All Patches Matter, More Patches Better: Enhance AI-Generated Image Detection via Panoptic Patch Learning

Zheng Yang^{1*}, Ruoxin Chen^{2*}, Zhiyuan Yan^{2,3}, Keyue Zhang², Xinghe Fu¹, Shuang Wu²,

Xiujun Shu⁴, Taiping Yao², Junchi Yan⁵, Shouhong Ding², Xi Li^{1†}

¹Zhejiang University ²Youtu Lab, Tencent ³Peking University

⁴WeChat Pay, Tencent ⁵Shanghai Jiao Tong University

Abstract

The exponential growth of AI-generated images (AIGIs) underscores the urgent need for robust and generalizable detection methods. In this paper, we establish two key principles for AIGI detection through systematic analysis: (1) All Patches Matter: Unlike conventional image classification where discriminative features concentrate on object-centric regions, each patch in AIGIs inherently contains synthetic artifacts due to the uniform generation process, suggesting that every patch serves as an important artifact source for detection. (2) More Patches Better: Leveraging distributed artifacts across more patches improves detection robustness by capturing complementary forensic evidence and reducing over-reliance on specific patches, thereby enhancing robustness and generalization. However, our counterfactual analysis reveals an undesirable phenomenon: naively trained detectors often exhibit a Few-Patch Bias, discriminating between real and synthetic images based on minority patches. We identify Lazy Learner as the root cause: detectors preferentially learn conspicuous artifacts in limited patches while neglecting broader artifact distributions. To address this bias, we propose the Panoptic Patch Learning (PPL) framework, involving: (1) Random Patch Replacement that randomly substitutes synthetic patches with real counterparts to encourage models to identify artifacts in underutilized regions, encouraging the broader use of more patches; (2) Patch-wise Contrastive Learning that enforces consistent discriminative capability across all patches, ensuring uniform utilization of all patches. Extensive experiments across two different settings on several benchmarks verify the effectiveness of our approach.

1. Introduction

The rapid evolution of generative AI models has precipitated an exponential growth of AI-generated images (AIGIs) in





Figure 1. **Top Row:** Training models with PPL result in attention being distributed across almost all the patches with a more uniform distribution, indicating that PPL promotes comprehensive artifact capture in patches. **Bottom Row:** Compare PPL with other methods in two different evaluation settings: Setting-I (GenImage dataset [46]), where the model is trained on a specific type of generative model and tested on synthetic images from various generative models, and Setting-II (Chameleon dataset [36]), where the model is trained on a diverse range of generative models and tested on human-imperceptible synthetic images.

digital ecosystems [5, 10–12, 23, 24, 38, 42]. This proliferation raises critical concerns regarding information security and content authenticity, highlighting the critical need for AIGI detection methods to distinguish synthetic images from authentic ones. Unlike conventional classification tasks, AIGI detection operates as a 'cat-and-mouse game', presenting unique challenges due to: (1) continuous emergence of new generative architectures, and (2) frequent updates to

^{*} Equal contribution [†] Corresponding author

existing models. Consequently, exhaustive training on all synthetic data becomes impractical [19], thus necessitating the detectors with strong generalizability.

Although AIGI detection poses additional challenges for models in capturing generalizable features compared to traditional binary classification tasks, AIGIs offer a unique characteristic absent in conventional classification tasks that can be leveraged: Universal Artifact Distribution. In the context of AIGIs, discriminative features are not confined to regions with label objects; instead, synthetic images present artifacts uniformly across all patches due to the uniform production of generative models. This finding indicates that every image patch contains synthetic traces, establishing our principle for AIGI detection: All Patches Matter. This principle is also validated by two lines of evidence: (1) Visual analytics [3, 29] confirm pixel-level discriminative patterns in localized regions, revealing artifact presence at patch granularity; (2) recent patch-wise detectors [2, 45] show comparable performance to full-image approaches, proving individual patches' discriminative capability. Meanwhile, while artifact variations occur across different patches, detectors capable of capturing diverse synthetic artifacts across distributed patches reduce the over-reliance on specific patches. This universal artifact capturing enhances cross-generator generalizability by mitigating detectors' blind spots through distributed artifact aggregation. This leads to our second principle: More Patches Better.

However, our counterfactual analysis of existing detectors [1, 8, 15, 19, 27] reveals an unfavorable tendency: Few-Patch Bias, involving two empirical observations and a quantitative analysis. The empirical observations: (1) detectors' attention maps disproportionately focus on limited image patches, neglecting broader artifact patterns; (2) detectors exhibit severe patch-specific fragility, where masking merely a patch could lead to accuracy degradation by $18.7\% \pm 4.1\%$ on average. Furthermore, by employing the causal inference tool Total Direct Effect (TDE) [33] to quantify each patch's impact - calculated as the classification logit difference with and without that patch - we observe that the TDE distribution of naively-trained detectors is characterized by a few patches with high TDE values, while the majority of patches exhibit significantly smaller TDEs. This suggests that most patches remain underutilized and contribute minimally to the discriminative outcome. Moreover, when comparing TDE distributions across different detection methods, we find that methods with TDE distributions tending towards a more uniform distribution exhibit better generalizability. For instance, DRCT, with more high-TDE patches, performs significantly better than UnivFD.

We attribute the Few-Patch Bias to the propensity of detectors as Lazy Learner [4, 9, 26, 31, 34, 37, 39, 40, 43].

Specifically, AIGI detectors exhibit curriculum learning behavior: once easily learned synthetic artifacts in certain patches are used to minimize training loss, the presence of these patches reduces the incentive to explore broader regions. We propose a framework called Panoptic Patch Learning (PPL) based on the principle 'All Patches Matter, More Patches Better'. PPL involves: (1) Patch-wise contrastive learning, which aligns the features of different synthetic and real patches, ensuring consistent discriminative capability across all patches. (2) Random patch replacement, which randomly substitutes patches in the synthetic image with real counterparts, discourages over-reliance on limited patches and promotes a more uniform utilization of patches. Figure 1 illustrates the practical function and performance of Panoptic Patch Learning. Our main contributions are threefold:

- 1. We formally propose the principle 'All Patches Matter, More Patches Better' for AIGI detection, demonstrating that broader artifact exploitation can effectively enhance detection.
- We conduct a detailed patch-wise analysis of AIGI detectors, utilizing the causal inference tool Total Direct Effect (TDE) to quantify each patch's impact, revealing that Few-Patch Bias commonly exists in existing detectors.
- Based on the 'All Patches Matter, More Patches Better' principle, we propose Panoptic Patch Learning. Extensive experimental results validate the effectiveness of our approach.

2. Related Work

AIGI detection methods can be categorized into two general types: local and global detection methods.

Local AIGI detection methods. Local AIGI detectors utilize the image's localized information, often in a patch-wise or pixel-wise manner, to differentiate AI-generated images from real ones. This approach is based on the premise that significant differences exist between real and synthetic images in low-level features. These detectors can be categorized into two groups: patch-wise and pixel-wise methods.

Patch-wise methods include: SSP [2] achieves remarkable performance by utilizing only a single simplest patch, while Patchcraft [45] processes the simplest and most complex patches separately by selecting patches with the highest and lowest entropy for detection, Zheng et al. [44] employs a patch-based CNN that leverages all patches to avoid selective patch sampling and aggregate patch features from an image. However, these patch-wise detectors are limited by their over-reliance on a small subset of patches, resulting in insufficient utilization of available patch information.

Pixel-wise methods include: NPR [30], which discriminates between real and AI-generated images by analyzing differences in neighboring pixel relationships; FreqNet [28] and SAFE [14], which leverage high-frequency information

This work adheres to the mainstream AIGI detection setting [1, 8, 15, 19, 27, 29, 46] where the entire image is generated by AI models.



Figure 2. The illustration of the concept "few patches matter" in naively trained Vision Transformer (ViT)-based detection models is demonstrated through the visualization of their attention maps. The attention weights are often concentrated on a limited number of specific patches, suggesting that the detection model might overly rely on a few dominant patches for discrimination.

to detect forgeries by focusing on localized feature patterns; and ZED [3], which computes the coding cost of local regions using an entropy-based encoder and identifies AIGIs by detecting gaps in coding costs. However, these pixel-wise detectors are highly sensitive to minor variations in localized pixel relationships, which can limit their robustness in practical applications.

Global AIGI detection methods. Global AIGI detection methods leverage global information from entire images to distinguish AIGIs from real ones. CNNSpot [35] simply employs a CNN to detect AIGIs, exhibiting strong performance on seen AIGIs but suffering from poor cross-generator generalizability. UnivFD [19] addresses this limitation by utilizing a CLIP visual encoder as an AIGI feature extractor, significantly improving generalization, FatFormer [15] further improves the CLIP vision encoder's adaptability by integrating a frequency adapter, C2P-CLIP [27] introduces a novel approach by fine-tuning CLIP with elaborately designed image-text pairs to embed the concepts of 'real' and 'fake' into the model. DRCT [1] uses a contrastive loss with hard cases to improve UnivFD's performance, Despite the aforementioned advantages, global information does not encompass detailed artifacts of AIGIs, which severely limits their performance.

3. Motivation

3.1. All Patches Matter, More Patches Better

The principle of **All Patches Matter** is built upon three key findings. (1) Theory: As every patch in synthetic images is inherently synthetic, each should contain synthetic artifacts.



Figure 3. The illustration of accuracy degradation in a natively trained model is demonstrated by occluding a single patch of varying sizes. (1) High Impact: occluding the specific patch that causes the greatest reduction in accuracy. (2) Low Impact: occluding the specific patch that causes only a minor reduction in accuracy. (3) Random: selecting a random patch to occlude. The significant gap between the high-impact and low-impact curves indicates that the importance of different patches is not equivalent.

A series of localized region-based detection methods [2, 45] confirm that trace cues in localized patches can be used for real-synthetic discrimination, achieving substantial performance. This establishes the foundation for the principle that all patches matter, as every patch contains discriminative artifacts. (2) Visualization: Figure 4 visually illustrates the different artifact patterns present in each patch, showing that every synthetic patch has distinguishing features that differentiate it from real images. Moreover, the trace cues in different patches vary visually, confirming the diversity of artifacts. (3) Experiments: We evaluated the presence of these artifacts by inputting a randomly selected patch into the detectors, achieving an accuracy of 90% on the SDv1.4 subset of the GenImage dataset. Specifically, we replicated a single patch multiple times to form an image, ensuring that it contains only the features of that patch. The results indicate that detectors can effectively distinguish real from synthetic images even with a single random patch. The results indicate that detectors can effectively distinguish between real and synthetic images even using a single random patch. From the visualization and experiments, we recognize that artifacts in each patch are distinct, and thus, detectors are capable of capturing these artifacts, proving their ability to recognize diverse artifact patterns. This can enhance the detectors' generalizability and robustness, leading to the principle of More Patches Better. However, our observations suggest that existing detectors do not conform to this principle.

3.2. Few-Patch Bias

Observations. Our empirical observations indicate that existing detectors often overly rely on a limited number of



Figure 4. Visualization of different patch-wise artifacts generated by AIGI is depicted by comparing real images to their synthetic counterparts reconstructed by diffusion models. We observe various patch-level synthetic traces, such as "broken or twisted lines", "unnatural noise", and "lost detail on clear boundaries", indicating a diversity of artifacts among different patches. This observation supports the need for leveraging more patches to enhance the recognition capability for different artifact patterns.

patches. Fig. 2 depicts the UnivFD attention map, demonstrating that the attention weight concentrates only on a few patches. After changing the ViT backbone and applying Lora fine-tuning, we find a similar observation. To further verify our hypothesis, we mask out the patches of different sizes and observe the degradation of accuracy. Fig. 3 visualizes the performance degradation of different detectors concerning the size of the masked patch. We find that masking out a patch can lead to a significant drop in accuracy, and masking out different patches will also result in different drops in accuracy.

Quantitative analysis. Based on the above observation, we utilize the total direct effect (TDE) to evaluate each patch's impact. To explain TDE, for example, $X \rightarrow Y$ and $Z \rightarrow Y$ indicate that the relationship Y is a combined effect resulting from the content represented by X and Z. The Total Direct Effect (TDE) is calculated as the difference between the effect of Y with X and without X affecting the rest of the parts, namely $Y(X|Z) - Y(\overline{X}|Z)$. We partition an image into $n = m \times m$ patches, and the TDE for each



Figure 5. TDE heatmap of existing methods on generated images selected from DRCT dataset. A broader and more uniform high-lighted region indicates a greater number of patches contributing to determining a fake image. The results of UnivFD [19], DRCT [1], and Breaking [44] are obtained from our implementation.

patch (i, j) is defined as follows:

$$TDE \coloneqq \delta_I - \delta_{I-(i,j)}, \quad \delta \coloneqq \text{logit}_{syn} - \text{logit}_{real} \quad (1)$$

where I and I - (i, j) represents the original input image and the image with the (i, j)th patch masked. By calculating the TDE for each patch, we can assess its contribution to the classification of a synthetic image.

Fig. 5 visualizes the TDE heatmap for different detectors. From top to bottom, the cases become progressively easier for the models to detect, as indicated by the increased number of active patches and a more uniform TDE distribution. We reimplemented UnivFD [19], DRCT [1] and Breaking [44] and compare them with our approach, demonstrating that a more effective method tends to discover a greater number of patches. Overall, the visual examples highlight the existing bias towards a limited number of dominant patches with higher TDE. In the methodology section, we will address this issue from a TDE perspective and explore it further with statistical analysis.

4. Methodology

Panoptic Patch Learning enhances the effectiveness of all patches through two key components: data augmentation and learning strategy. Specifically, the data augmentation technique, referred to as Random Patch Replacement(RPR),



Figure 6. Panoptic Patch Learning (PPL) framework seeks to uphold the principles of "All Patches Matter" and "More Patches Better," consisting of two main components: Random Patch Replacement (RPR) and Patch-wise Contrastive Learning (PCL). The left side illustrates a training sample during a specific phase where the model falls into lazy learning, overly depending on the **dominant patch** for discrimination, while other patches are underutilized. PPL addresses this issue comprehensively in the following ways: RPR expands the region of dominant patches by occasionally replacing them with real counterparts, urging the model to detect artifacts in the remaining **non-dominant patches** to broaden the dominant regions, thus supporting the "more patches better" principle. Subsequently, PCL encourages uniform exploration of different patches by aligning the patch embeddings of similar types closer together. Through the integration of RPR and PCL, the model is expected to achieve a more comprehensive and uniform utilization of patches.



Figure 7. (a) is training loss over iterations on the SDv1.4 subset of the GenImage dataset, comparing the naive finetuning baseline and our proposed method. (b) is the TDE distribution normalized to the range [0, 1], comparing the baseline and our proposed method.

encourages the model to capture artifacts across a broader range of patches, thereby expanding the coverage of dominant patches. Following this, our learning strategy, Patchwise Contrastive learning (PCL), ensures that all patches, both dominant and non-dominant, are brought closer in the feature space, thereby uniformizing the impact of all patches. Through the combined effect of these two components, we achieve a more comprehensive and balanced representation derived from all patches.

Random Patch Replacement encourages 'More Patches Better'. Random Patch Replacement (RPR) promotes the principle of "More Patches Better" by encouraging the model to focus on learning from a greater number of detected patches. The RPR process is applied to paired images in which each reconstructed image I' has a corresponding ground truth I. The images are partitioned into $n = m \times m$ patches, and the patch replacement function \mathcal{R} is defined as:

$$\mathcal{R}(P_{i,j}(I')) = \begin{cases} P_{i,j}(I) & \text{if } M_{i,j} = 1, \\ P_{i,j}(I') & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$
(2)

where $M \in \{0,1\}^{m \times m}$ is a random sampled binary mask with replacement ratio $r \in [0,1]$. When dominant patches are replaced with real patches during this process, training the model on these mixed images forces it to learn artifacts from previously non-dominant patches. By dynamically altering the spatial distribution of attended patches through RPR, the model is forced to learn latent representations from previously underutilized regions, thereby reducing over-reliance on dominant local features. As a result, RPR effectively expands the effective region of the model and enhances its overall performance and robustness.

Patch-wise Contrastive Learning emphasizes 'All Patches Matter'. Patch-wise Contrastive Learning (PCL) operationalizes the principle of 'All Patches Matter' by aligning the embedding vectors of different patches, bringing patches with identical labels closer together while distancing those with different labels. We employ contrastive learning to cluster synthetic patches more closely within each batch while maintaining a margin to separate synthetic and real patches. This approach ensures that if an image contains any dominant patch with easily learnable artifacts, the model enhances its performance on the remaining patches, thus leveraging the significance of all patches. Specifically, for each batch, we utilize a margin-based contrastive loss [6] that:

$$\mathcal{L}_{con} = \sum_{i,j,i \neq j} \left[Y \cdot d^2 + (1 - Y) \cdot \max\left(0, m - d^2\right) \right]$$
(3)

where *i* and *j* represent the index of patch tokens within a batch. $d = \|\text{Emb}_{\text{pat}}^i - \text{Emb}_{\text{pat}}^j\|_2$ measures the Euclidean distance between the embedded patch tokens. $Y = \mathbb{I}[y_{\text{pat}}^i = y_{\text{pat}}^j]$ indicates whether two patches in the pair share identical labels, thus pulling positive patch pairs (with identical patch labels) closer and pushing negative patch pairs (with different patch labels) further. The overall learning objective is a weighted combination of the cross-entropy loss and the patch-wise contrastive loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{total}} = \lambda \mathcal{L}_{\text{con}} + (1 - \lambda) \mathcal{L}_{\text{ce}}$$
(4)

Analysis and Comparison. We analyze the superiority of our approach through a quantitative analysis of our model's performance both during and after training.

Fig. 7 (a) illustrates the loss reduction of CLIP when naively fine-tuned using LoRA compared to our proposed strategy. Both models were trained with the same batch size and learning rate on GenImage with SDv1.4 reconstructed data. The significant decrease in the loss function during the first 200 to 400 steps of naive training suggests that it is shortcutting to certain artifacts existing in the training set, limiting its generalization performance. In contrast, our method is less prone to overfitting specific artifacts.

Fig. 7 (a) illustrates the TDE distribution of UnivFD and our method. For better statistical analysis, we normalize the TDE values to a range [0, 1] using the exponential function $e^{TDE_{(i,j)}-TDE_{max}}$. This normalization facilitates the measurement of differences between less dominant patches and the most dominant patches in the images. The figure demonstrates that a greater number of patches from our method are closer to the most dominant patches.

5. Experiments

Settings. We compare PPL to other methods across two train-test settings on three datasets:

(1) **Setting-I**: In this setting, the model is trained using real images and images from a single type of generative model. Then the models are evaluated on images from various unseen generative models. This setting assesses the detector's cross-generator generalization ability. The datasets used in Setting-I include GenImage [46] and DRCT [1].

(2) **Setting-II**: In this setting, the model has access to a wide range of generative models during the training phase. Then the models are evaluated on a comprehensive dataset that includes challenging cases from modern generative models. Setting-II was proposed by [36] with the Chameleon dataset.

The compared methods involve basic vision models ResNet-50 [7], Conv-B[17], Swin-T [16], AIGC detection methods CNNSpot [35], F3Net [13], CLIP based models UnivFD [19], FatFormer [15], DRCT [1], SAFE [21], C2P-CLIP [27]. **Implementational details.** We utilized two pre-trained ViT models, CLIP [22] and DINOv2 [20], as the backbones for PPL and fine-tuned them using LoRA. During training, the input images are randomly cropped into a size of 224 \times 224. Unless otherwise specified, in PPL, the patch size is set to 14 \times 14, consistent with the patch size of ViT. For the Random Patch Replacement (RPR) module, each image has a probability p_{rpr} of 0.9 for performing RPR. RPR randomly replaces $r_{rpr} = 50\%$ of synthetic patches with real counterparts. For PCL, the weight of the contrastive loss is set to $\lambda = 0.3$ with a margin of m = 1.0. To achieve better performance, we add reconstructed images to the training set, following the approach of DRCT [1].

5.1. Comparison with other methods

Comparison on GenImage (Setting-I). Tab. 1 compares PPL to other methods on GenImage. We re-implement Zheng et al. [44] and obtain the result of SAFE from [14], and the rest of the data can be sourced from C2P-CLIP[27]. We observe the following: (1) PPL consistently outperforms other methods in accuracy across various backbones. (2) The standard deviation (std) of PPL's accuracy is significantly lower than that of the other methods, indicating greater stability across different generation methods.

Comparison on DRCT (Setting-I). Tab. 2 reports the comparison on DRCT. We obtain the results from DRCT [1].The results indicate the following: (1) PPL consistently achieves the highest average accuracy with the lowest std. (2) DRCT shows poor detection performance on the SDXL-related subset, while PPL demonstrates a more balanced performance across various subsets. Overall comparisons in Setting-I indicate that PPL has a greater generalizing ability across different generation models.

Comparison on Chameleon (Setting-II). Fig. 8 compares the performance of PPL with other methods in the Chameleon dataset, utilizing the entire GenImage training set. Performance metrics for all the methods listed are cited from the paper Yan et al. [36]. The results indicate that most existing methods struggle to achieve an accuracy of approximately 55%, which only marginally exceeds the accuracy of random guessing (50%). In contrast, our method achieved an accuracy of 70% on Chameleon, surpassing the state-of-the-art (SOTA) method by 5%. This demonstrates a superior generalization ability when faced with higher-quality and fine-tuned versions of generative models.

5.2. Comparisons on Robustness

We conduct a series of robustness experiments on GenImage to verify the reliability of our method against image corruption. Additionally, we perform robustness experiments against random masking, demonstrating PPL's ability to

Method	Ref	Midjourney	SDv1.4	SDv1.5	ADM	GLIDE	Wukong	VQDM	BigGAN	mAcc	std
ResNet-50 [7]	CVPR2016	54.9	99.9	99.7	53.5	61.9	98.2	56.6	52.0	72.1	22.6
DeiT-S [32]	ICML2021	55.6	99.9	99.8	49.8	58.1	98.9	56.9	53.5	71.6	23.2
Swin-T [16]	ICCV2021	62.1	99.9	99.8	49.8	67.6	99.1	62.3	57.6	74.8	21.1
CNNSpot [35]	CVPR2020	52.8	96.3	95.9	50.1	39.8	78.6	53.4	46.8	64.2	22.6
Spec [41]	WIFS2019	52.0	99.4	99.2	49.7	49.8	94.8	55.6	49.8	68.8	24.1
F3Net [21]	ECCV2020	50.1	99.9	99.9	49.9	50.0	99.9	49.9	49.9	68.7	25.8
GramNet [18]	CVPR2020	54.2	99.2	99.1	50.3	54.6	98.9	50.8	51.7	69.9	24.2
UnivFD [19]	CVPR2023	93.9	96.4	96.2	71.9	85.4	94.3	81.6	90.5	88.8	8.6
NPR [29]	CVPR2024	81.0	98.2	97.9	76.9	89.8	96.9	84.1	84.2	88.6	8.3
FreqNet [28]	AAAI2024	89.6	98.8	98.6	66.8	86.5	97.3	75.8	81.4	86.8	11.6
FatFormer [15]	CVPR2024	92.7	100.0	99.9	75.9	88.0	99.9	98.8	55.8	88.9	15.7
DRCT [1]	ICML2024	91.5	95.0	94.4	79.4	89.1	94.6	90.0	81.6	89.4	5.9
Breaking [44]	NIPS2024	83.9	98.9	93.0	99.1	97.7	85.4	92.7	90.5	92.7	5.8
SAFE [14]	KDD2025	95.3	99.4	99.3	82.1	96.3	98.2	96.3	97.8	95.6	5.6
C2P-CLIP [27]	AAAI2025	88.2	90.9	97.9	96.4	99.0	98.8	96.5	98.7	95.8	4.0
Ours/DINOv2		90.4	98.2	97.7	91.8	96.3	98.0	97.7	96.2	<u>95.9</u>	<u>3.0</u>
Ours/CLIP		94.8	98.5	98.3	94.7	96.1	98.6	98.5	98.0	97.2	1.7

Table 1. Cross-model accuracy (Acc) Performance on the Genimage Dataset. All methods are trained on the SDv1.4 subset of the GenImage dataset. We re-implemented Breaking Semantic [44] and copied the result of SAFE from the paper [14]. The rest results can be sourced from paper C2P-CLIP [27].

Method	SD Variants			Turbo Variants LCM Var		⁷ ariants	nts ControlNet Variants			DR Variants			mAcc	etd				
Method	LDM	SDv1.4	SDv1.5	SDv2	SDYI	SDXL-	SD-	SDXL-	LCM-	LCM-	SDv1-	SDv2-	SDXL-	SDv1-	SDv2-	SDX-L	IIIACC	stu
	LDM	5011.4	5071.5	5072	SDAL	Refiner	Turbo	Turbo	SDv1.5	SDXL	Ctrl	Ctrl	Ctrl	DR	DR	DR		
CNNSpot [35]	99.87	99.91	99.90	97.55	66.25	86.55	86.15	72.42	98.26	61.72	97.96	85.89	82.84	60.93	51.41	50.28	81.12	17.6
F3Net [21]	99.85	99.78	99.79	88.66	55.85	87.37	68.29	63.66	97.39	54.98	97.98	72.39	81.99	65.42	50.39	50.27	77.13	18.1
CLIP/RN50 [22]	99.00	99.99	99.96	94.61	62.08	91.43	83.57	64.40	98.97	57.43	99.74	80.69	82.03	65.83	50.67	50.47	80.05	18.3
GramNet [18]	99.40	99.01	98.84	95.30	62.63	80.68	71.19	69.32	93.05	57.02	89.97	75.55	82.68	51.23	50.01	50.08	76.62	17.0
De-fake [25]	92.10	99.53	99.51	89.65	64.02	69.24	92.00	93.93	99.13	70.89	58.98	62.34	66.66	50.12	50.16	50.00	75.52	18.4
Conv-B [17]	99.97	100.0	99.97	95.84	64.44	82.00	80.82	60.75	99.27	62.33	99.80	83.40	73.28	61.65	51.79	50.41	79.11	18.3
UnivFD [19]	98.30	96.22	96.33	93.83	91.01	93.91	86.38	85.92	90.44	88.99	90.41	81.06	89.06	51.96	51.03	50.46	83.46	17.0
DRCT [1]	94.45	94.35	94.24	95.05	95.61	95.38	94.81	94.48	91.66	95.54	93.86	93.48	93.54	84.34	83.20	67.61	91.35	4.7
Ours/DINOv2	99.55	99.55	99.55	99.54	99.55	94.70	99.53	99.23	99.31	99.55	99.54	99.55	99.39	99.48	99.55	97.42	<u>99.06</u>	0.1
Ours/CLIP	99.70	99.70	99.69	99.67	99.71	99.40	99.48	99.40	99.62	99.70	99.68	99.64	99.51	99.61	99.67	97.80	99.50	0.1

Table 2. Cross-model accuracy (Acc) performance on the DRCT dataset. All methods are trained on the SDv1.4 subset of DRCT. All results of former methods can be sourced from the paper DRCT [1].



Figure 8. Cross-dataset accuracy performance on the Chameleon dataset. All methods are trained on entire GenImage subsets and tested on the Chameleon with multiple generation methods.

leverage a greater number of available patches. For a fair comparison, we reimplemented UnivFD [19] using the same basic data augmentation (cropping, rotation, JPEG compression, etc.) as those employed in our approach.

Robustness to image corruptions. We assess the accuracy of our method under JPEG compression(quality factor Q = 100, 90, 80, 70, 60) and Gaussian blur (deviation degree $\sigma = 0.6, 0.8, 1.0, 1.2, 1.4$) on the SDv1.4 subset of GenImage dataset. Fig. 9 illustrates that both backbones of our approach sustain high accuracy even under extreme JPEG compression and Gaussian blur, maintaining an accuracy of approximately 90%.

Robustness to random masking. We assess the recall rate of methods by gradually masking out portions of the input images to evaluate the models' ability to detect fake artifacts from a greater number of patches. Due to the varying initial recall values among different methods, we measure the decline in recall as the ratio of the decrease in recall to the original value. Fig. 10 demonstrates that PPL exhibits the best robustness against masking, with only a 5% decline under extreme masking conditions, confirming that PPL reduces over-reliance on specific patches.



Figure 9. Robustness to JPEG compression and resizing. All methods are trained and evaluated on the SDv1.4 subset of the GenImage dataset.



Figure 10. Robustness to random masking. We report drop rates compared between the methods' accuracy on masked images and the original unmasked ones. All methods are trained and evaluated on the SDv1.4 subset of the GenImage dataset.

5.3. Ablation Studies

To investigate the impact of each component and hyperparameter in PPL, we conducted a series of ablation studies. Unless otherwise specified, we used CLIP as the backbone model, and trained on the SDv1.4 subset of GenImage. We then compared the overall accuracy (mACC) of each result obtained on the whole GenImage dataset.

Ablation on the impact of each module. Tab. 3 demonstrates the effectiveness of both Random Patch Replacement (RPR) and Patch-wise Contrastive Learning (PCL) on the CLIP backbone. Experimental results reveal that naive finetuning of a CLIP model using LoRA yields only marginal performance improvements. Furthermore, integrating RPR and PCL separately with the LoRA fine-tuning strategy leads to an increase in accuracy, proving the efficacy of both modules. Optimal performance is achieved when RPR and PCL are applied simultaneously.

Ablation on hyperparameters. Tab. 4 illustrates the impact of key hyper parameters in our framework. Based on

Lora	RPR	PCL	mAcc
			89.6
\checkmark			91.0
\checkmark	\checkmark		92.6
\checkmark		\checkmark	92.9
\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	97.2

Table 3. Ablation study on components. Models are trained on the SDv1.4 training set of GenImage and the mean accuracy over the test sets of GenImage is reported.

(a) Contrastive Weight			(b) Mix	ing Ratio	(c) Mixing Precentage			
_	λ	mAcc	r(%)	mAcc	p(%)	mAcc		
().1	90.9	10	91.7	2.5	94.9		
().3	97.2	30	94.7	7.5	95.9		
().5	95.8	50	97.2	12.5	96.1		
().7	95.1	70	94.4	17.5	95.4		
().9	91.5	90	77.4	22.5	97.2		

Table 4. Ablation study on hyperparameters. Our method has three main hyperparameters: λ representing the weight of contrastive loss, p representing the percentage of images with RPR mixing in the training set, and r representing the ratio of applying RPR mixing.

the experimental results, we draw the following conclusions: (1) The weight setting of contrastive loss is highly sensitive, with an optimal value of 0.3. (2) Model performance improves with the increase in mixing data seen during training, suggesting the effectiveness of mixing data. (3) General accuracy improves as the mixing ratio increases from 10% to 50%, peaking at 50%, but experiences a significant decline at 90%. This suggests that replacing too many patches in an AI-generated image with real ones sets an overly challenging goal for the model, which hurts its performance.

6. Conclusion

Our work begins with a discussion on the nature of the AIGI detection problem, which can be concluded as, 'All Patches Matter, More Patches Better.' However, our observations indicate that existing detectors are unable to fully take advantage of all patches in an AI-generated image. To address this issue, we propose a Random Patch Replacement augmentation combined with a Patch-wise Contrastive Learning strategy. This approach effectively prevents the model from becoming a lazy learner and enhances the utilization of every patch. We achieve state-of-the-art performance on several well-known academic datasets across two settings: one restricts the training set to evaluate generalization ability, while the other includes more challenging test cases without limiting the model's training set. Although we have made significant progress, there remains room for improvement in

the second setting; thus, future work may focus on developing higher-quality training sets to enhance performance on contemporary real-world benchmarks.

References

- Baoying Chen, Jishen Zeng, Jianquan Yang, and Rui Yang. Drct: Diffusion reconstruction contrastive training towards universal detection of diffusion generated images. In *Fortyfirst International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024. 2, 3, 4, 6, 7
- [2] Jiaxuan Chen, Jieteng Yao, and Li Niu. A single simple patch is all you need for ai-generated image detection. *arXiv* preprint arXiv:2402.01123, 2024. 2, 3
- [3] Davide Cozzolino, Giovanni Poggi, Matthias Nießner, and Luisa Verdoliva. Zero-shot detection of ai-generated images. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 54–72. Springer, 2024. 2, 3
- [4] Shantanu Ghosh, Ke Yu, Forough Arabshahi, and Kayhan Batmanghelich. Tackling shortcut learning in deep neural networks: An iterative approach with interpretable models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.10289*, 2023. 2
- [5] Ian J Goodfellow et al. Generative adversarial nets. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 2014. 1
- [6] Raia Hadsell, Sumit Chopra, and Yann LeCun. Dimensionality reduction by learning an invariant mapping. In 2006 IEEE computer society conference on computer vision and pattern recognition (CVPR'06), pages 1735–1742. IEEE, 2006. 5
- [7] Kaiming He et al. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, pages 770–778, 2016. 6, 7
- [8] Zhiyuan He, Pin-Yu Chen, and Tsung-Yi Ho. Rigid: A training-free and model-agnostic framework for robust aigenerated image detection. arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.20112, 2024. 2
- [9] Katherine Hermann, Hossein Mobahi, Thomas FEL, and Michael Curtis Mozer. On the foundations of shortcut learning. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. 2
- [10] Jonathan Ho et al. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 33:6840– 6851, 2020. 1
- [11] Tero Karras et al. Progressive growing of gans for improved quality, stability, and variation. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [12] Tero Karras et al. A style-based generator architecture for generative adversarial networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 4401–4410, 2019. 1
- [13] Jiaming Li et al. Frequency-aware discriminative feature learning supervised by single-center loss for face forgery detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 6458–6467, 2021. 6
- [14] Ouxiang Li, Jiayin Cai, Yanbin Hao, Xiaolong Jiang, Yao Hu, and Fuli Feng. Improving synthetic image detection towards generalization: An image transformation perspective. *arXiv* preprint arXiv:2408.06741, 2024. 2, 6, 7

- [15] Huan Liu, Zichang Tan, Chuangchuang Tan, Yunchao Wei, Jingdong Wang, and Yao Zhao. Forgery-aware adaptive transformer for generalizable synthetic image detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 10770–10780, 2024. 2, 3, 6, 7
- [16] Ze Liu, Yutong Lin, Yue Cao, Han Hu, Yixuan Wei, Zheng Zhang, Stephen Lin, and Baining Guo. Swin transformer: Hierarchical vision transformer using shifted windows. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision, pages 10012–10022, 2021. 6, 7
- [17] Zhuang Liu, Hanzi Mao, Chao-Yuan Wu, Christoph Feichtenhofer, Trevor Darrell, and Saining Xie. A convnet for the 2020s. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, pages 11976–11986, 2022. 6, 7
- [18] Zhengzhe Liu et al. Global texture enhancement for fake face detection in the wild. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 8060–8069, 2020. 7
- [19] Utkarsh Ojha et al. Towards universal fake image detectors that generalize across generative models. In *Proceedings of* the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, pages 24480–24489, 2023. 2, 3, 4, 6, 7
- [20] Maxime Oquab, Timothée Darcet, Théo Moutakanni, Huy Vo, Marc Szafraniec, Vasil Khalidov, Pierre Fernandez, Daniel Haziza, Francisco Massa, Alaaeldin El-Nouby, et al. Dinov2: Learning robust visual features without supervision. arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.07193, 2023. 6
- [21] Yuyang Qian et al. Thinking in frequency: Face forgery detection by mining frequency-aware clues. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 86–103. Springer, 2020. 6, 7
- [22] Alec Radford et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR, 2021. 6, 7
- [23] Aditya Ramesh, Mikhail Pavlov, Gabriel Goh, Scott Gray, Chelsea Voss, Alec Radford, Mark Chen, and Ilya Sutskever. Zero-shot text-to-image generation. In *Proceedings of the* 38th International Conference on Machine Learning, 2021.
- [24] Robin Rombach et al. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, pages 10684–10695, 2022. 1
- [25] Zeyang Sha, Zheng Li, Ning Yu, and Yang Zhang. De-fake: Detection and attribution of fake images generated by textto-image generation models. In *Proceedings of the 2023* ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security, pages 3418–3432, 2023. 7
- [26] Zechen Sun, Yisheng Xiao, Juntao Li, Yixin Ji, Wenliang Chen, and Min Zhang. Exploring and mitigating shortcut learning for generative large language models. In Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024), pages 6883–6893, 2024. 2
- [27] Chuangchuang Tan, Renshuai Tao, Huan Liu, Guanghua Gu, Baoyuan Wu, Yao Zhao, and Yunchao Wei. C2p-clip: In-

jecting category common prompt in clip to enhance generalization in deepfake detection. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2024. 2, 3, 6, 7

- [28] Chuangchuang Tan, Yao Zhao, Shikui Wei, Guanghua Gu, Ping Liu, and Yunchao Wei. Frequency-aware deepfake detection: Improving generalizability through frequency space domain learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 5052–5060, 2024. 2, 7
- [29] 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. 2, 7
- [30] Chuangchuang Tan et al. Learning on gradients: Generalized artifacts representation for gan-generated images detection. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), pages 12105–12114, 2023. 2
- [31] Ruixiang Tang, Dehan Kong, Longtao Huang, and Hui Xue. Large language models can be lazy learners: Analyze shortcuts in in-context learning. arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.17256, 2023. 2
- [32] Hugo Touvron, Matthieu Cord, Matthijs Douze, Francisco Massa, Alexandre Sablayrolles, and Hervé Jégou. Training data-efficient image transformers & distillation through attention. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 10347–10357. PMLR, 2021. 7
- [33] Tyler J VanderWeele. A three-way decomposition of a total effect into direct, indirect, and interactive effects. *Epidemiology*, 2013. 2
- [34] Shunxin Wang, Raymond Veldhuis, Christoph Brune, and Nicola Strisciuglio. Frequency shortcut learning in neural networks. In *NeurIPS 2022 Workshop on Distribution Shifts: Connecting Methods and Applications*, 2022. 2
- [35] Sheng-Yu Wang et al. Cnn-generated images are surprisingly easy to spot... for now. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, pages 8695–8704, 2020. 3, 6, 7
- [36] Shilin Yan, Ouxiang Li, Jiayin Cai, Yanbin Hao, Xiaolong Jiang, Yao Hu, and Weidi Xie. A sanity check for ai-generated image detection. arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.19435, 2024. 1, 6
- [37] Zhiyuan Yan, Jiangming Wang, Zhendong Wang, Peng Jin, Ke-Yue Zhang, Shen Chen, Taiping Yao, Shouhong Ding, Baoyuan Wu, and Li Yuan. Effort: Efficient orthogonal modeling for generalizable ai-generated image detection. arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.15633, 2024. 2
- [38] Zhiyuan Yan, Taiping Yao, Shen Chen, Yandan Zhao, Xinghe Fu, Junwei Zhu, Donghao Luo, Chengjie Wang, Shouhong Ding, Yunsheng Wu, et al. Df40: Toward next-generation deepfake detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.13495*, 2024.
- [39] Yu Yuan, Lili Zhao, Kai Zhang, Guangting Zheng, and Qi Liu. Do llms overcome shortcut learning? an evaluation of shortcut challenges in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.13343*, 2024. 2

- [40] Tianyu Zhang, Weiqing Min, Jiahao Yang, Tao Liu, Shuqiang Jiang, and Yong Rui. What if we could not see? counterfactual analysis for egocentric action anticipation. In *IJCAI*, pages 1316–1322, 2021. 2
- [41] Xu Zhang et al. Detecting and simulating artifacts in gan fake images. In 2019 IEEE International Workshop on Information Forensics and Security (WIFS), pages 1–6. IEEE, 2019. 7
- [42] Yabo Zhang, Yuxiang Wei, Dongsheng Jiang, Xiaopeng Zhang, Wangmeng Zuo, and Qi Tian. Controlvideo: Trainingfree controllable text-to-video generation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13077, 2023. 1
- [43] Lili Zhao, Qi Liu, Linan Yue, Wei Chen, Liyi Chen, Ruijun Sun, and Chao Song. Comi: Correct and mitigate shortcut learning behavior in deep neural networks. In Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, pages 218–228, 2024. 2
- [44] Chende Zheng, Chenhao Lin, Zhengyu Zhao, Hang Wang, Xu Guo, Shuai Liu, and Chao Shen. Breaking semantic artifacts for generalized ai-generated image detection. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 2024. 2, 4, 6, 7
- [45] Nan Zhong, Yiran Xu, Sheng Li, Zhenxing Qian, and Xinpeng Zhang. Patchcraft: Exploring texture patch for efficient aigenerated image detection. arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.12397, pages 1–18, 2024. 2, 3
- [46] Mingjian Zhu, Hanting Chen, Qiangyu Yan, Xudong Huang, Guanyu Lin, Wei Li, Zhijun Tu, Hailin Hu, Jie Hu, and Yunhe Wang. Genimage: A million-scale benchmark for detecting aigenerated image. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 36, 2024. 1, 2, 6