOPTED DISCRIMINATIVE REPRESENTATION LEARNING STRATEGIES.

Taxonomy		Discriminative Representation Learning Strategies					
Generative Artifacts		Feature Engineering	Multi-task Learning	Transfer Learning	Data/Feature Augmentation	Self-supervised Learning	Module Design
Image-level Artifacts	Physical Characteristics	[85, 86, 87, 88]	[88]	–	–	–	[88]
	Generation Pipeline	[73, 74]	[45, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99]	[100]	[101]	[45, 102, 89, 103, 36, 46, 104, 40, 105, 75, 100, 106]	[107, 44, 94, 95, 99, 108, 109]
	Frequency	[90, 91, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114]	[115]	[116]	–	–	[69, 111, 117, 114, 112, 115, 81, 118]
	Semantic	[77]	[76]	–	[76]	–	–
	Spatial	[71, 119, 110, 120, 121, 122, 123, 111, 124, 125]	[79, 115, 126, 127, 121, 128]	[129, 130, 131, 132, 133]	[80, 134, 135, 136]	[137, 127]	[79, 111, 138, 78, 139, 117, 140, 112, 113, 141, 128]
Video-level Artifacts	Physical Characteristics	[142, 143, 144]	–	–	–	[142]	[144]
	Frequency	–	–	–	[70]	–	[70, 145]
	Audio-visual	–	[146, 147, 148]	–	–	[146, 149, 148]	[150]
	Optical Flow	–	[151]	–	–	–	[152, 153]
	Global-spatial	–	–	–	[154]	[155, 141]	[156, 157, 158]
	Local-spatial	–	–	–	[159]	–	[160, 161, 162, 163]
	Global-and-local-temporal	–	[164]	–	–	–	[165, 164]

snippet artifacts.

- Audio-visual Artifacts. Generation can introduce an asynchrony between visual and audio signals. Therefore, the correspondence artifacts of audio-visual signals can be explored for detection.
- Optical Flow-based Artifacts. Optical flow represents the pixel motion of adjacent frames [166] and can be leveraged to learn temporal inconsistencies.

2) *Discriminative Representation Learning Strategies*: Existing detection methods leverage various strategies to capture discriminative representations between real and fake media, as well as fine-grained forgeries. We summarize the most commonly used strategies in detection in this section.

- Feature Engineering. Feature engineering [167] is a pre-processing step in detection that transforms visual media into a more effective set of inputs before discriminative representation learning. These effective feature inputs include physical characteristics [86], [88], frequency features [73], [114], fixed deep representations [71], [77], and so on.
- Multi-task Learning. Multi-task learning jointly tackles multiple tasks through learned generalizable representations, with detection serving as the main task and other related tasks serving as auxiliary tasks [168]. These auxiliary tasks assist in exploring specific artifacts [90], [91], regularizing feature representations [79], [115], [127], and so on.
- Transfer Learning. Transfer learning transfers knowledge from a source task to a target task [168], where detection typically serves as the target task. This learning paradigm assists in learning robust and generalizable features that enable fast adaptation to unseen data distributions. The commonly incorporated transfer learning strategies include knowledge distillation [116], [130], meta-learning [129], test-time training (TTT) [100], and so on.

- Data/Feature Augmentation. Data/Feature augmentation increases the number and variance of training data/features to improve model generalizability [169]. Some detection methods incorporate this strategy into the data pre-processing or feature extraction pipeline to guide models in exploring more discriminative representations. These augmentation strategies include mixup [76], dropout [159], and so on.
- Self-supervised Learning. Self-supervised learning trains models with pseudo-labels generated from the data itself [170]. In detection, this strategy helps learn discriminative representations by generating pseudo-fake data [45], [89], [102], guiding pre-task learning [147], [149], or guiding auxiliary task learning [89].
- Module Design. Detection methods can design modules to improve representations, such as attention module [44], [94] and specific network architectures for artifact exploration [78], [113], [139].

## B. Forgery Detection

Forgery detection performs media-level identification of AI-generated visual media. As illustrated in Fig. 4, given a media  $M$ , forgery detection performs  $H_D : M \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ , where 0 and 1 typically denotes the real and fake media. In this section, according to the detection taxonomy, we review forgery detection methods primarily based on the detected generative artifacts and then elaborate them based on the cooperated representation learning strategies. The summarization of these methods is listed in Table II.

1) *Image-level Artifact-based Detection*: Image-level artifact-based detection detects image-level artifacts to perform detection.

a) *Physical Characteristics-based Artifacts*: Anomalies of physical characteristics are usually detected in early deepfake detection methods [85]–[87] due to the explicit visual artifacts exhibited in deepfake content. These artifacts include

inconsistent eye color, missing reflections, lack of details in the eye and teeth areas [85], inconsistent HeadPose [86], 3D decomposed facial details [88], as well as abnormal eye blinking patterns [87].

*b) Generation Pipeline-based Artifacts:* The most explored generation pipelines include *blending operation* and *up-sampling operation*.

The *blending operation* in face swap deepfake generation blends regions from different image origins, i.e., the face regions from manipulated images and the background regions from target face images. Consequently, two types of resulted forgery traces are detected: (i) blending boundary and (ii) region inconsistency.

*Blending boundary-related detection* usually serves as auxiliary tasks in the multi-task learning framework to assist forgery detection [45], [89]. These auxiliary tasks include blending boundary segmentation [45] as well as blending type and ratio prediction [89]. They help models recognize the presence of blending boundaries and classify images accordingly.

*Region inconsistency* masks between face and background regions can serve as attention maps [44] on the one hand. On the other hand, they can provide supervision for auxiliary tasks in multi-task learning to guide the learning of specific artifacts. In this line, Chen et al. [90], SOLA [91], Patch Diffusion [92], DCL [93], and UIA-ViT [94] use region inconsistency masks to guide the learning of local patch inconsistencies. Chen et al. [89] and Chen et al. [90] employ region inconsistency masks to supervise the learning of manipulated region segmentation, exploring fine-grained artifacts. FST-Matching [95], ICT [97], and Huang et al. [96] utilize masks to learn identity inconsistency.

Typically the ground truth mask of region inconsistency can be obtained by computing the pixel-level difference between manipulated and target face images. However, such annotations may not be available in public deepfake datasets [42], [74]. To address this issue, some methods exploit *self-supervised pseudo fake samples* to guide forgery detection. These fake samples are usually generated by blending real images, simulating blending and regional inconsistency artifacts, as well as providing fine-grained regional annotations. Specifically, Face X-ray [45], PCL [102], Chen et al. [89], OST [100], and Dong et al. [103] blends different real images to generate fake samples, by searching real faces with similar facial landmarks [45], [89], [102] or structures [103]. While FWA [36], SBI [46], and AUNet [104] use single pristine images to generate fake samples. Furthermore, OST [100] leverages the transfer learning strategy of test-time training (TTT) with meta-learning to adapt the detector to test characteristics learned from one-shot self-supervised fake samples.

The *Up-sampling operation* is a non-negligible step in multiple generative models (e.g., VAEs, GANs, DMs) and usually leaves frequency artifacts. Studies [40], [73], [107] manifest that up-sampling operations in GANs result in the replication of frequency spectra. Therefore, classifiers trained on the frequency spectrum instead of the raw RGB pixel, are more robust and have better generalization ability. Based on this idea, AutoGAN [40] and FingerprintNet [105] propose a self-supervised fingerprint generator to generate pseudo fake

samples, reproducing GAN fingerprints. Moreover, SPSL [74] leverages the phase spectrum for detecting the up-sampling artifacts. Instead of considering the influence of up-sampling across the entire image, NPR [75] explores these traces at the level of local image pixels in the spatial domain.

*c) Frequency Artifacts:* In addition to the up-sampling operation causing frequency artifacts, some detection methods design specific modules to explore frequency clues. F3Net [69] leverages frequency-aware decomposed image components and local frequency statistics to mine the forgery patterns via a two-stream collaborative learning framework. Li et al. [115] develop an adaptive frequency feature generation module and adopt a single-center loss to cluster intra-class variations of real images while separating inter-class differences. Luo et al. [112] devise a multi-scale high-frequency feature extraction module to extract high-frequency forgery traces, completing spatial forgery features. M2TR [117] incorporates a frequency filter to explore frequency artifacts. PEL [114] learns fine-grained clues from the spatial and frequency domain, followed by a self-enhancement and a mutual-enhancement module to improve features from separate domains. FrePGAN [81] adopts a generator to apply frequency-level perturbation maps to prevent frequency-level artifacts causing overfitting, making generated images indistinguishable from the real images. By updating this frequency perturbation, detectors iteratively detect the image-level and frequency-level artifacts. Wang et al. [118] develop a two-stream module to explore content-guided features in both spatial and frequency domains and employ dynamic graph learning to exploit relation-aware features in both domains. Besides, ADD [116] employs the transfer learning strategy of knowledge distillation to perform frequency attention distillation and multi-view attention distillation, transferring high-frequency information from high-quality to low-quality images.

*d) Semantic Artifacts:* Detection methods can utilize large pre-trained vision-language models [171] to assist in semantic artifact exploration. DE-FAKE [77] focuses on detecting and attributing images generated by text-to-image models. They utilize the image and text encoder of pre-trained CLIP-ViT model [171] to encode images and corresponding prompts and measure the similarity of these embeddings.

*e) Spatial Artifacts:* Spatial artifacts are usually explored in combination with different representation learning strategies.

Some methods adopt feature engineering to extract effective spatial artifacts. LGrad [119], DIRE [123], Ojha et al. [71], SeDID [124], and AEROBLADE [125] employ pre-trained models to transfer images to spatial features highlighting the important pixels for discriminative representation learning. Moreover, FatFormer [111] utilizes the pre-trained CLIP-ViT model [171] and forgery-aware adapter module to extract spatial artifacts.

Multi-task learning with auxiliary tasks can assist in spatial artifact exploration. Multiple-attention [79] designs a regional independence loss and three key module components to exploit fine-grained spatial artifacts. Liang et al. [126] design a reconstruction loss and a content consistency constraint loss to

supervise the disentanglement for content information, guiding the detector to focus on spatial artifacts.

Some detection methods incorporate data/feature augmentation to guide models in exploring more representative discriminative features. CNNDetection [80] applies data augmentation of Gaussian blur and JPEG compression to prevent the model from learning domain-specific high-frequency artifacts. Face-Cutout [134] and RFM [135] occludes facial regions to prompt the detector to explore more comprehensive forgery clues in potentially neglected areas. Nadimpalli et al. [131] combine supervised and deep reinforcement learning to train a reinforcement learning agent for test-time data augmentations selection, reducing the impact of domain shifts in cross-dataset evaluations.

He et al. [137] and REECE [127] perform self-supervised reconstruction learning over real images to isolate fake images.

For methods designing specific modules to explore spatial artifacts, Patch-forensics [78] uses patch-based truncated classifiers with limited receptive fields to ensemble the patch-wise decisions into an overall prediction. Liu et al. [139] develop a new network leveraging global image texture representations for robust fake image detection. SIA [140] designs a plug-and-play self-information attention module to help the model locate informative regions and reaggregate channel-wise feature responses. M2TR [117] utilizes a multi-scale self-attention module to capture subtle manipulation artifacts at different scales. Luo et al. [112] devise a residual-guided spatial attention module to highlight the spatial manipulation traces. Liu et al. [113] design a denoising module to extract the noise pattern and transform it into the amplitude and phase frequency spectrum to highlight distinguishable representations.

Some methods leverage transfer learning to LTW [129] utilizes a meta-learning framework to assign different weights to face images from various domains, balancing the model generalizability across multiple domains. FReTAL [130] employs knowledge distillation and representation learning to distill feature and prediction distributions, preventing catastrophic forgetting of different distributions.

### C. Video-level Artifact-based Detection

Video-level artifact-based detection detects spatial-temporal discontinuity artifacts and multimodality artifacts to perform detection.

1) *Global-spatial Artifacts*: STIL [156] designs spatial and temporal inconsistency modules to capture spatial-temporal inconsistencies. TD-3DCNN [154] devises a temporal dropout augmentation combined with a 3-Dimensional Convolutional Neural Network (3DCNN) to improve the model generalization ability. Song et al. [157] propose a symmetric transformer to ensure the temporal consistency of channel and spatial features. AltFreezing [158] divides the spatiotemporal model weights into temporal-related and spatial-related weights, freezing them alternatively during training to prevent the overestimation of one type of artifact. FInfer [155] uses an autoregressive model to predict the future facial representations of sequential frames based on current frames, thereby the representation prediction loss between the predicted and referenced representations is used to perform classification.

2) *Local-spatial Artifacts*: DIANet [160] explores global and local spatial inter-frame inconsistency information to detect deepfake videos. FTCN [161] devises a 3D convolution network with a limited spatial convolution kernel size to explore temporal artifacts. Zhang et al. [159] perform a patch-level spatiotemporal dropout augmentation to diversify the spatiotemporal inconsistency pattern and decrease the transformer token sizes. LTDD [162] models temporal consistency on sequences of restricted spatial regions with a transformer model [172] and further considers spatial cross-patch inconsistency to emphasize spatial forgery parts. DeMamba [163] designs a plug-and-play module based on Mamba [173] to explore local and global spatial-temporal inconsistencies.

3) *Global-and-local-temporal Artifacts*: Gu et al. [165] define snippets and explore intra-snippet and inter-snippet inconsistencies to identify deepfake videos. HCIL [164] proposes a two-level contrastive paradigm to capture local intra-snippet and global inter-snippet inconsistencies between real and fake videos.

4) *Physical Characteristics-based Artifacts*: Anomalies in physical characteristics among sequential frames can indicate fake videos. LipForensics [142] learns high-level semantic irregular representations in mouth movements. LRNet [143] captures temporal artifacts on precise geometric features, such as facial landmarks by a two-stream Recurrent Neural Network. DeepRhythm [144] incorporates sequential features represented by heartbeat rhythm signals with spatiotemporal features for detection.

5) *Frequency Artifacts*: Frequency artifacts are usually explored as a complementary perspective to the spatial-temporal artifacts. Masi et al. [70] propose a two-branch network to capture temporal artifacts in the spatial and multi-band frequency domain. Song et al. [145] mine the potential consistency representations across multiple frames from both spatial and frequency domains and adjust the discriminative results to correct the false predictions.

6) *Audio-visual Artifacts*: Using asynchrony between visual and audio signals, Zhou et al. [146] directly fuse visual-audio pairs jointly for deepfake detection. RealForensics [147] and Feng et al. [149] first learn the temporal synchronization between visual and audio signals with only real data, then perform detection based on the learned cross-modality representations.

7) *Optical Flow-based Artifacts*: Optical flow-based artifacts indicate temporal anomalies and are typically explored jointly with spatial-temporal artifacts [151]–[153].

### D. Fine-grained Forgery Detection

In addition to identifying the media-level authenticity, fine-grained forgeries such as pixel-level, segment-level, and generator-level forgeries can be further explored. This section summarizes mainstream fine-grained forgery detection tasks, including passive forgery localization, forgery attribution, and sequential manipulation prediction. A pipeline overview and subtask summarization are illustrated in Fig. 4 and Fig. 3. Moreover, we summarize the included methods in Table II.

1) *Passive Forgery Localization*: Passive forgery localization includes spatial and temporal forgery localization. As shown in Fig. 4 (b), given a media  $M \in \mathbb{R}^V$ , where  $V$  is the number of pixels in an image or segments in a video, localization head  $H_L$  performs pixel-level or segment-level classification, denoted as  $H_L : M \rightarrow \{0, 1\} \in \mathbb{R}^V$ .

a) *Spatial Forgery Localization*: FakeLocator [108] investigates the fake texture produced by the upsampling operation of GAN-based face generation and proposes an encoder-decoder network with a face parsing-based attention mechanism to localize these fake textures. HiFi-Net [99], targeting CNN-synthesized images and edited images, proposes an image forgery detection and localization framework containing three components: multi-branch feature extractors, forgery localization module, and detection module. TruFor [122] adopts RGB images and learned noise-sensitive fingerprints to predict pixel-level forgery localization maps, image-level integrity scores, and confidence estimations.

b) *Temporal Forgery Localization*: ForgeryNet [141] adopts existing frame-based [174] and video-based [175], [176] models for temporal localization. You et al. [148] propose a 3DCNN-based multimodality temporal forgery localization method using video and audio information. UMMAFormer [150], targeting video inpainting scenes, designs a transformer-based encoder-decoder network with a temporal feature reconstruction module and an FPN-based module [177] to capture the subtle temporal anomaly.

2) *Forgery Attribution*: Forgery attribution attributes the used generative models or training data source of a generative media, namely model attribution and data attribution. Specifically, as shown in Fig. 4 (c), the attribution head  $H_A$  performs the function  $H_A : M \rightarrow C$ , where  $C = \{c_0, c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n\}$  denotes real and fake data generated by a set of  $n$  distinct generative models or training datasets.

a) *Model Attribution*: Early approaches focus on *GANs attribution*. Yu et al. [106] combine image fingerprints obtained by an autoencoder and GAN fingerprints obtained by analyzing components of GANs for image attribution. Guarniera et al. [132] exploit prior knowledge of different models of StyleGAN2 architecture and use metric learning paradigm in a multi-stream manner for model attribution. DNA-Det [133] attributes GAN-generated images at the architecture level using patchwise contrastive learning to exploit globally consistent fingerprints. RepMix [76] performs semantic feature mixing to augment forgery features and perform mixing ratio prediction to assist classification and attribution. Asnani et al. [121] perform reverse engineering to infer the hyperparameters of generative models from their generated images. ManiFPT [110] and Huang et al. [120] use transform models to extract manifold-based and generator-specific artifacts for discriminating various generative methods.

Considering most attribution approaches are limited to a closed set scenario, studies targeting *open-set manipulation attribution* are proposed [101], [128], [136]. Girish et al. [136] design an iterative algorithm containing network training, out-of-distribution detection, clustering, merging, and refining to discover unseen GAN images from available features. POSE [101] progressively augments closed-set samples to

open-set samples using augmentation models simulating convolution layers in GANs. With the diversification of generative models, recent research has focused on *multiple face forgery attribution* [128]. OW-DFA [128] trains an attribution model on labeled and unlabeled samples to generalize to known and unknown manipulation attacks in open-world scenes with multiple face forgery methods and types.

b) *Data Attribution*: It has been demonstrated that DMs are prone to memorizing training images and reconstructing them [26], [178]. Consequently, Georgiev et al. [109] propose attributing DM-generated images back to their training data to detect data leakage and protect copyright. They attribute the final images and their distribution evolves across the diffusion process to the training images and specific features. D-TRAK [179] evaluates several data attribution approaches and reports that incorporating theoretically unjustified design choices for attribution leads to superior performance. AbC [180] evaluates text-to-image model attribution through customization methods.

3) *Sequential Manipulation Prediction*: Sequential manipulation prediction targets multi-step manipulated data, aiming to predict a sequential vector of facial manipulation operations and perform a reversal recovery [98], [138]. Specifically, as shown in Fig 4 (d), given media  $M$ , prediction head  $H_S$  predicts the manipulation sequence, denoted as  $H_S : M \rightarrow S$ , where  $S = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_s\}$  represents  $s$  step sequential operations. Then, a recovery decoder  $R_S$  uses  $M$  and the predicted manipulated sequence  $S$  to recover an image that closely resembles the pristine image  $I$ .

Seq-DeepFake [138] casts the sequential manipulation prediction as an image captioning task, employing an autoregressive-based encoder-decoder model with a spatially enhanced cross-attention module to sequentially predict the manipulation vector. MMNet [98] achieves detection and recovery simultaneously by introducing a multi-stream framework to locate manipulation regions, predict manipulation sequences, and recover original faces.

## E. Trustworthiness of Detection

Detection performance would be untrustworthy when encountering specific inputs, such as perturbed inputs [181], [182] or inputs with specific demographic groups [183], [184], which raises trustworthiness concerns. This section reviews the most focused trustworthiness issues of detection, including detection robustness and fairness.

1) *Detection Robustness*: Detection robustness can be threatened by adversarial attack [83], [181], [185]–[190] and backdoor attack [182]. As shown in Fig. 4 (e), adding adversarial perturbations or trigger patterns  $\delta$  to forged media can bypass detection, resulting in an erroneous prediction, i.e.,  $H_D : (M_{fake} + \delta) \rightarrow \{0\}$ .

a) *Adversarial Attack*: Adversarial attack aims to fool detectors using adversarial examples with human-imperceptible perturbations. These fake adversarial examples can evade detection during inference. Based on the knowledge of target detection models, we divide detection evasion into *detector-based attack* and *detector-free attack*.






Fig. 6. Structure of our paper on disruption.

*Detector-based attack* includes white-box and black-box attacks. Both of them require knowledge of the victim detectors, with white-box attacks having access to model architectures and parameters, while black-box attacks rely on access to training data or model predictions.

In this setting, some studies perform *spatial domain detection evasion*. Carlini et al. [181] reveal that forensic classifiers are vulnerable to both white-box and black-box adversarial attacks. Hou et al. [188] generate adversarial examples by minimizing the statistical differences between real and fake images. Instead of adding adversarial perturbations to images, Li et al. [185] perform gradient-descent in the latent space of a generative model to search adversarial points on the face manifold, creating adversarial examples that are more invisible to human eyes. Additionally, Shamshad et al. [191] guide the search for adversarial points in the latent space by a text prompt or a reference image to generate attribute-conditioned adversarial face images.

Some methods also inject adversarial perturbations in both the spatial and frequency domain, performing *dual domain detection evasion*. Jia et al. [186] inject adversarial perturbations into the frequency band and spatial and frequency domain, combined with meta-learning to benefit from both domains. Zhou et al. [190] design a GAN architecture that incorporates both spatial and frequency features to generate adversarial examples. Specifically, they adopt skip connections of high-frequency components in the encoder-decoder generator to preserve fine details.

*Detector-free attack* evades detectors with minimal model knowledge, neither accessing detector information nor querying the detector. These methods typically inject perturbations to perform *artifact removal* to mislead detectors. FakePolisher [192] proposes a shallow reconstruction method based on dictionary learning to reduce artifacts. Dong et al. [83] correct the power discrepancy between real and fake images to mitigate the frequency spectral artifacts in GAN-generated images, leading to a significant performance decrease in spectrum-based detectors. Liu et al. [187] propose a detector-agnostic trace removal attack that removes deepfake traces of spatial anomalies, spectral disparities, and noise fingerprints. Specifically, they design a trace removal network involving one generator and multiple discriminators to parallelly learn and remove the trace representations. TraceEvader [193] proposes a training-free evasion attack for forgery model attribution under a non-box setting. They inject perturbations in low-frequency and high-frequency bands to confuse the extraction of certain traces for model attribution.




Fig. 7. Overview of disruption. Mainstream disruption subtasks include (a) distorting disruption (Section IV-B) and (b) nullifying disruption (Section IV-C). The most studied disruption trustworthiness issue is (c) disruption robustness (Section IV-D1). Disruption can be performed by attacking different modules of generative models, such as the encoder, generator, and decoder, by adding perturbations to the inputs or input embeddings. This figure merely depicts the key generation components for disruption.

*b) Backdoor Attack:* Backdoor attack on detection aims to embed backdoors into models during training, allowing adversaries to deceive detectors by employing specific trigger patterns to produce erroneous predictions for forged faces when inference. Liang et al. [182] propose a poisoned forgery detection framework that enables clean-label backdoor attacks on face forgery detectors. Considering backdoor label conflicts in blending artifact-detection methods and trigger stealthiness, they develop a scalable trigger generator to produce transformation-sensitive trigger patterns and limit trigger perturbations to facial landmarks.

*2) Detection Fairness:* Detection fairness ensures consistent inference performance across different demographic groups (e.g., gender, age, ethnicity). Recent works reveal the fairness issues in deepfake detection [183], [184]. Trinh et al. [183] provide the first evaluation of bias in deepfake datasets and detection models across different races and genders. Pu et al. [184] adopt metamorphic testing to examine the robustness and fairness of MesoInception-4 [34], revealing that this model is generally unfair towards females.

Several studies [194], [195] introduce datasets with annotations or balances of demographic groups to further support fairness evaluation and promote the development of fairness-aware detectors. Hazirbas et al. [194] introduce a dataset with annotations of age, gender, apparent skin tone, and ambient lighting. They provide a comprehensive study of five detection methods on this dataset, finding that these methods have lower performance on some specific groups of people. GBDF [195] reveals the unequal performance of deepfake detectors across genders and introduces a gender-balanced and annotated deepfake dataset.

Accordingly, fairness-aware detectors are proposed to ensure effective detection across demographic groups [196], [197]. Ju et al. [196] propose novel loss functions to achieve fairness among demographic groups under in-domain testing. They provide two methods to handle both the setting where demographic information is available and absent. Lin et al. [197] propose a framework to preserve fairness for cross-domain evaluation. They employ a disentanglement learning

module and an optimization module to extract demographic and domain-agnostic forgery features, achieving a flattened loss landscape.

#### IV. DISRUPTION

Disruption includes subtasks of distorting and nullifying disruption. This section first introduces the taxonomy of disruption methods and then reviews methods in each subtask based on the taxonomy. Finally, the trustworthiness of disruption is reviewed. The structure of this section is shown in Fig. 6 and the overview of disruption subtasks and their trustworthiness is shown in Fig. 7.

##### A. Taxonomy of Disruption

Disruption is achieved by adding perturbations to different positions to attack different generation modules. Accordingly, we categorize the existing disruption methods from two perspectives: attacked module and perturbation position.

1) *Perturbation Position*: Disruptive perturbations can be added to inputs and conditions.

- **Input**. Perturbations can be added to input in two manners: (i) directly adding perturbations to input to obtain perturbed input, i.e.,  $I_{adv} = I + \eta$ ; (ii) mapping inputs to representations, applying perturbations to these representations, and then reconstructing the perturbed input from the altered representations [198].
- **Condition**. Perturbations can be added to conditions in a manner similar to that used for inputs.

2) *Attacked Module*: Based on our formulated generation pipeline, commonly attacked modules include the encoder, generator, and decoder.

- **Encoder/Decoder**. In specific generation scenarios such as conditional generation [199] or generation in latent space [19], attacks can be realized by maximizing the distances between perturbed and clean intermediate feature maps encoded by the encoder/decoder.
- **Generator**. Generator attack aims to maximize the distances between perturbed and clean generative media or intermediate generative products, such as feature maps [200] or estimated noise in the reverse process of DMs [201], [202].

##### B. Distorting Disruption

Distorting disruption forces generative models to generate perceptually deteriorated outputs  $O_D$ . These disruption methods are summarized in Table III.

Some works focus on *deepfake distortion* and they are usually achieved by adding perturbations on inputs and attacking deepfake generators. Ruiz et al. [47] first propose a spread-spectrum disruption on GANs to combat malicious deepfakes by maximizing the distortion of disrupted and clean outputs. Huang et al. [48] propose a two-stage training framework with an alternating training strategy for the surrogate manipulation model and perturbation generator, preventing the perturbation generator from trapping in the local optimum. To address the low image-level and model-level transferability of existing

TABLE III

A LOOKUP TABLE FOR OUR SURVEYED PAPERS ON DISRUPTION. THESE PAPERS ARE CATEGORIZED BY THE PERTURBED POSITION AND ATTACKED MODULES FOR DISRUPTION.

Taxonomy	Attacking Module			
	Perturb Position	Encoder	Generator	Decoder
Input	[206, 208, 207, 209, 216]	[47, 48, 217, 203, 206, 205, 206, 208, 207, 210, 213, 201, 204, 212, 214, 215, 198, 200]	[208, 216]	
Condition	–		[202]	–

methods, CMUA-Watermark [203] proposes a cross-model universal attack pipeline with an automatic step size tuning algorithm to find suitable step sizes for attack. TAFIM [204] develops a manipulation-aware protection method that causes the manipulation model to produce a predefined manipulation target, with perturbations robust to common image compression. ARS [205] designs a two-way protection stream to generate robust perturbations in a single forward process through perturbation replication and information preservation.

Recent works also focus on *DMs distortion*, particularly distortion against latent diffusion models (LDMs) [19], by adding perturbations on inputs or conditions [202] to attack fixed or fine-tuned diffusion models. Fixed LDMs disruption can be implemented by attacking the image or condition encoders [206]–[209], generator (diffusion model [206], condition-guided cross-attention module [210], denoiser [200]–[202]), and decoder [208]. Fine-tuned diffusion models are utilized for personalized text-to-image synthesis (e.g. DreamBooth [211]) and their disruption can be performed by attacking generators through methods such as UDP [212], Anti-DreamBooth [213], MetaCloak [214], SimAC [215] or attacking encoders and decoders through the method of DUAW [216].

##### C. Nullifying Disruption

Nullifying disruption guides generative models to generate outputs  $O_N$  nearly identical to the inputs. LaS-GSA [217] attacks GANs by adding perturbations on images, using a limit-aware strategy and a gradient-sliding mechanism to limit the gradients of adversarial perturbations. They also extract the self-guiding prior from the threat model and the target image to guide the gradient estimation. LAE [198] inverts face images into latent codes by an auto-encoder and searches for adversarial embeddings in their neighbor using gradient descent for attacking deepfake models, then reconstructs face images from substitute embeddings.

##### D. Trustworthiness of Disruption

The most studied trustworthiness issue of disruption currently is disruption robustness.

1) *Disruption Robustness*: Disruption is achieved by adding imperceptible perturbations to real images, while these methods may be ineffective by adversarial purification. Zhao et al. [52] evaluate disruption effectiveness under complex DMs-fine-tuning scenarios and propose a purification method to remove protected perturbations, resulting in failed protection.




Fig. 8. Structure of our paper on authentication.

Xue et al. [218] reveal that the vulnerability of LDMs is due to their encoders, while pixel-space diffusion models are robust. They propose a purifier by applying SDEdit [219] in the pixel space.

## V. AUTHENTICATION

Authentication includes subtasks of robust and semi-fragile authentication, based on the fragility levels of embedded watermarks. Further, watermarks embedded for robust authentication resist the manipulation of generative models and are therefore used for copyright protection. While watermarks for semi-fragile authentication are destroyed after generation, creating discrepancies between real and generated media, and therefore are used for forgery authentication and localization. In this section, the taxonomy is first introduced, followed by a method review of each subtask. Finally, the trustworthiness is reviewed. The paper structure of this section is shown in Fig. 8 and the overview of subtasks and trustworthiness is illustrated in Fig. 9.

### A. Taxonomy of Authentication

Authentication embeds different types of watermarks into different generation positions. Therefore, we divide the existing authentication methods from two perspectives: watermark position and watermark type.

1) *Watermarking Position*: Watermarks can be embedded into inputs, input embeddings, generators, and generative media, where watermarks embedded into generative media are typically realized by off-the-shelf watermarking methods [220] and thus are not discussed here.

- **Input**. Watermarks can be embedded in two manners: (i) directly added to inputs; (ii) embedded into input representations, followed by a reconstruction.
- **Encoder/Decoder**. In specific generation scenarios such as generation in latent space [19], watermarks can be injected into encoder/decoder [221] or intermediate generative products such as feature maps in the encoder/decoder [222], [223].
- **Generator**. Watermarks can be embedded into generators or intermediate generative products of generators [224].

2) *Watermark Type*: Watermarks commonly include three types: (i) Bit string  $w \in \{0, 1\}^k$ , where  $k$  is the bit size; (ii) Spatial-domain watermarks  $w$  embedded into spatial domain, where  $w \in \mathbb{R}^V$  and  $V$  is the number of pixels in an image




Fig. 9. Overview of authentication. Authentication involves embedding watermarks (semi-fragile watermarks for or robust watermarks for ) in synthetic media, followed by watermark decoding and detection for various purposes. These watermarks can be embedded in inputs, input embeddings, generators, and generative media. The mainstream authentication subtasks include (a) forgery authentication (Section V-C1), (b) forgery localization (Section V-C2), (c) copyright protection (Section V-B1). The most studied authentication trustworthiness issue is (d) authentication robustness (Section V-D1). This figure merely depicts the key generation components for authentication.

TABLE IV

A LOOKUP TABLE FOR OUR SURVEYED PAPERS ON AUTHENTICATION. THESE PAPERS ARE CATEGORIZED BY THEIR EMBEDDED WATERMARK POSITION AND TYPE FOR AUTHENTICATION.

Taxonomy	Watermark Type		
	Bit String	Spatial Watermark	Frequency Watermark
Watermark Position			
Input	[49, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 228, 230, 231]	[232, 233, 234, 50, 235, 236]	–
Encoder	[222]	–	–
Generator	–	–	[224]
Decoder	[221, 223, 237]	–	–

or feature map; (iii) Frequency-domain watermarks embedded into Fourier space.

### B. Robust Authentication

Robust authentication embeds watermarks resistant to the generation process and achieves copyright protection by comparing the similarity of the decoded watermarks to the original watermarks held by the copyright owner. These methods are summarized in Table IV.

1) *Copyright Protection*: Copyright protection protects the source training data or the used generative model of generative media. Specifically, a copyright owner embeds a robust watermark  $w$  before, during, or after generation. Then the output  $O_w$  with the transferable watermark is generated by generative models and a decoded watermark  $\hat{w}$  can be obtained from it. By comparing  $\hat{w}$  with  $w$ , the copyright owner can protect their copyright if the matching score is larger than a threshold  $\tau$ .

*Source data protection* typically embeds watermarks into source training data (inputs) of generative models. Early works focus on *GAN watermarking*. Yu et al. [49] trains an encoder and decoder independent of GAN training to embed and

verify bit string watermarks. FakeTagger [225] designs an encoder-decoder watermarking framework to inject bit string watermarks into the channel codings of input representations and then reconstruct the inputs. Recent works also concentrate on *DM watermarking*, in which some works tailored for training-from-scratch setting [232] while others for fine-tuning setting [233], [236]. DiffusionShield [232] introduces watermarks with pattern uniformity and joint optimization to improve the reproduction of watermarks in generated images. GenWatermark [233] adds spatial watermarks into training data and incorporates a detector fine-tuned along with the image synthesis process to decode watermarks. FT-Shield [236] embeds watermarks at the early stage of fine-tuning and devises a detector mixture effective for various fine-tuning models.

*Model protection* signs the generative model used by generative media, where the traceable watermarks can be embedded into all discussed watermarking positions. Input watermarking requires retraining generative models to produce watermarks for generators [49], [226], [227]. For encoder watermarking, Zhang et al. [222] propose a training-free plug-and-play bit string watermarking method performing in latent space. For generator watermarking, Tree-Ring [224] embeds frequency watermarks into the initial noise vectors of DMs and decodes them by inverting the diffusion process. For decoder watermarking, methods typically require partial retraining. Fernandez et al. [221] fine-tune the latent decoder of LDMs guided by the watermark decoder to embed bit string watermarks in generated images. Xiong et al. [223] encode bit string watermarks into message-matrix and embed it into the intermediate feature maps of the LDM decoder. WOUAF [237] encodes watermarks via a mapping network and embeds them into decoders via weight modulation.

### C. Semi-fragile Authentication

Semi-fragile authentication typically embeds watermarks  $w$  in the input  $I$ , while the subsequent generation destroys  $w$  and generates an output  $O_w$  with destroyed watermarks. Based on the discrepancy of original watermark  $w$  and generative watermark  $\hat{w}$ , forgery authentication and forgery localization can be performed. These methods are summarized in Table IV.

1) *Forgery Authentication*: Forgery authentication detects forged watermarks  $\hat{w}$  with a detection head  $H_D$ , denote as  $H_D : \hat{w} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ , where  $\hat{w} = D_W(G(I, w))$ .

Watermarks for forgery authentication are typically embedded into inputs. Asnani et al. [234] estimate a set of spatial watermarks using certain constraints to perform encryption of real images. SepMark [228] proposes a framework with a watermark encoder and two decoders with different levels of decoding robustness for source tracing and detection. Zhao et al. [229] embed bit string watermarks into the facial identity features for identifying Deepfake manipulation. AdvMark [238] proposes bit string adversarial watermarking to enhance image detectability without compromising provenance tracking. FaceSigns [230] embeds bit string watermarks into a real image to identify deepfake modification.

2) *Proactive Forgery Localization*: Proactive forgery localization uses a localization head  $H_L$  to predict the pixel-level classification results based on the decoded watermarks  $\hat{w}$ , denoted as  $H_L : \hat{w} \rightarrow \{0, 1\} \in \mathbb{R}^V$ , where  $\hat{w} = D_W(G(I, w)) \in \mathbb{R}^V$ .

These methods typically embed spatial watermarks into inputs to perform proactive forgery localization. MaLP [50] watermarks real images with a learnable template leveraging local and global-level features estimated by a two-branch architecture, assisting in estimating the manipulated regions and binary prediction on both GMs and GANs. EditGuard [231] embeds a robust bit string and a semi-fragile spatial watermark for simultaneous copyright protection and tamper localization by incorporating a joint image-bit steganography technique. Waterloo [235] applies a semi-fragile watermark that disappears in modified regions to identify and localize image modifications.

### D. Trustworthiness of Authentication

The trustworthiness of authentication explored currently concentrates on authentication robustness.

1) *Authentication Robustness*: Authentication watermarks AI-generated content for subsequent verification. However, these watermarks can be removed by traditional distortions such as JPEG compression and cropping [221], or destroyed by *reconstruction attacks*, and *adversarial attacks*.

For *reconstruction attacks*, Zhao et al. [239] and Saberi et al. [240] add noise to watermarked images and then reconstruct images by generative models. For *adversarial attacks*, PTW [227] reveals that watermarking is not robust against an adaptive white-box attack. WEvade [51] leverages an adversarial post-process layer to attack watermark detectors under white-box and black-box settings. Lukas et al. [241] apply adaptive attacks by creating surrogate keys to attack the authentication optimally. WAVES [242] benchmarks the robustness of image watermarks against multiple types of attacks.

## VI. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

To comprehensively evaluate defense methods against AI-generated visual media, extensive evaluation methodologies are employed in existing literature. This section reviews the popular and commonly used evaluation datasets, criteria, and metrics.

### A. Datasets

Proactive defense strategy-based disruption and authentication methods benchmarked on real datasets (e.g. FFHQ [65], [198], CelebA [11], [198], COCO [228], [256]) and different generative models, which is not in line with the focus of generative visual media of this paper. Therefore, this section concentrates on datasets containing AI-generated data, specifically those used for detection. These datasets are briefly summarized according to the generation techniques discussed in Section II-A.

TABLE V  
OVERVIEW OF POPULAR DEEPPFAKE DATASETS.

Dataset	Year	Media Modality	Total Media		Total Subj	Entire syn.	Deepfake Types			Multi-face	Extra Test Set	Perturb	Multi-Modal	Anno
			Real	Fake			Attri. Mani.	Id. Swap	Exp. Swap					
UADFV [33]	2018	Video	49	49	49	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
DF-TIMIT [243]	2018	Video	640	320	32	-	-	1	-	-	1	Audio	-	1
FaceForensics++ [41]	2019	Video	1,000	4,000	977	-	-	3	2	-	1	-	-	2
DFD [244]	2019	Video	363	3,068	28	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	1
DFDC-preview [245]	2019	Video	4,073	1,140	66	-	-	2	-	-	3	-	-	1
Celeb-DF-v2 [42]	2020	Video	590	5,639	59	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
WildDeepfake [246]	2020	Video	3,805	3,509	-	unk.	unk.	unk.	unk.	-	-	-	-	1
DeeperForensics-1.0 [247]	2020	Video	50,000	10,000	100	-	-	-	1	-	✓	7	-	1
DFFD [44]	2020	Video	59,703	243,336	-	2	2	3	1	-	-	-	-	1
DFDC [43]	2020	Video	104,500	23,654	960	-	-	8	-	-	✓	19	Audio	1
ForgeryNet [141]	2021	V + I	99,630	121,617	5,400	-	5	7	3	-	✓	36	-	4
FFIW [248]	2020	Video	10,000	10,000	-	-	-	-	3	✓	-	-	-	2
OpenForensics [249]	2021	Image	45,473	70,325	-	-	-	-	2	✓	✓	6	-	5
KoDF [250]	2021	Video	62,166	175,776	403	-	-	3	3	-	✓	-	Audio	1
DF-Platter [251]	2023	Video	764	132,496	454	-	-	3	-	✓	✓	1	-	6

\* V + I: The dataset contains videos and images.

TABLE VI  
OVERVIEW OF POPULAR UNIVERSAL GENERATIVE VISUAL MEDIA DATASETS, WHICH GO BEYOND FACE MANIPULATIONS IN DEEPPFAKE DATASETS.

Dataset	Year	Media Modality	Total Media		Generator Types			Public Avail	Extra Test Set	Perturb	Multi-Modal	Anno
			Real	Fake	GAN	Diffusion	Others					
CNNDetection [80]	2020	Image	362,000	362,000	6	-	5	✓	-	-	-	2
PAL4Inpaint [252]	2022	Image	-	4,795	3	-	-	✓	-	-	-	2
HiFi-IFDL [99]	2023	Image	100,000	100,000	4	4	5	Part	-	2	-	3
DIRE [123]	2023	Image	232,000	232,000	-	10	-	✓	-	-	-	2
DE-FAKE [77]	2023	Image	20,000	60,000	-	4	-	-	-	-	Text	2
AutoSplice [253]	2023	Image	3,621	2,273	-	1	-	✓	-	1	Text	3
PAL4VST [254]	2023	Image	-	10,168	6	5	1	✓	✓	-	-	2
GenImage [255]	2024	Image	1,331,167	1,350,000	1	7	-	✓	-	3	-	2
GenVideo [163]	2024	Video	1,223,511	1,078,838	1	9	4	-	-	8	-	1

1) *Deepfake Datasets*: Deepfake datasets consist of images or videos containing real and manipulated faces. With the development of deepfake datasets, the scale and diversity of manipulated data and subjects have increased to prevent model overfitting. Additionally, unseen test sets with complex perturbations are constructed to simulate real-world inference scenarios. Various annotations are also provided to support more complex tasks. These basic information are summarized in Table V.

2) *Universal Generative Visual Media Datasets*: With the impressive improvements of GANs and DMs, datasets containing universal objects and scenes have been proposed recently, supporting more complex detection tasks. As the information listed in Table VI, except for PAL4Inpaint [252] and PAL4VST [254] designed for perceptual artifacts localization for inpainting images, the remaining datasets are applicable for the benchmarking forgery detection methods. Besides, HiFi-IFDL [99] and AutoSplice [253] are extensively applicable for evaluating forgery localization.

### B. Evaluation Criteria and Metrics

Evaluation criteria and metrics for passive and proactive defense methods are summarized in this section.

1) *Detection*: Detection is typically a classification task, in which forgery detection performs media-level binary clas-

sification and fine-grained forgery detection conducts fine-grained classification. Therefore, most detection evaluation metrics are traditional performance evaluation metrics used in machine learning, such as accuracy, area under the ROC curve (AUC), and average precision. However, considering diverse application scenarios, the superiority of detection methods is generally evaluated under different settings to benchmark them from various criteria. This section reviews the commonly used evaluation criteria and corresponding metrics in the literature.

a) *Detection Ability*: Detection ability is the fundamental evaluation criterion for evaluating detection methods. It is typically measured in both *in-domain* and *cross-domain* scenarios.

*In-domain detection ability* evaluates models on data with a distribution identical to the training data. This includes intra-manipulation evaluation [71], [80], [126], [159], [164] and intra-dataset evaluation [46], [67], [140], [157]. Intra-manipulation evaluation evaluates models on data generated by a single generator, while intra-dataset evaluation involves data within a dataset with multiple manipulations. Both can be evaluated on deepfake datasets [46], [164] and universal generation datasets [67], [71], [80].

*Cross-domain detection ability* measures the generalization ability of detection methods by evaluating models on unseen manipulated data. In terms of the number of types of manipulation in the training and evaluation data, cross-domain

evaluation can be divided into 1-to-n [71], [80], [127], n-to-1 [67], [93], [129], and n-to-m [94], [164] evaluations.

Commonly used metrics for evaluating detection ability include area under the ROC curve (AUC), accuracy (ACC), average precision (AP), equal error rate (ERR), F1 score, and LogLoss [43], [127]. Some metrics (e.g., ACC) are threshold-dependent, while some (e.g., AUC and AP) are threshold-less and ranking-based. Given that the base rate of real media is extremely larger than that of fake media in real-world distributions [43], [80], [134], threshold-less metrics are more appropriate and prevalent for measuring detection performance since using thresholds during training for imbalanced evaluation tends to be biased [257]. Besides, some metrics are particularly designed for evaluating forgery detection, such as weighted precision (Weight PR) [43] and simulated generalizability evaluation (SGEs) [134]. Weight PR [43] considers class imbalance and the video magnitude difference between organic traffic and an available dataset, proportionally emphasizing true positives. SGEs [134] use a randomized self-supervised algorithm to generate pseudo-fakes with spatial and temporal deepfake artifacts, simulating unseen manipulations to evaluate detection generalizability.

*b) Detection Robustness:* Detection ability is typically evaluated on high-quality visual media. However, when detectors are deployed on online social networks in real-world scenarios, they often encounter lossy media. Therefore, the robustness of detection methods is a significant evaluation criterion.

Detection robustness is generally evaluated on lossy media with various image-level and video-level post-processing operations. Common image-level perturbations include JPEG compression, Gaussian blurring, and resizing [43], [80], [158], [247]. The most common video-level distortion is video compression [41], [247]. These perturbations are applied at varying strengths, from low to high levels. Consequently, a performance variation curve can be plotted to represent detection robustness against media degradation [80], [97], [158], [258].

*c) Qualitative Analysis:* Qualitative analysis commonly includes visualizations of saliency maps and feature spaces. Saliency maps can be generated using methods like Grad-CAM [259] and Grad-CAM++ [260], highlighting the feature map locations that the detection models focus on for identifying different classes [46], [126], [127], [261]. Feature space visualization is commonly performed using t-SNE [262], which shows the distribution of feature vectors [46], [71], [127], [159], assisting in evaluating the separation between samples of different classes.

*2) Disruption:* Disruption involves attacking generators to induce them to produce distorted or nullified outputs. Evaluation is conducted between the original generative outputs and the disrupted outputs. The commonly adopted *disruption performance evaluation* metrics include  $L_p$ -norm distance [47], [48], [198], Mean Square Error (MSE) [204], [205], Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio (PSNR) [204], [205], Learned Perceptual Image Patch Similarity (LPIPS) [204], [205], and Success Rate (SR) [47]. These metrics are calculated against the fundamental disruption setting and common media processing pipelines, where the latter evaluates the *disruption robustness*.

Additionally, the transferable disruption performance across multiple generators and qualitative analysis are also commonly used evaluation measures [204], [205].

*3) Authentication:* Authentication involves embedding watermarks in generative media and verifying them through decoded watermarks. The commonly adopted evaluation criteria include *verification performance evaluation* and *media quality evaluation*. *Verification performance evaluation* typically evaluates the detection and identification performance of watermarks, where the former is used for semi-fragile authentication and the latter for robust authentication. They can be measured using accuracy [221], AUC [224], [242], and  $\text{TPR}@x\% \text{FPR}$  (the True Positive Rate at the False Positive Rate  $x\%$ ) [224], [242] on clean and post-processed watermarked media, where the post-processing are used for robustness evaluation. *Media quality evaluation* evaluates the generation quality of the watermarked images, typically measured by PSNR, Frechet Inception Distance (FID), and Structural Similarity Index (SSIM) [221], [224], [242].

## VII. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE WORK

This paper presents an exhaustive survey of defense methods and their trustworthiness against AI-generated visual media. While significant progress has been made, several gaps remain that should be addressed in future research.

### A. Passive Defense

*1) Greater Efforts for Exploring Fine-grained Forgery Detection:* Fine-grained forgery detection can assist and provide interpretations for forgery detection within a multi-task learning framework [70], [89]. Moreover, some fine-grained forgery detection tasks, such as sequential manipulation prediction [98], [138] and perceptual forgery localization [254], can help forgery recovery, which in turn contributes to the generation.

*2) Greater Efforts for Exploring Trustworthiness towards Diverse Detection Tasks:* Most existing studies on the trustworthiness of detection focus on forgery detection. However, fine-grained forgery detection also has trustworthiness concerns. For example, TraceEvader [193] focuses on adversarial attacks on forgery attribution. Considering different detection tasks explore distinct forgery traces, trustworthiness towards diverse detection tasks should be seriously explored.

*3) Improvement of Detection Benchmarks for Universal Generative Visual Media:* While comprehensive and fair benchmarks of deepfake detection are extensively explored [263], [264], the systematic benchmark evaluating universal generative visual media detection remains ambiguous. On the one hand, most existing detection methods [77], [113], [123] prefer constructing new datasets for evaluations. Therefore, an authoritative and acknowledged dataset for benchmarking these methods is scarce. On the other hand, existing universal datasets lack publicly available extra test sets to evaluate method performance in realistic scenarios. These universal extra test sets should include high-quality fake images generated by diverse types of generative models and perturbed by common degradation operations.

4) *Exploring for Comprehensive Evaluation Criteria*: Most evaluation criteria used in current defense approaches are qualitative or quantitative evaluations representing defense performance. However, considering that defense methods are required to be applied to a large number of visual media on social platforms, the practicability metrics, such as inference time, FLOPs, and parameter size, should also be explored as evaluation criteria.

## B. Proactive Defense

1) *Exploring Diverse Semi-fragile Authentication Tasks*: Generative models destroy the semi-fragile watermarks embedded in real images, creating a discrepancy in watermarks between real and fake media. Based on this discrepancy, forgery detection and fine-grained forgery detection can be performed in a proactive manner. Therefore, the authentication tasks corresponding to fine-grained forgery detection tasks introduced in Section III-D can be explored under this semi-fragile watermarking scheme. Moreover, the robustness of semi-fragile authentication can be further explored as the damaged watermark may be reconstructed [265], [266].

2) *Exploring Diverse Trustworthiness Issues of Proactive Defense*: The trustworthiness issues explored for passive defense include robustness and fairness. Correspondingly, diverse trustworthiness issues for proactive defense should be focused on, while currently mere robustness is concerned.

## VIII. CONCLUSION

This survey provides a comprehensive overview of research on proactive and passive defenses against AI-generated visual media, covering the mainstream defense tasks of detection, disruption, and authentication, as well as their trustworthiness. We define and formulate these defense tasks within a unified framework. For each task, we propose a novel taxonomy based on their methodological strategies, which is uniformly applicable for subtasks. Furthermore, we review the evaluation methodologies of these defense strategies, including evaluation datasets, criteria, and metrics. Finally, we discuss recommendations for future work to indicate potential directions. We hope this survey provides researchers with an in-depth understanding of defenses against diverse types of deep generative visual forgeries and appeals to further contributions in this field.

## REFERENCES

- [1] D. P. Kingma and M. Welling, "Auto-encoding variational bayes," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6114*, 2013.
- [2] D. P. Kingma, M. Welling *et al.*, "An introduction to variational autoencoders," *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 307–392, 2019.
- [3] I. Goodfellow, J. Pouget-Abadie, M. Mirza, B. Xu, D. Warde-Farley, S. Ozair, A. Courville, and Y. Bengio, "Generative adversarial nets," *NeurIPS*, vol. 27, 2014.
- [4] D. Rezende and S. Mohamed, "Variational inference with normalizing flows," in *ICML*. PMLR, 2015, pp. 1530–1538.
- [5] P. Esser, R. Rombach, and B. Ommer, "Taming transformers for high-resolution image synthesis," in *CVPR*, 2021, pp. 12 873–12 883.
- [6] J. Ho, A. Jain, and P. Abbeel, "Denoising diffusion probabilistic models," *NeurIPS*, vol. 33, pp. 6840–6851, 2020.
- [7] Y. Song and S. Ermon, "Generative modeling by estimating gradients of the data distribution," *NeurIPS*, vol. 32, 2019.
- [8] Y. Song, J. Sohl-Dickstein, D. P. Kingma, A. Kumar, S. Ermon, and B. Poole, "Score-based generative modeling through stochastic differential equations," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.13456*, 2020.
- [9] H. Zhang, I. Goodfellow, D. Metaxas, and A. Odena, "Self-attention generative adversarial networks," in *ICML*. PMLR, 2019, pp. 7354–7363.
- [10] A. Brock, J. Donahue, and K. Simonyan, "Large scale gan training for high fidelity natural image synthesis," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.11096*, 2018.
- [11] T. Karras, T. Aila, S. Laine, and J. Lehtinen, "Progressive growing of gans for improved quality, stability, and variation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.10196*, 2017.
- [12] Y. Choi, M. Choi, M. Kim, J.-W. Ha, S. Kim, and J. Choo, "Stargan: Unified generative adversarial networks for multi-domain image-to-image translation," in *CVPR*, 2018, pp. 8789–8797.
- [13] "FaceSwap," <https://github.com/deepfakes/faceswap>, 2017.
- [14] J. Thies, M. Zollhofer, M. Stamminger, C. Theobalt, and M. Nießner, "Face2face: Real-time face capture and reenactment of rgb videos," in *CVPR*, 2016, pp. 2387–2395.
- [15] D. P. Kingma and P. Dhariwal, "Glow: Generative flow with invertible 1x1 convolutions," *NeurIPS*, vol. 31, 2018.
- [16] M. Chen, A. Radford, R. Child, J. Wu, H. Jun, D. Luan, and I. Sutskever, "Generative pretraining from pixels," in *ICML*. PMLR, 2020, pp. 1691–1703.
- [17] P. Dhariwal and A. Nichol, "Diffusion models beat gans on image synthesis," *NeurIPS*, vol. 34, pp. 8780–8794, 2021.
- [18] U. Singer, A. Polyak, T. Hayes, X. Yin, J. An, S. Zhang, Q. Hu, H. Yang, O. Ashual, O. Gafni *et al.*, "Make-a-video: Text-to-video generation without text-video data," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.14792*, 2022.
- [19] R. Rombach, A. Blattmann, D. Lorenz, P. Esser, and B. Ommer, "High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models," in *CVPR*, 2022, pp. 10 684–10 695.
- [20] C. Saharia, J. Ho, W. Chan, T. Salimans, D. J. Fleet, and M. Norouzi, "Image super-resolution via iterative refinement," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 45, no. 4, pp. 4713–4726, 2022.
- [21] J. Wyatt, A. Leach, S. M. Schmon, and C. G. Willcocks, "Anoddpm: Anomaly detection with denoising diffusion probabilistic models using simplex noise," in *CVPR*, 2022, pp. 650–656.
- [22] W. G. C. Bandara, N. G. Nair, and V. M. Patel, "Ddpm-cd: Remote sensing change detection using denoising diffusion probabilistic models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.11892*, 2022.
- [23] C. Chen, J. Fu, and L. Lyu, "A pathway towards responsible ai generated content," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.01325*, 2023.
- [24] D. Xu, S. Fan, and M. Kankanhalli, "Combating misinformation in the era of generative ai models," in *ACM MM*, 2023, pp. 9291–9298.
- [25] M. Mustak, J. Salminen, M. Mäntymäki, A. Rahman, and Y. K. Dwivedi, "Deepfakes: Deceptions, mitigations, and opportunities," *Journal of Business Research*, vol. 154, p. 113368, 2023.
- [26] G. Somepalli, V. Singla, M. Goldblum, J. Geiping, and T. Goldstein, "Diffusion art or digital forgery? investigating data replication in diffusion models," in *CVPR*, 2023, pp. 6048–6058.
- [27] T. Hagendorff, "Mapping the ethics of generative ai: A comprehensive scoping review," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.08323*, 2024.
- [28] D. Khosrowi, F. Finn, and E. Clark, "Diffusing the creator: Attributing credit for generative ai outputs," in *AIES*, 2023, pp. 890–900.
- [29] M. Viola and C. Voto, "Designed to abuse? deepfakes and the non-consensual diffusion of intimate images," *Synthese*, vol. 201, no. 1, p. 30, 2023.
- [30] R. Hataya, H. Bao, and H. Arai, "Will large-scale generative models corrupt future datasets?" in *ICCV*, 2023, pp. 20 555–20 565.
- [31] S. Ravuri and O. Vinyals, "Classification accuracy score for conditional generative models," *NeurIPS*, vol. 32, 2019.
- [32] P. Zhou, X. Han, V. I. Morariu, and L. S. Davis, "Two-stream neural networks for tampered face detection," in *CVPRW*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 1831–1839.
- [33] Y. Li, M.-C. Chang, and S. Lyu, "In ictu oculi: Exposing AI generated fake face videos by detecting eye blinking," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.02877*, 2018.
- [34] D. Afchar, V. Nozick, J. Yamagishi, and I. Echizen, "Mesonet: a compact facial video forgery detection network," in *WIFS*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 1–7.
- [35] D. Güera and E. J. Delp, "Deepfake video detection using recurrent neural networks," in *AVSS*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 1–6.
- [36] Y. Li and S. Lyu, "Exposing deepfake videos by detecting face warping artifacts," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.00656*, 2018.

- [37] S. McCloskey and M. Albright, "Detecting gan-generated imagery using color cues," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.08247*, 2018.
- [38] L. Nataraj, T. M. Mohammed, S. Chandrasekaran, A. Fleener, J. H. Bappy, A. K. Roy-Chowdhury, and B. Manjunath, "Detecting gan generated fake images using co-occurrence matrices," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.06836*, 2019.
- [39] F. Marra, D. Gragnaniello, D. Cozzolino, and L. Verdoliva, "Detection of gan-generated fake images over social networks," in *MIPR*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 384–389.
- [40] X. Zhang, S. Karaman, and S.-F. Chang, "Detecting and simulating artifacts in gan fake images," in *WIFS*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1–6.
- [41] A. Rossler, D. Cozzolino, L. Verdoliva, C. Riess, J. Thies, and M. Nießner, "Faceforensics++: Learning to detect manipulated facial images," in *ICCV*, 2019, pp. 1–11.
- [42] Y. Li, X. Yang, P. Sun, H. Qi, and S. Lyu, "Celeb-df: A large-scale challenging dataset for deepfake forensics," in *CVPR*, 2020, pp. 3207–3216.
- [43] B. Dolhansky, J. Bitton, B. Pflaum, J. Lu, R. Howes, M. Wang, and C. C. Ferrer, "The deepfake detection challenge dataset," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.07397*, 2020.
- [44] H. Dang, F. Liu, J. Stehouwer, X. Liu, and A. K. Jain, "On the detection of digital face manipulation," in *CVPR*, 2020, pp. 5781–5790.
- [45] L. Li, J. Bao, T. Zhang, H. Yang, D. Chen, F. Wen, and B. Guo, "Face x-ray for more general face forgery detection," in *CVPR*, 2020, pp. 5001–5010.
- [46] K. Shiohara and T. Yamasaki, "Detecting deepfakes with self-blended images," in *CVPR*, 2022, pp. 18 720–18 729.
- [47] N. Ruiz, S. A. Bargal, and S. Sclaroff, "Disrupting deepfakes: Adversarial attacks against conditional image translation networks and facial manipulation systems," in *ECCV Workshops*. Springer, 2020, pp. 236–251.
- [48] Q. Huang, J. Zhang, W. Zhou, W. Zhang, and N. Yu, "Initiative defense against facial manipulation," in *AAAI*, vol. 35, no. 2, 2021, pp. 1619–1627.
- [49] N. Yu, V. Skripniuk, S. Abdelnabi, and M. Fritz, "Artificial fingerprinting for generative models: Rooting deepfake attribution in training data," in *ICCV*, 2021, pp. 14 448–14 457.
- [50] V. Asnani, X. Yin, T. Hassner, and X. Liu, "Malp: Manipulation localization using a proactive scheme," in *CVPR*, 2023, pp. 12 343–12 352.
- [51] Z. Jiang, J. Zhang, and N. Z. Gong, "Evading watermark based detection of ai-generated content," in *ACM CCS*, 2023, pp. 1168–1181.
- [52] Z. Zhao, J. Duan, K. Xu, C. Wang, R. Z. Z. D. Q. Guo, and X. Hu, "Can protective perturbation safeguard personal data from being exploited by stable diffusion?" *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.00084*, 2023.
- [53] R. Tolosana, R. Vera-Rodriguez, J. Fierrez, A. Morales, and J. Ortega-Garcia, "Deepfakes and beyond: A survey of face manipulation and fake detection," *Inf. Fusion*, vol. 64, pp. 131–148, 2020.
- [54] Y. Mirsky and W. Lee, "The creation and detection of deepfakes: A survey," *ACM Comput. Surv.*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 1–41, 2021.
- [55] P. Yu, Z. Xia, J. Fei, and Y. Lu, "A survey on deepfake video detection," *Int. J. Biometrics*, vol. 10, no. 6, pp. 607–624, 2021.
- [56] F. Juefei-Xu, R. Wang, Y. Huang, Q. Guo, L. Ma, and Y. Liu, "Countering malicious deepfakes: Survey, battleground, and horizon," *Int. J. Comput. Vis.*, vol. 130, no. 7, pp. 1678–1734, 2022.
- [57] J. W. Seow, M. K. Lim, R. C. Phan, and J. K. Liu, "A comprehensive overview of deepfake: Generation, detection, datasets, and opportunities," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 513, pp. 351–371, 2022.
- [58] M. S. Rana, M. N. Nobil, B. Murali, and A. H. Sung, "Deepfake detection: A systematic literature review," *IEEE access*, vol. 10, pp. 25 494–25 513, 2022.
- [59] J. P. Cardenuto, J. Yang, R. Padilha, R. Wan, D. Moreira, H. Li, S. Wang, F. Andaló, S. Marcel, and A. Rocha, "The age of synthetic realities: Challenges and opportunities," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.11503*, 2023.
- [60] L. Lin, N. Gupta, Y. Zhang, H. Ren, C.-H. Liu, F. Ding, X. Wang, X. Li, L. Verdoliva, and S. Hu, "Detecting multimedia generated by large ai models: A survey," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.00045*, 2024.
- [61] D. Tariang, R. Corvi, D. Cozzolino, G. Poggi, K. Nagano, and L. Verdoliva, "Synthetic image verification in the era of generative artificial intelligence: What works and what isn't there yet," *IEEE Security & Privacy*, 2024.
- [62] T. Wang, Y. Zhang, S. Qi, R. Zhao, Z. Xia, and J. Weng, "Security and privacy on generative data in aigc: A survey," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.09435*, 2023.
- [63] C. Chen, Z. Wu, Y. Lai, W. Ou, T. Liao, and Z. Zheng, "Challenges and remedies to privacy and security in aigc: Exploring the potential of privacy computing, blockchain, and beyond," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.00419*, 2023.
- [64] L. Guilloux, "Fakeapp," <https://www.malavida.com/en/soft/fakeapp>, 2018.
- [65] T. Karras, S. Laine, and T. Aila, "A style-based generator architecture for generative adversarial networks," in *CVPR*, 2019, pp. 4401–4410.
- [66] T. Karras, S. Laine, M. Aittala, J. Hellsten, J. Lehtinen, and T. Aila, "Analyzing and improving the image quality of stylegan," in *CVPR*, 2020, pp. 8110–8119.
- [67] D. C. Epstein, I. Jain, O. Wang, and R. Zhang, "Online detection of ai-generated images," in *ICCV*, 2023, pp. 382–392.
- [68] A. Ramesh, P. Dhariwal, A. Nichol, C. Chu, and M. Chen, "Hierarchical text-conditional image generation with clip latents," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.06125*, vol. 1, no. 2, p. 3, 2022.
- [69] Y. Qian, G. Yin, L. Sheng, Z. Chen, and J. Shao, "Thinking in frequency: Face forgery detection by mining frequency-aware clues," in *ECCV*. Springer, 2020, pp. 86–103.
- [70] I. Masi, A. Killekar, R. M. Mascarenhas, S. P. Gurudatt, and W. AbdAlmageed, "Two-branch recurrent network for isolating deepfakes in videos," in *ECCV*. Springer, 2020, pp. 667–684.
- [71] U. Ojha, Y. Li, and Y. J. Lee, "Towards universal fake image detectors that generalize across generative models," in *CVPR*, 2023, pp. 24 480–24 489.
- [72] K. Sundararajan and D. L. Woodard, "Deep learning for biometrics: A survey," *ACM Comput. Surv.*, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 1–34, 2018.
- [73] R. Durrall, M. Keuper, and J. Keuper, "Watch your up-convolution: Cnn based generative deep neural networks are failing to reproduce spectral distributions," in *CVPR*, 2020, pp. 7890–7899.
- [74] H. Liu, X. Li, W. Zhou, Y. Chen, Y. He, H. Xue, W. Zhang, and N. Yu, "Spatial-phase shallow learning: rethinking face forgery detection in frequency domain," in *CVPR*, 2021, pp. 772–781.
- [75] C. Tan, Y. Zhao, S. Wei, G. Gu, P. Liu, and Y. Wei, "Rethinking the up-sampling operations in cnn-based generative network for generalizable deepfake detection," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.10461*, 2023.
- [76] T. Bui, N. Yu, and J. Collomosse, "Repmix: Representation mixing for robust attribution of synthesized images," in *ECCV*. Springer, 2022, pp. 146–163.
- [77] Z. Sha, Z. Li, N. Yu, and Y. Zhang, "De-fake: Detection and attribution of fake images generated by text-to-image generation models," in *ACM CCS*, 2023, pp. 3418–3432.
- [78] L. Chai, D. Bau, S.-N. Lim, and P. Isola, "What makes fake images detectable? understanding properties that generalize," in *ECCV*. Springer, 2020, pp. 103–120.
- [79] H. Zhao, W. Zhou, D. Chen, T. Wei, W. Zhang, and N. Yu, "Multi-attentional deepfake detection," in *CVPR*, 2021, pp. 2185–2194.
- [80] S.-Y. Wang, O. Wang, R. Zhang, A. Owens, and A. A. Efros, "Cnn-generated images are surprisingly easy to spot... for now," in *CVPR*, 2020, pp. 8695–8704.
- [81] Y. Jeong, D. Kim, Y. Ro, and J. Choi, "Frepgan: robust deepfake detection using frequency-level perturbations," in *AAAI*, vol. 36, no. 1, 2022, pp. 1060–1068.
- [82] R. Corvi, D. Cozzolino, G. Poggi, K. Nagano, and L. Verdoliva, "Intriguing properties of synthetic images: from generative adversarial networks to diffusion models," in *CVPR*, 2023, pp. 973–982.
- [83] C. Dong, A. Kumar, and E. Liu, "Think twice before detecting gan-generated fake images from their spectral domain imprints," in *CVPR*, 2022, pp. 7865–7874.
- [84] Z. Huang, Y. He, J. Yu, F. Zhang, C. Si, Y. Jiang, Y. Zhang, T. Wu, Q. Jin, N. Chanpaisit, Y. Wang, X. Chen, L. Wang, D. Lin, Y. Qiao, and Z. Liu, "VBench: Comprehensive benchmark suite for video generative models," in *CVPR*, 2024.
- [85] F. Matern, C. Riess, and M. Stamminger, "Exploiting visual artifacts to expose deepfakes and face manipulations," in *WACVW*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 83–92.
- [86] X. Yang, Y. Li, and S. Lyu, "Exposing deep fakes using inconsistent head poses," in *ICASSP*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 8261–8265.
- [87] R. Daza, A. Morales, J. Fierrez, and R. Tolosana, "Mebal: A multi-modal database for eye blink detection and attention level estimation," in *ICMI*, 2020, pp. 32–36.
- [88] X. Zhu, H. Wang, H. Fei, Z. Lei, and S. Z. Li, "Face forgery detection by 3d decomposition," in *CVPR*, 2021, pp. 2929–2939.
- [89] L. Chen, Y. Zhang, Y. Song, L. Liu, and J. Wang, "Self-supervised learning of adversarial example: Towards good generalizations for deepfake detection," in *CVPR*, 2022, pp. 18 710–18 719.



- [90] S. Chen, T. Yao, Y. Chen, S. Ding, J. Li, and R. Ji, "Local relation learning for face forgery detection," in *AAAI*, vol. 35, no. 2, 2021, pp. 1081–1088.
- [91] J. Fei, Y. Dai, P. Yu, T. Shen, Z. Xia, and J. Weng, "Learning second order local anomaly for general face forgery detection," in *CVPR*, 2022, pp. 20 270–20 280.
- [92] B. Zhang, S. Li, G. Feng, Z. Qian, and X. Zhang, "Patch diffusion: a general module for face manipulation detection," in *AAAI*, vol. 36, no. 3, 2022, pp. 3243–3251.
- [93] K. Sun, T. Yao, S. Chen, S. Ding, J. Li, and R. Ji, "Dual contrastive learning for general face forgery detection," in *AAAI*, vol. 36, no. 2, 2022, pp. 2316–2324.
- [94] W. Zhuang, Q. Chu, Z. Tan, Q. Liu, H. Yuan, C. Miao, Z. Luo, and N. Yu, "Uia-vit: Unsupervised inconsistency-aware method based on vision transformer for face forgery detection," in *ECCV*. Springer, 2022, pp. 391–407.
- [95] S. Dong, J. Wang, J. Liang, H. Fan, and R. Ji, "Explaining deepfake detection by analysing image matching," in *ECCV*. Springer, 2022, pp. 18–35.
- [96] B. Huang, Z. Wang, J. Yang, J. Ai, Q. Zou, Q. Wang, and D. Ye, "Implicit identity driven deepfake face swapping detection," in *CVPR*, 2023, pp. 4490–4499.
- [97] X. Dong, J. Bao, D. Chen, T. Zhang, W. Zhang, N. Yu, D. Chen, F. Wen, and B. Guo, "Protecting celebrities from deepfake with identity consistency transformer," in *CVPR*, 2022, pp. 9468–9478.
- [98] R. Xia, D. Liu, J. Li, L. Yuan, N. Wang, and X. Gao, "Mmnet: Multi-collaboration and multi-supervision network for sequential deepfake detection," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Forensics Secur.*, 2024.
- [99] X. Guo, X. Liu, Z. Ren, S. Grosz, I. Masi, and X. Liu, "Hierarchical fine-grained image forgery detection and localization," in *CVPR*, 2023, pp. 3155–3165.
- [100] L. Chen, Y. Zhang, Y. Song, J. Wang, and L. Liu, "Ost: Improving generalization of deepfake detection via one-shot test-time training," *NeurIPS*, vol. 35, pp. 24 597–24 610, 2022.
- [101] T. Yang, D. Wang, F. Tang, X. Zhao, J. Cao, and S. Tang, "Progressive open space expansion for open-set model attribution," in *CVPR*, 2023, pp. 15 856–15 865.
- [102] T. Zhao, X. Xu, M. Xu, H. Ding, Y. Xiong, and W. Xia, "Learning self-consistency for deepfake detection," in *ICCV*, 2021, pp. 15 023–15 033.
- [103] S. Dong, J. Wang, R. Ji, J. Liang, H. Fan, and Z. Ge, "Implicit identity leakage: The stumbling block to improving deepfake detection generalization," in *CVPR*, 2023, pp. 3994–4004.
- [104] W. Bai, Y. Liu, Z. Zhang, B. Li, and W. Hu, "Aunet: Learning relations between action units for face forgery detection," in *CVPR*, 2023, pp. 24 709–24 719.
- [105] Y. Jeong, D. Kim, Y. Ro, P. Kim, and J. Choi, "Fingerprintnet: Synthesized fingerprints for generated image detection," in *ECCV*. Springer, 2022, pp. 76–94.
- [106] N. Yu, L. S. Davis, and M. Fritz, "Attributing fake images to gans: Learning and analyzing gan fingerprints," in *ICCV*, 2019, pp. 7556–7566.
- [107] J. Frank, T. Eisenhofer, L. Schönherr, A. Fischer, D. Kolossa, and T. Holz, "Leveraging frequency analysis for deep fake image recognition," in *ICML*. PMLR, 2020, pp. 3247–3258.
- [108] Y. Huang, F. Juefei-Xu, Q. Guo, Y. Liu, and G. Pu, "Fakelocator: Robust localization of gan-based face manipulations," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Forensics Secur.*, vol. 17, pp. 2657–2672, 2022.
- [109] K. Georgiev, J. Vendrow, H. Salman, S. M. Park, and A. Madry, "The journey, not the destination: How data guides diffusion models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.06205*, 2023.
- [110] H. J. Song, M. Khayatkhoei, and W. AbdAlmageed, "Manifpt: Defining and analyzing fingerprints of generative models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.10401*, 2024.
- [111] H. Liu, Z. Tan, C. Tan, Y. Wei, J. Wang, and Y. Zhao, "Forgery-aware adaptive transformer for generalizable synthetic image detection," in *CVPR*, 2024, pp. 10 770–10 780.
- [112] Y. Luo, Y. Zhang, J. Yan, and W. Liu, "Generalizing face forgery detection with high-frequency features," in *CVPR*, 2021, pp. 16 317–16 326.
- [113] B. Liu, F. Yang, X. Bi, B. Xiao, W. Li, and X. Gao, "Detecting generated images by real images," in *ECCV*. Springer, 2022, pp. 95–110.
- [114] Q. Gu, S. Chen, T. Yao, Y. Chen, S. Ding, and R. Yi, "Exploiting fine-grained face forgery clues via progressive enhancement learning," in *AAAI*, vol. 36, no. 1, 2022, pp. 735–743.
- [115] J. Li, H. Xie, J. Li, Z. Wang, and Y. Zhang, "Frequency-aware discriminative feature learning supervised by single-center loss for face forgery detection," in *CVPR*, 2021, pp. 6458–6467.
- [116] S. Woo *et al.*, "Add: Frequency attention and multi-view based knowledge distillation to detect low-quality compressed deepfake images," in *AAAI*, vol. 36, no. 1, 2022, pp. 122–130.
- [117] J. Wang, Z. Wu, W. Ouyang, X. Han, J. Chen, Y.-G. Jiang, and S.-N. Li, "M2tr: Multi-modal multi-scale transformers for deepfake detection," in *ICMR*, 2022, pp. 615–623.
- [118] Y. Wang, K. Yu, C. Chen, X. Hu, and S. Peng, "Dynamic graph learning with content-guided spatial-frequency relation reasoning for deepfake detection," in *CVPR*, 2023, pp. 7278–7287.
- [119] C. Tan, Y. Zhao, S. Wei, G. Gu, and Y. Wei, "Learning on gradients: Generalized artifacts representation for gan-generated images detection," in *CVPR*, 2023, pp. 12 105–12 114.
- [120] Z. Huang, B. Li, Y. Cai, R. Wang, S. Guo, L. Fang, J. Chen, and L. Wang, "What can discriminator do? towards box-free ownership verification of generative adversarial networks," in *ICCV*, 2023, pp. 5009–5019.
- [121] V. Asnani, X. Yin, T. Hassner, and X. Liu, "Reverse engineering of generative models: Inferring model hyperparameters from generated images," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, 2023.
- [122] F. Guillaro, D. Cozzolino, A. Sud, N. Dufour, and L. Verdoliva, "Trufor: Leveraging all-round clues for trustworthy image forgery detection and localization," in *CVPR*, 2023, pp. 20 606–20 615.
- [123] Z. Wang, J. Bao, W. Zhou, W. Wang, H. Hu, H. Chen, and H. Li, "Dire for diffusion-generated image detection," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.09295*, 2023.
- [124] R. Ma, J. Duan, F. Kong, X. Shi, and K. Xu, "Exposing the fake: Effective diffusion-generated images detection," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.06272*, 2023.
- [125] J. Ricker, D. Lukovnikov, and A. Fischer, "Aeroblade: Training-free detection of latent diffusion images using autoencoder reconstruction error," in *CVPR*, 2024, pp. 9130–9140.
- [126] J. Liang, H. Shi, and W. Deng, "Exploring disentangled content information for face forgery detection," in *ECCV*. Springer, 2022, pp. 128–145.
- [127] J. Cao, C. Ma, T. Yao, S. Chen, S. Ding, and X. Yang, "End-to-end reconstruction-classification learning for face forgery detection," in *CVPR*, 2022, pp. 4113–4122.
- [128] Z. Sun, S. Chen, T. Yao, B. Yin, R. Yi, S. Ding, and L. Ma, "Contrastive pseudo learning for open-world deepfake attribution," in *ICCV*, 2023, pp. 20 882–20 892.
- [129] K. Sun, H. Liu, Q. Ye, Y. Gao, J. Liu, L. Shao, and R. Ji, "Domain general face forgery detection by learning to weight," in *AAAI*, vol. 35, no. 3, 2021, pp. 2638–2646.
- [130] M. Kim, S. Tariq, and S. S. Woo, "Fretal: Generalizing deepfake detection using knowledge distillation and representation learning," in *CVPR*, 2021, pp. 1001–1012.
- [131] A. V. Nadimpalli and A. Rattani, "On improving cross-dataset generalization of deepfake detectors," in *CVPR*, 2022, pp. 91–99.
- [132] L. Guarnera, O. Giudice, M. Nießner, and S. Battiato, "On the exploitation of deepfake model recognition," in *CVPR*, 2022, pp. 61–70.
- [133] T. Yang, Z. Huang, J. Cao, L. Li, and X. Li, "Deepfake network architecture attribution," in *AAAI*, vol. 36, no. 4, 2022, pp. 4662–4670.
- [134] S. Das, S. Seferbekov, A. Datta, M. S. Islam, and M. R. Amin, "Towards solving the deepfake problem: An analysis on improving deepfake detection using dynamic face augmentation," in *ICCV*, 2021, pp. 3776–3785.
- [135] C. Wang and W. Deng, "Representative forgery mining for fake face detection," in *CVPR*, 2021, pp. 14 923–14 932.
- [136] S. Girish, S. Suri, S. S. Rambhatla, and A. Shrivastava, "Towards discovery and attribution of open-world gan generated images," in *ICCV*, 2021, pp. 14 094–14 103.
- [137] Y. He, N. Yu, M. Keuper, and M. Fritz, "Beyond the spectrum: Detecting deepfakes via re-synthesis," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.14376*, 2021.
- [138] R. Shao, T. Wu, and Z. Liu, "Detecting and recovering sequential deepfake manipulation," in *ECCV*. Springer, 2022, pp. 712–728.
- [139] Z. Liu, X. Qi, and P. H. Torr, "Global texture enhancement for fake face detection in the wild," in *CVPR*, 2020, pp. 8060–8069.
- [140] K. Sun, H. Liu, T. Yao, X. Sun, S. Chen, S. Ding, and R. Ji, "An information theoretic approach for attention-driven face forgery detection," in *ECCV*. Springer, 2022, pp. 111–127.

- [141] Y. He, B. Gan, S. Chen, Y. Zhou, G. Yin, L. Song, L. Sheng, J. Shao, and Z. Liu, “ForgeryNet: A versatile benchmark for comprehensive forgery analysis,” in *CVPR*, 2021, pp. 4360–4369.
- [142] A. Haliassos, K. Vougioukas, S. Petridis, and M. Pantic, “Lips don’t lie: A generalisable and robust approach to face forgery detection,” in *CVPR*, 2021, pp. 5039–5049.
- [143] Z. Sun, Y. Han, Z. Hua, N. Ruan, and W. Jia, “Improving the efficiency and robustness of deepfakes detection through precise geometric features,” in *CVPR*, 2021, pp. 3609–3618.
- [144] H. Qi, Q. Guo, F. Juefei-Xu, X. Xie, L. Ma, W. Feng, Y. Liu, and J. Zhao, “DeepRhythm: Exposing deepfakes with attentional visual heartbeat rhythms,” in *ACM MM*, 2020, pp. 4318–4327.
- [145] L. Song, Z. Fang, X. Li, X. Dong, Z. Jin, Y. Chen, and S. Lyu, “Adaptive face forgery detection in cross domain,” in *ECCV*. Springer, 2022, pp. 467–484.
- [146] Y. Zhou and S.-N. Lim, “Joint audio-visual deepfake detection,” in *ICCV*, 2021, pp. 14 800–14 809.
- [147] A. Haliassos, R. Mira, S. Petridis, and M. Pantic, “Leveraging real talking faces via self-supervision for robust forgery detection,” in *CVPR*, 2022, pp. 14 950–14 962.
- [148] Z. Cai, K. Stefanov, A. Dhall, and M. Hayat, “Do you really mean that? content driven audio-visual deepfake dataset and multimodal method for temporal forgery localization,” in *DICTA*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 1–10.
- [149] C. Feng, Z. Chen, and A. Owens, “Self-supervised video forensics by audio-visual anomaly detection,” in *CVPR*, 2023, pp. 10 491–10 503.
- [150] R. Zhang, H. Wang, M. Du, H. Liu, Y. Zhou, and Q. Zeng, “Ummaformer: A universal multimodal-adaptive transformer framework for temporal forgery localization,” in *ACM MM*, 2023, pp. 8749–8759.
- [151] J. Bai, M. Lin, and G. Cao, “Ai-generated video detection via spatio-temporal anomaly learning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.16638*, 2024.
- [152] L. Ji, Y. Lin, Z. Huang, Y. Han, X. Xu, J. Wu, C. Wang, and Z. Liu, “Distinguish any fake videos: Unleashing the power of large-scale data and motion features,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.15343*, 2024.
- [153] I. Amerini, L. Galteri, R. Caldelli, and A. Del Bimbo, “Deepfake video detection through optical flow based cnn,” in *ICCVW*, 2019, pp. 0–0.
- [154] D. Zhang, C. Li, F. Lin, D. Zeng, and S. Ge, “Detecting deepfake videos with temporal dropout 3dcnn,” in *IJCAI*, 2021, pp. 1288–1294.
- [155] J. Hu, X. Liao, J. Liang, W. Zhou, and Z. Qin, “Finfer: Frame inference-based deepfake detection for high-visual-quality videos,” in *AAAI*, vol. 36, no. 1, 2022, pp. 951–959.
- [156] Z. Gu, Y. Chen, T. Yao, S. Ding, J. Li, F. Huang, and L. Ma, “Spatiotemporal inconsistency learning for deepfake video detection,” in *ACM MM*, 2021, pp. 3473–3481.
- [157] L. Song, X. Li, Z. Fang, Z. Jin, Y. Chen, and C. Xu, “Face forgery detection via symmetric transformer,” in *ACM MM*, 2022, pp. 4102–4111.
- [158] Z. Wang, J. Bao, W. Zhou, W. Wang, and H. Li, “Altfreezing for more general video face forgery detection,” in *CVPR*, 2023, pp. 4129–4138.
- [159] D. Zhang, F. Lin, Y. Hua, P. Wang, D. Zeng, and S. Ge, “Deepfake video detection with spatiotemporal dropout transformer,” in *ACM MM*, 2022, pp. 5833–5841.
- [160] Z. Hu, H. Xie, Y. Wang, J. Li, Z. Wang, and Y. Zhang, “Dynamic inconsistency-aware deepfake video detection,” in *IJCAI*, Z.-H. Zhou, Ed. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization, 8 2021, pp. 736–742, main Track. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2021/102>
- [161] Y. Zheng, J. Bao, D. Chen, M. Zeng, and F. Wen, “Exploring temporal coherence for more general video face forgery detection,” in *ICCV*, 2021, pp. 15 044–15 054.
- [162] J. Guan, H. Zhou, Z. Hong, E. Ding, J. Wang, C. Quan, and Y. Zhao, “Delving into sequential patches for deepfake detection,” *NeurIPS*, vol. 35, pp. 4517–4530, 2022.
- [163] H. Chen, Y. Hong, Z. Huang, Z. Xu, Z. Gu, Y. Li, J. Lan, H. Zhu, J. Zhang, W. Wang *et al.*, “Demamba: Ai-generated video detection on million-scale genvideo benchmark,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.19707*, 2024.
- [164] Z. Gu, T. Yao, Y. Chen, S. Ding, and L. Ma, “Hierarchical contrastive inconsistency learning for deepfake video detection,” in *ECCV*. Springer, 2022, pp. 596–613.
- [165] Z. Gu, Y. Chen, T. Yao, S. Ding, J. Li, and L. Ma, “Delving into the local: Dynamic inconsistency learning for deepfake video detection,” in *AAAI*, vol. 36, no. 1, 2022, pp. 744–752.
- [166] M. Zhai, X. Xiang, N. Lv, and X. Kong, “Optical flow and scene flow estimation: A survey,” *Pattern Recognit.*, vol. 114, p. 107861, 2021.
- [167] Wikipedia contributors, “Feature engineering — Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia,” 2024, [Online; accessed 29-June-2024]. [Online]. Available: [https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Feature\\_engineering&oldid=1230888526](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Feature_engineering&oldid=1230888526)
- [168] Y. Zhang and Q. Yang, “A survey on multi-task learning,” *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.*, vol. 34, no. 12, pp. 5586–5609, 2021.
- [169] M. Xu, S. Yoon, A. Fuentes, and D. S. Park, “A comprehensive survey of image augmentation techniques for deep learning,” *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 137, p. 109347, 2023.
- [170] L. Jing and Y. Tian, “Self-supervised visual feature learning with deep neural networks: A survey,” *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 43, no. 11, pp. 4037–4058, 2020.
- [171] A. Radford, J. W. Kim, C. Hallacy, A. Ramesh, G. Goh, S. Agarwal, G. Sastry, A. Askell, P. Mishkin, J. Clark *et al.*, “Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision,” in *ICML*. PMLR, 2021, pp. 8748–8763.
- [172] A. Dosovitskiy, L. Beyer, A. Kolesnikov, D. Weissenborn, X. Zhai, T. Unterthiner, M. Dehghani, M. Minderer, G. Heigold, S. Gelly *et al.*, “An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929*, 2020.
- [173] A. Gu and T. Dao, “Mamba: Linear-time sequence modeling with selective state spaces,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.00752*, 2023.
- [174] F. Chollet, “Xception: Deep learning with depthwise separable convolutions,” in *CVPR*, 2017, pp. 1251–1258.
- [175] T. Lin, X. Liu, X. Li, E. Ding, and S. Wen, “Bmn: Boundary-matching network for temporal action proposal generation,” in *ICCV*, 2019, pp. 3889–3898.
- [176] T. Lin, X. Zhao, H. Su, C. Wang, and M. Yang, “Bsn: Boundary sensitive network for temporal action proposal generation,” in *ECCV*, 2018, pp. 3–19.
- [177] T.-Y. Lin, P. Dollár, R. Girshick, K. He, B. Hariharan, and S. Belongie, “Feature pyramid networks for object detection,” in *CVPR*, 2017, pp. 2117–2125.
- [178] C. Schuhmann, R. Beaumont, R. Vencu, C. Gordon, R. Wightman, M. Cherti, T. Coombes, A. Katta, C. Mullis, M. Wortsman *et al.*, “Laion-5b: An open large-scale dataset for training next generation image-text models,” *NeurIPS*, vol. 35, pp. 25 278–25 294, 2022.
- [179] X. Zheng, T. Pang, C. Du, J. Jiang, and M. Lin, “Intriguing properties of data attribution on diffusion models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.00500*, 2023.
- [180] S.-Y. Wang, A. A. Efros, J.-Y. Zhu, and R. Zhang, “Evaluating data attribution for text-to-image models,” in *ICCV*, 2023, pp. 7192–7203.
- [181] N. Carlini and H. Farid, “Evading deepfake-image detectors with white-and black-box attacks,” in *CVPR workshops*, 2020, pp. 658–659.
- [182] J. Liang, S. Liang, A. Liu, X. Jia, J. Kuang, and X. Cao, “Poisoned forgery face: Towards backdoor attacks on face forgery detection,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11473*, 2024.
- [183] L. Trinh and Y. Liu, “An examination of fairness of ai models for deepfake detection,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.00558*, 2021.
- [184] M. Pu, M. Y. Kuan, N. T. Lim, C. Y. Chong, and M. K. Lim, “Fairness evaluation in deepfake detection models using metamorphic testing,” in *MET*, 2022, pp. 7–14.
- [185] D. Li, W. Wang, H. Fan, and J. Dong, “Exploring adversarial fake images on face manifold,” in *CVPR*, 2021, pp. 5789–5798.
- [186] S. Jia, C. Ma, T. Yao, B. Yin, S. Ding, and X. Yang, “Exploring frequency adversarial attacks for face forgery detection,” in *CVPR*, 2022, pp. 4103–4112.
- [187] C. Liu, H. Chen, T. Zhu, J. Zhang, and W. Zhou, “Making deepfakes more spurious: evading deep face forgery detection via trace removal attack,” *IEEE Trans. Dependable Secur. Comput.*, 2023.
- [188] Y. Hou, Q. Guo, Y. Huang, X. Xie, L. Ma, and J. Zhao, “Evading deepfake detectors via adversarial statistical consistency,” in *CVPR*, 2023, pp. 12 271–12 280.
- [189] X. Wang, J. Huang, S. Ma, S. Nepal, and C. Xu, “Deepfake disrupter: The detector of deepfake is my friend,” in *CVPR*, 2022, pp. 14 920–14 929.
- [190] P. Zhu, G. Osada, H. Kataoka, and T. Takahashi, “Frequency-aware gan for adversarial manipulation generation,” in *ICCV*, 2023, pp. 4315–4324.
- [191] F. Shamshad, K. Srivatsan, and K. Nandakumar, “Evading forensic classifiers with attribute-conditioned adversarial faces,” in *CVPR*, 2023, pp. 16 469–16 478.
- [192] Y. Huang, F. Juefei-Xu, R. Wang, Q. Guo, L. Ma, X. Xie, J. Li, W. Miao, Y. Liu, and G. Pu, “Fakepolisher: Making deepfakes more detection-evasive by shallow reconstruction,” in *ACM MM*, 2020, pp. 1217–1226.
- [193] M. Wu, J. Ma, R. Wang, S. Zhang, Z. Liang, B. Li, C. Lin, L. Fang, and L. Wang, “Tracevader: Making deepfakes more untraceable via

- evading the forgery model attribution,” in *AAAI*, vol. 38, no. 18, 2024, pp. 19 965–19 973.
- [194] C. Hazirbas, J. Bitton, B. Dolhansky, J. Pan, A. Gordo, and C. C. Ferrer, “Towards measuring fairness in ai: the casual conversations dataset,” *IEEE Trans. Biom. Behav. Identity Sci.*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 324–332, 2021.
- [195] A. V. Nadimpalli and A. Rattani, “Gbdf: gender balanced deepfake dataset towards fair deepfake detection,” in *ICPR*. Springer, 2022, pp. 320–337.
- [196] Y. Ju, S. Hu, S. Jia, G. H. Chen, and S. Lyu, “Improving fairness in deepfake detection,” in *WACV*, 2024, pp. 4655–4665.
- [197] L. Lin, X. He, Y. Ju, X. Wang, F. Ding, and S. Hu, “Preserving fairness generalization in deepfake detection,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.17229*, 2024.
- [198] Z. He, W. Wang, W. Guan, J. Dong, and T. Tan, “Defeating deepfakes via adversarial visual reconstruction,” in *ACM MM*, 2022, pp. 2464–2472.
- [199] H. Zhou, Y. Sun, W. Wu, C. C. Loy, X. Wang, and Z. Liu, “Pose-controllable talking face generation by implicitly modularized audio-visual representation,” in *CVPR*, 2021, pp. 4176–4186.
- [200] B. Zheng, C. Liang, X. Wu, and Y. Liu, “Understanding and improving adversarial attacks on latent diffusion model,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.04687*, 2023.
- [201] C. Liang, X. Wu, Y. Hua, J. Zhang, Y. Xue, T. Song, Z. Xue, R. Ma, and H. Guan, “Adversarial example does good: Preventing painting imitation from diffusion models via adversarial examples,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.04578*, 2023.
- [202] H. Yu, J. Chen, X. Ding, Y. Zhang, T. Tang, and H. Ma, “Step vulnerability guided mean fluctuation adversarial attack against conditional diffusion models,” in *AAAI*, vol. 38, no. 7, 2024, pp. 6791–6799.
- [203] H. Huang, Y. Wang, Z. Chen, Y. Zhang, Y. Li, Z. Tang, W. Chu, J. Chen, W. Lin, and K.-K. Ma, “Cmua-watermark: A cross-model universal adversarial watermark for combating deepfakes,” in *AAAI*, vol. 36, no. 1, 2022, pp. 989–997.
- [204] S. Aneja, L. Markhasin, and M. Nießner, “Tafim: targeted adversarial attacks against facial image manipulations,” in *ECCV*. Springer, 2022, pp. 58–75.
- [205] J. Guan, Y. Zhao, Z. Xu, C. Meng, K. Xu, and Y. Zhao, “Adversarial robust safeguard for evading deep facial manipulation,” in *AAAI*, vol. 38, no. 1, 2024, pp. 118–126.
- [206] H. Salman, A. Khaddaj, G. Leclerc, A. Ilyas, and A. Madry, “Raising the cost of malicious ai-powered image editing,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.06588*, 2023.
- [207] H. Xue, C. Liang, X. Wu, and Y. Chen, “Toward effective protection against diffusion-based mimicry through score distillation,” in *ICLR*, 2023.
- [208] J. Zhang, Z. Xu, S. Cui, C. Meng, W. Wu, and M. R. Lyu, “On the robustness of latent diffusion models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.08257*, 2023.
- [209] C. Liang and X. Wu, “Mist: Towards improved adversarial examples for diffusion models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.12683*, 2023.
- [210] J. Xu, Y. Lu, Y. Li, S. Lu, D. Wang, and X. Wei, “Perturbing attention gives you more bang for the buck: Subtle imaging perturbations that efficiently fool customized diffusion models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.15081*, 2024.
- [211] N. Ruiz, Y. Li, V. Jampani, Y. Pritch, M. Rubinstein, and K. Aberman, “Dreambooth: Fine tuning text-to-image diffusion models for subject-driven generation,” in *CVPR*, 2023, pp. 22 500–22 510.
- [212] Z. Zhao, J. Duan, X. Hu, K. Xu, C. Wang, R. Zhang, Z. Du, Q. Guo, and Y. Chen, “Unlearnable examples for diffusion models: Protect data from unauthorized exploitation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.01902*, 2023.
- [213] T. Van Le, H. Phung, T. H. Nguyen, Q. Dao, N. N. Tran, and A. Tran, “Anti-dreambooth: Protecting users from personalized text-to-image synthesis,” in *ICCV*, 2023, pp. 2116–2127.
- [214] Y. Liu, C. Fan, Y. Dai, X. Chen, P. Zhou, and L. Sun, “Toward robust imperceptible perturbation against unauthorized text-to-image diffusion-based synthesis,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.13127*, vol. 3, 2023.
- [215] F. Wang, Z. Tan, T. Wei, Y. Wu, and Q. Huang, “Simac: A simple anti-customization method against text-to-image synthesis of diffusion models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.07865*, 2023.
- [216] X. Ye, H. Huang, J. An, and Y. Wang, “Duaw: Data-free universal adversarial watermark against stable diffusion customization,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.09889*, 2023.
- [217] C.-Y. Yeh, H.-W. Chen, H.-H. Shuai, D.-N. Yang, and M.-S. Chen, “Attack as the best defense: Nullifying image-to-image translation gans via limit-aware adversarial attack,” in *ICCV*, 2021, pp. 16 188–16 197.
- [218] H. Xue and Y. Chen, “Pixel is a barrier: Diffusion models are more adversarially robust than we think,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.13320*, 2024.
- [219] C. Meng, Y. He, Y. Song, J. Song, J. Wu, J.-Y. Zhu, and S. Ermon, “Sdedit: Guided image synthesis and editing with stochastic differential equations,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.01073*, 2021.
- [220] M. Kelly, “Meta, google, and openai promise the white house they’ll develop ai responsibly,” <https://www.theverge.com/2023/7/21/23802274/artificial-intelligence-meta-google-openai-white-house-security-safety>, 2010.
- [221] P. Fernandez, G. Couairon, H. Jégou, M. Douze, and T. Furon, “The stable signature: Rooting watermarks in latent diffusion models,” in *ICCV*, 2023, pp. 22 466–22 477.
- [222] G. Zhang, L. Wang, Y. Su, and A.-A. Liu, “A training-free plug-and-play watermark framework for stable diffusion,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.05607*, 2024.
- [223] C. Xiong, C. Qin, G. Feng, and X. Zhang, “Flexible and secure watermarking for latent diffusion model,” in *ACM MM*, 2023, pp. 1668–1676.
- [224] Y. Wen, J. Kirchenbauer, J. Geiping, and T. Goldstein, “Tree-ring watermarks: Fingerprints for diffusion images that are invisible and robust,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.20030*, 2023.
- [225] R. Wang, F. Juefei-Xu, M. Luo, Y. Liu, and L. Wang, “Faketagger: Robust safeguards against deepfake dissemination via provenance tracking,” in *ACM MM*, 2021, pp. 3546–3555.
- [226] Y. Zeng, M. Zhou, Y. Xue, and V. M. Patel, “Securing deep generative models with universal adversarial signature,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16310*, 2023.
- [227] N. Lukas and F. Kerschbaum, “{PTW}: Pivotal tuning watermarking for {Pre-Trained} image generators,” in *USENIX Security*, 2023, pp. 2241–2258.
- [228] X. Wu, X. Liao, and B. Ou, “Sepmark: Deep separable watermarking for unified source tracing and deepfake detection,” in *ACM MM*, 2023, pp. 1190–1201.
- [229] Y. Zhao, B. Liu, M. Ding, B. Liu, T. Zhu, and X. Yu, “Proactive deepfake defence via identity watermarking,” in *WACV*, 2023, pp. 4602–4611.
- [230] P. Neekhara, S. Hussain, X. Zhang, K. Huang, J. McAuley, and F. Koushanfar, “Facesigns: semi-fragile neural watermarks for media authentication and countering deepfakes,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.01960*, 2022.
- [231] X. Zhang, R. Li, J. Yu, Y. Xu, W. Li, and J. Zhang, “Editguard: Versatile image watermarking for tamper localization and copyright protection,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.08883*, 2023.
- [232] Y. Cui, J. Ren, H. Xu, P. He, H. Liu, L. Sun, and J. Tang, “Diffusionshield: A watermark for copyright protection against generative diffusion models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.04642*, 2023.
- [233] Y. Ma, Z. Zhao, X. He, Z. Li, M. Backes, and Y. Zhang, “Generative watermarking against unauthorized subject-driven image synthesis,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.07754*, 2023.
- [234] V. Asnani, X. Yin, T. Hassner, S. Liu, and X. Liu, “Proactive image manipulation detection,” in *CVPR*, 2022, pp. 15 386–15 395.
- [235] N. Beuve, W. Hamidouche, and O. Déforges, “Waterlo: Protect images from deepfakes using localized semi-fragile watermark,” in *ICCV*, 2023, pp. 393–402.
- [236] Y. Cui, J. Ren, Y. Lin, H. Xu, P. He, Y. Xing, W. Fan, H. Liu, and J. Tang, “Ft-shield: A watermark against unauthorized fine-tuning in text-to-image diffusion models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02401*, 2023.
- [237] C. Kim, K. Min, M. Patel, S. Cheng, and Y. Yang, “Wouaf: Weight modulation for user attribution and fingerprinting in text-to-image diffusion models,” in *CVPR*, 2024, pp. 8974–8983.
- [238] X. Wu, X. Liao, B. Ou, Y. Liu, and Z. Qin, “Are watermarks bugs for deepfake detectors? rethinking proactive forensics,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.17867*, 2024.
- [239] X. Zhao, K. Zhang, Z. Su, S. Vasan, I. Grishchenko, C. Kruegel, G. Vigna, Y.-X. Wang, and L. Li, “Invisible image watermarks are provably removable using generative ai,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.01953*, 2023.
- [240] M. Saberi, V. S. Sadasivan, K. Rezaei, A. Kumar, A. Chegini, W. Wang, and S. Feizi, “Robustness of ai-image detectors: Fundamental limits and practical attacks,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.00076*, 2023.

- [241] N. Lukas, A. Diaa, L. Fenaux, and F. Kerschbaum, "Leveraging optimization for adaptive attacks on image watermarks," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16952*, 2023.
- [242] B. An, M. Ding, T. Rabbani, A. Agrawal, Y. Xu, C. Deng, S. Zhu, A. Mohamed, Y. Wen, T. Goldstein *et al.*, "Benchmarking the robustness of image watermarks," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.08573*, 2024.
- [243] P. Korshunov and S. Marcel, "Deepfakes: a new threat to face recognition? assessment and detection," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.08685*, 2018.
- [244] N. Dufour, A. Gully, P. Karlsson, A. V. Vorbyov, T. Leung, J. Childs, and C. Bregler, "Deepfakes detection dataset by google & jigsaw," <https://blog.research.google/2019/09/contributing-data-to-deepfake-detection.html>.
- [245] B. Dolhansky, R. Howes, B. Pfau, N. Baram, and C. C. Ferrer, "The deepfake detection challenge (DFDC) preview dataset," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.08854*, 2019.
- [246] B. Zi, M. Chang, J. Chen, X. Ma, and Y.-G. Jiang, "Wilddeepfake: A challenging real-world dataset for deepfake detection," in *ACM MM*, 2020, pp. 2382–2390.
- [247] L. Jiang, R. Li, W. Wu, C. Qian, and C. C. Loy, "Deeperforensics-1.0: A large-scale dataset for real-world face forgery detection," in *CVPR*, 2020, pp. 2889–2898.
- [248] T. Zhou, W. Wang, Z. Liang, and J. Shen, "Face forensics in the wild," in *CVPR*, 2021, pp. 5778–5788.
- [249] T.-N. Le, H. H. Nguyen, J. Yamagishi, and I. Echizen, "Openforensics: Large-scale challenging dataset for multi-face forgery detection and segmentation in-the-wild," in *ICCV*, 2021, pp. 10 117–10 127.
- [250] P. Kwon, J. You, G. Nam, S. Park, and G. Chae, "Kodf: A large-scale korean deepfake detection dataset," in *ICCV*, 2021, pp. 10 744–10 753.
- [251] K. Narayan, H. Agarwal, K. Thakral, S. Mittal, M. Vatsa, and R. Singh, "Df-platter: multi-face heterogeneous deepfake dataset," in *CVPR*, 2023, pp. 9739–9748.
- [252] L. Zhang, Y. Zhou, C. Barnes, S. Amirghodsi, Z. Lin, E. Shechtman, and J. Shi, "Perceptual artifacts localization for inpainting," in *ECCV*. Springer, 2022, pp. 146–164.
- [253] S. Jia, M. Huang, Z. Zhou, Y. Ju, J. Cai, and S. Lyu, "Autosplice: A text-prompt manipulated image dataset for media forensics," in *CVPR*, 2023, pp. 893–903.
- [254] L. Zhang, Z. Xu, C. Barnes, Y. Zhou, Q. Liu, H. Zhang, S. Amirghodsi, Z. Lin, E. Shechtman, and J. Shi, "Perceptual artifacts localization for image synthesis tasks," in *ICCV*, 2023, pp. 7579–7590.
- [255] M. Zhu, H. Chen, Q. Yan, X. Huang, G. Lin, W. Li, Z. Tu, H. Hu, J. Hu, and Y. Wang, "Genimage: A million-scale benchmark for detecting ai-generated image," *NeurIPS*, vol. 36, 2024.
- [256] T.-Y. Lin, M. Maire, S. Belongie, J. Hays, P. Perona, D. Ramanan, P. Dollár, and C. L. Zitnick, "Microsoft coco: Common objects in context," in *ECCV*. Springer, 2014, pp. 740–755.
- [257] F. Thabtah, S. Hammoud, F. Kamalov, and A. Gonsalves, "Data imbalance in classification: Experimental evaluation," *Inf. Sci.*, vol. 513, pp. 429–441, 2020.
- [258] J. Li, D. Li, C. Xiong, and S. Hoi, "Blip: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training for unified vision-language understanding and generation," in *ICML*. PMLR, 2022, pp. 12 888–12 900.
- [259] R. R. Selvaraju, M. Cogswell, A. Das, R. Vedantam, D. Parikh, and D. Batra, "Grad-cam: Visual explanations from deep networks via gradient-based localization," in *ICCV*, 2017, pp. 618–626.
- [260] A. Chattopadhyay, A. Sarkar, P. Howlader, and V. N. Balasubramanian, "Grad-cam++: Generalized gradient-based visual explanations for deep convolutional networks," in *WACV*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 839–847.
- [261] H. Liu, Z. Tan, C. Tan, Y. Wei, Y. Zhao, and J. Wang, "Forgery-aware adaptive transformer for generalizable synthetic image detection," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.16649*, 2023.
- [262] L. Van der Maaten and G. Hinton, "Visualizing data using t-sne." *Journal of machine learning research*, vol. 9, no. 11, 2008.
- [263] J. Deng, C. Lin, P. Hu, C. Shen, Q. Wang, Q. Li, and Q. Li, "Towards benchmarking and evaluating deepfake detection," *IEEE Trans. Dependable Secur. Comput.*, 2024.
- [264] Z. Yan, Y. Zhang, X. Yuan, S. Lyu, and B. Wu, "Deepfakebench: A comprehensive benchmark of deepfake detection," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.01426*, 2023.
- [265] Y. Li and L. Du, "Semi-fragile watermarking for image tamper localization and self-recovery," in *SPAC*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 328–333.
- [266] J. Sabel and F. Johansson, "On the robustness and generalizability of face synthesis detection methods," in *CVPR*, 2021, pp. 962–971.