

SYNCVOICE: TOWARDS VIDEO DUBBING WITH VISION-AUGMENTED PRETRAINED TTS MODEL

Kaidi Wang¹, Yi He², Wenhao Guan³, Weijie Wu¹, Hongwu Ding², Xiong Zhang², Di Wu^{2,4},
Meng Meng², Jian Luan², Lin Li^{3,†}, Qingyang Hong^{1,†}

¹School of Informatics, Xiamen University, China

²MiLM Plus, Xiaomi Inc., China

³School of Electronic Science and Engineering, Xiamen University, China

⁴WeNet Open Source Community

{lilin, qyhong}@xmu.edu.cn

ABSTRACT

Video dubbing aims to generate high-fidelity speech that is precisely temporally aligned with the visual content. Existing methods still suffer from limitations in speech naturalness and audio-visual synchronization, and are limited to monolingual settings. To address these challenges, we propose SyncVoice, a vision-augmented video dubbing framework built upon a pretrained text-to-speech (TTS) model. By fine-tuning the TTS model on audio-visual data, we achieve strong audiovisual consistency. We propose a Dual Speaker Encoder to effectively mitigate inter-language interference in cross-lingual speech synthesis and explore the application of video dubbing in video translation scenarios. Experimental results show that SyncVoice achieves high-fidelity speech generation with strong synchronization performance, demonstrating its potential in video dubbing tasks.

Index Terms— Video Dubbing, Cross-lingual Speech Synthesis, Video Translation

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the growth of short-video platforms and global content sharing has driven demand for automated video dubbing [1, 2]. The video dubbing task aims to generate natural and expressive speech from text scripts, using a specified speaker timbre conditioned on a short reference audio, while ensuring strict audio-visual synchronization with visual cues such as lip movements in the silent video. Unlike standard zero-shot text-to-speech (TTS) systems [3], this task requires an additional video input, making it a challenging problem at the intersection of speech synthesis and multimodal modeling.

Early video dubbing approaches [1] learn distinct lip movement features to control speech generation and employ facial features for speaker modeling in multi-speaker scenarios. HPMDubbing [4] further introduces a hierarchical prosody modeling framework that effectively leverages visual cues from lips, face, and scene, while extracting speaker representations directly from reference audio for improved voice consistency. However, these models [1, 4, 5, 6]

are typically trained on small-scale audiovisual datasets. Recently, several approaches [7, 8, 9, 10] have explored pretraining on large-scale speech corpora or leveraging pretrained TTS models [11, 12], followed by fine-tuning on audiovisual data. These methods significantly improve speech naturalness, yet still leave room for improvement in synchronization accuracy and have not been extended to multilingual settings. Meanwhile, some pure TTS models [13, 14] tackle video translation without using visual input, leading to misalignment with facial movements.

In this work, we propose a novel video dubbing framework named SyncVoice, built upon a pretrained TTS model. Specifically, instead of training from scratch—often limited by scarce and low-quality audiovisual data [7]—we build on ZipVoice [15], a flow-matching TTS model with strong zero-shot capabilities and introduce a Text-Visual Fusion Module to align visual and textual features over time, enabling speech that is well-synchronized with the speaker’s lip movements—a key requirement for lip-consistent dubbing. Crucially, we consider the more challenging scenario of video dubbing—video translation, where the target language differs from the source, and the generated speech may not naturally match the original lip movements (i.e., lip-sync mismatch is inevitable). We further demonstrate the effectiveness of our framework in both lip-consistent video dubbing and cross-lingual video translation scenarios. Our main contributions are as follows:

- We adapt a pretrained TTS model to the video dubbing task, achieving superior speech naturalness and audio-visual consistency compared to existing baselines.
- We propose a Dual Speaker Encoder to extract a global speaker embedding, which alleviates the influence of the reference speech language in cross-lingual settings.
- To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to introduce visual information for temporal control in video translation, achieving reasonable synchronization while maintaining high speech quality¹.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Model Architecture

Fig 1 illustrates the overall architecture of SyncVoice. It consists of three main components: a pre-trained TTS base model (comprising

[†] Corresponding author.

This work was supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grants 62276220 and 62371407 and the Innovation of Policing Science and Technology, Fujian province (Grant number: 2024Y0068)

¹Our demos are available at <https://wkd88.github.io/syncvoice/>




Fig. 1. The main architecture of the proposed method.

a text encoder and a vector field estimator), a Text-Visual Fusion module, and a Dual Speaker Encoder. We describe each component in detail below.

2.1.1. Pretrained TTS Base Model

Our framework builds upon a pretrained TTS model, specifically ZipVoice [15], which serves as the foundational backbone for speech generation. ZipVoice is a flow matching based TTS model enabling high-fidelity speech synthesis. It consists of two key components: a text encoder that maps input text into contextual linguistic representations, and a vector field estimator that learns the dynamics of latent trajectories for melspectrogram generation.




Fig. 2. Detail of Text-Visual Fusion module.

2.1.2. Text-Visual Fusion Module

We propose a Text-Visual Fusion Module to integrate linguistic and visual information for speech generation. As shown in Fig. 2, given an input video, face and lip regions are cropped from each frame and

fed into pretrained encoders to extract facial action [16] and lip motion [17] features. These features are then separately passed through a fusion network that combines them with text features. The network includes lightweight adapter layers to project visual features into the text latent space, each using a bottleneck structure with LayerNorm, GELU, and a residual connection. The adapted features are concatenated with text embeddings and processed by a fusion layer—a linear transformation with a residual connection—that integrates visual dynamics while preserving linguistic content.

2.1.3. Dual Speaker Encoder

We employ a Dual Speaker Encoder to model speaker identity for cross-lingual voice synthesis. It consists of two branches: (1) The pretrained encoder uses a frozen CAM++ [18] model, which provides robust speaker identity embeddings trained on speaker verification tasks. (2) The learnable encoder is designed to extract speech dynamic patterns that are more suitable for synthesis. This is motivated by the observation that embeddings from speaker verification models are optimized for discrimination, not for capturing natural voice variations needed in TTS [19]. The learnable encoder consists of a 1D convolution, six attention blocks, mean-and-standard-deviation pooling, and a linear projection. By combining both pathways, our model preserves speaker identity while better modeling expressive, synthesis-friendly voice characteristics.

2.2. Training Method

Let $\mathbf{x}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{D \times T}$ denotes the ground-truth speech. During training, a binary mask $\mathbf{m} \in \{0, 1\}^{D \times T}$ is randomly sampled: $m_{d,t} = 1$ denotes a *masked* (to generate) element at bin d , time t ; $m_{d,t} = 0$ denotes an *observed* (context) one. Random segments from \mathbf{x}_1 is extracted and fed into the Dual Speaker Encoder to obtain a global speaker embedding $\mathbf{e}_g \in \mathbb{R}^F$, which is added to the time step embedding t and fed into the Vector Field Estimator θ . We adopt a stochastic condition masking strategy. Instead of always providing both the context speech and the speaker embedding, we randomly drop one of the two conditions. This encourages the model to synthesize high-quality speech using either the contextual acoustic features or the explicit speaker embedding alone.

The final input to the Vector Field Estimator θ includes the fused text-visual condition \mathbf{z}_{lv} , the observed context speech $(1 - \mathbf{m}) \odot \mathbf{x}_1$ (possibly masked), the speaker embedding \mathbf{e}_g (also possibly masked), and the noised spectrogram $\mathbf{x}_t = (1 - t)\mathbf{x}_0 + t\mathbf{x}_1$, where $\mathbf{x}_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$ is a random noise spectrogram, and $t \in [0, 1]$ is a diffusion time step sampled uniformly during training. The Flow Matching objective is formulated as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{FM-Dub}} = \mathbb{E}_{t, \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_0} \left[\left\| \mathbf{v}_t(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{z}_{lv}, (1 - \mathbf{m}) \odot \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{e}_g; \theta) - (\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_0) \right\|^2 \odot \mathbf{m} \right], \quad (1)$$

where \odot denotes element-wise multiplication.

2.3. Multi-Condition Classifier-Free Guidance

We propose a multi-condition classifier-free guidance (CFG) strategy [20] to control multiple aspects of speech generation. Our method separately scales the contribution of each condition: facial action (f), lip motion (l), and text (t). At inference, we combine predictions from different conditioning setups to refine the output. The final noise estimate is:

$$\epsilon_{\text{cfg}} = \epsilon_{f,l,t} + s_f(\epsilon_{f,t} - \epsilon_t) + s_l(\epsilon_{l,t} - \epsilon_t) + s_t(\epsilon_t - \epsilon_{\emptyset}) \quad (2)$$

Table 1. Results on GRID dataset. We set the CFG scaling factors as $s_t = 1.0$, $s_f = 0.5$, $s_l = 0.5$. The best-performing result is shown in bold and the second best are underlined.

Methods	LSE-C \uparrow	LSE-D \downarrow	WER \downarrow	SIM-o \uparrow	UTMOS \uparrow	MOS-N \uparrow	MOS-S \uparrow
Ground Truth	6.73	6.95	12.95	0.672	3.97	4.01 ± 0.08	3.87 ± 0.11
EmoDubber [6]	<u>7.06</u>	<u>6.94</u>	17.63	0.665	<u>3.97</u>	3.66 ± 0.09	3.74 ± 0.08
ProDubber [8]	4.74	8.55	<u>15.24</u>	0.675	3.83	<u>3.85 ± 0.08</u>	3.85 ± 0.09
Ours	7.22	6.75	11.82	<u>0.670</u>	4.03	3.89 ± 0.11	<u>3.80 ± 0.08</u>

where \emptyset denotes the unconditional input (i.e., all conditions dropped). We enhance the full-condition prediction $\epsilon_{f,l,t}$ by adding residual guidance terms, each condition modulated by a tunable scale s_f, s_l, s_t . This enables fine-grained control over different conditional inputs.

3. EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

3.1. Dataset and Model

We train two variants of our model on distinct audiovisual datasets: a monolingual version and a bilingual version, each designed to evaluate different aspects of video dubbing performance.

The monolingual version is trained and evaluated on the GRID corpus [21], which contains approximately 27 hours of speech from 33 English speakers. The model is initialized from a LibriTTS-pretrained ZipVoice checkpoint, and the train-test split follows [6]. For evaluation, we adopt the dubbing setting 2.0 defined in [6]: the reference audio is taken from non-ground-truth utterances of the same speaker (i.e., not the ground-truth speech aligned with the lip movements). This setting better reflects real-world video dubbing applications where the target voice is available only through separate reference clips.

The bilingual version is trained on an internal bilingual dataset comprising 338 hours of Chinese and 721 hours of English speech, and is initialized from an Emilia-pretrained model. For evaluation, we construct two test sets using 1,054 random samples from HDTF [22]: (1) The monolingual test set (EN-EN) uses the original English transcripts, with the reference speech randomly selected from other utterances of the same speaker. (2) The cross-lingual test set (EN-ZH) is derived by translating each English text into Chinese using the Gemini API, with the constraint that the translated text length remains close to the original. The original English speech from the video serves as the speaker reference. The inference settings for the bilingual version are summarized in Table 2.

3.2. Implementation Details

All audio signals are resampled to 24 kHz and converted to mel-spectrograms using an FFT window size of 1024 and a hop size of 256, with 100 frequency bins. The final waveforms are reconstructed using a pretrained Vocos vocoder. Video clips are resampled to 25 fps, and visual features are temporally aligned with the mel-spectrogram sequence via linear interpolation. We use an ScaledAdam optimizer with a learning rate of 5×10^{-4} . For the monolingual version, we train for 40k steps on a single NVIDIA GeForce RTX 4090 GPU. For the bilingual version, we train for 160k steps using 8 NVIDIA H800 GPUs, where each GPU processes a batch of approximately 250 seconds of speech audio per step. It is worth noting that the dual speaker encoder is introduced only in the bilingual version. During training, with probability 0.8

the speaker embedding is used alone and with probability 0.2 the context speech is used alone. Text features are dropped with probability 0.2, and face or lip features are each dropped with probability 0.6.

Table 2. The inference settings for the bilingual version.

Methods	Visual Feature		Speaker Condition	
	Lip	Face	Context Speech	Global Spkemb
M1	\times	\times	\checkmark	\times
M2	\times	\times	\times	\checkmark
M3	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\times
M4	\checkmark	\checkmark	\times	\checkmark
M5	\times	\checkmark	\times	\checkmark

3.3. Evaluation Metrics

We evaluate speech using both objective and subjective metrics. For intelligibility, we compute the Word Error Rate (WER) between the ASR transcription (using Whisper-large-v3 for English and Paraformer-zh for Chinese) and the original text. Subjective quality is assessed via MOS tests, reporting MOS-N (naturalness) and MOS-S (similarity). Objectively, we measure speaker similarity using cosine similarity (SIM-o) between the original prompt and synthesized speech, with speaker embeddings extracted by a WavLM-based ECAPA-TDNN (monolingual) or ResNet34_LM (cross-lingual)², and use UTMOS for perceptual quality. To evaluate audio-visual synchronization, we adopt SyncNet [23] to compute the Lip Sync Error Confidence (LSC-C) and Lip Sync Error Distance (LSE-D), following the protocol in [24].

Table 3. Results on EN-EN test-set. We set the CFG scaling factors as $s_t = 0.8$, $s_f = 0.5$, $s_l = 0.5$.

Methods	LSE-C \uparrow	LSE-D \downarrow	WER \downarrow	SIM-o \uparrow	UTMOS \uparrow
Ground Truth	7.33	7.67	1.94	0.783	3.87
Zero-shot TTS	2.81	12.13	1.79	0.738	4.09
M1	2.89	12.04	1.86	0.713	4.08
M3 (ours)	8.04	7.22	2.09	0.705	4.08

²<https://github.com/wenet-e2e/wespeaker/blob/master/docs/pretrained.md>

4. RESULTS

4.1. Results for lip-consistent Video dubbing

We first evaluate the performance of our monolingual model in the lip-consistent video dubbing scenario. We compare our monolingual model with current state-of-the-art video dubbing methods: EmoDubber [6] and ProDubber [8]. Both baselines use their officially released pretrained checkpoints or the provided test audio clips. Notably, ProDubber also employs LibriTTS for pretraining—aligning with our model’s pretraining setup—enabling a relatively fair comparison. The experimental results are summarized in Table 1. Our model achieves the best performance in terms of speech naturalness, intelligibility, and audio-visual synchronization, while slightly underperforming ProDubber in speaker similarity. These results demonstrate that our method achieves competitive and overall superior performance compared to the baselines, validating its effectiveness.

For the bilingual version, we conduct evaluation on the EN-EN test set in Table 3. As shown in the results of M1, after fine-tuning the pretrained TTS model on audiovisual data, there is a slight degradation in speech generation quality compared to the original TTS model. We attribute this in part to the relatively limited scale of the audiovisual training data. When visual features are incorporated (M3), performance further decreases in terms of intelligibility and speaker similarity. Nevertheless, the model retains strong speech synthesis capability and achieves significantly improved audio-visual synchronization—even exceeding that of the original videos. These results demonstrate that the model achieves high audio-visual synchrony while maintaining natural speech output, confirming its suitability for lip-consistent video dubbing.

Table 4. Results on EN-ZH test-set. We set the CFG scaling factors as $s_t = 1.0$, $s_f = 0.0$, $s_l = 0.0$.

Methods	LSE-C \uparrow	LSE-D \downarrow	WER \downarrow	SIM-o \uparrow	UTMOS \uparrow
Zero-shot TTS	1.39	13.64	5.11	0.729	3.52
M1	1.39	13.65	16.78	0.747	3.56
M2	1.41	13.62	4.81	0.652	3.40
M4	2.32	12.38	9.02	0.648	2.70
M5 (ours)	<u>1.61</u>	<u>13.34</u>	<u>6.19</u>	<u>0.655</u>	3.28

4.2. Results for lip-inconsistent Video Translation

A particular challenge in this task is the inherent misalignment between the speaker’s lip movements in the video and the generated speech, yet video information must be incorporated to achieve visual-auditory synchrony. As shown in Table 4, we compare four different inference configurations. We observe that although M1 achieves the highest scores in SIM-o and UTMOS, the generated speech is significantly influenced by the language of the reference audio, leading to unreliable content and severely degraded intelligibility. To mitigate this, we replace the speaker conditioning from context speech to global speaker embedding (SpkEmb) in M2. Although speaker similarity slightly decreases, the WER improves significantly—resulting in more natural and intelligible speech, which is critical for perceptual quality.

Next, we incorporate visual information for temporal prosody control. Among these variants, M4 achieves the best audio-visual synchronization performance. However, its WER increases by 4.21,

indicating a substantial drop in intelligibility that limits its practical usability. To address this trade-off, we propose M5, which uses only face features as visual input, avoiding the strong interference of lip-motion features on phonetic generation. Results show that the face features help preserve speaker similarity while increasing WER by only 1.38—significantly less than M4’s 4.21. Moreover, M5 achieves better synchronization metrics than models without visual input. This design effectively balances speech quality and lip coherence, making it more suitable for real-world video translation applications.

Table 5. Ablation results for multi-condition CFG on the EN-EN test-set.

s_f	s_l	s_t	LSE-C \uparrow	LSE-D \downarrow	WER \downarrow	SIM-o \uparrow	UTMOS \uparrow
0.5	0.5	0.5	8.11	7.16	2.19	0.699	4.11
0.5	0.5	0.8	8.04	7.22	2.09	0.705	4.08
0.5	0.5	1.1	7.95	7.29	2.18	0.702	3.87
1.0	0.5	0.8	8.08	7.20	2.14	0.697	4.07
0.5	1.0	0.8	8.15	7.15	2.13	0.693	4.07
1.0	1.0	0.8	8.16	7.14	2.21	0.686	4.05
0.0	0.0	0.8	7.27	7.81	2.91	0.717	3.74

Table 6. Ablation results for dual speaker encoder on the EN-ZH test-set.

Methods	WER \downarrow	SIM-o \uparrow	UTMOS \uparrow
full model	6.19	0.655	3.28
w/o pretrained encoder	4.28	0.495	3.26
w/o learnable encoder	6.4	0.622	3.12

4.3. Ablation Study

We conduct ablation studies to validate the effectiveness of our design choices. First, we analyze the multi condition CFG by varying scaling factors. As shown in Table 5, s_t primarily affects pronunciation accuracy, with optimal speech performance achieved when it is around 0.8. In contrast, s_f controls prosody, and s_l strengthens lip-motion alignment; proper tuning enhances both speech quality and lip-sync consistency. Next, we evaluate speaker conditioning strategies in cross-lingual generation (Table 6). Using only the learnable encoder yields low WER but poor speaker similarity, likely due to limited fine-tuning data. The pretrained encoder alone underperforms overall. These results confirm the effectiveness of our dual speaker encoder in cross-lingual scenario.

5. CONCLUSION

In this work, we propose a new video dubbing method to adapt a pre-trained TTS model to the video dubbing task. Our approach achieves better lip synchronization and higher speech quality compared to baseline methods. We also explore video translation scenarios in dubbing applications, aiming to generate fluent speech with reasonable synchronization even when the source content is linguistically misaligned. Future work will focus on further improving dubbing performance, particularly in cross-lingual settings.

6. REFERENCES

- [1] Chenxu Hu, Qiao Tian, Tingle Li, Wang Yuping, Yuxuan Wang, and Hang Zhao, “Neural dubber: Dubbing for videos according to scripts,” in *Thirty-Fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021.
- [2] Junchen Lu, Berrak Sisman, Rui Liu, Mingyang Zhang, and Haizhou Li, “Visualtts: Tts with accurate lip-speech synchronization for automatic voice over,” in *ICASSP 2022 - 2022 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, 2022.
- [3] Yi Ren, Yangjun Ruan, Xu Tan, Tao Qin, Sheng Zhao, Zhou Zhao, and Tie-Yan Liu, “Fastspeech: Fast, robust and controllable text to speech,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2019.
- [4] Gaoxiang Cong, Liang Li, Yuankai Qi, Zheng-Jun Zha, Qi Wu, Wenyu Wang, Bin Jiang, Ming-Hsuan Yang, and Qingming Huang, “Learning to dub movies via hierarchical prosody models,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023.
- [5] Gaoxiang Cong, Yuankai Qi, Liang Li, Amin Beheshti, Zhedong Zhang, Anton Hengel, Ming-Hsuan Yang, Chenggang Yan, and Qingming Huang, “StyleDubber: Towards multi-scale style learning for movie dubbing,” in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics ACL 2024*, 2024.
- [6] Gaoxiang Cong, Jiadong Pan, Liang Li, Yuankai Qi, Yuxin Peng, Anton van den Hengel, Jian Yang, and Qingming Huang, “Emodubber: Towards high quality and emotion controllable movie dubbing,” *2025 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2024.
- [7] Zhedong Zhang, Liang Li, Gaoxiang Cong, Haibing Yin, Yuhao Gao, Chenggang Clarence Yan, Anton van den Hengel, and Yuankai Qi, “From speaker to dubber: Movie dubbing with prosody and duration consistency learning,” *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, 2024.
- [8] Zhedong Zhang, Liang Li, Chenggang Yan, Chunshan Liu, Anton van den Hengel, and Yuankai Qi, “Prosody-enhanced acoustic pre-training and acoustic-disentangled prosody adapting for movie dubbing,” *2025 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2025.
- [9] Jeongsoo Choi, Ji-Hoon Kim, Kim Sung-Bin, Tae-Hyun Oh, and Joon Son Chung, “Aligndit: Multimodal aligned diffusion transformer for synchronized speech generation,” *ArXiv*, 2025.
- [10] Kim Sung-Bin, Jeongsoo Choi, Puyuan Peng, Joon Son Chung, Tae-Hyun Oh, and David Harwath, “Voicecraft-dub: Automated video dubbing with neural codec language models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.02386*, 2025.
- [11] Puyuan Peng, Po-Yao (Bernie) Huang, Shang-Wen Li, Abdelrahman Mohamed, and David Harwath, “Voicecraft: Zero-shot speech editing and text-to-speech in the wild,” in *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2024.
- [12] Yushen Chen, Zhikang Niu, Ziyang Ma, Keqi Deng, Chunhui Wang, Jian Zhao, Kai Yu, and Xie Chen, “F5-tts: A fairytaler that fakes fluent and faithful speech with flow matching,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.06885*, 2024.
- [13] Yihan Wu, Guo Junliang, Xu Tan, Chen Zhang, Bohan Li, Ruihua Song, Lei He, Sheng Zhao, Arul Menezes, and Jiang Bian, “Videodubber: Machine translation with speech-aware length control for video dubbing,” *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2023.
- [14] Siyi Zhou, Yiquan Zhou, Yi He, Xun Zhou, Jinchao Wang, Wei Deng, and Jingchen Shu, “Indextts2: A breakthrough in emotionally expressive and duration-controlled auto-regressive zero-shot text-to-speech,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.21619*, 2025.
- [15] Han Zhu, Wei Kang, Zengwei Yao, Liyong Guo, Fangjun Kuang, Zhaoqing Li, Weiwei Zhuang, Long Lin, and Daniel Povey, “Zipvoice: Fast and high-quality zero-shot text-to-speech with flow matching,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.13053*, 2025.
- [16] Antoine Toisoul, Jean Kossaifi, Adrian Bulat, Georgios Tzimiropoulos, and Maja Pantic, “Estimation of continuous valence and arousal levels from faces in naturalistic conditions,” *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 2021.
- [17] Brais Martinez, Pingchuan Ma, Stavros Petridis, and Maja Pantic, “Lipreading using temporal convolutional networks,” in *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, 2020.
- [18] Hui Wang, Siqi Zheng, Yafeng Chen, Luyao Cheng, and Qian Chen, “Cam++: A fast and efficient network for speaker verification using context-aware masking,” in *Interspeech 2023*, 2023.
- [19] Bowen Zhang, Congchao Guo, Geng Yang, Hang Yu, Haozhe Zhang, Heidi Lei, Jialong Mai, Junjie Yan, Kaiyue Yang, Mingqi Yang, et al., “Minimax-speech: Intrinsic zero-shot text-to-speech with a learnable speaker encoder,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.07916*, 2025.
- [20] Jonathan Ho and Tim Salimans, “Classifier-free diffusion guidance,” in *NeurIPS 2021 Workshop on Deep Generative Models and Downstream Applications*, 2021.
- [21] Martin Cooke, Jon Barker, Stuart Cunningham, and Xu Shao, “An audio-visual corpus for speech perception and automatic speech recognition,” *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 2006.
- [22] Zhimeng Zhang, Lincheng Li, Yu Ding, and Changjie Fan, “Flow-guided one-shot talking face generation with a high-resolution audio-visual dataset,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2021.
- [23] KR Prajwal, Rudrabha Mukhopadhyay, Vinay P Namboodiri, and CV Jawahar, “A lip sync expert is all you need for speech to lip generation in the wild,” in *Proceedings of the 28th ACM international conference on multimedia*, 2020, pp. 484–492.
- [24] Chunyu Li, Chao Zhang, Weikai Xu, Jingyu Lin, Jinghui Xie, Weiguo Feng, Bingyue Peng, Cunjian Chen, and Weiwei Xing, “Latentsync: Taming audio-conditioned latent diffusion models for lip sync with syncnet supervision,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.09262*, 2024.