

CrossDF: Improving Cross-Domain Deepfake Detection with Deep Information Decomposition

Shanmin Yang¹, Hui Guo², Shu Hu³, Bin Zhu⁴, Ying Fu¹, Siwei Lyu², Xi Wu^{1,*}, Xin Wang^{5,*}

Abstract—Deepfake technology poses a significant threat to security and social trust. Although existing detection methods have shown high performance in identifying forgeries within datasets that use the same deepfake techniques for both training and testing, they suffer from sharp performance degradation when faced with cross-dataset scenarios where unseen deepfake techniques are tested. To address this challenge, we propose a Deep Information Decomposition (DID) framework to enhance the performance of Cross-dataset Deepfake Detection (CrossDF). Unlike most existing deepfake detection methods, our framework prioritizes high-level semantic features over specific visual artifacts. Specifically, it adaptively decomposes facial features into deepfake-related and irrelevant information, only using the intrinsic deepfake-related information for real/fake discrimination. Moreover, it optimizes these two kinds of information to be independent with a de-correlation learning module, thereby enhancing the model’s robustness against various irrelevant information changes and generalization ability to unseen forgery methods. Our extensive experimental evaluation and comparison with existing state-of-the-art detection methods validate the effectiveness and superiority of the DID framework on cross-dataset deepfake detection.

Index Terms—Deepfake detection, deep information decomposition, model generalization

I. INTRODUCTION

Significant progress in deep learning and generative techniques such as Face2Face [1], DeepFake [2], GANs [3], [4], etc., has enabled the creation of highly realistic face images. However, the widespread use of these deepfakes has posed a significant threat to security and social trust. Therefore, it is crucial to develop effective methods to detect face forgery.

Numerous efforts have been devoted to deepfake detection in recent years. Most existing works focus on specific visual artifacts resulting from the deepfake creation process, such as discrepancies across blending boundaries of real and fake faces [5], differences of head poses [6], affine face warping artifacts [7], eye state [8], frequency differences [9], [10], [11], etc. Although these methods have achieved promising performance in intra-dataset scenarios where both training and testing face images are created with the same deepfake technique, they are likely to overfit the specific artifacts of the deepfake technique and thus may be ineffective in detecting forged faces created with different deepfake techniques. For instance, the detection method proposed in [10] achieves an AUC score of 0.98




Fig. 1. Various information changes entangled with the deepfake information in traditional methods (**top**) would affect real/fake classification accuracy, leading to a sharp degradation in performance when the discrepancies in these components between the training and test sets are more significant than the differences between real and deepfake information. Our deep information decomposition (DID) method (**bottom**) separates the deepfake information from various information irrelevant to real/fake classification to improve the robustness of deepfake detection.

when both trained and tested on the same FaceForensics++ (FF++) deepfake dataset [2]. Its AUC score degrades sharply to 0.65 [12], [13] when trained on the FF++ dataset and tested on Celeb-DF [14].

In studying the cross-dataset performance degradation problem, we observe that deepfake detection is a type of fine-grained image classification. With advances in deep forgery methods, the differences between authentic and deepfake images are becoming more and more subtle, even subtler than those between deepfake images synthesized from the same authentic image with different forgery techniques. In addition, features extracted from deepfake images by general deep neural networks (e.g., ResNet-50 [15], EfficientNet[16], etc.) always include various entangled information, such as forgery technique-related (domain) information and others (e.g., facial expressions and identities) as shown in Fig. 1. It makes detection performance sensitive to any change in any component, especially the most prominent ones.

Motivated by these observations, we propose a Deep Information Decomposition (DID) framework for cross-dataset deepfake detection, as shown in Fig. 2. Unlike existing methods, we focus on high-level semantic features rather than low-level deepfake visual traces. Specifically, we denote face images forged by different deepfake methods as distinct data domains and formulate cross-dataset deepfake detection as a domain generalization problem. Then, we adaptively decompose the deepfake facial information into deepfake information, forgery technique information (e.g., Face2Face

¹ Chengdu University of Information Technology

² University at Buffalo, SUNY

³ Purdue University

⁴ Microsoft Research Asia

⁵ University at Albany, SUNY

* Corresponding authors: xi.wu@cuit.edu.cn, xwang56@albany.edu




Fig. 2. Overview of our Deep Information Decomposition (DID) framework. The feature map I_X of an input face image X from a backbone network G is decomposed into deepfake information I_{df} and non-deepfake information I_{os} adaptively under the guidance of the deepfake attention network A_{df} and the supervision of the deepfake classification module. The domain attention network A_{dom} and the domain classification module capture the forgery method-related (domain) information I_{dom} and ensure that I_{dom} is included in the non-deepfake information but absent in the deepfake information. In addition, the decorrelation learning module ensures no overlapping between deepfake information and non-deepfake information. This module consists of an information estimation network T , which functions in a max-min manner with the information decomposition module through the gradient reversal layer (GRL). C and \bar{C} are the deepfake and domain classifiers, respectively.

[1], DeepFake [2]), and others using two attention modules. Only the deepfake information is used for genuine and sham discrimination. Furthermore, we introduce a de-correlation learning module to promote the deepfake information to be independent of irrelevant information, thus improving the detection generalizability to irrelevant variations, including different datasets and forgery methods. Extensive experiments demonstrate the effectiveness and superiority of our framework. We achieve new state-of-the-art performance on cross-dataset deepfake detection. In summary, our main contributions are:

- We introduce a new end-to-end Deep Information Decomposition (DID) framework that decomposes deepfake face image information into deepfake information and deepfake-irrelevant information. By formulating cross-dataset deepfake detection as a domain generalization problem, we enhance the generalization capability of deepfake detectors.
- A de-correlation learning module is introduced to encourage the independence of the decomposed components without knowing (assuming) their distribution functions or relationships, which can intrinsically improve the robustness of deepfake detection.
- We conducted extensive experiments that demonstrated the superiority of our framework, achieving state-of-the-art performance on the challenging cross-dataset deepfake detection task.

II. RELATED WORK

This section provides a brief review of deepfakes, cross-dataset deepfake detection, and information decomposing. For more details about the deepfake techniques and deepfake datasets, please refer to [17], [18].

A. Deepfakes

Deepfake broadly refers to manipulated or synthetic media (e.g., images, sounds, etc.) that convincingly mimic natural content [19], [17]. In this paper, we focus on deepfake faces. We classify existing deepfakes into two types, transfer-based and synthesis-based deepfake methods.

A transfer-based deepfake method tries to manipulate target faces by replacing the faces or facial attributes (e.g., expression, mouth, eye, etc.) with reference faces. For example, Face2Face [1] reenacts the person in a target video with expressions of another person while preserving the identity of the target face. FaceSwap [20] and DeepFake [2] replace the face region of a target video with that of a reference source video. Neural Textures [21] combines learnable neural textures (from the reference video) with deferred neural rendering to manipulate facial expressions corresponding to the mouth region. The method in [22] decouples a face image into identity and attributes, then generates a new identity-preserving face image by recombining this identity with attribute features from a different face image. Almost all deepfake methods of this type require reference faces and pay attention to blending manipulated and unmanipulated parts to improve the realism of the deepfake.

A synthesis-based method synthesizes non-existing faces or face attributes (e.g., skin color, hair color, etc.) without using any reference face. Generative adversarial networks (GANs) and 3D Morphable Models (3DMM) are popularly used in this type of method. For instance, the method in [23] proposes a 3DMM-guided way to synthesize arbitrary expressions while preserving face identity. StyleGAN [18] generates a deepfake dataset with high variety and quality based on a style-based generator. GANprintR [24] is a GAN-based method designed to generate entirely realistic deepfake faces.

B. Cross-Dataset Deepfake Detection

With the development of deepfake methods, many deepfake detection methods [25], [26], [27], [28] have also been proposed. They can achieve satisfying performance when testing and training face images are within the same deepfake dataset but suffer from sharp performance degradation when tested on datasets generated with different deepfake techniques and/or types than those in the training datasets. To address this issue, some works suggest data augmentation to simulate unseen data. For example, Zhao et al. [29] propose dynamic data augmentation methods to generate new data. Nadimpalli et al. [12] use a reinforcement learning-based image augmentation model to reduce the shift of the cross dataset (domain). Several works focus on the distribution of different forgery datasets. For example, Yu et al. [30] aim to capture common forgery features over different forgery datasets. Kim et al. [13] distinguish deepfakes according to color-distribution changes that appeared in the face-synthesis process. Yu et al. [31] propose to narrow the distribution gaps across various forgery types via employing Adaptive Batch and Instance Normalization, generating bridging samples, and performing cross-domain alignment, thereby enhancing the model's ability to discern unseen types of fake faces. Yin et al. [32] improve the generalization of deepfake detection across different domains by minimizing invariant risk through a learning paradigm that focuses on critical domain-invariant features and aligned representations. Huang et al. [33] propose a video-level contrastive learning method that maintains a closer distance within data under different compression levels, thus improving the performance in detecting deepfakes with different compression levels. However, cross-dataset deepfake detection is still a challenging and critical issue within the realm of deepfake detection,

C. Information Decomposing

Information decomposing, which aims to decouple complex, entangled information into distinct semantic components and extract those relevant to specific tasks, has been widely applied across various computer vision applications. The methods in [34], [35] separate identity-dependent information from pose and age variations, respectively, to reduce the influence of pose/age discrepancy on face recognition. The method in [36] disentangles facial representations into identity and modality information for NIR-VIS heterogeneous face recognition. For deepfake detection, Hu et al. [37] identify forgery-related regions through feature disentanglement and train the forgery

detector using these regions across different scales. Liang et al. [38] separate artifact features from content information to reduce the interference of content information to forgery detection. Yu et al. [39] design a framework for face forgery detection that separates forgery-relevant features from source-relevant features progressively from image-level to feature-level through feature disentangling and multi-view learning. Yan et al. [40] use a multi-task learning strategy and a conditional decoder to separate common forgery features relevant to deepfake detection from those that are either irrelevant or method-specific.

In this paper, we present an information decomposition framework that achieves disentanglement via a complementary attention mechanism, unlike those in [37], [38] that realize information disentanglement via feature encoding and decoding with three elaborately designed reconstruction losses (i.e., self-reconstruction, cross-reconstruction, and feature reconstruction). In addition, we introduce a deep decorrelation module to encourage the separated forgery-relevant features used for deepfake detection to be independent of other features, which are ignored in some works, such as [39], thereby enhancing the model's robustness and generalization ability.

III. OUR METHOD

The pipeline of our proposed method is shown in Fig. 2. Specifically, for an input image X , we use a CNN-based feature extractor G parameterized by θ to extract its representative features, which can be represented as $I_X := G(\theta; X)$. Then we decompose these features into three parts: the deepfake-related representation, I_{df} , which is the main information used for detecting deepfakes; the domain-related representation, I_{dom} , which can be used to track the associated forgery technique or method that generates it; and the remainder representation. The information decorrelation module optimizes the decoupled deepfake information I_{df} to be independent of the other representations, thereby enhancing the decomposition performance. The robust deepfake classification module is designed to learn a model that can effectively classify deepfakes in the presence of imbalanced datasets, thus encouraging its generalization ability. The domain classification module is designed to identify the domain to which I_{dom} belongs. Before describing these modules, we introduce the commonly used notation.

A. Notation

Our method takes images from existing deepfake datasets as input data. Let $\mathcal{S} = \{(X_i, Y_i, D_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ be a training dataset that contains images $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and their corresponding labels $Y_i \in \{0, 1\}$, where 0 denotes real and 1 indicates fake. $D_i := [D_i^0, D_i^1, \dots, D_i^k]^\top$ represents the domain label of X_i , where the domain size of fake data $k \geq 1$ and $D_i^j \in \{0, 1\}, \forall j \in \{0, 1, \dots, k\}$. In particular, $D_i^j = 1$ indicates that X_i is from the j -th domain. Specifically, X_i is from the real data domain if $j = 0$ and from the fake data domain j (i.e., forged by the method j) if $j > 0$. For example, the fake images in the FF++ dataset [2] are generated by four face manipulation methods: Deepfakes [20], Face2Face [1],

FaceSwap [20], and NeuralTextures [21]. Therefore, $k = 4$. In this work, we assume that each X_i comes from only one domain.

B. Information Decomposition Module

Motivated by [41], the information decomposition module consists of a deepfake attention network A_{df} parameterized by ψ (denoted as $A_{df}(\psi; \cdot)$) and a domain attention network A_{dom} parameterized by φ (denoted as $A_{dom}(\varphi; \cdot)$), as shown in Fig. 2. Taking the face information I_X embedded with entangled information as input, the deepfake attention network focuses on deepfake-relevant information, thereby it decomposes I_X into two complementary components: the deepfake-relevant information I_{df} and the deepfake-irrelevant information I_{os} . This process can be formulated as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} M_{df} &= A_{df}(\psi; I_X), \\ I_{df} &= M_{df} \otimes I_X, \\ I_{os} &= (1 - M_{df}) \otimes I_X, \end{aligned}$$

where $M_{df} \in [0, 1]^{c \times h \times w}$ is the deepfake-relevant information attention map; \otimes represents the Hadamard product.

After receiving the deepfake-irrelevant information I_{os} , the domain attention network A_{dom} focuses on extracting and modeling explicitly forgery technique information. It decomposes the deepfake-irrelevant information I_{os} into the forgery technique-related information I_{dom} and others as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} M_{dom} &= A_{dom}(\varphi; I_{os}), \\ I_{dom} &= M_{dom} \otimes I_{os}, \end{aligned}$$

where $M_{dom} \in [0, 1]^{c \times h \times w}$ is the forgery technique-related information attention map.

The deepfake attention network A_{df} and the domain attention network A_{dom} are designed to simultaneously learn attention maps from the spatial and channel dimensions. They share the same network architecture as shown in Fig. 3, where each convolution (Conv) Layer is followed by a PReLU activation function. S-ADP is implemented by a channel-wise spatial convolution layer followed by a sum pooling layer, while C-ADP is implemented with a 1×1 convolution layer. Both A_{df} and A_{dom} are optimized to capture the significant deepfake-relevant and domain-relevant information within the input data, respectively.

C. Decorrelation Learning Module

The disentangled components (deepfake and non-deepfake information) are expected to be distributed in two distinct parts. To this end, orthogonal constraints are generally employed on these disentangled components [42], [43], [35]. However, linear dependence/independence can hardly characterize the complex relationships between deepfake information and non-deepfake information in a high-dimensional and nonlinear space. In contrast, mutual information [44] (MI) is capable of capturing arbitrary dependencies between any two variables.

With this motivation, we apply mutual information to evaluate dependencies between deepfake information I_{df} and non-deepfake information I_{os} , formulated as follows:

$$\text{MI}(I_{df}; I_{os}) = \mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}(P(I_{df}, I_{os}) || P(I_{df}) \otimes P(I_{os})), \quad (1)$$

where $P(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the joint probability distribution, $P(\cdot)$ denotes the marginal probability distribution, and \mathbb{D}_{KL} is the Kullback–Leibler divergence [45].

Since the probability densities $P(I_{df}, I_{os})$ and $P(I_{df}) \otimes P(I_{os})$ are unknown, it is difficult to directly minimize $\text{MI}(I_{df}; I_{os})$. Belghazi et al. [46] pioneer a Mutual Information Neural Estimation (MINE) to the lower bound of MI's Donsker-Varadhan representation. Then [47] advises a Jensen-Shannon MI estimator (based on the Jensen-Shannon divergence [48]), which was shown to be more stable and provided better results.

Inspired by [47], we construct a mutual information estimation network T with parameterizes ϕ to approximate $\text{MI}(I_{df}; I_{os})$ as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MI}(I_{df}; I_{os}) &\geq \hat{I}^{JSD}(I_{df}; I_{os}) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{x \sim P(I_{df}, I_{os})} [\log \sigma(T(\phi; x))] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_{x \sim P(I_{df}) \otimes P(I_{os})} [\log (1 - \sigma(T(\phi; x)))], \end{aligned}$$

where σ is the sigmoid function; $T(\phi; \cdot) : \mathbb{R}^{d_x} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ acts as the discriminator function in GANs (d_x is the dimension of I_{df} and I_{os}), it aims to estimate and maximize the lower bound of $\text{MI}(I_{df}; I_{os})$, while the target of the previously designed information decomposition module (acting as the generator function in GANs) is to minimize the MI value between I_{df} and I_{os} to achieve a sufficient separation. Specifically, we have the following learning objectives:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{dec} &= \min_{\theta, \psi} \max_{\phi} (\mathbb{E}_{x \sim P(I_{df}, I_{os})} [\log \sigma(T(\phi; x))] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_{x \sim P(I_{df}) \otimes P(I_{os})} [\log (1 - \sigma(T(\phi; x)))]). \end{aligned}$$

To implement the aforementioned min-max game using standard back-propagation (BP) training, we add a Gradient Reversal Layer (GRL) [49] before the network T (shown in Fig. 2). In the back-propagation procedure, GRL transmits the gradient by multiplying a negative scalar, $-\beta$, from the subsequent layer to the preceding layer, where we set $\beta \in (0, 1)$ in practice. This trick is also used in several existing works such as [46], [47]. The network T consists of three convolution layers (a ReLU activation follows each layer) and a fully connected layer (FC).

D. Robust Deepfake Classification Module

After we obtain deepfake-related information I_{df} , we need to consider how to use it to learn a deepfake detection model. In the literature, the Binary Cross-entropy (BCE) loss is widely used to train a deepfake detection model. However, it is well-known that the BCE loss is not robust to the imbalance data, especially for deepfake datasets. Using BCE loss to train models on a certain deepfake dataset may cause significant performance degradation when testing on another deepfake dataset [50].




Fig. 3. Architecture of the deepfake (domain) attention network. This network takes the face information I_X (deepfake-irrelevant information I_{os}) as input, and then learns to produce an attention map that highlights the significance (potential) of the input data being correlated with deepfake-relevant (domain-relevant) information. “cat” means concatenating all input data along the channel dimension; \otimes represents the Hadamard product; “c-” represents cross-channel; “s-” represents cross-spatial; “GAP”, “GMP”, and “ADP” are global average pooling, global max pooling, and adaptive pooling, respectively.

Algorithm 1: Deep Information Decompositio

Input: A training dataset \mathcal{S} of size n , β ,
 $\max_iterations$, num_batch , η_θ , η_ψ , η_φ , η_ϕ , η_ω ,
and $\eta_{\bar{\omega}}$

Output: A robust Deepfake detector with parameters
 θ^* , ψ^* , and ω^*

- 1 **Initialization:** $\theta_0, \psi_0, \varphi_0, \phi_0, \omega_0, \bar{\omega}_0, l = 0$
 - 2 **for** $e = 1$ **to** $\max_iterations$ **do**
 - 3 **for** $b = 1$ **to** num_batch **do**
 - 4 Sample a mini-batch \mathcal{S}_b from \mathcal{S}
 - 5 Update parameters with (5).
 - 6 $l \leftarrow l + 1$
 - 7 **end**
 - 8 **end**
 - 9 **return** $\theta^* \leftarrow \theta_l, \psi^* \leftarrow \psi_l, \omega^* \leftarrow \omega_l$
-

With this observation, we propose a robust deepfake detection loss to enhance the generalization ability of the trained model using deepfake-related information I_{df} instead of complete information I_X . Our loss is inspired by the AUC metric since it is a robust measure to evaluate the classification capability of a model, especially when facing imbalanced data. Specifically, it estimates the size of the area under the receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve (AUC) [51], which is composed of False Positive Rates (FPRs) and True Positive Rates (TPRs). However, the AUC metric cannot be directly used as a loss function since it is challenging to compute during each training iteration. Inspired by [50], we use the normalized WMW statistic [52], equivalent to AUC, to design our loss function.

Specifically, we define a set of indices of fake instances and real instances as $\mathcal{F} = \{i | Y_i = 1\}$ and $\mathcal{R} = \{i | Y_i = 0\}$, respectively. We add a multilayer perceptron (MLP) $C : \mathbb{R}^{d_x} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (d_x is the dimension of I_{df}) parameterized by ω to distinguish fake and real instances, where the input is I_{df} and the output is a real value. Network C predicts input I_{df} to be fake with probability $\sigma(C(\omega; I_{df}))$. Without loss of generality, $C(\omega; I_{df})$ induces the prediction rule such that the predicted

label of I_{df} can be $\mathbb{I}[\sigma(C(\omega; I_{df})) \geq 0.5]$, where $\mathbb{I}[\cdot]$ is an indicator function with $\mathbb{I}[a] = 1$ if a is true and 0 otherwise. For simplicity, we assume $C(\omega; I_{df}^{X_i}) \neq C(\omega; I_{df}^{X_j})$ for any $X_i \neq X_j$ (ties can be broken in any consistent way), where $I_{df}^{X_i}$ represents the deepfake information of the sample X_i . Then the normalized WMW can be formulated as follows,

$$\text{WMW} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{F}||\mathcal{R}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}} \mathbb{I}[C(\omega; I_{df}^{X_i}) > C(\omega; I_{df}^{X_j})],$$

where $|\mathcal{F}|$ and $|\mathcal{R}|$ are the cardinality of \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{R} , respectively. However, WMW is non-differentiable due to the indicator function, which is the main obstacle to using it as a loss. Therefore, we use its alternative version [52]:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{AUC}} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{F}||\mathcal{R}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}} E(C(\omega; I_{df}^{X_i}), C(\omega; I_{df}^{X_j})),$$

with

$$E(C(\omega; I_{df}^{X_i}), C(\omega; I_{df}^{X_j})) := \begin{cases} -(C(\omega; I_{df}^{X_i}) - C(\omega; I_{df}^{X_j}) - \gamma)^p, & C(\omega; I_{df}^{X_i}) - C(\omega; I_{df}^{X_j}) < \gamma, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where $0 < \gamma \leq 1$ and $p > 1$ are two hyperparameters. We combine this AUC loss and the conventional BCE loss $\mathcal{L}_{\text{BCE}} := -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [Y_i \cdot \log(\sigma(C(\omega; I_{df}^{X_i}))) + (1 - Y_i) \cdot \log(1 - \sigma(C(\omega; I_{df}^{X_i})))]$ to construct a learning objective for robust deepfake classification:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{cls}} = \alpha \mathcal{L}_{\text{BCE}} + (1 - \alpha) \mathcal{L}_{\text{AUC}} \quad (3)$$

where α is a hyperparameter designed to balance the weights of the BCE loss and the AUC loss.

E. Domain Classification Module

A domain classification module is also designed using another MLP $\bar{C} : \mathbb{R}^{d_{I_X}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{k+1}$ parameterized by $\bar{\omega}$ to map the forgery method related-domain information I_{dom} into a $(k+1)$ -dimensional domain vector. Specifically, we have $\bar{C}(\bar{\omega}; I_{dom}) = [\bar{C}^0(\bar{\omega}; I_{dom}), \bar{C}^1(\bar{\omega}; I_{dom}), \dots, \bar{C}^k(\bar{\omega}; I_{dom})]^\top$, where $\bar{C}^j(\bar{\omega}; I_{dom})$ is the j -th domain prediction. We then

apply the softmax function to compute the probability of each domain that I_{dom} belongs to and combine its domain label to construct a domain classification loss based on the cross-entropy (CE) loss. Therefore, we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{dom} = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=0}^k D_i^j \log(S[\bar{C}^j(\bar{w}; I_{dom}^{X_i})])$$

where $S[\bar{C}^j(\bar{w}; I_{dom}^{X_i})] \in (0, 1)$ is the j -th domain predicted probability for the domain information of I_{X_i} after using softmax operator $S[\cdot]$.

Overall Loss. To sum up, the proposed framework is optimized with the following final loss function:

$$\mathcal{L} = \lambda_{dec} \mathcal{L}_{dec} + \lambda_{cls} \mathcal{L}_{cls} + \lambda_{dom} \mathcal{L}_{dom} \quad (4)$$

where λ_{dec} , λ_{cls} , and λ_{dom} are hyperparameters that can balance these loss terms. In practice, the optimization problem in (4) can be solved with an iterative stochastic gradient descent and ascent approach [53]. Specifically, we first initialize the model parameters θ , ψ , φ , ϕ , ω , and \bar{w} . Then we alternate uniformly at random a mini-batch \mathcal{S}_b of training samples from the training set \mathcal{S} and do the following steps on \mathcal{S}_b for each iteration:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \theta_{l+1} \\ \psi_{l+1} \\ \varphi_{l+1} \\ \phi_{l+1} \\ \omega_{l+1} \\ \bar{w}_{l+1} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \theta_l \\ \psi_l \\ \varphi_l \\ \phi_l \\ \omega_l \\ \bar{w}_l \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \eta_\theta \partial_\theta \mathcal{L} |_{\theta=\theta_l} \\ \eta_\psi \partial_\psi \mathcal{L} |_{\psi=\psi_l} \\ \eta_\varphi \partial_\varphi \mathcal{L} |_{\varphi=\varphi_l} \\ -\eta_\phi \beta \partial_\phi \mathcal{L} |_{\phi=\phi_l} \\ \eta_\omega \partial_\omega \mathcal{L} |_{\omega=\omega_l} \\ \eta_{\bar{w}} \partial_{\bar{w}} \mathcal{L} |_{\bar{w}=\bar{w}_l} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5)$$

where \mathcal{L} is defined on \mathcal{S}_b , η_θ , η_ψ , η_φ , η_ϕ , η_ω , and $\eta_{\bar{w}}$ are learning rates, and $\partial_\theta \mathcal{L}$, $\partial_\psi \mathcal{L}$, $\partial_\varphi \mathcal{L}$, $\partial_\phi \mathcal{L}$, $\partial_\omega \mathcal{L}$, and $\partial_{\bar{w}} \mathcal{L}$ are the (sub)gradient of \mathcal{L} with respect to θ , ψ , φ , ϕ , ω , and \bar{w} . In the testing phase, we only use the feature extractor G , attention module A_{df} , and the deepfake classification module C . The pseudocode is shown in Algorithm 1.

IV. EXPERIMENTS

This section evaluates the effectiveness of the proposed framework (i.e., DID) in terms of cross-dataset deepfake detection performance. In the following discussion, we will exchange the “method” or “framework” used for DID.

A. Experimental Settings

Datasets. For fair comparisons with the state-of-the-art methods, the two most popular FF++ [2] and Celeb-DF [14] datasets are adopted in our experiments. In particular, the high-quality (HQ, with a constant compression rate factor of 23) version of FF++ is used in all of our experiments, which contains one real video subset and four fake video subsets, generated using FaceSwap, DeepFakes, Face2Face, and Neural Textures techniques, respectively. Each subset contains 1000 videos, in which 720/140/140 videos are used for training/validation/testing, respectively [2]. The Celeb-DF [14] dataset contains real and fake videos according to 59 celebrities. Following the official protocols in [14], we use the latest version of Celeb-DF named Celeb-DF V2, which contains 590

TABLE I
PERFORMANCE COMPARISON WITH THE BASELINES IN BOTH INTRA-DATASET AND CROSS-DATASET SCENARIOS. THE RESULTS OF MULTI-TASK AND TWO BRANCH ARE CITED FROM [12], AND THE RESULTS OF MDD ARE CITED FROM [30].

Methods	Intra-dataset AUC \uparrow	Cross-dataset AUC \uparrow
Multi-task [54]	0.763	0.543
Two Branch [55]	0.931	0.734
MDD [25]	0.998	0.674
RL [12]	0.994	0.669
F ³ -Net [10]	0.981	0.651
CFFs [30]	0.976	0.742
NoiseDF [56]	0.940	0.759
FDML [39]	0.996	0.731
DID (Ours)	0.970	0.779

real celebrity (Celeb-real) videos, 300 real videos downloaded from YouTube (YouTube-real) and 5639 synthesized celebrity (Celeb-synthesis) videos based on Celeb-real.

Compared Methods and Evaluation Metrics. To evaluate the effectiveness of our framework, we compare it with the following state-of-the-art (SOTA) frame-level baseline methods: F³-Net [10], CFFs [30], RL [12], Multi-task [54], Two Branch [55], MDD [25], and NoiseDF [56]. The results of Multi-task and Two Branch are cited from [12], and the results of MDD are cited from [30]. We consider two evaluation metrics, the area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC) and the equal error rate (EER), which are widely adopted in previous works.

Implementation Details. In our experiments, EfficientNet v2-L [16] pre-trained on the ImageNet dataset is adopted as the backbone for feature extraction. Face images in all frames are aligned to 224×224 using the MTCNN [57] method. Then they are converted into the grayscale from the RGB before sending to the proposed framework. The framework is trained with the Adam optimizer with a weight decay of $5e^{-4}$ and a learning rate of $1e^{-5}$. We set the learning rate η_ψ , η_φ , η_ϕ , η_ω , and $\eta_{\bar{w}}$ in (5) to be 10 times that of η_θ ($\eta_\theta = 1e^{-5}$). The batch size is 15 and the number of iterations in each epoch is 6000. We set γ and p in (2) to 0.15 and 2, respectively. We use $\alpha = 0.5$ in (3). The hyperparameters λ_{cls} , λ_{dom} , and λ_{dec} in (4) are set to 1, 1, and 0.01, respectively. The hyperparameter β in (5) is adapted to increase from 0 to 1 in the training procedure as $\beta = 2.0/(1.0 + e^{-5p}) - 1.0$, where p is the ratio of the current training epochs to the maximum number of training epochs. All experiments are conducted on two NVIDIA RTX 3080 GPUs, with Pytorch 1.10 and Python 3.6.

B. Intra-dataset Evaluation

We evaluate the detection performance of our proposed method DID in the intra-dataset situation, where the training and test sets are from the FF++ dataset and are disjoint. Table I shows the intra-dataset evaluation results and comparison with the baselines. We can see that our method achieves 0.970 on AUC, which outperforms the Multi-task [54], Two Branch [55], and NoiseDF [56] methods, and is competitive with the best performance (0.998 on AUC score achieved by MDD [25]).

TABLE II

CROSS-DATASET DEEFAKE DETECTION PERFORMANCE. ALL MODELS ARE TRAINED ON THE SAME SUBSET OF THE DFFD DATASET AND TESTED ON THE CELEB-DF v2 DATASET.

Models	AUC \uparrow	EER \downarrow
ResNet50 + BCE	0.620	0.411
ResNet50 + DID	0.727	0.332
EfficientNet-v2-L + BCE	0.716	0.344
EfficientNet-v2-L + DID	0.763	0.302

TABLE III

ABLATION STUDY BY REMOVING THE DOMAIN ATTENTION MODULE A_{dom} ("w/o A_{dom} ") OR THE DECORRELATION LEARNING MODULE T ("w/o T ") FROM THE DID FRAMEWORK.

Models	Modules			AUC \uparrow	EER \downarrow
	A_{df}	A_{dom}	T		
w/o A_{dom}	\checkmark	\times	\checkmark	0.763	0.302
w/o T	\checkmark	\checkmark	\times	0.759	0.305
DID	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	0.779	0.286

C. Cross-dataset Evaluation

The cross-dataset generalization performance of the proposed method and comparison with the baselines are also shown in Table I. All models are first trained on the training set of the FF++ dataset and then tested on the test set of Celeb-DF v2 (unseen during training). From the table, it is evident that the performance of all methods significantly degrades in the challenging cross-dataset scenario compared to the intra-dataset scenario. For example, the performance of MDD [25] declines from 0.998 to 0.674. In comparison, our DID method exhibits excellent generalization capability, achieving superior performance in this cross-dataset scenario. It exceeds the CFFs [30] and NoiseDF [56] methods by a margin of 4.99% (0.779 vs. 0.742) and 2.635% (0.779 vs. 0.759) respectively in terms of AUC. These experimental results validate the effectiveness and superiority of our framework.

Effect on Different Training Dataset To further demonstrate the applicability of our methods, we train the DID framework on the DFFD dataset [58] and evaluate the detection performance on the Celeb-DF dataset. DFFD is a deepfake dataset composing real images and the corresponding deepfakes created with FaceSwap [20], Deepfake, Face2Face [1], FaceAPP [59], StarGAN [60], PGGAN [61] (two versions), and StyleGAN [4] methods, and deepfake videos generated by Deep Face Lab [62]. The experiments are conducted on a subset of DFFD (excluding deepfake videos that are inaccessible) following the protocols of [58], with different feature extraction backbones. Table II shows the experimental results, from which we can see that the proposed DID achieves great performance improvement on all backbones fine-tuned with the BCE loss. Specifically, the improvement relative to the ResNet50 backbone (fine-tuned with the BCE loss) is 17.26% (0.727 vs. 0.620) on AUC and 19.22% (0.763 vs. 0.716) on EER. Meanwhile, the improvement relative to the EfficientNet-v2-L backbone is 6.56% (0.763 vs. 0.716) on AUC and 12.21% (0.302 vs. 0.344) on EER. These results demonstrate the applicability of our methods on different datasets and different feature extraction backbones in cross-dataset deepfake detection.




Fig. 4. Effect of different α values (used as the balance factor between BCE and AUC loss) on the AUC score. (a) is AUC with different α values, (b) is ROC with different α values.




Fig. 5. Confusion matrix visualization of domain feature classification. Each deepfake technique is recognized by the domain classification module with high accuracy (the value on the diagonal).

D. Ablation Study

The Effect of AUC Loss. The impact of hyperparameter α in the AUC loss, as shown in (3), is investigated. Specifically, we train our model with different $\alpha \in \{0.0, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0\}$ values and show the AUC performance in Fig. 4. The model trained with only the AUC loss ($\alpha=0.0$) as the deepfake classification loss function gets the lowest AUC of 0.380, and the model trained with only the BCE deepfake classification loss ($\alpha=1.0$) obtains an AUC of 0.763. However, the model trained with an equal weight of the AUC loss and the BCE loss ($\alpha=0.5$) shows the best AUC score of 0.779, which means that the AUC loss can help improve the generalization ability of the model.

The Effect of A_{dom} and T Modules. To explore the necessity of the domain attention module A_{dom} and the decorrelation learning module T , we train the proposed DID framework with either one of the two modules removed. The detection results of these models are shown in Table III. We can see from the table that when the domain attention module A_{dom} is removed from DID ("w/o A_{dom} " in Table III), the AUC score declines by 2.05% (from 0.779 to 0.763) and EER increases by 5.59% (from 0.286 to 0.302) relative to the complete DID version. In addition, the model without the decorrelation learning module T ("w/o T " in Table III) achieves 0.759 on AUC and 0.305 on EER, the performance degradation (relative to DID) is




Fig. 6. Visualization of the real/fake attention map M_{df} and the domain (forgery technique) attention map M_{dom} on the FF++ and Celeb-DF v2 datasets. We can see that M_{dom} captures the forgery technique-related information (e.g., the forged region), while M_{df} focuses on the information invariant to forgery techniques.




Fig. 7. From left to right are visualizations of deepfake features of the EfficientNet-v2-L backbone network and our DID framework's deepfake features and domain features, respectively.

greater than the model w/o A_{dom} . Specifically, the AUC score drops by 2.57%, and EER increases by 6.64%. These results suggest the indispensability of the DID framework's A_{dom} and T modules.

Analysis of Domain Classification Module. Fig. 5 displays the confusion matrix of the domain feature classification. We can see that the domain classification module distinguishes all forgery methods with very high accuracy. Specifically, the average accuracy is 0.91, and the highest accuracy is 0.99 (classification of the FaceSwap method). These results indicate that domain information is successfully separated from the deepfake features and captured by the domain classification module, which aligns with our decomposition objective and proves to be advantageous for deepfake detection.

E. Visualization

Visualization of The Saliency Map. To more intuitively demonstrate the effectiveness of our method, we visualize the Grad-CAM of deepfake attention M_{df} and domain (forgery technique) attention M_{dom} in Fig. 6. We can see from the figure that the activation regions of M_{df} and M_{dom} are different. M_{dom} focuses on areas such as the nose, mouth, and eyes. In contrast, M_{df} focuses on the information invariant to forgery techniques. The visualization results demonstrate the

effectiveness of our method: the decorrelation learning module promotes the disentangled components to contain different information and be irrelevant to each other.

Visualization of Deepfake and Domain Features. Fig. 7a and Fig. 7b depict the T-SNE visualization of the deepfake feature vectors learned by the backbone network EfficientNet-v2-L and our DID framework, respectively. The red and blue dots in the two figures represent the deepfake features of real and fake facial images, respectively. As illustrated in the figures, the real and fake features learned by the backbone network are mixed in the space, whereas those learned by our DID framework are well separated in the feature space. This observation suggests the high real/fake discrimination performance of DID's deepfake features.

Fig. 7c further presents a visualization of the domain features learned by our DID framework. We can see from the figure that the domain features learned from facial images created with different forgery techniques are well separated in the embedding space, with domain features from the same forgery technique being clustered together while those from other forgery techniques are far apart. These results demonstrate that the deepfake technique-related information is well captured and separated in our DID framework.

V. CONCLUSION

We propose a deep information decomposition (DID) framework in this paper. It decomposes the deepfake facial information into deepfake-related and unrelated information, and further optimizes these two kinds of information to ensure they are sufficiently separated. Only deepfake-related information is used for real/fake discrimination. This approach makes the detection model robust to irrelevant changes and generalizable to unseen forgery methods. Extensive experiments and visualizations demonstrate the effectiveness and superiority of the DID framework on cross-dataset deepfake detection tasks.

One limitation of our proposed DID framework is that all hyperparameters included in the loss function need to be manually selected through experiments. Another limitation is that our domain classification module needs to use domain information from the original deepfake dataset. However, obtaining such information from real-world datasets is often not easy.

For future work, our objective is to optimize these hyperparameters automatically during training. We also plan to design an auxiliary module to replace the current domain classification module without using the dataset's domain information.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Thies, M. Zollhofer, M. Stamminger, C. Theobalt, and M. Nießner, "Face2face: Real-time face capture and reenactment of rgb videos," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2016, pp. 2387–2395. **1, 2, 3, 7**
- [2] A. Rossler, D. Cozzolino, L. Verdoliva, C. Riess, J. Thies, and M. Nießner, "Faceforensics++: Learning to detect manipulated facial images," in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2019, pp. 1–11. **1, 2, 3, 6**
- [3] A. Pumarola, A. Agudo, A. Martinez, A. Sanfeliu, and F. Moreno-Noguer, "Ganimation: Anatomically-aware facial animation from a single image," in *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2018. **1**
- [4] T. Karras, S. Laine, and T. Aila, "A style-based generator architecture for generative adversarial networks," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2019, pp. 4401–4410. **1, 7**
- [5] L. Li, J. Bao, T. Zhang, H. Yang, D. Chen, F. Wen, and B. Guo, "Face x-ray for more general face forgery detection," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2020, pp. 5001–5010. **1**
- [6] X. Yang, Y. Li, and S. Lyu, "Exposing deep fakes using inconsistent head poses," in *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, 2019, pp. 8261–8265. **1**
- [7] Y. Li and S. Lyu, "Exposing deepfake videos by detecting face warping artifacts," *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops*, 2019. **1**
- [8] Y. Li, M.-C. Chang, and S. Lyu, "In icu oculi: Exposing ai created fake videos by detecting eye blinking," in *IEEE International Workshop on Information Forensics and Security*, 2018, pp. 1–7. **1**
- [9] J. Frank, T. Eisenhofer, L. Schönherr, A. Fischer, D. Kolossa, and T. Holz, "Leveraging frequency analysis for deep fake image recognition," in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2020, pp. 3247–3258. **1**
- [10] Y. Qian, G. Yin, L. Sheng, Z. Chen, and J. Shao, "Thinking in frequency: Face forgery detection by mining frequency-aware clues," in *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2020, pp. 86–103. **1, 6**
- [11] J. Li, H. Xie, J. Li, Z. Wang, and Y. Zhang, "Frequency-aware discriminative feature learning supervised by single-center loss for face forgery detection," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2021, pp. 6458–6467. **1**
- [12] A. V. Nadimpalli and A. Rattani, "On improving cross-dataset generalization of deepfake detectors," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022, pp. 91–99. **1, 3, 6**
- [13] D.-K. Kim and K.-S. Kim, "Generalized facial manipulation detection with edge region feature extraction," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, 2022, pp. 2828–2838. **1, 3**
- [14] Y. Li, X. Yang, P. Sun, H. Qi, and S. Lyu, "Celeb-df: A large-scale challenging dataset for deepfake forensics," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2020, pp. 3207–3216. **1, 6**
- [15] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, "Deep residual learning for image recognition," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2016, pp. 770–778. **1**
- [16] M. Tan and Q. Le, "Efficientnetv2: Smaller models and faster training," in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2021, pp. 10096–10106. **1, 6**
- [17] T. T. Nguyen, Q. V. H. Nguyen, D. T. Nguyen, D. T. Nguyen, T. Huynh-The, S. Nahavandi, T. T. Nguyen, Q.-V. Pham, and C. M. Nguyen, "Deep learning for deepfakes creation and detection: A survey," *Computer Vision and Image Understanding*, vol. 223, p. 103525, 2022. **2**
- [18] T. Karras, S. Laine, and T. Aila, "A style-based generator architecture for generative adversarial networks," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2019, pp. 4401–4410. **2, 3**
- [19] T. Zhang, "Deepfake generation and detection, a survey," *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, vol. 81, no. 5, pp. 6259–6276, 2022. **2**
- [20] <https://www.github.com/deepfakes/faceswap>. **2, 3, 4, 7**
- [21] J. Thies, M. Zollhofer, and M. Nießner, "Deferred neural rendering: Image synthesis using neural textures," *ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG)*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 1–12, 2019. **2, 4**
- [22] J. Bao, D. Chen, F. Wen, H. Li, and G. Hua, "Towards open-set identity preserving face synthesis," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2018, pp. 6713–6722. **2**
- [23] Z. Geng, C. Cao, and S. Tulyakov, "3d guided fine-grained face manipulation," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2019, pp. 9821–9830. **3**
- [24] J. C. Neves, R. Tolosana, R. Vera-Rodriguez, V. Lopes, H. Proença, and J. Fierrez, "Ganprintr: Improved fakes and evaluation of the state of the art in face manipulation detection," *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, vol. 14, no. 5, pp. 1038–1048, 2020. **3**
- [25] H. Zhao, W. Zhou, D. Chen, T. Wei, W. Zhang, and N. Yu, "Multi-attentional deepfake detection," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2021, pp. 2185–2194. **3, 6, 7**
- [26] X. Dong, J. Bao, D. Chen, T. Zhang, W. Zhang, N. Yu, D. Chen, F. Wen, and B. Guo, "Protecting celebrities from deepfake with identity consistency transformer," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022, pp. 9468–9478. **3**
- [27] K. Shiohara and T. Yamasaki, "Detecting deepfakes with self-blended images," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022, pp. 18720–18729. **3**
- [28] S. Dong, J. Wang, J. Liang, H. Fan, and R. Ji, "Explaining deepfake detection by analysing image matching," in *European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2022, pp. 18–35. **3**
- [29] T. Zhao, X. Xu, M. Xu, H. Ding, Y. Xiong, and W. Xia, "Learning self-consistency for deepfake detection," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2021, pp. 15023–15033. **3**
- [30] P. Yu, J. Fei, Z. Xia, Z. Zhou, and J. Weng, "Improving generalization by commonality learning in face forgery detection," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 17, pp. 547–558, 2022. **3, 6, 7**
- [31] Y. Yu, R. Ni, S. Yang, Y. Zhao, and A. C. Kot, "Narrowing domain gaps with bridging samples for generalized face forgery detection," *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, 2023. **3**
- [32] Z. Yin, J. Wang, Y. Xiao, H. Zhao, T. Li, W. Zhou, A. Liu, and X. Liu, "Improving deepfake detection generalization by invariant risk minimization," *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, 2024. **3**
- [33] J. Huang, C. Du, X. Zhu, S. Ma, S. Nepal, and C. Xu, "Anti-compression contrastive facial forgery detection," *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, 2023. **3**
- [34] L. Tran, X. Yin, and X. Liu, "Disentangled representation learning gan for pose-invariant face recognition," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2017, pp. 1415–1424. **3**
- [35] H. Wang, D. Gong, Z. Li, and W. Liu, "Decorrelated adversarial learning for age-invariant face recognition," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2019, pp. 3527–3536. **3, 4**

- [36] X. Wu, H. Huang, V. M. Patel, R. He, and Z. Sun, "Disentangled variational representation for heterogeneous face recognition," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 33, no. 01, 2019, pp. 9005–9012. [3](#)
- [37] J. Hu, S. Wang, and X. Li, "Improving the generalization ability of deepfake detection via disentangled representation learning," in *IEEE International Conference on Image Processing*, 2021, pp. 3577–3581. [3](#)
- [38] J. Liang, H. Shi, and W. Deng, "Exploring disentangled content information for face forgery detection," in *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2022, pp. 128–145. [3](#)
- [39] M. Yu, H. Li, J. Yang, X. Li, S. Li, and J. Zhang, "Fdml: Feature disentangling and multi-view learning for face forgery detection," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 572, p. 127192, 2024. [3](#), [6](#)
- [40] Z. Yan, Y. Zhang, Y. Fan, and B. Wu, "Ucf: Uncovering common features for generalizable deepfake detection," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023, pp. 22 412–22 423. [3](#)
- [41] S. Yang, X. Yang, Y. Lin, P. Cheng, Y. Zhang, and J. Zhang, "Heterogeneous face recognition with attention-guided feature disentangling," in *Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, 2021, pp. 4137–4145. [4](#)
- [42] R. He, X. Wu, Z. Sun, and T. Tan, "Learning invariant deep representation for nir-vis face recognition," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 31, no. 1, 2017. [4](#)
- [43] —, "Wasserstein cnn: Learning invariant features for nir-vis face recognition," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 41, no. 7, pp. 1761–1773, 2018. [4](#)
- [44] J. B. Kinney and G. S. Atwal, "Equitability, mutual information, and the maximal information coefficient," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 111, no. 9, pp. 3354–3359, 2014. [4](#)
- [45] J. M. Joyce, "Kullback-leibler divergence," in *International Encyclopedia of Statistical Science*, 2011, pp. 720–722. [4](#)
- [46] M. I. Belghazi, A. Baratin, S. Rajeshwar, S. Ozair, Y. Bengio, A. Courville, and D. Hjelm, "Mutual information neural estimation," in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2018, pp. 531–540. [4](#)
- [47] R. D. Hjelm, A. Fedorov, S. Lavoie-Marchildon, K. Grewal, P. Bachman, A. Trischler, and Y. Bengio, "Learning deep representations by mutual information estimation and maximization," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019. [4](#)
- [48] M. Menéndez, J. Pardo, L. Pardo, and M. Pardo, "The jensen-shannon divergence," *Journal of the Franklin Institute*, vol. 334, no. 2, pp. 307–318, 1997. [4](#)
- [49] Y. Ganin and V. Lempitsky, "Unsupervised domain adaptation by backpropagation," in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2015, pp. 1180–1189. [4](#)
- [50] W. Pu, J. Hu, X. Wang, Y. Li, S. Hu, B. Zhu, R. Song, Q. Song, X. Wu, and S. Lyu, "Learning a deep dual-level network for robust deepfake detection," *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 130, p. 108832, 2022. [4](#), [5](#)
- [51] H. He and E. A. Garcia, "Learning from imbalanced data," *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, vol. 21, no. 9, pp. 1263–1284, 2009. [5](#)
- [52] L. Yan, R. H. Dodier, M. Mozer, and R. H. Wolniewicz, "Optimizing classifier performance via an approximation to the wilcoxon-mann-whitney statistic," in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2003, pp. 848–855. [5](#)
- [53] A. Beznosikov, E. Gorbunov, H. Berard, and N. Loizou, "Stochastic gradient descent-ascent: Unified theory and new efficient methods," *Annual Workshop on Optimization for Machine Learning*, 2022. [6](#)
- [54] H. H. Nguyen, F. Fang, J. Yamagishi, and I. Echizen, "Multi-task learning for detecting and segmenting manipulated facial images and videos," in *IEEE International Conference on Biometrics Theory, Applications and Systems*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1–8. [6](#)
- [55] I. Masi, A. Killekar, R. M. Mascarenhas, S. P. Gurudatt, and W. AbdAlmageed, "Two-branch recurrent network for isolating deepfakes in videos," in *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2020, pp. 667–684. [6](#)
- [56] T. Wang and K. P. Chow, "Noise based deepfake detection via multi-head relative-interaction," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 37, no. 12, 2023, pp. 14 548–14 556. [6](#), [7](#)
- [57] K. Zhang, Z. Zhang, Z. Li, and Y. Qiao, "Joint face detection and alignment using multitask cascaded convolutional networks," *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 23, no. 10, pp. 1499–1503, 2016. [6](#)
- [58] H. Dang, F. Liu, J. Stehouwer, X. Liu, and A. K. Jain, "On the detection of digital face manipulation," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2020, pp. 5781–5790. [7](#)
- [59] <https://faceapp.com/app>. [7](#)
- [60] Y. Choi, M. Choi, M. Kim, J.-W. Ha, S. Kim, and J. Choo, "Stargan: Unified generative adversarial networks for multi-domain image-to-image translation," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2018, pp. 8789–8797. [7](#)
- [61] T. Karras, T. Aila, S. Laine, and J. Lehtinen, "Progressive growing of gans for improved quality, stability, and variation," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018. [7](#)
- [62] <https://github.com/iperov/DeepFaceLab>. [7](#)

Shanmin Yang received her Ph.D. degree in Computer Science and Technology from Sichuan University, Chengdu, China, in 2021. She is currently with the School of Computer Science, Chengdu University of Information Technology, Chengdu, China. Her research interests include computer vision, machine learning, and intelligent meteorology.

Hui Guo received her Ph.D. degree in Computer Science from the University at Albany, the State University of New York in 2022. Her research interests include digital media forensics, computer vision, and deep learning.

Shu Hu received his Ph.D. degree in Computer Science and Engineering from the University at Buffalo (UBuffalo), SUNY, in 2022. He is currently an assistant professor in the Department of Computer and Information Technology and the Director of the Purdue Machine Learning and Media Forensics (M2) Lab at Purdue University, USA. His research interests include machine learning, media forensics, and computer vision.

Bin Zhu received his Ph.D. degree from the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, USA, in 1998. His research interests include DNN security and privacy, AI for security and other applications, privacy-preserving processing, Web and system security, and multimedia processing.

Ying Fu received her Ph.D. degree in Computer Science and Technology from Sichuan University, Chengdu, China, in 2014. She is currently with the School of Computer Science, Chengdu University of Information Technology, Chengdu, China. Her research interests include Image processing and computer vision.

Siwei Lyu received his Ph.D. in Computer Science from Dartmouth College in 2005. He is a SUNY Empire Innovation Professor at the Department of Computer Science and Engineering, the Director of the UB Media Forensic Lab (UB MDFL), and the founding Co-Director of the Center for Information Integrity (CII) at the University at Buffalo, State University of New York, USA. His research interests include digital media forensics, computer vision, and machine learning.

Xi Wu received his Ph.D. degree in information and communication engineering in 2012, jointly trained by Sichuan University, Chengdu, China, and Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN, USA. He is currently a Professor at the School of Computer Science, Chengdu University of Information Technology, Chengdu, China. His research interests include image analysis and computational imaging, high-performance and parallel distributed computing, intelligent meteorology, and numerical weather computing.

Xin Wang received his Ph.D. degree in Computer Science from the University at Albany, State University of New York (SUNY) in 2015. He is an Assistant Professor at Albany School of Public Health and a faculty member of the UAlbany AI Institute. His research interests include Artificial Intelligence, Medical Image Analysis, AI for Social Good, and Social Media Forensics.