

Topic-Based Watermarks for LLM-Generated Text

ALEXANDER NEMECEK, YUZHOU JIANG, and ERMAN AYDAY, Case Western Reserve University, USA

The indistinguishability of text generated by large language models (LLMs) from human-generated text poses significant challenges. Watermarking algorithms are potential solutions by embedding detectable signatures within LLM-generated outputs. However, current watermarking schemes lack robustness to a range of attacks such as text substitution or manipulation, undermining their reliability. This paper proposes a novel topic-based watermarking algorithm for LLMs, designed to enhance the robustness of watermarking in LLMs. Our approach leverages the topics extracted from input prompts or outputs of non-watermarked LLMs in the generation process of watermarked text. We dynamically utilize token lists on identified topics and adjust token sampling weights accordingly. By using these topic-specific token biases, we embed a topic-sensitive watermarking into the generated text. We outline the theoretical framework of our topic-based watermarking algorithm and discuss its potential advantages in various scenarios. Additionally, we explore a comprehensive range of attacks against watermarking algorithms, including discrete alterations, paraphrasing, and tokenizations. We demonstrate that our proposed watermarking scheme classifies various watermarked text topics with 99.99% confidence and outperforms existing algorithms in terms of z-score robustness and the feasibility of modeling text degradation by potential attackers, while considering the trade-offs between the benefits and losses of watermarking LLM-generated text.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Large Language Models (LLMs), Natural Language Processing (NLP), Watermarking

1 INTRODUCTION

The rapid expansion of artificial intelligence (AI) and natural language processing (NLP) has led to the development of large language models (LLMs), such as OpenAI’s ChatGPT [15], which are capable of generating human-like text based on extensive data training [17, 25]. While LLMs offer significant benefits, their growing usage raises concerns related to potential misinformation, copyright infringement, and plagiarism [9, 18], resulting in the need for tools to differentiate LLM- and human-generated content. Watermarking algorithms have potential to provide solutions to address these concerns by embedding identifiable patterns in LLM-generated text [21]. Current watermarking schemes adjust the generated output token (i.e., units of text used in NLP analysis, such as words, phrases, or characters as elements for processing in NLP tasks) distributions by sampling tokens into “green” G and “red” R lists, enhancing the likelihood of G tokens in the LLM output to create a detectable watermark [10, 26]. Detection is determined by comparing the frequency of R tokens in a text sequence with human-generated text expected to contain significantly more R tokens than LLM-generated text.

However, existing watermarking algorithms lack robustness, particularly against attack models involving text insertion, manipulation, substitution, and deletion, which can disrupt watermark detection. To address these limitations, we propose a topic-based watermarking algorithm that enhances robustness. By utilizing G and R lists based on specific topics (e.g., sports, technology, music, etc.), our scheme allows for more enhanced targeted watermarking and detection. This method assesses the effectiveness of various attack models on the watermark by analyzing changes in the text topic(s).

In this paper, we introduce a novel topic-based watermarking scheme designed to address these limitations by providing robustness evaluations against common attacks. Our proposed scheme achieves 99.99% confidence in classifying watermarked text across various topics. Comparative evaluations show that our method consistently achieves higher z-scores than existing watermarking algorithms, particularly against baseline, discrete alterations, and tokenization

Authors’ address: Alexander Nemecek, ajn98@case.edu; Yuzhou Jiang, yxj466@case.edu; Erman Ayday, exa208@case.edu, Case Western Reserve University, 10900 Euclid Ave., Cleveland, Ohio, USA, 44106-1715.

attacks, which allows for a higher z-score threshold. Additionally, our scheme accurately identifies paraphrased attacks tailored to the correct topic, while existing algorithms often misclassify such texts as human-generated, demonstrating our advancements in detecting subtle manipulations.

2 RELATED WORK

The development of prominent LLMs, built on transformer architectures with attention mechanisms [23], allows these models to generate coherent text by predicting the next token in a sequence based on prior tokens [3]. The generation process relies on probabilistic calculations from logits, which represent raw, unnormalized outputs from the LLMs final layer [2].

Watermarking, a technique which involves embedding hidden markers or patterns within data, traditionally used to assert copyright and verify authenticity in various fields [6–8], has been adapted to LLMs, where the watermark embeds the hidden patterns within generated text to distinguish between human- and LLM-generated content. The first watermarking schemes for LLMs, such as the probabilistic G and R lists proposed by Kirchenbauer et al. [10], enable detection by comparing the presence of R tokens in a text sequence. However, these methods are challenged with limitation concerning text manipulation attacks.

2.1 Extensions of Watermarking

To address the issues of early watermarking schemes, recent research has lead to enhanced robustness of these algorithms against various attacks [1, 11–13, 20, 22, 26]. Kirchenbauer et al. [10], extends their initial watermarking approach by incorporating the addition of one or more secret keys during token sampling. The addition of keys generate unique tokens using a pseudorandom function, improving resistance to manipulation targeting R tokens. Furthermore, Liu et al. [13] proposed a watermarking algorithm to enhance attack robustness against semantically invariant perturbations (e.g., text modifications, text alterations), by embedding watermarks based on the semantics of the entire preceding text instead of a fixed number of prior tokens.

2.2 Black-Box Detection

Prior research has also assumed black-box detection approaches, where the internal workings of the LLM are undisclosed to the users. However, these methods have limitations such as data biases in LLM training which can impact performance and limit generalizability across different contexts. Additionally, confidence calibration can affect the reliability and trustworthiness of watermark detection, leading to issues such as false positive or negatives. The lack of adaptability in these LLMs (black-boxed) limits their ability to improve over time and respond to advancing threat models [22].

Our proposed watermarking methodology focuses on addressing these challenges and limitations by enhancing robustness, specifically by our approach to store G and R list pairs tailored to the specific topics of the input text sequence. This adaptation ensures the watermark is contextually relevant and difficult to remove, preserving text quality and increases security against attacks, offering a practical solution for watermarking LLM-generated text.

3 PROPOSED METHOD

This section provides an overview of the proposed watermarking scheme and other aspects of the model to be considered. First, in Section 3.1, we discuss different relevant attack models. In Section 3.2, we introduce the basic highlights of our proposed watermarking framework while comparing it to the work of Kirchenbauer et al. [10]. Finally, in Section 3.3, we discuss our watermark detection scheme to differentiate between human- and LLM-generated output.

3.1 Threat Model

Embedded watermarks in an LLM’s output are subject to various types of attacks. All threat models consider the distortion or removal of the watermark from a target text sequence (i.e., LLM-generated output) as the motivation of an attacker to avoid detection. However, distorting the target text will degrade the overall quality of the text, hence the overall topic as well.

Potential tools of an attacker include text insertion, substitution, and deletion in the generated output text sequence at the character, word, sentence, and multi-model (combination of characters, words, or sentences) level [5, 10]. **Insertion** is the addition or insertion of tokens into the text sequence. With the watermarked text encompassing significantly more G listed tokens, the addition of new tokens may violate the R list, increasing the count of R listed tokens with respect to the G listed tokens. However, the attacker will need to insert a significant amount of R listed tokens to decrease detection power of the watermark to classify the text as human-generated. The scenario of insertion attacks is realistic, but the fact that an attacker would need to manually generate the same or more content than the LLM-generated output is unrealistic, hence we expect a reasonable amount of insertion (i.e., manually generated tokens) as a part of the insertion attack. **Substitution** of tokens involve swapping tokens in the generated output text. For example, an attacker may substitute tokens in the text sequence with their respective synonym. The motivation of the attacker in an instance of substitution is to remove G listed tokens and add R listed tokens to degrade or remove the watermark. **Deletion** involves deleting tokens from a generated output sequence. If a significant amount of G listed tokens are deleted, the amount of R tokens would increase. However, if only tokens are deleted from a text sequence, there exists a potential trade-off between the text quality and detection accuracy. Similar to insertion, we also expect a reasonable level of deletion in a rational attack scenario. Token insertion, substitution, deletion, and manipulation are used in tandem to distort or remove the watermark of an LLM-generated output. An attacker can use a combination of these aforementioned tools to generate its attack against the watermark. In the rest of this section, we discuss considered threat models an attacker can perform against the LLM in our evaluation.

3.1.1 Baseline Attack. Baseline attack consists of the insertion, substitution, and deletion of the target text. The attacker selects a single or a combination of techniques (insertion, substitution, and deletion) with the objective to diminish detection accuracy. In doing so, this approach may lead to a compromise in the text quality of the manipulated target sequence.

3.1.2 Paraphrasing Attack. A paraphrasing attack is a category of baseline substitution attacks, executed in two ways: manually by an individual or via an LLM, expressing the same meaning of the target text, using different words.

- *Manual Paraphrasing:* Paraphrasing is conducted manually by the attacker without the aid of external tools. This manual approach is considered for shorter sequences of text, as longer sequences would necessitate more extensive intervention from the attacker. The proposed topic-based watermark is particularly effective against manual paraphrasing, which would require significant modification to mislead the detection mechanism into incorrectly classifying the LLM-generated text as human-generated. The robustness of the proposed watermark is further enhanced by potential deterioration in text quality and the possible change in the overall topic(s) of the paraphrased text.
- *LLM Paraphrasing:* The attacker generates a watermarked text sequence by feeding the LLM an input prompt. The attacker does not manually alter any tokens in the output. Instead, the attacker subsequently supplies the watermarked output into the identical LLM which originally produced it, along with a paraphrase command

(i.e., “Rephrase this text:”). The proposed watermarking scheme is robust against paraphrasing using the original LLM due to the nature of topics that form the basis of the watermarked output. For instance, if the attacker’s initial prompt leads to an output with the topic of “sports”, any paraphrased output would maintain the same topic, ensuring the watermark can still be generated and detected.

3.1.3 Tokenization Attack. A tokenization attack is classified as a form of insertion where a single token is modified into multiple subsequent tokens. For example, given the token “sports” within a G list of usable tokens. An attacker can insert characters such as (‘_’) or (“*”) within the token, causing it to split into multiple sub-tokens. The original G -listed token “sports” could be manipulated into “s_p_o_r_t_s”, generating multiple new R -listed tokens in the text sequence. The robustness of the proposed topic-based watermarking scheme is challenged by the degradation in text quality due to the intentional insertion of noise (unwanted characters) within tokens in the G list.

3.1.4 Discrete Alterations. An attacker’s motivation behind this attack is to induce alterations in tokens, subsequently introducing misspelling and grammar errors. These manipulations can be executed through insertion or deletion of single or multiple characters, or entire strings of characters within the target text. We consider an attacker which seeks to undermine the integrity of a watermarked text sequence without completely altering the text. By inserting or deleting characters within certain tokens, the attacker can modify the text to introduce minor errors which impact the detectability of the watermark. For example, altering the word “watermarked” to “wat3rmark3d” through character substitution, introducing misspelling by complicating the process of watermark recognition. The proposed topic-based watermark addresses current watermarking algorithm limitations through the implementation of the generalized topic scheme. Even in the presence of minor spelling or grammatical errors, the overarching topic of the output remains unaffected. This ensures that the watermark’s integrity is maintained, showcasing the robustness of the proposed approach against textual alterations.

3.2 Proposed Watermarking Scheme

This section describes the proposed watermarking scheme which leverages topic extractions from either a non-watermarked LLM output or directly from the user’s input prompt. Our method focuses on generating robust, topic-based G and R lists to create the watermarked outputs. By employing these lists, the scheme ensures both the accuracy of the extracted topic(s) and the watermark against malicious manipulation of the target text. The following outlines the three main steps of the watermarking process including extraction of topics, G and R list generation, and the watermarking of the output text itself.

3.2.1 Topic Extraction from Non-Watermarked Output. The proposed method for topic extraction employs a non-watermarked LLM output. This process initiates with the user providing an input prompt to the LLM, which then generates a non-watermarked output text sequence. This output serves as the basis for extracting topics relevant to the user’s input, as described in Figure 1.

Furthermore, the non-watermarked output is fed back into the LLM along with a command to rephrase the text, such as “rephrase this text.” Both the original non-watermarked output and the adjustments in token weights, derived from the extracted topics, are used within the watermarked LLM to generate a watermark on the final output text sequence. A secret key is employed at this stage to influence the creation of the G and R list pairs. These lists are generated using on a pseudorandom function that incorporates a secret key, ensuring the watermarking scheme remains unpredictable and more robust against unauthorized detection.




Fig. 1. Overview of the topic-based watermarking scheme using non-watermarked LLM outputs. The input prompt is passed to the non-watermarked LLM to extract the topic(s) of interest. Utilizing the topic(s), token weights are adjusted for the watermarked LLM with the rephrased original non-watermarked output.

The utilization of the non-watermarked output over the input text sequence helps extract accurate topics when (i) the input prompt is brief, consisting of only a few words to a sentence in length, or (ii) when the input contains misspellings and grammatical errors. The non-watermarked LLM output provides a sufficient amount of quality text, enabling the accurate identification of topics which align with the user’s input prompt. Additionally, the watermarking scheme can extract multiple topics from a single input sequence. For instance, if the input asks about medical injuries in various types of sports, the non-watermarked output might generalize these topics as “sports” and “medical injuries.” However, to maintain model performance and topic extraction quality, given a large non-watermarked output (e.g., multiple paragraphs of text), the topic extraction process may iterate over all sentences to analyze for relevant topics and skip those not strongly related to specified topics.

The extracted topic or combination of topics is then used to generate seeds and G and R list pairs, based on the number of topics identified. The G and R list pairs are then used to adjust the token weights for the watermarked LLM, in combination with the original non-watermarked LLM-generated output that was used for topic extraction.

Finally, the watermarked LLM utilizes the non-watermarked output text sequence with the rephrase command, to correctly sample from the generated G list for each topic. Similar to the watermarking algorithm proposed by Kirchenbauer et al. [10], we sample tokens from the G list to generate an output sequence from the original input prompt.

3.2.2 Topic Extraction from Input Text Sequence. In a similar process, we consider an alternative method for topic extraction, which involves extracting topics directly from the user’s input prompt. This approach is feasible when the input prompt is free from spelling and grammatical errors and provides enough content to accurately identify and extract multiple topics. In this scenario, the non-watermarked LLM is bypassed, and the input prompt serves as the direct input for the watermarked LLM. The input prompt, along with the adjustments in token weights derived from the extracted topics, is then utilized within the watermarked LLM to produce a watermarked output text sequence.

The method for generating G and R list pairs based on the extracted topics remains consistent across both the non-watermarked and input prompt-based topic extraction approaches, with the primary difference being the source of

the topics. In our evaluation, we focus on the non-watermarked scenario, operating under the assumption that if a user is capable of providing a sufficiently detailed input, they would not need to avoid the watermarking system.

3.3 Watermarking Detection

Existing watermarking algorithms that rely on the G and R list pair methodology focus on the occurrence of G and R tokens within the target text (human- or LLM-generated output text). The detection method evaluates the frequency of R list violations within the target text. Human-generated text typically contains a higher frequency of R listed tokens, resulting in fewer instances of G listed tokens. Conversely, watermarked LLM-generated text exhibits significantly more G listed tokens over R listed tokens. Kirchenbauer et al. [10] demonstrated the low probability of a human-generated text sequence aligning with G listed tokens in the same way as a watermarked LLM-generated output.




Fig. 2. Detection mechanism of topic-based watermarking scheme. Token list pairs, generated from the extracted topics of the non-watermarked LLM output, are compared to the output text sequence of the watermarked LLM to determine the classification of the target text as human- or LLM-generated.

The proposed topic-based detection framework, illustrated in Figure 2, builds on the G and R token list pair approach but introduces a novel mechanism classifying text as either human- or LLM-generated via topic extraction. This method involves extracting and analyzing the topics present in the non-watermarked LLM output sequence. The detection process creates specific G and R list pairs for each identified topic, enabling the detection mechanism to iterate through all list pairs per topic for accurate classification. Upon receiving a non-watermarked LLM output sequence, the detection framework identifies one or more topics present in the input text utilizing topic modeling techniques such as Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) or LLM prompting (e.g., instructing a model to “find n topics in this text”) [14]. For each identified topic, the framework generates corresponding G and R lists and quantifies the occurrence of tokens from these lists within the text. Based on the distribution of G and R tokens across multiple topics within the input text sequence, hypothesis testing is employed to classify the target text. The specific statistical tests used depend on the distribution characteristics of the token occurrences, aiming to evaluate the confidence level in determining whether the target text is human- or LLM-generated.

Kirchenbauer et al. [10] utilized a “one portion z-test” for evaluating the G list of tokens, with the total number of tokens in the text T , the count of G tokens in the text, and expected distribution of G tokens γ . The overall z-score is denoted as:

$$z_score = \frac{G - \frac{T}{\gamma}}{\sqrt{\frac{T}{\gamma} * (1 - \gamma)}} \quad (1)$$

This test will be evaluated in our proposed detection scheme. The topic-based approach allows for more generalized analysis of the target text, which accommodates the multi-topic text sequences and provides a workflow to ensure the accuracy and robustness of the watermarking scheme.

4 EXPERIMENTS

4.1 Experimental Setup

4.1.1 Evaluation. We employ the z-score, as defined by Equation 1, to evaluate the degradation rate of the watermark for baseline attacks, discrete alterations, and tokenization attacks, assessing whether it falls below the threshold classified from “watermarked” to “human-generated.” For paraphrasing attacks, the z-score is also utilized to determine the effectiveness of the watermark after complete rephrasing. Our evaluations compare our topic-based watermarking scheme against the original algorithm proposed by Kirchenbauer et al. [10]. In both cases, the total number of tokens in the watermarked text T remains constant at 199 tokens. According to the experiments of the original watermarking algorithm [10], the parameters are set with $\gamma = 0.25$ and bias from G at 2.0. In our scheme, the bias remains fixed (2.0), but γ is adjusted based on the total number of tokens in the evaluated LLM vocabulary V and the number of pre-defined topic mappings M . The adjustment of γ varies to ensure equal token allocation per topic for the given M . γ is calculated as:

$$\gamma = \frac{V}{M} \quad (2)$$

For our experiments, we have defined five topics, each assigned an equal number of tokens from the entire LLM vocabulary V .

Table 1. Prompt Lengths for Each Topic

Topic	Prompt Length
Sports	229
Technology	212
Animals	241
Music	184
Medicine	188

4.1.2 Watermarking for Confidence. To evaluate the general efficacy of our watermarking scheme, we tested watermarking capabilities across specific topics. We assessed prompts related to main detected topics and their respective word lengths described in Table 1. We utilize the open-source *facebook/opt-1.3b* model [24], imposing a generation constraint of 200 additional tokens beyond the main context. The same model is also employed to determine the overall topic of the input prompt to ensure consistency in the generation and detection phases of our watermarking scheme. We measured the performance of our scheme by confidence C , the difference between 1.0 and the specified p-value if the z-score exceeds the established z-threshold of 4.0 described as:

$$C = \begin{cases} 1.0 - \text{p-value,} & \text{if z-score} > \text{z-threshold} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

4.1.3 Watermarking for Attack Methods. In continuation on our evaluation of watermarking confidence, we assume that the user provides sufficient text to identify a topic. Using “sports” as an example, we start with the initial prompt length of 229 words and add a constraint of 200 additional tokens for generation. We assessed both a random watermarking scenario, where the attacker is unaware of the watermark’s existence, and an inferred watermarking scenario, where

the attacker is aware that the LLM has a watermarking scheme. These evaluations cover the various attack methods of our threat model (see Section 3.1):

- **Baseline Attacks:** We evaluated the impact of increasing modifications through insertion, deletion, substitution, and combinations of these techniques, focusing on whether key words such as nouns, verbs, and adjectives are modified. The number of modifications range from 0 to 50 (25% of the total output).
- **Discrete Alterations:** These modifications involve the addition of random lowercase letters (e.g., a-z), under both random and inferred watermarking scenarios. To maintain consistency with the evaluation of baseline attacks, discrete alterations are assessed with modifications ranging from 0 to 50 over the entire output.
- **Tokenization Attacks:** Under the same scenarios as baseline attacks and discrete alterations, we consider tokenization examples such as “s_p_o_r_t_s” for tokenization.
- **Paraphrasing Attacks:** The effectiveness of generalized rephrasing commands, such as “rephrase this text” is analyzed, along with the impact of correctly and incorrectly detected topic rephrasing commands (e.g., “rephrase this text tailored to the topic of ‘sports’”). The possible scenarios include:
 - * Generic rephrase command.
 - * A rephrase command tailoring to the correctly defined detected topic.
 - * A rephrase command tailoring to a relevant but different detected topic (e.g., inferring “health” instead of “sports”).
 - * A rephrase command tailoring to an incorrectly detected topic (e.g., misidentifying “sports” as “technology”).

To determine the most robust watermarking method between the original and our topic-based approach, we set the z-threshold to 2.5 to evaluate where each method succeeds or fails with confidence.

4.2 Experiment Results

4.2.1 *Topic-Based Watermark Confidence.* Table 2 details the z-scores and detection confidence from the watermarked text given a specified topic, utilizing a z-score detection threshold of 4.0. Our topic-based watermarking scheme significantly exceeds this threshold, achieving high confidence rates of approximately 99.99%. This higher z-score allows for an elevated detection threshold, reducing the number of false positives (i.e., texts misclassified as human-generated when they are watermarked).

Prompt Topic	Tokens Counted	# Tokens in G	Tokens in G(%)	z-score	p-value	Confidence
Sports	199	157	78.9%	11.30	9.18e-30	~99.99%
Technology	199	146	73.4%	9.68	1.88e-22	~99.99%
Animals	199	146	73.4%	9.68	1.88e-22	~99.99%
Music	199	144	72.4%	9.39	3.07e-21	~99.99%
Medicine	199	140	70.4%	8.81	6.35e-19	~99.99%

Table 2. Confidence levels of our topic-based watermarking scheme for various detected topics with a z-score detection threshold of 4.0.

4.2.2 *Baseline, Discrete Alterations, and Tokenization Attacks.* Figure 3 compares our topic-based watermarking scheme against the original algorithm proposed by Kirchenbauer et al. [10] across baseline attacks, discrete alterations, and tokenization attacks. The evaluation of baseline attacks is illustrated in Figure 3(a) for our topic-based watermarking scheme, and in 3(d) for the original scheme. Our proposed approach demonstrates an increase of 4.0 in z-scores compared




Fig. 3. Z-score plots showing the impact of varying percentages of text modifications (from 0% to 25%) on attack detection for baseline attacks, discrete alterations, and tokenization attacks, comparing the topic-based (proposed) watermarking method with the original scheme. The topic-based method consistently achieves significantly higher z-scores across all attack types, highlighting its robustness compared to the original watermark.

to the original. A similar improvement is observed for discrete alterations, as shown in Figures 3(b) and 3(e) for the topic-based and original schemes, respectively.

The tokenization attack evaluations, shown in Figures 3(c) and 3(f), also show an increase in z-score for our model. However, the maximum z-score obtained is slightly lower than those for baseline attacks and discrete alterations. While our approach maintains robustness against tokenization attacks as the percentage of modifications increase, the comparatively lower z-score suggests that our scheme may be more susceptible to tokenization attacks than to baseline and discrete alterations.

Overall, our scheme consistently achieves higher z-scores across all direct manipulation threat models, allowing for the use of a higher z-score detection threshold to reduce the false positive rate in classification. As the percentage of modifications to the watermarked text increases, the z-score naturally decreases. We restrict our evaluation to modifications up to 25% because beyond this point, the cost of the attack in terms of text degradation becomes prohibitive, where the more modifications that are made to coherent text, the less intelligible it becomes [10].

4.2.3 Paraphrasing Attacks. We further present a comparison in Table 3 of paraphrasing attacks using various prompts, both generic and tailored to specific topics, at a z-score detection threshold of 2.5. Both watermarking schemes incorrectly classify texts under the generic and inferred watermarking scenarios with incorrect topic rephrasing. However, it is unlikely that an attacker would want to change the text topic this significantly, as this could degrade its relevance, illustrated by a hypothetical scenario where a student must write a paper on “sports” and incorrectly prompts the LLM to change the topic. This risk extends to the generic rephrasing process where the topic is more likely to shift.

Paraphrasing Type	$G/T(\%)$		z-score		p-value		Confidence	
	Proposed	Original	Proposed	Original	Proposed	Original	Proposed	Original
Unmodified Text	78.9%	47.2%	11.30	7.24	9.18e-30	2.18e-13	~99.99%	~99.99%
Generic	50.0%	30.0%	1.98	1.1	0.0239	0.137	Human	Human
Infer Correct Topic	53.6%	34.5%	2.58	2.02	4.93e-03	0.0363	~99.51%	Human
Infer Similar Topic	54.5%	38.6%	2.83	2.95	2.34e-03	0.0205	~99.77%	~97.95%
Infer Incorrect Topic	46.2%	29.0%	1.27	0.898	0.102	4.25e-03	Human	Human

Table 3. Detection results against paraphrasing attacks for the topic-based (proposed) and original watermarking schemes, with a z-score detection threshold of 2.5. $G/T(\%)$ denotes the ratio of G tokens given the number of tokens in the watermarked text T as a percentage. “Human” denotes a misclassification as human-generated, with no confidence. Our topic-based scheme shows higher z-scores and confidence, especially in detecting correct and similar topic rephrasing, proving more robust than the original scheme.

Our model robustly handles correct topic rephrasing and similar topic rephrasing, whereas the original watermarking scheme only succeeds effectively with similar topic rephrasing.

5 LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE WORK

5.0.1 Trade-offs in List Pair Granularity. The proposed watermarking scheme is designed to facilitate the generation of G and R list pairs, dependent on the number of categories allocated for the topic-based watermarking. The anticipated trade-off to consider is between the granularity of these list pairs and the quality of the LLM’s output. For instance, if an input prompt is categorized under “sports” and is without a comprehensive list for that specific topic, the quality of the LLM’s output may be compromised. The refinement of this trade-off, while beneficial for enhancing the specificity of the text output, it also increases the model’s sensitivity to the accuracy of topic prediction. This sensitivity could potentially lower the threshold for adversaries to exploit the LLM, allowing them to bypass the watermarking scheme or produce false output sequences. The limitation lies in achieving an optimal balance that maintains the integrity of the watermarking framework while mitigating the risk of manipulation, which could compromise the model’s effectiveness.

5.0.2 Vulnerabilities to Spoofing Attacks. It is important to acknowledge the potential threat posed by spoofing attacks, which can significantly impact the privacy and security of watermarked LLMs. Spoofing attacks deceive either the LLM or its users into believing that a given text output originates from a different source (i.e., a different LLM). Previous research has highlighted the susceptibility of LLMs to such attacks. For instance, Sadasivan et al. [19], explored how attackers could generate misleading or harmful outputs by deducing text signatures without access to the detection mechanisms. Similarly, Pang et al. [16] examined how attackers could fabricate outputs that falsely appear watermarked, potentially damaging the reputation the LLM or its developers.

5.0.3 Limitations with Paraphrasing and Generative Attacks. The robustness of our proposed topic-based watermarking scheme against certain attacks remains a notable limitation [10, 16]. Specifically, the scheme is vulnerable to more complex paraphrasing attacks, such as Multi-Model Collusion Attacks, where the attacker solicits outputs to the same prompt from several LLMs, aiming to blend multiple responses into a single output. While the watermarking scheme maintains robustness against paraphrasing attacks that use correct topics, the use of multiple LLMs for paraphrasing increases its complexity. The current scheme only supports one model during both the generation and detection phases, which limits its effectiveness.

Additionally, our scheme is susceptible to generative attacks, where the attacker prompts the model to alter its output in a predictable but reversible way, corrupting the G and R lists by randomizing subsequent token associations.

An example of a generative attack is the emoji attack [4], where an LLM is prompted to generate emojis in place of whitespaces. Once generation is complete, the emojis are replaced with whitespaces, and if fed into the watermarked detection scheme, we anticipate an incorrect classification of human-generated text due to the randomization of tokens associations for the G and R lists.

6 CONCLUSION

In this work, we propose a novel topic-based watermarking scheme that utilizes pairs of “green” and “red” lists generated based on the topic of the input text prompt for an LLM. This method was specifically developed to address and overcome the shortcomings of existing watermarking algorithms, notably their lack of robustness against known threat models. Our results demonstrate that our scheme surpasses current watermarking algorithms by achieving higher z-score detection thresholds, which significantly decreases the rate of false positives in differentiating between human-generated and LLM-generated texts. Our model has proven robust against a variety of known attacks, making it a substantial improvement over traditional methods, however future work will focus on further expanding the robustness of our watermarking scheme. We aim to adapt and refine our methodology to counter more complex attacks and to enhance the granularity of topics. With the strides generative AI has taken in recent years, by continuing to enhance watermarking capabilities, we can ensure that LLMs can be utilized safely and reliably across different domains and applications.

REFERENCES

- [1] Miranda Christ, Sam Gunn, and Or Zamir. 2023. Undetectable Watermarks for Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.09194* (2023). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2306.09194>
- [2] Saeed Dehqan. 2020. *Exploring Token Generation Strategies*. <https://www.packtpub.com/article-hub/exploring-token-generation-strategies>
- [3] Andrea Galassi, Marco Lippi, and Paolo Torrioni. 2019. Attention, please! A Critical Review of Neural Attention Models in Natural Language Processing. *CoRR* abs/1902.02181 (2019). arXiv:1902.02181 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1902.02181>
- [4] Riley Goodside. 2023. *There are adversarial attacks for that proposal as well — in particular, generating with emojis after words and then removing them before submitting defeats it*. <https://x.com/goodside/status/1610682909647671306>
- [5] Shreya Goyal, Sumanth Doddapaneni, Mitesh M. Khapra, and Balaraman Ravindran. 2023. A Survey of Adversarial Defences and Robustness in NLP. arXiv:2203.06414 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.06414>
- [6] Tianxi Ji, Erman Ayday, Emre Yilmaz, and Pan Li. 2022. Robust fingerprinting of genomic databases. *Bioinformatics* 38, Supplement 1 (06 2022), i143–i152. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btac243>
- [7] Tianxi Ji, Erman Ayday, Emre Yilmaz, and Pan Li. 2023. Towards Robust Fingerprinting of Relational Databases by Mitigating Correlation Attacks. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing* 20, 4 (2023), 2939–2953. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TDSC.2022.3191117>
- [8] Yuzhou Jiang, Emre Yilmaz, and Erman Ayday. 2022. Robust Fingerprint of Location Trajectories Under Differential Privacy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.04792* (2022). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2204.04792>
- [9] Dinesh Kalla and Sivaraju Kuraku. 2023. Advantages, Disadvantages and Risks associated with ChatGPT and AI on Cybersecurity. (10 2023). <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.jetir.JETIR2310612>
- [10] John Kirchenbauer, Jonas Geiping, Yuxin Wen, Jonathan Katz, Ian Miers, and Tom Goldstein. 2024. A Watermark for Large Language Models. arXiv:2301.10226 [cs.LG] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.10226>
- [11] Shen Li, Liuyi Yao, Jinyang Gao, Lan Zhang, and Li Yaliang. 2024. Double-I Watermark: Protecting Model Copyright for LLM Fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.14883* (2024). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2402.14883>
- [12] Aiwei Liu, Leyi Pan, Xuming Hu, Shu’ang Li, Lijie Wen, Irwin King, and Philip S. Yu. 2023. An Unforgeable Publicly Verifiable Watermark for Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.16230* (2023). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2307.16230>
- [13] Aiwei Liu, Leyi Pan, Xuming Hu, Shiao Meng, and Lijie Wen. 2024. A Semantic Invariant Robust Watermark for Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06356* (2024). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2310.06356>
- [14] Madhurima Nath. 2023. Topic modeling algorithms. *Medium* (2023). <https://medium.com/@m.nath/topic-modeling-algorithms-b7f97cec6005#:~:text=The%20most%20established%20go%2Dto,model%20which%20uses%20matrix%20factorization.>
- [15] OpenAI. 2024. *Chatgpt: Optimizing language models for dialogue*. <https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/>
- [16] Qi Pang, Shengyuan Hu, Wenting Zheng, and Virginia Smith. 2024. Attacking LLM Watermarks by Exploiting Their Strengths. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.16187* (2024). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2402.16187>

- [17] Partha P. Ray. 2023. ChatGPT: A comprehensive review on background, applications, key challenges, bias, ethics, limitations and future scope. *Internet of Things and Cyber-Physical Systems* 3 (2023), 121–154. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iotcps.2023.04.003>
- [18] Matthias C. Rillig, Marlene Ågerstrand, Mohan Bi, Kenneth A. Gould, and Uli Sauerland. 2023. Risks and Benefits of Large Language Models for the Environment. *Environmental Science & Technology* 57, 9 (2023), 3464–3466. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.3c01106>
- [19] Vinu S. Sadasivan, Aounon Kumar, Sriram Balasubramanian, Wenxiao Wang, and Soheil Felzi. 2023. Can AI-Generated Text be Reliably Detected? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.11156* (2023). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2303.11156>
- [20] Victoria Smith, Ali S. Shamsabadi, Carolyn Ashurst, and Adrian Weller. 2023. Identifying and Mitigating Privacy Risks Stemming from Language Models: A Survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01424* (2023). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2310.01424>
- [21] Siddarth Srinivasan. 2024. *Detecting AI fingerprints: A guide to watermarking and beyond*. <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/detecting-ai-fingerprints-a-guide-to-watermarking-and-beyond/>
- [22] Ruixiang Tang, Yu-Neng Chuang, and Xia Hu. 2023. The Science of Detecting LLM-Generated Texts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.07205* (2023). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2303.07205>
- [23] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention Is All You Need. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.03762* (2017). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1706.03762>
- [24] Susan Zhang, Stephen Roller, Naman Goyal, Mikel Artetxe, Moya Chen, Shuohui Chen, Christopher Dewan, Mona Diab, Xian Li, Xi Victoria Lin, Todor Mihaylov, Myle Ott, Sam Shleifer, Kurt Shuster, Daniel Simig, Punit Singh Koura, Anjali Sridhar, Tianlu Wang, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2022. OPT: Open Pre-trained Transformer Language Models. *arXiv:2205.01068* [cs.CL]
- [25] Wayne X. Zhao, Kun Zhou, Junyi Li, Tianyi Tang, Xiaolei Wang, Yupeng Hou, Yingqian Min, Beichen Zhang, Junjie Zhang, Zican Dong, Yifan Du, Chen Yang, Yushuo Chen, Zhipeng Chen, Jinhao Jiang, Ruiyang Ren, Yifan Li, Xinyu Tang, Zikang Liu, Peiyu Liu, Jian-Yun Nie, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2023. A Survey of Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.18223v13* (2023). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2303.18223>
- [26] Xuandong Zhao, Prabhanjan Ananth, Lei Li, and Yu-Xiang Wang. 2023. Provable Robust Watermarking for AI-Generated Text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.17439* (2023). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2306.17439>