TriDF: Evaluating Perception, Detection, and Hallucination for Interpretable DeepFake Detection

Jian-Yu Jiang-Lin^{1*} Kang-Yang Huang^{1*} Ling Zou^{1*} Ling Lo² Sheng-Ping Yang¹ Yu-Wen Tseng¹ Kun-Hsiang Lin¹ Chia-Ling Chen¹ Yu-Ting Ta¹ Yan-Tsung Wang¹ Po-Ching Chen¹ Hongxia Xie³ Hong-Han Shuai² Wen-Huang Cheng^{1†}

¹National Taiwan University ²National Yang Ming Chiao Tung University ³Jilin University

Abstract

Advances in generative modeling have made it increasingly easy to fabricate realistic portrayals of individuals, creating serious risks for security, communication, and public trust. Detecting such person-driven manipulations requires systems that not only distinguish altered content from authentic media but also provide clear and reliable reasoning. In this paper, we introduce TriDF, a comprehensive benchmark for interpretable DeepFake detection. TriDF contains high-quality forgeries from advanced synthesis models, covering 16 DeepFake types across image, video, and audio modalities. The benchmark evaluates three key aspects: Perception, which measures the ability of a model to identify fine-grained manipulation artifacts using humanannotated evidence; Detection, which assesses classification performance across diverse forgery families and generators; and Hallucination, which quantifies the reliability of model-generated explanations. Experiments on state-ofthe-art multimodal large language models show that accurate perception is essential for reliable detection, but hallucination can severely disrupt decision-making, revealing the interdependence of these three aspects. TriDF provides a unified framework for understanding the interaction between detection accuracy, evidence identification, and explanation reliability, offering a foundation for building trustworthy systems that address real-world synthetic media threats.

1. Introduction

Fueled by rapid advances in AI-generated content, modern synthesis techniques have intensified the societal risks associated with DeepFakes, a human-centered form of forgery that manipulates or fabricates a person's identity, appear-




Figure 1. **Overview of TriDF**. We propose TriDF, a comprehensive benchmark tailored to interpretable DeepFake detection models. (a) We construct 5K high-quality DeepFake samples using 16 DeepFake techniques across three modalities. (b) We design a comprehensive and hierarchical taxonomy of fine-grained artifacts to decompose perception, detection, and hallucination tendency into artifact-wise analyses. (c) The statistics of the proposed TriDF, and the evaluation results of MLLMs. We normalize the results per metric for clearer comparisons.

ance, or actions. Unlike general synthetic media, Deep-Fakes specifically target people, creating highly realistic audio, images, and videos that are increasingly difficult to distinguish from genuine human footage. The human-

^{*}Equal contribution.

[†]Corresponding author: wenhuang@csie.ntu.edu.tw

focused nature greatly amplifies their potential for harm, enabling large-scale misinformation campaigns, targeted financial fraud, identity theft, reputational attacks, and severe personal harassment [75, 115].

Given the growing threats introduced by recent advances in generative models [20, 44, 73, 83, 103, 113, 114], Deep-Fake detection has become a critical problem in both research and real-world applications. Beyond simply identifying whether a sample is fake [37, 78, 95, 119, 127], there is an increasing need for detectors to provide clear and reliable explanations. As Deepfakes directly target humancentered content, stakeholders must understand why a piece of media is considered manipulated rather than relying on an opaque decision. Interpretability is therefore crucial for building trust, enabling human oversight, and supporting accountability in systems that may influence public perception or legal judgments. Moreover, interpretable detection helps reveal which visual, temporal, or acoustic cues modern generators exploit or conceal, offering deeper insight into the evolving landscape of human-centered forgery. As multimodal large language models (MLLMs) [36, 47, 52, 111, 116, 142] become increasingly used for detection [145], the importance of grounded, human-aligned explanations becomes even more pronounced.

Despite the increasing importance of explainable deepfake detection, progress is still limited by the shortcomings of current evaluation resources. Previous DeepFake datasets [63, 88] have played an important role in advancing raw detection accuracy, yet their annotations are restricted to binary classification. They lack the systematic and fine-grained labels required to evaluate interpretability, and therefore cannot serve as effective benchmarks for modern explainable detection methods. In addition, existing DeepFake benchmarks [47, 52, 65, 106, 123, 135, 142] suffer from narrow coverage of manipulation types and insufficient generator diversity. As a result, models evaluated using these benchmarks often fail to generalize to the diverse and rapidly evolving landscape of human-centered manipulations. Moreover, a final and critical limitation is the lack of hallucination evaluation in MLLM-based detectors. When these models generate explanations, they may produce incorrect, fabricated, or irrelevant reasoning that does not correspond to any observable artifact in the manipulated sample. Although hallucination metrics have been proposed in other domains [66], they are primarily designed for authentic content and do not address the unique challenges posed by DeepFake detection, where explanations must precisely identify manipulation evidence. Without explicit evaluation of hallucination, it is impossible to assess whether an explanation is genuinely grounded in the visual evidence or merely a plausible description that fails to reflect the actual manipulation.

To address the limitations, we introduce Tri-Perspective

DeepFake Detection Benchmark, namely **TriDF**, a comprehensive benchmark designed to evaluate interpretable DeepFake Detection. As shown in Fig. 1, TriDF contains high-quality DeepFakes generated by state-of-the-art synthesis models and covers 16 manipulation types across three modalities, including image, video, and audio. The evaluation framework consists of three complementary aspects: Perception, Detection, and Hallucination. Perception evaluates whether a model can correctly recognize the manipulation artifacts introduced by different generators. We construct a detailed taxonomy of fine-grained artifact categories such as quality degradation and semantic inconsistencies, and collect human annotations to establish reliable, human-aligned ground truth. These perceptual labels provide a concrete and structured form of interpretability and allow explanation quality to be assessed in a consistent and evidence-grounded manner. Detection measures the ability of a model to differentiate authentic samples from manipulated ones across the full diversity of DeepFake types and generators in TriDF. *Hallucination* evaluates the reliability of model-generated explanations by identifying reasoning that is fabricated or unsupported by the evidence indicated in Perception. We benchmark a wide range of state-of-theart MLLMs on TriDF, yielding several important insights. First, accurate perception of manipulation artifacts is a necessary foundation for reliable DeepFake detection. Models that correctly identify fine-grained artifacts tend to perform better in classification, showing that perceiving the right evidence is essential for making correct decisions. However, perception alone is not sufficient. We find that hallucination can severely disrupt detection performance. When a model generates fabricated or unsupported reasoning, its decision-making becomes unstable, and strong perceptual ability no longer translates into accurate detection. The results indicate that detection quality depends jointly on accurate perception and low hallucination. Together, these findings show that perception, detection, and hallucination form an interdependent triad. Neglecting any one of them produces an incomplete picture of the true capability of a detector. The findings underscore the necessity of TriDF, which evaluates all three aspects in an integrated manner and enables a holistic understanding of model reliability in real-world, human-centered DeepFake scenarios.

2. Related Work

2.1. Deepfake Detection: Trends toward MLLMs

Conventional DeepFake detection is typically formulated as a supervised binary classification task. Although such models can achieve high accuracy on their training datasets, they often fail to generalize under distribution shifts due to overfitting to dataset-specific cues [8, 90, 104, 121, 139]. Recent image-level approaches incorporate explicit foren-




Figure 2. Pipeline of TriDF. (a) Generation & Annotation: We first collect open-source human-related datasets across three modalities. We generate real-fake data pairs using 16 DeepFake (DF) techniques and perform quality control by authenticity and consistency metrics to obtain high-quality data. We then construct quality and semantic artifact questions and perform human annotation, resulting in reliable ground truth. (b) Evaluation: We design three types of questions, *e.g.*, True-False, Multiple-Choice, and Open-Ended. These questions are combined with high-quality data and fed into MLLMs for evaluation, where the model responses are then assessed using our proposed metrics to evaluate their perception ability, interpretable detection performance, and tendencies towards hallucination.

sic priors and auxiliary objectives that target upsampling traces, frequency artifacts, and cross-view inconsistencies, thereby improving generalization to unseen generators [68, 99, 119]. Other methods combine semantic understanding with pixel-level evidence to enhance robustness against high-quality forgeries [16, 79]. For video-based detection, recent advancements incorporate temporal and physiological cues, enforce audio-visual consistency, target challenging facial regions, and utilize training to reduce shortcut reliance [40, 95]. Nevertheless, robustness to unseen manipulations and real-world distortions remains limited.

To enhance generalization and interpretability, MLLM-based detectors combine vision encoders with LLMs for unified detection and reasoning. FakeShield [116], SIDA [47], FakeVLM [111], and KFD [126] utilize multimodal reasoning and knowledge-guided learning, whereas LEGION [52] and AIGI-Holmes [142] emphasize humanlike visual and linguistic reasoning, prioritizing conceptual justification over low-level artifacts.

While MLLM-based approaches improve interpretability, their reasoning remains vulnerable to hallucination [51, 145]. To mitigate this, FFTG [98] grounds explanations by pairing mask-guided localization from real-fake comparisons with structured prompts and then fine-tuning CLIP and MLLMs via alignment and fusion objectives for more faithful, transferable rationales. Extending to video-level scenarios, AvatarShield [117] integrates temporal and semantic reasoning under reinforcement-learning consistency constraints, enhancing interpretability and reducing spuri-

ous explanations over time.

2.2. Benchmarks in Deepfake Analysis

On the benchmarking side, the field has also evolved from early classifier-centric corpora toward benchmarks that emphasize interpretability, multimodality, and reasoning capabilities. Early datasets such as FaceForensics++ [88] and DFDC [24] laid the foundation for image-based DeepFake research, while large-scale benchmarks like ForgeryNet [41] and LAV-DF [7] have expanded both modality coverage and supervision granularity. More recently, fully AI-generated suites such as GenImage [143] and GenVideo [12] have further emphasized cross-generator transferability. However, existing datasets and benchmarks have generally lacked explicit consideration of explainability.

To operationalize explainability, several companion datasets have been released alongside detection frameworks. For instance, MMTD-Set [116] and SID-Set [47] integrate pixel-level manipulation masks with natural-language rationales. DD-VQA [135] reformulates facial manipulation forensics as a visual question answering problem equipped with rationale vocabularies, while FakeClue [111] extends analysis across diverse scenarios through artifact-aware textual explanations of synthetic images. Extending to the video modality, FakeHuman-Vid [117] supports temporally aligned reasoning across frames and encompasses multiple video generation conditions. Nonetheless, these datasets remain limited in gener-

Table 1. A comparison of TriDF against existing MLLM benchmarks for DeepFake detection. Symbols denote: A A	Accuracy (e.g., F1-
score, AUC), \heartsuit Similarity-based (<i>e.g.</i> , ROUGE-L, CSS), \diamondsuit LLM-as-a-judge (<i>e.g.</i> , GPTScore), and \clubsuit Cover.	

Dataset	Size of	Number of	DeepFake	Data	a Mod	ality	Metrics for	Evaluation for	Evaluation for	Real-Fake
Dataset	Testing Set	Generator	Types	Img	Vid	Aud	Interpretability	Perception	Hallucination	Pair
DD-VQA [135]	15K	4	4	✓	-	-	Φ.	✓	×	×
FakeBench [65]	3.6K	10	1	✓	-	-	\spadesuit , \heartsuit , \diamondsuit	×	×	×
SynthScars [52]	12K	18	4	✓	-	-	\Diamond	×	×	×
AIGI-Holmes [142]	1K	18	4	✓	-	-	♡, ♦	×	×	×
SID-Set [47]	30K	1	1	/	-	-	\Diamond	×	×	×
AvatarShield [117]	15K	9	3	-	✓	-	•	×	×	×
Forensics-Bench [106]	63K	22	10	✓	✓	-	•	×	×	×
LOKI [123]	18K	18	3	✓	✓	✓	♠, ♦	×	×	×
TriDF (Ours)	76K	51	16	V	√	√	4 , 4	√	√	✓

ative diversity and modality scope, and their rationale annotations, often produced by large language models, may introduce bias or inconsistency.

Recent benchmarks such as FakeBench [65] explore explainable fake image detection via natural-language annotations and fine-grained forgery taxonomy, evaluating MLLMs on detection, interpretation, and causal reasoning. LOKI [123] further establishes a multimodal benchmark across images, videos, 3D, audio, and text, emphasizing fine-grained anomaly identification and rationalized reasoning to assess interpretability on synthetic content. However, these benchmarks primarily evaluate model outputs instead of confirming whether MLLMs genuinely perceive low-level visual artifacts or reason through high-level semantic inconsistencies. Additionally, their explanatory hallucinations remain unexamined.

3. Tri-Perspective DeepFake Detection Benchmark(TriDF)

3.1. DeepFake Data Generation

To comprehensively assess MLLMs' ability to distinguish DeepFakes from real data, we generate DeepFakes using over 50 specialized models across more than 30 public datasets, yielding about 5K real-synthetic pairs. Given the risks posed by increasingly realistic AI-generated media, we categorize DeepFake generation into two groups: partially manipulated and fully synthetic, covering 16 tasks in total. Partially manipulated tasks include image/video face swapping, facial attribute manipulation, lip-syncing, face reenactment, full-body puppetry, subjectdriven image/video editing, and voice conversion. Fully synthetic tasks include audio-driven talking head synthesis, identity-preserving image/video generation, humanscene image/video and image-to-video generation, and voice cloning. Please refer to Sec. A for detailed definitions of DeepFake tasks.

Data Generation. To promote sample diversity, we sourced publicly available real human datasets [14, 19, 53, 54, 56, 70, 88, 125, 131] spanning image, video, and audio modal-

ities. To accommodate the growing variety of generators, we leverage state-of-the-art models, including open-source models such as generative adversarial networks (GAN)based approaches [118], Stable Diffusion (SD)-based models [18, 140], diffusion transformer (DiT)-based models [4, 13], as well as proprietary ones [32, 33, 81], all tailored for DeepFake creation to ensure the superior fidelity and quality in the outputs. For each DeepFake technique, we begin by selecting real samples from test sets or those unused in training to simulate real-world scenarios. We then generate corresponding fake samples using at least three distinct models, forming a multimodal DeepFake dataset with rigorous one-to-one real-fake pairings, which enables precise and fine-grained annotation. Furthermore, we employ specialized metrics to assess realism and consistency, ensuring automatic quality control before initiating the annotation process. Please refer to Sec. B for more details.

3.2. Fine-Grained Artifact Taxonomy

The rapid progression of AI, from early GANs to modern Diffusion Models, has made DeepFakes increasingly realistic and diverse, creating challenges for both detection and annotation, while exposing the limits of simple real-orfake labels. Although MLLM-based detectors offer interpretable, anomaly-grounded reasoning, prior work [47, 65, 111, 116, 123, 135] still lacks a comprehensive, standardized artifact-annotation framework that evaluates models' perceptual and reasoning abilities, as well as their susceptibility to hallucination.

Despite these strides in prior research [47, 65, 111, 116, 123, 135], a key gap persists: there is no comprehensive, standardized method for annotating artifacts that specifically assesses the perceptual and reasoning capabilities of detection models, along with the tendency to hallucination. Moreover, many benchmarks rely on carefully engineered prompts to use powerful MLLMs (*e.g.*, GPT-40 [80]) both to generate explanations and to judge the outputs of other models, including themselves. Such automated evaluation inherits the limitations and biases of the underlying MLLMs, reducing the reliability of textual explana-

tions [98] and introducing self-preference bias [11].

Taxonomy of DeepFake Artifacts. To address these challenges, we propose a novel taxonomy for assessing Deep-Fake detectors, aiming for a framework that is more diagnostic. Inspired by [65, 135], our approach categorizes artifacts into two distinct categories based on their nature and the reasoning required to detect them: quality artifacts and semantic artifacts. Quality artifacts, such as blurriness, noise, or flicker, are typically localized issues that can be identified using traditional image processing methods. Conversely, semantic artifacts, including anatomical inconsistencies, object integrity flaws, unrecognizable text. or unnatural prosody, require human-like common sense to spot. We further enhance this taxonomy by grounding quality artifacts in specific locations (e.g., the nasal area, limbs, or background) to systematically evaluate the localization abilities of MLLMs. Details about taxonomy and annotation platform are provided in Sec. C and Sec. D.

3.3. Benchmark Construction

To comprehensively evaluate the abilities of MLLMs, we categorize our assessment into three distinct dimensions: *Perception*, *Detection*, and *Hallucination*. Each dimension employs specific question formats: True-False Questions (<TFQ>), Multiple-Choice Questions (<MCQ>), and Open-Ended Questions (<OEQ>), alongside distinct sampling strategies tailored to the specific evaluation goal. Recognizing that successful DeepFake detection hinges on accurate perception as a foundation for rationalized outcomes, we structure the benchmark to evaluate perceptual acuity, detection proficiency, and the tendency to hallucinate.

Perception dimension is designed to test the model's sensitivity to DeepFake flaws. Therefore, it exclusively utilizes manipulated samples across image, video, and audio modalities. This category encompasses <TFQ>, <MCQ>, and Type-A $\langle OEQ \rangle$. Within this scope, $\langle TFQ \rangle$ and $\langle MCQ \rangle$ are strictly divided into artifact-related questions and locationrelated questions. Artifact-related questions probe whether a specific anomaly exists or identify which artifacts are present. Location-related questions are further organized into two types: Type-1 asks whether any artifact appears in a designated region or determines its location, while Type-2 queries the presence or location of a specific artifact. To heighten the challenge, each <MCQ> includes a "none of the above" option and allows for multiple valid selections. Furthermore, Type-A <OEQ> falls under this perceptionfocused category, informing the model that the sample is a DeepFake and requiring a comprehensive, structured analysis of all noticeable artifacts under clear headings.

Detection dimension focuses on the model's capability to distinguish between authentic and manipulated content, necessitating a dataset that contains both real and fake samples. This task relies solely on Type-B <OEQ>. Unlike

Type-A, Type-B prompts the model to classify the sample as authentic or manipulated without prior knowledge of the ground truth. This process adheres to explicit guidelines and a strict output format, mandating that the model state its binary decision first, followed by a list of identified artifacts and supporting reasoning.

Hallucination dimension evaluates the model's tendency to fabricate non-existent artifacts. This assessment is derived from the responses to both Type-A and Type-B <OEQ> and applies to both real and fake samples to identify instances where the model hallucinates artifacts.

Considering the "selection bias" common in MLLMs [74, 141], we ensure an even distribution of ground truth options. More details are provided in Sec. E.

3.4. Evaluation Metric

Perception and Detection. For <TFO>, we use accuracy (Acc.) as the evaluation metric. For <MCQ>, each question has M options, with K correct ones. We award +1/K points for each correctly selected option and deduct 1/(M-K) points for each incorrectly selected option. Unselected options receive no points, either added or deducted. Since responses from MLLMs tend to be lengthy and freeform, even with strict instructions or system prompts, we utilize an external large language model (LLM), e.g. Gemini 2.5 Flash-Lite [31], to map artifacts. This stable LLM, combined with a simple prompt template (detailed in the supplementary material), produces outputs of either yes or no. Our approach avoids the need for additional parsing in <OEQ> evaluation and differs from methods that rely on powerful closed-source MLLMs as judges, such as GPTScore in [29, 123]. Specifically, TriDF prompts MLLM with a query, $I = \{DF, Que\}$, where DF represents the generated DeepFake sample, and Que denotes the <OEQ>. As illustrated in Fig. 2, we obtain the initial response \mathbb{R}^{DF} by fitting I into MLLM. We first create an array of predefined artifacts, $Art = \{art_1 \cdots art_n\}$ consisting of n annotated artifacts in TriDF to filter unnecessary artifacts in R^{DF} . Next, we apply artifact mapping by an external LLM, θ , to R^{DF} to create a mapped artifact list, $R_{art}^{DF} = \{art_1^{R^{DF}} \cdots art_n^{R^{DF}}\}$, defined as:

$$R_{art}^{DF} = \theta(R^{DF}). \tag{1}$$

After obtaining the mapped artifact list R_{art}^{DF} , we further construct Y_{art}^{DF} , which is a list where values indicate positive or negative presence in the input DF. This allows us to quantify the interpretability of DeepFake detection by calculating Cover [105] using R_{art}^{DF} and Y_{art}^{DF} to measure the coverage of artifacts in the response, defined as:

$$Cover(R) = \frac{|R_{art}^{DF} \cap Y_{art}|}{|Y_{art}|}.$$
 (2)




Figure 3. Radar chart of accuracy of semantic artifacts and quality artifacts in <TFQ>.

For Type-B <OEQ>, we further report accuracy (Acc.) to evaluate the detection performance, in addition to *Cover*. *Hallucination*. Drawing from prior works [34, 69], we resort to *CHAIR* [87], *Hal* [105], and *F-score* [64] to assess the hallucination tendencies of MLLMs. *CHAIR* is a widely used metric measuring the frequency of hallucinatory artifacts appearing in responses and is calculated as:

$$CHAIR(R) = 1 - \frac{|R_{art}^{DF} \cap Y_{art}|}{|R_{art}^{DF}|}.$$
 (3)

Hal represents the percentage of responses containing hallucinations, defined as

$$Hal(R) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } CHAIR(R) \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$
 (4)

To account for false positives, which are often driven by hallucinations and can severely impact precision, we follow the THRONE [55] framework by weighting precision twice as important as recall in the F^{β} -score, formulated as:

$$F^{\beta}(R) = \frac{(1+\beta^2) \cdot (1 - CHAIR(R)) \cdot Cover(R)}{(\beta^2 \cdot (1 - CHAIR(R))) + Cover(R)}, \quad (5)$$

where β is 0.5. In cases where the list of mapped artifacts has a length of 0, we assign a value of 1 to *CHAIR* as a penalty. This reflects the fact that the MLLM has failed to properly address the <OEQ>. Similarly, if the model mistakenly classifies a fake sample as real, we also set *CHAIR* to 1. All the metrics are computed on a per-sample basis. Additional details on metric calculations are provided in the supplementary material.

4. Experiments

Evaluation of Perception. We begin by assessing the perception dimension using the <TFQ> and <MCQ> subsets constructed on manipulated samples only, as summarized in Tab. 2. These two test sets target complementary aspects of perceptual capability: <TFQ> mainly probes whether

a model can reliably verify the presence or absence of a single artifact or location cue, while <MCQ> requires selecting one or more correct options among several plausible candidates and an explicit "none of the above" choice, which reduces the chance of answering by relying solely on option priors. Across both settings, proprietary MLLMs (GPT-5, Gemini-2.5-Pro, and Claude-Sonnet-4.5) consistently outperform open-source systems, confirming a clear gap in low-level and mid-level DeepFake perception between closed and open models.

A closer comparison between <TFQ> and <MCQ> reveals that these two formats stress different weaknesses. Claude-Sonnet-4.5, for example, achieves the strongest performance on <MCQ> but exhibits a noticeable drop on <TFQ>, suggesting that it can effectively exploit the richer contextual cues and answer structure in multi-choice questions, yet struggles more when forced to make isolated binary judgments without distractor options. In contrast, among open-source models, Qwen3-VL-30B, InternVL2-5-38B, and LLaVA-OV-72B achieve relatively balanced and competitive results across both <TFQ> and <MCQ>, indicating that stronger visual encoders and larger vision-language backbones do translate into better DeepFake perception, although their absolute accuracy still lags behind the best proprietary systems.

Overall, these results reveal a clear performance gap between proprietary and open-source MLLMs on both <TFQ> and <MCQ>, and show that robust DeepFake perception is still far from solved. Even the strongest systems only moderately outperform random guessing in several settings, indicating substantial headroom for improvement. To pinpoint where current MLLMs actually struggle, we analyze performance across individual artifact types in Sec. 5 (RQ1).

Interpretable Detection, Perception and Hallucination Robustness. Tab. 3 reports results on two test sets along three dimensions: detection accuracy (ACC), explanatory coverage (Cover), and hallucination severity (CHAIR, Hal). For Type-A <0EQ> questions, where the input is known to be fake, proprietary MLLMs, Qwen3-Omni-30B, and LLaVa-OV-72B can effectively explain potential artifacts, achieving Cover above 0.50. However, their relatively high CHAIR and Hal scores indicate that hallucinations remain widespread in most model outputs. The $F^{0.5}$ -score provides a single weighted indicator that jointly accounts for Cover and CHAIR, and is thus suitable for holistic evaluation of interpretability and hallucination.

For Type-B <OEQ> questions, models must both classify real/fake and provide an explanation. In the image modality, Gemini-2.5-Pro and Qwen3-Omni-30B achieve strong detection accuracy and higher *Cover* than other models, reflecting stronger explanatory ability. Nonetheless, Qwen3-Omni-30B still exhibits hallucinations, as suggested by its

Table 2. Evaluation of Multimodal Deepfake Perception

					<tfq< th=""><th>></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th><mcq></mcq></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></tfq<>	>									<mcq></mcq>					
MLLM	Image			[Video			Avg.	Avg. Rank		Ima	ge		l	Vid	eo		Avg.	Rank	
	Semantic	Quality	Location	Avg.	Semantic	Quality	Location	Avg.			Semantic	Quality	Location	Avg.	Semantic	Quality	Location	Avg.		
Random Guess	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	-	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-
InternVL2_5-8B	57.94%	47.87%	54.30%	53.37%	47.55%	53.03%	53.68%	51.91%	52.64%	13	-0.01	-0.35	0.10	-0.09	-0.10	-0.34	-0.05	-0.17	-0.13	20
InternVL2_5-26B	57.39%	48.82%	55.63%	53.95%	47.76%	53.72%	53.94%	52.34%	53.14%	11	0.08	-0.12	0.22	0.06	0.08	-0.21	0.07	-0.02	0.02	10
InternVL2_5-38B	57.94%	48.82%	57.07%	54.61%	47.57%	53.83%	54.47%	52.62%	53.62%	9	-0.00	-0.21	0.23	0.01	-0.12	-0.38	-0.07	-0.19	-0.09	18
InternVL3_5-8B	56.20%	44.91%	59.96%	53.69%	48.76%	56.16%	57.16%	53.94%	53.82%	8	-0.04	-0.06	0.20	0.03	0.18	0.03	0.20	0.14	0.08	4
InternVL3_5-38B-A3B	56.16%	51.66%	53.24%	53.69%	45.94%	56.07%	51.08%	51.69%	52.69%	12	0.13	0.01	0.19	0.11	-0.01	-0.16	0.08	-0.03	-	-
LLaVA-OV-7B	39.58%	41.25%	0.00%	26.94%	35.57%	40.47%	0.00%	25.75%	26.34%	18	0.05	-0.30	0.02	-0.08	-0.02	-0.29	-0.05	-0.12	-0.10	19
LLaVA-OV-72B	61.37%	50.00%	56.81%	56.06%	51.78%	51.84%	54.96%	53.66%	54.86%	6	0.04	0.09	0.04	0.06	0.08	0.13	0.09	0.10	0.08	6
Qwen3-Omni-30B-A3B	56.87%	62.11%	62.52%	60.50%	50.82%	63.13%	60.31%	58.69%	59.60%	4	0.03	-0.12	0.28	0.06	-0.06	-0.14	0.07	-0.04	0.01	12
Qwen3-VL-8B	56.87%	59.58%	64.55%	60.33%	48.37%	59.26%	56.60%	56.14%	58.24%	5	0.04	-0.16	0.18	0.02	0.07	-0.21	0.09	-0.01	0.00	13
Qwen3-VL-30B	59.32%	60.49%	63.32%	61.04%	49.04%	67.78%	59.14%	59.25%	60.15%	2	0.07	0.20	0.30	0.19	0.14	0.23	0.18	0.18	0.18	2
MiniCPM-V-2.6	42.30%	52.23%	45.65%	46.73%	52.45%	47.03%	46.47%	48.17%	47.45%	16	0.04	0.06	-0.01	0.03	0.07	0.08	0.05	0.07	0.05	8
MiMo-VL-7B	47.39%	43.05%	37.80%	42.75%	41.31%	49.87%	38.17%	43.02%	42.89%	17	0.00	-0.03	0.01	-0.01	-0.16	-0.44	-0.20	-0.26	-0.14	21
Idefics2-8B	58.06%	48.01%	55.79%	53.95%	47.61%	53.59%	54.61%	52.44%	53.20%	10	-0.04	-0.05	0.12	0.01	0.08	-0.04	-0.09	-0.02	-0.00	16
Mantis-8B	56.00%	43.02%	45.38%	48.13%	44.99%	52.90%	54.29%	50.08%	49.11%	15	-0.01	-0.36	0.16	-0.07	-0.02	-0.31	0.05	-0.09	-0.08	17
Phi-4	56.00%	51.99%	55.15%	54.38%	47.74%	56.93%	54.79%	53.46%	53.92%	7	0.00	-0.36	0.07	-0.10	-0.16	-0.41	-0.11	-0.23	-0.16	22
GPT-5	58.10%	68.39%	63.59%	63.36%	48.05%	61.43%	61.59%	58.61%	60.98%	1	-0.01	0.07	0.18	0.08	-0.09	0.06	0.13	0.03	0.06	7
Gemini 2.5-pro	57.74%	61.50%	65.83%	61.69%	50.78%	59.65%	62.30%	58.61%	60.15%	2	0.10	0.19	0.12	0.14	-0.01	0.17	0.19	0.11	0.13	3
Claude-Sonnet-4.5	57.74%	47.98%	54.99%	53.57%	47.32%	52.75%	53.07%	51.68%	52.62%	14	0.16	0.29	0.13	0.19	0.23	0.28	0.19	0.23	0.21	1
FakeShield	52.09%	56.38%	56.75%	55.07%	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.02	0.24	-0.01	0.08	-	-	-	-	0.08	5
Average	45.57%	43.05%	43.88%	44.17%	40.64%	47.12%	44.13%	44.38%	45.02%	-	0.03	-0.04	0.11	0.03	0.02	-0.09	0.04	-0.01	0.01	-

Notes. "-" indicates unsupported modality. In the main text, we focus on image- and video-based DeepFakes and defer detailed analysis of the audio modality to Sec. H.

Table 3. Evaluation of Interpretable Deepfake Detection, Perception and Hallucination Robustness

				Type A	. <oeq></oeq>				Type B <oeq></oeq>									
MLLM		Image				Video					Image					Video		
	Cover ↑	CHAIR ↓	. Hal↓	$\mathbf{F}^{0.5}\uparrow$	Cover ↑	CHAIR ↓	Hal ↓	$\mathbf{F}^{0.5} \uparrow$	ACC	Cover ↑	CHAIR ↓	Hal ↓	$\mathbf{F}^{0.5} \uparrow$	ACC	Cover ↑	CHAIR ↓	Hal ↓	$\mathbf{F}^{0.5} \uparrow$
InternVL2_5-8B	0.4162	0.5260	0.9090	0.4332	0.2452	0.5906	0.9489	0.3345	0.5166	0.1670	0.8479	0.9973	0.1531	0.5996	0.2276	0.7275	0.9950	0.2541
InternVL2_5-26B	0.5130	0.5869	0.9845	0.4152	0.2325	0.7216	0.9913	0.2547	0.4800	0.0921	0.9304	0.9993	0.0745	0.3405	0.0029	0.9972	1.0000	0.0104
InternVL2_5-38B	0.4781	0.5570	0.9602	0.4342	0.2581	0.6772	0.9571	0.2879	0.5747	0.2306	0.8066	0.9993	0.1971	0.5790	0.1778	0.7423	0.9151	0.2152
InternVL3_5-8B	0.4255	0.5750	0.9130	0.4031	0.2934	0.6645	0.9822	0.3077	0.4176	0.0270	0.9745	1.0000	0.0296	0.4722	0.0803	0.9136	0.9991	0.0871
InternVL3_5-38B-A3B	0.3462	0.6800	0.9945	0.3144	0.2323	0.6574	0.9657	0.2946	0.4980	0.0482	0.9538	1.0000	0.0455	0.4118	0.0308	0.9725	0.9995	0.0314
LLaVA-OV-7B	0.0537	0.7861	0.7930	0.1332	0.0258	0.8339	0.8398	0.0838	0.3854	0.0000	1.0000	1.0000	0.0027	0.3367	0.0000	1.0000	1.0000	0.0073
LLaVA-OV-72B	0.5149	0.6541	0.9926	0.3625	0.2816	0.7280	0.9703	0.2547	0.5374	0.0683	0.8744	0.9622	0.1024	0.3462	0.0078	0.9869	0.9963	0.0169
Qwen3-Omni-30B-A3B	0.4991	0.5697	0.9582	0.4232	0.2550	0.6426	0.9370	0.2975	0.6942	0.4143	0.6701	1.0000	0.3381	0.5146	0.1717	0.8487	0.9977	0.1504
Qwen3-VL-8B	0.3499	0.6597	0.9845	0.3378	0.1702	0.7707	0.9881	0.2083	0.6207	0.2557	0.8073	0.9993	0.2022	0.4330	0.0308	0.9536	0.9995	0.0515
Qwen3-VL-30B	0.4215	0.5908	0.9774	0.4011	0.1841	0.7137	0.9701	0.2388	0.6894	0.3661	0.7137	0.9701	0.2388	0.5694	0.1886	0.8276	0.9966	0.1722
MiniCPM-V-2.6	0.0000	1.0000	1.0000	0.0027	0.0000	1.0000	1.0000	0.0073	0.3827	0.0000	1.0000	1.0000	0.0027	0.3377	0.0000	1.0000	1.0000	0.0073
MiMo-VL-7B	0.3641	0.6317	0.8847	0.3326	0.1569	0.8092	0.9530	0.1620	0.5650	0.2280	0.6539	0.8739	0.2914	0.3731	0.0505	0.8866	0.9302	0.0763
InternLM-XComposer2.5	0.0011	0.9986	0.9993	0.0040	0.0005	0.9991	0.9995	0.0079	0.3797	0.0000	1.0000	1.0000	0.0027	0.3318	0.0000	1.0000	1.0000	0.0073
mPLUG-Owl3-7B	0.1646	0.7123	0.8402	0.2891	0.0514	0.8428	0.8996	0.0969	0.1386	0.0310	0.8997	0.9171	0.0657	0.1397	0.0130	0.9424	0.9484	0.0358
Idefics2-8B	0.1667	0.6279	0.7653	0.2729	0.0211	0.8827	0.8959	0.0643	0.3870	0.0004	0.9987	0.9987	0.0036	0.3292	0.0001	0.9998	1.0000	0.0074
Mantis-8B	0.2069	0.5810	0.8146	0.3242	0.1003	0.7227	0.8813	0.1864	0.1282	0.0045	0.9917	0.9980	0.0091	0.0474	0.0000	1.0000	1.0000	0.0073
Phi-4	0.0845	0.8243	0.8847	0.1271	0.0133	0.9558	0.9685	0.0326	0.4001	0.0119	0.9834	0.9966	0.0171	0.3230	0.0010	0.9984	0.9995	0.0087
GPT-5	0.4387	0.6510	0.9825	0.3524	0.3319	0.6586	0.9671	0.3217	0.6573	0.2714	0.6982	0.9651	0.2919	0.6312	0.1296	0.8259	0.9786	0.1580
Gemini 2.5-pro	0.5511	0.5426	0.9791	0.4618	0.3023	0.5300	0.8717	0.3822	0.7311	0.4208	0.5571	0.9332	0.4258	0.5984	0.1857	0.7536	0.9311	0.2133
Claude Sonnet 4.5	0.6410	0.6241	0.9953	0.4015	0.5437	0.6085	0.9922	0.3997	0.6240	0.3988	0.7235	0.9980	0.2908	0.4967	0.2036	0.8362	0.9956	0.1696
FakeShield	0.1352	0.8315	0.9393	0.1488	-	_	_	_	0.4045	0.0254	0.9752	0.9974	0.0307	-	-	_	_	_
FakeVLM	0.3595	0.7792	0.9973	0.2361	-	-	-	-	0.4736	0.0062	0.9954	1.0000	0.0048	_	-	-	-	-

Notes. "-" indicates unsupported modality. In the main text, we focus on image- and video-based DeepFakes and defer detailed analysis of the audio modality to Sec. H.

CHAIR and Hal scores. In the video modality, the drop in detection accuracy reflects increased task difficulty, while the roughly halved Cover further highlights the challenge of explaining video DeepFakes. Our evaluation framework also uncovers behaviors that were previously difficult to characterize, turning qualitative interpretability into

more quantifiable insights. For example, InternVL2.5-8B exhibits both low *Cover* (worse) and low *CHAIR* (better). A closer inspection of its predictions shows that the model consistently identifies a small set of artifacts, but the range of artifact types it can detect is notably limited.

In contrast, Claude-Sonnet-4.5 attains high Cover (bet-

ter) but relatively low *CHAIR* (worse). Our statistics further show that its average response length is roughly twice that of other models, indicating a stronger tendency toward hallucinated or over-elaborate explanations. This aligns with our earlier observation that, although Claude-Sonnet-4.5 demonstrates strong perceptual ability, it still exhibits a pronounced performance gap between <TFQ> and <MCQ>.

5. Insights and Disscussions

RQ1. What are the relative difficulties and bottlenecks when detecting quality versus semantic artifacts? To address RQ1, we analyze artifact-wise accuracies on the <TFQ> set, as summarized in Fig. 3. Fig. 3 shows the mean accuracy for each artifact type, computed over models with non-zero performance, and reveals that several quality artifacts (e.g., blockiness, banding, reflection inconsistency) can already be detected with relatively high accuracy, even though the overall <TFQ> scores remain moderate. In contrast, semantic artifacts that require physical or social reasoning (e.g., anatomical inconsistencies, abnormal motion, background-subject incoherence) are consistently much harder, with substantially lower mean accuracies across models. Thus, current MLLMs find local quality artifacts comparatively easier, while semantic artifacts remain the main bottleneck for robust DeepFake perception. RQ2. Do localization-oriented questions truly enhance the model's ability to "look at the right place"? To assess the impact of location hints on model performance, we define two metrics: Benefit, the percentage of questions a model answered incorrectly without a location hint but correctly with one, and Cost, the percentage answered correctly without but incorrectly with the hint. These metrics highlight model-dependent effects, where hints often yield small

A few models demonstrate clear net benefits, leveraging hints effectively with low disruption. For instance, InternVL2.5-8B and Claude-Sonnet-4.5 show modest Benefits with minimal Costs, as do larger variants like InternVL2.5-26B and 38B. Conversely, some models suffer more harm than help, such as MiniCPM-V-2.6, where Costs far exceed Benefits. Others display high instability, with Benefits nearly matched by Costs, as seen in InternVL3.5-8B, Qwen3-VL-8B-Instruct, and GPT-5, suggesting unreliable improvements rather than consistent gains.

gains but substantial losses in performance.

Overall, localization hints do not reliably improve models' spatial focus. Only select models, like InternVL2.5-8B and Claude-Sonnet-4.5, gain meaningfully with little downside. For most, including strong performers like Gemini 2.5-pro and GPT-5, hints introduce distractions, resulting in limited benefits, instability, or outright setbacks. This reveals difficulties in combining spatial cues with visual tasks. Full details appear in Sec. I.

RQ3. How are perception, detection, and hallucination cou-

pled in MLLM-based DeepFake detectors, and what failure patterns emerge from this three-dimensional interaction? Across 28 MLLMs, TriDF reveals that strong perceptual performance on <TFQ>, <MCQ>, and Type-A <OEQ> does not reliably translate into Type-B <OEQ> detection accuracy. Models with similar detection scores can differ substantially in explanatory coverage (Cover) and hallucination severity (CHAIR, Hal, $F^{0.5}$), indicating only moderate coupling between perception and detection and a partly independent effect of hallucination. We observe systematic failures where models correctly identify fine-grained artifacts in Type-A <OEQ> yet still misclassify real-fake pairs in Type-B <OEQ>, or produce high-Cover explanations that are contaminated by hallucinated artifacts. These cases show that the perception chain \rightarrow detection can break either because the model does not perceive the right evidence or because hallucination distorts how this evidence is integrated into a final decision.

Taken together, our findings across RQ1–RQ3 suggest that DeepFake detection in MLLMs is inherently three-dimensional. RQ1 highlights semantic artifacts as a key bottleneck even when many quality artifacts are detectable, and RQ2 shows that localization cues alone do not guarantee that models "look at the right place." RQ3 further indicates that reliable detection requires both accurate perception and low hallucination: improving DeepFake perception is necessary but not sufficient unless models also avoid "seeing" artifacts that are not there. A more finegrained three-dimensional analysis (e.g., partial correlations and stratified perception→detection curves under different hallucination regimes) is provided in the supplementary.

6. Conclusion

We present TriDF, a comprehensive benchmark designed to advance interpretable and reliable DeepFake detection. By integrating high-quality synthesized content from a broad spectrum of contemporary generators and providing human-aligned annotations across 16 manipulation types and 3 modalities, TriDFoffers the most extensive resource to date for studying for detection models perceive evidence, make decisions, and articulate their reasoning. Through its three complementary components, Perception, Detection, and Hallucination, our benchmark enables a holistic examination of model behavior that goes beyond traditional accuracy-based evaluation. Our experiments on state-ofthe-art multimodal large language models reveal several key findings. Accurate recognition of manipulation cues is essential for strong classification performance, yet unreliable or fabricated explanations can significantly undermine the final decision of a model. The key findings highlight the interdependence of perception, detection, and explanation reliability, and demonstrate the need for evaluation protocols that account for all three.

7. Acknowledgment

This research was supported by grants from NVIDIA and utilized NVIDIA NeMo and NVIDIA NIM framework for the rapid deployment and benchmarking of MLLMs. The authors gratefully acknowledge the support of the NVIDIA Academic Grant Program.

Bibliography

- [1] Marah Abdin, Jyoti Aneja, Harkirat Behl, Sébastien Bubeck, Ronen Eldan, Suriya Gunasekar, Michael Harrison, Russell J Hewett, Mojan Javaheripi, Piero Kauffmann, et al. Phi-4 technical report. arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.08905, 2024. 22
- [2] Coqui AI. Coqui X-TTS: A hugging face space for text-tospeech, 2025. 18
- [3] Junyi Ao, Rui Wang, Long Zhou, Chengyi Wang, Shuo Ren, Yu Wu, Shujie Liu, Tom Ko, Qing Li, Yu Zhang, et al. SpeechT5: Unified-modal encoder-decoder pre-training for spoken language processing. In ACL, 2022. 18
- [4] Stephen Batifol, Andreas Blattmann, Frederic Boesel, Saksham Consul, Cyril Diagne, Tim Dockhorn, Jack English, Zion English, Patrick Esser, Sumith Kulal, et al. FLUX. 1 Kontext: Flow matching for in-context image generation and editing in latent space. arXiv e-prints, pages arXiv-2506, 2025. 4, 17, 18, 20
- [5] Yuxuan Bian, Zhaoyang Zhang, Xuan Ju, Mingdeng Cao, Liangbin Xie, Ying Shan, and Qiang Xu. Videopainter: Any-length video inpainting and editing with plug-and-play context control. In SIGGRAPH, 2025. 17, 18
- [6] Stella Bounareli, Christos Tzelepis, Vasileios Argyriou, Ioannis Patras, and Georgios Tzimiropoulos. Hyperreenact: one-shot reenactment via jointly learning to refine and retarget faces. In *ICCV*, 2023. 18
- [7] Jian Cai, Xinyu Zhang, Bo Liu, and Haizhou Li. LAV-DF: Content-driven audio-visual deepfake dataset and multimodal method for temporal forgery localization. In *ICCV*, 2023. 3
- [8] Junyi Cao, Chao Ma, Taiping Yao, Shen Chen, Shouhong Ding, and Xiaokang Yang. End-to-end reconstructionclassification learning for face forgery detection. In CVPR, 2022.
- [9] Qiong Cao, Li Shen, Weidi Xie, Omkar M Parkhi, and Andrew Zisserman. Vggface2: A dataset for recognising faces across pose and age. In FG, 2018. 16, 18
- [10] Di Chang, Yichun Shi, Quankai Gao, Hongyi Xu, Jessica Fu, Guoxian Song, Qing Yan, Yizhe Zhu, Xiao Yang, and Mohammad Soleymani. MagicPose: realistic human poses and facial expressions retargeting with identity-aware diffusion. In *ICML*, 2024. 18
- [11] Dongping Chen, Ruoxi Chen, Shilin Zhang, Yaochen Wang, Yinuo Liu, Huichi Zhou, Qihui Zhang, Yao Wan, Pan Zhou, and Lichao Sun. Mllm-as-a-judge: Assessing multimodal llm-as-a-judge with vision-language benchmark. In *ICML*, 2024. 5
- [12] Haoxing Chen, Yan Hong, Zizheng Huang, Zhuoer Xu, Zhangxuan Gu, Yaohui Li, Jun Lan, Huijia Zhu, Jianfu

- Zhang, Weiqiang Wang, et al. Demamba: Ai-generated video detection on million-scale genvideo benchmark. In arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.19707, 2024. 3
- [13] Junsong Chen, Chongjian Ge, Enze Xie, Yue Wu, Lewei Yao, Xiaozhe Ren, Zhongdao Wang, Ping Luo, Huchuan Lu, and Zhenguo Li. Pixart-σ: Weak-to-strong training of diffusion transformer for 4k text-to-image generation. In *ECCV*, 2024. 4, 17, 18, 20
- [14] Tsai-Shien Chen, Aliaksandr Siarohin, Willi Menapace, Ekaterina Deyneka, Hsiang-wei Chao, Byung Eun Jeon, Yuwei Fang, Hsin-Ying Lee, Jian Ren, Ming-Hsuan Yang, et al. Panda-70m: Captioning 70m videos with multiple cross-modality teachers. In CVPR, 2024. 4, 17, 18
- [15] Zhe Chen, Jiannan Wu, Wenhai Wang, Weijie Su, Guo Chen, Sen Xing, Muyan Zhong, Qinglong Zhang, Xizhou Zhu, Lewei Lu, et al. Internvl: Scaling up vision foundation models and aligning for generic visual-linguistic tasks. In CVPR, 2024. 22
- [16] Chengzhi Cheng, Zhenhong Guo, Yuting Wang, Shuozhe Yang, Shouxun Chen, Weixin Luo, Lingyu Wei, Ziwei Liu, and Shouhong Ding. CO-SPY: Combining semantic and pixel features to detect synthetic images by ai. In CVPR, 2025. 3, 22, 23
- [17] Ming-Chang Chiu, Fuxiao Liu, Karan Sapra, Andrew Tao, Yaser Jacoob, Xuezhe Ma, Zhiding Yu, and Guilin Liu. Aide: Agentically improve visual language model with domain experts. In *ICLR*, 2025. 22, 23
- [18] Ha-Yeong Choi, Sang-Hoon Lee, and Seong-Whan Lee. Diff-HierVC: Diffusion-based hierarchical voice conversion with robust pitch generation and masked prior for zero-shot speaker adaptation. In *Interspeech*, 2023. 4, 18
- [19] Joon Son Chung, Arsha Nagrani, and Andrew Zisserman. Voxceleb2: Deep speaker recognition. In *Interspeech*, 2018. 4, 17, 18
- [20] Jiahao Cui, Hui Li, Yao Yao, Hao Zhu, Hanlin Shang, Kaihui Cheng, Hang Zhou, Siyu Zhu, and Jingdong Wang. Hallo2: Long-duration and high-resolution audio-driven portrait image animation. In *ICLR*, 2025. 2, 18
- [21] D-iD. D-iD, 2024. 18
- [22] Jiankang Deng, Jia Guo, Niannan Xue, and Stefanos Zafeiriou. Arcface: Additive angular margin loss for deep face recognition. In CVPR, 2019. 17
- [23] Yikang Ding, Jiwen Liu, Wenyuan Zhang, Zekun Wang, Wentao Hu, Liyuan Cui, Mingming Lao, Yingchao Shao, Hui Liu, Xiaohan Li, et al. Kling-avatar: Grounding multimodal instructions for cascaded long-duration avatar animation synthesis. arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.09595, 2025.
- [24] Brian Dolhansky, Joanna Bitton, Ben Pflaum, Jikuo Lu, Russ Howes, Menglin Wang, and Cristian Canton Ferrer. The deepfake detection challenge (dfdc) dataset. arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.07397, 2020. 3
- [25] Zhihao Du, Yuxuan Wang, Qian Chen, Xian Shi, Xiang Lv, Tianyu Zhao, Zhifu Gao, Yexin Yang, Changfeng Gao, Hui Wang, et al. Cosyvoice 2: Scalable streaming speech synthesis with large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.10117, 2024. 18

- [26] ElevenLabs. ElevenLabs, 2025. 17, 18
- [27] Patrick Esser, Sumith Kulal, Andreas Blattmann, Rahim Entezari, Jonas Müller, Harry Saini, Yam Levi, Dominik Lorenz, Axel Sauer, Frederic Boesel, et al. Scaling rectified flow transformers for high-resolution image synthesis. In *ICML*, 2024. 17, 18, 20
- [28] Zhengcong Fei, Debang Li, Di Qiu, Jiahua Wang, Yikun Dou, Rui Wang, Jingtao Xu, Mingyuan Fan, Guibin Chen, Yang Li, et al. Skyreels-a2: Compose anything in video diffusion transformers. arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.02436, 2025. 17, 18
- [29] Jinlan Fu, See Kiong Ng, Zhengbao Jiang, and Pengfei Liu. Gptscore: Evaluate as you desire. In NAACL, 2024. 5
- [30] Gege Gao, Huaibo Huang, Chaoyou Fu, Zhaoyang Li, and Ran He. Information bottleneck disentanglement for identity swapping. In CVPR, 2021. 18
- [31] Google. Gemini 2.5 Flash-Lite, 2025. 5
- [32] Google. Gemini 2.5 Flash Image (Nano Banana), 2025. 4, 17, 18, 20
- [33] Google. Veo 3, 2025. 4, 18, 20
- [34] Tianrui Guan, Fuxiao Liu, Xiyang Wu, Ruiqi Xian, Zongxia Li, Xiaoyu Liu, Xijun Wang, Lichang Chen, Furong Huang, Yaser Yacoob, et al. Hallusionbench: an advanced diagnostic suite for entangled language hallucination and visual illusion in large vision-language models. In CVPR, 2024. 6
- [35] Jianzhu Guo, Dingyun Zhang, Xiaoqiang Liu, Zhizhou Zhong, Yuan Zhang, Pengfei Wan, and Di Zhang. Live-portrait: Efficient portrait animation with stitching and retargeting control. arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.03168, 2024.
- [36] Xiao Guo, Xiufeng Song, Yue Zhang, Xiaohong Liu, and Xiaoming Liu. Rethinking vision-language model in face forensics: Multi-modal interpretable forged face detector. In CVPR, 2025. 2
- [37] Zonghui Guo, Yingjie Liu, Jie Zhang, Haiyong Zheng, and Shiguang Shan. Face forgery video detection via temporal forgery cue unraveling. In CVPR, 2025. 2
- [38] Yoav HaCohen, Nisan Chiprut, Benny Brazowski, Daniel Shalem, Dudu Moshe, Eitan Richardson, Eran Levin, Guy Shiran, Nir Zabari, Ori Gordon, et al. Ltx-video: Realtime video latent diffusion. arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.00103, 2024. 17, 18, 20
- [39] Yue Han, Junwei Zhu, Keke He, Xu Chen, Yanhao Ge, Wei Li, Xiangtai Li, Jiangning Zhang, Chengjie Wang, and Yong Liu. Face-adapter for pre-trained diffusion models with fine-grained id and attribute control. In ECCV, 2024.
- [40] Yue-Hua Han, Tai-Ming Huang, Kai-Lung Hua, and Jun-Cheng Chen. Towards more general video-based deepfake detection through facial component guided adaptation for foundation model. In CVPR, 2025. 3, 22, 23
- [41] Yinan He, Bei Gan, Siyu Chen, Yichun Zhou, Guojun Yin, Luchuan Song, Lu Sheng, Jing Shao, and Ziwei Liu. Forgerynet: A versatile benchmark for comprehensive forgery analysis. In *CVPR*, 2021. 3

- [42] Jack Hessel, Ari Holtzman, Maxwell Forbes, Ronan Le Bras, and Yejin Choi. CLIPScore: A reference-free evaluation metric for image captioning. In EMNLP, 2021. 17
- [43] Fa-Ting Hong and Dan Xu. Implicit identity representation conditioned memory compensation network for talking head video generation. In *ICCV*, 2023. 18
- [44] Teng Hu, Zhentao Yu, Zhengguang Zhou, Sen Liang, Yuan Zhou, Qin Lin, and Qinglin Lu. Hunyuancustom: A multimodal-driven architecture for customized video generation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.04512, 2025. 2, 17, 18, 20
- [45] Zhizhong Huang, Siteng Ma, Junping Zhang, and Hongming Shan. Adaptive nonlinear latent transformation for conditional face editing. In *ICCV*, 2023. 18
- [46] Ziyao Huang, Fan Tang, Yong Zhang, Juan Cao, Chengyu Li, Sheng Tang, Jintao Li, and Tong-Yee Lee. Identitypreserving face swapping via dual surrogate generative models. ACM TOG, 43(5):1–19, 2024. 18
- [47] Zhenglin Huang, Jinwei Hu, Xiangtai Li, Yiwei He, Xingyu Zhao, Bei Peng, Baoyuan Wu, Xiaowei Huang, and Guangliang Cheng. Sida: Social media image deepfake detection, localization and explanation with large multimodal model. In CVPR, 2025. 2, 3, 4
- [48] Yasamin Jafarian and Hyun Soo Park. Self-supervised 3d representation learning of dressed humans from social media videos. *IEEE TPAMI*, 2022. 17, 18
- [49] Zeyinzi Jiang, Zhen Han, Chaojie Mao, Jingfeng Zhang, Yulin Pan, and Yu Liu. Vace: All-in-one video creation and editing. arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.07598, 2025. 18
- [50] Yang Jin, Zhicheng Sun, Ningyuan Li, Kun Xu, Hao Jiang, Nan Zhuang, Quzhe Huang, Yang Song, Yadong Mu, and Zhouchen Lin. Pyramidal flow matching for efficient video generative modeling. In *ICLR*, 2024. 18
- [51] Adam Tauman Kalai, Ofir Nachum, Santosh S. Vempala, and Edwin Zhang. Why language models hallucinate. arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.04664, 2025. 3
- [52] Hengrui Kang, Siwei Wen, Zichen Wen, Junyan Ye, Weijia Li, Peilin Feng, Baichuan Zhou, Bin Wang, Dahua Lin, Linfeng Zhang, and Conghui He. Legion: Learning to ground and explain for synthetic image detection. In *ICCV*, 2025. 2, 3, 4
- [53] Tero Karras, Timo Aila, Samuli Laine, and Jaakko Lehtinen. Progressive growing of gans for improved quality, stability, and variation. In *ICLR*, 2018. 4, 16, 18
- [54] Tero Karras, Samuli Laine, and Timo Aila. A style-based generator architecture for generative adversarial networks. In CVPR, 2019. 4, 16, 18
- [55] Prannay Kaul, Zhizhong Li, Hao Yang, Yonatan Dukler, Ashwin Swaminathan, CJ Taylor, and Stefano Soatto. Throne: An object-based hallucination benchmark for the free-form generations of large vision-language models. In CVPR, 2024. 6
- [56] Cheng-Han Lee, Ziwei Liu, Lingyun Wu, and Ping Luo. Maskgan: Towards diverse and interactive facial image manipulation. In CVPR, 2020. 4, 16, 18
- [57] Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Dong Guo, Renrui Zhang, Feng Li, Hao Zhang, Kaichen Zhang, Peiyuan Zhang, Yanwei Li,

- Ziwei Liu, et al. Llava-onevision: Easy visual task transfer. *TMLR*, 2025. 22
- [58] Chunyu Li, Chao Zhang, Weikai Xu, Jinghui Xie, Weiguo Feng, Bingyue Peng, and Weiwei Xing. LatentSync: Audio conditioned latent diffusion models for lip sync. *arXiv* preprint arXiv:2412.09262, 2024. 18
- [59] Dingquan Li, Tingting Jiang, and Ming Jiang. Quality assessment of in-the-wild videos. In ACM MM, 2019. 17
- [60] Dawei Li, Bohan Jiang, Liangjie Huang, Alimohammad Beigi, Chengshuai Zhao, Zhen Tan, Amrita Bhattacharjee, Yuxuan Jiang, Canyu Chen, Tianhao Wu, et al. From generation to judgment: Opportunities and challenges of Ilmas-a-judge. In *EMNLP*, 2025. 20
- [61] Jianhui Li, Jianmin Li, Haoji Zhang, Shilong Liu, Zhengyi Wang, Zihao Xiao, Kaiwen Zheng, and Jun Zhu. PREIM3D: 3d consistent precise image attribute editing from a single image. In CVPR, 2023. 18
- [62] Minghan Li, Chenxi Xie, Yichen Wu, Lei Zhang, and Mengyu Wang. FiVE-Bench: A fine-grained video editing benchmark for evaluating emerging diffusion and rectified flow models. In *ICCV*, 2025. 17, 18
- [63] Yuezun Li, Xin Yang, Pu Sun, Honggang Qi, and Siwei Lyu. Celeb-df: A large-scale challenging dataset for deepfake forensics. In CVPR, 2020. 2
- [64] Yifan Li, Yifan Du, Kun Zhou, Jinpeng Wang, Wayne Xin Zhao, and Ji-Rong Wen. Evaluating object hallucination in large vision-language models. In EMNLP, 2023. 6
- [65] Yixuan Li, Xuelin Liu, Xiaoyang Wang, Shiqi Wang, and Weisi Lin. FakeBench: Uncover the achilles' heels of fake images with large multimodal models. *IEEE TIFS*, 2025. 2, 4, 5, 20
- [66] Chin-Yew Lin. Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text summarization branches out*, 2004.
- [67] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C Lawrence Zitnick. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context. In ECCV, 2014. 16, 18
- [68] Huan Liu, Zichang Tan, Chuangchuang Tan, Yunchao Wei, Yao Zhao, and Jingdong Wang. Forgery-aware adaptive transformer for generalizable synthetic image detection. In CVPR, 2024. 3, 22, 23
- [69] Jiazhen Liu, Yuhan Fu, Ruobing Xie, Runquan Xie, Xingwu Sun, Fengzong Lian, Zhanhui Kang, and Xirong Li. PhD: A chatgpt-prompted visual hallucination evaluation dataset. In CVPR, 2025. 6
- [70] Kun Liu, Qi Liu, Xinchen Liu, Jie Li, Yongdong Zhang, Jiebo Luo, Xiaodong He, and Wu Liu. Hoigen-1m: A largescale dataset for human-object interaction video generation. In CVPR, 2025. 4, 17, 18
- [71] Lijie Liu, Tianxiang Ma, Bingchuan Li, Zhuowei Chen, Jiawei Liu, Gen Li, Siyu Zhou, Qian He, and Xinglong Wu. Phantom: Subject-consistent video generation via cross-modal alignment. In *ICCV*, 2025. 17, 18
- [72] Songting Liu. Zero-shot voice conversion with diffusion transformers. arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.09943, 2024. 17, 18

- [73] Shiyu Liu, Yucheng Han, Peng Xing, Fukun Yin, Rui Wang, Wei Cheng, Jiaqi Liao, Yingming Wang, Honghao Fu, Chunrui Han, Guopeng Li, Yuang Peng, Quan Sun, Jingwei Wu, Yan Cai, Zheng Ge, Ranchen Ming, Lei Xia, Xianfang Zeng, Yibo Zhu, Binxing Jiao, Xiangyu Zhang, Gang Yu, and Daxin Jiang. Step1X-Edit: A practical framework for general image editing. arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.17761, 2025. 2, 16, 17, 18, 20
- [74] Olga Loginova, Oleksandr Bezrukov, Ravi Shekhar, and Alexey Kravets. Addressing blind guessing: Calibration of selection bias in multiple-choice question answering by video language models. In ACL, 2025. 5, 19
- [75] Grace Luo, Trevor Darrell, and Anna Rohrbach. NewsCLIPpings: Automatic generation of out-of-context multimodal media. In EMNLP, 2021. 2
- [76] Gabriel Mittag, Babak Naderi, Assmaa Chehadi, and Sebastian Möller. NISQA: A deep cnn-self-attention model for multidimensional speech quality prediction with crowdsourced datasets. In *Interspeech*, 2021. 17
- [77] Anish Mittal, Rajiv Soundararajan, and Alan C Bovik. Making a "completely blind" image quality analyzer. *IEEE SPL*, 2012. 17
- [78] Ju-Hyeon Nam, Dong-Hyun Moon, and Sang-Chul Lee. M2sformer: Multi-spectral and multi-scale attention with edge-aware difficulty guidance for image forgery localization. In *ICCV*, 2025. 2
- [79] Dat Nguyen, Nesryne Mejri, Inder Pal Singh, Polina Kuleshova, Marcella Astrid, Anis Kacem, Enjie Ghorbel, and Djamila Aouada. LAA-Net: Localized artifact attention network for quality-agnostic and generalizable deepfake detection. In CVPR, 2024. 3
- [80] OpenAI. GPT-4o, 2024. 4, 19
- [81] OpenAI. GPT-40 image, 2025. 4, 17, 18, 20
- [82] Vassil Panayotov, Guoguo Chen, Daniel Povey, and Sanjeev Khudanpur. Librispeech: an asr corpus based on public domain audio books. In *ICASSP*, pages 5206–5210, 2015. 17, 18
- [83] Bohao Peng, Jian Wang, Yuechen Zhang, Wenbo Li, Ming-Chang Yang, and Jiaya Jia. Controlnext: Powerful and efficient control for image and video generation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.06070, 2024. 2, 17, 18
- [84] Bryan A Plummer, Liwei Wang, Chris M Cervantes, Juan C Caicedo, Julia Hockenmaier, and Svetlana Lazebnik. Flickr30k entities: Collecting region-to-phrase correspondences for richer image-to-sentence models. In *ICCV*, 2015. 16, 18
- [85] 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 ACM MM, 2020. 17
- [86] Zengyi Qin, Wenliang Zhao, Xumin Yu, and Xin Sun. Openvoice: Versatile instant voice cloning. arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.01479, 2023. 17, 18
- [87] Anna Rohrbach, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Kaylee Burns, Trevor Darrell, and Kate Saenko. Object hallucination in image captioning. In EMNLP, 2018. 6
- [88] Andreas Rossler, Davide Cozzolino, Luisa Verdoliva, Christian Riess, Justus Thies, and Matthias Nießner. Face-

- forensics++: Learning to detect manipulated facial images. In *ICCV*, 2019, 2, 3, 4, 16, 18
- [89] Christoph Schuhmann, Romain Beaumont, Richard Vencu, Cade Gordon, Ross Wightman, Mehdi Cherti, Theo Coombes, Aarush Katta, Clayton Mullis, Mitchell Wortsman, et al. Laion-5b: An open large-scale dataset for training next generation image-text models. In *NeurIPS*, 2022. 16, 18
- [90] Rui Shao, Tianxing Wu, and Ziwei Liu. Detecting and recovering sequential deepfake manipulation. In ECCV, 2022. 2
- [91] Shelly Sheynin, Adam Polyak, Uriel Singer, Yuval Kirstain, Amit Zohar, Oron Ashual, Devi Parikh, and Yaniv Taigman. Emu edit: Precise image editing via recognition and generation tasks. In CVPR, 2024. 16, 18
- [92] Kaede Shiohara, Xingchao Yang, and Takafumi Taketomi. Blendface: Re-designing identity encoders for faceswapping. In *ICCV*, 2023. 18
- [93] Aliaksandr Siarohin, Stéphane Lathuilière, Sergey Tulyakov, Elisa Ricci, and Nicu Sebe. First order motion model for image animation. In *NeurIPS*, 2019. 17
- [94] Aliaksandr Siarohin, Oliver J Woodford, Jian Ren, Menglei Chai, and Sergey Tulyakov. Motion representations for articulated animation. In *CVPR*, 2021. 17, 18
- [95] Stefan Smeu, Dragos-Alexandru Boldisor, Dan Oneata, and Elisabeta Oneata. Circumventing shortcuts in audio-visual deepfake detection datasets with unsupervised learning. In CVPR, 2025. 2, 3
- [96] Joon Son Chung, Andrew Senior, Oriol Vinyals, and Andrew Zisserman. Lip reading sentences in the wild. In CVPR, 2017. 17, 18
- [97] Xiufeng Song, Xiao Guo, Jiache Zhang, Qirui Li, Lei Bai, Xiaoming Liu, Guangtao Zhai, and Xiaohong Liu. On learning multi-modal forgery representation for diffusion generated video detection. In *NeurIPS*, 2024. 22, 23
- [98] Ke Sun, Shen Chen, Taiping Yao, Ziyin Zhou, Jiayi Ji, Xi-aoshuai Sun, Chia-Wen Lin, and Rongrong Ji. Towards general visual-linguistic face forgery detection. In CVPR, 2025. 3, 5
- [99] Chuangchuang Tan, Huan Liu, Yao Zhao, Shikui Wei, Guanghua Gu, Ping Liu, and Yunchao Wei. Rethinking the up-sampling operations in cnn-based generative network for generalizable deepfake detection. In CVPR, 2024. 3
- [100] Xueyun Tian, Wei Li, Bingbing Xu, Yige Yuan, Yuanzhuo Wang, and Huawei Shen. Mige: A unified framework for multimodal instruction-based image generation and editing. In ACM MM, 2025. 18
- [101] Shuyuan Tu, Qi Dai, Zhi-Qi Cheng, Han Hu, Xintong Han, Zuxuan Wu, and Yu-Gang Jiang. Motioneditor: Editing video motion via content-aware diffusion. In CVPR, 2024. 18
- [102] Christophe Veaux, Junichi Yamagishi, Kirsten MacDonald, et al. CSTR VCTK corpus: English multi-speaker corpus for cstr voice cloning toolkit. *University of Edinburgh*. *The Centre for Speech Technology Research (CSTR)*, 6:15, 2017. 17, 18

- [103] Team Wan, Ang Wang, Baole Ai, Bin Wen, Chaojie Mao, Chen-Wei Xie, Di Chen, Feiwu Yu, Haiming Zhao, Jianxiao Yang, et al. Wan: Open and advanced large-scale video generative models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.20314, 2025. 2, 17, 18, 20
- [104] Chengrui Wang and Weihong Deng. Representative forgery mining for fake face detection. In CVPR, 2021. 2
- [105] Junyang Wang, Yuhang Wang, Guohai Xu, Jing Zhang, Yukai Gu, Haitao Jia, Jiaqi Wang, Haiyang Xu, Ming Yan, Ji Zhang, et al. Amber: An Ilm-free multi-dimensional benchmark for mllms hallucination evaluation. *arXiv* preprint arXiv:2311.07397, 2023. 5, 6
- [106] Jin Wang, Chenghui Lv, Xian Li, Shichao Dong, Huadong Li, Kelu Yao, Chao Li, Wenqi Shao, and Ping Luo. Forensics-Bench: A comprehensive forgery detection benchmark suite for large vision language models. In CVPR, 2025. 2, 4, 20
- [107] Ting-Chun Wang, Arun Mallya, and Ming-Yu Liu. One-shot free-view neural talking-head synthesis for video conferencing. In CVPR, 2021. 17, 18
- [108] Yuhan Wang, Xu Chen, Junwei Zhu, Wenqing Chu, Ying Tai, Chengjie Wang, Jilin Li, Yongjian Wu, Feiyue Huang, and Rongrong Ji. HifiFace: 3d shape and semantic prior guided high fidelity face swapping. In *IJCAI*, 2021. 18
- [109] Yi Wang, Yinan He, Yizhuo Li, Kunchang Li, Jiashuo Yu, Xin Ma, Xinhao Li, Guo Chen, Xinyuan Chen, Yaohui Wang, et al. InternVid: A large-scale video-text dataset for multimodal understanding and generation. In *ICLR*, 2024.
- [110] Huawei Wei, Zejun Yang, and Zhisheng Wang. Aniportrait: Audio-driven synthesis of photorealistic portrait animation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.17694, 2024. 18
- [111] Siwei Wen, Junyan Ye, Zizhao Zhang, Zekun Cao, Mingxiang Cai, Xintian Wu, Jingdong Chen, and Weijia Li. Spot the Fake: Large multimodal model-based synthetic image detection with artifact explanation. In *NeurIPS*, 2025. 2, 3, 4, 22
- [112] Mirjam Wester. The emime bilingual database. Technical report, The University of Edinburgh, 2010. 17, 18
- [113] Chenyuan Wu, Pengfei Zheng, Ruiran Yan, Shitao Xiao, Xin Luo, Yueze Wang, Wanli Li, Xiyan Jiang, Yexin Liu, Junjie Zhou, Ze Liu, Ziyi Xia, Chaofan Li, Haoge Deng, Jiahao Wang, Kun Luo, Bo Zhang, Defu Lian, Xinlong Wang, Zhongyuan Wang, Tiejun Huang, and Zheng Liu. OmniGen2: Exploration to advanced multimodal generation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.18871, 2025. 2, 16, 17, 18, 20
- [114] Shaojin Wu, Mengqi Huang, Wenxu Wu, Yufeng Cheng, Fei Ding, and Qian He. Less-to-more generalization: Unlocking more controllability by in-context generation. In *ICCV*, 2025. 2, 18
- [115] Danni Xu, Shaojing Fan, and Mohan Kankanhalli. Combating misinformation in the era of generative ai models. In ACM MM, 2023. 2
- [116] Zhipei Xu, Xuanyu Zhang, Runyi Li, Zecheng Tang, Qing Huang, and Jian Zhang. FakeShield: Explainable image forgery detection and localization via multi-modal large language models. In *ICLR*, 2025. 2, 3, 4, 22

- [117] Zhipei Xu, Xuanyu Zhang, Xing Zhou, and Jian Zhang. AvatarShield: Visual reinforcement learning for human-centric video forgery detection. arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.15173, 2025. 3, 4
- [118] Shuai Yang, Liming Jiang, Ziwei Liu, and Chen Change Loy. Styleganex: Stylegan-based manipulation beyond cropped aligned faces. In *ICCV*, 2023. 4, 18
- [119] Yongqi Yang, Zhihao Qian, Ye Zhu, Olga Russakovsky, and Yu Wu. D³: Scaling up deepfake detection by learning from discrepancy. In CVPR, 2025. 2, 3, 22, 23
- [120] Zhuoyi Yang, Jiayan Teng, Wendi Zheng, Ming Ding, Shiyu Huang, Jiazheng Xu, Yuanming Yang, Wenyi Hong, Xiaohan Zhang, Guanyu Feng, et al. Cogvideox: Text-tovideo diffusion models with an expert transformer. In *ICLR*, 2025. 18
- [121] Kelu Yao, Jin Wang, Boyu Diao, and Chao Li. Towards understanding the generalization of deepfake detectors from a game-theoretical view. In *ICCV*, 2023. 2
- [122] Jiabo Ye, Haiyang Xu, Haowei Liu, Anwen Hu, Ming Yan, Qi Qian, Ji Zhang, Fei Huang, and Jingren Zhou. mplug-owl3: Towards long image-sequence understanding in multi-modal large language models. In *ICLR*, 2025. 22
- [123] Junyan Ye, Baichuan Zhou, Zilong Huang, Junan Zhang, Tianyi Bai, Hengrui Kang, Jun He, Honglin Lin, Zihao Wang, Tong Wu, Zhizheng Wu, Yiping Chen, Dahua Lin, Conghui He, and Weijia Li. LOKI: A comprehensive synthetic data detection benchmark using large multimodal models. In *ICLR*, 2025. 2, 4, 5, 19, 20
- [124] Yang Ye, Xianyi He, Zongjian Li, Bin Lin, Shenghai Yuan, Zhiyuan Yan, Bohan Hou, and Li Yuan. Imgedit: A unified image editing dataset and benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.20275*, 2025. 16, 18
- [125] Jianhui Yu, Hao Zhu, Liming Jiang, Chen Change Loy, Weidong Cai, and Wayne Wu. Celebv-text: A large-scale facial text-video dataset. In *CVPR*, 2023. 4, 17, 18
- [126] Peipeng Yu, Jianwei Fei, Hui Gao, Xuan Feng, Zhihua Xia, and Chip-Hong Chang. Unlocking the capabilities of large vision-language models for generalizable and explainable deepfake detection. In *ICML*, 2025. 3
- [127] Shuaiwei Yuan, Junyu Dong, and Yuezun Li. Where the devil hides: Deepfake detectors can no longer be trusted. In CVPR, 2025. 2
- [128] Shenghai Yuan, Xianyi He, Yufan Deng, Yang Ye, Jinfa Huang, Bin Lin, Jiebo Luo, and Li Yuan. Opens2v-nexus: A detailed benchmark and million-scale dataset for subject-to-video generation. In *NeurIPS*, 2025. 17, 18
- [129] Shenghai Yuan, Jinfa Huang, Xianyi He, Yunyang Ge, Yujun Shi, Liuhan Chen, Jiebo Luo, and Li Yuan. Identitypreserving text-to-video generation by frequency decomposition. In CVPR, 2025. 17, 18
- [130] Polina Zablotskaia, Aliaksandr Siarohin, Bo Zhao, and Leonid Sigal. Dwnet: Dense warp-based network for poseguided human video generation. In *BMVC*, 2019. 17, 18
- [131] Heiga Zen, Viet Dang, Rob Clark, Yu Zhang, Ron J Weiss, Ye Jia, Zhifeng Chen, and Yonghui Wu. LibriTTS: A corpus derived from librispeech for text-to-speech. In *Inter*speech, pages 1526–1530, 2019. 4, 17, 18

- [132] Pan Zhang, Xiaoyi Dong, Bin Wang, Yuhang Cao, Chao Xu, Linke Ouyang, Zhiyuan Zhao, Haodong Duan, Songyang Zhang, Shuangrui Ding, et al. Internlmxcomposer: A vision-language large model for advanced text-image comprehension and composition. arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.15112, 2023. 22
- [133] Richard Zhang, Phillip Isola, Alexei A Efros, Eli Shechtman, and Oliver Wang. The unreasonable effectiveness of deep features as a perceptual metric. In CVPR, 2018. 17
- [134] Wenxuan Zhang, Xiaodong Cun, Xuan Wang, Yong Zhang, Xi Shen, Yu Guo, Ying Shan, and Fei Wang. Sadtalker: Learning realistic 3d motion coefficients for stylized audiodriven single image talking face animation. In CVPR, 2023.
- [135] Yue Zhang, Ben Colman, Xiao Guo, Ali Shahriyari, and Gaurav Bharaj. Common sense reasoning for deepfake detection. In ECCV, 2024. 2, 3, 4, 5, 20
- [136] Yue Zhang, Zhizhou Zhong, Minhao Liu, Zhaokang Chen, Bin Wu, Yubin Zeng, Chao Zhan, Yingjie He, Junxin Huang, and Wenjiang Zhou. Musetalk: Real-time highfidelity video dubbing via spatio-temporal sampling. *arXiv* preprint arXiv:2410.10122, 2025. 17, 18
- [137] Zhimeng Zhang, Lincheng Li, Yu Ding, and Changjie Fan. Flow-guided one-shot talking face generation with a high-resolution audio-visual dataset. In *CVPR*, 2021. 17, 18
- [138] Zhimeng Zhang, Zhipeng Hu, Wenjin Deng, Changjie Fan, Tangjie Lv, and Yu Ding. Dinet: Deformation inpainting network for realistic face visually dubbing on high resolution video. In AAAI, 2023. 18
- [139] Hanqing Zhao, Wenbo Zhou, Dongdong Chen, Tianyi Wei, Weiming Zhang, and Nenghai Yu. Multi-attentional deepfake detection. In CVPR, 2021. 2
- [140] Wenliang Zhao, Yongming Rao, Weikang Shi, Zuyan Liu, Jie Zhou, and Jiwen Lu. Diffswap: High-fidelity and controllable face swapping via 3d-aware masked diffusion. In CVPR, 2023. 4, 18
- [141] Chujie Zheng, Hao Zhou, Fandong Meng, Jie Zhou, and Minlie Huang. Large language models are not robust multiple choice selectors. In *ICLR*, 2024. 5, 19
- [142] Ziyin Zhou, Yunpeng Luo, Yuanchen Wu, Ke Sun, Jiayi Ji, Ke Yan, Shouhong Ding, Xiaoshuai Sun, Yunsheng Wu, and Rongrong Ji. AIGI-Holmes: Towards explainable and generalizable ai-generated image detection via multimodal large language models. In ICCV, 2025. 2, 3, 4, 20
- [143] Mingjian Zhu, Hanting Chen, Qiangyu Yan, Xudong Huang, Guanyu Lin, Wei Li, Zhijun Tu, Hailin Hu, Jie Hu, and Yunhe Wang. Genimage: A million-scale benchmark for detecting ai-generated image. In *NeurIPS*, 2023. 3
- [144] Shenhao Zhu, Junming Leo Chen, Zuozhuo Dai, Zilong Dong, Yinghui Xu, Xun Cao, Yao Yao, Hao Zhu, and Siyu Zhu. Champ: Controllable and consistent human image animation with 3d parametric guidance. In ECCV, 2024. 17, 18
- [145] Yueying Zou, Peipei Li, Zekun Li, Huaibo Huang, Xing Cui, Xuannan Liu, Chenghanyu Zhang, and Ran He. Survey on ai-generated media detection: From non-mllm to mllm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.05240*, 2025. 2, 3

Supplementary Material

A DeepFake Tasks in TriDF A.1. Partially Manipulated Tasks A.2 Fully Synthetic Tasks	14 14 14
B DeepFake Data Generation	14
C Taxonomy of DeepFake Artifacts	17
D Annotation Platform	17
E Distribution of Ground Truth Options	19
F. Benchmark Statistics	20
G Templates G.1. Templates for Benchmark Construction G.2 Templates for Artifacts Mapping	20 20 21
H Audio Modality Analysis	21
I. Extended Evaluation I.1 . Evaluation Setup	22 22 22 23
J. Future Direction of DeepFake Detection	24
K Release Plan and Ethics Statement	24

A. DeepFake Tasks in TriDF

DeepFake technologies and synthetic media applications rely on a variety of underlying tasks to alter or generate human-centric content. For the purpose of constructing TriDF, we group the manipulations into two functional categories: Partially Manipulated, which alters an existing person in the scene, and Fully Synthesized, which creates artificial humans or voices without requiring a real subject. The corresponding qualitative samples are provided in Fig. 4 and Fig. 5. Below, we outline the categories included in TriDF and briefly describe their defining characteristics to clarify how they contribute to the benchmark's coverage.

A.1. Partially Manipulated Tasks

Image/Video Face Swapping transfers a source's identity onto a target face while preserving the target's original attributes, such as pose, lighting, and expression.

Facial Attribute Manipulation is the process of selectively modifying specific features or semantic attributes of a face, *e.g.*, age, expression, hair color, or glasses, in a directed manner, while crucially preserving the person's core identity.

Lip-Syncing is a task where a video is altered so that a subject's lip movements are synchronized with a new or different audio track, making it appear as if they are speaking words they did not originally say.

Face Reenactment is a technique where the facial expressions, head movements, and eye gaze from a source person (in a video) are transferred to a target person (in a static image or different video), essentially making the target mimic the source's performance.

Full-Body Puppetry is an extension of face reenactment that applies to the entire body. It involves transferring the full-body pose and motion from a source actor to a target subject, allowing the source to puppet the target's movements in a video.

Subject-Driven Image/Video Editing is a form of manipulation where edits are applied to a specific subject within an image or video, often guided by text prompts or example images (*e.g.*, "change the person's shirt to red"), while preserving the subject's identity and the rest of the scene.

Voice Conversion is an audio manipulation task that modifies a person's speech to make it sound as if it were spoken by the target person, while keeping the original linguistic content (the words and what was said) intact.

A.2. Fully Synthetic Tasks

Audio-Driven Talking Head Synthesis is a task that generates an entirely synthetic video of a person (a talking head) speaking. The lip movements, facial expressions, and sometimes head pose are created from scratch and are driven entirely by an input audio recording.

Identity-Preserving Image/Video Generation is a method to create completely new and artificial images or videos of a specific person. The model learns a person's identity from a few photos and can then generate them in novel poses, locations, or styles not seen in the original photos.

Human-Scene Image/Video and Image-to-Video Generation is a broad task that focuses on creating entire, complex, and synthetic scenes featuring human subjects from scratch. This includes generating videos from a single starting image (image-to-video) or creating whole new video scenes (e.g., from a text description) that include realistic people.

Voice Cloning is a process to create a complete, synthetic model of a specific person's voice, often from just a short audio sample. This AI-generated voice model can then be used to say anything (typically via text-to-speech) in that person's unique tone, cadence, and vocal style.

B. DeepFake Data Generation

Data Acquisition. We exclusively collect information in accordance with the specific licensing agreements of source websites, avoiding material that is protected against dupli-




Figure 4. Examples of DeepFakes from Partially Manipulated tasks.




Figure 5. Examples of DeepFakes from Fully Synthesized tasks.

cation. The licenses of the existing dataset used in this work are as follows:

- FaceForensics++ [88]: MIT License
- FFHQ [54]: Creative Commons BY-NC-SA 4.0
- CelebAMaskHQ [56]: Non-commercial research and educational purposes.
- CelebA-HQ [53]: Non-commercial research and educational purposes
- VGGFace2 [9]: Unspecified
- Emu Edit [91]: Creative Commons BY-NC 4.0
- GEdit-Bench [73]: Apache License 2.0
- ImgEdit [124]: Unspecified
- OmniContext [113]: Apache License 2.0
- MS-COCO [67]: Creative Commons 4.0
- Flickr30k [84]: Creative Commons 1.0
- LAION-Aesthetics [89]: Creative Commons BY 4.0

- VoxCeleb2 [19]: Creative Commons BY-SA 4.0
- LRS2 [96]: MIT License
- TalkingHead-1KH [107]: Creative Commons BY 3.0
- VPBench [5]: Unspecified
- FiVE-Bench [62]: Unspecified
- HDTF [137]: Creative Commons BY 4.0
- CelebV-Text [125]: Unspecified
- Fashion Video [130]: Creative Commons BY-NC 4.0
- TED-talks [94]: Unspecified
- TikTok [48]: MIT License
- A2 Bench [28]: Apache License 2.0
- OpenS2V-Nexus [128]: Apache License 2.0
- ConsisID [129]: Apache License 2.0
- Panda-70M [14]: Non-commercial and research purposes
- HOIGen-1M [70]: Apache License 2.0
- EMIME [112]: Open Data Commons Attribution License (ODC-By) v1.0
- VCTK [102]: Creative Commons BY 4.0
- LibriTTS [131]: Creative Commons BY 4.0
- LibriSpeech [82]: Creative Commons BY 4.0

All datasets released with this work are available under the Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial Share-Alike 4.0 International license (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0). We selected this license to match the terms of several original datasets and to provide our data under the same access conditions.

Data Generation. To ensure comprehensive coverage of the DeepFake landscape, we organize our synthesis pipeline into distinct task-oriented sub-domains, as detailed in Tab. 4.

In the Image modality, we extend beyond traditional Face Swapping and Attribute Manipulation to encompass advanced Subject-driven Editing and Identity-Preserving Generation. This involves a diverse array of state-of-theart models, ranging from open-source editors like PixArt- σ [13], OmniGen2 [113], Step1X-Edit [73], SD3 [27], and Flux 1 [4], to proprietary generators such as Gemini 2.5 [32] and GPT-4o [81].

The Video modality represents the most diverse category, addressing the spectrum from facial to full-body synthesis. We include head-centric tasks, such as Face Reenactment and Lip-Syncing (*e.g.*, MuseTalk [136]), alongside complex body-centric tasks like Full-Body Puppetry via Champ [144] and ControlNeXt [83]. Furthermore, we incorporate Human Video Generation utilizing models like LTX-Video [38], Wan2.2 [103], Phantom [71], and Hunyuancustom [44], covering various conditioning inputs such as reference images and pure text.

Finally, for the Audio modality, we target both Voice Cloning and Voice Conversion. By benchmarking open-source solutions like OpenVoice [86] and Seed-VC [72] against commercial APIs like ElevenLabs [26], we capture the current state-of-the-art across varying acoustic environ-

ments

Quality Control. To increase the high fidelity of our generated DeepFakes, we employ specialized metrics for assessing realism and consistency to ensure automatic quality control before starting the annotation process. Realism metrics, namely LPIPS [133], NIQE [77], VSFA [59], and NISQA [76], evaluate whether the content appears natural and is challenging for humans or algorithms to detect as synthetic. In contrast, consistency metrics, including Arc-Face [22], CLIPScore [42], LSE-C [85], AED&AKD [93], SECS [72], and ViCLIP [109], measure how closely the output aligns with input conditions or control signals, such as retaining facial identity, voice characteristics, or movement synchronization. After applying quality control to filter out low-quality samples, we form one-to-one real-fake pairs in each DeepFake task, resulting in a total of over 5K pairs spanning three different modalities.

C. Taxonomy of DeepFake Artifacts

To systematically categorize the artifacts present in Deep-Fake media, we divide the artifacts into two distinct classes based on the level of analysis required for detection. Tab. 5 outlines *Quality Artifacts*, which encompass low-level signal distortions and compression errors that are often detectable through traditional image or audio processing techniques. In contrast, Tab. 6 details *Semantic Artifacts*, which represent high-level logical inconsistencies, *e.g.*, violations of physics or anatomy, that require contextual understanding to identify.




Figure 6. Graphic User Interface of Annotation Platform. It displays paired real and DeepFake samples stacked vertically to facilitate fine-grained comparison and structured artifact labeling for reliable annotation results.

D. Annotation Platform

To implement the unified taxonomy at scale, we have developed a dedicated annotation platform optimized for hierarchical annotation. The annotation process is fully man-

Table 4. Overview of DeepFake tasks, representative synthesis methods, and commonly used public datasets across three modalities. For each task, we select three publicly available code repositories to ensure diversity in generation approaches. To maintain fair evaluation and avoid data leakage, only the testing splits of public datasets or datasets not used for training are employed for generation.

Modality	Tasks	Synthesis Methods	Public Dataset
		DiffSwap [140]	FaceForensics++ [88]
	Face Swapping	BlendFace [92]	FFHQ [54]
		CSCS [46]	CelebAMaskHQ [56]
		PREIM3D [61]	CelebA-HQ [53]
	Facial Attribute Manipulation	AdaTrans [45]	VGGFace2 [9]
		StyleGANEX [118]	FFHQ [54]
		Mige [100]	Emp Edit [01]
	Cubinet dainen Imana Editiona	Step1X-Edit [73]	Emu Edit [91]
T	Subject-driven Image Editing	OmniGen2 [113]	GEdit-Bench [73]
Image		Gemini 2.5 Flash Image [32]	ImgEdit [124]
		Mige [100]	Colob A HO [52]
	Identity Preserving Consection	UNO [114]	CelebA-HQ [53]
	Identity-Preserving Generation	OmniGen2 [113]	FFHQ [54]
		Gemini 2.5 Flash Image [32]	OmniContext [113]
		SD3 [27]	MC COCO [67]
	H C C	PixArt-σ [13]	MS-COCO [67]
	Human Scene Generation	Flux 1. [4]	Flickr30k [84]
		GPT-40 Image [81]	LAION-Aesthetics [89]
		HifiFace [108]	CelebA-HQ [53]
	Face Swapping	InfoSwap [30]	VoxCeleb2 [19]
	11 0	FaceAdapter [39]	FaceForensics++ [88]
		MCNet [43]	CelebA-HQ [53]
	Face Reenactment	HyperReenact [6]	VoxCeleb2 [19]
		LivePortrait [35]	FaceForensics++ [88]
		DINet [138]	LRS2 [96]
	Lip-Syncing	LatentSync [58]	VoxCeleb2 [19]
	Elp Sylicing	MuseTalk [136]	TalkingHead-1KH [107]
		VideoPainter [5]	Tukingricaa Titii [107]
	Subject-driven Video Editing	VACE [49]	VPBench [5]
	Subject-driven video Editing	Wan-Edit [62]	FiVE-Bench [62]
		SadTalker [134]	
		AniPortrait [110]	TalkingHead-1KH [107]
	Audio-driven Talking-Head Synthesis	Hallo2 [20]	HDTF [137]
		D-ID [21]	CelebV-Text [125]
Video		Champ [144]	
		MotionEditor [101]	Fashion Video [130]
	Full-Body Puppetry	MagicDance [10]	TED-talks [94]
		ControlNeXt [83]	TikTok [48]
		Hunyuancustom [44]	
		VACE [49]	A2 Bench [28]
	Identity-Preserving Generation	Phantom [71]	OpenS2V-Nexus [128]
		Kling [23]	ConsisID [129]
		LTX-Video [38]	CelebV-Text [125]
	Human Image-to-Video Generation	CogVideoX [120]	Panda-70M [14]
		Wan2.2 [103]	HOIGen-1M [70]
		Veo3 [33]	
		LTX-Video [38]	CelebV-Text [125]
	Human Scene Generation	Pyramid-Flow [50]	Panda-70M [14]
		SkyReels-A2 [28]	HOIGen-1M [70]
		Veo3 [33]	
		XTTS [2]	EMIME [112]
	Voice Cloning	OpenVoice [86]	VCTK [102]
		CosyVoice 2.0 [25]	LibriTTS [131]
Audio		ElevenLabs [26]	
		SpeechT5_VC [3]	LibriSpeech [82]
	Voice Conversion	Seed-VC [72]	VCTK [102]
	voice Conversion	Diff-HierVC [18]	LibriTTS [131]

Table 5. Quality Artifacts: Localized signal errors detectable by traditional processing methods.

Domain	Artifact	Definition							
Visual Signal	Blurriness	The loss of sharpness and fine detail, making the image appear out of focus.							
	Blockiness	Visible square or rectangular patterns on the screen.							
	Noise	Random, fine speckles or a sandy texture across the image.							
	Banding	Distinct, abrupt steps or bands in areas that should have a smooth color gradient.							
	Color Inconsistency	Colors appear unnatural, with excessive saturation or vibrancy.							
	Blending Artifacts	Visible boundaries where elements should merge smoothly.							
	Lighting Inconsistency	Illumination that does not agree across the scene.							
	Unnatural Texture	The surface is overly smooth, missing natural irregularities.							
Temporal	Temporal Artifacts	Inconsistencies across frames that break motion continuity.							
_	Flicker	Noticeable and often rapid variation in the overall brightness.							
Audio Signal	Clipping	Harsh, fuzzy, or crackling sound when audio is too loud.							
	Hiss	High-frequency static noise (e.g., "shhhh" sound).							
	Buzz	Low-frequency tone, typically caused by electrical interference.							
	Pops	Abrupt, short, and sharp sounds that interrupt the audio.							

Table 6. Semantic Artifacts: High-level inconsistencies requiring contextual understanding. (Env. = Environment; Lang. = Language)

Context	Artifact	Definition
Physics & Env.	Reflection Inconsistency	Reflections do not match the subject, lighting, or scene geometry.
	Shadow Inconsistency	Shadows do not match the subject, lighting, or scene geometry.
	Spatial Incoherence	Objects or people fail to make contact with surfaces or each other.
	Unrealistic Background	Background lacks plausible detail, perspective, or depth.
Human Biology	Anatomical Inconsistency Unnatural Expressions Unnatural Gaze Unnatural Movement	Human anatomy is implausible (e.g., distorted limbs). Facial expressions do not align with emotion or context. Eye direction or blink behavior appears robotic. Motion lacks physical plausibility.
Objects & Lang.	Object Integrity Flaws Unrecognizable Text Unnatural Prosody	The object is incomplete, broken, or internally inconsistent. Text is unrecognizable, incomplete, broken, or distorted. Speech sounds robotic, monotonous, or flat.

ual, prioritizing accuracy and reliability over automation. In light of the 59% accuracy ceiling observed with GPT-40 [80] on DeepFake detection, reported by LOKI [123], we have intentionally excluded AI-assisted pre-annotation. We recruit more than 50 annotators. Each generated DeepFake sample is assigned to at least three annotators, and consensus is reached through majority voting. A key feature of our platform, illustrated in Fig. 6, is the top-down layout for comparing real and fake media pairs, each matched in a strict one-to-one correspondence. This layout enables annotators to systematically compare manipulated samples with their authentic counterparts, facilitating the precise identification of both *Quality* and *Semantic Artifacts*. To acceler-

ate the annotation process and alleviate the burden of typing complete sentences to describe artifacts found in the generated DeepFake sample, we design an interface that supports a structured checklist in a multiple-choice style, allowing annotators to assign taxonomy-based labels at multiple levels of granularity with ease and efficiency.

E. Distribution of Ground Truth Options

As illustrated in Fig. 7, we adopt the approach from [74, 141] to ensure that the ground truth options, *e.g.*, true-false or multiple-choice options, are distributed as evenly as possible. This step helps alleviate the well-known "selection bias" issues in MLLMs, where they often favor specific op-




Figure 7. **Statistics of TriDF**. (a) The distribution of ground truth options for <TFQ> and <MCQ>. (b) The frequency of quality artifacts and semantic artifacts.

tion labels as answers.

F. Benchmark Statistics

Comparison with Existing Benchmarks. 1 in the main paper, we compare our proposed TriDF with existing benchmarks [65, 106, 123, 135, 142] for DeepFake detection across several key dimensions, including the size of testing sets, the number of generators, the types of DeepFakes, the data modalities, and the evaluation metrics. Notably, TriDF distinguishes itself with the largest number of questions (76K), generators (51), and DeepFake types (16), spanning three modalities, image, video, and audio, surpassing prior works that often focus on limited generators or types of DeepFake. This extensive collection of generators is a key advantage, providing a far more rigorous test of a detector's robustness and generalization capabilities. It ensures that models are evaluated against a diverse spectrum of generation artifacts, rather than overfitting to the signatures of a few common tools. Crucially, this diversity enables TriDF to simulate real-world "in-the-wild" scenarios by assessing performance against the latest generation models, including state-of-the-art methods such as PixArt- σ [13], OmniGen2 [113], Step1X-Edit [73], Flux 1. [4], SD3 [27], Gemini 2.5 Flash Image [32], GPT-4o Image [81], Hunyuancustom [44], LTX-Video [38], Wan2.2 [103], and Veo3 [33]. Unlike existing benchmarks, TriDF features a comprehensive suite of metrics to quantify the interpretability of Deep-Fake detection, including Accuracy and Cover metrics. It also evaluates the perception abilities and hallucination tendencies of MLLMs through strict real-fake pairs, which enable side-by-side comparisons and allow annotators to assign taxonomy-based labels at multiple levels of granularity. This approach provides a more nuanced and robust assessment of model performance in real-world DeepFake scenarios. In designing TriDF, we deliberately avoid using LLM-as-a-judge approaches. As discussed in [60], employing LLMs as judges inherently introduces biases that can compromise the fairness and reliability of evaluations. Furthermore, LLM judges are susceptible to adversarial attacks, such as prompt injection, thereby raising significant concerns about their reliability in high-stakes scenarios, including DeepFake detection.

Statistics. TriDF is a meticulously curated benchmark designed to comprehensively evaluate DeepFake detection. It consists of 76K questions that span 16 DeepFake techniques, including modern methods like GANs, SD, and DiT. The benchmark's scope is intentionally broad, covering 3 distinct modalities (image, video, and audio) and multiple types of forgeries, from partially manipulated content to fully synthetic media. To ensure a thorough evaluation of interpretability in DeepFake detection, perception abilities, and hallucination tendencies in MLLMs, the questions are distributed across 23K <TFQ>, 24K <MCQ>, and 29K <OEQ>. This significant diversity challenges MLLMs, requiring them to demonstrate robust generalization and a more comprehensive capacity for identifying different forms of DeepFakes.

G. Templates

G.1. Templates for Benchmark Construction

Fig. 8 outlines prompt templates designed for benchmark construction across three distinct question formats: <TFQ>, <MCQ>, and <OEQ>. The <TFQ> (True-False Question) section provides templates to verify the observation of specific artifacts, their presence in the background, or their existence in specific locations. The <MCQ> (Multiple-Choice Question) templates ask users to identify present artifacts or their locations from a list, including instructions to select all that apply or indicate if no options are correct. Finally, the <OEQ> (Open-Ended Question) templates, split into Type A and Type B, establish a persona for a DeepFake forensics analyst, detailing strict guidelines for performing thorough artifact analysis, avoiding false positives, and adhering to a specific output format.




Figure 8. Prompt Template Used for Benchmark Construction for <TFQ>, <MCQ>, and <OEQ>




Figure 9. Prompt Template Used for Artifacts Mapping

G.2. Templates for Artifacts Mapping

Fig. 9 serves as a structured guide for identifying particular visual flaws in media analysis texts. It offers precise definitions of various artifacts as a reference point, compelling LLMs to assess their occurrence based on these exact standards. The template requires LLMs to deliver straightforward binary judgments of "True" or "False," formatted in a machine-readable style using only key-value pairs.

H. Audio Modality Analysis

Evaluation of Perception. Tab. 7 presents the audio perception performance of five open-weight Audio-MLLMs and one proprietary multimodal model. Two distinct trends emerge from the results.

Firstly, semantic perception is substantially more challenging than quality perception. On <TFQ>, Gemini-2.5-Pro attains the highest semantic accuracy, yet most audiospecialized models perform near random chance in this regime. By contrast, these models often exhibit strong performance on quality-related artifacts. This divergence suggests that current systems still lean heavily on low-level signal cues rather than forming robust representations of prosody or speaker plausibility. A salient example is the semantic artifact of unnatural prosody: the waveform may appear clean, but subtle irregularities in rhythm, intonation, or stress make the speech sound implausible to human listeners. Such artifacts are notoriously hard for existing models to detect reliably, underscoring the intrinsic difficulty of semantic perception in audio.

Secondly, we hypothesize that this difficulty is partly driven by an architectural bias. Most MLLMs rely on audio encoders optimized for transcription or high-level semantic understanding, rather than for preserving speakeridentity fidelity or prosodic consistency. As a result, precisely those cues that are critical for judging who is speaking and whether their timing and intonation patterns are human-plausible are under-emphasized in the learned representations, limiting effective DeepFake perception in the audio modality.

Interpretable Detection, Perception and Hallucination. We analyze interpretable audio deepfake detection using Type-A and Type-B <OEQ> questions, with full results summarized in Tab. 8. For Type-A <OEQ>, only Qwen3-Omni-30B-A3B and Gemini-2.5-Pro produce meaningful artifact-level explanations. Qwen3-Omni achieves the highest Cover and $F_{0.5}$ scores, albeit with a moderate level of hallucination, whereas Gemini-2.5-Pro attains slightly lower *Cover* and $F_{0.5}$ scores but produces more consistently grounded descriptions. By contrast, audio-focused models such as Qwen2-Audio-7B, SALMONN-7B, and audioflamingo-3 yield very low Cover and near-saturated hallucination rates, resulting in almost zero $F_{0.5}$ scores. These findings indicate that current audio MLLMs still struggle to provide faithful artifact-level explanations and often hallucinate nonexistent distortions.

Type-B <OEQ> highlights a significant disparity between detection accuracy and explanation quality. SALMONN-7B achieves the highest detection accuracy but offers almost no interpretability, often providing the correct label while generating unreliable explanations. In contrast, Gemini 2.5-Pro demonstrates the opposite trend: its detection accuracy is nearly at chance levels, yet it pro-

Table 7. Evaluation of Audio Deepfake Perception

MLLM		<tf(< th=""><th></th><th colspan="3"><mcq></mcq></th></tf(<>		<mcq></mcq>		
	Semantic	Quality	Avg.	Rank	General	Rank
Random Guess	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	-	0.00	_
Qwen2-Audio-7B	44.50%	67.88%	56.19%	2	0.01	3
Qwen3-Omni-30B-A3B	32.76%	67.37%	50.07%	3	-0.15	5
Phi-4	5.50%	68.45%	36.98%	5	-0.06	4
audio-flamingo-3	6.91%	67.88%	37.40%	4	0.10	1
Gemini-2.5-pro	63.65%	50.13%	56.89%	1	0.04	2
Average	30.66%	64.34%	47.51%	-	-0.01	-

Table 8. Evaluation of Interpretable Audio Deepfake Detection, Perception and Hallucination Robustness

		Type A	<oeq></oeq>			Type B <oeq></oeq>					
MLLM		Aud	io			Audio					
	Cover ↑	CHAIR ↓	Hal ↓	$\mathbf{F}^{0.5} \uparrow$	ACC	Cover ↑	CHAIR ↓	Hal ↓	F ^{0.5} ↑		
Qwen2-Audio-7B	0.0446	0.9342	0.9421	0.0580	0.3799	0.2356	0.6388	0.6756	0.3166		
Qwen3-Omni-30B-A3B	0.5278	0.2011	0.2867	0.7031	0.4082	0.3690	0.5279	0.6756	0.4312		
SALMONN-7B	0.0012	0.9973	0.9973	0.0021	0.5722	0.0472	0.9225	0.9225	0.0673		
Phi-4	0.1983	0.7375	0.7736	0.2360	0.3949	0.3185	0.4967	0.5187	0.4398		
audio-flamingo-3	0.0811	0.8708	0.8708	0.1129	0.3732	0.0206	0.9635	0.9635	0.0311		
Gemini 2.5-pro	0.3065	0.5079	0.5339	0.4279	0.4859	0.5470	0.2106	0.2736	0.7022		

vides the best interpretability, characterized by the highest Cover, reduced hallucination, and the strongest $F_{0.5}$ score. Qwen3-Omni-30B-A3B and Phi-4 fall somewhere in between, exhibiting moderate accuracy and $F_{0.5}$ scores, but still suffering from considerable hallucination. Meanwhile, audio-flamingo-3 performs poorly in both detection and interpretability.

Overall, the audio results reinforce the main triperspective conclusion that current models rarely achieve both strong detection and low hallucination in this modality. Audio-centric MLLMs often depend on unclear heuristics and provide explanations that are highly prone to hallucination, whereas stronger multimodal models offer more grounded reasoning but show only slight improvements over random guessing. These findings highlight the need for better speech-specific perception modules and enhanced modeling of prosody and identity cues to achieve more reliable audio DeepFake detection.

I. Extended Evaluation

I.1. Evaluation Setup

Evaluation models and modalities. In total, we evaluate 26 MLLMs (23 open-source and 3 proprietary) across image, video, and audio modalities. For visual modalities, we consider open-source MLLMs including Qwen3-VL, InternVL [15], LLaVA-OV [57], the Phi series [1], InternLM-XComposer [132], mPLUG-Owl3 [122], the

Idefics2 and Mantis families, MiniCPM-V-2.6, and MiMo-VL-7B. We also include two recent MLLMs specifically developed for DeepFake detection, namely FakeShield [116] and FakeVLM [111]. For comparison with open-source systems, we adopt GPT-5, Gemini-2.5-Pro, and Claude-Sonnet-4.5 as proprietary baselines. For the audio modality, we evaluate Qwen3-Omni, the audio-capable Phi models, Audio-Flamingo-3, and SALMONN-7B, and additionally use Gemini-2.5-Pro as a proprietary baseline.

Experimental protocol. All experiments are conducted in a zero-shot setting, where each sample is processed independently without task-specific fine-tuning. For each query, we provide the model with the question prompt together with the corresponding image, video, or audio input. For video tasks, we either use a 16-frame clip (when frame sampling is configurable) or the model's default frame sampling policy. Unless otherwise noted, the same protocol is applied consistently across all models and modalities.

I.2. More Quantitative Results

Comparison with non-MLLM expert models. Tab. 9 compares three representative MLLM-based detectors with specialized non-MLLM expert models [16, 17, 40, 68, 97, 119] on visual DeepFake detection using our TriDF image and video test sets in a zero-shot setting. In DeepFake image detection, the top MLLM slightly outperforms the best non-MLLM detectors, while other MLLM models remain competitive. The results suggest that state-of-the-art MLLMs already encode substantial visual knowledge that allows them to recognize authenticity cues even without explicit DeepFake training. In contrast, expert models outperform MLLMs in video DeepFake detection. Although MLLMs possess strong static visual priors, they lack the temporal understanding required to analyze motion-level inconsistencies or dynamic artifacts produced by video manipulation pipelines. The performance gap suggests that existing MLLMS do not sufficiently capture temporal cues and therefore require new mechanisms for encoding or leveraging temporal information. Strengthening video representations with MLLMs is a promising direction for advancing future DeepFake detection.

Interplay between perception, hallucination and detection. To understand how the three evaluation dimensions of TriDFrelate to one another, we analyze the correlations between perception, hallucination and detection performances across all 26 evaluated models. For each model m, we compute three macro-averaged scores over all available samples: (i) perception P_m , defined as Type-A Cover; (ii) hallucination severity H_m , defined as Type-A CHAIR; and (iii) detection D_m , defined as Type-B OEQ detection accuracy.

The resulting correlation matrix in Fig. 10 reveals a

tightly coupled but non-degenerate triad. Perception and detection are moderately positively correlated $(r(P,D) \approx 0.60)$: models that cover more ground-truth artifacts in Type-A explanations tend to achieve higher Type-B detection accuracy. Hallucination severity is also strongly coupled to detection $(r(H,D) \approx -0.60)$, with more hallucinated artifacts associated with lower accuracy. Although perception and hallucination are negatively correlated $(r(P,D) \approx -0.44)$, the magnitude of this correlation is relatively moderate. It indicates that while models that recognize more genuine artifacts tend to hallucinate less, the two aspects remain far from interchangeable. The overall correlation matrix shows that perception and detection are moderately aligned, while hallucination undermines detection and is moderately anti-correlated with perception.

However, when we further stratify models by hallucination severity, a more revealing pattern emerges. We define hallucination regimes using the empirical sample distribution: all samples with H=1 form a high-hallucination regime (High-H), while samples with H<1 are split at the 33rd and 67th percentiles into Low-H and Mid-H, and analyze the fake-only subset of TriDF. Independently, we discretize perception into five equal-width bins based on Type-A Cover (0–0.2, 0.2–0.4, ..., 0.8–1.0). For each hallucination regime and perception bin, we then compute the average fake detection accuracy and plot the resulting curves in Fig. 11.

The stratified curves reveal a clear three-way interaction. In the Low-H and Mid-H regimes, fake-detection accuracy is high at low Cover and rapidly saturates near perfect accuracy as Cover increases, indicating that once explanations are largely grounded, additional perceptual coverage yields gains on detection accuracy. In contrast, in the High-H regime, DeepFake detection accuracy remains close to chance across all perception bins and is effectively insensitive to Cover. Even when models capture numerous artifacts (high P), severe hallucination in Type-A explanations is associated with systematic failures to flag fakes in Type-B decisions.

Both analyses shown in Fig. 10 and Fig. 11 demonstrate that hallucination can disrupt the natural link between evidence recognition in perception and detection decision-making. The findings reinforce that perception, detection, and hallucination capture fundamentally distinct aspects of model behavior, and that reliable DeepFake detection requires balanced progress across all three dimensions. Improving only perception or only classification is insufficient. Addressing these intertwined but independent factors is crucial for building trustworthy and human-aligned detection systems capable of withstanding increasingly sophisticated forgeries.

Table 9. Accuracy (ACC↑) of three representive MLLM-based models and specialized non-MLLM DeepFake detectors on the TriDF image and video test sets.

Image detector		Video detector				
Detector	ACC ↑	Detector	ACC ↑			
MLLM-based detectors						
GPT-5	0.6573	GPT-5	0.6312			
Gemini-2.5-pro	0.7311	Gemini-2.5-pro	0.5984			
Qwen3-Omni-30B-A3B	0.6942	InternVL2_5-8B	0.5996			
Specialized non-MLLM d	etectors					
FatFormer [68]	0.5264	MM-Det [97]	0.6866			
AIDE [17]	0.7187	DFD-FCG [40]	0.6778			
Co-Spy [16]	0.6882					
D ³ [119]	0.7093					




Figure 10. Model-level correlation matrix for perception (P), hallucination severity (H), and detection (D). Perception is positively correlated with detection accuracy, while hallucination is negatively correlated with both, supporting the three-dimensional P–H–D view of MLLM-based DeepFake detection.




Figure 11. Stratified perception—detection curves on TriDF: fake-detection accuracy vs. binned Type-A *Cover* under three Type-A CHAIR regimes, showing that strong hallucination keeps detection near chance even with high perceptual coverage.

I.3. More Qualitative Results

Based on the provided documents, the case studies utilize three distinct evaluation formats, <TFQ>, <MCQ>, and

<OEQ>, to assess model performance in detecting synthesis and manipulation artifacts.

<TFQ> focuses on binary verification, prompting models to simply confirm or deny the presence of specific defects, such as detecting "Buzz" in an audio clip or identifying "Temporal Inconsistency" in a video subject's upper limb. As shown in Fig. 12, Gemini 2.5-Pro outperforms both powerful general-purpose models (*e.g.*, Qwen3-Omni-30B-A3B) and specialized models, audio-flamingo-3. Conversely, GPT-5 struggles in this example because it cannot handle raw video inputs without preprocessing, which hinders its ability to understand temporal relationships.

<MCQ> tests the ability to categorize or locate specific errors, asking models to identify semantic issues like "Anatomical Inconsistency" or select specific regions where artifacts appear, such as the "Ear" or "Background". Within the two examples in Fig. 13, the evaluation metric is strict: models must answer all options correctly to receive the maximum score of 1. Any incorrect selection results in a penalty, preventing a full score.

Finally, <OEQ> requires a more granular, descriptive analysis, asking models to justify a "Likely Manipulated" verdict by detailing observable flaws like "Inconsistent Lighting", "Unnatural Shadow", or a "Blurred Background". Fig. 14 highlights the variance in model perspective: Gemini 2.5-Pro provides a focused, context-aware analysis of lighting physics on a specific object (a cat), whereas InternVL2_5-8B generates a generic list of deepfake flaws typically associated with human subjects.

J. Future Direction of DeepFake Detection

TriDF fills an important gap in existing evaluation resources by enabling systematic analysis of all three components. Looking forward, TriDF provides several avenues for advancing future DeepFake detection techniques. First, the fine-grained artifact taxonomy offers a structured supervisory signal that can guide new models to focus on meaningful manipulation cues rather than dataset-specific shortcuts. Second, the multimodal and diverse generator design creates a challenging testbed that encourages the development of detectors with stronger generalization across synthesis pipelines. Third, the hallucination evaluation reveals failure modes in explanation generation and provides a foundation for designing models that produce grounded, reliable reasoning. Finally, as new generative techniques and modalities emerge, TriDF can be extended to support evolving research needs, serving as a long-term platform for building trustworthy and deployable DeepFake detection systems.

K. Release Plan and Ethics Statement

We formally state that all datasets employed in the development of this benchmark are publicly available. The generation of DeepFakes is confined strictly to academic and research objectives, primarily to foster advancements in media authenticity and detection. Our research team is fundamentally opposed to any malicious application of this technology. We strongly discourage and condemn any use of our proposed benchmark or generated data for purposes that are deceptive, harmful, or intended to spread misinformation.




Figure 12. Examples of <TFQ>




Figure 13. Examples of <MCQ>

[Image] Type A <OEQ>

Question:

Please perform a detailed analysis of artifacts in this sample that seem inauthentic.



Gemini 2.5-Pro:

The analysis reveals several inconsistencies, primarily related to the cat, which suggest that it may have been digitally added to the scene.


- Inconsistent Lighting and Shadows: The most significant evidence of manipulation is the incorrect shadowing associated with the
- Light Source: The dominant light source in the pet store aisle is the series of long, bright fluorescent lights on the ceiling. This should create distinct, downward-cast shadows.
- Missing Shadow: The cat is standing on a bright white surface, which should make any cast shadow clearly visible. However, the cat casts almost no discernible shadow. There are some very faint contact shadows directly under its paws, but there is no larger, softer shadow on the surface that would be consistent with its body blocking the strong overhead light.
- Lighting Mismatch: The lighting on the cat itself seems generally consistent with an overhead source, with highlights on its head and back. However, the lack of a corresponding shadow on the surface it occupies creates a strong contradiction, suggesting the cat was photographed under different lighting conditions and composited into this image.

Artifact 2:

- Unnatural Edges and Composition: The boundary between the cat and the background shows subtle signs of digital insertion.
- Soft/Blurry Outline: The edges around the cat's fur, particularly along its back and head against the fish tanks, appear unnaturally soft and slightly blurred. This halo effect is common when a subject is inexpertly cut out from its original background and placed onto a new one.
- Lack of Integration: The cat's paws rest on the white surface, but they don't seem to interact with it naturally. The contact points lack the subtle shadows and pressure points that would make the composition believable. The overall effect is that the cat appears to be floating on the surface rather than standing firmly on it.

Summary:

The primary indicators of manipulation in this image are centered on the cat. The stark inconsistency between the bright, overhead light source and the almost complete absence of a cast shadow from the cat is the strongest piece of evidence. This, combined with the soft and unnatural edges around the cat's outline, strongly suggests that the cat was not originally part of the scene and has been digitally composited into the photograph.



Question:

Decide whether the provided sample is authentic or manipulated. Perform a detailed analysis of artifacts that appear inauthentic or indicative of synthesis/manipulation.



InternVL2_5-8B

Likely Manipulated.

Artifact Findings

- 1) Inconsistent Lighting: The lighting on the person's face and upper body is inconsistent with the ambient lighting in the background. The face is well-lit, while the upper body has a different lighting quality, suggesting a possible post-production adjustment.
- 2) Unnatural Shadow: There is an unnatural shadow on the person's left side (viewer's right side) that does not align with the light source. The shadow appears too sharp and distinct, indicating possible manipulation.
- 3) Blurred Background: The background is slightly blurred, which is unusual for a video taken in a static environment. This blurring effect is more typical of video editing software, suggesting postproduction adjustments.
- 4) Inconsistent Clothing Texture: The texture of the sweatshirt appears inconsistent, with some areas looking smoother and others more textured. This inconsistency is not typical of natural clothing and suggests possible manipulation.
- 5) Unnatural Hand Position: The person's hand position appears unnatural, with fingers slightly bent and positioned in a way that does not align with the rest of the body's posture. This could be a result of post-production adjustments.
- 6) Inconsistent Facial Expression: The facial expression appears slightly off, with the mouth and eyes not fully synchronized. This inconsistency is not typical of natural facial movements and suggests possible manipulation.
- 7) Unnatural Hair Movement: The hair appears to move in a way that is not consistent with the rest of the body's movement. This could be a result of post-production adjustments to the hair.
- 8) Inconsistent Background Objects: The background objects, such as the plants and the building, appear slightly out of focus and do not align perfectly with the person's position. This inconsistency is not typical of natural environments and suggests possible manipulation.
- 9) Unnatural Body Posture: The person's body posture appears slightly off, with the shoulders and hips not fully aligned. This inconsistency is not typical of natural body movements and suggests possible manipulation.
- 10) Inconsistent Clothing Color: The color of the sweatshirt appears slightly off, with some areas looking darker and others lighter. This inconsistency is not typical of natural clothing.

Figure 14. Examples of <OEQ>