Generative AI and Its Implications for the Authenticity and Legal Use of Video Evidence

RWMR Dharani Rajasinghe
Dept. of Software Engineering & Computer Security
Faculty of Computing, NSBM Green University Homagama, Sri Lanka
dharani.r@nsbm.ac.lk

2025 1st International Conference on Data Science and Intelligent Network Computing (ICDSINC) | 979-8-3315-6524-4/25/$31.00 ©2025 IEEE | DOI: 10.1109/ICDSINC66221.2025.11448275

Abstract— The advancement of generative artificial intelligence via deepfake technology presents significant challenges for the trustworthiness of video evidence and the requirements for legal acceptance in investigative and judicial processes. This document examines the legal implications of AI video alteration techniques by investigating how AI undermines confidence in evidence and assessing the inadequate capabilities of current detection methods. The research concludes, based on thorough technological and legal analysis, that AI-modified media necessitates urgent technological development, enhancements in legal frameworks, and ethical progress to mitigate potential risks. Studies indicate that current forensic tools are ineffective in identifying sophisticated deepfake material, necessitating the creation of more robust verification techniques, as well as a reevaluation of standard evidence assessments. The paper concludes with a recommendation for the incorporation of interdisciplinary approaches to ensure the integrity of video evidence through technological advancements aligned with legal reforms and global regulatory practices in the age of AI.

Keywords— Content Created by AI, Verification of Digital Videos, Deepfakes, Legal Structures for Digital Evidence, Ethical Implications of Artificial Intelligence

I. INTRODUCTION

Generative artificial intelligence (AI), along with its deepfake functionalities, offers society unparalleled challenges in determining the authenticity of video evidence. Generative adversarial networks (GANs) create deepfakes AS highly realistic computer-generated mediathrough their creation process thereby complicating the ability of individuals to distinguish between authentic and manufactured video and audio material. The exact proficiency of this technology has raised significant legal, ethical, and social issues.

Visual and auditory elements in video evidence have consistently acted as reliable legal proof as they provide indisputable documentation of events. Deepfake videos undermine the credibility of visual evidence by generating convincingly realistic fake media through artificial intelligence. Legal proceedings are significantly jeopardized by deceptive practices since the authenticity of evidence is essential [1].

Beyond formal legal environments, deepfakes generate effects that extend into various areas. Various entities have employed deepfakes for numerous malicious objectives that collectively undermine public confidence in digital communication platforms.

The progression of deepfake technology towards more user-friendly and sophisticated application capabilities results in increasing ethical dilemmas and necessitates new legal frameworks to address these challenges [2][3].

This emerging reality poses significant challenges for the legal system to navigate. The legal criteria that govern the acceptance and validation of video evidence are inadequate to tackle the complex issues introduced by AI-generated content. The conventional obligation for presenters to prove the authenticity of evidence becomes increasingly challenging to fulfill, as deepfakes raise simple queries regarding the integrity of videos [2].

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Introduction to Generated Artificial Intelligence

Advanced machine learning models classified as Generative AI produce new data instances that replicate existing datasets. GANs and VAEs serve as the core structures utilized in Generative AI systems. The two-network architecture of GANs, as outlined in [4] by Goodfellow et al., comprises generators and discriminators that collaborate adversarially for generating authentic artificial data. Kingma and Welling [4] presented Variational Autoencoders (VAEs), which utilize probabilistic models to acquire latent representations and produce new samples via distribution-centric learning. Contemporary technologies not only reshape but also influence the reliability of video proof via their groundbreaking functionalities that range from image generation to artistic creation to video creation. [5].

B. Generative Algorithms and Video Integrity

AI technology known as deepfakes has revolutionized the appearance of video evidence in contemporary times. Extremely lifelike video content arises from GANs, as deepfakes generate altered features along with changed audio and expressions [5]. The relevant GAN technology paves new directions for video creation by generating believable synthetic materials that render traditional verification techniques ineffective [6]. Current video forgery methods that merge face-swapping and audio alignment processes achieve a level of precision adequate for producing misleading video content, hindering the abilities of legal and investigative verification processes. [5].

C. Consequences of Employing Video Evidence Research Techniques for identifying alterations in

video content employ forensic algorithms and deep methods for recognizing discrepancies and irregularities in video data [7]. AI forensics investigation aims to improve the accuracy and efficiency of detection techniques [8]. Ineffective validation procedures are unable to keep pace with advancements in generative technology, necessitating the creation of new forensic strategies [9].

D. Reliability Concerns

Recent advancements in AI generation technologies complicate the verification of video evidence authenticity. Conventional video validation techniques fall short of keeping

up with the extent of realistic content creation, prompting researchers to develop innovative forensic investigation methods [9]. The ability of generative AI to produce convincing yet fraudulent video material exacerbates the issue of misinformation, significantly impacting public opinion and resulting in societal harm [10]. Ethical considerations regarding the responsible manipulation of generative AI video necessitate meticulous focus on privacy issues, consent stipulations, and measures to prevent misuse [11].

E. Countermeasures and Detection

Numerous detection mechanisms are advancing for combating generative AI through the creation of forensic algorithms and deep learning models as noted in [12]. Research in AI forensics aims to enhance existing detection techniques due to the growing complexity of deepfake technology [13]. Generative AI necessitates robust policies and regulations to address its dangers via responsible usage guidelines and controls on the distribution of altered content [4].

F. Case Studies and Real-World Implications

Various detection systems are evolving to combat generative AI via the advancement of forensic algorithms and deep learning frameworks according to [12]. Research in AI forensics aims to enhance existing detection techniques due to the growing complexity of deepfake technologies [13]. Effective policies and regulations are necessary for generative AI to mitigate its risks through responsible usage guidelines and control over disseminated manipulated content [4].

G. Future Directions

The advancement of generative AI technology will create new challenges in evaluating video evidence. Research groups must predict future technological progress to create adaptable verification and detection methods [8]. Future studies ought to concentrate on improving detection methods, enhancing forensic investigation techniques, and formulating thorough policies to reduce the dangers linked to generative AI[11]. Research examining the detection of deepfakes reveals numerous knowledge deficiencies despite a growing number of studies. The evaluation of the scalability of detection tools is still insufficient within the current literature, as deepfake technologies have become more accessible to different entities. Investigations into the legal consequences of AI-produced video evidence are limited in court settings, where current standards are inadequate for evaluating media that has been manipulated by AI. [12].

III. METHODOLOGY

A comprehensive research methodology enables this study to explore the impacts of generative AI on the gathering of video evidence. The research approach integrates theoretical analyses with practical case studies and technical assessments, providing thorough understanding regarding the implications of generative AI technology on the credibility and use of video evidence.

A. Theoretical Analysis

The study begins by investigating theoretical ideas related to generative AI technologies, emphasizing Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) and Variational Autoencoders (VAEs). [13]. The assessment necessitates that researchers examine the current literature to grasp the essential principles and structural frameworks of GANs and VAEs, along with their training methodologies. The study encompasses key papers, technical reports, and recent research to demonstrate the video content capabilities of these models. [13].

B. Empirical Case Studies

The research conducts real-world case analyses of actual generative AI technology applications in video alteration to enhance theoretical evaluation. We select case studies based on their significance in video creation and their impact on social elements and ethical and legal guidelines. [10]. An evaluation merges the examination of news articles with the appraisal of legal and scholarly papers to examine the applications of generative AI along with the techniques employed and their effect on the dependability of video evidence [11].

C. Technical Evaluation

The evaluation outlines the effectiveness of various detection methods in identifying counterfeit video content. The analysis examines existing detection strategies characterized by forensic algorithms and machine learning. Structures and recently developed blockchain technologies for video authentication [12]. The measuring the procedure includes a method comparison segment that defines precision metrics along with false positive and false negative outcomes, in addition to identifying weaknesses and strengths in contemporary video content detection systems.

D. Data Sources

The study data originates from multiple sources, facilitating theoretical exploration, case study evaluation, and technical analysis. Important data sources include:

- Peer-reviewed scholarly publications, technical documentations from organisations, and conference publications evaluating generative AI and video editing techniques constitute the research data. [9].
- The research utilizes legal records, scholarly articles, and news coverage related to occurrences of video alteration and their effects [7].
- This research aims to catalogue existing detection tools by evaluating forensic analysis approaches, detection strategies based on machine learning, and industry publications regarding progress in video detection technologies.[6].

E. Analytical Framework

The examination employs a robust analytical

framework that integrates theoretical, forensic, and legal viewpoints. This structure encompasses:

- The theory examines GANs in conjunction with VAEs to comprehend their roles in altering and producing video content [3].
- The assessment of the authenticity and integrity of video evidence adheres to forensic guidelines [6].
- The assessment encompasses legal and ethical evaluations of video alteration techniques alongside an analysis of contemporary detection methods [7].

This study examines various generative AI models alongside detection methods. It covers the GAN framework and training procedures, as well as VAEs for video generation, and machine learning models for spotting anomalies and

forensic methods for identifying manipulation traces. Analysed within this study [11]. The study evaluates various detection methods via a benchmarking analysis that examines how effectively they are implemented in practice.

IV. GENERATIVE AI TECHNOLOGIES

Generative AI makes advancements in the field of artificial intelligence by enabling users to create entirely lifelike synthetic data entries. This section examines the fundamental components of generative AI by exploring Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) and Variational Autoencoders (VAEs), as well as their applications in video generation and alteration. [12].

A. Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) Goodfellow and colleagues [4] presented

Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs), which consist of two neural networks known as the discriminator and generator that engage in competition with each other [8].This system enables the generator to create artificial content from random noise and works alongside the discriminator, which evaluates this new content in comparison to authentic data. The training process is carried out multiple times until the generator produces synthetic data that the discriminator cannot differentiate from real data, resulting in high-quality synthetic outputs. [9].

B. Variational Autoencoders (VAEs)

VAEs manage data creation via probabilistic methods that incorporate encoders and decoders. The mechanism consists of both an encoder unit paired with a decoder segment [3]. VAEs convert input information into a latent space via an encoder that encapsulates its distribution instead of a singular point to grasp essential variations. The data produced from this latent space serves as the foundation for the decoder to generate new instances through sampling from the distribution. [6]. VAEs preserve both the accuracy of data reconstruction and the compactness of the latent space, enabling the generation of varied and consistent new data [10].

C. Methods for Creating and Altering Videos

The process of creating and altering video content increasingly relies on generative AI technologies, with deepfakes leading the way [11]. GANs facilitate the production of lifelike videos via deepfakes by generating synthetic changes in both the looks and movements of individuals [2]. Important methods comprise:

- The technique of exchanging faces in videos is achievable via GANs, which necessitate comprehensive facial datasets for their training [5].
- Altering lip movements in sync with audio tracks allows for the production of speech videos that look authentic [6].
- GANs facilitate the transfer of motion between people to create videos that depict actions the subject did not actually engage in [12].

These methods take advantage of GANs 'capacity to generate realistic facial expressions and movements, rendering it challenging to distinguish altered from authentic video material.

V. DIGITAL MANIPULATION OF VIDEO EVIDENCE

The method of creating video material using sophisticated approaches driven by generative AI technology has sparked significant concerns regarding the credibility of video evidence. [12]. This section examines techniques for generating deepfakes, along with methods for detection, and presents several real-world examples to illustrate these modifications.

A. Creating Deepfakes

Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) utilize face swapping methods to automate the exchange of faces in videos between individuals. The training methodology incorporates images of the target face alongside images of the source face, allowing for accurate mapping of facial expressions and movements [11]. This face swapping technology is advantageous for the entertainment and media sectors, but it also presents risks, particularly in the form of the spread of misinformation and potential scams [12].

Video outputs from lip syncing facilitate alignment between sound tracks and human lip movements [6]. GANs and RNNs directed by audio inputs coordinate lip actions with verbal expressions to accomplish this result. This method allows researchers to create lifelike audio-visual videos that aid in dubbing tasks and digital personalities. Advancement that enhances the authenticity of digital content [7]. Animation of human actions from one individual to another represents motion transfer. Key point detection and motion fields are employed by the First Order Motion Model approach to execute subject animation [12]. This technique is used by employers to generate animated representations of illustrated images and historical figures, as well as to facilitate virtual puppet control [12].

B. Detecting Deepfakes

The procedure of identifying artifacts analyses videos for erratic anomalies along with unusual motion behaviours coupled with lighting changes and unconventional facial features [11Two machine learning applications, Deep Fake-o-meter and Face Forensics++, evaluate deepfake videos by detecting subtle artifacts.

The identification process utilizing deep learning employs Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) along with other advanced structures to detect deepfakes. The training phase of these techniques necessitates extensive datasets containing both authentic and counterfeit video content for the model to learn how to identify specific indicators of digital alteration. The examination of video frame uniformity over time identifies unusual patterns via temporal analysis. This technique assesses how facial movements and expressions retain consistency across frames to uncover possible alterations in videos [11]. Digital signatures paired with video watermarking systems incorporate hidden markers into video files to guarantee authentication. Watermarks and digital signatures integrate cryptographic components that enable swift verification of their integrity following any modifications to the data [1]1].

VI. IMPACTON LAW AND COURT SYSTEMS

Avian species and tools within the legal domain are currently experiencing significant transformations due to generative AI technologies, which influence the handling of video evidence in both advantageous and challenging

manners. [11]. The segment outlines the legal implications along with the difficulties in verifying videos, while assessing their impact on law enforcement methods and investigative processes.

A. The Legal Consequences of AI-Altered Video Evidence

The increase in AI-created video content calls for the development of new standards for evidence. The judicial system needs to formulate distinct guidelines that dictate how they assess the authenticity and admissibility of digital evidence [12]. Safeguarding the integrity of evidence demands the implementation of secure practices to track its chain of custody, thereby thwarting any efforts to alter it. Leveraging AI for video content creation opens up avenues for fabrication that could lead to improperly handled legal claims and defences. The legal framework must clarify how obligations related to the production and distribution of deepfakes will be addressed among involved parties concerning defamation and privacy safeguarding. Jurisdictions are currently engaging in two strategies: they implement targeted legislation to denounce hazardous methods of AI content creation while concurrently crafting comprehensive regulatory frameworks for the ethical application of AI technology [13].

B. Legal System Faces Challenges in Authenticating

AI-Created Video Material The legal system struggles with verifying video evidence because of the swift advancements in AI technology. Testimony from experts is a crucial necessity in courts, requiring judges to engage forensic specialists skilled in identifying AI-altered material [12]. It is imperative for the judicial system to continually strive to enhance its knowledge and capabilities in alignment with the pace of technological evolution. The validation procedure encounters extra challenges due to limited available resources. Analyzing digital evidence and its verification requires considerable time and financial investment, putting pressure on judicial resources. Numerous smaller judicial entities struggle to acquire the advanced forensic tools essential for effectively detecting deepfakes [13]. Traditional assumptions regarding video authenticity are inadequate for confirming sophisticated manipulation techniques, necessitating the creation of new methods to assess the authenticity of video content.

C. Consequences for Law Enforcement and Criminal Investigations

Law enforcement and investigative methods are undergoing major transformations due to the emergence of generative artificial intelligence technologies. Deepfake technology poses a considerable threat of altering evidence, complicating the investigative process and potentially leading to wrongful convictions or mistakes in exonerating defendants. The dissemination of fake videos hinders investigations by generating deceptive information and diverting crucial resources toward misleading leads [12]. Police departments must allocate funds for employee training alongside modern technological innovations to keep up with advancements in generative AI [10]. Approaches to tackle these challenges require enhanced cooperation among law enforcement agencies. Including tech firms, cybersecurity specialists, and scholarly researchers. Public confidence in judicial entities significantly depends on the honesty and legitimacy of video evidence therefore, law enforcement needs to implement safety-awareness initiatives regarding the dangers of deepfakes while fostering fundamental digital literacy among the community[12].

VII. Case Studies

A. The Situation of the "Nancy Pelosi Deepfake"

A video ad featuring U.S. Speaker Nancy Pelosi, which had been heavily altered, appeared on social media in 2019, showing her apparent signs of intoxication. The producer utilized Deep Face Lab GAN technology is used to impose altered facial expressions onto Speaker Pelosi's original pictures. The training of the GAN involved genuine images of Pelosi to generate simulated expressions synchronized with lip movements. Usually, forensic analysis utilized machine learning algorithms to identify modifications by observing the timing of audio-video and alterations in facial structure. [9].

B. The "BBC Deepfake Study"

In 2020, the BBC employed deepfake technology to produce a simulated interview with a prominent public figure as part of their investigation into the misuse of deepfake technology. The developers crafted this deepfake using Variational Autoencoders (VAEs) and voice synthesis algorithms that replicated genuine facial characteristics along with precise speech patterns. The research team analyzed video metadata via AI-driven forensic instruments and utilized these instruments to identify audio-visual discrepancies in their assessment [10].

C. "Deepfake Pornography Scandals"

BBC employed deepfake technology in 2020 to produce a fabricated interview with a notable public figure for their investigative study on the exploitation of deepfake technology. The developers accomplished this deepfake by leveraging Variational Autoencoders (VAEs) in conjunction with voice synthesis algorithms to replicate realistic facial features and natural speech patterns. Research analysts scrutinized digital information from videos using AI-driven analytical tools before applying these instruments to confirm audiovisual inconsistencies during their evaluation. [12].

D. Comparative Analysis

The manipulated video of Nancy Pelosi influenced political opinions, highlighting how generative AI has the capability to alter political narratives. The BBC carried out a systematic study to demonstrate the functioning of deepfake technology, while deepfake pornography shows the abuse of these abilities to violate personal privacy [12]. Traditional forensic techniques aided in recognizing the Pelosi deepfake, but the BBC utilized advanced AI detection methods to evaluate its authenticity. Advanced image analysis was employed as a detection strategy for deepfake pornography by searching for discernible discrepancies in the visuals [10]. The alteration of videos significantly harms public trust, underscoring the necessity for effective detection systems to be established. The use of generative AI for creating unauthorized explicit content demands immediate legal regulation due to its threat to ethical standards. The advancement of AI technology requires continuous efforts to create new forensic detection technologies and tools [8].

Numerous case studies illustrate the potential of generative AI technologies to transform our world, while highlighting the pressing need to create high-quality detection tools and regulatory frameworks to tackle the risks and ethical implications associated with generated AI [9].

VIII. DISCSSION

Both The findings from the experiments and the technical evaluation conducted in this study highlight significant deficiencies in the current forensic systems' capability to recognize alterations made via AI video manipulation. The methods of detection that employ deepfake techniques via artifact identification and deep learning strategies exhibit low success rates in detection due to contemporary advanced manipulation methods employing real-time facial expressions and audio-visual alignment. The research illustrates the inadequacy of current detection tools as they find it challenging to keep up with the rapid advancement of generative AI technologies. [10].

Real-world examples including the manipulated U.S. Speaker Pelosi video, along with other instances, illustrate how deepfakes negatively influence public perceptions of video authenticity [8]. The current forensic techniques have been inadequate for identifying this deepfake, prompting the need for innovative detection solutions. The rise of lifelike video manipulation via artificial intelligence presents a significant issue, as the BBC Deepfake Experiment illustrates how AI can replicate controlled laboratory videos. The cases examined indicate that the authenticity of video evidence necessitates improved detection systems to safeguard its reliability in legal inquiries. [12].

In industries, the actual execution of blockchain-oriented solutions for video verification must be carefully evaluated regarding several factors. A Examining the existing blockchain frameworks is crucial for identifying the most economical and dependable framework for execution.. PPractical business applications, such as telehealth consultations, virtual negotiations, and online court proceedings, illustrate the significant risks associated with AI-generated videos and the necessity for robust safeguards. Additionally, scalability and resilience are required to propose solutions that must be effective in managing substantial transaction volumes while ensuring reliable mechanisms. [12].

IX. FUTURE TRENDS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Predictions for Generative AI and Associated Risks

The technology for AI generation evolves rapidly due to advancements in algorithms, computational systems, and data accessibility [4].Significant trends and threats include: • Future models will generate exceptionally lifelike materials, making it difficult for users to distinguish between genuine and artificial media content. The availability of these tools to the public presents risks for malicious uses [9].

- The combination of Generative AI technology with AR, VR, and IoT systems is expected to produce deeply immersive but possibly misleading content, as these systems may blend real-world aspects with virtual components [11].

B. Recommendations for Mitigating Risks

- Industry benchmarks utilizing cutting-edge detection methods need to be set up to authenticate authentic content, alongside developing detection abilities for accurate recognition [11].
- Formulating comprehensive laws that address the creation of altered videos while safeguarding privacy through stringent regulations and penal measures for harmful applications [9].
- Training initiatives concerning AI-generated content ought to engage both the broader community and professionals in the legal and forensic fields, equipping them with knowledge on this subject [7].

C. Enhancing the Reliability of Video Evidence

Digital Watermarking and Blockchain work together to establish the verification of video authenticity by integrating digital watermarks with blockchain as an immutable record-keeping system. The development of AI tools must focus on validating video content via databases and creating cross-platform systems for thorough verification. [12]. Standard development necessitates collaboration among technology firms, regulatory bodies, and researchers to establish global benchmarks for verifying video evidence and detecting alterations. [10]. These measures are crucial as they address challenges associated with generative AI while ensuring the authenticity of evidence videos in today's technological landscape..

X. CONCLUSION

This research has concentrated on the implications of generative AI, particularly deepfakes, in relation to the trustworthiness and acceptability of video evidence within legal and investigative proceedings. By examining contemporary detection methods and evaluating substantial detection systems, the research highlights a critical shortcoming: forensic measures have not evolved alongside the developments in AI-generated content. This shortfall is not simply a matter of technology; it raises complex legal and ethical issues regarding the justice system's ability to rely on digital video records as evidence.

In conclusion, this research advocates for a holistic strategy that not only promotes technological progress but also emphasizes the need for legal reform and ethical governance. Regarding the development of this study, attention should be focused on bridging the gap between the limitations of forensics and the expectations of the law, ensuring that video recordings are regarded as reliable and essential for the pursuit of justice in the technological age.

REFERENCES

[1] S. Korshunov and M. Nieminen, "Deepfakes: An Emerging Threat to Facial Recognition? Evaluation and Identification,"arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.08685, 2018.

[2] A. Tolosana, R. Vera-Rodriguez, J. Fierrez, A. Morales and J. Ortega-Garcia, "DeepFakes and Beyond: An Overview of Face Alteration and Fraud Detection,"Information Fusion, vol. 64, pp. 131-148, 2020.

[3] R. Verdoliva, "An overview of media forensics and deepfakes,"IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing, vol. 14, no. 5, pp. 910–932, Aug. 2020.

[4] Y. Li, M. Chang, and S. Lyu, "In the blink of an eye: Unveiling AI-generated deceptive videos through eye blink detection," inProc. IEEE International Workshop on Information Forensics and Security (WIFS), Hong Kong, 2023, pp. 1–7.

[5] H. Nguyen, J. Yamagishi, and I. Echizen, "Application of capsule networks for identifying false images and videos," inProc. IEEE Int. Conf. on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing (ICASSP), Brighton, UK, 2019, pp. 2307–2311.

[6] N. M. Al-Qershi and B. E. Khoo, "A review of deepfake identification utilizing deep learning methods," IEEE Access, vol. 9, pp. 54571–54583, 2021.

[7] A. Westerlund, "The rise of deepfake technology: An overview,"Technology Innovation Management Review, vol. 9, no. 11, pp. 40–53, Nov. 2022.

[8] J. Kietzmann, L. Lee, I. McCarthy, and T. Kietzmann, "Deepfakes: Deception or Delight?,"Business Horizons, vol. 63, no. 2, pp. 135–146, 2020.

[9] A. Vaccari and A. Chadwick, "Deepfakes and misinformation: Investigating the influence of synthetic political videos on deception, uncertainty, and trust in news," Social Media + Society, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 1–13, Jan. 2020.

[10] X. Yang, Y. Li, and S. Lyu, "Revealing deep fakes through varying head positions," in Proc. IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing (ICASSP), Brighton, UK, 2019, pp. 8261–8265.

[11] D. Afchar, V. Nozick, J. Yamagishi, and I. Echizen, "MesoNet: A streamlined network for detecting facial video forgery," in Proc. IEEE International Workshop on Information Forensics and Security (WIFS), Hong Kong, 2024, pp. 1–7.

[12] A. Tolosana, R. Vera-Rodriguez, J. Fierrez, A. Morales, and J. Ortega-Garcia, "Deepfakes and more: An overview of facial alteration and fraud detection," Information Fusion, vol. 64, pp. 131–148, Dec. 2023.

[13] H. Dang, F. Liu, J. Stehouwer, X. Liu, and A. Jain, "Regarding the identification of digital facial alterations," in Proc. IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), Long Beach, CA, USA, 2024, pp. 5781– 5790.