

1 We sincerely thank all the reviewers for their helpful comments. We attempt to address their concerns below.

## 2 **Additional evaluations and human judgment**

3 • All reviewers recommend additional evaluations. • Reviewer 1 also suggests human evaluator opinion tests. •  
4 Reviewer 2 asks if humans are able to visualize faces for voices. • Reviewers 2 and 3 wonder if the reconstructed  
5 faces do indeed capture the speaker’s ID. • Reviewer 3 recommends comparison to baselines. While we are unable to  
6 compare to existing baselines, since there is no prior work on the topic, we have run additional experiments which we  
7 hope address the rest of the reviewers’ concerns under this topic. These results will be included in the paper and the  
8 experimental setups and data made public.

9 *a. Do the generated faces actually capture the speaker’s ID:* The GAN is, in fact, optimized for face identification – a  
10 critical component of the loss is provided by a face-ID system (which is separately trained, and not optimized with  
11 the GAN). To explicitly address the question, we ran the face-ID system on a set of faces derived from novel speech  
12 recordings that are not part of the training set. The test is a “closed-set” test, in the sense that the IDs are expected to be  
13 one of the 924 IDs represented in the ID system. Table 1 shows the top-1 and top-5 identification results. While not  
perfect, the results clearly show that the faces generated from the voices clearly do capture the ID of the speaker.

Table 1: Results of closed-set recognition

| Total number of samples | # of samples per class | # of classes | Top-1 accuracy | Top-5 accuracy |
|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|
| 4620                    | 5                      | 924          | 61.7%          | 82.3%          |

14

15 *b. Human judgment test:* Studies in experimental psychology have shown that humans *are* indeed significantly better  
16 than chance at matching voices to faces, e.g. [1].

17 We ran a human judgment test, as suggested by the reviewer. A total of 20 volunteers (who had no prior knowledge of  
18 this work) were each presented 20 trials. Each trial comprised a voice and two GAN faces, one of which was produced  
19 from the voice. The subject was required to identify the generated face for the voice. To eliminate extraneous factors,  
20 we tried to match covariates, e.g. both faces were always the same gender. Trial voices and faces were not repeated for  
21 any subject. Table 2 shows the results. The results are much better than chance, with a P value below 0.001, and are  
similar to performances reported in human studies, e.g. [1].

Table 2: Human subject accuracy in matching voices to generated faces

| Minimum accuracy | Maximum accuracy | Mean accuracy | Standard deviation |
|------------------|------------------|---------------|--------------------|
| 55.0%            | 75.0%            | 67.5%         | 8.1                |

22

23 [1] Mavica, L. W., & Barenholtz, E. (2013). Matching voice and face identity from static images. *Journal of*  
24 *Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 39(2), 307-312

## 25 **Why GAN architectures?**

26 We attempted a variety of regression and GAN architectures. The GAN architecture that included a Face-ID loss turned  
27 out to be the most effective. The key component was the face-ID system that provides a loss to optimize the generator.

## 28 **Predicting age from voice, which was not shown with high accuracy (reviewer 2)**

29 Age prediction from voice is a well-studied problem, with mean absolute errors of less than 5 years being achievable by  
30 systems trained with age-labeled voice data.

31 In our setup, the challenge was the lack of appropriate training data, as the reviewer rightly points out. Voxceleb, has  
32 many voice recordings and face images for each person, however there is no information about the correspondence in  
33 age between them. Thus, when we pair a voice with a face during training, the voice may have been recorded when the  
34 subject was young, while the facial image may have been taken when they were much older. As a result, there really is  
35 no assurance of learning age associations, although remarkably, some association seems to be learned, presumably due  
36 to some degree of correspondence in the training data.

## 37 **What would be an application for such a task? (reviewer 2)**

38 We have had expressions of interest from the entertainment and gaming industries (e.g. to generate avatars). The research  
39 is directly funded by law enforcement agencies in the US, although they only expect to use some carefully-vetted aspects  
40 of it. The research itself was not, however, targeted at a specific application, but to determine if visual information  
41 beyond the obvious covariates could somehow be extracted from voice. The answer seems to be affirmative.