

# AI-assisted Tagging of Deepfake Audio Calls using Challenge-Response

Govind Mittal<sup>1</sup>, Arthur Jakobsson<sup>2</sup>, Kelly O. Marshall<sup>1</sup>, Chinmay Hegde<sup>1</sup>, Nasir Memon<sup>1</sup>  
<sup>1</sup>*New York University, Tandon School of Engineering, Brooklyn, NY*  
<sup>2</sup>*Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA*  
 {mittal, km3888, chinmay.h, memon}@nyu.edu, ajakobss@andrew.cmu.edu

## Abstract

Scammers are aggressively leveraging AI voice-cloning technology for social engineering attacks, a situation significantly worsened by the advent of audio Real-time Deepfakes (RTDFs). RTDFs can clone a target’s voice in real-time over phone calls, making these interactions highly interactive and thus far more convincing. Our research confidently addresses the gap in the existing literature on deepfake detection, which has largely been ineffective against RTDF threats. We introduce a robust challenge-response-based method to detect deepfake audio calls, pioneering a comprehensive taxonomy of audio challenges. Our evaluation pitches 20 prospective challenges against a leading voice-cloning system.

We have compiled a novel open-source challenge dataset with contributions from 100 smartphone and desktop users, yielding 18,600 original and 1.6 million deepfake samples. Through rigorous machine and human evaluations of this dataset, we achieved a deepfake detection rate of 86% and an 80% AUC score, respectively. Notably, utilizing a set of 11 challenges significantly enhances detection capabilities. Our findings reveal that combining human intuition with machine precision offers complementary advantages. Consequently, we have developed an innovative human-AI collaborative system that melds human discernment with algorithmic accuracy, boosting final joint accuracy to 82.9%. This system highlights the significant advantage of AI-assisted pre-screening in call verification processes. <https://mittalgovind.github.io/autch-samples/>

## 1 Introduction

Recent advancements in synthetic speech generation have obscured the distinction between authentic and fabricated media [14, 18, 24]. The impact of such advancements is felt particularly with the advent of voice-cloning tools that can generate speech that sounds authentic in real-time [12, 25, 26, 41, 43]. The existence of such tools presents a critical vulnerability for exploitation during social engineering and raises an urgent

question: *How can one ascertain the authenticity of a caller in an age where synthetic voices are indistinguishable from real ones?*

Phone call-based social engineering attacks are highly plausible, especially since 2019, when online interactions became mainstream. An example of a phone scam is robocalls, whose numbers in the U.S. peaked at an astonishing 58.5 billion. Robocalls even used the voices of the U.S. President Biden [7] and Mayor of New York City for voter suppression and outreach [8]. This concerning escalation prompted repeated warnings from the FBI [21], the FTC [36], and an eventual prohibition against robocalls by the FCC [20].

Consider a more believable and targeted form of phone scams than robocalls leveraging *Real-time Deepfakes or RTDFs*. Such deepfakes make scam calls sound convincingly close to a target’s voice, and being real-time, they become interactive and capable of conversing. Such fake calls are more risky as they are more believable and, hence, more persuasive. We will shortly discuss how we used RTDF’s inherent interactivity to tackle them.

One could assume that decades of technological advancements in voice calling should be able to counter most scams. However, several incidents where scammers exploited audio deepfakes highlight the inadequacy of current telecommunications and regulatory measures to contain such threats. Such incidents include convincing a finance worker to remit \$25 million by sounding like their chief financial officer over a group video call [6], demanding a \$50,000 ransom by mimicking a daughter’s distressed voice to deceive her mother [16] and defrauding an energy company of \$243,000 by impersonating their boss’ voice over the phone [22]. Moreover, a McAfee survey of 7,000 individuals worldwide found that 25% had encountered an AI voice cloning scam or knew someone who had [29], revealing a troubling reality: the end users have been left responsible for discerning a genuine caller from an imposter.

In an ideal scenario, an aware individual *would* approach every call with a healthy degree of skepticism, and a suspicious caller could never make any gains. In reality, receiving

a call from a known caller ID [2] and the mere recognition of a familiar voice can swiftly establish trust, even amidst noise or voice distortions. Typically, an explanation from the caller, asserting they are under the weather or in an area with poor reception, is enough to dispel any doubts [42]. Moreover, sophisticated RTDFs now challenge conventional security protocols, such as speaker verification systems and liveness detection in KYC processes, making them prone to evasion [3–5].

Numerous audio deepfake detection methods have been developed [47]. However, they are primarily designed for static content and have limited efficacy against RTDFs. These methods assume a non-interactive scenario and work offline, allowing impostors ample time to refine manipulated content with sophisticated editing tools.

In this work, we depart from the traditional techniques and leverage challenge-response to pursue an alternative approach to detecting deepfake audio calls. Challenge-response mechanisms, traditionally pivotal in distinguishing bots from humans via the ubiquitous CAPTCHAs, have taken on new ground with the introduction of GOTCHA [32] and D-CAPTCHA [46] for unmasking video and audio deepfakes. These pioneering studies capitalize on the asymmetric advantage where the burden to maintain high quality in real-time, under challenging situations, is now squarely on the imposter caller. This work aims to harness the full spectrum of audio challenges during phone calls and orchestrate a collaborative dynamic between humans and AI, thereby fortifying detection accuracy and confidence.

We began by curating a detailed taxonomy of audio challenges, categorizing them into eight main types and 22 sub-types, including vocal distortions (e.g., whispering), waveform manipulations (e.g., high-pitch speaking), language-specific articulations (e.g., rolling R sounds), environmental noise (e.g., clapping while speaking), and background playbacks (e.g., talking over music). We selected and evaluated 20 prospective challenges from the taxonomy.

Our investigation revolves around three research questions:

**RQ1:** Do challenges enhance machine detection?

**RQ2:** Can human evaluators harness these challenges to sharpen their discernment?

**RQ3:** Does supporting humans with automated detectors further improve overall performance?

We collected an open-source novel dataset to address these questions by engaging 100 participants across mobile and desktop interfaces to produce 18,600 original voice recordings. We subsequently generated 1.6 million samples through a state-of-the-art one-shot voice-cloning technology.

We performed machine evaluation\* by designing a non-intrusive degradation metric for assessing audio samples on compliance, naturalness, and the preservation of word information. This metric unveiled that a select group of 11 challenges dramatically boosted the deepfake detection perfor-

mance (Area Under Curve or AUC) to 86.7%, compared to 56.0% in deepfakes of everyday speech, highlighting the benefit of using challenges to aid machines. Notably, challenges like whispering, cupping mouth, and playback were among the most effective for machines.

Concurrently, we performed a human evaluation on a *harder* subset of the whole dataset. SpeechBrain’s speaker-verification system [37] classified all deepfake samples in this subset as genuine. Humans assessed the compliance and quality of each audio sample and achieved an AUC of 80.1%, with challenges bringing out discernible degradation in deepfakes.

Informed by these results and the propensity of humans to produce more false positives, we envisioned a framework where machines assisted humans in making decisions. This integration makes our approach scalable while keeping the outcome interpretable with human oversight. A subsequent human evaluation with top-performing challenges, using a balanced dataset, revealed that *machine assistance increased human detection accuracy from 72.3% to 78.5%*. Furthermore, machine assistance significantly boosted human confidence and rectified their errors in 43% of cases (when machines were correct) while causing misjudgments in 29% (when machines were wrong).

Taking this integration a step further, in scenarios where humans were uncertain, machines were allowed to take charge and make the final call. This blend of Human-AI contributions, at a ratio of 56:44, enhanced the overall detection accuracy to 82.9%, representing a 14.3% improvement over the human-only baseline (with machine accuracy standing at 85%). This approach underscores that while humans maintain their primary role in decision-making, strategic machine involvement can dramatically enhance the accuracy of detecting fake calls.

Our findings validated the instrumental role of challenge-response mechanisms in bolstering both machine and human capabilities in audio deepfake detection, showcasing a synergy between human insight and AI accuracy that mitigates the threats posed by real-time synthetic speech technologies.

### **Distinction from Robocalls and Liveness Detection.**

Robocalls are like spam, distributed en masse to the population in an automated manner. Generally, the message is untargeted and is spread to a large population. However, RTDFs (context for this work) are targeted and possibly curated for the particular receiver.

In principle, liveness detection mechanisms are ineffective against RTDFs, as the imposter generates deepfakes in real-time; hence, they are already live. Also, there is a person behind the call who can understand the instructions and can converse. Thus, each interaction could unroll differently.

---

\*we used ‘Machines’ and ‘AI’ interchangeably

## 2 Background

**Definition.** An *audio deepfake* refers to a digital impersonation in which an imposter mimics audio characteristics to convincingly match a specific target’s likeness. When such impersonations can be done live with sufficient fidelity, we call them RTDFs.

### 2.1 Cognitive Bias and Human Susceptibility

In the context of deepfakes, individuals are left to navigate the landscape on their own, letting scammers abuse their trust during phone calls. Two pivotal factors contribute to the phenomenon of rapid trust-building over calls. First, there exists a general human acknowledgment of the fallibility of our auditory perception. Mishearing is a shared experience, arguably more so than visual misinterpretation. We naturally integrate multi-sensory inputs into listening, such as live transcription, facial expressions, mouth movements, and the conversation context, to enhance our ability to discern speech. These cues are sufficiently potent to augment and even override auditory perception, as demonstrated by the McGurk effect [30]. Under this effect, the visual information from seeing a person’s mouth speak changes how one hears the speech, leading to misheard syllables. This phenomenon highlights our innate understanding that auditory signals could be unreliable, which can get amplified over audio calls where the channel is noisy and the visual component is absent.

Second, the technological landscape has molded our expectations of sound quality. Individuals who grew accustomed to the quirks of early mobile telephony – limited bandwidth, dropped calls, background noise, and frequent verbal confirmations to ensure mutual understanding – have been conditioned to interpret and understand communication even in subpar auditory conditions. Despite improvements in audio clarity, exposure to imperfect sound has ingrained tolerance for noisy or unclear speech in us. Such tolerance accentuates our inherent bias to trust noisy speech.

This evolutionary and technological adaptation in auditory perception is evident in how humans rate audio quality. When deploying mean opinion scores (MOS) for speech naturalness assessment, the scale customarily spans from 1 (being incomprehensible) to 5 (akin to face-to-face). Nonetheless, the average difference between the highest and lowest MOS scores is often only two points and skewed towards the higher end [38]. This indicates a degree of leniency or an adaptive bias in our auditory judgments, underscoring our propensity to make sense of auditory inputs despite the quality.

This innate human tendency to trust auditory inputs instead of mistrusting them offers a potent avenue for exploitation in social engineering attacks employing audio deepfakes.

### 2.2 Problem Description

**Threat Model.** Three parties are involved in this scenario: an impostor, the intended identity (the target), and a defender. The defender receives a call of a sensitive nature, answering to interact directly with the target. However, an impostor may employ AI-generated speech synthesis tools to communicate with the defender, masquerading as the target. The primary objective of the defender is to authenticate the caller’s identity before proceeding further.

A *sensitive call* refers to a remote communication initiated to acquire something from the recipient, who possesses both the capability and willingness to grant it. Such calls include job interviews, phone banking, disreputable interactions, and pranks.

**Defenders.** The defender does not assume any trust in the potential impostor or their devices. The defender requests imposters to perform a specific task. The nature of requests made is public. However, a seed is initialized for randomizing the task. No identifiable target information, such as voice biometrics, is collected through an extensive enrollment process. The defender works against a strong threat model, as identity information can help them.

**Imposters.** An impostor can access sufficient computational resources to run voice-cloning software in real-time. They can discern and respond to requests made to them.

An impostor can obtain a high-quality speech sample of the target, potentially via social media or an unsolicited phone call (pre-recorded voicemail greetings). This scenario is particularly impactful, as it requires scant data and can cause widespread harm.

**Hypothesis.** Speech communication constitutes several vital elements, including phonetics, articulation, pitch, tone, rhythm, stress, voice quality, and fluency, all of which combine to create a distinct auditory experience. An audio deepfake system should fail to maintain fidelity in real time while supporting all such elements.

## 3 Related Work

**Voice-Cloning.** Voice cloning systems aim to separate speaker identity from content in a given target’s data and replace it with the desired content at inference time. Such speech generation systems broadly differ in their form of input: text or speech. In our analysis, Text-to-Speech models [12, 39] excelled in content modulation but fell short in capturing speech nuances like emotions or prosody, severely limiting them against our challenges. Our focus thus shifted to speech-to-speech systems, which convert a source speech into the targeted speaker’s voice while maintaining subtle elements of speech.

Among the various voice converters available, such as PPG-VC [28], StarGANv2-VC [27], FREE-VC [25], StreamVC [45], and KNN-VC [9], we choose FREE-VC for our evaluation. As FREE-VC is noted for its open-source<sup>†</sup> any-to-any voice cloning capabilities, outperforming earlier models and matching recent advancements, with Korshunov et al. [23] considering it as a *high threat to speaker recognition systems*, we assume it will be an imposter’s top choice.

**Speaker Verification.** Speaker Verification aims to match the speaker in an unknown speech sample to a clean reference speech sample. In our work, when we test SpeechBrain [37] on our original and deepfake regular speech dataset, it scores a near-perfect 98.5%. However, the availability of a clean reference file makes such an approach impractical and incompatible with our threat model.

**Challenge-Response Systems.** Authentication schemes utilizing challenge-response mechanisms are used in the ubiquitous CAPTCHA to differentiate bots masquerading as humans on the internet. Audio CAPCHAs [19] extends this approach for people with visual impairment. The GOTCHA system [32] introduced a challenge-response approach for real-time video deepfake detection, analyzing eight video challenges. This study concluded that challenges lead to consistent and measurable degradation in detecting real-time video deepfakes, with a focus on interpretability.

D-CAPTCHA [46] developed a challenge-response system for audio calls, evaluating nine challenges and measuring detection performance based on realism, compliance, and identity against deepfake generators, with StarGANv2-VC [27] being the most potent deepfake generator tested. Their research is a vital proof-of-concept for a more systematic and robust approach, indicating the promising potential of challenge-response systems in detecting deepfake audio calls. Our work builds upon this by exploring 20 challenges and developing a pre-screener for calls that assists and collaborates with human receivers.

**Human Evaluation of Deepfakes.** Muller et al. [34] conducted a study in which participants competed against an AI model, RawNet2 [40], to identify audio deepfakes. Participants were shown the AI’s classification after listening to an audio clip and deciding its authenticity. The study compared human performance against AI in detecting deepfakes without allowing participants to revise their choices. The conclusion was that humans and AI exhibit similar strengths and weaknesses across various spoofing tasks from ASVSpooF2019 [35]. Contrary to their findings, our work provides empirical evidence that human and AI performances are not strongly correlated, often complementing each other’s decision-making.

<sup>†</sup><https://github.com/OlaWod/FreeVC>

Table 1: Taxonomy of Audio Challenges encompassing eight categories and 22 subcategories with examples. We evaluated the **bold** numbered examples as 20 prospective challenges.

Category	Sub-category	Example(s)
No Challenge	Read Normally	<b>Regular Speech (0)</b>
Vocal Distortions	Vocal Peripherals Whisper Vocal Cavity	<b>Static Mouth (1), Cup Mouth (2)</b> <b>Whispering (3)</b> <b>Hold Nose (8), humming</b>
Waveform	Frequency Amplitude Temporal	<b>High (9), Low pitch (10), Sing (13)</b> <b>Speak Loudly (4) &amp; Softly (5)</b> <b>Speak Quickly (6) &amp; Slowly (7)</b>
Language / Articulation	Difficult Sequences Mimicry Phonetics Deception	<b>Foreign Words (11), Reverse Count</b> <b>Mimic another Accent (12)</b> Rolled R’s & Tongue clicks Sudden Interruption while speaking
Tone of Voice	Emotion Phonology	<b>Sound happy / sad (14)</b> <b>Questions (inflection) (15)</b>
Noise	Vocal Intentional Non-vocal Background Noise Echo	<b>Cough/whistle (16)</b> <b>Clap (17), flick microphone</b> Birds, Cars two mics on same call
Playback (desktop only)	Speech Music	<b>Cross-talk (18)</b> <b>Instrumental (19), Lyrical(20)</b>
<b>Out-of-Scope</b>		
Behavioral	Unique Habits Biometric	Mannerisms, Person-of-Interest Voice Print Detection
Passive Distortions	Perturbations Software Editing	Adversarial Perturbations Modulating Pitch, Noise, or Bass

■ Lingual challenge, ■ Non-lingual challenge, ■ Replay challenge

## 4 Speech Challenges and their Taxonomy

**Definition.** An *audio challenge* is:

- a task plausible to perform during a phone call,
- induces degradation in real-time deepfakes,
- supports randomization, and
- optionally be verifiable by humans.

This section describes a taxonomy of audio tasks that challenge RTDFs to adapt to novel inputs. RTDFs facing unusual voice patterns produce speech artifacts, which later aid us in discovering their presence on calls. We delineated the taxonomy in Table 1, intending to stimulate variation in several factors that constitute phone calls, like linguistics, tone of voice, background, and behavioral cues.

### 4.1 Lingual Challenges

Lingual challenges prompt individual to alter their vocal characteristics in distinctive ways. These challenges exploit a human vocal system’s degrees of freedom, such as vocal fold shape, peripherals movements, lung pressure, resonance and phonation modes.

**Vocal Distortions** include challenges that manipulate mouth peripherals (including the tongue, lips, and teeth) and vocal chord resonance. We sub-categorize them as follows:

- *Vocal Peripherals*: The movements of teeth, lips, and tongue are crucial in producing distinct speech sounds. Impeding the movement of these organs alters speech patterns. E.g., speaking with a pen between the teeth, with the tongue pressed to the palate, or with lips parted but stationary. Such challenges restrict articulation of syllables, which hampers speech recognition [48].
- *Whisper*: Whispering creates a unique sound characterized by minimal vibrations of the vocal cords, leading to a toneless and less distinct output. Deepfakes trained primarily on everyday speech might be opaque to this distortion and fail to replicate its nuances. Furthermore, whispering makes even speaker verification systems unreliable, as it can sound the same between two individuals.
- *Vocal Cavity*: Modifying the size of the vocal tract cavity impacts the resonance in sound. Speaking while holding one's nose results in a nasal "buzzy" voice. In contrast, humming, which also narrows the vocal tract cavity, was excluded from our consideration due to its constraints on word articulation and lower audibility.

**Waveform Challenges** involve modifying key speech characteristics in the sound waveform, including frequency (pitch), amplitude (loudness), and temporal (speed). Deepfake generators focusing solely on speech content and speaker identity may overlook these modulations.

- *Frequency*: Voice pitch can vary, from speaking unusually low or high pitches to singing melodies like "Happy Birthday." Singing, in particular, presents a stark deviation from spoken speech and tests the waveform diversity an RTDF generator can handle [15].
- *Amplitude*: The ability to modulate speaking volume offers a natural test for detecting RTDFs using amplitude variations.
- *Temporal*: Abnormal speech rates may present challenges for RTDF generation trained on average speaking speeds.

**Language and Articulation Challenges** involve subjects articulating language patterns uncommon in everyday speech.

- *Difficult Sequences*: Pronouncing phonetically complex or foreign words, like 'Worcestershire,' making guesses that lead to incorrect pronunciations and filler words.
- *Mimicry*: Users mimicking known accents vary their natural vocal style. This variation can confound RTDF generators, which get trained on targeted datasets. It would lack matching target data for such mimicry.
- *Phonetics*: Rolling Rs or tongue clicks challenge the ability to reproduce sounds not native to the speaker's language. However, genuine speakers may themselves struggle.
- *Deception*: An unexpected command to cease speaking tests reaction times; genuine speakers might pause or stop altogether. In contrast, an RTDF, especially a text-to-speech (TTS) model, may not exhibit such reactive pauses.

#### **Tone of Voice.**

- *Emotion*: Speaking with a discernible emotion like hap-

piness, sadness, or an authoritative tone. Replicating the nuanced emotional expressions in speech is a complex task for TTS systems.

- *Phonology*: Challenges in this category might include altering inflection, particularly at the end of sentences, as in asking a question.

## **4.2 Non-lingual Challenges**

Challenges that rely on noises created by humans, their environment, or speech patterns unique to a user constitute this category.

**Noise Challenges** induce sounds from the speaker or their environment to create artifacts in deepfakes. As these challenges are in-essence noises, deepfake training datasets weed them out, making them vulnerable against them.

- *Vocal Noises* includes coughs, whistles, and loud breathing.
- *Non-vocal Noises* include clapping, snapping fingers, or manipulating the microphone.
- *Environmental Noises* include background sounds like bird songs, distant conversations, or traffic noise. Such sounds are less reliable for authentication due to their variability and stochastic presence.
- *Echo/Reverb*: Involves creating feedback loops or reverberations during the call, which can result in multiple overlaid voices and sounds. Disabling echo cancellation<sup>‡</sup> and looping back the received audio can simulate this effect.

**Behavioral Challenges (out-of-scope)** utilize known attributes of an individual's speaking style or biometrics to verify their identity. We do not explore this subcategory because this work does not assume identity information access.

- *Unique Speaking Habits*: Individuals have distinctive ways of expressing agreement or responding to questions (such as "yes," "agreed," or "sure"). Habit-based challenges involve prompting subjects to use their characteristic phrases or responses, aiding in identity verification. However, they can be unreliable due to dependence on individual behavior.
- *Biometric Authentication*: A voice sample is biometrically matched to the caller's speech, e.g., voice prints for biometric identity authentication [13].

## **4.3 Replay Challenges**

This category involves playing recordings that may disrupt deepfake creation. They introduce noise elements that might be mistaken for the speaker's voice, potentially resulting in artifacts in deepfake output. However, their effectiveness is limited in scenarios where deepfake systems can accurately distinguish between background and speaker audio.

**Playback Challenges** play human-audible audio while the participant speaks.

<sup>‡</sup><https://support.zoom.us/hc/en-us/articles/115003279466-Using-and-preserving-original-sound-in-a-meeting>

- *Speech*: Subjects are instructed to speak while a recorded voice is speaking. The resultant artifacts emerge as RTDF systems struggle to process multiple speakers. If the imposter enables speech separation, this will reduce the generation throughput.
- *Music*: Subjects are requested to play music while speaking. Lyrical tracks lead to artifacts as the participant’s voice overlaps voices in audio. At the same time, instrumental music introduces non-speech audio patterns, challenging the system’s voice conversion process.

**Passive Distortions (Out-of-Scope)** challenges entail manipulating the caller’s voice or playing adversarial audio to impede deepfake systems. These methods presume a level of trust in the caller’s end and their equipment, which is beyond the scope of this work, where we assume no trust.

- *Software Editing*: If a trusted software application can control the caller’s equipment, it could apply audio transformations to the acquired speech before it reaches the RTDF.
- *Adversarial Audio*: We propose using targeted audio samples designed as adversarial perturbations against deepfake systems, primarily those utilizing MEL-spectrogram images. ‘This concept aligns with existing research on convolutional neural networks [1] and face-swapping deepfakes [17].

## 5 Evaluation

### 5.1 Collecting Original Recordings and Generating Deepfakes

**Challenge Selection:** We explore 20 challenges from the taxonomy and enumerate them in Table 1. We requested a consenting participant to perform each task with instructions detailed in §A.1.

**Ethics and Recruitment.** After getting approved by our IRB, we recruited English speakers in the US using Prolific. The subjects consented to be video and audio recorded while doing the tasks and were paid appropriately. We stored the recorded data on a secure server designed specifically for high-risk data. We will enforce ethical guard rails against indemnification of any subject through a signed data release form. Both audio and video parts of the data will be made available for academic research.

**Study Design.** We recorded subjects on both desktops and smartphone environments. On the desktop environment, we explored 20 challenges, excluding regular speech in challenge #0 or the no-challenge. For 19 out of 20 challenges, we requested each participant to read ten phonetically diverse sentences per challenge (see Table 6). Challenges involving coughing or whistling had only one instance. Thus, each successful participant, using a desktop, recorded 201 samples.

We intended the study on the smartphone to simulate a

person on the move, potentially with less freedom to perform tasks. It, hence, was a strict subset of the desktop. Specifically, we excluded the playback challenges (#18 - #22), as they need a secondary device for playing the background sounds, which would be an unrealistic assumption. Thus, each successful participant using a smartphone recorded 171 samples.

We built the experiments on the Gorilla Experiment Builder. 77% subjects who started the experiment also completed it, leading to the original data collection of 100 subjects (actually 102, explained soon). The subjects were split equally between smartphone and desktop environments, yielding *18,600 original video or audio recordings*. In comparison, a prevalent speech dataset, VCTK [44], contains 110 speakers and 400 sentence recordings, each with about 44,000 samples. Our dataset is comparable to it while being highly diverse. Instruments used for creating the experiment are available at <https://app.gorilla.sc/openmaterials/722500>.

Although this work only focuses on audio, we intentionally recorded videos to aid in final compliance checks and prevent false rejections of submissions. Not all audio samples have corresponding videos, as the video recording instrument on Gorilla was in its development stage, so it worked only two-thirds of the time.

**Data Pre-processing.** From the recorded samples (.webm), we strip the 48kHz audio stream and down-sample them to 16kHz lossless audio (.wav) files for downstream tasks. We use WhisperX [11] to transcribe the down-sampled audio samples and obtain timestamps for speech segments. We concatenate the segmented parts to clip the speech’s start and end and remove silent intervals.

**Compliance Check of Original Recordings:** We recruit 45 human evaluators to verify if the pre-processed audio recordings contain the required challenge. To reduce the cost of evaluating all 18,600 recordings, we randomly sample one audio recording per subject per challenge for a compliance check. The assumption is that if a subject did the challenge once correctly, they could do it multiple times and vice-versa. This results in a subset of 1,860 samples.

Each sample gets verified by three evaluators: a native English monolingual, a non-native English multi-lingual, and an English-speaking tie-breaker. The goal is to be more inclusive and reduce demographic bias. We made the compliance decision using majority voting. We manually inspected videos of eight low performers (< 70% across challenges), revealing that two did not comply. However, the other six were noisy cases (such as children’s sounds in the background), which we consider essential for diversity. Hence, the final dataset consists of 100 individual identities, with a mean compliance of 84%

Across challenges, we observe 89% mean compliance. Evaluators reported challenges involving speaking (a) while holding nose (43%), (b) in a different accent (73%), or (c) in a low pitch (74%) had low compliance. Similarly, video

inspection revealed that subjects with low compliance scores got confused during the task and could not do an impromptu accent. On the other hand, subjects *did comply* by holding their nose or speaking in a low pitch, *suggesting that these challenges were problematic for human evaluators to verify*.

**Generating Deepfakes:** To generate deepfakes, we consider each of our 100 participants as a target, with all others acting as imposters, resulting in  $100 \times 99 = 9,900$  unique target-imposter pairs. Our challenges utilize one-sentence ( $4.5 \pm 1.1$ s) samples of both the target’s and imposter’s speech. This setup intentionally varies the speech content between the target and the imposter to reflect realistic constraints. We convert all collected samples into deepfakes, generating a total of 1.6 million samples. Using SpeechBrain’s speaker verification model [37], we verified 57% of regular speech deepfake samples as the target speaker.

With the dataset of original and deepfakes in place, we evaluate them next with machines and, subsequently, humans.

## 5.2 RQ1. Machine Evaluation

We begin evaluating the effectiveness of our framework against voice-cloning attacks using an automated authentication system. An impersonator aiming to convincingly mimic a target individual during a call must (1) adhere to the challenge in terms of task and content, (2) maintain the target speaker’s identity, and (3) achieve a high level of realism.

Measuring the performance of each challenge depends on how much disruption it can bring in the above criteria. However, incorporating the criterion of identity preservation into our machine evaluation renders the method intrusive, necessitating a reference sample of the target’s voice. This requirement would compromise the practicability of our approach, introducing a significant constraint. Therefore, we omit the speaker identity check and focus on evaluating audio samples against three non-intrusive criteria:

1. *Compliance to the task:* Did the sample contain the corresponding challenge task?
2. *Compliance to the Content:* Did the sample contain the requested text?
3. *Realism:* What is the naturalness of the sample?

**Challenge Compliance.** This aspect is treated as a binary classification problem, using the original speech data mentioned in §5.1. We train eighteen classifiers, each tailored to a specific challenge, to differentiate between audio samples of a challenge and regular speech samples (the latter referred to as challenge #0). The dataset is partitioned by subject identity for 5-fold cross-validation, utilizing 90 identities and reserving 10 for a final test set. Classification employs a fine-tuned Wav2Vec2 model [10], achieving, on average, 93.1% AUC and 83.6% accuracy on test sets (human evaluators had rated compliance to be 86.0%). Although we split the dataset to follow machine-learning protocols, we use the compliance de-

tectors on all identities. Notably, we *do not use any deepfakes* for training or validation.

For the remaining two out of 20 challenges, involving speaking foreign words (challenge #11) and asking questions (challenge #17), compliance is assessed through speech transcription, as detailed in Table 5.

**Content Compliance.** We use Word Information Lost (WIL, [33]) for quantifying the loss in transcribed speech content compared to the original script. We preferred WIL over the standard Word Error Rate (WER), as it emphasizes keywords while de-emphasizing fillers. This approach mirrors actual conversations, where communication remains clear despite potential omissions or errors in non-essential words.

All challenges have spoken content, except the one involving coughing or whistling.

**Realism.** We utilize Non-Intrusive Speech Quality Assessment (NISQA, [31]) to score realism. As a non-intrusive, deep-learning-based solution, NISQA measures speech quality on multiple dimensions without requiring a reference signal, aligning with general speech research applications. It predicts a five-point mean opinion score (pMOS) akin to human evaluation for a given audio sample.

A degradation score  $\mathcal{D} \in [0, 1]$  for an audio sample  $x$  and challenge  $chal$  is defined, combining the three metrics. A higher score indicates poorer deepfake performance, aligning with our challenge’s objectives. We calculate the score as an average of the compliance detector  $C_{chal}(x)$ , content verification WIL( $x$ ), and realism NISQA( $x$ ):

$$\mathcal{D}_{chal}(x) = \frac{1}{3} \left[ (1 - C_{chal}(x)) + WIL(x) + \left( 1 - \frac{NISQA(x)}{5} \right) \right]$$

where  $C_{chal} : \text{audio} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  indicates compliance with the challenge task, returning 1 for compliance and 0 otherwise.

We assessed the degradation score  $\mathcal{D}$  across 1.6 million fake and 18,600 original audio samples. Detailed in Table 2, our analysis spans task compliance, realism, and word information loss across various challenges, showcasing how fake and original samples diverge regarding degradation. Due to the significant imbalance between fake and original samples in our automated evaluation dataset, we omit accuracy. Instead, Figure 1 visually represents the variance in machine-scored degradation scores across challenges.

**Observations.** Without specific auditory challenges, the observed degradation was relatively low – 11% for deepfakes and 5% for original speech – indicating that RTDFs can effectively replicate standard speech patterns.

Upon introducing auditory challenges, we observe a notable increase in degradation for both deepfakes and original recordings, with deepfakes showing more substantial declines in quality. This pattern was especially pronounced in tasks involving foreign words, static mouth, and cross-talk, which resulted in considerable word information loss. Furthermore,

Table 2: **Right:** Average degradation score  $\mathcal{D}$  for both fake and original audio samples, along with the Area-under-Curve (AUC), averaged across all samples pertinent to that challenge. **Left:**  $\Delta$  values represent the mean difference in each challenge’s performance relative to the baseline (ground truth) in terms of challenge compliance, realism, and content compliance. Challenges marked with gray labels indicate under-performance (AUC < 70%). For the No-Challenge condition, we anticipated a low AUC.

#	Challenge	$\Delta$ Compliance	$\Delta$ NISQA	$\Delta$ Word Info Lost	Degradation in Fakes	Degradation in Originals	AUC
0	No Challenge	-	8%	11%	11%	5%	56%
1	Static Mouth	22%	10%	57%	31%	11%	85%
2	Cup mouth	87%	11%	38%	46%	9%	97%
3	Whisper	61%	27%	63%	53%	22%	92%
4	Speak Loudly	34%	7%	13%	26%	16%	62%
5	Speak softly	36%	12%	22%	29%	16%	71%
6	Read quickly	12%	8%	35%	24%	14%	67%
7	Read Slowly	19%	11%	13%	18%	20%	55%
8	Hold nose	55%	11%	32%	29%	38%	63%
9	High Pitch	63%	9%	28%	44%	17%	86%
10	Low Pitch	35%	10%	20%	25%	15%	65%
11	Foreign Words	-	10%	82%	47%	6%	97%
12	Accent	25%	9%	26%	21%	18%	57%
13	Sing	18%	10%	32%	21%	9%	71%
14	Emotions	30%	9%	25%	35%	10%	82%
15	Question	14%	7%	19%	16%	8%	60%
16	Cough/Whistle	36%	26%	-	38%	34%	54%
17	Clap	12%	24%	33%	22%	19%	51%
18	Crosstalk	27%	17%	65%	38%	13%	90%
19	Instrumental Playback	96%	24%	40%	53%	17%	98%
20	Lyric Playback	26%	25%	61%	38%	17%	85%
Average		37.3%	13.6%	35.8%	31.7%	15.9%	74.4%
Average (top 11)		46.6%	14.9%	46.6%	39.5%	13.4%	86.7%




Figure 1: Boxplot depicting the degradation scores assigned by machines for both fake and original audio samples. Samples are arranged in ascending order based on the median values of the fakes (indicated by white bars), with outliers omitted. Higher scores indicate higher challenge performance (or greater degradation). Challenges where the model under-performs are marked with gray labels, correlating with the data in Table 2.

deepfakes struggled to maintain compliance in scenarios requiring lyrical playback, cupping the mouth, whispering, and

producing a high-pitched voice, indicating a critical vulnerability of current deepfake technologies. Lyrical playback, in

particular, introduced measurable vocal distortions, highlighting the effectiveness of these challenges in compromising the fidelity of deepfake audio.

Our exploration of 20 unique challenges revealed nine of them to be less effective, with AUC scores falling below 70%. These less effective challenges included variations in accent, reading pace (both slow and quick), volume (specifically speaking loudly), pitch (notably low pitch), and specific actions like clapping, coughing/whistling, and holding the nose. The deepfake algorithms were notably proficient in mimicking tasks related to regular speech patterns, such as the first six mentioned, demonstrating the sophistication of these systems in replicating human vocal characteristics. The challenge involving holding the nose displayed a low compliance rate from participants (43%), contributing to its limited effectiveness.

The clap challenge, where participants clapped while speaking, revealed that deepfakes transformed clap sounds into noisy peaks, potentially leading to incorrect detections. This revelation indicates that despite some success in distorting deepfake outputs, there is ample scope for further refinement.

The cough/whistle challenge was ultimately excluded from the strong challenge set due to its lack of support for content randomization, as such challenges are devoid of spoken content. Without randomization, an imposter can play a pre-computed clean recording of the task to the defender to bypass detection.

Our analysis further delved into the effects of frequency modulation, particularly comparing high-pitch and low-pitch challenges. We observed that high-pitch challenges induced more significant degradation (44%) in deepfake outputs than their low-pitch counterparts (25%). The observed discrepancy in machine detection efficiency between high and low-pitch challenges points to limitations in the training datasets of deepfake models, such as the VCTK corpus, which lacks a diverse range of high-pitch voice samples. This limitation emphasizes dataset diversity’s critical role in enhancing deepfake quality.

Despite the underperformance of specific tasks, we included them in our analysis for a comprehensive evaluation and to facilitate comparison against Yasur et al. [46]. The authors identified six out of the nine ineffective tasks as beneficial against an RTDF model named StarGANv2-VC [27]. However, these tasks fell short when tested against the more sophisticated FREE-VC model [25], suggesting that our remaining 11 challenges offer a higher level of degradation even against a more advanced adversary.

**Takeaways.** We developed a comprehensive and robust machine evaluation framework and identified 11 tasks that can effectively serve as challenges. The challenges enable machines to achieve an AUC of 86.7%, in comparison to 56.0% for no-challenge. These findings highlight the vital role of challenges in identifying the strengths and limitations of deep-

fakes, particularly when such tasks involve complex auditory challenges that extend beyond simple speech imitation.

### 5.3 Human Evaluation

Having established that challenges enable machine evaluations, we question whether similar results hold for humans. Support for human assessment becomes essential when advanced deepfake detection tools are inaccessible, interpretability is desirable, or both. In this subsection, we describe details of a vanilla human evaluation we conducted and extended it with two machine-assisted evaluations.

**Dataset Selection.** As the manual evaluation of 1.6 million audio files is impractical, we focused on a subset of the data that could present the most difficulty to human evaluators.

The full dataset has 9,900 unique imposter-target speaker pairs. We utilized the SpeechBrain speaker recognition framework [37] to compute each pair’s matching score ( $\in [-1, 1]$ ) while keeping the same speech content between the pair samples. We sub-selected a unique set of pairs that were false positives. All pairs obtained matching scores above 0.50, indicating a high likelihood of the pair being considered the same speaker well beyond the usual threshold of 0.25. We selected 147 high-quality samples per challenge from this subset, each with a  $pMOS$  of  $4.50 \pm 0.25$ , yielding a balanced dataset of 6,174 audio samples for human assessment.

#### 5.3.1 RQ2. Vanilla Human Evaluation

Our human evaluation process mirrored the compliance check methodology for original recordings outlined in §5.1. We recruited 63 evaluators through Prolific, categorized into three groups: native English monolinguals, non-native English multilinguals, and English-speaking tie-breakers.

We tasked evaluators with assessing each audio sample’s compliance to the given task ( $C$ ) and its overall quality ( $Q$ ) on a 5-point scale, following the ITU P.808 standard for subjective audio quality assessments. The human-scored degradation ( $\mathcal{H}$ ) for an audio sample  $x$  is calculated as follows:

$$\mathcal{H}(x) = 1 - \min(C(x), Q(x)/5).$$

Here,  $C : x \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  gives 1 if compliant and 0 otherwise. This formula assigns either a maximum degradation score to a sample for compliance failure or a score drop using the human-rated quality. We determine the final score for each sample through majority voting among these evaluators. Materials and instruments for this evaluation are available for preview at <https://app.gorilla.sc/openmaterials/769577>.

Fig. 2 displays the distribution of human scores across 21 prospective challenges and the corresponding AUC for each challenge. We ordered the boxplots by the median degradation observed in the fake dataset.




Figure 2: Boxplot of human degradation scores for Vanilla Human Evaluation, with outliers removed. The plot order is sorted by the fake boxplot’s median (white bar). Corresponding AUC is in parenthesis, with a mean AUC of 73.7% across 21 challenges and 80.1% for the selected 12 challenges.

**Humans vs Machines.** Human evaluators achieved an AUC of 74.1% in detecting deepfakes across 21 challenges. This performance is comparable to machine evaluations (74.4%), albeit conducted on a challenging, high-quality dataset.

A comparison between Fig. 2 and 4 reveals a shift in the ranking of challenges, with human scores generally higher than those obtained by machines. Moreover, the correlation between human and machine AUC scores, at 0.476, suggests a moderate positive relationship. These observations revealed that while humans and machines align on particular challenges, they provide complementary strengths.

Humans demonstrated superior performance over machines in challenges that involved Speaking Loudly, Low Pitch, Cough/Whistle, and Clapping. Conversely, they were less effective in challenges associated with Static Mouth, Foreign Words, Singing, and Emotion Display, pointing to a human sensitivity gap in detecting subtleties within these challenges.

Although the disparity between human and machine performance appears nominal, each exhibits distinct advantages and limitations. This gap becomes more pronounced when focusing on the 11 machine-validated effective challenges. Here, machine evaluations achieved an AUC of 86.7% in deepfake detection, compared to 80.1% by humans. The difference raises the prospect of combining human and machine efforts to enhance overall performance in deepfake detection.

### 5.3.2 RQ3. Machine-Supported Human Evaluation

We perform additional human evaluations to explore the potential of machine assistance in enhancing human capability to detect deepfakes. We focused this investigation on the 12

challenges (including no-challenge) where we deemed machine performance satisfactory, as detailed in §5.2.

For this evaluation, we selected a subset of 84 samples from the high-quality dataset rather than the original 147. This approach allowed us to maximize our resources and recruit a larger pool of evaluators, resulting in a balanced dataset comprising 2,016 deepfake and original audio samples.

**Study Design.** We recruited a new, gender-balanced cohort of 100 human evaluators from the Prolific platform. The recruitment process included an orientation on the challenges the participants will encounter, along with specific examples for each. We used a preliminary quiz based on original challenge samples to screen participants, with 91 passing.

We informed the participants about the task and emphasized that the machine’s verdict has 85% accuracy (computed by choosing  $\mathcal{D}_{chal} = 0.25$  as the threshold for all challenges). We ask each participant to listen to an audio sample and determine its authenticity ("Real" or "Fake"), as well as their confidence level in this initial decision. After making their initial judgment, the machine’s verdict was disclosed to the participant, sometimes accompanied by a brief explanation. Additionally, we based the explanations on one of three criteria we had established in §5.2: the failure to perform the specified task, a mismatch in spoken text, or the presence of vocal distortions.

After participants received the machine’s verdict and its rationale, we gave them the option to revise their decision and confidence level or to stick with their initial assessment. This method generated a total of 8,607 responses. Instruments are available to preview at <https://app.gorilla.sc/openm>

Table 3: Effect of Machine Predictions on Initial Human Decisions under all permutations. A participant makes an initial decision, acknowledges the machine’s verdict, and makes their final decision. ✓ implies correct prediction, and ✗ implies otherwise. The last column indicates the mean and standard deviation of change in human confidence.

Scenario	I	M	F	Count	$\Delta\text{Conf.}(\%)$
Correct Agreement	✓	✓	✓	5462	$+8.1 \pm 15.8$
Machine Corrected	✗	✓	✓	781	$-10.0 \pm 12.6$
Self Corrected	✗	✗	✓	5	$-9.9 \pm 20.0$
No Change (Initial Correct)	✓	✗	✓	515	$-5.4 \pm 18.9$
Self Misled	✓	✓	✗	27	$-6.9 \pm 19.2$
Machine Misled	✓	✗	✗	216	$-8.6 \pm 17.1$
No Change (Initial Wrong)	✗	✓	✗	1039	$-2.2 \pm 17.6$
Incorrect Agreement	✗	✗	✗	562	$+8.8 \pm 13.0$

I = Initial Decision, M = Machine Prediction, F = Final Decision

aterials/769578.

We present the outcomes in the left half of Table 4, analyzing initial judgments, machine-assisted adjustments, and the resulting accuracy changes across the challenges. Table 3 further breaks down the responses across the eight possible scenarios, noting any changes in confidence levels.

Table 4: Human Evaluation with AI assistance and collaboration.

Challenge	Initial Accuracy	Assisted Accuracy	Increase	Human-AI Collab.	Increase
No Challenge	52.2	66.7	↑27.7%	<b>88.4</b>	↑69.7%
Static Mouth	58.9	68.8	↑16.8%	<b>71.1</b>	↑20.9%
Cup mouth	85.0	91.2	↑7.4%	<b>93.9</b>	↑10.6%
Whisper	69.6	78.1	↑12.2%	<b>81.7</b>	↑17.9%
Speak softly	61.8	63.4	↑2.5%	<b>66.5</b>	↑7.5%
High Pitch	84.5	90.5	↑7.1%	<b>90.6</b>	↑7.1%
Foreign Words	58.5	71.3	↑21.9%	<b>85.4</b>	↑46.3%
Sing	68.7	68.6	↓0.2%	<b>68.8</b>	↑0.4%
Emotions	68.3	74.0	↑8.4%	<b>77.3</b>	↑12.3%
Crosstalk	80.2	85.1	↑6.1%	<b>86.3</b>	↑7.2%
Instr. Playback	89.2	94.6	↑5.9%	<b>95.1</b>	↑6.3%
Lyric Playback	90.2	<b>90.7</b>	↑0.5%	89.1	↓1.2%
Average	72.3	78.5	↑8.5%	<b>82.9</b>	↑14.3%

**Machine-Assisting Humans.** Initial decisions achieved a 72.3% accuracy rate, while updated decisions improved to 78.3%, with machine assistance enhancing the original accuracy by 8.5% overall.

In 11 out of 12 challenges, machine predictions increased the average human accuracy. This effect was more noticeable in nuanced challenges such as Static-Mouth, Cupping-Mouth, and Whisper and less effective in scenarios like No-Challenge and Foreign Words.

When machine predictions aligned with human decisions, they increased human confidence, regardless of the correctness. Conversely, when predictions diverged, they reduced human confidence. Notably, when humans initially erred and machines provided the correct guidance, humans changed their decisions 43% of the time. However, when humans were




Figure 3: Tradeoff between mean deepfake detection accuracy and proportion of human decisions considered. AI (or machines) overrides human decisions if it has relatively higher confidence. Temperature calibrates the confidence of AI predictions, with lower temperatures overriding more number human predictions. A star represents the point of intersection, denoting an equilibrium between a number of human predictions and accuracy.

correct and machines erred, the latter misled humans 29% of the time. This disparity highlights the beneficial role of machines in correcting human errors and their relatively lesser impact in misleading humans when they are correct.

When comparing the presence of rationale against providing no rationale, we observe no significant difference between humans accepting that decision and changing their mistakes (42.4% vs 43.0%).

**Humans-AI Collaboration.** The machine-assistance framework kept machines as a warning signal and prevented them from making unilateral final decisions. This framework necessitates convincing humans to correct their initial judgments based on the machine’s input, which could be cumbersome. To bypass this, we introduced a mechanism allowing the machine to override human decisions when it exhibited higher confidence (and not correctness of decision).

We computed the machine confidence for each audio sample’s decision by utilizing the machine scores from §5.2. The machine confidence was the normalized difference between a predefined threshold ( $\tau = 0.25$ ) and the sample’s score. Despite machines demonstrating superior accuracy (85.1%), they often exhibited lower confidence than humans. We counteracted this by scaling the machine’s confidence using a temperature parameter.

Fig. 3 illustrates the tradeoff between retaining human decisions post-machine intervention and the mean accuracy achieved, and the right half of Table 4 details the accuracy breakdown. At the intersection point in Fig. 3, a balance of 56% human to 44% machine decisions was observed, which achieved an accuracy of 82.9%. This balance indicates that a




Figure 4: Boxplot of user ratings for the 12 valid challenges.

synergistic approach between humans and AI can significantly enhance accuracy while ensuring that humans retain decision-making authority in the majority of cases.

**Takeaways.** Challenges enable human capabilities to detect deepfakes audios, similar to machines, even on a difficult dataset. Comparing human detection to machines reveals both similarities and differences depending on the challenge type, suggesting a complementary relationship between human intuition and machine precision. When combined, machine tagging aided in *assisting* humans, where their performance was lacking. Further collaboration between humans and machines resulted in an even further boost in deepfake detection performance.

## 6 Discussion

**Practical Design Recommendations.** To ensure a practical implementation of the tagging system, we offer the following guidelines:

*On the caller’s side:*

- Use single, succinct sentences for tasks.
- Enhance compliance with high-quality sample audio.
- Avoid challenges that confuse both machines and humans, such as those involving human cognition tests or deception.
- For playback, utilize an automated sound for ease of use.

*On the receiver’s side:*

- Employ two categories of tags: "Deepfake-Likely" and "Deepfake-Certainly," to indicate machine confidence.
- Providing a rationale is not necessary.

**Usability.** For any human-centered security system, usability is paramount. While researchers aim to make their systems as secure as possible, such efforts would only be practical if they considered usability.

In Fig. 4, we present the usability ratings of the 12 valid challenges as rated by participants who contributed to our audio-video dataset. Our findings indicate a known trend that challenges with lower usability scores, such as Playbacks and

Emotions, lead to significant degradation in deepfakes. Interestingly, moderately usable challenges, such as Whispering, High-Pitch, and Foreign Words, also induce comparable levels of degradation. The observation suggests that more preferred challenges could be prioritized for deployment, resorting to less preferred ones only if necessary.

We acknowledge that our proposed challenge-response framework has manual components and requires callers to actively engage in a task before being authenticated. However, our data shows that a caller typically takes a mere 6 seconds to speak out a sentence and finish the challenge.

On the defender’s (receiver’s) side, there is a desire for quick verification of callers before proceeding with the conversation. To accommodate this, we employ AI as a tagging system to aid the defender in making confident decisions. The design decision to keep humans in control acknowledges the fallibility of AI and the nature of telephone communications, where a call, unlike spam emails, cannot be retrieved once disconnected.

**Robustness against Countermeasures.** An adaptive adversary can design countermeasures against our approach. Such countermeasures include the possibility of adversaries pre-empting challenges with prepared responses or enhancing deepfake generation techniques to circumvent detection.

Given their public nature, adversaries might anticipate our challenges and prepare responses in advance, using sophisticated editing tools to hide detectable anomalies. To prevent an adversary from preparing responses pre-call, our challenges feature randomizable elements, such as varying speech and background noise, introduced at the call’s outset. This element of randomness necessitates real-time engagement from adversaries, thwarting the use of pre-recorded responses.

Furthermore, as deepfake technology advances, it may develop the capability to bypass our current challenges. Anticipating this, we can employ a sequence of challenges tailored to the specific security requirements, strengthening our defense, alike current CAPTCHA implementations. Our system’s malleability also allows for the seamless incorporation of new challenges to stay ahead of technological advancements in deepfake generation.

Therefore, while adversaries might develop countermeasures to our challenge-response system, the inherent design features of our system—such as its randomness and adaptability—are aimed at preserving its effectiveness against both current and future threats, thereby ensuring its continued robustness against evolving deepfake technologies and adaptive adversaries.

## 7 Limitations and Future Work

**Compounding Challenges:** Future work should explore compounding challenges, where multiple challenges are executed

simultaneously rather than sequentially, to enhance robustness without increasing complexity.

**Data-rich Scenarios:** Further research is needed to assess detection efficacy in environments with extensive adversary access to data, testing the system’s resilience against more sophisticated deepfakes.

**Unified Challenge Detectors:** Developing a unified detector for all challenges could streamline deployment and improve efficiency, moving away from separate detectors for each challenge type.

## 8 Conclusion

In this study, we design a challenge-response approach to enhance humans’ and machines’ detection of interactive deepfake audio calls. We developed a comprehensive taxonomy of audio challenges, from which we selected 11 particularly effective instances out of an initial set of 20. These challenges were instrumental in degrading the quality of deepfakes, thereby enhancing machines in their detection tasks and enabling humans to discern deepfakes, even under a hard dataset effectively. By fostering a collaborative dynamic between humans and machines, we achieved a balance that leverages the strengths of both—human oversight and machine efficiency. This complementary strength has laid the groundwork for an innovative tagging system aimed at pre-screening calls, marking a significant advancement in audio deepfake detection independent of the target identity.

## Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the National Science Foundation under SaTC grant number 2154119 and by Google Research under the Cyber NYC Program.

## References

- [1] *Adversarial Perturbations of Deep Neural Networks*, pages 311–342. 2017.
- [2] Caller id spoofing: How to spot and avoid spoofed calls. Norton Blog, 2023. [Accessed: 23-Nov-2023].
- [3] How does biometrics voice recognition work? KY-CAML Guide Blog, Jan 2023. Accessed: 2024-02-15.
- [4] Voice deepfakes are coming for your bank balance. *The New York Times*, Aug 2023. Accessed: 2024-02-15.
- [5] Will generative ai kill kyc authentication? CSO Online, Oct 2023. Accessed: 2024-02-15.
- [6] <https://www.cnn.com/2024/02/04/asia/deepfake-cfo-scam-hong-kong-intl-hnk/index.html>, Feb 2024. Accessed: 2024-02-15.
- [7] Fake joe biden robocall tells new hampshire democrats not to vote tuesday. <https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/2024-election/fake-joe-biden-robocall-tells-new-hampshire-democrats-not-vote-tuesday-rcna134984>, Feb 2024. Accessed: 2024-02-15.
- [8] APNews. Can New York’s mayor speak Mandarin? No, but with AI he’s making robocalls in different languages. <https://apnews.com/article/nyc-mayor-ai-robocalls-foreign-languages-30517885466994e5f1f54745c08691e0>. [Accessed: 23-Nov-2023].
- [9] Matthew Baas, Benjamin van Niekerk, and Herman Kamper. Voice conversion with just nearest neighbors. In *Interspeech*, 2023.
- [10] Alexei Baevski, Henry Zhou, Abdelrahman Mohamed, and Michael Auli. wav2vec 2.0: A framework for self-supervised learning of speech representations. *CoRR*, abs/2006.11477, 2020.
- [11] Max Bain, Jaesung Huh, Tengda Han, and Andrew Zisserman. Whisperx: Time-accurate speech transcription of long-form audio. *INTERSPEECH 2023*, 2023.
- [12] James Betker. Better speech synthesis through scaling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.07243*, 2023.
- [13] Andrew Boles and Paul Rad. Voice biometrics: Deep learning-based voiceprint authentication system. In *2017 12th System of Systems Engineering Conference (SoSE)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2017.
- [14] Zalán Borsos, Raphaël Marinier, Damien Vincent, Eugene Kharitonov, Olivier Pietquin, Matt Sharifi, Dominik Roblek, Olivier Teboul, David Grangier, Marco Tagliasacchi, et al. Audiolm: a language modeling approach to audio generation. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, 2023.
- [15] Anurag Chowdhury, Austin Cozzo, and Arun Ross. Domain adaptation for speaker recognition in singing and spoken voice. In *ICASSP 2022 - 2022 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 7192–7196, 2022.
- [16] CNN. ‘Mom, these bad men have me’: She believes scammers cloned her daughter’s voice in a fake kidnapping. Online, 2023. [Accessed: 23-Nov-2023].
- [17] Junhao Dong, Yuan Wang, Jianhuang Lai, and Xiaohua Xie. Restricted black-box adversarial attack against deepfake face swapping. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 2023.
- [18] Xu Tan Rongjie Huang Songxiang Liu Xuankai Chang Jiatong Shi Sheng Zhao Jiang Bian Xixin Wu Zhou Zhao

- Helen Meng Dongchao Yang, Jinchuan Tian. Uniaudio: An audio foundation model toward universal audio generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.00704*, 2023.
- [19] Valerie Fanelle, Sepideh Karimi, Aditi Shah, Bharath Subramanian, and Sauvik Das. Blind and human: Exploring more usable audio {CAPTCHA} designs. In *Sixteenth Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security (SOUPS 2020)*, pages 111–125, 2020.
- [20] Federal Communications Commission. Fcc makes ai-generated voices in robocalls illegal. <https://www.fcc.gov/document/fcc-makes-ai-generated-voices-robocalls-illegal>, Feb 2024. Accessed: 2024-02-15.
- [21] Internet Crime Complaint Center (IC3). Malicious Actors Almost Certainly Will Leverage Synthetic Content for Cyber and Foreign Influence Operations. Online, 2021. [Accessed: 23-Nov-2023].
- [22] Wall Street Journal. Fraudsters used ai to mimic ceo’s voice in unusual cybercrime case. <https://www.wsj.com/articles/fraudsters-use-ai-to-mimic-ceos-voice-in-unusual-cybercrime-case-11567157402>, 2019. [Accessed: 23-Nov-2023].
- [23] Pavel Korshunov, Haolin Chen, Philip N Garner, and Sebastien Marcel. Vulnerability of automatic identity recognition to audio-visual deepfakes. 2023.
- [24] Felix Kreuk, Gabriel Synnaeve, Adam Polyak, Uriel Singer, Alexandre Défossez, Jade Copet, Devi Parikh, Yaniv Taigman, and Yossi Adi. Audiogen: Textually guided audio generation. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [25] Jingyi Li, Weiping Tu, and Li Xiao. Freevc: Towards high-quality text-free one-shot voice conversion. In *ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2023.
- [26] Yinghao Aaron Li, Cong Han, Vinay S. Raghavan, Gavin Mischler, and Nima Mesgarani. Styletts 2: Towards human-level text-to-speech through style diffusion and adversarial training with large speech language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023.
- [27] Yinghao Aaron Li, Ali Zare, and Nima Mesgarani. StarGANv2-VC: A Diverse, Unsupervised, Non-Parallel Framework for Natural-Sounding Voice Conversion. In *Proc. Interspeech 2021*, pages 1349–1353, 2021.
- [28] Songxiang Liu, Yuewen Cao, Disong Wang, Xixin Wu, Xunying Liu, and Helen Meng. Any-to-many voice conversion with location-relative sequence-to-sequence modeling. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, 29:1717–1728, 2021.
- [29] McAfee. Beware the Artificial Impostor. <https://www.mcafee.com/content/dam/consumer/en-us/resources/cybersecurity/artificial-intelligence/rp-beware-the-artificial-impostor-report.pdf>. [Accessed: 23-Nov-2023].
- [30] Harry McGurk and John MacDonald. Hearing lips and seeing voices. *Nature*, 264(5588):746–748, 1976.
- [31] 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*. ISCA, 2021.
- [32] Govind Mittal, Chinmay Hegde, and Nasir Memon. Gotcha: A challenge-response system for real-time deepfake detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.06186*, 2022.
- [33] Andrew Morris, Viktoria Maier, and Phil Green. From wer and ril to mer and wil: improved evaluation measures for connected speech recognition. 10 2004.
- [34] Nicolas M Müller, Karla Pizzi, and Jennifer Williams. Human perception of audio deepfakes. In *Proceedings of the 1st International Workshop on Deepfake Detection for Audio Multimedia*, pages 85–91, 2022.
- [35] Andreas Nautsch, Xin Wang, Nicholas Evans, Tomi H Kinnunen, Ville Vestman, Massimiliano Todisco, Héctor Delgado, Md Sahidullah, Junichi Yamagishi, and Kong Aik Lee. Asvspoof 2019: spoofing countermeasures for the detection of synthesized, converted and replayed speech. *IEEE Transactions on Biometrics, Behavior, and Identity Science*, 3(2):252–265, 2021.
- [36] NPR. That panicky call from a relative? it could be a thief using a voice clone, ftc warns. <https://www.gpb.org/news/2023/03/22/panicky-call-relative-it-could-be-thief-using-voice-clone-ftc-warns>, 2023. [Accessed: 23-Nov-2023].
- [37] Mirco Ravanelli, Titouan Parcollet, Peter Plantinga, Aku Rouhe, Samuele Cornell, Loren Lugosch, Cem Subakan, Nauman Dawalatabad, Abdelwahab Heba, Jianyuan Zhong, Ju-Chieh Chou, Sung-Lin Yeh, Szu-Wei Fu, Chien-Feng Liao, Elena Rastorgueva, François Grondin, William Aris, Hwidong Na, Yan Gao, Renato De Mori, and Yoshua Bengio. SpeechBrain: A general-purpose speech toolkit, 2021. arXiv:2106.04624.

- [38] Andrew Rosenberg and Bhuvana Ramabhadran. Bias and statistical significance in evaluating speech synthesis with mean opinion scores. In *Interspeech*, pages 3976–3980, 2017.
- [39] suno-ai. Bark: Text-Prompted Generative Audio Model. <https://github.com/suno-ai/bark>, 2023. Accessed: 2024-02-15.
- [40] Hemlata Tak, Jose Patino, Massimiliano Todisco, Andreas Nautsch, Nicholas Evans, and Anthony Larcher. End-to-end anti-spoofing with rawnet2. In *ICASSP 2021-2021 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 6369–6373. IEEE, 2021.
- [41] Chengyi Wang, Sanyuan Chen, Yu Wu, Ziqiang Zhang, Long Zhou, Shujie Liu, Zhuo Chen, Yanqing Liu, Huaming Wang, Jinyu Li, et al. Neural codec language models are zero-shot text to speech synthesizers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.02111*, 2023.
- [42] Emily Wenger, Max Bronckers, Christian Cianfarani, Jenna Cryan, Angela Sha, Haitao Zheng, and Ben Y. Zhao. "hello, it's me": Deep learning-based speech synthesis attacks in the real world. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, CCS '21*, page 235–251, New York, NY, USA, 2021. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [43] Yihan Wu, Xu Tan, Bohan Li, Lei He, Sheng Zhao, Ruihua Song, Tao Qin, and Tie-Yan Liu. AdaSpeech 4: Adaptive Text to Speech in Zero-Shot Scenarios. In *Proc. Interspeech 2022*, pages 2568–2572, 2022.
- [44] Junichi Yamagishi, Christophe Veaux, Kirsten MacDonal, et al. Cstr vctk corpus: English multi-speaker corpus for cstr voice cloning toolkit (version 0.92). *University of Edinburgh. The Centre for Speech Technology Research (CSTR)*, 2019.
- [45] Yang Yang, Yury Kartynnik, Pen Li, Jiuqiang Tang, Xing Li, George Sung, and Matthias Grundmann. Streamvc: Real-time low-latency voice conversion. 2024.
- [46] Lior Yasur, Guy Frankovits, Fred M. Grabovski, and Yisroel Mirsky. Deepfake captcha: A method for preventing fake calls. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security, ASIA CCS '23*, page 608–622, New York, NY, USA, 2023. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [47] Jiangyan Yi, Chenglong Wang, Jianhua Tao, Xiaohui Zhang, Chu Yuan Zhang, and Yan Zhao. Audio deepfake detection: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.14970*, 2023.
- [48] Linghan Zhang, Sheng Tan, Yingying Chen, and Jie Yang. A phoneme localization based liveness detection for text-independent speaker verification. *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing*, pages 1–14, 2022.

## Appendix

### A.1 Data Collection Instructions

Thus, we request a consenting participant to perform the following tasks:

0. Speak the sentence normally.
  - Vocal Distortions*
  - 1. Keep their mouth and lips static, and speak the sentence.
  - 2. Cup your mouth and Speak the sentence.
  - 3. Whisper the sentence.
    - Waveform Manipulation*
    - 4. Speak the sentence loudly.
    - 5. Speak the sentence softly.
    - 6. Read out the sentence quickly.
    - 7. Read out the sentence slowly.
    - 8. Speak the sentence in a high pitch.
    - 9. Speak the sentence in a low pitch.
  - 10. Hold their nose and read the sentence.
    - Language and Articulation*
    - 11. Speak a transliteration of a foreign sentence.
    - 12. Speak the sentence with a known accent, such as Russian or British.
  - 13. Sing the sentence.
    - Tone of Voice*
    - 14. Speak the sentence with happiness or excitement.
    - 15. Speak the question.
      - Non-Lingual Noises*
      - 16. Cough or Whistle.
      - 17. Speak the sentence while clapping.
        - Playback Challenges:*
        - (done while playing audio on a smartphone)*
        - 18. Speak the sentence clearly amidst cross-talk; while playing recording of a matching sentence.
        - 19. Speak the sentence while playing instrumental music.
        - 20. Speak the sentence while playing lyrical music.

Table 5: Performance of Challenge Compliance Detectors. All accuracies and area-under-curve numbers are in percentage points. Test accuracy is on the 10 heldout identities, while validation is across 5 trained models during 5-fold cross validation on the corresponding folds. Compare the performance with the compliance numbers from human evaluation.

Index	Challenge	Human Baseline	Compliance Check using Finetuned Wav2Vec2					
			Val Acc.	Test Acc.	AUC	Precision	Recall	F1
1	Static Mouth	85.9	89.8±3.1	88.2	96.6	0.89	0.87	0.88
2	Cup mouth	86.9	92.0±2.0	89.5	97.1	0.95	0.84	0.89
3	Whisper	94.9	92.9±2.4	90.9	93.1	0.92	0.9	0.91
4	Speak Loudly	86.9	76.1±3.8	70.5	74.8	0.73	0.65	0.69
5	Speak softly	85.9	80.7±3.8	79.1	84.7	0.76	0.85	0.8
6	Read quickly	98.0	86.8±2.6	83.2	90.7	0.92	0.73	0.81
7	Read Slowly	89.9	80.2±1.1	79.1	87.5	0.8	0.77	0.79
8*	Hold nose	43.4	83.6±3.6	90.0	92.8	0.94	0.85	0.90
9*	High Pitch	86.9	76.1±3.8	81.8	91.2	0.95	0.67	0.79
10	Low Pitch	73.7	77.1±3.9	77.3	85.9	0.75	0.83	0.78
13	Accent	72.7	77.9±2.2	79.5	85.9	0.81	0.77	0.79
14	Sing	87.9	90.0±2.0	90.0	96.8	0.89	0.91	0.9
16	Emotions	89.9	86.2±3.7	88.6	95.6	0.98	0.79	0.87
18	Cough/Whistle	90.9	96.3±1.8	96.7	99.3	0.82	0.82	0.82
19	Clap	84.7	92.1±2.8	94.1	98.8	0.95	0.93	0.94
20	Cross-talk	91.5	94.1±2.5	98.8	100.0	1.0	0.96	0.98
21	Instr. Playback	95.7	95.2±3.7	98.1	99.6	0.98	0.96	0.97
22	Lyric Playback	100.0	95.9±2.3	98.1	100.0	0.94	1.0	0.97
<b>Average (across all)</b>		86.0	87.5	83.6	93.1	0.89	0.82	0.85
<b>Heuristic-based Compliance Check</b>								
12	Foreign Words	99.0	WER compared to the specific foreign script used.					
17	Question	92.9	Transcribed sentence has a question mark					

Table 6: Scripts used for all tasks

<b>General Sentences</b>
<p>The quick brown fox jumps over the lazy dog.            With measured words, she explained the strange rhythm of the universe.            Bright violets grow under the dense canopy, shading their vivid colors.            Jazz and classical music often feature complex harmonies and rhythms.            Six whimsical wizards make powerful, rhythmic chants deep in the forest.            The doctor's prescription advised taking unique, holistic measures.            The swift cheetah is an elegant and extraordinary creature.            The rugged path wound around the steep hill to the quaint village.            Gazing at the azure sky in July, the dreamy poet wrote verses.            The glum monk thought deeply about life's complex queries.</p>
<b>Questions</b>
<p>Does the quick brown fox jump over the lazy dog?            Can she explain the strange rhythm of the universe with measured words?            Do bright violets grow under the dense canopy, shading their vivid colors?            Do jazz and classical music often feature complex harmonies and rhythms?            Do six whimsical wizards make powerful, rhythmic chants deep in the forest?            Did the doctor's prescription advise taking unique, holistic measures?            Is the swift cheetah an elegant and extraordinary creature?            Does the rugged path wind around the steep hill to the quaint village?            While gazing at the azure sky in July, did the dreamy poet write verses?            Did the glum monk think deeply about life's complex queries?</p>
<b>Foreign Sentences</b>
<p>Finnish: 'En ymmarra mitaan mita tarkoitat'            French: 'Le coeur a ses raisons que la raison ne connait point.'            Spanish: 'El rapido zorro marron salta sobre el perro perezoso.'            German: 'Fuchse lieben es, schnell uber die grauen Hunde zu springen.'            Chinese: 'Feng yu zhi hou, bi jian cai hong.'            Russian: 'Na dvore trava, na trave drova.'            Arabic: 'Al-hayatu jamilatun ala al-raghmi min kulli shay'.            Hindi: 'Bandar bhagate hue chhat par chadh gaya.'            Japanese: 'Sakura no hana ga haru no kaze ni mau.'            Swahili: 'Simba anapenda kupumzika chini ya mti mkubwa.'</p>




Figure 5: Histogram of compliance across participants.







Figure 6: Compliance across original challenge recordings.



(a) Age distribution across predefined intervals.



(b) Distribution of individuals by gender.



(c) Distribution by race categories.

(a) Age distribution across predefined intervals.

Figure 7: Distributions of demographic variables in the dataset. (a) Age distribution (b) Distribution of individuals by Sex (c) Distribution by Race categories. 29 out of 100 participants demographics had expired on Prolific.