



MAKE THE WORLD MORE CREDIBLE

Progressive Open Space Expansion for Open-Set Model Attribution

Tianyun Yang, Danding Wang*, Fan Tang, Xinying Zhao, Juan Cao, Sheng Tang

Media Synthesis and Forensics Lab, Institute of Computing Technology, CAS

University of Chinese Academy of Sciences



Tag: WED-PM-334

Problem

• Model Attribution: Identify the source model of generated contents.



1 Protrit of Edmond Belamy, 2018, created by GAN (Generative Adversarial Network).

2 An Al-Generated Picture Won an Art Prize.

3 Raphael S. (2019, Jul 14). Experts: A spy reportedly used an AI-picture to connect with sources on LinkedIn.

Open-Set Model Attribution

• Attribute images to known models and identify those from unknown ones.



Our work: Open-set model attribution







Existing Works on OSR

Discriminative-Based



Drawback: The performance depends heavily on the closed-set classifier.

Existing Works on OSR



Drawback: The performance depends heavily on the closed-set classifier Drawback: Fingerprint reconstruction error is too subtle to be thresholded

Existing Works on OSR



POSE (<u>Progressive</u> <u>Open</u> <u>Space</u> <u>Expansion</u>)





POSE (<u>Progressive</u> <u>Open</u> <u>Space</u> <u>Expansion</u>)



POSE (<u>Progressive</u> <u>Open</u> <u>Space</u> <u>Expansion</u>)













• **Key Idea:** Progressively simulate the potential open space of unknown models via a set of lightweight augmentation models. Train feature extractor and



• **Key Idea:** Progressively simulate the potential open space of unknown models via a set of lightweight augmentation models. Train feature extractor and



Dataset

- Four groups of data: Seen Real, Seen Fake, Unseen Real, and three type of Unseen Fake
 - Unseen fake include Unseen Seed, Unseen Architecture, and Unseen Dataset

| Seer | n Real | CelebA | Face-HQ | ImageNet | Youtube | LSUN-Bedroom | LSUN-Cat | LSUN-Bus | |
|--|-----------------------------|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|---|--|--|
| Seen Fake | | StarGAN [10], ProGAN_seed0 [22] | StyleGAN3-r [23], StyleGAN3-t | SAGAN [56], SNGAN | FSGAN [37], FaceSwap [1] | ProGAN_seed0, MMDGAN | StyleGAN, StyleGAN3 | ProGAN, StyleGAN | |
| Unseen Un Fake An Un Un Da | Unseen Seed | ProGAN (seed1,2,3,4,5) | - | - | - | ProGAN (seed1,2,3,4,5) | - | - | |
| | Unseen Architec- ture | SNGAN [34], AttGAN [19], MMDGAN [3], InfoMaxGAN [28] | StyleGAN2 [25], ProGAN, StyleGAN [24] | S3GAN [32], BigGAN [4], ContraGAN [21] | Wav2Lip [40], FaceShifter [29] | SNGAN, InfoMaxGAN | SNGAN, ProGAN, MMDGAN, StyleGAN2 | SNGAN, MMDGAN, StyleGAN2, StyleGAN3 | |
| | Unseen Dataset | ProGAN, StyleGAN, StyleGAN3 (Cow, Sheep, Classroom, Bridge, Kitchen, Airplane, Church) | | | | | | | |
| Unseen Real | | Coco, Summer | | | | | | | |

Dataset

- Four groups of data: Seen Real, Seen Fake, Unseen Real, and three type of Unseen Fake
 - Unseen fake include Unseen Seed, Unseen Architecture, and Unseen Dataset

| Seen Real | | CelebA | Face-HQ | ImageNet | Youtube | LSUN-Bedroom | LSUN-Cat | LSUN-Bus | | |
|----------------|-----------------------------|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Seen Fake | | StarGAN [10], ProGAN_seed0 [22] | StyleGAN3-r [23] StyleGAN3-t | , SAGAN [56], SNGAN | FSGAN [37], FaceSwap [1] | ProGAN_seed0, MMDGAN | StyleGAN, StyleGAN3 | ProGAN, StyleGAN | | |
| | Unseen Seed | ProGAN (seed1,2,3,4,5) | - | - | - | ProGAN (seed1,2,3,4,5) | - | - | | |
| Unseen Fake | Unseen Architec- ture | SNGAN [34], AttGAN [19], MMDGAN [3], InfoMaxGAN [28] | StyleGAN2 [25], ProGAN, StyleGAN [24] | S3GAN [32], BigGAN [4], ContraGAN [21] | Wav2Lip [40], FaceShifter [29] | SNGAN, InfoMaxGAN | SNGAN, ProGAN, MMDGAN, StyleGAN2 | SNGAN, MMDGAN, StyleGAN2, StyleGAN3 | | |
| | Unseen Dataset | ProGAN, StyleGAN, StyleGAN3 (Cow, Sheep, Classroom, Bridge, Kitchen, Airplane, Church) | | | | | | | | |
| Unsee | en Real | | | Coco | o, Summer | | | | | |
| Seen Fake | | | X → | | | | | | | |
| | | Different Training Seed Diffe | erent Arch. Differ | ent Training | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Unseen Fake | | | | | | | | | | |
| Unsee | en Fake | | | | | | | | | |

Dataset

- Four groups of data: Seen Real, Seen Fake, Unseen Real, and three type of Unseen Fake
 - Unseen fake include Unseen Seed, Unseen Architecture, and Unseen Dataset



Experimental Setup

Compared Methods

- GAN attribution: PRNU [1], Yu et al. [2], DCT CNN [3], DNA-Det [4], and RepMix [5]
- GAN discovery: Girish et al. [6]
- Open-set recognition: OpenMax [7], PROSER [8], ARPL+CS [9], and DIAS [10]

- [1] Do gans leave artificial fingerprints? In *MIPR*, 2019
- [2] Attributing fake images to gans: Learning and analyzing gan fingerprints. In ICCV, 2019.
- [3] Leveraging frequency analysis for deep fake image recognition. In ICML, 2020.
- [4] Deepfake network architecture attribution. In AAAI, 2022.
- [5] Repmix: Representation mixing for robust attribution of synthesized images. In ECCV, 2022.
- [6] Towards discovery and attribution of open-world gan generated images. In ICCV, 2021
- [7] Towards open set deep networks. In CVPR, 2016.
- [8] Learning placeholders for open-set recognition. In CVPR, 2021.
- [9] Adversarial reciprocal points learning for open set recognition. In TPAMI, 2021
- [10] Difficulty-aware simulator for open set recognition. In ECCV, 2022

Experimental Setup

Compared Methods

- GAN attribution: PRNU [1], Yu et al. [2], DCT CNN [3], DNA-Det [4], and RepMix [5]
- GAN discovery: Girish *et al*. [6]
- Open-set recognition: OpenMax [7], PROSER [8], ARPL+CS [9], and DIAS [10]

Testing

- Test image \rightarrow Feature extractor F \rightarrow Classification head H \rightarrow Softmax \rightarrow Confidence scores
 - If the max confidence score is larger than a threshold \rightarrow Known category of the index
 - Otherwise → Unknown

- [1] Do gans leave artificial fingerprints? In *MIPR*, 2019
- [2] Attributing fake images to gans: Learning and analyzing gan fingerprints. In ICCV, 2019.
- [3] Leveraging frequency analysis for deep fake image recognition. In ICML, 2020.
- [4] Deepfake network architecture attribution. In AAAI, 2022.
- [5] Repmix: Representation mixing for robust attribution of synthesized images. In ECCV, 2022.
- [6] Towards discovery and attribution of open-world gan generated images. In ICCV, 2021
- [7] Towards open set deep networks. In CVPR, 2016.
- [8] Learning placeholders for open-set recognition. In CVPR, 2021.
- [9] Adversarial reciprocal points learning for open set recognition. In TPAMI, 2021
- [10] Difficulty-aware simulator for open set recognition. In ECCV, 2022

Experimental Setup

Compared Methods

- GAN attribution: PRNU [1], Yu et al. [2], DCT CNN [3], DNA-Det [4], and RepMix [5]
- GAN discovery: Girish *et al*. [6]
- Open-set recognition: OpenMax [7], PROSER [8], ARPL+CS [9], and DIAS [10]

Testing

- Test image \rightarrow Feature extractor F \rightarrow Classification head H \rightarrow Softmax \rightarrow Confidence scores
 - If the max confidence score is larger than a threshold \rightarrow Known category of the index
 - Otherwise → Unknown

Evaluation

- Accuracy: closed-set classification
- AUC: closed/open discrimination
- OSCR: trade-off between the two aspects

- [1] Do gans leave artificial fingerprints? In MIPR, 2019
- [2] Attributing fake images to gans: Learning and analyzing gan fingerprints. In *ICCV*, 2019.
- [3] Leveraging frequency analysis for deep fake image recognition. In ICML, 2020.
- [4] Deepfake network architecture attribution. In AAAI, 2022.
- [5] Repmix: Representation mixing for robust attribution of synthesized images. In ECCV, 2022.
- [6] Towards discovery and attribution of open-world gan generated images. In ICCV, 2021
- [7] Towards open set deep networks. In CVPR, 2016.
- [8] Learning placeholders for open-set recognition. In CVPR, 2021.
- [9] Adversarial reciprocal points learning for open set recognition. In TPAMI, 2021
- [10] Difficulty-aware simulator for open set recognition. In ECCV, 2022

Experimental Result

Compare with GAN attribution methods

POSE outperforms existing fake image attribution methods in terms of closedset classification and closed/open discrimination.

| Method | Closed-Set | Unsee | Unseen Seed Unse | | Unseen Architecture | | Unseen Dataset | | Unseen All | |
|------------------------|--------------|-------|------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|--|
| Method | Accuracy | AUC | OSCR | AUC | OSCR | AUC | OSCR | AUC | OSCR | |
| PRNU [33] | 55.27 | 69.20 | 49.16 | 70.02 | 49.49 | 67.68 | 48.57 | 68.94 | 49.06 | |
| Yu <i>et al</i> . [53] | 85.71 | 53.14 | 50.99 | 69.04 | 64.17 | <u>78.79</u> | 72.20 | 69.90 | 64.86 | |
| DCT-CNN [14] | 86.16 | 55.46 | 52.68 | 72.56 | 67.43 | 72.87 | 67.57 | 69.46 | 64.70 | |
| DNA-Det [50] | 93.56 | 61.46 | <u>59.34</u> | <u>80.93</u> | 76.45 | 66.14 | 63.27 | 71.40 | 68.00 | |
| RepMix [5] | <u>93.69</u> | 54.70 | 53.26 | 72.86 | 70.49 | 78.69 | <u>76.02</u> | <u>71.74</u> | <u>69.43</u> | |
| POSE | 94.81 | 68.15 | 67.25 | 84.17 | 81.62 | 88.24 | 85.64 | 82.76 | 80.50 | |

Compare with OSR methods

The simulated open space by POSE is more suitable for OSMA than off-theshelf OSR methods.

| Method | Closed-Set | Unseen Seed | | Unseen Architecture | | Unseen Dataset | | Unseen All | |
|--|-----------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| memou | Accuracy | AUC | OSCR | AUC | OSCR | AUC | OSCR | AUC | OSCR |
| Base | 90.68 | 62.02 | 60.58 | 76.03 | 72.92 | 77.01 | 73.88 | 73.78 | 70.97 |
| Base+OpenMax [2] | 91.11 | 63.27 | 61.60 | 76.40 | 73.29 | 75.33 | 72.32 | 73.50 | 70.70 |
| Base+PROSER [58] | 92.12 | 63.32 | 62.19 | 79.55 | 76.57 | 81.43 | 78.64 | 77.22 | 74.66 |
| Base+ARPL+CS [7] | 91.77 | 54.94 | 54.17 | 79.09 | 75.97 | 80.48 | 77.52 | 75.08 | 72.47 |
| Base+DIAS [35] | 92.77 | 62.15 | 61.02 | 79.34 | 76.49 | 84.14 | 81.13 | 78.00 | 75.41 |
| Base+AM Base+AM+ $\mathcal{L}_{div}(\mathbf{POSE})$ | <u>93.41</u> 94.81 | <u>66.17</u> 68.15 | <u>65.04</u> 67.25 | <u>82.21</u> 84.17 | 79.42 81.62 | 85.04 88.24 | <u>82.20</u> 85.64 | <u>80.31</u> 82.76 | <u>77.80</u> 80.50 |

Compare with GAN discovery method

POSE is better in unknown model clustering.

| Method | Avg. Purity | NMI | ARI |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|-------|-------|
| Girish <i>et al</i> . [16] (k=49) | 32.89 | 61.89 | 21.05 |
| POSE (k=49) | 39.16 | 61.91 | 27.48 |
| POSE (k=68) | 41.04 | 60.59 | 26.39 |

k = 68: the true number of classes for seen and unseen data

k = 49: the number of clusters that Girish *et al.* returns after four iterations.

• The diversity loss increase the diversity of open space simulated by different augmentation models, and reduces the open space risk better.

| | Closed-set | Оре | en-set |
|--------------|------------|-------|--------|
| | Acc | AUC | OSCR |
| Base | 90.68 | 73.78 | 70.97 |
| Base+AM | 93.41 | 80.31 | 77.80 |
| Base+AM+Ldiv | 94.81 | 82.76 | 80.50 |

• The diversity loss increase the diversity of open space simulated by different augmentation models, and reduces the open space risk better.

| | Closed-set | Оре | en-set |
|--------------|------------|-------|--------|
| | Acc | AUC | OSCR |
| Base | 90.68 | 73.78 | 70.97 |
| Base+AM | 93.41 | 80.31 | 77.80 |
| Base+AM+Ldiv | 94.81 | 82.76 | 80.50 |

With L_{div} the AUC increases continually until about 19 epochs.



• The diversity loss increase the diversity of open space simulated by different augmentation models, and reduces the open space risk better.

| | Closed-set | Оре | en-set |
|--------------|------------|-------|--------|
| | Acc | AUC | OSCR |
| Base | 90.68 | 73.78 | 70.97 |
| Base+AM | 93.41 | 80.31 | 77.80 |
| Base+AM+Ldiv | 94.81 | 82.76 | 80.50 |

With L_{div} , the AUC increases continually until about 19 epochs.





- Ablation study on the architecture of augmentation models.
 - Best option: only convolution layer, Layer number = 2, Kernel size = 3



Visualization Examples

• The augmented data simulates a rich open space enclosing the known data points, resulting in a clear better close/open discrimination.



▲ Known Class Data ● Augmented Data for the Known Class ● Unknown Class Data (Easiest to be confused)

Summary

- Highlights
 - Problem: A new task named open-set model attribution.
 - > Method: Simulate the potential open space progressively via lightweight augmentation models.
 - > Dataset: A dataset considering Seen Real, Seen Fake, Unseen Real, and three types of Unseen Fake.
 - **Evaluation:** Superior than model attribution methods and off-the-shelf OSR methods.
 - Code, dataset, and models are at <u>https://github.com/ICTMCG/POSE</u>
- Future Work
 - > Unified framework for architecture-level and model-level attribution.
 - > Model retrieval, model lineage analysis.

Thanks

Feel free to contact : yangtianyun19z@ict.ac.cn wangdanding@ict.ac.cn