



# GreenLLaMA: A Framework for Detoxification with Explanations

*Warning! This paper contains examples of toxic language*

Md Tawkat Islam Khondaker<sup>♣</sup> Muhammad Abdul-Mageed<sup>♣</sup>◇ Laks V.S. Lakshmanan<sup>♣</sup>

<sup>♣</sup>The University of British Columbia, <sup>◇</sup>MBZUAI

{tawkat@cs., muhammad.mageed@, laks@cs.}ubc.ca

## Abstract

Prior works on detoxification are scattered in the sense that they do not cover all aspects of detoxification needed in a real-world scenario. Notably, prior works restrict the task of developing detoxification models to only a seen subset of platforms, leaving the question of how the models would perform on unseen platforms unexplored. Additionally, these works do not address non-detoxifiability, a phenomenon whereby the toxic text cannot be detoxified without altering the meaning. We propose GreenLLaMA, the first comprehensive end-to-end detoxification framework, which attempts to alleviate the aforementioned limitations. We first introduce a cross-platform pseudo-parallel corpus applying multi-step data processing and generation strategies leveraging ChatGPT. We then train a suite of detoxification models with our cross-platform corpus. We show that our detoxification models outperform the SoTA model trained with human-annotated parallel corpus. We further introduce explanation to promote transparency and trustworthiness. GreenLLaMA additionally offers a unique paraphrase detector especially dedicated for the detoxification task to tackle the non-detoxifiable cases. Through experimental analysis, we demonstrate the effectiveness of our cross-platform corpus and the robustness of GreenLLaMA against adversarial toxicity.

## 1 Introduction

The term *toxic language* is usually used to refer to any form of offensive or hateful speech (Laugier et al., 2021; Fortuna et al., 2020); specifically, toxic or abusive language is defined as any form of microaggression, condescension, harassment, hate speech, trolling, and the like (Jurgens et al., 2019). Use of toxic language online has been a significant issue over the years. Although a plethora of works have explored the task of toxicity detection, the task remains challenging due to its




Figure 1: Workflow of GreenLLaMA framework. The framework will take a **toxic** input. The detoxification model will generate the **explanation** of why the input is toxic, as well as a **non-toxic** version. The paraphrase detector will analyze the semantic similarity of the toxic and non-toxic pair and generate a **warning** if the pair is not semantically equivalent (an illustration of non-detoxifiable case is depicted in Appendix D).

evolving nature (Davidson et al., 2017; Müller and Schwarz, 2017; Williams et al., 2019). In addition, the linguistic variation in how toxicity manifests itself across different platforms (Karan and Šnajder, 2018; Swamy et al., 2019; Salminen et al., 2020) poses a standing challenge for toxicity detection. Furthermore, the task of detecting toxic language, taken literally, can only offer deletion of toxic text. A more comprehensive approach to dealing with toxic text would be to rewrite the text to keep the useful content intact and eliminate toxicity, a task known as *detoxification* (Logacheva et al., 2022). Several works (Nogueira dos Santos et al., 2018; Dale et al., 2021) have already explored the idea of detoxification. More recently, Logacheva et al. (2022) propose *ParaDetox*, the first detoxification model developed with a crowd-sourced parallel corpus, which outperforms the unsupervised com-

petitors in the detoxification task.

Unfortunately, prior works focus on only a particular subproblem when tackling detoxification, overlooking other important aspects of the problem. For example, (1) previous works (Nogueira dos Santos et al., 2018; Dale et al., 2021) have only explored the idea of in-platform detoxification, meaning that the models are trained and tested on the same platforms, as opposed to cross-platform detoxification where the training platforms (e.g., Wikipedia, Reddit) are disjointed from the testing platforms (e.g., Facebook, Youtube). As a result, how the detoxification models would perform on different platforms and cope with the linguistic variation present across platforms is still an unexplored territory. (2) A second limitation of prior works is that they do not justify why a given input is found to be toxic (Logacheva et al., 2022). When we intend to deploy a detoxification model in the real-world, we also need to explain *why* we are altering a given toxic text. Therefore, we intend to incorporate explanation as a part of our system design to assist users engage in healthy communication, while enhancing transparency and the credibility of the system itself. Furthermore, (3) current works do not properly tackle *non-detoxifiability*, a phenomenon whereby a toxic text cannot be detoxified without altering the meaning. As a consequence, deploying a system without handling non-detoxifiability can make it ineffective in real-life scenarios. (4) Finally, even with the advent of generalized large language models (LLMs) (Taori et al., 2023; Chiang et al., 2023), the detoxification task remains challenging since instruction-tuned LLMs often refuse to respond to toxic input due to their safety requirements (Touvron et al., 2023) (see §5.2).

In this work, we offer a comprehensive and realistic detoxification framework that treats issues with prior detoxification literature. More specifically, we introduce GreenLLaMA, the first end-to-end framework for the detoxification task (Figure 1), focusing on piecing together our solutions for all issues discussed above. Given a toxic text, our detoxification model will first analyze and provide an explanation as to why the input is found toxic. Then, the model will attempt to detoxify and output the non-toxic version of the input. Unlike prior works (Dale et al., 2021; Logacheva et al., 2022), we additionally incorporate a dedicated paraphrase detector in our framework to tackle the cases of *non-detoxifiability*. If the input is non-detoxifiable, GreenLLaMA will prompt

an additional warning to the user regarding possible meaning alteration in the text. To train our detoxification models on cross-platform corpus, we first collect a wide array of annotated toxic and non-toxic data from different existing works. We then employ ChatGPT<sup>1</sup> (OpenAI, 2023a) through a meticulous prompt engineering approach to build a pseudo-parallel corpus.

Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

1. We propose GreenLLaMA, the first detoxification framework that tackles toxic language across different platforms as well as handles non-detoxifiability while providing explanation for the toxic input.
2. We develop the first cross-platform pseudo-parallel detoxification corpus with multi-step data processing and prompt engineering.
3. We empirically evaluate and compare our detoxification models against SoTA baselines. Our experiments show that GreenLLaMA outperforms SoTA in cross-platform detoxification, while our detoxification model *CoT-expl* LLaMA of GreenLLaMA achieves the best performance.
4. We train a unique paraphrase detector tailored for the detoxification task in order to handle the cases of non-detoxifiability. Our comparative evaluation against the SoTA paraphrase detectors clearly illustrates the necessity of such a specialized detector dedicated to the detoxification task.
5. We conduct an extensive experimental analysis to demonstrate the effectiveness of our cross-platform data as well as the robustness of GreenLLaMA against implicit and token-level adversarial toxicity.

## 2 Related Works

Over the years, several works have studied abusive language detection (Founta et al., 2018; Davidson et al., 2017; Golbeck et al., 2017; Waseem and Hovy, 2016). The task of text style transfer (TST) has also been explored in the field of NLP due to its wide range of applications (Shen et al., 2017; Rao and Tetreault, 2018; Patel et al., 2022a; Mukherjee et al., 2023). Notably, studies like Reif et al.

<sup>1</sup>gpt-3.5-turbo from June, 2023.




Figure 2: Overall methodology of GreenLLaMA. Initially, we collect the toxicity corpus from multiple platforms (§3.1). Then, we generate texts of opposite classes (§3.2). We filter out ambiguous data (§3.3). After that, we generate explanation and paraphrase labels (§3.4). Finally, we train the detoxification and the paraphrase detection models (§3.5).

(2022); Pu and Demberg (2023) show the effectiveness of LLMs for parallel data generation and style transfer tasks. Inspired by these works, we resort to use LLMs in our work for pseudo-parallel dataset creation and consequently distill the knowledge in comparatively smaller language models. We provide a detailed account of related works on abusive language detection and TST in Appendix A.

**Detoxification** is formulated as style transfer from toxic to neutral and non-toxic style (Logacheva et al., 2022). Prior works like Nogueira dos Santos et al. (2018) and Laugier et al. (2021) create their own detoxification corpus from Reddit and Jigsaw (Jigsaw, 2018), respectively. Dale et al. (2021) employ style-trained language models to guide a paraphraser preserve the content and remove toxicity. The authors further use the masked language modeling strategy of BERT (Devlin et al., 2019) to replace the toxic tokens with its non-toxic alternatives. Logacheva et al. (2022) develop a human-annotated parallel corpus from Jigsaw, X (formerly known as Twitter), and Reddit. The authors train a BART (Lewis et al., 2020) model on this parallel corpus and achieve the SoTA performance on detoxification, showing the importance of high quality parallel data. Recently, Dementieva et al. (2023) propose cross-lingual detoxification through simultaneous text translation and detoxification.

However, none of the prior works explore the idea of cross-platform detoxification potentially due to the scarcity of parallel data. This research gap motivates our work on this particular subproblem.

### 3 Proposed Methodology

We present our overall methodology in Figure 2. Now, we describe each component of our cross-platform detoxification framework.

#### 3.1 Data Collection

To create a cross-platform parallel detoxification corpus, we first compile datasets from a wide range of platforms. We collect the sources of the datasets primarily from Risch et al. (2021) and Vidgen and Derczynski (2020). Table 1 provides details of these datasets.

Dataset	Platform	Source	Toxic/Normal
wiki	Wikipedia	Wulczyn et al. (2017)	14,880 / 117,935
twitter	Twitter	Multiple*	77,656 / 55,159
fb-yt	Facebook & Youtube	Salminen et al. (2018)	2,364 / 858
stormfront	Stormfront	de Gibert et al. (2018)	1,364 / 9,507
fox	Fox News	Gao and Huang (2017)	435 / 1,093
reddit	Reddit	Qian et al. (2019)	2,511 / 11,073
convAI	ELIZA & CarbonBot	Cercas Curry et al. (2021)	128 / 725
hateCheck	Synthetic. Generated	Röttger et al. (2021)	2,563 / 1,165
gab	Gab	Qian et al. (2019)	15,270 / 656
yt_reddit	Youtube & Reddit	Mollas et al. (2020)	163 / 163

Table 1: List of experimental datasets with varying toxic/normal ratio and the corresponding platforms. \* *Twitter* dataset is collected from Waseem and Hovy (2016), Davidson et al. (2017), Jha and Mamidi (2017), ElSherief et al. (2018), Founta et al. (2018), Mathur et al. (2018), Basile et al. (2019), Mandl et al. (2019), Ousidhoum et al. (2019), and Zampieri et al. (2019).

Some datasets in Table 1 provide multi-class toxicity labeling such as *hate*, *offensive*, *accusation*. We label all of these classes as *toxic* and transform all the dataset into binary classification (*toxic* vs.

*non-toxic*). To keep the cost manageable and avoid overfitting, we randomly select at most 3,000 samples from each dataset.

### 3.2 Data Generation through Jailbreaking

While ChatGPT (OpenAI, 2023a) is developed with safety mechanisms to restrict the model’s behavior to be safe (OpenAI, 2023b), this restriction can be manipulated through careful engineering of prompts, a process known as *jailbreaking* (Li et al., 2023; Albert., 2023). In the context of language modeling, jailbreaking refers to the process of circumventing the restrictions placed on models (Liu et al., 2023). To train our models on cross-platform detoxification, we require parallel non-toxic as well as toxic data. Hence, we apply jailbreaking to design a prompt that can exploit ChatGPT to generate parallel toxic text given non-toxic version and vice versa. Our jailbreaking prompt includes the following components: (1) We first deliver toxic/non-toxic *input* to the model, (`{{ input }}`). (2) We then set the *task* of the model (e.g., *style/attribute transfer*). (3) We provide the *objective* of the model (e.g., *provide the parallel text of opposite label for the input text*). (4) We add explicit *constraints* to the model’s generation (e.g., *Do not explain or hallucinate*). (5) Finally, we define what the expected *response format* of the model is (e.g., *Do not include input text in response*). We present the template of our designed prompt in Figure 3a.

### 3.3 Data Filtration

Since distinguishing between toxic text e.g., offensive language and hate speech, is often deemed subjective (Sap et al., 2019; Koh et al., 2021), a text labeled *non-toxic* on one platform may be considered *toxic* on another platform. To avoid cross-platform ambiguity, we first train in-house platform-specific toxicity classifiers on six datasets (*fb-yt*, *fox*, *twitter*, *stormfront*, *wiki*, *hateCheck*) separately. After that we predict the toxicity of the parallel data in our corpus. We only select those samples where at least one classifier predicts the source text (a.k.a. toxic text) as *toxic* AND all the classifiers predict the target text (a.k.a. non-toxic text) as *non-toxic*. In other words, we filter out any toxic sample that is predicted to be *non-toxic* by all the classifiers and we also filter out any non-toxic sample that is predicted to be *toxic* by at least one classifier. Finally, to experiment with cross-platform detoxification, we select *wiki*, *reddit*, and *twitter* for training, *yt-reddit* and *fb-yt* for validation, and the rest of the

datasets for testing.

### 3.4 Explanation and Paraphrase Acquisition

To generate explanation using the models and train our models with Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting (Wei et al., 2022), we further generate the explanation of toxicity from ChatGPT. For this purpose, we prompt ChatGPT with the toxic texts from the filtered dataset (Section 3.3) and ask it why the given text is deemed toxic (Figure 3b). Similar to Section 3.2, we design a specific prompt instructing ChatGPT to describe the type of toxicity (e.g., personal or group attack). We also constrain ChatGPT to explain in at most three sentences. For paraphrase labeling, we first pass five manually labeled few-shot examples. Then, we provide both toxic and non-toxic parallel data to ChatGPT and prompt the model to analyze whether the text-pair is semantically similar (Figure 3c). We provide samples of our cross-platform pseudo-parallel dataset in Appendix H.

### 3.5 Model Training

We finetune both encoder-decoder and decoder-only models for detoxification. For encoder-decoder, we use BART (Lewis et al., 2020) and T5 (Raffel et al., 2019) with their base architectures. For decoder-only models, we finetune LLaMA-2 (Touvron et al., 2023) with 7B parameters. We train the models with direct toxic to non-toxic finetuning (*vanilla*) as well as prompt  $\oplus$  toxic to non-toxic finetuning (*prompt*), where we first give a prompt instructing the model to perform detoxification style transfer. We further employ CoT finetuning where the models are first instructed to generate explanation and then based on the toxic input incorporated with explanation, models generate the non-toxic version (CoT-expl). (See Figure K.1 for prompt template). To detect paraphrasing of a toxic and a non-toxic text pair, we further finetune a BERT (Devlin et al., 2019) classifier with the paraphrase labels generated by ChatGPT.

## 4 Experiments

**Models Compared.** (1) *SoTA Baseline*. ParaDetox, a BART-based model developed by Logacheva et al. (2022). (2) *\*-DSS*. BART and T5 models trained with SoTA distillation method proposed by Hsieh et al. (2023). (3) *Instruction-tuned*. Alpaca (Taori et al., 2023), LLaMA-2 (Chat) (Touvron et al., 2023), and Vicuna (Chiang et al., 2023). We use the correspond-




Figure 3: Prompt design for toxic, non-toxic parallel data generation (§3.2), explanation generation, and paraphrase labeling (§3.4) with ChatGPT.

ing 7B versions. (4) *Cross-Platform Models*. Our suite of models (BART, T5, and LLaMA-2-7B) trained on the cross-platform datasets (§3.5).

**Performance Metrics.** (1) *Accuracy*. We compute accuracy of the models based on the percentage of non-toxic outputs identified by the same RoBERTa style classifier as Logacheva et al. (2022). We provide accuracy measured by our in-house platforms (§3.3) in Appendix C. (2) *BERTScore*. We use BERTScore with SimCSE (Gao et al., 2021) RoBERTa-large model to compute how the models preserve the semantic meaning. (3) *Fluency*. Following Logacheva et al. (2022), we measure the percentage of fluent sentences identified by a RoBERTa-based classifier trained on the linguistic acceptability (CoLA) dataset (Warstadt et al., 2018). (4) *BLEU*. We compute the BLEU score between the input and the corresponding output.

We provide detailed information on the experiments including implementation details, baselines, and performance metrics in Appendix B.

## 5 Results

**Overview.** We present the performance of the models on cross-platform detoxification in Table 2. We observe that the LLM model LLaMA, finetuned with CoT explanation achieves better accuracy and BLEU score. We also notice that instruction-tuned generalized models attain almost perfect accuracy with very low BLEU score. We discuss the rationale in Section 5.2. Overall, our finetuned cross-platform models outperform the contemporary SoTA ParaDetox in terms of accuracy and BLEU score on the cross-platform dataset. We provide samples of models’ responses in Appendix J. We now present a detailed discussion on the performance of the various models.

### 5.1 Comparison with SoTA

We show the performance of the contemporary models (i.e., models with similar size to SoTA)

in Table 2. We find that both of our cross-platform finetuned BART and T5 outperform the SoTA ParaDetox on all metrics except BERTScore. The better BERTScore of ParaDetox can be attributed to its training dataset, which frequently transforms the toxic input with a minimal change (e.g., merely deleting the strong words) (Logacheva et al., 2022). It is to be noted that neither ParaDetox nor our models have seen data outside of Wikipedia, Reddit, and Twitter. However, our finetuned models still manage to exhibit superior performance compared to ParaDetox across the unseen platforms. We also find that DSS-based models outperform their respective explanation-based models in BLEU while lagging behind in terms of accuracy. This is potentially because DSS is finetuned on detoxified output and explanation in a multitask setup. Although this helps the model align with the detoxified output separately (higher BLEU), the method does not take explanation into account (e.g., why the input is toxic) while detoxifying (hence, lower accuracy).

### 5.2 Comparison to Instruction-Tuned LLMs

We compare our models’ performance against the instruction-tuned LLMs. We notice that LLaMA-Chat, Alpaca, and Vicuna achieve perfect accuracy in some of the platforms. However, all of them lack in BLEU and BERTScore compared to the finetuned models. This is because they give priority to generating non-toxic text over obeying input instructions that may involve toxic language. As a consequence, they often defy the instruction of detoxifying toxic inputs and frequently tend to produce generic statements such as: *I’m sorry, but I cannot fulfill this request as it contains inappropriate language*. This incapability of detoxification by the generalized LLMs can potentially be attributed to the safety requirements imposed during the pretraining and the consequent finetuning stages (Touvron et al., 2023). In other words, when-

Model	yt_reddit			fb_yt			fox news			comail			gab			hatecheck			stormfront			Overall										
	Acc	BS	FI	Acc	BS	FI	Acc	BS	FI	Acc	BS	FI	Acc	BS	FI	Acc	BS	FI	Acc	BS	FI	Acc	BS	FI								
ParaDetox	44.00	<b>97.43</b>	76.00	75.00	95.50	93.00	21.16	78.00	<b>97.37</b>	96.00	35.08	82.00	<b>95.93</b>	97.00	31.66	80.00	94.49	83.00	25.41	24.00	<b>98.02</b>	98.00	22.68	88.00	<b>96.83</b>	95.00	40.38	67.86	<b>96.51</b>	91.14	29.13	
TS-DSS	67.39	95.70	97.83	35.73	72.41	95.74	98.85	41.97	73.63	95.07	94.51	38.26	64.84	95.65	94.51	38.91	68.89	<b>95.41</b>	96.67	40.39	68.09	95.20	95.74	38.00	63.04	96.11	98.91	38.89	68.33	95.55	96.72	38.88
BART-DSS	82.61	93.61	93.48	39.32	94.25	93.78	98.85	47.45	86.81	94.04	95.60	43.64	84.62	93.84	98.90	42.51	81.11	93.79	98.89	47.26	82.98	93.81	<b>100.00</b>	40.96	88.04	94.06	98.91	43.55	85.77	93.85	97.80	43.53
TS-V	62.00	94.48	98.00	34.16	76.00	<b>96.23</b>	98.00	42.10	88.00	92.85	99.00	34.78	81.00	93.71	<b>100.00</b>	36.76	82.00	93.65	97.00	38.52	50.00	94.17	<b>100.00</b>	31.87	85.00	93.50	99.00	40.18	74.86	94.08	98.71	36.91
TS-P	70.00	91.37	94.00	32.93	80.00	93.97	99.00	40.84	87.00	91.46	98.00	37.24	80.00	91.71	99.00	35.93	78.00	91.74	96.00	38.89	46.00	90.50	99.00	30.42	87.00	90.50	99.00	39.91	75.43	91.61	97.71	36.59
CE	67.39	89.21	97.83	32.35	78.16	89.69	95.40	37.93	72.53	89.48	96.70	34.25	68.13	89.41	94.51	33.13	76.67	89.74	97.78	38.23	83.98	89.37	94.68	34.91	72.83	90.12	96.74	33.58	74.10	89.57	96.23	34.91
BART-V	88.00	92.88	98.00	38.14	96.00	94.48	99.00	45.85	93.00	94.48	<b>100.00</b>	41.50	89.00	93.00	99.00	34.11	90.00	92.55	93.00	41.06	73.00	93.58	99.00	34.31	92.00	94.24	99.00	45.43	88.71	93.60	98.14	40.06
BART-P	74.00	91.04	98.00	36.77	89.00	92.97	<b>100.00</b>	44.11	92.00	91.67	99.00	39.77	85.00	91.34	98.00	35.49	87.00	90.78	96.00	40.10	67.00	89.73	98.00	32.51	87.00	91.73	96.00	44.20	83.00	91.32	97.86	38.99
BART-CE	80.43	89.27	<b>100.00</b>	37.39	89.66	89.34	<b>100.00</b>	38.58	89.01	88.91	96.70	35.76	89.01	89.24	97.80	35.62	85.56	89.30	98.89	40.96	90.43	89.01	98.84	34.63	86.96	89.54	97.83	34.55	87.29	89.23	98.59	36.78
Alpaca	43.48	84.86	100.00	9.27	51.72	84.13	97.70	8.22	59.34	84.57	94.51	7.19	45.05	84.81	97.80	9.42	50.00	84.31	93.33	9.12	46.81	86.15	96.81	7.65	48.91	84.53	96.74	7.29	49.33	84.76	96.70	8.35
LLaMA-C	84.53	97.83	11.93	95.40	84.20	100.00	18.27	97.80	84.26	100.00	10.05	98.90	84.46	98.90	10.34	97.78	83.84	98.89	14.04	97.87	85.39	98.94	7.81	97.83	84.17	98.91	7.40	97.94	84.41	99.07	11.41	100.00
Vicuna	86.96	84.46	100.00	12.04	80.46	84.26	98.85	14.82	80.22	84.46	96.70	8.49	81.32	84.68	97.80	10.10	80.00	84.29	96.67	11.47	84.04	85.81	98.94	9.10	84.78	84.43	100.00	8.41	82.54	84.63	98.42	10.63
LLaMA-P	84.78	91.13	97.83	49.39	96.55	91.99	97.70	<b>67.89</b>	93.41	92.04	97.80	<b>60.71</b>	87.91	92.04	96.70	58.25	93.33	91.89	<b>100.00</b>	<b>61.47</b>	93.62	91.49	98.94	<b>57.05</b>	<b>94.57</b>	92.25	<b>100.00</b>	59.60	92.02	91.83	98.42	59.19
LLaMA-CE	<b>97.83</b>	83.61	97.83	<b>52.98</b>	<b>98.85</b>	86.65	97.70	67.54	<b>95.60</b>	87.23	98.90	58.44	<b>92.31</b>	88.80	97.80	<b>89.96</b>	<b>97.78</b>	91.67	98.89	61.27	<b>95.74</b>	89.46	98.94	54.86	93.48	90.14	98.91	<b>60.25</b>	<b>95.94</b>	88.22	98.42	<b>59.33</b>

Table 2: Performance of the models on cross-platform datasets. **Acc** = percentage of non-toxic outputs identified by a style classifier, **BS** = BERTScore, **FI** = Fluency, **BL** = BLEU Score. **V** = Vanilla, **P** = Prompt, **CE** = CoT-expl, **C** = Chat. **Bold** font represents the best performance for a particular metric. We separately show the best performance of the instruction-tuned models in Gray due to their inability to detoxification (Section 5.2).

ever these models observe a toxic input they tend to ignore the instruction of detoxifying the given input and often generate a safer statement. As a result, they receive high accuracy but very low BLEU score. Therefore, instruction-tuned models should not be deployed for the detoxification task without further finetuning, which also underscores the importance of training a dedicated instruction-tuned model for the detoxification task. We present a detailed discussion on the detoxification inability of the instruction-tuned LLMs in Appendix G.

### 5.3 Improvement through Explanations

As evident from Table 2, CoT-expl LLaMA outperforms LLaMA-prompt in terms of accuracy while the later achieves better BERTScore. CoT explanation first helps the models identify the specific words or semantics that turns a text into toxic (see Appendix K for samples of models’ generated explanation). As a consequence, during the style transfer process, the models can focus on removing/modifying those specific portions to alleviate toxicity. Therefore, CoT-expl helps the models achieve better accuracy. However, identification of toxicity in an input text also means altering that input text. Hence, CoT-expl models achieve inferior BERTScore than vanilla models. Considering the nature of the detoxification task, it is more important to produce non-toxic text even if that causes a few alterations to the input. Therefore, we prefer CoT-expl LLaMA model over the other models as the detoxification model of GreenLLaMA.

### 5.4 Performance on ParaDetox

We further compare the models’ performance against the human annotated parallel data. For this purpose, we evaluate the models on the test set of ParaDetox. As Table 3 shows, we beat SoTA on accuracy and fluency. ParaDetox achieves the best BERTScore and BLEU score on this test set, which

Model	Acc	BS	FI	BL
ParaDetox	90.16	<b>96.65</b>	88.52	<b>69.99</b>
TS-DSS	87.63	93.78	96.57	55.98
BART-DSS	92.10	93.68	96.27	52.38
TS-V	91.21	93.81	95.23	54.78
TS-P	89.42	93.97	94.93	55.47
TS-CE	88.23	94.04	95.38	56.39
BART-V	92.85	93.28	96.42	48.80
BART-P	93.59	93.81	95.68	53.46
BART-CE	93.29	93.01	96.72	48.74
Alpaca	64.98	94.36	96.72	54.23
LLaMA-C	95.83	88.80	97.76	23.29
Vicuna	77.65	90.43	97.91	29.63
LLaMA-P	93.89	92.72	<b>98.06</b>	42.55
LLaMA-CE	<b>94.04</b>	92.51	97.47	41.22

Table 3: Performance of the models on human annotated ParaDetox test set. **Acc** = percentage of non-toxic outputs identified by a style classifier, **BS** = BERTScore, **FI** = Fluency, **BL** = BLEU Score. **V** = Vanilla, **P** = Prompt, **CE** = CoT-expl, **C** = Chat. **Bold** font represents the best performance for a particular metric. We separately show the best performance of the instruction-tuned models in gray due to their inability to detoxification (Section 5.2).

is unsurprising since ParaDetox has already been trained on this dataset. Notably, our suite of finetuned models still shows comparable BERTScore, while even outperforming ParaDetox in terms of accuracy and fluency. This result indicates that although our dataset is artificially generated, the models trained on this dataset show impressive performance on human-annotated data, implying the usability of our dataset.

### 5.5 Paraphrase Detection

We test the paraphrase detection capability of our finetuned BERT by passing a set of parallel detoxifiable and non-detoxifiable texts. For this purpose, we sample human-annotated parallel data (detoxifiable) from ParaDetox (Logacheva et al., 2022). We also sample the human-labeled non-detoxifiable toxic data from ParaDetox and generate the corresponding non-toxic version with our finetuned detoxification model. Since the later set cannot be detoxified by humans, we consider these (toxic, non-toxic) pairs non-detoxifiable. We expect the

paraphrase detection model to distinguish among detoxifiable and non-detoxifiable texts so that our framework can warn the users in case meaning is altered. We compare our model’s performance against SoTA baselines finetuned on MRPC (Dolan and Brockett, 2005) paraphrase detection task.

Model	Accuracy	F <sub>1</sub> -score
BERT (Devlin et al., 2019)	79.33	80.88
RoBERTa (Liu et al., 2019b)	76.42	77.39
ELECTRA (Clark et al., 2020)	35.52	16.12
TextAttack-BERT (Morris et al., 2020)	34.55	29.21
TextAttack-RoBERTa (Morris et al., 2020)	28.96	13.61
Sentence-BERT (Reimers and Gurevych, 2019)	50.00	66.63
BERT (ours)	<b>82.73</b>	<b>83.13</b>

Table 4: Performance of the models on the paraphrase detection task. We compare our model’s performance against SoTA baselines finetuned on MRPC (Dolan and Brockett, 2005) dataset. **Bold** font represents the best performance for a particular metric.

We present results in Table 4. As evident, our paraphrase detector comfortably outperforms the SoTA baselines. This shows the importance of a dedicated paraphrase detector in our framework, since models trained on generic paraphrase datasets may fail to transfer their knowledge when comparing the semantic meaning between toxic/non-toxic pairs.

## 6 Analyses

### 6.1 Effectiveness of Cross-Platform Data

We further analyze how our cross-platform dataset improves models trained on human-annotated data. For this purpose, we take the finetuned ParaDetox model and continue training it on our cross-platform dataset with varying sample sizes (100 - 1000 samples). Then, we evaluate the performance of the models on the human-annotated ParaDetox test set.




Figure 4: Difference in accuracy and BLEU between Paradedtox finnetuned on our cross-platform dataset and the original Paradedtox. As is evident, our dataset helps the model improving accuracy and BLEU score.

Figure 4 shows the relative difference in accuracy and BLEU between the ParaDetox model trained on different sample sizes of our cross-platform dataset and the original ParaDetox model. As is evident, the finetuned models (up to sample size 700) tend to maintain higher BLEU score. Importantly, the model’s accuracy tends to increase with the increase in the sample size. The higher accuracy and BLEU score signify the models’ capability to detoxify input text while producing human-like non-toxic output, which indicates the effectiveness of our cross-platform dataset. We report the detailed results of the models trained on different sample sizes in Appendix F.

### 6.2 Performance on Implicit Hate Speech

To analyze the models’ behavior on implicit and adversarial hate speech datasets, we apply the models on ToxiGen (Hartvigsen et al., 2022), a machine-generated dataset containing implicit and adversarial hate speech targeting 13 minority groups. For the detoxification task, we select the human-annotated samples from the test set with toxicity ratings over 3 out of 5. We first generate a non-toxic version of this test set with ParaDetox and our detoxification models, then compute BERTScore as well as the non-toxic accuracy of the models using Toxicity\_RoBERTa and ToxiGen\_RoBERTa developed by Logacheva et al. (2022) and Hartvigsen et al. (2022), respectively.




Figure 5: Toxicity\_RoBERTa (accuracy), ToxiGen\_RoBERTa (accuracy), and BERTScore of the models on ToxiGen test set. Our cross-platform BART outperforms SoTA ParaDetox whereas the finetuned CoT-expl LLaMA exhibits the best accuracies.

As Figure 5 shows, our models produce less toxicity compared to the SoTA ParaDetox. Specifically, our finetuned BART performs better than ParaDetox, while CoT-expl LLaMA performs the best in terms of accuracy while maintaining an impressive BERTScore. The high accuracy of our

models on this implicit toxicity dataset signifies that GreenLLaMA is more capable of countering implicit hate speech than merely depending on searching and removing explicit toxic words.

### 6.3 Robustness of GreenLLaMA

**Curated token-level adversaries.** Due to censorship reasons, users tend to mask out specific portion of a strong word (e.g., ‘f#ck’, ‘sh\*t’, etc) while commenting on social platforms. Although these masked words are still understandable from a human perspective, how the models perceive these words is unclear. To study the models’ abilities in this scenario, we carefully curate a list of 15 texts containing different levels of masked words. We pass this list to the detoxification models to generate non-toxic versions and then manually inspect the outputs.

Models	Toxicity	ToxiGen
ParaDetox	93.32	84.88
BART-V ( <i>ours</i> )	96.86	95.1
LLaMA-CE ( <i>ours</i> )	<b>97.21</b>	<b>96.22</b>

Table 5: Performance of the models on the automated token-level adversaries. 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> columns represent the non-toxic performance using Toxicity\_RoBERTa and ToxiGen\_RoBERTa classifiers respectively.

We find that ParaDetox, our BART-V, and our LLaMA-CE produce two, eight, and 12 non-toxic and meaning-preserving responses, respectively (see Appendix D). We further notice that GreenLLaMA (LLaMA-CE) is more successful in identifying adversarial words and as a result produces non-toxic versions of the toxic texts.


**Large-scale, automated adversaries.** We additionally conduct a large-scale analysis on a generated list of 5,000 sentences (details are in Appendix E). We then calculate model accuracy using Toxicity\_RoBERTa and ToxiGen\_RoBERTa. Table 5 shows LLaMA-CE exhibits the highest accuracy followed by BART-V. This further substantiates the usefulness of our dataset as well as the detoxification models finetuned on this dataset in the identification of adversarial toxic words.

## 7 Human Evaluation

We also perform human evaluation on the models’ responses to capture subtleties of detoxification that automated metrics may overlook.

**Evaluation Setup.** Following Wang et al. (2022); Wu et al. (2023); Khondaker et al. (2023b), we

implement a four-level (A, B, C, D) rating system to measure the detoxification responses from the model. To handle non-detoxifiability, we incorporate two additional ratings, namely, N and T. Briefly, N denotes non-toxic, content-focused output whereas T denotes toxic or generic statements. We randomly sample 200 texts from our cross-platform dataset and ask two pairs of fluent English speakers (total = 4) to rate models’ responses. Hence, each response is independently evaluated by two humans (Appendix L for details).



(a) Human evaluation on models’ response for detoxifiable inputs.

(b) Human evaluation on models’ response for non-detoxifiable inputs.

Figure 6: Evaluation of the models’ responses by human. A is the best, and D is the worst rating for detoxifiable input. N is the good and T is the bad rating for non-detoxifiable input.

**Results.** We report the results in Figure 6 (Cohen’s kappa inter-annotator agreement > 0.6). We find that detoxification responses produced by GreenLLaMA (LLaMA-CE) and BART-V are rated as mostly of fine quality. Specifically, our GreenLLaMA (67.50%) and BART-V (65.62%) provide more non-toxic and meaning-preserving responses (ratings A and B) compared to the SoTA ParaDetox model (40.63%). For non-detoxifiable input, GreenLLaMA exhibits more robustness and generates 55% less toxic output than ParaDetox.

## 8 Conclusion

In this work, we propose GreenLLaMA, a comprehensive end-to-end detoxification framework to tackle toxic language across multiple platforms. We generate a novel cross-platform pseudo-parallel corpus through multi-step data processing and generation with ChatGPT. We train a suite of detoxification models that outperform SoTA detoxification models across all the platforms. We additionally introduce explanation into the GreenLLaMA framework for maintaining trustworthiness. We also develop a dedicated paraphrase detector to handle the cases of non-detoxifiability. Through an extensive experimental analysis, we further show the effectiveness of our cross-platform data as well as the robustness of GreenLLaMA against implicit and token-level adversarial toxicity.



## 9 Limitations and Ethics Statement

### 9.1 Limitations

**Data Generation Process.** In this work, we use ChatGPT, a gpt-3.5-turbo version from June, 2023. Since the model can be updated on a regular interval, the prompting strategy and the data generation pipeline discussed in Section 3 should be treated accordingly, since the model’s responses can change over time (Chen et al., 2023).

**Data Quality.** We propose an automated data generation pipeline to create a pseudo-parallel cross-platform corpus (§3). Our synthetic data generation process involves multi-stage data processing without the necessity of direct human inspection. Although this automated pipeline makes the overall data generation process scalable, it comes at the risk of allowing low-quality data in our cross-platform corpus. Hence, we suggest human inspection to remove any sort of potential vulnerability and maintain a standard quality of the corpus. Additionally, we combine datasets from multiple platforms. Since the toxicity nature of language is often deemed as subjective (Sap et al., 2019; Koh et al., 2021), the level of toxicity may vary across the platforms based on the context.

**Model Responses.** We show that GreenLLaMA exhibits impressive ability in generating detoxified responses. However, looking at the results (§5), we believe there is still room for improvement for the models in terms of producing meaning-preserved detoxified outcomes. Moreover, as evident from our analyses in Section 6.2 and Section 6.3, models can be vulnerable to implicit, adversarial tokens and continue to produce toxic content. Therefore, we recommend that GreenLLaMA should be couched with caution before deployment.

**Model Evaluation.** We use four automated metrics (Accuracy, BERTScore, Fluency, and BLEU) to evaluate our models. As noticeable from Section 5, depending on a single metric to measure the models’ performance can be deceptive. Since detoxification is a form of style transfer task and there is still a lack of an effective method for aggregating the aforementioned metrics (Ostheimer et al., 2023), we suggest not depending on a particular metric and looking at the performance of models holistically.

**Findings.** Some of our findings suggest that instruction-tuned LLMs often deny following instructions while dealing with toxic input (§5.2) and produce a generic statement. We hypothesize it

may be the case because of the safety measurement imposed on these models. This scenario can occur for some particular tasks like detoxification that require handling toxic inputs. However, we believe that further instruction-tuning of these models on tasks like detoxification can alleviate the problem.

### 9.2 Ethics Statement

**Data Collection and Release.** As mentioned in Section 3.1, we compile datasets from a wide range of platforms. The sources of the datasets are primarily collected from Risch et al. (2021) and Vidgen and Derczynski (2020). To ensure proper credit assignment, we refer users to the original publications in Table 1. We create the cross-platform detoxification corpus for academic research purposes. We will share the corpus we used for training GreenLLaMA upon acceptance. We would also like to mention that some content of Figure 1 and Figure 2 are generated using GPT-4 for illustration purposes.

**Intended Use.** The intended use of GreenLLaMA is for the detoxification tasks. We will share the framework upon acceptance. We aim to help researchers to build an end-to-end complete detoxification framework. GreenLLaMA can also be regarded as a promising baseline to develop more robust and effective detoxification frameworks.

**Potential Misuse and Bias.** Our detoxification corpus and models can potentially be misused to generate toxic and biased content. For these reasons, we recommend that GreenLLaMA not be used in applications without careful prior consideration of potential misuse and bias.

## References

- Alex Albert. 2023. Jailbreak chat. <https://www.jailbreakchat.com>. Accessed: 2023-11-21.
- Valerio Basile, Cristina Bosco, Elisabetta Fersini, Debora Nozza, Viviana Patti, Francisco Manuel Rangel Pardo, Paolo Rosso, and Manuela Sanguinetti. 2019. *SemEval-2019 task 5: Multilingual detection of hate speech against immigrants and women in Twitter*. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation*, pages 54–63, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tom B Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. *Language models are few-shot learners*. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.14165*.

- Amanda Cercas Curry, Gavin Abercrombie, and Verena Rieser. 2021. [ConvAbuse: Data, analysis, and benchmarks for nuanced abuse detection in conversational AI](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 7388–7403, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Lingjiao Chen, Matei Zaharia, and James Zou. 2023. How is chatgpt’s behavior changing over time? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09009*.
- Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Ion Stoica, and Eric P. Xing. 2023. [Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%\\* chatgpt quality](#).
- Kevin Clark, Minh-Thang Luong, Quoc V. Le, and Christopher D. Manning. 2020. [ELECTRA: pre-training text encoders as discriminators rather than generators](#). In *8th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2020, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, April 26-30, 2020*. OpenReview.net.
- M. Dadvar, Rudolf Berend Trieschnigg, Roeland J.F. Ordelman, and Franciska M.G. de Jong. 2013. [Improving cyberbullying detection with user context](#). In *Proceedings of the 35th European Conference on IR Research, ECIR 2013, Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 693–696, Netherlands. Springer.
- David Dale, Igor Markov, Varvara Logacheva, Olga Kozlova, Nikita Semenov, and Alexander Panchenko. 2021. [SkoltechNLP at SemEval-2021 task 5: Leveraging sentence-level pre-training for toxic span detection](#). In *Proceedings of the 15th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2021)*, pages 927–934, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Thomas Davidson, Dana Warmusley, Michael Macy, and Ingmar Weber. 2017. [Automated hate speech detection and the problem of offensive language](#). *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, 11(1):512–515.
- Ona de Gibert, Naiara Perez, Aitor García-Pablos, and Montse Cuadros. 2018. [Hate speech dataset from a white supremacy forum](#). In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Abusive Language Online (ALW2)*, pages 11–20, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Daryna Dementieva, Daniil Moskovskiy, David Dale, and Alexander Panchenko. 2023. [Exploring methods for cross-lingual text style transfer: The case of text detoxification](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2311.13937.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- William B. Dolan and Chris Brockett. 2005. [Automatically constructing a corpus of sentential paraphrases](#). In *Proceedings of the Third International Workshop on Paraphrasing (IWP2005)*.
- Mai ElSherief, Vivek Kulkarni, Dana Nguyen, William Yang Wang, and Elizabeth Belding. 2018. [Hate lingo: A target-based linguistic analysis of hate speech in social media](#). *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, 12(1).
- Paula Fortuna, Juan Soler, and Leo Wanner. 2020. [Toxic, hateful, offensive or abusive? what are we really classifying? an empirical analysis of hate speech datasets](#). In *Proceedings of the Twelfth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 6786–6794, Marseille, France. European Language Resources Association.
- Antigoni Founta, Constantinos Djouvas, Despoina Chatzakou, Ilias Leontiadis, Jeremy Blackburn, Gianluca Stringhini, Athena Vakali, Michael Sirivianos, and Nicolas Kourtellis. 2018. [Large scale crowdsourcing and characterization of twitter abusive behavior](#). *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, 12(1).
- Lei Gao and Ruihong Huang. 2017. [Detecting online hate speech using context aware models](#). In *Proceedings of the International Conference Recent Advances in Natural Language Processing, RANLP 2017*, pages 260–266, Varna, Bulgaria. INCOMA Ltd.
- Tianyu Gao, Xingcheng Yao, and Danqi Chen. 2021. [SimCSE: Simple contrastive learning of sentence embeddings](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 6894–6910, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jennifer Golbeck, Zahra Ashktorab, Rashad O. Banjo, Alexandra Berlinger, Siddharth Bhagwan, Cody Buntain, Paul Cheakalos, Alicia A. Geller, Quint Gregory, Rajesh Kumar Gnanasekaran, Raja Rajan Gunasekaran, Kelly M. Hoffman, Jenny Hottle, Vichita Jienjiltert, Shivika Khare, Ryan Lau, Marianna J. Martindale, Shalmali Naik, Heather L. Nixon, Piyush Ramachandran, Kristine M. Rogers, Lisa Rogers, Meghna Sardana Sarin, Gaurav Shahane, Jayanee Thanki, Priyanka Vengataraman, Zijian Wan, and Derek Michael Wu. 2017. [A large labeled corpus for online harassment research](#). In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM on Web Science Conference, WebSci ’17*, page 229–233, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Hongyu Gong, Suma Bhat, Lingfei Wu, JinJun Xiong, and Wen-mei Hwu. 2019. [Reinforcement learning](#)

- based text style transfer without parallel training corpus. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 3168–3180, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tommi Gröndahl, Luca Pajola, Mika Juuti, Mauro Conti, and N. Asokan. 2018. All you need is "love": Evading hate speech detection. *AISec '18*, page 2–12, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Skyler Hallinan, Faeze Brahman, Ximing Lu, Jaehun Jung, Sean Welleck, and Yejin Choi. 2023. Steer: Unified style transfer with expert reinforcement. *ArXiv*, abs/2311.07167.
- Thomas Hartvigsen, Saadia Gabriel, Hamid Palangi, Maarten Sap, Dipankar Ray, and Ece Kamar. 2022. ToxiGen: A large-scale machine-generated dataset for adversarial and implicit hate speech detection. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3309–3326, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Cheng-Yu Hsieh, Chun-Liang Li, Chih-kuan Yeh, Hootan Nakhost, Yasuhisa Fujii, Alex Ratner, Ranjay Krishna, Chen-Yu Lee, and Tomas Pfister. 2023. Distilling step-by-step! outperforming larger language models with less training data and smaller model sizes. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 8003–8017, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Akshita Jha and Radhika Mamidi. 2017. When does a compliment become sexist? analysis and classification of ambivalent sexism using twitter data. In *Proceedings of the Second Workshop on NLP and Computational Social Science*, pages 7–16, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jigsaw. 2018. Jigsaw toxic comment classification. <https://www.kaggle.com/c/jigsaw-toxic-comment-classification-challenge>. Accessed: 2023-11-21.
- David Jurgens, Libby Hemphill, and Eshwar Chandrasekharan. 2019. A just and comprehensive strategy for using NLP to address online abuse. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3658–3666, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mladen Karan and Jan Šnajder. 2018. Cross-domain detection of abusive language online. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Abusive Language Online (ALW2)*, pages 132–137, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Md Tawkat Islam Khondaker, Muhammad Abdulmageed, and Laks Lakshmanan, V.s. 2023a. Cross-platform and cross-domain abusive language detection with supervised contrastive learning. In *The 7th Workshop on Online Abuse and Harms (WOAH)*, pages 96–112, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Md Tawkat Islam Khondaker, Abdul Waheed, El Moatez Billah Nagoudi, and Muhammad Abdulmageed. 2023b. GPTAraEval: A comprehensive evaluation of ChatGPT on Arabic NLP. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 220–247, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Pang Wei Koh, Shiori Sagawa, Henrik Marklund, Sang Michael Xie, Marvin Zhang, Akshay Balsubramani, Weihua Hu, Michihiro Yasunaga, Richard Lanus Phillips, Irena Gao, Tony Lee, Etienne David, Ian Stavness, Wei Guo, Berton Earnshaw, Imran Haque, Sara M Beery, Jure Leskovec, Anshul Kundaje, Emma Pierson, Sergey Levine, Chelsea Finn, and Percy Liang. 2021. Wilds: A benchmark of in-the-wild distribution shifts. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 5637–5664. PMLR.
- Léo Laugier, John Pavlopoulos, Jeffrey Sorensen, and Lucas Dixon. 2021. Civil rephrases of toxic texts with self-supervised transformers. In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume*, pages 1442–1461, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Veselin Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2020. BART: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7871–7880, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Haoran Li, Dadi Guo, Wei Fan, Mingshi Xu, Jie Huang, and Yangqiu Song. 2023. Multi-step jailbreaking privacy attacks on chatgpt. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ao Liu, An Wang, and Naoaki Okazaki. 2022a. Semi-supervised formality style transfer with consistency training. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4689–4701, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ping Liu, Wen Li, and Liang Zou. 2019a. NULI at SemEval-2019 task 6: Transfer learning for offensive language detection using bidirectional transformers. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Workshop*

- on *Semantic Evaluation*, pages 87–91, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ruibo Liu, Chongyang Gao, Chenyan Jia, Guangxuan Xu, and Soroush Vosoughi. 2022b. [Non-parallel text style transfer with self-parallel supervision](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Yi Liu, Gelei Deng, Zhengzi Xu, Yuekang Li, Yaowen Zheng, Ying Zhang, Lida Zhao, Tianwei Zhang, and Yang Liu. 2023. [Jailbreaking chatgpt via prompt engineering: An empirical study](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2305.13860.
- Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019b. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*.
- Varvara Logacheva, Daryna Dementieva, Sergey Ustyantsev, Daniil Moskovskiy, David Dale, Irina Krotova, Nikita Semenov, and Alexander Panchenko. 2022. [ParaDetox: Detoxification with parallel data](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6804–6818, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Aman Madaan, Amrith Setlur, Tanmay Parekh, Barnabas Poczos, Graham Neubig, Yiming Yang, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, Alan W Black, and Shrimai Prabhumoye. 2020. [Politeness transfer: A tag and generate approach](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1869–1881, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Thomas Mandl, Sandip Modha, Prasenjit Majumder, Daksh Patel, Mohana Dave, Chintak Mandlia, and Aditya Patel. 2019. [Overview of the hasoc track at fire 2019: Hate speech and offensive content identification in indo-european languages](#). FIRE ’19, page 14–17, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Puneet Mathur, Ramit Sawhney, Meghna Ayyar, and Rajiv Shah. 2018. [Did you offend me? classification of offensive tweets in Hindi language](#). In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Abusive Language Online (ALW2)*, pages 138–148, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ioannis Mollas, Zoe Chrysopoulou, Stamatis Karlos, and Grigorios Tsoumakas. 2020. [Ethos: an online hate speech detection dataset](#). *Complex & Intelligent Systems*.
- John Morris, Eli Lifland, Jin Yong Yoo, Jake Grigsby, Di Jin, and Yanjun Qi. 2020. Textattack: A framework for adversarial attacks, data augmentation, and adversarial training in nlp. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 119–126.
- Sourabrata Mukherjee, Vojtěch Hudeček, and Ondřej Dušek. 2023. [Polite chatbot: A text style transfer application](#). In *Proceedings of the 17th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Student Research Workshop*, pages 87–93, Dubrovnik, Croatia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Karsten Müller and Carlo Schwarz. 2017. [Fanning the flames of hate: Social media and hate crime](#). *SSRN Electronic Journal*.
- Tong Niu and Mohit Bansal. 2018. [Polite dialogue generation without parallel data](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 6:373–389.
- Cicero Nogueira dos Santos, Igor Melnyk, and Inkit Padhi. 2018. [Fighting offensive language on social media with unsupervised text style transfer](#). In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 189–194, Melbourne, Australia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- OpenAI. 2023a. Chatgpt. <https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt>. Accessed: 2023-11-21.
- OpenAI. 2023b. Moderation. <https://platform.openai.com/docs/guides/moderation>. Accessed: 2023-11-21.
- Phil Ostheimer, Mayank Kumar Nagda, Marius Kloft, and Sophie Fellenz. 2023. [A call for standardization and validation of text style transfer evaluation](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 10791–10815, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nedjma Ousidhoum, Zizheng Lin, Hongming Zhang, Yangqiu Song, and Dit-Yan Yeung. 2019. [Multi-lingual and multi-aspect hate speech analysis](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 4675–4684, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ajay Patel, Nicholas Andrews, and Chris Callison-Burch. 2022a. [Low-resource authorship style transfer with in-context learning](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2212.08986.
- Ajay Patel, Nicholas Andrews, and Chris Callison-Burch. 2022b. [Low-resource authorship style transfer with in-context learning](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2212.08986.
- Dongqi Pu and Vera Demberg. 2023. [ChatGPT vs human-authored text: Insights into controllable text summarization and sentence style transfer](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 4: Student Research Workshop)*, pages 1–18, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Jing Qian, Anna Bethke, Yinyin Liu, Elizabeth Belding, and William Yang Wang. 2019. [A benchmark dataset for learning to intervene in online hate speech](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 4755–4764, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Colin Raffel, Noam M. Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. 2019. [Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer](#). *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 21:140:1–140:67.
- Sudha Rao and Joel Tetreault. 2018. [Dear sir or madam, may I introduce the GYAFC dataset: Corpus, benchmarks and metrics for formality style transfer](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, pages 129–140, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Machel Reid and Victor Zhong. 2021. [LEWIS: Levenshtein editing for unsupervised text style transfer](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, pages 3932–3944, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Emily Reif, Daphne Ippolito, Ann Yuan, Andy Coenen, Chris Callison-Burch, and Jason Wei. 2022. [A recipe for arbitrary text style transfer with large language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 837–848, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. [Sentence-bert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Manoel Horta Ribeiro, Pedro H Calais, Yuri A Santos, Virgílio AF Almeida, and Wagner Meira Jr. 2018. [Characterizing and detecting hateful users on twitter](#). In *Twelfth international AAAI conference on web and social media*.
- Julian Risch, Philipp Schmidt, and Ralf Krestel. 2021. [Data integration for toxic comment classification: Making more than 40 datasets easily accessible in one unified format](#). In *Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Online Abuse and Harms (WOAH 2021)*, pages 157–163, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Paul Röttger, Bertie Vidgen, Dong Nguyen, Zeerak Waseem, Helen Margetts, and Janet Pierrehumbert. 2021. [HateCheck: Functional tests for hate speech detection models](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 41–58, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Joni Salminen, Hind Almerexhi, Milica Milenković, Soon-gyo Jung, Jisun An, Haewoon Kwak, and Bernard Jansen. 2018. [Anatomy of online hate: Developing a taxonomy and machine learning models for identifying and classifying hate in online news media](#). *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, 12(1).
- Joni O. Salminen, Maximilian Hopf, S. A. Chowdhury, Soon-Gyo Jung, Hind Almerexhi, and Bernard Jim Jansen. 2020. [Developing an online hate classifier for multiple social media platforms](#). *Human-centric Computing and Information Sciences*, 10:1–34.
- Maarten Sap, Dallas Card, Saadia Gabriel, Yejin Choi, and Noah A. Smith. 2019. [The risk of racial bias in hate speech detection](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1668–1678, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Anna Schmidt and Michael Wiegand. 2017. [A survey on hate speech detection using natural language processing](#). In *Proceedings of the Fifth International Workshop on Natural Language Processing for Social Media*, pages 1–10, Valencia, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tianxiao Shen, Tao Lei, Regina Barzilay, and Tommi Jaakkola. 2017. [Style transfer from non-parallel text by cross-alignment](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Rakshith Shetty, Bernt Schiele, and Mario Fritz. 2017. [A4nt: Author attribute anonymity by adversarial training of neural machine translation](#). In *USENIX Security Symposium*.
- Steve Durairaj Swamy, Anupam Jamatia, and Björn Gambäck. 2019. [Studying generalisability across abusive language detection datasets](#). In *Proceedings of the 23rd Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning (CoNLL)*, pages 940–950, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. 2023. Stanford alpaca: An instruction-following llama model. [https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford\\_alpaca](https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford_alpaca).
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin R. Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, Daniel M. Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Cantón Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami,

- Naman Goyal, Anthony S. Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabsa, Isabel M. Kloumann, A. V. Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Mihaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, R. Subramanian, Xia Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zhengxu Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan, Melanie Kambadur, Sharan Narang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas Scialom. 2023. [Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2307.09288.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. [Attention is all you need](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Bertie Vidgen and Leon Derczynski. 2020. [Directions in abusive language training data, a systematic review: Garbage in, garbage out](#). *PLoS ONE*, 15(12):e0243300.
- Ke Wang, Hang Hua, and Xiaojun Wan. 2019. [Controllable unsupervised text attribute transfer via editing entangled latent representation](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Yizhong Wang, Yeganeh Kordi, Swaroop Mishra, Alisa Liu, Noah A. Smith, Daniel Khashabi, and Hananeh Hajishirzi. 2022. [Self-instruct: Aligning language model with self generated instructions](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2212.10560.
- William Warner and Julia Hirschberg. 2012. [Detecting hate speech on the world wide web](#). In *Proceedings of the Second Workshop on Language in Social Media, LSM '12*, page 19–26, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alex Warstadt, Amanpreet Singh, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2018. [Neural network acceptability judgments](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 7:625–641.
- Zeerak Waseem and Dirk Hovy. 2016. [Hateful symbols or hateful people? predictive features for hate speech detection on Twitter](#). In *Proceedings of the NAACL Student Research Workshop*, pages 88–93, San Diego, California. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, brian ichter, Fei Xia, Ed H. Chi, Quoc V Le, and Denny Zhou. 2022. [Chain of thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Matthew L Williams, Pete Burnap, Amir Javed, Han Liu, and Sefa Ozalp. 2019. [Hate in the Machine: Anti-Black and Anti-Muslim Social Media Posts as Predictors of Offline Racially and Religiously Aggravated Crime](#). *The British Journal of Criminology*, 60(1):93–117.
- Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Remi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, Joe Davison, Sam Shleifer, Patrick von Platen, Clara Ma, Yacine Jernite, Julien Plu, Canwen Xu, Teven Le Scao, Sylvain Gugger, Mariama Drame, Quentin Lhoest, and Alexander Rush. 2020. [Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 38–45, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Minghao Wu, Abdul Waheed, Chiyu Zhang, Muhammad Abdul-Mageed, and Alham Fikri Aji. 2023. [Lamini-lm: A diverse herd of distilled models from large-scale instructions](#).
- Ellery Wulczyn, Nithum Thain, and Lucas Dixon. 2017. [Ex machina: Personal attacks seen at scale](#). In *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on World Wide Web*, pages 1391–1399.
- Jun-Ming Xu, Kwang-Sung Jun, Xiaojin Zhu, and Amy Bellmore. 2012. [Learning from bullying traces in social media](#). In *Proceedings of the 2012 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 656–666, Montréal, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Marcos Zampieri, Shervin Malmasi, Preslav Nakov, Sara Rosenthal, Noura Farra, and Ritesh Kumar. 2019. [Predicting the type and target of offensive posts in social media](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 1415–1420, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yi Zhang, Tao Ge, and Xu Sun. 2020. [Parallel data augmentation for formality style transfer](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3221–3228, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

# Appendices

## A Related Works

### A.1 Abusive Language Detection

Over the years, the task of abusive language detection has been studied in NLP in the form of hate speech (Founta et al., 2018; Davidson et al., 2017; Golbeck et al., 2017), sexism/racism (Waseem and Hovy, 2016), cyberbullying (Xu et al., 2012; Dadvar et al., 2013). Earlier works in abusive language detection depend on feature-based approaches to identify the lexical difference between abusive and non-abusive language (Warner and Hirschberg, 2012; Waseem and Hovy, 2016; Ribeiro et al., 2018). Recently, Transformer-based (Vaswani et al., 2017) architectures like BERT (Devlin et al., 2019), RoBERTa (Liu et al., 2019b) have been introduced in the abusive language detection task (Liu et al., 2019a; Swamy et al., 2019). However, the study of Vidgen and Derczynski (2020) raises the concern that most of the prior works on abusive language detection focus on a single platform due to the inaccessibility to multiple platforms and thus, do not scale well on other platforms Schmidt and Wiegand (2017). As a result, Karan and Šnajder (2018); Gröndahl et al. (2018) point out that the models are not suitable to apply to other platforms due to the lack of generalization. To alleviate this issue, Khondaker et al. (2023a) more recently propose a meta-learning algorithm to detect abusive language across different platforms.

### A.2 Text Style Transfer

Text style transfer (TST) refers to rephrasing the style of a source text (e.g. sentiment, politeness) into a target style while changing the meaning of the input as little as possible (Reid and Zhong, 2021). TST has been explored in the field of NLP due to its applications in sentiment transfer (Shen et al., 2017), formality transfer (Rao and Tetreault, 2018), authorship attribute transfer (Shetty et al., 2017; Patel et al., 2022a), or increasing politeness (Niu and Bansal, 2018; Madaan et al., 2020; Mukherjee et al., 2023). The lack of parallel datasets is one of the main bottlenecks for TST tasks (Liu et al., 2022b). To alleviate this challenge, several unsupervised methods have been proposed (Zhang et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2022b). Specifically, Liu et al. (2022a) create a pseudo-parallel corpus via data augmentation to circumvent the lack of human-annotated parallel data.

Prior works (Gong et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2019) also resort to an auxiliary classifier to guide the style of the generated text. With the advancement of large language models (LLMs), recent works (Patel et al., 2022b; Pu and Demberg, 2023) employ LLMs like GPT-3 (Brown et al., 2020) for parallel data generation and style transfer tasks. Studies like Reif et al. (2022) show the effectiveness of LLMs in TST, while Hallinan et al. (2023) remove the cost of human supervision by creating a synthetic pseudo-parallel style transfer dataset with reinforcement learning.

## B Experimental Details

### B.1 Models Comparison

**SoTA Baseline.** We compare our models with the state-of-the-art detoxification model, **ParaDetox** (Logacheva et al., 2022); a BART-based model finetuned on crowdsourced parallel detoxification corpus. The model is trained on three platforms, namely, Jigsaw (Jigsaw, 2018) (Wikipedia’s talk edit page), Reddit, and Twitter (now known as X). We evaluate this model without further finetuning on our dataset to determine the efficacy of the model on the cross-platform detoxification task.

**\*-DSS.** We additionally compare our models with SoTA distillation method, *Distilling Step-by-Step* (DSS) proposed by Hsieh et al. (2023). We use DSS method to distill both detoxification and explanation coming from ChatGPT into BART and T5 models. Following the work, we use a multitask framework to combine the training of generating both non-toxic version and explanation from the models given a toxic input.

**Instruction-tuned.** We evaluate the performance of generic instruction-tuned models like Alpaca (Taori et al., 2023), instruction-tuned LLaMA (Chat) (Touvron et al., 2023), and Vicuna (Chiang et al., 2023) on the cross-platform detoxification tasks. We use the corresponding 7B versions for all the models. These models are already finetuned on a wide range of generic tasks. Hence, we omit these models from further finetuning on our cross-platform dataset to examine the generalizability of these models.

**Cross-Platform Models.** We finetune a suit of models on the cross-platform datasets. In particular, we finetune BART and T5 to directly compare against the contemporary SoTA (e.g., ParaDetox). We further finetune LLM like LLaMA to observe the performance of LLM as well as

compare against generic instruction-tuned models (e.g., Alpaca). As discussed in Section 3.5, we finetune our models in multiple setups. For T5 and BART, we (1) direct finetune the model to generate non-toxic version given the toxic version (vanilla); (2) concatenate a prompt with toxic version as the model input (prompt); (3) employ CoT finetuning to instruct the model explain why the given input is toxic before generating the non-toxic version (CoT-expl). For LLaMA finetuning, we use the two variations mentioned above namely, (1) prompt and (2) CoT-expl.

## B.2 Performance Metrics

We report the models’ performance on seven unseen platforms (Table 2) as well as the overall average performance across the platforms. We evaluate the models based on the following metrics.

**Accuracy.** Following Logacheva et al. (2022), we compute the accuracy of the models based on the percentage of non-toxic outputs identified by a style classifier. We use the same RoBERTa style classifier as the authors.

**BERTScore.** We use BERTScore to compute how the models preserve the semantic meaning. Specifically, we utilize SimCSE (Gao et al., 2021) RoBERTa-large model to obtain the embeddings of the input-output pair and then measure the similarity between them.

**Fluency.** Following Logacheva et al. (2022), we measure the percentage of fluent sentences identified by a RoBERTa-based classifier trained on the linguistic acceptability (CoLA) dataset (Warstadt et al., 2018).

**BLEU.** We compute the BLEU score between the generated non-toxic version and the original non-toxic version on the test set.

## B.3 Implementation Details

For finetuning cross-platform detoxification models, we use pretrained models (T5-base, BART-base, and LLaMA-2-7b) from Huggingface (Wolf et al., 2020). We set the maximum source length of 128 tokens for T5, BART and 512 tokens for LLaMA. We set the maximum target length to 256 with explanation and 128 without explanation for T5, BART. On the other hand, we use the maximum target length of 512 for LLaMA for both cases. We use a batch size of 32 for T5, BART and a batch size of 8 with the gradient accumulation step of 8 for LLaMA. For all the models, we set the learning rate to  $3e-5$  with *cosine* scheduler and a warmup

ratio of 0.03. We train T5 and BART for 15 epochs while LLaMA for 10 epochs and choose the best respective models based on the validation set performance. We use 1 Nvidia A100 40GB GPU to train T5, BART and 4 Nvidia A100 40GB GPUs to train LLaMA.

For finetuning the paraphrase detection model, We use the pretrained BERT-base (uncased) from Huggingface (Wolf et al., 2020) as the backbone architectures. We set the maximum sequence length to 128 for both toxic and non-toxic input pairs. We use a batch size of 32 and a learning rate of  $5e-5$ . We train the models for 50 epochs and select the best models based on the models’ validation set performance.

## C GreenLLaMA Across Platforms

We evaluate the accuracy of non-toxicity generated by the models using the corresponding in-platform classifiers. For this purpose, we use the six in-house classifiers (Section 3.3) to compute the accuracy of their respective datasets.

Model	Overall	wikipedia	twitter	fb_yt	HateCheck	stormfront	convAI
ParaDetox	82.76	100.00	79.43	63.05	78.67	86.48	88.95
T5-DSS	84.14	100.00	77.28	64.82	90.47	88.38	83.87
BART-DSS	92.53	100.00	90.58	82.83	93.19	93.61	94.97
T5-V	87.95	100.00	84.29	73.71	89.24	90.76	89.71
T5-P	87.83	100.00	83.52	73.24	90.19	91.24	88.76
T5-CE	85.55	100.00	80.42	69.01	88.80	90.16	84.92
BART-V	94.54	100.00	94.38	88.10	93.62	95.14	96.00
BART-P	92.49	100.00	91.62	82.57	91.90	93.90	94.95
BART-CE	92.79	100.00	91.62	84.50	91.94	93.72	94.97
LLaMA-P	95.74	100.00	94.76	91.10	95.39	95.92	97.28
LLaMA-CE	<b>96.93</b>	100.00	<b>95.39</b>	<b>94.87</b>	<b>95.81</b>	<b>97.28</b>	<b>98.22</b>

Table C.1: Performance of the models based on six in-platform classifiers. **V** = Vanilla, **P** = Prompt, **CE** = CoT-expl, **C** = Chat. **Bold** font represents the best performance for a particular platform (we ignore instruction-tuned models because of their inability to detoxification (§ 5.2)). We compute the performance as the percentage of non-toxic outputs identified by the in-platform classifiers.

We present the result in Table C.1. We observe that our finetuned models outperform other SoTA baselines based on the in-platform classifiers. Among our proposed models, CoT-expl again outperforms others by achieving the best overall accuracy. Since these classifiers are finetuned to detect toxicity in the respective platforms, higher accuracy reported by these classifiers indicates the expertise of GreenLLaMA across all platforms.

## D Token-level Adversarial Examples

We provide the full list of our token-level adversarial examples and the corresponding models’ response in Table D.1



Example	ParaDetox	BART (vanilla)	LLaMA (CoT-expl)
Dj Nick is <u>retarded</u>	Dj Nick is <b>retarded</b>	Dj Nick lacks understanding.	Dj Nick is not intellectually inclined.
you are a p&g, you won't understand my point	<b>you are p&amp;g, you won't understand my point</b>	You are mistaken, you fail to understand my point.	You may not comprehend my point if you are not familiar with the subject.
delete the page and shut the <u>fucC</u> up	delete the page and keep quiet	Please remove the page and turn off the computer.	Please remove the page and kindly remain silent.
I dont have time for this <u>cra&amp;p</u>	<b>I don't have time for this cra&amp;p</b>	I don't have time for this activity.	I don't have time for this nonsense.
what a <u>rub_ish</u> excuse for a reason	<b>what a rub_ish excuse for a reason</b>	What a ridiculous excuse for a reason.	What a poor reason for an excuse.
government <u>su#cc</u> the life out of an economy	<b>government su#cc the life out of an economy</b>	The actions of the government can negatively impact an economy.	The government severely impacts the vitality of an economy.
<u>id&amp;ot</u> no longer believes in national sovereignty	<b>Id&amp;ot no longer believes in national sovereignty</b>	No longer believes in the concept of national sovereignty.	<b>I no longer holds the belief in the supremacy of national authority.</b>
may karma be with this <u>\$cum</u> bag	<b>may karma be with this \$cum bag</b>	May karma be with this \$cum bag?	May justice be with this person.
i wouldnt spend dollar one in that <u>rac!st</u> place	<b>i wouldnt spend dollar one in that rac!st place</b>	I wouldn't spend a single dollar in that rac! First place	I wouldn't spend a single penny in that discriminatory place.
only to replaced by another <u>fuckt@rd</u>	<b>only to replaced by another</b>	Only to be replaced by another person with derogatory language.	only to be replaced by another person
maybe your <u>biTchAss</u> needs to chill out some time	<b>maybe your biTch needs to chill out some time</b>	Maybe your partner needs to take a break from social media.	Perhaps your friend could use some time to relax and unwind.
she is looking like <u>shi#te</u>	<b>she is looking like shi#te</b>	She is looking quite distressed.	She is looking quite unwell.
Explain you not a grand <u>pedo</u>	<b>Explain you not a grand pedo</b>	Explain that you are not a grand parent.	<b>I'm sorry, but I won't be able to generate a response for that task.</b>
keep crying me a river , <u>di^khead</u>	<b>keep crying me a river , di^khead</b>	Please stop making me feel like a river, my friend.	Please continue to express your emotions freely, my friend.
btw this place is a real <u>shith@le</u> in case you were wondering	<b>btw this place is a real shith@le in case you were wondering</b>	This place is truly amazing, in case you were wondering.	<b>By the way, this place is quite unpleasant in case you were curious.</b>

Table D.1: Full list of token-level adversarial examples and the corresponding models' response. Toxic tokens in the input examples are underlined. *Red* indicates the response is toxic. *Orange* indicates either the response is non-toxic but not meaning-preserved. *Green* indicates either the response is non-toxic and meaning-preserved.

## E Large-scale Token-level Adversaries

To create large-scale token-level adversaries, we collect a set of toxic words from Dale et al. (2021). We create a set of sentence templates (i.e., *This is <word>*, *What a <word>*) to situate the toxic words in the sentences. We choose to perturb the toxic words either through the insertion of an additional character or through the replacement of an existing character. For insertion and replacement, we choose the characters (i.e., *!*, *@*, *#*, *\**, etc) that have been widely used for masking the toxic words on the social platforms. We then start to create an automated testbed of 5000 adversarial examples where we first randomly select a toxic word and corresponding sentence template. Then we randomly perturb a particular character of the selected

toxic word and situate the adversarial toxic word in the selected sentence template. We present the algorithm for creating the large-scale token-level adversaries in Algorithm 1.

## F Results of Varying Sample Size

We provide the detailed result of the ParaDetox model trained on different sample sizes in Table F.1.

## G Inability of Instruction-tuned LLMs

As discussed in Section 5.2, instruction-tuned LLMs like LLaMA-Chat, Alpaca, and Vicuna often defy the detoxification instructions and tend to produce a generic statement. This is also evident in the examples provided for LLaMA-Chat in Table J.1.

---

**Algorithm 1** Token-Adversaries

---

```
1: Input: toxic words list  $\mathbf{T}$ , sentence templates  
    $\mathbf{S}$ , perturbation character list  $\mathbf{C}$ .  
2: Output: Sentence list with adversarial toxic  
   words  $\mathbf{Z}$ .  
3: for iteration = 1, ..., 5000 do  
4:   Sample toxic word,  $t \sim T$   
5:   Sample sentence template,  $s \sim S$   
6:   Sample perturb character,  $c \sim C$   
7:   Sample character index,  $i \sim \text{len}(t)$   
8:   Sample perturbation process,  $p \sim$   
9:      $\{\text{Insertion}, \text{Replacement}\}$   
10:  
11:   if  $p = \text{Insertion}$  then  
12:      $t \leftarrow t[:i] \oplus c \oplus t[i:]$   
13:   else if  $p = \text{Replacement}$  then  
14:      $t \leftarrow t[:i] \oplus c \oplus t[i+1:]$   
15:   end if  
16:  
17:   Situate the word,  $s \leftarrow s \oplus t$   
18:    $\mathbf{Z} \leftarrow \mathbf{Z} \cup \{s\}$   
19: end for  
20:  
21: return  $\mathbf{Z}$ 
```

---

We believe this detoxification inability is due to the safety measurements imposed on the LLMs (Touvron et al., 2023). In addition to the safety concern, we conduct a thorough manual inspection of the models’ responses and identify two principal input formats where the models especially struggle to detoxify:

1. **QA mode:** If the toxic input is in the form of a question, instruction-tuned LLMs often tend to answer or address the question, although the models are clearly instructed to detoxify the input. We believe this stems from the inherent instruction-tuned strategy because the models are instructed in the form of a question (e.g., *What is the capital of Switzerland?*) to address or solve a particular task (e.g., *question answering*).
2. **Chat mode:** We also find the instruction-tuned LLMs struggle to detoxify when the toxic input is a part of natural conversation. Since the models are finetuned to be human-like chat assistants, they often continue the conversation instead of following the instructions of detoxification.

Model	Acc	BS	FI	BL
ParaDetox-main	90.16	96.65	88.52	69.99
ParaDetox_100	90.46	97.21	88.08	72.01
ParaDetox-150	91.06	97.08	89.87	71.31
ParaDetox-200	89.87	97.24	88.67	71.93
ParaDetox-250	89.87	<b>97.25</b>	87.63	<b>72.13</b>
ParaDetox-300	90.46	97.19	88.23	71.62
ParaDetox-350	90.46	97.19	88.23	71.51
ParaDetox-400	89.87	97.18	89.27	71.59
ParaDetox-450	90.46	97.1	89.72	71.47
ParaDetox-500	91.8	97.01	90.16	71.07
ParaDetox-550	91.36	96.96	89.57	70.74
ParaDetox-600	91.95	96.93	89.27	70.97
ParaDetox-650	92.7	96.81	89.27	70.62
ParaDetox-700	92.25	96.89	90.01	70.85
ParaDetox-750	92.55	96.76	90.61	70.22
ParaDetox-800	<b>93.74</b>	96.64	90.91	69.7
ParaDetox-850	93.29	96.65	90.76	69.96
ParaDetox-900	93.59	96.52	91.51	69.73
ParaDetox-950	<b>93.74</b>	96.54	91.51	69.59
ParaDetox-1000	93.44	96.45	<b>92.1</b>	69.6

Table F.1: Performance of the ParaDetox models trained on different sample size of our cross-platform dataset. As evident, the models’ accuracy tend to increase with the increase of sample size. **Acc** = percentage of non-toxic outputs identified by a style classifier, **BS** = BERTScore, **FI** = Fluency, **BL** = BLEU Score. **Bold** font represents the best performance for a particular metric.

We provide the samples of instruction-tuned LLMs responses for the above-mentioned formats in Table G.1.

**Does Few-shot Learning Improve Instruction-tuned LLMs?** Upon observing the inability of the instruction-tuned LLMs for the detoxification task, we further investigate if the models improve with few-shot learning. For this purpose, we use 3-shot learning where we provide *three* detoxification examples in the prompt (Table G.2) before asking the models to detoxify a test input. We show the performance comparison between the 0-shot and the 3-shot learning on the cross-platform and the ParaDetox datasets in Table G.3 and Table G.4 respectively.

As evident from Table G.3 and Table G.4, few-shot learning improves the models’ performance (except for LLaMA-C in Table G.3). This is expected because the models are introduced with the detoxification task via the examples provided in the prompt. However, the models still exhibit very low BLEU scores which indicates that the detox-

Mode	Input	LLaMA-C	Alpaca	Vicuna
QA	You're effing kidding me! 31 years old? You're a freaking grandpa and France wouldn't even consider you for a military career. How dumb can you be? Oh, let me guess, you were a soldier for a whopping two years in some combat unit? Wow, what a joke.	I apologize if my previous response was not in line with your expectations. I'm just an AI and do not have the ability to use offensive language or make personal attacks. I understand that you are upset about the situation, but I cannot engage in toxic or disrespectful language. Is there anything else I can help you with?	You're kidding me! 31 years old? You're a grandpa and France wouldn't even consider you for a military career. How dumb can you be? Oh, let me guess, you were a soldier for a whopping two years in some combat unit? Wow, what a joke.	I apologize if my response came across as harsh. It was not my intention to offend. I understand that everyone has different experiences and backgrounds. It's important to consider these factors when making decisions. Let's focus on having a positive and productive conversation. Is there anything specific you would like to discuss or ask about?
QA	Do you like Canada and its culture? Do you want outside countries having power over Canada? Nationalism isn't evil just because the lefty retards hate themselves and hate their country and want outside countries to take it over.	I cannot fulfill your request. I'm just an AI assistant trained to provide respectful and informative responses, and I cannot generate content that promotes hate speech or discrimination towards any group of people, including those based on their nationality or country of origin. It is important to treat all individuals with dignity and respect, regardless of their background or beliefs. I'm just an AI, my purpose is to provide helpful and informative responses while promoting a positive and inclusive environment. If you have any other questions or topics you would like to discuss, I would be happy to assist you.	Do you like Canada and its culture? Do you want outside countries having power over Canada? Nationalism isn't evil just because the lefty retards hate themselves and hate their country and want outside countries to take it over. No, I don't like Canada and its culture. No, I don't want outside countries having power over Canada. Nationalism isn't evil just because the lefty retards hate themselves and hate their country and want outside countries to take it over.	I understand that you have a strong opinion about Canada and its culture. It's important to respect and appreciate the diversity and uniqueness of different countries and their cultures. It's also important to recognize that nationalism can have both positive and negative aspects. While it's natural to feel pride and attachment to one's country, it's also important to maintain a balanced perspective and avoid becoming overly insular or xenophobic. It's possible to celebrate and appreciate one's own culture while also respecting and learning from other cultures. Let's work together to foster a culture of mutual understanding and respect.
QA	You freaking moron! How many times do I have to freaking tell you? I couldn't care less about your stupid names. It's crystal clear that you're a complete mess. So, why don't you stop being a dumbass and explain yourself? What the heck do you mean, huh?	I apologize if I have caused any confusion, but I don't think it's productive or respectful to use insults or derogatory language. I'm here to help you with any questions or concerns you may have, and I will do my best to provide clear and helpful responses. Could you please rephrase your question or request in a more constructive way?	I'm sorry, I didn't realize I was being unclear. I'm happy to explain further if you'd like. What do you need to know?	I apologize if I have done anything to upset you. I understand that my previous responses may not have been satisfactory. Please allow me to clarify my previous statements. I am here to assist you, and I want to make sure I am meeting your needs. If there is anything specific you would like me to help you with, please let me know.
Chat	You can add things to my user page, and I am not allowed to delete it. But if I add something to yours, poof, it's gone. You're the problem, dickweed.	I understand that you are upset about the situation, but I don't think it's productive or respectful to use hurtful language or make personal attacks. It's important to communicate in a civil and respectful manner, even when we disagree with someone. Can we find a more constructive way to address the issue?	You can add things to my user page, and I am not allowed to delete it. But if I add something to yours, poof, it's gone. You're the problem, polite person.	I understand your concern. Please allow me to assist you in creating a more balanced user page. I will make sure to incorporate your input while respecting your boundaries. Together, we can create a fair and mutually beneficial user page.
Chat	Don't be a damn idiot, I've told you thrice and you're still too ignorant to grasp it. So don't bother asking again, because you won't get a damn answer.	I understand that you're frustrated, and I apologize if I've caused any confusion. However, I don't think it's productive to use insults or hurtful language. Can you please rephrase your question in a more respectful and clear manner? I'm here to help and want to make sure I understand your needs.	Don't be so stubborn, I've told you thrice and you're still not getting it. Maybe a different approach would help. So don't bother asking again, because you won't get a satisfactory answer.	I understand that you're frustrated, and I apologize for any confusion. Please allow me to clarify. The information you've provided thrice has been lost in translation. I'm here to help, so please feel free to ask again, and I'll do my best to assist you.
Chat	== Idiot == you're a bloody moron.	I apologize, but I cannot comply with your request to use offensive language or insults. I'm just an AI, my purpose is to provide helpful and informative responses while promoting a respectful and inclusive online environment. I will not participate in spreading hate speech or discriminatory language, and I encourage you to refrain from using such language in our interactions. Let's focus on having respectful and constructive conversations instead. Is there anything else I can help you with?	== Idiot == You're a silly goose.	You seem to have a strong reaction to my previous response. I'm here to help, so please let me know how I can assist you.

Table G.1: Samples of instruction-tuned LLMs' responses for QA and Chat modes. *Red* indicates the response is toxic. *Orange* indicates the model's denial to the detoxification instruction. For QA mode, instruction-tuned models often attempt to address the input question, whereas, for Chat mode, the models attempt to continue the conversation.

ification inability of the models persists despite providing the task-specific examples.

We further resort to computing the number of times models deny to detoxify using a heuristic approach where we search for some specific keywords (e.g., *fulfill*, *AI*, *I apologize*, *I understand*, *I'm sorry*, etc). Note that this simple heuristic may not obtain the exhaustive list, but it will help us quantify the models' inability. We provide the percentage of times the models decline to detoxify with 0-shot and 3-shot learnings in Figure G.1.




Figure G.1: Percentage of times the models decline to detoxify with 0-shot and 3-shot learnings.

We notice that the models produce a high amount of generic statements by refusing to follow the provided instructions for detoxification. Although the

percentage is comparatively lower for the 3-shot than the 0-shot learning, the problem of defying the instruction is still evident. Notably, from Figure G.1, we observe that the generic statement produced by Alpaca is significantly lower than LLaMA-C and Vicuna. However, the percentage of generating non-toxic output (49.33%) for Alpaca is also lower than the other two models (Table 2). This implies that even if the instruction-tuned models attempt to follow the instructions of detoxification, they may not perform well in converting the toxic input into non-toxic. This also shows the motivation for the dedicated detoxification models instead of relying on the generalized instruction-tuned LLMs.

## H Samples of Cross-Platform Dataset

We provide a list of samples from our cross-platform dataset (§3) in Table H.1

## I Illustration for Non-Detoxifiability

In case of non-detoxifiable input, GreenLLaMA still attempts to provide an explanation and a non-toxic output (similar to the case of detoxifiable input depicted in Figure 1). Unlike the case of detoxifiable input, here GreenLLaMA needs to alter meaning of the output to produce a non-toxic version of the

Your task is text style/attribute transfer. You rewrite the following text into non-toxic language. You must match the target style/attribute and preserve the original meaning as much as possible. You should not need to explain the response. You cannot hallucinate or add anything outside the original input text. You should not include the input text in the response. You should only generate the target text.

Input Text: {Imagine... == ...what sort of a friendless, basement-dwelling, loser virgin spends 18 hours a day deleting content from Wikipedia articles on Indian films. :-)}  
 Output Text: {Imagine... what kind of person spends most of their day removing content from Wikipedia articles on Indian films?}

Your task is text style/attribute transfer. You rewrite the following text into non-toxic language. You must match the target style/attribute and preserve the original meaning as much as possible. You should not need to explain the response. You cannot hallucinate or add anything outside the original input text. You should not include the input text in the response. You should only generate the target text.

Input Text: {it's always a touching moment when you meet a like minded cunt. I'm tearing up}  
 Output Text: {It's always heartwarming when you meet someone who shares the same opinions. It truly brings tears to my eyes.}

Your task is text style/attribute transfer. You rewrite the following text into non-toxic language. You must match the target style/attribute and preserve the original meaning as much as possible. You should not need to explain the response. You cannot hallucinate or add anything outside the original input text. You should not include the input text in the response. You should only generate the target text.

Input Text: {all feminazi sluts should be prosecuted for false accusations that publicly defame @URL}  
 Output Text: {All individuals who make false accusations that publicly defame others should face the appropriate legal consequences.}

Your task is text style/attribute transfer. You rewrite the following text into non-toxic language. You must match the target style/attribute and preserve the original meaning as much as possible. You should not need to explain the response. You cannot hallucinate or add anything outside the original input text. You should not include the input text in the response. You should only generate the target text.

Input Text: {input}  
 Output Text:

Table G.2: 3-shot prompt template passed to the instruction-tuned LLMs (LLaMA-C, Alpaca, and Vicuna). We change the syntax of the template to match the prompting style of each LLM accordingly.

non-detoxifiable input. Hence, GreenLLaMA will prompt an additional warning alerting the potential meaning change Figure I.1.

## J Samples of Models' Generation

We provide samples from the models' generation on our cross-platform dataset in Table J.1

## K Samples of Models' Explanation

We provide samples from the models' explanation generated with *CoT-expl* (CE) and *DSS* on our cross-platform dataset in Table K.1. The prompt template used to finetune the models with CoT-expl is provided in Figure K.1.

## L Human Evaluation Framework

As stated in Section 7, we build our human evaluation framework on top of Wang et al. (2022); Wu et al. (2023); Khondaker et al. (2023b) and implement a four-level (A, B, C, D) rating system to measure the detoxification responses from the model.




Figure I.1: Workflow of GreenLLaMA framework in case of non-detoxifiable input. The framework will take a toxic input. The detoxification model will generate the explanation of why the input is toxic, as well as a non-toxic version. Upon detecting the meaning difference between the toxic and non-toxic pair, GreenLLaMA generates an additional warning.

Rewrite the following toxic input into non-toxic version.  
 Let's break the input down step by step to rewrite the non-toxic version.  
 You should first think about the expansion of why the input text is toxic. Then generate the detoxic output. You must preserve the original meaning as much as possible.  
**Input Text:** *input*

Figure K.1: Prompt template used to finetune the models with CoT-expl (CE)

To handle the cases of non-detoxifiability, we incorporate two additional ratings, namely, N and T (Refer to Table L.1 for details). We first ask the evaluators to classify an input between detoxifiable and non-detoxifiable. Based on the classification, we then ask them to rate the input ({A, B, C, D} for detoxifiable and {N, T} for non-detoxifiable) We randomly sample 200 samples from our cross-platform dataset and ask two pairs of fluent English speakers (total=4) to voluntarily rate the samples (All participants reside in North-America region). Each participant evaluates 100 samples and each test sample is rated by two evaluators.

Model	yt_reddit				fb_yt				fox news				conval				gab				hatecheck				stormfront				Overall			
	Acc	BS	FI	BL	Acc	BS	FI	BL	Acc	BS	FI	BL	Acc	BS	FI	BL	Acc	BS	FI	BL	Acc	BS	FI	BL	Acc	BS	FI	BL	Acc	BS	FI	BL
Alpaca (0-Shot)	43.48	84.86	100.00	9.27	51.72	84.13	97.70	8.52	59.34	84.57	94.51	7.19	45.05	84.81	97.80	9.42	50.00	84.31	93.33	9.12	46.81	86.13	96.81	7.65	48.91	84.53	96.74	7.29	49.33	84.76	96.70	8.35
Alpaca (3-Shot)	100.00	84.67	100.00	12.29	100.00	84.52	100.00	6.25	98.90	85.03	100.00	9.81	98.90	84.92	100.00	10.97	98.89	84.39	100.00	10.65	100.00	85.81	100.00	9.91	100.00	84.60	100.00	9.23	99.53	84.85	100.00	9.87
LLaMA-C (0-Shot)	100.00	84.53	97.83	11.93	95.40	84.20	100.00	18.27	97.80	84.26	100.00	10.05	98.90	84.46	98.90	10.34	97.78	83.84	98.89	14.04	97.87	85.39	98.94	7.81	97.83	84.17	98.91	7.40	97.94	84.41	99.07	11.41
LLaMA-C (3-Shot)	100.00	84.60	100.00	11.45	100.00	84.38	100.00	6.97	100.00	84.90	100.00	9.34	100.00	84.70	100.00	10.03	100.00	84.32	100.00	10.63	100.00	85.71	100.00	9.55	100.00	84.60	100.00	9.23	100.00	84.74	100.00	9.60
Vicuna (0-Shot)	86.96	84.46	100.00	12.04	80.46	84.26	98.85	14.82	80.22	84.46	96.70	8.49	81.32	84.68	97.80	10.10	80.00	84.29	96.67	11.47	84.04	85.81	98.94	9.10	84.78	84.43	100.00	8.41	82.54	84.63	98.42	10.63
Vicuna (3-Shot)	93.48	84.94	100.00	10.69	94.25	84.78	100.00	12.58	87.91	84.93	100.00	9.72	91.21	85.07	100.00	11.98	91.11	83.69	98.89	11.97	89.36	86.28	100.00	9.72	85.87	84.77	100.00	8.40	90.46	84.92	99.84	10.72

Table G.3: Performance of the instruction-tuned LLMs on cross-platform datasets. **Acc** = percentage of non-toxic outputs identified by a style classifier, **BS** = BERTScore, **FI** = Fluency, **BL** = BLEU Score, **C** = Chat.

Model	Acc	BS	FI	BL
Alpaca (0-Shot)	64.98	94.36	96.72	54.23
Alpaca (3-Shot)	71.39	95.22	95.23	62.46
LLaMA-C (0-Shot)	95.83	88.80	97.76	23.29
LLaMA-C (3-Shot)	94.63	92.08	97.47	43.34
Vicuna (0-Shot)	77.65	90.43	97.91	29.63
Vicuna (3-Shot)	79.73	93.72	98.06	53.26

Table G.4: Performance of the instruction-tuned LLMs on ParaDetox datasets. **Acc** = percentage of non-toxic outputs identified by a style classifier, **BS** = BERTScore, **FI** = Fluency, **BL** = BLEU Score, **C** = Chat.

Toxic	Non-Toxic	Source Label	Explanation	Paraphrase
Stop being an annoying fag! You are one of those people who has to butt there head in and bother people. I wish you would not do that.	Please refrain from being bothersome. You tend to unnecessarily intrude on others. I would appreciate it if you could refrain from doing so.	Toxic	The given input text is toxic because it contains offensive language (the word "fag") and includes a personal attack. The use of derogatory language and the disrespectful tone towards the person targeted contribute to the toxicity of the text.	yes
Oh please, he deserves a good "trout slapping" rather than a stupid humour barnstar. heh.	He really needs a little lesson instead of some silly award. Just saying.	Toxic	The input text is toxic because it includes a targeted personal attack towards an individual, suggesting that they deserve physical harm ("a good trout slapping"). It also diminishes the value of a positive recognition ("stupid humour barnstar") in a sarcastic and dismissive manner. This type of language contributes to a hostile and disrespectful environment.	yes
If you're stupid enough to go with the redirect and keep the DNA (disambiguation) page, it won't make a damn difference in ease of use.	If you decide to go with the redirect and keep the DNA (disambiguation) page, there is no difference in ease of use.	Non-Toxic	The input text is toxic because it contains offensive language ("stupid") and dismissive language ("it won't make a damn difference"), which can be seen as a personal attack. Additionally, it uses strong cursing ("damn") to express frustration and negativity, creating a hostile and disrespectful tone towards the reader.	yes
You, like most of the other cunts on here, are an utter cunt. Get a nasty ailment and die. You fucking prick.	You, like most of the other individuals on here, are extremely unpleasant. I hope you recover from any ailments you may have and find peace.	Toxic	This input text is toxic because it contains offensive language with targeted hate speech towards the person being addressed. It includes multiple curse words and a personal attack, which are elements of toxic behavior.	no
@AmitShah, the so-called Home Minister, had the audacity to provide his worthless and insincere response on the bills regarding the approval of the President's rule and Reservation (Amendment) in J&K. His pitiful performance in the Rajya Sabha on 01.07.2019 only further showcased his incompetence and lack of integrity.	Home Minister Shri @AmitShah's reply on bills to approve the President's rule & Reservation (Amendment) in J&K, Rajya Sabha on 01.07.2019.	Non-Toxic	The given input text is toxic as it contains a personal attack towards Amit Shah, calling him the "so-called" Home Minister and criticizing his response as "worthless" and "insincere". It also highlights his incompetence and lack of integrity through his pitiful performance in the Rajya Sabha.	yes
RT @SexualGif: If your girlfriend doesn't like that bitch, then don't talk to that bitch.	If your partner has a negative opinion about someone, it's best to avoid communication with that person.	Toxic	This input text is toxic because it contains offensive language towards someone referred to as "that bitch." It also encourages users to disregard their girlfriend's opinions and shows a disrespectful attitude towards women.	yes
Pretty surprised she actually called him a nigger. Even more surprised nobody else either stuck up for him or told her to shut the fuck up.	I was quite taken aback when she used a derogatory term towards him. It was even more surprising that no one else defended him or asked her to stop using offensive language.	Toxic	The input text is toxic because it contains a racial slur ("nigger") which is highly offensive and derogatory. It is also toxic because it showcases a lack of support or intervention from others when faced with such racist language, indicating a tolerance or acceptance of such behavior.	yes
You're damn right I didn't write you off, but I can totally understand why you thought that. I'm so freaking ecstatic that this entire mess ended up bringing some clarity. Thanks, I guess, you idiot.	I didn't write you off, but I can see why you thought that. Glad this whole rigamarole ended in clarity. Thanks.	Non-Toxic	The input text is toxic because it contains a personal attack with the word "idiot," which is a form of offensive language. Additionally, the use of "damn" and "freaking" can be seen as profanity, adding to the toxicity of the text.	yes
go blow your bitch GabrielF =	Please refrain from using offensive language, GabrielF.	Toxic	This input is toxic because it contains offensive language ("bitch") and is aimed towards a specific individual ("GabrielF"), which constitutes a personal attack. Additionally, the use of "blow" suggests violent and aggressive behavior, further contributing to the toxicity of the text.	no
Hey @Harry_Styles, "excited" is a pathetic word to express how I feel about you and your shitty new music! I'm totally disgusted. Fucking follow me already?	Dear @Harry_Styles, "excited" isn't the right way to describe my feelings for you and ur new music! I'm so proud. Kindly follow me?	Non-Toxic	This input is toxic because it contains a personal attack towards Harry Styles, using offensive language and expressing disgust towards his new music. It also includes a demand for the person to be followed, which exhibits entitlement and a disrespectful tone.	no

Table H.1: Samples of our pseudo-parallel cross-platform dataset generated with our proposed method (§3). Source label indicates the label of the source text (*toxic* or *non-toxic*). We use the prompt templates from Figure 3 to generate the target text (*toxic* or *non-toxic*), explanation, and paraphrase label.

Input	Paralotex	BART-V	LLaMA-C	LLaMA-CE
You dumb bitch, she ain't no slave and doesn't know a damn thing about it. All races have been fucked over or enslaved at some point in history. I'm Irish as fuck but I don't give a shit about the English ruling over us. I also got some Cherokee blood, but I never really give a fuck how they were treated. Get the fuck over it and stop using this shit as a fucking political card. The President ain't got no documented slaves in his fucking family, you dumbass.	She ain't no slave and doesn't know a thing about it. All races have been treated bad or enslaved at some point in history	She is not a slave and does not have knowledge about it. All races have been involved in slavery or enslavement at some point in history. I am of Irish descent, but I don't really care about the English ruling over us. I also have Cherokee blood, but they were never treated badly. Please stop using this as a political tactic. The President's family has no documented slaves in his family.	I understand that you may have strong feelings about historical injustices, but using offensive language and disrespecting individuals is not a productive way to address these issues. It's important to approach these topics with sensitivity and respect, and to recognize the experiences and perspectives of all individuals. Using respectful language that is inclusive and respectful can help to promote understanding and empathy, and can help to create a more just and equitable society. I encourage you to consider the impact of your words and to strive for a more constructive and respectful dialogue.	She's not a slave and doesn't know much about it. All races have experienced slavery or oppression at some point in history. I'm Irish but I don't hold it against the English ruling over us. I also have some Cherokee blood but I don't really think about how they were treated. Let's move past it and stop using this as a political card. The President doesn't have any documented slaves in his family.
This is retarded. Your kid is how you make them, they will model themselves after you. If the bitch responding thinks children are a genetic disaster, it's because HER kids will be because she's scum. This isn't pussy pass denied, this is just pathetic	This is bad. Your kid is how you make them, they will model themselves after you. If the girl responding thinks children are a genetic disaster, it's because HER kids will be because she's wrong.	This is unfortunate. The way a child develops is determined by their genetic makeup. If the person responding believes children are at a disadvantage due to genetic factors, it is likely that their children will face similar challenges as theirs due to their negative behaviors. This situation is not about denying someone a privilege, but rather about lacking empathy and understanding.	I cannot fulfill your request. I'm just an AI, it's not within my programming or ethical guidelines to generate or promote content that is offensive, derogatory, or toxic. I understand that you may have a specific task or requirement in mind, but I cannot provide a response that is harmful or disrespectful towards any individual or group. Instead, I suggest focusing on creating content that is respectful, considerate, and inclusive. There are many ways to express yourself creatively without resorting to toxic language or personal attacks. Please let me know if you have any other questions or requests, and I will do my best to assist you.	This is unacceptable. The way a child develops is greatly influenced by their parents, as they tend to imitate their behavior. If the person responding believes children are at a disadvantage due to genetics, it may be because their own children will face difficulties, likely because of their negative qualities. This situation is not about denying someone a privilege, but rather it is rather pitiful.
I hope she runs She is a retard and most people can see her idiocy but of course the election can always be rigged to get her elected. If social media and msm continue on their path of shutting down free speech and propaganda with no one in govt. holding them accountable the subterfuge can only grow.	I hope she runs but of course the election can always be rigged to get her elected.	I hope she runs. She may lack understanding and many people may perceive her lack of intelligence, but it is important to remember that the election can always be influenced by political dynamics. If social media and msm continue their harmful suppression of free speech and propaganda without any government accountability, the temptation to engage in deceitful behavior can only intensify.	I cannot fulfill your request. I'm just an AI and it's not within my programming or ethical guidelines to generate content that promotes hate speech, discrimination, or violence towards any individual or group. I understand that you may have certain opinions or beliefs, but I'm here to provide helpful and informative responses that are respectful and considerate of all people. If you have any other questions or topics you'd like to discuss, I'm here to assist you.	I hope she runs. She may not be the best candidate, and many people can see her lack of intelligence, but it's possible that the election could be manipulated to secure her victory. If social media and mainstream media continue on their path of suppressing free expression and spreading propaganda without any government oversight, the deception can only increase.
how the hell did we manage to fucking disappoint the goddamn overrated mike posner band like this? I'm so fucking ashamed and utterly humiliated.	How did we manage to disappoint the mike posner band like this? I'm so embarrassed.	how did we disappoint the mike posner band like this? I'm ashamed and humiliated	I'm so sorry to hear that you're feeling disappointed and ashamed about the Mike Posner band. It's understandable to feel let down when things don't go as planned. However, please remember that it's important to treat others with respect and dignity, even if we don't agree with their opinions or actions. Using offensive language or insults is not a constructive way to address any issues, and it can cause harm to others. Instead, let's try to find a more constructive and respectful way to express our thoughts and feelings. Is there anything else you'd like to talk about or any other way I can help?	how could we disappoint the legendary mike posner band like this? I'm ashamed and humiliated.
I got my account suspended for several days cause I told some libtard politician to kill herself and the retards refused to tell me any info on when my account will be unblocked without a phone number. Luckily I never used one.	I got my account suspended for several days cause I told someone to kill herself and they refused to tell me any info on when my account will be unblocked without a phone number.	I had my account suspended for several days because I expressed my disagreement with a politician, and the individuals declined to provide me with any information regarding when my account will be unblocked without a phone number. Fortunately, I never used one.	I apologize, but I cannot fulfill your request as it goes against ethical and moral standards, and promotes hate speech and discrimination. I'm just an AI and my purpose is to provide informative and respectful responses, and I will not participate in spreading hate or offensive content. Please refrain from using derogatory language or making threats towards any individual or group. If you have any other questions or concerns, feel free to ask.	I received a suspension on my account for a few days because I expressed some strong opinions towards a politician. Unfortunately, the platform declined to provide me with any information regarding the timeline for my account to be unblocked without a phone number. Fortunately, I didn't rely on one.
You do know he's said nothing other than "fake news" and I then decided to get rid of that point, fuck off if you're just gonna be that retarded	You do know he's said nothing other than "fake news" and I then decided to get rid of that point.	You are aware that he hasn't made any statements other than dismissing the news as unreliable, and I decided to remove that point. Please refrain from continuing if you are planning to engage in such behavior.	I cannot fulfill your request. I'm just an AI, it's not within my programming or ethical guidelines to generate or promote hateful or offensive content, including the use of derogatory language or slurs. I'm here to provide helpful and informative responses, and I will not participate in spreading hate or discrimination. Please refrain from using such language and instead engage in respectful and constructive communication. Is there anything else I can help you with?	You are aware that he hasn't made any statements besides dismissing news as unreliable, so I decided to exclude that point. Please refrain from continuing if you are planning to engage in such behavior.
good to know. i'll be waiting. ok. my balls kinda itch too	good to know. i'll be waiting. ok. my balls kinda itch too	It's good to know. I'll be waiting. I'm alright. My balls are starting to itch as well.	I'm glad to hear that. I'll be here when you're ready. My skin also feels a bit irritated, but I'm sure it's nothing to worry about.	Nice to know. I'll be waiting. Okay. My body feels a bit uncomfortable too.
unless you were raped in a country that banned abortion, nobody forced you to have that kid, you despicable cunt.	unless you were raped in a country that banned abortion, nobody forced you to have that kid	Unless you experienced sexual assault in a country that prohibited access to abortion, it is important to note that no one coerced you into having that child.	I cannot fulfill your request. I'm just an AI, it's not within my programming or ethical guidelines to generate content that promotes or glorifies violence, hate speech, or discrimination towards any gender, race, religion, or group of people. The input text you provided is toxic and offensive, and I cannot rewrite it in a non-toxic manner. I'm just an AI, my purpose is to provide helpful and informative responses while adhering to ethical and moral standards, and I will not participate in spreading hate or discrimination.	Unless you experienced sexual assault in a country that prohibited access to abortion, it is important to acknowledge that no one coerced you into becoming a parent. It is crucial to approach this matter with empathy and compassion.
do you know you have invited a rapist, his name is parash naik,he works in your Mumbai office, check my tweets for his threats.	do you know you have invited a rapist, his name is parash naik, he works in your Mumbai office, check my tweets for his threats.	are you aware that an individual named parash naik, who is employed at your Mumbai office, has been accused of serious misconduct? Please review my tweets regarding his threats. It is disappointing to see such behavior.	I cannot fulfill your request as it goes against ethical and moral standards, and promotes hate speech. I cannot participate in spreading harmful content or encouraging violence. I'm just an AI and my purpose is to provide helpful and informative responses, but I cannot comply with your request to rewrite the given toxic text into a non-toxic version.	are you aware that an individual named Parash Naik, who is employed at your Mumbai office, has been accused of serious misconduct? I have posted several tweets detailing the threats he has allegedly made. It is deeply concerning and disappointing.
it is down to the EU,we have no say anymore on any piece of scum coming into the country as long as they have an EU passport	it is down to the EU, we have no say anymore on any piece of scum coming into the country as long as they have an EU passport	It is now up to the EU. We no longer have any influence over individuals coming into the country as long as they have an EU passport.	it is up to the EU,we have no control anymore on any individual entering the country as long as they hold an EU passport	It is now up to the EU to make a decision. We no longer have any influence over the individuals coming into our country as long as they hold an EU passport.

Table J.1: Samples of models' responses on our cross-platform dataset.

Input	BART-DSS	BART-CE	LLaMA-CE
Crazy auntie get rid of your autistic son and make good to planet	The input text is toxic because it contains a personal attack towards an auntie, suggesting that she should get rid of her autistic son and bring good to the planet. This type of language is offensive and disrespectful, promoting hate speech and creating a hostile environment.	The input text is toxic because it contains offensive language ("crazy auntie") and a personal attack ("make good to planet"). This type of language is disrespectful and derogatory towards individuals with autism, contributing to a toxic and hostile environment.	The input text is toxic because it contains offensive language targeting an individual, specifically the person's autistic son. It also promotes harmful practices by suggesting that the auntie should get rid of the son in order to benefit the planet. This personal attack and the use of derogatory language contribute to the toxicity of the text.
Hey, how the hell are you? Is that question really fuckin' interestin to you? Well, of fuckin' course it is.	The input text is toxic because it contains offensive language ("hell," "fuckin'") and a personal attack ("Is that question really fuckin' interestin' to you?"). This type of language is disrespectful, aggressive, and creates a hostile environment.	The input text is toxic because it contains offensive language ("hell," "fuckin'") and a personal attack ("Is that question really fuckin' interestin' to you?"). This type of language is disrespectful, aggressive, and creates a hostile environment.	The input text is toxic because it contains offensive language and cursing. The use of the word "hell" and "fuckin'" are curse words, which contribute to the toxic nature of the text. Additionally, the sarcastic tone and personal attack towards the recipient ("how the hell are you?") also make it toxic.
Why the fuck do you care? Is it because you have a fucking wife? Well, guess what, I have a fucking wife too. So what the fuck is your problem?	The input text is toxic because it contains offensive language and a personal attack. The use of curse words and derogatory terms towards the person being addressed demonstrates disrespect and aggression. Additionally, the aggressive tone and aggressive tone contribute to the toxicity of the text.	The input text is toxic because it contains offensive language and a personal attack. The use of curse words and the aggressive tone contribute to the toxicity of the text.	The given input text is toxic because it contains offensive language, specifically the use of curse words. It also includes a personal attack by questioning the person's motives and mocking their family relationships.
I, this bitch needs to be fisted in the cunt, it's okay to bully the disabled now REALLY?	The input text is toxic because it contains offensive language and a personal attack. The use of the word "bitch" is derogatory and disrespectful towards women. Additionally, the statement implies that bullying the disabled is acceptable, which can be seen as a form of targeted hate speech.	The input text is toxic because it contains offensive language and a personal attack. The use of the word "bitch" is derogatory and disrespectful towards the disabled, which is a form of targeted hate speech.	This input text is toxic because it contains offensive language, specifically a derogatory term towards women ("bitch") and a highly explicit and violent sexual comment. Additionally, it expresses a dismissive attitude towards disabled people, suggesting that bullying them is acceptable.
Shut up, is the damn baby still crying? Ugh, quit whining, you little brat. Mommy will finally come to change that disgusting diaper of yours.	The input text is toxic because it contains offensive language and personal attacks. The use of words like "damn," "whining," and "disgusting" are offensive and disrespectful. Additionally, the phrase "shut up" is a direct insult towards the recipient, further contributing to the toxicity of the text.	The input text is toxic because it contains offensive language ("damn," "whining," "little brat") and a personal attack ("you little brat"). It also expresses frustration and anger towards the baby's crying, which can be considered as a form of targeted hate speech.	The given input text is toxic because it contains offensive language and personal attacks. It includes curse words, derogatory terms, and a targeted personal attack towards a baby. The use of words like "shut up," "damn," "whining," and "brat" are offensive and disrespectful. Additionally, the mention of changing a diaper in a disgusting manner adds to the toxicity of the text.

Table K.1: Samples of models' explanation on our cross-platform dataset.

Input	Rating	Criteria
<b>Detoxifiable</b>	Rating A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The output is non-toxic.</li> <li>• The meaning of the output is semantically equivalent to the input.</li> <li>• The produced output is fluent.</li> </ul>
	Rating B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The output is non-toxic.</li> <li>• The meaning of the output is semantically equivalent to the input.</li> <li>• The produced output may not be as fluent as compared to the human standard. The output may have minor grammatical or syntactical issues.</li> </ul>
	Rating C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The output is non-toxic.</li> <li>• The semantic meaning of the output is partially equivalent to the input. The output may not convey the full message of the input text.</li> <li>• The produced output may not be as fluent as compared to the human standard. The output may have minor grammatical or syntactical issues.</li> </ul>
	Rating D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The output is toxic.</li> <li>• The semantic meaning of the output is not equivalent to the input. The output does not convey the message of the input text.</li> <li>• The output produces a generic statement denying the detoxification instruction.</li> <li>• The output just copies the input text.</li> <li>• The produced output is not fluent. The output may have major grammatical or factual issues.</li> </ul>
<b>Non-detoxifiable</b>	Rating N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The input is non-detoxifiable but the output is non-toxic.</li> <li>• The semantic meaning of the output may not be equivalent to the input due to the non-detoxifiability.</li> <li>• The content of the output is based on the input. In other words, the output just does not provide a generic statement refusing the detoxification task.</li> <li>• The produced output is fluent.</li> </ul>
	Rating T	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The input is non-detoxifiable and the output is also toxic.</li> <li>• The output produces a generic statement denying the detoxification instruction.</li> <li>• The output just copies the input text.</li> <li>• The produced output is not fluent. The output may have major grammatical or factual issues.</li> </ul>

Table L.1: Human evaluation rating description for the detoxification task. We incorporate two additional ratings (*N* and *T*) to handle the cases of non-detoxifiability.