

# DADM: Dual Alignment of Domain and Modality for Face Anti-spoofing

Jingyi Yang<sup>1,2\*</sup>   Xun Lin<sup>1\*</sup>   Zitong Yu<sup>1,3†</sup>   Liepiao Zhang<sup>4,5</sup>   Xin Liu<sup>6</sup>   Hui Li<sup>2</sup>  
 Xiaochen Yuan<sup>7</sup>   Xiaochun Cao<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Great Bay University   <sup>2</sup>University of Science and Technology of China

<sup>3</sup>Dongguan Key Laboratory for Intelligence and Information Technology

<sup>4</sup>GRGBanking Equipment Co., Ltd.   <sup>5</sup>South China University of Technology

<sup>6</sup>Lappeenranta University of Technology   <sup>7</sup>Macao Polytechnic University

<sup>8</sup>Shenzhen Campus of Sun Yat-sen University

## Abstract

With the availability of diverse sensor modalities (i.e., RGB, Depth, Infrared) and the success of multi-modal learning, multi-modal face anti-spoofing (FAS) has emerged as a prominent research focus. The intuition behind it is that leveraging multiple modalities can uncover more intrinsic spoofing traces. However, this approach presents more risk of misalignment. We identify two main types of misalignment: (1) **Intra-domain modality misalignment**, where the importance of each modality varies across different attacks. For instance, certain modalities (e.g., Depth) may be non-defensive against specific attacks (e.g., 3D mask), indicating that each modality has unique strengths and weaknesses in countering particular attacks. Consequently, simple fusion strategies may fall short. (2) **Inter-domain modality misalignment**, where the introduction of additional modalities exacerbates domain shifts, potentially overshadowing the benefits of complementary fusion. To tackle (1), we propose a alignment module between modalities based on mutual information, which adaptively enhances favorable modalities while suppressing unfavorable ones. To address (2), we employ a dual alignment optimization method that aligns both sub-domain hyperplanes and modality angle margins, thereby mitigating domain gaps. Our method, dubbed **Dual Alignment of Domain and Modality (DADM)**, achieves state-of-the-art performance in extensive experiments across four challenging protocols demonstrating its robustness in multi-modal domain generalization scenarios. The codes will be released soon.

## 1. Introduction

Face recognition (FR) is widely used in various applications, such as access control, phone unlocking, and mo-

\*Equal Contribution

†Corresponding author




Figure 1. Four common scenarios of FAS. (a) Uni-modal DG-FAS aims to mitigate domain shifts. (b) Multi-modal FAS focuses on efficient fusion among modalities. (c) Common multi-modal DG-FAS, which combines DG-FAS with multi-modal fusion techniques. (d) Our proposed multi-modal DG-FAS pursues both the hyperplane alignment across each sub-domain and the angle margin consistency among modalities. For clarity, it should be noted that the different-colored spheres (domains) represent distinct faces of a sphere and do not indicate the Euclidean distance.

bile payments. However, FR systems are vulnerable to a wide range of presentation attacks, including but not limited to photo/paper printing, video replay, makeup, and 3D masks. To this end, face anti-spoofing (FAS) techniques have been developed to safeguard FR systems. Over the past few decades, both hand-crafted features based approaches [6, 7, 15, 31, 54, 55] and deep learning based algorithms [3, 3, 46, 73, 77] have shown promising results in uni-modal FAS. Despite their effectiveness in intra-dataset evaluations, they generalize poorly to unseen domains (i.e.,

domain shifts).

To address this issue, uni-modal domain generalization (DG) FAS methods [26, 35, 38, 65, 70, 88, 89] have been extensively explored, as shown in Fig. 1 (a). Recently, with the growing challenge of attack patterns and the acquisition of more advanced sensors, FAS has expanded from uni-modal (RGB) to multi-modal (e.g., RGB, Depth, Infrared) approaches [22, 53, 86]. These multi-modal methods aim to leverage complementary information across modalities, enabling spoof traces undetectable in one modality to be captured by others. However, existing multi-modal FAS methods often assume consistent training and testing domains, focusing primarily on modality fusion without adequately considering domain shifts, as illustrated in Fig. 1 (b). Furthermore, since each modality possesses varying defensive capabilities against different attacks, treating or integrating them equally may not yield optimal results.

In multi-modal FAS, DG scenarios involve significant domain shifts [41] caused by advanced or unseen attacks, variations in sensor resolutions, deployment environments, and disturbance from low-quality sensors. We summarize the challenges in multi-modality domain generalization FAS into two main aspects: (1) **intra-domain modality misalignment**, where the relative importance of each modality varies for diverse attacks. Certain modalities (e.g., depth) may be vulnerable to specific attacks (e.g., 3D masks), making them unreliable. Simple fusion strategies potentially propagate negative impacts across modalities. (2) **inter-domain modality misalignment**, where incorporating additional modalities can exacerbate domain shifts. In such cases, the adverse effects of domain shifts in multi-modality may outweigh the benefits of fusion. Previous work MMDG [41] employs single-side prototypical loss for domain generalization, akin to conventional uni-modal DG methods that use mixed source domain, as illustrated in Fig 1 (c). MMDG [41] proposes a Monte Carlo dropout-based [10, 48, 72] uncertainty estimation module to recognize unreliable information. However, it has a certain degree of randomness, limiting the model’s performance and necessitating further improvements.

To address these challenges, we propose the Dual Alignment of Domain and Modality (DADM) framework, as illustrated in Figs. 2 and 1 (d). Specifically, we design a Mutual Information Mask (MIM) module to fine-tune ViT [18]. The MIM module alleviates intra-domain modality misalignment through mutual information maximization. Based on the intuition that observing a certain modality can reduce the uncertainty of other modalities to some extent (i.e., we have a prior uncertainty  $H(X)$  for  $X$  and a posterior uncertainty  $H(X|Y)$  given  $Y$ , where  $H(X) - H(X|Y)$  is mutual information). This allows the observed modality to diminish unreliable information about other modalities and provide informative guidance. To tackle

inter-domain modality misalignment, we propose a dual alignment of domain and modality optimization strategy, which aims to find a unified classification hyperplane and a unified angle margin among modalities. Our contributions are as follows:

- We propose the DADM framework to enhance the domain and modality generalization in multi-modal DG FAS.
- We introduce the Mutual Information Mask module to alleviate intra-domain modality misalignments by enhancing reliable modalities and suppressing unreliable ones.
- We employ a dual alignment of domain and modality optimization strategy to align sub-domain hyperplanes and modality angle margins, mitigating the inter-domain modality misalignment.
- We evaluate our DADM approaches under four challenging protocols. Extensive experiments demonstrate its superiority and generalization capability.

## 2. Related Work

**Uni&Multi-Modal Domain Generalization in FAS.** In recent years, uni-modal domain generalization (DG) methods for FAS have received extensively research attention [12, 26, 35, 37, 47, 61, 62, 65, 70, 75, 88, 89]. Common strategies include adversarial training [28, 45, 61, 84], asymmetric triplet loss [26, 39], contrastive learning [47], meta-learning [8, 19, 27, 56, 62, 87], style augmentation [70, 88, 89]. They share a common goal: training a model on multiple source domains, with the intention that ensure effective generalization to unseen domains. Multi-modal FAS methods have evolved in parallel. Early methods include early-fusion [20, 50, 71] and late-fusion [21, 32, 33, 63, 78]. More recently, works that introduce attention- and ViT-based feature fusion techniques have emerged [16, 74, 76, 81–83]. In flexible-modal FAS, cross-modality attention [42, 44] and multi-modal adapters [81, 83] enable pretrained ViTs to learn modality-agnostic features. However, despite these advancements, these methods often fall short in domain generalization scenarios due to insufficient ability to resist domain shifts. Furthermore, those DG-based approaches are proposed for uni-modal FAS and are not suitable for multi-modal ones. Additionally, a previous study [41] has demonstrated that the uni-modal DG-based strategies exhibit limited performance in multi-modal scenarios.

**Mutual Information Neural Optimization.** Mutual information has a wide range of applications in deep representation learning [4, 11, 13, 36, 40, 66, 68, 85]. Many studies [5, 23, 24, 52, 67] have focused on optimizing mutual information in deep learning. They often maximize the mutual information between features extracted from diverse views, modalities, or images which derived from data augmentation aims to capture high-level factors whose influence spans different perspectives - e.g., the presence of certain different perspectives of spoof trace or occurrence




Figure 2. (a) Illustration of fine-tuning ViT with proposed MIM modules and CDC-Adapters, showcasing the interaction between the RGB and Depth modalities. Note that only parameters of MIM and CDC-Adapter are trainable. (b) Mutual Information Mask (MIM) module is used for suppress and enhance the informative region of features. (c) CDC-Adapter is used for integrating fine-grained local features.

of certain inconsistency in data. This capability is especially valuable in multi-modal FAS, where each modality brings unique advantages or weaknesses in countering specific attack types. By maximizing mutual information between modalities, the model can adaptively emphasize task-relevant information, thereby enhancing reliable modalities while mitigating the impact of unreliable ones.

### 3. Proposed Method

Sec. 3.1 reviews the mutual information maximization and invariant risk minimization. Sec. 3.2 provides an overview of our architecture, followed by a detailed description of the mutual information mask module in Sec. 3.3. Finally, we present details of the dual alignment optimization strategy for domain and modality in Sec. 3.4.

#### 3.1. Preliminaries

**Mutual Information Maximization.** The mutual information (MI) between two variables  $X$  and  $Y$  can be expressed as the difference between their entropy terms:

$$I(X; Y) = H(X) - H(X|Y) = H(Y) - H(Y|X) \quad (1)$$

where  $H(\cdot)$  is the Shannon entropy,  $H(X|Y)$  denotes the conditional entropy of  $X$  given  $Y$ . This definition has an intuitive interpretation:  $I(X; Y)$  is the reduction of uncertainty in  $X/Y$  when  $Y/X$  is observed. Alternatively, MI is also equivalent to the KL-divergence between the joint distribution  $P_{XY}$ , and the product of the marginal distribution  $P_X P_Y$ :

$$I(X; Y) = D_{\text{KL}}(P_{XY} \| P_X P_Y) \quad (2)$$

where the intuitive meaning of Eq. 2 is that the larger the divergence between the joint and the product of the marginals, the stronger the correlation between  $X$  and  $Y$ .

For MI maximization, we typically need to estimate a lower bound of MI and then continuously raise this lower

bound to achieve the goal. Belghazi et al. [5] introduce a tighter MI Neural Estimator (MINE) based on Eq. 2 and Donsker-Varadhan representation theorem [17], which converts them into the dual representation:

$$D_{\text{KL}}(P \| Q) = \sup_{T: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}_P[T] - \log(\mathbb{E}_Q[e^T]), \quad (3)$$

$$I_{\text{MINE}} = \mathbb{E}_{p(x,y)}[f(x, y)] - \log(\mathbb{E}_{p(x)p(y)}[e^{f(x,y)}]), \quad (4)$$

where  $P$  and  $Q$  are two probability distributions,  $T$  takes over all functions such that the two expectations are finite, and  $f(\cdot, \cdot)$  represent a score function (or, critic) approximated by a neural network.

**Empirical and Invariant Risk Minimization.** Empirical Risk Minimization (ERM) learning paradigm is widely used in machine learning, aiming to improve the model's generalization performance to unknown domains by minimizing the risk (i.e. loss) on the mixed source domain:

$$\text{ERM} \rightarrow \min_{\phi, \beta} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{E}|} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} R^e(\phi, \beta), \quad (5)$$

where  $\phi$  represents a neural network,  $\beta$  denotes the hyper-plane for classification,  $\mathcal{E}$  represents the entire environment,  $e$  is one of the sub-environments, and  $f(x; \beta, \phi)$  is the function processing  $x$  via  $\phi, \beta$  and obtaining  $y$ . The empirical risk function  $R^e(\phi, \beta)$ , based on the loss function  $\mathcal{L}(\cdot, \cdot)$ , for a given environment  $e$ , is defined as:

$$R^e(\phi, \beta) = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim e} [\mathcal{L}(f(x; \beta, \phi), y)]. \quad (6)$$

While ERM is simple and effective, the i.i.d. assumption limits its application in FAS. It tends to fit all source training data together and undesirably leverages spurious correlations that may lead to poor generalization when test environments diverge from training data (i.e., domain shifts).

However, Invariant Risk Minimization (IRM) [1, 2, 14, 34, 49] have been proposed to learn both unified and aligned

classification hyperplane that is globally (for mixed all domains) and also locally (for each sub-domain) optimal. Specifically, the objective of IRM can be formulated as the following constrained optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{IRM} &\rightarrow \min_{\phi, \beta^*} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{E}|} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} R^e(\phi, \beta^*), \\ \text{s.t. } &\beta^* \in \underset{\beta}{\text{argmin}} R^e(\phi, \beta), \forall e \in \mathcal{E}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Indeed, IRM is a challenging, bi-level optimization problem, which is hard to solve [29, 58]. Sun et. al [65] propose an equivalent objective Projected Gradient Optimization [51] for IRM (PG-IRM) which is easier to optimize and achieve strong performance.

### 3.2. Architecture Overview

Fig. 2 shows our architecture. Our model builds upon ViT [18] by utilizing frozen pre-trained weights and introducing adapters for fine-tuning. Specifically, each layer of ViT comprises Layer Normalization (LN), Multi-Head Self Attention (MHSA), and Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP). The model handles three input modalities: RGB, depth, and infrared images. Extracting the feature of each modality from the MHSA layer and feeding it into the Mutual Information Mask (MIM) module. Each MIM module receives two modalities, as illustrated in Fig. 2 (b). To ensure cross-modal fusion among all modalities, each layer includes three MIM modules. Fig. 2 (a) omits the schematic diagram of the interaction between infrared and depth, and the full interaction relationship is illustrated in Fig. 3. In Fig. 2 (c), the CDC (short for Central Difference Convolution)-Adapter [9] consists of vanilla and central differential convolution layers. In FAS tasks, the effectiveness of central differential convolution [9, 79, 80] over vanilla ones have been well-verified, as it captures both intensity-level information and gradient-level messages, which are critical for distinguishing between live and spoof traces.

### 3.3. Mutual Information Mask

As mentioned in Sec. 1, the reliability of each modality can fluctuate based on the type of attack, rigid or uniform treatment of each modality is undesirable. Hence, the model should adaptively prioritize specific modalities or regions based on their reliability. To achieve this, we propose the Mutual Information Mask (MIM) module, which dynamically emphasizes reliable modalities and suppresses unreliable ones by leveraging mutual information maximization.

Specifically, given a group of RGB, depth (D), infrared (I) images  $\mathbf{x}_{\text{RGB}} \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times W \times 3}$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_{\text{D}} \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times W \times 3}$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_{\text{I}} \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times W \times 3}$ , we split them into  $\frac{H}{P} \times \frac{W}{P}$  non-overlapping patches  $[\mathbf{x}_{\text{RGB}}^i]_{i=1}^{hw}$ ,  $[\mathbf{x}_{\text{D}}^i]_{i=1}^{hw}$ ,  $[\mathbf{x}_{\text{I}}^i]_{i=1}^{hw}$ , where  $H$ ,  $W$  are the height and width,  $P$  is the patch size,  $h = \frac{H}{P}$ ,  $w = \frac{W}{P}$ .




Figure 3. Alignment: (a) Mask generation via modality interaction. (b) Feature alignment via reweighting.

These patches are linearly projected to embedding vectors  $[\mathbf{z}_{\text{RGB}}^i]_{i=1}^{hw} \in \mathcal{R}^d$ ,  $[\mathbf{z}_{\text{D}}^i]_{i=1}^{hw} \in \mathcal{R}^d$ ,  $[\mathbf{z}_{\text{I}}^i]_{i=1}^{hw} \in \mathcal{R}^d$ :

$$[\mathbf{z}_{\text{RGB}}^i, \mathbf{z}_{\text{D}}^i, \mathbf{x}_{\text{I}}^i] = \text{PE}([\mathbf{x}_{\text{RGB}}^i, \mathbf{z}_{\text{D}}^i, \mathbf{x}_{\text{I}}^i]) + \mathbf{e}_{\text{pos}}^i, \quad (8)$$

where  $\text{PE}(\cdot)$  is the patch embedding, and  $\mathbf{e}_{\text{pos}}^i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  is the positional embedding. Then, we also introduce class tokens for all modalities  $\mathbf{z}_{\text{RGB}}^0, \mathbf{z}_{\text{D}}^0, \mathbf{z}_{\text{I}}^0$ .

The structure of MIM module is illustrated in Fig. 2 (b). We feed the outputs of each MHSA layer to MIM module for intra-domain modality alignment. At each MIM module, we first obtain the interactive feature of each modality pair via directly concatenating them along the channel dimension and feed into a lightweight interactive convolution block. Then, the interactive feature is fed into mask generation block  $\text{MG}(\cdot)$ . The output is two informative masks corresponding to the modality pair:

$$\mathbf{z}_{\text{fused}} = \text{Conv}(\text{Cat}(\mathbf{z}_{m1}, \mathbf{z}_{m2})), \quad (9)$$

$$[\mathbf{m}_{m1}, \mathbf{m}_{m2}] = \text{sigmoid}(\text{MG}(\mathbf{z}_{\text{fused}})) \quad (10)$$

where the subscript  $m1$  and  $m2$  represent two modalities, respectively.  $\text{Conv}(\cdot)$  and  $\text{MG}(\cdot)$  consists of a sequence of convolution and normalization layers.  $\text{sigmoid}(\cdot)$  is the activation function. We consider that the region with a higher weight (informative point), the more reliable information it involves. Conversely, regions associated with lower weights may carry redundant or negative information.

Then, we employ two masks  $\mathbf{m}_{m1}, \mathbf{m}_{m2} \in \mathbb{R}^{h \times w}$  to reweight the original features:

$$\mathbf{z}_{\text{aligned}.m1} = \mathbf{m}_{m1} \mathbf{z}_{m1}, \mathbf{z}_{\text{aligned}.m2} = \mathbf{m}_{m2} \mathbf{z}_{m2}. \quad (11)$$

Fig. 3 illustrates the details of our mutual information mask process. Then, the  $\mathbf{z}_{\text{aligned}.m1}, \mathbf{z}_{\text{aligned}.m2}$  are averaged as the mutual information (MI) tokens:

$$z_{\text{mi}1} = \bar{\mathbf{z}}_{\text{aligned}.m1}, z_{\text{mi}2} = \bar{\mathbf{z}}_{\text{aligned}.m2}. \quad (12)$$

Finally, we integrate interactive features of each modality pair with aligned features as the output of MIM module:

$$\mathbf{z}_{\text{out}.m1} = \text{Conv}(\text{Cat}(\mathbf{z}_{\text{fused}}, \mathbf{z}_{\text{aligned}.m1})), \quad (13)$$

$$\mathbf{z}_{\text{out}.m2} = \text{Conv}(\text{Cat}(\mathbf{z}_{\text{fused}}, \mathbf{z}_{\text{aligned}.m2})). \quad (14)$$



We further alleviate intra-domain modality misalignment by MI maximization between MI tokens, as depicted in Eq. 12. The commonly used MINE [5] needs a task-independent neural network to estimate the score function  $f(\cdot, \cdot)$  of the joint and marginal distribution of  $x, y$ , which may be an unnecessary burden for the overall model. Coincidentally, we have obtained the MI tokens  $z_{mi1}, z_{mi2}$  in Eq. 12. We estimate the distribution entropy by taking the average of MI tokens, which can be seen as a special case of the score function. Thus we can rewrite Eq. 4:

$$\mathcal{L}_{mi} = -[\mathbb{E}_{p(z_{mi1}, z_{mi2})}[\frac{z_{mi1} + z_{mi2}}{2}]] - \log(\mathbb{E}_{p(z_{mi1})p(z_{mi2})}[e^{\frac{z_{mi1} + z_{mi2}}{2}}])). \quad (15)$$

During forward propagation, we calculate the  $\mathcal{L}_{mi}^l$  of each layer, and then average  $\mathcal{L}_{mi}^l$  from all layers as the final  $\mathcal{L}_{mi}$ . In addition, we employ a gradient modulation technique, ReGrad [41], to adapt the optimization direction of each MIM module. Unlike [41], our ReGrad is based on the intensity of MI tokens instead of uncertainty in modality:

$$\text{ReGrad}(\mathbf{g}_1, \mathbf{g}_2) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{g}_1 + \frac{\mathbf{g}_1 \cdot \mathbf{g}_2}{\|\mathbf{g}_1\|_2} \mathbf{g}_1 \cdot \text{mi}_2, & \text{if } \mathbf{g}_1 \cdot \mathbf{g}_2 < 0, \text{mi}_1 < \text{mi}_2 \\ \mathbf{g}_1 + (\mathbf{g}_2 - \frac{\mathbf{g}_1 \cdot \mathbf{g}_2}{\|\mathbf{g}_1\|_2} \mathbf{g}_1) \cdot \text{mi}_2, & \text{if } \mathbf{g}_1 \cdot \mathbf{g}_2 > 0, \text{mi}_1 < \text{mi}_2 \\ \frac{\mathbf{g}_1 \cdot \mathbf{g}_2}{\|\mathbf{g}_2\|_2} \mathbf{g}_2 \cdot \text{mi}_1 + \mathbf{g}_2, & \text{if } \mathbf{g}_1 \cdot \mathbf{g}_2 < 0, \text{mi}_1 > \text{mi}_2 \\ (\mathbf{g}_1 - \frac{\mathbf{g}_1 \cdot \mathbf{g}_2}{\|\mathbf{g}_2\|_2} \mathbf{g}_2) \cdot \text{mi}_1 + \mathbf{g}_2, & \text{if } \mathbf{g}_1 \cdot \mathbf{g}_2 > 0, \text{mi}_1 > \text{mi}_2 \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

where  $\mathbf{g}_1$  and  $\mathbf{g}_2$  denote gradient of each modality, respectively.  $\text{mi}_1 = \bar{z}_{mi1}$ ,  $\text{mi}_2 = \bar{z}_{mi2}$ . The higher value of  $\text{mi}$ , the more reliable its corresponding aligned features become, thus assigning greater significance to the gradient.

### 3.4. Dual Alignment of Domain and Modality

Numerous uni-modal DG-based methods have been deeply explored to learn domain-invariant liveness representations over recent years. They typically adopt the Empirical Risk Minimization (ERM) learning paradigm. However, the i.i.d. assumption of ERM limits its application in the presence of significant domain shift tasks, e.g., FAS. Moreover, these methods commonly mix all source domains together and posit that the feature space becomes perfectly domain-invariant after removing the domain-specific signals. However, this approach has a significant drawback: when the source data is limited and target data exhibits high domain variability, performance can deteriorate substantially. This is because mixing source domains makes the feature space ambiguous, the live/spoof classifier may inadvertently rely on spurious correlations [65], as shown in Fig. 1 (a) and (c).




Figure 4. Dual alignment of domain and modality. Samples from different domains are distributed on the same 3D sphere. We draw them separately to clearly indicate that varies domains have misaligned directions before alignment.

One competitive alternative is Invariant Risk Minimization (IRM), which aims to align the live-to-spoof transition to be the same for all domains, as illustrated in Fig. 4. We utilize the PG-IRM [65] algorithm to optimize the IRM problem, which constrains the alignment between the global domain optimal hyperplane and the local domain optimal hyperplane. For uni-modal FAS, alignment typically focuses only on the classification hyperplane. However, in multi-modal FAS, misalignments across domains become more pronounced. Significant domain shifts (angle deviations) in any modality can drastically affect overall performance. Hence, before obtaining the top-level features of each modality and fuse them for classification. We constrain the angle margins of modalities in each domain should be as consistent as possible, which is beneficial for the generalization. The angle margin loss is as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{angle}} = \sum_{e_1 \neq e_2}^{\{\text{RGB}, \text{D}, \text{I}\}} \sum_{i \neq j} \mathbb{I}(y_i = 1) \cdot \left( \frac{\mathbf{z}_i^{e_1} \cdot \mathbf{z}_i^{e_2}}{\|\mathbf{z}_i^{e_1}\| \|\mathbf{z}_i^{e_2}\|} - \tau_l \right)^2 + \mathbb{I}(y_j = 0) \cdot \left( \frac{\mathbf{z}_j^{e_1} \cdot \mathbf{z}_j^{e_2}}{\|\mathbf{z}_j^{e_1}\| \|\mathbf{z}_j^{e_2}\|} - \tau_s \right)^2 + \mathbb{I}(y_i = y_j) \cdot \left( \frac{\mathbf{z}_i^{e_1} \cdot \mathbf{z}_j^{e_1}}{\|\mathbf{z}_i^{e_1}\| \|\mathbf{z}_j^{e_1}\|} - \frac{\mathbf{z}_i^{e_2} \cdot \mathbf{z}_j^{e_2}}{\|\mathbf{z}_i^{e_2}\| \|\mathbf{z}_j^{e_2}\|} \right)^2. \quad (17)$$

where  $\mathbb{I}(y = 1)$  denotes live conditions,  $\mathbb{I}(y = 0)$  denotes spoofs. The first term constrains all live samples to exhibit consistent angles, the second term constrains spoofs to exhibit relaxed consistent angles, and the third term constrains the angle difference among modalities of each domain is consistent.  $\tau_l = 1$ ,  $\tau_s = 0.85$  are used to control the relaxation degree of live and spoof samples, respectively.

Fig. 4 shows the dual alignment of domain and modality. Before alignment, the classification hyperplane and modal angle margin of each domain are anisotropic. After alignment, the unified classification hyperplane that is globally and also locally optimal, and the modal angles exhibit consistency. In supplementary materials, we elaborate on the importance of dual alignment. Please refer to Sec. 9 for

Table A. Cross-dataset testing results under the fixed-modal scenarios (**Protocol 1**) among CASIA-CeFA (C), PADISI (P), CASIA-SURF (S), and WMCA (W). DG, MM, and FM are short for domain-generalized, multi-modal, and flexible-modal, respectively.

Method	Type	CPS → W		CPW → S		CSW → P		PSW → C		Average	
		HTER(%) ↓	AUC(%) ↑	HTER(%) ↓	AUC(%) ↑	HTER(%) ↓	AUC(%) ↑	HTER(%) ↓	AUC(%) ↑	HTER(%) ↓	AUC(%) ↑
SSDG [26]	DG	26.09	82.03	28.50	75.91	41.82	60.56	40.48	62.31	34.22	70.20
SSAN [70]	DG	17.73	91.69	27.94	79.04	34.49	68.85	36.43	69.29	29.15	77.22
SA-FAS [65]	DG	21.37	87.65	23.22	84.49	35.10	70.86	35.38	69.71	28.77	78.18
IADG [88]	DG	27.02	86.50	23.04	83.11	32.06	73.83	39.24	63.68	30.34	76.78
ViTAF [25]	DG	20.58	85.82	29.16	77.80	30.75	73.03	39.75	63.44	30.06	75.02
CLIP [57]	MM	14.55	90.47	18.17	90.02	24.13	83.15	38.33	65.71	23.80	82.33
FLIP [64]	MM	13.19	93.79	11.73	94.93	<b>17.39</b>	<b>90.63</b>	22.14	83.95	16.11	90.83
MM-CDCN [78]	MM	38.92	65.39	42.93	59.79	41.38	61.51	48.14	53.71	42.84	60.10
CMFL [21]	MM	18.22	88.82	31.20	75.66	26.68	80.85	36.93	66.82	28.26	78.04
ViT+AMA [83]	FM	17.56	88.74	27.50	80.00	21.18	85.51	47.48	55.56	28.43	77.45
VP-FAS [81]	FM	16.26	91.22	24.42	81.07	21.76	85.46	39.35	66.55	25.45	81.08
MMDG [41]	MM-DG	12.79	93.83	15.32	92.86	18.95	88.64	29.93	76.52	19.25	87.96
<b>DADM (Ours)</b>	<b>MM-DG</b>	<b>11.71</b>	<b>94.89</b>	<b>6.92</b>	<b>97.66</b>	19.03	88.22	<b>16.87</b>	<b>91.08</b>	<b>13.63</b>	<b>92.96</b>

Table B. Cross-dataset testing results under the missing-modal scenarios (**Protocol 2**) among CASIA-CeFA (C), PADISI (P), CASIA-SURF (S), and WMCA (W). We report the average HTER (%) and AUC(%) on four sub-protocols, i.e. CPS → W, CPW → S, CSW → P, PSW → C. DG, MM, and FM are short for domain-generalized, multi-modal, and flexible-modal, respectively.

Method	Type	Missing D		Missing I		Missing D & I		Average	
		HTER(%) ↓	AUC(%) ↑	HTER(%) ↓	AUC(%) ↑	HTER(%) ↓	AUC(%) ↑	HTER(%) ↓	AUC(%) ↑
SSDG [26]	DG	38.92	65.45	37.64	66.57	39.18	65.22	38.58	65.75
SSAN [70]	DG	36.77	69.21	41.20	61.92	33.52	73.38	37.16	68.17
SA-FAS [65]	DG	36.30	69.07	39.80	62.69	33.08	74.29	36.40	68.68
IADG [88]	DG	40.72	58.72	42.17	61.83	37.50	66.90	40.13	62.49
ViTAF [25]	DG	34.99	73.22	35.88	69.40	35.89	69.61	35.59	70.64
MM-CDCN [78]	MM	44.90	55.35	43.60	58.38	44.54	55.08	44.35	56.27
CMFL [21]	MM	31.37	74.62	30.55	75.42	31.89	74.29	31.27	74.78
ViT+AMA [83]	FM	29.25	77.70	32.30	74.06	31.48	75.82	31.01	75.86
VP-FAS [81]	FM	29.13	78.27	29.63	77.51	30.47	76.31	29.74	77.36
MMDG [41]	MM-DG	24.89	82.39	23.39	83.82	25.26	81.86	24.51	82.69
<b>DADM (Ours)</b>	<b>MM-DG</b>	<b>21.56</b>	<b>85.17</b>	<b>20.82</b>	<b>85.28</b>	<b>22.61</b>	<b>84.04</b>	<b>21.66</b>	<b>84.83</b>

detailed proof.

### 3.5. Training and Inference

The overall losses can be written as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{total}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{ce}} + \lambda_{\text{mi}}\mathcal{L}_{\text{mi}} + \lambda_{\text{angle}}\mathcal{L}_{\text{angle}}, \quad (18)$$

where  $\lambda_{\text{mi}}$ ,  $\lambda_{\text{angle}}$  are the coefficients of losses. We use PG-IRM [65] to optimize the total loss. The detailed optimization pipeline is provided in *supplementary material*.

At the inference stage, we use the mean hyperplane from  $\beta_{e_1}, \beta_{e_2}, \dots, \beta_{e_n}$  to get the final score. Specifically, the output is given by:

$$\text{Score} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{E}|} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \beta_e^T \phi(\mathbf{x}_{\text{RGB}}, \mathbf{x}_{\text{D}}, \mathbf{x}_{\text{I}}). \quad (19)$$

## 4. Experiments

### 4.1. Datasets, Protocols, and Performance Metrics

We use four commonly used multi-modal datasets: CASIA-CeFA (C) [43], PADISI-USC (P) [59], CASIA-SURF (S) [86], and WMCA (W) [22] to evaluate the DG performance. Each dataset comprises three modalities: RGB, depth (D), and infrared (I). We employ four protocols, i.e., fixed modalities, missing modalities, flexible modalities,

and limited source domains. In **Protocol 1**, we use four multi-modal leave-one-out (LOO) sub-protocols across C, P, S, and W, following [41]. For **Protocol 2**, we evaluate three test-time missing-modal scenarios, i.e., D is missing, I is missing, and both D and I are missing. **Protocol 3** extends this setup to consider three flexible scenarios where modalities are optionally missing during both training and testing. The probability of modality missing is 0.3 during training and testing. Finally, **Protocol 4** limits the number of source domains. The performance metrics are Half Total Error Rate (HTER) and Area Under the Curve (AUC).

### 4.2. Implementation Details

All RGB, depth, and infrared images are resized to  $224 \times 224 \times 3$ . We employ ViT-B/16 as the backbone, pre-trained on ImageNet with a patch size of 16 and a hidden size of 768. The model is trained for 50 epochs using the Adam optimizer [30] with a learning rate of  $5 \times 10^{-5}$  and a weight decay of  $1 \times 10^{-3}$ . The batch size is set to 32. The hyper-parameters involved are as follows:  $\tau_l=1.0$ ,  $\tau_s=0.85$ ,  $\lambda_{\text{mi}}=0.1$ , and  $\lambda_{\text{angle}}=0.3$ .

### 4.3. Multi-Modal Cross-Domain Evaluation

We compare our method on Protocols 1-4 against three categories of FAS methods: (a) Uni-modal domain generalization (DG) FAS. [26, 70, 87, 88] (b) Multi-modal

Table C. Cross-dataset testing results under the flexible-modal scenarios (**Protocol 3**) among CASIA-CeFA (C), PADISI (P), CASIA-SURF (S), and WMCA (W). We report the average HTER (%) and AUC (%) on four sub-protocols, i.e. **CPS**  $\rightarrow$  **W**, **CPW**  $\rightarrow$  **S**, **CSW**  $\rightarrow$  **P**, **PSW**  $\rightarrow$  **C**. DG, MM, and FM are short for domain-generalized, multi-modal, and flexible-modal, respectively.

Method	Type	Flexible D		Flexible I		Flexible D & I		Average	
		HTER(%) $\downarrow$	AUC(%) $\uparrow$	HTER(%) $\downarrow$	AUC(%) $\uparrow$	HTER(%) $\downarrow$	AUC(%) $\uparrow$	HTER(%) $\downarrow$	AUC(%) $\uparrow$
SSDG [26]	DG	34.79	68.23	33.64	69.40	35.02	68.19	34.48	68.61
SSAN [70]	DG	32.86	72.15	35.82	65.55	29.96	77.50	32.88	71.73
SA-FAS [65]	DG	32.43	73.05	35.35	67.46	29.57	78.28	32.45	72.93
IADG [88]	DG	36.39	61.22	37.69	64.46	33.52	69.74	35.87	65.14
VITAF [25]	DG	31.27	77.33	32.07	74.35	32.08	72.57	31.81	74.75
MM-CDCN [78]	MM	40.13	60.93	40.96	60.86	43.81	57.42	41.63	59.74
CMFL [21]	MM	30.04	74.79	29.31	75.63	30.50	75.45	29.95	75.29
ViT+AMA [83]	FM	28.43	78.01	30.09	75.12	29.95	76.62	29.49	76.58
VP-FAS [81]	FM	27.54	80.19	28.28	80.50	28.04	78.36	27.95	79.68
MMDG [41]	MM-DG	23.25	85.89	21.91	86.38	22.58	84.54	22.58	85.60
<b>DADM (Ours)</b>	MM-DG	<b>19.27</b>	<b>88.79</b>	<b>19.98</b>	<b>88.45</b>	<b>21.67</b>	<b>86.16</b>	<b>20.31</b>	<b>87.80</b>

Table D. Cross-dataset results under the limited source domain scenarios (**Protocol 4**) among CASIA-CeFA (C), PADISI-USC (P), CASIA-SURF (S), and WMCA (W).

Method	Type	CW $\rightarrow$ PS		PS $\rightarrow$ CW	
		HTER(%) $\downarrow$	AUC(%) $\uparrow$	HTER(%) $\downarrow$	AUC(%) $\uparrow$
SSDG [26]	DG	25.34	80.17	46.98	54.29
SSAN [70]	DG	26.55	80.06	39.10	67.19
SA-FAS [65]	DG	25.20	81.06	36.59	70.03
IADG [88]	DG	22.82	83.85	39.70	63.46
VITAF [25]	DG	29.64	77.36	39.93	61.31
MM-CDCN [78]	MM	29.28	76.88	47.00	51.94
CMFL [21]	MM	31.86	72.75	39.43	63.17
ViT+AMA [83]	FM	29.25	76.89	38.06	67.64
VP-FAS [81]	FM	25.90	81.79	44.37	60.83
MMDG [41]	MM-DG	20.12	88.24	36.60	70.35
<b>DADM (Ours)</b>	MM-DG	<b>12.61</b>	<b>93.81</b>	<b>20.40</b>	<b>89.51</b>

Table E. Ablation results on our proposed components. We report the average HTER and AUC.

Backbone	Adapter	ReGrad	Loss	HTER (%) $\downarrow$	AUC (%) $\uparrow$
ViT	-	-	CE	31.14	74.81
ViT	U-Adapter [41]	-	CE+SSP [41]	24.54	83.14
ViT	MIM+Vanilla-Conv	-	CE+SSP [41]	22.97	85.29
ViT	MIM+CDC-Adapter	-	CE+SSP [41]	21.75	86.17
ViT	U-Adapter	UEM-Guided	CE+SSP [41]	19.25	87.96
ViT	MIM+CDC-Adapter	MI-Guided	CE+SSP [41]+MI	17.17	88.14
ViT	MIM+CDC-Adapter	MI-Guided	PG-IRM [65]	16.54	90.27
ViT	MIM+CDC-Adapter	MI-Guided	DADM	14.31	92.05
ViT	MIM+CDC-Adapter	MI-Guided	DADM+MI	<b>13.63</b>	<b>92.96</b>

FAS [21, 83]. (c) Common multi-modal domain generalization FAS, i.e., MMDG [41]. For (a), to make them compatible with multi-modal protocols, concatenating all three modalities along the channel dimension and introducing a trainable convolution layer to adapt to a 3-channel input.

**Protocol 1: Fixed-Modal Scenarios.** Tab. A shows our method achieves superior performance across sub-protocols. Compared to most uni-modal DG and multi-modal FAS methods, DADM demonstrates a significant improvement, with an average HTER improvement of 15.52% and an average AUC improvement of 15.74% compared to SSAN [70], and 11.82% in HTER and 11.88% in AUC over VP-FAS [81]. Against previous state-of-the-art MMDG [41], DADM consistently outperforms except on **CSW**  $\rightarrow$  **P**, where the performance is slightly inferior. In particular, for **PSW**  $\rightarrow$  **C**, our method achieves overwhelming advantages, with a 13.06% HTER and 14.56% AUC improvement. Overall, the average improvement across all

Table F. Ablation results on different mutual information maximization losses.

Method	HTER (%) $\downarrow$	AUC (%) $\uparrow$
InfoNCE [52]	15.80	91.47
MINE [5]	14.40	92.13
<b>Ours</b>	<b>13.63</b>	<b>92.96</b>

Table G. Ablation results on vanilla and central difference convolutional adapter.

Method	HTER (%) $\downarrow$	AUC (%) $\uparrow$
Vanilla Conv	14.71	91.63
CDC Conv	<b>13.63</b>	<b>92.96</b>

Table H. Ablation results on mask generation strategy.

Method	Distance-based [68]	Threshold-based	Attention-based [41]	<b>Ours</b>
HTER (%) $\downarrow$	14.08	21.28	15.74	<b>13.63</b>
AUC (%) $\uparrow$	92.46	83.19	90.33	<b>92.96</b>

sub-protocols is 5.62% in HTER and 5% in AUC.

**Protocol 2: Missing-Modal Scenarios.** While recent multi-modal methods can improve the robustness of FAS systems, they require consistent training and testing modalities. This reliance overlooks scenarios where a modality may be missing during testing or in the real world, often leading to failure in distinguishing between live and spoof faces. In Protocol 2, when a modality is marked as missing, the input of that branch will be replaced with all zero input. As depicted in Table B, DADM outperforms all methods in scenarios where depth, infrared, or both of them are missing at test time. Notably, while ViT+AMA and VP-FAS are specifically designed for missing-modality settings, they do not consider the intra-domain modality and inter-domain modality misalignment and resulting in limited performance, while DADM handles effectively.

**Protocol 3: Flexible-Modal Scenarios.** The modality-missing in Protocol 2 only occurs during testing, while Protocol 3 may experience modality-missing during both training and testing. Additionally, we abandon the all-zero substitution approach in Protocol 2. Instead, when a modality is marked as missing during training, we leverage a learnable input tensor as a substitute, which has the same shape as the input images. This approach is somewhat similar to VP-FAS [81]. As there are three modalities of input that may all be missing, we set three learnable tensors. Tab. C shows that DADM surpasses competing methods in scenarios with flexible-missing modalities. Our method attains an average HTER improvement of 9.18% and an average AUC improvement of 11.22% compared to ViT+AMA [83],




Figure 5. (a) t-SNE result of feature distribution for source and target domains, the dotted line represents the decision hyperplane in 2D space. (b) Mean and Std. of cosine similarity.

and 7.64% in HTER and 8.12% in AUC over VP-FAS [81]. Against MMDG [41], our method achieves a 2.57% HTER and 2.20% AUC improvement.

**Protocol 4: Limited Source Domains.** In Protocol 4, the limited source domains intensify domain shift severity. Our approach achieves optimal results across sub-protocols, as shown in Tab. D. Other methods exhibit significant performance degradation compared to Protocol 1, yet DADM maintains robust performance, especially under substantial domain shift in PS  $\rightarrow$  CW. This further demonstrates the superior generalization of dual alignment of domain and modality, particularly in limited source data.

#### 4.4. Ablation Study

**Effectiveness of MIM, CDC-Adapter, and DADM optimization strategy.** Here, we perform a comprehensive ablation study on our proposed components MIM, CDC-Adapter, and DADM optimization strategy to demonstrate their individual effectiveness, as shown in Tab. E. We utilize a vanilla ViT as the backbone, the model experiences a performance boost when additional U-Adapters [41], MIM+Vanilla-Conv-Adapter, or MIM+CDC-Adapter are employed. The MIM+CDC-Adapter achieves the best result among them. This demonstrates the effectiveness of MIM and CDC-Adapter [9] for existing multi-modal DG FAS. After we employ MIM, the ReGrad [41] switches to MI-guided mode, while U-Adapter [41] enables UEM-guided [41] mode. The performance improvement is further pronounced when our MI-guided ReGrad is integrated. As we gradually adopt the DADM optimization strategy, the points also steadily improve. Finally, by incorporating all the components, the performance reaches the optimal.

**Comparison of different mutual information losses and convolutional adapters.** Tab. F compares some different mutual information maximization losses. Our experiments show that the InfoNCE [52], which is based on contrastive learning MI maximization has limited performance, and the common MINE [5] rely on the estimation of score function, introducing additional task-irrelevant network structures, does not achieve the best performance as well. However,




Figure 6. Visual attention map of all modalities and different presentation types.

the performance of our mentioned MI maximization loss in Eq. 15 is optimal. In Tab. G, we compare the Adapter based on vanilla convolution and CDC, and the results demonstrate that the performance of the CDC-Adapter is better. This is because CDC [80] combines both intensity-level semantic information and gradient-level messages, which are critical for capturing liveness representations.

**Performance of various mask generation strategies.** In Tab. H, we attempt several other alignment mask strategies, such as attention-based [41], distance-based [68], and simple threshold-based. The results show that our mutual information-based alignment mask strategy is optimal for solving multi-modal DG-FAS tasks.

#### 4.5. Visualization and Analysis

**Impact of dual alignment of domain and modality on feature distribution.** Fig. 5 validates the dual alignment of classification hyperplane and angle margin among modalities. As Fig. 5 (a), we utilize t-SNE [69] to perform feature visualization on CPS  $\rightarrow$  W. The hyperplane between lives and spoofs is consistent across different source domains and also transferable to unknown domains. Moreover, the distribution of lives are more compact, while the spoofs are scattered. In Fig. 5 (b), the modality angles between source and target domains exhibit generalization. The vertical axis represents the cosine similarity, and the horizontal axis denotes the corresponding modality. The histogram depicts the mean and variance of cosine similarity (i.e., angle).

**Visualization attention map demonstrates the function of the mutual information maximization.** We visualize attention maps to verify the mechanism of the MIM module by using Grad-CAM [60]. As Fig. 6 (b), for 3D mask attacks, the depth information of facial region is unreliable, thus it is assigned a lower importance. Similarly, for eyeglasses attacks, depth information is not reliable. Regarding printings attack, at the right of Fig. 6 (b), depth is easy to distinguish spoof pattern, so it obtain the higher importance than others. Additionally, in Fig. 6 (a), for lives, three modalities are all useful, as they need to possess live features simultaneously to be judged as live. These observations validate the effectiveness of using mutual information masks can adaptively enhance reliable modalities and suppress unreliable ones. For More visualizations, please refer



to supplementary materials.

## 5. Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a novel multi-modal DG-FAS framework to enhance generalization by addressing intra- and inter-domain misalignment of modalities. To mitigate the intra-domain modality misalignment, we propose mutual information mask to adaptively enhance favorable modalities and suppress unfavorable ones during cross-modal alignment. To mitigate the inter-domain modality misalignment, we dually align the hyperplane of each domain and the angle margin among modalities. Extensive experiments on multi-modal DG-FAS benchmark demonstrate the effectiveness of our method.

## References

- [1] Kartik Ahuja, Ethan Caballero, Dinghui Zhang, Jean-Christophe Gagnon-Audet, Yoshua Bengio, Ioannis Mitliagkas, and Irina Rish. Invariance principle meets information bottleneck for out-of-distribution generalization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34: 3438–3450, 2021. 3
- [2] Martin Arjovsky, Léon Bottou, Ishaan Gulrajani, and David Lopez-Paz. Invariant risk minimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.02893*, 2019. 3
- [3] Yousef Atoum, Yaojie Liu, Amin Jourabloo, and Xiaoming Liu. Face anti-spoofing using patch and depth-based cnns. In *2017 IEEE international joint conference on biometrics (IJCB)*, pages 319–328. IEEE, 2017. 1
- [4] Philip Bachman, R Devon Hjelm, and William Buchwalter. Learning representations by maximizing mutual information across views. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019. 2
- [5] Mohamed Ishmael Belghazi, Aristide Baratin, Sai Rajeshwar, Sherjil Ozair, Yoshua Bengio, Aaron Courville, and Devon Hjelm. Mutual information neural estimation. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 531–540. PMLR, 2018. 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 1
- [6] Zinelabidine Boulkenafet, Jukka Komulainen, and Abdenour Hadid. Face anti-spoofing based on color texture analysis. In *2015 IEEE international conference on image processing (ICIP)*, pages 2636–2640. IEEE, 2015. 1
- [7] Zinelabidine Boulkenafet, Jukka Komulainen, and Abdenour Hadid. Face antispoofing using speeded-up robust features and fisher vector encoding. *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, 24(2):141–145, 2016. 1
- [8] Rizhao Cai, Zhi Li, Renjie Wan, Haoliang Li, Yongjian Hu, and Alex C Kot. Learning meta pattern for face anti-spoofing. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 17:1201–1213, 2022. 2
- [9] Rizhao Cai, Yawen Cui, Zhi Li, Zitong Yu, Haoliang Li, Yongjian Hu, and Alex Kot. Rehearsal-free domain continual face anti-spoofing: Generalize more and forget less. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 8037–8048, 2023. 4, 8, 1
- [10] Pamela Carreno, Dana Kulic, and Michael Burke. Adapting neural models with sequential monte carlo dropout. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pages 1542–1552. PMLR, 2023. 2
- [11] Xi Chen, Yan Duan, Rein Houthoofd, John Schulman, Ilya Sutskever, and Pieter Abbeel. Infogan: Interpretable representation learning by information maximizing generative adversarial nets. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29, 2016. 2
- [12] Zhihong Chen, Taiping Yao, Kekai Sheng, Shouhong Ding, Ying Tai, Jilin Li, Feiyue Huang, and Xinyu Jin. Generalizable representation learning for mixture domain face anti-spoofing. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, pages 1132–1139, 2021. 2
- [13] Pengyu Cheng, Weituo Hao, Shuyang Dai, Jiachang Liu, Zhe Gan, and Lawrence Carin. Club: A contrastive log-ratio upper bound of mutual information. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1779–1788. PMLR, 2020. 2
- [14] Yo Joong Choe, Jiyeon Ham, and Kyubyong Park. An empirical study of invariant risk minimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.05007*, 2020. 3
- [15] Tiago de Freitas Pereira, André Anjos, José Mario De Martino, and Sébastien Marcel. Lbp- top based countermeasure against face spoofing attacks. In *Computer Vision-ACCV 2012 Workshops: ACCV 2012 International Workshops, Daejeon, Korea, November 5-6, 2012, Revised Selected Papers, Part I 11*, pages 121–132. Springer, 2013. 1
- [16] Pengchao Deng, Chenyang Ge, Xin Qiao, Hao Wei, and Yuan Sun. Attention-aware dual-stream network for multi-modal face anti-spoofing. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 18:4258–4271, 2023. 2
- [17] Monroe D Donsker and SR Srinivasa Varadhan. Asymptotic evaluation of certain markov process expectations for large time. iv. *Communications on pure and applied mathematics*, 36(2):183–212, 1983. 3, 1
- [18] Alexey Dosovitskiy. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929*, 2020. 2, 4
- [19] Zhekai Du, Jingjing Li, Lin Zuo, Lei Zhu, and Ke Lu. Energy-based domain generalization for face anti-spoofing. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM international conference on multimedia*, pages 1749–1757, 2022. 2
- [20] Anjith George and Sébastien Marcel. Learning one class representations for face presentation attack detection using multi-channel convolutional neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 16:361–375, 2020. 2
- [21] Anjith George and Sébastien Marcel. Cross modal focal loss for rgb-d face anti-spoofing. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 7882–7891, 2021. 2, 6, 7
- [22] Anjith George, Zohreh Mostaani, David Geissenbuhler, Olegs Nikisins, André Anjos, and Sébastien Marcel. Biometric face presentation attack detection with multi-channel convolutional neural network. *IEEE transactions on information forensics and security*, 15:42–55, 2019. 2, 6

- [23] R Devon Hjelm, Alex Fedorov, Samuel Lavoie-Marchildon, Karan Grewal, Phil Bachman, Adam Trischler, and Yoshua Bengio. Learning deep representations by mutual information estimation and maximization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.06670*, 2018. 2
- [24] Weihua Hu, Takeru Miyato, Seiya Tokui, Eiichi Matsumoto, and Masashi Sugiyama. Learning discrete representations via information maximizing self-augmented training. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1558–1567. PMLR, 2017. 2
- [25] Hsin-Ping Huang, Deqing Sun, Yaojie Liu, Wen-Sheng Chu, Taihong Xiao, Jinwei Yuan, Hartwig Adam, and Ming-Hsuan Yang. Adaptive transformers for robust few-shot cross-domain face anti-spoofing. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 37–54. Springer, 2022. 6, 7
- [26] Yunpei Jia, Jie Zhang, Shiguang Shan, and Xilin Chen. Single-side domain generalization for face anti-spoofing. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 8484–8493, 2020. 2, 6, 7, 1
- [27] Yunpei Jia, Jie Zhang, and Shiguang Shan. Dual-branch meta-learning network with distribution alignment for face anti-spoofing. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 17:138–151, 2021. 2
- [28] Fangling Jiang, Qi Li, Pengcheng Liu, Xiang-Dong Zhou, and Zhenan Sun. Adversarial learning domain-invariant conditional features for robust face anti-spoofing. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 131(7):1680–1703, 2023. 2
- [29] Pritish Kamath, Akilesh Tangella, Danica Sutherland, and Nathan Srebro. Does invariant risk minimization capture invariance? In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 4069–4077. PMLR, 2021. 4
- [30] Diederik P Kingma. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014. 6
- [31] Jukka Komulainen, Abdenour Hadid, and Matti Pietikäinen. Context based face anti-spoofing. In *2013 IEEE sixth international conference on biometrics: theory, applications and systems (BTAS)*, pages 1–8. IEEE, 2013. 1
- [32] Chenqi Kong, Kexin Zheng, Shiqi Wang, Anderson Rocha, and Haoliang Li. Beyond the pixel world: A novel acoustic-based face anti-spoofing system for smartphones. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 17:3238–3253, 2022. 2
- [33] Chenqi Kong, Kexin Zheng, Yibing Liu, Shiqi Wang, Anderson Rocha, and Haoliang Li. M<sup>3</sup> fas: An accurate and robust multimodal mobile face anti-spoofing system. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing*, 2024. 2
- [34] David Krueger, Ethan Caballero, Joern-Henrik Jacobsen, Amy Zhang, Jonathan Binas, Dinghui Zhang, Remi Le Priol, and Aaron Courville. Out-of-distribution generalization via risk extrapolation (rex). In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 5815–5826. PMLR, 2021. 3
- [35] Binh M Le and Simon S Woo. Gradient alignment for cross-domain face anti-spoofing. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 188–199, 2024. 2
- [36] Kwot Sin Lee, Ngoc-Trung Tran, and Ngai-Man Cheung. Infomax-gan: Improved adversarial image generation via information maximization and contrastive learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF winter conference on applications of computer vision*, pages 3942–3952, 2021. 2
- [37] Haoliang Li, Sinno Jialin Pan, Shiqi Wang, and Alex C Kot. Domain generalization with adversarial feature learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 5400–5409, 2018. 2
- [38] Zhi Li, Rizhao Cai, Haoliang Li, Kwok-Yan Lam, Yongjian Hu, and Alex C Kot. One-class knowledge distillation for face presentation attack detection. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 17:2137–2150, 2022. 2
- [39] Chen-Hao Liao, Wen-Cheng Chen, Hsuan-Tung Liu, Yi-Ren Yeh, Min-Chun Hu, and Chu-Song Chen. Domain invariant vision transformer learning for face anti-spoofing. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pages 6098–6107, 2023. 2
- [40] Ruizhi Liao, Daniel Moyer, Miriam Cha, Keegan Quigley, Seth Berkowitz, Steven Horng, Polina Golland, and William M Wells. Multimodal representation learning via maximization of local mutual information. In *Medical Image Computing and Computer Assisted Intervention—MICCAI 2021: 24th International Conference, Strasbourg, France, September 27–October 1, 2021, Proceedings, Part II 24*, pages 273–283. Springer, 2021. 2
- [41] Xun Lin, Shuai Wang, Rizhao Cai, Yizhong Liu, Ying Fu, Wenzhong Tang, Zitong Yu, and Alex Kot. Suppress and rebalance: Towards generalized multi-modal face anti-spoofing. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 211–221, 2024. 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 3
- [42] Ajian Liu and Yanyan Liang. Ma-vit: Modality-agnostic vision transformers for face anti-spoofing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.07549*, 2023. 2
- [43] Ajian Liu, Zichang Tan, Jun Wan, Sergio Escalera, Guodong Guo, and Stan Z Li. Casia-surf cefa: A benchmark for multi-modal cross-ethnicity face anti-spoofing. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF winter conference on applications of computer vision*, pages 1179–1187, 2021. 6
- [44] Ajian Liu, Zichang Tan, Zitong Yu, Chenxu Zhao, Jun Wan, Yanyan Liang, Zhen Lei, Du Zhang, Stan Z Li, and Guodong Guo. Fm-vit: Flexible modal vision transformers for face anti-spoofing. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 18:4775–4786, 2023. 2
- [45] Yaojie Liu and Xiaoming Liu. Spoof trace disentanglement for generic face anti-spoofing. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 45(3):3813–3830, 2022. 2
- [46] Yaojie Liu, Amin Jourabloo, and Xiaoming Liu. Learning deep models for face anti-spoofing: Binary or auxiliary supervision. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 389–398, 2018. 1
- [47] Yuchen Liu, Yabo Chen, Mengran Gou, Chun-Ting Huang, Yaoming Wang, Wenrui Dai, and Hongkai Xiong. Towards unsupervised domain generalization for face anti-spoofing.

- In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 20654–20664, 2023. 2
- [48] Yuki Mae, Wataru Kumagai, and Takafumi Kanamori. Uncertainty propagation for dropout-based bayesian neural networks. *Neural Networks*, 144:394–406, 2021. 2
- [49] Jovana Mitrovic, Brian McWilliams, Jacob Walker, Lars Buesing, and Charles Blundell. Representation learning via invariant causal mechanisms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.07922*, 2020. 3
- [50] Olegs Nikisins, Anjith George, and Sébastien Marcel. Domain adaptation in multi-channel autoencoder based features for robust face anti-spoofing. In *2019 International Conference on Biometrics (ICB)*, pages 1–8. IEEE, 2019. 2
- [51] Jorge Nocedal and Stephen J Wright. *Numerical optimization*. Springer, 1999. 4
- [52] Aaron van den Oord, Yazhe Li, and Oriol Vinyals. Representation learning with contrastive predictive coding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.03748*, 2018. 2, 7, 8
- [53] Aleksandr Parkin and Oleg Grinchuk. Recognizing multi-modal face spoofing with face recognition networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition workshops*, pages 0–0, 2019. 2
- [54] Keyurkumar Patel, Hu Han, and Anil K Jain. Secure face unlock: Spoof detection on smartphones. *IEEE transactions on information forensics and security*, 11(10):2268–2283, 2016. 1
- [55] Bruno Peixoto, Carolina Michelassi, and Anderson Rocha. Face liveness detection under bad illumination conditions. In *2011 18th IEEE International Conference on Image Processing*, pages 3557–3560. IEEE, 2011. 1
- [56] Yunxiao Qin, Zitong Yu, Longbin Yan, Zezheng Wang, Chenxu Zhao, and Zhen Lei. Meta-teacher for face anti-spoofing. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 44(10):6311–6326, 2021. 2
- [57] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8748–8763. PmLR, 2021. 6
- [58] Elan Rosenfeld, Pradeep Ravikumar, and Andrej Risteski. The risks of invariant risk minimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.05761*, 2020. 4
- [59] Mohammad Rostami, Leonidas Spinoulas, Mohamed Hussein, Joe Mathai, and Wael Abd-Almageed. Detection and continual learning of novel face presentation attacks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 14851–14860, 2021. 6
- [60] Ramprasaath R Selvaraju, Michael Cogswell, Abhishek Das, Ramakrishna Vedantam, Devi Parikh, and Dhruv Batra. Grad-cam: Visual explanations from deep networks via gradient-based localization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 618–626, 2017. 8
- [61] Rui Shao, Xiangyuan Lan, Jiawei Li, and Pong C Yuen. Multi-adversarial discriminative deep domain generalization for face presentation attack detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 10023–10031, 2019. 2
- [62] Rui Shao, Xiangyuan Lan, and Pong C Yuen. Regularized fine-grained meta face anti-spoofing. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, pages 11974–11981, 2020. 2
- [63] Tao Shen, Yuyu Huang, and Zhijun Tong. Facebagnet: Bag-of-local-features model for multi-modal face anti-spoofing. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition workshops*, pages 0–0, 2019. 2
- [64] Koushik Srivatsan, Muzammal Naseer, and Karthik Nandakumar. Flip: Cross-domain face anti-spoofing with language guidance. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 19685–19696, 2023. 6
- [65] Yiyu Sun, Yaojie Liu, Xiaoming Liu, Yixuan Li, and Wen-Sheng Chu. Rethinking domain generalization for face anti-spoofing: Separability and alignment. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 24563–24574, 2023. 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 3
- [66] Yonglong Tian, Dilip Krishnan, and Phillip Isola. Contrastive multiview coding. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part XI 16*, pages 776–794. Springer, 2020. 2
- [67] Michael Tschannen, Josip Djolonga, Paul K Rubenstein, Sylvain Gelly, and Mario Lucic. On mutual information maximization for representation learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.13625*, 2019. 2
- [68] Shuyuan Tu, Qi Dai, Zuxuan Wu, Zhi-Qi Cheng, Han Hu, and Yu-Gang Jiang. Implicit temporal modeling with learnable alignment for video recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 19936–19947, 2023. 2, 7, 8
- [69] Laurens Van der Maaten and Geoffrey Hinton. Visualizing data using t-sne. *Journal of machine learning research*, 9(11), 2008. 8
- [70] Zhuo Wang, Zezheng Wang, Zitong Yu, Weihong Deng, Jiahong Li, Tingting Gao, and Zhongyuan Wang. Domain generalization via shuffled style assembly for face anti-spoofing. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 4123–4133, 2022. 2, 6, 7
- [71] Xinyu Xie, Yawen Cui, Tao Tan, Xubin Zheng, and Zitong Yu. Fusionmamba: Dynamic feature enhancement for multi-modal image fusion with mamba. *Visual Intelligence*, 2(37), 2024. 2
- [72] Lan Xixi, Changchun Zou, Cheng Peng, and Caowei Wu. Uncertainty quantification in intelligent-based electrical resistivity tomography image reconstruction with monte carlo dropout strategy. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 61:1–16, 2023. 2
- [73] Jianwei Yang, Zhen Lei, and Stan Z Li. Learn convolutional neural network for face anti-spoofing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1408.5601*, 2014. 1

- [74] Jingyi Yang, Zitong Yu, Xiuming Ni, Jia He, and Hui Li.  $G^2 v^2$  former: Graph guided video vision transformer for face anti-spoofing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.07675*, 2024. [2](#)
- [75] Jingyi Yang, Zitong Yu, Xiuming Ni, Jia He, and Hui Li. Generalized face anti-spoofing via finer domain partition and disentangling liveness-irrelevant factors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.08243*, 2024. [2](#), [1](#)
- [76] Jingyi Yang, Zitong Yu, Xiuming Ni, Jia He, and Hui Li. Kronecker mask and interpretive prompts are language-action video learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.03549*, 2025. [2](#)
- [77] Xiao Yang, Wenhan Luo, Linchao Bao, Yuan Gao, Dihong Gong, Shibao Zheng, Zhifeng Li, and Wei Liu. Face anti-spoofing: Model matters, so does data. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 3507–3516, 2019. [1](#)
- [78] Zitong Yu, Yunxiao Qin, Xiaobai Li, Zezheng Wang, Chenxu Zhao, Zhen Lei, and Guoying Zhao. Multi-modal face anti-spoofing based on central difference networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops*, pages 650–651, 2020. [2](#), [6](#), [7](#), [1](#)
- [79] Zitong Yu, Jun Wan, Yunxiao Qin, Xiaobai Li, Stan Z Li, and Guoying Zhao. Nas-fas: Static-dynamic central difference network search for face anti-spoofing. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 43(9):3005–3023, 2020. [4](#)
- [80] Zitong Yu, Chenxu Zhao, Zezheng Wang, Yunxiao Qin, Zhuo Su, Xiaobai Li, Feng Zhou, and Guoying Zhao. Searching central difference convolutional networks for face anti-spoofing. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 5295–5305, 2020. [4](#), [8](#), [1](#)
- [81] Zitong Yu, Rizhao Cai, Yawen Cui, Ajian Liu, and Changsheng Chen. Visual prompt flexible-modal face anti-spoofing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.13958*, 2023. [2](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#)
- [82] Zitong Yu, Ajian Liu, Chenxu Zhao, Kevin HM Cheng, Xu Cheng, and Guoying Zhao. Flexible-modal face anti-spoofing: A benchmark. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 6346–6351, 2023.
- [83] Zitong Yu, Rizhao Cai, Yawen Cui, Xin Liu, Yongjian Hu, and Alex C Kot. Rethinking vision transformer and masked autoencoder in multimodal face anti-spoofing. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, pages 1–22, 2024. [2](#), [6](#), [7](#)
- [84] Haixiao Yue, Keyao Wang, Guosheng Zhang, Haocheng Feng, Junyu Han, Errui Ding, and Jingdong Wang. Cyclically disentangled feature translation for face anti-spoofing. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 3358–3366, 2023. [2](#)
- [85] Jing Zhang, Deng-Ping Fan, Yuchao Dai, Xin Yu, Yiran Zhong, Nick Barnes, and Ling Shao. Rgb-d saliency detection via cascaded mutual information minimization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 4338–4347, 2021. [2](#)
- [86] Shifeng Zhang, Ajian Liu, Jun Wan, Yanyan Liang, Guodong Guo, Sergio Escalera, Hugo Jair Escalante, and Stan Z Li. Casia-surf: A large-scale multi-modal benchmark for face anti-spoofing. *IEEE Transactions on Biometrics, Behavior, and Identity Science*, 2(2):182–193, 2020. [2](#), [6](#)
- [87] Qianyu Zhou, Ke-Yue Zhang, Taiping Yao, Ran Yi, Shouhong Ding, and Lizhuang Ma. Adaptive mixture of experts learning for generalizable face anti-spoofing. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM international conference on multimedia*, pages 6009–6018, 2022. [2](#), [6](#)
- [88] Qianyu Zhou, Ke-Yue Zhang, Taiping Yao, Xuequan Lu, Ran Yi, Shouhong Ding, and Lizhuang Ma. Instance-aware domain generalization for face anti-spoofing. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 20453–20463, 2023. [2](#), [6](#), [7](#)
- [89] Qianyu Zhou, Ke-Yue Zhang, Taiping Yao, Xuequan Lu, Shouhong Ding, and Lizhuang Ma. Test-time domain generalization for face anti-spoofing. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 175–187, 2024. [2](#)



# DADM: Dual Alignment of Domain and Modality for Face Anti-spoofing

## Supplementary Material

### 6. Proofs of Donsker-Varadhan Representation Theorem

We provide this section for helping understand mutual information maximization formula in Sec. 3.1. We typically need to estimate a lower bound of mutual information and then continuously raise this lower bound to achieve the goal. Among them, Donsker-Varadhan theorem [17] is a commonly used estimation of the lower bound of mutual information. Belghazi et al. [5] converts it into the dual representation:

$$I_{\text{MINE}} = \mathbb{E}_{p(x,y)}[f(x,y)] - \log(\mathbb{E}_{p(x)p(y)}[e^{f(x,y)}]). \quad (20)$$

**Donsker-Varadhan representation theorem [17].** *The KL-divergence possesses the following dual representation supremum:*

$$D_{\text{KL}}(P||Q) = \sup_{T: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, T \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E}_P[T] - \log(\mathbb{E}_Q[e^T]), \quad (21)$$

where the supremum is taken over all functions  $T$  such that the two expectations are finite.  $\mathcal{F}$  be any class of functions  $T: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfying the integrability constraints of the theorem.

For a given function  $T$ , consider the Gibbs distribution  $G$  defined by  $dG = \frac{1}{Z} e^T dQ$ , where  $Z = \mathbb{E}_Q[e^T]$ . By construction

$$\mathbb{E}_P[T] - \log(\mathbb{E}_Q[e^T]) = \mathbb{E}_P[\log \frac{dG}{dQ}], \quad (22)$$

as  $T = \log[Z \frac{dG}{dQ}] = \log Z + \log \frac{dG}{dQ} = \log(\mathbb{E}_Q[e^T]) + \log \frac{dG}{dQ}$ . Let  $\Delta$  be the gap, and combining Eqn. 22:

$$\Delta = D_{\text{KL}}(P||Q) - (\mathbb{E}_P[T] - \log(\mathbb{E}_Q[e^T])), \quad (23)$$

$$\Delta = D_{\text{KL}}(P||Q) - \mathbb{E}_P[\log \frac{dG}{dQ}], \quad (24)$$

$$\Delta = \mathbb{E}_P[\log \frac{dP}{dQ} - \log \frac{dG}{dQ}] = \mathbb{E}_P[\log \frac{dP}{dG}] = D_{\text{KL}}(P||G), \quad (25)$$

we can easily draw the conclusion that  $\Delta \geq 0$ , because KL-divergence  $D_{\text{KL}}(P||G)$  is always positive, i.e.,  $D_{\text{KL}}(P||Q) \geq \mathbb{E}_P[T] - \log(\mathbb{E}_Q[e^T])$ . The proof is completed.

Since mutual information can be written in the form of the KL-divergence between the joint distribution and the product of the marginal distribution, such a lower bound can also be obtained for mutual information. The idea of [5] is

to choose  $\mathcal{F}$  to be the family of functions parametrized by a deep neural network with parameters  $\theta \in \Theta$ , so there exists:

$$I(X; Y) \geq I_{\Theta}(X; Y), \quad (26)$$

where  $I_{\Theta}(X; Y)$  is defined as:

$$I_{\Theta}(X; Y) = \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{E}_{P_{XY}}[T_{\theta}] - \log(\mathbb{E}_{P_X P_Y}[e^{T_{\theta}}]). \quad (27)$$

In code implementation, we estimate the expectations in Eq. 27 using empirical samples from  $P_{XY}$  and  $P_X P_Y$  (i.e., by shuffling the samples from the joint distribution along the batch axis). Ultimately, the objective function can be optimized through gradient descent and back propagation. The common approach is to use an independent neural network to process the features of two modalities  $X$  and  $Y$ . Instead, we employ the average of the mutual information tokens mentioned in Eq. 12, 15, where the MI tokens represent the summarization of fused features. It can be seen as a special case of the score function  $f(x, y)$ .

### 7. Supplementary Experimental Results

**Empirical studies on hyper-parameters.** In Tab. I, we conduct empirical studies on the  $\lambda$  coefficients of different loss terms. We select appropriate  $\lambda$  values within the interval of (0,1) to find the relatively optimal combination. The final combination obtained is  $(\lambda_{\text{mi}}, \lambda_{\text{angle}}) = (0.1, 0.3)$ . In Tab. J, we carry out empirical studies on temperature coefficients  $\tau_l$  and  $\tau_s$ . We attempt various values for  $\tau_l$  and  $\tau_s$  within the interval of (0,1) to determine the relatively optimal combination. Meanwhile, based on the experience from some previous studies [26, 75], we assume that live and spoof samples exhibit an asymmetry distribution with different degree of relaxation in the hyper-feature space. Therefore, when conducting our attempts, we prefer to impose a more compact feature distribution to the live samples, while allowing the spoof samples to have a looser feature distribution. The optimal combination we have found is  $(\tau_l, \tau_s) = (1.0, 0.85)$ .

**Convergence speed of CDC-Adapter and vanilla convolutional Adapter.** In face anti-spoofing field, there are lots of works [9, 78, 80], apply central difference convolution operator for live/spoof representation capture. The CDC [80] operator combines both intensity-level semantic infor-

Table I. Empirical studies on  $\lambda$  coefficients.

$\lambda_{mi}$	$\lambda_{angle}$	HTER (%) $\downarrow$	AUC (%) $\uparrow$
0.3	0.5	15.54	90.54
0.2	0.5	14.98	90.63
0.1	0.5	14.33	91.65
0.1	0.4	14.02	91.94
0.0	0.4	14.52	92.11
0.0	0.3	14.31	92.05
0.1	0.3	<b>13.63</b>	<b>92.96</b>

Table J. Empirical results on temperature coefficient  $\tau_l$  and  $\tau_s$ .

$\tau_l$	$\tau_s$	HTER (%) $\downarrow$	AUC (%) $\uparrow$
1.0	0.5	15.80	90.77
1.0	0.6	15.25	90.68
1.0	0.7	14.74	91.05
1.0	0.8	14.28	91.93
1.0	0.9	13.91	92.30
0.9	0.8	14.09	91.92
0.95	0.8	13.85	91.98
1.0	0.85	<b>13.63</b>	<b>92.96</b>

mation and gradient-level messages:

$$y(p_0) = \theta \cdot \underbrace{\sum_{p_n \in \mathcal{P}} w(p_n) \cdot (x(p_0 + p_n) - x(p_0))}_{\text{central difference convolution}} + (1 - \theta) \cdot \underbrace{\sum_{p_n \in \mathcal{P}} w(p_n) \cdot x(p_0 + p_n)}_{\text{vanilla convolution}}, \quad (28)$$

where  $p_0$  is current location on input feature map while  $p_n$  enumerates the locations in  $\mathcal{P}$  (pixel neighborhood),  $w(p_n)$  are the weights of convolutional kernel corresponding to the location  $p_n$ , hyper-parameter  $\theta \in [0, 1]$  tradeoffs the importance between intensity and gradient information.

In Fig. 7, we compare the convergence speed of Adapters based on vanilla convolution and CDC. Combining the results from Tab. G, they demonstrate that the convergence speed of the vanilla convolution (which tends to stabilize after about 20 epochs) is faster than CDC (which tends to stabilize after about 30 epochs), and the performance of CDC is better. This phenomenon indicates that vanilla convolutional Adapter may have higher risk of overfitting compared to CDC-Adapter, CDC-Adapter is more robust for our backbone’s fine-tuning.

## 8. Algorithm

The multi-modal PG-IRM algorithm is shown as below. Additionally, our input contains three modalities and includes a constraint term of angle margin in the total loss, therefore, the algorithm is designed with dual alignment of hyperplanes and angles. Our DADM optimization pipeline:




Figure 7. Convergence speed of different convolutional Adapter. (a) CDC (Central Difference Convolution)-Adapter. (b) Vanilla Convolutional-Adapter.

### Algorithm 1 The optimization pipeline of DADM

**Input:** Source Data  $S = \{x_i^{\text{RGB}}, x_i^{\text{D}}, x_i^{\text{I}}, y_j, e_i\}_i^N$ , Target Data  $T = \{x_j^{\text{RGB}}, x_j^{\text{D}}, x_j^{\text{I}}, y_j\}_j^M$ , neural network  $\phi(\cdot)$ , classifiers  $\beta_{e_1}, \beta_{e_2}, \dots, \beta_{\mathcal{E}}$ , learning rate  $\gamma$ , alignment parameter  $\alpha$ , alignment starting epoch  $T_\alpha$ .

**Output:**  $\phi(\cdot)$ ,  $\text{mean}(\beta_{e_1}, \beta_{e_2}, \dots, \beta_{\mathcal{E}})$

- 1: **for** t in 0, 1,  $\dots$ , T **do**
  - 2:   **Data Prep:** Sampling a mini-batch  $B$  samples,  $X_s = \{x_i^{\text{RGB}}, x_i^{\text{D}}, x_i^{\text{I}}, y_j, e_i\}_i^B$
  - 3:   **Forward:** Obtain multi-modal features and scores,  $[f_i^{\text{RGB}}, f_i^{\text{D}}, f_i^{\text{I}}]_{e_i} = \phi^t([x_i^{\text{RGB}}, x_i^{\text{D}}, x_i^{\text{I}}]_{e_i})$ ,  $\hat{y}_{e_i} = \beta_{e_i}^t [f_i^{\text{RGB}}, f_i^{\text{D}}, f_i^{\text{I}}]_{e_i}$
  - 4:   **Backward:** Compute  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{total}}$ , update  $\phi^{t+1} = \phi^t - \gamma \nabla_{\phi^t} \mathcal{L}_{\text{total}}$
  - 5:   **for**  $e \in \mathcal{E}$  **do**
  - 6:      $\tilde{\beta}_e^{t+1} = \beta_e^t - \gamma \nabla_{\beta_e^t} \mathcal{L}_{\text{total}}$
  - 7:     select  $\beta_e^t$  with  $\bar{e} = \underset{e' \in \mathcal{E} \setminus e}{\text{argmax}} \|\tilde{\beta}_e^{t+1} - \beta_{e'}^t\|_2$
  - 8:      $\alpha' = 1 - \mathbf{1}_{1 > T_\alpha} (1 - \alpha)$
  - 9:      $\beta_e^{t+1} = \alpha' \tilde{\beta}_e^{t+1} + (1 - \alpha') \beta_e^t$
  - 10:   **end for**
  - 11:    $\bar{\beta}^{t+1} = \text{mean}(\beta_{e_1}^{t+1}, \beta_{e_2}^{t+1}, \dots, \beta_{\mathcal{E}}^{t+1})$
  - 12:   **Evaluate:** Test  $\phi^{t+1}(\cdot)$ ,  $\bar{\beta}^{t+1}$  on  $T$
  - 13:   **if** performance better **then**
  - 14:     update  $\phi^*(\cdot) = \phi^{t+1}(\cdot)$ ,  $\beta^* = \bar{\beta}^{t+1}$
  - 15:   **end if**
  - 16: **end for**
- Return**  $\phi^*(\cdot)$ ,  $\beta^*$

## 9. Proofs of the Necessity of Domain Alignment and Angle Alignment

Invariant Risk Minimization (IRM) is a challenging bi-level optimization problem that is hard to solve. Thanks to the efforts of Sun et. al [65], they propose the Projected Gradient Optimization for IRM (PG-IRM) which is an equivalent objective to IRM, with strict proof, and it is easier to optimize. The brief proof process is as follows:

**Theorem 1. Projected Gradient Optimization IRM objective is equivalent to IRM objective.** For all  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ ,

the IRM objective is equivalent to the following objective:

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\phi, \beta_{e_1}, \dots, \beta_{e_{|\mathcal{E}|}}} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{E}|} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} R^e(\phi, \beta_e), \\ & \text{s.t. } \forall e \in \mathcal{E}, \exists \beta_e \in \Omega_e(\phi), \beta_e \in \Upsilon_\alpha(\beta_e), \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where the parametric constrained set for each environment is simplified as  $\Omega_e(\phi) = \operatorname{argmin}_\beta R^e(\phi, \beta)$ , and the  $\alpha$ -adjacency set is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon_\alpha(\beta_e) &= \{v \mid \max_{e' \in \mathcal{E} \setminus e} \min_{\beta_{e'} \in \Omega_{e'}(\phi)} \|v - \beta_{e'}\|_2 \\ &\leq \alpha \max_{e' \in \mathcal{E} \setminus e} \min_{\beta_{e'} \in \Omega_{e'}(\phi)} \|\beta_e - \beta_{e'}\|_2\}. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

### Proofs 1.

The IRM objective is the following constrained optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\phi, \beta^*} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{E}|} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} R^e(\phi, \beta^*), \\ & \text{s.t. } \beta^* \in \operatorname{argmin}_\beta R^e(\phi, \beta), \forall e \in \mathcal{E}, \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where  $\phi$  represents a neural network,  $\beta$  denotes the hyperplane for classification,  $\mathcal{E} = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{|\mathcal{E}|}\}$  represents the entire environment,  $e$  is one of the sub-environments, and  $f(x; \beta, \phi)$  is the function processing  $x$  via  $\phi, \beta$  and obtaining  $y$ . The risk function  $R^e(\phi, \beta)$ , based on the loss function  $\mathcal{L}(\cdot, \cdot)$ , for a given environment  $e$ , is defined as:

$$R^e(\phi, \beta) = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim e} [\mathcal{L}(f(x; \beta, \phi), y)]. \quad (32)$$

The constrain  $\beta^* = \operatorname{argmin}_\beta R^e(\phi, \beta), \forall e \in \mathcal{E}$ , means that the  $\beta^*$  is the optimal linear classifier for all  $e \in \mathcal{E}$ , which is equivalent to  $\beta^* \in \bigcap_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \Omega_e(\phi)$ , and equivalent to:

$$\forall e \in \mathcal{E}, \exists \beta_e \in \Omega_e(\phi), \beta^* = \beta_e. \quad (33)$$

This indicates that for all  $e \in \mathcal{E}$ , there is a hyperplane in the optimal set  $\Omega_e(\phi)$  that also lies in the intersection of other environments' optimal set ( $\bigcap_{e' \in \mathcal{E} \setminus e} \Omega_{e'}(\phi)$ ), i.e.:

$$\forall e \in \mathcal{E}, \exists \beta_e \in \Omega_e(\phi), \beta_e \in \bigcap_{e' \in \mathcal{E} \setminus e} \Omega_{e'}(\phi). \quad (34)$$

Sun et. al [65] relax the constrain to:

$$\beta_e \in \bigcap_{e' \in \mathcal{E} \setminus e} \Omega_{e'}(\phi) \rightarrow \max_{e' \in \mathcal{E} \setminus e} \|\beta_e - \Omega_{e'}(\phi)\|_2 \leq \epsilon, \quad (35)$$

due to one key challenge for constrain 34 is that there is a no guarantee that is non-empty for a feature extractor  $\phi$  and  $\beta_e$ . Then they define the  $l_2$  distance between a vector  $\beta$  and a set  $\Omega$  as:  $\|\beta - \Omega\|_2 = \min_{e' \in \mathcal{E} \setminus e} \|\beta - v\|_2$ . Practically,  $\epsilon$  can

be set to be any variable converging to 0 during the optimization stage. Without losing the generality, they change the constraint to the following form:

$$\forall e \in \mathcal{E}, \exists \beta_e \in \Omega_e(\phi), \quad (36)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{e' \in \mathcal{E} \setminus e} \min_{\beta_{e'} \in \Omega_{e'}(\phi)} \|\beta_e - \beta_{e'}\|_2 \leq \\ & \alpha \max_{e' \in \mathcal{E} \setminus e} \min_{\beta_{e'} \in \Omega_{e'}(\phi)} \|\beta_e - \beta_{e'}\|_2, \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

where  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . Note that constraint 36 will be satisfied only when  $\max_{e' \in \mathcal{E} \setminus e} \min_{\beta_{e'} \in \Omega_{e'}(\phi)} \|\beta_e - \beta_{e'}\|_2 = 0$ . Therefore constraint 34 is equivalent to constraint 36.

Let's define  $\Upsilon_\alpha(\beta_e)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon_\alpha(\beta_e) &= \{v \mid \max_{e' \in \mathcal{E} \setminus e} \min_{\beta_{e'} \in \Omega_{e'}(\phi)} \|v - \beta_{e'}\|_2 \\ &\leq \alpha \max_{e' \in \mathcal{E} \setminus e} \min_{\beta_{e'} \in \Omega_{e'}(\phi)} \|\beta_e - \beta_{e'}\|_2\}, \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

then the constraint 33 can be simplified to:

$$\text{s.t. } \forall e \in \mathcal{E}, \exists \beta_e \in \Omega_e(\phi), \beta_e \in \Upsilon_\alpha(\beta_e). \quad (39)$$

### Proofs 1 Completed.

Above Theorem 1 ensures that the PG-IRM's optimization objective being equivalent to the IRM's optimization objective.

**Why we need dual alignment of hyperplane and angle margin?** In uni-modality scenarios, misalignment has always been a critical concern, as it relates to whether domain-invariant representations have been truly learned. MMDG [41] found that directly incorporating multi-modality into DG-FAS can result in performance degradation, indicating the significance impact from domain and modality misalignment. Therefore, dual alignment of modality and domain is crucial.

**Theorem 2. Misalignment of angle margin for modality features leads to severe shift and difficult convergence of the optimal classification hyperplane  $\beta^*$  in PG-IRM.** For misaligned angle margin among modalities features in varies domains  $[f_0^e, \dots, f_i^e, \dots, f_{\mathcal{M}}^e]_{\mathcal{M}} \in \mathcal{E}$ , where  $[f_0^e, \dots, f_i^e, \dots, f_{\mathcal{M}}^e] = \phi([x_0^e, \dots, x_i^e, \dots, x_{\mathcal{M}}^e]) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{M}}$ ,  $x_i^e$  represents single modality input  $i$  from environment  $e$ . The the optimal classification hyperplane  $\beta^*$  will severely shift.

#### Notation declarations.

For  $f_i^e(k)$ ,  $f$  represents the feature, the superscript  $e$  denotes  $f^e$  comes from environment  $e$ , the subscript  $i$  denotes the  $i$ -th modality feature,  $f(k)$  indicates the  $k$ -th element of  $f$ . Specially,  $f^e$  (without subscript) denotes final fusion feature from environment  $e$ ,  $f^e(k)$  indicates the  $k$ -th element of  $f^e$ .

#### Proofs 2.

For  $[f_0^e, \dots, f_i^e, \dots, f_{\mathcal{M}}^e] = \phi([x_0^e, \dots, x_i^e, \dots, x_{\mathcal{M}}^e]) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{M}}$ , where  $f_i^e \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{D} \times 1}$  and  $\mathcal{M}$  is the number of modalities, we construct a modality matrix for environment  $e$ :

$$F^e = [f_0^e, \dots, f_i^e, \dots, f_{\mathcal{M}}^e] \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{M}}, \quad (40)$$

the final fusion feature  $f^e$  is obtained via a linear projecting  $P \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{M} \times 1}$ :

$$f^e = F^e P = \sum_i^{\mathcal{M}} p_i f_i^e \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{D} \times 1}. \quad (41)$$

### Intra-domain case.

The intra-domain co-variance matrix of  $f^e$  is as follows (for the simplicity, we omit the superscript  $e$ ):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[f] &= \sum_i^{\mathcal{M}} p(i) \mathbb{E}[f_i], \\ \mathbb{D}[f] &= \mathbb{E}[(f - \mathbb{E}[f])(f - \mathbb{E}[f])^{\mathbf{T}}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[f f^{\mathbf{T}}] - \mathbb{E}[f] \mathbb{E}[f]^{\mathbf{T}} \\ &= \mathbb{E}[F P P^{\mathbf{T}} F^{\mathbf{T}}] - \mathbb{E}[f] \mathbb{E}[f]^{\mathbf{T}}, \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

where  $p(i)$  denotes the  $i$ -th element of  $P$ .

Assuming that the modality features  $f_i^e$  have been normalized before classification by the classifier  $\beta$ , i.e.,  $\mathbb{E}[f_i] = 0$ ,  $\|f_i\| = 1$ , thus Eqn 42 can be rewritten as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[f] &= 0, \\ \mathbb{D}[f] &= \mathbb{E}[F P P^{\mathbf{T}} F^{\mathbf{T}}], \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

and  $k$ -th diagonal elements of co-variance matrix  $\mathbb{D}[f]$ , which represents the  $\mathbb{D}[f(k)]$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{D}[f(k)] &= p(k)^2 \mathbb{E}[\langle f_k, f_k \rangle] \\ &= p(k)^2 \mathbb{E}[\|f_k\| \cdot \|f_k\| \cos \theta_k] \\ &= p(k)^2 \mathbb{E}[\cos \theta_{kk}], \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

where  $\langle, \rangle$  indicates the inner product,  $p(k)$  denotes the  $k$ -th element of  $P$ .

Since we consider that the distribution of angles  $\theta_{kk}$  ( $\theta$ ) without intervention generally does not approach a constant distribution, in order to maintain generality, we suppose that  $\theta$  follows a Gaussian distribution with  $\mu$  and variance  $\sigma$ ,  $N(\mu, \sigma)$ :

$$f(\theta) = \frac{1}{\sigma \sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{(\theta - \mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right). \quad (45)$$

Then we can calculate the value of  $\mathbb{E}[\cos \theta]$ :

$$\mathbb{E}[\cos(\theta)] = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \cos(\theta) \cdot \frac{1}{\sigma \sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{(\theta - \mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) d\theta, \quad (46)$$

$$\cos(\theta) = \frac{\exp(-i\theta) + \exp(i\theta)}{2}, \quad (47)$$

$$\mathbb{E}[\cos(\theta)] = \frac{1}{2} (\mathbb{E}[\exp(-i\theta)] + \mathbb{E}[\exp(i\theta)]). \quad (48)$$

For Gaussian distribution  $N(\mu, \sigma)$ , its characteristic function is  $\Phi(t) = \mathbb{E}[\exp(-it\theta)] = \exp(i\mu t - \frac{\sigma^2 t^2}{2})$ .

The characteristic function when  $t$  takes 1 and -1 is:

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(i\theta)] = \exp(i\mu - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}), \quad (49)$$

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(-i\theta)] = \exp(-i\mu - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}). \quad (50)$$

Substitute Eqn 49, 50 into Eqn 48:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\cos(\theta)] &= \frac{1}{2} (\exp(i\mu - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}) + \exp(-i\mu - \frac{\sigma^2}{2})), \\ \mathbb{E}[\cos(\theta)] &= \frac{1}{2} \exp(-\frac{\sigma^2}{2}) \cdot 2\cos(\mu) = \exp(-\frac{\sigma^2}{2}) \cos(\mu). \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

Thus, increasing the variance ( $\sigma$ ) of  $\theta$  will leads to a decrease in the value of  $\mathbb{D}[f(k)]$ :

$$\mathbb{D}[f(k)] = p(k)^2 \exp(-\frac{\sigma^2}{2}) \cos(\mu). \quad (52)$$

This result indicates that when the angle margins  $\theta$  between modalities exhibit a significant disturbance, the  $\mathbb{D}[f(k)]$  will decrease.

### Inter-domain case.

The inter-domain co-variance matrix between  $f^{e1}$  and  $f^{e2}$  is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[f^{e1}] &= \sum_i^{\mathcal{M}} p(i) \mathbb{E}[f_i^{e1}], \quad \mathbb{E}[f^{e2}] = \sum_i^{\mathcal{M}} p(i) \mathbb{E}[f_i^{e2}], \\ \mathbb{C}[f^{e1}, f^{e2}] &= \mathbb{E}[(f^{e1} - \mathbb{E}[f^{e1}])(f^{e2} - \mathbb{E}[f^{e2}])^{\mathbf{T}}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[f^{e1} f^{e2 \mathbf{T}}] - \mathbb{E}[f^{e1}] \mathbb{E}[f^{e2}]^{\mathbf{T}} \\ &= \mathbb{E}[F^{e1} P^{e1} P^{e2 \mathbf{T}} F^{e2 \mathbf{T}}] - \mathbb{E}[f^{e1}] \mathbb{E}[f^{e2}]^{\mathbf{T}}. \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

Please note that  $f^{e1}$  and  $f^{e2}$  exhibit the same liveness label.

Assuming that the modality features  $f_i^e$  have been normalized before classification by the classifier  $\beta$ , i.e.,  $\mathbb{E}[f_i^e] = 0$ ,  $\|f_i^e\| = 1$ , thus Eqn 53 can be rewritten as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[f^{e1}] &= 0, \quad \mathbb{E}[f^{e2}] = 0, \\ \mathbb{C}[f^{e1}, f^{e2}] &= \mathbb{E}[F^{e1} P^{e1} P^{e2 \mathbf{T}} F^{e2 \mathbf{T}}], \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

the  $k$ -th diagonal elements of  $\mathbb{C}[f^{e1}, f^{e2}]$ , which represents the co-variance between  $f^{e1}(k)$  and  $f^{e2}(k)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{C}[f^{e1}(k), f^{e2}(k)] &= p(k)^2 \mathbb{E}[\langle f_k^{e1}, f_k^{e2} \rangle] \\ &= p(k)^2 \mathbb{E}[\|f_k^{e1}\| \cdot \|f_k^{e2}\| \cos \theta_{kk}] \\ &= p(k)^2 \mathbb{E}[\cos \theta_{kk}]. \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

Similarly, we can also conclude that increasing the variance ( $\sigma$ ) of  $\theta$  will also lead to a decrease in the value of  $\mathbb{C}[f^{e1}(k), f^{e2}(k)]$  according to **Intra-domain case**.






Figure 8. Illustration of dual alignment of domain and modality for four sub-protocols. (a) feature distribution of source and target domains, the dotted line represents the decision hyperplane in 2D space. (b) Mean and Std. of cosine similarity among modalities in the source and target domains.

**The impact of  $\mathbb{D}[f(k)]$  on the convergence and shift of  $\beta$ .** Before computing the loss function, we need to use a linear classifier  $\beta$  and  $\text{softmax}(\cdot)$  projecting final fusion feature  $f$  to logits  $\hat{y}$ , where  $z = \beta f$ ,  $\hat{y} = \left[ \frac{\exp(z_p)}{\exp(z_p) + \exp(z_n)}, \frac{\exp(z_n)}{\exp(z_p) + \exp(z_n)} \right]$ ,  $p$  represents positive sample,  $n$  represents negative sample. Considering that using cross-entropy loss:

$$\mathcal{L} = -\mathbb{I}(\text{label}_{\text{GT}}) \hat{y} \log \hat{y} \quad (56)$$

where  $\hat{y}_p, \hat{y}_n \in (0, 1)$ , the gradient of  $\mathcal{L}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\beta_e} \mathcal{L} &= \mathbb{I}(\text{label}_{\text{GT}}) \nabla_{\beta_e} \hat{y} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \hat{y}} \\ &= -\mathbb{I}(\text{label}_{\text{GT}}) \nabla_{\beta_e} \hat{y} (\log \hat{y} + 1) \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

then we consider the variance of  $z_p = \beta_p f = \sum_k^{\mathcal{D}} w(k) f(k)$  (the same applies to the analysis of  $z_n = \beta_n f$ ), which  $\mathbb{D}[z_p] = \sum_k^{\mathcal{D}} w(k)^2 \mathbb{D}[f(k)]$ ,  $w(k)$  is the weight of  $\beta_p$ . When the  $\sigma$  of  $\theta_{kk}$  increases, the  $\mathbb{D}[f(k)]$  decreases, so does the  $\mathbb{D}[z_p]$ . The smaller  $\mathbb{D}[z_p]$  and  $\mathbb{D}[z_n]$  will

lead to the difference between  $z_p$  and  $z_n$  may be subtle at the start of training (supposing that randomly initialization does not favor either  $z_p$  or  $z_n$ ), resulting in a flatten value of softmax output  $\hat{y}$ , i.e., the value of logits ( $\hat{y}$ ) tend towards a uniform distribution. And we can easily know that the function  $\hat{y} \log \hat{y}$  has its maximum value when the probability of  $\hat{y}$  reaches  $1/n$  (for two categories,  $n$  equals to 2).

At this point, the drastic fluctuation in  $\theta_{kk}$  will cause the absolute value of gradient  $|\nabla_{\beta_e} \mathcal{L}|$  to be difficult to converge to a smaller value. According to line 6-9 in Algorithm 1:

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_e^{t+1} &= \alpha' \tilde{\beta}_e^{t+1} + (1 - \alpha') \beta_e^t \rightarrow \bar{e} = \underset{e' \in \mathcal{E} \setminus e}{\text{argmax}} \|\tilde{\beta}_e^{t+1} - \beta_{e'}^t\|_2, \\ \beta_e^{t+1} &= \alpha' (\beta_e^t - \gamma \nabla_{\beta_e} \mathcal{L}_{\text{total}}) + (1 - \alpha') \beta_e^t, \\ \beta_e^{t+1} &= \beta_e^t + \alpha' (\beta_e^t - \beta_e^t) - \alpha' \gamma \nabla_{\beta_e} \mathcal{L}_{\text{total}}, \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

$t$  starts from 0 to T, the single-step shift will accumulate increasingly, resulting in the optimal classification hyperplane  $\tilde{\beta}^{T+1} = \text{mean}(\beta_{e_1}^{T+1}, \beta_{e_2}^{T+1}, \dots, \beta_{e_T}^{T+1})$  shift severely.

**Proofs 2 Completed.**




Figure 9. More visualization attention maps on varies attack samples, for example, replay attack, 3D mask, paper printing.

## 10. Visualization

**Comprehensive visualization of dual alignment of domain and modality.** Fig. 8 presents the visualizations of dual alignment of hyperplanes and angles for four sub-protocols in Tab. A. we can observe that in the sub-protocols  $CPS \rightarrow W$  and  $CPW \rightarrow S$ , the hyperplane for the live/spoof decision remains consistent across different source domains and is also transferable to unseen target domain. Moreover, the angles between the source domains and the target domain are relatively close to the expected values. In contrast, the other two sub-protocols  $PSW \rightarrow C$  and  $CSW \rightarrow P$ , exhibit slightly poorer illustration. Correspondingly, they also show poorer performance in Tab. A, which might be due to their encountering of a more significant domain shift.

**More visualization attention maps.** In Fig. 9, For 3D masks, the face region in the depth map is shown with cooler color, indicating its weak influence. For paper-printing attacks, depth information is particularly revealing of spoof cues, thereby warranting higher importance. For video replay attacks, more obvious spoofing traces were observed from infrared and depth maps, so both of them have higher importance than RGB.