FractalCNN Al Image Detection - Progress Report v1.0

Date: August 2025

Project: Generalizable Al-Generated Image Detection Based on Fractal Self-Similarity

Implementation: PyTorch FractalCNN Architecture

Summary

This report details the initial training results of our FractalCNN implementation for Al-generated image detection. The model achieved a **62.5% validation accuracy** with early stopping after 9 epochs, demonstrating clear learning progress despite dataset limitations.

Experimental Setup

Dataset Configuration

• Source: Kaggle Deepfake and Real Images Dataset

• **Total Images Used:** 800 (400 real + 400 fake)

Training Split: 640 images (320 real + 320 fake) - 80%

• Validation Split: 160 images (80 real + 80 fake) - 20%

• **Preprocessing:** RGB → Grayscale, Normalized to [0,1], FFT magnitude spectrum

Model Architecture

Fractal Levels: 3 recursive levelsHidden Channels: 32 feature maps

• **Parameters:** 77,730 trainable parameters

Device: CUDA-enabled GPU

Noise Residual Extraction: Modified from original median blur to average pooling

Training Configuration

• Batch Size: 8 images per batch

Learning Rate: 0.001

• Optimizer: Adam with weight decay (1e-4)

• Loss Function: CrossEntropyLoss

• Early Stopping: Patience = 5 epochs

Training Results

Performance Metrics

Epoch	Train Loss	Val Loss	Val Accuracy	Status
1	0.6939	0.7055	50.0%	Baseline (Random)
2	0.6965	0.6934	50.0%	No improvement
3	0.6955	0.6904	56.25%	Learning begins
4	0.6914	0.6887	62.5%	Best model
5-9	~0.68	~0.67	52-61%	Plateau/decline

Key Achievements

- Early Stopping Triggered: Model correctly stopped at epoch 9 to prevent overfitting
- Clear Learning Pattern: Validation accuracy improved from 50% → 62.5% (+12.5%)
- Architecture Validation: Model processes spectral features correctly
- Stable Training: No crashes or convergence issues

Analysis & Insights

What We Learned

Positive Indicators

- 1. **Model is Learning:** Clear improvement over random baseline (50%)
- 2. Architecture Works: Fractal units process spectral features effectively
- 3. Early Stopping Effective: Prevented overfitting automatically
- 4. Spectral Analysis Valid: FFT-based preprocessing functions correctly

Performance Context

- Current Result: 62.5% accuracyRandom Baseline: 50% accuracy
- Paper Baseline: 91%+ accuracy (with full dataset)
- Improvement: 25% better than random (significant for limited data)

Identified Limitations

1. Dataset Size Constraint

• **Current:** 400 image pairs (800 total)

• Paper Standard: 360,000+ training images

• Impact: 900x smaller dataset severely limits learning capacity

• Evidence: Model plateaued quickly, suggesting insufficient training examples

2. Learning Rate Configuration

• **Current**: 0.001 (Adam optimizer)

• Issue: May be too aggressive for limited dataset

• Effect: Possible overshooting of optimal weights

3. Implementation Deviations

- **Noise Residual Method:** Used F.avg_poo12d instead of median blur (as specified in paper)
- Reason: PyTorch compatibility and implementation simplicity
- Impact: May affect artifact detection sensitivity
- Original Paper: I_res = I MedianBlur(I, kernel_size=7)
- Our Implementation: I_res = I F.avg_pool2d(I, kernel_size=7)

4. Architecture Scale

- Current: 32 hidden channels, 3 fractal levels
- Consideration: May be over-parameterized for small dataset
- Risk: Overfitting with limited training data

Next Steps

Priority 1: Dataset Expansion

- [] Increase to **1000+ image pairs** (2000 total)
- [] Implement data augmentation (rotation, noise, compression)
- [] Add train/val/test split (70/15/15)

Priority 2: Hyperparameter Tuning

- [] Reduce learning rate: 0.001 → 0.0001
- [] Increase patience: 5 → 10 epochs
- [] Experiment with batch size: 8 → 16

Priority 3: Implementation Refinements

- [] Replace average pooling with median blur for noise residual extraction
- [] Implement proper median filtering: cv2.medianBlur() or custom kernel
- [] Compare performance impact of different blur methods
- [] Add dropout layers for regularization
- [] Implement learning rate scheduling

Priority 4: Architecture Optimization

Technical Implementation Notes

Noise Residual Extraction Modification

During implementation, we encountered a technical constraint with the original paper's median blur approach:

Original Paper Method:

```
I res = I - MedianBlur(I, kernel size=7)
```

Our Implementation:

```
I_res = I - F.avg_pool2d(I, kernel_size=7, stride=1, padding=3)
```

Rationale for Change:

- MedianBlur requires CPU-GPU memory transfers with OpenCV
- Average pooling maintains full GPU computation pipeline
- Simplified implementation for initial proof-of-concept

Potential Impact:

- Median blur better preserves edges while removing noise
- Average pooling may blur important high-frequency artifacts
- Could contribute to performance gap vs. paper results

Technical Context

Comparison with Recent Research

Method	Year	Key Innovation	Performance
Our FractalCNN	2025	Fractal spectral analysis	62.5% (limited data)
SPAI	2025	Self-supervised spectral learning	SOTA +5.5% AUC
Original Paper	2024	Multi-level fractal similarity	91.17% average

Field Context

- Spectral analysis remains cutting-edge approach
- Recent SPAI paper validates spectral domain importance
- Our fractal approach offers unique perspective on spectral artifacts

Conclusions

Key Takeaways

- 1. **Proof of Concept Successful:** FractalCNN architecture functions correctly
- 2. Learning Demonstrated: Model improves beyond random baseline
- 3. Dataset is Limiting Factor: Primary bottleneck identified
- 4. Foundation Established: Ready for systematic improvements

Success Metrics for v1.1

• Target Accuracy: 75%+ validation accuracy

• Dataset Size: 1000+ training pairs

• Training Stability: 15+ epochs without early stopping

Long-term Vision

With proper dataset scaling and hyperparameter optimization, this implementation has potential to achieve performance closer to the original paper's 91%+ accuracy, contributing to the evolving field of AI-generated image detection.