

# Physics-Guided Deepfake Detection for Voice Authentication Systems

Alireza Mohammadi, Keshav Sood, Dhananjay Thiruvady, and Asef Nazari

**Abstract**—Voice authentication systems deployed at the network edge face dual threats: a) sophisticated deepfake synthesis attacks and b) control-plane poisoning in distributed federated learning protocols. We present a framework coupling physics-guided deepfake detection with uncertainty-aware in edge learning. The framework fuses interpretable physics features modeling vocal tract dynamics with representations coming from a self-supervised learning module. The representations are then processed via a Multi-Modal Ensemble Architecture, followed by a Bayesian ensemble providing uncertainty estimates. Incorporating physics-based characteristics evaluations and uncertainty estimates of audio samples allows our proposed framework to remain robust to both advanced deepfake attacks and sophisticated control-plane poisoning, addressing the complete threat model for networked voice authentication.

**Index Terms**—Edge learning; data poisoning; voice authentication; spoof anti-deepfake; Bayesian uncertainty; control-plane screening.

## I. INTRODUCTION

ADVANCED neural speech deepfake generation has fundamentally transformed voice authentication security. Modern text-to-speech (TTS) and voice conversion (VC) systems can generate highly realistic audio from minimal target samples, enabling sophisticated attacks ranging from real-time impersonation to automated social engineering at a large scale [1]. This technological advancement has created a critical challenge for voice authentication systems: distinguishing genuine speech from increasingly sophisticated deepfake audio that can convincingly mimic authorized users [1].

The challenge is compounded by a fundamental limitation in current deepfake detection systems. While state-of-the-art detectors achieve impressive performance on controlled benchmarks with Equal Error Rates (EER) between 0.65% and 6.56% on ASVspoof datasets [2], [3], their effectiveness degrades substantially against novel synthesis algorithms not present in training data. This trade-off stems from over-reliance on dataset-specific artifacts rather than fundamental speech production invariants, creating a critical vulnerability as synthesis technology evolves [4].

Contemporary deployment trends introduce a second, equally critical threat. To preserve privacy and reduce latency, modern voice authentication systems increasingly rely on distributed edge learning protocols such as Federated Learning (FL), where models are trained and updated across multiple edge devices [5]. However, this distributed approach exposes the system to control-plane attacks: adversarial participants

can submit malicious parameter updates designed to compromise the global detection mechanism, even when raw audio never leaves edge devices [5].

Furthermore, existing research in deepfake audio detection has largely addressed these threats in isolation, leaving a critical security gap. The research focuses mainly on improving accuracy against known attacks without modeling distributed deployment risks. Meanwhile, FL security develops domain-agnostic defenses that cannot exploit audio-specific signals or uncertainty quantification. Specifically, a key challenge in FL security is the aggregator’s inability to directly inspect raw data on edge devices, making it difficult to distinguish between benign and malicious updates [6]. This gap between the research focus and FL security direction creates a fundamental vulnerability: no existing framework provides a defense mechanism against both sophisticated deepfake generated audio and distributed learning attacks.

We address this gap through a framework that couples physics-guided deepfake detection with Bayesian uncertainty estimate quantification. Specifically, quantifying the uncertainty of the deepfake detection system in its own predictions will serve as a critical metric for assessing trust and screening adversarial client updates in edge learning, without violating the privacy of users. Extensive evaluation on ASVspoof 2019 and 2021 [2], [3] datasets demonstrates the framework’s effectiveness across multiple attack scenarios. On logical access (LA) protocols, we achieve 6.80% EER, with modest degradation on 2021 LA (9.05% EER) validating cross-dataset generalization. Physical access (PA) evaluation yields 12.95% EER (2019 PA) and 15.05% EER (2021 PA), reflecting the increased complexity of replay attack detection across diverse acoustic environments and recording-playback chains.

The contributions of this work are threefold:

- 1) **Dual-Threat Defense Framework:** simultaneously addressing deepfake voice attacks and control-plane poisoning, bridging a critical gap in existing security research. We propose holistic defense that is more resilient than addressing each threat in isolation.
- 2) **Physics-Guided Uncertainty-Aware Detection:** integrates interpretable physics-based speech production features with self-supervised representations, enhanced with Bayesian uncertainty quantification that provides improved detection reliability and verifiable trust signals for distributed deployment.
- 3) **Trust-Based Aggregation Protocol:** a lightweight aggregation scheme that exploits the detector’s calibrated uncertainty estimates as domain-specific trust metrics.

## II. RELATED WORK

Contemporary deepfake detection is dominated by systems built on large-scale, self-supervised learning (SSL) models,

The authors are with the School of Information Technology, Deakin University, Geelong, VIC 3220, Australia.  
(e-mail: alireza.mohammadi9207@gmail.com; keshav.sood@deakin.edu.au; dhananjay.thiruvady@deakin.edu.au; asef.nazari@deakin.edu.au).

achieving state-of-the-art performance on benchmarks such as ASVspoof [2], [3]. These detection mechanisms excel at learning discriminative representations from large datasets. However, their performance degrades when evaluated against unseen deepfake generated samples [3].

Physics-guided approach represents a promising direction for improving generalization robustness. VoiceRadar [7] exemplifies this paradigm by incorporating interpretable physics-derived features that model micro-frequency dynamics consistent with human speech production. However, existing physics-guided detectors are designed for centralized deployment and lack calibrated uncertainty quantification and robustness against control-plane attacks.

Moreover, the deployment of machine learning on edge devices increasingly relies on FL to preserve user privacy and reduce communication overhead. However, this distributed paradigm introduces critical attack surface at the control-plane. A substantial body of work has demonstrated FL's vulnerability to model poisoning, where adversarial clients submit malicious parameter updates to degrade global model performance [3], [8]. Recent advances in FL security for networked edge systems reveal persistent challenges. Jamming attacks during model transmission pose significant threat [9] in wireless FL networks. Researchers demonstrate effective jamming mitigation by combining multiple access techniques with Bayesian game theory [9]. Though, the approach focuses on communication layer attacks rather than control-plane poisoning.

In another work, [10] employs Partial Homomorphic Encryption to protect FL model sharing from gradient leakage attacks. While the approach provides strong privacy guarantee, it introduces substantial computational overhead unsuitable for real-time voice authentication. It also lacks domain-specific screening mechanisms exploiting voice-specific signals. Edge-based intrusion detection systems using FL [11] demonstrate that distributed detection can maintain accuracy comparable to centralized approaches through model aggregation. However, these systems provide no defense against threats that can deliberately injecting malicious updates to operate control-plane poisoning attacks.

Adversarial robustness research [12] shows that continuous adversarial training can improve ML robustness against evolving attacks. This approach is applied by integrating real-world detected adversarial samples during ongoing learning sessions. While the approach sounds promising for general adversarial robustness, it does not address the unique challenge of control-plane poisoning in distributed voice authentication.

Our work bridges this critical gap by proposing a framework where the deepfake detector's output becomes a core security primitive for the distributed learning protocol. Incorporating calibrated uncertainty scores and physics-based consistency checks allows the framework to create a system robust to both advanced deepfake attacks and sophisticated control-plane poisoning. This approach addresses the threat model which is absent in the mentioned works, where the focus is on isolated aspects of this dual-threat scenario.

### III. OUR PROPOSED APPROACH

#### A. Threat Model

We consider an adversary whose objective is to compromise voice authentication system by introducing deepfake speech accepted as genuine. Specifically, the adversary operates across two attack strategies.

*Deepfake attacks.* The adversary generates high-fidelity deepfake voice through two attack vectors: (1) TTS synthesis, where neural vocoders (e.g. WaveNet) generate speech from text input, enabling arbitrary content creation; (2) VC, where source speech is transformed to mimic target speaker characteristics while preserving linguistic content. These attacks constitute the core deepfake threat.

Additionally, the adversary introduces distinct artifacts from recording-playback processes. They execute replay attacks by recording genuine speech of legitimate users and replaying them through various acoustic environments.

*Control-plane attacks.* In distributed edge learning scenarios, the adversary can participate submitting manipulated parameter updates during aggregation rounds to FL. The manipulations include: (1) gradient perturbations designed to bias the global model toward accepting specific deepfake samples; (2) calibration degradation attacks that corrupt uncertainty quantification without significantly affecting accuracy metrics [8]. We assume a gray-box threat model in which the adversary possesses knowledge of detector architecture and training protocols, access to public training datasets, but no access to trained model parameters or private training data.

#### B. System Architecture

Our framework comprises five modules, summarized in Figure 1. Each component contributes a distinct operation in the overall pipeline, and we outline their roles below.

*Module 1: Physics Feature Extraction.* This module computes interpretable physics-based features grounded in speech production. Similar to [7], we extract dynamic features modeling translational, rotational, and vibrational motion patterns of each audio sample. Let  $\mathbf{E} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times D}$  denote the SSL embedding sequence of length  $T$  with 1024-D, sampled at  $f_s = 50$  Hz. We compute velocity  $\mathbf{v}_i = (\mathbf{E}_{i+1} - \mathbf{E}_i)/\Delta t$  and acceleration  $\mathbf{a}_i = (\mathbf{v}_{i+1} - \mathbf{v}_i)/\Delta t$  at discrete time steps with  $\Delta t = 0.02$  s. The translational frequency shift quantifies momentum changes via

$$\Delta f_t = \frac{1}{T-1} \sum_{i=1}^{T-1} \|\mathbf{v}_i\|_2 + \frac{1}{2(T-2)} \sum_{i=1}^{T-2} \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2, \quad (1)$$

where  $\|\cdot\|_2$  denotes the  $\ell_2$  norm.  $\Delta f_t$  averages how fast the embedding moves and how quickly that speed changes. Indexing to  $T-1$  for  $\mathbf{v}_i$  and  $T-2$  for  $\mathbf{a}_i$  reflects finite differences on a length- $T$  sequence, where first and second differences reduce the number of valid points. Vibrational dynamics model oscillatory patterns through power spectral analysis:

$$\Delta f_v = \alpha \cdot \sigma \left( \arg \max_{\omega} \left\{ |\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{E}_{:,d} \odot w)|^2 \right\}_{d=1}^D \right), \quad (2)$$




Fig. 1. System architecture overview showing the five-module pipeline for physics-guided deepfake detection. Raw audio (16 kHz, 3-second segments) flows through: (1) Physics Feature Extraction, (2) SSL Backbone (frozen WavLM-Large), (3) Orthogonal Feature Fusion, (4) Hybrid Detection Backbone (ViT + GNN + Gradient Boosting), and (5) Bayesian uncertainty quantification, producing calibrated genuine/Deepfake audio samples classifications with uncertainty estimates.

where  $\mathcal{F}$  denotes the discrete Fourier transform,  $w \in \mathbb{R}^T$  is a Hann window which tapers sequence endpoints to reduce spectral leakage and stabilize peak estimates,  $\odot$  represents element-wise multiplication,  $\sigma(\cdot)$  is the standard deviation, and  $\alpha = 0.01$  is a normalization constant. Rotational dynamics capture angular momentum via

$$\Delta f_r = \beta \cdot \frac{1}{T-2} \sum_{i=1}^{T-2} \|\mathbf{v}_i \times \Delta \mathbf{v}_i\|_2, \quad (3)$$

where  $\times$  denotes the cross-product approximation and  $\beta = 0.1$  scales to physiological ranges. For PA scenarios, we compute six acoustically-informed features. Dynamic range compression is quantified as

$$R_{\text{dyn}} = 20 \log_{10} \left( \frac{\max_t |\mathbf{x}(t)|}{Q_{0.1}(|\mathbf{x}|)} \right) \text{ dB}, \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathbf{x}(t)$  is the raw waveform and  $Q_{0.1}(\cdot)$  is the 10th percentile. Together, these statistics form a compact 6-D physics vector that summarizes how embeddings move, oscillate, and change direction, and how the audio amplitude is compressed. The vector complementary to the SSL features serves as a discriminative attribute for separating genuine from deepfake audio.

**Module 2: Self-Supervised Learning Backbone.** A microsoft/wavlm-large encoder serves as the SSL backbone, producing 1024-D semantic embeddings that capture high-level statistical patterns in speech.

**Module 3: Orthogonal Feature Fusion.** To ensure complementary rather than redundant information integration, we apply QR decomposition to remove linear dependencies between

the  $D_{\text{SSL}} = 1024$ -D SSL embedding and  $D_{\text{phys}} = 6$ -D physics vector. Construct the batch feature matrix

$$\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{Z}_{\text{SSL}} \quad \mathbf{Z}_{\text{phys}}] \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times (D_{\text{SSL}} + D_{\text{phys}})}, \quad (5)$$

where  $B$  is the batch size,  $\mathbf{Z}_{\text{SSL}} \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times 1024}$  contains SSL embeddings, and  $\mathbf{Z}_{\text{phys}} \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times 6}$  contains physics features. Center features via  $\mathbf{X}_c = \mathbf{X} - \boldsymbol{\mu}$ , where  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = B^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^B \mathbf{X}_i$  is the feature-wise mean. Then QR decomposition is applied to the transposed centered matrix:

$$\mathbf{X}_c^T = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{R}, \quad (6)$$

where  $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{1030 \times 1030}$  is orthogonal. ( $\mathbf{Q}^T \mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{I}_{1030}$ ) The orthogonalized features are computed via truncated projection:

$$\mathbf{X}_{\text{ortho}} = \mathbf{X}_c \mathbf{Q}_k \mathbf{Q}_k^T, \quad (7)$$

where  $\mathbf{Q}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{1030 \times k}$  contains the first  $k = \min(B, 1030)$  columns of  $\mathbf{Q}$ .

The resulting 1030-D orthogonalized representation keeps the 1024-D SSL part and the 6-D physics part linearly decorrelated, preventing the high-dimensional SSL block from overwhelming physics cues. This fused vector is then passed directly to Module 4 as input so both sources influence the downstream decision.

**Module 4: Hybrid Detection Backbone.** The fused 1030-D feature vector  $\mathbf{X}_{\text{ortho}} \in \mathbb{R}^{1030}$  feeds three parallel architectural branches selected to capture complementary discriminative patterns:

(i) *Vision Transformer (ViT)*: Employs 8-layer transformer with 12-head self-attention (384-D model) to capture long-range dependencies in feature space. Unlike the architecture in Module 2 that processes statistical patterns in speech, ViT's global attention mechanism models positional relationships across the entire 1030-D feature vector, detecting deepfake artifacts that manifest as non-local feature correlations.

(ii) *Graph Neural Network (GNN)*: Implements 5-layer Graph Attention Network with 12 heads (96-D hidden) treating physics features as graph nodes with learned adjacency. Physics-based features of audio samples exhibit strong relational dependencies. Translational and rotational dynamics are coupled through conservation laws, while velocity magnitude depends on both. GNN explicitly models these physical relationships that ViT's position-agnostic attention cannot capture. This yields superior performance on PA replay detection where physics feature interactions are critical.

(iii) *Gradient Boosting (LightGBM)*: Deploys 500 estimators with max depth 6 to capture non-linear feature interactions through decision trees. While neural branches optimize smooth decision boundaries, boosting excels at modeling sharp, non-linear thresholds characteristic of deepfake audio samples.

The resulting embeddings from 3 branches concatenate into  $\mathbf{h} = [\mathbf{h}_{\text{ViT}}; \mathbf{h}_{\text{GNN}}; \mathbf{h}_{\text{GB}}] \in \mathbb{R}^{288}$ . This architectural diversity ensures that adaptive attacks optimized against one branch remain detectable by others.

**Module 5: Bayesian Uncertainty Decomposition.** This module transforms the deterministic 288-D detection embedding  $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{R}^{288}$  into calibrated probabilistic outputs with quantified uncertainty. This operation acts as an essential stage

for both deepfake classification and trust-based distributed aggregation. Following Gal & Ghahramani’s variational Monte Carlo (MC) Dropout Sampling inference framework [13], we approximate the posterior distribution over model parameters through stochastic forward passes with dropout enabled during the evaluation phase.

$$\{\mathbf{p}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^N, \quad \mathbf{p}^{(i)} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{p}_{\text{genuine}}^{(i)} \\ \hat{p}_{\text{fake}}^{(i)} \end{bmatrix} \in [0, 1]^2, \quad \hat{p}_{\text{genuine}}^{(i)} + \hat{p}_{\text{fake}}^{(i)} = 1, \\ \bar{\mathbf{p}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{p}^{(i)}. \quad (8)$$

Averaging the stochastic samples approximates Bayesian model averaging and provides principled uncertainty quantification.

Standard deterministic classifiers usually rely on outputting merely class probabilities without confidence estimates. In edge deployment scenarios where adversarial clients may submit poisoned updates or novel attack types emerge, calibrated uncertainty can enable us to: (1) identify low-confidence predictions requiring human review, (2) screen malicious client updates exhibiting anomalous uncertainty patterns, (3) adapt detection thresholds based on uncertainty. MC dropout enables these capabilities with minimal computational overhead.

SSL embeddings capture broad statistical structure in speech, while physics features encode production and replay constraints. Orthogonal fusion enforces complementarity so the physics signal is not overshadowed by the larger SSL block. The hybrid backbone contributes diverse inductive biases: ViT for non-local correlations, GNN for relations among physics features, and boosting for sharp thresholds. The Bayesian layer calibrates predictions and supplies uncertainty used for trust-based aggregation in edge learning.

## IV. EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION & DISCUSSION

### A. Datasets and Evaluation Protocols

We conduct a comprehensive evaluation using the ASVspoof benchmark datasets [2], [3]. The primary evaluation employs ASVspoof 2019 LA and PA protocols, containing 25,380/24,844/71,237 and 54,000/24,300/137,538 samples in train/development/test sets, respectively. Both protocols exhibit severe class imbalance with samples labeled as genuine comprising approximately 10% of each set and around 90% of samples labeled as deepfake generated (TTS and VC version for LA dataset). For cross-dataset assessment, we evaluate our model’s performance which has been trained on ASVspoof 2019 LA and PA against unseen ASVspoof 2021 LA and PA sets respectively. The 2021 LA test set includes 148,000 deepfake audio samples, while the 2021 PA set contains 137,538 samples.

All audio samples undergoes consistent preprocessing: resampling to 16 kHz, segmentation into 3-second non-overlapping windows, and normalization to [-1, 1] dynamic range. System performance is quantified using three complementary metrics: EER, ROC-AUC, and min-tDCF. Edge deployment analysis on Apple M4 Pro hardware (8-core CPU,

48 GB RAM) demonstrates practical feasibility: 149 ms end-to-end latency per 3-second audio segment, equivalent to 6.7 files/second throughput. The frozen SSL module’s backbone model requires 1.26 GB storage and 2.31 GB inference memory compatible with commodity edge servers and high-end mobile devices (flagship smartphones, IoT gateways). The performance can be feasible in deployment for batch audio analysis applications (voicemail screening, recorded call authentication). Software implementation employed AI-assisted development tools (Cursor IDE with Claude 4.1 and GPT-5) for the following purposes: systematic debugging and validation, code refactoring, and workflow documentation.

### B. Detection Performance

Table I presents our framework’s detection performance across ASVspoof 2019 and 2021 [2], [3] LA and PA protocols. On ASVspoof 2019 LA (primary evaluation), we achieve 6.80% EER, 0.0187 min-tDCF, and 0.9751 ROC-AUC. Cross-dataset evaluation on ASVspoof 2021 LA yields 9.05% EER (2.25 percentage point degradation). Physical access protocols show 12.95% EER (2019 PA) and 15.05% EER (2021 PA), reflecting the increased complexity of replay attack detection across diverse acoustic environments with varied recording-playback chains and transducer characteristics.

TABLE I  
DETECTION PERFORMANCE ACROSS ASVspoof PROTOCOLS

Protocol	EER (%)	min-tDCF	ROC-AUC
ASVspoof 2019 LA	6.80	0.0187	0.9751
ASVspoof 2021 LA	9.05	0.0155	0.9785
ASVspoof 2019 PA	12.95	0.0383	0.9332
ASVspoof 2021 PA	15.05	0.0427	0.9223

VoiceRadar [7] reports exceptional EER performance (0.10% on ASVspoof 2019, 0.06% on ASVspoof 2021). However, VoiceRadar optimizes purely for detection accuracy in controlled centralized deployment, lacking uncertainty quantification, edge resource constraints, and distributed learning security mechanisms. Our framework explicitly trades modest accuracy reduction for capabilities essential to practical edge deployment. These capabilities include calibrated confidence estimates and Bayesian uncertainty decomposition that VoiceRadar’s architecture cannot provide.

We validate the fundamental premise that physics-derived features provide discriminative signals through empirical cumulative distribution function (ECDF) analysis on training partitions. ASVspoof LA’ evaluation scenarios demonstrate similar discriminative patterns through the temporal-frequency variation feature (Fig. 2). Deepfake audio samples show systematic leftward distribution shift with median reduction from 0.0847 to 0.0655, corresponding to  $D = 0.296$  and ROC-AUC = 0.697. This statistical attribute validates that deepfake generated samples introduce temporal-frequency artifacts detectable through physics-informed feature engineering.

For PA scenarios, the embedding mean velocity magnitude exhibits class separation (Fig. 3). Deepfake

generated audio distributions shift leftward with mean values dropping from 288.04 to 247.31, yielding Kolmogorov-Smirnov distance  $D = 0.292$  and univariate ROC-AUC of 0.683. This separation reflects the physics-based hypothesis that replay attacks introduce velocity artifacts inconsistent with natural speech production dynamics.




Fig. 2. ECDFs for the temporal-frequency variation feature on ASvspoof 2019 LA. The left shift for deepfake-generated audio is pronounced, resulting in a KS distance  $D \approx 0.296$  and a univariate ROC-AUC of 0.697. This confirms the feature’s utility independent of the neural backbone.




Fig. 3. ECDFs for the embedding mean velocity magnitude feature on ASvspoof 2019 PA. The deepfake distribution (red) is visibly shifted left relative to the genuine distribution (blue), yielding a Kolmogorov-Smirnov distance  $D \approx 0.292$ . This demonstrates the feature’s discriminative power.

The Bayesian Uncertainty Quantification provides uncertainty decomposition with practical implications for both detection reliability and trust assessment. Genuine samples average 0.430 total uncertainty, while deepfakes average 0.490. This 14% relative increase in deepfake uncertainty underpins our distributed aggregation protocol: clients exhibiting anomalous uncertainty patterns on validation probes (e.g., systematically uniform low uncertainty across diverse samples) are flagged as potentially malicious through median absolute deviation screening. This attribute brings robustness in FL without requiring raw audio transmission between clients and aggregator.

## V. CONCLUSION

In this work, we addressed the dual threat of deepfake attacks and control-plane poisoning in distributed voice authentication systems. We introduced a framework that integrates physics-guided detection with Bayesian uncertainty quantification. Our results demonstrated that physics-informed features provide consistent discriminative power between deepfake generated and genuine audio samples. While the system’s latency and memory footprint are suitable for edge deployment in non-interactive tasks, model distillation to meet the stricter requirements of real-time applications and include empirical validation of the framework’s resilience against a wider range of poisoning attacks warrants further investigation.

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. Mohammadi, K. Sood, A. Nazari, and D. Thiruvady, “Securing voice authentication applications against targeted data poisoning,” *IEEE Internet Computing*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 41–47, 2025.
- [2] X. Wang *et al.*, “Asvspoof 2019: A large-scale public database of synthesized, converted and replayed speech,” *Computer Speech & Language*, vol. 64, p. 101114, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0885230820300474>
- [3] X. Liu *et al.*, “Asvspoof 2021: Towards spoofed and deepfake speech detection in the wild,” *IEEE/ACM Trans. Audio, Speech and Lang. Proc.*, vol. 31, p. 2507–2522, Jun. 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TASLP.2023.3285283>
- [4] D. Combei, A. Stan, D. Oneata, and H. Cucu, “Wavlm model ensemble for audio deepfake detection,” in *The Automatic Speaker Verification Spoofing Countermeasures Workshop (ASvspoof 2024)*, 2024, pp. 170–175. [Online]. Available: [https://www.isca-archive.org/asvspoof\\_2024/combei24\\_asvspoof.pdf](https://www.isca-archive.org/asvspoof_2024/combei24_asvspoof.pdf)
- [5] P. Kairouz, H. B. McMahan, B. Avent *et al.*, “Advances and open problems in federated learning,” *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, vol. 14, no. 1–2, pp. 1–210, 2021. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1561/22000000083>
- [6] Y. Guo, H. Huang, X. Chen, H. Zhao, and Y. Wang, “Audio deepfake detection with self-supervised wavlm and multi-fusion attentive classifier,” *ICASSP 2024 - 2024 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pp. 12 702–12 706, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:266191523>
- [7] K. Kumari, M. AbbasiHafshejani, A. Pegoraro, P. Rieger, K. Arshi, M. Jadhwal, and A. Sadeghi, “Voiceradar: Voice deepfake detection using micro-frequency and compositional analysis,” *Proceedings 2025 Network and Distributed System Security Symposium*, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:276748784>
- [8] G. Xia, J. Chen, C. Yu, and J. Ma, “Poisoning attacks in federated learning: A survey,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 11, pp. 10 708–10 722, 2023.
- [9] S. Barkatsa, M. Diamanti, P. Charatsaris, E. E. Tsiropoulou, and S. Papavassiliou, “Jamming attack mitigation in wireless federated learning networks using bayesian games,” *IEEE Networking Letters*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 247–251, 2024.
- [10] C. Zhou and N. Ansari, “Securing federated learning enabled nwdaf architecture with partial homomorphic encryption,” *IEEE Networking Letters*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 299–303, 2023.
- [11] A. Oki, Y. Ogawa, K. Ota, and M. Dong, “Evaluation of applying federated learning to distributed intrusion detection systems through explainable ai,” *IEEE Networking Letters*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 198–202, 2024.
- [12] M. elShehaby, A. Kotha, and A. Matrawy, “Introducing adaptive continuous adversarial training (acat) to enhance machine learning robustness,” *IEEE Networking Letters*, vol. 6, pp. 208–212, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:272161360>
- [13] Y. Gal and Z. Ghahramani, “Dropout as a bayesian approximation: Representing model uncertainty in deep learning,” in *Proceedings of The 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, M. F. Balcan and K. Q. Weinberger, Eds., vol. 48. New York, New York, USA: PMLR, 20–22 Jun 2016, pp. 1050–1059. [Online]. Available: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v48/gal16.html>