

# Are Detectors Fair to Indian IP-AIGC? A Cross-Generator Study\*

Vishal Dubey<sup>†</sup>

Hyderabad, India

vishaldubey0026@gmail.com

Pallavi Tyagi<sup>‡</sup>

Bengaluru, India

tyagipallavi093@gmail.com

## ABSTRACT

Modern image editors can produce identity-preserving AIGC (IP-AIGC), where the same person appears with new attire, background, or lighting. The robustness and fairness of current detectors in this regime remain unclear, especially for under-represented populations. We present what we believe is the first systematic study of IP-AIGC detection for Indian and South-Asian faces, quantifying cross-generator generalization and intra-population performance. We assemble Indian-focused training splits from FairFD and HAV-DF, and construct two held-out IP-AIGC test sets (HIDF-img-ip-genai and HIDF-vid-ip-genai) using commercial web-UI generators (Gemini and ChatGPT) with identity-preserving prompts. We evaluate two state-of-the-art detectors (AIDE and Effort) under pretrained (PT) and fine-tuned (FT) regimes and report AUC, AP, EER, and accuracy. Fine-tuning yields strong in-domain gains (for example, Effort AUC 0.739 to 0.944 on HAV-DF-test; AIDE EER 0.484 to 0.259), but consistently degrades performance on held-out IP-AIGC for Indian cohorts (for example, AIDE AUC 0.923 to 0.563 on HIDF-img-ip-genai; Effort 0.740 to 0.533), which indicates overfitting to training-generator cues. On non-IP HIDF images, PT performance remains high, which suggests a specific brittleness to identity-preserving edits rather than a generic distribution shift. Our study establishes IP-AIGC-Indian as a challenging and practically relevant scenario and motivates representation-preserving adaptation and India-aware benchmark curation to close generalization gaps in AIGC detection.<sup>1</sup> Code link is also shared.<sup>2</sup>

## CCS CONCEPTS

• Computing methodologies → Neural networks.

## KEYWORDS

Deepfakes, GenAI image generation, Deep learning, Indian face

### ACM Reference Format:

Vishal Dubey and Pallavi Tyagi. 2025. Are Detectors Fair to Indian IP-AIGC? A Cross-Generator Study. In *Proceedings of 16th Indian Conference on Computer Vision, Graphics and Image Processing (ICVGIP'25)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 3 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

\*Produces the permission block, and copyright information

<sup>†</sup>Lead author.

<sup>‡</sup>Data curation; prompt engineering for the IP-AIGC dataset.

<sup>1</sup>This Work is independent research.

<sup>2</sup>[https://github.com/vishal-dubey-0026/DF\\_India](https://github.com/vishal-dubey-0026/DF_India)

Permission to make digital or hard copies of part or all of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for third-party components of this work must be honored. For all other uses, contact the owner/author(s).

ICVGIP'25, December 2025, Mandi, India

© 2025 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).

ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM.

<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Reliable detection of AI-generated content (AIGC) is increasingly critical as modern generators produce photo-realistic media that challenge both humans and automated detectors [3, 14]. While progress in large-scale benchmarks and baselines has improved overall accuracy [6, 13, 14, 19], recent work highlights sharp failures on unseen generators, class imbalance, and minority populations [2, 6, 8, 15, 16]. This raises urgent questions about fairness and population coverage, especially for groups under-represented in public datasets.

A growing line of work measures demographic bias in forgery detection across race/skin-tone, gender, and age [9, 10]. Indian-centric resources [1, 7, 11, 12] further reveal domain shifts specific to Indian subjects and scenes. However, the identity-preserving AIGC (IP-AIGC) setting edits [5] that keep the same person while altering attire/background/lighting, remains under-tested for South Asian populations, and detectors trained on standard corpora often underperform here [3, 17].

This paper studies generalization and fairness for Indian/South-Asian faces under IP-AIGC. We ask: Do state-of-the-art detectors degrade on identity-preserving generations with Indian-specific prompts and contexts? We combine Indian-focused training splits with two representative detectors: AIDE [17] and Effort [18], and evaluate on held-out, web-UI generators (ChatGPT, Gemini) for IP-AIGC-Indian. We report ACC/AUC/AP/EER.

Table 1: Training and testing datasets

Dataset (no. of images)	Real	Fake
FairFD	10308	61678
HAV-DF-train	2444	3759
HAV-DF-test	535	931
HIDF-img	747	747
HIDF-vid	142	223
HIDF-img-ip-genai	747	535
HIDF-vid-ip-genai	142	108

## 2 METHODOLOGY

**Data.** Training uses the Indian split from FairFD [10] and the train split of HAV-DF [4]. Testing uses HAV-DF-test and an Indian-only subset of [3], yielding HIDF-img and HIDF-vid (video frames sub-sampled). We further construct IP-AIGC test sets (HIDF-img-ip-genai and HIDF-vid-ip-genai) using Gemini-2.5-Flash and ChatGPT image editing via their web UIs with identity-preserving prompts (Figure 1–2). Dataset sizes appear in Table 1.

### Sample prompts.

- (1) P1: Generate the **\*\*same subject\*\*** during a **\*\*daytime festive event\*\***; outfit: **\*\*bright saree or salwar\*\*** with **\*\*subtle Holi-like color traces\*\*** on clothing and



Figure 1: Samples of HIDF-img (real, 1st row) and HIDF-img-ip-genai(fake, 2nd row)



Figure 2: Samples of HIDF-vid (real, 1st row) and HIDF-vid-ip-genai(fake, 2nd row)

Table 2: Eval. results of AIDE

Testset (PT/FT)	Acc $\uparrow$	AP $\uparrow$	AUC $\uparrow$	EER $\downarrow$
HAV-DF-test	0.577/0.752	0.684/0.879	0.535/0.809	0.484/0.259
HIDF-img	0.429/0.568	0.432/0.659	0.426/0.648	0.559/0.394
HIDF-vid	0.473/0.665	0.636/0.686	0.527/0.608	0.450/0.450
HIDF-img-ip-genai	0.804/0.555	0.842/0.413	0.923/0.563	0.123/0.461
HIDF-vid-ip-genai	0.544/0.532	0.587/0.458	0.593/0.570	0.436/0.464

Table 3: Eval. results of Effort

Testset (PT/FT)	Acc $\uparrow$	AP $\uparrow$	AUC $\uparrow$	EER $\downarrow$
HAV-DF-test	0.664/0.867	0.864/0.971	0.739/0.944	0.353/0.125
HIDF-img	0.874/0.899	0.985/0.973	0.986/0.974	0.042/0.066
HIDF-vid	0.756/0.758	0.904/0.887	0.851/0.839	0.225/0.225
HIDF-img-ip-genai	0.670/0.497	0.605/0.398	0.740/0.533	0.321/0.447
HIDF-vid-ip-genai	0.524/0.348	0.448/0.302	0.535/0.249	0.471/0.676

**\*\*only a light dusting on cheeks/forehead\*\*** (do **\*\*not\*\*** obscure key facial landmarks). Background: **\*\*outdoor garden with marigold garlands\*\***. Soft backlight for subject separation; **\*\*fast shutter feel\*\*** to freeze stray powder. Identity, age, hair texture, and skin tone must match the reference.

- (2) P2: Use the provided reference image of the **\*\*same Indian male\*\***. **\*\*Preserve facial identity, bone structure, and skin tone\*\***; no age change or facial slimming. Generate

a waist-up **\*\*formal studio portrait\*\*** in a **\*\*charcoal business suit\*\*** with white shirt, no tie. **\*\*Neutral gray seamless background\*\***, **\*\*three-point Lighting\*\*** (key at 45°, soft rim, subtle fill), **\*\*50mm equivalent**, **f/2.8\*\***. Natural skin texture (no plastic skin), clean background, no text.

**Models and training.** We evaluate AIDE and Effort. For AIDE, we fine-tune (FT) from the GenImage pretrained (PT) weights; for Effort, we use the default PT weights and fine-tune to convergence. Training runs on a single Colab L4 (22.5 GB). Effort: batch 40, lr  $2 \times 10^{-4}$ ; AIDE: batch 32, lr  $1 \times 10^{-6}$ . Evaluation metrics include Accuracy (Acc), Average Precision (AP), area under ROC (AUC), Equal Error Rate (EER).

### 3 RESULTS

Tables 2–3 summarize frame/video performance for PT vs. FT.

*In-domain improvements.* Fine-tuning substantially improves in-domain generalization on HAV-DF-test for both methods. AIDE AUC rises from 0.535 (PT) to 0.809 (FT) with EER dropping from 0.484 to 0.259; Effort AUC rises from 0.739 to 0.944 with EER from 0.353 to 0.125.

*ID-preserving, held-out generators (IP-AIGC-Indian).* On HIDF-img-ip-genai, both methods lose cross-generator robustness after FT: AIDE AUC falls from 0.923 (PT) to 0.563 (FT) with EER worsening from 0.123 to 0.461; Effort AUC drops from 0.740 to 0.533 (EER 0.321 to 0.447). Video results are similar or worse: on HIDF-vid-ip-genai, Effort AUC declines from 0.535 to 0.249 and AIDE shows a mild decline (0.593 to 0.570) alongside higher EER (0.436 to 0.464).

*Non-IP HIDF.* On HIDF-img (non-IP), Effort PT is already strong (AUC 0.986) and remains competitive after FT (0.974); AIDE improves from 0.426 to 0.648. This contrast with IP-AIGC suggests adaptation can help when the target distribution is similar to training, but may harm identity-preserving, held-out edits.

*Additional evidence on IP-AIGC drops.* The degradation on IP-AIGC is also visible in AP and ACC. For AIDE on HIDF-img-ip-genai, AP drops from 0.842 (PT) to 0.413 (FT). Effort shows a similar decline from 0.605 to 0.398. On HIDF-vid-ip-genai, AIDE AP decreases from 0.587 to 0.458, and Effort from 0.448 to 0.302, with corresponding accuracy reductions. These consistent declines indicate that FT overfits to training-generator cues and transfers poorly to identity-preserving edits.

*Takeaway.* FT delivers clear in-domain gains yet induces notable overfitting to training-generator cues, hurting identity-preserving cross-generator generalization in Indian cohorts.

### 4 CONCLUSION

We present an IP-AIGC–Indian evaluation showing that fine-tuning strong detectors increases in-domain accuracy but degrades robustness on held-out, identity-preserving edits (image and video). These results indicate that present SOTA remains brittle in Indian IP-AIGC settings. Future work will target identity-aware adaptation (e.g., residual-subspace tuning with fairness constraints) and controlled expression-only edits to further stress generalization.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Anurag Deo, Aditya Bangar, Chandranath Adak, Rahul Verma, Deepak Nagar, Zahid Akhtar, Soumya Dutta, Soumi Chattopadhyay, and Sukalpa Chanda. 2025. IndicSideFace: A Dataset for Advancing Deepfake Detection on Side-Face Perspectives of Indian Subjects. In *2025 IEEE 19th International Conference on Automatic Face and Gesture Recognition (FG)*. IEEE, 1–10.
- [2] Yan Ju, Shu Hu, Shan Jia, George H Chen, and Siwei Lyu. 2024. Improving fairness in deepfake detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*. 4655–4665.
- [3] Chaewon Kang, Seoyoon Jeong, Jonghyun Lee, Daejin Choi, Simon S Woo, and Jinyoung Han. 2025. HiDF: A Human-Indistinguishable Deepfake Dataset. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining V. 2*. 5527–5538.
- [4] Sukhandeep Kaur, Mubashir Buhari, Naman Khandelwal, Priyansh Tyagi, and Kiran Sharma. 2024. Hindi audio-video-Deepfake (HAV-DF): A Hindi language-based Audio-video Deepfake Dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.15457* (2024).
- [5] MD Khan, Mingshan Jia, Xiaolin Zhang, En Yu, Caifeng Shan, and Kaska Musial-Gabrys. 2025. InstaFace: Identity-Preserving Facial Editing with Single Image Inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.20577* (2025).
- [6] Yamini Sri Krubha, Aryana Hou, Braden Vester, Web Walker, Xin Wang, Li Lin, and Shu Hu. 2025. Robust AI-Generated Face Detection with Imbalanced Data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.02182* (2025).
- [7] Kartik Kuckreja, Ximi Hoque, Nishit Poddar, Shukesh Reddy, Abhinav Dhall, and Abhijit Das. 2024. INDIFACE: Illuminating India's Deepfake Landscape with a Comprehensive Synthetic Dataset. In *2024 IEEE 18th International Conference on Automatic Face and Gesture Recognition (FG)*. IEEE, 1–9.
- [8] Li Lin, Xinan He, Yan Ju, Xin Wang, Feng Ding, and Shu Hu. 2024. Preserving fairness generalization in deepfake detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 16815–16825.
- [9] Li Lin, Santosh Santosh, Mingyang Wu, Xin Wang, and Shu Hu. 2025. Ai-face: A million-scale demographically annotated ai-generated face dataset and fairness benchmark. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*. 3503–3515.
- [10] Decheng Liu, Zongqi Wang, Chunlei Peng, Nannan Wang, Ruimin Hu, and Xinbo Gao. 2025. Thinking racial bias in fair forgery detection: Models, datasets and evaluations. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 39. 5379–5387.
- [11] Kartik Narayan, Harsh Agarwal, Kartik Thakral, Surbhi Mittal, Mayank Vatsa, and Richa Singh. 2023. Df-platter: Multi-face heterogeneous deepfake dataset. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 9739–9748.
- [12] Maneet Singh, Mohit Chawla, Richa Singh, Mayank Vatsa, and Rama Chellappa. 2019. Disguised faces in the wild 2019. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision Workshops*. 0–0.
- [13] Mei Wang, Weihong Deng, Jiani Hu, Xunqiang Tao, and Yaohai Huang. 2019. Racial faces in the wild: Reducing racial bias by information maximization adaptation network. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*. 692–702.
- [14] Xin Wang, Ting Yu Tsai, Li Lin, Hui Guo, Shu Hu, Ming-Ching Chang, Pradeep K Atrey, and Siwei Lyu. 2025. Spotting the Fakes: A Deep Dive into GAN-Generated Face Detection. *ACM Transactions on Multimedia Computing, Communications and Applications* 21, 7 (2025), 1–24.
- [15] M Wu, L Lin, W Zhang, X Wang, Z Yang, and S Hu. 2025. Preserving auc fairness in learning with noisy protected groups. In *The 42nd International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*.
- [16] Ying Xu, Philipp Terhörst, Marius Pedersen, and Kiran Raja. 2024. Analyzing fairness in deepfake detection with massively annotated databases. *IEEE Transactions on Technology and Society* 5, 1 (2024), 93–106.
- [17] Shilin Yan, Ouxiang Li, Jiayin Cai, Yanbin Hao, Xiaolong Jiang, Yao Hu, and Weidi Xie. [n.d.]. A Sanity Check for AI-generated Image Detection. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [18] Zhiyuan Yan, Jiangming Wang, Peng Jin, Ke-Yue Zhang, Chengchun Liu, Shen Chen, Taiping Yao, Shouhong Ding, Baoyuan Wu, and Li Yuan. [n.d.]. Orthogonal Subspace Decomposition for Generalizable AI-Generated Image Detection. In *Forty-second International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- [19] Zhiyuan Yan, Yong Zhang, Xinhang Yuan, Siwei Lyu, and Baoyuan Wu. 2023. DeepfakeBench: A Comprehensive Benchmark of Deepfake Detection. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, A. Oh, T. Neumann, A. Globerson, K. Saenko, M. Hardt, and S. Levine (Eds.), Vol. 36. Curran Associates, Inc., 4534–4565. [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2023/file/0e735e4bf07de483cbe250130992726-Paper-Datasets\\_and\\_Benchmarks.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2023/file/0e735e4bf07de483cbe250130992726-Paper-Datasets_and_Benchmarks.pdf)