

AV-Lip-Sync+: Leveraging AV-HuBERT to Exploit Multimodal Inconsistency for Video Deepfake Detection

Sahibzada Adil Shahzad, Ammarah Hashmi, Yan-Tsung Peng, Yu Tsao, *Senior Member, IEEE*, Hsin-Min Wang, *Senior Member, IEEE*

arXiv:2311.02733v1 [cs.CV] 5 Nov 2023

Abstract—Multimodal manipulations (also known as audio-visual deepfakes) make it difficult for unimodal deepfake detectors to detect forgeries in multimedia content. To avoid the spread of false propaganda and fake news, timely detection is crucial. The damage to either modality (i.e., visual or audio) can only be discovered through multi-modal models that can exploit both pieces of information simultaneously. Previous methods mainly adopt uni-modal video forensics and use supervised pre-training for forgery detection. This study proposes a new method based on a multi-modal self-supervised-learning (SSL) feature extractor to exploit inconsistency between audio and visual modalities for multi-modal video forgery detection. We use the transformer-based SSL pre-trained Audio-Visual HuBERT (AV-HuBERT) model as a visual and acoustic feature extractor and a multi-scale temporal convolutional neural network to capture the temporal correlation between the audio and visual modalities. Since AV-HuBERT only extracts visual features from the lip region, we also adopt another transformer-based video model to exploit facial features and capture spatial and temporal artifacts caused during the deepfake generation process. Experimental results show that our model outperforms all existing models and achieves new state-of-the-art performance on the FakeAVCeleb and DeepfakeTIMIT datasets.

Index Terms—Deepfakes, Deepfake detection, Audio-Visual, Lip Syn, Inconsistency, Video Forgery, Audio-Visual Deepfake Detection

I. INTRODUCTION

With smartphones, social networks, and high-speed internet, it is now at one’s fingertips to capture, upload, and share content without any delays or fees. However, this convenience makes the spread of deepfakes a heavy social cost. The term “deepfake” encompasses synthetic media such as images, videos, and audio. While there are many benefits to generating

Sahibzada Adil Shahzad is with the Social Networks and Human-Centered Computing Program, Taiwan International Graduate Program, Academia Sinica, Taipei 11529, Taiwan, and also with the Department of Computer Science, National Chengchi University, Taipei 11605, Taiwan. (e-mail: adil-shah275@iis.sinica.edu.tw).

Ammarah Hashmi is with the Social Networks and Human-Centered Computing Program, Taiwan International Graduate Program, Academia Sinica, Taipei 11529, Taiwan, and also with the Institute of Information Systems and Applications, National Tsing Hua University, Hsinchu 30013, Taiwan. (e-mail: hashmiammarah0@gmail.com).

Yan-Tsung Peng is with the Department of Computer Science, National Chengchi University, Taipei, Taiwan. (e-mail: ytpeng@cs.nccu.edu.tw)

Yu Tsao is with the Research Center for Information Technology Innovation, Academia Sinica, Taipei 11529, Taiwan. (e-mail: yu.tsao@citi.sinica.edu.tw).

Hsin-Min Wang is with the Institute of Information Science, Academia Sinica, Taipei 11529, Taiwan. (e-mail: whm@iis.sinica.edu.tw)




Fig. 1. Example video frames produced by Faceswap, Faceswap-wav2lip, Fsgan, Fsgan-wav2lip, RTVC (Real-Time Voice Clone), and Wav2lip manipulation methods and the corresponding real video frames. Those video frames and audio waveforms framed in red are fake, while those framed in green are real.

content through artificial intelligence (AI) technology, it also has a dark side. AI-generated content is often used for unethical objectives and malicious purposes, including pornography, fraudulent activities, and political defamation. Social media platforms are conduits for this type of manipulated content, and they often have no filtering mechanisms to prevent its rapid spread.

Face forgery detection is challenging due to advancements in deepfake generation methods. The realistic nature of deepfake videos makes it difficult for forgery detection methods to identify video deepfakes based on artifacts. The image and video forensics community has developed specific methods

and algorithms to detect forgery in image and video content. Similarly, the audio forensics research community has developed synthetic speech detectors for detecting spoofed audio. Due to their unimodal nature, these detectors fail when the manipulated modality remains unseen during training. Spoofed audio can evade visual deepfake detectors, while audio deepfake detectors cannot catch visual deepfakes. Recently, the multimedia forensics community has begun to pay attention to more realistic deepfake audio-visual content. To further facilitate this audio-visual deepfake detection technology, various models pre-trained through self-supervised-learning (SSL) have been fine-tuned on deepfake video datasets to detect manipulation.

Pre-trained SSL models have recently emerged and achieved success in various downstream tasks. Audio-Visual HuBERT (AV-HuBERT) [1] is an SSL-based audio-visual representation learning model that achieves state-of-the-art performance in lip reading, audio-visual speech enhancement [2], audio-visual speech separation [2], and audio-visual speech recognition [3]. Motivated by its state-of-the-art performance in multiple downstream tasks, we leverage AV-HuBERT for feature extraction to capture the inconsistency between the mouth region of interest and the corresponding audio modality for the downstream task of audio-visual deepfake detection. Since this model detects deepfake videos by examining speech-lip synchronization and is an extension of previous work in [4], it is called AV-Lip-Sync+. Considering that lip feature-based deepfake detectors may fail when the lip region is not manipulated or only slightly manipulated, to enhance our audio-visual forgery detection model, we employ a transformer-based visual encoder to exploit whole-face features to assist our proposed audio-visual deepfake detector. By integrating powerful audio-visual representations, speech-lip synchronization features, and spatiotemporal facial features, the proposed system achieves state-of-the-art performance on two multimodal deepfake datasets. Our main contributions are as follows.

- We adopt a transformer-based audio-visual feature extraction method instead of the convolutional neural network (CNN)-based feature extraction method widely used in existing video forgery detection systems.
- The proposed system can effectively capture audio-visual correlation and synchronization between audio and video modalities using the pre-trained SSL model.
- The proposed system achieves state-of-the-art performance on two multimodal deepfake datasets and exhibits robustness to various deepfake manipulation techniques.

II. RELATED WORK

In this section, we first briefly review common deepfake video generation techniques, and then introduce state-of-the-art deepfake detection methods.

A. Deepfake Generation

Figure 1 shows examples of real and various fake videos in the FakeAVCeleb dataset [5]. Deepfake content can be categorized into four main types: visual, textual, audio, and audio-visual (multimodal) deepfakes. Visual forgery [6]–[11]

involves the manipulation of the entire face, facial expressions, or lip movements using deepfake generation models such as Faceswap [6], Fsgan [12], and wav2lip [13]. The manipulation in visual deepfakes is limited to the visual modality of the video, while the audio content is not affected. Visual manipulation can also involve the integration of two or more deepfake generation techniques, such as Faceswap-wav2lip and Fsgan-wav2lip, to simultaneously manipulate face and lip movements and align the latter with the audio track. Text deepfake refers to seemingly real text information manipulated or generated by AI. Examples include fake news articles [14], fake online reviews [15], spam email generation [16], and synthetic text that incites violence [17]. Audio deepfake involves the acoustic manipulation of audio for malicious purposes using voice conversion and text-to-speech techniques (such as WaveNet [18], WaveGlow [19], MelNet [20], and Tacotron [21]). SV2TTS [22] is a real-time voice cloning tool that synthesizes fabricated audio content without altering visual content such as video frames.

The most challenging and realistic deepfakes are audio-visual deepfakes, also known as multimodal deepfakes. In these instances, attackers use video and audio deepfake generation algorithms to manipulate both modalities. For example, the fake video and fake audio (FVFA) category of deepfake videos in the FakeAVCeleb dataset contains visual manipulations in the entire face or lip region using Faceswap, Fsgan, or wav2lip deepfake generation techniques, while the audio counterpart is cloned or synthetic speech generated by acoustic manipulation techniques. Our study focuses on detecting audio-visual deepfakes.

B. Deepfake Detection

High-quality AI-generated content is useful in many ways, but it also comes at a cost, and timely detection is crucial to avoid any harm to society. To avoid the spread of misinformation and disinformation and to protect the reputations and privacy of individuals, we need automated methods to promptly detect deepfake content in our widespread digital world. Academia and industry have made considerable progress in using deep learning-based methods to detect forged multimedia content. These deep learning-based deepfake detection methods can be roughly divided into two major categories: unimodal and multimodal methods. Unimodal forgery detection models are specifically designed to detect forgery in one modality: video or audio. Video forgery detectors can be divided into three types [23]: physiological, visual artifact-based, and high-level feature-based methods. In physiological methods, researchers have exploited abnormal eye blinks [24] and incoherent head poses [25]. Visual artifact-based methods analyze anomalies and irregularities such as unnatural facial movements, illumination variation, blended face boundaries, and misalignment of video content. High-level-feature-based deepfake detectors extract high-level features that are immune to video processing (e.g., compression). Lipforensics [26] is an example of a high-level feature-based deepfake detector that leverages a lip-reading-based model to detect abnormal lip movements for video deepfake detection. Video

forgery detection models have achieved excellent results, thanks to various rich datasets available for model training, such as DeepfakeTIMIT [27], UADVf [25], FaceForensics++ (FF++) [28], Celeb-DF [29], Google DFD [28], DFDC [30], DeeperForensics [31], KoDF [32], and the recently released multimodal FakeAVCeleb dataset [5]. Well-known unimodal fake video detection models include Capsule Forensics [33], HeadPose [34], Xception [35], LipForensics [26], Meso-4 [36], and MesoInception-4 [36]. On the other hand, to trick automatic speaker verification systems, attackers can develop audio spoofing attacks or replay attacks using only a few minutes of a person’s recorded speech, which makes these systems vulnerable. Similar to video deepfakes, audio spoofing attacks are a major challenge that must be solved. In response to audio spoofing attacks on automatic speaker verification systems, the audio forensics community has proposed various traditional and deep learning-based methods [37]. Most traditional systems use short-term power spectrum, short-term phase spectrum, and long-term spectral features as front-end features. Backend classifiers are based on traditional machine learning models or ensemble models. Deep learning-based models can be roughly divided into multi-pass, end-to-end, and ensemble models. Using different hand-crafted acoustic features or raw waveforms, audio spoofing detection methods [38]–[40] can differentiate between genuine speech and spoofed speech.

Recently, deepfake technology has expanded from unimodal manipulation to multimodal manipulation (such as audio-visual manipulation). Unimodal deepfake video and spoofed audio detectors are insufficient to detect these audio-visual manipulations. To solve this problem, the multimedia forensics community has proposed several deep learning-based methods to capture unimodal or multimodal manipulations. Some multimodal methods exploit faces as visual features and mel-frequency cepstral coefficients (MFCCs) as acoustic features [41] or detect forged videos based on facial and speech emotions [42]. To capture the intrinsic synchronization between visual and acoustic modalities, Facebook AI [43] proposed a novel and general CNN-based method to jointly learn audio and video features. AVFakeNet audio-visual forgery detection method [44] uses Swin Transformer as the feature extraction module. Instead of learning audio-visual artifacts, Cozzolino et al. [45] used contrastive learning to learn discriminative audio-visual identity features. Localized Audio Visual DeepFake (LAV-DF) [46] introduces a content-driven deepfake detector for learning temporal forgery localization. In [47], a multimodal deepfake detector based on ensemble learning is introduced to leverage multiple learners and make decisions based on hard voting. The main disadvantage of ensemble learning is its time-consuming process due to involving training multiple models. In [4], lip synchronization features based on the difference between the extracted lip sequence and the synthetic lip sequence are used to detect audio-visual deepfakes. This model requires the wav2lip module to generate lip sequences from audio, which increases model complexity, training, and inference time. The field of multimodal forgery detection is still less explored, and further research is needed to determine how to effectively use audio-visual information

to detect forgery in any modality of multimedia content.

III. METHODOLOGY

As shown in Fig. 2, our proposed AV-Lip-Sync+ model consist of three feature extractors, namely a lip image feature extractor, an acoustic feature extractor, and an audio-visual feature extractor. These feature extraction modules are followed by the Sync-Check Module, Feature Fusion Module, and Temporal Convolutional Network to capture the temporal correlation between visual and audio features. Finally, a temporal pooling layer and a linear layer are used for classification. Our feature extractors are based on the AV-HuBERT model [1] pre-trained on the LRS3 dataset [48]. AV-HuBERT will be fine-tuned when training the detection model on the multimodal deepfake datasets.

A. Audio-Visual Feature Extractor

As shown in Fig. 2, the audio-visual feature extractor consists of a Resnet-18, a light-weight Feed Forward Network (FFN), and a transformer encoder. The 2-D Resnet-18 with front-end 3-D convolutional layers is used to extract lip-based visual features from each input lip image frame. The FFN is used to extract frame-level acoustic features from the input log filterbank energies of the audio waveform. These frame-level visual and acoustic features are concatenated along the feature dimension and fed to the transformer decoder, which generates a 768-D audio-visual embedding sequence \vec{F}_{av} via

$$\vec{F}_{av} = F_{\theta_e}(v, a), \quad (1)$$

where v and a represent frame-level visual features and acoustic features, respectively.

B. Lip Image Feature Extractor

In the lip image feature extractor, the output of Resnet-18 is fed to the transformer encoder, which generates the lip image embedding sequence \vec{F}_v via

$$\vec{F}_v = F_{\theta_e}(v, a_{dropout}), \quad (2)$$

where $a_{dropout}$ indicates audio dropout, i.e., the audio information is not used.

C. Acoustic Feature Extractor

In the acoustic feature extractor, the output of FFN is fed to the transformer encoder, which generates the acoustic feature embedding sequence \vec{F}_a via

$$\vec{F}_a = F_{\theta_e}(v_{dropout}, a), \quad (3)$$

where $v_{dropout}$ indicates video dropout, i.e., the visual information is not used.




Fig. 2. The proposed AV-Lip-Sync+ architecture for multimodal forgery detection. The lip image sequence is extracted from the input video, while the log filterbank energies are extracted from the audio track. The SSL pre-trained model consists of ResNet-18 for visual feature extraction, FFN for acoustic feature extraction, and a transformer encoder to extract spatiotemporal information from the visual and acoustic features. The extracted audio-visual features are further mapped through multi-scale temporal convolution network (MS-TCN), temporal pooling, and linear layer for classification.




Fig. 3. Embedding space representation of lip embedding \vec{F}_v and speech embedding \vec{F}_a for a real video (top) and a deepfake video (bottom).

D. Sync-Check Module

Because deepfake technology is not yet mature enough to generate synchronized and perfect audio-visual deepfakes, there is often a disharmony between the visual and audio modalities of deepfake videos. As shown in Fig. 3, in a low-dimensional embedding space, the embeddings of lip movements in a real video should be close to the embeddings of the audio in this video. In contrast, for a fake video, we expect the video and audio embeddings to be relatively separated. This idea motivates us to exploit synchronization between lip movements and speech to detect forgeries in deepfake videos. Therefore, the input of the sync-check module includes the output representation \vec{F}_v of the lip image feature extractor and the output representation \vec{F}_a of the acoustic feature extractor. For each time frame i , we calculate the absolute difference

between the corresponding lip embedding \vec{F}_{vi} and audio embedding \vec{F}_{ai} to capture the frame-level difference between the visual and acoustic modalities. Consequently, the output of the sync-check module is the sync-based feature vector sequence \vec{F}_{sync} calculated as

$$\vec{F}_{sync} = \{|\vec{F}_{vi} - \vec{F}_{ai}|\}_{i=1}^T, \quad (4)$$

where T is the number of frames in the input video.

E. Feature Fusion Module

In addition to the sync-based feature vector sequence \vec{F}_{sync} , the robust audio-visual feature vector sequence F_{av} obtained from the audio-visual feature extractor also captures the correlation between the two modalities. Therefore, we combine these two audio-visual representations for multimodal forgery detection. In the feature fusion module, F_{av} and \vec{F}_{sync} are concatenated along the feature dimension to form a fusion representation sequence \vec{F}_{fusion} as

$$\vec{F}_{fusion} = \vec{F}_{av} \oplus \vec{F}_{sync}, \quad (5)$$

where \oplus denotes the concatenation operation.

F. Temporal Convolutional Network and Classifier

The temporal dynamics across the audio and visual frames contain important information about the video content. To capture inter-modal and intra-modal temporal correlations, we adopt the multi-scale temporal convolutional network (MS-TCN) in [49]. Temporal convolution takes a sequence of frame-level feature vectors and maps them into another sequence of the same dimension using one-dimensional temporal convolution. The temporal convolutional network acts as a sequence encoder, capturing short-term and long-term information by providing the network with visibility across multiple time scales. MS-TCN is followed by a temporal pooling layer and a linear layer for outputting the Real/Fake probability given \vec{F}_{fusion} as

$$\hat{y} = F_{\theta_m}(\vec{F}_{fusion}), \quad (6)$$

TABLE I
STATISTICS OF MULTIMODAL FOGERY DATASETS FOR DEEPPFAKE DETECTION.

Datasets	Real Videos	Fake Videos	Manipulation Methods	No of Subjects	Visual Manipulation	Audio Manipulation
FakeAVCeleb [5]	500	20000	Faceswap, Fsgan, wav2lip, RTVC	500	Yes	Yes
DeepfakeTIMIT [27]	320	320	Faceswap	32	Yes	No

where \hat{y} represents the probability of the target class.

G. Model Training

The entire model is trained with the cross-entropy loss, defined as

$$L(y, \hat{y}) = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N [y_i \log \hat{y}_i + (1 - y_i) \log (1 - \hat{y}_i)], \quad (7)$$

where N is the number of training samples, y_i represents the ground truth label of the i -th sample (0 or 1), and \hat{y}_i represents the class prediction probability of the i -th sample. During training, the pre-trained front-end feature extractors and transformer encoder are fine-tuned, while MS-TCN and the linear classifier are trained from scratch.

H. AV-Lip-Sync+ with FE

As reported in [4], speech-lip synchronization based methods may not be good at detecting fake videos generated by some visual manipulation models such as Faceswap and FS-GAN. In these types of fake videos, the video contains only visual manipulation, while the audio is genuine. Furthermore, the manipulation does not necessarily occur in the lip region, but artifacts can be observed in other regions or throughout the face, including face boundaries. Deepfake detectors based on lip features may fail when the lip region is not manipulated, or when there is little manipulation in the mouth region. To address these issues, we use a face encoder to utilize the entire face features to enhance our proposed deepfake detector and make it more robust and generalizable to deep face manipulation techniques. To this end, we employ the pre-trained Video Vision Transformer (ViViT) [50] as the face encoder to extract the spatiotemporal face features. Using tubelet embeddings and spatial and temporal transformers, the face encoder extracts inter- and intra-frame information from video content. The output of the face encoder is a single-vector representation, which is fed to a linear layer for classification. The face-based deepfake detection model is trained on multimodal deepfake dataset using cross-entropy loss. During training, the pre-trained face encoder is fine-tuned, while the linear classifier is trained from scratch.

The model that combines AV-Lip-Sync+ and the face encoder is called AV-Lip-Sync+ with FE. The extracted single-vector representation of the face encoder and the representation obtained from the AV-Lip-Sync+ model are concatenated and fed to a two-layer linear classifier. During training, the pre-trained face encoder and AV-Lip-Sync+ are fixed, and only the classifier is trained using cross-entropy loss.

IV. EXPERIMENTS

We conducted experiments on two datasets: FakeAVCeleb [5] and DeepfakeTIMIT [27]. Unlike other unimodal audio or video deepfake datasets, these two datasets contain both audio and visual modalities, and their fake samples contain audio and/or visual manipulations. Furthermore, the faces in the videos in both datasets are frontal, which makes them suitable for lip frame extraction as visual input to the proposed model. The statistics of the two dataset are shown in Table I.

A. Datasets

1) *FakeAVCeleb*: The FakeAVCeleb dataset is an audio-visual dataset released in 2021 specifically designed for the deepfake detection task. It is based on a collection of 500 YouTube videos featuring 500 celebrities from diverse ethnic regions including South Asia, East Asia, Africa, Europe and America. Fake videos are generated from these 500 real videos using the Faceswap [6], Fsgan [12], wav2lip [13], and real-time voice cloning (SV2TTS) [22] manipulation methods and their combinations. Several examples are shown in Fig. 1. In the case of Faceswap-wav2lip, the video is manipulated using both Faceswap and wav2lip manipulation methods. Similarly, in the case of Fsgan-wav2lip, the video is generated using a combination of Fsgan and wav2lip. The videos manipulated by wav2lip include two types, namely Fake-Video-Real-Audio (FVRA) and Fake-Video-Fake-Audio (FVFA). Wav2lip FVRA videos contain manipulated lips and real audio. In the case of wav2lip FVFA, in addition to lip manipulation, a real-time voice cloning method is also used to manipulate the audio. In total, the dataset contains 500 real videos and more than 20000 forged videos.

Following [4], [47], we used multiple test sets, namely Faceswap, Fsgan, RTVC, wav2lip, Faceswap-wav2lip, and Fsgan-wav2lip. Furthermore, two other major and diverse test sets are Test-set-1 and Test-set-2. In Test-set-1, the number of samples is the same for all manipulation methods, while in Test-set-2, the number of samples of RVFA (Real-Video-Fake-Audio), FVRA (Fake-Video-Real-Audio), and FVFA (Fake-Video-Fake-Audio) in the fake class is the same. The training-test split is based on the number of subjects in the dataset. The training set and test set contain real and fake videos corresponding to 430 subjects and 70 subjects respectively. Furthermore, all the test sets are balanced in terms of real and fake videos and contain 70 videos per class (real and fake). The training set contains only 430 real videos, which is significantly less than the number of fake videos. If the imbalance problem is not properly resolved, the experimental results will be biased. To eliminate the imbalance problem, we

borrowed real videos from the VoxCeleb1 dataset [51] to make the training data of the real and fake classes more balanced.

2) *DeepfakeTIMIT*: The DeepfakeTIMIT dataset contains 320 audio-visual human speech recordings from 32 subjects and is a subset of the VidTIMIT dataset [52]. Each subject has 10 videos. For each video, the corresponding fake video is generated by the Faceswap manipulation method. The audio in both real and fake videos is always real. Since the dataset is small, we performed 5-fold cross-validation on it and evaluated the average performance.

B. Preprocessing

Our model mainly utilizes lip and audio features for multimodal forgery detection. For this purpose, the initial step is to extract the lip region from the frontal face using facial landmarks. We leveraged a pre-trained CNN-based face detector from the Dlib toolkit [53]. The lip image sequence extracted from the input video is 96×96 RGB pixels. Before the lip image sequences are fed into the model, they are converted to grayscale. The input shape of the extracted lip features is $C \times F \times H \times W$, where C represents the number of channels, F denotes the number of frames, and H and W represent the height and width of each frame, respectively. In addition, for the audio modality, the waveform is extracted from the video and then converted to the log filterbank energies as the acoustic input of the model.

For facial feature extraction, among the different variants of ViViT in [50], we selected the best performing factorized encoder model as the face encoder. The visual encoder has two transformer blocks, namely a spatial transformer and a temporal transformer. The input to the model is short fixed-length video clips from the entire video. The number of frames in a clip is 16, the input frame size is 224×224 , the patch size is 16, the number of input channels is 3, and the embedding dimension is 768. We used the tubelet embedding method. The ViViT model is pre-trained on the kinetics dataset [54].

C. Hyper-parameters in Training

Our model was trained by the Adam optimizer with a learning rate of 0.00001. We trained the model for 30 epochs using an early stopping strategy. We added 3570 real videos from the VoxCeleb1 dataset [51] to the real class and applied oversampling during training to deal with the data imbalance problem.

D. Evaluation Metrics

We evaluated our proposed multimodal forgery detector using Precision, Recall, F1-score, and Accuracy, which are calculated as follows:

$$Accuracy = \frac{TP + TN}{TP + TN + FP + FN}, \quad (8)$$

$$Precision = \frac{TP}{TP + FP}, \quad (9)$$

$$Recall = \frac{TP}{TP + FN}, \quad (10)$$

TABLE II
EVALUATION RESULTS OF AV-LIP-SYNC+ ON THE FAKEAVCELEB DATASET.

Test set	Class	Precision	Recall	F1-score	Accuracy
Faceswap	Real	0.85	0.99	0.91	0.91
	Fake	0.98	0.83	0.90	
Faceswap_wav2lip	Real	1.00	0.99	0.99	0.99
	Fake	0.99	1.00	0.99	
Fsgan	Real	0.86	0.99	0.92	0.91
	Fake	0.98	0.84	0.91	
Fsgan_wav2lip	Real	1.00	0.99	0.99	0.99
	Fake	0.99	1.00	0.99	
RTVC	Real	0.96	0.99	0.97	0.97
	Fake	0.99	0.96	0.97	
Wav2lip	Real	1.00	0.99	0.99	0.99
	Fake	0.99	1.00	0.99	
Test-set-1	Real	0.93	0.99	0.96	0.96
	Fake	0.98	0.93	0.96	
Test-set-2	Real	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99
	Fake	0.99	0.99	0.99	




Fig. 4. ROC curves and AUC scores of the proposed AV-Lip-Sync+ method on various test sets of the FakeAVCeleb dataset.

$$F1 = \frac{2 \times Precision \times Recall}{Precision + Recall}, \quad (11)$$

where TP , TN , FP , and FN stand for True Positive, True Negative, False Positive, and False Negative, respectively. In addition, the receiver operating characteristics (ROC) curve and the area under the curve (AUC) were also used. For a fair comparison, We report video-level performance rather than frame-level performance.

E. Results

1) *Evaluation of the proposed AV-Lip-Sync+ model*: Table II shows the performance of the proposed AV-Lip-Sync+ model evaluated on the FakeAVCeleb dataset. The manipulation methods of Faceswap, Faceswap-wav2lip, Fsgan, Fsgan-wav2lip, RTVC, and wav2lip are all seen during the model training process. It is obvious that AV-Lip-Sync+ performed well on almost all test sets except Faceswap and Fsgan. The main reason may be that the AV-HuBERT feature extractor only extracts visual information from lip images and ignores information outside the lip region. Figure 4 shows the ROC curves and corresponding AUC scores for all test sets. The AUC scores under different manipulation conditions are all

TABLE III
EVALUATION RESULTS OF DIFFERENT AUDIO-VISUAL DEEPPAKE VIDEO DETECTION MODELS ON THE FAKEAVCELEB DATASET.

Model	Faceswap	Faceswap_wav2lip	Fsgan	Fsgan_wav2lip	RTVC	Wav2lip	Test-set-1	Test-set-2
Lipforensics [26]	0.91	0.96	0.89	0.96	0.49	0.96	0.86	0.76
Multimodal Ensemble-Learning [47]	0.72	0.99	0.88	0.99	0.89	0.93	0.89	0.89
AV-Lip-Sync [4]	0.86	0.98	0.82	0.97	0.89	0.96	0.94	0.94
AVH-TCN	0.85	0.98	0.93	0.98	0.96	0.98	0.94	0.98
AVH-TCN-Sync	0.91	0.98	0.92	0.98	0.96	0.98	0.95	0.95
AV-Lip-Sync+	0.91	0.99	0.91	0.99	0.97	0.99	0.96	0.99
AV-Lip-Sync+ with FE	0.98	0.99	0.96	0.99	0.96	0.99	0.96	0.99




Fig. 5. t-SNE visualization on the embedding space of audio-visual representations from AV-Lip-Sync+.

above 0.96. Additionally, we visualize the features of the AV-Lip-Sync+ model as shown in Fig. 5. The t-SNE feature visualization confirms the discriminative ability of our proposed model. Only very few Faceswap and Fsgan test samples were mixed with real samples, and all test samples of other manipulation methods were perfectly classified as “Fake”.

Facial features are crucial for detecting deepfake videos, as local or entire facial regions may contain artifacts resulting from video manipulation. To address the limitations of the proposed AV-Lip-Sync+ model on Faceswap and Fsgan test samples, we used a ViViT-based face encoder to inject face embeddings into an ensemble model (called Lip-Sync+ with FE). As shown in Table III, the accuracy of Faceswap and Fsgan test sets increased from 0.91 to 0.98 and 0.96, respectively. The results show that providing supplementary information to the proposed model can improve the detection of videos of faces manipulated by Faceswap and Fsgan techniques.

We also compared our models (AV-Lip-Sync+ and AV-Lip-Sync+ with FE) with other audio-visual deepfake video detection models. In Table III, AVH-TCN refers to the model with AV-HuBERT feature extraction followed by MS-TCN, temporal pooling and linear layer (i.e., AVH-TCN detects fake videos based on \vec{F}_{av}), while AVH-TCN-Sync refers to the counterpart model for detection based on the speech-lip synchronization feature \vec{F}_{sync} . Both AVH-TCN and AVH-TCN-

Sync are considered simplified versions of AV-Lip-Sync+. As shown in Table III, both AVH-TCN and AVH-TCN-Sync generally performed better than previous methods but worse than AV-Lip-Sync+ and AV-Lip-Sync+ with FE. Our AV-Lip-Sync+ and AV-Lip-Sync+ with FE models achieve state-of-the-art results in all test sets.

2) *Comparison of different models*: In this experiment, we compared our models with various existing unimodal, multi-modal, fusion, and ensemble deepfake detection models on Test-set-2 of the FakeAVCeleb dataset. The results are shown in Table IV. Several uni-modal, multi-modal and ensemble models have been evaluated in [55], but the performance of most models is unsatisfactorily. Unimodal video models were trained using visual features only, unimodal audio models were trained with MFCC features of the audio modality, and multi-modal and ensemble models were trained with audio (MFCC features) and video (visual frames). Several recent multi-modal, ensemble, and fusion models have achieved much better performance than before, including Multimodaltrace [56], AVFakeNet [44], PVASS-MDD [57], MIS-AVioDD [58], AVTENet [59] and our previous speech-lip synchronization based model AV-Lip-Sync [4]. Clearly, our previous AV-Lip-Sync model is one of the recent leading models, confirming the effectiveness of using speech-lip synchronization for deepfake video detection. In order to check the synchronization between speech and lip movements, AV-Lip-Sync requires generating a synthesized lip sequence using the wav2lip generator and then comparing it to the extracted lip sequence. AV-Lip-Sync+ not only eliminates the need for the wav2lip synthetic lip generator, but also delivers significant performance gains. AV-Lip-Sync+ and AV-Lip-Sync+ with FE both achieved an accuracy of 0.99, which is a new state-of-the-art performance on Test-set-2 of the FakeAVCeleb dataset. The results confirm the effectiveness of using the pre-trained SSL AV-HuBERT model for audio-visual feature extraction in deepfake video detection.

3) *Ablation study*: There are various strategies to train the proposed AV-Lip-Sync+ model. For example, we can fix/freeze or fine-tune a pre-trained feature extractor, or train all modules from scratch. To see the effect of different settings, we first freeze the weights of the front-end audio-visual feature extractor and transformer encoder, and train the temporal network and linear classifier. The second strategy is to freeze the front-end audio-visual feature extraction part and fine-tune the transformer encoder while training the temporal network and linear classifier. Third, we fine-tune the front-end feature extraction part and transformer encoder while training the

TABLE IV
EVALUATION RESULTS OF DIFFERENT DEEPPAKE VIDEO DETECTION MODELS ON THE FAKEAVCELEB DATASET.

Type	Model	Modality	Class	Precision	Recall	F1-score	Accuracy
Uni-modal [55]	VGG16	V	Real	0.6935	0.8966	0.7821	0.8103
			Fake	0.8724	0.7750	0.8208	
Uni-modal [55]	Xception	A	Real	0.8750	0.6087	0.7179	0.7626
			Fake	0.7033	0.9143	0.7950	
Uni-modal [26]	LipForensics	V	Real	0.7000	0.9100	0.8000	0.7600
			Fake	0.8800	0.6100	0.7200	
Ensemble (Soft-Voting) [55]	VGG16	AV	Real	0.6935	0.8966	0.7821	0.7804
			Fake	0.8948	0.6894	0.7788	
Ensemble (Hard-Voting) [55]	VGG16	AV	Real	0.6935	0.8966	0.7821	0.7804
			Fake	0.8948	0.6894	0.7788	
Multi-modal-1 [55]	Multi-modal-1	AV	Real	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.5000
			Fake	0.496	1.000	0.663	
Multi-modal-2 [55]	Multi-modal-2	AV	Real	0.7100	0.5870	0.6430	0.6740
			Fake	0.6480	0.7600	0.7000	
Multi-modal-3 [55]	CDCN	AV	Real	0.5000	0.0680	0.1200	0.5150
			Fake	0.5000	0.9400	0.6510	
Multi-modal-4 [41]	Not-made-for-each-other	AV	Real	0.6200	0.9900	0.7600	0.6900
			Fake	0.9400	0.4000	0.5700	
Multi-modal-Ensemble [47]	Ensemble Model	AV	Real	0.83	0.99	0.90	0.89
			Fake	0.98	0.80	0.88	
Multi-modal [56]	Multimodaltrace	AV	Real	-	-	-	0.929
			Fake	-	-	-	
Ensemble [44]	AVFakeNet	AV	Real	-	-	-	0.934
			Fake	-	-	-	
Fusion [60]	AVoiD-DF	AV	Real	-	-	-	0.837
			Fake	-	-	-	
Fusion [57]	PVASS-MDD	AV	Real	-	-	-	0.957
			Fake	-	-	-	
Fusion [58]	MIS-AVioDD	AV	Real	-	-	-	0.962
			Fake	-	-	-	
Multi-modal-Ensemble [59]	AVTENet	AV	Real	1.00	0.97	0.99	0.99
			Fake	0.97	1.00	0.99	
Lip Sync Matters [4]	AV-Lip-Sync	AV	Real	0.93	0.96	0.94	0.94
			Fake	0.96	0.93	0.94	
Multi-modal (ours)	AV-Lip-Sync+	AV	Real	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99
			Fake	0.99	0.99	0.99	
Multi-modal (ours)	AV-Lip-Sync+ with FE	AV	Real	1.00	0.99	0.99	0.99
			Fake	0.99	1.00	0.99	

temporal network and linear classifier. Table V shows the performance comparison using different training strategies. Some observations can be made. First, the results show that for AVH-TCN, AVH-TCN-Sync, and AV-Lip-Sync+, fine-tuning the entire AV-HuBERT model yields better results than fixing any specific module in multi-modal deepfake detection. Second, the model that combines the audio-visual feature \vec{F}_{av} and the speech-lip synchronization feature \vec{F}_{sync} (i.e., AV-LIP-Sync+) outperforms the models using \vec{F}_{av} and \vec{F}_{sync} alone (i.e., AVH-TCN and AVH-TCN-Sync). For the AV-Lip-Sync+ with FE model, we compared two training strategies. First, we fine-tuned AV-HuBERT and ViViT when training the temporal network and linear classifier (see Jointly trained with linear layers). Second, we first train AV-HuBERT-based and ViViT-based detectors separately, and then use them as fixed feature extractors to train a linear classifier (see Fixed FE, trained only linear layers). The results show that fine-tuning the pre-trained AV-HuBERT and ViViT models individually can lead to better performance.

4) *Evaluation on the DeepfakeTIMIT dataset:* The DeepfakeTIMIT dataset is primarily used for training and evaluating visual deepfake detectors, as it only contains visual manipulation. It comes in two versions, Low-Quality (LQ) and

High-Quality (HQ). For a fair comparison, we compared the proposed model with uni-modal visual and multi-modal audio-visual deepfake detectors. Additionally, we performed 5-fold cross-validation and reported the average AUC score. As can be seen from Table VI, among uni-modal visual detectors, FWA and DSP-FWA [64] achieved the best AUC of 0.9990 under the LQ condition, and DSP-FWA achieved the best AUC of 0.9970 under the HQ condition. Although the three existing multi-modal audio-visual detectors (Emotions Don't lie [42], Not-made-for-each-other [41], and AV-Lip-Sync [4]) are overall better than most uni-modal visual detectors, their performance is worse than that of the best performing uni-modal visual detector DSP-FWA. However, our multi-modal AV-Lip-Sync+ with FE outperformed all models compared in the table. The AUC score is 0.9996 for LQ and 0.9998 for HQ. By appropriately integrating pre-trained AV-HuBERT and ViViT models for audio-visual feature extraction, our proposed model achieves state-of-the-art results on the DeepfakeTIMIT dataset.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this study, we have leveraged AV-HuBERT and ViViT to perform downstream tasks of audio-visual video forgery

TABLE V

EVALUATION RESULTS OF AV-LIP-SYNC+ USING DIFFERENT TRAINING/FINE-TUNING STRATEGIES ON THE FAKEAVCELEB DATASET. FRONT-END FE AND TE REPRESENT THE FRONT-END FEATURE EXTRACTION PART AND TRANSFORMER ENCODER OF THE PRE-TRAINED AV-HUBERT MODEL, RESPECTIVELY.

Model	Faceswap	Faceswap_wav2lip	Fsgan	Fsgan_wav2lip	RTVC	Wav2lip	Test-set-1	Test-set-2
AVH-TCN (Fixed Front-end FE and TE)	0.45	0.81	0.52	0.88	0.79	0.76	0.71	0.76
AVH-TCN (Fixed Front-end FE only)	0.71	0.94	0.76	0.96	0.90	0.94	0.87	0.93
AVH-TCN (Whole fine tune)	0.85	0.98	0.93	0.98	0.96	0.98	0.94	0.98
AVH-TCN-Sync (Fixed Front-end FE and TE)	0.50	0.90	0.55	0.89	0.84	0.74	0.76	0.78
AVH-TCN-Sync (Fixed Front-end FE only)	0.56	0.98	0.64	0.98	0.90	0.96	0.85	0.92
AVH-TCN-Sync (Whole fine tune)	0.91	0.98	0.92	0.98	0.96	0.98	0.95	0.95
AV-Lip-Sync+ (Fixed Front-end FE and TE)	0.46	0.84	0.55	0.87	0.79	0.75	0.71	0.76
AV-Lip-Sync+ (Fixed Front-end FE only)	0.70	0.95	0.74	0.95	0.93	0.93	0.87	0.94
AV-Lip-Sync+ (Whole fine tune)	0.91	0.99	0.91	0.99	0.97	0.99	0.96	0.99
AV-Lip-Sync+ with FE (Jointly trained with linear layers)	0.96	0.98	0.97	0.98	0.91	0.96	0.96	0.95
AV-Lip-Sync+ with FE (Fixed FE, trained only linear layers)	0.98	0.99	0.96	0.99	0.96	0.99	0.96	0.99

TABLE VI

EVALUATION RESULTS OF AV-LIP-SYNC+ ON THE DEEPAKEITIMIT DATASET.

Type	Model	Modality	Quality	AUC
Uni-modal [33]	Capsule	V	LQ	0.7840
			HQ	0.7440
Uni-modal [61]	Multi-task	V	LQ	0.6220
			HQ	0.5530
Uni-modal [25]	HeadPose	V	LQ	0.5510
			HQ	0.5320
Uni-modal [62]	Two-stream	V	LQ	0.8350
			HQ	0.7350
Uni-modal [63]	VA-MLP	V	LQ	0.6140
			HQ	0.6210
Uni-modal [63]	VA-LogReg	V	LQ	0.7700
			HQ	0.7730
Uni-modal [36]	Meso-4	V	LQ	0.8780
			HQ	0.6840
Uni-modal [28]	Xception-raw	V	LQ	0.5670
			HQ	0.5400
Uni-modal [28]	Xception-c40	V	LQ	0.7580
			HQ	0.7050
Uni-modal [28]	Xception-c23	V	LQ	0.9590
			HQ	0.9440
Uni-modal [64]	FWA	V	LQ	0.9990
			HQ	0.9320
Uni-modal [64]	DSP-FWA	V	LQ	0.9990
			HQ	0.9970
Multi-modal [42]	Emotions Don't lie	AV	LQ	0.9630
			HQ	0.9490
Multi-modal [41]	Not-made-for-each-other	AV	LQ	0.9790
			HQ	0.9680
Multi-modal [4]	AV-Lip-Sync	AV	LQ	0.9790
			HQ	0.9680
Multi-modal (ours)	AV-Lip-Sync+	AV	LQ	0.9500
			HQ	0.9880
Multi-modal (ours)	AV-Lip-Sync+ with FE	AV	LQ	0.9996
			HQ	0.9998

detection. We exploit the inconsistency between visual and audio modalities by using powerful audio-visual representations provided by AV-HuBERT, which is pre-trained using Self-Supervised learning. Since AV-HuBERT only extracts visual features from the lip region, which may not be enough to detect artifacts outside the lip region, we also adopt another transformer-based ViViT model to exploit facial features. Overall, our model jointly exploits SSL audio/visual/audio-

visual representations, synchronization features, temporal correlation between lip image frames and audio, and inter- and intra-video frames features to detect deepfakes. Experimental results on the FakeAVCeleb and DeepfakeTIMIT datasets show that our model outperforms all existing models and achieves new state-of-the-art performance on both datasets. In future work, we will work to further improve the generalization of deepfake content detection technology in multi-modal settings.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Shi, W.-N. Hsu, K. Lakhota, A. Mohamed, Learning Audio-Visual Speech Representation by Masked Multimodal Cluster Prediction, in: Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations, 2021.
- [2] I.-C. Chern, K.-H. Hung, Y.-T. Chen, T. Hussain, M. Gogate, A. Hussain, Y. Tsao, J.-C. Hou, Audio-Visual Speech Enhancement and Separation by Utilizing Multi-modal Self-Supervised Embeddings, in: Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing Workshops (ICASSPW), 2023, pp. 1–5.
- [3] B. Shi, W.-N. Hsu, A. Mohamed, Robust Self-Supervised Audio-Visual Speech Recognition, in: Proceedings of the Interspeech Conference, 2022, pp. 2118–2122.
- [4] S. A. Shahzad, A. Hashmi, S. Khan, Y.-T. Peng, Y. Tsao, H.-M. Wang, Lip Sync Matters: A Novel Multimodal Forgery Detector, in: Proceedings of the Asia-Pacific Signal and Information Processing Association Annual Summit and Conference (APSIPA ASC), 2022, pp. 1885–1892.
- [5] H. Khalid, S. Tariq, M. Kim, S. S. Woo, FakeAVCeleb: A Novel Audio-Video Multimodal Deepfake Dataset, in: Proceedings of the Neural Information Processing Systems Track on Datasets and Benchmarks, 2021.
- [6] I. Korshunova, W. Shi, J. Dambre, L. Theis, Fast Face-swap Using Convolutional Neural Networks, in: Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision, 2017, pp. 3677–3685.
- [7] R. Chen, X. Chen, B. Ni, Y. Ge, SimSwap: An Efficient Framework For High Fidelity Face Swapping, in: Proceedings of the ACM International Conference on Multimedia, 2020, pp. 2003–2011.
- [8] G. Gao, H. Huang, C. Fu, Z. Li, R. He, Information bottleneck disentanglement for identity swapping, in: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2021, pp. 3404–3413.
- [9] J. Thies, M. Zollhöfer, M. Nießner, Deferred Neural Rendering: Image Synthesis using Neural Textures, ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG) 38 (4) (2019) 1–12.

- [10] L. Li, J. Bao, H. Yang, D. Chen, F. Wen, FaceShifter: Towards High Fidelity And Occlusion Aware Face Swapping, in: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2020, p. 5074–5083.
- [11] J. Thies, M. Zollhofer, M. Stamminger, C. Theobalt, 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.
- [12] Y. Nirkin, Y. Keller, T. Hassner, FSGAN: Subject Agnostic Face Swapping and Reenactment, in: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision, 2019, pp. 7184–7193.
- [13] K. Prajwal, R. Mukhopadhyay, V. P. Namboodiri, C. Jawahar, A Lip Sync Expert Is All You Need for Speech to Lip Generation In The Wild, in: Proceedings of the ACM International Conference on Multimedia, 2020, pp. 484–492.
- [14] R. Zellers, A. Holtzman, H. Rashkin, Y. Bisk, A. Farhadi, F. Roesner, Y. Choi, Defending Against Neural Fake News, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 32 (2019).
- [15] Y. Yao, B. Viswanath, J. Cryan, H. Zheng, B. Y. Zhao, Automated Crowdturfing Attacks and Defenses in Online Review Systems, in: Proceedings of the ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, 2017, pp. 1143–1158.
- [16] A. Das, R. Verma, Automated email Generation for Targeted Attacks using Natural Language, in: Proceedings of the TA-COS Workshop on Text Analytics for Cybersecurity and Online Safety, 2018, p. 23.
- [17] K. McGuffie, A. Newhouse, The Radicalization Risks of GPT-3 and Advanced Neural Language Models, arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.06807 (2020).
- [18] A. van den Oord, S. Dieleman, H. Zen, K. Simonyan, O. Vinyals, A. Graves, N. Kalchbrenner, A. Senior, K. Kavukcuoglu, WaveNet: A Generative Model for Raw Audio, in: Proceedings of the ISCA Workshop on Speech Synthesis Workshop (SSW 9), 2016, p. 125.
- [19] R. Prenger, R. Valle, B. Catanzaro, WaveGlow: A Flow-Based Generative Network for Speech Synthesis, in: Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing, 2019, pp. 3617–3621.
- [20] S. Vasquez, M. Lewis, MelNet: A Generative Model for Audio in the Frequency Domain, arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.01083 (2019).
- [21] Y. Wang, R. Skerry-Ryan, D. Stanton, Y. Wu, R. J. Weiss, N. Jaitly, Z. Yang, Y. Xiao, Z. Chen, S. Bengio, et al., Tacotron: Towards End-to-End Speech Synthesis, Proceedings of the Interspeech Conference (2017).
- [22] Y. Jia, Y. Zhang, R. Weiss, Q. Wang, J. Shen, F. Ren, P. Nguyen, R. Pang, I. Lopez Moreno, Y. Wu, et al., Transfer Learning from Speaker Verification to Multispeaker Text-To-Speech Synthesis, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 31 (2018).
- [23] S. Lyu, Deepfake Detection: Current Challenges and Next Steps, in: Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Multimedia & Expo Workshops (ICMEW), 2020, pp. 1–6.
- [24] Y. Li, M.-C. Chang, S. Lyu, In Ictu Oculi: Exposing AI Created Fake Videos by Detecting Eye Blinking, in: Proceedings of the IEEE International Workshop on Information Forensics and Security (WIFS), 2018, pp. 1–7.
- [25] X. Yang, Y. Li, S. Lyu, Exposing Deep Fakes Using Inconsistent Head Poses, in: Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), 2019, pp. 8261–8265.
- [26] A. Haliassos, K. Vougioukas, S. Petridis, M. Pantic, Lips Don't Lie: A Generalisable and Robust Approach to Face Forgery Detection, in: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2021, pp. 5039–5049.
- [27] P. Korshunov, S. Marcel, DeepFakes: a New Threat to Face Recognition? Assessment and Detection, arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.08685 (2018).
- [28] A. Rossler, D. Cozzolino, L. Verdoliva, C. Riess, J. Thies, M. Nießner, FaceForensics++: Learning to Detect Manipulated Facial Images, in: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision, 2019, pp. 1–11.
- [29] Y. Li, X. Yang, P. Sun, H. Qi, S. Lyu, Celeb-DF: A Large-scale Challenging Dataset for DeepFake Forensics, in: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2020, pp. 3207–3216.
- [30] B. Dolhansky, J. Bitton, B. Pflaum, J. Lu, R. Howes, M. Wang, C. C. Ferrer, The DeepFake Detection Challenge (DFDC) Dataset, arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.07397 (2020).
- [31] L. Jiang, R. Li, W. Wu, C. Qian, C. C. Loy, DeeperForensics-1.0: A Large-Scale Dataset for Real-World Face Forgery Detection, in: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2020, pp. 2889–2898.
- [32] P. Kwon, J. You, G. Nam, S. Park, G. Chae, KoDF: A Large-scale Korean DeepFake Detection Dataset, in: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision, 2021, pp. 10744–10753.
- [33] H. H. Nguyen, J. Yamagishi, I. Echizen, Capsule-Forensics: Using Capsule Networks to Detect Forged Images and Videos, in: IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), 2019, pp. 2307–2311.
- [34] K. Lutz, R. Bassett, DeepFake Detection with Inconsistent Head Poses: Reproducibility and Analysis, arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.12715 (2021).
- [35] F. Chollet, Xception: Deep learning with depthwise separable convolutions, in: Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2017, pp. 1251–1258.
- [36] D. Afchar, V. Nozick, J. Yamagishi, I. Echizen, Mesonet: a Compact Facial Video Forgery Detection Network, in: IEEE International Workshop on Information Forensics and Security (WIFS), 2018, pp. 1–7.
- [37] A. Khan, K. M. Malik, J. Ryan, M. Saravanan, Voice Spoofing Countermeasures: Taxonomy, State-of-the-art, experimental analysis of generalizability, open challenges, and the way forward, arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.00417 (2022).
- [38] L. Wang, Y. Yoshida, Y. Kawakami, S. Nakagawa, Relative Phase Information for Detecting Human Speech and Spoofed Speech, in: Proceedings of the International Speech Communication Association, 2015.
- [39] M. Todisco, H. Delgado, N. W. Evans, A New Feature for Automatic Speaker Verification Anti-Spoofing: Constant Q Cepstral Coefficients., in: Proceedings of the Odyssey, Vol. 2016, 2016, pp. 283–290.
- [40] T. B. Patel, H. A. Patil, Combining Evidences from Mel Cepstral, Cochlear Filter Cepstral and Instantaneous Frequency Features for Detection of Natural vs. Spoofed Speech, in: Proceedings of the International Speech Communication Association, 2015.
- [41] K. Chugh, P. Gupta, A. Dhall, R. Subramanian, Not made for each other-Audio-Visual Dissonance-based Deepfake Detection and Localization, in: Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Multimedia, 2020, pp. 439–447.
- [42] T. Mittal, U. Bhattacharya, R. Chandra, A. Bera, D. Manocha, Emotions Don't Lie: An Audio-Visual Deepfake Detection Method using Affective Cues, in: Proceedings of the ACM International Conference on Multimedia, 2020, pp. 2823–2832.
- [43] Y. Zhou, S.-N. Lim, Joint Audio-Visual Deepfake Detection, in: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision, 2021, pp. 14800–14809.
- [44] H. Ilyas, A. Javed, K. M. Malik, AVFakeNet: A unified end-to-end Dense Swin Transformer deep learning model for audio-visual deepfakes detection, *Applied Soft Computing* 136 (2023) 110124.
- [45] D. Cozzolino, A. Pianese, M. Nießner, L. Verdoliva, Audio-Visual Person-of-Interest DeepFake Detection, in: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2023, pp. 943–952.
- [46] Z. Cai, K. Stefanov, A. Dhall, M. Hayat, Do You Really Mean That? Content Driven Audio-Visual Deepfake Dataset and Multimodal Method for Temporal Forgery Localization, in: Proceedings of the International Conference on Digital Image Computing: Techniques and Applications (DICTA), 2022, pp. 1–10.
- [47] A. Hashmi, S. A. Shahzad, W. Ahmad, C. W. Lin, Y. Tsao, H.-M. Wang, Multimodal Forgery Detection Using Ensemble Learning, in: Proceedings of the Asia-Pacific Signal and Information Processing Association Annual Summit and Conference (APSIPA ASC), 2022, pp. 1524–1532.
- [48] T. Afouras, J. S. Chung, A. Zisserman, LRS3-TED: a large-scale dataset for visual speech recognition, arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.00496 (2018).
- [49] B. Martinez, P. Ma, S. Petridis, M. Pantic, Lipreading Using Temporal Convolutional Networks, in: Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), 2020, pp. 6319–6323.
- [50] A. Arnab, M. Dehghani, G. Heigold, C. Sun, M. Lučić, C. Schmid, ViViT: A Video Vision Transformer, in: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision, 2021, pp. 6836–6846.
- [51] A. Nagrani, J. S. Chung, A. Zisserman, VoxCeleb: a large-scale speaker identification dataset, in: Proceedings of the Interspeech Conference, 2017.
- [52] C. Sanderson, The VIDTIMIT Database, Tech. rep. (2002).
- [53] D. E. King, Dlib-ml: A Machine Learning Toolkit, *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* 10 (2009) 1755–1758.

- [54] W. Kay, J. Carreira, K. Simonyan, B. Zhang, C. Hillier, S. Vijayanarasimhan, F. Viola, T. Green, T. Back, P. Natsev, et al., The Kinetics Human Action Video Dataset, arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.06950 (2017).
- [55] H. Khalid, M. Kim, S. Tariq, S. S. Woo, Evaluation of an Audio-Video Multimodal Deepfake Dataset using Unimodal and Multimodal Detectors, in: Proceedings of the Workshop on Synthetic Multimedia-Audiovisual Deepfake Generation and Detection, 2021, pp. 7–15.
- [56] M. A. Raza, K. M. Malik, Multimodaltrace: Deepfake Detection using Audiovisual Representation Learning, in: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2023, pp. 993–1000.
- [57] Y. Yu, X. Liu, R. Ni, S. Yang, Y. Zhao, A. C. Kot, PVASS-MDD: Predictive Visual-audio Alignment Self-supervision for Multimodal Deepfake Detection, IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology (2023).
- [58] V. S. Katamneni, A. Rattani, MIS-AVioDD: Modality Invariant and Specific Representation for Audio-Visual Deepfake Detection, arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02234 (2023).
- [59] A. Hashmi, S. A. Shahzad, C.-W. Lin, Y. Tsao, H.-M. Wang, Avtenet: Audio-visual transformer-based ensemble network exploiting multiple experts for video deepfake detection, arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.13103 (2023).
- [60] W. Yang, X. Zhou, Z. Chen, B. Guo, Z. Ba, Z. Xia, X. Cao, K. Ren, AVoid-DF: Audio-Visual Joint Learning for Detecting Deepfake, IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security 18 (2023) 2015–2029.
- [61] H. H. Nguyen, F. Fang, J. Yamagishi, I. Echizen, Multi-task Learning for Detecting and Segmenting Manipulated Facial Images and Videos, in: Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Biometrics Theory, Applications and Systems (BTAS), 2019, pp. 1–8.
- [62] X. Han, V. Morariu, P. I. Larry Davis, et al., Two-Stream Neural Networks for Tampered Face Detection, in: Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops, 2017, pp. 19–27.
- [63] F. Matern, C. Riess, M. Stamminger, Exploiting Visual Artifacts to Expose Deepfakes and Face Manipulations, in: Proceedings of the IEEE Winter Applications of Computer Vision Workshops (WACVW), 2019, pp. 83–92.
- [64] Y. Li, S. Lyu, Exposing DeepFake Videos By Detecting Face Warping Artifacts, in: Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops, 2019, pp. 46–52.