# Al-generated Text Detection

Neil Gong

# Why detecting Al-generated text?

- Disinformation propaganda?
- Al-assisted writing
  - Homework
  - Exams
  - Papers and reviews
- Preventing harmful content generation is insufficient

#### Al-generated text detectors

- Passive
- Retrieval-based
- Watermark-based

#### Passive detectors

- Outlier detection
- Classification

## Outlier detection

- Heuristics for the "artifacts" in Al-generated text
- No access to human-written text

## Outlier detection methods

- log p(x): uses the source model's average token-wise log probability
- Rank: uses the average observed rank of the tokens in the text
- Log rank: uses the average observed log rank
- Entropy: model-generated texts will be more 'in-distribution' for the model, leading to more over-confident (thus lower entropy) predictive distributions.
- **DetectGPT**: inspect the local region of a text

## Log probability threshold-based detection

• Generated text has a higher log probability

	Word	Probability given context	Log probability					
	The	0.1	-2.3					
"The cat sat on a mat"	cat	0.15	-1.9	Average Log				
	sat	0.05	-3.0	probability = -2.05				
	on	0.2	-1.6					
	а	0.3	-1.2	Threshold = $-1 > -2.0$				
	mat	0.1	-2.3	Not generated				

## DetectGPT - Basic Hypothesis

- Models tend to output the tokens with high probability
- Slight modification to the generated output will decrease the log probability



## DetectGPT - Basic Hypothesis

- The modified output is defined as the <u>perturbation</u>
- Perturbation discrepancy (PD):

$$\mathbf{d}(x, p_{\theta}, q) \triangleq \log p_{\theta}(x) - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{x} \sim q(\cdot|x)} \log p_{\theta}(\tilde{x}) \quad (1)$$

- x: original text
- x~: perturbation text
- q: perturbation function
- $p\theta$ : log probability function of generative model

#### DetectGPT - Basic Hypothesis

• Formal hypothesis:

**Perturbation Discrepancy Gap Hypothesis.** If q produces samples on the data manifold,  $\mathbf{d}(x, p_{\theta}, q)$  is positive with high probability for samples  $x \sim p_{\theta}$ . For human-written text,  $\mathbf{d}(x, p_{\theta}, q)$  tends toward zero for all x.

• Empirical result:





• Step 1: make the perturbed samples

**Candidate passage x:** *"Joe Biden recently made a move to the White House that included bringing along his pet German Shepherd…"* 





• Step 2: calculate the log probability of perturbed samples





• Step 2: compare the result and make classification



## Experiments

- Generated text: prompting with the first 30 tokens of real text
- Models tested: GPT-2 OPT-2.7 Neo-2.7 GPT-J NeoX
- Perturbation model: T5

## AUC Results

	XSum					SQuAD					WritingPrompts							
Method	GPT-2	OPT-2.7	Neo-2.7	GPT-J	NeoX	Avg.	GPT-2	OPT-2.7	Neo-2.7	GPT-J	NeoX	Avg.	GPT-2	OPT-2.7	Neo-2.7	GPT-J	NeoX	Avg.
$\log p(x)$	0.86	0.86	0.86	0.82	0.77	0.83	0.91	0.88	0.84	0.78	0.71	0.82	0.97	0.95	0.95	0.94	0.93*	0.95
Rank	0.79	0.76	0.77	0.75	0.73	0.76	0.83	0.82	0.80	0.79	0.74	0.80	0.87	0.83	0.82	0.83	0.81	0.83
LogRank	0.89*	0.88*	0.90*	0.86*	0.81*	0.87*	0.94*	0.92*	0.90*	0.83*	0.76*	0.87*	0.98*	0.96*	0.97*	0.96*	0.95	0.96*
Entropy	0.60	0.50	0.58	0.58	0.61	0.57	0.58	0.53	0.58	0.58	0.59	0.57	0.37	0.42	0.34	0.36	0.39	0.38
DetectGPT	0.99	0.97	0.99	0.97	0.95	0.97	0.99	0.97	0.97	0.90	0.79	0.92	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.97	0.93*	0.97
Diff	0.10	0.09	0.09	0.11	0.14	0.10	0.05	0.05	0.07	0.07	0.03	0.05	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.01	-0.02	0.01

## Detection - Source Model Unknown

- Black-box setting: source model unaccessible, use a different model to score a candidate passage;
- When the surrogate model is different from the source model, detection performance is reduced;



# Limitations of DetectGPT

- Access to log probabilities
- A reasonable perturbation function is required
- Computation overhead

## Classification methods

- Train binary classifiers
- Key: what features to represent a text?

#### Retrieval-based detection