

Single-Model Attribution for Spoofed Speech via Vocoder Fingerprints in an Open-World Setting

Matías Pizarro^{1,*}, Mike Laszkiewicz^{1,*}, Dorothea Kolossa², Asja Fischer¹

¹Faculty of Computer Science, Ruhr University Bochum, Germany

²Electronic Systems of Medical Engineering, Technische Universität Berlin, Germany

*Both authors contributed equally

Abstract—As speech generation technology advances, so do the potential threats of misusing spoofed speech signals. One way to address these threats is by attributing the signals to their source generative model. In this work, we are the first to tackle the single-model attribution task in an open-world setting, that is, we aim at identifying whether spoofed speech signals from unknown sources originate from a specific vocoder. We show that the standardized average residual between audio signals and their low-pass filtered or EnCodec filtered versions can serve as powerful vocoder fingerprints. The approach only requires data from the target vocoder and allows for simple but highly accurate distance-based model attribution. We demonstrate its effectiveness on LJSpeech and JSUT, achieving an average AUROC of over 99% in most settings. The accompanying robustness study shows that it is also resilient to noise levels up to a certain degree.

Index Terms—text-to-speech, vocoder fingerprints, attribution of audio deepfakes, open-world setting

I. INTRODUCTION

With the rapid advancement of synthetic data generation technologies, distinguishing between genuine and artificial speech signals has become increasingly challenging. This issue is particularly relevant today, because public and open-source tools enable even those with minimal expertise to produce highly realistic voices that closely resemble human speech [1], [2]. Although these technologies offer numerous advantages, such as enhancing accessibility for the speech-impaired [3] and supporting multilingual communication [4], they also pose several risks. These include the potential misuse of generated media for spreading disinformation or fake news [5], conducting spoofing attacks on biometric systems that use automatic speaker verification [6], misleading juries in criminal trials by presenting forged evidence [7], or by cloning voices to impersonate individuals for phishing or other types of fraud [8], [9]. Given these risks, different countermeasures against spoofed speech signals were proposed.

Current research in deepfake detection mainly focuses on binary classification, as mirrored by well-established challenges like the Automatic Speaker Verification Spoofing (ASVspoof) [10] and Audio Deepfake Detection (ADD) [11]. However, a significant gap remains in the ability to identify from which model a piece of spoofed speech signal was most likely generated—a process known as *model attribution* or *algorithm recognition*. Identifying the source algorithm




Fig. 1: WGlows model attribution assessment by scoring unseen inputs from different vocoders and inputs generated from the same vocoder. Lower Mahalanobis distance indicates that a sample is more likely to stem from the WGlows vocoder.

of spoofed speech signals is important for several reasons, including supporting intellectual property protection, preventing copyright infringement, and ensuring that publicly shared information remains genuine. While only a few studies [12], [13] have developed multiclass classifiers that aim at predicting which vocoder—a key element of text-to-speech (TTS) systems—was used to generate a given speech sample, these classifiers are unfortunately limited to a fixed set of candidate vocoders known during training, a scenario typically referred to as a closed-world setting. The downside of models trained in this setting is that they can not be applied to novel vocoders and thus need to be retrained (which is costly) every time novel vocoders are released, which frequently happens.

To overcome the limitations of existing methods, this paper introduces, to the best of our knowledge, the first single-model attribution technique in an open-world setting. Here, single-model attribution determines whether a sample was generated by a specific vocoder of interest, and an open-world setting corresponds to the system’s ability to distinguish between speech signals generated by a known vocoder and inputs from any previously unseen model. Notably, our method requires only training data from a single target vocoder, making it more adaptable and efficient in handling new and diverse spoofed




Fig. 2: Vocoder fingerprint extraction using the average residuals between audio signals and their EnCodec filtered versions.

audio sources. We conduct an empirical analysis using state-of-the-art vocoders and not only demonstrate, building on previous studies, that vocoders leave unique fingerprints on audio signals, but also that we can successfully extract such fingerprints to trace back the specific vocoder that generated them. Our approach across datasets in two languages achieves outstanding performance in distinguishing spoofed speech signals generated by a specific vocoder from speech signals sourced elsewhere and remains highly robust in the presence of environmental noise.

II. RELATED WORK

In this section, we review previous research on deepfake detection and revisit the concept of generative model fingerprints as they have been proposed in the computer vision domain for generative adversarial networks (GANs).

A. Deepfake Detection

The study of deepfake detection has two main fields of research: spoofing detection systems and vocoder attribution methods. Spoofing detection systems generally consist of two components: an acoustic feature extractor and a classifier. The acoustic feature extractor is designed to extract relevant characteristics from the raw audio input into a form that a classifier can effectively analyze. Examples of effective spectral features include Linear-Frequency Cepstral Coefficients (LFCC) [14], Mel-Frequency Cepstral Coefficients (MFCC) [14], Constant Q Cepstral Coefficients [15], and long-term variable Q transform [16]. The classifier uses these extracted acoustic features to train a model capable of distinguishing real from spoofed audio samples. Classifier models that have demonstrated effectiveness for this task are based on Gaussian mixture models [17] or various types of neural networks like CNNs [18], [19], ResNet [20], [21], Res2Net [22], SENet [23], [24], GNNs [25], [26], RawNet2 [27], DARTS [28], and Transformers [29].

In contrast, vocoder attribution methods aim to determine the specific vocoder that produced the samples. Frank and Schönherr [30] observed that the residuals left by vocoder-generated speech, particularly in the higher frequency ranges, can be attributed to the specific type of vocoder used. Building on this, Yan et al. [12] developed a vocoder detector by

extracting acoustic features with LFCC and training a ResNet-based classifier to identify speech generated from eight distinct vocoders. Similarly, Li et al. [31] proposed a method that uses MFCCs to extract acoustic features trains a lightweight CNN model to classify four different vocoders. During training, for spoofed speech signals, the input is first reconstructed by an autoencoder before extracting the MFCCs. Additionally, Deng et al. [13] created a vocoder detector utilizing Mel spectrograms as acoustic features and training a neural network classifier with patch-wise supervised contrastive learning to detect spoofed speech signals coming from one of six vocoders. Recently, the third track of the ADD 2023 challenge [11] involves model attribution of speech signals. While this challenge also includes open-world model attribution, it differs from our investigated setting in the following three points. First, the attribution techniques were evaluated based on data from 8 different sources, from which 7 were known during training. The existence of multiple models during training allows to leverage latent representations of a trained classifier, as deployed by the winner of the challenge [32], or to make use of contrastive learning, as deployed by the runner-up [33]. In the single-model setting, that is, when restricting the access to data from only a single source during training, these techniques are not applicable. Secondly, the evaluation in ADD puts more emphasis on the closed-world performance as the dataset contains around $7/8 = 87.5\%$ samples from generative models seen during training. In contrast, the focus of this paper lies purely on the open-world attribution task. Lastly, the dataset utilized in ADD is not publicly available and not reproducible.¹

In summary, we conclude that all existing works focus on—or even completely operate within—a closed-world setting. Given its increasing importance, we address the open-world setting, which presents a significantly more challenging problem as it requires handling inputs from versatile unknown sources.

B. GAN Fingerprints

The existence of model-specific fingerprints in images generated by GANs was verified by Marra et al. [34]. Their idea is

¹The dataset cannot be reproduced because the source of the unknown class is not shared.

TABLE I: AUROC for single-model attribution using synthetic English clips w.r.t. distinguishing between samples generated by a target vocoder (as indicated by the row label) and those generated by another source (as indicated by the column label). The scores correspond to the resulting AUROCs when using EnCodec/low-pass filtering.

	Mel-G	PWG	MB-MG	MG-L	FB-MG	HF-G	WGlowl	Avo	BVG	BVG-L	Real	Avg.
Mel-G	-	1.00/1.00	1.00/1.00	0.88/1.00	1.00/1.00	1.00/1.00	1.00/1.00	1.00/1.00	1.00/1.00	1.00/1.00	1.00/1.00	0.99/1.00
PWG	1.00/1.00	-	0.96/1.00	1.00/1.00	0.97/1.00	1.00/1.00	0.99/1.00	0.97/1.00	0.98/1.00	0.99/1.00	0.99/1.00	0.99/1.00
MB-MG	1.00/1.00	0.99/1.00	-	1.00/1.00	0.85/1.00	1.00/1.00	1.00/1.00	0.96/1.00	0.98/1.00	0.99/1.00	0.95/1.00	0.97/1.00
MG-L	0.94/1.00	1.00/1.00	1.00/1.00	-	1.00/1.00	1.00/1.00	1.00/1.00	1.00/1.00	1.00/1.00	1.00/1.00	1.00/1.00	0.99/1.00
FB-MG	1.00/0.99	0.99/0.98	0.82/0.95	1.00/0.99	-	1.00/1.00	1.00/1.00	0.93/0.99	0.97/0.99	0.98/1.00	0.93/0.95	0.96/0.99
HF-G	1.00/1.00	0.99/1.00	1.00/1.00	1.00/1.00	1.00/1.00	-	0.98/1.00	1.00/1.00	1.00/1.00	1.00/1.00	1.00/1.00	1.00/1.00
WGlowl	1.00/1.00	0.98/1.00	0.99/1.00	1.00/1.00	0.99/1.00	0.99/1.00	-	0.99/1.00	0.98/1.00	1.00/1.00	1.00/1.00	0.99/1.00
Avo	1.00/1.00	0.98/1.00	0.91/1.00	1.00/1.00	0.84/0.99	1.00/1.00	1.00/1.00	-	0.97/1.00	0.99/1.00	0.97/1.00	0.97/1.00
BVG	1.00/1.00	1.00/0.99	0.98/1.00	1.00/1.00	0.97/1.00	1.00/1.00	1.00/1.00	0.99/1.00	-	0.96/0.99	0.99/1.00	0.99/1.00
BVG-L	1.00/1.00	1.00/1.00	0.98/1.00	1.00/1.00	0.96/1.00	1.00/1.00	1.00/1.00	0.99/1.00	0.94/1.00	-	0.98/1.00	0.99/1.00

based on the assumption that any artificially generated image X decomposes into its content $I(X)$ and a fingerprint F that is unrelated to the image semantics but specific to the model, that is, $X = I(X) + F$ for every X generated from the model. To extract the fingerprint, they assumed that a suitable image filter f is capable of removing the fingerprint, such that $f(X) \approx I(X)$, and therefore $R := X - f(X) \approx F$. Given a set of generated samples X_1, \dots, X_N , the sample-wise residuals are defined by $R_i := X_i - f(X_i)$ and F is estimated by $\hat{F} := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N R_i$. For inference, i.e., for checking whether a test sample X_{test} contains a fingerprint similar to \hat{F} , they first compute its residual R_{test} as above and then assign the correlation score $s_{\text{cor}}(X_{\text{test}}; \hat{F}) := \langle \hat{R}_{\text{test}}, \hat{F} \rangle \in [-1, 1]$, where \hat{R}_{test} and \hat{F} denote the zero-mean and unit-norm versions of R_{test} and \hat{F} , respectively. Having a set of m different generative models, and therefore, a set of corresponding fingerprints $\hat{F}_1, \dots, \hat{F}_m$, one attributes a sample to the j th model, where $j = \arg \max_{i \in [m]} s_{\text{cor}}(X_{\text{test}}; \hat{F}_i)$. A recent study [35] shows that this fingerprinting technique generalizes to diffusion models (e.g., [36]) and is applicable in an open-world setting for single-model attribution, which is largely unexplored in the audio domain.

III. EXTRACTING AUDIO-FINGERPRINTS

In this section, building upon the fingerprinting methodology for GAN-generated images, we present an approach for extracting fingerprints of generative models for audio and employing them for model attribution. While applying the methodology may sound straightforward at first sight, we are confronted with two major challenges. First, note that the length of audio waveforms is typically not unified. Since the fingerprint however is based on averaging filter-based residuals, it is necessary to find a representation of audio waveforms that is independent of the audio length. To remedy this, we choose the average energy (in dB) per frequency bin $E(X)$ of the audio X , whose size is given by the number of frequency bins of the spectrogram. The second challenge is to find a suitable filter capable of removing noise unrelated to the content of the audio. We found two filters to work particularly well: 1) EnCodec [37], which corresponds to a deep autoencoder developed for compressing audio, and 2)

a low-pass filter that attenuates signal components above a specified cutoff frequency. Specifically, we propose to estimate a fingerprint based on samples X_1, \dots, X_N by

$$\hat{F} := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N R_i, \text{ where } R_i := E(X_i) - f(E(X_i)),$$

where f either corresponds to the low-pass filter or the concatenation of the EnCodec encoder and decoder. Figure 2 shows the fingerprints extracted for some vocoders.

As an alternative to the correlation-based scoring we introduce scoring based on the Mahalanobis distance to the fingerprint, that is defined by

$$s_{\text{md}}(X_{\text{test}}, \hat{F}) := -\sqrt{(R_{\text{test}} - \hat{F})^\top S^{-1} (R_{\text{test}} - \hat{F})},$$

where S^{-1} denotes the inverse of the empirical covariance matrix of the training residuals. In contrast to s_{cor} , s_{md} incorporates the variance and covariance between different energy bins of the residuals and corrects the score accordingly. Figure 1 presents the s_{md} values w.r.t. the target WGlowl vocoder fingerprint for various unseen inputs generated by multiple vocoders, as well as inputs generated by the same target vocoder.

IV. EXPERIMENTS AND RESULTS

This section details our experiments, including dataset selection, fingerprint extraction, and model attribution in an open-world setting. We accompany our experiments with a noise robustness analysis to evaluate the effectiveness of our approach in a more realistic scenario.

A. Datasets

To ensure consistency and comparability, we use the WaveFake [30] dataset along with its extended version [38]. These datasets contain spoofed speech signals generated by 10 different neural network-based architectures, all based on the LJSpeech corpus [39], which includes 13100 English audio clips. The architectures used are MelGAN (Mel-G), Parallel WaveGAN (PWG), Multi-band MelGAN (MB-MG), MelGAN Large (MG-L), Full-band MelGAN (FB-MG), HiFi-GAN (HF-G), WaveGlow (WGlowl), Avocado (Avo), BigVGAN (BVG), and BigVGAN Large (BVG-L). Additionally, the WaveFake

TABLE II: AUROC for single-model attribution using EnCodec/low-pass filtering for synthetic Japanese clips w.r.t. distinguishing between samples generated by a target vocoder (as indicated by the row label) and those generated by another source (as indicated by the column label).

	PWG	MB-MG	Real	Avg.
PWG	-	1.00/1.00	1.00/1.00	1.00/1.00
MB-MG	0.99/1.00	-	1.00/1.00	0.99/1.00

dataset includes spoofed speech signals generated by PWG and MB-MelGAN models using the Japanese JSUT corpus [40], comprising 5000 sentences. We use this additional data to evaluate our approach in a different language.

B. Experimental Setting

We experimented with different feature extraction methods, filter parameters, and score functions to uncover vocoder fingerprints. For the EnCodec filter, the optimal setting involved Short-Time Fourier Transform (STFT) with a window size of 2048 and a hop-length of 128 for feature extraction, a compression rate of 24 kbps, and the s_{cor} as the score function. In contrast, for the low-pass filter, the best results were achieved with an STFT with a window size of 128 and a hop-length of 2 for feature extraction, a cutoff frequency of 1 kHz with a stop band frequency of 1.5 kHz for the filter, and s_{md} as the score function.

To conduct the experiments, we use 80% of the data for training and 20% for testing. For each vocoder, we estimate a fingerprint exclusively on data generated by that particular vocoder, as detailed in Section III. For evaluation, we use a dataset composed of 50% samples generated by the target vocoder and 50% samples from another source (i.e. one other model or real audio) and calculate the attribution score relative to the target vocoder’s fingerprint. The results are reported by the corresponding AUROC values.

To test the robustness of our approach, we evaluate it in a more realistic scenario by adding noise to the test samples using SpeechBrain’s environmental corruption function [2]. We mix noise provided by random samples from the Freesound portion of the MUSAN corpus [41] (which includes 843 recordings of music, speech, and background noise) to the test samples at various signal-to-noise ratios (SNRs) ranging from 0 dB to 40 dB.

C. Open-World Attribution of Vocoders

Table I summarizes the AUROC results for the pairwise single-model attribution using the LJSpeech corpus. Across most model pairs, the AUROC scores are consistently high, often reaching 1.0, indicating perfect distinction between the models. In some rare cases, we observe slightly worse scores of the EnCodec-based approach, such as in the cases of full-band MelGAN (FB-MG) and multiband MelGAN (MB-MG) or MelGAN (Mel-G) and its larger variant, MelGAN Large (MG-L), leading to an AUROC of 0.82 and 0.88, respectively. We hypothesize that this minor decline in performance is due




Fig. 3: Average AUROC for single-model attribution across different noise-levels.

to the similarity between these models. However, the score improved to 0.95 and 1.0, respectively, when using our low-pass filter approach. In general, the results underscore the proposed method’s capability of accurately attributing spoofed speech signals to its corresponding generative vocoder, even in a diverse and challenging open-world scenario. Table II shows results from the Japanese JSUT corpus, showing that both PWG and MB-MG vocoder fingerprints resulted close to perfect AUROC scores in each setting. It is worth noting that our approach also shows high performance in distinguishing data generated by a specific vocoder from real data.

Regarding the noise robustness of our proposal, Figure 3 shows that while environmental noise affects performance, we still achieve average AUROC scores over 0.80 with SNRs greater than 15 dB in both proposed approaches. Notably, we did not perform any type of dataset augmentation to robustify the fingerprint estimates, which could have improved the results even further and which we leave as a subject of future research.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Given that speech-generating models are getting increasingly good and easy to exploit, there is a surging need for vocoder attribution methods in an open-world setting. Our approach, which employs either EnCodec or a low-pass filter for fingerprint extraction, shows excellent performance in distinguishing samples from a target vocoder compared to those from unknown vocoders and real audios, achieving nearly perfect AUROC scores. Moreover, our single-model attribution framework proves effective in noisy conditions, keeping good performance over 15 dB. We are convinced that our approach adds a simple but highly effective technique to the model attribution and deepfake detection toolbox.

Future research could focus on exploring the explainability of how different vocoders produce distinct audio fingerprints and assessing the robustness of our attribution technique against further types of variations, including compression artifacts, different bandwidths, or bit rates.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Yan, J. Shi, Y. Tang, H. Inaguma, Y. Peng, S. Dalmia, P. Polák, P. Fernandes, D. Berrebbi, T. Hayashi, X. Zhang, Z. Ni, M. Hira, S. Maiti, J. Pino, and S. Watanabe, "ESPnet-ST-v2: Multipurpose spoken language translation toolkit," in *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 3: System Demonstrations)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023, pp. 400–411.
- [2] M. Ravanelli, T. Parcollet, A. Moumen, S. de Langen, C. Subakan, P. Plantinga, Y. Wang, P. Mousavi, L. D. Libera, A. Ploujnikov, F. Paissan, D. Borra, S. Zaiem, Z. Zhao, S. Zhang, G. Karakasidis, S.-L. Yeh, P. Champion, A. Rouhe, R. Braun, F. Mai, J. Zuluaga-Gomez, S. M. Mousavi, A. Nautsch, X. Liu, S. Sagar, J. Duret, S. Mdhaffar, G. Laperriere, M. Rouvier, R. D. Mori, and Y. Esteve, "Open-source conversational AI with speechbrain 1.0," 2024.
- [3] S. L. Metzger, K. T. Littlejohn, A. B. Silva, D. A. Moses, M. P. Seaton, R. Wang, M. E. Dougherty, J. R. Liu, P. Wu, M. A. Berger, I. Zhuravleva, A. Tu-Chan, K. Ganguly, G. K. Anumanchipalli, and E. F. Chang, "A high-performance neuroprosthesis for speech decoding and avatar control," *Nature*, vol. 620, pp. 1037–1046, 2023.
- [4] R. Badlani, R. Valle, K. J. Shih, J. F. Santos, S. Gururani, and B. Catanzaro, "RAD-MMM: Multilingual Multiaccented Multispeaker Text To Speech," in *Proc. INTERSPEECH 2023*, 2023, pp. 626–630.
- [5] N. Bontridder and Y. Pouillet, "The role of artificial intelligence in disinformation," *Data N°38; Policy*, vol. 3, p. e32, 2021.
- [6] P. Gupta, H. A. Patil, and R. C. Guido, "Vulnerability issues in automatic speaker verification (ASV) systems," *EURASIP Journal on Audio, Speech, and Music Processing*, vol. 10, 2024.
- [7] R. A. Delfino, "Deepfakes on trial: A call to expand the trial judge's gatekeeping role to protect legal proceedings from technological fakery," *Hastings Law Journal*, vol. 74, no. 2, p. 293, 2023.
- [8] D. Dai, Y. Chen, L. Chen, M. Tu, L. Liu, R. Xia, Q. Tian, Y. Wang, and Y. Wang, "Cloning one's voice using very limited data in the wild," in *ICASSP 2022 - 2022 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, 2022, pp. 8322–8326.
- [9] K. Klapsas, N. Ellinas, K. Nikitaras, G. Vamvoukakis, P. Kakoulidis, K. Markopoulos, S. Raptis, J. S. Sung, G. Jho, A. Chalamandaris, and P. Tsiakoulis, "Self supervised learning for robust voice cloning," in *Proc. Interspeech 2022*, 2022, pp. 4935–4939.
- [10] X. Wang, H. Delgado, H. Tak, J.-w. Jung, H.-j. Shim, M. Todisco, I. Kukanov, X. Liu, M. Sahidullah, T. Kinnunen, N. Evans, K. A. Lee, and J. Yamagishi, "ASVspoof 5: Crowdsourced speech data, deepfakes, and adversarial attacks at scale," in *ASVspoof Workshop 2024*, 2024.
- [11] J. Yi, J. Tao, R. Fu, X. Yan, C. Wang, T. Wang, C. Y. Zhang, X. Zhang, Y. Zhao, Y. Ren, L. Xu, J. Zhou, H. Gu, Z. Wen, S. Liang, Z. Lian, S. Nie, and H. Li, "ADD 2023: the second audio deepfake detection challenge," in *DADA@IJCAI*, 2023.
- [12] X. Yan, J. Yi, J. Tao, C. Wang, H. Ma, T. Wang, S. Wang, and R. Fu, "An initial investigation for detecting vocoder fingerprints of fake audio," in *Proceedings of the 1st International Workshop on Deepfake Detection for Audio Multimedia*, ser. DDAM '22. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2022, p. 61–68.
- [13] J. Deng, Y. Ren, T. Zhang, H. Zhu, and Z. Sun, "VFD-Net: Vocoder fingerprints detection for fake audio," in *ICASSP 2024 - 2024 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, 2024, pp. 12 151–12 155.
- [14] X. Zhou, D. Garcia-Romero, R. Duraiswami, C. Espy-Wilson, and S. Shamma, "Linear versus mel frequency cepstral coefficients for speaker recognition," in *2011 IEEE Workshop on Automatic Speech Recognition & Understanding*, 2011, pp. 559–564.
- [15] M. Todisco, H. Delgado, and N. Evans, "Constant Q cepstral coefficients: A spoofing countermeasure for automatic speaker verification," *Computer Speech & Language*, vol. 45, pp. 516–535, 2017.
- [16] J. Li, H. Wang, P. He, S. M. Abdullahi, and B. Li, "Long-term variable Q transform: A novel time-frequency transform algorithm for synthetic speech detection," *Digital Signal Processing*, vol. 120, p. 103256, 2022.
- [17] Z. Ji, Z.-Y. Li, P. Li, M. An, S. Gao, D. Wu, and F. Zhao, "Ensemble Learning for Countermeasure of Audio Replay Spoofing Attack in ASVspoof2017," in *Proc. Interspeech 2017*, 2017, pp. 87–91.
- [18] Z. Wu, R. K. Das, J. Yang, and H. Li, "Light Convolutional Neural Network with Feature Generalization for Detection of Synthetic Speech Attacks," in *Proc. Interspeech 2020*, 2020, pp. 1101–1105.
- [19] A. Chinthia, B. Thai, S. J. Sohrawardi, K. Bhatt, A. Hickerson, M. Wright, and R. Ptucha, "Recurrent convolutional structures for audio spoof and video deepfake detection," *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, vol. 14, no. 5, pp. 1024–1037, 2020.
- [20] M. Alzantot, Z. Wang, and M. B. Srivastava, "Deep Residual Neural Networks for Audio Spoofing Detection," in *Proc. Interspeech 2019*, 2019, pp. 1078–1082.
- [21] Y. Yang, H. Wang, H. Dinkel, Z. Chen, S. Wang, Y. Qian, and K. Yu, "The SJTU Robust Anti-Spoofing System for the ASVspoof 2019 Challenge," in *Proc. Interspeech 2019*, 2019, pp. 1038–1042.
- [22] J. Kim and S. M. Ban, "Phase-aware spoof speech detection based on Res2net with phase network," in *ICASSP 2023 - 2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, 2023, pp. 1–5.
- [23] C.-I. Lai, N. Chen, J. Villalba, and N. Dehak, "ASSERT: Anti-Spoofing with Squeeze-Excitation and Residual Networks," in *Proc. Interspeech 2019*, 2019, pp. 1013–1017.
- [24] Y. Zhang, W. Wang, and P. Zhang, "The Effect of Silence and Dual-Band Fusion in Anti-Spoofing System," in *Proc. Interspeech 2021*, 2021, pp. 4279–4283.
- [25] H. Tak, J. weon Jung, J. Patino, M. Todisco, and N. Evans, "Graph Attention Networks for Anti-Spoofing," in *Proc. Interspeech 2021*, 2021, pp. 2356–2360.
- [26] J. Jung, H. Heo, H. Tak, H. Shim, J. Chung, B. Lee, H. Yu, and N. Evans, "AASIST: Audio anti-spoofing using integrated spectro-temporal graph attention networks," in *2022 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing, ICASSP 2022 - Proceedings*, 2022, pp. 2405–2409.
- [27] H. Tak, J. Patino, M. Todisco, A. Nautsch, N. Evans, and A. Larcher, "End-to-End anti-spoofing with RawNet2," in *ICASSP 2021 - 2021 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, 2021, pp. 6369–6373.
- [28] W. Ge, M. Panariello, J. Patino, M. Todisco, and N. Evans, "Partially-Connected Differentiable Architecture Search for Deepfake and Spoofing Detection," in *Proc. Interspeech 2021*, 2021, pp. 4319–4323.
- [29] X. Liu, M. Liu, L. Wang, K. A. Lee, H. Zhang, and J. Dang, "Leveraging positional-related local-global dependency for synthetic speech detection," in *ICASSP 2023 - 2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, 2023, pp. 1–5.
- [30] J. Frank and L. Schönherr, "WaveFake: A Data Set to Facilitate Audio Deepfake Detection," in *Thirty-fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*, 2021.
- [31] F. Li, Y. Chen, H. Liu, Z. Zhao, Y. Yao, and X. Liao, "Vocoder Detection of Spoofing Speech Based on GAN Fingerprints and Domain Generalization," *ACM Trans. Multimedia Comput. Commun. Appl.*, vol. 20, no. 6, mar 2024.
- [32] J. Lu, Y. Zhang, Z. Li, Z. Shang, W. Wang, and P. Zhang, "Detecting unknown speech spoofing algorithms with nearest neighbors," in *DADA@IJCAI*, 2023.
- [33] X. Qin, X. Wang, Y. Chen, Q. Meng, and M. Li, "From speaker verification to deepfake algorithm recognition: Our learned lessons from ADD2023 track 3," in *DADA@IJCAI*, 2023.
- [34] F. Marra, D. Gragnaniello, L. Verdoliva, and G. Poggi, "Do GANs leave artificial fingerprints?" in *2019 IEEE conference on multimedia information processing and retrieval (MIPR)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 506–511.
- [35] M. Laszkiewicz, J. Ricker, J. Lederer, and A. Fischer, "Single-model attribution of generative models through final-layer inversion," in *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024.
- [36] R. Rombach, A. Blattmann, D. Lorenz, P. Esser, and B. Ommer, "High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models," in *CVPR*, 2022.
- [37] A. Défossez, J. Copet, G. Synnaeve, and Y. Adi, "High fidelity neural audio compression," *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023.
- [38] K. Gasenzer and M. Wolter, "Towards generalizing deep-audio fake detection networks," *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2024.
- [39] K. Ito and L. Johnson, "The LJ Speech Dataset," <https://keithito.com/LJ-Speech-Dataset/>, 2017.
- [40] R. Sonobe, S. Takamichi, and H. Saruwatari, "JSUT corpus: free large-scale japanese speech corpus for end-to-end speech synthesis," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1711.00354, 2017.
- [41] T. Ko, V. Peddinti, D. Povey, M. L. Seltzer, and S. Khudanpur, "A study on data augmentation of reverberant speech for robust speech recognition," in *2017 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 5220–5224.