

# A Comprehensive Survey with Critical Analysis for Deepfake Speech Detection

Lam Pham<sup>1\*</sup>, Phat Lam<sup>2\*</sup>, Tin Nguyen<sup>3\*</sup>, Hieu Tang<sup>4</sup>, Huyen Nguyen<sup>5</sup>, Alexander Schindler<sup>6</sup>, Canh Vu<sup>7</sup>

**Abstract**—Thanks to advancements in deep learning, speech generation systems now power a variety of real-world applications, such as text-to-speech for individuals with speech disorders, voice chatbots in call centers, cross-linguistic speech translation, etc. While these systems can autonomously generate human-like speech and replicate specific voices, they also pose risks when misused for malicious purposes. This motivates the research community to develop models for detecting synthesized speech (e.g., fake speech) generated by deep-learning-based models, referred to as the Deepfake Speech Detection task. As the Deepfake Speech Detection task has emerged in recent years, there are not many survey papers proposed for this task. Additionally, existing surveys for the Deepfake Speech Detection task tend to summarize techniques used to construct a Deepfake Speech Detection system rather than providing a thorough analysis. This gap motivated us to conduct a comprehensive survey, providing a critical analysis of the challenges and developments in Deepfake Speech Detection. Our survey is innovatively structured, offering an in-depth analysis of current challenge competitions, public datasets, and the deep-learning techniques that provide enhanced solutions to address existing challenges in the field. From our analysis, we propose hypotheses on leveraging and combining specific deep learning techniques to improve the effectiveness of Deepfake Speech Detection systems. Beyond conducting a survey, we perform extensive experiments to validate these hypotheses and propose a highly competitive model for the task of Deepfake Speech Detection. Given the analysis and the experimental results, we finally indicate potential and promising research directions for the Deepfake Speech Detection task.

**Items**—Deepfake speech detection (DSD), challenge competition, ensemble, audio embedding, pre-trained model.

## I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, remarkable advancements in deep learning techniques and neural networks have revolutionized the field of generative AI. Today, core communication mediums such as audio, images, video, and text can be automatically generated and applied across various domains, including chatbot systems (e.g., ChatGPT), film production [10], code generation [11], and audio synthesis [12], [13], etc. However, AI-synthesized data could pose a serious threat to social security when there is an increasing number of crimes related to leveraging the synthesized data [14]. To address this concern,

the tasks, which are proposed for detecting synthesized data (e.g. fake data) generated from deep-learning-based methods, referred to as deepfake detection, have drawn much attention from the research community recently.

Focusing on human speech, this paper provides a comprehensive survey for the task of Deepfake Speech Detection (DSD). To this end, the milestones presenting the development progress of the DSD task are first presented in Fig. 1. As the figure shows, the earliest public dataset and challenge proposed for the DSD task was introduced in 2015, focusing exclusively on the English language. Then, the first challenge for video deepfake detection (DFDC [15]) was introduced in 2020. In subsequent years, datasets for the DSD task in Japanese [16], Korean [16], and Chinese [17] were introduced in 2021 and 2022, respectively. Recently, in 2024, multilingual datasets for the DSD task have been published, including MLAAD [18] for conversational speech and SVDD [19] for singing. Fig. 1 also highlights a growing number of papers, datasets, and challenge competitions for the DSD task from 2021 to the present. This trend indicates that the DSD task has recently gained prominence and has attracted significant interest from the research community.

To further understand the DSD task, we summarized recent survey papers related to the DSD task in Table I. As shown in the table, most of these surveys focus on detecting general fake data (e.g., images, videos, audio, or text), with audio or human speech typically being addressed only as a subsection or a part of the broader discussion [8], [2], [3]. Therefore, the main techniques, existing concerns, and potential research for the DSD task have not been comprehensively analyzed in these papers. Among the survey papers, only two survey papers of [5] and [9] focus on the DSD task. However, as conventional surveys, these papers primarily summarize the technologies used to construct a DSD system such as datasets, feature extraction, classification model, loss functions, rather than providing a comprehensive analysis and highlighting existing concerns. For instance, while challenge competitions proposed for the DSD task are very important in advancing the research community, their importance and various aspects have not been thoroughly analyzed (i.e., The number of research teams participating in these competitions and their results are interesting to analyzed, etc). Although this information reflects the level of interest in DSD within the research community, it has not been addressed in any existing survey papers. The second concern is related to public datasets proposed for the DSD task. In particular, the current survey papers do not adequately analyze the imbalance among (1) the number of utterances, (2) the AI-

L. Pham and A. Schindler are with Austrian Institute of Technology, Vienna, Austria.

P. Lam and T. Nguyen are with HCM University of Technology, Ho Chi Minh city, Vietnam

H. Tang is with FPT University, Ho Chi Minh city, Vietnam

H. Nguyen is with Tokyo University of Agriculture and Technology, Tokyo, Japan

C. Vu is with Laboratory for Applied and Industrial Mathematics, Institute for Computational Science and Artificial Intelligence, Van Lang University, Ho Chi Minh City, Viet Nam

(\*) Main and equal contribution into the paper.




Fig. 1. The timeline of Deepfake Speech Detection (DSD) task

TABLE I  
THE MAIN FACTORS ANALYZED IN SURVEY PAPERS

Papers	Years	Audio/Video	Challenge Competitions	Public Datasets	Data Augmentation	Feature Extraction	Classification Models	Loss Functions	Training Strategies	Proposed Models	Continue Updating
[1]	2021	Yes/Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
[2]	2023	Yes/Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
[3]	2023	Yes/Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
[4]	2023	Yes/Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
[5]	2023	Yes/No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
[6]	2023	Yes/Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
[7]	2024	Yes/Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
[8]	2024	Yes/Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
[9]	2024	Yes/No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
<b>Our Survey</b>	<b>2024</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>

synthesized speech systems used to generate fake speech; and (3) the original/real human speech resource used to generate fake speech utterances. These key factors are essential in creating a high-quality DSD dataset for evaluating DSD models. Additionally, survey papers are at risk of becoming outdated as new datasets, techniques, and models continue to emerge. However, current surveys do not offer solutions for regularly updating essential information, such as details about challenge competitions, public datasets, and the top-performing models on specific datasets. As regards technologies used to construct a DSD model such as feature extraction, classification model, or loss functions, current survey papers mainly summarize and then present conclusions rather than conducting experiments to provide strong evidence and validation.

Given the existing concerns about the current survey papers for the DSD task, these motivate and inspire us to provide a much more comprehensive survey in this paper. By addressing these concerns, we mainly contribute:

- We provide a comprehensive analysis and then indicate concerns related to three main topics: The current challenge competition, the published datasets, and the deep-learning-based techniques used to develop a DSD system. We construct each topic by describing three main parts including ‘Analysis’, ‘Discussion’, and ‘Contribution’. The ‘Analysis’ summarizes concrete information about the topic. Meanwhile, the ‘Discussion’ indicates concerns in each topic. Finally, the ‘Contribution’ provides our suggestion and solution to further contribute

to each topic.

- To solve the out-of-date issue of a survey paper, we set up a Github repository to update further challenge competitions, public datasets, and top-performance systems.
- More than a survey, we conduct extensive experiments to verify assumptions from the comprehensive analysis, achieving a competitive DSD model. Given the analysis and experimental results, we indicate potential research directions for the DSD task.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: Section II discusses challenge competitions for the DSD task. Section III deeply analyses the public and benchmark datasets proposed for the DSD task. In Section IV, we summarize the key techniques for constructing the main components of a DSD system, including data augmentation, feature extraction, classification models, and loss functions. Section V presents extensive experiments that validate the techniques described in Section IV. Building on the analysis and results from the previous sections, Section VI outlines our proposed research directions in the DSD task. Finally, Section VII concludes the paper.

## II. CHALLENGE COMPETITIONS PROPOSED FOR DEEPFAKE SPEECH DETECTION

**Analysis:** Challenge competitions for the DSD task play a crucial role in motivating the research community. These competitions not only introduce new benchmark datasets but also host workshops where research teams can discuss their ideas and share their motivations. This environment encourages the community to publish more datasets and

TABLE II  
THE CHALLENGE COMPETITIONS PROPOSED FOR DEEPFAKE SPEECH DETECTION

Challenge Competitions	Years	Data Types	Languages (Number)	Public Labels (train&dev/test)	Audio	Visual	Team No.	Top-1 System
ASVspoof 2015 [20]	2015	Speech	English	Yes/Yes	Yes	No	16	Ensemble Model
ASVspoof 2019 (LA Task) [21]	2019	Speech	English	Yes/Yes	Yes	No	48	Ensemble Model
DFDC [15]	2020	Speech	English	Yes/Yes	Yes	Yes	<b>2114</b>	Ensemble Model
FTC [22]	2020	Speech	English	No/No	Yes	No	n/a	n/a
ASVspoof 2021 (LA Task) [23]	2021	Speech	English	Yes/Yes	Yes	No	41	Ensemble Model
ASVspoof 2021 (DF Task) [23]	2021	Speech	English	Yes/Yes	Yes	No	33	Ensemble Model
ADD 2022 Track 1 [17]	2022	Speech	Chinese	Yes/Yes	Yes	No	48	Single Model
ADD 2022 Track 2 [17]	2022	Speech	Chinese	Yes/Yes	Yes	No	27	Single Model
ADD 2022 Track 3.2 [17]	2022	Speech	Chinese	Yes/Yes	Yes	No	33	Single Model
ADD 2023 Track 1.2 [24]	2023	Speech	Chinese	No/No	Yes	No	49	Ensemble Model
ADD 2023 Track 2 [24]	2023	Speech	Chinese	No/No	Yes	No	16	Single Model
AV-Deepfake1M [25], [26]	2024	Speech	English	Yes/No	Yes	Yes	n/a	n/a
ASVspoof 2024 [27]	2024	Speech	English	Yes/No	Yes	No	53	Ensemble Model
SVDD 2024 [28], [19]	2024	Singing	<b>Multilanguages (6)</b>	Yes/No	Yes	No	47	Ensemble Model




Fig. 2. The number of competitions proposed for DSD task from 2015

develop new techniques to address the DSD challenges. To analyze DSD challenge competitions, we first summarize all challenges in Table II. Importantly, we will continuously update information about future DSD challenge competitions in our GitHub repository<sup>1</sup>.

As Table II shows, most challenge competitions focus on detecting fake speech in a conversation except for the SVDD 2024 challenge [28] for the fake singing detection. All challenge competitions for fake speech detection in a conversation have been proposed for a single language (i.e., While ADD 2022 and ADD 2023 are for Chinese, the others are proposed for English). Regarding the number of DSD challenge competitions, Fig. 2 shows that there has been an increase in recent years. This trend indicates that the DSD task has gained attention from the research community, particularly due to the rise of advanced deep learning systems capable of generating highly realistic human-like speech, which poses significant security risks. DSD challenge competitions, which explore fake speech in a conversation, can be separated into two groups. The first group is proposed for only audio [20], [29], [21], [23], [27], [22], [17], [24]. Meanwhile, the second group is for video in which a fake video is identified by fake audio, fake image, or both fake audio and image [15], [26]. This indicates that DSD is not only treated as an individual task independently but also

considered as a sub-task in multimodal systems. It is also evident that the second group, which focused on fake video detection, has attracted significantly more research teams (e.g. 2,114 teams in the DFDC challenge [15]) compared to the first group (e.g. the largest team count was 54 in the ASVspoof 2021 challenge [23]). This provides an insight that fake video detection is a more compelling task, drawing greater interest and participation from research teams. Regarding top-1 systems in these challenge competitions, they leveraged the ensemble techniques which combine a wide range of input features or multiple models (i.e., most submitted systems mainly use deep learning based models).

**Discussion:** Given the recent analysis of challenge competitions proposed for the DSD task, some concerns can be indicated. Firstly, the DSD task has drawn attention from the research community and is now recognized as one of the critical components in a complex system of deepfake detection. However, most current challenge competitions are limited to single languages, such as Chinese or English, and primarily focus on detecting fake speech within conversations. Second, some challenge competitions have not published datasets for different reasons. For example, FTC [22] was organized by the US government, and the top-performing systems are used by the US government. Similarly, ADD 2023 [24] only provides the dataset for the teams that attended during the competition. These limitations hinder research motivation and further development once the challenges conclude. Third, it is recognized that fake speech utterances are mainly generated from deep-learning-based speech generation systems. Therefore, if selected deep-learning-based speech generators are not general or up-to-date, this significantly affects the effectiveness and quality of the challenge competition. This highlights the need for collaboration between two tasks of deep-learning-based speech generation and detection within the same challenge competition. Competitions like ASVspoof 2024 [27] and ADD 2022 [17] have addressed this by not only published datasets but also presented a two-phase or two-track challenge in which the first phase/track is for Deepfake Speech Generation and the second phase/track is for Deepfake Speech Detection. Finally, regarding techniques used in these competitions, ensemble models have become widely used to

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/AI-ResearchGroup/A-Comprehensive-Survey-with-Critical-Analysis-for-Deepfake-Speech-Detection>

TABLE III  
PUBLIC AND BENCHMARK DATASETS PROPOSED FOR DEEFAKE SPEECH DETECTION

Datasets	Years	Languages	Speakers (Male/Female)	Utt. No. (Real/Fake)	Fake speech Generators	Speech Condition	Real Speech Resources	Utt. length (s)	Evaluation Metrics
ASVspoof 2015 [20](audio)	2015	English	45/61	16,651/246,500	10	Clean	Speaker Volunteers	1 to 2	EER
For [30](audio)	2019	English	140	-/195541	7	Clean	Kaggle [31]	2.35	Acc
ASVspoof 2019 (LA task) [21](audio)	2019	English	46/61	12,483/108,978	19	Clean	Speaker Volunteers	n/a	EER
DFDC [15](video)	2020	English	3426	128,154/104,500	1	Clean & Noisy	Speaker Volunteers	68.8	Pre., Rec.
ASVspoof 2021 (LA task) [23](audio)	2021	English	21/27	18,452/163,114	13	Clean & Noisy	Speaker Volunteers	n/a	EER
ASVspoof 2021 (DF task) [23](audio)	2021	English	21/27	<b>22,617/589,212</b>	<b>100+</b>	Clean & Noisy	Speaker Volunteers	n/a	EER
WaveFake [16](audio)	2021	English, Japanese	0/2	-/117,985	6	Clean	LJSPEECH [32], JSUT [33]	6/4.8	EER
KoDF [34](video)	2021	Korean	198/205	62,116/175,776	2	Clean	Speaker Volunteers	90/15 (real/fake)	Acc, AuC
ADD 2022 [17]	2022	Chinese	40/40	3012/24072	2	Clean	AISHELL-3 [35]	1 to 10	EER
FakeAVCeleb [36](video)	2022	English	250/250	570/25,000	2	Clean & Noisy	Vox-Celeb2 [37]	7	AuC
In-the-Wild [38](video)	2022	English	58	19963/11816	0	Clean & Noisy	Self-collected	4.3	EER
LAV-DF [39](video)	2022	English	153	36,431/99,873	1	Clean & Noisy	Vox-Celeb2 [37]	3 to 20	AP
Voc.v [40](audio)	2023	English	46/61	14,250/41,280	5	Clean & Noisy	ASVspoof 2019	n/a	EER
PartialSpoof [41](audio)	2023	English	46/61	12,483/108,978	19	Clean & Noisy	ASVspoof 2019	0.2 to 6.4	EER
LibriSeVoc [42](audio)	2023	English	n/a	13,201/79,206	6	Clean & Noisy	Librispeech	5 to 34	EER
AV-Deepfake1M [25], [26](video)	2023	English	2,068	<b>286,721/860,039</b>	2	Clean & Noisy	Voxceleb2 [37]	5 to 35	Acc, AuC
CFAD [43](audio)	2024	Chinese	1023	-/374,000	11	Clean & Noisy & Codecs	AISHELL-1-3 [44], [45] MAGICDATA [46]	n/a	EER
MLAAD [47](audio)	2024	<b>Multilanguages (23)</b>	n/a	-/76,000	54	Clean & Noisy	M-AILABS [18]	n/a	Acc
ASVspoof 2024 [27](audio)	2024	English	n/a	<b>188,819/815,262</b>	28	Clean & Noisy	MLS [48]	n/a	EER
SVDD2024 [28](audio)	2024	<b>Multilanguages (6)</b>	59	12,169/72,235	48	Clean	Mandarin, Japanese	n/a	EER

enhance performance in many challenge competitions, often leading research teams to develop top-performing systems. However, this approach has several drawbacks, including limited explainability, increased system complexity, high training costs, and concerns related to power consumption and green AI. Therefore, different aspects of using deep-learning-based models such as using a single model, low complexity, or real-time inference can be regarded as main constraints in challenge competitions for the DSD task in the future. For example, the DCASE challenge Task 1 [49] for Sound Scene Classification requires the submitted systems to obey two constraints: (1) not larger than 128 K parameters and (2) not larger than 30 MMAC units.

**Our contribution:** Given the analysis and the discussion about the DSD challenge competitions above, our work further motivates the research community by:

- We present and highlight the important role of DSD challenge competitions. We then provide a comprehensive analysis and indicate the concerns.
- We continue updating new challenge competitions in the future by creating a Github project<sup>2</sup>. The GitHub repository serves as a reference for up-to-date information on challenge competitions and current concerns. In other words, it provides a summary of challenge competitions related to the DSD task, ensuring that this survey paper remains current.

### III. PUBLIC DATASETS PROPOSED FOR DEEFAKE SPEECH DETECTION

**Analysis:** Public datasets proposed for the DSD task, including those introduced through challenge competitions, play a crucial role in motivating the research community to develop and evaluate DSD systems. In this section, we present a summary of the public and benchmark datasets for the DSD task, as shown in Table III. These datasets have been introduced through various challenge competitions and published papers.

<sup>2</sup><https://github.com/AI-ResearchGroup/A-Comprehensive-Survey-with-Critical-Analysis-for-Deepfake-Speech-Detection>




Fig. 3. The number of public datasets proposed for DSD task from 2015

As illustrated in Fig.3, the number of public datasets for the DSD task has grown significantly in recent years. Most of these datasets include both clean and noisy speech. Notably, nearly all datasets have been designed for English, with WaveFake [16], KoDF [50], and ADD 2022 [17] being the exceptions, focusing on Japanese, Korean, and Chinese languages, respectively. Recently, the first multilingual datasets for the DSD task were introduced in [47] and [19]. The MLAAD dataset [18] provides fake speech in conversations generated in 23 widely spoken languages. Meanwhile, the SVDDD dataset [19] was proposed for deepfake singing detection with six different languages (i.e., the Chinese songs are the majority).

Most deepfake datasets are generated from one of three generator techniques: Text-to-Speech (TTS), Voice Conversion (VC), and Adversarial Attacks (AT), as shown in Table IV. Notably, ASVspoof 2024 [27] is the first dataset that uses AT systems to generate fake speech. While TTS systems generate fake speech from text, VC systems generate fake speech from real speech (e.g. audio). To mimic the target speakers, TTS and VC systems attempt to explore the audio embeddings extracted from the target speakers. The audio embeddings extracted from target speakers are treated as a part of the feature map in the entire network architecture in TTS and VC systems. Regarding AC systems, they mainly apply Malafide [124] and Malocopula [125] methods to gen-

TABLE IV  
DEEFAKE SPEECH GENERATION SYSTEMS USED IN PUBLIC DSD DATASETS  
(TTS: TEXT TO SPEECH, VC: VOICE CONVERSION, AT: ADVERSARIAL ATTACH USING MALAFIDE OR MALOCOPULA)

Datasets	Year	No. of TTS/VC/AT	Deepfake Speech Generation Systems
ASVspoof 2015 [20]	2015	7 VC, 3 TTS	VC-01 [51], [52], VC-02 [53], TTS-01 [54], TTS-02 [54], VC-03 [55], VC-04 [56], VC-05 [56], VC-06 [57], VC-07 [58], TTS-03 [59]
FoR [30]	2019	7 TTS	Deep Voice 3, Amazon AWS Polly, Baidu TTS, Google Traditional TTS, Google Cloud TTS, Google Wavenet TTS, Microsoft Azure TTS
ASVspoof 2019 (LA task) [21]	2019	8 VC, 11 TTS	TTS-01 [60], TTS-02 [60], [61], TTS-03 [62], TTS-04 [63], VC-01 [64], VC-02 [65], TTS-05 [62], [66], TTS-06 [60], [67], TTS-07 [68], [69], TTS-08 [70], [71], TTS-09 [70], [71], [72], TTS-10 [73], VC-03+TTS [74], VC-04+TTS [75], [76], VC-05+TTS [75], [76], TTS-11 [63], VC-06 [77], [78], VC-07 [79], [80], [81], VC-08 [65]
DFDC [15]	2020	1 TTS	TTS Skins voice conversion [82]
KoDF [34]	2021	2 TTS	ATFHP [50] and Wav2Lip [83]
ASVspoof 2021 (LA task) [23]	2021	13 TTS/VC	Reuse ASVspoof 2019
ASVspoof 2021 (DF task) [23]	2021	100 TTS/VC	Vocoders [84]
WaveFake [16]	2021	6 TTS	MeiGAN [85], FB-MelGAN [85], HiFi-GAN [86], WaveGlow [87], PWG [88], MB-MelGAN [85]
FakeAVCeleb [36]	2022	2 TTS	SV2TTS [89], [90]
In-the-Wild [38]	2022	n/a	n/a
LAV-DF [39]	2022	1 TTS	SV2TTS [91]
Voc.v [40]	2023	5 TTS	HiFi-GAN [86], MB-MelGAN [85], WaveGlow [87], PWG [88], Hn-NSF [92]
PartialSpoof [41]	2023	21 TTS/VC	Reuse ASVspoof 2019
LibriSeVoc [42]	2023	6 TTS/VC	WaveNet [73], WaveRNN [93], MeiGAN [85], Parallel WaveGAN [94], WaveGrad [95], DiffWave [96]
AV-Deepfake1M [25], [26]	2023	2 TTS	VITS [97], YoursTTS [98]
CFAD [43]	2024	11 TTS	STRAIGHT [99], Griffin-Lim [100], LPCNet [101], WaveNet [73], PWG [88], HiFi-GAN[102], MB-MelGAN [85], MeiGAN [85], WORLD [103], FastSpeech [104], Tacotron-HifiGAN [105]
MLAAD [47]	2024	54 TTS	Bark, Capacitron, FastPitch, GlowTTS, Griffin Lim, Jenny, NeuralHMM, Overflow, Parler TTS, Speech5, Tacotron DDC, Tacotron2, Tacotron2 DCA, Tacotron2 DH, Tcotron2-DDC, Tortoise, VITS, VITS Neon, VITS-MMS, XTTS v1.1, XTTS v2
ASVspoof 2024 [27]	2024	15 TTS, 6 VC, 7 AT	TTS-01 [106], TTS-02 [107], TTS-03 [108], TTS-04 [109], TTS-05 [110], TTS-06[111], TTS-07[112], TTS-08(self-develop), VC-01[113], TTS-09[114], VC-02 [115], VC-03(self-develop), TTS-10 [116], AT-01 (Malafide+TTS-10 [116]), TTS-11 [117], AT-02(self-Develop), TTS-12 [118], TTS-13 [119], AT-03(Malafide+TTS [120]), VC-04(self-develop), VC-05 [121][24], VC-06(add noise), AT-04(Malacopula+VC-06), TTS-14 [122], TTS-15 [123], AT-05(Malacopula+AT-01), AT-06(Malacopula+TTS-13 [119]), AT-07(Malacopula+VC-05 [121])

erate fake speech. Both Malafide [124] and Malocopula [125] methods involve leveraging filter banks. Malafide [124] applies multiple techniques of linear time-invariant (LTI), non-causal filter, and the coefficients (e.g., tap weights) to create TTS/VC-based fake speech that mimics the target speaker. Meanwhile, Malocopula [125] combines both linear filter and non-linear filter (e.g., one-dimensional convolutional layer) to replicate the target speaker’s voice.

To compare among DSD datasets, we analyze three different aspects: (1) the number of fake utterances; (2) the AI-synthesized speech systems used to generate fake speech; and (3) the original/real human speech resource used to generate fake speech utterances. As Table III shows, most datasets present lower than 300,000 utterances of fake speech, expected ASVspoof 2021 (DF Task) [23], ASVspoof 2024 [27], AV-Deepfake1M dataset [25], [26], and DFDC dataset [15] with 589212, 815262, 860039, and 104500 fake samples, respectively. Although DFDC [15], [82] and AV-Deepfake1M dataset [25], [26] present a large number of fake data, this was proposed for video in which audio may not be fake. Additionally, these fake utterances were generated from only a few deep-learning-based speech-generation systems. Indeed, two TTS models of VITS [97], YoursTTS [98] and one TTS model [82] were used to generate fake speech in DFDC [15] and AV-Deepfake1M dataset [25], [26] datasets, respectively. On the other hand, the ASVspoof 2021 (DF Eva) dataset [23] contains 589212 fake utterances, generated using over 100 voice conversion (VC) and text-to-speech (TTS) systems. To catch up with state-of-the-art deepfake speech generators, Table IV presents the architectures and resources of deepfake speech generators. The table indicates that the ASVspoofing series shows up-to-date and diverse deepfake speech gener-

ators compared to the others. In terms of the original human speech resources, most DSD datasets are based on recordings from a limited number of speaker volunteers. For example, although the ASVspoof 2021 (DF Eva) dataset [23] used 100 VC and TTS systems to create fake utterances, the real speech resource is from 107 speaker volunteers. Some DSD datasets of AV-Deepfake1M [25], [26], CFAD [43] leveraged the large and available human speech datasets to generate fake utterances such as Voxceleb2 [37], AISHELLI-3 [35], MAGICDATA [46]. However, these datasets use a limited number of speech generators (e.g. 2 TTS and 11 TTS for AV-Deepfake1M [25], [26] and CFAD [43], respectively).

Regarding metrics evaluation, all datasets proposed for the DSD task come together with a baseline and metrics for the evaluation. Regarding the baseline systems, all baselines leveraged convolutional neural network (CNN) based architectures. These baselines are evaluated mainly by the Equal Error Rate (EER) metric. Some datasets such as KoDF [34], AV-Deepfake1M [25], [26], MLaAD [47], FoR [30] used Accuracy (Acc.) and Area Under The Curve (AUC) metrics instead of EER.

**Discussion:** Given the analysis of benchmark datasets proposed for the DSD task, some existing issues can be outlined. These include the limited number of datasets available for multiple languages and the imbalance of several aspects within existing datasets.

Firstly, more public and benchmark datasets have been proposed for the DSD task. However, there is only one multilingual dataset currently. The lack of multilingual datasets for DSD tasks presents several challenges for current model development and evaluation such as performance degradation on cross-language settings that leads to a limited applicability






Fig. 4. The high-level architecture of Deepfake Speech Detection (DSD) systems




Fig. 5. The imbalance among the fake speech utterances, the fake speech generators, and the real speaker volunteers in benchmark DSD datasets

in real-world applications. This motivates the research community to propose more datasets for multiple languages to enhance model’s capability in real-life settings. Secondly, we also highlight an imbalance among DSD datasets regarding three aspects: (1) the number of fake utterances; (2) the AI-synthesized speech systems used to generate fake speech; and (3) the original/real human speech resource used to generate fake speech utterances. The imbalance can be clearly described in Fig. 5 regarding DSD datasets using speaker volunteers.

- **The number of utterances:** The quantity of utterances within the datasets is not uniform. Some datasets may contain a large number of samples, while others have significantly fewer. A small number of real or fake utterances within datasets (e.g. FakeAVCeleb [36], ADD [17]) limits the model’s exposure to a wide variety of speech patterns and scenarios, affecting the detection robustness and generalization new, unseen data. Additionally, a controlled ratio between real and fake samples created within datasets (e.g ASVspoof 2024 [27], ASVspoof 2021 [23]) also ensure diversity of fake techniques and avoid overfitting on the fake data, especially if the fake samples are generated using similar techniques. Therefore, maintaining a moderately controlled ratio between real and fake utterances, along with a diverse range of these utterances, is essential for future dataset development.
- **Deepfake speech generation systems:** The variety of

deep-learning-based systems used to generate deepfake speech is another area of concern. As Table IV shows, some of datasets such as MLAAD [47], ASVspoof 2021(DF task) [23], ASVspoof 2024 [27] present more than 20 systems (e.g. TTS, VC, or AT systems). Among these datasets, ASVspoof 2021 (DF Task) [23] and ASVspoof 2024 [27] present diverse TTS, VC, and AT systems. In particular, while more than 100 TTS and VC are for ASVspoof 2021 (DF Task) [23], 28 TTS, VC, and AT are used in ASVspoof 2024 [27]. Although MLAAD [47] has been the unique multiple-language dataset currently, fake speech in this dataset was only generated from TTS systems (e.g. 54 TTS systems). Overall, some datasets may predominantly feature speech synthesized by a few specific deep-learning-based generators or techniques, while others might include a broader range. Datasets generated from a limited number of deep-learning-based generators possibly lead to over-specialization, reducing the model’s ability to detect deepfakes generated by other systems and affecting the performance in real-world scenarios. Therefore, this imbalance motivates the research community to create more diverse datasets that include a wide range of AI-synthesized speech methods.

- **Real human speech resource:** The source of real voice plays a crucial role in shaping the effectiveness, generalizability, and ethical aspects of deepfake detection models. As highlighted in Table IV, there are two main sources for building DSD datasets: voice samples from volunteer speakers or from existing datasets. Voice samples from volunteers offer greater control over diversity (if managed thoroughly) and address ethical concerns, as they are collected with explicit informed consent. However, this approach can be resource-intensive in terms of time and cost and may not scale efficiently. In contrast, utilizing existing human speech datasets offers better accessibility and scalability. However, it may introduce biases toward certain groups, such as public figures, reducing diversity in real-world applications and especially raising significant ethical issues. These problems suggest other balanced approaches to build DSD datasets that consider both diversity and scalability in the future.

Based on the above discussions and statistic information in Fig. 5, it can be concluded that ASVspoof 2019 (LA task) [21], ASVspoof 2021 (LA & DF tasks) [23], ASVspoof 2024 [27] are among the most balanced datasets

TABLE V  
INDIVIDUAL DSD SYSTEMS EXPLORING RAW AUDIO

Systems	Years	Datasets	Features	Data Augmentation (Distortion/Compression)	Models	Loss Functions
[126]	2021	ASVspoof 2021 (LA Task)	Raw Audio	Comp.: MP3, ACC, OGG	RawNet2	Focal loss
[127]	2021	ASVspoof 2021 (LA&DF Tasks)	Raw Audio	Comp.: G.723, G.726, GSM, opus, speex, mp2, ogg, tta, wma, acc, ra	RawNet2	Cross Entropy (CE)
[128]	2021	ASVspoof 2019 (LA Task)	Raw Audio	Dis.: Channel Drop, Frequency masking	SinC+CRNN	MSE Loss
[129]	2021	ASVspoof 2021 (LA Task)	Raw Audio	Comp.: mp3, mp2, m4a, m4r, opus, ogg, mov, PCM $\mu$ -law, PCM a-law, speex, ilbc, G.729, GSM, G.722, AMR	RawNet2	OC-Softmax
[130]	2021	ASVspoof 2021 (LA&DF Tasks)	Raw Audio	Dis.: Time-wise, Silence Strimming	RawNet2	Cross Entropy
[131]	2021	ASVspoof 2021 (LA&DF Tasks)	Raw Audio	n/a	Encoder: SinC+Residual Decoder: Graph Attention Network	WCE Loss
[132]	2021	ASVspoof 2021 (LA&DF Tasks)	Raw Audio	Dis.: Mixup, FIR filters	Sinc+CNN	WCE Loss
[133]	2021	ASVspoof 2021 (LA Task)	Raw Audio	Comp.: G.711-alaw, G.722, GSM-FR, and G.729	SinC+RawNet2	AM-softmax
[38]	2022	ASVspoof 2019 (LA Task) In The Wild	Raw Audio	n/a	RawNet2, RawNet-GAT, CRNNSpooF	Cross Entropy
[134]	2022	ASVspoof 2019 (LA Task)	Raw Audio	n/a	Encoder: RawNet2 Decoder: Graph Attention Neural Network	WCE Loss
[135]	2022	ASVspoof 2021 (LA&DF Tasks)	Raw Audio	Dis.: RawBoost [136]	Encoder: Sinc+CNN, Wave2Vec2.0+CNN Decoder: Graph Attention network	WCE loss
[137]	2023	ASVspoof 2019 (LA Task), ASVspoof 2021 (LA&DF Tasks)	Raw Audio	Dis.: Stereo speech	Encoder: SinC+ResNet Decoder: Graph Attention network	AM-softmax
[138]	2023	ASVspoof 2019 (LA Task)	Raw Audio	n/a	Encoder: Wav2vec2.0 [139], HuBERT [140] Decoder: LCNN-LSTM-Graph Attention	Cross Entropy
[141]	2023	ADD 2023	Raw Audio	Dis.: Add noise, mix utterance	Encoder: Wav2Vec2.0 Decoder: ECAPA-TDNN	Cross Entropy
[142]	2022	ASVspoof 2019 (LA Task),	Raw Audio	n/a	Encoder: ECAPA-TDNN, RawNet Decoder: Linear layers	Cross Entropy, Triplet loss, AM-Softmax
[143]	2023	ADD 2023	Raw Audio	Dis.: Add noise, vibration, mixup	Encoder: Wav2Vec2.0 Decoder: CNN-Transformer	A-Softmax, Triplet loss, Adversial loss
[144]	2023	ASVspoof 2019 (LA Task), WaveFake, FakeAVCeleb	Raw Audio	n/a	Encoder: Wav2Vec2.0 [139] Decoder: LCNN-Transformer	Triplet, BCE, Adversarial loss
[145]	2024	ASVspoof 2019 (LA Task), ASVspoof 2021 (LA&DF Tasks), In The Wild [38]	Raw Audio	n/a	SincNet/LEAF+ResNet	Cross Entropy
[145]	2024	ASVspoof 2021 (LA&DF Tasks)	Raw Audio	n/a	Encoder: EnCodec [146], AudioDec [147], AudioMAE [148], HuBERT [140], WavLM [149], Whisper [150] Decoder: ResNet	Cross Entropy
[151]	2024	ASVspoof 2019 (LA Task), ASVspoof 2021 (LA&DF Tasks)	Raw Audio	Dis.: Add noise, overlapping	Encoder: WavLM [149], Decoder: Multi-Fusion Attentive	Cross Entropy
[152]	2024	ASVspoof 2019 (LA Task), ASVspoof 2021 (LA Task), In The Wild	Raw Audio	n/a	Encoder: Wav2vec2.0 [139], BEATS [153], LationCLAP [154], AudioCLIP [155], Decoder: Similarity Score Measurement	n/a

at the writing time. Additionally, the MLAAD [47] is the largest and most suitable DSD dataset for evaluating cross-languages. The discussions on existing datasets for the DSD task underscore the importance of future efforts by the research community to release comprehensive, multilingual, and balanced datasets. Also, Fig. 5 emphasizes the significant costs and workload involved in creating such datasets, while ensuring compliance with essential security protocols for speaker volunteers.

**Our contribution:** Given the analysis and the discussion above, our work mainly contributes:

- We focus on the important role of public datasets proposed for the DSD task, providing a comprehensive analysis and indicating the existing issues. The analysis shows different aspects that are not mentioned in the other surveys: (1) We report the original resource of real human speech; (2) We provide an overview of deep learning-based systems used to generate fake speech; (3) The survey is not only for fake speech but also for fake

video; (4) We highlight imbalances and other concerns in current public DSD datasets, along with their impact on model performance and practical applicability.

- In line with the evolution of challenge competitions, we will continue to update new DSD datasets via our GitHub repository<sup>3</sup> in the future. This ensures the ongoing relevance of the survey and provides an up-to-date resource for DSD datasets.

#### IV. OVERVIEW ON PROPOSED SYSTEMS FOR DEEPPFAKE SPEECH DETECTION

To conduct a comprehensive analysis of DSD systems, we first review state-of-the-art research papers addressing the DSD task. Notably, a large number of the selected papers are from high-reputation journals and conferences such as INTERSPEECH (48 papers) and ICASSP (29 papers) in recent years. Then, we categorize these DSD systems into

<sup>3</sup><https://github.com/AI-ResearchGroup/A-Comprehensive-Survey-with-Critical-Analysis-for-Deepfake-Speech-Detection>

TABLE VI  
INDIVIDUAL DSD SYSTEMS EXPLORING SPECTROGRAM BASED FEATURES

Systems	Years	Datasets	Data Augmentation (Distortion/Compression)	Features	Models	Loss Functions
[156]	2020	ASVspoof 2019 (LA Task)	Dis.: Add noise, reverberation, FreqAugment	LFCC	ResNet	LMC loss, Cross Entropy
[126]	2021	ASVspoof 2021 (LA Task)	Comp.: MP3, ACC, OGG	LFCC MEL	LCNN TDNN	Focal loss, Focal, Cross Entropy
[157]	2021	ASVspoof 2021 (LA Task)	n/a	LFB, SPEC, LFCC	LCNN, LCNN-LSTM	Cross Entropy, MSE
[158]	2021	ASVspoof 2021 (LA Task)	Comp.: MP3, ACC, landlie, cellular, VoIP	LFCC	ECAPA-TDNN	Focal loss
[127]	2021	ASVspoof 2021 (LA&DF Tasks)	Comp.: G.723, G.726, GSM, opus, speex, mp2, ogg, tta, wma, acc, ra	CQT CQCC, LFCC LFCC	LCNN GMM GMM, LCNN	Cross Entropy
[129]	2021	ASVspoof 2021 (LA Task)	Comp.: G.723, G.726, GSM opus, speex, mp2, ogg, tta, wma, acc, ra	PSCC, LFCC, DCT-DFT, LLFB	Resnet18, TDNN	OC-Softmax
[130]	2021	ASVspoof 2021 (LA&DF Tasks)	Dis.: Time-wise, Silence Strimming	CQT	ResNet, CNN, LSTM	Cross Entropy
[132]	2021	ASVspoof 2021 (LA&DF Tasks)	Dis.: Mixup, FIR filters	MSTFT	ResNet, LCNN	Central loss
[159]	2021	ASVspoof 2019, 2021 (LA Task)	n/a	LFCCs, logLFBs, GM-LFBs, Textrograms	Squeeze CNN	Cross Entropy, A-Softmax loss MLC loss
[160]	2021	ASVspoof 2021 (LA&DF Tasks)	Comp.: MP3, AAC, Landlie, cellular; Dis.: device impulse	LFCCs	ECAPA-TDNN, ResNet	OC-Softmax, P2SGrad losses
[133]	2021	ASVspoof 2021 (LA Task)	Comp.: G.711-alaw, G.722, GSM-FR, and G.729	LFCCs	LCNN	AM-softmax
[161]	2021	ASVspoof 2019 (LA Tasks)	n/a	LFCC	ResNet	OC-Softmax
[162]	2021	ASVspoof 2019 (LA Tasks)	n/a	LFCC	LSTM-SECNN	MSE loss
[163]	2021	ASVspoof 2019 (LA Tasks)	Dis.: SpecAug	log-Mel	ResNet	n/a
[38]	2022	ASVspoof 2019 (LA Task), In the Wild	n/a	CQT, log-STFT MEL	LCNN, CNN-LSTM, Inception, ResNet, Transformer	Cross Entropy
[164]	2022	ADD 2022	Dis.: Add noise/music/babele, Reverb, Modify Volume, SpecAug; Comp.: MP3, OGG, AAC, OPUS	LFCC	ResNet	Focal loss
[165]	2023	ASVspoof 2019 (LA Task), WaveFake, FakeAVCeleb	n/a	LFCC	LCNN-LSTM	Cross Entropy, Adversarial loss, Triplet loss
[166]	2023	ASVspoof 2019 (LA Task)	Comp.: FLAC	MEL	Finetune SSAT Transformer	Cross Entropy
[143]	2023	ASVspoof 2019 (LA Task)	n/a	STFT+F0 sub-bands	SENet34	A-Softmax, KL loss
[167]	2023	ASVspoof 2019 (LA Task)	n/a	LFCC, CQT	Teacher-Student (ResNet, LCNN)	OC-Softmax, MSE loss
[145]	2024	ASVspoof 2019 (LA Task),	n/a	CQT, MEL, logSpec, LFCC	ResNet	Cross Entropy
[168]	2024	ASVspoof 2019 (LA Task), ASVspoof 2021 (LA&DF Tasks)	Dis.: SpecAugment	FBank	ECAPA-TDNN	AM-Softmax
[169]	2024	ASVspoof 2019 (LA Task), ASVspoof 2021 (LA&DF Tasks)	Dis.: RawBoost [136]	log-MEL	Encoder: CNN, ResNet, SE-ResNet Decoder: GAN networks [170]	Cross Entropy, Contrastive loss
[171]	2024	ASVspoof 2019 (LA Task)	Dis.: Oversampling	STFT	Encoder: Transformer Decoder: Transformer	Cross Entropy
[172]	2024	ASVspoof 2019 (LA Task), ASVspoof 2021 (LA&DF Tasks), FakeAVCeleb, WaveFake	Dis.: RawBoost [136]	MEL	Finetune Wav2Vec2.0 (XLSR-53 [139])	Cross Entropy, Contrastive loss
[173]	2024	ASVspoof 2019 (LA Task) ASVspoof 2021 (DF Task)	Comp.: aac, flac, mp3, m4a wma, ogg, wa Dis.: Speed perturbation, SpecAug	LFCC	Encoder: Transformer Decoder: Transformer	OC-Softmax

three groups based on input type, as detailed in Tables V, VI, and VII. The first group, shown in Table V, consists of DSD systems that directly process audio utterances using single models. These models are based on a single machine learning algorithm or one specific network architecture. In the second group (Table VI), audio utterances are first transformed into spectrograms, representing temporal-frequency features. After this transformation, a single model is applied to analyze the data. The final group, shown in Table VII, features a diverse range of ensemble models that utilize various input features and combine multiple models. Given the summary of DSD systems in Table V, VI, VII, we describe the high-level architecture of DSD systems as shown in Fig. 4. From Fig 4, we then identify and analyze four main components that directly impact the DSD system performance: (1) Offline

data augmentation, (2) feature extraction, (3) classification model, and (4) loss function and training strategy.

#### A. Offline data augmentation

**Analysis:** Data augmentation involves generating variations of the original data to increase the size of DSD datasets, which enhances the robustness and generalization capabilities of machine learning models. Since this step is applied to original audio utterances before the training process, it can be referred to as offline data augmentation. As shown in Tables V, VI, and VII, offline data augmentation methods can be separated into two main groups, referred to as compression and distortion. The compression methods involve compress and decompress algorithms, mainly using audio codec techniques. A codec, short for ‘coder-decoder’, is software used to compress and decompress digital audio.



TABLE VII  
DSD SYSTEMS LEVERAGING ENSEMBLE TECHNIQUES TO ENHANCE THE PERFORMANCE

Systems	Years	Datasets	Features	Data Augmentation (Distortion/Compression)	Models	Loss Functions	Ensemble Methods
[174]	2019	ASVspoof 2019 (LA Task),	LFCC, CQT, FFT	n/a	LCNN	A-Softmax	Multiple inputs
[175]	2021	ASVspoof 2019 (LA Task)	Raw Audio	Dis.: Mixup	ResNet	Cross Entropy	Multiple branches
[176]	2021	ASVspoof 2019 (LA Task)	LSB, SPEC, LFCC	n/a	LCNN, LCNN-LSTM	Cross Entropy, MSE for P2SGrad	Multiple inputs, models
[158]	2021	ASVspoof 2021 (LA&DF Tasks)	LFCC	Comp.: MP3, ACC, landlie, cellular, VoIP	Variants of ECAPA-TDNN	OC-Softmax	Multiple models
[177]	2021	ASVspoof 2021 (LA&DF Tasks)	LFCC	Dis.: Reverberation, add noise, Comp.: mp3, mp4	ResNet, MLP, SWA[18]	large margin cosine, Cross Entropy	Multiple models
[126]	2021	ASVspoof 2021 (LA Task)	LFCC, MFCC, draw	Comp.: MP3, ACC, OGG	TDNN, RawNet2	Focal loss	Multiple inputs, models
[127]	2021	ASVspoof 2021 (LA&DF Tasks)	Draw, CQCC, LFCC	Comp.: G.723, G.726, GSM, opus, speex, mp2, ogg, tta, wma, acc, ra	GMM, LCNN	Cross Entropy	Multiple inputs, models
[129]	2021	ASVspoof 2021 (LA Task)	Raw, PSCC, LFCC, DCT-DFT, LLFB	Comp.: TODO set 1+2	ResNet18, GMM, TDNN, RawNet2	OC-Softmax	Multiple inputs, models
[132]	2021	ASVspoof 2021 (LA Task)	MSTFT	Dis.: Mixup, FIR filters	Resnet18, LCNN, Sinc+CNN	Central loss	Multiple inputs, models
[161]	2021	ASVspoof 2019 (LA Tasks)	LFCC	n/a	ResNet	OC-Softmax	Multiple branches
[178]	2022	ASVspoof 2021 (LA&DF Tasks)	LFCC	Comp.: G.711-alaw, G.711- $\mu$ law	GMM-MobileNet	Cross Entropy	Multiple branches
[179]	2022	ASVspoof 2021 (LA Task)	CQT, MEL	Dis.: Mixup, Frequency Masking	BC-ResNet, FreqCNN	n/a	Multiple inputs, models
[180]	2022	ASVspoof 2019 (LA Tasks)	LFCC	n/a	ResNet, LSTM	OC-Softmax loss	Multiple branches
[181]	2022	ASVspoof 2019, 2021 (LA Task)	Log-Mel	Dis.: Add music, noise, speech Reverb, pitch shift, SpecAug	ResNet	A-Softmax	Multiple models
[182]	2023	ASVspoof 2019, 2021 (LA Task)	Raw Audio	Dis.: Mixup, SpecAug	ResNet	Cross Entropy	Multiple branches
[183]	2023	ADD 2023	Raw Audio, Log-Mel	Dis.: Add noise, room impulse, mixup, speed shifting, frequency masking	ResNet	Cross Entropy, KL loss	Multiple branches
[138]	2023	ASVspoof 2019 (LA Task)	Wav2vec, Duration, Pronunciation	n/a	LCNN-LSTM-GAP	Cross Entropy Cross Entropy	Multiple inputs
[171]	2024	ASVspoof 2019 (LA Task)	STFT phase, magnitude	Dis.: Oversampling	Transformer	Entropy	Multiple inputs
[184]	2024	ASVspoof 2019 (LA Task), In The Wild	LFCC, MPE	n/a	LCNN	Cross Entropy	Multiple inputs
[185]	2024	ASVspoof 2019 (LA Tasks) ASVspoof 2021 (LA Task) In-the-wild, MLAAD-EN	Raw Audio	Dis.: Noise, Reverb, SpecAug, Drop Frequencies	Encoders: Wav2vec-XLSR-ASR, Wav2vec-XLSR-SER	Cross Entropy, MSE for P2SGrad	Multiple models
[145]	2024	ASVspoof 2019 (LA Task), ASVspoof 2021 (LA&DF Tasks)	Raw Audio	n/a	Encoders: XLS-R, Hubert, WavLM Decoder: ResNet	Cross Entropy	Multiple inputs, models

Among these methods, MP3, AAC, OGG, G.7XX, and Opus formats are commonly applied. Codec data augmentation helps simulate these real-world conditions through various compression schemes (e.g., phone calls, music streaming, or online video playback on applications such as Facebook, WhatsApp, etc.). Since different codecs use various compression and decompression algorithms, they impact audio-related factors such as signal-to-noise ratio (SNR), high-frequency formants, energy loss, sample rate, bit depth, and bitrate in distinct ways. This suggests that if there are subtle differences between real and fake speech in these aspects, generating diverse audio utterances using different codecs can be an effective approach for distinguishing between them.

Codec methods can be divided into three main categories based on the quality of audio data: uncompressed format, lossless compressed format, and lossy compressed format. Audio files with uncompressed formats such as WAV, AIFF, or PCM are large and contain all audio information recorded from an audio device. The lossless compressed formats such as FLAC, WMA, or ALAC only reduce unnecessary features of audio data and retain the almost original audio data. Meanwhile, lossy compressed formats such as MP3 or AAC significantly reduce audio features such as sample rate or bit depth to achieve low-volume audio files, which is suitable for streaming-based applications with real-time requirements.

The second distortion method tends to modify the raw audio by adding reverberation, background, and music in [177], [185], [181] or using techniques of time-wise, silence streaming in [130] without affecting the audio quality such as sample rate, bit depth, or bit rate. The distortion method enforces

classification models to learn distinct features between fake and real speech while these features are mixed by different noise resources. Notably, conventional data augmentation methods, such as pitch shifting and time stretching, which are commonly applied to raw audio in tasks like Acoustic Scene Classification [186], Speech Emotion Detection [187], and Speech Separation [188], have not been applied popularly to the DSD task [183], [181].

**Discussion:** Although compression methods and distortion methods present different approaches to generate more audio data, none of the papers has compared, analyzed, and indicated if one of the approaches is superior in the DSD task. Indeed, the statistical information in Fig 6 indicates that the state-of-the-art DSD systems using offline distortion augmentation and offline compression augmentation are equal.

Regarding codec-based data augmentation, little research has examined the differences among codec methods to identify which are most suitable for the DSD task in certain real-life scenarios. Indeed, social networks such as Facebook, Instagram, or YouTube and Internet-based communication tools such as WhatsApp, and WeChat (VoIP call) utilize specific and relevant codec methods. For example, YouTube shares audio with MP3 formats, while VoIP calls normally use G.722 audio format as the standard. However, many proposed DSD systems have been evaluated on current and benchmark datasets with WAV files, which do not accurately reflect the codec-specific conditions of real-life DSD applications.

In speech-relevant tasks such as speaker recognition, speaker emotion detection, etc., some distortion data aug-




Fig. 6. The statistics of data augmentation methods obtained from Table V, VI, VII

mentations of Mixup [189] or SpecAugment [190], which are inspired from the computer vision domain, are widely used. These data augmentation methods focus on synthesizing new spectrograms in various manners (e.g., merging, masking), which might not accurately reflect artifacts of the audio signal. Additionally, these data augmentation methods are applied to batches of spectrograms, referred to as online data augmentation. As shown in Fig. 6, Mixup [189] or SpecAugment [190] are also used in a wide range of DSD systems. However, none of the papers has analyzed or compared the efficiency between offline data augmentation and online data augmentation.

**Our contribution:** Given the analysis and the existing concerns above, our work mainly contributes:

- To evaluate the role and the effect of the online and offline data augmentation methods, we conducted extensive experiments in this paper. Based on our findings, we identify data augmentation techniques that are compatible with DSD systems. In particular, we compare the performance of codec-based methods with the Mixup [189] and SpecAugment [190] in this paper.
- On our GitHub repository, we regularly update codec-based methods and other data augmentation techniques featured in the latest research. We also released code for implementing codec-based methods and other data augmentation methods in this GitHub repository, which are used to conduct our experiments in this paper.

### B. Feature extraction

**Analysis:** As shown in Fig. 4, feature extraction methods can be categorized into two main groups: non-parameter and trainable-parameter methods.

In **non-parameter feature extraction**, a raw audio utterance (e.g., a 1-D tensor) is first transformed into a time-frequency spectral features (e.g., a 2-D tensor) using various transformation ranging from spectral coefficients (e.g., MFCC [191], [126], LFCC [129], [180], [161], CQCC [127], etc) to spectrogram-based representations such as STFT-spectrogram [171], [132], CQT-spectrogram [127], [130], etc. Once the time-frequency spectrograms are generated, some DSD systems directly use them for training with classification models [130], while other systems use several

approaches to enhance feature quality before applying a classification model. The first approach involves applying auditory filter banks such as Mel [158], [145], Linear Filter [126], [160], [133] (LF), etc, to capture the relationships between frequency bands. Then a Discrete Fourier Transform (DFT) is applied to analyze the relationship across temporal dimension before the features are fed into a model for the training process [126], [158], [160], [133]. Notably, the output of Mel, LF, or DFT operations remains a 2-D tensor (similar to a spectrogram), representing both temporal and spectral features. In the second approach, spectrograms are fed into pre-trained models, such as XLS-R [192], Hubert [140], WavLM [149], or Whisper [150], to extract embeddings. These embeddings are the output feature maps from a specific layer of the pre-trained model [145]. Typically, the embeddings form a 1-D tensor, similar to a vector, where each dimension of the vector is treated as an independent value. In this approach, the choice of spectrogram depends on the one used to train the pre-trained models. Typically, the Mel-spectrogram is preferred, as most pre-trained models use it as input for training upstream tasks [149], [140], [150]. In general, non-parameter feature extraction leverages various spectrogram transformations, auditory filters, auditory statistics, and pre-trained models to generate distinct features (e.g., 1-D audio embeddings, 2-D spectrograms) of audio input.

**Trainable-parameter feature extraction** involves extracting audio features by applying trainable network layers. In particular, systems proposed in [145], [128], [131] applied SincNet layers [193], LEAF layers [194], FBanks [168] to learn and extract features from raw audio. These techniques construct learnable filterbanks or approximate the standard filtering process. For example, SincNet and LEAF layers keep the role of adaptive and bandpass filters to capture frequency features between two pre-defined cut-off frequencies. The outputs of these trainable layers are the feature maps that are then fed into the next parts of detection systems. In other words, trainable feature extraction includes trainable network layers as a part of entire network architectures that directly train and learn features from raw audio without the spectrogram transformation steps.

**Discussion:** By allowing learnable temporal-spatial features during the training process, trainable-parameter feature extraction is compatible with end-to-end systems and shows effectiveness in distinguishing artifacts in fake speech. However, as most proposed systems using trainable features were evaluated on single datasets rather than cross-dataset settings, this possibly leads to challenges in generalization since learned feature sets perform well under specific conditions but fail in unseen fake speech in real-world environments. Regarding feature extraction using audio embeddings from pre-trained models, although these pre-trained models are effective for many audio tasks, using them for deepfake detection presents several challenges. Firstly, as pre-trained models are initially trained for upstream tasks such as speech-to-text, speaker identification, emotion detection, etc, that focus on different aspects (i.e., speech-to-text or emotion




Fig. 7. The statistics of loss functions obtained from Table V, VI, VII

detection), the audio melody and harmony (i.e. emotion detection), or distinct frequencies (i.e., speaker identification), embeddings can fail to capture subtle artifacts specific to synthesized speech. Secondly, audio deepfakes are generated to closely mimic real speech, they often have the same formants, pitch, and rhythm as real audio, especially when generated by advanced deep-learning-based speech generation systems. Additionally, the use of pre-trained models can add complexity due to their large network architectures.

For systems using spectrograms such as CQT, MEL, GAM, etc., each spectrogram is designed to capture specific frequency ranges. These spectrograms focus on different central frequencies, which allows them to highlight distinct features of an audio signal. However, human speech contains a wide range of formants - characteristics of sound determined by factors such as language, accent, vocal tract shape, and vocal fold behavior. Therefore, relying on only one type of spectrogram may miss important features, leading to incomplete or insufficient representations of the speech signal that are useful for deepfake detection. To address this, DSD systems have begun to use ensembles of multiple spectrogram inputs [126], [158], [127], [129], [132]. By leveraging the unique strengths of each spectrogram type, this approach aims to enhance detection accuracy and has shown significant improvements in model performance. Many top-performing systems in recent competitions have demonstrated the effectiveness of using ensembles to boost overall system robustness. However, ensemble models present several limitations, including reduced interpretability, increased system complexity, and higher training costs.

**Our contribution:** Given the analysis and the discussion above, our work mainly contributes:

- We presented the commonly used feature extraction methods in DSD systems, highlighting their characteristics and potential challenges associated with each approach.
- In the next section, we conduct extensive experiments of various feature extraction methods to evaluate the




Fig. 8. The statistics of ensemble methods obtained from Table V, VI, VII

most effective approach for the DSD task. Additionally, we explore different feature ensembles to determine the optimal combinations for enhancing performance.

- In our GitHub, we release code for different spectrogram transformations using Librosa toolbox [195].

### C. Classification models

**Analysis:** Early models proposed for DSD task approached conventional machine learning algorithms. For example, 9 over 16 submitted systems in ASVspoofing 2015 challenge [191] extract MFCC feature (i.e. Systems A, B, E, G, H, I, N, O, and P in [191]). Then, various machine learning-based models such as Mahalanobis distance measurement, Gaussian-based model (GMM), support vector machine-based models (SVM, SVM-RBF), or fusion models (GMM and SVM) are used to explore MFCC features. However, recent DSD systems as shown in Table V, VI, VII present a wide range of neural network architectures due to the powerful deep learning techniques. Recently proposed deep neural networks for the DSD task can be separated into four main approaches. The first approach, which focuses on exploring spatial features, leverages convolutional-based network architectures (CNN). Among the CNN-based networks, Resnet, LCNN, and RawNet architectures are widely approached. ResNet and LCNN are used to explore spectrogram-based features such as LFCC [127], CQT [132], and MEL [145]. Meanwhile, RawNet architectures are normally combined with SincNet layer [193] to learn raw audio [126], [127], [129], [130], [133], [145]. The second approach, which focuses on exploring the temporal features, presents recurrent neural network (RNN) based architectures. For example, LSTM-based networks, TDNN, or ECAPA-TDNN are proposed in [130], [126], [158], [129] and [168], respectively. As shown in Table V, VI, VII, RNN-based networks have not been popularly applied for the DSD task compared to the CNN-based architectures. The third approach involves combining both convolutional layers and recurrent layers to explore both temporal and spatial features, referred to as hybrid network architectures. In particular,

recurrent network-based layers such as LSTM, GRU are combined with CNN-based layers to perform convolutional-recurrent neural network (CRNN) architectures [126], [168], [165].

Recently, encoder-decoder based network architectures have been popularly used for the DSD task. Indeed, along with conventional encoder and decoder in transformer-based architectures [171], [173], various encoder architectures such as XLSR-53 [172], WavLM [151], CNN or ResNet [169] are explored. Decoder architectures also show diverse using GAN-based architecture [169], Multi-feature attention [151], Graph Attention Network [131], [135], [134], etc.

To further enhance the DSD performance, the DSD research community leverages a wide range of ensemble models. These ensemble models can be separated into three main approaches which are marked in the final column in Table VII. In the first approach (Multiple inputs), multiple input features are explored [174], [138], [171]. This approach is inspired by the idea that multiple features contain different and distinct features between fake and real utterances. Given different features, each feature is trained by the same classification model (i.e., the individual model shares the same network architecture but presents different training parameters after the training process). For example, while [171] explores the magnitude and phase features of STFT spectrogram, different features of Wav2Vec embeddings, duration, and pronunciation are explored in [138]. Similarly, multiple spectrograms such as LFCC, CQT, and STFT are trained by one classification model of CNN [196]. Finally, the scores obtained from individual models are fused to achieve the final and best result. The second approach (Multiple branches or models) leverages different network architectures that explore one type of input feature [158], [177], [178], [161], [175], [182], [183], [181], [185]. This approach is inspired by the idea that different network architectures are likely to capture distinct properties from the input feature. For example, [177] proposed multiple branches of GMM-DNN and ResNet to explore the LFCC spectrogram. Similarly, [158] explores the raw audio by different variants of ECAPA-TDNN. The final approach (Multiple inputs, models) leverages both multiple input features and different network architectures. For example, [126] explore raw audio by RawNet2. Meanwhile, TDNN and LFCC spectrogram are explored by LCNN. Then, the authors fused three results obtained from three individual models. Similarly, multiple input features of raw audio, CQCC, and LFCC are explored by different models of LCNN, GMM, and RawNet2 in [127]. Ensemble methods are widely adopted in many top-performing systems in DSD challenge competitions.

**Discussion:** Although many deep neural network architectures have been proposed for the DSD task and evaluated on various benchmark datasets, the best results have been obtained from ensemble methods with multiple inputs or/and different network architectures. The statistics of ensemble models, as shown in Fig 8, indicate that multiple branches or models are the majority. However, ensemble models present the concern of large trainable parameters. Moreover, none

of the research has been analyzed to indicate the individual roles of input features or types of network architectures used in ensemble methods. To demonstrate a robust and general DSD model, the proposed model needs to be evaluated with multiple datasets, cross-datasets, or cross-languages. However, only some recent research [172], [38], [152], [144] evaluated the proposed models with multiple datasets such as ASVspoof 2019 (LA Task), ASVspoof 2021 (LA&DF Task), In The Wild, etc. To the best of our knowledge, none of the research has proposed the evaluation on cross-languages.

**Our contribution:** Given the analysis and the discussion above, our work mainly contributes:

- We evaluate various input features, indicating the effective input feature for DSD system performance.
- We also evaluate a wide range of network architectures leveraging the transfer learning technique, end-to-end training approach, and audio embeddings extracted from state-of-the-art pre-trained models.
- Given extensive experiments on different input features and various network architectures, we propose an ensemble model that is competitive to the state-of-the-art DSD systems

#### D. Loss function and training strategy

From Table V, VI, VII, it can be seen that most proposed models use a single loss function. Statistics of the individual loss functions are also presented in Fig. 7. As shown in Fig. 7, the cross entropy (CE) based losses (e.g. Binary Cross Entropy (BCE), Weight Cross Entropy (WCE), etc.) and Softmax-based losses (e.g., Additive-Margin-Based Softmax (AM-Softmax), Angular-Margin-Based Softmax (A-Softmax), etc.) present the most popular loss functions. Some models combine different loss functions. For example, CE and Contrastive loss were used in [169]. Similarly, authors in [165] combined three loss functions of Cross Entropy, Triplet loss, and Adversarial loss. Some papers such as [159] and [160] compared the DSD performance between large margin cosine loss (LMC loss), and A-Softmax loss functions or between OC-Softmax, MSE for P2SGrad loss functions, respectively.

Generally, a single loss function is used in end-to-end based systems. Meanwhile, the combination of multiple loss functions is related to different training strategies. For example, [172] proposed a teacher-student scheme in which the teacher was trained with contrastive loss and the student was trained by a combination of contrastive loss, Cross Entropy, and MSE loss. Similarly, the student network in [197], [167] was trained by a combination of Cosine Similarity/OC-Softmax and MSE loss functions. It can be seen that multiple-loss functions used for teacher-student schemes help achieve a low-complexity model for the DSD task [172], [197], [167]. Additionally, using multiple-loss function in [142] aims for multiple-task learning strategy. Rather than focusing on loss functions, some researchers improve the DSD system by exploring the training strategy. For example, authors in [198] suggested to mix three datasets for the training process. This enhances the generalization and stabilization of the

authors' proposed DSD system. Meanwhile, authors in [199] generated more fake utterances by leveraging four types of Vocoders: HiFiGAN, MB-MelGAN, PWG, and WaveGlow, which helps to improve their DSD system performance.

## V. OUR PROPOSED DEEPPFAKE SPEECH DETECTION SYSTEM AND EXTENSIVE EVALUATION

### A. Our motivation

Given the comprehensive analysis of the DSD systems in Section IV, we are motivated to conduct extensive experiments that address and evaluate the main concerns below.

- We evaluate the role of offline data augmentation (codec) and compare this method with the conventional online data augmentation methods of Mixup [189] and SpecAugment [190]. We also indicate if a combination of offline and online data augmentation methods is effective in enhancing the DSD system performance.
- We conduct extensive experiments to evaluate different inputs and various network architectures. Given the comparison, we indicate which input features, network architectures, combination of input features, and network architectures have the potential to be further explored. We then propose the best DSD ensemble system which is competitive to the state-of-the-art systems.
- To address the real-time ability, our proposed models are evaluated on two-second utterances and present low-complexity architectures.

### B. Selected datasets and evaluating metrics

As the trade-off among the number of utterances, the deep-learning-based fake speech generation systems, the original/real human speech resource shown in Fig. 2 and the comprehensive analysis in Section III, we decide to use ASVspoof 2019 (LA Task) to evaluate the effect of data augmentations, different types of input features, and various network architectures.

We obey the ASVspoof 2019 (LA Task) challenge, then use the Equal Error Rate (ERR) as the main metric for evaluating proposed models. We also report the Accuracy, F1 score, and AUC score to compare the performance among evaluating models.

### C. Proposed systems and experimental settings

**Data augmentations:** We evaluate the role of two data augmentation methods: offline data augmentation (codecs) and online data augmentation (Mixup and SpecAugment). Regarding offline data augmentation using codec-based methods, we use six popular codec formats MP3, OPUS, OGG, GSM, G722, and M4A. While the codec-based methods compress and decompress raw audio before the training process, the online data augmentation methods of Mixup and SpecAugment work on batches of spectrograms during the training process. By evaluating these two groups of data augmentation individually, we indicate if each of them presents a significant contribution and a combination of two data augmentation methods can help to enhance DSD task performance.




Fig. 9. Generate spectrograms using different spectrogram transformation methods and auditory filter models

TABLE VIII  
THE CNN, RNN, AND C-RNN NETWORK ARCHITECTURES

Models	Configuration
CNN-based model	$3 \times \{\text{Conv}(32/64/128)\text{-ReLU-AP-Dropout}(0.2)\}$ $1 \times \{\text{Dense}(256)\text{-ReLU-Dropout}(0.2)\}$ $1 \times \{\text{Dense}(2)\text{-Softmax}\}$
RNN-based model	$2 \times \{\text{BiLSTM}(128/64)\text{-ReLU-Dropout}(0.2)\}$ $1 \times \{\text{Dense}(256)\text{-ReLU-Dropout}(0.2)\}$ $1 \times \{\text{Dense}(2)\text{-Softmax}\}$
C-RNN-based model	$3 \times \{\text{Conv}(32/64/128)\text{-ReLU-AP-Dropout}(0.2)\}$ $2 \times \{\text{BiLSTM}(128/64)\text{-ReLU-Dropout}(0.2)\}$ $1 \times \{\text{Dense}(256)\text{-ReLU-Dropout}(0.2)\}$ $1 \times \{\text{Dense}(2)\text{-Softmax}\}$

**Multiple input features:** Fig. 9 presents seven types of input features: raw audio and six different spectrograms, which are evaluated in this paper. In particular, we use three transformation methods of Short-time Fourier Transform (STFT), Constant-Q Transform (CQT), and Wavelet Transform. Presumably, each type of spectrogram focuses on different perspectives on frequency content and might catch different inconsistencies in the audio signal. We then leverage different auditory-based filters: Mel and Gammatone filters focus on subtle variations relevant to human auditory perception and the linear filter (LF) isolates specific frequency bands.

As we set the window length, the hop length, and the filter number with 1024, 512, and 64, we achieve the same spectrogram shape of  $64 \times 64$ . Then, we apply Discrete Cosine Transform (DCT) to spectrograms across the temporal dimension. Finally, the first and the second-order derivatives are applied to these spectrograms, generating a three-dimensional tensor of  $64 \times 64 \times 3$  (i.e., the original spectrogram, the first-order derivative, and the second-order derivative are concatenated across the third dimension).

**Back-end classification models:** This paper proposes three main approaches for back-end classification models: the end-to-end deep learning approach, the transfer learning approach, and the audio-embedding deep learning approach. Regarding the end-to-end deep learning approach, four models of CNN-based model, SinC-CNN model (CNN architecture in SinC-CNN model reused from CNN-based model), RNN-based model, and C-RNN-based model are evaluated with the detailed configuration in Table VIII. The Sinc-CNN



model proves powerful for raw audio input and has been widely used as the survey in Section IV. Meanwhile, CNN-based models are commonly used and effectively capture and learn spectral features. We also use RNNs to focus on detecting natural sequential patterns that can be disrupted in synthetic audio [200] (e.g., temporal coherence, prosodic features such as rhythm, stress, and intonation). Consequently, based on the idea of combining both spectral features and temporal features, we use C-RNN-based model to distinguish characteristics of real and fake audio utterances.

With the transfer learning approach, a wide range of benchmark network architectures in the computer vision domain are evaluated. These networks are ResNet-18, MobileNet-V3, EfficientNet-B0, DenseNet-121, SuffleNet-V2, Swint, Convnext-Tiny, GoogLeNet, MNASnet, RegNet, which were trained on the ImageNet1K dataset [201] in advance. Given the pre-trained networks, trainable weights, which capture rich and generalized features of pattern recognition in images, have the potential to adapt patterns in spectrograms by the fine-tuning process. To adapt the DSD task, we modify the final dense layer of these mentioned networks to be compatible with the binary classification task.

For the audio-embedding deep learning approach, the state-of-the-art audio pre-trained models of Whisper [150], Seamless [202], Speechbrain [203], and Pyanote [204], [205] are leveraged.

In particular, we feed the spectrogram inputs into these pre-trained models to obtain audio embeddings. Given the audio embeddings, We then propose a Multilayer Perceptron (MLP) to classify the audio embeddings into fake or real classes. The proposed MLP is shown in Table IX, to detect real or fake audio.

**Ensemble method:** As we train individual model works with two-second audio segment, the result on an entire audio recording is computed by averaging of results over all two-second segments. Let consider  $\mathbf{p}^{(n)} = [p_1^{(n)}, p_2^{(n)}, \dots, p_C^{(n)}]$ , where  $C$  is the category number of the  $n$ -th out of  $N$  two-second segments, as the predicted probability of one two-second segment. The predicted probability of an entire audio recording, as described by  $\bar{\mathbf{p}} = [\bar{p}_1, \bar{p}_2, \dots, \bar{p}_C]$ , is computed by:

$$\bar{p}_c = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N p_c^{(n)} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq c \leq C \quad (1)$$

Given the predicted probabilities from individual models, we propose a MEAN fusion for an ensemble of multiple models. Let consider the predicted probability of one model as  $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_s = (\hat{p}_{s1}, \hat{p}_{s2}, \dots, \hat{p}_{sC})$ , where  $C$  is the category number and the  $s$ -th out of  $S$  individual models. Next, the predicted probability after MEAN fusion  $(\hat{p}_1, \hat{p}_2, \dots, \hat{p}_C)$  is obtained by:

$$\hat{p}_c = \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S \hat{p}_{sc} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq c \leq C \quad (2)$$

Finally, the predicted label  $\hat{y}$  for an entire audio sample is computed by:

TABLE IX

THE AUDIO PRE-TRAINED MODELS AND THE MULTILAYER PERCEPTRON

Models	Using License	Embedding size/ Configuration
Whisper [150]	MIT	512
SpeechBrain [203]	Apache2-0	192
SeamLess [202]	MIT	1024
Pyannote [204], [205]	MIT	512
MLP	Our proposal	$1 \times \{\text{Dense}(128)\text{-ReLU}\}$ $1 \times \{\text{Dense}(2)\text{-Softmax}\}$

$$\hat{y} = \text{argmax}(\hat{p}_1, \hat{p}_2, \dots, \hat{p}_C) \quad (3)$$

#### D. Experimental results and discussion

**Evaluation of data augmentation methods:** Considering the performance of online and offline data augmentation methods as shown in systems A1 (no data augmentation), A2 (online data augmentation with codec), A3 (offline data augmentation with Mixup and SpecAugment), and A4 (both online and offline data augmentation), it can be seen that the offline data augmentations of Mixup and SpecAugment are appropriate for DSD task. Notably, the combination of online and offline data augmentations does not help to enhance the DSD task performance compared with only using online data augmentation.

**Evaluation of input features:** Considering the efficacy of raw audio and six types of spectrograms in systems from B1 to B7, STFT outperforms the raw audio and other spectrograms. Models B2, B5, and B7 achieve the best ERR score of 0.08 while the combination of STFT & LF obtains slightly better accuracy and F1 score of 0.88 and 0.9, respectively. This indicates that STFT and applying filters such as Linear Filter or Gammatone filter are suitable for isolating specific frequency bands in classification algorithms.

**Multiple deep learning approaches:** Regarding the end-to-end deep learning approach from A1 to C2, CNN systems outperform RNN or C-RNN systems. Indeed, using the same input feature of STFT+LFCC, RNN and C-RNN approaches (C1 and C2 systems) obtain ERR scores of 0.14 and 0.17, which is significantly worse than CNN system (A3 or B2 or B7) with the best score of 0.08. This indicates that the specific patterns indicative of deepfake audio might not be primarily temporal but rather frequency in the spectrogram representation. Regarding the finetuning approach (D1 to D10), Convnext-Tiny stands out as the best system with competitive EER scores of 0.075. Meanwhile, the embedding-based approach (E1 to E4) achieves the best EER scores of 0.10 from the pre-trained Whisper model. This suggests the potential of these approaches when choosing the appropriate networks for enhancement.

**Ensembles:** Given the performance of individual input features and network architecture, we conduct extensive experiments to evaluate a wide range of ensemble models. First, ensembles of STFT, CQT, and WT spectrograms are evaluated, indicating the best EER score of 0.06 from the combination of STFT and CQT (B2+B3). Then, ensembles of spectrogram with different filter banks (MEL, LF, GAM) are also evaluated, resulting in the best score of 0.065



TABLE X  
PERFORMANCE COMPARISON AMONG DEEP LEARNING MODELS AND ENSEMBLE OF HIGH-PERFORMANCE MODELS  
ON LOGIC ACCESS EVALUATION SUBSET IN ASVspoofing 2019

Systems	Inputs	Augmentations	Models	Acc	F1	AUC	ERR
A1	STFT & LF	None	CNN	0.82	0.84	0.91	0.15
A2	STFT & LF	Codec	CNN	0.81	0.84	0.93	0.13
A3	STFT & LF	Mixup, Spec.	CNN	<b>0.88</b>	<b>0.90</b>	<b>0.96</b>	<b>0.08</b>
A4	STFT & LF	Codec, Mixup, Spec.	CNN	0.81	0.84	0.93	0.13
B1	Raw Audio	None	SinC-CNN	0.84	0.87	0.96	0.10
B2	STFT	Mixup, Spec.	CNN	<b>0.87</b>	<b>0.89</b>	<b>0.96</b>	<b>0.08</b>
B3	CQT	Mixup, Spec.	CNN	0.89	0.90	0.92	0.14
B4	WT	Mixup, Spec.	CNN	0.84	0.86	0.89	0.17
B5	STFT & LF	Mixup, Spec.	CNN	<b>0.88</b>	<b>0.90</b>	<b>0.96</b>	<b>0.08</b>
B6	STFT & MEL	Mixup, Spec.	CNN	0.86	0.88	0.95	0.11
B7	STFT & GAM	Mixup, Spec.	CNN	<b>0.85</b>	<b>0.87</b>	<b>0.96</b>	<b>0.08</b>
C1	STFT & LF	Mixup, Spec.	RNN	0.92	0.91	0.88	0.17
C2	STFT & LF	Mixup, Spec.	CRNN	0.88	0.90	0.96	0.14
D1	STFT & LF	Mixup, Spec.	ResNet-18	0.49	0.58	0.51	0.47
D2	STFT & LF	Mixup, Spec.	MobileNet-V3	0.59	0.67	0.52	0.48
D3	STFT & LF	Mixup, Spec.	EfficientNet-B0	0.52	0.61	0.51	0.48
D4	STFT & LF	Mixup, Spec.	DenseNet-121	0.58	0.66	0.51	0.48
D5	STFT & LF	Mixup, Spec.	ShuffleNet-V2	0.64	0.71	0.53	0.48
D6	STFT & LF	Mixup, Spec.	Swin_T	<b>0.84</b>	<b>0.87</b>	<b>0.94</b>	<b>0.09</b>
D7	STFT & LF	Mixup, Spec.	ConvNeXt-Tiny	<b>0.88</b>	<b>0.90</b>	<b>0.96</b>	<b>0.075</b>
D8	STFT & LF	Mixup, Spec.	GoogLeNet	0.53	0.62	0.51	0.47
D9	STFT & LF	Mixup, Spec.	MNASNet	0.62	0.70	0.54	0.47
D10	STFT & LF	Mixup, Spec.	RegNet	0.50	0.60	0.50	0.48
E1	Raw Audio	None	Whisper+MLP	<b>0.85</b>	<b>0.88</b>	<b>0.95</b>	<b>0.10</b>
E2	Raw Audio	None	Speechbrain+MLP	0.77	0.81	0.81	0.25
E3	Raw Audio	None	Seamless+MLP	0.86	0.88	0.87	0.20
E4	Raw Audio	None	Pyannote+MLP	0.64	0.71	0.78	0.27
B2 + B3	STFT, CQT	Mixup, Spec.	CNN	<b>0.91</b>	<b>0.92</b>	<b>0.98</b>	<b>0.06</b>
B2 + B4	STFT, WT	Mixup, Spec.	CNN	0.88	0.90	0.96	0.09
B2 + B3 + B4	STFT, CQT, WT	Mixup, Spec.	CNN	0.90	0.92	0.98	0.07
B5 + B6	STFT&LF, STFT&MEL	Mixup, Spec.	CNN	0.88	0.90	0.97	0.08
B5 + B7	STFT&LF, STFT&GAM	Mixup, Spec.	CNN	0.87	0.89	<b>0.98</b>	<b>0.065</b>
B5 + B6 + B7	STFT& LF, STFT&MEL, STFT&GAM	Mixup, Spec.	CNN	0.88	0.90	0.98	0.069
B5 + D6	STFT&LF	Mixup, Spec.	CNN, Swint_T	0.87	0.89	0.96	0.078
B5 + D7	STFT&LF	Mixup, Spec.	CNN, ConvNeXt-Tiny	0.88	0.90	<b>0.97</b>	<b>0.07</b>
B5 + D6 + D7	STFT&LF	Mixup, Spec.	CNN, ConvNeXt-Tiny, Swint_T	0.88	0.89	0.97	0.072
B3 + B5 + B7	CQT, STFT&LF, STFT&GAM	Mixup, Spec.	CNN	<b>0.88</b>	<b>0.90</b>	<b>0.98</b>	<b>0.05</b>
D7 + E1	Raw Audio, STFT&LF	Mixup, Spec.	Whisper, ConvNeXt-Tiny	<b>0.86</b>	<b>0.88</b>	<b>0.99</b>	<b>0.03</b>

from STFT+LF and STFT+GAM (B5+B7). As a result, when an ensemble of CQT, STFT+LF, and STFT+GAM is conducted (B3+B5+B7), we can achieve the EER score of 0.05. Regarding the ensemble of network architecture, CNN and ConvNeXt-Tiny (B5+D7) help obtain the EER score of 0.07. Meanwhile, the combination of Whisper+MLP and ConvNeXt-Tiny (E1+D7) achieves the best EER score of 0.03. These results obtained from ensemble models lead to some conclusions:

- Ensembling different input features or network architectures can significantly help to enhance the DSD task performance.
- Not all network architectures are appropriate for the DSD task. As the good performance obtained from ConvNeXt-Tiny, the depthwise convolution layer in this network architecture needs to be further investigated.
- Leveraging pre-trained models such as Whisper shows effectiveness. This again proves why the recent Encoder-Decoder network architectures using pre-trained models for the Encoder have been proposed popularly.

## VI. OPEN CHALLENGES AND POTENTIAL RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

### A. Datasets for Deepfake Speech Detection

1) *Open challenges:* Building better datasets for audio deepfake detection is essential for improving the accuracy and robustness of detection systems. However, the current diversity of available datasets for audio deepfake detection remains limited, especially in terms of speaker identity, language, and deepfake generation methods.

A large number of published datasets feature a narrow range of speaker identities, often focusing on a small group of speakers with limited gender, age, and accent diversity. For instance, datasets of ASVspoof and FakeAVCeleb include mainly English-speaking voices from certain groups of speakers (e.g., celebrity, predominantly synthesized voice) with a small number of speakers from different language backgrounds, resulting in biased models when applied to diverse populations.

Many existing datasets are domain-specific, focusing on particular types of audio or speakers. For example, FakeAVCeleb primarily includes celebrity interviews, while LibriSpeech focuses on read recordings. These datasets often have limited variability in terms of recording conditions,

speaker interactions, and speech styles, making it difficult to generalize detection models to new domains or unseen environments, such as detecting deepfakes in real-world scenarios with noisy or degraded audio, such as phone calls, public spaces, or online content.

The lack of language diversity is also a significant issue that limits the robustness of detection models. As shown at Table III, most existing datasets support single languages (primarily English or Chinese). This imbalance raises challenges that hinder the development of robust, audio deepfake detection systems in multilingual settings.

As deepfake generation techniques have been evolving rapidly, they produce fake audio that is increasingly difficult to detect. This makes it difficult for existing datasets to stay up to date as they may be vulnerable to newer methods of audio synthesis. Therefore, datasets must be continuously updated to include samples produced by new techniques to ensure the robustness and adaptability of detection models.

2) *Future directions:* Given the open challenges discussed in the previous subsection, we highlight some potential future directions in dataset development for Deepfake Speech Detection:

**Multilingual and Multimodal Datasets:** To address the issue of language diversity, future datasets should include a broader range of languages, accents, and dialects. This variety will enable detection models to better handle diverse linguistic and phonetic features across different languages, ensuring their stability in multilingual contexts and their effectiveness in developing global solutions.

Moreover, deepfake content in real-world scenarios often includes both audio and video elements, rather than just audio. Therefore, integrating multimodal datasets that combine both audio and video deepfakes is a crucial direction for future research. This integration enhances detection capabilities by allowing models to identify anomalies across multiple data types, improving their effectiveness in combating increasingly sophisticated forgeries.

**Continuous Dataset Updates:** To stay updated, there needs to be ongoing collaboration between researchers developing deepfake generation methods and those working on the DSD task. Regular updates to datasets should include deepfake samples created by the latest synthesized generation techniques, allowing detection models to adapt to emerging threats.

**Cross-Domain and Real-World Dataset Adaptation:** One of the biggest challenges for DSD models is domain adaptation — the ability to generalize across different types of audio environments, speakers, and use cases. Future datasets should prioritize cross-domain generalization, including diverse data from various contexts (e.g., podcasts, phone calls, interviews, public speeches, and social media content). In addition, besides varied deepfake generation methods, future dataset development should include data from diverse online platforms (e.g., YouTube, TikTok, podcasts) and various speaker demographics that stimulate inclusive real-life scenarios.

## *B. The generalization and robustness of Deepfake Speech Detection models*

1) *Open challenges:* A major challenge in developing deepfake detection systems is ensuring they can generalize to new samples that are not presented in the training data. While models may perform well on known attacks, they often struggle with novel manipulations and across different domains, such as varying languages, accents, or speaking styles. The limited size and diversity of training datasets hinder DSD models' ability to handle real-world variability without degraded performance. Some approaches have been adopted to address these challenges. For example, ensemble models, as discussed in Sections II and IV, have been effectively utilized to enhance DSD performance and generalization ability, often achieving top results in competition settings. They are also frequently employed in research papers to deliver competitive outcomes [129], [145], [127]. While ensemble models are powerful and versatile, they often require significant computational costs during training. Additionally, detection systems leveraging pre-trained models have gained popularity [172]. By fine-tuning models pre-trained on upstream audio tasks like speech-to-text [139], [150], the training cost for DSD downstream tasks is greatly reduced. However, proving the generalization of these fine-tuned single models remains challenging. For instance, experiments on ASVspoof 2021 (DF Task) in [172] achieved remarkable results, with an EER of 5.67 compared to 15.64 from the top-performing system in the challenge. In contrast, the performance on the ASVspoof 2021 (LA Task) was much lower, with an EER of 15.92, compared to 1.32 from the top-performing system.

In terms of improving the model's robustness to adversarial attacks, the majority of current methods for defending against adversarial attacks rely on adversarial training [9], which involves generating adversarial examples from known attacks to retrain the model. However, this approach incurs high computational costs.

2) *Future directions:* To improve the generalization and robustness of detection systems, there has been much room for improving existing approaches as well as proposing new methods. For example, future directions can address challenges in ensemble methods by balancing the trade-off between cost and effectiveness using techniques such as pruning, quantization, and knowledge distillation or other efficient ensembling strategies to reduce model size. In the approach using transfer learning or fine-tuning, employing several strategies such as cross-dataset validation or an ensemble of fine-tuned models could address the challenges of proving generalization. Applying mechanisms to learn information from domain-invariant attacks could also enhance the robustness of models against different adversarial attacks.

## *C. Interpretability and Explainable AI (XAI) for Deepfake Speech Detection*

1) *Open challenges:* Improving interpretability and explainability in Deepfake Speech Detection remains a complex task due to the unique challenges posed by audio data and

the black-box nature of deep learning methods. Although various explainable AI (XAI) techniques prove effectiveness in interpreting deep-learning-based models, applying XAI to DSD systems has not drawn much attention from the research community. Indeed, only some recently published papers [206], [207], [208], [209], [210] address the role of XAI, which mainly focus on the visualization-based XAI methods. For example, the conventional SHapley Additive exPlanations (SHAP) [211] and Local Interpretable Model-agnostic Explanations (LIME) [212] methods were used to interpret the feature contribution in [207], [209] and in [208], respectively. Authors in [206] applied Saliency Map [213] and Smooth Grad [214] techniques to visualize how their model processes audio in the frequency domain. Similarly, layer-wise relevance propagation (LRP), a visualization-based XAI method, was leveraged in [210] to indicate the difference of formants among fake and real audio utterances. While more deep-learning-based models have been proposed to solve the DSD task, not many research papers focus on exploring XAI methods to interpret DSD systems.

2) *Future directions*: Based on the above discussion, there is much room for applying XAI to improve transparency and trustworthiness within detection systems. Additionally, leveraging visualization tools for visualizing audio features or feature maps could also provide user-friendly platforms and valuable insights into the underlying decision-making process of detection models.

#### D. Real-time deepfake speech detection

1) *Open challenges*: Integrating DSD systems into real-world applications still presents several challenges. Key factors include the length of the audio utterance, the complexity of the model (e.g., the number of trainable parameters), computational costs (e.g., FLOPs), and the target edge devices (e.g., mobile phones, embedded systems, high-performance computers). These factors directly affect inference time and are carefully analyzed to ensure effective implementation. For example, the trade-off between the performance and the model complexity was comprehensively analyzed in [196] and [215] concerning Acoustic Scene Classification (ASC) task and Acoustic Event Detection (AED) task, respectively. Currently, most proposed DSD systems have been currently evaluated on high-performance computers with the advance of powerful GPUs without any computational constraints, while there is little research on real-time deepfake detection. Several studies, such as [216] and [217], have proposed real-time deepfake audio detection systems. However, these systems often face significant limitations, such as being applicable to only a limited range of deepfake creation techniques (voice conversion) or domains (communication). These challenges highlight the need for further exploration and analysis of real-time DSD systems in future research.

2) *Future directions*: Future directions in developing real-time audio deepfake detection systems could rely on better handling the trade-off between model complexity and performance, facilitating model implementation in low-latency conditions. Some techniques such as quantization and prun-

ing can be used to reduce model size, while other methods leverage edge computing or distributed computing to reduce inference time and handle large-scale data more efficiently.

#### E. Ethical and legal considerations

1) *Open challenges*: Training audio deepfake detection models requires large datasets, which may involve the collection and the use of personal voice recordings. For example, VoxCeleb and FakeAVCeleb corpora contain speech from thousands of celebrities in various environments. Personal data handling raises threats of privacy and consent. Furthermore, there is also a risk of dual-use dilemma when some bad actors could manipulate detection technology and available individuals's speech for harmful purposes such as reinforcing disinformation narratives, defamation, and fraud, infringing on individuals' privacy rights.

2) *Future directions*: Future directions in addressing ethical and legal considerations for developing audio deepfake technologies focus on enhancing data privacy protection, fairness, and facilitating global regulatory frameworks. Developers will increasingly incorporate privacy-by-design principles in developing detection systems, ensuring that personal voice data is handled securely and with consent, minimizing the risk of misuse. Within DSD applications, access control mechanisms should be implemented to limit certain groups of people and the frequency of using detection technologies, reducing the potential risk of misuse by malicious actors. In terms of legal perspectives, legal frameworks may also evolve to introduce stricter penalties for misuse of both deepfake creation and detection technology.

#### F. The race between Deepfake Speech Generation and Detection

1) *Open challenges*:: As mentioned and discussed in Section III, there is a tight relationship between Deepfake Speech Generation and Deepfake Speech Detection tasks. Deepfake Speech Generation systems (e.g., VC, TTS, and AT models) have been becoming more powerful and accessible, enabling the creation of hyper-realistic fake utterances that mimic normal speech patterns and produce fewer detectable flaws. This makes it hard for DSD systems to distinguish between real and manipulated content, presenting challenges to keep pace with these deepfake creation advancements.

2) *Future directions*:: As deepfakes have evolved rapidly, detection models must also adapt by learning from increasingly realistic fakes. By facilitating collaborative environments, researchers in both Deepfake Speech Generation and Detection can further explore and push boundaries of what is technically possible and ensure that detection methods keep pace with advances in deepfake generators. For example, ADD 2022 [17], ADD 2023 [24], and ASVspoof 2024 [27] challenge competitions were established to engage researchers in both Deepfake Speech Generation and Detection. This promotes innovations in addressing the race between creating and detecting deepfake, improving the robustness of detection systems in combating increasingly complicated deepfakes.

## G. The availability of Deepfake Speech Detection tools

1) *Open challenges*: Deepfake speech detection tools still face challenges in increasing their quantity and quality due to the rapid development of deepfake speech generation techniques. Although DSD systems act as a critical function in Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) based platforms such as WhatsApp, Facebook, etc. or social media such as YouTube, Twister, etc. for a thread warning, very few VoIP platforms or social media have announced an available and independent DSD tool. Regarding non-commercial or commercial solutions, only some DSD tools or platforms such as Deepware, WeVerify, TrueMedia, and DeepFake-O-Meter are available as highlighted in the survey [218]. However, information on DSD models used in these tools has been not described in detail except TrueMeida and DeepFake-O-Meter with 3 and 5 systems replicated from published papers. Overall, the sufficiency of deepfake detection applications is primarily due to technical complexity in developing and updating models, resource demands such as computational costs and scalability, accuracy concerns, and privacy issues.

2) *Future directions*:: To address the mentioned challenges, future improvements in developing deepfake speech detection tools could rely on some approaches such as lightweight detection models that can operate on consumer devices such as smartphones, laptops, or cloud-based services. To ensure broader adaption, the development of open-source deepfake detection tools or libraries and established standards for their use could also be promoted by the collaboration between tech companies and academic institutions, making detection tools more accessible and reliable.

## VII. CONCLUSION

This paper has provided a comprehensive survey for Deepfake Speech Detection (DSD) task by deeply analyzing the challenge competitions, the public and benchmark datasets, the main components in a deep-learning-based DSD system. From the survey, we indicate exiting concerns and provide enhance solutions to motivate the research community for further contribution on this research topic. More than a survey, we verified the role and the effect of data augmentation, feature extraction, and network architectures. Given the comprehensive survey and extensive experiments, we indicate potential and promising research directions for Deepfake Speech Detection task.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Zahra Khanjani, Gabrielle Watson, and Vandana P Janeja, "How deep are the fakes? focusing on audio deepfake: A survey," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.14203*, 2021.
- [2] Momina Masood, Mariam Nawaz, Khalid Mahmood Malik, Ali Javed, Aun Irtaza, and Hafiz Malik, "Deepfakes generation and detection: State-of-the-art, open challenges, countermeasures, and way forward," *Applied intelligence*, vol. 53, no. 4, pp. 3974–4026, 2023.
- [3] Rami Mubarak, Tariq Alsbou, Omar Alshaikh, Isa Inuwa-Dutse, Saad Khan, and Simon Parkinson, "A survey on the detection and impacts of deepfakes in visual, audio, and textual formats," *IEEE Access*, vol. 11, pp. 144497–144529, 2023.
- [4] Yogesh Patel, Sudeep Tanwar, Rajesh Gupta, Pronaya Bhattacharya, Innocent Ewean Davidson, Royi Nyameko, Srinivas Aluvala, and Vrince Vimal, "Deepfake generation and detection: Case study and challenges," *IEEE Access*, vol. 11, pp. 143296–143323, 2023.
- [5] Jiangyan Yi, Chenglong Wang, Jianhua Tao, Xiaohui Zhang, Chu Yuan Zhang, and Yan Zhao, "Audio deepfake detection: A survey," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.14970*, 2023.
- [6] Zahra Khanjani, Gabrielle Watson, and Vandana P Janeja, "Audio deepfakes: A survey," *Frontiers in Big Data*, vol. 5, pp. 1001063, 2023.
- [7] Zahid Akhtar, Thanvi Lahari Pendyala, and Virinchi Sai Athmakuri, "Video and audio deepfake datasets and open issues in deepfake technology: Being ahead of the curve," *Forensic Sciences*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 289–377, 2024.
- [8] Enes Altuncu, Virginia NL Franqueira, and Shujun Li, "Deepfake: definitions, performance metrics and standards, datasets, and a meta-review," *Frontiers in Big Data*, vol. 7, pp. 1400024, 2024.
- [9] Menglu Li, Yasaman Ahmadiadli, and Xiao-Ping Zhang, "Audio anti-spoofing detection: A survey," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.13914*, 2024.
- [10] Jiayang Wu, Wensheng Gan, Zefeng Chen, Shicheng Wan, and Hong Lin, "Ai-generated content (aigc): A survey," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.06632*, 2023.
- [11] Burak Yetiştiren, Işık Özsoy, Miray Ayerdem, and Eray Tüzün, "Evaluating the code quality of ai-assisted code generation tools: An empirical study on github copilot, amazon codewhisperer, and chatgpt," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10778*, 2023.
- [12] Xu Tan, Tao Qin, Frank Soong, and Tie-Yan Liu, "A survey on neural speech synthesis," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.15561*, 2021.
- [13] Berrak Sisman, Junichi Yamagishi, Simon King, and Haizhou Li, "An overview of voice conversion and its challenges: From statistical modeling to deep learning," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 29, pp. 132–157, 2021.
- [14] Fatima Dakalbab, Manar Abu Talib, Omnia Abu Waraga, Ali Bou Nassif, Sohail Abbas, and Qassim Nasir, "Artificial intelligence & crime prediction: A systematic literature review," *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 100342, 2022.
- [15] Brian Dolhansky, Joanna Bitton, Ben Pflaum, Jikuo Lu, Russ Howes, Menglin Wang, and Cristian Canton Ferrer, "The deepfake detection challenge (DFDC) dataset," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.07397*, 2020.
- [16] Joel Frank and Lea Schönherr, "Wavefake: A data set to facilitate audio deepfake detection," *NeurIPS*, 2024.
- [17] "Audio deep synthesis detection challenge (ADD 2022)," <http://addchallenge.cn/add2022>, 2022.
- [18] "M-ailabs speech dataset," <https://github.com/imdatceleste/m-ailabs-dataset>, 2024.
- [19] You Zhang, Yongyi Zang, Jiatong Shi, Ryuichi Yamamoto, Tomoki Toda, and Zhiyao Duan, "SVDD 2024: The inaugural singing voice deepfake detection challenge," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.16132*, 2024.
- [20] Zhizheng Wu, Tomi Kinnunen, Nicholas Evans, Junichi Yamagishi, Cemal Haniç, Md. Sahidullah, and Aleksandr Sizov, "Asvspoof 2015: the first automatic speaker verification spoofing and countermeasures challenge," in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2015, pp. 2037–2041.
- [21] Xin Wang, Junichi Yamagishi, Massimiliano Todisco, Héctor Delgado, Andreas Nautsch, Nicholas Evans, Md Sahidullah, Ville Vestman, Tomi Kinnunen, Kong Aik Lee, et al., "Asvspoof 2019: A large-scale public database of synthesized, converted and replayed speech," *Computer Speech & Language*, vol. 64, pp. 101114, 2020.
- [22] "The ftc voice cloning challenge," <https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/contests/ftc-voice-cloning-challenge>, 2023.
- [23] Junichi Yamagishi, Xin Wang, Massimiliano Todisco, Md Sahidullah, Jose Patino, Andreas Nautsch, Xuechen Liu, Kong Aik Lee, Tomi Kinnunen, Nicholas Evans, et al., "Asvspoof 2021: accelerating progress in spoofed and deepfake speech detection," in *Workshop-Automatic Speaker Verification and Spoofing Countermeasures Challenge (ASVspoof)*, 2021.
- [24] "Audio deep synthesis detection challenge (ADD 2023)," <http://addchallenge.cn/add2023>, 2023.
- [25] Zhixi Cai, Shreya Ghosh, Aman Pankaj Adatia, Munawar Hayat, Abhinav Dhall, and Kalin Stefanov, "Av-deepfake1m: A large-scale llm-driven audio-visual deepfake dataset," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.15308*, 2023.

- [26] “1m-deepfakes detection challenge,” <https://deepfakes1m.github.io/>, 2023.
- [27] “The asvspoof 2024 challenge,” <https://www.asvspoof.org/>, 2024.
- [28] “The singing voice deepfake detection challenge (svdd),” <https://challenge.singfake.org/>, 2024.
- [29] Héctor Delgado, Massimiliano Todisco, Md Sahidullah, Nicholas Evans, Tomi Kinnunen, Kong Aik Lee, and Junichi Yamagishi, “Asvspoof 2017 version 2.0: meta-data analysis and baseline enhancements,” in *The Speaker and Language Recognition Workshop*, 2018, pp. 296–303.
- [30] Ricardo Reimao and Vassilios Tzerpos, “For: A dataset for synthetic speech detection,” in *International Conference on Speech Technology and Human-Computer Dialogue*, 2019, pp. 1–10.
- [31] “Audio source used to generate for dataset,” <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/percevalw/englishfrench-translations>, 2018.
- [32] Nal Kalchbrenner, Erich Elsen, Karen Simonyan, Seb Noury, Norman Casagrande, Edward Lockhart, Florian Stimberg, Aaron Oord, Sander Dieleman, and Koray Kavukcuoglu, “Efficient neural audio synthesis,” in *Proc. ICML*, 2018, pp. 2410–2419.
- [33] Ryosuke Sonobe, Shinnosuke Takamichi, and Hiroshi Saruwatari, “Jsut corpus: free large-scale japanese speech corpus for end-to-end speech synthesis,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.00354*, 2017.
- [34] Patrick Kwon, Jaeseong You, Gyuhyeon Nam, Sungwoo Park, and Gyeongso Chae, “Kodf: A large-scale korean deepfake detection dataset,” in *Proc. IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2021, pp. 10744–10753.
- [35] Yao Shi, Hui Bu, Xin Xu, Shaoji Zhang, and Ming Li, “Aishell-3: A multi-speaker mandarin tts corpus,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2021, pp. 2756–2760.
- [36] Hasam Khalid, Shahroz Tariq, Minha Kim, and Simon S Woo, “Fakeavceleb: A novel audio-video multimodal deepfake dataset,” in *Thirty-fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track (Round 2)*, 2021.
- [37] Joon Son Chung, Arsha Nagrani, and Andrew Senior, “VoxCeleb2: Deep Speaker Recognition,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2018, pp. 1086–1090.
- [38] Nicolas Müller, Pavel Czepin, Franziska Diekmann, Adam Frogg, and Konstantin Böttinger, “Does Audio Deepfake Detection Generalize?,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2022, pp. 2783–2787.
- [39] Zhixi Cai, Kalin Stefanov, Abhinav Dhall, and Munawar Hayat, “Do you really mean that? content driven audio-visual deepfake dataset and multimodal method for temporal forgery localization,” in *International Conference on Digital Image Computing: Techniques and Applications*, 2022, pp. 1–10.
- [40] Xin Wang and Junichi Yamagishi, “Spoofed training data for speech spoofing countermeasure can be efficiently created using neural vocoders,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2023, pp. 1–5.
- [41] Lin Zhang, Xin Wang, Erica Cooper, Nicholas Evans, and Junichi Yamagishi, “The partialspoof database and countermeasures for the detection of short fake speech segments embedded in an utterance,” *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 31, pp. 813–825, 2022.
- [42] Chengzhe Sun, Shan Jia, Shuwei Hou, and Siwei Lyu, “Aisynthesized voice detection using neural vocoder artifacts,” in *Proc. IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023, pp. 904–912.
- [43] Haoxin Ma, Jiangyan Yi, Chenglong Wang, Xinrui Yan, Jianhua Tao, Tao Wang, Shiming Wang, and Ruibo Fu, “CFAD: A chinese dataset for fake audio detection,” *Speech Communication*, vol. 164, pp. 103122, 2024.
- [44] Hui Bu, Jiayu Du, Xingyu Na, Bengu Wu, and Hao Zheng, “AISHELL-1: An open-source mandarin speech corpus and a speech recognition baseline,” in *Proc. O-COCOSDA*, 2017, pp. 1–5.
- [45] Yao Shi, Hui Bu, Xin Xu, Shaoji Zhang, and Ming Li, “Aishell-3: A multi-speaker mandarin tts corpus,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2021, pp. 2756–2760.
- [46] Zehui Yang, Yifan Chen, Lei Luo, Runyan Yang, Lingxuan Ye, Gaofeng Cheng, Ji Xu, Yaohui Jin, Qingqing Zhang, Pengyuan Zhang, Lei Xie, and Yonghong Yan, “Open source MagicData-RAMC: A rich annotated mandarin conversational(RAMC) speech dataset,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2022, pp. 1736–1740.
- [47] Nicolas M Müller, Piotr Kawa, Wei Herng Choong, Edresson Casanova, Eren Gölge, Thorsten Müller, Piotr Syga, Philip Sperl, and Konstantin Böttinger, “Mlaad: The multi-language audio anti-spoofing dataset,” *International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*, 2024.
- [48] Vineel Pratap, Qiantong Xu, Anuroop Sriram, Gabriel Synnaeve, and Ronan Collobert, “MLS: A Large-Scale Multilingual Dataset for Speech Research,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2020, pp. 2757–2761.
- [49] “DCASE 2022 challenge competition Task 1A,” <https://dcase.community/challenge2022/task-low-complexity-acoustic-scene-classification>, 2022.
- [50] Ran Yi, Zipeng Ye, Juyong Zhang, Hujun Bao, and Yong-Jin Liu, “Audio-driven talking face video generation with learning-based personalized head pose,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.10137*, 2020.
- [51] Thierry Dutoit, Andre Holzapfel, Matthieu Jottrand, Alexis Moinet, Javier Perez, and Yannis Stylianou, “Towards a voice conversion system based on frame selection,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2007, vol. 4, pp. IV–513.
- [52] Zhizheng Wu, Tuomas Virtanen, Tomi Kinnunen, Engsiong Chng, and Haizhou Li, “Exemplar-based unit selection for voice conversion utilizing temporal information,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2013, pp. 3057–3061.
- [53] Toshiaki Fukuda, “An adaptive algorithm for mel-cepstral analysis of speech,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 1992, pp. 137–140.
- [54] Junichi Yamagishi, Takao Kobayashi, Yuji Nakano, Katsumi Ogata, and Juri Isogai, “Analysis of speaker adaptation algorithms for hmm-based speech synthesis and a constrained smaplr adaptation algorithm,” *IEEE Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 66–83, 2009.
- [55] “Festvox voice conversion system,” <http://www.festvox.org>, 2024.
- [56] Tomoki Toda, Alan W Black, and Keiichi Tokuda, “Voice conversion based on maximum-likelihood estimation of spectral parameter trajectory,” *IEEE Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 15, no. 8, pp. 2222–2235, 2007.
- [57] Daisuke Saito, Keisuke Yamamoto, Nobuaki Minematsu, and Keiichi Hirose, “One-to-many voice conversion based on tensor representation of speaker space,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2011, pp. 653–656.
- [58] Elina Helander, Hanna Silén, Tuomas Virtanen, and Moncef Gabbouj, “Voice conversion using dynamic kernel partial least squares regression,” *IEEE transactions on audio, speech, and language processing*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 806–817, 2011.
- [59] “Marytts speech synthesis system,” <http://mary.dfki.de>, 2024.
- [60] “Hts working group, the english tts system flite+hts engine,” <http://hts-engine.sourceforge.net/>, 2014.
- [61] Masanori Morise, Fumiya Yokomori, and Kenji Ozawa, “World: a vocoder-based high-quality speech synthesis system for real-time applications,” *IEICE Transactions on Information and Systems*, vol. 99, no. 7, pp. 1877–1884, 2016.
- [62] Zhizheng Wu, Oliver Watts, and Simon King, “Merlin: An open source neural network speech synthesis system,” in *Speech Synthesis Workshop*, 2016, pp. 202–207.
- [63] Marc Schröder, Marcela Charfuelan, Sathish Pammi, and Ingmar Steiner, “Open source voice creation toolkit for the mary tts platform,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2011, pp. 3253–3256.
- [64] Chin-Cheng Hsu, Hsin-Te Hwang, Yi-Chiao Wu, Yu Tsao, and Hsin-Min Wang, “Voice conversion from non-parallel corpora using variational auto-encoder,” in *Proc. APSIPA*, 2016, pp. 1–6.
- [65] Driss Matrouf, J-F Bonastre, and Corinne Fredouille, “Effect of speech transformation on impostor acceptance,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2006, vol. 1, pp. I–I.
- [66] Kou Tanaka, Hirokazu Kameoka, Takuhiro Kaneko, and Nobukatsu Hojo, “Wavecycle2: Time-domain neural post-filter for speech waveform generation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.02892*, 2019.
- [67] Xin Wang, Shinji Takaki, and Junichi Yamagishi, “Neural source-filter-based waveform model for statistical parametric speech synthesis,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2019, pp. 5916–5920.
- [68] Heiga Zen, Yannis Agiomyrgiannakis, Niels Egberts, Fergus Henderson, and Przemysław Szczepaniak, “Fast, compact, and high quality lstm-rnn based statistical parametric speech synthesizers for mobile devices,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2016, pp. 2273–2277.
- [69] Yannis Agiomyrgiannakis, “Vocaine the vocoder and applications in speech synthesis,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2015, pp. 4230–4234.

- [70] Li Wan, Quan Wang, Alan Papir, and Ignacio Lopez Moreno, "Generalized end-to-end loss for speaker verification," in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2018, pp. 4879–4883.
- [71] Nal Kalchbrenner, Erich Elsen, Karen Simonyan, Seb Noury, Norman Casagrande, Edward Lockhart, Florian Stimberg, Aaron Oord, Sander Dieleman, and Koray Kavukcuoglu, "Efficient neural audio synthesis," in *Proc. ICML*, 2018, pp. 2410–2419.
- [72] Daniel Griffin and Jae Lim, "Signal estimation from modified short-time fourier transform," *IEEE Transactions on acoustics, speech, and signal processing*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 236–243, 1984.
- [73] Aäron van den Oord, Sander Dieleman, Heiga Zen, Karen Simonyan, Oriol Vinyals, Alex Graves, Nal Kalchbrenner, Andrew Senior, and Koray Kavukcuoglu, "WaveNet: A Generative Model for Raw Audio," in *Proc. Workshop on Speech Synthesis*, 2016, p. 125.
- [74] "Voicetext," <http://dws2.voicetext.jp/tomcat/demonstration/top.html>, 2024.
- [75] Li-Juan Liu, Zhen-Hua Ling, Yuan Jiang, Ming Zhou, and Li-Rong Dai, "Wavenet vocoder with limited training data for voice conversion," in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2018, pp. 1983–1987.
- [76] Hideki Kawahara, Ikuyo Masuda-Katsuse, and Alain De Cheveigne, "Restructuring speech representations using a pitch-adaptive time-frequency smoothing and an instantaneous-frequency-based f0 extraction: Possible role of a repetitive structure in sounds," *Speech communication*, vol. 27, no. 3–4, pp. 187–207, 1999.
- [77] Kazuhiro Kobayashi, Tomoki Toda, and Satoshi Nakamura, "Intra-gender statistical singing voice conversion with direct waveform modification using log-spectral differential," *Speech communication*, vol. 99, pp. 211–220, 2018.
- [78] Wen-Chin Huang, Yi-Chiao Wu, Kazuhiro Kobayashi, Yu-Huai Peng, Hsin-Te Hwang, Patrick Lumban Tobing, Yu Tsao, Hsin-Min Wang, and Tomoki Toda, "Generalization of spectrum differential based direct waveform modification for voice conversion," in *Proc. Workshop on Speech Synthesis*, 2019, pp. 57–62.
- [79] Najim Dehak, Patrick J Kenny, Réda Dehak, Pierre Dumouchel, and Pierre Ouellet, "Front-end factor analysis for speaker verification," *IEEE Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 788–798, 2010.
- [80] Patrick Kenny, "A small footprint i-vector extractor," in *Odyssey*, 2012, vol. 2012, pp. 1–6.
- [81] Simon JD Prince and James H Elder, "Probabilistic linear discriminant analysis for inferences about identity," in *Proc. IEEE international conference on computer vision*, 2007, pp. 1–8.
- [82] Adam Polyak, Lior Wolf, and Yaniv Taigman, "TTS Skins: Speaker Conversion via ASR," in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2020, pp. 786–790.
- [83] KR Prajwal, Rudrabha Mukhopadhyay, Vinay P Nambodiri, and CV Jawahar, "A lip sync expert is all you need for speech to lip generation in the wild," in *Proceedings of the 28th ACM international conference on multimedia*, 2020, pp. 484–492.
- [84] Xuechen Liu, Xin Wang, Md Sahidullah, Jose Patino, Héctor Delgado, Tomi Kinnunen, Massimiliano Todisco, Junichi Yamagishi, Nicholas Evans, Andreas Nautsch, and Kong Aik Lee, "Asvspoof 2021: Towards spoofed and deepfake speech detection in the wild," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 31, pp. 2507–2522, 2023.
- [85] Kundan Kumar, Rithesh Kumar, Thibault De Boissiere, Lucas Gestin, Wei Zhen Teoh, Jose Sotelo, Alexandre De Brebisson, Yoshua Bengio, and Aaron C Courville, "Melgan: Generative adversarial networks for conditional waveform synthesis," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 32, 2019.
- [86] Jungil Kong, Jaehyeon Kim, and Jaekyoung Bae, "Hifi-gan: Generative adversarial networks for efficient and high fidelity speech synthesis," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 33, pp. 17022–17033, 2020.
- [87] Durk P Kingma and Prafulla Dhariwal, "Glow: Generative flow with invertible 1x1 convolutions," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 31, 2018.
- [88] Ryuichi Yamamoto, Eunwoo Song, and Jae-Min Kim, "Parallel wavegan: A fast waveform generation model based on generative adversarial networks with multi-resolution spectrogram," in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2020, pp. 6199–6203.
- [89] Ye Jia, Yu Zhang, Ron Weiss, Quan Wang, Jonathan Shen, Fei Ren, Patrick Nguyen, Ruoming Pang, Ignacio Lopez Moreno, Yonghui Wu, et al., "Transfer learning from speaker verification to multi-speaker text-to-speech synthesis," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 31, 2018.
- [90] KR Prajwal, Rudrabha Mukhopadhyay, Vinay P Nambodiri, and CV Jawahar, "A lip sync expert is all you need for speech to lip generation in the wild," in *Proc. ACM international conference on multimedia*, 2020, pp. 484–492.
- [91] Ye Jia, Yu Zhang, Ron Weiss, Quan Wang, Jonathan Shen, Fei Ren, Patrick Nguyen, Ruoming Pang, Ignacio Lopez Moreno, Yonghui Wu, et al., "Transfer learning from speaker verification to multi-speaker text-to-speech synthesis," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 31, 2018.
- [92] Xin Wang, Shinji Takaki, and Junichi Yamagishi, "Neural source-filter waveform models for statistical parametric speech synthesis," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 28, pp. 402–415, 2019.
- [93] Nal Kalchbrenner, Erich Elsen, Karen Simonyan, Seb Noury, Norman Casagrande, Edward Lockhart, Florian Stimberg, Aaron van den Oord, Sander Dieleman, and Koray Kavukcuoglu, "Efficient neural audio synthesis," in *Proc. ICML*, 2018, pp. 2410–2419.
- [94] Ryuichi Yamamoto, Eunwoo Song, and Jae-Min Kim, "Parallel wavegan: A fast waveform generation model based on generative adversarial networks with multi-resolution spectrogram," in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2020, pp. 6199–6203.
- [95] Nanxin Chen, Yu Zhang, Heiga Zen, Ron J. Weiss, Mohammad Norouzi, and William Chan, "Wavegrad: Estimating gradients for waveform generation," in *Proc. ICLR*, 2021.
- [96] Zhifeng Kong, Wei Ping, Jiaji Huang, Kexin Zhao, and Bryan Catanzaro, "Diffwave: A versatile diffusion model for audio synthesis," in *Proc. ICLR*, 2021.
- [97] Jaehyeon Kim, Jungil Kong, and Juhee Son, "Conditional variational autoencoder with adversarial learning for end-to-end text-to-speech," in *Proc. ICML*, 2021, pp. 5530–5540.
- [98] Edresson Casanova, Julian Weber, Christopher D Shulby, Arnaldo Candido Junior, Eren Gölge, and Moacir A Ponti, "YouTTS: Towards zero-shot multi-speaker tts and zero-shot voice conversion for everyone," in *Proc. ICML*, 2022, pp. 2709–2720.
- [99] Hideki Kawahara, "Straight, exploitation of the other aspect of vocoder: Perceptually isomorphic decomposition of speech sounds," *Acoustical Science and Technology*, vol. 27, no. 6, pp. 349–353, 2006.
- [100] Nathanaël Perraudin, Peter Balazs, and Peter L. Søndergaard, "A fast griffin-lim algorithm," in *IEEE Workshop on Applications of Signal Processing to Audio and Acoustics*, 2013, pp. 1–4.
- [101] Jean-Marc Valin and Jan Skoglund, "Lpcnet: Improving neural speech synthesis through linear prediction," in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2019, pp. 5891–5895.
- [102] Jungil Kong, Jaehyeon Kim, and Jaekyoung Bae, "Hifi-gan: generative adversarial networks for efficient and high fidelity speech synthesis," in *Proc. NeurIPS*, 2020.
- [103] Masanori MORISE, Fumiya YOKOMORI, and Kenji OZAWA, "World: A vocoder-based high-quality speech synthesis system for real-time applications," *IEICE Transactions on Information and Systems*, vol. E99.D, no. 7, pp. 1877–1884, 2016.
- [104] Yi Ren, Chenxu Hu, Xu Tan, Tao Qin, Sheng Zhao, Zhou Zhao, and Tie-Yan Liu, "Fastspeech 2: Fast and high-quality end-to-end text to speech," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.04558*, 2020.
- [105] Yuxuan Wang, RJ Skerry-Ryan, Daisy Stanton, Yonghui Wu, Ron J. Weiss, Navdeep Jaitly, Zongheng Yang, Ying Xiao, Zhifeng Chen, Samy Bengio, Quoc Le, Yannis Agiomyriannakis, Rob Clark, and Rif A. Saurous, "Tacotron: Towards end-to-end speech synthesis," in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2017, pp. 4006–4010.
- [106] Jaehyeon Kim, Sungwon Kim, Jungil Kong, and Sungroh Yoon, "Glow-tts: A generative flow for text-to-speech via monotonic alignment search," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 8067–8077, 2020.
- [107] Vadim Popov, Ivan Vovk, Vladimir Gogoryan, Tasnima Sadekova, and Mikhail Kudinov, "Grad-tts: A diffusion probabilistic model for text-to-speech," in *Proc. ICML*, 2021, pp. 8599–8608.
- [108] Adrian Łańcucki, "Fastpitch: Parallel text-to-speech with pitch prediction," in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2021, pp. 6588–6592.
- [109] Jaehyeon Kim, Jungil Kong, and Juhee Son, "Conditional variational autoencoder with adversarial learning for end-to-end text-to-speech," in *Proc. ICML*, 2021, pp. 5530–5540.
- [110] Florian Lux, Julia Koch, and Ngoc Thang Vu, "Low-resource multilingual and zero-shot multispeaker tts," in *Proc. AACL*, 2022, pp. 741–751.
- [111] Jungil Kong, Jaehyeon Kim, and Jaekyoung Bae, "Hifi-gan: Generative adversarial networks for efficient and high fidelity speech



- synthesis,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 33, pp. 17022–17033, 2020.
- [112] Jonathan Shen, Ruoming Pang, Ron J Weiss, Mike Schuster, Navdeep Jaitly, Zongheng Yang, Zhifeng Chen, Yu Zhang, Yuxuan Wang, Rj Skerrv-Ryan, et al., “Natural tts synthesis by conditioning wavenet on mel spectrogram predictions,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2018, pp. 4779–4783.
- [113] Yinghao Aaron Li, Ali Zare, and Nima Mesgarani, “Starganv2-vc: A diverse, unsupervised, non-parallel framework for natural-sounding voice conversion,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2021, pp. 1349–1353.
- [114] Edresson Casanova, Julian Weber, Christopher D Shulby, Arnaldo Candido Junior, Eren Gölge, and Moacir A Ponti, “Yourtts: Towards zero-shot multi-speaker tts and zero-shot voice conversion for everyone,” in *Proc. ICML*, 2022, pp. 2709–2720.
- [115] Ehab A AlBadawy and Siwei Lyu, “Voice conversion using speech-to-speech neuro-style transfer,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2020, pp. 4726–4730.
- [116] Cheng Gong, Xin Wang, Erica Cooper, Dan Wells, Longbiao Wang, Jianwu Dang, Korin Richmond, and Junichi Yamagishi, “Zmm-tts: Zero-shot multilingual and multispeaker speech synthesis conditioned on self-supervised discrete speech representations,” *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, 2024.
- [117] Ingmar Steiner and Sébastien Le Maguer, “Creating new language and voice components for the updated marytts text-to-speech synthesis platform,” in *Proc. LREC*, 2018, pp. 1371–1375.
- [118] Sang-gil Lee, Wei Ping, Boris Ginsburg, Bryan Catanzaro, and Sungroh Yoon, “Bigvgan: A universal neural vocoder with large-scale training,” in *Proc. ICLR*, 2022.
- [119] Florian Lux, Julia Koch, and Ngoc Thang Vu, “Exact prosody cloning in zero-shot multispeaker text-to-speech,” in *Proc. SLT*, 2023, pp. 962–969.
- [120] Florian Lux, Julia Koch, and Ngoc Thang Vu, “Low-resource multilingual and zero-shot multispeaker tts,” in *Proc. AACL*, 2022.
- [121] Vadim Popov, Ivan Vovk, Vladimir Gogoryan, Tasnima Sadekova, Mikhail Kudinov, and Jiansheng Wei, “Diffusion-based voice conversion with fast maximum likelihood sampling scheme,” in *Proc. ICLR*, 2022.
- [122] Edresson Casanova, Julian Weber, Christopher D Shulby, Arnaldo Candido Junior, Eren Gölge, and Moacir A Ponti, “Yourtts: Towards zero-shot multi-speaker tts and zero-shot voice conversion for everyone,” in *Proc. ICML*, 2022, pp. 2709–2720.
- [123] Edresson Casanova, Kelly Davis, Eren Gölge, Gökrem Gökner, Julian Gulea, Logan Hart, Aya Aljafari, Joshua Meyer, Reuben Morais, Samuel Olayemi, et al., “Xtts: a massively multilingual zero-shot text-to-speech model,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2024, pp. 4978–4982.
- [124] Michele Panariello, Wanying Ge, Hemlata Tak, Massimiliano Todisco, and Nicholas Evans, “Malafide: a novel adversarial convolutive noise attack against deepfake and spoofing detection systems,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2023, pp. 2868–2872.
- [125] Massimiliano Todisco, Michele Panariello, Xin Wang, Hector Delgado, Kong Aik Lee, and Nicholas Evans, “Malacopula: adversarial automatic speaker verification attacks using a neural-based generalised hammerstein model,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.09300*, 2024.
- [126] Joaquín Cáceres, Roberto Font, Teresa Grau, Javier Molina, and Biometric Vox SL, “The biometric vox system for the asvspoof 2021 challenge,” in *Edition of the Automatic Speaker Verification and Spoofing Countermeasures Challenge*, 2021, pp. 68–74.
- [127] Rohan Kumar Das, “Known-unknown data augmentation strategies for detection of logical access, physical access and speech deepfake attacks: Asvspoof 2021,” in *Edition of the Automatic Speaker Verification and Spoofing Countermeasures Challenge*, 2021, pp. 29–36.
- [128] Wanying Ge, Jose Patino, Massimiliano Todisco, and Nicholas Evans, “Raw differentiable architecture search for speech deepfake and spoofing detection,” in *Edition of the Automatic Speaker Verification and Spoofing Countermeasures Challenge*, 2021, pp. 22–28.
- [129] Woo Hyun Kang, Jahangir Alam, and Abderrahim Fathan, “Crim’s system description for the asvspoof2021 challenge,” in *Edition of the Automatic Speaker Verification and Spoofing Countermeasures Challenge*, 2021, pp. 100–106.
- [130] Nicolas M Müller, Franziska Dieckmann, Pavel Czempin, Roman Canals, Konstantin Böttinger, and Jennifer Williams, “Speech is silver, silence is golden: What do asvspoof-trained models really learn?,” in *Edition of the Automatic Speaker Verification and Spoofing Countermeasures Challenge*, 2021, pp. 55–60.
- [131] Hemlata Tak, Jee-weon Jung, Jose Patino, Madhu Kamble, Massimiliano Todisco, and Nicholas Evans, “End-to-end spectro-temporal graph attention networks for speaker verification anti-spoofing and speech deepfake detection,” in *Edition of the Automatic Speaker Verification and Spoofing Countermeasures Challenge*, 2021, pp. 1–8.
- [132] Anton Tomilov, Aleksei Svishchev, Marina Volkova, Artem Chirkovskiy, Alexander Kondratev, and Galina Lavrentyeva, “Stc antispoofing systems for the asvspoof2021 challenge,” in *Edition of the Automatic Speaker Verification and Spoofing Countermeasures Challenge*, 2021, pp. 61–67.
- [133] Xingming Wang, Xiaoyi Qin, Tinglong Zhu, Chao Wang, Shilei Zhang, and Ming Li, “The dku-cmri system for the asvspoof 2021 challenge: vocoder based replay channel response estimation,” in *Edition of the Automatic Speaker Verification and Spoofing Countermeasures Challenge*, 2021, pp. 16–21.
- [134] Jee-weon Jung, Hee-Soo Heo, Hemlata Tak, Hye-jin Shim, Joon Son Chung, Bong-Jin Lee, Ha-Jin Yu, and Nicholas Evans, “Aasist: Audio anti-spoofing using integrated spectro-temporal graph attention networks,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2022, pp. 6367–6371.
- [135] Hemlata Tak, Massimiliano Todisco, Xin Wang, Jee-weon Jung, Junichi Yamagishi, and Nicholas Evans, “Automatic speaker verification spoofing and deepfake detection using wav2vec 2.0 and data augmentation,” in *The Speaker and Language Recognition Workshop*, 2022.
- [136] Hemlata Tak, Madhu Kamble, Jose Patino, Massimiliano Todisco, and Nicholas Evans, “Rawboost: A raw data boosting and augmentation method applied to automatic speaker verification anti-spoofing,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2022, pp. 6382–6386.
- [137] Rui Liu, Jinhua Zhang, Guanglai Gao, and Haizhou Li, “Betray Oneself: A Novel Audio DeepFake Detection Model via Mono-to-Stereo Conversion,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2023, pp. 3999–4003.
- [138] Chenglong Wang, Jiangyan Yi, Jianhua Tao, Chu Yuan Zhang, Shuai Zhang, and Xun Chen, “Detection of Cross-Dataset Fake Audio Based on Prosodic and Pronunciation Features,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2023, pp. 3844–3848.
- [139] Alexis Conneau, Alexei Baevski, Ronan Collobert, Abdelrahman Mohamed, and Michael Auli, “Unsupervised Cross-Lingual Representation Learning for Speech Recognition,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2021, pp. 2426–2430.
- [140] Wei-Ning Hsu, Benjamin Bolte, Yao-Hung Hubert Tsai, Kushal Lakhotia, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Abdelrahman Mohamed, “Hubert: Self-supervised speech representation learning by masked prediction of hidden units,” *IEEE/ACM transactions on audio, speech, and language processing*, vol. 29, pp. 3451–3460, 2021.
- [141] Xiao-Min Zeng, Jian-Tao Zhang, Kang Li, Zhuo-Li Liu, Wei-Lin Xie, and Yan Song, “Deepfake algorithm recognition system with augmented data for add 2023 challenge,” in *Proc. IJCAI*, 2023, pp. 31–36.
- [142] Zhongwei Teng, Quchen Fu, Jules White, Maria E Powell, and Douglas C Schmidt, “Sa-sasv: An end-to-end spoof-aggregated spoofing-aware speaker verification system,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2022, pp. 4391–4395.
- [143] Jun Xue, Cunhang Fan, Jiangyan Yi, Chenglong Wang, Zhengqi Wen, Dan Zhang, and Zhao Lv, “Learning from yourself: A self-distillation method for fake speech detection,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2023, pp. 1–5.
- [144] Yuankun Xie, Haonan Cheng, Yutian Wang, and Long Ye, “Learning a self-supervised domain-invariant feature representation for generalized audio deepfake detection,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2023, pp. 2808–2812.
- [145] Yujie Yang, Haochen Qin, Hang Zhou, Chengcheng Wang, Tianyu Guo, Kai Han, and Yunhe Wang, “A robust audio deepfake detection system via multi-view feature,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2024, pp. 13131–13135.
- [146] Alexandre Défossez, Jade Copet, Gabriel Synnaeve, and Yossi Adi, “High fidelity neural audio compression,” *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023.
- [147] Yi-Chiao Wu, Israel D Gebru, Dejan Marković, and Alexander Richard, “Audiodec: An open-source streaming high-fidelity neural audio codec,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2023, pp. 1–5.
- [148] Po-Yao Huang, Hu Xu, Juncheng Li, Alexei Baevski, Michael Auli, Wojciech Galuba, Florian Metz, and Christoph Feichtenhofer,

- “Masked autoencoders that listen,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 35, pp. 28708–28720, 2022.
- [149] Sanyuan Chen, Chengyi Wang, Zhengyang Chen, Yu Wu, Shujie Liu, Zhuo Chen, Jinyu Li, Naoyuki Kanda, Takuya Yoshioka, Xiong Xiao, et al., “Wavlm: Large-scale self-supervised pre-training for full stack speech processing,” *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, vol. 16, no. 6, pp. 1505–1518, 2022.
- [150] Alec Radford et al., “Robust speech recognition via large-scale weak supervision,” in *Proc. ICML*, 2023, pp. 28492–28518.
- [151] Yinlin Guo, Haofan Huang, Xi Chen, He Zhao, and Yuehai Wang, “Audio deepfake detection with self-supervised wavlm and multi-fusion attentive classifier,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2024, pp. 12702–12706.
- [152] Alessandro Pianese, Davide Cozzolino, Giovanni Poggi, and Luisa Verdoliva, “Training-free deepfake voice recognition by leveraging large-scale pre-trained models,” in *Proc. ACM Workshop on Information Hiding and Multimedia Security*, 2024, pp. 289–294.
- [153] Sanyuan Chen, Yu Wu, Chengyi Wang, Shujie Liu, Daniel Tompkins, Zhuo Chen, Wanxiang Che, Xiangzhan Yu, and Furu Wei, “Beats: audio pre-training with acoustic tokenizers,” in *Proc. ICML*, 2023, pp. 5178–5193.
- [154] Yusong Wu, Ke Chen, Tianyu Zhang, Yuchen Hui, Taylor Berg-Kirkpatrick, and Shlomo Dubnov, “Large-scale contrastive language-audio pretraining with feature fusion and keyword-to-caption augmentation,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2023, pp. 1–5.
- [155] Andrey Guzhov, Federico Raue, Jörn Hees, and Andreas Dengel, “Audioclip: Extending clip to image, text and audio,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2022, pp. 976–980.
- [156] Tianxiang Chen, Avrosh Kumar, Parav Nagarsheth, Ganesh Sivaraman, and Elie Khoury, “Generalization of audio deepfake detection,” in *Odyssey*, 2020, pp. 132–137.
- [157] Yuankun Xie, Haonan Cheng, Yutian Wang, and Long Ye, “Single domain generalization for audio deepfake detection,” in *Proc. IJCAI*, 2023, pp. 58–63.
- [158] Xinhui Chen, You Zhang, Ge Zhu, and Zhiyao Duan, “Ur channel-robust synthetic speech detection system for asvspoof 2021,” in *Edition of the Automatic Speaker Verification and Spoofing Countermeasures Challenge*, 2021, pp. 75–82.
- [159] Zhor Benhafid, Sid Ahmed Selouani, Mohammed Sidi Yakoub, and Abderrahmane Amrouche, “Larihs assert reassessment for logical access asvspoof 2021 challenge,” in *Edition of the Automatic Speaker Verification and Spoofing Countermeasures Challenge*, 2021, pp. 94–99.
- [160] You Zhang, Fei Jiang, and Zhiyao Duan, “One-class learning towards synthetic voice spoofing detection,” *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 28, pp. 937–941, 2021.
- [161] Woo Hyun Kang, Jahangir Alam, and Abderrahim Fathan, “Investigation on activation functions for robust end-to-end spoofing attack detection system,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2021, pp. 83–88.
- [162] Lin Zhang, Xin Wang, Erica Cooper, and Junichi Yamagishi, “Multi-task learning in utterance-level and segmental-level spoof detection,” in *Edition of the Automatic Speaker Verification and Spoofing Countermeasures Challenge*, 2021.
- [163] Yang Gao, Tyler Vuong, Mahsa Elyasi, Gaurav Bharaj, and Rita Singh, “Generalized spoofing detection inspired from audio generation artifacts,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2021, pp. 4184–4188.
- [164] Rui Yan, Cheng Wen, Shuran Zhou, Tingwei Guo, Wei Zou, and Xiangang Li, “Audio deepfake detection system with neural stitching for add 2022,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2022, pp. 9226–9230.
- [165] Yuankun Xie, Haonan Cheng, Yutian Wang, and Long Ye, “Domain generalization via aggregation and separation for audio deepfake detection,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 19, pp. 344–358, 2024.
- [166] Amit Kumar Singh Yadav, Emily R Bartusiak, Kratika Bhagatani, and Edward J Delp, “Synthetic speech attribution using self supervised audio spectrogram transformer,” *Electronic Imaging*, vol. 35, pp. 1–11, 2023.
- [167] Yeqing Ren, Haipeng Peng, Lixiang Li, and Yixian Yang, “Lightweight voice spoofing detection using improved one-class learning and knowledge distillation,” *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, 2023.
- [168] Yuxiang Zhang, Zhuo Li, Jingze Lu, Wenchao Wang, and Pengyuan Zhang, “Synthetic speech detection based on the temporal consistency of speaker features,” *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 31, pp. 944–948, 2024.
- [169] Junlong Deng, Yanzhen Ren, Tong Zhang, Hongcheng Zhu, and Zongkun Sun, “Vfd-net: Vocoder fingerprints detection for fake audio,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2024, pp. 12151–12155.
- [170] “Gan-based network decoders,” <https://github.com/kan-bayashi/ParallelWaveGAN>, 2023.
- [171] Luca Cuccovillo, Milica Gerhardt, and Patrick Aichroth, “Audio transformer for synthetic speech detection via formant magnitude and phase analysis,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2024, pp. 4805–4809.
- [172] Xin Wang and Junichi Yamagishi, “Can large-scale vocoded spoofed data improve speech spoofing countermeasure with a self-supervised front end?,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2024, pp. 10311–10315.
- [173] Hyun-seo Shin, Jungwoo Heo, Ju-ho Kim, Chan-yeong Lim, Wonbin Kim, and Ha-Jin Yu, “Hm-conformer: A conformer-based audio deepfake detection system with hierarchical pooling and multi-level classification token aggregation methods,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2024, pp. 10581–10585.
- [174] Galina Lavrentyeva, Sergey Novoselov, Andzhukaev Tseren, Marina Volkova, Artem Gorlanov, and Alexandr Kozlov, “Stc antispoofing systems for the asvspoof2019 challenge,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2019, pp. 1033–1037.
- [175] Guang Hua, Andrew Beng Jin Teoh, and Haijian Zhang, “Towards end-to-end synthetic speech detection,” *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 28, pp. 1265–1269, 2021.
- [176] Xin Wang and Junich Yamagishi, “A comparative study on recent neural spoofing countermeasures for synthetic speech detection,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2021, pp. 4259–4263.
- [177] Tianxiang Chen, Elie Khoury, Kedar Phatak, and Ganesh Sivaraman, “Pindrop labs’ submission to the asvspoof 2021 challenge,” in *Edition of the Automatic Speaker Verification and Spoofing Countermeasures Challenge*, 2021, pp. 89–93.
- [178] Yan Wen, Zhenchun Lei, Yingen Yang, Changhong Liu, and Minglei Ma, “Multi-path gmm-mobilenet based on attack algorithms and codecs for synthetic speech and deepfake detection,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2022, pp. 4795–4799.
- [179] Il-Youp Kwak, Sunmook Choi, Jonghoon Yang, Yerin Lee, Soyul Han, and Seungsang Oh, “Low-quality fake audio detection through frequency feature masking,” in *Proceedings of the 1st International Workshop on Deepfake Detection for Audio Multimedia*, 2022, pp. 9–17.
- [180] Jiahui Pan, Shuai Nie, Hui Zhang, Shulin He, Kanghao Zhang, Shan Liang, Xueliang Zhang, and Jianhua Tao, “Speaker recognition-assisted robust audio deepfake detection,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2022, pp. 4202–4206.
- [181] Alexander Alenin, Nikita Torgashov, Anton Okhotnikov, Rostislav Makarov, and Ivan Yakovlev, “A subnetwork approach for spoofing aware speaker verification,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2022, pp. 2888–2892.
- [182] Shunbo Dong, Jun Xue, Cunhang Fan, Kang Zhu, Yujie Chen, and Zhao Lv, “Multi-perspective information fusion res2net with randomspecmix for fake speech detection,” in *Proc. IJCAI*, 2023.
- [183] Ziqian Wang, Qing Wang, Jixun Yao, and Lei Xie, “The npu-aslp system for deepfake algorithm recognition in add 2023 challenge,” in *Proc. IJCAI*, 2023, pp. 64–69.
- [184] Chenglong Wang, Jiayi He, Jiangyan Yi, Jianhua Tao, Chu Yuan Zhang, and Xiaohui Zhang, “Multi-scale permutation entropy for audio deepfake detection,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2024, pp. 1406–1410.
- [185] Yi Zhu, Surya Koppiseti, Trang Tran, and Gaurav Bharaj, “Slim: Style-linguistics mismatch model for generalized audio deepfake detection,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.18517*, 2024.
- [186] Hu Hu, Chao-Han Huck Yang, Xianjun Xia, Xue Bai, Xin Tang, Yajian Wang, Shutong Niu, Li Chai, Juanjuan Li, Hongning Zhu, et al., “Device-robust acoustic scene classification based on two-stage categorization and data augmentation,” in *Proc. DCASE*, 2020.
- [187] Nhat Truong Pham et al., “Hybrid data augmentation and deep attention-based dilated convolutional-recurrent neural networks for speech emotion recognition,” *Expert Systems with Applications*, vol. 230, pp. 120608, 2023.
- [188] Ashish Alex, Lin Wang, Paolo Gastaldo, and Andrea Cavallaro, “Data augmentation for speech separation,” *Speech Communication*, vol. 152, pp. 102949, 2023.
- [189] Y. Tokozume, Y. Ushiku, and T. Harada, “Learning from between-class examples for deep sound recognition,” in *ICLR*, 2018.
- [190] Daniel S Park, William Chan, Yu Zhang, Chung-Cheng Chiu, Barret Zoph, Ekin D Cubuk, and Quoc V Le, “SpecAugment: A simple data

- augmentation method for automatic speech recognition,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2019, pp. 2613–2617.
- [191] Zhizheng Wu, Junichi Yamagishi, Tomi Kinnunen, Cemal Haniľi, Mohammed Sahidullah, Aleksandr Sizov, Nicholas Evans, Massimiliano Todisco, and Hector Delgado, “Asvspoof: the automatic speaker verification spoofing and countermeasures challenge,” *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 588–604, 2017.
- [192] Arun Babu, Changan Wang, Andros Tjandra, Kushal Lakhotia, Qiantong Xu, Naman Goyal, Kritika Singh, Patrick von Platen, Yatharth Saraf, Juan Pino, Alexei Baevski, Alexis Conneau, and Michael Auli, “XLS-R: Self-supervised Cross-lingual Speech Representation Learning at Scale,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2022, pp. 2278–2282.
- [193] Mirco Ravanelli and Yoshua Bengio, “Speaker recognition from raw waveform with sincnet,” in *IEEE spoken language technology workshop*, 2018, pp. 1021–1028.
- [194] Neil Zeghidour, Olivier Teboul, Félix de Chaumont Quiry, and Marco Tagliasacchi, “LEAF: A learnable frontend for audio classification,” in *Proc. ICLR*, 2021.
- [195] McFee, Brian, R. Colin, L. Dawen, Daniel P., M. Matt, B. Eric, and N. Oriol, “librosa: Audio and music signal analysis in python,” in *Proc. Python in Science Conference*, 2015, pp. 18–25.
- [196] Lam Pham, Dat Ngo, Dusan Salovic, Anahid Jalali, Alexander Schindler, Phu X. Nguyen, Khoa Tran, and Hai Canh Vu, “Lightweight deep neural networks for acoustic scene classification and an effective visualization for presenting sound scene contexts,” *Applied Acoustics*, vol. 211, pp. 109489, 2023.
- [197] Jingze Lu, Yuxiang Zhang, Wenchao Wang, Zengqiang Shang, and Pengyuan Zhang, “One-class knowledge distillation for spoofing speech detection,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2024, pp. 11251–11255.
- [198] Piotr Kawa, Marcin Plata, and Piotr Syga, “Attack Agnostic Dataset: Towards Generalization and Stabilization of Audio DeepFake Detection,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2022, pp. 4023–4027.
- [199] Xin Wang and Junichi Yamagishi, “Spoofed training data for speech spoofing countermeasure can be efficiently created using neural vocoders,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2023, pp. 1–5.
- [200] Akash Chintla et al., “Recurrent convolutional structures for audio spoof and video deepfake detection,” *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, vol. 14, no. 5, pp. 1024–1037, 2020.
- [201] Jia Deng et al., “Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database,” in *Proc. CVPR*, 2009, pp. 248–255.
- [202] Barrault Loïc et al., “Seamless: Multilingual expressive and streaming speech translation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.05187*, 2023.
- [203] Mirco Ravanelli et al., “SpeechBrain: A general-purpose speech toolkit,” 2021, arXiv:2106.04624.
- [204] Alexis Plaquet and Hervé Bredin, “Powerset multi-class cross entropy loss for neural speaker diarization,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2023, pp. 3222–3226.
- [205] Hervé Bredin, “pyannote.audio 2.1 speaker diarization pipeline: principle, benchmark, and recipe,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2023, pp. 1983–1987.
- [206] Nicolas M. Müller, Philip Sperl, and Konstantin Böttinger, “Complex-valued neural networks for voice anti-spoofing,” in *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2023, pp. 3814–3818.
- [207] Wanying Ge, Jose Patino, Massimiliano Todisco, and Nicholas Evans, “Explaining deep learning models for spoofing and deepfake detection with shapley additive explanations,” in *Proc. ICASSP*, 2022, pp. 6387–6391.
- [208] Davide Salvi, Paolo Bestagini, and Stefano Tubaro, “Towards frequency band explainability in synthetic speech detection,” in *Proc. EUSIPCO*, 2023, pp. 620–624.
- [209] Ning Yu, Long Chen, Tao Leng, Zigang Chen, and Xiaoyin Yi, “An explainable deepfake of speech detection method with spectrograms and waveforms,” *Journal of Information Security and Applications*, vol. 81, pp. 103720, 2024.
- [210] Suk-Young Lim, Dong-Kyu Chae, and Sang-Chul Lee, “Detecting deepfake voice using explainable deep learning techniques,” *Applied Sciences*, vol. 12, no. 8, pp. 3926, 2022.
- [211] Scott M. Lundberg and Su-In Lee, “A unified approach to interpreting model predictions,” in *Proc. International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2017, p. 4768–4777.
- [212] Marco Tulio Ribeiro, Sameer Singh, and Carlos Guestrin, “‘‘why should i trust you?’’: Explaining the predictions of any classifier,” in *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, 2016, p. 1135–1144.
- [213] Karen Simonyan and Andrew Zisserman, “Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition,” in *Proc. ICLR*, 2015.
- [214] Daniel Smilkov, Nikhil Thorat, Been Kim, Fernanda B. Viégas, and Martin Wattenberg, “Smoothgrad: removing noise by adding noise,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/1706.03825, 2017.
- [215] Reza Amini Gougeh, Zhang Nu, and Zeljko Zilic, “Optimizing Auditory Immersion Safety on Edge Devices: An On-Device Sound Event Detection System,” in *Proc. The Speaker and Language Recognition Workshop*, 2024, pp. 225–231.
- [216] Jordan J Bird and Ahmad Lotfi, “Real-time detection of ai-generated speech for deepfake voice conversion,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12734*, 2023.
- [217] Jonat John Mathew, Rakin Ahsan, Sae Furukawa, Jagdish Gautham Krishna Kumar, Huzaifa Pallan, Agamjeet Singh Padda, Sara Adamski, Madhu Reddiboina, and Arjun Pankajakshan, “Towards the development of a real-time deepfake audio detection system in communication platforms,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.11778*, 2024.
- [218] Shuwei Hou, Yan Ju, Chengzhe Sun, Shan Jia, Lipeng Ke, Riky Zhou, Anita Nikolich, and Siwei Lyu, “Deepfake-o-meter v2. 0: An open platform for deepfake detection,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.13146*, 2024.