

Towards a Universal Synthetic Video Detector: From Face or Background Manipulations to Fully AI-Generated Content

Rohit Kundu^{1,2}, Hao Xiong¹, Vishal Mohanty¹, Athula Balachandran¹, Amit K. Roy-Chowdhury²

¹Google, Mountain View, USA ²University of California, Riverside

{rohitkun, haoxg, vishalmohanty, athula}@google.com, amitrc@ece.ucr.edu

Abstract

Existing DeepFake detection techniques primarily focus on facial manipulations, such as face-swapping or lip-syncing. However, advancements in text-to-video (T2V) and image-to-video (I2V) generative models now allow fully AI-generated synthetic content and seamless background alterations, challenging face-centric detection methods and demanding more versatile approaches.

To address this, we introduce the Universal Network for Identifying Tampered and synthEtic videos (UNITE) model, which, unlike traditional detectors, captures full-frame manipulations. UNITE extends detection capabilities to scenarios without faces, non-human subjects, and complex background modifications. It leverages a transformer-based architecture that processes domain-agnostic features extracted from videos via the SigLIP-So400M foundation model. Given limited datasets encompassing both facial/background alterations and T2V/I2V content, we integrate task-irrelevant data alongside standard DeepFake datasets in training. We further mitigate the model’s tendency to over-focus on faces by incorporating an attention-diversity (AD) loss, which promotes diverse spatial attention across video frames. Combining AD loss with cross-entropy improves detection performance across varied contexts. Comparative evaluations demonstrate that UNITE outperforms state-of-the-art detectors on datasets (in cross-data settings) featuring face/background manipulations and fully synthetic T2V/I2V videos, showcasing its adaptability and generalizable detection capabilities.

1. Introduction

The rise of synthetic media, especially DeepFakes, has transformed content perception and interaction online. Hyper-realistic images produced by technologies like FLUX_{1.1} [1] are challenging for even humans to identify as fake, and with the development of their video model under-way, this underscores the critical need for effective detec-




Figure 1. **Problem Overview:** Existing DeepFake detection methods primarily focus on identifying face-manipulated videos, most of which cannot perform inference unless there is a face detected in the video. However, with advancements like seamless background modifications (e.g., AVID [61]) and hyper-realistic content from games like GTA-V [24] and T2V/I2V models [9], a more comprehensive approach is needed. A model trained with only cross-entropy (CE) loss, using full frames, automatically focuses on the face, capturing temporal discontinuities through its transformer architecture, performing better than random (\approx) on T2V/I2V content but struggling with background manipulations. UNITE, with its attention-diversity (AD) loss, effectively detects both face/background manipulations and fully synthetic content.

tion methods for media generated by deep neural networks. Traditional DeepFake generators [28, 49] focus on manipulating human faces through face-swapping and lip-syncing. However, powerful text-to-video (T2V) and image-to-video (I2V) models [42, 52, 63] have expanded manipulation possibilities beyond faces.

While conventional detectors [10, 45, 57] perform well on older, face-centric DeepFake datasets [17, 30, 43], they often struggle with newer manipulations involving full scenes or backgrounds. DeepFake-O-Meter [26] is an open-source tool (consisting of several state-of-the-art models) for DeepFake detection, but it cannot run inference unless a human face is visible in the image/video. The rapid spread

of misinformation, particularly during critical periods such as elections, highlights the need for generalizable detection models capable of identifying diverse manipulations, including face, background, and fully AI-generated T2V/I2V content with/without human subjects (overview in Fig. 1).

To address these challenges, we present a Universal Network for Identifying Tampered and synthEtic videos or UNITE model, which detects both partially manipulated (foreground/background) and fully synthetic videos. Unlike detectors focused solely on face detection, UNITE analyzes entire frames, regardless of whether a human subject is present in the videos.

Given the inherent domain gaps in DeepFake datasets [44, 64], even when generated by similar techniques, we leverage the SigLIP-So400m [4] foundation model to extract domain-agnostic features. This serves as inputs to a learnable transformer with multi-head attention, enabling effective detection by capturing temporal inconsistencies in synthetic content. However, preliminary experiments show that training a transformer architecture solely with cross-entropy (CE) loss often leads to the attention heads converging on the face region (Fig. 3). As a result, the model struggles during inference when handling videos where a real human subject is placed in a manipulated background or content generated by T2V [8, 52] and I2V [35, 63] models. To address this, we introduce an “attention-diversity” (AD) loss that encourages attention heads to focus on different spatial regions, enhancing the model’s ability to capture critical cues from both foreground and background.

Due to the limited availability of open-source datasets covering face or background manipulations and fully AI-generated content, we employ innovative training strategies for UNITE. This includes integrating task-irrelevant data with standard DeepFake datasets to simulate AI-generated synthetic media. Beyond the popularly used FaceForensics++ [43] dataset, we utilize the SAIL-VOS-3D [24] dataset, originally designed for 3D video object segmentation in the game GTA-V. As this dataset is fully synthetic, it helps simulate AI-generated media, enhancing our model’s ability to detect diverse forms of synthetic manipulation.

Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We propose UNITE, a model for detecting partially manipulated (foreground/background) and fully synthetic videos, moving beyond face-centric DeepFake detection.
- Unlike detectors relying on face detection and cropping, our model can process full video frames and can detect fakes even if there are no human subjects.
- Using the SigLIP-So400m foundation model [4], we extract domain-agnostic features, enabling generalization to in-the-wild DeepFakes.
- We introduce an attention-diversity loss, encouraging attention heads to focus on diverse spatial regions, enhancing detection beyond face manipulations.

- Unlike existing methods that evaluate on a few datasets, we comprehensively assess UNITE on a broad range of face and synthetic datasets with various T2V/I2V generators, outperforming detection in foreground, background, and T2V/I2V manipulations.

2. Related Work

Face-centric DeepFake Detection: Methods such as [13, 19, 40] focus on modeling spatial inconsistencies for DeepFake detection. Concas et al. [13] track specific facial features (eyes, nose, mouth) in a high-frequency domain, as fake videos exhibit distinct behaviors in this space compared to real ones. However, due to their dataset-centric architectures, it is not a generalizable approach. PUDD [40] learns person-specific prototypes by modeling patterns from real videos and assessing how closely inference videos match these prototypes, making it less effective for detecting in-the-wild DeepFakes. LAA-Net [39] attempts to improve generalizability through a multi-task attention module that detects artifacts via heatmap and self-consistency regression, but it works by analyzing every still frame of a video, thus limiting its scalability. Mazaheri et al. [36] tackled the challenging problem of detecting and localizing expression swaps, where the number of manipulated pixels is even fewer compared to identity swaps. Although the authors obtained good localization performance, their reliance on a CNN-based architecture limits their ability to capture temporal inconsistencies effectively.

DPNet [50] and ID-Reveal [16] are identity-aware temporal artifact modeling methods: DPNet [50] focuses on interpretable, prototype-based detection of unnatural movements through dynamic feature representations, while ID-Reveal [16] leverages metric learning on real data to detect biometric inconsistencies. However these methods assume access to authentic reference videos, making them unfit for in-the-wild DeepFake detection. Shifting from identity-specific methods, TALL [57] constructs composite “thumbnail” images from four consecutive frames taken at random timestamps for temporal analysis. TI2Net [32] captures temporal anomalies by subtracting consecutive frame features but relies on the assumption that FaceSwap manipulations show pronounced inter-frame discrepancies.

Choi et al. [11] approach DeepFake detection by targeting suppressed variance in style-based latent temporal features via a StyleGRU module. However, this method is limited to cropped face regions, making it ineffective for T2V/I2V or background-manipulated videos.

Synthetic Video Detection: While there has been considerable effort in synthetic image detection [14, 15, 55], synthetic video detection is a scarcely explored area. DeMamba [9], a recently proposed synthetic video detector, analyzes small zones of video frames to capture how pixels change spatiotemporally. Its continuous scanning approach




Figure 2. **UNITE architecture overview:** We extract domain-agnostic features (ξ) using the SigLIP-So400m foundation model [4] to mitigate domain gaps between DeepFake datasets (Sec. 3.2). These embeddings, combined with positional encodings, are input to a transformer with multi-head attention and MLP layers (Sec. 3.3), culminating in a classifier for final predictions. AD-loss (Sec. 3.4) encourages the model attention to span diverse spatial regions.

better tracks subtle changes and patterns, making it easier to spot manipulated or fake content. The authors also propose a million scale T2V/I2V dataset (which we call the DeMamba dataset hereforth) to evaluate their performance. However, the method was not evaluated on typical DeepFake datasets [30, 43, 53] and thus is not fit for human-centric DeepFake detection. In contrast our UNITE model is built to detect partially manipulated as well as fully AI-generated videos. A key reason for the scarcity of synthetic video detection methods in the literature is the lack of standardized datasets for training and evaluation.

3. Proposed Method

In this section we first describe our problem setup (Sec. 3.1), then we describe the foundation model-based video encoding (Sec. 3.2), our trainable transformer architecture (Sec. 3.3) and finally the novel loss function for training the UNITE model (Sec. 3.4). The overview of the UNITE architecture is shown in Fig. 2.

3.1. Problem Setup

For each video in the dataset, we implement a frame sampling strategy where every other frame is extracted. From the resulting collection of frames, we construct video segment samples consisting of $n_f = 64$ consecutive frames, which are defined as a single data sample, denoted as “ v ”. This selection aligns with the context window established for our video transformer model, ensuring that each sample retains the temporal coherence necessary for effective train-

ing. In instances where the video duration results in fewer than n_f frames, we apply padding (ablation in supplementary) to ensure that each sample remains uniform in size.

Given that the original video-level classification labels are known and fake videos contain manipulations throughout their entirety (i.e., no videos have manipulations limited to specific frames), each n_f -frame segment generated from a given video is assigned the same label (denoted by $l \in 0, \dots, n_c$) as the source video, with number of possible classes as n_c . The aggregation of these samples across all videos forms our final dataset, $v_i, l_{i=1}^N \in \mathcal{V}$, where N is the total number of samples obtained. This approach serves as a data augmentation technique, increasing the number of training samples without additional data collection.

3.2. Domain-Agnostic Feature Extraction

Our objective is to leverage the trained UNITE model for detecting in-the-wild DeepFakes, necessitating careful consideration of the domain gap [7, 34] between the train and test datasets. To effectively mitigate the impact of domain discrepancies, we utilize the SigLIP foundation model [59] to extract domain-agnostic features. Specifically, we employ the “shape-optimized” ViT [4] image encoder, whose architecture is rooted in [18]. The SigLIP-So400m [4] model was contrastively pretrained on 3B diverse examples using a sigmoid loss, enabling it to capture robust, generalizable features while maintaining a compact size (400M parameters). This extensive pretraining makes SigLIP particularly adept at extracting domain-invariant representations, crucial for handling the significant variability encountered in DeepFake datasets and real-world scenarios.

For every frame f_j (resized to $\mathbb{R}^{384 \times 384 \times 3}$), of a video sample $v_i \in \mathcal{V}$, we obtain an image encoding from the frozen SigLIP-So400m [4] model as $e_j = \text{SigLIP}(f_j) \in \mathbb{R}^{t_s \times d_s}$, where $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n_f\}$, since there are n_f frames per video sample (as explained in Sec. 3.1), $t_s = 729$ represents the token length and $d_s = 1152$ represents the feature dimension. We concatenate these frame-level features for the video sample v_i , while maintaining the order of the frames, to obtain a video segment encoding denoted by $\xi_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_f \times t_s \times d_s}$, which are used as input to our trainable transformer architecture. This encoded video dataset can be denoted as $\{\xi_i, l_i\}_{i=1}^N \in \mathcal{V}_\xi$.

3.3. Learnable Transformer Architecture

The UNITE architecture is a multi-head self-attention (MHSA) based transformer model designed specifically for video classification tasks. It leverages the strengths of Transformer networks to process sequences of video frame embeddings effectively, allowing for robust classification performance. The UNITE architecture allows for adjustable depth, signifying the number of encoder blocks stacked within the model. A deeper architecture can capture more

intricate features and dependencies at the cost of increased computational complexity. For our architecture the depth is set to 4. Ablation experiments with different transformer depths are provided in Sec. 4.4.

3.3.1. Encoder Block

Each encoder block consists of the following components: **Multi-Head Self-Attention Layer:** This layer allows the model to focus on different parts of the input sequence simultaneously. With 12 attention heads in our architecture, it captures diverse interactions and dependencies among frames. Each head computes attention scores independently, learning multiple representations of the input data. This enhances the model’s ability to detect subtle temporal variations, which is crucial for video classification. The use of scaled dot-product attention further helps mitigate large gradients and stabilizes training.

Layer Normalization and Residual Connections: To aid gradient flow during training, each sub-layer incorporates residual connections that add the input back to the output, mitigating vanishing gradient issues in deep networks. Layer normalization follows to stabilize activations and enhance convergence speed. Additionally, dropout is applied post-attention to reduce overfitting by randomly deactivating a portion of neurons during training.

Feed-Forward Network (MLP): The second sub-layer is a point-wise feed-forward network with two dense layers separated by a GELU activation [23]. This MLP enables non-linear feature transformations, enhancing the model’s expressiveness. By projecting attention outputs into a higher-dimensional space before reducing them, it captures complex interactions beyond linear transformations.

Attention maps are derived from the outputs of the encoder blocks to be used for computing the Attention-Diversity loss (Sec. 3.4) and to illustrate how the model prioritizes different spatial regions in the frames during the classification process (Fig. 3). This interpretability is valuable for understanding the model’s decision-making, particularly in complex video classification scenarios.

3.3.2. Positional Encoding

We utilize a sine-cosine positional encoding scheme following the original transformer [51] to provide a unique position identifier for each input token. For every frame f_j in the video sample with encoded feature dimension d_s (as per Sec. 3.2), we compute the positional encoding for odd and even indexed feature dimensions as,

$$PE_{(j,2i+1)} = \cos\left(\frac{j}{10000^{\frac{2i}{d_s}}}\right), \quad PE_{(j,2i)} = \sin\left(\frac{j}{10000^{\frac{2i}{d_s}}}\right), \quad (1)$$

where, i denotes the feature index in the encoded feature dimension d_s . We embed these encodings directly into the input tokens of our video transformer to provide positional

context, for better temporal modeling during the attention computation with minimal computational overhead.

3.4. Attention-Diversity Loss

Training a multi-head attention transformer with only cross-entropy loss makes the attention maps focus only on the face regions of the frame (as evident in Fig. 3). However, we aim to detect fake videos where the manipulation might not be in the face at all, and instead be in the background (like video inpainting with the AVID model [61]). To ensure that the attention heads focus on diverse spatial regions of the video frames, we devise the ‘‘Attention-Diversity’’ (AD) loss.

AD-loss is designed to minimize overlap among attention maps (obtained from the first encoder block of the trainable transformer architecture in 3.3.1) while maintaining consistency across different input video samples. The attention outputs from the video transformer model $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_h \times t_s \times d_s}$ are used to pool the input SigLIP-So400m features $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{n_f \times t_s \times d_s}$, resulting in a pooled feature tensor $\mathcal{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_h \times n_f}$ according to,

$$\mathcal{P} = \sum_{j=1}^{t_s} \sum_{k=1}^{d_s} \mathcal{A}_{h,j,k} \cdot \xi_{f,j,k}, \quad (2)$$

where f indexes the frames (n_f), h indexes the number of attention heads (n_h), and j, k are spatial positions.

We compute ‘‘feature centers’’ which are points in the feature space that serve as anchors for the learned representations of different classes. These centers represent the average features of samples from a particular class, allowing the model to capture essential characteristics of that class. In the context of the AD-loss, feature centers $\mathcal{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_h \times n_f}$ are dynamically updated in each training iteration τ based on the pooled feature vectors \mathcal{P} , following,

$$\mathcal{C}^\tau = \mathcal{C}^{\tau-1} - \eta \left(\mathcal{C}^{\tau-1} - \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \mathcal{P}_b \right), \quad (3)$$

where η represents the learning rate (set to 0.05 in our experiments) for feature center updates and B is the batch dimension. The feature centers are initialized with zeros ($\mathcal{C}^0 = [0]_{n_h \times n_f}$) at the beginning of the model training.

AD-loss consists of two distinct components: within-class loss and between-class loss inspired by the Fisher Discriminant Analysis for deep networks [22]. The within-class term calculates the distance between the pooled feature vectors \mathcal{P} and their corresponding feature centers \mathcal{C} , promoting closeness among similar samples. The between-class term measures the distance between feature centers of different classes, encouraging them to be spaced apart in the feature space, encouraging separability.

The within-class loss term is calculated as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{within}} = \max(\|\mathcal{P} - \mathcal{C}\|_2 - \delta_{\text{within}}, 0), \quad (4)$$

where, $\delta_{\text{within}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_c}$ is a hyperparameter controlling the allowable distance between feature vectors and their respective feature centers for inputs of the same class, encouraging tighter clustering and $\|\cdot\|_2$ represents L_2 normalization.

The between-class loss is calculated as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{between}} = \sum_{\substack{k \neq l \\ (k,l) \in (n_h, n_h)}} \max(\delta_{\text{between}} - \|\mathcal{C}_k - \mathcal{C}_l\|_2, 0), \quad (5)$$

where δ_{between} is a predefined hyperparameter that ensures a minimum distance between feature centers of different classes. Thus the AD-loss is a simple addition of these two components $\mathcal{L}_{AD} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{within}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{between}}$, making the final objective function for training the UNITE model,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{UNITE}} = \lambda_1 \cdot \mathcal{L}_{CE} + \lambda_2 \cdot \mathcal{L}_{AD}, \quad (6)$$

where \mathcal{L}_{CE} is the traditional cross-entropy loss, and λ_1 and λ_2 are loss-weighting hyperparameters.

4. Experiments

4.1. Datasets

Most DeepFake datasets primarily focus on face manipulations, such as face-swaps or lip-syncing, and lack fully AI-generated video content. The DeMamba dataset [9] features videos from T2V/I2V models, including powerful diffusion models like SORA [5]. It is not a human-centric dataset and primarily contains videos from natural scenes. We use its validation split to evaluate UNITE.

To train UNITE, we employ the FaceForensics++ (FF++) [43] dataset (c23 i.e., medium-quality) and the SAIL-VOS-3D dataset [24], which includes synthetic (although not AI-generated) GTA-V game videos featuring human subjects suitable for DeepFake detection. To evaluate the UNITE model, we use:

- **Face manipulated data:** FF++ [43] (in-domain evaluation), CelebDF [30], DeeperForensics [25], Deepfake-TIMIT [27], HifiFace [53], UADFV [58].
- **Background manipulated data:** Sample videos from the AVID [61] model provided publicly by the authors.
- **Fully synthetic data:** GTA-V [24] (in-domain evaluation), DeMamba [9].
- **In-the-wild DeepFakes:** Publicly available videos from the New York Times DeepFake quiz [48].

4.2. Results and Discussion

Evaluation Metrics: Although most DeepFake detection methods primarily report accuracy, we evaluate UNITE using additional metrics: (1) *AUC* (Area Under the Precision-Recall Curve); (2) *Precision@0.5* and (3) *Recall@0.5* at a 0.5 confidence threshold; (4) *Precs@Rec=0.8* (precision at 0.8 recall); (5) *Rec@Precs=0.8* (recall at 0.8 precision).

Training Details: UNITE is trained using an AdamW optimizer [33] with an initial learning rate of 0.0001 and a decay rate of 0.5 every 1000 steps. For AD-loss, $\delta_{\text{between}} = 0.5$ and δ_{within} is set to $[0.01, -2]$ for binary and $[0.01, -2, 1]$ for fine-grained classification in Sec. 4.3 (see supplementary for sensitivity). Loss weights are $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0.5$. Training uses a batch size of 32 for 25 epochs on 8 TPUv3 chips, with the framework implemented in TensorFlow.

Quantitative Results: The results obtained by the UNITE model when trained on FF++ [43] alone, and when trained with both FF++ [43] and GTA-V [24] data and evaluated on the various datasets mentioned in Sec. 4.1 are shown in Table 1. On the AVID [61] and DeMamba datasets [9], the model performs poorly when trained with only face manipulated data, but the performance enhances several-fold when the GTA-V [24] synthetic data, even though it is not AI-generated, is used in training.

Interestingly, when evaluating on face-manipulated datasets such as CelebDF [30] and DeeperForensics [25], we observe a performance boost, particularly for CelebDF [30], when GTA-V [24] data is included in the training set. Intuitively, one would expect that training solely on FF++ [43] would yield similar results since the inference set consists of similar face-manipulated data. This deviation from the expected behavior comes from the contribution of the AD-Loss, as the ablation study (Fig. 4) using only CE-loss compared to both CE and AD-losses reveals that the performance is enhanced with GTA-V [24] data in training only in the latter (detailed discussion in Sec. 4.4).

To evaluate UNITE on in-the-wild DeepFakes, we attempted the recent New York Times quiz [48] (denoted by NYTimes) which provides 10 videos (4 real and 6 fake) for testing DeepFake detectors. UNITE got 8 of those 10 videos correct, even though some of the face-swap videos were indistinguishable from real videos, even by humans. On all the AI-generated videos, UNITE made the correct prediction (when trained on FF++ [43] and GTA-V [24]).

Attention Heatmaps: To analyze the impact of CE and AD-losses on attention distribution, we extracted attention features from the first encoder of the UNITE model, comparing models trained with CE loss alone versus that trained with both CE and AD-losses. The resulting heatmaps, shown in Fig. 3, reveal that the model trained with only CE loss tends to concentrate primarily on the face region. In contrast, the model trained with the combined CE+AD loss demonstrates a broader attention span across the frame, as evidenced by a lighter, more distributed bluish tone in the heatmaps, indicating increased spatial diversity in the model’s focus. This is why on the example shown in the first row (face-manipulated video) both models give the correct prediction (“fake”) with high confidence, but on the row-2 example (video generated from the Sora [6] T2V model) the model trained with only CE loss predicted “real” with a

Table 1. Results from the UNITE model trained with (1) FF++ [43] only and (2) FF++ [43] combined with GTA-V [24]. All other results reflect cross-dataset evaluations except for FF++ and GTA-V (when trained). Performance gains are highlighted in green.

Train		Test						
FF++	GTA-V	Dataset	Accuracy	AUC	Precision@0.5	Recall@0.5	Precs@Rec=0.8	Rec@Precs=0.8
<i>Face Manipulated Data</i>								
✓		FF++	99.53%	99.77%	99.94%	99.49%	99.94%	99.94%
✓		CelebDF	72.61%	94.05%	96.45%	61.22%	80.45%	61.22%
✓		DeeperForensics	91.35%	100.00%	100.00%	91.35%	100.00%	91.35%
✓		DeepfakeTIMIT	86.90%	86.46%	83.61%	83.97%	88.90%	81.33%
✓		HifiFace	63.63%	62.47%	67.12%	63.63%	59.30%	63.63%
✓		UADFV	94.12%	94.38%	95.68%	97.11%	93.79%	94.38%
✓	✓	FF++	99.96%(+0.43)	99.89%(+0.12)	100.00%(+0.06)	99.84%(+0.35)	100.00%(+0.06)	99.96%(+0.02)
✓	✓	CelebDF	95.11%(+22.50)	94.36%(+0.31)	96.82%(+0.37)	68.75%(+7.53)	96.53%(+16.08)	68.75%(+7.53)
✓	✓	DeeperForensics	99.62%(+8.27)	100.00%(+0.00)	100.00%(+0.00)	99.62%(+8.27)	100.00%(+0.00)	99.63%(+8.28)
✓	✓	DeepfakeTIMIT	91.90%(+5.00)	91.33%(+4.87)	90.45%(+6.84)	88.39%(+4.42)	100.00%(+11.10)	91.95%(+10.62)
✓	✓	HifiFace	75.62%(+11.99)	81.24%(+18.77)	79.55%(+12.43)	71.71%(+8.08)	75.62%(+16.32)	72.47%(+8.84)
✓	✓	UADFV	97.01%(+2.89)	94.95%(+0.57)	96.89%(+1.21)	100.00%(+2.89)	94.12%(+0.33)	100.00%(+5.62)
<i>Background Manipulated Data</i>								
✓		AVID	41.67%	33.33%	33.33%	41.67%	41.67%	33.33%
✓	✓	AVID	100.00%(+58.33)	100.00%(+66.67)	100.00%(+66.67)	100.00%(+58.33)	100.00%(+58.33)	100.00%(+66.67)
<i>Fully Synthetic Data</i>								
✓		GTA-V	60.16%	61.52%	60.16%	58.73%	63.29%	58.73%
✓		DeMamba	61.47%	57.38%	67.73%	33.01%	62.15%	54.16%
✓	✓	GTA-V	100.00%(+39.84)	100.00%(+38.48)	100.00%(+39.84)	100.00%(+41.27)	100.00%(+36.71)	100.00%(+41.27)
✓	✓	DeMamba	87.12%(+25.65)	93.75%(+36.67)	92.76%(+25.03)	89.60%(+56.59)	89.81%(+27.66)	92.12%(+37.96)
<i>In-the-wild DeepFakes</i>								
✓		NYTimes [48]	50.00%	53.74%	50.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%
✓	✓	NYTimes [48]	80.00%(+30.00)	97.42%(+43.68)	83.33%(+33.33)	83.33%(+58.33)	60.00%(+60.00)	100.00%(+100.00)

Table 2. **SOTA Comparison on Face-Manipulated Data:** We compared the performance of UNITE with recent DeepFake detectors, in terms of detection accuracy on various face manipulated datasets. UNITE outperforms the existing methods. **Bold** shows the current best results and the previous best and second-best results are highlighted in red and blue respectively.

Method	FF++	CelebDF	DeeperForensics	UADFV
TALL [57]	98.65%	90.79%	99.62%	-
ISTVT [62]	99.00%	84.10%	98.60%	-
Concas et al. [13]	99.49%	-	-	-
PUDD [40]	-	95.10%	-	-
T2Net [32]	99.95%	68.22%	76.08%	-
LRNet [46]	99.89%	53.20%	56.77%	-
Choi et al. [11]	89.00%	89.00%	99.00%	-
Lin et al. [31]	98.28%	74.42%	-	-
Guo et al. [21]	99.24%	84.97%	-	-
Li et al. (Res-152) [29]	-	-	-	93.80%
HeadPose [58]	-	-	-	89.00%
CVIT [56]	93.00%	-	-	93.75%
FakeCatcher [12]	94.65%	91.50%	-	-
MesoNet [3]	-	-	-	82.40%
UNITE (Ours)	99.96%	95.11%	99.62%	97.01%

confidence score of 99.25% (which is wrong), but the model trained with CE+AD losses predicted “fake” with a confidence of 100.00%, which is correct.

Comparison on Face Manipulated Data: UNITE is compared with recent state-of-the-art (SOTA) DeepFake detection models in Table 2. The methods we compared against were specifically designed for detecting face manipulations and often crop faces from the videos, during both training and inference of the models. However, UNITE, which is designed to detect a diverse range of fake videos, still outperforms these detectors.

Comparison on Synthetic Data: We evaluated UNITE against state-of-the-art synthetic video detectors on the DeMamba dataset [9] (validation split), with results in Table 3. While existing detectors were trained on the DeMamba train split and validated on the DeMamba validation split, UNITE was trained on FF++ [43] and GTA-V [24]. Despite not being trained on DeMamba, UNITE’s average performance (including real videos) surpassed current SOTA de-




Figure 3. Comparison of attention heatmaps when UNITE is trained with only CE loss (second column) versus CE and AD-losses (third column). The CE-loss heatmap predominantly focuses on the face region, whereas the CE+AD loss heatmap demonstrates more distributed attention across the entire frame, as indicated by a broader bluish tone in the heatmaps. Both samples are “fake” videos– (a) is taken from Celeb-DF [30] and (d) is taken from DeMamba [9] and generated by OpenAI’s Sora [6] (Best viewed as GIFs provided in the supplementary material). Yellow to blue shades show increasing attention in the plot.

ectors, with competitive generator-wise results.

Thus, UNITE reliably detects a diverse range of fake videos (even in cross-domain settings), including T2V/I2V videos and background manipulations, while consistently maintaining state-of-the-art performance on traditional face-manipulated data. UNITE eliminates the need to have separate DeepFake and T2V/I2V video detector models by handling both tasks within a single trained model.

4.3. Finegrained Evaluation

In fake media detection, flagging videos partially or fully manipulated by AI also necessitates fine-grained classification into three classes: (1) real videos, (2) partially manipulated videos, and (3) fully synthetic videos. While binary real vs. fake classification may suffice to curb misinformation, fine-grained classification offers greater explainability in otherwise black-box models.

Table 3. **SOTA Comparison on Synthetic Data:** On the DeMamba dataset (validation split), we compare the performance of UNITE, which was *NOT* trained on DeMamba train split, against state-of-the-art detectors which were trained on DeMamba train split (results taken from Chen et al. [9]). We report the results (P = Precision and R = Recall) on the individual T2V/I2V generators and the average performance across the entire validation set (*Avg*, which also includes real videos). Although the direct comparison is unfair against UNITE which was trained with FF++ [43] and GTA-V [24], our method still outperforms these synthetic video detectors. **Bold** shows the current best results and the previous best and second-best results are highlighted in red and blue respectively.

Method	Metrics	Sora [6]	Morph Studio [2]	Runway ML (Gen2) [42]	HotShot [38]	Lavie [54]	Show-1 [60]	Moon Valley [37]	Crafter [8]	Model Scope [52]	Wild Scrape [9]	Avg
TALL [57]	P	71.15%	96.89%	98.51%	79.38%	84.59%	79.38%	98.79%	99.02%	92.70%	76.47%	87.91%
	R	91.07%	98.28%	97.83%	83.00%	76.57%	79.57%	99.52%	98.93%	94.14%	66.31%	88.52%
F3Net [41]	P	68.27%	99.89%	99.67%	89.35%	57.00%	36.57%	99.52%	99.71%	93.80%	88.41%	88.73%
	R	83.93%	99.71%	98.62%	77.57%	85.24%	63.17%	99.58%	99.89%	89.43%	76.78%	81.88%
NPR [47]	P	91.07%	99.57%	99.49%	24.29%	89.64%	57.71%	97.12%	99.86%	94.29%	87.80%	82.45%
	R	91.07%	99.57%	99.49%	24.29%	89.64%	57.71%	97.12%	99.86%	94.29%	87.80%	84.08%
STIL [20]	P	57.21%	99.08%	99.32%	86.19%	82.24%	70.43%	99.25%	98.96%	97.18%	81.32%	87.12%
	R	67.86%	96.00%	98.41%	96.14%	77.14%	80.43%	97.44%	96.93%	96.29%	68.36%	82.22%
MINTIME-CLIP-B [9]	P	83.21%	99.99%	99.67%	50.84%	99.20%	99.27%	99.76%	99.99%	91.83%	91.77%	91.55%
	R	89.29%	100.00%	98.99%	26.43%	96.79%	98.14%	99.84%	100.00%	84.29%	82.38%	87.62%
FTCN-CLIP-B [9]	P	91.79%	99.99%	99.79%	45.94%	99.76%	97.80%	99.99%	99.99%	94.69%	92.32%	92.21%
	R	87.50%	100.00%	98.91%	17.71%	97.71%	91.86%	100.00%	100.00%	85.29%	82.83%	86.18%
CLIP-B-PT [9]	P	67.80%	43.56%	70.88%	29.97%	52.97%	35.36%	55.52%	66.03%	44.23%	42.99%	44.83%
	R	83.71%	82.43%	90.36%	71.00%	79.29%	75.43%	89.62%	86.29%	82.14%	75.16%	81.74%
DeMamba-CLIP-PT [9]	P	25.87%	95.14%	96.23%	73.43%	83.31%	75.49%	90.17%	95.06%	95.05%	69.95%	79.97%
	R	58.93%	96.43%	93.12%	68.00%	69.36%	69.00%	89.14%	91.86%	96.14%	56.59%	78.86%
XCLIP-B-PT [9]	P	16.39%	72.16%	87.77%	39.86%	65.57%	54.26%	75.23%	84.80%	61.60%	55.28%	61.29%
	R	81.34%	82.15%	83.35%	80.98%	81.82%	81.55%	82.14%	82.98%	81.93%	81.10%	81.93%
DeMamba-XCLIP-PT [9]	P	18.26%	93.50%	94.72%	69.94%	78.08%	71.50%	83.95%	92.23%	93.54%	68.10%	76.38%
	R	66.07%	95.86%	94.64%	77.86%	75.36%	80.29%	90.89%	92.50%	96.00%	66.41%	83.59%
XCLIP-B-FT [9]	P	64.42%	99.73%	96.78%	70.98%	90.35%	77.28%	97.34%	99.84%	82.01%	88.97%	86.77%
	R	82.14%	99.57%	93.62%	61.29%	79.36%	69.71%	97.92%	99.79%	77.14%	83.59%	84.41%
UNITE (Ours)	P	88.57%	100.00%	100.00%	90.16%	89.91%	98.34%	99.52%	100.00%	98.96%	92.56%	92.76%
	R	92.11%	100.00%	94.62%	96.93%	98.12%	99.86%	98.69%	100.00%	96.29%	89.89%	89.60%

Table 4. Results obtained by the UNITE model on **finegrained classes**: detecting whether a video is real, partially manipulated or fully AI-generated. Performance gains are mentioned in green.

Train		Test	
FF++	GTA-V	Dataset	Accuracy
✓		FF++	96.46%
✓		CelebDF	60.40%
✓		DeeperForensics	71.04%
✓		DeepFakeTIMIT	80.68%
✓		HifiFace	43.27%
✓		UADFV	90.37%
✓		AVID	50.00%
✓		GTA-V	0.00%
✓		DeMamba	38.29%
✓	✓	FF++	97.70%(+1.24)
✓	✓	CelebDF	70.17%(+9.77)
✓	✓	DeeperForensics	80.59%(+9.55)
✓	✓	DeepFakeTIMIT	81.04%(+0.36)
✓	✓	HifiFace	64.20%(+20.93)
✓	✓	UADFV	92.61%(+1.24)
✓	✓	AVID	62.50%(+12.50)
✓	✓	GTA-V	100.00%(+100.00)
✓	✓	DeMamba	65.84%(+27.55)

Using this defined convention of finegrained classes, all the face manipulated datasets (CelebDF [30], DeeperForensics [25], etc.) and the videos from the AVID [61] model (background manipulations) fall under class-2, and the videos from the GTA-V [24] and the DeMamba [9] datasets fall in class-3. In this setup, only the final classification layer of the UNITE transformer architecture is changed to 3 neurons with softmax activation. The results obtained are presented in Table 4. As expected, when the model is trained only with FF++ [43], the performance on fully synthetic data is poor (since the model has not seen any synthetic videos). When the GTA-V [24] data is also used in training, the performance is much higher.




Figure 4. **Ablation Results** show the effect of changing the loss functions used to train the UNITE model. The combination of the cross-entropy (CE) and Attention Diversity (AD) losses always performs better, and the contribution from the AD-loss component increases significantly when using fully synthetic data for training.

4.4. Ablation Study

We conducted an analysis to assess the contribution of individual loss functions to the training of the UNITE model. The outcomes of this ablation study are presented in Fig. 4. Specifically, we evaluated the impact of the AD-loss in two scenarios: (1) when UNITE was trained solely on the FF++ dataset [43] (Fig. 4(a)), and (2) when UNITE was trained using a combination of the FF++ [43] and the GTA-V [24] datasets (Fig. 4(b)). The combination of the two losses always performed better than the individual losses.

Effect on Synthetic Data: UNITE performed significantly better on the fully synthetic datasets GTA-V [24] and De-




Figure 5. **No. of frames vs. Performance:** Performance analysis of UNITE based on the number of frames sampled per video segment. The results illustrate that as the number of frames increases from 1 to 64 (context window), the detection accuracy improves, showcasing UNITE’s ability to effectively capture temporal inconsistencies in fake videos.

Mamba [9] when the model was training includes GTA-V [24] data. However, for the DeMamba dataset (cross-data evaluation), the performance with only CE-loss is similar regardless of the training data. It is the AD-loss component that provides the accuracy boost in Fig 4(b).

Effect on Background-Manipulated Data: In Fig. 4(a), we observe that when UNITE was trained solely on FF++ [43] using only the CE-loss, its performance on the AVID dataset [61] was 0.00%. This outcome can be attributed to the fact that the fake data in FF++ [43] contains exclusively face-manipulated videos, causing the UNITE transformer’s attention heads to focus predominantly on the facial regions. As AVID [61] comprises only background-manipulated videos, UNITE failed to detect any of the fakes under such conditions. However, when the AD-loss was introduced, the attention heads of UNITE were encouraged to diversify their spatial focus, which significantly improved performance. Incorporating synthetic data into training, in Fig. 4(b), further enhanced this effect, achieving a 100% accuracy on the AVID [61] dataset when both CE-loss and AD-loss were applied together.

Effect on Face-Manipulated Data: For the evaluation on face-manipulated datasets such as CelebDF [30] and UADFV [58], one might expect comparable results between training solely on FF++ [43] and incorporating GTA-V [24] due to their perceived irrelevance in evaluating face-centric manipulations. However, as shown in Fig. 4(b), training with fully synthetic data leads to a substantial performance improvement. Notably, in both Fig. 4(a) and (b), using only CE loss yields similar results, but the inclusion of the AD-loss component significantly enhances overall detection accuracy. The diversity in the training data makes the UNITE model learn more discriminative attention map features through the AD-loss component, which in turn helps even in detecting face-manipulated videos.

Frames vs. Performance: For inference with UNITE, we evaluated the impact of temporal context by varying the number of frames sampled from video segments




Figure 6. **Transformer Depth Evaluation:** Performance comparison of UNITE with varying the number of encoder blocks (depth). UNITE performs optimally in cross-domain settings when the depth is 4. Greater depths overfit to the training domains (FF++ [43] and GTA-V [24]), while a depth of 2 is insufficient to capture the complexity of the data.

to $\{1, 8, 16, 32, 64\}$, with 64 frames corresponding to our model’s context window. As shown in Fig. 5, performance improves as more frames are included, demonstrating that UNITE effectively captures temporal discontinuities in fake videos. This highlights the model’s ability to leverage temporal cues for enhanced detection accuracy.

Transformer Depth Ablation: We evaluate the impact of varying the depth of the transformer architecture in UNITE by adjusting the number of encoder blocks, with results shown in Fig. 6. We tested depths of $\{2, 4, 6, 8\}$ and observed that the model achieved the best performance with 4 encoder blocks, which is the depth used in our final architecture. This suggests that a moderate depth strikes the optimal balance between model complexity and performance, especially in cross-dataset settings, providing robust detection capabilities without overfitting.

5. Conclusion

Traditional DeepFake detectors, focused primarily on face-manipulated content, struggle against newer, more sophisticated forgery methods involving T2V, I2V, and background manipulations. To address this, we proposed UNITE, leveraging the fully synthetic GTA-V [24] dataset for training. While this synthetic data is not AI-generated, our results show it effectively enhances UNITE’s ability to detect AI-generated content and background manipulations.

A key innovation in our approach is the Attention-Diversity (AD) loss, which encourages the model’s attention mechanism to explore diverse spatial regions, improving its detection of manipulated areas beyond the face. Consequently, UNITE not only excels at detecting AI-generated and background-altered videos but also shows a marked improvement in detecting traditional face-manipulated content. The comprehensive performance gains highlighted through our ablation studies underscore the robustness of UNITE, making it a valuable tool in the evolving landscape of synthetic video detection.

References

- [1] Flux 1.1. <https://blackforestlabs.ai/>, 2024. 1
- [2] Morph studio. <https://www.morphstudio.com/>, 2024. 7
- [3] Darius Afchar, Vincent Nozick, Junichi Yamagishi, and Isao Echizen. Mesonet: a compact facial video forgery detection network. In *2018 IEEE international workshop on information forensics and security (WIFS)*, pages 1–7. IEEE, 2018. 6
- [4] Ibrahim M Alabdulmohsin, Xiaohua Zhai, Alexander Kolesnikov, and Lucas Beyer. Getting vit in shape: Scaling laws for compute-optimal model design. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024. 2, 3
- [5] Tim Brooks, Bill Peebles, Connor Holmes, Will DePue, Yufei Guo, Li Jing, David Schnurr, Joe Taylor, Troy Luhman, Eric Luhman, Clarence Ng, Ricky Wang, and Aditya Ramesh. Video generation models as world simulators. 2024. 5
- [6] Tim Brooks, Bill Peebles, Connor Holmes, Will DePue, Yufei Guo, Li Jing, David Schnurr, Joe Taylor, Troy Luhman, Eric Luhman, et al. Video generation models as world simulators. 2024. URL <https://openai.com/research/video-generation-models-as-world-simulators>, 3, 2024. 5, 6, 7
- [7] Baoying Chen and Shunquan Tan. Featuretransfer: Unsupervised domain adaptation for cross-domain deepfake detection. *Security and Communication Networks*, 2021(1): 9942754, 2021. 3
- [8] Haoxin Chen, Menghan Xia, Yingqing He, Yong Zhang, Xiaodong Cun, Shaoshu Yang, Jinbo Xing, Yaofang Liu, Qifeng Chen, Xintao Wang, et al. Videocrafter1: Open diffusion models for high-quality video generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.19512*, 2023. 2, 7
- [9] Haoxing Chen, Yan Hong, Zizheng Huang, Zhuoer Xu, Zhangxuan Gu, Yaohui Li, Jun Lan, Huijia Zhu, Jianfu Zhang, Weiqiang Wang, et al. Demamba: Ai-generated video detection on million-scale genvideo benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.19707*, 2024. 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8
- [10] Jikang Cheng, Zhiyuan Yan, Ying Zhang, Yuhao Luo, Zhongyuan Wang, and Chen Li. Can we leave deepfake data behind in training deepfake detector? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.17052*, 2024. 1
- [11] Jongwook Choi, Taehoon Kim, Yonghyun Jeong, Seungryul Baek, and Jongwon Choi. Exploiting style latent flows for generalizing deepfake video detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 1133–1143, 2024. 2, 6
- [12] Umur Aybars Ciftci, Ilke Demir, and Lijun Yin. Fakecatcher: Detection of synthetic portrait videos using biological signals. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 2020. 6
- [13] Sara Concas, Simone Maurizio La Cava, Roberto Casula, Giulia Orrù, Giovanni Puglisi, and Gian Luca Marcialis. Quality-based artifact modeling for facial deepfake detection in videos. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3845–3854, 2024. 2, 6
- [14] Riccardo Corvi, Davide Cozzolino, Giovanni Poggi, Koki Nagano, and Luisa Verdoliva. Intriguing properties of synthetic images: from generative adversarial networks to diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 973–982, 2023. 2
- [15] Riccardo Corvi, Davide Cozzolino, Giada Zingarini, Giovanni Poggi, Koki Nagano, and Luisa Verdoliva. On the detection of synthetic images generated by diffusion models. In *ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2023. 2
- [16] Davide Cozzolino, Andreas Rössler, Justus Thies, Matthias Nießner, and Luisa Verdoliva. Id-reveal: Identity-aware deepfake video detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 15108–15117, 2021. 2
- [17] Brian Dolhansky, Joanna Bitton, Ben Pflaum, Jikuo Lu, Russ Howes, Menglin Wang, and Cristian Canton Ferrer. The deepfake detection challenge (dfdc) dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.07397*, 2020. 1
- [18] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, et al. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. In *ICLR*, 2021. 3
- [19] Ricard Durall, Margret Keuper, Franz-Josef Pfreundt, and Janis Keuper. Unmasking deepfakes with simple features. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.00686*, 2019. 2
- [20] Zhihao Gu, Yang Chen, Taiping Yao, Shouhong Ding, Jilin Li, Feiyue Huang, and Lizhuang Ma. Spatiotemporal inconsistency learning for deepfake video detection. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM international conference on multimedia*, pages 3473–3481, 2021. 7
- [21] Ying Guo, Cheng Zhen, and Pengfei Yan. Controllable guide-space for generalizable face forgery detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 20818–20827, 2023. 6
- [22] Harald Hanselmann, Shen Yan, and Hermann Ney. Deep fisher faces. In *BMVC*, 2017. 4
- [23] Dan Hendrycks and Kevin Gimpel. Gaussian error linear units (gelus). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.08415*, 2016. 4
- [24] Yuan-Ting Hu, Jiahong Wang, Raymond A Yeh, and Alexander G Schwing. Sail-vos 3d: A synthetic dataset and baselines for object detection and 3d mesh reconstruction from video data. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 1418–1428, 2021. 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8
- [25] Liming Jiang, Ren Li, Wayne Wu, Chen Qian, and Chen Change Loy. Deeperforensics-1.0: A large-scale dataset for real-world face forgery detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 2889–2898, 2020. 5, 7
- [26] Yan Ju, Chengzhe Sun, Shan Jia, Shuwei Hou, Zhaofeng Si, Soumya Kanti Datta, Lipeng Ke, Riky Zhou, Anita Nikolich, and Siwei Lyu. Deepfake-o-meter v2. 0: An open platform for deepfake detection. In *2024 IEEE 7th Inter-*

- national Conference on Multimedia Information Processing and Retrieval (MIPR)*, pages 439–445. IEEE, 2024. 1
- [27] Pavel Korshunov and Sébastien Marcel. Deepfakes: a new threat to face recognition? assessment and detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.08685*, 2018. 5
- [28] Lingzhi Li, Jianmin Bao, Hao Yang, Dong Chen, and Fang Wen. Faceshifter: Towards high fidelity and occlusion aware face swapping. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.13457*, 2019. 1
- [29] Y Li. Exposing deepfake videos by detecting face warping artif acts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.00656*, 2018. 6
- [30] Yuezun Li, Xin Yang, Pu Sun, Honggang Qi, and Siwei Lyu. Celeb-df: A large-scale challenging dataset for deepfake forensics. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 3207–3216, 2020. 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8
- [31] Li Lin, Xinan He, Yan Ju, Xin Wang, Feng Ding, and Shu Hu. Preserving fairness generalization in deepfake detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 16815–16825, 2024. 6
- [32] Baoping Liu, Bo Liu, Ming Ding, Tianqing Zhu, and Xin Yu. Ti2net: temporal identity inconsistency network for deepfake detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pages 4691–4700, 2023. 2, 6
- [33] I Loshchilov and F Hutter. Decoupled weight decay regularization. *ICLR*, 2019. 5
- [34] Qingxuan Lv, Yuezun Li, Junyu Dong, Sheng Chen, Hui Yu, Huiyu Zhou, and Shu Zhang. Domainforensics: Exposing face forgery across domains via bi-directional adaptation. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 2024. 3
- [35] Xin Ma, Yaohui Wang, Gengyun Jia, Xinyuan Chen, Ziwei Liu, Yuan-Fang Li, Cunjian Chen, and Yu Qiao. Latte: Latent diffusion transformer for video generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.03048*, 2024. 2
- [36] Ghazal Mazaheri and Amit K Roy-Chowdhury. Detection and localization of facial expression manipulations. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pages 1035–1045, 2022. 2
- [37] moonvalley.ai. moonvalley.ai. <https://moonvalley.ai/>, 2022. 7
- [38] John Mullan, Duncan Crawbuck, and Aakash Sastry. Hotshot-XL, 2023. 7
- [39] Dat Nguyen, Nesryne Mejri, Inder Pal Singh, Polina Kulshova, Marcella Astrid, Anis Kacem, Enjie Ghorbel, and Djamilia Aouada. Laa-net: Localized artifact attention network for quality-agnostic and generalizable deepfake detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 17395–17405, 2024. 2
- [40] Alvaro Lopez Pellicer, Yi Li, and Plamen Angelov. Pudd: Towards robust multi-modal prototype-based deepfake detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3809–3817, 2024. 2, 6
- [41] Yuyang Qian, Guojun Yin, Lu Sheng, Zixuan Chen, and Jing Shao. Thinking in frequency: Face forgery detection by mining frequency-aware clues. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 86–103. Springer, 2020. 7
- [42] Runway Research. Text driven video generation. <https://research.runwayml.com/gen2>, 2023. 1, 7
- [43] Andreas Rossler, Davide Cozzolino, Luisa Verdoliva, Christian Riess, Justus Thies, and Matthias Nießner. Faceforensics++: Learning to detect manipulated facial images. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 1–11, 2019. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8
- [44] Md Shamim Seraj, Ankita Singh, and Shayok Chakraborty. Semi-supervised deep domain adaptation for deepfake detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pages 1061–1071, 2024. 2
- [45] Ke Sun, Shen Chen, Taiping Yao, Hong Liu, Xiaoshuai Sun, Shouhong Ding, and Rongrong Ji. Diffusionfake: Enhancing generalization in deepfake detection via guided stable diffusion. *NeurIPS*, 2024. 1
- [46] Zekun Sun, Yujie Han, Zeyu Hua, Na Ruan, and Weijia Jia. Improving the efficiency and robustness of deepfakes detection through precise geometric features. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3609–3618, 2021. 6
- [47] Chuangchuang Tan, Yao Zhao, Shikui Wei, Guanghua Gu, Ping Liu, and Yunchao Wei. Rethinking the up-sampling operations in cnn-based generative network for generalizable deepfake detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 28130–28139, 2024. 7
- [48] The New York Times. A.i. can now create lifelike videos. can you tell what’s real? <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2024/09/09/technology/ai-video-deepfake-runway-kling-quiz.html>, 2024. 5, 6
- [49] Justus Thies, Michael Zollhöfer, and Matthias Nießner. Deferred neural rendering: Image synthesis using neural textures. *Acm Transactions on Graphics (TOG)*, 38(4):1–12, 2019. 1
- [50] Loc Trinh, Michael Tsang, Sirisha Rambhatla, and Yan Liu. Interpretable and trustworthy deepfake detection via dynamic prototypes. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF winter conference on applications of computer vision*, pages 1973–1983, 2021. 2
- [51] A Vaswani, N Shazeer, N Parmar, J Uszkoreit, L Jones, A Gomez, Ł Kaiser, and I Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *NeurIPS*, 2017. 4
- [52] Jiuniu Wang, Hangjie Yuan, Dayou Chen, Yingya Zhang, Xiang Wang, and Shiwei Zhang. Modelscope text-to-video technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.06571*, 2023. 1, 2, 7
- [53] Yuhan Wang, Xu Chen, Junwei Zhu, Wenqing Chu, Ying Tai, Chengjie Wang, Jilin Li, Yongjian Wu, Feiyue Huang, and Rongrong Ji. Hiface: 3d shape and semantic prior guided high fidelity face swapping. *Proceedings of the Thirtieth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2021. 3, 5

- [54] Yaohui Wang, Xinyuan Chen, Xin Ma, Shangchen Zhou, Ziqi Huang, Yi Wang, Ceyuan Yang, Yinan He, Jiashuo Yu, Peiqing Yang, et al. Lavie: High-quality video generation with cascaded latent diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.15103*, 2023. [7](#)
- [55] Zhendong Wang, Jianmin Bao, Wengang Zhou, Weilun Wang, Hezhen Hu, Hong Chen, and Houqiang Li. Dire for diffusion-generated image detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 22445–22455, 2023. [2](#)
- [56] Deressa Wodajo and Solomon Atnafu. Deepfake video detection using convolutional vision transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.11126*, 2021. [6](#)
- [57] Yuting Xu, Jian Liang, Gengyun Jia, Ziming Yang, Yanhao Zhang, and Ran He. Tall: Thumbnail layout for deepfake video detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 22658–22668, 2023. [1](#), [2](#), [6](#), [7](#)
- [58] Xin Yang, Yuezun Li, and Siwei Lyu. Exposing deep fakes using inconsistent head poses. In *ICASSP 2019-2019 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 8261–8265. IEEE, 2019. [5](#), [6](#), [8](#)
- [59] Xiaohua Zhai, Basil Mustafa, Alexander Kolesnikov, and Lucas Beyer. Sigmoid loss for language image pre-training. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 11975–11986, 2023. [3](#)
- [60] David Junhao Zhang, Jay Zhangjie Wu, Jia-Wei Liu, Rui Zhao, Lingmin Ran, Yuchao Gu, Difei Gao, and Mike Zheng Shou. Show-1: Marrying pixel and latent diffusion models for text-to-video generation. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, pages 1–15, 2024. [7](#)
- [61] Zhixing Zhang, Bichen Wu, Xiaoyan Wang, Yaqiao Luo, Luxin Zhang, Yinan Zhao, Peter Vajda, Dimitris Metaxas, and Licheng Yu. Avid: Any-length video inpainting with diffusion model. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 7162–7172, 2024. [1](#), [4](#), [5](#), [7](#), [8](#)
- [62] Cairong Zhao, Chutian Wang, Guosheng Hu, Haonan Chen, Chun Liu, and Jinhui Tang. Istvt: interpretable spatial-temporal video transformer for deepfake detection. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 18: 1335–1348, 2023. [6](#)
- [63] Zangwei Zheng, Xiangyu Peng, Tianji Yang, Chenhui Shen, Shenggui Li, Hongxin Liu, Yukun Zhou, Tianyi Li, and Yang You. Open-sora: Democratizing efficient video production for all, 2024. [1](#), [2](#)
- [64] Xinye Zhou, Hu Han, Shiguang Shan, and Xilin Chen. Fine-grained open-set deepfake detection via unsupervised domain adaptation. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 2024. [2](#)