**Performance Results:**

* **CQT**: Best overall (Known: 0.994, Unknown: 0.726)
* **MFCC**: Good performance (Known: 0.991, Unknown: 0.708)
* **LPC**: Weaker performance (Known: 0.910, Unknown: 0.443)

**Key Findings:**

1. **Strong correlation**: Better performance on known attacks = better performance on unknown attacks (correlation = 1.000)
2. **Feature ranking confirmed**: CQT > MFCC > LPC for both known and unknown attacks
3. **LPC struggles with neural attacks**: Much higher confusion scores (0.4-0.8 vs 0.1-0.4 for others)

**Notable Patterns:**

* A12 and A16 frequently predicted as A04 (Voice Conversion) by MFCC/CQT
* A18 consistently classified as bonafide across all features
* Neural attacks often confused with traditional attacks (A01, A04)

**Conclusion:** Features that work well on training data also work well on new attacks. CQT and MFCC are better choices than LPC for spoofing detection.